medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Association of country-wide coronavirus mortality with demographics, testing, lockdowns, and public wearing of masks.

Christopher T. Leffler, MD, MPH.[1,2]

Edsel Ing MD, MPH, CPH, MIAD.[3]

Joseph D. Lykins V, MD.[4,5]

Matthew C. Hogan, MS, MPH.[6]

Craig A. McKeown, MD.[7]

Andrzej Grzybowski, MD, PhD, MBA.[8,9]

1. Department of Ophthalmology. Virginia Commonwealth University. Richmond, VA 23298. chrislefflermd@gmail.com

2. Department of Ophthalmology. Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center, Richmond, VA.

3. Department of Ophthalmology & Vision Sciences, University of Toronto.

4. Department of Internal Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University. Richmond, VA 23298.

5. Department of Emergency Medicine. Virginia Commonwealth University. Richmond, VA 23298.

6. School of Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23298.

7. Bascom Palmer Eye Institute, University of Miami, Miller School of Medicine.

8. Department of Ophthalmology, University of Warmia and Mazury, Olsztyn, Poland.

9. Institute for Research in Ophthalmology, Poznan, Poland.

Corresponding author: Christopher T. Leffler, MD, MPH.

Department of Ophthalmology. Virginia Commonwealth University. 401 N. 11th St., Box 980209, Richmond, VA 23298. chrislefflermd@gmail.com.

May 22, 2020.

None of the authors has any conflicts of interest to disclose.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract.

Background. Wide variation between countries has been noted in per-capita mortality from the disease (COVID-19) caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Determinants of this variation are not fully understood.

Methods. Potential predictors of country-wide per-capita coronavirus-related mortality were studied, including age, sex ratio, temperature, urbanization, viral testing, smoking, duration of infection, lockdowns, and public mask-wearing norms and policies. Multivariable linear regression analysis was performed.

Results. In univariate (but not multivariable) analyses, prevalence of smoking, per-capita gross domestic product, and colder average country temperature were positively associated with coronavirus-related mortality. In a multivariable analysis of 183 countries, urbanization, the duration of the infection in the country, and percent of the population at least 60 years of age were all positively associated with per-capita mortality, while duration of mask-wearing by the public was negatively associated with mortality (all $p<0.001$). In countries with cultural norms or government policies supporting public mask-wearing, per-capita coronavirus mortality increased on average by just 5.4% each week, as compared with 48% each week in remaining countries. In the multivariable analysis, lockdowns tended to be associated with less mortality ($p=0.31$), and per-capita testing with higher reported mortality ($p=0.26$), though neither association was statistically significant.

Conclusions. Societal norms and government policies supporting the wearing of masks by the public are independently associated with less mortality from COVID-19.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction.

The COVID-19 global pandemic caused by infection with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has presented a major public health challenge. For reasons that are not completely understood, the per-capita mortality from COVID-19 varies by several orders of magnitude between countries.[1] Numerous sources of heterogeneity have been hypothesized. Higher mortality has been observed in older populations and in men.[2,3] Patient-level behaviors, such as smoking, might also have an impact.[3] Other potentially relevant factors include economic activity, and environmental variation, such as temperature.[4] More urban settings and increased population density would be expected to enhance viral transmission.[5]

In addition, public health responses to the COVID-19 pandemic may influence per-capita mortality. Various strategies have been implemented, ranging from robust testing programs to lockdown or stay-at-home orders, to mandates regarding social distancing and face mask usage. Practices with theoretical benefit, such as social distancing, stay-at-home orders, and implementation of mandates regarding use of masks in public spaces, must be assessed quickly, as implementation has the potential to reduce morbidity and mortality.

Mask usage by the public is postulated to decrease infection by blocking the spread of respiratory droplets,[1] and was successfully implemented during other coronavirus outbreaks (i.e. SARS and MERS).[6] In the context of the ongoing pandemic, we assessed the impact of masks on per-capita COVID-19-related mortality, controlling for the aforementioned factors. We hypothesized that in countries where mask use was either an accepted cultural norm or favored by government policies on a national level, the per-capita mortality might be reduced, as compared with remaining countries.

Methods.

Data acquisition.

Data from 183 countries for which coronavirus mortality and testing data were available were retrieved from a publicly available source on May 9, 2020.[7] Archived testing data for April were also downloaded.[8] The date of the country's first reported infection and first death were obtained from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control.[9]

Mean temperature in each country during the pandemic was estimated using the average monthly temperature in the country's largest city from public sources.[10,11]

Online news reports were searched to identify countries in which the public wore masks early in the outbreak based on tradition, as well as countries in which the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

national government mandated or recommended mask-wearing by the public before April 16, 2020.

