

1 **Effects of universal masking on Massachusetts healthcare workers' COVID-19**
2 **incidence**

3 Authors: Fan-Yun Lan^{1,2}, Costas A Christophi^{1,3}, Jane Buley⁴, Eirini Iliaki^{4,5}, Lou Ann
4 Bruno-Murtha⁵, Assaad J. Sayah^{6,7}, Stefanos N. Kales MD^{1,4}

5

6 1 Department of Environmental Health, Harvard University T.H. Chan School of
7 Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

8 2 Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, National Cheng Kung
9 University Hospital, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan,
10 Taiwan

11 3 Cyprus International Institute for Environmental and Public Health, Cyprus
12 University of Technology, Limassol, Cyprus

13 4 Cambridge Health Alliance (Occupational Medicine⁴, Infection Prevention,
14 Infectious Diseases⁵, Emergency Medicine⁶, Cambridge Department of Public
15 Health⁷), Harvard Medical School, Cambridge MA, USA

16

17 Corresponding author: Stefanos N. Kales MD, MPH,
18 Occupational Medicine, Cambridge Health Alliance, Macht Building 427
19 1493 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, MA 02139

20 Tel. 617/665-1580 Fax. 617/665-1672

21 E-mail: skales@hsph.harvard.edu

22

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** Healthcare workers (HCWs) and other essential workers are at risk for
25 occupational infection during the COVID-19 pandemic. Several infection control
26 strategies have been implemented. Particularly, evidence shows that universal
27 masking can mitigate COVID-19 infection, though existing research is limited by
28 secular trend bias.

29 **Aims:** To investigate the effect of hospital universal masking on COVID-19 incidence
30 among HCWs compared to the general community population.

31 **Methods:** We compared the 7-day averaged incidence rates between a Massachusetts
32 (USA) healthcare system and Massachusetts residents statewide. The study period
33 was from March 17 (the date of first incident case in the healthcare system) to May 6
34 (the date Massachusetts implemented public masking). The healthcare system
35 implemented universal masking on March 26, we allotted a 5-day lag for effect onset,
36 and peak COVID-19 incidence in Massachusetts was April 20. Thus, we categorized
37 March 17-31 as the pre-intervention phase, April 1-20 the intervention phase, and
38 April 21-May 6 the post-intervention phase. Temporal incidence trends (i.e. 7-day

39 average slopes) were compared using standardized coefficients from linear regression

40 models.

41 **Results:** The standardized coefficients were similar between the healthcare system

42 and the state in both the pre- and post-intervention phases. During the intervention

43 phase, the healthcare system's epidemic slope became negative (standardized β : -0.68,

44 95% CI: -1.06 – -0.31), while Massachusetts' slope remained positive (standardized β :

45 0.99, 95% CI: 0.94 – 1.05).

46 **Conclusions:** Universal masking at the healthcare system was associated with

47 flattening the COVID-19 curve among HCWs, while the infection rate continued to

48 rise in the surrounding community.

49

50 **Key words:** occupational health, personal protective equipment, PPE, infectious

51 disease, emerging, SARS-CoV-2, hospital, infection control

52

53 **Introduction**

54 COVID-19 is an occupational risk for all essential workers, including healthcare
55 workers (HCWs) who are essential to maintain health and hospital systems [1].
56 Evidence has shown HCWs are at risk for infection due to direct exposure to
57 co-workers, patients and contaminated environments [2]. Accumulating research
58 suggests that optimal infection control strategies, including the use of personal
59 protective equipment, can minimize the risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission to HCWs
60 [3, 4]. Among now established hospital mitigation measures, universal masking is
61 thought to be one of the most effective means to protect HCWs. However, existing
62 evidence of universal masking efficacy is largely based on self-comparison results (i.e.
63 comparing pre- and post-masking phases) [5] instead of comparing HCWs with a
64 reference population, and thus cannot be free from secular trend bias. Therefore, we
65 conducted this study to investigate the effect of universal masking policy in a
66 Massachusetts (USA) healthcare system, using the surrounding statewide population
67 as a comparison group.

68

69 **Methods**

70 This time-series study examined the daily changes in COVID-19 incidence
71 among 1) the Massachusetts statewide population and 2) the HCWs of a
72 Massachusetts community healthcare system, which has been testing symptomatic
73 employees since the initial outbreak. The statewide data were derived from
74 Massachusetts Department of Public Health [6]. The HCW cohort of the healthcare
75 system and related ethical statement are described in our previous paper [7]. We
76 calculated 7-day moving averaged COVID-19 incidence to account for daily
77 fluctuation. The date of an incident case was defined as the date when a HCW called
78 the occupational health “hotline” for triage, and its’ reported date for the state.

