Examining face-mask usage as an effective strategy to control COVID-19 spread

Adam Catching[1,2 §], Sara Capponi[3,4 §], Ming Te Yeh[1], Simone Bianco[3,4 *], Raul Andino[1 *]

[1] Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94158

[2] Graduate Program in Biophysics, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94158

[3] Industrial and Applied Genomics, AI and Cognitive Software, IBM Almaden Research Center, San Jose, CA, 95120

[4] Center for Cellular Construction, San Francisco, CA 94158

[§] authors contributed equally to the manuscript

* corresponding authors: sbianco@us.ibm.com, Raul.Andino@ucsf.edu

Abstract

COVID-19's high virus transmission rates have caused a pandemic that is exacerbated by the high rates of asymptomatic and presymptomatic infections. These factors suggest that face masks and social distance could be paramount in containing the pandemic. We examined the efficacy of each measure and the combination of both measures using an agent-based model within a closed space that approximated real-life interactions. By explicitly considering different fractions of asymptomatic individuals, as well as a realistic hypothesis of face masks protection during inhaling and exhaling, our simulations demonstrate that a synergistic use of face masks and social distancing is the most effective intervention to curb the infection spread. To control the pandemic, we show that practicing social distance is less efficacious than the widespread usage of face masks and that wearing face masks provides optimal protection even if only a small portion of the population comply with social distance. Finally, the face mask effectiveness in curbing the viral spread is not reduced if a large fraction of population is asymptomatic. Our findings have important implications for policies that dictate the reopening of social gatherings.

Keywords: epidemic, virus, agent-based simulation

Author summary:

The COVID-19 outbreak has created an enormous burden on the worldwide population. Among the various ways of preventing the spread of the virus, face masks have been proposed as a main way of reducing transmission. Yet, the interplay between the usage of face mask and other forms of Non-Pharmaceutical Intervention is still not completely clear. In this paper we introduce a stochastic individual-based model which aims at producing realistic scenarios of disease spread when mask wearing with different inward and outward efficacy and social distancing are enforced. The model elucidates the conditions that makes the two forms of intervention synergistic in preventing the spread of the disease.

Introduction

The COVID-19 outbreak has caused high levels of mortality and economic damage around the world. The causative agent of COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, is an airborne pathogen that can be transmitted between humans through droplets and aerosols that can travel 1–8 meters[1]. The virus is transmitted by both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. COVID-19 can cause severe symptoms that require hospitalization in 1-5% of cases, as well as severe long-term sequels and death. Accordingly, the outbreak has seriously impacted healthcare systems around the world[2]. One of the major difficulties to contain the COVID-19 pandemic has been detection of infected asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals, who are estimated to be responsible for as much as 95% of all transmissions[3] [4]. As these individuals carry and spread the virus without manifesting any sign of the disease, they represent a crucial variable in managing the outbreak.

In the absence of an effective vaccine or antiviral, most countries have implemented non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to curb the spread of COVID-19[5]. These include closure of schools, workplaces, churches, offices, factories and other social venues, while encouraging preventative measures ranging from maintaining social distancing (SD, usually 2 m/6 ft between individuals) to total quarantine and societal lockdowns. These measures aim to reduce the effective contact rate of the population, which in turn decreases the disease reproductive number R_e. These

NPIs limit the epidemic, but they present important drawbacks. Total lockdown can only be implemented for short periods, due to its severe impact on the social fabric and economy of a country. Meanwhile, essential workers remain vulnerable to infection and transmission due to the frequent encounters with infected, often asymptomatic, individuals. Because of their social and economic impact, lockdowns and SD measures have been lifted in some countries, leading to reactivation of virus spread and ensuing increased morbidity and mortality.

Face masks covering the nose and mouth area also provide a level of filtration that blocks virus transmission to a certain extent[6-8]. Masks prevent the spread of droplets and aerosols generated by an infected individual[1], where correctly worn surgical masks can reduce viral transmission by 95%. Uninfected individuals wearing a surgical mask are about 85% protected against infection[9]. Masks may be more effective than restrictions in people's interactions for controlling the spread of infectious virus because they prevent the larger expelled droplets from being converted into smaller droplets that can travel farther, rather than removing the interactions between individuals that cause droplets . Accordingly, face masks reduce the spread of influenza[10] and coronaviruses[11,12].

In the past, several papers have used theoretical models to study how efficacious mask wearing is in avoiding the spread of airborne viruses. In 2010 at least two studies were focused on the effect of face mask usage to contrast the diffusion of Novel Influenza A (H1N1)[13,14]. Although these works are not on COVID-19 or another Coronavirus disease, they underline the necessity of developing more accurate models to describe similar diseases and reinforce their results in the light of new diseases. Specifically on COVID-19, the efficacy of mask wearing has recently been studied using an ordinary differential equations (ODE) model[15], which considered also a varying percentage of asymptomatic individuals, compliance with mandate to wear masks, and a different inward and outward efficacy of protection. However, the authors consider face masks as the sole preventative, excluding additional NPIs like SD or shelter in place[1].

Additionally, the problem has been studied in several papers using agent-based models, each being focused on a specific part of the problem. In some cases, the presence of asymptomatic

112 infected individuals was not considered[16,17]. In other studies, the efficacy of wearing masks was not
113 analyzed when combined with other NPIs[18]. Finally, the difference in inward and outward protection
114 given by a face mask was often neglected or parametrized with a single value[19]. A rather
115 comprehensive data-driven investigation of all these effects has been performed by Hoertel et al.[20].
116 However, their results are specific to the country of France, and the high dimensionality of the
117 parameter space makes it difficult to disentangle the effect of the various interventions.

