

## **Title page**

### **Title**

The use of facemasks by the general population to prevent transmission of Covid 19 infection: A systematic review.

### **Subtitle**

A systematic review on use of face mask to prevent Covid 19 infection.

### **Authors**

Madhu Gupta<sup>1</sup>, Khushi Gupta<sup>2</sup>, Sarika Gupta<sup>3</sup>

### **Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>Professor of Community Medicine

Department of Community Medicine and School of Public Health

Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research (PGIMER)

Chandigarh 160 012, India

Tel +91 172 2755223

Mobile +91 7087008223;+917009769629

Fax +91 172 2744401

Email:madhugupta21@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Student Grade 11 IB ,

The Shri Ram School ,

V-37 Mousari Avenue ,

DLF phase 3

Gurugram -122002

Mob - 9810320677

Email- [khushi.gupta0716@gmail.com](mailto:khushi.gupta0716@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Chief radiologist

Saral Diagnostic center

2, Shakti Vihar, Pitampura

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

New Delhi 110034

Tel - 01147111110

Mob -9871270677

Email - [drsarikarajan@gmail.com](mailto:drsarikarajan@gmail.com)

### **Corresponding Author**

Dr Madhu Gupta

Professor of Community Medicine

Department of Community Medicine and School of Public Health

Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research (PGIMER)

Chandigarh 160 012, India

Tel +91 172 2755223

Mobile +91 7087008223; +917009769629

Fax +91 172 2744401

Email:madhugupta21@gmail.com

### **Conflict of Interest**

None declared

### **Financial Conflicts**

None declared

### **Source of Funding**

None

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

The pandemic of COVID-19, caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has become a serious worldwide public health emergency. This systematic review aims to summarize the available evidence regarding the role of face mask in community settings in slowing the spread of respiratory viruses such as SARS-CoV-2.

### **Methods**

The preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines were used for this review. Literature search using PUBMED, Google Scholar and Cochrane database was performed using Medical subject heading (MeSH) words from the year 2000-2020. The articles focused on the use of masks and N95 respirators in healthcare workers were excluded.

### **Results**

A total of 305 records were identified, out of which 14 articles were included in the review based upon quality and eligibility criteria. All the articles mentioned about role of face masks in preventing the spread of respiratory viruses like influenza, SARS and SARS-CoV-2, in the community or experimental setting. Studies also suggested that early initiation of face mask usage was more effective. Masks were also reported to be more effective in viruses which transmit easily from asymptomatic individuals, as is now known in SARS-CoV-2.

### **Conclusion**

Theoretical, experimental and clinical evidence suggested that usage of face masks in general population offered significant benefit in preventing the spread of respiratory viruses especially in the pandemic situation, but its utility is limited by inconsistent adherence to mask usage.

## **Key words**

Covid 19, face mask, pandemic, systematic review

## **Main text**

### **The use of facemasks by the general population to prevent transmission of Covid 19 infection: A systematic literature review.**

#### **Introduction**

The ongoing pandemic of coronavirus (COVID-19), caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS- CoV-2) has become a serious worldwide public health emergency. The number of infected patients is increasing exponentially with every passing day with over two million cases reported worldwide. In the absence of clearly defined therapeutic agents and vaccines, the mitigation of the pandemic and “flattening the curve” is primarily being attempted by nonpharmaceutical interventions, like social distancing and hand hygiene. The usage of face masks in the general population has been a controversial subject as the WHO and most European guidelines did not support the use of facemasks by healthy people in the community. WHO guidelines recommend the use of facemasks only for healthcare workers, symptomatic people and their caregivers<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, few countries like Japan and Hong Kong have recommended the use of masks by the general population<sup>2,3</sup>. These countries have also been relatively more successful in reducing the spread of the infection, better than Europe and USA. In view of these conflicting guidelines, we conducted a systematic literature review to assess the utility of facemasks in the general population for reducing the spread of respiratory viruses like COVID 19, especially in the setting of a pandemic.

#### **Material and methods**

A systematic review of published literature from the year 2000-2020 was done, to estimate the effectiveness of face masks (surgical/cloth) in community settings, in reducing the spread of respiratory viruses. The preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta analysis (PRISMA) guidelines were used for the review. The publications chosen for this study included randomized control trials, non randomized experimental studies

and observational studies. The articles excluded from the study were the ones that focused on the use of masks and N95 respirators in healthcare workers.

