medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946; this version posted June 12, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

June 9, 2020

Use of face coverings by the public during the COVID-19 pandemic: an observational study

[1]Nicholas L. Arp, BA, [1]Tung H. Nguyen, MS, [1]Emma J. Graham Linck, MS, [1]Austin K. Feeney, MS, [1]Jonathan H. Schrope, BS, [1]Katrina L. Ruedinger, MS, [1]Anqi Gao, BS, [1]Margot Miranda-Katz, BA, [2]Ashley E. Kates, PhD, [2]Nasia Safdar, MD, PhD

Affiliations
[1] School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Wisconsin-Madison
[2] Department of Medicine, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Corresponding Author:
Nasia Safdar, MD PhD
5th Floor UW Medical Foundation Centennial Building
Madison, WI 53705
ns2@medicine.wisc.edu

No author has a conflict of interest.

Funding: Nasia Safdar is supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number DP2AI144244. AEK is supported by the National Library of Medicine (NLM) Training Grant to the Computation and Informatics in Biology and Medicine Training Program (NLM5T15LM007359). NLA, AKF, AG, EJGL, MMK, THN, KLR, JHS are supported by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Medical Scientist Training Program (T32GM008692). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Word count: 632
References: 5
Figures: 1
Tables: 1

Abstract: Public health agencies have recommended that the public wear face coverings as a major non-pharmaceutical intervention to mitigate COVID-19 transmission. However, there is concern whether or not the public has adopted this recommendation. An observational study of 3,271 members of the public was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic and examined the use of face coverings at grocery stores across 20 Wisconsin counties between May 16th and June 1st, 2020. Of the total individuals observed, we found that only 41.2% used face coverings. Individuals who appeared to be adults (aOR = 1.65; 95% CI = 1.20-2.27) or older adults (aOR = 3.67; 95% CI = 2.59-5.19) were more likely to be wearing face coverings than younger individuals. Additionally, individuals with female gender expression (aOR = 1.43; 95% CI = 1.24-1.66) and individuals shopping at a more expensive grocery store (aOR = 1.95; 95% CI = 1.69-2.25) were more likely to be wearing face coverings. We did not find an association between county level prevalence of COVID-19 cases and face covering use. To our knowledge, this is the first study using direct observations to examine face covering behavior by the public and our findings have implications for public health agencies.

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/10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946; this version posted June 12, 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 .

Background: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends that the public wear face coverings as a major non-pharmaceutical intervention to mitigate COVID-19 transmission (1), particularly when physical distancing is difficult. Given that the United States does not have a culture of face covering use by the public and recent media reports of violent retaliation by people asked to wear a face covering (2), there is concern regarding widespread adoption of this recommendation. A recent survey by Gallup reported 68% of U.S. adults claim to 'always' or 'sometimes' wear a face covering in public (3). To date, however, there have been no direct observational studies examining face covering usage by the general public in the United States.

Objective: To determine face covering usage by the public visiting grocery stores using a convenience sample of Wisconsin residents.

Methods: We used direct observations of individuals exiting 26 grocery stores to assess face covering use across 20 counties in Wisconsin between 16 May and 1 June 2020 (Figure 1A). No stores required face coverings upon entry. Two simultaneous observers recorded the shoppers' apparent age (minor, young adult, adult, older adult), gender expression (female/male), and face covering use (present/absent: any type of cloth, surgical mask, or N95 respirator). Inter-rater reliability was assessed for 307 observations using Cohen's kappa coefficients.

The price index for each store was calculated as a relative z-score based on the price of 12 staple food items (onion, potato, apple, soda, yogurt, milk, and two types of eggs, chicken, and butter) to determine if face covering use was associated with expense.

We used multiple logistic regression with face covering usage as the dependent variable, to examine associations between age category, gender expression, price indices, and county-level COVID-19 case prevalence (4). Adjusted odds ratios (aOR), including these covariates, and 95% confidence intervals were calculated. Analyses were conducted using glm in R version 4.0.

To determine the representativeness of the sample, we used a two-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test to evaluate whether the U.S. census tract of the observed locations reflected the distribution of race (percent non-white) and median family income reported across Wisconsin (5).