118 In our current study, we analyzed the relative efficacy of wearing face masks and/or
119 exercising SD to reducing the spread of COVID-19 in the presence of asymptomatic individuals.
120 This analysis may be particularly important in the current phase of the pandemic. As
121 pharmaceutical interventions (e.g. vaccines) are deployed, people may experience a false sense
122 of safety, which may lead to unsafe behavior. This may allow the virus to circulate at the interface
123 between immune and non-immune individuals, accelerating the emergence of variants resistant to
124 vaccination. Face masks have distinct inward and outward protection, parameterized using a
125 Gamma function (see Methods). Through stochastic computer simulations of infection spread, we
126 modeled realistic outbreak scenarios and found that SD only yields beneficial effects if
127 accompanied by a widespread population adherence to SD. In contrast, wearing face masks is a
128 highly effective strategy to reduce the spread of infection. Our results are general, and suggest
129 that, even when a large fraction of infected individuals is asymptomatic, mask wearing is the most
130 effective strategy to control virus spread and alleviate the impact of COVID-19 outbreak, particularly
131 when combined with conditions of partial SD compatible with the function of society.

132

133 **Results**

134 **Stochastic model description and calibration.** We developed an agent-based model (ABM) to
135 examine the effectiveness of wearing masks and SD on the rate of infections and viral spread
136 during the pandemic. Unlike ODE models of the spread of COVID-19 disease[15,21], ABMs are
137 stochastic models that allow the description of non-homogeneous distributions of agents that act
138 individually[12,22]. In ABMs, each individual behaves dynamically and independently in response to

139 environmental changes[23] according to rules that describe their interactions. To model the COVID-
140 19 pandemic, we used a SEAIR system in which each agent represents an individual who can be
141 susceptible (S), exposed (E), asymptomatically infected (A), symptomatically infected (I), or
142 recovered (R). Although important, we do not explicitly consider reinfection with the same or a
143 different viral variant, as it is outside the scope of this work. To obtain a realistic model of virus
144 spread, we chose parameters that describe the spread of SARS-CoV2: transmission events occur
145 through contacts made between susceptible and infectious individuals in close proximity (distance
146 ≤ 2*r*, Fig. 1A), and exposed individuals undergo an incubation period of 5.1 days to become
147 infectious (Fig. 1, spheres with red border). This incubation time represents the interval required to
148 increase viral loads to levels sufficient for transmission[3 4,24]. We assume that recovered individuals
149 (Fig. 1, spheres with black border), who resolve the infection, cannot be re-infected or infect others,
150 which is a reasonable assumption for the duration of our models (45 days). Symptomatic agents
151 are in the Infected state for 7 days but are only infectious to other agents for 12 hours.
152 Asymptomatic agents are infectious for all 7 days but the probability of transmission is reduced by
153 33%. Presymptomatic agents are similar to Susceptible agents in their interactions but have a
154 countdown for 5.1 days until they become either asymptomatically or symptomatically Infected

155 To define the probabilities of infection, we used reported COVID-19 parameters[24]. The
156 probability of transmission follows a Γ (*gamma)* distribution (see Methods) whose shape is
157 described by a constant (α), estimated to be 0.25. Wearing masks reduces this probability (Fig. 1,
158 probability of infection). To estimate the protective effect of masks, we used parameters determined
159 for FDA-approved surgical masks, whose efficacy has been experimentally verified to inhibit virus
160 transmission[10]. Based on previous studies (Leung et al.)[9], we assumed that, if an infectious
161 individual wears a mask, the effective probability of transmission is reduced by 95%. If a susceptible
162 individual wears a mask, α is reduced by 85% (Fig. 1A). Our assumption that wearing masks is
163 more effective to reduce transmission than to prevent getting infected is supported by experimental
164 data[25]. However, if both infectious and susceptible individuals wear masks the probability of
165 transmission is the product of these probabilities (0.0075) and, thus, sufficiently low such that
166 transmission is effectively null. We calibrated our model by running simulations without any

167 individuals wearing a face mask or practicing SD and considering that 50% of infected individuals
168 are asymptomatic at the beginning of the simulation, with each new infection throughout the
169 epidemic having a 50% probability of being asymptomatic (Movie 1). In this way, we determined
170 the simulation parameters, such as velocity and density of individuals, to obtain a value of $R_0 = 2.5$,
171 consistent with what was reported early on as the infection rate of the epidemic in Wuhan[9].

172 **Percentage of population wearing masks determines the daily infection incidence and**
173 **cumulative number of cases.** We started each simulation with one individual being infected and
174 all others susceptible and assuming all subsequent infections have a 50% chance of being an
175 asymptomatic. Non-infected and asymptomatic individuals circulate in the population without any
176 restriction (i.e., they do not isolate themselves or become hospitalized) (see Methods). In contrast,
177 symptomatic individuals no longer move after 12 hours of the symptom onset, simulating
178 hospitalization or self-isolation. Thus, symptoms are assumed to manifest after the incubation time
179 of 5.1 days (Fig. 2B). Using these assumptions and model calibration, we carried out a set of
180 simulations in which we gradually increased the percentage of individuals in the population that
181 wear masks. Individuals, who are assigned randomly to wear a mask at the beginning of the
182 simulation, keep on the mask for the entire duration of the simulation. Increasing the fraction of the
183 population wearing face masks has a highly significant effect on the spread of the virus (Fig. 1B,
184 1C and Movie 2). Mask wearing reduces the cumulative number of infected individuals at the end
185 of the simulation (Fig. 1B). Strikingly, we observed a negative correlation between the percentage
186 of the population wearing masks and the overall number of cases (Fig. 1B). The description of the
187 dynamics of infection generated by this model is consistent with previous clinical studies[9,25] and
188 highlights the benefit of wearing masks (Fig. 1C, Movie 1).