### **Literature search in data sources**

Pubmed and Cochrane databases were used for searching the literature, using the following MeSH words - *'face masks'* or *'masks'* or *'surgical masks'* or *'cloth masks'* and *'respiratory infection'* or *'respiratory virus'* or *'influenza'* or *'SARS'* or *'Subacute respiratory syndrome'* and *'COVID 19'* or *'coronavirus'*, *'influenza pandemic'* and *'community'* or *'household'*. We used an open date strategy up to April 2020. Considering that studies published in local journals might not be indexed on fore-mentioned databases, we made an additional search on Google Scholar using the same keywords. We set a limit of 30 results per combination of search words ranked on the basis of 'Relevance'.

### **Screening**

The article titles, abstracts and summary of all the studies were screened for potential inclusion in this review. The authors then reviewed the full text versions of the selected articles to determine inclusion. Those that did not focus on use of masks for respiratory infections by healthy individuals in household or community settings were excluded to arrive at the final list. The full texts of these articles were then studied independently by three investigators.

### **Data extraction and analysis**

The data from the articles was extracted by the authors, the key points were assessed and noted from each selected article. Because the designs of these studies, nature of participants, interventions and reported outcome measures varied significantly, we focused on describing the studies, their results and their limitations and on qualitative assessment rather than meta-analysis. The findings from the key experimental articles were then tabulated and summarized.

## Results

A total of 305 records were identified through appropriate databases; 53 were removed as they were duplicates and 145 were removed after the readers screened through the title and abstract. Full texts of the remaining 107 articles were read and 76 were removed on the basis of pre-defined exclusion criteria. Seventeen of the remaining 31 articles were excluded due to quality issues leaving a final 14 studies in this review. (Figure 1).

**Insert Figure 1 here.**

### **Figure 1. Flow Diagram for Search Strategy:**

The summary of the studies reviewed in this review is given in table 1, and described below:

#### **Experimental studies**

##### *Randomized controlled trials*

Seven randomized controlled or cluster randomized trials were done in community settings. A trial conducted amongst 509 primarily Hispanic households found that mask wearing was associated with reduced secondary transmission of respiratory viruses / influenza-like illness/ laboratory-confirmed influenza and should be encouraged during outbreak situations. Use of hand sanitizer alone resulted in no significant reduction in the outcome. The masks used were regular surgical masks and not National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health certified N95 respirators.<sup>4</sup> Another randomized intervention trial was conducted amongst 1437 young adults, living in university residence halls during the 2006–2007 influenza season. The authors found a significant reduction in the rate of Influenza like Illness (ILI) among participants randomized to the face mask and hand hygiene intervention during the latter half of this study, ranging from 35% to 51% when compared with a control group that did not use face masks.<sup>5</sup> There was another prospective, cluster-randomized trial of mask use in households, conducted during the 2 winter seasons of 2006 and 2007 in Sydney, Australia.

The key findings of this study were that <50% of participants were adherent with mask use. However, adherent mask users (P2 or surgical) in the study showed a relative reduction in the daily risk of acquiring a respiratory infection in the range of 60%–80%<sup>6</sup>. A randomized control trial done in Berlin, Germany in 2009-2011 showed encouraging results with early implementation of face mask use and hand hygiene in preventing spread of influenza in households<sup>7</sup>. Three other randomized mask intervention studies done in Bangkok and Hong Kong, reported no significant reduction in secondary transmission of ILI.<sup>8,9,10</sup>

#### *Non Randomized controlled trials*

Van der saande et al, (2008), conducted experiments with healthy volunteers to assess short-term and long-term protection provided by different types of masks worn during 10–15 minutes by the same volunteer following a standardized protocol. Inward protection was defined as the effect of mask wearing to protect the wearer from the environment; outward protection was defined as the effect of a mask on protecting the environment from the generation of airborne particles by a patient (or in this case a mechanical head).<sup>13</sup> The study result revealed that all types of masks provided protection against transmission by reducing exposure during all types of activities. The inward protection of a cloth mask was approximately 2.5 times more than no mask. Surgical masks provided about twice as much protection as homemade masks. In the final experiment, they also assessed the effectiveness of different types of masks in providing outward protection or reducing outgoing transmission from an infectious subject shedding aerosolized particle. This was simulated by fitting the different types of masks to an artificial test head, which was connected to PC-driven respirator. The home-made masks only provided marginal protection, compared with no mask. The outward protection offered by a surgical mask and a FFP2 (European equivalent of N95 mask) was only 2-3 times, compared to a no mask state.<sup>13</sup>

Johnson et al, (2009), did an experimental study to test the performance of surgical and N95 masks to filter influenza virus in nine volunteers with confirmed influenza A or B virus infection. Participants coughed five times onto a Petri dish containing viral transport medium



held 20 cm in front of their mouth.<sup>14</sup> The experiment was repeated with subjects wearing a surgical mask, and wearing an N95 respirator. While influenza virus could be detected by RT-PCR in all nine volunteers without a mask, no influenza virus could be detected on the Petri dish specimens when participants wore either type of face mask. A limitation was that the study did not consider the role of leakage around the sides of the mask.<sup>14</sup> A study done by Lai et al, (2012), showed that wearing a mask reduces exposure to air borne disease by an average of 45%.<sup>15</sup> The degree of protection varies between 33-100% depending on the fit of the mask and variables of transmissibility of the infectious agent.<sup>15</sup>

### **Observational studies**

A matched case-control study was done during the Beijing outbreak of SARS in 2003, among a sample of patients who had no reported contact with other SARS patients. This observational study concluded that people who always wore masks had a 70% lower risk of being diagnosed with clinical SARS compared with those who never wore masks, and persons with intermittent mask use had a 60% lower risk.<sup>11</sup>

Another observational study suggested that , during the height of the SARS epidemic of April and May 2003 in Hong Kong, adherence to infection control measures was high with 76% of the population wearing a face mask The authors found that distributing masks during seasonal winter influenza outbreaks is an ineffective control measure characterized by low adherence, results indicate the potential efficacy of masks in contexts where a larger adherence may be expected, such as during a severe influenza pandemic or other emerging infection.<sup>12</sup>

### **Mathematical models**

Mathematical models were not collected in a tabular form. Mathematical models have been used to analyze the effectiveness of facemasks in reducing the spread of novel influenza A (H1N1) virus.<sup>16</sup> The model in this study is a Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered

(SEIR) model. The conclusion of this study was that the effectiveness of surgical masks is low and therefore the impact of wearing them during an epidemic is not significant. Even at 50% effectiveness in reducing both susceptibility and infectivity and with 50% of the population wearing surgical masks only a 6% reduction in the number of cumulative cases is seen. However, a large proportion of infections are asymptomatic, therefore another mathematical model was studied, by introducing the asymptomatic class to the SEIR model. An improved model (SEIAR)<sup>17</sup> was studied to analyze the influence of wearing masks on the final size and the basic reproduction number of H1N1. This model shows that, in the absence of facemasks wearing, the cumulative number of infections will be 73%. To demonstrate the effect of the asymptomatic class in the model, numerical simulations of the model were studied presuming that 10%, 25% and 50% of the population wear them under various levels of effectiveness of masks in reducing susceptibility and infectivity. The more effective the masks are and the more they are worn, the more quickly final size will be decreased. In detail, when the proportion of people wearing facemasks is 10%, 25%, and 50%, the final size of H1N1 infections will be reduced by 17%, 28%, and 35%, respectively. Wearing masks can effectively decrease the final size of the infected population. When influenza outbreaks occur, it is almost ineffective to wear facemasks only for infected individuals. In order to effectively reduce infection, all people need to wear facemasks. There is no significant reduction of the final size if only infected individuals wear facemasks. It is important for susceptible, exposed, symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals to wear facemasks and there is a 70% reduction in the final size.

## **Discussion**

The protective effect of facemasks is determined by the transmission blocking potential of the mask material and the degree of adherence to proper wearing of masks. It also depends on the transmission characteristics of the virus. Most of the studies we reviewed were based on transmission of influenza and influenza like illnesses with few observational studies about the SARS virus. Our study was focused on the usage of surgical/cloth masks in the general population setting.