Population,[12] fraction of the population age 60 years and over, and age 14 and under, male: female ratio per country,[13] surface area,[12,13] gross domestic product per capita,[14] percent urbanization,[12,15] and adult smoking prevalence[16-19] were obtained from publicly-available databases. Whether a nation was an isolated political entity on an island was also recorded.

Statistical analysis.

The prevalence of an infectious process subject to exponential growth (or decay) appears linear over time when graphed on a logarithmic scale.[1] Therefore, we postulated that the logarithm of the country-wide infection prevalence would be linearly related with the duration of the infection in each country. In addition, our analysis postulated that deaths from coronavirus would follow infections with some delay.

On average, the time from infection with the coronavirus to onset of symptoms is 5.1 days,[20] and the time from symptom onset to death is on average 17.8 days.[21] Therefore, the time from infection to death is expected to be 23 days.[1,22] These incubation and mortality times were prespecified.[1,22] Therefore, the date of each country's initial infection was estimated as the earlier of: 5 days before the first reported infection, or 23 days before the first death.[8,9,23] Deaths by May 9, 2020 would typically reflect infections beginning 23 days previously (by April 16). Therefore, we recorded the time from the first infection in a country until April 16. We also recorded the period of the outbreak: 1) from the mandating of activity restrictions until April 16, and 2) from when public mask-wearing was recommended until April 16.

In univariate analysis, characteristics of countries with above-median per-capita mortality were compared with the remaining (lower mortality) countries by the two-group t-test. The odds ratio for being in the high-mortality group was calculated by logistic regression.

Significant predictors of per-capita coronavirus mortality in the univariate analysis were analyzed by stepwise backwards multivariable linear regression analysis. The dependent variable was the logarithm (base 10) of per-capita coronavirus-related mortality. Because of the importance relative to public health, the weeks the country spent in lockdown and using masks, and per-capita testing levels, were all retained in the model. Statistical analysis was performed with xlstat 2020.1 (Addinsoft, New York). An alpha (p value) of 0.05 was deemed to be statistically significant. The study was approved by the Virginia Commonwealth University Office of Research Subjects Protection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Results.

A total of 183 countries reported coronavirus mortality and testing data by May 9, 2020. The 91 lower-mortality countries had 1.1 deaths per million population, in contrast with an average of 101.0 deaths per million population in the 92 higher-mortality countries (p<0.001, Table 1). The median value was 4.7 deaths per million population.

We assumed that island nations might find it less challenging to isolate and protect their populations. However, 21 of 91 low-mortality countries were isolated on islands, compared with 25 of 92 high-mortality countries. Country surface area and population were not associated with coronavirus mortality (Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of countries with low and high per-capita coronavirus mortality by May 9, 2020.

		Mean (SD)		p value
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Low Mortality	High Mortalilty	
Deaths (/1M)	--	1.14 (1.35)	101.0 (188.6)	<0.001
Deaths (per capita, log)	--	-6.44 (0.79)	-4.47 (0.62)	<0.001
Tests per capita (log) by May 9.	4.07 (2.52 to 6.56)	-2.71 (0.86)	-1.92 (0.62)	<0.001
Tests per capita (log) by Apr 16.	2.93 (2.03 to 4.25)	-3.37 (1.05)	-2.40 (0.79)	<0.001
Tests per capita (log) by Apr 4.	1.67 (1.39 to 2.02)	-4.80 (1.79)	-3.23 (1.58)	<0.001
Duration infection (weeks)	1.23 (1.09 to 1.39)	6.52 (2.69)	7.83 (2.38)	<0.001
Duration infection without masks (weeks)	1.26 (1.11 to 1.43)	5.38 (2.59)	6.83 (2.52)	<0.001
Duration infection without lockdown (weeks)	1.14 (1.01 to 1.27)	2.57 (2.67)	3.45 (2.68)	0.03
Temperature, mean (C)	0.89 (0.86 to 0.93)	21.7 (7.5)	13.4 (9.1)	<0.001
Urban population (%)	1.03 (1.02 to 1.05)	55.1 (23.4)	70.3 (20.2)	<0.001
GDP per capita ($1000)	1.04 (1.02 to 1.06)	10.570 (17.720)	27.600 (27.710)	<0.001
Age 14 & under (% of pop.)	0.84 (0.80 to 0.89)	31.0 (9.6)	19.6 (6.0)	<0.001
Age 60 & over (% of pop.)	1.20 (1.14 to 1.27)	9.3 (5.5)	18.9 (7.7)	<0.001
Surface area (million km^2)	1.09 (0.91 to 1.30)	0.501 (0.978)	0.770 (2.440)	0.33
Population (million)	0.999 (0.995 to 1.002)	39.4 (15.0)	25.9 (49.9)	0.41
Sex ratio (males / 100 females)	0.995 (0.981 to 1.009)	103.3 (24.3)	100.9 (19.4)	0.45
Smoking prevalence, adult (%)	1.09 (1.04 to 1.13)	14.0 (7.8)	18.7 (7.7)	<0.001

Per M = per million members of the population. Durations run from the estimated date of first infection in the country until 23 days before May 9, 2020 (i.e. April 16), or the stated event (mask recommendation or lockdown).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Demographics.

Countries with older populations suffered higher coronavirus mortality. Countries with low mortality had on average 9.3% of their population over age 60, as compared with 18.9% in the high-mortality countries (Table 1). Sex ratio was not associated with country-wide mortality (p=0.45, Table 1). Smoking prevalence was on average 14.0% in low mortality countries and 18.7% in high-mortality countries (p<0.001, Table 1).

Temperature.

Colder countries were associated with higher coronavirus mortality in univariate analysis. The mean temperature was 21.7 C (SD 7.5 C) in the low-mortality countries, and 13.4 C (SD 9.1 C) in the high-mortality countries (p<0.001, Table 1).

Economics.

Urbanization was associated with coronavirus mortality. In low-mortality countries, on average 55% of the population was urban, as compared with 70% of the population in the high-mortality countries (p<0.001, Table 1). Richer countries suffered a higher coronavirus related mortality. The mean GDP per capita was $10,570 in the low-mortality countries, and was $27,600 in the high-mortality countries (Table 1, p<0.001).

Masks.

In some Asian countries, masks were used extensively by the public, essentially from the beginning of the outbreak,[1,24] including: Thailand,[25] Japan,[24,26] South Korea,[24,27] Taiwan,[28] Hong Kong,[24,29,30] Vietnam,[31] Malaysia,[32] Cambodia,[33,34] and the Philippines[35] (Table 2). In fact, in Mongolia[36] and Laos,[37] the public began wearing masks before any cases were confirmed in their countries. Despite the fact that the outbreak tended to appear in these 11 countries quite early, the countries had experienced a low per-capita coronavirus mortality by May 9 (mean 1.9 per million, SD 2.5, Table 2).

The World Health Organization initially advised against widespread mask wearing by the public, as did the United States CDC.[1,24] Nonetheless, some Western governments mandated or recommended wearing of masks by the general public during March 2020. Masks were required in public in Venezuela beginning March 13.[38,39] In Slovakia, masks were mandated in shops and transit on March 15,[40] and more broadly in public on March 25.[41] Masks were required in public in Czechia on March 19,[42] and in Uzbekistan on March 25.[43] Masks were mandated in indoor public spaces in Slovenia on March 29.[44] In Austria, a mandate to wear masks in shops was announced on March 30, with the expectation that masks would be available by April 1.[45] In

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

addition, the requirement to wear masks on public transit was announced there on April 6.[46] Masks were recommended for the public in Bulgaria on March 30.[47]

Table 2. Countries in which masks were widely used by the public or recommended by the government early in their outbreak.

	First Case Date	Per-capita mortality (per M. pop.) by May 9.	Comment.
Thailand	Jan. 13	0.8	Mask use was traditional, and was recommended by the Ministry of Public Health on Jan. 31.[25]
Japan	Jan. 16	4.8	Public use of masks is traditional,[24] and was manifest by Jan. 31.[26] The government initially recommended them when in "confined, badly ventilated spaces".[24]
South Korea	Jan. 20	5.0	Use of masks is traditional.[24] South Korea initially had trouble obtaining enough masks, but at the end of February the government began to control the distribution of masks to the public.[27]
Taiwan	Jan. 21	0.3	Use of masks is traditional. By January 27, the government had to limit mask exports and limit sales from pharmacies to those needed for personal use.[28]
Hong Kong	Jan. 23[29]	0.5	Surgical masks were traditionally used, and also were recommended on public transport and in crowded places, on January 24, 2020.[24,30]
Vietnam	Jan. 23	0.0	Masks were widely used by the public immediately,[31] and were mandated by the government on March 16.
Malaysia	Jan. 25	3.3	Masks were used by the public almost immediately.[32]
Cambodia	Jan. 27[33]	0.0	Masks were used by the public almost immediately after the outbreak in Wuhan.[34]
Philippines	Jan. 30	6.4	Masks were used from the start of the outbreak,[35] and were mandated on April 2.
Mongolia	Mar. 10	0.0	Mongolians began wearing masks in January.[36]
Laos	Mar. 24	0.0	The public in Laos began wearing masks even before any cases were reported in the country.[37]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Government mandates or recommendations for mask wearing by the public were issued by April 16 in multiple countries, including: Israel on April 1; in the Philippines and Mauritius on April 2; the United States, Turkey, Singapore, and Cyprus on April 3; Colombia and the UAE on April 4; Kenya, Lebanon, and Trinidad and Tobago on April 5; Ukraine, Cuba, Canada, and Morocco on April 6; Honduras, Peru, and Panama on April 7; Ecuador, El Salvador, Lithuania, Indonesia, and Chile on April 8; Guatemala and Mozambique on April 9; South Africa on April 10; Spain and Sri Lanka on April 11; Ethiopia on April 12; Equatorial Guinea, Sint Maarten, Mongolia, and Finland on April 14; Grenada on April 15; the Dominican Republic, Poland, Libya, Zambia, and Estonia on April 16.

Multivariable analysis.

By multivariable linear regression, significant predictors of the logarithm of each country's per-capita coronavirus mortality included: duration of infection in the country, duration of wearing masks, percentage of the population over age 60 , and urbanization (all $p<0.001$, Table 3). With the duration of infection in the country controlled for, there was a trend for time in lockdown to be negatively associated with mortality, and for per-capita testing to be positively associated with mortality, though neither association was significant (Table 3). In a population not wearing masks, the per-capita mortality tended to increase each week by a factor of $10^{0.171} = 1.48$, or 48%. On the other hand, in a population wearing masks, the per-capita mortality tended to increase each week by a factor of $10^{(0.171-0.148)} = 1.054$, or just 5.4%. Compared with the baseline condition (without masks), under lockdown, the per-capita mortality increased each week by $10^{(0.171-0.039)} = 1.36$, or 36% (Table 3).

Table 3. Predictors of (log) Country-wide Per-capita Coronavirus Mortality by May 9 by Multivariable Linear Regression in 183 Countries.

	$10^{coefficient}$	Coefficient (SE)	95% CI	P
Duration in country (weeks)	1.48	0.171 (0.034)	0.105 to 0.237	<0.001
Time wearing masks (weeks)	0.71	-0.148 (0.028)	-0.203 to -0.093	<0.001
Time in lockdown (weeks)	0.91	-0.039 (0.039)	-0.115 to 0.037	0.31
Population, % age 60 or over	1.13	0.052 (0.011)	0.031 to 0.073	<0.001
Urbanization (%)	1.019	0.00838 (0.00343)	0.00161 to 0.01514	0.02
Tests per capita, by May 9 (log)	1.34	0.127 (0.112)	-0.093 to 0.348	0.26
Constant	--	-7.323 (0.517)	-8.343 to -6.304	<0.001

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A country with 10% more of its population living in an urban environment than another country will tend to suffer a mortality 21% higher ($10^{0.0838}$ = 1.21). A country in which the percentage of the population age 60 or over is 10% higher than in another country will tend to suffer mortality 231% higher ($10^{0.52}$ = 3.31, Table 3).

The trend towards a positive association with testing by May 9 probably reflects the greater recognition of coronavirus-related mortality with more testing, as well as the increased incentive countries have to test when they suffer a more intense outbreak.

Testing.

As noted above, testing was positively associated with mortality. By May 9, 2020, low-mortality countries had performed 1 test for every 510 members of the population, while high-mortality countries had performed 1 test for every 82.6 members of the population (p<0.001, Table 1). Presumably, testing performed early on would better help to contain the outbreak. By April 4 (the earliest testing data archived), low-mortality countries had tested 1 in 63,300 in the population, as compared with 1 in 1,710 in the high-mortality countries (p<0.001, Table 1). By April 16, 2020, low-mortality countries had tested 1 in 2,340 in the population, as compared with 1 in 251 in the high-mortality countries (p<0.001, Table 1). If early testing lowers mortality, one might expect negative regression coefficients (more testing associated with less mortality). However, when (log) per-capita testing on April 4, 2020 was included in the model in Table 3 (which also includes later testing), early testing was not inversely related to mortality (coefficient = 0.01, p=0.83). Likewise, when (log) per-capita testing on April 16, 2020 was included in the model in Table 3, early testing still tended not to be inversely related to coronavirus mortality (coefficient = 0.21, p=0.11).

