

# Impact of Personal Care Habits on Post-Lockdown COVID-19 Contagion: Insights from Agent-based Simulations

4 Lindsay Álvarez-Pomar<sup>1\*</sup> and Sergio Rojas-Galeano<sup>1\*</sup>

\*For correspondence:

[srojas@udistrital.edu.co](mailto:srojas@udistrital.edu.co) (SRG);  
[lalvarez@udistrital.edu.co](mailto:lalvarez@udistrital.edu.co) (LAP)

5 <sup>1</sup> School of Engineering, Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, Bogotá,  
6 Colombia.

---

8 **Abstract** After the first wave of spread of the COVID-19 pandemic, countries around the world  
9 are struggling to recover their economies by slowly lifting the mobility restrictions and social  
10 distance measures enforced during the crisis. Therefore, the post-lockdown containment of the  
11 disease will depend strongly not any more on government-imposed interventions but on  
12 personal care measures, taken voluntarily by their citizens. In this respect, recent studies have  
13 shed some light regarding the effectiveness individual protection habits may have in preventing  
14 SARS-Cov-2 transmission, particularly physical contact distancing, facial mask wearing and  
15 hand-washing habits. In this paper we describe experiments performed on a simulated COVID-19  
16 epidemic in an artificial population using an agent based model, so as to illustrate to what extent  
17 the interplay between such personal care habits contributes to mitigate the spread of the disease,  
18 assuming the lack of other population-wide non-pharmaceutical interventions or vaccines. We  
19 discuss scenarios where wide adherence to these voluntary care habits alone, can be enough to  
20 contain the unfold of the contagion. Our model purpose is illustrative and contributes to ratify the  
21 importance of disseminating the message regarding the collective benefits of mass adoption of  
22 personal protection and hygiene habits, as an exit strategy for COVID-19 in the new normal state.

---

## 24 Introduction

25 Countries around the world are facing the extraordinary challenge of recovering the economy after  
26 the crisis brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic (*Pichler et al., 2020; Fernandes, 2020; Coibion*  
27 *et al., 2020*). The crisis yielded negative impact on social, economic and psychological conditions of  
28 the population due to the application of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPI) intended to limit  
29 the mobility of people, reducing in this way the risk of contagion by direct contact, e.g. total lock-  
30 down, home quarantines, isolation of confirmed cases, closing conglomeration facilities (*Ferguson*  
31 *et al., 2020; Lai et al., 2020; Giordano et al., 2020; Kantner, 2020*).

32 After a first peak of infections, most countries have decided to lift these kind of NPIs in order to  
33 reopen their economies, allowing susceptible persons to move around freely, despite the contin-  
34 uing prevalence of the virus and the lack of approved vaccines (to this date). Thus, the major risk  
35 of contagion would be caused by sustained person-to-person contact with asymptomatic SARS-  
36 CoV-2 patients, particularly in crowded gatherings or poorly ventilated spaces (*Harris, 2020; Allen*  
37 *and Marr, 2020; Qian et al., 2020*). Consequently, individual protection measures taken voluntarily  
38 by the citizens in order to minimise such person-to-person contact risk (e.g. maintaining physical  
39 proximity distance, wearing face protection equipment and washing hands regularly), would be  
40 of extreme importance to combat a resurgence of COVID-19 transmission in the new reopening

41 scenario. In other words, they will play a key role in preventing not only the spread of the disease  
42 but also the need of sending communities back into lockdown.

43 Compared to the socioeconomic cost inflicted by government-mandate NPIs, it may be argued  
44 that personal protection measures are seemingly inexpensive (or at least simple to deploy) and yet,  
45 highly effective in preventing SARS-CoV-2 contagion (*Chu et al., 2020*). A study showed that washing  
46 hands with a frequency of 6 to 10 times per day yields a reduction of personal risk of infection of  
47 about 34%, compared to individuals that washed them with lower frequency (*Beale et al., 2020*).  
48 Other studies have previously linked hand hygiene as an effective countermeasure against similar  
49 respiratory infectious diseases such as influenza (*Liu et al., 2016; Abdulrahman et al., 2019*).

50 In a similar vein, given that airborne transmission has been identified as the principal route  
51 for the spread of SARS-CoV-2 (*Zhang et al., 2020*), the habit of wearing facial mask protection that  
52 once was dismissed as innocuous by the World Health Organization (*WHO, 2020*), now it is being  
53 recommended as a necessary barrier to filter the enveloped droplet-borne shedding mechanism  
54 of this respiratory virus (*Leung et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020*).

55 Reducing outward shedding and thus, reducing contamination of the environment are the ma-  
56 jor benefits of adopting this habit. The beneficial filtering effect both inwards and outwards of  
57 masks made out of different cloth materials has been documented (*Clase et al., 2020*). Some  
58 studies found a reduced risk of getting infected for healthy mask users, but in addition, if anyway  
59 infection occurs, masks reduced the amount of virus particles the susceptible person was exposed  
60 to, presumably leading to a mild or asymptomatic infection (*Gandhi and Rutherford, 2020*). As a re-  
61 sult, universal masking could become an alternative mechanism to community-level immunisation,  
62 before a safe and approved vaccine arrives (*Gandhi et al., 2020*).

63 Another observational study reported successful protection of a community using facial masks,  
64 while attending a hair salon where two stylists (who also wore facial protection) were later on  
65 diagnosed with COVID-19 and developed symptoms; none of these clients become infected with  
66 the disease (*Hendrix, 2020*). A retrospective study of secondary infections in households revealed  
67 that mask wearing by the index case and family contacts before onset of the patient's symptoms,  
68 yielded a significant reduction in the risk of transmission (*Wang et al., 2020*).

69 Although no sufficient evidence is yet available to estimate the exact ratio of risk reduction  
70 provided by face mask protection, an overall trend of epidemic mitigation has been noticed in  
71 several countries after this measure is adopted by the majority of the community (*Howard et al.,*  
72 *2020; Mitze et al., 2020*). Similar studies regarding combination of measures involving physical  
73 contact distancing, face mask and eye protection hint at their efficacy to prevent person-to-person  
74 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 (*Chu et al., 2020*). It has been suggested that in community contexts,  
75 masks appeared to be effective with and without hand hygiene, or even more protective if both  
76 together are taken (*MacIntyre and Chughtai, 2020*).

77 In view of this background, our study addresses the following question: To what extent per-  
78 sonal protection habits can be effective in containing the spread of the post-lockdown COVID-19  
79 contagion, in absence of any other NPIs or treatment, when examined within a controlled simu-  
80 lated environment? As our findings indicate indeed, mitigation effects emerge when the majority  
81 of the population adheres to these protection measures. Our computational model purpose is  
82 illustrative (*Squazzoni et al., 2020*), and contributes to ratify the importance of reaching out across  
83 the community to disseminate the message about the collective benefits of mass adoption of per-  
84 sonal care against COVID-19, under the new normal state.

## 85 **Methods and tools**

86 We build upon the agent-based simulation of COVID-19 epidemic introduced in (*Alvarez and Rojas-*  
87 *Galeano, 2020*). That model was designed to simulate the dynamics of the COVID-19 contagion  
88 within a population of a toy city, based-on a SIRE+CARDS epidemic model considering four states:  
89 Susceptible, Infectious, Recovered and Extinct. The Infectious is actually seen as a macro-state

90 including conditions Confirmed, Asymptomatic, Risky, Deadly and Severe. The contagion unfolds  
91 as infectious agents go out of their households and wonder around the city while interacting with  
92 other healthy agents. In addition, a number of NPIs are available including lockdowns, quarantines  
93 and mass-testings. For more details of the agent-based design, the epidemic model, the transition  
94 events, and the NPIs dynamics, we refer the reader to (*Alvarez and Rojas-Galeano, 2020*).

95 We proceeded to extend the model to account for individual voluntary protection measures,  
96 related to personal health habits, namely physical distance, facial masks wearing and regular hand-  
97 washing. Consequently, each agent was designed with three different personal habit traits: social-  
98 distancer (SD), mask-user (MU) and hand-washer (HW). The actual choice of traits for an arbitrary  
99 agent at the beginning of the simulation, is controlled with three adjustable parameters that rep-  
100 resent the willingness of the total population to adopt them, in a proportion between 0 and 100%.

101 The incidence of these personal habits in the risk of contagion during person-to-person contact  
102 was modelled as follows. Firstly, for social-distancer agents the chance of a direct contact will be  
103 diminished as a result of their tendency to divert their trajectory to avoid a close encounter. The  
104 actual occurrence of contact events would depend on the random spatial interactions agents will  
105 have as they move around the city during their daily activities, as the simulation unfolds.

106 Secondly, after pondering the evidence favouring the efficacy of facial masks to prevent SARS-  
107 CoV-2 transmission (*Wang et al., 2020; Leung et al., 2020; Mitze et al., 2020; Chu et al., 2020; Gandhi*  
108 *et al., 2020; Clase et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020; Hendrix, 2020; Howard et al., 2020*), we defined  
109 four possible cases of protection configuration during a single contagion event involving one sus-  
110 ceptible and one infectious agents, along with their associated risks of transmission: if none of the  
111 agents are wearing masks, the chance of contagion would be 90%; if susceptible wears mask but  
112 infectious does not, the chance of contagion would be 50%; if infectious wears mask but suscep-  
113 tible does not, the chance of contagion would be 30%; the last case correspond to both agents  
114 wearing masks, with a chance of contagion of 10%.

115 Thirdly, and again taking into account the recent studies suggesting the benefits of the hand-  
116 washing habit in preventing coronavirus-like diseases (*Beale et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2016*), we de-  
117 fined a further reduction of the contagion risk in a 30% factor if the susceptible agent involved in  
118 any of the above described contagion events happens to be a hand washer (e.g, in the case where  
119 infectious agent wears masks but susceptible does not, the risk decreases from 30% to 9%).

