

1 **Associations between wearing masks, washing hands, and social distancing practices, and**  
2 **risk of COVID-19 infection in public: a cohort-based case-control study in Thailand**

3  
4 Pawinee Doung-ngern,<sup>1</sup> Repeepong Suphanchaimat,<sup>1,2</sup> Apinya Panjangampattana,<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> Chawetsan Namwat,<sup>1,2</sup> Direk  
9 Limmathurotsakul,<sup>3,4,5</sup>

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

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

15 <sup>3</sup>Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol  
16 University, Rajvithi Road, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand

17 <sup>4</sup>Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Rajvithi  
18 Road, Bangkok, 10400, Thailand

19 <sup>5</sup>Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University  
20 of Oxford, Old Road Campus, Oxford, OX3 7LG, United Kingdom

21

22 **Corresponding author:** Direk Limmathurotsakul, 420/6 Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine

23 Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Rajvithi Road, Bangkok, Thailand, 10400. Tel.

24 +66-2-203-6333 Email: [direk@tropmedres.ac](mailto:direk@tropmedres.ac)

25

26 **Alternative corresponding author:** Pawinee Doung-ngern, Department of Disease Control,

27 Ministry of Public Health, Nonthaburi, 11000, Thailand. Email: [pawind@gmail.com](mailto:pawind@gmail.com)

28

29 **Word count:** Abstract 368, Main Text 3,930

30 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, mask, medical mask, non-medical mask, hand washing,

31 social distancing, contact tracing

32

33 **Abstract**

34 **Objective.** To investigate whether wearing masks, washing hands and social distancing practices  
35 are associated with lower risk of COVID-19 infection.

36 **Design.** A retrospective cohort-based case-control study. All participants were retrospectively  
37 interviewed by phone about their preventive measures against COVID-19 infection.

38 **Setting.** Thailand, using the data from contact tracing of COVID-19 patients associated with  
39 nightclub, boxing stadium and state enterprise office clusters from the Surveillance Rapid  
40 Response Team, Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health. Contacts were tested  
41 for COVID-19 using PCR assays per national contact tracing guidelines.

42 **Participants.** A cohort of 1,050 asymptomatic contacts of COVID-19 patients between 1 and 31  
43 March 2020.

44 **Main outcome measures.** Diagnosis of COVID-19 by 21 April 2020. Odds ratios for COVID-  
45 19 infection and population attributable fraction were calculated.

46 **Exposure.** The study team retrospectively asked about wearing masks, washing hands, and  
47 social distancing practices during the contact period through telephone interviews.

48 **Results.** Overall, 211 (20%) were diagnosed with COVID-19 by 21 Apr 2020 (case group) while  
49 839 (80%) were not (control group). Fourteen percent of cases (29/210) and 24% of controls  
50 (198/823) reported wearing either non-medical or medical masks all the time during the contact  
51 period. Wearing masks all the time (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.23; 95%CI 0.09-0.60) was  
52 associated with lower risk of COVID-19 infections compared to not wearing masks, while  
53 wearing masks sometimes (aOR 0.87; 95%CI 0.41-1.84) was not. Shortest distance of contact >1  
54 meter (aOR 0.15; 95%CI 0.04-0.63), duration of close contact  $\leq$ 15 minutes (aOR 0.24; 95%CI  
55 0.07-0.90) and washing hands often (aOR 0.33; 95%CI 0.13-0.87) were significantly associated

56 with lower risk of infection. Sharing a cigarette (aOR 3.47; 95%CI 1.09-11.02) was associated  
57 with higher risk of infection. Type of mask was not independently associated with risk of  
58 infection. Those who wore masks all the time were more likely to wash hands and practice social  
59 distancing. We estimated that if everyone wore a mask all the time, washed hands often, did not  
60 share a dish, cup or cigarette, had shortest distance of contact >1 meter and had duration of close  
61 contact  $\leq 15$  minutes, cases would have been reduced by 84%.

62 **Conclusions.** Our findings support consistently wearing non-medical masks, washing hands, and  
63 social distancing in public to prevent COVID-19 infections.

## 64 **Introduction**

65 There is an urgent need to evaluate the effectiveness of wearing masks by healthy persons in the  
66 general public against COVID-19 infections.<sup>1 2</sup> During the early stages of the outbreak of  
67 COVID-19, the World Health Organization (WHO) announced on 27 February 2020 that, “For  
68 asymptomatic individuals, wearing a mask of any type is not recommended”.<sup>3</sup> The rationale, at  
69 that time, was to avoid unnecessary cost, procurement burden, and a false sense of security.<sup>3 4</sup> A  
70 number of systematic reviews also found no conclusive evidence to support the widespread use  
71 of masks in public against respiratory infectious diseases such as influenza, SARS and COVID-  
72 19.<sup>5-8</sup> However, China and many countries in Asia including South Korea, Japan and Thailand  
73 have recommended the use of face mask among the general public since early in the outbreak.<sup>9</sup>  
74 There is also increasing evidence that COVID-19 patients can have a “pre-symptomatic” period,  
75 during which infected persons can be contagious and, therefore, transmit the virus to others  
76 before symptoms develop.<sup>2</sup> This led to the change of the recommendation of the US Centers for  
77 Disease Control and Prevention, updated on 4 April 2020, from warning the public against  
78 wearing face masks to advising everyone to wear a cloth face covering when in public.<sup>10</sup> On 6  
79 April and 5 June 2020, WHO updated their advice on the use of masks for the general public,  
80 and encouraged countries that issue the recommendations to conduct research on this topic.<sup>2</sup>

81  
82 Thailand has been implementing multiple measures against transmission of COVID-19 since the  
83 beginning of the outbreak. The country has established thermal screening at airports since 3  
84 January 2020, and detected the first case of COVID-19 outside China, a traveler from Wuhan  
85 arriving at Bangkok Suvarnabhumi airport, on 8 January 2020.<sup>11</sup> The country utilized the  
86 Surveillance and Rapid Response Team (SRRT), together with Village Health Volunteers, to