Experimental studies establish varying degrees of outward protection of masks, indicating that masks worn by infectious subjects (both symptomatic and asymptomatic) will reduce the transmission of infection in the population. The study by van Der Sande et al (2008)<sup>13</sup>, elucidates that masks offer better inward protection than outward protection. Unlike the current guidelines by most countries which assert more on the usage of masks by symptomatic people, the protective effect of masking of healthy individuals in a population has been underscored.

Three of the randomized controlled studies done in community setting suggested significant benefit of face mask usage in reducing the transmission of influenza like illness. None of these studies was however done on a large population. There were no randomized controlled trials done on a larger population for mask usage. Two critical points were also observed in these trials. The benefit of mask usage by the community depends on the time of initiation of usage of masks and the degree of adherence to it. There was much greater advantage when mask usage was started early i.e. right at the beginning of a community infection outbreak, compared with later when secondary transmission might have happened, and more household members may already have been infected by the time of mask adoption. A much greater benefit was also seen when higher percentage of population wore masks. According to the health belief model<sup>18</sup>, adherence with preventive measures increases with higher perception of risk and that is expected to significantly increase during a pandemic. The observational studies done mostly during the SARS epidemic give us a better insight into this behavioral aspect. During the height of the SARS epidemic of April and May 2003 in Hong Kong, adherence to infection control measures was high; and nearly 76% of the population wore a face mask.<sup>12</sup> Wearing a mask can also raise awareness of the infection risk and the importance of other non-pharmaceutical measures like more frequent hand-washing and social distancing. A face mask may also reduce contact transmission by preventing wearers from touching their mouths or noses with their hands or other objects potentially contaminated with virus. The limitation though is a false sense of security that can lead to poorer compliance with other methods like hand washing.

The transmission characteristics of a virus also plays an important role. Mask usage is practically the only way to prevent aerosol transmission, which may cause the most severe cases of respiratory infections like influenza and Covid-19. Hand washing and social distancing can largely prevent transmission by contact and droplets, but these methods are much less effective against aerosol transmission. The population mask approach is also more beneficial when a disease gets transmitted by asymptomatic carriers. Many SARS-CoV-2 infections are transmitted by people who are asymptomatic.<sup>19</sup> The length of this asymptomatic period for SARS-CoV-2 infections is estimated to vary from 3-24 days.<sup>20</sup> This characteristic is unique to SARS-CoV-2 vis a vis other respiratory viruses including SARS and may be reason enough for the entire population to mask up.

In conclusion, Facemask usage by the general population is vital in the prevention of a respiratory virus with unique transmission characteristics as the SARS-CoV-2. While the first priority for facemask usage has to be given to healthcare workers, the general population also needs to adopt masks, as soon as possible. In view of the likely paucity of surgical masks, the community can use homemade cloth masks with adequate precautions of hygiene. The home-made masks still confer a significant degree of protection, albeit less strong than surgical masks or N95/ FFP2 masks. Homemade masks however would not suffer from limited supplies. Even if the transmissibility of the virus reduces by a small fraction due to masking, we will be able to reduce the exponential rate at which the virus has been spreading. It may not mitigate the pandemic but significantly 'flatten the curve' and give us more time for the pharmaceutical interventions to take over.

## References

1. *Advice on the Use of Masks in the Community, during Home*. Available at [www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-2019-ncov.pdf](http://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-2019-ncov.pdf). Accessed on 29 January 2020.

2. *Guidelines on Prevention of Coronavirus Disease 2019*. Available at [...www.chp.gov.hk/files/pdf/nid\\_guideline\\_general\\_public\\_en.pdf](http://www.chp.gov.hk/files/pdf/nid_guideline_general_public_en.pdf). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
3. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan. Q & A on coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19): when should I wear a facemask? Available at [https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/kenkou\\_iryou/den\\_gue\\_fever\\_qa\\_00014.html](https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/kenkou_iryou/den_gue_fever_qa_00014.html). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
4. Larson, Elaine L, et al. "Impact of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions on URIs and Influenza in Crowded, Urban Households." *Public Health Reports* (Washington, D.C. : 1974), Association of Schools of Public Health.2010. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2821845/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2821845/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
5. Aiello, Allison E, et al. "Facemasks, Hand Hygiene, and Influenza among Young Adults: a Randomized Intervention Trial." *PloS One*. 2012. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3266257/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3266257/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
6. MacIntyre, C Raina, et al. "Face Mask Use and Control of Respiratory Virus Transmission in Households." *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2662657/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2662657/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
7. Suess T, Remschmidt C, Schink SB, Schweiger B, Nitsche A, Schroeder K et al. The Role of Facemasks and Hand Hygiene in the Prevention of Influenza Transmission in Households: Results from a Cluster Randomised Trial; Berlin, Germany, 2009-2011. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2012;12:6. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3285078/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3285078/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
8. Simmerman JM, Suntarattiwong P, Levy J, Jarman RG, Kaewchana S, Gibbons RV, Cowling BJ et al. Findings from a Household Randomized Controlled Trial of Hand Washing and Face Masks to Reduce Influenza Transmission in Bangkok, Thailand. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses*. 2014; 5(4): 250-257. Available at