120 Given that the purpose of our study is to assess the effect these habits can have in the mitigation  
121 of the epidemic, we decided to call off the application of any of the other NPIs available in the model,  
122 and experiment with simulations where the population to some degree adheres only to SD, MU  
123 and HW habits. For each of these traits, we defined willingness parameters modelling scenarios  
124 where nobody observes the habit (0%), approximately half of the population adopt it (50%) or  
125 everybody adheres to it (100%). Thus, twenty-seven scenarios were considered corresponding to  
126 different permutations of the tuple of proportions (SD%, MU%, HW%), beginning with the organic  
127 "do nothing" scenario (0%, 0%, 0%) up to the ideal "everybody adheres to" scenario (100%, 100%,  
128 100%) plus the in between permutations: (0%, 0%, 50%), (0%, 0%, 100%), (0%, 50%, 0%), etc.

129 Besides, our analysis will consider the following epidemic indicators:

- 130 1. *Mortality*. This measure is the cumulative count of deaths in the population. Notice that  
131 in our model all deaths are due to COVID-19, and no births or immigration are taking into  
132 account during the simulation timeline. Thus, this indicator determines the mortality rate.
- 133 2. *Cases*. This measure is the cumulative count of infections in the population. Since the popu-  
134 lation evolves within a controlled environment where both symptomatic and asymptomatic  
135 patients can be traced, this would be in fact the actual number of cases due to the disease.  
136 This indicator is associated to the Infection Fatality Rate (IFR).
- 137 3. *Confirmed cases*. This measure is the cumulative count of confirmed infection cases. Since  
138 in our simulations we did not enable the application of mass-testing interventions, these  
139 cases correspond to symptomatic patients whose disease worsens to severe or deadly states

Parameter	Description	Value
<i>City and population settings</i>		
pop-size	Total number of simulated people (agents)	400
zones	Number of residential zones	9
days	Period of observation days (simulation length)	60 days
% high-risk	% of population with co-morbidities	30%
hospital-beds	Total number of hospital beds available	12
ICU-beds	Total number of ICU beds available	2
ambulances-zone	Number of ambulances (sentinels) per zone	1
<i>Disease settings</i>		
avg-duration	Average day period to recover from illness	18 days
% asymptomatic	% of patients showing no or mild symptoms	50%
<i>NPI settings (authority-enforced, not used)</i>		
total-lockdown?	Enforce stay-at-home order for the entire population	off
% permits	% of mobility permits when lockdown is activated	not used
case-isolation?	Confirmed cases are isolated at home	off
home-quarantine?	Housemates of confirmed cases are also isolated	off
zone-enforcing?	Restraint mobility of agents within zones only	off
pick-zone	Zone id number	not used
sentinel-testing?	Enable mass-testing by ambulance sentinels	off
zonal?	Restraint mobility of sentinels within zones	off
<i>NPI settings (personal-habits)</i>		
social-distancing?	Maintain a minimum physical distance with others (SD)	on
% willings	Estimated % of population willing to comply with SD	{0, 50, 100}
% mask-users	Estimated % of population willing to use masks (MU)	{0, 50, 100}
% hand-washers	Estimated % of population willing to wash hands (HW)	{0, 50, 100}

**Table 1.** Settings used in the simulation tool to perform the experiments.

140 requiring hospital care, where upon admission, are reported as diagnosed. This indicator is  
 141 associated to the Case Fatality Rate (CFR) which is usually an overestimated representative  
 142 of incidence rate (i.e,  $CFR \gg IFR$ ).

143 4. *Recovered.* This measure is the cumulative count of agents that recovered from disease. The  
 144 model assumes that upon recovery, immunity to the disease is acquired and no re-infection  
 145 will occur. Therefore, this indicator is related to the survival rate and herd immunity rate.


146 The derived model was developed in the NetLogo programming language version 6.1.0; the  
 147 source-code and user documentation have been released openly in: [http://modelingcommons.org/  
 148 browse/one\\_model/6423](http://modelingcommons.org/browse/one_model/6423). There, the model can be run online or downloaded for local execution.

## 149 Simulation results

150 The setup of the experiments, including settings for the artificial city, population, disease, NPIs  
 151 and running parameters are shown in Table 1 (notice that for the sake of completeness, we report  
 152 settings for authority-enforced NPIs although they were disabled during the simulations). A single  
 153 simulation starts at 00 hours of day 0, and runs until 00 hours of day 60. At 12h of day 0 an  
 154 outbreak is simulated causing 5% of the population to get infected. From that moment, the simu-  
 155 lation unfolds according to the rules designed for the model, and to the random local interactions  
 156 occurring during the movement of the agents.