87 perform contact tracing, educate the public about the disease and monitor the close contacts of  
88 COVID-19 patients in quarantine. The SRRT is an epidemiologic investigation team trained to  
89 conduct surveillance, investigations and initial controls of communicable diseases; including  
90 H5N1, SARS and MERS.<sup>12 13</sup> Currently, there are more than 1,000 SRRTs established at district,  
91 provincial and regional levels in the country,<sup>12</sup> working on contact tracing for COVID-19. In  
92 February 2020, public pressure to wear masks was high, medical masks were difficult to procure  
93 by the public, and the government categorized medical masks as price-controlled goods and  
94 announced COVID-19 as a dangerous communicable disease according to the Communicable  
95 Disease Act 2015 in order to empower officials to quarantine contacts and close venues.<sup>14 15</sup> On 3  
96 March, the Ministry of Public Health (MoPH) announced the recommendation of cloth mask for  
97 the public.<sup>16</sup> On 18 March, schools, universities, bars, nightclubs and entertainment venues were  
98 closed.<sup>17</sup> On 26 March, while the country was reporting approximately 100-150 new COVID-19  
99 patients per day, the government declared a national state of emergency, prohibited public  
100 gatherings, and enforced everyone to wear a face mask on public transport.<sup>18 19</sup> On 21 April, 19  
101 new PCR-confirmed COVID-19 patients were announced by the Ministry of Public Health  
102 (MoPH), Thailand, bringing the total number of patients to 2,811 patients.<sup>20</sup>

103  
104 Given the lack of currently available evidence, we evaluated the effectiveness of mask wearing,  
105 hand washing, social distancing and other preventive measures against COVID-19 infection in  
106 public in Thailand

107  
108  
109

## 110 **Methods**

### 111 **Study design.**

112 We conducted a retrospective case-control study in which both cases and controls were drawn  
113 from a cohort of contact tracing records of the central SRRT team, Department of Disease  
114 Control (DDC), MoPH, Thailand (Figure 1). Contacts were defined by the DDC MoPH as  
115 individuals who had activities together with or were in the same location(s) as a COVID-19  
116 patient.<sup>21 22</sup> Contacts were classified by MoPH as high-risk contacts if they were family members  
117 or lived in the same household as a COVID-19 patient, if they were within 1-meter distance  
118 longer than 5 minutes of a COVID-19 patient, if they were exposed to cough, sneeze or  
119 secretions of a COVID-19 patient and were not wearing a protective gear, such as mask, or if  
120 they were in the same closed environment (e.g. room, nightclub, stadium, vehicle) within 1-  
121 meter distance longer than 15 minutes of a COVID-19 patient and they were not wearing a  
122 protective gear, such as mask.<sup>21 22</sup> Contacts were classified as low-risk contacts if they had  
123 activities together with or were in the same locations as a COVID-19 patient, but did not fulfil  
124 the criteria of a high-risk contact.<sup>21 22</sup> All high-risk contacts with any symptoms were tested with  
125 a PCR assay and quarantined in a hospital or a quarantine site.<sup>21 22</sup> All high-risk contacts without  
126 any symptoms were self-quarantined at home.<sup>21 22</sup> Before 23 March 2020, all high-risk contacts  
127 without any symptoms were tested using PCR assays on day 5 after the last date of exposure to a  
128 case.<sup>21</sup> As of 23 March 2020, all household contacts were tested using PCR assays regardless of  
129 their symptoms. Other high-risk contacts were tested only if they developed any COVID-19  
130 symptoms.<sup>22</sup> All low-risk contacts were recommended to perform self-monitoring for 14 days,  
131 and visit healthcare facilities immediately for PCR-assays if they develop any symptoms of  
132 COVID-19.<sup>21 22</sup> Hence, the main aim of the contact tracing was to identify and evaluate contacts,

133 perform PCR diagnostic tests, and quarantine high-risk contacts. All PCR tests were performed  
134 at laboratories certified for COVID-19 testing by the National Institute of Health of Thailand.  
135 Data of risk factors associated with COVID-19 infection, such as type of contact and use of mask,  
136 were recorded during the contact investigation, but not complete.

137  
138 The central SRRT team was tasked to perform contact investigations for any cluster with at least  
139 five PCR-confirmed COVID-19 patients from the same location(s) within a one-week period.<sup>21</sup>  
140 We primarily used these data to identify asymptomatic contacts of COVID-19 patients between 1  
141 and 31 March 2020. To reduce the bias of the selection of asymptomatic contacts, all contact  
142 tracing records of the central SRRT team were used in the study.

143  
144 We then conducted telephone calls and asked details about their contacts with COVID-19  
145 patients (e.g. date, location, duration and distance of contacts), whether they wore masks, washed  
146 their hands and performed social distancing during the contact period, and whether the COVID-  
147 19 patient, if known, wore a mask. We also asked, and checked using records of the DDC,  
148 whether and when they were sick and diagnosed with COVID-19. To include only asymptomatic  
149 contacts in the study, we excluded people from the analysis who already had any symptoms of  
150 COVID-19; including cough, fever, fatigue, diarrhoea, abdominal pain, loss of appetite, and loss  
151 of smell and taste,<sup>23 24</sup> on the first day of contact. We also excluded contacts whose contact  
152 locations were healthcare facilities because this study aimed to focus on infection in the public.

153



154 Asymptomatic contacts, cases, controls, index patients, primary index patients and COVID-19  
155 patients were defined as described in Table 1. The reporting of this study follows the STROBE  
156 guidelines.

157

### 158 **Selection of cases and controls**

159 We defined asymptomatic contacts who were later diagnosed as COVID-19 patients using PCR  
160 assays by 21 Apr 2020 as cases (Table 1). All asymptomatic contacts who were not diagnosed as  
161 COVID-19 patients using PCR assays by 21 Apr 2020 were controls. We arbitrarily used 21 days  
162 after 31 March as the cutoff based on the evidence that most COVID-19 patients would likely  
163 develop symptoms within 14 days<sup>25</sup> and it should take less than another 7 days for symptomatic  
164 patients, under contact investigations, to present at healthcare facilities and be tested for COVID-  
165 19 with PCR assays.

166

### 167 **Statistical analysis**

168 Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were estimated for associations between development  
169 of COVID-19 and baseline covariates, such as wearing masks, washing hands and social  
170 distancing using logistic regression with a random effect for location and a random effect for  
171 index patient nested within the same location. The interviewer identified the index patient, the  
172 symptomatic COVID-19 patient who had the closest contact, if an asymptomatic contact  
173 contacted more than one symptomatic COVID-19 patient. The percentage of missing values in  
174 the variable whether the COVID-19 patients wore a mask was 27%, and the variable was not  
175 included in the analyses. We assumed that missing values were missing at random and used  
176 imputation by chained equations. We created 10 imputed datasets and the imputation model

177 included all listed confounders and the case-control indicator. We developed the final multilevel  
178 mixed-effect logistic regression models on the basis of previous knowledge and a purposeful  
179 selection method.<sup>26</sup>

180

181 We also estimated odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for associations between compliance  
182 of mask wearing and other practices; including washing hands and social distancing using  
183 multinomial logistic regression models and the imputed data set. Logistic regression was also  
184 used to estimate p value for pairwise comparisons. Bonferroni correction was not performed. We  
185 estimated secondary attack rate using definitions as described in Table 1, to allow for  
186 comparison with other studies.

187

### 188 **Sensitivity analyses**

189 We conducted a sensitivity analysis by including type of mask in the multilevel mixed-effects  
190 logistic regression model for COVID-19 infection. We also tested a pre-defined interaction  
191 between type of mask and compliance of wearing masks.

192

### 193 **Additional analyses**

194 To respond to the national policy, we estimated population attributable fraction (PAF) using the  
195 imputed dataset and a direct method based on logistic regression as described previously (details  
196 in Supplementary Text).<sup>27 28</sup> In short, the final multivariable model was modified by considering  
197 each risk factor dichotomously, and PAF was calculated by subtraction of the total number of  
198 predicted cases from total number of observed cases, divided by the total number of observed  
199 cases.

200

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

202

### 203 **Participants and public involvement**

204 No participants were involved in setting the research question or the outcome measures, nor were  
205 they involved in developing plans for design or implementation of the study. However, the study,  
206 as part of the outbreak investigation of the DDC, MoPH, was developed to respond to concerns  
207 by the public about risks and effectiveness of preventive measures of COVID-19 in different  
208 settings, and which preventive measures should be implemented when public gathering places,  
209 including restaurants, nightclubs, stadiums, workplaces, etc., were re-opening. No participants  
210 were asked to aid in interpreting or disseminated the results. There are plans to disseminate the  
211 results of the research to the public.

212

213

## 214 **RESULTS**

### 215 **Characteristics of the cohort data**

216 The contact tracing of the central SRRT team consisted of 1,716 individuals who had contact  
217 with or were in the same location as a COVID-19 patient who were associated with three large  
218 clusters in nightclubs, boxing stadiums and a state enterprise office in Thailand (Figure 1).  
219 Overall, we considered 18 individuals as primary index patients because they were the first who  
220 had symptoms at those places, had had symptoms since the first day of visiting those places, or  
221 were considered to be the origin of infection of cases based on the contact investigations; 11  
222 from the nightclub cluster, 5 from the boxing stadium cluster and 2 from the state enterprise

223 office cluster. Timelines of primary index patients from nightclub, boxing stadium and state  
224 enterprise clusters are described in details in Supplementary Text and Supplementary Figure 1-3.  
225 All 18 primary index patients were excluded from the analysis of the case-control study.

226

### 227 **Selection of cases and controls**

228 After retrospectively interviewing each contact by phone and applying the exclusion criteria  
229 (Figure 1), we included 1,050 asymptomatic contacts who had contact with or were in the same  
230 location as a symptomatic COVID-19 patient between 1 and 31 March 2020 in the analysis. The  
231 median age of individuals was 38 years (IQR 28-51) and 55% were male (Table 1). Most  
232 asymptomatic contacts included in the study were associated with the boxing stadium cluster  
233 (61%, n=645), with 36% (n=374) with the nightclub cluster, and 3% (n=31) with the state  
234 enterprise office cluster.

235

236 Overall, 211 (20%) asymptomatic contacts were later diagnosed with COVID-19 by 21 Apr 2020  
237 (case group) and 839 (80%) were not (control group). Of the 211 cases, 150 (71%) had  
238 symptoms prior to the diagnosis of COVID-19 using PCR assays. The last date that a COVID-19  
239 case diagnosed was 9 April 2020. Of 839 controls, 719 (86%) were tested with PCR assays at  
240 least once.

241

242 Figure 2 illustrates contacts (and possible transmission of COVID-19 infections) between index  
243 patients to asymptomatic contacts included in the study. A total of 228, 144 and 20  
244 asymptomatic contacts contacted with index patients at nightclubs, boxing stadiums and the state  
245 enterprise office, respectively. For simplicity, Figure 2 is shown as all of them were contacted

246 with the primary index patients in the clusters. The others then contacted with cases associated  
247 with nightclubs, boxing stadiums and the state enterprise office at workplaces (n=277),  
248 households (n=230) and other places (n=151).

