

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## **Who was wearing a mask in 2021? Update on gender-, age-, and location-related differences during the COVID-19 pandemic**

Michael H. Haischer<sup>1,2</sup>, Rachel N. Beilfuss<sup>1,2</sup>, Meggie Rose Hart<sup>1</sup>, Lauren Opielinski<sup>1</sup>, Emma Schmit<sup>1</sup>, David Wrucke<sup>3</sup>, Helena Zhao<sup>2</sup>, Toni D. Uhrich<sup>1,2</sup>, Sandra K. Hunter<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physical Therapy, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Athletic and Human Performance Research Center, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Biomedical Sciences, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.

\* Corresponding author

E-mail: [sandra.hunter@marquette.edu](mailto:sandra.hunter@marquette.edu)

## 16 **Abstract**

17 Previous observational work from 2020 demonstrated gender-, age-, and location-related  
18 differences in mask-wearing behavior, despite the efficacy and public health messaging that  
19 emphasized face coverings in combatting the spread of COVID-19. In 2021, COVID-19  
20 vaccinations and a corresponding change in public health policy became new considerations in  
21 deciding personal protective behaviors. To provide an update on mask wearers and resisters  
22 approximately one year after our initial study, we observed shoppers ( $n = 6,118$ ) entering retail  
23 stores using the same experimental methodology. Approximately 26% of individuals wore a  
24 mask. Mask wearing has decreased across demographic groups compared to 2020. Aligning  
25 with previous findings, females were  $\sim 1.5x$  more likely to be observed wearing a mask than  
26 males, and the odds of observing a shopper wearing a mask in a suburban or urban area was  
27 far greater than at rural stores ( $\sim 5.7x$  and  $\sim 3.3x$ , respectively). Gender and location are  
28 confirmed to be significant and stable factors that impact mask-wearing behavior in the United  
29 States during the COVID-19 pandemic. The impact of age on mask wearing was heavily  
30 reduced compared to 2020, potentially due to the availability of COVID-19 vaccines and change  
31 in mask guidance for vaccinated individuals.

## 32 Introduction

33 The respiratory virus that causes coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), SARS-CoV-2 [1], is  
34 transmitted primarily through the air in small particles that can travel more than six feet [2,3].  
35 Despite the strong public health focus on cleaning and sanitizing touch surfaces [4], evidence  
36 suggests that fomites do not appreciably contribute to the spread of the virus [5]. On the other  
37 hand, mask wearing and adequate ventilation and filtration of indoor spaces where air is shared  
38 by individuals are essential layers of protection to minimize the short-term (e.g., cases,  
39 hospitalizations, deaths) and long-term (e.g., “long COVID”) impact on public health [2].  
40 Controversy on the issue of face coverings has continued throughout the COVID-19 pandemic,  
41 largely politicized and in rare cases even leading to violence [6-9]. Even so, scientific experts in  
42 a variety of fields agree that masks are a safe and effective way of reducing airborne  
43 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [2,10-12]. Similarly, though responses vary considerably across  
44 political party lines, polling from August 2021 suggested most Americans favor mandatory  
45 masking in public spaces [13]. Epidemiological studies have shown mask wearing to be  
46 associated with a reduction in cases, hospitalizations, and deaths [14-16]. Schools with mask  
47 policies demonstrate a better ability to limit spread among children [17], and though the acute  
48 illness may be mild in most pediatric cases [18], an alarming percentage of individuals of all  
49 ages suffer long-term health complications [19,20]. The unknown lasting public health  
50 implications of the pandemic and the chronic effects of post-acute COVID-19 syndrome (i.e.,  
51 “long COVID”) within individuals highlight the importance of considering future public health  
52 burden in adopting personal protective measures. While the effectiveness of masks largely  
53 depends on material and fit, face coverings may confer protection to both the wearer and  
54 individuals in spaces where air is shared [21-23]. To that end, health messaging that  
55 encouraged mask wearing gained strength in the United States summer 2020 (June - August),

## Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

56 with many public entities and private companies eventually requiring masks for all except young  
57 children [24,25].

58 To study the demographics of mask wearers during summer months of 2020 in the USA,  
59 we conducted an observational study and systematically recorded the behavior of individuals  
60 entering retail stores [26]. We found that in June 2020, women (gender expression), older adults  
61 (estimated age), and those in urban area stores (location) wore masks at the highest levels [26].  
62 Importantly, follow-up observations collected after mask mandates were announced or  
63 implemented (July-August 2020) showed over 90% of individuals were wearing masks. Thus,  
64 public health policies addressing masks have great impact on the personal protective behaviors  
65 of retail shoppers.

66 In early 2021, COVID-19 vaccinations became widely available for individuals over the  
67 age of 16 under an emergency use authorization from the United States Food and Drug  
68 Administration [27]. However, adoption of vaccines among the public was moving slower than  
69 United States officials hoped [28]. To help encourage vaccinations, the Centers for Disease  
70 Control and Prevention changed their policy on May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2021, to state that vaccinated  
71 individuals do not need to wear masks [29]. This change in policy and the increased prevalence  
72 of the Delta variant of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, known to be more transmissible and potentially  
73 more deadly than earlier strains [30,31], introduced new considerations into personal protective  
74 behaviors. Thus, based on the new developments in public policy resulting from the availability  
75 of vaccines, the aim of this study was to update mask use by gender expression, estimated age,  
76 and location, approximately one year after the study conducted in June 2020 [26]. Due to the  
77 availability of vaccines and corresponding change in public health messaging, we *hypothesized*  
78 that mask use would be reduced in all demographic groups compared to 2020. Further, we  
79 *hypothesized* that mask use among females would be greater than males across all age groups  
80 and locations, aligning with our previous study and others demonstrating that a greater

## Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

81 percentage of females adopt personal protective behaviors [32]. Individuals aged 12-15 years  
82 were not able to get the vaccine until May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2021 [33] and adults, especially those in  
83 advanced age, were strongly encouraged to get vaccinated. While data suggests rural counties  
84 receive COVID-19 vaccinations at lower rates than urban counties [34], rural shoppers wore  
85 masks at lower rates in our initial study compared to urban and suburban store-goers [26].  
86 Consequently, we *hypothesized* that mask use would be approximately equal across age  
87 groups but would still be less common in rural than in urban or suburban areas.

## 88 **Materials and Methods**

89 Our primary aim was addressed by observing mask wearing in the same experimental manner  
90 at the same retail locations in southeastern Wisconsin as the previous study [26]. The center  
91 point used to define location was in the city of Milwaukee (United States Postal Service main  
92 office; [345 W St. Paul Ave, Milwaukee, WI, USA](#)). Thus, stores were placed into the same urban  
93 (<6.1 km from city center;  $n = 15$ ,  $3.2 \pm 1.8$  km to city center), suburban (11.5-32.1 km;  $n = 13$ ,  
94  $20.5 \pm 7.2$  km), and rural (>36.9 km;  $n = 9$ ,  $55.8 \pm 21.4$  km) store groups. Visits to stores ( $n =$   
95 37) occurred between 9:00 am and 8:00 pm (June 8<sup>th</sup>–28<sup>th</sup>, 2021) and lasted approximately 44  
96 minutes on average. Shoppers were not aware they were being observed and children under  
97 the estimated age of two were not recorded. Age categories were defined as young = 2-30  
98 years old, middle age = 30-65 years old, older: >65 years old, aligning with the increases in  
99 stratified death rates [35]. Summary observation sheets were crosschecked by other observers  
100 and all procedures involved public observation or information and did not require review by an  
101 Institutional Review Board.

102 The impact of gender, age, location, and their interactions on mask wearing was determined via  
103 multiple logistic regression analysis. Only individuals that could be grouped into a dichotomous  
104 outcome (mask/no mask) were considered. Thus, individuals who were wearing their mask or

## Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

105 face covering improperly (not over nose and mouth) were recorded but excluded from further  
106 analyses ( $n = 52$ ). Observations of the remaining 6118 individuals were dummy coded for  
107 gender expression, age, and location independent variables before being entered into a  
108 backward elimination regression. Limit for variable removal and test classification cutoff were  
109 set at 0.025 and 0.5, respectively. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) are expressed with respect to  
110 reference groups (gender: male, age: young, location: rural) with 95% confidence intervals and  
111 significance was determined at  $p < 0.05$ . All analyses were performed with either Microsoft  
112 Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA) or IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences version  
113 26 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA).


## 114 **Results and Discussion**

115 Over 37 observational visits to retail stores, and 6118 individuals were recorded entering retail  
116 stores. They were grouped into a dichotomous outcome (mask/no mask). Overall, 25.7% of  
117 individuals were wearing a mask or face covering over their nose and mouth (Fig 1). The trend  
118 across gender, age, and location generally aligned with our hypotheses and only young females  
119 in rural areas exhibited a positive change in observed odds of mask wearing compared to 2020  
120 (Table 1). Females wore masks 7.6% more than males (28.8% vs. 21.2%; Fig 2A). Additionally,  
121 masks were observed at similar percentages across all age groups (young: 27.2%; middle age:  
122 23.7%; older: 27.0%) (Fig 2B). Mask wearing was more in urban (35.9%) than suburban  
123 (25.8%) locations and was lowest at stores in rural areas (9.2%) (Fig 2C).

124

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

125 **Fig 1. Update on mask-wearing percentages by Wisconsin county.** Data shown indicates  
126 the number of observations collected and percentage of people wearing a mask (vs. no mask)  
127 in each county where retail stores were visited between June 8<sup>th</sup> and June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021. Italicized  
128 data indicates percentage change in mask wearing from Haischer et al., 2020 [26]. Created in  
129 Tableau Public 2020.2.1 (Tableau Software, LLC., Seattle, WA, USA).




130

131

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

132 **Fig 2. Update on mask-wearing percentages across gender, age, and location.** Data  
 133 indicate percentage of individuals wearing a mask (vs. no mask) between June 8<sup>th</sup> and June  
 134 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021, and percentage change from Haischer et al., 2020 [26] (Darker bars: current study;  
 135 lighter bars: results from Haischer et al., 2020). **A.** Females still wear masks more than males,  
 136 but both genders wear masks less than in 2020. **B.** Mask wearing behavior is similar across age  
 137 groups, unlike in Summer 2020. **C.** Mask-wearing is observed less across all locations and still  
 138 drops off considerably at rural stores. **D.** Mask wearing plotted by location shows that mask-  
 139 wearing behavior of all age groups is impacted similarly across geographic areas (older: O;  
 140 middle-age: MA; young: Y; darker lines: current study; lighter lines: results from Haischer et al.,  
 141 2020).



142

143

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

**Table 1.** Observed odds ( $\frac{mask}{no\ mask}$ ) of wearing a mask by age and location\* (shown with change in observed odds from Haischer et al., 2020 [26]). Only young females in rural areas showed increased odds of wearing a mask when compared to results from Haischer et al., 2020.


|                 | Young             |                   | Middle Age        |                   | Older             |                   |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                 | Female            | Male              | Female            | Male              | Female            | Male              |
| <i>Urban</i>    | 0.545<br>(-0.334) | 0.372<br>(-0.267) | 0.926<br>(-0.096) | 0.443<br>(-0.420) | 1.108<br>(-1.007) | 0.661<br>(-0.388) |
| <i>Suburban</i> | 0.442<br>(-0.444) | 0.350<br>(-0.217) | 0.372<br>(-0.885) | 0.203<br>(-0.560) | 0.385<br>(-1.728) | 0.267<br>(-1.201) |
| <i>Rural</i>    | 0.162<br>(+0.086) | 0.090<br>(-0.027) | 0.162<br>(-0.125) | 0.052<br>(-0.120) | 0.231<br>(-0.863) | 0.175<br>(-0.425) |

\* Odds > 1 show odds of wearing a mask are greater than not wearing a mask

144  
 145 Results of the logistic regression analysis indicated that females were significantly more likely to  
 146 be observed wearing a mask compared to males (aOR = 1.548, 95% CI = 1.369-1.740, p <  
 147 0.001) (Fig 3). Additionally, odds of mask wearing were slightly greater for older adults  
 148 compared to younger individuals (aOR = 1.236, 95% CI = 1.034-1.477, p = 0.020), but did not  
 149 differ between middle age and younger shoppers (p = 0.449). Coinciding with the low rate of  
 150 mask wearing at rural stores, the odds of observing a mask wearer was much greater in urban  
 151 (aOR = 5.712, 95% CI = 4.616-7.086, p < 0.001) and suburban areas (aOR = 3.342, 95% CI =  
 152 2.711-4.120, p < 0.001). Unlike the previous study which showed a significant age-location  
 153 interaction effect [26], the impact of age on mask-wearing behavior was generally consistent  
 154 across locations (Fig 2D).  
 155

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

156 **Fig 3. Odds of wearing a mask.** Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) and 95% confidence interval plots  
 157 of mask usage for gender expression, age, and location from June 8<sup>th</sup> to June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021 and  
 158 change in odds ratios ( $\Delta$ aOR) from Haischer et al., 2020 [26]. Odds ratios are expressed in  
 159 relation to reference groups (gender: male; age: young; location: rural). \*Confidence intervals of  
 160 aOR do not overlap with Haischer et al., 2020.



161  
 162  
 163 When comparing the results of the current study to those from the initial study performed in  
 164 2020 [26], there are several notable differences. Overall, mask wearing decreased by about  
 165 16% in a year (41.5% in 2020, 25.7% in current study), with similar declines for both males and  
 166 females (Fig 2A). Thus, despite both genders exhibiting reductions in masking compared to  
 167 2020, the odds of observing a female wearing a mask are stable at ~1.5 times that of males.  
 168 The explanation for this finding is likely multifactorial but could be related to the perception that  
 169 masks are seen as emasculating among males in the US [36]. Other factors that may facilitate  
 170 gender differences in mask-wearing behavior include differences in caregiving responsibilities  
 171 [37] and preexisting gender inequalities that were exposed due to the pandemic [38].

## Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

172 In examining age groups, mask-wearing rates were markedly different in 2020 but a greater  
173 reduction among older and middle-aged adults resulted in similar rates across age groups in  
174 2021 (~25%, Fig 2B). As a result of this differential reduction in masking, the odds of older and  
175 middle-aged individuals being observed wearing a mask compared to younger individuals was  
176 markedly changed compared to 2020 (older  $\Delta$ aOR = -2.198; middle age  $\Delta$ aOR = -0.646).  
177 Consequently, in 2021 there was only slightly greater odds of observing an older adult masking  
178 compared to a younger individual and no longer a difference in behavior between middle age  
179 and younger individuals. A possible explanation of the greater percentage of older adults  
180 wearing masks in 2020 was the higher risk for more severe outcomes from COVID-19 [35].  
181 Consequently, as soon as the emergency use authorization was granted, older individuals were  
182 prioritized for COVID-19 vaccines [27,39]. Thus, the change in public health messaging stating  
183 masks were not necessary for the vaccinated [29] may be a primary reason for the reduction in  
184 mask wearing, especially among older adults.

185 As in 2020, when considering store location, mask wearing was observed much less frequently  
186 in rural compared to urban or suburban areas. However, while mask wearing declined similarly  
187 in urban and rural areas (~11%), the behavior was more heavily reduced in suburban locations  
188 (~23%). As a result, the odds of observing a mask wearer compared to 2020 were increased in  
189 urban areas ( $\Delta$ aOR = 1.588) but reduced in suburban areas ( $\Delta$ aOR = -0.505). Even so,  
190 overlapping confidence intervals of the odds ratios calculated in 2020 and 2021 for these areas  
191 suggest the changes are not appreciably different.

