medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 4.0 International license .

Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis, 2020 (submitted)

Comparative policy analysis of face mask mandates during COVID 19 pandemic on rate of mask use in the United States

MICHAEL J. MALONEY
Proof School, San Francisco, CA, USA

ABSTRACT As COVID 19 continues to spread throughout the United States, there has been a search for policies to both prevent individual infections, to slow the spread of the virus in general, and to mitigate the economic impact of the pandemic. Masks have proven to be a cost-effective measure in all regards, and as such some state governments have begun to mandate their use. However, while the efficacy of masks has been demonstrated, the efficacy of public policies which mandate the use of masks has not been demonstrated. This paper compares the rates of mask use in counties as defined by state policy. It is found that state mandates are strongly correlated with higher rates of mask use, and that mandating use by all individuals in public spaces is more effective than a less comprehensive mandate for mask use by all public facing employees.

Keywords: comparative, mask, policy, COVID 19, retrospective cohort

INTRODUCTION

At the time of writing, the COVID 19 pandemic has killed over 175,000 people in the United States alone[1]. It has drastically impacted economic activity, producing an annualized US GDP contraction of ~30%, the largest economic contraction since the great depression[2]. One tool that can be used to reduce the impact of COVID 19 is wearing a face mask in public. Face masks are a cost-effective tool in contending with respiratory infections[3]. Face mask use reduces the airborne inoculum of COVID 19[4 5 6 7], and there is some empirical evidence that mask use reduces the spread of COVID 19[8 9 10 11]. The evidence for state policies' impacts on the use of face masks by the public is more limited[12]. To explore the relationship between state policy and public use of face masks, a previously reported survey of mask use was analyzed and compared between three distinct populations based upon their state-level policies in the United States[13]. This retrospective cohort study was performed to assess the equality of the three populations for reported face mask usage.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 4.0 International license .

METHODS

A comparative analysis of state level mask policy on public face mask use in the United States was undertaken. Data for mask use was from a previously reported survey[13]. The three groups for comparison were defined by their state level mask policy. The first, states with no state level mask mandate **(None)**. The second, those with state level mandated mask use for public facing employees **(Public)**. The third, those with a state level mandate for all Individuals in public spaces **(All)**. States with a mandate for both public facing Employees and all individuals in public spaces were treated as belonging to the more restrictive All group.

Survey results were calculated for the 3,142 Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) counties[14] in the United States and the District of Columbia from 7/2/2020 until 7/14/2020. The original data on mask usage is from the New York Times and Dynata online survey of 250,000 individuals from the 74,134 US census tracts[13]. The survey data was weighted by age and gender, and survey respondents' locations were approximated from their ZIP codes to transform raw survey responses into county-level estimates. Then mask-wearing estimates were made for each census tract by taking a weighted average of the 200 nearest responses, with closer responses getting more weight in the average. The county-level estimates were assigned to one of three groups defined by their state mask policy. The comparison is a retrospective cohort study which uses the state level mask mandate as of 7/2/2020, reported in the COVID-19 US state policy database (CUSP)[15], defining the three groups.

The original survey asked:

"How often do you wear a mask in public when you expect to be within six feet of another person?"

With responses:

"NEVER", "RARELY", "SOMETIMES", "FREQUENTLY" or "ALWAYS" reported as a percentage of responses for each county.

Additionally, a county Mask Score was calculated as a weighted score for each county.

Mask Score = (%NEVER*0) + (%RARELY*1) + (%SOMETIMES*2) + (%FREQUENTLY*3) + (%ALWAYS*4)

The three comparison groups were defined by their state policy of face mask use as described above:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 4.0 International license .

None (1,124 Counties): CO, FL, GA, ID, IA, KS, LA, MO, MT, NH, OK, SC, SD, TN, VT and WI

Public Facing Employees (945 Counties): AL, AK, AZ, AR, MN, MS, NE, ND, OH, TX, WV and WY

All Individuals in Public (1,068 Counties): CA, CT, DE, DC, HI, IL, IN, KY, ME, MD, MA, MI, NV, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OR, PA, RI, UT, VA and WA

Each group of the three comparison groups were examined for normality with the Shapiro-Francia test for normality, intended for samples of up to 5,000 observations[16]. To visualize the degree of skewness between the three populations a skewness test for normality was determined[17] [18]. Analysis of equality-of-populations test was performed using the Kruskal –Wallis test[19] [20] Statistical analysis was done with Stata 16.1[21].

Potential bias rests principally in the original survey. Respondents were surveyed online and may be representative of subjects more concerned about COVID 19. Additionally, as with any self - report, social desirability impacts reporting. The strength of the study lies in its large sample size and in its geographic reach.

RESULTS

The Shapiro-Francia test for normal data show that responses in the group **None** was normally distributed ($p=0.067$) but that the responses in the groups **Public** and **All** were not normally distributed ($p \leq 0.001$). The equality of populations test was therefore determined by the Kruskal-Willis test. The populations were statistically significantly different from each other ($p \leq 0.001$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 4.0 International license .