[www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4634545/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4634545/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.

9. Cowling, Benjamin J, et al. "Preliminary Findings of a Randomized Trial of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions to Prevent Influenza Transmission in Households." *PloS One*. 2008. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2364646/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2364646/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
10. Cowling, Benjamin J, et al. "Facemasks and Hand Hygiene to Prevent Influenza Transmission in Households: a Cluster Randomized Trial." *Annals of Internal Medicine*, U.S. National Library of Medicine. 2009. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19652172](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19652172). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
11. Wu, Jiang, et al. "Risk Factors for SARS among Persons without Known Contact with SARS Patients, Beijing, China." *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2004. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3322931/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3322931/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
12. Lau, Joseph T F, et al. "SARS Transmission, Risk Factors, and Prevention in Hong Kong." *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3323085/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3323085/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
13. Van Der Sande, Marriane, et al. "Professional and Home-Made Face Masks Reduce Exposure to Respiratory Infections among the General Populatoin." *PloS One*. 2008. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2440799](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2440799). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
14. Johnson, D F, et al. "A Quantitative Assessment of the Efficacy of Surgical and N95 Masks to Filter Influenza Virus in Patients with Acute Influenza Infection." *Clinical Infectious Diseases : an Official Publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*, U.S. National Library of Medicine. 2009. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19522650](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19522650). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
15. Lai, A C K, et al. "Effectiveness of Facemasks to Reduce Exposure Hazards for Airborne Infections among General Populations." *Journal of the Royal Society*,

- Interface, The Royal Society. 2012. Available at [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3306645/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3306645/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
16. Tracht, Samantha M, et al. "Mathematical modeling of the Effectiveness of Facamasks in Reducing the Spread of Novel Influenza A (H1N1)." PloS One, Public Library of Science, 10 Feb. 2010, [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2818714/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2818714/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
17. Cui, Jing'an, et al. "Influence of Asymptomatic Infections for the Effectiveness of Facemasks during Pandemic Influenza." Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering : MBE, U.S. National Library of Medicine, 6 May 2019, [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31499643](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31499643). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
18. Sim, Shin Wei, et al. "The Use of Facemasks to Prevent Respiratory Infection: a Literature Review in the Context of the Health Belief Model." Singapore Medical Journal, Singapore Medical Association, Mar. 2014, [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4293989/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4293989/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
19. Lai, Chih-Cheng, et al. "Asymptomatic Carrier State, Acute Respiratory Disease, and Pneumonia Due to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2): Facts and Myths." Journal of Microbiology, Immunology and Infection, Elsevier, 4 Mar. 2020, [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1684118220300402](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1684118220300402). Accessed on 29 January 2020.
20. Aiello, Allison E, et al. "Facemasks, Hand Hygiene, and Influenza among Young Adults: a Randomized Intervention Trial." PloS One, Public Library of Science, 2012, [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3266257/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3266257/). Accessed on 29 January 2020.