79 We defined the study period to be from March 17, 2020, when the first case of
80 the healthcare system was identified, to May 6, 2020. The study period was divided
81 into three phases of interest: pre-intervention phase (March 17-31), intervention phase
82 (April 1-20), and post-intervention phase (April 21-May 6). The phases’ date cut-offs
83 were determined as follows. First, the healthcare system implemented universal
84 masking on March 26 and we allowed five more days for the policy to take effect.
85 The policy included securing N95s for all direct care staff managing confirmed or
86 suspect COVID-19 patients, and providing procedure masks to all other staff. Second,

87 April 20 is the day when Massachusetts reached the peak of COVID-19 incidence

88 (Figure). Finally, Massachusetts implemented a statewide masking policy on May 6.

89 We built linear regression models to investigate the temporal trends for each

90 cohort's 7-day averaged incidence within each of the three phases. Standardized beta

91 coefficients were calculated and presented to account for the difference in scale

92 between the healthcare system and the state. We further obtained the standard errors

93 and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) of the standardized coefficients. The

94 analyses were performed using R software (version 3.6.3) and SAS software (version

95 9.4, SAS Institute).

96

97 **Results**

98 During the study period, incident cases in the healthcare system and the state

99 were 142 and 75,493, respectively. In the pre-intervention phase, both the healthcare

100 system and the state had strong increasing trends in the 7-day averaged COVID-19

101 incidence (Figure and Table) with overlapping slopes (0.96 (0.80– 1.13) and 0.99

102 (0.92– 1.07), respectively). While the temporal trend among Massachusetts residents

103 kept increasing with a similar slope in the second phase (the intervention phase) (0.99

104 (0.94– 1.05)), that of the healthcare system decreased (-0.68 (-1.06– -0.31). In the
105 post-intervention phase, following the epidemic peak, incidence among both
106 populations showed overlapping negative slopes (-0.90 (-1.19– -0.60) and -0.99
107 (-1.07– -0.92)) (Figure and Table).

108

109 **Discussion**

110 Our present study provides additional, independent evidence of the protective
111 effect of universal masking in healthcare settings. The healthcare system’s epidemic
112 curve was flattened, and in fact, demonstrated a decreasing daily incidence trend after
113 implementing the masking policy, while the statewide infection rate continued to
114 increase during the same time period. The findings are in agreement with a recently
115 published study using HCW self-comparison [5]. In that study, the authors found a
116 significant decrement in the SARS-CoV-2 positivity rate after the implementation of
117 universal masking. We further confirm this effect by including a comparison group,
118 eliminating potential secular trend bias that limits before- and after- time-series
119 studies.

120 Evidence has shown that the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) can
121 prevent HCWs from being infected [8]. Two epidemiological studies conducted in
122 Wuhan, China investigated 278 and 420 frontline HCWs with optimal PPE protection
123 from different healthcare systems, respectively, and reported none infected [3, 9]. On
124 the other hand, in the one study, 10 out of 213 HCWs without appropriate masking
125 protection sustained nosocomial infection [9]. Furthermore, a Singaporean research
126 team examined the surfaces of used PPE from HCWs who took care of a symptomatic
127 COVID-19 patient and failed to detect SARS-CoV-2 (the virus causing COVID-19)
128 from the collected samples [10]. In accordance with the existing evidence, our results
129 further support masking's protective effects from the perspective of hospital infection
130 prevention.

131 The current study has several strengths such as the use of a comparable reference
132 group, a validated outcome measurement, and a distinct intervention being
133 implemented. Nonetheless, there are also some limitations. First, the current study is
134 limited by small sample size of HCWs, the short intervention period and individual
135 HCW compliance with the masking policy was not measured. Larger-scale studies are
136 warranted. Second, the five-day interval assumed for the policy to take effect was

137 somewhat arbitrary, but reasonable since most people develop symptoms within five
138 days of infection. Finally, there could be unmeasured confounding, such as improved
139 practices regarding social distancing, hand hygiene, and isolation of COVID-19
140 patients. However, our results show significant differences between the estimates,
141 with a drastic change from positive to negative slope shortly after the masking
142 policy's implementation, which are unlikely to be entirely biased.

143 In conclusion, our results suggest a significant mitigation effect of universal
144 masking on COVID-19 incidence when implemented in the healthcare setting, which
145 may be applicable to other essential workers and indoor businesses.