189 If the daily incidence surpasses the treatment capacity, it will overwhelm the healthcare
190 system with detrimental consequences for medical care of infected individuals and increased
191 mortality and morbidity. Thus, we examined the effects of face masks on the daily incidence of
192 infection over time (Fig. 2B). If all individuals move freely and randomly interact with others (i.e.,
193 0% SD), the rate of daily infection through the population depends on the percentage of individuals
194 wearing masks. The average number of new daily infection varies considerably, according to the

number of individuals wearing face masks. When 0% of individuals wear face masks (Fig. 2b, red line), the number of daily infections peaks sharply at day 27 with a maximum of 54.8 (51.2, 58.4 95% C.I.) infections per day for a population of 500 individuals. No additional infections are observed after day 39, when the entire population (100%) has been infected. Thus, without any intervention, the infection quickly reaches every individual through an epidemic characterized by a very sharp infection peak. Note that, in these original models, we assume all individuals recover after ~11 days post-infection and cannot be re-infected. When 40% of all individuals wear masks, the number of individuals infected at any given day is reduced by approximately 30% (maximum of infected individuals 35.1 (32.6, 37.7 95% C.I.) Fig. 2A, blue line), both flattening the curve and extending the duration of the outbreak by more than 10 days, with a peak maximum at day 32. By day 52, an average of 472 individuals has been infected, and none of the individuals is infectious or exposed any longer. Even more significantly, if 80% of the population wear masks, we observed a significant flattening of the curve, with a substantial reduction in the maximum number of infected individuals per day, 5.9 (4.6, 7.3 95% C.I.) (Fig. 2A, green line), and the number of new infected individuals reached zero by day 57.8 ± 35.0. Thus, the shape of the outbreak changes from a curve characterized by a sharp peak when no intervention is considered to a broader peak when 80% of the individuals wear masks. By increasing the percentage of the individuals wearing masks, the number of newly infected individuals per day substantially decreases, which will reduce mortality and morbidity. Moreover, since the use of masks eliminates the sharp peak that characterizes SARS CoV2 epidemics, the overall impact of the outbreak on the health system is alleviated. These results highlight the importance of widespread mask wearing as an effective intervention that can be implemented as soon as the first cases are reported.

Effect of social distancing on viral infection spread. Next, we evaluated the effect of SD in shaping the spread of infection. Practicing SD does not affect the probability of infection conditional on an encounter but reduces the chances of encounters leading to transmission. Thus, SD was introduced into the model by limiting the proportion of individuals in the population that move freely in the field. This simulates a scenario in which a given proportion of individuals in the population quarantine or shelter-in-place, thereby reducing the probability of contacts and transmission (Fig.

223 2A). As reported, if a percentage of individuals practice SD, even without any other non-
224 pharmacological intervention, the number of infections and daily infection rate are reduced
225 (compare Fig. 2B, SD 0, 40, and 80%, red line). However, if no one wears masks but 40% of
226 individuals practice SD, we observed a very small effect in the shape of the infection curve (Fig.
227 2B, the peak maximum decreases from 51.0 (48.3, 53.6 95% C.I.) to 30.1 (27.5, 32.7 95% C.I.) ().
228 When 80% of the population practices SD, a more significant reduction in the number of new daily
229 infections was observed (Fig. 2B, 80%). Notably, the shape of the new daily infection curve
230 broadens considerably upon increasing the percentage of individuals wearing face masks (Fig. 2B,
231 compare blue and green curves with red curve). For instance, if 80% of the population wears masks
232 with 40% SD, the peak maximum decreases to one-tenth (from 51.0 (48.3, 53.6 95% C.I.) to 5.7
233 (4.5, 6.7 95% C.I.)) and is slightly delayed (Fig. 2B). At 80% SD, the peak of new daily infections is
234 no longer observed, and the number of new infected individuals per day averages 1.6 (1.4, 1.9 95%
235 C.I.) (Fig. 2B). Thus, the effects of individuals wearing face masks and practicing SD are
236 synergistic, with the most pronounced effects occurring when 60% or 80% of individuals wear
237 masks.

238 It is possible that our results may vary depending on the way social distancing is
239 implemented in the model. To test this possibility, we carried out additional simulations in which
240 modulate the amounts of social distancing by completely removing infected agent practicing SD
241 from the simulation, and only allowed infected agents to be symptomatically infected (see SM 6).
242 The results from these simulations were similar to those described above, confirming that around
243 ~60-80% of the population is required to practice SD to effectively slow the rate of infection, even
244 when SD reduce the probability of transmission to zero. Our results also show that, if infection is
245 always symptomatic, the number of infections drops significantly, which is consistent with the
246 spread driven by asymptomatic individuals.

247

248

Effectiveness of combining mask wearing and social distancing to control infection in populations with high proportions of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic cases. Asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection is emerging as possibly the most common clinical manifestation of COVID-19[26-30]. This finding could only be revealed once mass testing campaigns were performed, regardless of symptoms (e.g., universal testing campaigns). One of the earliest studies documenting clinical manifestations in a testing campaign (which still focused testing mainly on symptomatic individuals) was on the *Diamond Princess* cruise ship, where the rate of asymptomatic infection was 18%[31,32]. In a mass testing campaign in Iceland, where testing was offered to a segment of the general population (regardless of symptoms), 43% of individuals were asymptomatic at the time of testing[33]. Thus, the actual percentage of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic cases is currently unknown, but it is clear that a large number of SARS CoV2 new infections derive from undetected infections. Controlling the outbreaks by isolation or even by increased population testing is a big challenge and may be difficult to implement. We thus determined the efficacy of mask wearing and SD in the context of different proportions of asymptomatic incidence. We assume that asymptomatic individuals are less infectious than symptomatic individuals: asymptomatic individuals may have lower viral loads and reduced coughing, sneezing, and nasal secretions, all of which may facilitate transmission[34-36]. The model considers that symptomatic infected individuals isolated themselves 12 hours after the onset of symptoms, because they get hospitalized or self-isolated. In contrast, asymptomatic individuals remain infectious, circulate and transmit for a period of 7 days (Fig. 3A). Because some individuals can be pre-symptomatic (i.e., symptoms emerge later after the initial incubation time (Fig. 2B, $t = 5.1$ days)), we modelled infectivity of asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic as linearly declining until the individual is no longer infectious, after 7 days[37]. Using these assumptions, we performed a sensitivity analysis by carrying out simulations, varying the percent of asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic cases to determine the efficiency of non-pharmacological interventions in populations with 25, 50, and 75% pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic infected individuals (Fig. 3).

Our simulations demonstrate that the total number of infected individuals increases linearly with the increase of the percentage of asymptomatic individuals in the population (Fig. 3B). To

compare each condition, we normalized the peak of new daily infected individuals to conditions in which no one practiced SD or wore masks. Strikingly, increasing the percentage of individuals wearing masks linearly reduces the normalized peak number of infected individuals per day (Fig. 3B). For instance, when 40% of the individuals wear face masks, the peak number of infected decreases similarly independently of the percent of asymptomatic cases considered (to 0.6–0.7, Fig. 3B). Furthermore, the linear relationship between the decrease in peak number of newly infected individuals per day and increase in percent individuals wearing masks is independent of the proportion of asymptomatic individuals in the population (Fig. 3B). This finding indicates that, when the fraction of asymptomatic cases is high, as in the case for COVID-19, wearing face masks is as effective to reduce the peak number of infected as when a low percentage of individuals are asymptomatically infected.

In contrast, SD was only effective in populations with high incidence of asymptomatic infections when a very high fraction of the population practice SD (more than 60%) (Fig. 3B). Furthermore, the low efficacy of SD as a containment strategy is more pronounced when the proportion of asymptomatic individuals increase (compare 25, 50, and 75%). Of note, if the number of individuals wearing face masks is high, increasing the number of individuals practicing SD has negligible effects on the daily number of infected individuals (see supplementary materials). One noteworthy observation from our model is that, at high rates of SD (e.g. 80 %), there is more variability.

Our analysis uncovers a linear relationship between the fraction of a population wearing masks and the reduction in infection rate. In contrast, we find SD requires a high fraction of compliance to be effective. These findings indicate that having a high percentage of individuals wearing face masks is more beneficial in preventing virus spread and reducing the peak number of infected individuals than having a high percent of people practicing SD. Notably, the benefit of wearing masks is not affected if the percent of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic increases.

Interplay of face masks and social distancing for controlling infection spread and protecting from COVD-19. Next, we determined the average cumulative incidence as a function of the

304 percentage of individuals wearing masks and practicing SD (standard deviation described in Fig.
305 SM3-A). When neither SD nor masks were used our simulations indicate that up to 99% of the
306 population will end up infected, leading to unacceptable levels of mortality and morbidity. When the
307 proportion of the population wearing masks was increased, no significant effect on the total number
308 of infected people was noted until more than 40% of the population wore masks. However, if 80%
309 of people use masks, the average cumulative incidence of infection decreased to around 35%.
310 Therefore, wearing face masks alone would greatly limit the spread of the virus. In contrast, SD
311 alone does not have a significant effect. Increasing SD compliance to 80% only reduced total
312 infections by 8%, and 87% of the population was eventually infected. Importantly, the combination
313 of wearing masks and practicing SD by a high proportion of the population dramatically reduces
314 the total number of infected individuals to 10% of the population (Fig. 4A; and Fig. SM2-C).

315 To gain additional insights into the characteristics of the epidemic in response to these
316 mitigation strategies, we studied the shape of the epidemic curve by calculating the peak and full-
317 width half-maximum (FWHM) of the peak of the new daily infections (Methods). While the peak
318 reports on the maximum number of daily infections at the height of the epidemic, the FWHM is a
319 simple way to represent the duration of the characteristic peak of new daily infections. Indeed,
320 FWHM reports on the extinction time of the infection within the population (number of days until no
321 individual is still infected) (Fig. 4A, and Fig. SM3-B standard deviation). A larger FWHM
322 corresponds to a flatter but longer epidemic curve. A flatter epidemic curve enables better
323 management of the epidemic, as the healthcare system is not overwhelmed by the number of cases
324 at a given time. Initially, the FWHM was calculated assuming no individual practice SD. FWHM was
325 ~8.3 days if none of the individuals wears masks, ~12.8 if 40% of individuals wear masks, and but
326 increases dramatically to 85.4 when 80% of the population wears masks (Fig. 2B). Our data
327 indicate that wearing masks has a more profound effect than SD on flattening the epidemic curve.
328 For instance, when 80% of the population wears masks, the epidemic curve is eight times flatter
329 than without any non-pharmacological intervention (Fig. 4B). In contrast, if 80% of the population
330 practices SD, the flattening of the curve is less than threefold. The most dramatic effect on flattening
331 of the curve is observed when wearing masks is combined with SD; for instance, if 80% of the

332 population wears masks and 80% practices SD, the curve is flattened over 10-fold, compared to
333 no intervention.