Only 5 countries had performed over 1 test for every 10 people in the country by May 9, 2020 (in order of most testing to least): the Faeroe Islands, Iceland, the Falkland Islands, the UAE, and Bahrain. The Faeroe and Falkland Islands reported no coronavirus-related deaths. The remaining 3 countries had per-capita mortality above the median value. The highest per-capita mortality among this group was 29.0 per million population (or 1 in 34,480 people), seen in Iceland.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion.

These results confirm that over 4 months since the appearance of COVID-19 in late 2019, there remains a great deal of variation between countries in related mortality. Countries in the lower half of mortality have experienced an average COVID-19-related per-capita mortality of 1.1 deaths per million population, in contrast with an average of 101 deaths per million in the remaining countries. Independent predictors of mortality included urbanization, fraction of the population age 60 years or over, duration of the outbreak in the country, and the period of outbreak subject to cultural norms or government policies favoring mask-wearing by the public.

These results support the universal wearing of masks by the public to suppress the spread of the coronavirus.[1] Given the low levels of coronavirus mortality seen in the Asian countries which adopted widespread public mask usage early in the outbreak, it seems highly unlikely that masks are harmful. One major limitation is that evidence concerning the actual levels of mask-wearing by the public are not available for most countries. Particularly in Western countries which only recommended (rather than mandated) mask-wearing by the public, such as the United States, the practice has been steadily increasing, but change has not occurred overnight. Our analysis based on norms and policies can be compared with “intention-to-treat” analysis in a clinical trial.

Much of the randomized controlled data on the effect of mask-wearing on the spread of respiratory viruses relates to influenza. One recent meta-analysis of 10 trials in families, students, or religious pilgrims found that the relative risk for influenza with the use of face masks was 0.78, a 22% reduction, though the findings were not statistically significant.[48] Combining all the trials, there were 29 cases in groups assigned to wear masks, compared with 51 cases in control groups.[48] The direct applicability of these results to mask-wearing at the population level is uncertain. For instance, there was some heterogeneity in methods of the component trials, with one trial assigning mask wearing to the person with a respiratory illness, another to his close contacts, and the remainder to both the ill and their contacts.[48] Mask-wearing was inconsistent. The groups living together could not wear a mask when bathing, sleeping, eating, or brushing teeth.[49-51] In one of the studies reviewed, parents wore a mask during the day, but not at night when sleeping next to their sick child.[51] In a different trial, students were asked to wear a mask in their residence hall for at least 6 hours daily (rather than all the time).[49] The bottom line is that it is nearly impossible for people to constantly maintain mask wear around the people with whom they live. In contrast, wearing a mask when on public transit or shopping is quite feasible. In addition, as an infection propagates through multiple generations in the population, the benefits multiply exponentially. Even if one accepts that masks would only reduce transmissions by 22%, then after 10 cycles of the infection, mask-wearing would reduce the level of infection in the population by 91.7%, as compared with a non-mask wearing population (because $0.78^{10} = 0.083$). It is highly unlikely that anyone will ever randomize entire

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

countries or populations to either wear, or not wear, masks. Public policies can only be formulated based on the best evidence available.

A recent study demonstrated that in 4 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 who were asked to cough without and with a cloth mask, the viral load on a nearby petri dish was reduced with the cloth mask in all patients, and in half was not detectable with the cloth mask.[52]

Nationwide policies to ban large gatherings and to close schools or businesses, tended to be associated with lower mortality, though not in a statistically significant fashion. However, a full accounting would consider local policies, which often varied within each country. Moreover, businesses, schools, and individuals made decisions to limit contact, independent of any government policies. The adoption of numerous public health policies at the same time can make it difficult to tease out the relative importance of each.

Colder average monthly temperature was associated with higher levels of COVID-19 mortality in univariate analysis, but not when accounting for other independent variables. Nonetheless, environmental factors which could influence either human behavior or the stability and spread of virus particles are worthy of further study.

Per-capita testing both early (April 4, 16) and later (May 9) were positively associated with reported coronavirus-related mortality. It seems likely that countries which test at a low level are missing many cases. We previously identified just 3 countries (Iceland, the Faeroe Islands, and the UAE) which had performed over 75,000 tests per million population by April 16, and all 3 had mortality below 1 in 46,000 at that point.[53] By May 9, we could add to this “high-testing” group, the Falkland Islands and Bahrain, as all 5 countries had tested over one tenth of their population. All 5 countries had a mortality of 29 per million (1 in 34,480 people) or less. The degree to which these results would apply to larger, less isolated, or less wealthy countries is unknown. Statistical support for benefit of high levels of testing might be demonstrated if additional and more diverse countries are able to test at this level.