All differences between groups are statistically significant with $p \leq 0.0001$



All differences between groups are statistically significant with $p \leq 0.0001$. Mask Score for each of the 3124 counties studied was determined by the weighted sum of responses such that MASK

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 4.0 International license .

SCORE = (%NEVER*0) + (%RARELY*1) + (%SOMETIMES*2) + (%FREQUENTLY*3) + (%ALWAYS*4).



County mask scores show a shift from normal distribution of mask use for people living in counties with no mask mandate (**NONE** skewness of -0.01) to progressively more significant skewness for counties with a mask mandate for all public facing employees (**PUBLIC** skewness of -0.20) and the greatest skewness for the more universal mandate for all individuals in public (**ALL** skewness of -0.57).

DISCUSSION

Different state policies are related to three different patterns of reported mask use. The more comprehensive the state policy the larger the scale of change – halving the percent of NEVERS and increasing the percent of ALWAYS by a third. The distribution of the responses was normal for the county Mask Score for states with No mandate, but skewed in the states with mask mandates, perhaps indicating an impact of the mandates in shifting attitudes toward face mask use in public.

These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that public policies impact public behaviors relevant to the COVID 19 pandemic. The policy of state level mask mandates appears to increase the use of masks in public. While these results are not sufficient to demonstrate a causal impact

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 4.0 International license .

on COVID 19 spread they are suggestive that governmental policies related to mask use may help limit COVID 19 spread. These results further suggest that mask policies may help reduce the health and economic impact of COVID 19 pandemic. Moreover, these empirical results have clear implications for public policy and support the utility of a national face mask mandate for all individuals in public.

References

[1] "Data from The New York Times, based on reports from state and local health agencies." https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data

[2] Gross Domestic Product, 2nd Quarter 2020 (Advance Estimate) and Annual Update, Bureau of Economic Analysis, July 30, 2020. https://www.bea.gov/news/2020/gross-domestic-product-2nd-quarter-2020-advance-estimate-andannual-update.

[3] Mukerji S, MacIntyre CR, Newall AT. Review of economic evaluations of mask and respirator use for protection against respiratory infection transmission. BMC Infect Dis. 2015;15:413.

[4] Bourouiba L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 Mar 26]. JAMA. 2020;10.1001/jama.2020.4756.

[5] Clase CM, Fu EL, Joseph M, et al. Cloth Masks May Prevent Transmission of COVID-19: An Evidence-Based, Risk-Based Approach [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 22]. Ann Intern Med. 2020;M20-2567.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 4.0 International license .

---

[6] Ippolito M, Vitale F, Accurso G, et al. Medical masks and Respirators for the Protection of Healthcare Workers from SARS-CoV-2 and other viruses. Pulmonology. 2020;26(4):204-212.

[7] Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, et al. Face masks for the public during the covid-19 crisis. BMJ
2020;369:m1435.

[8] Cheng VC, Wong SC, Chuang VW, et al. The role of community-wide wearing of face mask for control of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) epidemic due to SARS-CoV-2. J Infect. 2020;81(1):107-114.

[9] MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA, Rahman B, et al. The efficacy of medical masks and respirators against respiratory infection in healthcare workers. Influenza Other Respir Viruses. 2017;11(6):511-517.

[10] Eikenberry SE, Mancuso M, Iboi E, 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. Infect Dis Model. 2020;5:293-308. Published 2020 Apr 21.

[11] Feng S, Shen C, Xia N, Song W, Fan M, Cowling BJ. Rational use of face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic. Lancet Respir Med. 2020;8(5):434-436.

[12] Lyu W, Wehby GL. Community Use Of Face Masks And COVID-19: Evidence From A Natural Experiment Of State Mandates In The US. Health Aff (Millwood). 2020;39(8):1419-1425.

[13] "Estimates from The New York Times, based on roughly 250,000 interviews conducted by Dynata from July 2 to July 14."
https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/17/upshot/coronavirus-face-mask-map.html.

[14] Federal Information Processing Standards, National Institutes of Standards and Technology, US Department of Commerce. https://www.nist.gov/itl/publications-0/federal-information-processing-standards-fips

[15] Raifman J, Nocka K, Jones D, Bor J, Lipson S, Jay J, and Chan P. (2020). "COVID-19 US state policy database." Available at: www.tinyurl.com/statepolicies

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.03.20206326; this version posted October 6, 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 4.0 International license .

[16] Royston, P. 1982. An extension of Shapiro and Wilks's W test for normality to large samples. Applied Statistics 31: 115–12

[17] D'Agostino, R. B., A. J. Belanger, and R. B. D'Agostino, Jr. 1990. A suggestion for using powerful and informative tests of normality. American Statistician 44: 316–321.

[18] Royston, P 1991. sg3.6: A response to sg3.3: Comment on tests of normality. Stata Technical Bulletin 4: 8–9. Reprinted in Stata Technical Bulletin Reprints, vol. 1, pp. 112–114. College Station, TX: Stata Press

[19] Kruskal, W. H., and W. A. Wallis. 1952. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. Journal of the American Statistical Association 47: 583–621.

[20] Kruskal, W. H., and W. A. Wallis. 1953. Errata: Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. Journal of the American Statistical Association 48: 907–911

[21] StataCorp. 2019. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC.