Characterizing spatiotemporal trends in self-reported mask-wearing behavior in the United States

Juliana C. Taube[1], Zachary Susswein[1], and Shweta Bansal[1,*]

[1]Department of Biology, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, U.S.A
[*]Corresponding Author, shweta.bansal@georgetown.edu

July 2022

Abstract

Although face mask-wearing has been adopted throughout the U.S. to prevent the spread of COVID-19, reliable spatial estimates of mask-wearing through different phases of the pandemic do not yet exist. Using 8+ million survey responses, survey raking, and debiasing with ground-truth data on a different mitigation behavior, we generate fine-scale spatiotemporal estimates of mask-wearing across the U.S. from September 2020 to May 2021. We find that county-level masking behavior is spatially heterogeneous along an urban-rural gradient and moderately temporally heterogeneous. Because these survey data could be prone to social desirability and non-response biases, we evaluate whether a question about community mask-wearing could be a less biased alternative and find support for this social sensing approach to behavioral surveillance. Our work highlights the need to characterize public health behaviors at fine spatiotemporal scales to capture heterogeneities driving outbreak trajectories, and the role of behavioral big data to inform public health efforts.

Keywords: COVID-19, face mask, non-pharmaceutical interventions, spatiotemporal, United States, survey bias

Introduction

Human behavior plays a key role in infectious disease transmission [1, 2]. Individuals' decisions to get vaccinated, reduce their contacts, or wear a face mask, for example, can have a tremendous impact on disease dynamics [3, 4, 5]. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted that we are grossly limited in our ability to accurately measure and predict human behavior in the face of a novel pathogen. Yet knowledge of how human behaviors vary over time and space is critical to assess the effectiveness of mitigation strategies, to forecast disease surges, and to parameterize coupled disease-behavior models [6]. In particular, there is a paucity of data on how the frequency of face mask-wearing varies across the U.S. over different phases of the pandemic. This lack of fine-scale spatiotemporal data has forced public health organizations to adopt an inefficient one-size-fits-all approach to encourage masking nationwide, rather than directing resources and messaging to areas with lowest uptake. Here, we identify spatiotemporal trends in self-reported data on mask-wearing behavior across the U.S. from a large survey distributed from September 2020 to May 2021.

Mask-wearing has been identified as an effective strategy to reduce transmission of SARS-CoV-2. At the individual level, masks decrease both the amount of viral particles dispersed by an infectious wearer and

inhaled by an uninfected wearer [7]. Modeling studies at the population-level (e.g., [4, 8, 9]) have suggested that mask-wearing can limit SARS-CoV-2 transmission and COVID-19 deaths, including under scenarios where masks aren't worn universally or aren't completely effective at blocking transmission. Randomized controlled trials (e.g., [10]) have also demonstrated that mask-wearing is an effective community-level intervention against COVID-19. Despite limited information at the time, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) initially recommended mask-wearing on April 3, 2020 [11]. Lack of a national mandate, though, resulted in a heterogeneous landscape of mask policies across states, counties, towns, and even individual businesses in the U.S. [12, 13]. Compounded with this spatial heterogeneity in mandates is additional heterogeneity in compliance, documented by localized observational studies (e.g., [14]). Collection of systematic, accurate data on mask-wearing levels across the U.S. is therefore essential to informing our understanding of the role of mask-wearing in the U.S. COVID-19 pandemic trajectory.

To address this gap, researchers and organizations have implemented extensive surveys on human behavior, including mask-wearing (e.g., [15, 16, 17]). These surveys hold exciting promise, yet they have contributed relatively little to our understanding of human behavior due to significant sampling limitations. Larger surveys with sufficient power to detect trends at local geographic scales are often not designed to capture a representative sample of the population. Demographic biases arising from a non-representative sample can be addressed with standard statistical tools such as survey weights, but other forms of bias, particularly non-response and social desirability bias, are more challenging to correct. Surveys about salient public health issues are especially likely to suffer from response bias; COVID-19 cautious individuals may be overrepresented in a survey about COVID-19 behavior. However, without estimates of the proportion of individuals in a given region that are COVID-19 cautious, there is no way to use survey weights on this demographic. Likewise, respondents may be influenced by social desirability bias when self-reporting COVID-19 preventive behaviors such as vaccination, social distancing, or mask-wearing so that they respond in a manner deemed favorable by society despite being inaccurate. Without observational or ground-truth data to validate survey responses, quantifying this social desirability bias is difficult. Furthermore, it is critical that ground-truth data to correct biases in health behavior be used at a fine spatial and temporal scale to avoid further exacerbation of biases (e.g., [18]).

The value of surveys on public health behaviors can be further restricted when data collection is at the national or state level. Coarse-grained spatiotemporal information on human behavior is of limited utility, providing only sparse insight into local trends. Collecting responses at the national or state level ignores spatial heterogeneity at these finer scales, preventing the identification of these local effects that can drive disease dynamics. Spatial heterogeneity in not only drivers of disease transmission like human behavior, but also disease prevalence, has been well-documented across pathogens (e.g., [19, 20, 21]). For example, differences in connectivity between counties or states can affect the timing and geographic scale of disease spread, while national scale mobility data elides these key patterns [22, 23]. Likewise, aggregation of vaccination data to the state level can hide spatial clustering of unvaccinated individuals, which undermines herd immunity and could drive sustained measles outbreaks in the U.S. [24, 25]. Despite the importance of detailed local estimates on drivers of disease incidence, few studies have analyzed human behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic nationally at these fine spatial scales. Furthermore, most surveys are not conducted for long enough to capture human behavior changes over time, leaving scant opportunity to assess the effects of changing public health messaging/guidance or disease prevalence on human behavior.

Here, we systematically characterize mask-wearing across the United States at a fine spatiotemporal scale for nine months using a national survey and account for the bias in this survey. By comparing survey demographics and vaccination statuses with accurate ground-truth data, we estimate and account for survey and response biases in our analysis of masking behavior. With these bias-corrected estimates, we characterize the spatiotemporal heterogeneity in masking behavior at the county-month level across the U.S. Finally, we examine the differences between self-reported and community-reported estimates of masking using an additional survey question, seeking to understand whether these two measures are good predictors of one another. Our results are the most precise estimates of masking in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic, providing insight into local variation in behavior in response to public health messaging and changes in COVID-19 incidence.

Results

To characterize trends in masking behavior in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic we used data from the COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey (CTIS) conducted via Facebook from September 2020 through May 2021. Respondents self-reported how often they had worn a mask while in public in the last week (8,338,877 valid responses). We transformed these responses into a binary variable of masking or not masking and aggregated the responses to the county-month level to analyze spatiotemporal trends. To validate this data source, we analyzed a separate dataset from Outbreaks Near Me and found consistent spatiotemporal patterns (Figs. S14, S15, S16), though both data sources suffer from issues of bias and low sample size. We addressed these issues in the CTIS data using binomial regression models to inform estimates of masking in counties with low sample size, and raking and sample rebalancing on age, gender, and education to adjust for unrepresentative samples. After finding that responses to a different CTIS question overestimated true vaccination rates (corroborating the finding of [18]), we quantified this bias and used it to correct estimates of masking behavior, assuming that vaccination and masking behavior responses were equally as biased. (Vaccination and mask-wearing are both prosocial public health behaviors which are socially desirable to report and are likely correlated [26].) We analyzed overall spatial and temporal trends as well as fine-scale heterogeneity in the bias-corrected masking behavior estimates. Finally, we validated the bias-corrected CTIS values by comparing them to respondents' estimates of the proportion of people masking in their community.

Spatially heterogeneous effects of binomial regression model, survey raking, and debiasing

To demonstrate the spatially heterogeneous effects of our data processing scheme, Fig. 1 shows the difference between estimates from three separate model runs and the raw CTIS masking data. We refer to this difference as the residual, though it is only an indicator of model fit in Fig. 1A. In Fig. 1B and C the residual values indicate where data processing has caused the largest changes in estimates compared to the original data. After modeling the data with binomial regression, estimates of masking proportions are higher than observed values (Fig. S3) in the central U.S., and slightly lower than observed values in the Northeast, Northwest, and Southwest (Fig. 1A). Adjusting for unrepresentative samples with raking and resampling and rerunning the binomial regression model has a minor effect on mask-wearing estimates, only exhibiting a slight decrease compared to the model without raking (Fig. 1B). Correcting for survey biases using vaccination data in the binomial regression model run on raked survey responses systematically decreases masking proportions, as expected and denoted by increased residuals (Fig. 1C). We refer to estimates from the model in Fig. 1C as debiased or bias-corrected for the remainder of the paper. Our results reinforce that behavioral surveillance should be conducted carefully to limit bias initially.

Masking behavior exhibits spatial and temporal heterogeneity and is positively associated with population density

Using bias-corrected masking proportions from the CTIS, we find that masking behavior is spatially heterogeneous over all months (Moran's I between 0.68 and 0.70 for all months, Figs. 2A, S7). Bias-corrected masking proportions range from 0.11 to 0.96, and vary substantially within states, emphasizing the importance of analyzing masking behavior at finer scales than the state or HHS region level. Masking proportions are closely linked to population density over the survey period: urban counties tend to have higher masking proportions than rural counties (Fig. 2B). While masking proportions range quite a bit within NCHS urban-rural classifications, all differences between NCHS classes are significant (Kruskal-Wallis and Pairwise Wilcox test). Over all counties and survey months, the median fitted masking proportion in urban counties exceeds 0.8 while the median fitted masking proportion in the most rural counties is below 0.6.

Masking behavior not only varies geographically but also temporally. Peak masking behavior is observed



Figure 1: **Visualization of spatially heterogeneous data processing effects.** (A) Residuals following binomial regression model. (B) Residuals following binomial regression model with raking/sample rebalancing. (C) Residuals following binomial regression model with raking/sample rebalancing, and an offset for bias. All maps shown for February 2021.



Figure 2: **Bias-corrected masking behavior is spatially heterogeneous and higher in urban areas.** (A) Map of bias-corrected masking behavior in October 2020 reveals high spatial heterogeneity. Masking proportions vary substantially even within a single state. Spatial heterogeneity does not notably vary over time (Fig. S7). (B) Breakdown of county masking proportions over all survey months by NCHS urban-rural classification. A direct relationship between median masking proportion and population density is observed.

in January 2021 while the lowest masking proportions are observed in May 2021 (Fig. 3). Counties with higher mean masking proportions fluctuate less than counties with lower mean masking proportions from September to April but experience the largest differences from their mean values in May 2021. For context, we highlight that this decrease coincides with increasing proportions of vaccinated individuals in the U.S. (Fig. 3, [27]), declining new infections [28], and decreasing reported worry about severe illness due to COVID-19 from the CTIS [29]. The policy context during this time was also shifting: On April 27, 2021 the CDC announced that fully vaccinated individuals no longer needed to wear masks outdoors [30] and on May 13, 2021 they announced that fully vaccinated individuals no longer had to wear masks indoors either [31]. Meanwhile, 49% of counties that ever had a mask mandate lifted it before May 1, 2021 (Fig. S17). These announcements coincide with the observed decrease in masking in these months. Together, these analyses underscore the importance of tracking and analyzing mask wearing at fine spatial and across long

temporal scales: further spatial and temporal aggregation of these data would have missed key heterogeneity previously not quantified and prevented future work from investigating the connection between policy and behavior change at appropriate granularity.



Figure 3: **Bias-corrected masking behavior peaks in the winter of 2020-21 and falls in the spring of 2021, mirroring new cases and increasing vaccinations.** Top curves show time series of z-score of bias-corrected masking proportions for each county colored by average masking proportion across the survey period. Inset plot shows z-scores of 7-day rolling average of new cases (green), proportion of individuals vaccinated nationally (orange), and reported worry about severe illness from COVID-19 in CTIS respondents (purple).

Community-reported masking levels are a good predictor of bias-corrected self-reported estimates

Bias-corrected masking proportions are well-approximated by modeled estimates of community-reported masking (Fig. 4). The difference between the two mask-wearing proportion estimates ranges from −6% to 5% and becomes more apparent in April and May 2021, particularly in rural areas. In May 2021, though, community estimates in urban areas tend to overestimate bias-corrected individual masking estimates. This result is quantitatively affected by influential observations but is qualitatively robust (Fig. S18). These results suggest that surveying participants about community masking may give less biased responses than asking individuals to report their own masking behavior, potentially reducing social desirability bias and capturing parts of the population that may be otherwise less likely to respond to the survey.

Discussion

Despite the widespread adoption of face mask-wearing at points during the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S., the true prevalence of this behavior across temporal and spatial scales is largely unknown. Data on



Figure 4: **Community-reported masking gives a good estimate of bias-corrected self-reported masking.** Community-reported masking refers to the CTIS question where individuals report how many people in their community are masking, which may decrease non-response and social desirability bias compared to asking individuals to self-report their masking behavior. Point color denotes urban-rural classes.

mask wearing has been collected through surveys, at varying spatiotemporal resolutions and with potentially varying survey biases (see e.g., [15, 16, 17]). Here, we characterize mask wearing behavior across the U.S. using self-reported masking data from a large national online survey. We employ Bayesian binomial regression models to remediate issues of small sample size, perform raking/sample balancing to address unrepresentative survey samples, and correct for additional response biases using measurable bias in vaccination data. We observe substantial spatial heterogeneity in masking behavior across urban versus rural counties with some temporal changes in mean masking estimates at the county-month level, most notably a steep decline in masking in May 2021. We find that community-reported masking responses well approximate our bias-corrected masking estimates. Other work adds to this validation: similar spatial heterogeneity is found in two other surveys, with some overlapping time periods (Figs. S14, S15, S16, [32, 17]) and our debiased estimates generally agree with those recorded in observational studies, including higher levels of masking in urban areas (Fig. S19, [14, 33]. Our results reveal the landscape of masking behavior across three distinct phases of the pandemic (pre-surge, during the winter 2020-21 surge, and post-surge during the initial COVID-19 vaccination rollout). Our work also highlights the critical role that behavioral big data can play in pandemic response, if such data are used with caution.