334 We also find that the reduction in the number of infected individuals per day correlates with
335 a lengthening of the outbreak. Broadening of the peak affects the extinction time of the infection
336 (Fig. 4C). For instance, when the percentage of individuals wearing face masks rises from 0 to 80%
337 of the population, the extinction time increases from ~39.0 to ~58 days (Fig. 4C). Similarly, as a
338 higher proportion of individuals practice SD, the time to extinction of the infection also increases
339 (Fig. 4C, ~39 to ~54 days for 0% to 80% of SD). Importantly, even though the time to epidemic
340 extinction is extended, the total number of infected individuals dramatically decreases (Fig. 4A). If
341 a higher proportion of the population (80%) wears face masks and practices SD, the time to
342 epidemic extinction is reduced (Fig. 4C) because the total number of infected individuals is
343 dramatically reduced (Fig. 4A). Thus, stochastic effects dominate, and this can be appreciated by
344 the wider error bars (Fig. 4F).

345 To relate the impact of these interventions to their societal impact, we determined the
346 number of deaths per million after each mitigation strategy, assuming a mortality rate of ~3%[38].
347 This analysis illustrates the heavy cost of lives of the virus, but also demonstrates that a high level
348 of mask wearing compliance is the most effective non-pharmacological approach to protect human
349 lives, particularly when combined with even moderate SD measures (Fig. 4D). In contrast, SD,
350 without masks wearing is not effective to reduce mortality (Fig. 4E). Finally, our simulations predict
351 that increasing the proportion of the population wearing masks will increase the time to outbreak
352 extinction (from ~40 to ~60 days) (Fig. 4F). Together with the broadening of the peak (Fig. 4C), this
353 shows an effective flattening of the curve. Importantly, with 80% mask wearing, we observed an
354 increase in the statistical distribution from the average time to extinction (Fig. 4F, see 95%
355 confidence intervals). Thus, a generally low disease incidence triggers stochastic events leading to
356 extinction of the infection. Our simulations represent real outbreak scenarios and reveal that as the
357 outbreak approaches its extinction there is an increase in the uncertainty of whether or not the

358 infection has been completed eliminated, which argue to be prudent before society reopening can
359 be done safety.

360

361 **Discussion**

362 Here we use realistic simulations rooted in experimentally measured parameters of SARS-Cov2
363 spread, contagion mode and mortality, to evaluate two available NPIs that reduce the spread of a
364 respiratory infection, such as COVID-19. In our simulation, we assumed proper use of FDA-
365 approved face masks. We showed that a high degree of compliance in the use of masks, regardless
366 of whether the wearer displays symptoms, slows the spread of infection. Face masks substantially
367 reduce the transmission of respiratory droplets and aerosols containing viral particles[9-11].
368 Increasing the fraction of the population wearing face masks reduces the number of new infected
369 individuals per day and flattened the curve of total individuals infected (Fig. 2A and 4A). These two
370 effects should reduce mortality and morbidity, alleviate the current stress on healthcare systems,
371 and enable a more effective management of severe cases. However, solely wearing masks cannot
372 entirely prevent an outbreak from occurring. It cannot by itself extinguish the virus, since as long
373 as a small fraction of the population is non-compliant, the virus can persist in the population. Our
374 models show that combining proper use of masks with practices such as SD, indisputably
375 decreases the number of new infected individuals per day (Fig. 2). The asymmetry between the
376 effectiveness of SD and mask wearing is of particular interest. In a classical, ODE-based
377 epidemiological model, mask wearing and SD would both affect the transmission rate. In the
378 absence of SD, imagining a 100% effectiveness of mask, the reduction in transmission due to mask
379 wearing would be the same as the decrease due to SD in the absence of mask wearing. In fact,
380 both controls would be, effectively, modeled as a removal of people from the population. On the
381 other hand, our simulations show that mask wearing has a stronger effect than SD on the disease
382 incidence. This is due to the way we model SD, that is, as a decrease in mobility. A better
383 approximation of our model is to consider an epidemic dynamic on a scale-free network, where
384 homogeneous mixing is relaxed and SD is modeled as a change in the degree distribution of the

network[39]. In addition, our model was demonstrated to be scalable and able to describe realistic situations such as interactions between 5000 agents (see supplementary materials).

Our analysis provides guidance for policies to protect the population from COVID-19. Optimizing the use of masks with SD practices effectively limits the virus spread and reduces several parameters in the epidemic, including cumulative incidence, shape of the peak, and the extinction rate (Fig. 3). In particular, we observed that wearing masks is more effective than SD. Even in a population with a high number of asymptomatic infections, increasing the use of masks up to 80% results in a significant reduction in infection (Fig. 4A). Meanwhile, even 80% of individuals practicing SD has only a marginal effect (Fig. 4D). This result can be understood in terms of contact rate, since we assume that asymptomatic infectious individuals have higher mobility than symptomatic infectious ones. If the vast majority of the population is asymptomatic, then high compliance with face mask use is a key factor for curbing the epidemic. Moreover, we believe that our methods are general and they may inform policies against other respiratory infections like influenza.

Our simulations also provide insights into how enforcing different mitigation practices affects the length of the epidemic. Assuming a homogenous population, the trajectory of epidemic extinction lasts 50–60 days, when 80% of the population either wears masks or practices SD (Fig. 4C). However, when 80% of the population is wearing masks and 0% of the population is practicing SD, the cumulative incidence is reduced three times (~35%), and the peak is very broad (FWHM of ~ 85 days). In contrast, when the population solely practices SD (80%), the majority of the population (93%) will end up infected, and the peak of daily infected individuals will be sharper (FWHM of ~ 20 days).

Our model indicates that the synergistic utilization of face mask wearing and social distancing practice is most effective in controlling SARS-CoV-2 spread. We observed that wearing masks in combination with some degree of SD relaxes the need for a complete lockdown, leading to a potential suggestion for an intervention policy based on a mix of the two measures. The effectiveness of mask wearing to control virus spread is not reduced if a large fraction of the

population is asymptomatic. This suggests that, in the absence of universal testing, widespread use of face masks is necessary and sufficient to prevent a large outbreak. Our results are supported by the real data of Korea[33] and Taiwan[34], where an early mandate to requiring face mask usage, in combination with SD, severely limited the spread of the virus. While more work is necessary to specifically assess the impact of other variables shaping COVID-19 outbreaks, such as increased mobility, age stratification, testing a fraction of the population, our study can accurately inform strategies to reduce the spread of the virus. In particular, our results may be highly relevant toward informing specific realistic situations, such as the spread of the disease in a confined space, where effective SD may not be easily achievable (e.g., schools, essential businesses, correctional facilities, public transportation, hospitals). These strategies, if effectively implemented, will save countless lives from the SARS-Cov2 infection. According to our model, if the United States (330 million people) does not implement any NPIs, then ~627,000 people are expected to die. Contrastingly, if 80% of the population wear face masks, that number would significantly shrink to about 250,000. If both face masks and SD were practiced by 80% of the population from the start of a pandemic, the mortality rate decreases to 65,600 people.

Materials and Methods

We developed and used our python codes using the NumPy library version 1.15.4[40] to carry out ABM and describe the dynamic evolution of a SEAIR system affected by COVID-19 disease, in which each individual can be in a susceptible (S), exposed (E), asymptomatic infected (A), symptomatic infected (I), or recovered (R) status. In addition, each individual can wear a face mask (M) or can practice social distancing (SD), where wearing face masks or practicing SD are independent binary values of an individual. In the simulations, each individual was represented by a position in a 2-D lattice of 21x21 dimension with periodic boundary conditions. Individual initial positions are assigned randomly by NumPy's random module, and the simulations start with all susceptible individuals and only one exposed. During the simulation, each individual move along a randomly oriented trajectory at a constant velocity, moves the same distance between each time step of the simulation, and interacts with individuals whose position is within a fixed diameter of another individual. The data from each individual are saved as vectors of attributes, including

position, velocity, state (S, E, A, I, R, M, SD), and number of individuals they come into contact with at every simulation time step. A time step corresponds to 1 hour. We implemented the state of M by defining sub-routine during the interaction between two individuals where the probability of infection was reduced by an amount corresponding to which of the two individuals is wearing a mask. For the SD state, we assigned the individual to be stationary and not follow along a randomly assigned trajectory.

We refer to Ferguson et al. for defining the rules governing the interactions among individuals[24]. For the interaction between symptomatic infected and susceptible individuals, the infection probability was randomly sampled from a gamma distribution with a mean of 1 and a shape of 2.5, whereas for that between asymptomatic infected and susceptible individuals, the infection probability is reduced by 33 %. We assume this reduction of infectivity for the asymptomatic, based on the absence of transmission-aiding symptoms, such as coughing, sneezing, and a runny nose[24]. The time between a susceptible individual being exposed to being in the infectious infected state is 5.1 days[24]. Pre-symptomatic agents are defined as infected agents during the incubation period. Symptomatic infected individuals are infectious for 12 hours before self-isolating. After this time, we assume that these individuals no longer infect those around them because they are hospitalized or self-isolating. Asymptomatic infected individuals are infectious for 7 days, and the infectivity linearly declines until the individual is no longer infectious on day 7[37]. If an infected, a susceptible, or both individuals are wearing a mask their probability of another individual being infected is reduced to 5, 15, or 0%, respectively, from the original gamma distribution.

First, we carried out a simulation with 500 individuals with 0% of individuals wearing face masks and 0% practicing SD to optimize parameters as velocities and individual density to obtain a basic reproduction number, R_0, equal to 2.5, based on reported values. The basic reproduction number was computed from the mean number of symptomatic cases, resulting from a single symptomatic individual. Then, we carried out four more sets of simulations in which we increased the percentage of individuals wearing masks by the 20, 40, 60, and 80%. Finally, for each of these simulation sets we carried out four more sets in which we increased the percentage of individuals

468 practicing SD by the 20, 40, 60, and 80%. Simulations are stochastic, and we simulated each
469 condition 100 times to increase the statistical power of the analysis. In total, we simulated 25
470 different conditions for a total of 2500 simulations, 100 for each condition. In all these simulations,
471 the probability of a new infection being asymptomatic was 50%. Simulations were run until there
472 were no individuals either infected or exposed. Summary values were computed by methods in the
473 NumPy module. Error bars were calculated by the standard deviation method in NumPy and for
474 figure 3 and 4 the error bars were calculated by 95% confidence interval. The full-width half-
475 maximum (FWHM) was calculated for each simulation from the newly infected per day data by
476 taking the maximum and using it to find the days that intersect the value of half the maximum value.
477 The first and last days of this intersection were then used to calculate the number of days of the
478 FWHM. From the set of FWHM for each simulation, an average and standard deviation were
479 calculated using the NumPy module. FWHM error bars are large due to a large variation in how flat
480 the curves are. Graphs were created by using the Matplotlib[41] and Seaborn[42] modules in python.

481 We followed the same protocol described above to perform simulations, varying the
482 probability of a new infection being asymptomatic from 25 to 75%. Finally, to monitor the
483 reproducibility of our results with a larger population and contrast with real data, we ran four sets
484 of 30 simulations with 5000 individuals in the combinations of 0 or 80% SD and 0 or 80% wearing
485 masks. All 5000 individual simulations were done with 50% asymptomatic infection rates.

486 As the position, trajectory, and state of each individual in the simulation are explicitly
487 known, using the matplotlib library's animation package, we converted each time step of the
488 simulation to an image in a movie, representing 1 day as a second spanning the length of the
489 simulation.

490 For each simulation, we saved in a .csv in tidy data format the summary values of the
491 simulations, which we used for the analysis. The simulation was written in python and all scripts

are available on GitHub at https://github.com/adamcatching/SARS_SEIR_Simulation, simulations were generated using script mask_single_sim.py.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the use of the UCSF Computing Cluster Wynton (https://wynton.ucsf.edu/hpc/index.html). We thank Judith Frydman, Alma Andino-Frydman, and Patrick Dolan for their suggestions on the manuscript.