**Table 1. Summary of studies reviewed for use of face masks.**

Author, Year, country	Objectives	Study design	Main findings	Major limitations	Reference
Suess T, et al. 2012 Germany	To study the efficacy, adherence and tolerability of facemasks (M) and intensified hand hygiene (H) to prevent influenza transmission in households Main outcome measure was laboratory confirmed influenza infection in a household contact.	Cluster RCT Households with an influenza positive index case in the absence of further respiratory illness within the preceding 14 days were included Study arms were wearing a facemask and practicing intensified hand hygiene (MH group), wearing facemasks only (M group) and none of the two (control group). Main outcome measure was laboratory confirmed influenza infection in a household contact	The total secondary attack rate was 16% Overall, there was no statistically significant effect of the M and MH interventions on secondary infections upon intention-to treat analysis. Secondary infection in the M and MH groups was significantly lower compared to the control group when analysing only households where intervention was implemented within 36 h after symptom onset of the index case Odds ratios were significantly reduced among participants of the M group In a per-protocol analysis. Results suggested that household transmission of influenza can be reduced by the use of NPI, such as facemasks and intensified hand hygiene, when implemented early and used diligently.	Study design resulted in delays (as long as 3 days) between symptom onset of the index patients and implementation of the intervention. Laboratory testing of household contacts was only conducted for the virus subtype the index patient was infected with. This could have led to an underestimation of secondary cases. Could not determine whether a possible protective effect of wearing facemasks is more attributable to their use by index patients or by household contacts (or both), nor could it say if intensified hand hygiene provides any additional protection.	7
Simmerman JM et al 2010 Thailand	To estimate the efficacy of interventions to promote the use of hand washing alone, and hand	RCT Studied NPIs in households with a febrile, influenza-positive child. Households were	The secondary attack rate was 21.5% & 16.3% secondary cases were asymptomatic. The odds ratios (ORs) for secondary influenza infection were not significantly different in	Not designed to determine exposure risk epidemiologically and influenza virus transmission risk outside the household setting from exposure to ill non-household members Delays in the implementation of the	8



	washing with face mask use to decrease influenza virus transmission in households.	randomized to control, hand washing (HW), or hand washing plus paper surgical face masks (HW + FM) arms. Study nurses conducted home visits within 24 hours of enrollment and on days 3, 7, and 21. Respiratory swabs and serum were collected from all household members and tested for influenza by RT-PCR or serology.	the HW arm or the HW + FM arm. Results suggested that Influenza transmission was not reduced by interventions to promote hand washing and face mask use but authors also suggest that the findings should not be interpreted to conclude that hand washing or face mask use are not potentially useful public health measures to prevent infections other than influenza,	interventions are an inherent flaw in this study design Study was not designed to assess other potentially important parameters such as air flow, air quality, and other environmental factors that may play a role in household influenza transmission	
Elaine L. Larson et al 2010 USA	To compare impact of three household interventions—education, education with alcohol-based hand sanitizer, and education with hand sanitizer and face masks—on incidence and secondary transmission of upper respiratory infections (URIs) and influenza, knowledge of transmission of URIs, and vaccination rates.	Block RCT Households were block randomized into one of three groups: (1) Education group (2) Hand Sanitizer group & (3) Hand Sanitizer and Face Mask group. Households were followed for up to 19 months & deep nasal swabs were obtained from those with influenza-like illness and tested.	Regarding URI, ILI, and influenza episodes, there was a significant decrease in secondary attack rates in the Hand Sanitizer and Face Mask group when compared with the Education group There was no detectable additional benefit of hand sanitizer or face masks over targeted education on overall rates of URIs, but mask wearing was associated with reduced secondary transmission and should be encouraged during outbreak situations. CONCLUSION: Mask wearing is a promising non-pharmaceutical intervention to reduce risk of secondary transmission of viral URI, but it is likely that adherence to mask wearing would occur only	Power of the study to detect differences among groups for influenza was limited. Compliance was extremely low for the Hand Sanitizer and Face Mask group: it was not possible to determine whether the interventions might have been more effective if they had been more consistently practiced.	4