Our findings have several implications for the fields of public health, disease modeling, and survey design. We identify high spatial and moderate temporal heterogeneity in masking behavior at the county-level – patterns that are obscured if data are aggregated to the state or HHS region-level. Contrary to our expectations, this level of spatial variability around the mean is consistent over time. Consequently, disease models should account for spatial variability in masking behavior, but may only need to consider changes in masking dynamics over longer temporal scales. This high spatial heterogeneity highlights the need for diverse and targeted public health approaches across the country rather than a single national program. Guidance set at the state-level without regard for differences in local conditions may miss early opportunities to control

disease spread, may prematurely enforce public health restrictions, and may contribute to fatigue with public health restrictions. Despite a large number of responses (>8 million), these survey data still suffer from bias, underscoring that while larger samples may increase precision, without greater accuracy this precision is not useful (i.e., the big data paradox, [18]) and reinforcing the importance of careful survey design. Future analyses can compare demographic, policy, environmental, disease burden, and other factors between regions we have identified with low and high masking levels to tease out what may be driving these differences in masking, and therefore how public health efforts can be more effective moving forward.

While county-level mask-wearing behavior varies across months, we observe little heterogeneity across counties in these temporal trends. The observed changes in masking behavior roughly corresponded to national trends in new cases in the U.S. and self-reported worry about severe disease as reported in the CTIS, though we did not determine causality or examine this relationship at the individual or county level. Because we model county-level averages, this observed correlation could be driven by a specific demographic group or subset of individuals modifying their masking behavior rather than a uniform change in average mask uptake in a county's population. The sharp decrease in masking in May 2021 is contemporaneous with many states lifting mask mandates (Fig. S17) and an announcement from the CDC that vaccinated individuals no longer had to wear masks outdoors (April 27, 2021 [30]) or indoors (May 13, 2021 [31]). It is plausible that these policy changes could have impacted masking behavior, both in vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals, even though the change in CDC guidance did not apply to unvaccinated individuals [34, 35]. More work is needed to explore the potential differences in masking between vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals. Additional research could also focus on quantifying the impact of social norms on individuals' masking behavior at fine spatiotemporal resolution in the U.S.

Community-reported masking estimates agree closely with bias-corrected self-reported masking behavior. Because community-focused questions may be subject to less non-response and social desirability bias than self-reporting questions [36], this result serves to validate our bias-corrected masking estimates. More importantly, our finding highlights that surveying participants about community behavior may be an avenue to reduce survey bias. We note, however, that this finding may not apply in all settings; self-reported masking behavior on a university campus closely matched observed masking levels and questions about community masking were less accurate [37]. This approach also does not resolve issues of small sample size; the association we found between bias-corrected self-reported masking and community-reported masking is stronger between modeled estimates than between raw means. While these implications for analysis of surveys on human behavior may not apply universally, similar results have been found in other infectious disease applications including disease surveillance (using the CTIS data [29, 38]) and early outbreak detection in social networks [39, 40]. Our results further emphasize the promise of human social sensing going forward [41].

Our work has several limitations. First, our results are subject to many of the limitations of the survey on which they are based, including the likelihood of unrepresentative samples (as we cannot account for biases in all demographic characteristics through raking and resampling), dishonest responses, incomplete responses, and the exclusion of children under 18 years old. More detailed information on the limitations of the CTIS can be found in [29, 42]. Further limitations are introduced by our analysis of the data. We ignore potential heterogeneity at smaller temporal (weekly) and spatial (zipcode) scales due to limited sample size. By dichotomizing masking responses, we also lose information about the frequency with which people mask, though we do expect the effect of this to be minimal (see Supplement for details). In addition, our binomial regression approach compensates for small sample sizes in some county-months, but the resulting estimates depend on the validity of our model structure. Poor model specification could produce biased or inaccurately confident results, especially in counties with fewer respondents. Lastly, we assume that bias in the CTIS survey on self-reported masking behavior has the same generative process as that of self-reported vaccination status and is constant over time. Given evidence of an association between vaccination intention and the practice of COVID-19 preventive behaviors, we think this assumption is reasonable [26]. Further, trends observed in the bias-corrected results were visible prior to debiasing, implying that our findings are qualitatively robust to this assumption.

In summary, we have produced the first accurate high-resolution spatiotemporal estimates of face mask wearing in the United States for the period from September 2020 through May 2021. Our work reveals that

masking behavior is highly variable across the United States, suggesting that a one-size-fits-all approach to increasing mask wearing behavior is likely to be ineffective. Instead, we have identified regions of the country with higher and lower masking levels. These differences should be investigated going forward as public health organizations consider how to more effectively target these low masking regions. For example, these communities may be more susceptible to mis- and disinformation regarding mitigation behaviors which must be strategically confronted. Furthermore, this variability in behavior demonstrates the need to develop infectious disease dynamics models to analyze and predict how spatiotemporal trends in disease are affected by changes in human behavior, such as vaccination, contact patterns, and face mask-wearing. Our analyses also address issues of survey bias, with the takeaway that, in the future, we should invest in robust survey infrastructure that can recruit large representative samples with minimal bias, including using certain representative respondents as human social sensors to report on their communities.

Methods

In this study, we seek to characterize the spatiotemporal heterogeneity in self-reported masking behavior in the United States from the fall of 2020 to the spring of 2021. Due to low sample size in some counties, we use Bayesian binomial regression models to estimate mask-wearing proportions each month. Recognizing that surveys are subject to several types of bias, we use raking and resampling of responses to correct for unrepresentative samples and self-reported vaccination status compared to ground-truth vaccination data to quantify non-response and social desirability biases. With these estimates, we are able to identify spatiotemporal trends in bias-corrected masking behavior and compare these values to reported community levels of masking in a different survey question.

Survey data & processing

We analyzed self-reported mask-wearing survey responses for all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia using data from the U.S. COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey (CTIS) [29]. The CTIS was created by the Delphi Research Group at Carnegie Mellon University and distributed through a partnership with Facebook. Beginning in September 2020, a random state-stratified sample of active Facebook users were invited daily to take the survey about COVID-19 and report how often they wore a mask in the past 5-7 days (the number of days changed from 5 to 7 on February 8, 2021). Answer options were (1) All, (2) Most, (3) Some, (4) A little, or (5) None of the time, or (6) I have not been in public in the last 5-7 days (Fig. S1). To dichotomize these responses for an analysis of the proportion of respondents wearing masks, we dropped respondents who hadn't been in public recently or did not respond to the masking question, and considered responses of "all" and "most of the time" as masking, and all other responses as not masking. This cutoff is reasonable considering the raw proportions of responses in each category for September thru May (Fig. S2). Due to sample size constraints, we aggregated these responses to the county-month scale. See Supplement for additional details on survey distribution and data processing.

Bayesian binomial regression model

Due to small sample sizes in some U.S. counties, we used Bayesian binomial regression models to develop reliable estimates of the proportion of individuals masking in a given county-month. Population density was used as a fixed effect; masking behavior has previously been linked to population density and this variable was easily available at the county scale [14, 33]. We fit separate models for each month, allowing for a temporal trend without explicitly modeling it by specifying a parametric form. We define M_i as the number of respondents masking in county i (e.g., respondents that masked most or all of the time in the past 5-7 days), N_i as the total number of respondents in county i ($M_i \leq N_i$), and p_i as the county-level probability

of a response consistent with masking. We use the the following model to estimate $\hat{p}_i$ and $\hat{M}_i$:

$$M_i \sim Binomial(N_i, p_i)$$

$$\text{logit}(p_i) \sim Normal(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$z_i^D = \left(\frac{D_i - \bar{D}}{\sigma_D}\right)$$

$$\mu_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 z_i^D$$

$$\beta_0 \sim Normal(0, 1)$$

$$\beta_1 \sim Normal(1, 1)$$

where $D_i = \log_{10}(\text{population density}_i)$ for county i. We ran the model using `brms` [43] with the `cmdstanR` [44] backend. We ran the sampler with 4 chains for 3000 iterations per chain. Sampler diagnostics indicate efficient exploration and that the model has converged: the $n_{\text{eff}} > 950$, n_{eff} per iteration ≥ 0.25, $\hat{R} \leq 1.01$, E-BFMI > 0.25, and no transitions hit max tree depth. All PSIS-LOO k statistic values are below 0.71, indicating that the model is robust to the influence of individual observations, and the distribution of Pareto k statistics is uniform, indicating that the model captures essential features of the data [45]. Posterior predictive checks indicate good model fit (Fig. S4) as do plots of observed versus predicted and residual values (Figs. S5, S6).

Survey raking and resampling

We were unable to use the provided weights for responses to the CTIS due to spatial and temporal mismatch with the scales of our data analysis. Thus, we calculated county-month weights for each observation using the `anesrake` package [46] and the U.S. Census American Community Survey's 2018 data on county age, sex, and education distributions. We did not to use race or ethnicity data in the raking scheme as its inclusion substantially reduced algorithm convergence but note that race/ethnicity was moderately correlated with education (Cramer's V > 0.10). We then resampled from these responses using the calculated weights to estimate a raked masking proportion, which was fed into the binomial models, as described above. Observations from county-months that did not converge were all assigned equal weights. (Additional details are in the Supplement).

Estimation of CTIS masking bias

Given the likelihood of sampling, non-response, and social desirability biases, we generated bias-corrected estimates of masking in the U.S. In the absence of ground-truth masking data with which to calibrate these CTIS responses, we turned to a different survey question for which ground-truth data were available.

Beginning in late December 2020, the CTIS asked respondents whether they had received a COVID-19 vaccine. Response options were (1) Yes, (2) No, or (3) I don't know. Meanwhile, ground-truth vaccination data were collected at `http://vaccinetracking.us` by combining state-reported and CDC data to estimate the percentage of people vaccinated in each county in the U.S. [27]. A comparison of CTIS responses and ground-truth vaccination data revealed that estimates of COVID-19 vaccination based on CTIS responses were much higher than true vaccination rates at the US county scale (Fig. S8, [18, 47]). Assuming that masking survey responses suffer from the same bias issues (in magnitude and direction) as vaccination responses, this result would suggest that CTIS responses also substantially overestimate masking behavior. Thus, we approximated survey bias by comparing the CTIS vaccination responses to the ground-truth vaccination data at the county-level and incorporating this bias into the model of CTIS masking behavior.

Like the masking data, the CTIS vaccination response data suffers from small and unrepresentative samples in some counties. Thus, we resampled the responses from April and May 2021 according to the survey

weights we generated above and then used a (frequentist) binomial generalized linear mixed-effects model to estimate p_i, the proportion of respondents who were vaccinated (assumed to be partial vaccination, with 1 of a 1-dose or 2-dose vaccine) at the county-level each week (details in Supplement).

Given these modeled CTIS county-level vaccination proportions, we compared them with the true vaccination data to calculate the expected bias in reported survey responses relative to ground truth data in county i:

$$\text{bias}_\text{i} = \text{logit}(\text{CTIS estimated vaccination proportion}_\text{i}) - \text{logit}(\text{true vaccination proportion}_\text{i}).$$

To increase the stability of our bias estimates, we used a linear mixed-effect model. This mixed effects model used random intercepts, which penalizes extreme coefficient estimates to the overall mean, and assumed that the residual error in the estimates was normally distributed. This model generates a penalized estimate of survey bias for each county from the difference in modeled reported vaccination and ground truth vaccination:

$$\text{bias} = \beta_0 + u_i + \epsilon_i$$

$$u_i \sim Normal(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

$$\epsilon_i \sim Normal(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2).$$

This model was implemented using `lmer` in the `lme4` package [48]. If there were no responses in the county i or a bias estimate could not be calculated, bias estimates for this county were imputed by taking the mean of surrounding county estimates.

We then incorporated these estimates into a Bayesian binomial regression model with an offset for bias to estimate the bias-corrected probability of reporting masking in county i. We define M_i as the number of respondents masking in county i out of N_i total respondents, and p_i as the county-level probability of a response consistent with masking. We use the the following model to estimate $\hat{p}_i$ and $\hat{M}_i$:

$$M_i \sim Binomial(N_i, p_i)$$

$$\text{logit}(p_i) \sim Normal(\mu_i, \sigma)$$

$$z_i^D = \left(\frac{D_i - \bar{D}}{\sigma_D}\right)$$

$$\mu_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 z_i^D + \text{offset(bias)}$$

$$\beta_0 \sim Normal(0, 1)$$

$$\beta_1 \sim Normal(1, 1)$$

where $D_i = \log_{10}(\text{population density}_i)$ for county i. The bias-corrected proportion of individuals masking, c_i, was calculated as

$$c_i = \text{logit}^{-1}(\mu_i - \text{bias}).$$

We ran the model using `brms` [43] with the `cmdstanR` [44] backend. We ran the sampler with 4 chains for 3000 iterations per chain. Sampler diagnostics indicate efficient exploration and that the model has converged: the $\text{n}_\text{eff} > 1000$, n_eff per iteration ≥ 0.3, and $\hat{R} \leq 1.01$.

Community-reported masking

Beginning November 24, 2020, the CTIS asked a question about masking in one's community: "In the past 7 days, when out in public places where social distancing is not possible, about how many people would you estimate wore masks?" The answer options were (1) All, (2) Most, (3) Some, (4) A few, or (5) None of the people, or (6) I have not been out in public places in the past 7 days. We dichotomized these responses and aggregated them to the county-month the same way as the self-reported CTIS masking responses for December 2020 through May 2021. We then modeled these community masking estimates the same way we modeled the CTIS masking data using Bayesian binomial regression and resampling weighted by survey weights but without a bias offset.

Spatiotemporal analysis

All analyses were completed in R version 4.1.3 and maps were produced using choroplethr [49]. Urban-rural classes are from the National Center for Health Statistics' Urban-Rural Classification Scheme [50].

Competing interests

All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

JCT performed analyses, interpreted results, drafted, and edited the manuscript. ZS designed and guided analyses, and edited the manuscript. SB designed the study, guided analysis, interpreted results, and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Carnegie Mellon University Delphi team for sharing the US COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey openly and freely, and Alex Reinhart for his feedback on this work. We also thank the OutbreaksNearMe team at Boston Children's Hospital and Momentive for data sharing, and Benjamin Rader and John Brownstein for their feedback.

Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under award number R01GM123007. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Data availability

Data aggregated to the county-month scale and all code to analyze these data will be made available on GitHub at `https://github.com/bansallab/spatial_masking`. Individual survey responses cannot be shared by the authors, but researchers can visit `https://cmu-delphi.github.io/delphi-epidata/symptom-survey/data-access.html` if they would like to enter an agreement for data usage with CMU Delphi.

