

1 **Associations between mask-wearing, handwashing, and social distancing practices and risk**  
2 **of COVID-19 infection in public: a case-control study in Thailand**

3  
4 Pawind Doung-ngern,<sup>1</sup> Repeepong Suphanchaimat,<sup>1,2</sup> Apinya Panjangampathana,<sup>1</sup> Chawisar  
5 Janekrongtham,<sup>1</sup> Duangrat Ruampoom,<sup>1</sup> Nawaporn Daochaeng,<sup>1</sup> Napatchakorn Eungkanit,<sup>1</sup>  
6 Nichakul Pisitpayat,<sup>1</sup> Nuengruethai Srisong,<sup>1</sup> Oiythip Yasopa,<sup>1</sup> Patchanee Plernprom,<sup>1</sup> Pitiphon  
7 Promduangsi,<sup>1</sup> Panita Kumphon,<sup>1</sup> Paphanij Suangtho,<sup>1</sup> Peeriya Watakulsin,<sup>1</sup> Sarinya Chaiya,<sup>1</sup>  
8 Somkid Kripattanapong,<sup>1</sup> Thanawadee Chantian,<sup>1</sup> Emily Bloss,<sup>3</sup> Chawetsan Namwat,<sup>1,2</sup> Direk  
9 Limmathurotsakul<sup>4,5,6</sup>

10 <sup>1</sup>Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Tiwanon Road, Nonthaburi, 11000,  
11 Thailand.

12 <sup>2</sup>International Health Policy Program (IHPP), Ministry of Public Health, Tiwanon Road,  
13 Nonthaburi, 11000, Thailand.

14 <sup>3</sup>Division of Global Health Protection (DGHP), Thailand Ministry of Public Health – U.S.  
15 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Collaboration, Tiwanon Road, Nonthaburi, 11000,  
16 Thailand.

17 <sup>4</sup>Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol  
18 University, Rajvithi Road, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand.

19 <sup>5</sup>Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Rajvithi  
20 Road, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand.

21 <sup>6</sup>Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University  
22 of Oxford, Old Road Campus, Oxford, OX3 7LG, United Kingdom.

23 **Corresponding author:** Direk Limmathurotsakul, 420/6 Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine  
24 Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Rajvithi Road, Bangkok, Thailand, 10400. Tel.  
25 +66-2-203-6333 Email: [direk@tropmedres.ac](mailto:direk@tropmedres.ac)

26 **Alternative corresponding author:** Pawind Doungngern, Department of Disease Control,  
27 Ministry of Public Health, Nonthaburi, 11000, Thailand. Email: [pawind@gmail.com](mailto:pawind@gmail.com)

28 **Word count:** Abstract 244, Main Text 3,955

29 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, mask, medical mask, non-medical mask, hand washing,  
30 social distancing, contact tracing

31 **Disclaimer:** The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not  
32 necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

33 **Abstract**

34 We evaluated the effectiveness of personal protective measures, including mask-wearing,  
35 handwashing, and social distancing, against COVID-19 infection among contacts of cases. We  
36 conducted a case-control study with 211 cases and 839 non-matched controls using all contact  
37 tracing records of Thailand's national Surveillance and Rapid Response Team. Cases were  
38 asymptomatic contacts of COVID-19 patients identified between 1 and 31 March 2020 who were  
39 diagnosed with COVID-19 by 21 April 2020; controls were asymptomatic contacts who were not  
40 diagnosed with COVID-19. Participants were queried about practices during contact periods with  
41 a case. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated for  
42 associations between diagnosis of COVID-19 and covariates using multivariable logistic  
43 regression models. Wearing masks all the time during contact was independently associated with  
44 lower risk of COVID-19 infection compared to not wearing masks (aOR 0.23, 95% CI 0.09–  
45 0.60), while sometimes wearing masks during contact was not (aOR 0.87, 95% CI 0.41–1.84).  
46 Maintaining at least 1 meter distance from a COVID patient (aOR 0.15, 95% CI 0.04–0.63),  
47 duration of close contact  $\leq 15$  minutes versus longer (aOR 0.24, 95% CI 0.07–0.90), and  
48 handwashing often (aOR 0.34, 95% CI 0.13–0.87) were significantly associated with lower risk  
49 of infection. Type of mask was not independently associated with infection. Those who wore  
50 masks all the time also were more likely to practice social distancing. Our findings suggest  
51 consistent wearing of masks, handwashing, and social distancing in public to protect against  
52 COVID-19 infection.

## 53 **Introduction**

54 Evaluation of the effectiveness of mask-wearing by healthy persons in the general public against  
55 COVID-19 infection is urgently needed (1, 2). On 27 February 2020, during the early stages of  
56 the COVID-19 outbreak, the World Health Organization (WHO) announced “For asymptomatic  
57 individuals, wearing a mask of any type is not recommended” (3). The rationale, at that time,  
58 was to avoid unnecessary cost, procurement burden, and a false sense of security (3). A number  
59 of systematic reviews found no conclusive evidence to support widespread use of masks in  
60 public against respiratory infectious diseases, such as influenza and SARS (4-6). However,  
61 China and many countries in Asia including South Korea, Japan, and Thailand have  
62 recommended the use of face masks among the general public since early in the outbreak (7).  
63 There is evidence that COVID-19 patients can have a “pre-symptomatic” period, during which  
64 infected persons can be contagious and, therefore, transmit the virus to others before symptoms  
65 develop (8). These findings led to a change in recommendations from the US Centers for Disease  
66 Control and Prevention on 4 April 2020 that advised all persons to wear a cloth face covering  
67 when in public (9). On 6 April and 5 June 2020, WHO updated its advice on the use of masks for  
68 the general public, and encouraged countries that issue the recommendations to conduct research  
69 on this topic (8).

70 Thailand has been implementing multiple measures against transmission of COVID-19 since the  
71 beginning of the outbreak (10, 11). The country established thermal screening at airports on 3  
72 January 2020, and detected the first case of COVID-19 outside China—a traveler from Wuhan  
73 arriving at Bangkok Suvarnabhumi airport—on 8 January 2020 (10). The country utilizes  
74 Surveillance and Rapid Response Teams (SRRTs), together with village health volunteers, to  
75 conduct contact tracing, educate the public about the disease, and monitor the close contacts of

76 COVID-19 patients in quarantine (11). SRRTs are epidemiologic investigation teams trained to  
77 conduct surveillance, investigations, and initial controls of communicable diseases including  
78 influenza H5N1, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), and Middle East respiratory  
79 syndrome (12, 13). Currently, there are more than 1,000 SRRTs established at district, provincial,  
80 and regional levels in Thailand (12) working on COVID-19 contact tracing.

81 By February 2020, public pressure to wear masks in Thailand was high, medical masks had  
82 become difficult for the public to procure, and the government had categorized medical masks as  
83 price-controlled goods and announced COVID-19 as a dangerous communicable disease  
84 according to the Communicable Disease Act 2015. These developments empowered officials to  
85 quarantine contacts and close public venues (14, 15). On 3 March, the Thai Ministry of Public  
86 Health (MoPH) announced that public use of cloth face masks were recommended (16). On 18  
87 March, schools, universities, bars, nightclubs and entertainment venues were closed (17). On 26  
88 March, when the country was reporting ~100–150 new COVID-19 patients per day, the  
89 government declared a national state of emergency, prohibited public gatherings, and enforced  
90 wearing of face masks by all persons on public transport (18). On 21 April, 19 new PCR-  
91 confirmed COVID-19 patients were announced by MoPH, bringing the total number of patients  
92 to 2,811 (18).

93 Given the current lack of evidence, we sought to evaluate the effectiveness of mask wearing,  
94 handwashing, social distancing, and other preventive measures against COVID-19 infection in  
95 Thailand.

## 96 **Methods**

### 97 **Study design**

98 We conducted a retrospective case-control study in which both cases and controls were drawn  
99 from a cohort of contact tracing records of the central SRRT team at the Department of Disease  
100 Control (DDC), MoPH, Thailand (Figure 1). Contacts were defined by the DDC MoPH as  
101 individuals who had activities together with or were in the same location(s) as a COVID-19  
102 patient (19, 20). The main aim of contact tracing was to identify and evaluate contacts, perform  
103 reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) COVID-19 diagnostic tests, and  
104 quarantine high-risk contacts, as defined by the MoPH (Table 1). Contacts were classified as  
105 high-risk if they were family members or lived in the same household as a COVID-19 patient, if  
106 they were within a 1-meter distance of a COVID-19 patient longer than 15 minutes; if they were  
107 exposed to coughs, sneezes, or secretions of a COVID-19 patient and were not wearing  
108 protective gear, such as a mask; or if they were in the same closed environment within a 1-meter  
109 distance of a COVID-19 patient longer than 15 minutes and were not wearing protective gear,  
110 such as a mask (19, 20). All RT-PCR tests were performed at laboratories certified for COVID-  
111 19 testing by the National Institute of Health of Thailand (19, 20). Data on risk factors associated  
112 with COVID-19 infection, such as type of contact and use of mask, were recorded during the  
113 contact investigation, but data were sometimes incomplete.

114 The central SRRT team performed contact investigations for any cluster with at least five PCR-  
115 confirmed COVID-19 patients from the same location(s) within a 1-week period (19, 20). We  
116 used these data to identify contacts of COVID-19 patients who were asymptomatic from 1  
117 through 31 March 2020. All available contact tracing records of the central SRRT team were  
118 used in the study. See Supplemental Materials for further details.

119 We telephoned the contacts during 30 April–27 May 2020 and asked details about their contact  
120 with COVID-19 patients (e.g., date(s), location(s), duration and distance of contacts); whether,

121 during the contact period, they wore a mask and the type of mask (1) never, 2) yes, non-medical  
122 mask, 3) yes, medical mask, 4), yes, alternately non-medical and medical masks, 5) unknown or  
123 cannot remember); and if so, the frequency of wearing a mask during the contact period (1)  
124 sometimes, 2) all the time, 3) unknown or cannot remember); if and how frequently they washed  
125 their hands during the contact period (1) no washing with soap or alcohol-based solutions, 2) yes,  
126 sometimes, 3) yes, all the time after any contact (defined below as ‘often’), 4) unknown or  
127 cannot remember); if they performed social distancing, including type of contact with COVID-  
128 19 patient or other people at place of contact, if unable to remember who the patient was (1) had  
129 physical contact, 2) shortest distance  $\leq 1$  meter and no physical contact, 3) shortest distance  $> 1$   
130 meter and no physical contact, 4) unknown or cannot remember); total duration of contact (1) in  
131 total, more than 1 hour, 2) at least 15 minutes but not more than 1 hour, 3) less than 15 minutes,  
132 4) unknown or cannot remember); if they shared a cup or a cigarette with other people in the  
133 place they had contact or had highest risk of contact with the patient (1) no, 2) yes, 3) unknown  
134 or cannot remember); and whether the COVID-19 patient, if known to the respondent, had worn  
135 a mask (1) never, 2) yes, non-medical mask, 3) yes, medical mask, 4) yes, alternately non-  
136 medical and medical masks, 5) unknown or cannot remember), and if so, the frequency of  
137 wearing a mask (1) sometimes, 2) all the time, 3) unknown or cannot remember). We also asked,  
138 and verified using DDC records, whether and when the contacts became sick and diagnosed with  
139 COVID-19.

140 We defined cases as asymptomatic contacts who were later diagnosed with COVID-19 based on  
141 RT-PCR assay results available by 21 Apr 2020 (Table 1). All asymptomatic contacts who were  
142 not diagnosed with COVID-19 by 21 Apr 2020, including those who tested negative and those  
143 who were not tested, were classified as controls. We used 21 days after 31 March as a cutoff date

144 based on evidence that (1) most COVID-19 patients would likely develop symptoms within 14  
145 days (21) and (2) it could take <7 additional days for symptomatic patients under contact  
146 investigation to present at healthcare facilities and be tested for COVID-19 by RT-PCR assay.

147 Definitions for asymptomatic contacts, cases, controls, index patients, primary index patients,  
148 COVID-19 patients, high-risk and low-risk contacts were described in Table 1. The reporting of  
149 this study follows the STROBE guidelines (see Supplemental Materials) (22).

### 150 **Statistical analysis**

151 To include only initially asymptomatic contacts in the study, we excluded from the analysis  
152 people who reported having any symptoms of COVID-19 at the time of initial contact with a  
153 case. We excluded contacts whose contact locations were healthcare facilities because this study  
154 focused on the risk of infection in the community. Primary index patients were also excluded if  
155 they were the first to have symptoms at the contact investigation location, had symptoms since  
156 the first day of visiting the location, or were the origin of infection based on the contact  
157 investigation.

158 Univariate and bivariate analyses were conducted. We estimated secondary attack rate using  
159 definitions as described in Table 1 to allow for comparison with other studies. Odds ratios (OR)  
160 and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were estimated for associations between development of  
161 COVID-19 and baseline covariates, such as mask-wearing, handwashing, and social distancing  
162 during the contact period. We used logistic regression with random effects for location and for  
163 index patient nested within the same location. If an asymptomatic contact had contact with  $\geq 1$   
164 symptomatic COVID-19 patient, the interviewer identified the index patient as the symptomatic  
165 COVID-19 patient who had the closest contact. The percentage of missing values for the variable



166 indicating whether the index patients wore a mask was 27%, so this variable was not included in  
167 analyses. For other variables, we assumed that missing values were missing at random and used  
168 imputation by chained equations (23, 24). We created 10 imputed datasets and the imputation  
169 model included the case-control indicator and all independent variables included in the  
170 multivariable models. We developed the final multilevel mixed-effect logistic regression models  
171 on the basis of previous knowledge and a purposeful selection method (25). Because of  
172 collinearity between mask use and mask type, we conducted a separate analysis including mask  
173 type in the multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression model for COVID-19 infection. We also  
174 tested a pre-defined interaction between mask type and mask-wearing compliance (see  
175 Supplemental Materials).

176 To better understand patterns of behavior and factors related to compliance in mask-wearing, we  
177 also estimated OR and 95% CI for associations between three categories of mask-wearing  
178 compliance (i.e. never, sometimes, all the time) and other practices including handwashing and  
179 social distancing during the contact period using multinomial logistic regression models with the  
180 imputed data set. Logistic regression was used to estimate a p-value for pairwise comparisons.

181 To estimate the proportional reduction in cases that would occur if exposure to risk factors was  
182 reduced, we estimated the population attributable fraction (PAF) using the imputed dataset and a  
183 direct method based on logistic regression, as described previously (see Supplemental Materials)  
184 (26, 27). The final multivariable model was modified by considering each risk factor  
185 dichotomously, and PAF was calculated by subtraction of the total number of predicted cases  
186 from total number of observed cases, divided by the total number of observed cases.