			if there was a major pandemic that resulted in a heightened level of community concern and fear.		
C. Raina MacIntyre et al 2009 Australia	To study of the effectiveness of using face masks to prevent or reduce transmission of influenza like illness (ILI).	Prospective, cluster-RCT of mask use in households was conducted during the 2 winter seasons of 2006 and 2007 Households were randomized to 1) surgical masks, 2) P2 masks 3) a control group (no masks used). Participants who developed respiratory disease symptoms were swabbed and tested for respiratory viruses	<50% of participants were adherent with mask use and that the intention-to-treat analysis showed no difference between arms Study suggests that community use of face masks is unlikely to be an effective control policy for seasonal respiratory diseases but when mask usage was adhered to, there was significant reduction in the risk for clinical infection.	The size of the study did not permit conclusive comparison of the relative efficacy of P2 masks and surgical masks. Some adults may have been incubating infection at the time of enrollment. Some parents may have acquired infection outside the home.	6
Allison E. Aiello 2012 USA	to examine if the use of facemasks and hand hygiene reduced rates of influenza-like illness (ILI) and laboratory-confirmed influenza in the natural setting	Cluster-randomized intervention trial Eligible participants living within university residence halls during the influenza season were assigned to face mask and hand hygiene, face mask only, or control group during the study. Discrete-time survival models using generalized estimating equations to estimate intervention effects on	A significant reduction in the rate of ILI was observed in weeks 3 through 6 of the study, with a maximum reduction of 75% during the final study week. Both intervention groups compared to the control showed cumulative reductions in rates of influenza over the study period, although results did not reach statistical significance. Statistically significant findings were not observed for the face mask only group when compared to the control group Nonpharmaceutical measures	It is possible that transmission of infection occurred outside of the residential environment when masks were not in use. Another limitation was the reliance on self-reported data, which may be susceptible to reporting and recall bias.	5

		ILI and confirmed influenza A/B infection over a 6-week study period were examined.	should be recommended in crowded settings at the start of an influenza pandemic.		
Benjamin J. Cowling 2008 Hong Kong	To study feasibility and efficacy of face masks and hand hygiene to reduce influenza transmission among Hong Kong household members.	Cluster Randomized Trial The households of eligible study index patients were allocated to 3 groups in a 1:1:1 ratio – Lifestyle education (control), hand hygiene, or surgical facemasks plus hand hygiene for all household members. The primary outcome measure was the secondary attack ratio at the individual level. the secondary outcome was clinically diagnosed influenza (by self-reported symptoms).	The laboratory-based or clinical secondary attack ratios did not significantly differ across the intervention arms. Conclusion: serious deficit in the evidence base of the efficacy of non-pharmaceutical interventions.	The study was underpowered. Very low adherence to interventions was observed leading to underestimation of the efficacy of these interventions in a pandemic situation (where adherence is generally high). Design results in an unavoidable delay between onset of symptoms in the index subject and the application of the intervention. The dropout was also higher than expected.	9
Benjamin J. Cowling et al 2009 Hong Kong	To investigate whether hand hygiene and use of facemasks prevents household transmission of influenza.	Cluster Randomized Trial The households of eligible study index patients were allocated to 3 groups in a 1:1:1 ratio – Lifestyle education (control), hand hygiene, or surgical facemasks plus	Hand hygiene with or without facemasks seemed to reduce influenza transmission, but the differences compared with the control group were not significant. When interventions were implemented within 36 hours of symptom onset in the index patient, transmission of RT-PCR–confirmed infection seemed	The delay from index patient symptom onset to intervention and variable adherence may have mitigated intervention effectiveness.	10

		<p>hand hygiene for all household members.</p> <p>The primary outcome measure was the secondary attack ratio at the individual level. An additional secondary outcome measure was the secondary attack ratio at the household (cluster) level: the proportion of households with 1 or more secondary case.</p>	<p>reduced, an effect attributable to fewer infections among participants using facemasks plus hand hygiene</p>		
<p>A. C. K. Lai et al Hong Kong 2011</p>	<p>To measure the protection provided by facemasks against aerosols under realistic expiratory processes and pseudosteady conditions.</p> <p>To investigate the performance of facemasks in providing protection under various environmental conditions and human factors.</p>	<p>To calculate the magnitude of protection provided by the facemasks, experiments were divided into two categories: no facemask wearing and facemask wearing.</p> <p>Six important parameters were considered: nature of the source, wearing conditions, emission velocity <math>V</math>, duration of the expiratory process, separation distance between two manikins <math>D</math> and leaks around facemasks.</p> <p>Both transient and</p>	<p>Under pseudo-steady conditions, the Protection Degree (PD) was 45 per cent for normal wearing scenarios. Under transient scenarios, the PD varied from 33 to 100 percent with different parameters. It was observed that fully sealed facemasks provide the highest protection, while the least protective was the normal wearing. It was also observed that the reduction of exposure decreases with increasing emission velocity and emission duration, and with decreasing separation distance between source and susceptible manikins.</p>	<p>Truly normal wearing conditions could not be mimicked as human skin's surface is soft, while the manikins used had a hard (solid) surface.</p> <p>Leaks could not be guaranteed to be the same for all 'normal wearing' scenarios.</p> <p>Water vapour might have formed if the wearing period was long, which might have affected the performance of the facemask.</p> <p>The particles used in this study were spherical, but the shapes of viruses and bacteria are cylindrical or of some irregular morphologies. In this case, even with the same equivalent size, the behaviour of particles and viruses may be different.</p>	<p>15</p>