192 Importantly, our overarching findings confirm that many individuals still resist masks despite  
193 public health guidance to wear a mask in public locations such as retail stores. As of June 27<sup>th</sup>,  
194 2021, only 49.3% of Wisconsin residents over the age of 12 years were fully vaccinated [40].  
195 Consequently, if there was compliance with public health recommendations, we should have  
196 observed approximately half of individuals wearing masks. The difference between overall

## Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

197 vaccination rate in Wisconsin and mask wearing in the current study however was ~24%.  
198 Despite the limitations of estimating gender and age, and the availability of vaccines to  
199 individuals over 12 years, it can be roughly estimated that up to 25% of shoppers observed  
200 during data collection were not vaccinated and were also not wearing a mask. Even  
201 asymptomatic individuals may transmit the virus to other people [41-43] and unvaccinated  
202 persons likely transmit at a greater rate than vaccinated individuals [44-45]. Taken together with  
203 our results, the potentially large number of unvaccinated and unmasked persons in retail stores  
204 could have a substantial impact in prolonging the pandemic.

## 205 **Conclusions**

206 Despite the efficacy of mask wearing as a personal protective intervention during the COVID-19  
207 pandemic, only 26% of over 6100 individuals entering retail stores in Wisconsin were observed  
208 to be wearing a mask. This was a 16% reduction from one year before (2020) in the same  
209 locations [26]. Males and shoppers in rural stores wore masks significantly less than females  
210 and store-goers at suburban and urban locations, respectively, aligning with findings from the  
211 previous year [26]. The impact of age on mask-wearing was considerably diminished compared  
212 to 2020, in that only slightly greater odds of mask wearing were observed for older adults in  
213 reference to younger individuals. The widespread availability of COVID-19 vaccines and  
214 corresponding change in health guidance on masking may be viewed as a possible explanation  
215 for this differential result over the year. Considering vaccination rates in the area, we estimated  
216 an alarming percentage of shoppers were likely unvaccinated and also not wearing a mask (up  
217 to 25%). Our updated findings will help individuals to continue to assess the risks of retail  
218 shopping during the COVID-19 pandemic. Key stakeholders may also benefit from considering  
219 these results when devising public health policies related to face masks in the current and future  
220 pandemics.

## 221 References

- 222 1. Coronaviridae Study Group of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. The  
223 species severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus: classifying 2019-nCoV  
224 and naming it SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Microbiol.* 2020;5: 536–544.
- 225 2. National Academy of Sciences, Environmental Health Matters Initiative. Airborne  
226 Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. 2020 Aug 26-27. [Cited 2020 Sept 23]. Available from:  
227 [https://www.nationalacademies.org/event/08-26-2020/airborne-transmission-of-sars-cov-](https://www.nationalacademies.org/event/08-26-2020/airborne-transmission-of-sars-cov-2-a-virtual-workshop)  
228 [2-a-virtual-workshop](https://www.nationalacademies.org/event/08-26-2020/airborne-transmission-of-sars-cov-2-a-virtual-workshop)
- 229 3. Greenhalgh T, Jimenez JL, Prather KA, Tufekci Z, Fisman D, Schooley R. Ten scientific  
230 reasons in support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *The Lancet.*  
231 2021;397(10285): 1603-1603.
- 232 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Cleaning and Disinfecting Your Facility:  
233 Every Day and When Someone is Sick. 2021 June 15 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available  
234 from: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/disinfecting-building-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/disinfecting-building-facility.html#anchor_1617548426741)  
235 [facility.html#anchor\\_1617548426741](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/disinfecting-building-facility.html#anchor_1617548426741)
- 236 5. Rocha ALS, Pinheiro JR, Nakamura TC, Da Silva JDS, Rocha BGS, Klein RC, et al.  
237 Fomites and the environment did not have an important role in COVID-19 transmission  
238 in a Brazilian mid-sized city. *Sci Rep.* 2021; 11(15960).
- 239 6. Gutierrez M. Anti-vaccine activists, mask opponents target public health officials - at their  
240 homes. *Los Angeles Times.* 2020 June 18 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available from:  
241 [https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-18/anti-mask-protesters-target-county-](https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-18/anti-mask-protesters-target-county-health-officers)  
242 [health-officers](https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-06-18/anti-mask-protesters-target-county-health-officers)
- 243 7. Kessler B. Black mayor of Kansas city says he was called N-word, received death threat  
244 over mask rule. *NBC News.* 2020 June 30 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available from:  
245 [https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/black-mayor-kansas-city-says-he-was-called-](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/black-mayor-kansas-city-says-he-was-called-n-word-n1232514)  
246 [n-word-n1232514](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/black-mayor-kansas-city-says-he-was-called-n-word-n1232514)
- 247 8. Rubenstein S. No mask, no service. McDonald's customer attacks drive-through worker  
248 over safety rule. *San Francisco Chronicle.* 2020 July 2 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available  
249 from: [https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/No-mask-no-service-McDonald-s-](https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/No-mask-no-service-McDonald-s-customer-15383603.php)  
250 [customer-15383603.php](https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/No-mask-no-service-McDonald-s-customer-15383603.php)
- 251 9. Sarteschi C, Blotcky AD. Anti-maskers and anti-vaxxers now present a real threat of  
252 violence. *Salon.* 2021 Sept 8 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available from:  
253 [https://www.salon.com/2021/09/08/anti-maskers-and-anti-vaxxers-now-present-a-real-](https://www.salon.com/2021/09/08/anti-maskers-and-anti-vaxxers-now-present-a-real-threat-of-violence/)  
254 [threat-of-violence/](https://www.salon.com/2021/09/08/anti-maskers-and-anti-vaxxers-now-present-a-real-threat-of-violence/)
- 255 10. Greenhalgh T. Face coverings for the public: Laying straw men to rest. *J Eval Clin Pract.*  
256 2020; e13415.
- 257 11. Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. Face masks for the public  
258 during the COVID-19 crisis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.).* 2020;369: m1435.
- 259 12. Prather KA, Wang CC, Schooley RT. Reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Science.*  
260 2020;368(6498): 1422-1424.