249

### 250 **Primary analysis**

251 Table 2 shows that there was a negative association between risk of COVID-19 infection and  
252 shortest distance of contact >1 meter (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 0.15, 95% confidence interval  
253 [CI] 0.04-0.63), duration of contact within 1 meter  $\leq$ 15 minutes (aOR 0.24, 95%CI 0.07-0.90),  
254 washing hands often (aOR 0.33, 95%CI 0.13-0.87) and wearing masks all the time (aOR 0.23,  
255 95%CI 0.09-0.60). Wearing masks sometimes was not significantly associated with lower risk of  
256 infection (aOR 0.87, 95%CI 0.41-1.84). Sharing cigarettes was associated with higher risk of  
257 COVID-19 infection (aOR 3.47, 1.09-11.02). Type of masks was not independently associated  
258 with the risk of infection, and was not included in the final multivariable model.

259

### 260 **Association between compliance of mask wearing and other social distancing practices.**

261 Since wearing masks all the time was found to be negatively associated with COVID-19  
262 infection, we wanted to explore characteristics of those patients because of a potential false sense  
263 of security caused by wearing masks. We found that those who wore masks all the time were  
264 more likely to have shortest distance of contact >1 meter (25% vs. 18%, pairwise p=0.03), have  
265 duration of contact within 1 meter  $\leq$ 15 minutes (26% vs 13%, pairwise p<0.001) and wash their  
266 hands often (79% vs. 26%, pairwise p<0.001) compared with those who did not wear masks  
267 (Table 3). We found that those who wore masks sometimes were more likely to wash their hands  
268 often (43% vs. 26%, pairwise p<0.001) compared with those who did not wear masks. However,

269 they were more likely to had physical contact (50% vs. 42%, pairwise  $p=0.03$ ) and duration of  
270 contact within 1 meter  $>60$  minutes (75% vs. 67%, pairwise  $p=0.04$ ) compared with those who  
271 did not wear masks.

272

### 273 **Secondary attack rate**

274 Overall, 982 (94%) were contacts with high-risk exposure. All 68 asymptomatic contacts without  
275 high-risk exposure were controls. Among asymptomatic contacts with high-risk exposure  
276 included in the study, the nightclub secondary attack rate was 16% (35/213), the boxing stadium  
277 secondary attack rate was 87% (125/144), the workplace secondary attack rate was 4% (11/250),  
278 the household secondary attack rate was 17% (38/230), and the secondary attack rate at other  
279 places was 1% (2/145).

280

### 281 **Sensitivity analyses**

282 Since aOR of type of mask could be useful for future studies, we modified the final multivariable  
283 model and presented those aOR in the Supplementary Table 1. Interaction between type of mask  
284 and compliance of mask wearing was not observed.

285

### 286 **Population attributable fraction (PAF)**

287 Using the direct method to calculate PAF, we estimated that the proportional reduction in cases  
288 that would occur if everyone wore a mask all the time during contact with index patients (PAF of  
289 not wearing masks all the time) was 0.28 (Table 4). Among modifiable risk factors evaluated,  
290 PAF of shortest distance of contact  $<1$  meter was highest at 0.40. If everyone wore a mask all the

291 time, washed hands often, did not share a dish, cup or cigarette, had shortest distance of contact  
292 >1 meter and had duration of close contact  $\leq 15$  min, cases would have been reduced by 84%.

293

294

## 295 **DISCUSSIONS**

### 296 **Statement of principal findings**

297 This cohort-based case-control study provides a supporting evidence that wearing masks,  
298 washing hands and social distancing are independently associated with lower risk of COVID-19  
299 infection in the general public. We observed that wearing masks all the time when expose to  
300 someone with COVID-19 was associated with lower risk of infection, while wearing masks  
301 sometimes was not. This supports the recommendation that people should be wearing their  
302 masks correctly at all times in public and at home when there is an increased risk.<sup>2,4,9,10</sup>

303

304 We also quantified the effectiveness of different measures that could be implemented to prevent  
305 transmission in nightclubs, stadiums, workplaces and other public gathering places. We found  
306 that those who wore masks all the time were also more likely to wash hands and perform social  
307 distancing. We estimated that adopting all recommendations (wear masks all the time, wash  
308 hands often, not sharing dishes, cups or cigarettes, maintain a distance of <1 meter and, if needed,  
309 have less than 15 minutes contact) could result in controlling 84% of the burden of COVID-19  
310 infections in our setting during the study period. We recommend that all public gathering places  
311 consider multiple measures to prevent transmission of COVID-19 and new pandemic diseases in  
312 the future.

313

314 Public messaging on how to wear masks correctly needs to be consistently delivered, particularly  
315 among those who wear masks sometimes or incorrectly (e.g. not covering both nose and mouth).  
316 This is because, based on our findings, those who wear masks intermittently could be a group  
317 that did not practice social distancing adequately.

318

### 319 **Comparison with other studies**

320 The effectiveness of wearing masks observed in this study is consistent with previous studies;  
321 including a randomized-controlled trial (RCT) showing that adherent use of a face mask reduce  
322 the risk of influenza-like illness<sup>29</sup> and case-control studies which found that wearing masks is  
323 associated with lower risk of SARS infection.<sup>30-32</sup> While previous studies found use of surgical  
324 masks or 12–16-layer cotton masks demonstrated protection against coronavirus infection in the  
325 community,<sup>30-32</sup> we did not observe a difference between wearing non-medical and medical  
326 masks in the general population. Therefore, we strongly support wearing non-medical masks in  
327 public to prevent COVID-19 infections. Even though the risk perception of COVID-19 threat can  
328 increase the likelihood of wearing medical masks in other settings,<sup>33</sup> we maintain that medical  
329 masks should be reserved for healthcare workers.

