medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Brief Report: High-Quality Masks Can Reduce Infections and Deaths in the US

Running Head: Masks Can Reduce Infections and Deaths in the US

Authors: Erik Rosenstrom, BS[1], Buse Eylul Oruc, MS[2], Julie Ivy, PhD[1], Pinar Keskinocak, PhD[2,3], Maria E. Mayorga, PhD[1], Julie L. Swann, PhD[1,4]

1. Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, United States of America

2. School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

3. Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America

4. Biomedical Engineering, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, United States of America

Correspondence: Julie Swann, jlswann@ncsu.edu; Office phone (919-515-6423); NC State University; 111 Lampe Drive; Raleigh, NC 27695

Manuscript Word Count: 1356

Financial Support[1]

ABSTRACT

[1] *Financial support for this study was provided in part by a grant from several sources from state universities including NC TrCS at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC State University, and the Fitts Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering. It also received partial support from alumni donations at NC State University and Georgia Institute of Technology. The funding agreement ensured the authors' independence in designing the study, interpreting the data, writing, and publishing the report. All of the authors are employed by the state universities associated with the sponsorship.*

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Objectives: To evaluate the effectiveness of widespread adoption of masks or face coverings to reduce community transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus that causes Covid-19.

Methods: We employed an agent-based stochastic network simulation model, where Covid-19 progresses across census tracts according to a variant of SEIR. We considered a mask order that was initiated 3.5 months after the first confirmed Covid-19 case. We evaluated scenarios where wearing a mask reduces transmission and susceptibility by 50% or 80%; an individual wears a mask with a probability of 0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, or 100%.

Results: If 60% of the population wears masks that are 50% effective, this decreases the cumulative infection attack rate (CAR) by 25%, the peak prevalence by 51%, and the population mortality by 25%. If 100% of people wear masks (or 60% wear masks that are 80% effective), this decreases the CAR by 38%, the peak prevalence by 67%, and the population mortality by 40%.

Conclusions: After community transmission is present, masks can significantly reduce infections.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

In the United States, by August 2020, SARS-CoV-2 that causes Covid-19 was widely circulating in many communities, especially throughout the South and Midwest (1). There is much speculation over the role of masks or face coverings with some officials stating that if people would wear masks for a few weeks that community transmission could be stopped (2). While there is growing empirical evidence that masks can be effective at reducing droplets (3, 4), it is not well understood what this would mean across a population or if they can stop an outbreak when community transmission is already in existence. This study prospectively assesses the effectiveness of face coverings at the state level and across urban, suburban, and rural counties under different population compliance and mask effectiveness levels.

METHODS

We employ an agent-based stochastic network model with an SEIR framework (5) for the progression of SARS-CoV-2 (6, 7). As in Keskinocak et al (7), we simulate interactions among agents, where transmission can occur daily in households, workplaces and schools, and community settings, with day/night differentiation in interactions. The network of agents is built using US Census data (8) at the tract level using household size, presence of children, and age groups (defined as <= 4, 9, 19, 64, or above). Model parameters include the reproductive rate (2.4 without interventions), hospitalization and mortality rates (by age group), an effective overall Infection Fatality Rate just under 0.5%, and asymptomatic and symptomatic transmission coefficients (6, 7). Full details are outlined in Supplementary Materials available online.

Analysis was performed for the representatiave state of North Carolina (NC), which has had moderate transmission as represented by deaths per capita(1). The population of 10.5 million people is represented with 1,017,720 agents. The simulation is seeded (day 1) with cumulative cases as of March 24(1), where the cases are multiplied by 10 to account for underreporting (9) and scaled to the number of agents in the simulation; the simulation is run for 365 days. County cases are distributed to random households across the county's census tracts proportionally to the tract population; the random location drives much of the uncertainty in the results.