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

- 261 13. Talev M. Axios-Ipsos poll: Most Americans favor mandates. Axios. 2021 Aug 17 [Cited  
262 2021 Oct 18]. Available from: [https://www.axios.com/axios-ipsos-poll-mandates-masks-  
263 vaccinations-f0f105a7-3c2e-4953-aac9-f25516128b11.html](https://www.axios.com/axios-ipsos-poll-mandates-masks-vaccinations-f0f105a7-3c2e-4953-aac9-f25516128b11.html)
- 264 14. Fischer CB, Adrien N, Silguero JJ, Hoper JJ, Chowdhury AI, Werler MM. Mask  
265 adherence and rate of COVID-19 across the United States. PLoS ONE. 2021;16(4):  
266 e0249891.
- 267 15. Ginther Dk, Zambrana C. Association of mask mandates and COVID-19 case rates,  
268 hospitalizations, and deaths in Kansas. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(6): e2114514.
- 269 16. Lyu W, Wehby GL. Community use of face masks and COVID-19: Evidence from a  
270 natural experiment of state mandates in the US. Health Affairs. 2020;39(8): 1419-1425.
- 271 17. Budzyn SE, Panaggio MJ, Parks SE, Papazian M, Magid J, Eng M, et al. Pediatric  
272 COVID-19 cases in counties with and without school mask requirements – United  
273 States, July 1-September 4, 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021;70: 1377-1378.
- 274 18. Bialik S, Gierke R, Hughes M, McNamara LA, Pilishvili T, Skoff T. Coronavirus disease  
275 2019 in children – United States, February 12-April 2, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly  
276 Rep. 2020;69(14): 422-426.
- 277 19. Nalbandian A, Sehgal K, Gupta A, Madhavan MV, McGroder C, Stevens JS, et al. Post-  
278 acute COVID-19 syndrome. Nat Med. 2021;27(4): 601-615.
- 279 20. Raveendran AV, Jayadevan R, Sashidharan S. Long COVID: An overview. Diabetes  
280 Metab Syndr. 2021;15(3): 869-875.
- 281 21. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ. Physical distancing,  
282 face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-  
283 2 and COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet. 2020;395(10242):  
284 1973-1987.
- 285 22. Drewnick F, Pikmann J, Fachinger F, Moormann L, Sprang F, Borrmann S. Aerosol  
286 filtration efficiency of household materials for homemade face masks: Influence of  
287 material properties, particle size, particle electrical charge, face velocity, and leaks.  
288 Aerosol Science and Technology. 2021;55(1): 63-79.
- 289 23. Pan J, Harb C, Leng W, Marr LC. Inward and outward effectiveness of cloth masks, a  
290 surgical mask, and a face shield. Aerosol Science and Technology. 2021;55(6): 718-  
291 733.
- 292 24. Friedman G. McDonald's joins Walmart and dozens of other chains with mask  
293 mandates. New York Times. 2020 July 24 [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from:  
294 <https://www.nytimes.com/article/which-stores-require-masks.html>
- 295 25. Evers T. Emergency order #1: Relating to preventing the spread of COVID-19 by  
296 requiring face coverings in certain situations. The State of Wisconsin Office of the  
297 Governor. 2020 July 20 [Cited 2020 August 16]. Available from:  
298 <https://evers.wi.gov/Documents/COVID19/EmO01-FaceCoverings.pdf>
- 299 26. Haischer MH, Beilfuss R, Hart MR, Opielinski L, Wrucke D, Zirgaitis G, et al. Who is  
300 wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related differences during the COVID-19  
301 pandemic. PLoS ONE. 2020;15(10): e0240785.
- 302 27. United States Food & Drug Administration. FDA Takes Key Action in Fight Against  
303 COVID-19 By Issuing Emergency Use Authorization for First COVID-19 Vaccine. 2020  
304 Dec 11 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press->