### 157 Effect in “flattening the curve”

158 An illustration of the SIRE curves obtained in a single representative run for each of the 27 scenar-  
 159 ios are shown in Figures 1, 2 and 3. Firstly, Figure 1 reveals that most of the plots when no social  
 160 distancing is adopted ( $SD=0\%$ ), exhibit the typical unfold of an uncontrolled epidemic, that is a  
 161 exponential grow of the infectious curve (red) achieving an early peak in the first third of the simu-  
 162 lation. Only the scenarios where all the agents wear mask protection ( $MU=100\%$ ) and half or more  
 163 of the agent population wash hands regularly ( $HW=50\%$ ,  $100\%$ ), the infectious curve developed a  
 164 flattened shape indicating a mitigation on the speed of contagion.



**Figure 1.** Representative SIRE curves for scenarios with  $SD=0\%$  and different combinations of  $MU$  and  $HW$  proportions (green: Susceptible, red: Infectious, blue: Recovered, black: Extinct).


165 On the other hand, Figure 2 shows that a 50% increment of agents adhering to social distance  
166 ( $SD=50\%$ ) has a noticeable effect in the mitigation of the infectious curve. Even when no other habit  
167 is adopted ( $MU=0\%$ ,  $HW=0\%$ ) the peak is lowered and shifted towards the middle of the simulation  
168 timeline. When any other habit is adopted to some extent, the curve is flattened more drastically  
169 ( $MU=50\%$  or  $HW=50\%$ ). Moreover, when more than 50% of the population adopts mask wearing  
170 or washing hands or both ( $MU=100\%$ ,  $HW=100\%$ ), the transmission of the infection is suppressed,  
171 even from the early stages of the simulation.

172 Lastly, Figure 3 shows that all scenarios where everybody adheres to maintain physical dis-  
173 tance ( $SD=100\%$ ) and abide by the other habits to some extent ( $MU > 0\%$ ,  $HW > 0\%$ ), result in  
174 a remarkable effect of suppressing the contagion. Indeed, when nobody uses masks or washes  
175 hands ( $MU=0\%$ ,  $HW=0\%$ ), that is, only universal compliance with physical distance is observed, the  
176 infectious curve is clearly flattened and shifted towards the end of the simulation.

### 177 **Effect on the epidemic indicators**

178 For each of the 27  $SD$ - $MU$ - $HW$  scenarios we performed 30 repetitions. Then, at the end of the  
179 simulation run (day 60), we collected average statistics of the aforementioned epidemic indicators.  
180 We focused the analysis of these results, on assessing the effect of variations in the estimated  
181 ratios of population adopting personal care habits, that is, we compare the results of the epidemic  
182 indicators for a number of variations  $SD$ - $MU$ - $HW$ . For this purpose we defined as baseline three  
183 scenarios: in the first one, nobody adopts any habit (0%, 0%, 0%); in the second, half the population  
184 comply with physical distance but do not use masks or wash hands (50%, 0%, 0%); lastly, the third  
185 baseline scenario assumes everybody observe physical distance but again, nobody use masks or  
186 wash hands (100%, 0%, 0%). The differences in the behaviour between baseline scenarios and  
187 variations, were assessed using the Mann-Whitney U statistical test (see Supplementary Material).

188 Next we report the results for the epidemic indicators of interest. In the following plots, some  
189 periodic patterns can be seen when groups of three boxes are examined from left to right (a box  
190 with higher average, then a box in-between and then a lower average box) which are just an artefact  
191 of the order we chose to present the permutation of the tuple ( $SD$ ,  $MU$ ,  $HW$ ), with each parameter  
192 taking values 0%, 50% and 100%. We remark that permutations in different order exhibit similar  
193 patterns with falling rates in their respective epidemic indicators (in cycles of every three scenarios).



**Figure 2.** Representative SIRE curves for scenarios with SD=50% and different combinations of MU and HW proportions (green: Susceptible, red: Infectious, blue: Recovered, black: Extinct).

## 194 Mortality

195 The behaviour of this epidemic indicator across all the simulated scenarios is shown in Figure 4.  
196 The left panel shows scenarios where no one complies with physical distancing (SD=0%). No sig-  
197 nificant difference in the firsts 5 scenarios were found with respect to the (0%, 0%, 0%) baseline  
198 (number of deaths around 65, i.e 16% of the population). Only the last three scenarios in that  
199 panel, where everyone uses face masks (MU=100%), showed a significant decrease in the number  
200 of deaths, with the sharpest fall when also everyone washes hands (HW=100%) to around the half.


201 The middle panel shows scenarios where half of the population adheres to physical distanc-  
202 ing (SD=50%). Within each group of 3 boxes, a trend can be seen where the number of deaths  
203 decreases as the percentage of HW increases. In any case, the number of deaths in all scenarios  
204 drops significantly compared to the baseline (50%, 0%, 0%) scenario for this panel. As expected,  
205 the lasts group of three scenarios obtained the lowest values, approximately fewer than 10 deaths  
206 (i.e 2.5% of the population).

207 The right panel shows scenarios where the entire population observes physical distancing (SD=100%).  
208 A similar pattern to the results of middle panel can be seen, as comparing to the baseline (100%,  
209 0%, 0%) scenario, all the other scenarios exhibited a significant reduction in mortality, including  
210 the last six with death ratios fewer than 2.5% of the population. These results are corroborated  
211 with the black coloured Extinct curve of the SIRE plots of Figure 3, which is seen rising very low or  
212 even not rising at all.


## 213 Cases

214 The behaviour of this epidemic indicator across all the simulated scenarios is shown in Figure 5.  
215 The three panels are organised as before: scenarios with SD=0% are plotted in the left panel, sce-  
216 narios with SD=50% in the middle, and scenarios with SD=100% in the right panel. Regarding the  
217 left panel, a significant drop in the number of cases can be seen clearly on the (0%, 100%, 50%)  
218 and (0%, 100%, 100%) scenarios, around 350 and 270 cases, respectively; the difference is not no-  
219 ticeable with respect to the other scenarios where, the number of cases approaches the entire  
220 population (nearly 400 agents). In the middle panel a significant decrease in the number of cases  
221 can be seen for all scenarios. The largest drop is observed between the (50%, 50%, 50%) scenario  
222 and the (50%, 50%, 100%) scenario (around half of the cases, from 250 to 120 cases).

223 Lastly, in the right panel, a similar pattern to the middle panel can be seen, although more




**Figure 3.** Representative SIRE curves for scenarios with SD=100% and different combinations of MU and HW proportions (green: Susceptible, red: Infectious, blue: Recovered, black: Extinct).




**Figure 4.** Mortality results. Box plots represent average and standard deviation of the cumulative count of deaths in each scenario. Scenarios are labelled according to the willingness of agents to adhere to personal health habits such as Social Distance, Mask User or Hands Washer (SD%-MU%-HW%). Baseline scenarios were defined varying the proportion of social distancers in the population assuming no agents adopt using masks or washing hands. In each panel, the baseline scenario is coloured blue (left: 0%-0%-0%, middle: 50%-0%-0%, right: 100%-0%-0%). Scenarios with statistical significant difference compared to their corresponding panel baseline are coloured green ( $p$ -value < 0.05), otherwise are coloured red.

224 notably: compared to the baseline (100%, 0%, 0%) for this panel, the other scenarios exhibited a  
 225 significant reduction in cases, approaching around 25 (6.25% of the population) cases in the last  
 226 four scenarios. These low rates are explained because, as Figure 2 and Figure 3 show, the red  
 227 Infectious curve in some of these scenarios is flattened, and therefore the contagion is at the stage  
 228 of initial growth when the indicator was collected at the end of the simulated timeline (day 60);  
 229 what is more, in some other cases the curve was entirely suppressed indeed.



**Figure 5.** *Cases* results. Box plots represent average and standard deviation of the cumulative count of infections in the population. See caption of Fig. 4 for interpretation details.




**Figure 6.** *Confirmed cases* results. Box plots represent average and standard deviation of the cumulative count of only those cases reported as diagnosed. See caption of Fig. 4 for interpretation details.

### 230 Confirmed cases

231 The behaviour of this epidemic indicator across all the simulated scenarios is shown in Figure 6. A  
 232 similar pattern with the mortality plots of Figure 4 can be seen in the three panels. In contrast to  
 233 mortality, the value of confirmed cases is higher than deaths (notice the three baseline scenarios  
 234 approaching around 90 confirmed cases in average). We remark that the confirmed cases results  
 235 are much lower compared to the actual cases results, because in these simulations we did not ap-  
 236 pplied mass testing, voluntary isolation or home quarantine, therefore diagnosed cases correspond  
 237 only to those admitted (and reported as cases) to hospital due to complications with the disease.





**Figure 7.** *Recovered* results. Box plots represent average and standard deviation of the cumulative count of agents that recovered from disease. See caption of Fig. 4 for interpretation details.

238 This behaviour is in line with the CFR overestimation of the IFR, mentioned before. For example,  
 239 comparing the (0%, 0%, 0%) scenarios in Figure 5 vs Figure 6, these rates are IFR= 17% (68/400) vs  
 240 CFR=72% (68/95); another example is the (100%, 0%, 0%) where these rates are IFR=12% (47/400)  
 241 vs CFR=55% (47/85).

## 242 Recovered

243 The behaviour of this epidemic indicator across all the simulated scenarios is shown in Figure 7.  
 244 Here again, similar patterns appeared. In the left panel (SD=0%), only the (0%, 100%, 50%) and (0%,  
 245 100%, 100%) scenarios show a significant decrease of recovered agents compared to the baseline  
 246 scenario, dropping from around 340, to 300 and to 200 recovered agents, respectively. Moreover,  
 247 in the middle (SD=50%) and right panels (SD=100%), significant reductions are seen within all the  
 248 scenarios compared to the baselines, with even sharper falls in the scenarios where half or more  
 249 of the population adopt any or both of the other two measures (MU and HW), achieving values  
 250 as fewer as approximately 20 agents (i.e 5% of the population). These reductions in the number  
 251 of recovered agents emerge as a consequence of the mitigation or suppressing effects of these  
 252 personal protection habits, implying much lower infections occurred, as the SIRE curves of Figure 2  
 253 and Figure 3 show evidently.