187 STATA version 14.2 and R version 4.0.0 were used for all analyses.

## 188 **RESULTS**

### 189 **Characteristics of the cohort data**

190 The contact tracing records of the central SRRT team included 1,716 persons who had contact  
191 with or were in the same location as a COVID-19 patient who was diagnosed in an investigation  
192 of three large clusters in nightclubs, boxing stadiums, and a state enterprise office in Thailand  
193 (Figure 1). Overall, 18 individuals were defined as primary index patients: 11 from the nightclub  
194 cluster, 5 from the boxing stadium cluster, and 2 from the state enterprise office cluster.  
195 Timelines of primary index patients from nightclub, boxing stadium, and state enterprise clusters  
196 are described in detail in the Supplemental Text and Supplemental Figures 1–3. All 18 primary  
197 index patients were excluded from case-control study analyses.

### 198 **Characteristics of cases and controls**

199 After retrospectively interviewing each contact by phone and applying exclusion criteria (Figure  
200 1), we included 1,050 asymptomatic contacts who had contact with or were in the same location  
201 as a symptomatic COVID-19 patient from 1 through 31 March 2020 in the analysis. The median  
202 age of individuals was 38 years (interquartile range 28–51) and 55% were male (Table 2). Most  
203 asymptomatic contacts included in the study were associated with the boxing stadium cluster  
204 (61%, n=645); 36% (n=374) were related to the nightclub cluster, and 3% (n=31) were related to  
205 the state enterprise office cluster. Overall, 890 (85%) were contacts with high-risk exposure.

206 In total, 211 (20%) asymptomatic contacts were later diagnosed with COVID-19 by 21 Apr 2020  
207 and classified as cases; 839 (80%) were not diagnosed and represented the control group. Of the  
208 211 cases, 195 (92%) were contacts with high-risk exposure and 150 (71%) had symptoms of

209 COVID-19 prior to diagnosis by RT-PCR results. The last date that a COVID-19 case was  
210 diagnosed was 9 April 2020. Among 839 controls, 696 (83%) were deemed to have had high-risk  
211 exposures and 719 (86%) were tested for COVID-19 at least once.

212 Figure 2 illustrates contacts (and possible transmission routes) between index patients and  
213 asymptomatic contacts included in the study. There were 228, 144, and 20 asymptomatic  
214 contacts of index patients at nightclubs, boxing stadiums, and the state enterprise office,  
215 respectively. Figure 2 shows all contacts of primary index patients in the clusters. The others had  
216 contact with cases associated with nightclubs, boxing stadiums, at workplaces (n=277),  
217 households (n=230), and other places (n=151).

218 Among 890 asymptomatic contacts with high-risk exposures included in the study, the boxing  
219 stadium secondary attack rate was 86% (111/129), the nightclub secondary attack rate was 18%  
220 (34/187), the household secondary attack rate was 17% (38/230), the workplace secondary  
221 attack rate was 5% (10/205), and the secondary attack rate at other places was 1% (2/139).

## 222 **Bivariate analyses**

223 Table 2 shows that COVID-19 infection was negatively associated with maintaining a distance  
224 of at least >1 meter from a case (crude odds ratio [OR] 0.08, 95% CI 0.02–0.31), duration of  
225 contact ≤15 minutes (OR 0.13, 95% CI 0.04–0.46), handwashing sometimes (OR 0.41, 95% CI  
226 0.18–0.91) or often (OR 0.19, 95% CI 0.08–0.46) and wearing a mask all the time during the  
227 period of contact with the COVID-19 case (OR 0.16, 95% CI 0.07–0.36). Sharing dishes or cups  
228 (OR 2.71 95% CI 1.48–4.94) and sharing cigarettes (OR 6.12, 2.12–17.72) with other people (not  
229 necessarily including the case) were associated with higher risk of COVID-19 infection. Type of  
230 mask was associated with infection in the bivariate model (p=0.003).

## 231 **Multivariable analyses**

232 We found a negative association between risk of COVID-19 infection and maintaining a distance  
233 of at least >1 meter from a case (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.15, 95% CI 0.04–0.63), duration of  
234 contact  $\leq$ 15 minutes (aOR 0.24, 95% CI 0.07–0.90), handwashing often (aOR 0.34, 95% CI  
235 0.13–0.87), and wearing a mask all the time during the period of contact with the COVID-19  
236 case (aOR 0.23, 95% CI 0.09–0.60) (Table 2). Wearing masks sometimes during contact with the  
237 case was not significantly associated with lower risk of infection (aOR 0.87, 95% CI 0.41–1.84).  
238 Sharing cigarettes with other people was associated with higher risk of COVID-19 infection  
239 (aOR 3.47, 1.09–11.02).

240 Compliance with mask-wearing during the period of contact with a case was strongly associated  
241 with lower risk of infection in the multivariable model. Because of collinearity with mask-  
242 wearing compliance, mask type was not included in the final model. We included mask type in a  
243 separate multivariable model and found type of mask was not independently associated with  
244 infection ( $p=0.54$ ) (Supplemental Materials, Table 1). We found no evidence of effect  
245 modification between mask type and mask-wearing compliance.

## 246 **Association between mask-wearing compliance and other social distancing practices**

247 Because mask-wearing throughout the contact period was negatively associated with COVID-19  
248 infection, we further explored characteristics of those patients to ascertain if wearing a mask  
249 produced a potential false sense of security. We found that during the contact period, those who  
250 wore masks all the time were more likely to report closest contacts >1 meter (25% vs. 18%,  
251 pairwise  $p=0.03$ ), durations of contact  $\leq$ 15 minutes (26% vs 13%, pairwise  $p<0.001$ ), and  
252 washing hands often (79% vs. 26%, pairwise  $p<0.001$ ) compared with those who did not wear

253 masks (Table 3). We found that those who wore masks sometimes were more likely to wash their  
254 hands often (43% vs. 26%, pairwise  $p < 0.001$ ) compared with those who did not wear masks.  
255 However, they were more likely to have physical contact (50% vs. 42%, pairwise  $p = 0.03$ ) and  
256 report duration of contacts  $> 60$  minutes (75% vs. 67%, pairwise  $p = 0.04$ ) compared with those  
257 who did not wear masks.

### 258 **Population attributable fraction**

259 We estimated that the proportional reduction in cases that might occur if everyone wore a mask  
260 all the time during contact with COVID-19 patients (i.e., PAF of not wearing masks all the time)  
261 was 0.28 (Table 4). Among modifiable risk factors evaluated, PAF of shortest distance of contact  
262  $< 1$  meter was highest at 0.40. If everyone wore a mask all the time; washed hands often; did not  
263 share a dish, cup, or cigarette; had shortest distance of contact  $> 1$  meter; and had duration of  
264 contact  $< 15$  min, cases may have been reduced by 84%, based on our data.

### 265 **DISCUSSION**

266 Our findings provide evidence that mask-wearing, handwashing, and social distancing are  
267 independently associated with lower risk of COVID-19 infection among the general public in  
268 Thai community settings. We observed that wearing masks throughout the period of exposure to  
269 someone infected with COVID-19 was associated with lower risk of infection, while wearing  
270 masks sometimes during the exposure period was not. This evidence supports mask-wearing  
271 consistently and correctly at all times in public (2, 7-9).

272 We also quantified the effectiveness of different measures that could be implemented to prevent  
273 transmission in nightclubs, stadiums, workplaces, and other public gathering places. We

274 estimated that adopting all recommendations (mask-wearing all the time; handwashing often; not  
275 sharing dishes, cups or cigarettes; maintaining a distance of >1 meter and, if this distance cannot  
276 be maintained, limiting contact duration to <15 minutes) might prevent up to 84% of COVID-19  
277 infections in the study settings during the study period. Public gathering places may consider  
278 multiple measures to protect against COVID-19 and new pandemic diseases in the future.