		<p>steady aerosol concentrations were used to test</p> <p>The distance between the source and the susceptible was varied from 30 to 60 cm. Four facemask wearing conditions were mimicked to represent different ways people might wear facemasks.</p>			
<p>Marianne van der Sande et al 2008 Netherlands</p>	<p>To assess Short-term (10-15 mins) protection for different types of masks worn by same volunteer; Long-term (3 hours) protection of a specific mask by a normal volunteer; and Effectiveness of different types of mask in preventing outgoing transmission by a simulated infectious subject</p>	<p>A volunteer was asked to perform 5 successive tasks and the concentration of particles was measured on both sides of the mask through a receptor fixed on the facial and on the external side.</p> <p>In the first short-term experiment, 28 healthy adult volunteers were recruited, as well as 11 children.</p> <p>In the second long-term experiment, 22 volunteers, all adults, were divided into 3 groups. Each group wore a single type of mask for a period of three hours, being either a FFP2 mask, a surgical mask or a home-made</p>	<p>Surgical masks provided about twice as much protection as home made masks, the difference a bit more marked among adults. FFP2 masks provided adults with about 50 times as much protection as home made masks, and 25 times as much protection as surgical masks.</p> <p>In the long term inward protection experiment, Protection factors for each type of mask were similar to the protection factors measured in the short term experiments for adults. Whereas in the outward protection experiment, protection factors for all types of masks were considerably lower than those observed for inward protection. The home-made masks only provided marginal protection, while protection offered by a surgical mask and an FFP2 mask did not differ,</p>	<p>Study didn't assess the impact of e.g. coughing or sneezing on outward transmission through a mask.</p> <p>The observed limited particle retention in our experiments may still be an overestimate of protection, as it may for instance be challenging to enforce adherence to mask wearing by a patient who is short of breath</p> <p>This is an experimental study, with relatively small numbers of volunteers, which limits the generalisability of some of the findings</p>	13

		<p>mask, similar to the masks used in the short-term experiment described above.</p> <p>The final experiment assessed the effectiveness of different types of masks in reducing outgoing transmission from an infectious subject shedding aerosolized particles. This was simulated by fitting the different types of masks to an artificial test head, which was connected to PC-driven respirator. Breathing frequency was varied to mimic different respiratory rates.</p>	<p>Regardless of mask type, children were less well protected.</p> <p>Outward protection (mask wearing by a mechanical head) was less effective than inward protection (mask wearing by healthy volunteers).</p> <p>Any type of general mask use is likely to decrease viral exposure and infection risk on a population level, in spite of imperfect fit and imperfect adherence, personal respirators providing most protection. Masks worn by patients may not offer as great a degree of protection against aerosol transmission</p>		
<p>D. F. Johnson 2009 Australia</p>	<p>To assess the efficacy of both standard surgical masks and N95 masks to adequately filter influenza virus among patients with laboratory-proven acute influenza A and B to determine which was more appropriate to prevent spread.</p>	<p>Appropriately selected participants coughed 5 times onto specified Petri dish held 20 cm directly in front of the participant's mouth in the following sequence: (1) coughing without a mask (before control), (2) coughing while wearing a fitted N95 mask, (3) coughing while wearing a routine surgical mask, and (4) coughing without a</p>	<p>Surgical and N95 masks appeared to be equally effective in filtering influenza, given that no influenza could be detected by RT-PCR of the ISP viral transport medium in any of the 9 participants for either mask</p>	<p>Small number of participants</p> <p>Because the protocol required the mask to be worn for only 3–5 minutes, it could not be ascertained that longer periods of mask use, such as may occur in some clinical situations, would be associated with the same efficacy</p>	<p>14</p>

		mask (after control). After coughing, viral transport media were assessed by quantitative real-time RTPCR for influenza A and B.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