## 254 Conclusion

255 As control policies are gradually lifted, the risk of a novel surge of the COVID-19 health crisis is highly  
 256 likely, although it would be modulated by the adherence to voluntary individual protection habits  
 257 by the community. We have illustrated the interplay between maintaining physical distance, using  
 258 facial masks and washing hands regularly, with an agent-based simulation model of the spread  
 259 of the epidemic on an artificial population. Despite the necessary assumptions made to simplify  
 260 the model, our findings indicate that nearly-universal adoption of a single of these three habits  
 261 alone, would not suffice to mitigate the rise of the infectious curve to controlled levels. Maintaining  
 262 physical distance among persons plays a dominant role in decreasing the risk. However, in order  
 263 to effectively suppress the growth of second outbreaks, the adoption by the population of one or  
 264 both of the other two habits to some extent, is needed.

265 Some of the idealistic scenarios of universal adoption of these personal habits (100% scenar-  
266 ios), would be far to achieve in reality, due to many factors related with personal biases, socio-  
267 economic conditions and collective idiosyncrasies. Therefore in realistic scenarios, public health  
268 policies should be deployed to accompany these habit adoption, focusing on sustained mass-  
269 testing campaigns, rigorous contact tracing and mandatory household quarantine of confirmed  
270 cases (*Aleta et al., 2020*), so as to reduce or keep under control the spread of the disease in forth-  
271 coming epidemic waves during the “new normal”. Great attention should be taken by authorities to  
272 communicate clearly the evidence, uncertainties, risks and particularities of these personal protec-  
273 tion strategies, without creating the sense of false dilemmas (*Escandón et al., 2020*) whilst aiming  
274 to ensure continued adherence of the community to these measures (*Thompson et al., 2020*).

275 There are interesting points not captured by the model, that we regard as worthy of a closer  
276 look. For example, effectiveness of material of face masks (it has been suggested that N95 res-  
277 pirators might be more strongly associated with protection from viral transmission than surgical  
278 masks or single-layer or fabric masks (*Chu et al., 2020*)). Additionally, considerations related to the  
279 adverse effects of universal masking wearing, including discomfort, irritation or misuse, psycho-  
280 logical impact (*Bakhit et al., 2020*) or incidence in people with disabilities (inability of lip-reading  
281 for the hearing-impaired persons, difficulties with breathing for individuals with asthma or other  
282 respiratory disabilities (*Kohek et al., 2020; Chodosh et al., 2020*)), inadequate manipulation or risk  
283 of suffocation in preschool children (*Esposito and Principi, 2020*), and also environmental costs  
284 (*Allison et al., 2020; Klemeš et al., 2020*) might be taken as well into account. Besides, it is possible  
285 for masking habits to provoke misleading feelings of security causing to overlook other personal  
286 precautions in the community, although recent studies have found no association between mask  
287 usage and distance transgression (*Seres et al., 2020b*) or beyond that, have found evidence of in-  
288 dividual attitudes to observe larger distance on waiting lines from someone wearing a face mask  
289 than from an unmask person, in a community with no face masking mandate (*Seres et al., 2020a*).

290 The question of how elaborated an agent-based model should be to account for additional real-  
291 istic features of the SARS-CoV-2 contagion phenomena, including infections via contaminated sur-  
292 faces, population structure, spatial stratification, contact networks, host vulnerabilities and other  
293 sources of heterogeneity between individuals, pose interesting challenges from a computational  
294 modelling perspective (*Thompson et al., 2020*). Regarding the current version of our model, we are  
295 also interested in studying design mechanisms allowing agents to develop willingness to uptake  
296 the personal age protection habits as an emergent consequence of changes in individual biases or  
297 beliefs, affected by fluctuations in the popular consciousness.

## 298 References


- 299 **Abdulrahman AKB**, Abdulrahman KAB, Almadi MK, Alharbi AM, Mahmoud MA, Almasri MS, Alanazi TR, Alarifi  
300 RA, Kilani AA, Albluwi OS, et al. Do various personal hygiene habits protect us against influenza-like illness?  
301 BMC public health. 2019; 19(1):1324.
- 302 **Aleta A**, Martín-Corral D, y Piontti AP, Ajelli M, Litvinova M, Chinazzi M, Dean NE, Halloran ME, Longini Jr IM,  
303 Merler S, et al. Modelling the impact of testing, contact tracing and household quarantine on second waves  
304 of COVID-19. Nature Human Behaviour. 2020; 4(9):964–971.
- 305 **Allen JG**, Marr LC. Recognizing and controlling airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in indoor environments.  
306 Indoor air. 2020; 30(4):557.
- 307 **Allison AL**, Ambrose-Dempster E, T Aparsi D, Bawn M, Casas Arredondo M, Chau C, Chandler K, Dobrijevic  
308 D, Hailes H, Lettieri P, et al. The environmental dangers of employing single-use face masks as part of a  
309 COVID-19 exit strategy. UCL Open: Environment Preprint, DOI: 1014324/111444/000031v1. 2020; .
- 310 **Alvarez L**, Rojas-Galeano S. Simulation of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions on COVID-19 with an Agent-based  
311 Model of Zonal Restraint. medRxiv Preprint, DOI: 101101/2020061320130542. 2020; .
- 312 **Bakhit M**, Krzyzaniak N, Scott AM, Clark J, Glasziou P, Del Mar C. Downsides of face masks and possible mitiga-  
313 tion strategies: a systematic review and meta-analysis. medRxiv Preprint, DOI: 101101/2020061620133207.  
314 2020; .