330

331 This study found a negative association between risk of COVID-19 infection and social  
332 distancing (i.e. distance and duration of contact), which is consistent with previous studies which  
333 found that at least 1-meter physical distancing was strongly associated with a large protective  
334 effect, and distances of 2 meters could be more effective.<sup>32</sup> Effectiveness of hand hygiene is  
335 consistent with the previous studies.<sup>34</sup> Although sharing dishes or cups was not independently



336 associated with the infection in our study, based on previous studies,<sup>35</sup> we still recommend not  
337 sharing dishes or cups.

338

339 The household secondary attack rate in our study (17%) is comparable with those reported  
340 ranging from 11% to 19%,<sup>35 36</sup> and relatively high compared to workplaces and other places.

341 While challenging and sometimes impractical, household members should immediately separate  
342 a person who develops any possible symptoms of COVID-19 from other household members (i.e.  
343 a sick person should stay in a specific room, use a separate bathroom, if possible, and do not  
344 share dishes, cups and other utensils in the households).<sup>37</sup> All household members should be  
345 encouraged to wear masks, keep washing hands and perform social distancing to the extent  
346 possible.<sup>38</sup>

347

348 The high number of COVID-19 patients associated with nightclubs in Bangkok is comparable to  
349 COVID-19 outbreak associated with Itaewon nightclub cluster in Seoul, Korea, in May 2020.<sup>39</sup>

350 Similarly, we also found individuals who visited several nightclubs in the same area during the  
351 short period of time. The high number of COVID-19 patient cluster associated with boxing  
352 stadiums in Bangkok is similar to COVID-19 case cluster probably associated with a football  
353 match in Italy in February 2020.<sup>40</sup> The secondary attack rate of COVID-19 at a choir practice in  
354 the U.S. was reported to be as high as 53%,<sup>41</sup> and the secondary attack rates in public gathering  
355 places with high density of people shouting and cheering, such as football and boxing stadiums,  
356 are still largely unknown.

357

358 It is likely that clear and consistent public messaging from policy makers prevents a false sense  
359 of security and promotes compliance with social distancing in Thailand. It is recommended that  
360 both mainstream and social media should support public health responses by teaming with  
361 government in providing consistent, simple and clear messages.<sup>42</sup> Both positive and negative  
362 messages can influence the public.<sup>42</sup> In Thailand, daily briefings of Thailand's Centre for  
363 COVID-19 Situation Administration (CCSA) gave clear and consistent messages on social  
364 distancing every day, as well as how to put on a mask and wash hands. The situation reports and  
365 advices by CCSA on daily basis have greatly improved the confidence in the public and  
366 compliance with the recommendations. Those are shown by the official online surveys of the  
367 DDC,<sup>43</sup> of which results are reported during the daily briefings regularly.

368

### 369 **Strength and limitations of the study**

370 To our knowledge,<sup>32</sup> this is the first epidemiological study to quantitatively assess the protective  
371 effect of wearing masks against COVID-19 infections in the general population. Studying  
372 asymptomatic contacts covering the period when multiple measures (including wearing masks)  
373 were recommended but not compulsory, allowed us to evaluate the potential effectiveness of  
374 each measure.

375

376 There are several limitations of the study. First, our finding might not be generalizable to all  
377 settings, since findings were based on contacts associated with three major COVID-19 clusters in  
378 Thailand during March 2020. Second, the estimated odds ratios were based on a condition that  
379 the contact with index patients occurred. Our study did not evaluate or take into account the  
380 probability of contacting index patients in public. Third, our findings were based on PCR testing

381 per national contact tracing guideline,<sup>21 22</sup> and as such the estimated odds ratios might not take  
382 account of all asymptomatic infections. Fourth, it is impossible to identify every potential contact  
383 an individual has and some individuals may have been contacts to more than one COVID-19  
384 patient. Hence, our estimated secondary attack rates among contacts with high-risk exposure  
385 could be over or under-estimated. Fifth, findings were subject to common biases of retrospective  
386 case-control studies; including memory bias, observer bias and information bias. Nonetheless,  
387 we used structured interviews, whereby each participant was asked the same set of defined  
388 questions, to reduce potential biases.

389

### 390 **Considerations for further research**

391 Evaluating effectiveness of wearing masks, washing hands and social distancing during an  
392 outbreak of COVID-19 is difficult. Prospective RCTs could give the best estimate of the  
393 effectiveness of each measure; however, setting up an RCT in an area or a country where a  
394 measure of interest is strongly recommended or compulsory is probably impractical. Nonetheless,  
395 we suggest that RCT of wearing masks should be conducted when and where possible because  
396 findings of RCTs will give a higher level of evidence to the public and policy makers. Other  
397 types of studies; including natural experiment,<sup>44</sup> cross-sectional, case-control and cohort studies  
398 should also be conducted to evaluate effectiveness of wearing masks against COVID-19 and  
399 other respiratory infections in different settings. In addition, social and behavioural studies are  
400 needed to understand how people could perceive and adopt the recommendations of wearing  
401 masks, washing hands and social distancing in different settings.<sup>45</sup>

402

### 403 **Conclusions and future implications**

404 As measures against COVID-19 are being implemented or relaxed in many countries worldwide,  
405 it is important that we continue to expand our understanding about the effectiveness of each  
406 measure. Wearing masks, washing hands and social distancing are strongly associated with lower  
407 risk of COVID-19 infections. We strongly support wearing non-medical masks in public to  
408 prevent COVID-19 infections. We also suggest that medical masks should be reserved for  
409 healthcare workers. Everyone should also wash their hands frequently and comply with  
410 recommendations of social distancing.