279 The effectiveness of mask-wearing observed in this study is consistent with previous studies,  
280 including a randomized-controlled trial showing that consistent face mask use reduced risk of  
281 influenza-like illness (28); two case-control studies that found mask-wearing was associated with  
282 lower risk of SARS infection (29, 30); and a retrospective cohort study that found that wearing  
283 mask-wearing by index patients or family members at home was associated with lower risk of  
284 COVID-19 infection (31).

285 While previous studies found use of surgical masks or 12–16-layer cotton masks demonstrated  
286 protection against coronavirus infection in the community (32), we did not observe a difference  
287 between wearing non-medical and medical masks in the general population. Our results suggest  
288 that wearing non-medical masks in public can potentially reduce transmission of COVID-19  
289 infection. Previous studies have shown perception of risk of developing COVID-19 can increase  
290 individuals' likelihood of wearing medical masks in non-medical settings (33); however, given  
291 recent shortages, it is important that medical masks be reserved for use by healthcare workers.

292 We found a negative association between risk of COVID-19 infection and social distancing (i.e.,  
293 shorter distances and durations of contact), consistent with previous studies that found that  $\geq 1$ -  
294 meter physical distancing was associated with a larger protective effect, and distances of >2

295 meters could be even more effective (32). Our findings on effectiveness of hand hygiene were  
296 also consistent with those reported in previous studies (34).

297 Secondary attack rates at different venues in this study varied widely. The household secondary  
298 attack rate in our study (17%) is comparable with ranges reported previously (11%–23%) (35,  
299 36) and relatively high compared to workplaces and other settings. While quarantine measures  
300 may be challenging and sometimes impractical, household members should immediately  
301 separate a person who develops any symptoms of COVID-19 from other household members  
302 (i.e., a sick person should stay in a specific room; use a separate bathroom, if possible; and not  
303 share dishes, cups, and other utensils) (37). All household members should wear masks,  
304 frequently wash hands, and perform social distancing to the extent possible (38).

305 The high number of COVID-19 patients associated with nightclub exposures in Bangkok is  
306 comparable to the COVID-19 outbreak associated with the Itaewon nightclub cluster in Seoul,  
307 Korea, in May 2020 (39). Similarly, we found individuals who visited several nightclubs in the  
308 same area during a short period of time. The secondary attack rate in boxing stadiums was high,  
309 at 86%. The high number of COVID-19 infections reported from a boxing stadium in Bangkok is  
310 similar to a cluster of COVID-19 cases associated with a football match in Italy in February 2020  
311 (40). The secondary attack rate of COVID-19 at a choir practice in the United States was  
312 reported to be as high as 53% (41). Secondary attack rates in public gathering places with high  
313 densities of people who are shouting and cheering—such as football and boxing stadiums—are  
314 still uncertain but may be high.

315 It is likely that clear, consistent public messaging from policymakers can prevent a false sense of  
316 security and promote compliance with social distancing in Thailand. We found that those who

317 wore masks throughout the exposure period to a case were also more likely to wash hands and  
318 perform social distancing. Both traditional and social media outlets can support public health  
319 responses by working with governments to provide consistent, simple and clear messages (42).  
320 In Thailand, daily briefings by Thailand's Centre for COVID-19 Situation Administration  
321 (CCSA) provided clear and consistent messages on social distancing every day, including how to  
322 put on a mask and wash hands. CCSA's regular situation reports and advice may have improved  
323 public confidence and compliance with the recommendations. Public messages on how to wear  
324 masks correctly need to be consistently delivered, particularly to those who wear masks  
325 sometimes or incorrectly (e.g., not covering both nose and mouth); we found that those who wear  
326 masks during exposure intermittently also did not practice social distancing adequately.

327 Our study has several limitations. First, our findings might not be generalizable to all settings,  
328 since they were based on contacts related to three major COVID-19 clusters in Thailand during  
329 March 2020. Second, estimated ORs were conditioned on occurrence of the reported contact  
330 with index patients. Our study did not evaluate or consider the probability of having contact with  
331 other infected people in the community setting, which must have occurred. Third, since only  
332 89% of controls were tested at least once, those not tested could have been infected, and  
333 therefore, cases with mild or no symptoms who did not report symptoms or seek care and testing  
334 could have been missed. Fourth, it is impossible to identify every potential contact an individual  
335 has and some individuals may have had contact with >1 COVID-19 patient. Hence, our  
336 estimated secondary attack rates among contacts with high-risk exposure could be over- or  
337 underestimated. Fifth, findings were subject to common biases of retrospective case-control  
338 studies, including memory bias, observer bias, and information bias (43). To reduce potential



339 biases, we used structured interviews where each participant was asked the same set of defined  
340 questions.

341 As social distancing measures are being relaxed in many countries, our findings provide  
342 evidence supporting consistent mask-wearing, handwashing, and adhering to social distancing  
343 recommendations can reduce COVID-19 transmission in public gathering places. Wearing non-  
344 medical masks in public may help slow the spread of COVID-19. The effectiveness of  
345 complying with all measures could be high; however, in places with a high density of people,  
346 additional measures may be required.

347 Clear and consistent public messaging on recommendations against COVID-19 infection is  
348 important, particularly targeting those who wear masks intermittently or incorrectly. Our data  
349 also showed that no single protective measure was associated with complete protection from  
350 COVID-19 infection. All measures, including wearing masks, handwashing, and social  
351 distancing can increase protection against COVID-19 infections in public.

## 352 **Acknowledgements**

353 We thank all participants and all COVID-19 patients involved in providing information. We  
354 thank all SRRT members at the central, regional, provincial and district levels, as well as all  
355 Village Health Volunteers in Thailand. We thank Pattraporn Klanjatturat for her technical  
356 assistance. We thank Dr. Suwannachai Wattanayingcharoenchai, Dr. Sombat Thanprasertkul, Dr.  
357 Virasakdi Chongsuvivatwong, Dr. Panithee Thammawijaya, and Dr. Walairat Chaifoo of the  
358 DDC, MoPH, and Dr. Virasakdi Chongsuvivatwong from Prince of Songkhla University for  
359 their advice and direction.

360 **Contributors**

361 PD, RS, CN, and DL contributed to design of the study. PD, RS, and DL contributed to setting  
362 up the database and quality control. AP, CJ, DR, ND, NE, NP, NS, OY, PaP, PiP, PK, PS, PW,  
363 SC, SK, and TC contributed to data collection. DL carried out the main statistical analysis. PD  
364 and RS coordinated the study and contributed to the statistical analyses. PD, RS, EB, and DL  
365 contributed to interpretation of the results and drafted the manuscript. All authors commented on  
366 drafts and read and approved the final manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed  
367 authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. PD is  
368 the guarantor.

369 **Competing interests**

370 The authors declare that they have no completing interests.

371 **Ethical approval**

372 As this study was part of the routine situation analysis and outbreak investigation of the DDC  
373 MoPH Thailand, it was not required to obtain ethics approval and no written informed consent  
374 was collected. However, the study team strictly followed ethical standards in research, that is, all  
375 individual information was strictly kept confidential and not reported in the paper. The DDC  
376 MoPH Thailand approved the analysis and reporting of data in aggregate.