Findings: We observed a total of 3,271 individuals, 41.2% of whom were observed wearing face coverings when exiting grocery stores. There was a higher prevalence of face covering use by older adults (59.5%) compared to minors (26.2%), young adults (34.8%), and adults (39.9%) and by females (44.8%) compared to males (36.9%) (Table 1). In the multiple logistic regression analyses, we found that age categories of adult and older adult, female gender, and observations at higher price index stores were statistically significantly associated with higher odds of face covering usage (Figure 1B). However, case prevalence was not associated with higher odds of face covering usage.

The Cohen's kappa coefficients for age (0.79, 'substantial agreement'), gender expression (0.98, 'almost perfect agreement'), and face covering usage (0.92, 'almost perfect agreement') indicate these variables were robustly collected across observers independently. Additionally, we found no significant difference between the sample and Wisconsin at large using the KS test (median income: $p = 0.751$, $D = 0.145$; percent non-white: $p = 0.203$, $D = 0.24$).

Discussion: We found face covering usage in public was not widely practiced, despite recommendations by multiple public health agencies, including the Wisconsin Department of Health Services (4). Our study has limitations due to its cross-sectional design and the potential of misclassifying face covering use if the covering was removed prior to the observation at the store's exit door. However, our results have important implications for public health agencies. Our results suggest the need to develop and test interventions to promote face covering usage by the general public in the United States. Future directions from this report include examining the reasons why some individuals choose not to wear face coverings in public.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946; this version posted June 12, 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. CDC. 2019 Novel Coronavirus. 2020. Accessed at https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus on May 29 2020.

2. MacFarquhar, Neil. 2020. "Who's Enforcing Mask Rules? Often Retail Workers, and They're Getting Hurt." May 15, 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/15/us/coronavirus-masks-violence.html.

3. Ritter by Z, Brenan M. New April Guidelines Boost Perceived Efficacy of Face Masks. 2020. Accessed at https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-efficacy-face-masks.aspx on May 27 2020.

4. Wisconsin Department of Health Services. COVID-19 (Coronavirus Disease). 2020. Accessed at https://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/covid-19/ on May 27 2020.

5. U.S. Census Bureau. 2018 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Tables DP05 and S1903. 2018. Accessed at https://data.census.gov/cedsci/ on May 30 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946; this version posted June 12, 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 .

Table 1. Multi-county observation data of face covering use by the public at grocery stores in Wisconsin