411

412

### 413 **Acknowledgement:**

414 We thank all participants and all COVID-19 patients involved in providing information. We  
415 thank all SRRT members at the central, regional, provincial and district levels, as well as all  
416 Village Health Volunteers in Thailand. We thank Pattaporn Klanjatturat and Inthira Yamabhai  
417 for the technical assistance. We thank Dr. Suwannachai Wattanayingcharoenchai, Dr. Sombat  
418 Thanprasertkul, Dr. Panithee Thammawijaya and Dr. Walairat Chaifoo of the DDC, MoPH, and  
419 Dr. Virsasakdi Chongsuvivatwong from Prince of Songkhla University for their advices and  
420 direction.

421

### 422 **Contributors**

423 PD, RS, CN and DL contributed to design of the study. PD, RS and DL contributed to setting up  
424 the database and quality control. AP, CJ, DR, ND, NE, NP, NS, OY, PaP, PiP, PK, PS, PW, SC,  
425 SK and TC contributed to data collection. DL carried out the main statistical analysis. PD and RS  
426 coordinated the study and contributed to the statistical analyses. PD, RS and DL contributed to

427 interpretation of the results and drafted the manuscript. All authors commented on drafts and  
428 read and approved the final manuscript. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors  
429 meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. PD is the  
430 guarantor.

431

#### 432 **Competing interests:**

433 The authors declare that they have no completing interests.

434

#### 435 **Ethical approval**

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

441

#### 442 **Funding**

443 The study was supported by the DDC, MoPH, Thailand. DL is supported by the Wellcome Trust  
444 (106698/Z/14/Z).

445

#### 446 **Data sharing**

447 All data in aggregate are reported in the manuscript.

448

449

450 **References**

- 451 1. Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, et al. Face masks for the public during the covid-19  
452 crisis. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1435. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1435
- 453 2. WHO. Advice on the use of masks in the context of COVID-19. 2020.  
454 [https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)  
455 [during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)  
456 [\(2019-ncov\)-outbreak.](https://www.who.int/publications-detail/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)
- 457 3. WHO. Rational use of personal protective equipment for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-  
458 19) 2020. [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/rational-use-of-personal-protective-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/rational-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-for-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-and-considerations-during-severe-shortages)  
459 [equipment-for-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-19\)-and-considerations-during-severe-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/rational-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-for-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-and-considerations-during-severe-shortages)  
460 [shortages](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/rational-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-for-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-and-considerations-during-severe-shortages)
- 461 4. Cheng KK, Lam TH, Leung CC. Wearing face masks in the community during the COVID-19  
462 pandemic: altruism and solidarity. *Lancet* 2020 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30918-1
- 463 5. Long Y, Hu T, Liu L, et al. Effectiveness of N95 respirators versus surgical masks against  
464 influenza: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Evid Based Med* 2020 doi:  
465 10.1111/jebm.12381
- 466 6. Cowling BJ, Zhou Y, Ip DK, et al. Face masks to prevent transmission of influenza virus: a  
467 systematic review. *Epidemiol Infect* 2010;138(4):449-56. doi:  
468 10.1017/S0950268809991658
- 469 7. Jefferson T, Del Mar CB, Dooley L, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the  
470 spread of respiratory viruses. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011(7):CD006207. doi:  
471 10.1002/14651858.CD006207.pub4

- 472 8. Aledort JE, Lurie N, Wasserman J, et al. Non-pharmaceutical public health interventions for  
473 pandemic influenza: an evaluation of the evidence base. *BMC Public Health* 2007;7:208.  
474 doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-7-208
- 475 9. Feng S, Shen C, Xia N, et al. Rational use of face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*  
476 *Respir Med* 2020 doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30134-X
- 477 10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) How to  
478 Protect Yourself and Others. 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention-H.pdf)  
479 [getting-sick/prevention-H.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/prevention-H.pdf).
- 480 11. Okada P, Buathong R, Phuygun S, et al. Early transmission patterns of coronavirus disease  
481 2019 (COVID-19) in travellers from Wuhan to Thailand, January 2020. *Euro Surveill*  
482 2020;25(8) doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.8.2000097
- 483 12. Chunsuttiwat S. Response to avian influenza and preparedness for pandemic influenza:  
484 Thailand's experience. *Respirology* 2008;13 Suppl 1:S36-40. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-  
485 1843.2008.01256.x
- 486 13. Putthasri W, Lertiendumrong J, Chompook P, et al. Capacity of Thailand to contain an  
487 emerging influenza pandemic. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2009;15(3):423-32. doi:  
488 10.3201/eid1503.080872
- 489 14. Bangkok Post. Tougher Covid-19 measures take effect Sunday. 2020.  
490 [https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1868439/tougher-covid-19-measures-](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1868439/tougher-covid-19-measures-take-effect-sunday)  
491 [take-effect-sunday](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1868439/tougher-covid-19-measures-take-effect-sunday).
- 492 15. WHO Thailand. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) WHO Thailand Situation Report -  
493 29 February 2020 2020. [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)  
494 [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).

- 495 16. Channel News Asia. 'Better than nothing': Thailand encourages cloth masks amid surgical  
496 mask shortage. 2020. [https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/coronavirus-thailand-](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/coronavirus-thailand-cloth-masks-surgical-shortage-covid-19-12530896)  
497 [cloth-masks-surgical-shortage-covid-19-12530896](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/coronavirus-thailand-cloth-masks-surgical-shortage-covid-19-12530896).
- 498 17. Bangkok Post. Cabinet approves plans to close schools, postpone Songkran. 2020.  
499 [https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1880635/cabinet-approves-plans-to-](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1880635/cabinet-approves-plans-to-close-schools-postpone-songkran)  
500 [close-schools-postpone-songkran](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1880635/cabinet-approves-plans-to-close-schools-postpone-songkran).
- 501 18. Thai PBS. Thai government declares COVID-19 state of emergency. 2020.  
502 <https://www.thaipbsworld.com/covid-19-government-to-impose-state-of-emergency/>.
- 503 19. Bangkok Post. Face masks compulsory on all trains. 2020.  
504 [https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1885665/face-masks-compulsory-on-all-](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1885665/face-masks-compulsory-on-all-trains)  
505 [trains](https://www.bangkokpost.com/thailand/general/1885665/face-masks-compulsory-on-all-trains).
- 506 20. WHO Thailand. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) WHO Thailand Situation Report -  
507 21 April 2020. 2020. [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/thailand/2020-04-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/searo/thailand/2020-04-21-tha-sitrep-59-covid19-new-template-final.pdf?sfvrsn=31bc500a_0)  
508 [21-tha-sitrep-59-covid19-new-template-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).
- 509 21. Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. Coronavirus Disease  
510 2019: COVID-19, updated on 3 March 2020. 2020.  
511 [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).
- 512 22. Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. Coronavirus Disease  
513 2019: COVID-19, updated on 23 March 2020. 2020.  
514 [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).
- 515 23. Shi H, Han X, Jiang N, et al. Radiological findings from 81 patients with COVID-19  
516 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20(4):425-34.  
517 doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30086-4