One limitation of our study is that the ultimate source of mortality data is often from governments which may not have the resources to provide a full accounting of their public health crises, or an interest in doing so.

In summary, older age of the population, urbanization, and longer duration of the outbreak in a country were independently associated with higher country-wide per-capita coronavirus mortality. Lockdowns and the amount of viral testing were not statistically significant predictors of country-wide coronavirus mortality, after controlling for other variables. The use of masks in public is an important and readily modifiable public health measure. Societal norms and government policies supporting mask-wearing by the public were independently associated with lower per-capita mortality from COVID-19.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References.

1. Leffler CT, Ing E, McKeown CA, Pratt D, Grzybowski A. Final Country-wide Mortality from the Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic and Notes Regarding Mask Usage by the Public. April 4, 2020. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340438732_Country-wide_Mortality_from_the_Novel_Coronavirus_COVID-19_Pandemic_and_Notes_Regarding_Mask_Usage_by_the_Public Accessed: May 20, 2020.

2. Leffler CT, Hogan MC. Age-dependence of mortality from novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in highly exposed populations: New York transit workers and residents and Diamond Princess passengers. MedRxiv. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.14.20094847 Accessed May 20, 2020.

3. Jordan RE, Adab P, Cheng KK. Covid-19: risk factors for severe disease and death. BMJ. 2020;368:m1198. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m1198.long Accessed May 20, 2020.

4. Zhu Y, Xie J. Association between ambient temperature and COVID-19 infection in 122 cities from China. Science of The Total Environment. 2020 Mar 30:138201. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7142675/ Accessed May 20, 2020.

5. Squalli J. Evaluating the determinants of COVID-19 mortality: A cross-country study. medRxiv. 2020 Jan 1. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.05.12.20099093v1 Accessed May 20, 2020.

6. Syed Q, Sopwith W, Regan M, Bellis MA. Behind the mask. Journey through an epidemic: some observations of contrasting public health responses to SARS. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health. 2003 Nov 1;57(11):855-6.

7. Worldometers. COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic. Available from: https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/?utm_campaign=homeAdUOA?Si Accessed May 9, 2020.

8. Worldometers. COVID-19 Coronavirus Pandemic. April 5, 2020. Available from: https://web.archive.org/web/20200405020252/https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/ Accessed May 17, 2020.

9. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Download today's data on the geographic distribution of COVID-19 cases worldwide. Available from:

https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/download-todays-data-geographic-distribution-covid-19-cases-worldwide Accessed April 16, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

10. No author listed. World Climate Guide. Available from: https://www.climatestotravel.com/ Accessed May 14, 2020.

11. No author listed. List of Cities by Average Temperature. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_cities_by_average_temperature Accessed May 14, 2020.

12. Countries in the world by population (2020). Available from: https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/population-by-country/

Accessed May 16, 2020.

13. United Nations Population Division, New York. World Population Prospects: The 2019 Revision. Population, surface area, and density. Available from:

http://data.un.org/_Docs/SYB/PDFs/SYB61_T02_Population,%20Surface%20Area%20and%20Density.pdf Accessed May 16, 2020.

14. International Monetary Fund. World Economic Outlook Database, October 2019. Report for Selected Countries and Subjects. Available from: https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/SPROLLs/world-economic-outlook-databases#sort=%40imfdate%20descending Accessed April 11, 2020.

15. World Bank. Urban population (% of total population). United Nations Population Division. World Urbanization Prospects: 2018 Revision. Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.URB.TOTL.in.zs Accessed May 16, 2020.

16. The American Cancer Society. The Tobacco Atlas. 2020 Available from: https://tobaccoatlas.org/topic/prevalence/ Accessed April 11, 2020.

17. WHO Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2009. Surveys of adult tobacco use in WHO Member States. Available from: https://www.who.int/tobacco/mpower/2009/Appendix_VIII-table_1.pdf

Accessed May 16, 2020.

18. World Bank. Smoking prevalence, males (% of adults). https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.PRV.SMOK.MA?locations=ME

Accessed May 16, 2020.

19. World Bank. Smoking prevalence, females (% of adults). Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.PRV.SMOK.FE?locations=ME Accessed May 16, 2020.

20. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, Azman AS, Reich NG, Lessler J. The incubation period of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) from publicly reported confirmed cases: estimation and application. Annals of Internal Medicine. Mar 10, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

21. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Thompson H, Walker P, Fu H, Dighe A. Estimates of the severity of COVID-19 disease. Lancet Infectious Disease. 2020: 1-9.

22. Leffler CT, Ing E, Lykins JD, McKeown CA, Grzybowski A. Prevention of the spread of coronavirus using masks. Annals of Internal Medicine. April 30, 2020. Available from: https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M20-1342 Accessed May 20, 2020.

23. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 Coronavirus data. Available from: https://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/covid-19-coronavirus-data

Accessed April 16, 2020.

24. Feng S, Shen C, Xia N, Song W, Fan M, Cowling BJ. Rational use of face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic. Lancet Respir Med. 2020 Mar 20. pii: S2213-2600(20)30134-X. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(20) 30134-X.

25. Thongthab S. Ministry of Public Health Enhances Disease Prevention and Control. The Bangkok Insight. January 31, 2020. Available from:

https://www.thebangkokinsight.com/282702/ Accessed May 9, 2020.

26. Takahashi. Amid virus outbreak, Japan stores scramble to meet demand for face masks. Japan Times. Available from: https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2020/01/31/national/coronavirus-japan-surgical-masks/#.Xrc8Z2hKhPY Accessed May 9, 2020.

27. Kim ET. How South Korea Solved Its Face Mask Shortage: Neighborhood pharmacists and government intervention were the secret weapons. New York Times. April 1, 2020. Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/01/opinion/covid-face-maskshortage.html Accessed April 17, 2020.

28. Blanchard B. Taiwan ups Chinese visitor curbs, to stop mask exports. Reuters. January 27, 2020. Available from: https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-health-taiwan/taiwan-ups-chinese-visitor-curbs-to-stop-mask-exports-idUSKBN1ZQ1C6

Accessed May 9, 2020.

29. Cheung E. China coronavirus: death toll almost doubles in one day as Hong Kong reports its first two cases. South China Morning Post. January 22, 2020. Available from: https://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/health-environment/article/3047193/china-coronavirus-first-case-confirmed-hong-kong

Accessed May 9, 2020.

30. Department of Health, Hong Kong. Latest recommendations by Scientific Committee on Emerging and Zoonotic Diseases and Scientific Committee on Infection Control after reviewing cases of novel coronavirus infection. January 24, 2020. Available from:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202001/24/P2020012400762.htm Accessed May 9, 2020.

31. Taylor K. I've been traveling in Asia for 3 weeks amid the deadly coronavirus outbreak, and actually catching the virus is far from my biggest fear. Business Insider. February 18, 2020. Available from: https://www.businessinsider.com/travel-in-asia-during-coronavirus-outbreak-2020-2#so-for-now-my-travels-continue-17 Accessed May 9, 2020.

32. Harun HN, Yusof TA, Solhi F. Demand for face masks, hand sanitisers soars. New Straits Times. January 30, 2020. Available from:

https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2020/01/561250/demand-face-masks-hand-sanitisers-soars Accessed May 9, 2020.

33. Khan S. Cambodia Confirms First Coronavirus Case. VOA Khmer. January 27, 2020. Available from: https://www.voanews.com/science-health/coronavirus-outbreak/cambodia-confirms-first-coronavirus-case Accessed May 9, 2020.

34. Khan S. Cambodian Businesses Embrace Protective Measures Against Coronavirus. VOA Khmer. March 30, 2020. Available from: https://www.voacambodia.com/a/cambodian-businesses-embrace-protective-measures-against-coronavirus/5352023.html

Accessed May 9, 2020.

35. Lasco G. Why Face Masks Are Going Viral. Sapiens. February 7, 2020. Available from: https://www.sapiens.org/culture/coronavirus-mask/ Accessed May 9, 2020.

36. Baljmaa.T. SEC: MNT 150,000 fine for not wearing face masks. April 14, 2020. Available from: https://www.montsame.mn/en/read/222259 Accessed May 9, 2020.

37. No author listed. Laos reports no case of COVID-19, to import face masks from Vietnam. Vietnam Times. March 20, 2020. Available from: https://vietnamtimes.org.vn/laos-reports-no-case-of-covid-19-to-import-face-masks-from-vietnam-18566.html Accessed May 9, 2020.

38. AFP. Coronavirus: Maduro tells Venezuelans to make their own masks. March 17, 2020. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EjTsjJNCAuc Accessed May 15, 2020.