377 **Funding**

378 The study was supported by the DDC, MoPH, Thailand. DL is supported by the Wellcome Trust  
379 (106698/Z/14/Z).

380 **Data sharing**

381 All data in aggregate are reported in the manuscript.

382

383 **References**

- 384 1. Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. Face masks for the public  
385 during the covid-19 crisis. *BMJ*. 2020 Apr 9;369:m1435.
- 386 2. Cheng KK, Lam TH, Leung CC. Wearing face masks in the community during the  
387 COVID-19 pandemic: altruism and solidarity. *Lancet*. 2020 Apr 16.
- 388 3. WHO. Rational use of personal protective equipment for coronavirus disease (COVID-  
389 19): interim guidance, 27 February 2020. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
390 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/331215>
- 391 4. Long Y, Hu T, Liu L, Chen R, Guo Q, Yang L, et al. Effectiveness of N95 respirators  
392 versus surgical masks against influenza: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Evid Based*  
393 *Med*. 2020 Mar 13.
- 394 5. Cowling BJ, Zhou Y, Ip DK, Leung GM, Aiello AE. Face masks to prevent transmission  
395 of influenza virus: a systematic review. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2010 Apr;138(4):449-56.
- 396 6. Jefferson T, Del Mar CB, Dooley L, Ferroni E, Al-Ansary LA, Bawazeer GA, et al.  
397 Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. *Cochrane Database*  
398 *Syst Rev*. 2011 Jul 6(7):CD006207.
- 399 7. Feng S, Shen C, Xia N, Song W, Fan M, Cowling BJ. Rational use of face masks in the  
400 COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020 Mar 20.
- 401 8. WHO. Advice on the use of masks in the context of COVID-19: interim guidance, 5 June  
402 2020. 2020 [cited 2020 06 23]. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/332293>
- 403 9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) How  
404 to Protect Yourself and Others. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
405 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention-H.pdf>

- 406 10. Okada P, Buathong R, Phuygun S, Thanadachakul T, Parnmen S, Wongboot W, et al.  
407 Early transmission patterns of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in travellers from Wuhan  
408 to Thailand, January 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 2020 Feb;25(8).
- 409 11. Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. Corona Virus  
410 Disease (COVID-19): Situation Reports. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
411 <https://ddc.moph.go.th/viralpneumonia/eng/situation.php>
- 412 12. Chunsuttiwat S. Response to avian influenza and preparedness for pandemic influenza:  
413 Thailand's experience. *Respirology.* 2008 Mar;13 Suppl 1:S36-40.
- 414 13. Putthasri W, Lertiendumrong J, Chompook P, Tangcharoensathien V, Coker R. Capacity  
415 of Thailand to contain an emerging influenza pandemic. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2009 Mar;15(3):423-  
416 32.
- 417 14. Bangkok Post. Tougher Covid-19 measures take effect Sunday. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
418 [https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1868439/tougher-covid-19-measures-take-effect-](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1868439/tougher-covid-19-measures-take-effect-sunday)  
419 [sunday](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1868439/tougher-covid-19-measures-take-effect-sunday)
- 420 15. WHO Thailand. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) WHO Thailand Situation Report  
421 - 29 February 2020. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23]. [https://www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/thailand/20200229-tha-sitrep-11-covid-19-final.pdf?sfvrsn=eccaf9ec_0)  
422 [source/searo/thailand/20200229-tha-sitrep-11-covid-19-final.pdf?sfvrsn=eccaf9ec\\_0.](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/thailand/20200229-tha-sitrep-11-covid-19-final.pdf?sfvrsn=eccaf9ec_0)
- 423 16. Channel News Asia. 'Better than nothing': Thailand encourages cloth masks amid  
424 surgical mask shortage. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
425 [https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/coronavirus-thailand-cloth-masks-surgical-](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/coronavirus-thailand-cloth-masks-surgical-shortage-covid-19-12530896)  
426 [shortage-covid-19-12530896](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/coronavirus-thailand-cloth-masks-surgical-shortage-covid-19-12530896)

- 427 17. Bangkok Post. Cabinet approves plans to close schools, postpone Songkran. 2020. [cited  
428 2020 06 23]. [https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1880635/cabinet-approves-plans-](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1880635/cabinet-approves-plans-to-close-schools-postpone-songkran)  
429 [to-close-schools-postpone-songkran](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1880635/cabinet-approves-plans-to-close-schools-postpone-songkran)
- 430 18. WHO Thailand. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) WHO Thailand Situation Report  
431 - 21 April 2020 2020 [cited 2020 06 23]. [https://www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/thailand/2020-04-21-tha-sitrep-59-covid19-new-template-final.pdf?sfvrsn=31bc500a_0)  
432 [source/searo/thailand/2020-04-21-tha-sitrep-59-covid19-new-template-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/thailand/2020-04-21-tha-sitrep-59-covid19-new-template-final.pdf?sfvrsn=31bc500a_0)  
433 [final.pdf?sfvrsn=31bc500a\\_0](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/thailand/2020-04-21-tha-sitrep-59-covid19-new-template-final.pdf?sfvrsn=31bc500a_0)
- 434 19. Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. Coronavirus  
435 Disease 2019: COVID-19, updated on 3 March 2020. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
436 [https://ddc.moph.go.th/viralpneumonia/file/guidelines/G\\_Invest\\_03\\_2.pdf](https://ddc.moph.go.th/viralpneumonia/file/guidelines/G_Invest_03_2.pdf)
- 437 20. Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. Coronavirus Disease  
438 2019: COVID-19, updated on 23 March 2020. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
439 [https://ddc.moph.go.th/viralpneumonia/file/g\\_srrt/g\\_srrt\\_250363.pdf](https://ddc.moph.go.th/viralpneumonia/file/g_srrt/g_srrt_250363.pdf)
- 440 21. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, Jones FK, Zheng Q, Meredith HR, et al. The Incubation  
441 Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases:  
442 Estimation and Application. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020 Mar 10.
- 443 22. Vandembroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, et al.  
444 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation  
445 and elaboration. *PLoS Med*. 2007 Oct 16;4(10):e297.
- 446 23. van Buuren S, Boshuizen HC, Knook DL. Multiple imputation of missing blood pressure  
447 covariates in survival analysis. *Stat Med*. 1999 Mar 30;18(6):681-94.

- 448 24. Raghunathan T, Lepkowski J, Hoewyk J, Solenberger P. A Multivariate Technique for  
449 Multiply Imputing Missing Values Using a Sequence of Regression Models. *Survey*  
450 *Methodology*. 2001 11/30;27.
- 451 25. Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. Purposeful selection of variables in  
452 logistic regression. *Source Code Biol Med*. 2008 Dec 16;3:17.
- 453 26. Azimi SS, Khalili D, Hadaegh F, Yavari P, Mehrabi Y, Azizi F. Calculating population  
454 attributable fraction for cardiovascular risk factors using different methods in a population based  
455 cohort study. *J Res Health Sci*. 2015 Winter;15(1):22-7.
- 456 27. Ruckinger S, von Kries R, Toschke AM. An illustration of and programs estimating  
457 attributable fractions in large scale surveys considering multiple risk factors. *BMC Med Res*  
458 *Methodol*. 2009 Jan 23;9:7.
- 459 28. MacIntyre CR, Cauchemez S, Dwyer DE, Seale H, Cheung P, Browne G, et al. Face  
460 mask use and control of respiratory virus transmission in households. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2009  
461 Feb;15(2):233-41.
- 462 29. Wu J, Xu F, Zhou W, Feikin DR, Lin CY, He X, et al. Risk factors for SARS among  
463 persons without known contact with SARS patients, Beijing, China. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004  
464 Feb;10(2):210-6.
- 465 30. Lau JT, Tsui H, Lau M, Yang X. SARS transmission, risk factors, and prevention in  
466 Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004 Apr;10(4):587-92.
- 467 31. Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, Zhang M, Guo D, Wu W, et al. Reduction of secondary  
468 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing:  
469 a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020 May;5(5).