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

- 305 [announcements/fda-takes-key-action-fight-against-covid-19-issuing-emergency-use-](#)  
306 [authorization-first-covid-19](#)
- 307 28. Wilson C. The U.S. Is Entering a New COVID-19 Vaccination Crisis. Time. 2020 May 10  
308 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available from: [https://time.com/6046880/covid-19-vaccine-](https://time.com/6046880/covid-19-vaccine-slowdown/)  
309 [slowdown/](https://time.com/6046880/covid-19-vaccine-slowdown/)
- 310 29. Lovelace Jr., B. CDC says fully vaccinated people don't need to wear face masks  
311 indoors or outdoors in most settings. CNBC. 2021 May 13 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]. Available  
312 from: [https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/13/cdc-says-fully-vaccinated-people-dont-need-to-](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/13/cdc-says-fully-vaccinated-people-dont-need-to-wear-face-masks-indoors-or-outdoors-in-most-settings.html)  
313 [wear-face-masks-indoors-or-outdoors-in-most-settings.html](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/13/cdc-says-fully-vaccinated-people-dont-need-to-wear-face-masks-indoors-or-outdoors-in-most-settings.html)
- 314 30. Herrero L. How contagious is Delta? How long are you infectious? Is it more deadly? A  
315 quick guide to the latest science. The Conversation. 2021 Sept 28 [Cited 2021 Oct 18].  
316 Available from: [https://theconversation.com/how-contagious-is-delta-how-long-are-you-](https://theconversation.com/how-contagious-is-delta-how-long-are-you-infectious-is-it-more-deadly-a-quick-guide-to-the-latest-science-165538)  
317 [infectious-is-it-more-deadly-a-quick-guide-to-the-latest-science-165538](https://theconversation.com/how-contagious-is-delta-how-long-are-you-infectious-is-it-more-deadly-a-quick-guide-to-the-latest-science-165538)
- 318 31. Toole M. Why is Delta such a worry? It's more infectious, probably causes more severe  
319 disease, and challenges our vaccines. The Conversation. 2021 July 5 [Cited 2021 Oct  
320 18]. Available from: [https://theconversation.com/why-is-delta-such-a-worry-its-more-](https://theconversation.com/why-is-delta-such-a-worry-its-more-infectious-probably-causes-more-severe-disease-and-challenges-our-vaccines-163579)  
321 [infectious-probably-causes-more-severe-disease-and-challenges-our-vaccines-163579](https://theconversation.com/why-is-delta-such-a-worry-its-more-infectious-probably-causes-more-severe-disease-and-challenges-our-vaccines-163579)
- 322 32. Moran KR, Del Valle SY. A meta-analysis of the association between gender and  
323 protective behaviors in response to respiratory epidemics and pandemics. PLoS One.  
324 2016;11(10): e0164541.
- 325 33. United States Food & Drug Administration. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA  
326 Authorizes Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine for Emergency Use in Adolescents in  
327 Another Important Action in Fight Against Pandemic. 2021 May 10 [Cited 2021 Oct 18].  
328 Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine-emergency-use)  
329 [covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine-emergency-use](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine-emergency-use)
- 330 34. Murthy BP, Sterrett N, Weller D, Zell E, Reynolds L, Toblin RL, et al. Disparities in  
331 COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage Between Urban and Rural Counties – United States,  
332 December 14-April 10, 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021;70(20): 759-764.
- 333 35. Wiersinga WJ, Rhodes A, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology,  
334 transmission, diagnosis, and treatment of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). JAMA.  
335 2020;324(8): 782-793.
- 336 36. Capraro V, Barcelo H. The effect of messaging and gender on intentions to wear a face  
337 covering to slow down COVID-19 transmission. PsyarXiv [Preprint]. 2020 psyarXiv tg7vz  
338 [posted 2020 May 11; revised 2020 May 16; cited 2021 Oct 18]: [19 p.]. Available from:  
339 <https://psyarxiv.com/tg7vz> doi:10.31234/osf.io/tg7vz
- 340 37. Lawson V. Geographies of care and responsibility. Ann Am Assoc Geogr. 2007;1: 1-11.
- 341 38. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women, United Nations  
342 Secretariat. The impact of COVID-19 on women. 2020 April 9 [Cited 2021 Oct 18]:  
343 [21p.]. Available from: [https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-](https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/04/policy-brief-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-women)  
344 [library/publications/2020/04/policy-brief-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-women](https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/04/policy-brief-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-women)
- 345 39. Morrow-Howell N. Why older people are among the first to get the vaccine. Washington  
346 University in St. Louis, Harvey A. Friedman Center for Aging. 2020 Dec 16 [Cited 2021  
347 Oct 18]. Available from: [https://publichealth.wustl.edu/why-older-people-are-among-the-](https://publichealth.wustl.edu/why-older-people-are-among-the-first-to-get-the-vaccine/)  
348 [first-to-get-the-vaccine/](https://publichealth.wustl.edu/why-older-people-are-among-the-first-to-get-the-vaccine/)

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

- 349 40. Wisconsin COVID-19 Vaccine Tracker. Springfield News-Leader. [Cited 2021 Oct 18].  
350 Available from: <https://data.news-leader.com/covid-19-vaccine-tracker/wisconsin/55/>
- 351 41. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Eggo RM.  
352 Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. Nat  
353 Med. 2020; s41591-020-0962-9.
- 354 42. Ganyani T, Kremer C, Chen D, Torneri A, Faes C, Wallinga J, et al. Estimating the  
355 generation interval for coronavirus disease (COVID-19) based on symptom onset data,  
356 March 2020. Euro Surveill. 2020;25(17): 2000257.
- 357 43. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng W, Wang J, Hao X, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral  
358 shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26(5): 672-675.
- 359 44. Eyre DW, Taylor D, Purver M, Chapman D, Fowler T, Pouwels KB, et al. The impact of  
360 SARS-CoV-2 vaccination on Alpha and Delta variant transmission. Medrxiv [Preprint].  
361 2021 medrxiv 2021.09.28.21264260 [posted 2021 Sept 29; revised 2021 Oct 15; cited  
362 2021 Oct 18]: [27 p.]. Available from:  
363 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.09.28.21264260v2> doi:  
364 10.1101/2021.09.28.21264260
- 365 45. Kang M, Xin H, Yuan J, Ali ST, Liang Z, Zhang J, et al. Transmission dynamics and  
366 epidemiological characteristics of Delta variant infections in China. Medrxiv [Preprint].  
367 2021 medrxiv 2021.08.12.21261991 [posted 2021 Aug 13; cited 2021 Oct 18]: [26 p.].  
368 Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.08.12.21261991v1> doi:  
369 10.1101/2021.08.12.21261991