- 315 **Beale S**, Johnson AM, Zambon M, Hayward AC, Fragaszy EB, et al. Hand Hygiene Practices and the Risk of  
316 Human Coronavirus Infections in a UK Community Cohort. Wellcome Open Research. 2020; 5(98):98.
- 317 **Chodosh J**, Weinstein B, Blustein J. Face masks can be devastating for people with hearing loss. BMJ (Clinical  
318 Research ed). 2020; 370:m2683–m2683.
- 319 **Chu DK**, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, El-harakeh A, Bognanni A, Lotfi T, Loeb M, et al.  
320 Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2  
321 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet. 2020; 395(10242):1973 – 1987.
- 322 **Clase CM**, Fu EL, Ashur A, Beale RC, Clase IA, Dolovich MB, Jardine MJ, Joseph M, Kansime G, Mann JF, Pecoits-  
323 Filho R, Winkelmayr WC, Carrero JJ. Forgotten Technology in the COVID-19 Pandemic. Filtration Properties  
324 of Cloth and Cloth Masks: A Narrative Review. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, DOI: 101016/jmayocp202007020.  
325 2020; .
- 326 **Coibion O**, Gorodnichenko Y, Weber M. The cost of the COVID-19 crisis: Lockdowns, macroeconomic expecta-  
327 tions, and consumer spending. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2020.
- 328 **Escandón K**, Rasmussen AL, Bogoch II, Murray EJ, Escandón K. COVID-19 and false dichotomies: time to change  
329 the black-or-white messaging about health, economy, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and masks. OSF Preprints,  
330 DOI: 1031219/osfio/k2d84. 2020; .
- 331 **Esposito S**, Principi N. To mask or not to mask children to overcome COVID-19. European Journal of Pediatrics.  
332 2020; 179(8):1267–1270.
- 333 **Ferguson N**, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, Bhatia S, Boonyasiri A, Cucunuba Perez Z,  
334 Cuomo-Dannenburg G, et al. Report 9: impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19  
335 mortality and healthcare demand. Imperial College: UK. 2020; .
- 336 **Fernandes N**. Economic effects of coronavirus outbreak (COVID-19) on the world economy. Available at SSRN,  
337 DOI: 102139/ssrn3557504. 2020; .
- 338 **Gandhi M**, Beyrer C, Goosby E. Masks Do More Than Protect Others During COVID-19: Reducing the Inoculum  
339 of SARS-CoV-2 to Protect the Wearer. Journal of General Internal Medicine, DOI: 101007/s11606-020-06067-8.  
340 2020; .
- 341 **Gandhi M**, Rutherford GW. Facial Masking for Covid-19—Potential for “Variolation” as We Await a Vaccine. New  
342 England Journal of Medicine, DOI: 101056/NEJMp2026913. 2020; .
- 343 **Giordano G**, Blanchini F, Bruno R, Colaneri P, Di Filippo A, Di Matteo A, Colaneri M. Modelling the COVID-19  
344 epidemic and implementation of population-wide interventions in Italy. Nature Medicine. 2020; 26(6):855–  
345 860.
- 346 **Harris JE**. The subways seeded the massive coronavirus epidemic in New York city. National Bureau of Eco-  
347 nomic Research Working Paper. 2020; (w27021).
- 348 **Hendrix MJ**. Absence of apparent transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from two stylists after exposure at a hair sa-  
349 lon with a universal face covering policy—Springfield, Missouri, May 2020. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality  
350 Weekly Report. 2020; 69.
- 351 **Howard J**, Huang A, Li Z, Tufekci Z, Zdimal V, van der Westhuizen HM, von Delft A, Price A, Fridman L, Tang LH,  
352 et al. Face masks against COVID-19: an evidence review. Preprints, DOI: 1020944/preprints2020040203v1.  
353 2020; .
- 354 **Kantner M**. Beyond just “flattening the curve”: Optimal control of epidemics with purely non-pharmaceutical  
355 interventions. arXiv preprint arXiv:200409471. 2020; .
- 356 **Klemeš JJ**, Van Fan Y, Jiang P. The energy and environmental footprints of COVID-19 fighting measures—PPE,  
357 disinfection, supply chains. Energy. 2020; p. 118701.
- 358 **Kohok J**, Seth A, Edwards M, Zwicker J. Mandatory Mask Bylaws: Considerations Beyond Exemption For Persons  
359 With Disabilities. The School of Public Policy Publications. 2020; 13.
- 360 **Lai S**, Ruktanonchai NW, Zhou L, Prosper O, Luo W, Floyd JR, Wesolowski A, Santillana M, Zhang C, Du X, et al.  
361 Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain COVID-19 in China. Nature. 2020; 585(7825):410–413.