References

[1] Funk S, Salathé M, Jansen VAA. Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread of infectious diseases: A review. Journal of The Royal Society Interface. 2010 Sep;7(50):1247–1256. Available from: `https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsif.2010.0142`.

[2] Ferguson N. Capturing human behaviour. Nature. 2007 Apr;446(7137):733–733. Available from: `http://www.nature.com/articles/446733a`.

[3] Del Valle S, Hethcote H, Hyman JM, Castillo-Chavez C. Effects of behavioral changes in a smallpox attack model. Mathematical Biosciences. 2005 Jun;195(2):228–251. Available from: `https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0025556405000593`.

[4] Worby CJ, Chang HH. Face mask use in the general population and optimal resource allocation during the COVID-19 pandemic. Nature Communications. 2020 Dec;11(1):4049. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-17922-x.

[5] Bayham J, Kuminoff NV, Gunn Q, Fenichel EP. Measured voluntary avoidance behaviour during the 2009 A/H1N1 epidemic. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2015 Nov;282(1818):20150814. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4650148/.

[6] Verelst F, Willem L, Beutels P. Behavioural change models for infectious disease transmission: A systematic review (2010–2015). Journal of The Royal Society Interface. 2016 Dec;13(125):20160820. Publisher: Royal Society. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsif.2016.0820.

[7] Ueki H, Furusawa Y, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, Imai M, Kabata H, Nishimura H, et al. Effectiveness of face masks in preventing airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. mSphere. 2020 Oct;5(5):e00637–20. Publisher: American Society for Microbiology. Available from: https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mSphere.00637-20.

[8] 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 Jan;5:293–308. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468042720300117.

[9] Stutt ROJH, Retkute R, Bradley M, Gilligan CA, Colvin J. A modelling framework to assess the likely effectiveness of facemasks in combination with 'lock-down' in managing the COVID-19 pandemic. Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences. 2020 Jun;476(2238):20200376. Publisher: Royal Society. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspa.2020.0376.

[10] Abaluck J, Kwong LH, Styczynski A, Haque A, Kabir MA, Bates-Jefferys E, et al. Impact of community masking on COVID-19: A cluster-randomized trial in Bangladesh. Science. 2022 Jan;375(6577):eabi9069. Available from: https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abi9069.

[11] Fisher KA, Barile JP, Guerin RJ, Vanden Esschert KL, Jeffers A, Tian LH, et al. Factors associated with cloth face covering use among adults during the COVID-19 pandemic — United States, April and May 2020. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2020 Jul;69(28):933–937. Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6928e3.htm?s_cid=mm6928e3_w.

[12] Joo H, Miller GF, Sunshine G, Gakh M, Pike J, Havers FP, et al. Decline in COVID-19 hospitalization growth rates associated with statewide mask mandates — 10 states, March–October 2020. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2021 Feb;70(6):212–216. Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7006e2.htm?s_cid=mm7006e2_w.

[13] Guy GP, Lee FC, Sunshine G, McCord R, Howard-Williams M, Kompaniyets L, et al. Association of state-issued mask mandates and allowing on-premises restaurant dining with county-level COVID-19 case and death growth rates — United States, March 1–December 31, 2020. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2021 Mar;70(10):350–354. Available from: http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7010e3.htm?s_cid=mm7010e3_w.

[14] Haischer MH, Beilfuss R, Hart MR, Opielinski L, Wrucke D, Zirgaitis G, et al. Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and location-related differences during the COVID-19 pandemic. PLOS ONE. 2020 Oct;15(10):e0240785. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240785.

[15] Kapteyn A, Angrisani M, Bennett D, Bruin WBd, Darling J, Gutsche T, et al. Tracking the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on the lives of American households. Survey Research Methods. 2020 Jun;14(2):179–186. Number: 2. Available from: https://ojs.ub.uni-konstanz.de/srm/article/view/7737.

[16] Bureau UC. Measuring household experiences during the coronavirus pandemic;. Section: Government. Available from: https://www.census.gov/householdpulsedata.

[17] Katz J, Sanger-Katz M, Quealy K. A detailed map of who is wearing masks in the U.S. The New York Times. 2020 Jul;Available from: https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/17/upshot/coronavirus-face-mask-map.html.

[18] Bradley VC, Kuriwaki S, Isakov M, Sejdinovic D, Meng XL, Flaxman S. Unrepresentative big surveys significantly overestimated US vaccine uptake. Nature. 2021 Dec;600(7890):695–700. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-04198-4.

[19] Favier C, Schmit D, Müller-Graf CDM, Cazelles B, Degallier N, Mondet B, et al. Influence of spatial heterogeneity on an emerging infectious disease: The case of dengue epidemics. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2005 Jun;272(1568):1171–1177. Publisher: Royal Society. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rspb.2004.3020.

[20] Merler S, Ajelli M. The role of population heterogeneity and human mobility in the spread of pandemic influenza. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2010 Feb;277(1681):557–565. Publisher: Royal Society. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rspb.2009.1605.

[21] Susswein Z, Valdano E, Brett T, Rohani P, Colizza V, Bansal S. Ignoring spatial heterogeneity in drivers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the US will impede sustained elimination. medRxiv; 2021. Type: article. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.08.09.21261807v1.

[22] Viboud C, Bjørnstad ON, Smith DL, Simonsen L, Miller MA, Grenfell BT. Synchrony, waves, and spatial hierarchies in the spread of influenza. Science. 2006 Apr;312(5772):447–451. Available from: https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1125237.

[23] Cuadros DF, Xiao Y, Mukandavire Z, Correa-Agudelo E, Hernández A, Kim H, et al. Spatiotemporal transmission dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on critical healthcare capacity. Health & Place. 2020 Jul;64:102404. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1353829220309400.

[24] Truelove SA, Graham M, Moss WJ, Metcalf CJE, Ferrari MJ, Lessler J. Characterizing the impact of spatial clustering of susceptibility for measles elimination. Vaccine. 2019 Jan;37(5):732–741. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264410X18316724.

[25] Masters NB, Eisenberg MC, Delamater PL, Kay M, Boulton ML, Zelner J. Fine-scale spatial clustering of measles nonvaccination that increases outbreak potential is obscured by aggregated reporting data. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020 Nov;117(45):28506–28514. Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. Available from: https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2011529117.

[26] Latkin CA, Dayton L, Kaufman MR, Schneider KE, Strickland JC, Konstantopoulos A. Social norms and prevention behaviors in the United States early in the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychology, Health & Medicine. 2022 Jan;27(1):162–177. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13548506.2021.2004315.

[27] Tiu A, Susswein Z, Merritt A, Bansal S. Characterizing the spatiotemporal heterogeneity of the COVID-19 vaccination landscape. medRxiv; 2021. ISSN: 2126-3345 Type: article. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.10.04.21263345v2.

[28] covid-19-data/rolling-averages at master · nytimes/covid-19-data;. Available from: https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data.

[29] Salomon JA, Reinhart A, Bilinski A, Chua EJ, La Motte-Kerr W, Rönn MM, et al. The US COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey: Continuous real-time measurement of COVID-19 symptoms, risks, protective behaviors, testing, and vaccination. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2021 Dec;118(51):e2111454118. Available from: https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2111454118.