- 470 32. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schunemann HJ, et al. Physical  
471 distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-  
472 CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2020 Jun 1.
- 473 33. Huynh TD. The more I fear about COVID-19, the more I wear medical masks: A survey  
474 on risk perception and medical masks uses. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.03.26.20044388.
- 475 34. Jefferson T, Del Mar C, Dooley L, Ferroni E, Al-Ansary LA, Bawazeer GA, et al.  
476 Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses: systematic review.  
477 *BMJ*. 2009 Sep 21;339:b3675.
- 478 35. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, Ye C, Zou X, Zhang Z, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of  
479 COVID-19 in 391 cases and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective  
480 cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020 Apr 27.
- 481 36. Jing Q-L, Liu M-J, Yuan J, Zhang Z-B, Zhang A-R, Dean NE, et al. Household  
482 Secondary Attack Rate of COVID-19 and Associated Determinants. *medRxiv*.  
483 2020:2020.04.11.20056010.
- 484 37. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus Disease 2019 What To Do If  
485 You Are Sick. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23]. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-  
486 sick/steps-when-sick.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html)
- 487 38. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Households Living in Close Quarters: How  
488 to Protect Those That Are Most Vulnerable. 2020. [cited 2020 06 23].  
489 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/living-in-close-quarters.html>
- 490 39. Kang CR, Lee JY, Park Y, Huh IS, Ham HJ, Han JK, et al. Coronavirus Disease  
491 Exposure and Spread from Nightclubs, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Jul 7;26(10).



- 492 40. Boccia S, Ricciardi W, Ioannidis JPA. What Other Countries Can Learn From Italy  
493 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020 Apr 7.
- 494 41. Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, Ross A, Jordan A, Lee J, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack  
495 Rate Following Exposure at a Choir Practice - Skagit County, Washington, March 2020.  
496 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020 May 15;69(19):606-10.
- 497 42. Hopman J, Allegranzi B, Mehtar S. Managing COVID-19 in Low- and Middle-Income  
498 Countries. *JAMA.* 2020 Mar 16.
- 499 43. Kopec JA, Esdaile JM. Bias in case-control studies. A review. *J Epidemiol Community*  
500 *Health.* 1990 Sep;44(3):179-86.

501

502 **Table 1. Definitions used in the study**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Asymptomatic contacts	Individuals who had contact with or were in the same location as a symptomatic COVID-19 patient and had no symptoms of COVID-19 on the first day of contact.
Cases	Asymptomatic contacts of COVID-19 patients who were later diagnosed and officially reported as COVID-19 patients by 21 Apr 2020.
Controls	Asymptomatic contacts of COVID-19 patients who were not diagnosed as COVID-19 patients by 21 Apr 2020.
Index patients	The COVID-19 patients identified from contact tracing data as the potential source of infection. Cases (as defined above) could also be included as index patients.
Primary index patients	The earliest COVID-19 patients, whose probable sources of infection were prior to the study period (1 to 31 March 2020); from whom we were not able to identify the source of infection; or whose probable sources of infection were outside the contact tracing data included in the study.
COVID-19 patients	Individuals who had positive RT-PCR test results for SARS-CoV-2, officially confirmed and reported by Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand.
Secondary attack rate	The percentage of new cases among asymptomatic contacts with high-risk exposure.
High-risk contacts	Family members or lived in the same household as a COVID-19 patient, if they were within a 1-meter distance of a COVID-19 patient longer than 15 minutes; if they were exposed to coughs, sneezes, or secretions of a COVID-19 patient and were not wearing a protective gear, such as a mask; or if they were in the same closed environment (e.g., room, nightclub, stadium, vehicle) within a 1-meter distance of a COVID-19 patient longer than 15 minutes and they were not wearing protective gear, such as a mask (19, 20).
Low-risk contacts	Contacts who had activities together with or were in the same location(s) as a COVID-19 patient but did not meet criteria for a high-risk contact.
Household contact	Individuals who lived in the same household as a COVID-19 patient.

503

504

**Table 2. Factors associated with COVID-19 infection among persons followed through contract tracing, Thailand, March-April 2020**

Factors	Cases (n=211)	Controls (n=839)	Crude odds ratio (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	P	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	P
<b>Male gender</b>	146/211 (69%)	434/838 (52%)	0.83 (0.47–1.46)	0.52	0.76 (0.41–1.41)	0.37
<b>Age group</b>						
≤15 years old	6/211 (3%)	49/829 (6%)	0.65 (0.17–2.48)	0.29	0.57 (0.15–2.21)	0.21
>15–40 years old	94/211 (45%)	435/829 (52%)	1.0		1.0	
>40–65 years old	98/211 (46%)	302/829 (36%)	1.65 (0.91–2.97)		1.77 (0.94–3.32)	
>65 years old	13/211 (6%)	43/829 (5%)	1.29 (0.33–5.07)		0.97 (0.22–4.24)	
<b>Contact place<sup>b</sup></b>						
Nightclub	35 (17%)	193 (23%)	Not applicable <sup>c</sup>	-	Not applicable <sup>c</sup>	-
Boxing stadium	125 (59%)	19 (2%)				
Workplace	11 (5%)	286 (34%)				
Household	38 (18%)	192 (23%)				
Others	2 (1%)	149 (18%)				
<b>Shortest distance of contact</b>						
Physical contact	132/197 (67%)	292/809 (36%)	1.0	0.001	1.0	0.02
≤1 meter without physical contact	61/197 (31%)	335/809 (41%)	0.76 (0.43–1.35)		1.09 (0.58–2.07)	
>1 meter	4/197 (2%)	182/809 (22%)	0.08 (0.02–0.31)		0.15 (0.04–0.63)	
<b>Duration of contact within 1 meter</b>						
>60 minutes	180/199 (90%)	487/801 (61%)	1.0	0.003	1.0	0.09
>15–60 minutes	14/199 (7%)	162/801 (20%)	0.53 (0.24–1.17)		0.67 (0.29–1.55)	
≤15 minutes	5/199 (3%)	152/801 (19%)	0.13 (0.04–0.46)		0.24 (0.07–0.90)	
<b>Sharing dishes or cups<sup>d,e</sup></b>						
None	125/210 (60%)	576/837 (69%)	1.0	0.001	1.0	0.39
Yes	85/210 (40%)	261/837 (31%)	2.71 (1.48–4.94)		1.33 (0.70–2.54)	
<b>Sharing cigarettes<sup>d,f</sup></b>						
None	196/209 (94%)	824/836 (99%)	1.0	0.001	1.0	0.03
Yes	13/209 (6%)	12/836 (1%)	6.12 (2.12–17.72)		3.47 (1.09–11.02)	
<b>Washing hands<sup>d,g</sup></b>						
None	44/210 (21%)	121/826 (15%)	1.0	<0.001	1.0	0.045
Sometimes	114/210 (54%)	333/826 (40%)	0.41 (0.18–0.91)		0.34 (0.14–0.81)	
Often	52/210 (25%)	372/826 (45%)	0.19 (0.08–0.46)		0.33 (0.13–0.87)	

<b>Wearing masks</b> <sup>d,h</sup>						
Not wearing masks	102/211 (48%)	500/834 (60%)	1.0	0.003	-	-
Wearing non-medical masks	25/211 (12%)	77/834 (9%)	0.78 (0.32–1.90)			
Wearing non-medical and medical masks alternately	12/211 (6%)	48/834 (6%)	0.46 (0.13–1.64)			
Wearing medical masks	72/211 (34%)	209/834 (25%)	0.25 (0.12–0.53)			
<b>Compliance with mask wearing</b> <sup>d,h</sup>						
Not wearing a mask	102/210 (49%)	500/823 (61%)	1.0	<0.001	1.0	0.006
Sometimes	79/210 (38%)	125/823 (15%)	0.75 (0.37–1.52)		0.87 (0.41–1.84)	
All the time	29/210 (14%)	198/823 (24%)	0.16 (0.07–0.36)		0.23 (0.09–0.60)	

<sup>a</sup> Both crude and adjusted odds ratios were estimated using logistic regression with a random effect for location and a random effect for index patient nested within the same location. <sup>b</sup> The state enterprise office was included as a workplace. “Others” included restaurants, markets, malls, religious places, and households of index patients or other people but not living together. <sup>c</sup> Location was included in the model as a random effect variable. <sup>d</sup> During the contact period. <sup>e</sup> Sharing multi-serving dishes using communal serving utensils to portion food individually was categorized as not sharing dishes. <sup>f</sup> Included sharing electronic cigarettes and any vaping devices. <sup>g</sup> Included washing with soap and water, and with alcohol-based solutions. <sup>h</sup> Wearing masks incorrectly (e.g., not covering both nose and mouth) was considered to be the same as not wearing a mask for analyses.