Author contributions

A. C., S. C., and M. T. Y. conceived the study. A. C. and S. C. designed the simulations. A. C. wrote and executed the simulations. A. C., S. C., and S. B. analyzed the data. S. B. and R. A. provided guidance and support. All authors wrote the manuscript.

Competing interest statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

509

510 **References**

511

512

513 1 Bourouiba, L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions:
514 Potential Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. *Jama* **323**, 1837,
515 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4756 (2020).
516 2 Miller, I. F., Becker, A. D., Grenfell, B. T. & Metcalf, C. J. E. Disease and
517 healthcare burden of COVID-19 in the United States. *Nature Medicine*, 1,
518 doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0952-y (2020).
519 3 Bai, Y. *et al.* Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *Jama*
520 **323**, 1406, doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2565 (2020).
521 4 Wölfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-
522 2019. *Nature* **581**, 465, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x (2020).
523 5 Schwartz, I. B., Kaufman, J., Hu, K. & Bianco, S. Predicting the impact of
524 asymptomatic transmission, non-pharmaceutical intervention and testing on the
525 spread of COVID19.
526 6 Feng, S. *et al.* Rational use of face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*
527 *Respiratory Medicine* **8**, 434, doi:10.1016/s2213-2600(20)30134-x (2020).
528 7 Ng, K. *et al.* COVID-19 and the Risk to Health Care Workers: A Case Report.
529 *Annals of Internal Medicine*, doi:10.7326/l20-0175 (2020).
530 8 Suess, T. *et al.* The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of
531 influenza transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial;

Berlin, Germany, 2009-2011. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **12**, 1, doi:10.1186/1471-2334-12-26 (2012).

9 Leung, N. H. L. *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine* **26**, 676, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2 (2020).

10 Offeddu, V., Yung, C. F., Low, M. S. F. & Tam, C. C. Effectiveness of Masks and Respirators Against Respiratory Infections in Healthcare Workers: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **65**, 1934, doi:10.1093/cid/cix681 (2017).

11 Konda, A. *et al.* Aerosol Filtration Efficiency of Common Fabrics Used in Respiratory Cloth Masks. *ACS Nano* **14**, 6339, doi:10.1021/acsnano.0c03252 (2020).

12 Howard, J. *et al.* Face Masks Against COVID-19: An Evidence Review. doi:10.20944/preprints202004.0203.v1 (2020).

13 Tracht, S. M., Valle, S. Y. D. & Hyman, J. M. Mathematical Modeling of the Effectiveness of Facemasks in Reducing the Spread of Novel Influenza A (H1N1). *Plos One* **5**, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0009018 (2010).

14 Brienen, N. C. J., Timen, A., Wallinga, J., Steenbergen, J. E. V. & Teunis, P. F. M. The Effect of Mask Use on the Spread of Influenza During a Pandemic. *Risk Analysis* **30**, 1210, doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01428.x (2010).

15 Ngonghala, C. N. *et al.* Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Mathematical Biosciences* **325**, doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2020.108364 (2020).

16 Mahdizadeh Gharakhanlou, N. & Hooshangi, N. Spatio-temporal simulation of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak using the agent-based modeling approach (case study: Urmia, Iran). *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked* **20**, doi:10.1016/j.imu.2020.100403 (2020).

17 Chang, S. L., Harding, N., Zachreson, C., Cliff, O. M. & Prokopenko, M. Modelling transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. (2020).

18 Kai, D., Goldstein, G.-P., Morgunov, A., Nangalia, V. & Rotkirch, A. Universal Masking is Urgent in the COVID-19 Pandemic: SEIR and Agent Based Models, Empirical Validation, Policy Recommendations. *arXiv:2004.13553 [physics, q-bio]* (2020).

19 Silva, P. C. L. *et al.* COVID-ABS: An agent-based model of COVID-19 epidemic to simulate health and economic effects of social distancing interventions. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **139**, doi:10.1016/j.chaos.2020.110088 (2020).

20 Hoertel, N. *et al.* A stochastic agent-based model of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in France. *Nature Medicine* **26**, 1417, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1001-6 (2020).

21 Kuniya, T. Prediction of the Epidemic Peak of Coronavirus Disease in Japan, 2020. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* **9**, doi:10.3390/jcm9030789 (2020).

22 Bauer, A. L., Beauchemin, C. A. A. & Perelson, A. S. Agent-based modeling of host–pathogen systems: The successes and challenges. *Information Sciences* **179**, 1379, doi:10.1016/j.ins.2008.11.012 (2009).

23 Rahmandad, H., Hu, K., Tebbens, R. J. D. & Thompson, K. M. Development of an individual-based model for polioviruses: implications of the selection of

network type and outcome metrics. *Epidemiology and Infection* **139**, 836, doi:10.1017/s0950268810001676 (2011).

24 Ferguson, N. *et al.* Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand.

25 Liang, M. *et al.* Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*, doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101751 (2020).

26 Oran, D. P. & Topol, E. J. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, doi:10.7326/m20-3012 (2020).

27 Ing, A. J., Cocks, C. & Green, J. P. COVID-19: in the footsteps of Ernest Shackleton. *Thorax* **75**, 693, doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215091 (2020).

28 Arons, M. M. *et al.* Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled Nursing Facility. *New England Journal of Medicine* **382**, 2081, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2008457 (2020).