County	n/total (%) using face coverings							Price Index of Store(s) (interval)	COVID-19 cases per hundred-thousand (total cases)[†]
	Total	Gender		Age					
		Female	Male	Minor	Young Adult	Adult	Older Adult		
Adams	7/103 (6.8)	4/58 (6.9)	3/45 (6.7)	0/1 (0)	1/26 (3.8)	4/53 (7.5)	2/23 (8.7)	0.6	19.9 (4)[f]
Brown[‡*]	118/313 (37.7)	76/181 (42)	42/132 (31.8)	3/22 (13.6)	7/51 (13.7)	79/186 (42.5)	29/54 (53.7)	(-0.2, 0.8)	893 (2320)[g]
Dane[‡**]	644/934 (69)	353/485 (72.8)	291/449 (64.8)	13/35 (37.1)	175/287 (61)	343/476 (72.1)	113/136 (83.1)	(-0.6, 1.8)	138.7 (735)[a,b,h]
Fond Du Lac	24/123 (19.5)	14/62 (22.6)	10/61 (16.4)	5/13 (38.5)	2/24 (8.3)	13/75 (17.3)	4/11 (36.4)	-0.2	209.2 (214)[g]
Grant	38/100 (38)	22/51 (43.1)	16/49 (32.7)	5/13 (38.5)	9/35 (25.7)	13/34 (38.2)	11/18 (61.1)	-0.3	142.8 (74)[a]
Iowa	57/151 (37.7)	44/102 (43.1)	13/49 (26.5)	5/22 (22.7)	12/33 (36.4)	26/68 (38.2)	14/28 (50)	-0.5	50.8 (12)[e]
Jackson	25/105 (23.8)	16/61 (26.2)	9/44 (20.5)	5/14 (35.7)	2/23 (8.7)	9/52 (17.3)	9/16 (56.2)	-0.1	68.3 (14)[d]
Kenosha	48/100 (48)	26/55 (47.3)	22/45 (48.9)	7/12 (58.3)	10/26 (38.5)	18/44 (40.9)	13/18 (72.2)	-0.2	699.8(1178)[h]
Lafayette	16/59 (27.1)	11/29 (37.9)	5/30 (16.7)	1/4 (25)	2/5 (40)	2/35 (5.7)	11/15 (73.3)	-0.2	149.4 (25)[e]
Milwaukee	41/100 (41)	29/62 (46.8)	12/38 (31.6)	1/11 (9.1)	4/15 (26.7)	28/60 (46.7)	8/14 (57.1)	-0.4	817.3 (7799)[h]
Monroe	10/103 (9.7)	5/48 (10.4)	5/55 (9.1)	0/7 (0)	0/23 (0)	6/64 (9.4)	4/9 (44.4)	-0.3	33 (15)[c]
Outagamie	90/200 (45)	55/109 (50.5)	35/91 (38.5)	1/7 (14.3)	12/40 (30)	34/93 (36.6)	43/60 (71.7)	0.1	124.5 (230)[g]
Pierce	46/118 (39)	34/68 (50)	12/50 (24)	1/5 (20)	6/26 (23.1)	24/65 (36.9)	15/22 (68.2)	-0.3	103.4 (43)[e]
Polk	29/104 (27.9)	22/62 (35.5)	7/42 (16.7)	1/1 (100)	0/18 (0)	10/42 (23.8)	18/43 (41.9)	0.1	39.2 (17)[e]
Racine	36/100 (36)	15/62 (24.2)	21/38 (55.3)	0/5 (0)	5/14 (35.7)	22/65 (33.8)	9/16 (56.2)	-0.3	886.9 (1733)[h]
St. Croix	19/101 (18.8)	12/41 (29.3)	7/60 (11.7)	0/4 (0)	0/23 (0)	2/49 (4.1)	17/25 (68)	0.5	80.8 (71)[e]
Walworth	22/100 (22)	11/47 (23.4)	11/53 (20.8)	5/12 (41.7)	4/27 (14.8)	10/45 (22.2)	3/16 (18.8)	-0.5	275.7 (284)[b]
Waushara	27/98 (27.6)	21/60 (35)	6/38 (15.8)	2/3 (66.7)	1/8 (12.5)	16/62 (25.8)	8/25 (32)	0.1	33.2 (8)[g]
Winnebago	27/145 (18.6)	17/75 (22.7)	10/70 (14.3)	1/18 (5.6)	8/35 (22.9)	14/82 (17.1)	4/10 (40)	-0.8	146.5 (249)[g]
Wood	24/114 (21.1)	12/67 (17.9)	12/47 (25.5)	2/12 (16.7)	5/23 (21.7)	13/68 (19.1)	4/11 (36.4)	0.4	15 (11)[f]
Total	**1348/3271 (41.2)**	**799/1785 (44.8)**	**549/1486 (36.9)**	**58/221 (26.2)**	**265/762 (34.8)**	**686/1718 (39.9)**	**339/570 (59.5)**		

[†]Data retrieved from WDHS based on date direct observations were recorded: May 16[a], 17[b], 18[c], 26[d], 27[e], 29[f], 31[g], and June 1[h], 2020 (5). In counties where multiple observations on different dates occurred as marked, the prevalence of the latest date observed was reported.
[‡]Observations recorded from * 3 or ** 5 different stores and price indices were calculated for each store in each respective county.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946; this version posted June 12, 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 .



Figure 1. **A.** Map of Wisconsin counties represents observation locations where face covering use was quantified. Color of county outline indicates case prevalence per hundred-thousand cases. Fill shade intensity represents the percentage of total individuals that wore a face covering. **B.** Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) of face covering usage were calculated and plotted from multiple logistic regression. The aOR for age is in reference to the odds of face covering use by minors. All variables included in the model are shown in the table.