**Table 3. Factors associated with mask-wearing compliance among persons followed through contract tracing, Thailand, March-April 2020**

Factors	Not wearing masks (n=602)	Wearing masks sometimes (n=204)	Wearing masks all the time (n=227)	P
<b>Male gender</b>	324/601 (54%)	129/204 (63%)	115/227 (51%)	0.03
<b>Age group</b>				
≤15 years old	45/594 (8%)	5/204 (2%)	3/225 (1%)	<0.001
>15–40 years old	269/594 (45%)	117/204 (57%)	132/225 (59%)	
>40–65 years old	236/594 (40%)	76/204 (37%)	84/225 (37%)	
>65 years old	44/594 (7%)	6/204 (3%)	6/225 (3%)	
<b>Contact places</b>				
Nightclub	84 (14%)	51 (25%)	91 (40%)	<0.001
Boxing stadium	48 (8%)	66 (32%)	29 (13%)	
Workplace <sup>a</sup>	178 (30%)	46 (23%)	64 (28%)	
Household	167 (28%)	27 (13%)	33 (15%)	
Others <sup>b</sup>	125 (21%)	14 (7%)	10 (4%)	
<b>Shortest distance of contact</b>				
Physical contact	246/588 (42%)	96/191 (50%)	76/212 (36%)	0.005
≤1 meter without physical contact	238/588 (40%)	70/191 (37%)	83/212 (39%)	
>1 meter	104/588 (18%)	25/191 (13%)	53/212 (25%)	
<b>Duration of contact within 1 meter</b>				
>60 minutes	396/590 (67%)	143/190 (75%)	121/205 (59%)	<0.001
>15–60 minutes	120/590 (20%)	23/190 (12%)	30/205 (15%)	
≤15 minutes	74/590 (13%)	24/190 (13%)	54/205 (26%)	
<b>Sharing dishes or cups <sup>c,d</sup></b>				
None	361/601 (60%)	130/203 (64%)	200/226 (88%)	<0.001
Yes	240/601 (40%)	73/203 (36%)	26/226 (12%)	
<b>Sharing cigarettes <sup>c,e</sup></b>				
None	586/600 (98%)	194/202 (96%)	223/226 (99%)	0.29
Yes	14/600 (2%)	8/202 (4%)	3/226 (1%)	
<b>Washing hands <sup>c,f</sup></b>				
None	142/594 (24%)	16/203 (8%)	6/224 (3%)	<0.001
Sometimes	298/594 (50%)	99/203 (49%)	42/224 (19%)	
Often	154/594 (26%)	88/203 (43%)	176/224 (79%)	


P values were estimated using univariable multinomial logistic regression models. Missing values were imputed using the imputation model. Wearing masks incorrectly (e.g., not covering both nose and mouth) was considered to be the same as not wearing a mask for analyses. <sup>a</sup> The state enterprise office was included as a workplace. <sup>b</sup> Included restaurants, markets, malls, religious places, public places, and households of index patients or other people but not living together. <sup>c</sup> During the contact period. <sup>d</sup> Sharing multi-serving dishes using communal serving utensils to portion food individually was categorized as not sharing dishes. <sup>e</sup> Included sharing electronic cigarettes and any vaping devices. <sup>f</sup> Included washing with soap and water, and with alcohol-based solutions.

**Table 4. Population attributable fraction (PAF) of risk factors for COVID-19 infection based on contact tracing data, Thailand, March-April 2020**

Risk factors	Nightclub		Boxing stadium		Workplace		Household		Other places		Overall	
	Prev <sup>a</sup>	PAF <sup>b</sup>	Prev <sup>a</sup>	PAF <sup>b</sup>	Prev <sup>a</sup>	PAF <sup>b</sup>	Prev <sup>b</sup>	PAF <sup>b</sup>	Prev <sup>a</sup>	PAF <sup>b</sup>	Prev <sup>a</sup>	PAF <sup>b</sup>
<b>Non-modifiable</b>												
Female gender	0.51	0.08	0.13	0.002	0.40	0.03	0.68	0.09	0.40	0.08	0.45	0.03
Age group >15 years old	1.00	0.32	0.98	0.05	0.99	0.37	0.82	0.26	0.96	0.37	0.95	0.15
<b>Modifiable</b>												
Distance of contact <1 m <sup>c</sup>	0.88	0.71	0.98	0.19	0.65	0.72	0.87	0.68	0.85	0.76	0.82	0.40
Duration of contact within 1 m >15 min <sup>c</sup>	0.86	0.55	0.99	0.11	0.70	0.57	0.91	0.53	0.91	0.64	0.85	0.29
Sharing dishes or cups <sup>c,d</sup>	0.34	0.10	0.30	0.01	0.19	0.06	0.57	0.11	0.26	0.13	0.33	0.04
Sharing cigarettes <sup>c,e</sup>	0.08	0.12	0.02	0.001	0.01	0.06	0	0	0.01	0.007	0.02	0.02
Not washing hands <sup>c,f</sup>	0.05	0.06	0.21	0.01	0.20	0.17	0.10	0.08	0.28	0.29	0.16	0.04
Not wearing masks all the time <sup>c,g</sup>	0.60	0.52	0.80	0.08	0.78	0.65	0.86	0.55	0.94	0.68	0.78	0.28
<b>Sum of all modifiable risk factors<sup>1</sup></b>		0.98		0.75		0.98		0.97		0.99		0.84


<sup>a</sup> Prevalence (Prev) was estimated using the imputed data set. <sup>b</sup> PAF was estimated using the direct method (Supplemental Text). <sup>c</sup> During the contact period. <sup>d</sup> Sharing multi-serving dishes using communal serving utensils to portion food individually was categorized as not sharing dishes. <sup>e</sup> Included sharing an electronic cigarette and any vaping device. <sup>f</sup> Washing hands included washing with soap and water, and with alcohol-based solutions. <sup>g</sup> Wearing masks incorrectly (i.e. not covering both nose and mouth) was considered to be the same as not wearing a mask for analyses. <sup>1</sup> Age and gender were considered non-modifiable risk factors, while other risk factors were considered modifiable. Total PAF was directly estimated using logistic regression in the form of natural logarithm; therefore, total PAF was not equal to the direct summation of PAF of each risk factor.