[30] CDC says fully vaccinated Americans can go without masks outdoors, except in crowded settings. Washington Post;Available from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/04/27/cdc-guidance-masks-outdoors/.

[31] CDC says fully vaccinated Americans no longer need masks indoors or outdoors in many cases. Washington Post;Available from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/05/13/cdc-says-fully-vaccinated-americans-no-longer-need-masks-indoors-or-outdoors-most-cases/.

[32] Rader B, White LF, Burns MR, Chen J, Brilliant J, Cohen J, et al. Mask-wearing and control of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the USA: A cross-sectional study. The Lancet Digital Health. 2021 Mar;3(3):e148–e157. Publisher: Elsevier. Available from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/landig/article/PIIS2589-7500(20)30293-4/fulltext.

[33] Callaghan T, Lueck JA, Trujillo KL, Ferdinand AO. Rural and urban differences in COVID-19 prevention behaviors. The Journal of Rural Health. 2021 Mar;37(2):287–295. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jrh.12556.

[34] Calamari LE, Tjaden AH, Edelstein SL, Weintraub WS, Santos R, Gibbs M, et al. Self-reported mask use among persons with or without SARS CoV-2 vaccination —United States, December 2020–August 2021. Preventive Medicine Reports. 2022 Aug;28:101857. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2211335522001644.

[35] How many unvaccinated people will stop wearing masks now? - The Washington Post;Available from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/05/14/how-many-unvaccinated-people-will-quietly-stop-wearing-masks-now/.

[36] Bradburn, Norman M , Sudman, Seymour, Wansink, Brian. Asking questions: the definitive guide to questionnaire design–for market research, political polls, and social and health questionnaires. John Wiley and Sons; 2004.

[37] Adaryukov JA, Grunevski S, Reed DD, Pleskac TJ. I'm wearing a mask, but are they?: Perceptions of self-other differences in COVID-19 health behaviors. PsyArXiv; 2022. Available from: https://osf.io/6rb4t.

[38] Astley CM, Tuli G, Mc Cord KA, Cohn EL, Rader B, Varrelman TJ, et al. Global monitoring of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic through online surveys sampled from the Facebook user base. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2021 Dec;118(51):e2111455118. Available from: https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2111455118.

[39] Christakis NA, Fowler JH. Social network sensors for early detection of contagious outbreaks. PLoS ONE. 2010 Sep;5(9):e12948. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0012948.

[40] Garcia-Herranz M, Moro E, Cebrian M, Christakis NA, Fowler JH. Using friends as sensors to detect global-scale contagious outbreaks. PLoS ONE. 2014 Apr;9(4):e92413. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0092413.

[41] Galesic M, Bruine de Bruin W, Dalege J, Feld SL, Kreuter F, Olsson H, et al. Human social sensing is an untapped resource for computational social science. Nature. 2021 Jul;595(7866):214–222. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-03649-2.

[42] Survey Limitations;. Available from: https://cmu-delphi.github.io/delphi-epidata/symptom-survey/limitations.html.

[43] Bürkner PC. brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. Journal of Statistical Software. 2017 Aug;80:1–28. Available from: https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01.

[44] R Interface to CmdStan;. Available from: https://mc-stan.org/cmdstanr/index.html.

[45] Vehtari A, Simpson D, Gelman A, Yao Y, Gabry J. Pareto smoothed importance sampling. arXiv:150702646 [stat]. 2021 Feb;ArXiv: 1507.02646. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.02646.

[46] Pasek J. anesrake: ANES raking implementation; 2018. Available from: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=anesrake.

[47] Reinhart A, Tibshirani R. Big data, big problems: Responding to "Are we there yet?". arXiv:210900680 [stat]. 2021 Sep;ArXiv: 2109.00680. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/2109.00680.

[48] Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software. 2015 Oct;67:1–48. Available from: https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

[49] Lamstein A, Johnson B, Trulia, Inc. choroplethr: Simplify the creation of choropleth maps in R; 2020. Available from: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=choroplethr.

[50] Ingram DD, Franco SJ. 2013 NCHS urban-rural classification scheme for counties. Vital and Health Statistics Series 2, Data Evaluation and Methods Research. 2014 Apr;(166):1–73.

[51] Meta. User guide for the COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey weights; 2022. Version 1. Available from: https://scontent-iad3-2.xx.fbcdn.net/v/t39.8562-6/281310961_1000166414205006_3176544355420994098_n.pdf?_nc_cat=110&ccb=1-7&_nc_sid=ae5e01&_nc_ohc=xj-cbn4nsPsAX83PID8&_nc_ht=scontent-iad3-2.xx&oh=00_AT9Jlz2utDGj2DKsO_WW8bUbDaYr18j5g8qhsE2r4zsAYg&oe=62A6462D.

[52] HUD USPS ZIP Code Crosswalk Files | HUD USER;. Available from: https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/usps_crosswalk.html.

Supplementary Information

Additional CTIS details

The COVID-19 Trends and Impact Survey was created by researchers in the Delphi Group at Carnegie Mellon University and distributed via Facebook to active users 18 or older starting in April 2020. On a daily basis, a random state-stratified sample of Facebook users are invited to take the survey at the top of their news feed. These users will not be re-invited to take the survey for at least thirty days. The survey asks a broad range of questions related to COVID-19 symptoms and behaviors, with variations across each of the thirteen different waves spanning from April 2020 to June 2022. In this study, we make use of data from Wave 4 (September 8, 2020 - November 23, 2020), Wave 5 (November 24, 2020 - December 18, 2020), Wave 6 (December 19, 2020 - January 11, 2021), Wave 7 (January 12, 2021 - February 7, 2021), Wave 8 (February 8, 2021 - March 1, 2021), and Wave 10 (March 2, 2021 - May 19, 2021, Wave 9 was skipped for numbering purposes).

Weights were provided by Facebook for each response to adjust for non-response and coverage bias at the daily-state level [51]. Briefly, each weight describes the number of people represented by a respondent based on their age, gender, location, and date of response. These weights were calculated via a two step process using inverse propensity score weighting based on respondents' demographics recorded in their Facebook user profiles to adjust the survey sample to reflect active Facebook users, followed by revisions of these weights using post-stratification so that the survey sample reflects the general population [29]. Because these weights were not at the same scale of our data analysis, we did not use them and instead performed raking to calculate our own weights as described in Methods.

As part of our data processing, we also dropped responses missing fips codes or outside the 50 states and the District of Columbia. When raking, we use three categories for age (18-24, 25-54, and 55+), two categories for sex (ACS)/gender (CTIS) (male and female), and six categories for education (less than high school, high school graduate or equivalent, some college, 2 year college degree, 4 year college degree, and postgraduate degree). Subsetting age further results in issues of nonconvergence. Raking on race/ethnicity with more than two categories leads to substantial nonconvergence whether or not we include education. We drop responses missing age, gender, or education from being raked.

In addition, when dichotomizing CTIS responses we assume that people who "sometimes" wore a face mask in public were not masking which may lead us to underestimate self-reported masking levels. We believe the effects of this assumption are minimal because the proportion of "sometimes" responses was small compared to other options (Figs. S2).