39. Berwick A, Nava M, Kinosian S. Venezuela confirms coronavirus cases amid public health concerns. Reuters. March 14, 2020. Available from: https://www.physiciansweekly.com/venezuela-confirms-coronavirus-cases/ Accessed May 15, 2020.

40. Štefúnová I. "Slovensko pritvrdilo v boji s vírusom. Nosenie rúšok je povinné". Pravda. March 15, 2020. Available from:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

https://spravy.pravda.sk/domace/clanok/545657-slovensko-pritvrdilo-v-boji-s-virusom-nosenie-rusok-je-povinne/ Accessed May 15, 2020.

41. Public Health Authority, Slovakia. "Opatrenie Úradu verejného zdravotníctva Slovenskej republiky pri ohrození verejného zdravia" March 24, 2020. Available from:

http://www.uvzsr.sk/docs/info/covid19/Opatrenie_UVZSR_povinnost_nosit_ruska_24032020.pdf Accessed May 15, 2020.

42. Veronika B. Could Czech's Measure to Fight Coronavirus Save Thousands of Lives? Prague Morning. April 4, 2020. Available from: https://www.praguemorning.cz/could-czechs-measure-to-fight-coronavirus-save-thousands-of-lives-2/ Accessed May 7, 2020.

43. COVID-19 Information. US Embassy in Uzbekistan. May 1, 2020. Available from: https://uz.usembassy.gov/covid-19-information/ Accessed May 9, 2020.

44. STA. COVID-19 & Slovenia, Night 29 March: Movement Restrictions, Mandatory Masks, More Aid for Individuals. Total Slovenia News. March 29, 2020. Available from: https://www.total-slovenia-news.com/politics/5951-covid-19-slovenia Accessed May 8, 2020.

45. ORF. Regierung verschärft Maßnahmen. March 30, 2020. Available from: https://orf.at/stories/3159909/ Accessed May 15, 2020.

46. Reuters. Austria widening face-mask requirement while loosening lockdown. April 6, 2020. Available from:

https://www.reuters.com/article/health-coronavirus-austria-masks/austria-widening-face-mask-requirement-while-loosening-lockdown-idUSV9N28601G Accessed May 15, 2020.

47. Borissov B. "Здравният министър даде заден за задължителните маски". March 31, 2020. Available from:

https://www.segabg.com/hot/category-bulgaria/gledayte-na-zhivo-vutreshniyat-i-zdravniyat-ministur-razyasnyavat-merkite/ Accessed May 15, 2020.

48. Xiao J, Shiu EY, Gao H, Wong JY, Fong MW, Ryu S, Cowling BJ. Nonpharmaceutical Measures for Pandemic Influenza in Nonhealthcare Settings-Personal Protective and Environmental Measures. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2020; 26(5): 967-75.

49. Aiello AE, Perez V, Coulborn RM, Davis BM, Uddin M, Monto AS. Facemasks, hand hygiene, and influenza among young adults: a randomized intervention trial. PLoS One. 2012;7:e29744.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20109231; this version posted May 25, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

50. Cowling BJ, Fung RO, Cheng CK, Fang VJ, Chan KH, Seto WH, et al. Preliminary findings of a randomized trial of non-pharmaceutical interventions to prevent influenza transmission in households. PLoS One. 2008;3:e2101.

51. MacIntyre CR, Cauchemez S, Dwyer DE, Seale H, Cheung P, Browne G, et al. Face mask use and control of respiratory virus transmission in households. Emerg Infect Dis. 2009;15:233–41.

52. Bae S, Kim MC, Kim JY, Cha HH, Lim JS, Jung J, Kim MJ, Oh DK, Lee MK, Choi SH, Sung M. Effectiveness of surgical and cotton masks in blocking SARS–CoV-2: a controlled comparison in 4 patients. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2020 Apr 6.

53. Leffler CT, Zhan S. Suppression of the Covid-19 Outbreak by Mass Testing and Tracing, and Other Measures: Real-World Data. April 17, 2020. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340720271_Suppression_of_the_Covid-19_Outbreak_by_Mass_Testing_and_Tracing_and_Other_Measures_Real-World_Data?_sg=gmL3zeijOGrKwY3pKS5BGQ_-H9KzOsEYC2mgy_71nifHMme737SciFndah2rLwHEKXAlQQN_-JNV5_rCOIawtoo36uhRDVW7cXDeCEId.MivUKSPrK2FO3h6BPweYc9NwomngmcwdCrIxkXVDJWBozq01jbOPpwb5y4G1IVs3Gsgu2QZcmND_XnYclY_j1g Accessed May 17, 2020.