**Figure 1. Study flow diagram**



**Footnote to Figure 1.** SRRT= Surveillance and Rapid Response Team (SRRT), Ministry of Public Health (MoPH), Thailand

**Figure 2. Development and transmission of COVID-19 among asymptomatic contacts in Thailand, during March-April 2020, included in the study**



**Footnote to Figure 2.** A, B, and C represent the nightclub cluster, boxing stadium cluster, and state enterprise office cluster, respectively. Black nodes represent primary index patients, red dots represent cases, and green dots represent controls. Orange dots represent index patients



(confirmed COVID-19 patients) who could not be contacted by the study team. Black lines represent household contacts, purple lines represent contacts at workplaces, and gray lines represent contacts at other locations. Definitions of index patients, cases, and controls are listed in Table 1.

## **Supplemental Materials**

### **Supplemental Methods**

#### **Study design**

All high-risk contacts with any symptoms were tested with a reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assay and quarantined in a hospital or a quarantine site. All high-risk contacts without any symptoms were self-quarantined at home. Before 23 March 2020, all high-risk contacts without any symptoms were tested using RT-PCR assays on day 5 after the last date of exposure to a case (19, 20). As of 23 March 2020, all household contacts were tested using RT-PCR assays regardless of their symptoms (19, 20). Other high-risk contacts were tested only if they developed any COVID-19 symptoms. All low-risk contacts were recommended to perform self-monitoring for 14 days, and visit healthcare facilities immediately for RT-PCR assays if they developed any symptoms of COVID-19 (19, 20).

## STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *case-control studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1-3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	1-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-5
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	6-9
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	6-9
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls	6-9
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-9
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	6-9
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	6-9
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	6-9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6-9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	9
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	6-9
		(d) If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	9

<b>Results</b>			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	10-12
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	10-12
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Figure1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	10-12 Table2
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table2
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	10-12

Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Table2
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	10-12 Table2
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	12-13 Table4
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	13
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	14-17
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	14-17
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	18

\*Give information separately for cases and controls.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.

## Statistical analysis

We estimated the direct population attributable fraction (PAF) using the imputed dataset and the direct method as previously described (26, 27). Direct PAF can be obtained by calculating PAFs directly from individuals' data using logistic regression (26, 27). First, we modified our final logistic regression model by considering each risk factor dichotomously. Then, irrespective of exposure to each risk factor for each individual, that factor was removed from the population by calculating probability based on all observations as unexposed. The predicted probability of developing COVID-19 infection for each asymptomatic contact, with the assumption that there was no exposure to a certain risk factor, was defined by:

$$P_{ki} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp [-(\beta_0 + \sum_{j \neq i} \beta_j x_j)]}$$

$P_{ki}$  is representative of predicted probability of COVID-19 infection in individual asymptomatic contact  $k$ , assuming no exposure to a specific risk factor ( $x_i$ );  $\beta_j$  indicates the regression coefficient of risk factor ( $x_j$ ), except risk factor number  $i$  ( $x_i$ ). Subsequently, the sum of all predicted probabilities for all individuals in the study would be equal to adjusted estimate of total cases, which is anticipated in the absence of that specific risk factor ( $x_i$ ).

Then, PAF was estimated by subtraction of the total number of predicted cases from total number of observed cases, divided by the total number of observed cases:

$$\text{PAF} = \frac{\text{Total number of observed cases} - \text{Total number of predicted cases}}{\text{Total number of observed cases}}$$

## Supplemental Results

For the nightclub cluster, we identified 11 primary index patients who started having symptoms from 4 to 8 March and were diagnosed (and isolated) from 3 to 10 March (Supplemental Figure 1). Those primary index patients visited multiple nightclubs included in the analysis during the study period, and 35 of 228 (15%) asymptomatic contacts at nightclubs had PCR-confirmed COVID-19 infections after the contact (Figure 2, Cluster A).

For the boxing stadium cluster, we identified 5 primary index patients who started having symptoms from 6 through 12 March and were diagnosed (and isolated) from 11 through 21 March (Supplemental Figure 2). Those primary index patients visited multiple boxing stadiums included in the analysis during the study period, and 125 of 144 (87%) asymptomatic contacts at the boxing stadiums had RT-PCR-confirmed COVID-19 infections after the contact (Figure 2, Cluster B).

Among the two primary index patients for the office cluster, one had had symptoms since 15 March 2020 (Primary index patient C1 in Supplemental Figure 3) and was considered the source of infection for one new case in the office during the study period. The other primary index patient (Primary index patient C2 in Supplemental Figure 3) was a household member of a staffer at the office and was considered as the source of infection for the staffer via household contact.

**Supplemental Table 1. Factors associated with COVID-19 infection in a multivariable model including type of mask among persons followed through contract tracing, Thailand, March-April 2020**


<b>Factors</b>	<b>Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>P</b>
<b>Male gender</b>	0.75 (0.40–1.38)	0.35
<b>Age group</b>		
≤15 years old	0.56 (0.14–2.18)	0.19
>15–40 years old	1.0	
>40–65 years old	1.77 (0.94–3.35)	
>65 years old	1.00 (0.23–4.34)	
<b>Contact place<sup>b</sup></b>		
Nightclub	Not applicable <sup>c</sup>	-
Boxing stadium		
Workplace		
Household		
Others		
<b>Shortest distance of contact</b>		
Physical contact	1.0	0.02
≤1 meter without physical contact	1.08 (0.57–2.03)	
>1 meter	0.15 (0.04–0.66)	
<b>Duration of contact within 1 meter</b>		
>60 minutes	1.0	0.10
>15–60 minutes	0.67 (0.29–1.56)	
≤15 minutes	0.25 (0.07–0.94)	
<b>Sharing dishes or a cups<sup>d,e</sup></b>		
None	1.0	0.39
Yes	1.32 (0.69–2.53)	
<b>Sharing cigarettes<sup>d,f</sup></b>		
None	1.0	0.03
Yes	3.48 (1.09–11.05)	
<b>Washing hands<sup>d,g</sup></b>		
None	1.0	0.04
Sometimes	0.33 (0.14–0.79)	
Often	0.33 (0.12–0.87)	
<b>Wearing masks<sup>d,h</sup></b>		
Not wearing masks	1.0	0.54
Wearing non-medical masks	1.29 (0.48–3.45)	
Wearing non-medical and medical masks alternately	1.03 (0.26–4.07)	
Wearing medical masks	0.61 (0.25–1.49)	
<b>Wearing masks all the time<sup>d,h</sup></b>		
No	1.0	0.02




Yes	0.32 (0.12–0.82)	
-----	------------------	--

<sup>a</sup> Both crude and adjusted odds ratios were estimated using logistic regression with a random effect for location and a random effect for index patient nested within the same location. Missing values were imputed using the imputation model. <sup>b</sup> The state enterprise office was included in workplaces. Others included restaurants, markets, malls, religious places, and households of index patients or other people but not living together, etc. <sup>c</sup> Location was included in the model as a random effect variable. <sup>d</sup> During the contact period. <sup>e</sup> Sharing multi-serving dishes using communal serving utensils to portion food individually was categorized as not sharing dishes. <sup>f</sup> Included sharing electronic cigarettes and any vaping devices. <sup>g</sup> Included washing with soap and water, and with alcohol-based solutions. <sup>h</sup> Wearing masks incorrectly (e.g., not covering both nose and mouth) was considered to be the same as not wearing a mask for analyses.

**Supplemental Figure 1. Timeline and possible SARS-CoV2 transmission of primary index patients of the nightclub cluster Thailand, March-April 2020**



**Supplemental Figure 2. Timeline and possible SARS-CoV2 transmission of primary index patients of the boxing stadium cluster, Thailand, March-April 2020**



**Supplemental Figure 3. Timeline and possible SARS-CoV2 transmission of primary index patients of the state enterprise office cluster, Thailand, March-April 2020**