- 518 24. Menni C, Valdes A, Freydin MB, et al. Loss of smell and taste in combination with other  
519 symptoms is a strong predictor of COVID-19 infection. *medRxiv*  
520 2020:2020.04.05.20048421. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.05.20048421
- 521 25. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019  
522 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann*  
523 *Intern Med* 2020 doi: 10.7326/M20-0504
- 524 26. Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, et al. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic  
525 regression. *Source Code Biol Med* 2008;3:17. doi: 10.1186/1751-0473-3-17
- 526 27. Azimi SS, Khalili D, Hadaegh F, et al. Calculating population attributable fraction for  
527 cardiovascular risk factors using different methods in a population based cohort study. *J*  
528 *Res Health Sci* 2015;15(1):22-7.
- 529 28. Ruckinger S, von Kries R, Toschke AM. An illustration of and programs estimating  
530 attributable fractions in large scale surveys considering multiple risk factors. *BMC Med*  
531 *Res Methodol* 2009;9:7. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-9-7
- 532 29. MacIntyre CR, Cauchemez S, Dwyer DE, et al. Face mask use and control of respiratory  
533 virus transmission in households. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2009;15(2):233-41. doi:  
534 10.3201/eid1502.081167
- 535 30. Wu J, Xu F, Zhou W, et al. Risk factors for SARS among persons without known contact  
536 with SARS patients, Beijing, China. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004;10(2):210-6. doi:  
537 10.3201/eid1002.030730
- 538 31. Lau JT, Tsui H, Lau M, et al. SARS transmission, risk factors, and prevention in Hong Kong.  
539 *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004;10(4):587-92. doi: 10.3201/eid1004.030628

- 540 32. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to  
541 prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic  
542 review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2020 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9
- 543 33. Huynh TD. The more I fear about COVID-19, the more I wear medical masks: A survey on  
544 risk perception and medical masks uses. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.03.26.20044388. doi:  
545 10.1101/2020.03.26.20044388
- 546 34. Jefferson T, Del Mar C, Dooley L, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the  
547 spread of respiratory viruses: systematic review. *BMJ* 2009;339:b3675. doi:  
548 10.1136/bmj.b3675
- 549 35. Bi Q, Wu Y, Mei S, et al. Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases and  
550 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet*  
551 *Infect Dis* 2020 doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5
- 552 36. Jing Q-L, Liu M-J, Yuan J, et al. Household Secondary Attack Rate of COVID-19 and  
553 Associated Determinants. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.04.11.20056010. doi:  
554 10.1101/2020.04.11.20056010
- 555 37. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus Disease 2019 What To Do If You  
556 Are Sick. 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html)  
557 [sick.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/steps-when-sick.html).
- 558 38. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Households Living in Close Quarters: How to  
559 Protect Those That Are Most Vulnerable. 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/living-in-close-quarters.html)  
560 [ncov/daily-life-coping/living-in-close-quarters.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/living-in-close-quarters.html).
- 561 39. PROMED. PRO/AH/EDR> COVID-19-update (176): China, S. Korea, countries w/ high  
562 local transmission. 2020. <https://promedmail.org/promed-post/?id=7325551>.

- 563 40. Boccia S, Ricciardi W, Ioannidis JPA. What Other Countries Can Learn From Italy During  
564 the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020 doi:  
565 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1447
- 566 41. Hamner L, Dubbel P, Capron I, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following Exposure at  
567 a Choir Practice - Skagit County, Washington, March 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*  
568 *Rep* 2020;69(19):606-10. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6919e6
- 569 42. Hopman J, Allegranzi B, Mehtar S. Managing COVID-19 in Low- and Middle-Income  
570 Countries. *JAMA* 2020 doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.4169
- 571 43. Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand. COVID-19 surveys.  
572 2020. <https://ddc.moph.go.th/viralpneumonia/survey.php>.
- 573 44. Craig P, Cooper C, Gunnell D, et al. Using natural experiments to evaluate population health  
574 interventions: new Medical Research Council guidance. *J Epidemiol Community Health*  
575 2012;66(12):1182-6. doi: 10.1136/jech-2011-200375
- 576 45. Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, et al. Using social and behavioural science to support  
577 COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nat Hum Behav* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z
- 578

579 **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 never diagnosed as COVID-19 patients by 21 Apr 2020.
Index patients	The COVID-19 patients identified from the contract 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), whom we were not able to identify the source of infection from, or whose probable sources of infection were outside the contract tracing data included in the study
COVID-19 patients	Individuals who had PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2, officially confirmed and reported by Department of Disease Control (DDC), Ministry of Public Health (MoPH), Thailand
Secondary attack rate	The percentage of new cases among asymptomatic contacts with high-risk exposure
High-risk exposure	Individuals who lived in the same household as a COVID-19 patient, had a direct physical contact with a COVID-19 case, had face-to-face contact with a COVID-19 case within 1 meter and longer than 15 minutes, or were in a closed environment with a COVID-19 patient at a distance of within 1 meter and longer than 15 minutes.
Household contact	Individuals who lived in the same household as a COVID-19 patient

580

581

**Table 2. Factors associated with COVID-19 infections**

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)	0.38
<b>Age group</b>						
≤15 years old	6/211 (3%)	49/829 (6%)	0.65 (0.17-2.48)	0.28	0.57 (0.15-2.21)	0.20
>15 – 40 years old	94/211 (45%)	435/829 (52%)	1.0		1.0	
>40 – 65 years old	98/211 (46%)	302/829 (36%)	1.66 (0.92-2.99)		1.77 (0.94-3.32)	
>65 years old	13/211 (6%)	43/829 (5%)	1.27 (0.32-4.97)		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 (0.43-1.36)		1.09 (0.58-2.07)	
>1 meter	4/197 (2%)	182/809 (22%)	0.08 (0.02-0.30)		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%)	0.52 (0.23-1.16)		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	0.38
Yes	85/210 (40%)	261/837 (31%)	2.72 (1.49-4.97)		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	0.04
Yes	13/209 (6%)	12/836 (1%)	6.19 (2.13-17.95)		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	0.04
Sometimes	114/210 (54%)	333/826 (40%)	0.40 (0.18-0.89)		0.34 (0.14-0.81)	
Often	52/210 (25%)	372/826 (45%)	0.19 (0.08-0.44)		0.33 (0.13-0.87)	
<b>Wearing masks<sup>d,h</sup></b>						

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	0.007
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%)	0.15 (0.07-0.36)		0.23 (0.09-0.60)	

**Footnote of Table 2.** <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 considered and included as a workplace. Others included restaurants, markets, malls, religious places, 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 dishes but using communal spoons all the time was considered 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 (i.e. not covering both nose and mouth) was considered as not wearing.

**Table 3. Factors associated with compliance of mask wearing**

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%)	0.26
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%)	

**Footnote of Table 3.** P values were estimated using univariable multinomial logistic regression models. Missing values were imputed using the imputation model. Wearing masks incorrectly (i.e. not covering both nose and mouth) was considered as not wearing. <sup>a</sup> The state enterprise office was considered and included as a workplace. <sup>b</sup> Included restaurants, markets, malls, religious places, public places, households of index patients or other people but not living together, etc. <sup>c</sup> During the contact period. <sup>d</sup> Sharing dishes but using communal spoons all the time was considered 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**

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 a 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>i</sup></b>		0.98		0.75		0.98		0.97		0.99		0.84

**Footnote of Table 4.** <sup>a</sup> Prevalence (Prev) was estimated using the imputed data set. <sup>b</sup> PAF was estimated using the direct method (Supplementary Text). <sup>c</sup> During the contact period. <sup>d</sup> Sharing a dish but using communal spoons all the time was considered as not sharing a dish. <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 as not wearing. <sup>i</sup> Age and gender were considered as non-modifiable risk factors, while other risk factors were considered as 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 of 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 included in the study**



**Footnote of 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. Definition of index patients, cases and controls are listed in Table 1.

## Supplementary Text

### Supplementary Methods

To respond to the national policy, we estimated direct population attributable fraction (PAF) using the imputed dataset and the direct method as previously described.<sup>27,28</sup> Direct PAF can be obtained by calculating PAFs directly from individuals' data using logistic regression.<sup>27,28</sup> First, we had to modify 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, is:

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

$P_{ki}$  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:

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

## Supplementary Results

For the pub 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 (Supplementary 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 to 12 March and were diagnosed (and isolated) from 11 to 21 March (Supplementary 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 PCR-confirmed COVID-19 infections after the contact (Figure 2, Cluster B).

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




**Supplementary Table 1. Factors associated with COVID-19 infections in a multivariable model including type of mask**

<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	0.55 (0.14-2.15)	
>15 – 40 years old	1.0	
>40 – 65 years old	1.76 (0.93-3.31)	
>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	1.07 (0.56-2.01)	
>1 meter	0.15 (0.04-0.63)	
<b>Duration of contact within 1 meter</b>		
>60 minutes	1.0	0.09
>15 – 60 minutes	0.66 (0.28-1.52)	
≤15 minutes	0.24 (0.06-0.91)	
<b>Sharing dishes or a cups<sup>d,e</sup></b>		
None	1.0	0.39
Yes	1.32 (0.69-2.52)	
<b>Sharing cigarettes<sup>d,f</sup></b>		
None	1.0	0.03
Yes	3.46 (1.09-10.98)	
<b>Washing hands<sup>d,g</sup></b>		
None	1.0	0.04
Sometimes	0.33 (0.14-0.79)	
Often	0.33 (0.13-0.88)	
<b>Wearing masks<sup>d,h</sup></b>		
Not wearing masks	1.0	0.55
Wearing Non-medical masks	1.30 (0.48-3.47)	
Wearing Non-medical and medical mask alternately	1.04 (0.26-4.14)	
Wearing Medical masks	0.62 (0.25-1.52)	
<b>Wearing masks all the time<sup>d,h</sup></b>		
No	1.0	0.006
Yes	0.31 (0.12-0.80)	


**Footnote of Supplementary Table 1.** <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 considered and included as workplaces. Others included restaurants, markets, malls, religious places, 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 dishes but using communal spoons all the time was considered 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 (i.e. not covering both nose and mouth) was considered as not wearing.



**Supplementary Figure 1. Timeline and possible transmission of primary index patients of the pub cluster**



Supplementary Figure 2. Timeline and possible transmission of primary index patients of the boxing stadium cluster



**Supplementary Figure 3. Timeline and possible transmission of primary index patients of the state enterprise office cluster**