146

147 **Key points**

148 ● **What is already known about this subject**

149 ■ Healthcare workers (HCWs) are occupationally exposed to SARS-CoV-2.

150 ■ Protecting HCWs and other essential workers is important to maintain

151 healthcare and other essential businesses.

152 ■ Optimal personal protective equipment (PPE) use can minimize workers'

153 risk of being affected by COVID-19.

154 ● **What this study adds**

155 ■ Additional evidence that universal masking is associated with decreased

156 incident COVID-19 infections among HCWs.

157 ■ Universal masking in the healthcare setting protects HCWs.

158 ● **What impact this may have on practice or policy**

159 ■ Timely universal masking policy should be implemented and maintained in

160 healthcare settings during the COVID-19 pandemic.

161 ■ Our study indirectly supports universal masking by other essential workers

162 and indoor businesses.

163 **Competing Interests**

164 All authors declare no competing interest.

165

166 **Funding**

167 None of the authors receives funding toward the present study.

168 **References**

- 169 1. Fraher EP, Pittman P, Frogner BK et al. Ensuring and Sustaining a Pandemic
170 Workforce. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(23):2181-3.
- 171 2. Lan FY, Wei CF, Hsu YT, Christiani DC, Kales SN. Work-related COVID-19
172 transmission in six Asian countries/areas: A follow-up study. PLoS One.
173 2020;15(5):e0233588.
- 174 3. Liu M, Cheng SZ, Xu KW et al. Use of personal protective equipment against
175 coronavirus disease 2019 by healthcare professionals in Wuhan, China: cross
176 sectional study. BMJ. 2020;369:m2195.
- 177 4. Behrens GMN, Cossmann A, Stankov MV et al. Perceived versus proven
178 SARS-CoV-2-specific immune responses in health-care professionals. Infection. 2020.
179 doi: 10.1007/s15010-020-01461-0.
- 180 5. Wang X, Ferro EG, Zhou G, Hashimoto D, Bhatt DL. Association Between
181 Universal Masking in a Health Care System and SARS-CoV-2 Positivity Among
182 Health Care Workers. JAMA. 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.12897.
- 183 6. Massachusetts Department of Public Health. COVID-19 Response Reporting.
184 Available from: <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/covid-19-response-reporting>

185 [Accessed 7 August 2020]

186 7. Lan FY, Filler R, Mathew S et al. COVID-19 symptoms predictive of healthcare

187 workers' SARS-CoV-2 PCR results. PLoS One. 2020;15(6):e0235460.

188 8. Lan F-Y, Fernandez-Montero A, Kales SN. COVID-19 and healthcare workers:

189 emerging patterns in Pamplona, Asia and Boston. Occupational Medicine.

190 2020;70(5):340-1.

191 9. Wang X, Pan Z, Cheng Z. Association between 2019-nCoV transmission and

192 N95 respirator use. Journal of Hospital Infection. 2020;105(1):104-5.


193 10. Ong SWX, Tan YK, Chia PY et al. Air, Surface Environmental, and Personal

194 Protective Equipment Contamination by Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome

195 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) From a Symptomatic Patient. JAMA. 2020.

196 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.3227.

Figure. Temporal distribution of COVID-19 incidence among the (A) healthcare system employees and (B) Massachusetts residents statewide.



Bars indicate the absolute number of daily cases. The red line denotes the 7-day average of new cases. The black lines show linear regression slopes in each specific phase. The phases were categorized based on the implementation date of universal masking policy by the healthcare system (pre-intervention phase, March 17-31; intervention phase, April 1-20; post-intervention phase, April 21-May 6).

Table. The crude and standardized beta coefficients of 7-day averaged COVID-19 incident cases regressed on days during the three study phases.

	Pre-intervention phase (March 17-31)	Intervention phase (April 1-20)	Post-intervention phase (April 21-May 6)
The healthcare system			
Crude	0.26 (0.19– 0.26)	-0.10 (-0.15– -0.04)	-0.10 (-0.14– -0.07)
Standardized	0.96 (0.80– 1.13)	-0.68 (-1.06– -0.31)	-0.90 (-1.19– -0.60)
Massachusetts statewide			
Crude	59.25 (54.73– 63.77)	69.14 (65.31– 72.97)	-42.90 (-46.05– -39.76)
Standardized	0.99 (0.92– 1.07)	0.99 (0.94– 1.05)	-0.99 (-1.07– -0.92)

Beta coefficient (95% CI) derived from linear regression models in each phase.