Estimation of CTIS bias

We compare CTIS responses about vaccination to true vaccination estimates for the period from April 1, 2021 through May 31, 2021. We chose this period when nearly all adults were eligible for vaccination in the U.S. so that the sample population responding to the masking and vaccination questions would be most similar. In this time period, the differences between the survey and ground-truth vaccination data have also stabilized (Fig. S8). We use a (frequentist) binomial generalized linear mixed-effects model to estimate p_i, the proportion of respondents who were vaccinated at the county-level each week. If V_i is the number of (partially) vaccinated respondents in each county i out of N_i respondents, then the model is as follows:

$$V_i \sim Binomial(N_i, p_i)$$

$$\text{logit}(p_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \beta_2 t^2 + u_i$$

$$u_i \sim Normal(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

where t and t^2 are orthogonal polynomials of degree 1 and 2, respectively, generated by the poly function in R from the rank of the weeks in which the vaccination data were observed. Therefore, β_1 and β_2 are

C14 **In the past 5 days,** how often did you wear a mask when in public?

- All the time (1)
- Most of the time (2)
- Some of the time (3)
- A little of the time (4)
- None of the time (5)
- I have not been in public during the past 5 days (6)

Figure S1: **CTIS question on masking behavior.** Note that time period of interest changed from 5 days to 7 days on February 8, 2021.



Figure S2: **Raw proportions of each CTIS response for a selection of counties spanning population densities across time.** Number of responses in that county-month listed above each bar. NCHS urban-rural classifications are as follows: (1) Denver, CO; (2) Montgomery, MD; (3) Onondaga, NY; (4) Baldwin, AL; (5) Gallatin, MT; Douglas, OR; (6) Wood, TX; Piscataquis, ME; Harrison, KY.

covariates that describe the trend of time in expected reported vaccination across counties, while u_i describes systematic difference in vaccination in county i relative to the mean trend. This model was implemented using `glmer` in the `lme4` package [48].

Using these modeled CTIS county-level vaccination proportions, we compared them with the true vaccination data to calculate the expected bias in reported survey responses relative to ground truth data in county i. There were 45 counties that had missing bias estimates due to either a lack of weekly CTIS vaccination survey responses between 0 and 1 (cannot use logits of $p = 0, 1$), or missing true vaccination estimates for



Figure S3: **Raw masking data for February 2021.** Proportions masking most of the time or more are much higher than observational studies would suggest, with spatial trends difficult to identify.



Figure S4: **Posterior predictive checks of binomial regression model of CTIS data.**

weeks with survey responses between 0 and 1 (therefore, cannot calculate difference between true and CTIS vaccination estimates).



Figure S5: **Observed versus predicted CTIS masking estimates with binomial regression model.**

CTIS model coefficients

Model coefficients for z-score($\log_{10}$(population density)) ranged from 0.45 to 0.55 (Fig. S9), meaning a one unit change in z-score($\log_{10}$(population density)) is correlated with the expected odds of masking multiplying by $e^{0.5} \approx 1.65$. The coefficient of the population density covariate in our binomial regression model is consistent over time, indicating that the relationship between population density and masking behavior is stable across months.



Figure S6: **Observed versus residual CTIS masking estimates with binomial regression model.**

Outbreaks Near Me survey details & results

The Outbreaks Near Me (ONM) survey was created by scientists at Harvard and Boston Children's Hospital and distributed through a partnership with SurveyMonkey. Following the completion of another survey on SurveyMonkey, a random representative sample of users across the United States were invited to take the Outbreaks Near Me survey. The survey was released in June 2020 and asked respondents how likely they were to wear a mask in several different environments: while grocery shopping, visiting with friends and family in their homes, exercising outside, and in the workplace. Answer options were (1) Very, (2) Somewhat, (3) Not so, or (4) Not likely at all (Fig. S10). We focus on the responses to the grocery shopping scenario, as this setting is most comparable to the "in public" scenario described in the CTIS question. To dichotomize these responses for an analysis of the proportion of respondents wearing masks, we consider "very likely" responses as masking and all other responses as not masking. This choice allows for comparison with CTIS data and makes sense given the small percentage of "somewhat likely" responses (Fig. S11). We aggregate responses at the zipcode-month scale and crosswalk these estimates to the county-month level using HUD files [52]. The Outbreaks Near Me survey dropped responses from individuals who reported their age as less than 13 or more than 100 years old. We additionally drop respondents who did not respond to the grocery store portion of the masking question or who have an invalid zip code that cannot be crosswalked to a fips code; this process leaves us with 1,042,685 valid responses. Survey weights were provided for individual responses at the weekly-state and daily-national scales, though we do not to use them because our analysis focuses on the county-month scale.

Due to small sample sizes, we use binomial regression models to estimate masking proportions for each county-month, as described in 'Bayesian binomial regression model' in the Methods (Figs. S12, S13). We



Figure S7: **Spatial heterogeneity in self-reported masking behavior does not vary over time.** Moran's I calculated for self-reported masking behavior from the CTIS estimates from binomial regression model with raking/resampling and bias offset.

compare estimates from these models to CTIS values calculated using only the binomial regression model, i.e., no raking/resampling or debiasing. We calculate the ratio of ONM to CTIS masking proportions for each county each month and take the average across all months in the survey, excluding counties that have estimates for fewer than five of nine months. Additionally, we visualize the time series of individual counties from the two surveys side by side.



Figure S8: **Motivation for bias correction using vaccination survey and ground-truth data.** Ratio of modeled CTIS vaccination estimates to true vaccination proportions for each state over time (January 1 to June 30, 2021). Dashed line at a ratio of 1.

Month	Estimate	l-95% CI	u-95% CI
09/2020	0.51	0.51	0.52
10/2020	0.5	0.5	0.51
11/2020	0.49	0.48	0.5
12/2020	0.5	0.49	0.51
01/2021	0.53	0.52	0.54
02/2021	0.55	0.54	0.56
03/2021	0.55	0.54	0.55
04/2021	0.55	0.54	0.55
05/2021	0.45	0.45	0.46

Figure S9: **Coefficients and 95% credible intervals for z-score(log_{10}(population density)) coefficient in the rake and debias model for each month.**

How likely would you be to wear a protective mask in each of the following circumstances, if you were to do them in the next week?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not so likely	Not likely at all
While exercising outside	○	○	○	○
While grocery shopping	○	○	○	○
While visiting with friends or family in their homes	○	○	○	○
While working at your office or workplace	○	○	○	○

Figure S10: **ONM question on masking behavior.**



Figure S11: **Raw proportions of each ONM response for a selection of counties spanning population densities across time.** Number of responses in that county-month listed above each bar. NCHS urban-rural classifications are as follows: (1) Denver, CO; (2) Montgomery, MD; (3) Onondaga, NY; (4) Baldwin, AL; (5) Gallatin, MT; Douglas, OR; (6) Wood, TX; Piscataquis, ME; Harrison, KY.



Figure S12: **Observed versus predicted ONM masking estimates.**



Figure S13: **Observed versus residuals for ONM masking estimates.**



Figure S14: **CTIS and ONM responses show similar values and trends across space and time.** (A) Average ratio of ONM to CTIS masking proportions for each county from September 2020 through May 2021. All average ratios are greater than 1, but only 0.4% are greater than 1.1. Counties with estimates for less than five of nine months are excluded. (B) Across three counties of varying urbanicity, masking proportions increase through January 2021 and then decrease through May 2021 in both surveys. Differences between survey estimates appear to decrease over time. Urban counties may exhibit higher levels of masking and less variability in these estimates over time compared to rural counties.