The model accounts for distancing measures put in place similar to Keskinocak et al (7): initially 60% of adults stay home, decreasing by 1 point weekly to a minimum of 50% for the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

46 day sheltering period in NC from March 24 to May 8. After the sheltering period, we assume that households with a symptomatic Covid-19 infection will voluntarily quarantine (low quarantining scenario from (7)), beginning at 60% and decreasing by 15 points each week to a minimum of 15%, based on comparisons to mobility data. Schools are closed throughout, and anyone who is symptomatic stays home.

Unlike Keskinocak et al (7), a proportion of the population wears masks. The rate increases approximately monthly (4/1 to 6/26 or days 8-94, corresponding to the state mask order), evenly from 0 to the final compliance probability of (0, 40, 60, 80, or 100%). We assume the rate is homogeneous across the population, as supported by recent reports (10). According to recent analysis(4), in the baseline mask cases we assume masks reduce the infectivity to others and susceptibility of self by 50% each. We compare the baseline mask effectiveness with scenarios where higher quality masks are employed and are more effective (e.g., 80% reduction in transmission and susceptibility risk, like surgical or N95 masks). For our no-intervention benchmark, we assume there are no interventions throughout the pandemic.

The model is validated against reported hospitalizations and deaths as of August 18, 2020. All simulation output values are adjusted to the true population of 10.49 million.

We compute the infection attack rate (IAR) of all infections over the time horizon, the peak percentage of the population simultaneously infected, peak count of hospitalizations, and the mortality of the total population. We quantify the mean and standard deviation values over 15 replications. We provide values at the state level, by county and stratified by urban/suburban/rural status, where urban corresponds to Rural-Urban-Commuting-Area (RUCA) codes of 1,2; rural of 6,7,8,9,10; and the remainder for suburban (11). In the studied state, 75% of people are in urban areas, 15% in suburban, and 10% in rural.

The funding supported the students performing the analysis; it had no relationship with the design of the experiments, interpretation of the results, or determining the conclusions.

This study uses publicly available de-identified data and does not require IRB approval.

RESULTS

The wearing of masks reduces cumulative infections, peak infections, hospitalizations, and mortality (Table 1). In the benchmark scenario with 0% masks, the IAR is 36%, the peak

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

infection rate is 1.15%, and the overall mortality is 0.176%, while the scenario where 60% wear masks those metrics are reduced by 25%, 51%, and 25%, respectively.

A higher rate of mask-wearing leads to improvement in each metric. For each 20 point increase in compliance (e.g., 60% compliance to 80% compliance), the IAR decreases by approximately 2.47 points, the mortality rate drops by approximately 0.014 points, and the peak prevalence decreases (14-37% of the previous value).

Notably, if 100% of people wear a mask that is 50% effective, then this results in an IAR of 22% (compared to 27.0% for 60% compliance). Hospitalizations decrease by 30% and deaths by 16.7% from the scenario with 60% compliance.

For all scenarios, community transmission continues to occur after the mask order, with the peak day of infection occurring approximately day 190.

If higher quality masks are worn, then all metrics improve. With 60% of people wearing masks, increasing the mask effectiveness from 50% to 80% is better than the scenario with 100% compliance where masks are 50% effective (see Figure 1, which shows results over time, and Table 1 for corresponding summary values).

The results vary by RUCA county type. In the baseline scenario (60% compliance): urban, rural, and suburban counties have an average 28.1% , 23.3% and 24.5% IAR, respectively, as compared to 36.9%, 34.3%, and 32.1% with 0% compliance. The benefit of masks as measured by the percentage improvement in the IAR is slightly higher in rural and suburban areas than urban areas (see Figure 2).

The impact of masks is over and above that of the initial shelter in place and voluntary quarantining, where the no mask benchmark results in an IAR of 49%, peak prevalence of 3.03%, and mortality 76% higher than with 60% masks.

DISCUSSION

Widespread usage of masks decreases the impact of the pandemic, consistent with a deterministic aggregate model of disease spread (12) and empirical findings using publicly reported data from states April 1 to May 21 (13). The impact can include 25% to 40% reductions in infections and mortality, over and above the distancing interventions in place. This is further support for states or other localities to put mask orders in place.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

However, even if 100% of people wore masks, this would not stop community transmission. To stop transmission, other interventions are also needed, such as distancing, closures of some community settings, or a vaccine. Public health officials should take this into consideration in managing expectations of the public.

Improving the quality of masks worn also has the potential to improve population health, e.g., by shifting people from lower-effectiveness coverings like neck gaiters or bandanas to masks with multiple fabric layers or special filtration material like N95 masks. Public health organizations should consider adding this to messaging around face masks.

There are limitations with this work, including that models never match reality exactly. Some of the key assumptions that are critical include the effectiveness of masks and the compliance in the population. If compliance is not uniform across geographies or subpopulations then results by subpopulation could differ.

In future research it would be useful to examine the role of vaccines in curbing the pandemic, compliance with masks or uptake differences in vaccine, and the link with equity across the population.

CONCLUSION

In states with ongoing transmission, transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus can be greatly reduced if many people wear masks and if people wear higher quality masks. To stop transmission after it is widespread in the community, multiple interventions will be needed simultaneously.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial support for this study was provided in part by a grant from several sources from state universities including NC TrCS at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC State University, the Fitts Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering. It also received partial support from alumni donations at NC State University and Georgia Institute of Technology. The funding agreement ensured the authors' independence in designing the study, interpreting the data, writing, and publishing the report. All of the authors are employed by the state universities associated with the sponsorship. We would like to acknowledge Dr. Nicoleta Serban of Georgia Tech for her work on a previous Covid-19 simulation and Dr. Mehul Patel for his leadership on the CovSim initiative.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1: The results of the mask compliance and effectiveness scenarios are shown for the metrics of IAR, peak prevalence rate, peak hospitalizations, and deaths for a state population of 10.5 million with mean (stdev) displayed. Highlighted rows are used in figure comparisons.

Mask Compliance	**Mask Effective -ness**	**IAR**	**Percentage of Infections after Mask Order**	**Peak Prevalence Rate**	**Peak Hospital-izations**	**Deaths (in population of 10.5M)**
Mask Compliance Experiments (Initial Shelter, Low Voluntary Quarantine throughout, School cancelled)						
0%, Overall	N/A	35.9% (0.20%)	91% (0.3%)	1.15% (0.065%)	12,574 (784)	18,483 (624)
40%	50%	29.8% (0.23%)	91% (0.4%)	0.72% (0.047%)	7,985 (603)	15,163 (425)
60%	50%	27.0% (0.24%)	90% (0.5%)	0.56% (0.046%)	6,289 (418)	13,831 (560)
80%	50%	24.5% (0.245%)	89% (0.5%)	0.48% (0.039%)	5,368 (473)	12,380 (596)
100%	50%	22.1% (0.255%)	88% (0.3%)	0.38% (0.018%)	4,389 (169)	11,150 (526)
Mask Effectiveness Experiments (Initial Shelter, Low Voluntary Quarantine throughout, School cancelled)						
60%	40%	29.4% (0.23%)	92% (0.42%)	0.69% (0.04%)	7,711 (467)	15,137 (482)
60%	60%	25.2% (0.245%)	89% (0.54%)	0.5% (0.036%)	5,667 (470)	12,916 (500)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

60%	80%	19.4% (0.255%)	87% (0.66%)	0.32% (0.035%)	3,610 (442)	9,780 (441)
60%	90%	16.5% (0.26%)	85% (0.76%)	0.25% (0.024%)	2,837 (266)	8,235 (523)
Benchmark case with no interventions at all.						
From the beginning: No masks, no shelter, yes school. Usual status.		49% (0.14%)	N/A	3.03% (0.1%)	32,608 (877)	24,383 (397)
Geographical Settings						
		Urban, IAR	Rural, IAR	Suburban, IAR	Overall, IAR	
Cases by March 24		0.003%	0.00027%	0.00025%	0.0023%	
0% masks (Initial shelter, Low VQ, schools cancelled)		36.89% (0.07%)	34.33% (0.38%)	32.12% (0.23%)	35.09% (0.20%)	
60%	50%	28.1% (0.25%)	24.5% (0.28%)	23.3% (0.5%)	27.0% (0.24%)	
100%	50%	23.4% (0.05%)	19.2% (0.15%)	17.7% (0.2%)	22.1% (0.255%)	
60%	80%	20.3% (0.23%)	17.9% (0.26%)	16.2% (0.32%)	19.4% (0.255%)	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .





Figure 1: Prevalence of infectious people over time is shown. Subfigure (top) has cases with different levels of population compliance (0%, 40%, 60%, 80%, 100%) while mask effectiveness is 50%. Subfigure (bottom) has cases with different levels of mask effectiveness (20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, 90%) while population compliance is 60%.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2: Infection Fatality Rates for areas categorized in urban, rural, and suburban status, where the band is ± 2 standard deviations around the daily mean for all area in that category across all replications. Subfigure (a) shows cumulative infections for varying compliance levels with 60% effectiveness; subfigure (b) shows the percentage change for several scenarios in comparison to no masks.

REFERENCES

1. The New York Times. Coronavirus in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count 2020 [cited 2020 18 Aug]. Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-us-cases.html.

2. If everyone wore a mask, Covid-19 could be brought under control, CDC director urges [Internet]. statnews.com; 2020; 15 July. Available from: https://www.statnews.com/2020/07/14/if-everyone-wore-mask-covid19-could-be-controlled-cdc-director-urges/

3. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schunemann HJ, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2020;395(10242):1973-87. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31142-9. PubMed PMID: WOS:000547825600015.

4. Fischer EP, Fischer MC, Grass D, Henrion I, Warren WS, Westman E. Low-cost measurement of facemask efficacy for filtering expelled droplets during speech. Science Advances. 2020. doi: DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.abd3083

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.27.20199737; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

5. Shi P, Keskinocak P, Swann JL, Lee BY. Modelling seasonality and viral mutation to predict the course of an influenza pandemic. Epidemiology and Infection. 2010;138(10):1472-81. doi: 10.1017/s0950268810000300. PubMed PMID: WOS:000282195900016.

6. Keskinocak P, Asplund J, Serban N, Oruc Aglar BE. Evaluating Scenarios for School Reopening under COVID19. medRxiv. 2020:2020.07.22.20160036. doi: 10.1101/2020.07.22.20160036.

7. Keskinocak P, Oruc Aglar BE, Baxter A, Asplund J, Serban N. The Impact of Social Distancing on COVID19 Spread: State of Georgia Case Study. Forthcoming in PLOS One. 2020:2020.04.29.20084764. doi: 10.1101/2020.04.29.20084764 on MedRXiv

8. The United States Census Bureau. The U.S. Census 2020 [cited 2020 01 July]. Available from: https://www.census.gov/data.html.

9. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, Montgomery JM, Klena JD, Hall AJ, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2020. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4130.

10. The New York Times. A Detailed Map of Who Is Wearing Masks in the U.S. 2020 [cited 2020 18 Aug]. Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/17/upshot/coronavirus-face-mask-map.html.

11. US Department of Agriculture. Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes 2010 [cited 2020 July 30]. Available from: https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-commuting-area-codes.aspx.

12. Eikenberry SE, Mancuso M, Iboi E, Phan T, Eikenberry K, Kuang Y, et al. To mask or not to mask: Modeling the potential for face mask use by the general public to curtail the COVID-19 pandemic. Infectious Disease Modelling. 2020;5:293-308. doi: 10.1016/j.idm.2020.04.001. PubMed PMID: WOS:000538690300021.

13. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Community Use Of Face Masks And COVID-19: Evidence From A Natural Experiment Of State Mandates In The US. Health Affairs. 2020;39(8):1419-25. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2020.00818. PubMed PMID: WOS:000557072300020.