- 362 **Leung NH**, Chu DK, Shiu EY, Chan KH, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJ, Yen HL, Li Y, Ip DK, Peiris JM, et al. Respiratory virus  
363 shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature medicine*. 2020; 26(5):676–680.
- 364 **Liu M**, Ou J, Zhang L, Shen X, Hong R, Ma H, Zhu BP, Fontaine RE. Protective effect of hand-washing and good  
365 hygienic habits against seasonal influenza: a case-control study. *Medicine*. 2016; 95(11).
- 366 **MacIntyre CR**, Chughtai AA. A rapid systematic review of the efficacy of face masks and respirators against  
367 coronaviruses and other respiratory transmissible viruses for the community, healthcare workers and sick  
368 patients. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2020; p. 103629.
- 369 **Mitze T**, Kosfeld R, Rode J, Wälde K. Face Masks Considerably Reduce COVID-19 Cases in Germany. *medRxiv*  
370 Preprint, DOI: 101101/2020062120128181. 2020; .
- 371 **Pichler A**, Pangallo M, del Rio-Chanona RM, Lafond F, Farmer JD. Production networks and epidemic spreading:  
372 How to restart the UK economy? *arXiv preprint arXiv:200510585*. 2020; .
- 373 **Qian H**, Miao T, Li L, Zheng X, Luo D, Li Y. Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*, DOI:  
374 101101/2020040420053058. 2020; .
- 375 **Seres G**, Balleyer AH, Cerutti N, Danilov A, Friedrichsen J, Liu Y, Süer M. Face Masks Increase Compliance with  
376 Physical Distancing Recommendations During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Available at OSF <https://osf.io/db8sj>.  
377 2020 May; .
- 378 **Seres G**, Balleyer AH, Cerutti N, Friedrichsen J, et al. Face mask use and physical distancing before and after  
379 mandatory masking: Evidence from public waiting lines. Available at SSRN 3641367. 2020; .
- 380 **Squazzoni F**, Polhill JG, Edmonds B, Ahrweiler P, Antosz P, Scholz G, Chappin É, Borit M, Verhagen H, Giardini  
381 F, et al. Computational models that matter during a global pandemic outbreak: A call to action. *Journal of*  
382 *Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*. 2020; 23(2).
- 383 **Thompson RN**, Hollingsworth TD, Isham V, Arribas-Bel D, Ashby B, Britton T, Challenor P, Chappell LH, Clapham  
384 H, Cunniffe NJ, et al. Key questions for modelling COVID-19 exit strategies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*  
385 *B*. 2020; 287(1932):20201405.
- 386 **Wang Y**, Tian H, Zhang L, Zhang M, Guo D, Wu W, Zhang X, Kan GL, Jia L, Huo D, et al. Reduction of secondary  
387 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a cohort  
388 study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020; 5(5):e002794.
- 389 **WHO**. Advice on the use of masks in the community, during home care and in healthcare settings in the context  
390 of the novel coronavirus outbreak: interim guidance, 29 January 2020. World Health Organization; 2020.
- 391 **Zhang R**, Li Y, Zhang AL, Wang Y, Molina MJ. Identifying airborne transmission as the dominant route for the  
392 spread of COVID-19. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2020; 117(26):14857–14863.

393 **Supplementary material**


394 **1. Mortality hypothesis tests for differences.** Heatmaps represent counts and  $p$ -values obtained by the Mann-Whitney U statistical test for permutations (SD%, MU%, HW%) with varying proportions of social physical distance, mask using and hand washing adoption by the population. Blue: baseline scenario, red: accept, green: reject.



399 **2. Cases hypothesis tests for differences.** Heatmaps represent counts and  $p$ -values obtained by the Mann-Whitney U statistical test for permutations (SD%, MU%, HW%) with varying proportions of social physical distance, mask using and hand washing adoption by the population. Blue: baseline scenario, red: accept, green: reject.



404 **3. Confirmed cases hypothesis tests for differences.** Heatmaps represent counts and  $p$ -  
 405 values obtained by the Mann-Whitney U statistical test for permutations (SD%, MU%, HW%)  
 406 with varying proportions of social physical distance, mask using and hand washing adoption  
 407 by the population. Blue: baseline scenario, red: accept, green: reject.



409 **4. Recovered hypothesis tests for differences.** Heatmaps represent counts and  $p$ -values ob-  
 410 tained by the Mann-Whitney U statistical test for permutations (SD%, MU%, HW%) with vary-  
 411 ing proportions of social physical distance, mask using and hand washing adoption by the  
 412 population. Blue: baseline scenario, red: accept, green: reject.