29 Day, M. Covid-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. *Bmj* **369**, doi:10.1136/bmj.m1375 (2020).

30 Cline, S. *Cases at seafood plant cause spike in Oregon COVID numbers | News Break*, <https://www.newsbreak.com/oregon/salem/news/1581086288035/cases-at-seafood-plant-cause-spike-in-oregon-covid-numbers> (

31 Moriarty, L. F. Public Health Responses to COVID-19 Outbreaks on Cruise Ships — Worldwide, February–March 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **69**, doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6912e3 (2020).

599 32 Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A. & Chowell, G. Estimating the
600 asymptomatic proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on
601 board the Diamond Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro*
602 *Surveillance: Bulletin Europeen Sur Les Maladies Transmissibles = European*
603 *Communicable Disease Bulletin* **25**, doi:10.2807/1560-
604 7917.es.2020.25.10.2000180 (2020).
605 33 Gudbjartsson, D. F. *et al.* Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population.
606 *New England Journal of Medicine* **382**, 2302, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2006100
607 (2020).
608 34 Buitrago-Garcia, D. C. *et al.* Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a living
609 systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.04.25.20079103
610 (2020).
611 35 Sakurai, A. *et al.* Natural History of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *New*
612 *England Journal of Medicine* **0**, doi:10.1056/NEJMc2013020 (2020).
613 36 Fernandez, M. *WHO: Data suggests it's "very rare" for coronavirus to spread*
614 *through asymptomatics*, <https://www.axios.com/who-coronavirus-
615 asymptomatic-patients-08d84e31-1846-44d8-8fe1-2343ff850764.html> (
616 37 He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
617 COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*, 1, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5 (2020).
618 38 *Mortality Risk of COVID-19 - Statistics and Research*,
619 <https://ourworldindata.org/mortality-risk-covid> (

39 Kai, D., Goldstein, G.-P., Morgunov, A., Nangalia, V. & Rotkirch, A. Universal Masking is Urgent in the COVID-19 Pandemic: SEIR and Agent Based Models, Empirical Validation, Policy Recommendations. (2020).

40 Van Der Walt, S., Colbert, S. C. & Varoquaux, G. The NumPy array: a structure for efficient numerical computation. *Computing in Science & Engineering* **13**, 22, doi:10.1109/mcse.2011.37 (2011).

41 *Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment - IEEE Journals & Magazine*, <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4160265> (

42 *mwaskom/seaborn: v0.8.1 (September 2017) | Zenodo*, <https://zenodo.org/record/883859> (

Figures



Figure 1. Individual states and rules of interactions. Using the same coloring system used in animated simulations, we show the different states an individual can be in during a simulation. Individuals keep the masked or not masked attribute assigned at initialization during the course of the simulation. **A**) Spread of infection is caused by interactions of overlapping trajectories between infected and susceptible individuals. If the distance between individuals, d, is less than the radius of the two individuals, r, then an interaction occurs. Interactions initiate the generation of a random number that determines if transmission occurs. The chance of infection is randomly generated, based on a gamma distribution with shape parameter, alpha, of 0.25. This probability is further modulated by which individuals in the interactions are wearing face masks.

B) Agents are shown at their positions and states during snapshots of the simulation. Representative simulations of are shown of 0, 40, or 80% of the population wearing face masks. Snapshots are collected at days 0, 20, and 40 of the simulations. **C**) Progression of the outbreak, the trajectory of the number of new daily infected individuals (Currently infected) and cumulatively infected from a representative simulation are graphed in light blue and black, respectively.



Figure 2. Average new infections per day when varying the population wearing masks and practicing social distancing. A) SD is implemented by assigning agents to not move along a trajectory during the simulation. This lack of movement reduces the number of trajectories overlaps between agents and subsequently reduces the number of transmission events. **B)** The number of new infections per day for 0, 40, or 80% of a population wearing face-masks are displayed by red, blue, or green trajectories, respectively, for 0% of the population practicing SD, for the 40% and for

the 80%. Simulations were repeated 100 times for each condition, the curves and the highlighted regions around the curves represent the mean value +/- one standard deviation.



Figure 3. Effects of the asymptomatic population on the infected peak number. A) Schematic representation of the asymptomatic transmission during the simulations. After 5.1 days of coming into contact with an infected individual, infectious agents can develop symptoms and after 12 hours will be isolated. On the contrary, asymptomatic individuals don't develop symptoms of the disease so they are not isolated but keep circulating thus contributing to spread the infection for 7 more days after the initial contact with an infectious agent. **B**) The normalized peak of new daily infected is represented as a function of the percentage of the population wearing mask (left panels, green solid circles) and as a function of increasing the percentage of asymptomatic individuals (25% top left panel, 50% central left panel, 75% bottom left panel). The normalized peak of new daily infected is represented as a function of the percentage of the population practicing social distance (right panels, blue solid circles) and as a function of increasing the percentage of asymptomatic individuals (25% top right panel, 50% central right panel, 75% bottom right panel). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals calculated.

Figure 4



Figure 4. Summary values from 2500 simulations of varying percentages of population wearing masks or social distancing. A) Proportion of infected population. The average cumulative incidence is represented as a function of the population practicing SD or wearing a mask, which are given by the x and y axis, respectively. **B**) The shape of the daily new infection curve. Full-width half-maximum (FWHM), denoting the number of days between the first day and last day of cases that have half the peak number of infected individuals. **C**) Extinction rate of the epidemic estimated as the average number of days for which the simulation reports no new infected individuals. In the figure, the numbers represent the mean value calculated over 100 of simulations carried out for each condition. For clarity, we reported the standard deviation of the mean for each value reported in this figure in Fig. SM5. **D**) and **E**) Number of death people. Extrapolated for one million individuals from the cumulative incidence of infections estimated from our model at a

688 mortality rate of 3%. **F)** Number of days from the start of infection spread to the last infected agent

689 recovering. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals calculated for **D**), **E**) and **F**).

690

691

692

693