Figure S15: **Time series correlations between the CTIS and ONM surveys.** (A) Time series correlation for each county across all months is high across all counties. (B) Time series correlation for all counties each month is 1 across all months.



Figure S16: **Difference between county masking estimates from the CTIS and ONM survey decreases over time, with greater variability in more rural counties.** Facets designate NCHS urban-rural classification. Difference between survey estimates goes to nearly 0 across all counties in April 2021, with increasing, albeit small, differences in May 2021.



Figure S17: **Timeline of lifting of county mask mandates in the U.S.** Neither state nor county mask mandates were ever imposed in AK, AZ, FL, GA, ID, MO, NE, OK, SC, SD, and TN during the period from April 10, 2020 to August 15, 2021. Thus, these states have been excluded. Approximately 49% of counties that ever imposed a mask mandate lifted it before May 1, 2021.



Figure S18: **Community reported masking gives a good estimate of bias-corrected self-reported masking even when influential fips code are removed from the model.** Fips codes with pareto k values >= 0.7 were excluded from the Bayesian binomial regression model with bias offsets (specifically fips 4019, 6037, 6071, 12071, 12103, 36005, 40143, 41039, 45045, 48201, 48439, 53033). Community reported masking refers to the CTIS question where individuals report how many people in their community are masking, which may decrease non-response and social desirability bias compared to asking individuals to self-report their masking behavior. Point color denotes urban-rural classes.

Date	Location	Literature estimate	Model debiased estimate	Difference	Model fips	Model date	Speculation on any differences	Other notes	Source
August 2020	Milwaukee, Waukesha, Ozaukee, Washington, and Sheboygan, WI	0.96	0.7	0.26	55079, 55133, 55089, 55131, 55117	September 2020	Time period is different, averaging across several counties in Wisconsin	Retail stores, this time period is after state mandate, pre-state mandate masking levels were lower	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240785
June 2021	Milwaukee, Waukesha, Ozaukee, Washington, and Sheboygan, WI	0.26	0.61	-0.35	55079, 55133, 55089, 55131, 55117	May 2021	Time period is different, averaging across several counties in Wisconsin	Retail stores	https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.18.22269479
June-July 2020	Greensboro, NC	< 0.75	0.72		37081	September 2020	Time period is different	Retail stores, mask mandate in effect, no overall percentage given	https://www.osjournal.org/ojs/index.php/OSJ/article/view/3084
December 2020	Louisville, KY	0.86	0.87	-0.01	21111	December 2020		Retail stores, average use was 0.96 among visitors, but only 0.86 wore properly; among staff average proper use was 0.87	https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248324
September-November 2020	South and West	0.77				October 2020	Location too vague for comparison	University campuses with mask mandates, 0.86 wore masks, but only 0.77 properly, 0.92 indoors properly	http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7006e1.htm?s_cid=mm7006e1_w
May-June 2020	Wisconsin	0.41	0.54	-0.13	Average all WI	September 2020	Time period different, model estimate is averaged over the entirety of Wisconsin	Grocery stores across 20 counties	https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.09.20126946
September 2020	Philadelphia, PA	0.76	0.85	-0.09	42101	September 2020		Average across all observations in outside and retail sites	https://public.tableau.com/shared/BMNFWW75K?:display_count=y&:origin=viz_share_link&:embed=y&:showVizHome=no
October 2020	Philadelphia, PA	0.77	0.86	-0.09	42101	October 2020		Average across all observations in outside and retail sites	https://public.tableau.com/shared/BMNFWW75K?:display_count=y&:origin=viz_share_link&:embed=y&:showVizHome=no
November 2020	Philadelphia, PA	0.87	0.89	-0.02	42101	November 2020		Average across all observations in outside and retail sites	https://public.tableau.com/shared/BMNFWW75K?:display_count=y&:origin=viz_share_link&:embed=y&:showVizHome=no
December 2020	Philadelphia, PA	0.88	0.92	-0.04	42101	December 2020		Average across all observations in outside and retail sites	https://public.tableau.com/shared/BMNFWW75K?:display_count=y&:origin=viz_share_link&:embed=y&:showVizHome=no
September 2020	Little Italy, NYC, NY	0.9	0.91	-0.01	36061	September 2020		Uses webcam footage, mask worn correctly	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261321
September 2020	Key West, FL	0.66	0.56	0.1	12087	September 2020		Uses webcam footage, mask worn correctly	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261321
September 2020	New Orleans, LA	0.32	0.78	-0.46	22071	September 2020	Observations of Bourbon Street which may be a sample disproportionately composed of tourists, people partying during a pandemic who may be less likely to wear a mask	Uses webcam footage, mask worn correctly	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261321
September 2020	Times Square, NY	0.65	0.91	-0.26	36061	September 2020	Sample may be disproportionately composed of tourists during a pandemic who may be less likely to wear a mask if choosing to travel during this time	Uses webcam footage, mask worn correctly	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261321
September 2020	Las Vegas, NV	0.86	0.85	0.01	32003	September 2020		Uses webcam footage, mask worn correctly	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0261321
August 2020	Philadelphia, PA	0.43	0.85	-0.42	42101	September 2020	Time period different, mostly observed people outside at parks/streets where mask compliance may have been lower due to the outdoor nature		https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmedr.2021.101449
June-July 2020	Auburn-Opelika, AL	0.55	0.65	-0.10	1081	September 2020	Time period different	Essential businesses, single estimate not recorded so averaging across Fig 2	https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/S0895-99352022000029006/full/html
April-May 2021	Auburn-Opelika, AL	0.74	0.64	0.10	1081	April-May 2021		Essential businesses, single estimate not recorded so averaging across Fig 3	https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/S0895-99352022000029006/full/html
March-April 2021	Indianapolis, IN	0.74	0.85	-0.11	18097	March-April 2021	Indoor basketball tournament (March Madness) may not be representative of typical people living in this area		https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.14057
May 2020	Chittenden County, VT	0.76	0.66	0.1	50007	September 2020	Time period different		https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033354921009496
November 2020-May 2021	Marion County, IN	0.86	0.84	0.02	18097	November 2020-May 2021		Weekly data are available and are pretty consistent over time with a drop in last couple study weeks (May); anywhere between 80 - 90% usually	https://doi.org/10.1097%2FPHH.0000000000001467
July 2020	Honolulu, HI	0.77	0.76	0.01	15003	September 2020	Time period different		https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7477702/
June-August 2020	Portland, OR and Toronto, CAN	0.68	0.77	-0.09	41051	September 2020	Time period different	Higher levels of masking in Portland than Toronto but individual proportions not given	https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-049389

Figure S19: **Validation of model estimates from observational studies.** Most studies that overlap with the survey period estimate the proportion of people wearing masks correctly within 10% of our debiased model estimates (green cells). Yellow cells denote literature estimates more than 10% higher than our estimates and red cells denote estimates more than 10% lower, with speculation on the reason for these differences provided in the similarly named column. Gray date cells indicate lack of overlap with our survey period.