

1 **Examining face-mask usage as an effective strategy to control COVID-19 spread**

2

3

4

5

6 Adam Catching^{1,2§}, Sara Capponi^{3,4§}, Ming Te Yeh¹, Simone Bianco^{3,4*}, Raul Andino^{1*}

7

8

9 ¹ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
10 94158

11 ² Graduate Program in Biophysics, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94158

12 ³ Industrial and Applied Genomics, AI and Cognitive Software, IBM Almaden Research Center, San Jose,
13 CA, 95120

14 ⁴ Center for Cellular Construction, San Francisco, CA 94158

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 § authors contributed equally to the manuscript

23

24 * corresponding authors: sbianco@us.ibm.com, Raul.Andino@ucsf.edu

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 **Abstract**

34 The COVID-19 global crisis is facilitated by high virus transmission rates and high percentages of
35 asymptomatic and presymptomatic infected individuals. Containing the pandemic hinged on combinations
36 of social distancing and face mask use. Here we examine the efficacy of these measures, using an agent-
37 based modeling approach that evaluates face masks and social distancing in realistic confined spaces
38 scenarios. We find face masks are more effective than social distancing. Importantly, combining face masks
39 with even moderate social distancing provides optimal protection. The finding that widespread usage of
40 face masks limits COVID-19 outbreaks can inform policies to reopening of social functions.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 Keywords: epidemic, virus, individual-based simulation

50

51 Introduction

52 The COVID-19 outbreak has caused a catastrophic mortality and economic damage around the world. The
53 causative agent of COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, is an airborne pathogen that can be transmitted between
54 humans through droplets and aerosols that can travel 1–8 meters¹. The virus is transmitted by both
55 symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. COVID-19 causes severe symptoms that require
56 hospitalization, as well as severe long-term sequels and death. Accordingly, the outbreak has seriously
57 impacted healthcare systems around the world². One of the major difficulties to contain the COVID-19
58 pandemic has been detection of infected asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals, who are estimated
59 to be responsible for as much as 95% of all transmissions^{3 4}. As these individuals carry and spread the
60 virus without manifesting any sign of the disease, they represent a crucial variable in managing the
61 outbreak.

62 In the absence of an effective vaccine or antiviral, most countries have implemented non-
63 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to curb the spread of COVID-19⁵. These include closure of schools,
64 workplaces, churches, offices, factories and other social venues, while encouraging preventative measures
65 ranging from maintaining social distancing (SD, usually 2 m/6 ft between individuals) to total quarantine and
66 societal lockdowns. These measures aim to reduce the effective contact rate of the population, which in
67 turn decreases the disease reproductive number R_0 . These NPIs limit the epidemic, but they present
68 important drawbacks. Total lockdown can only be implemented for short periods, due to its severe impact
69 on the social fabric and economy of a country. Meanwhile, essential workers remain vulnerable to infection
70 and transmission due to the frequent encounters with infected, often asymptomatic, individuals. Because
71 of their social and economic impact, lockdowns and SD measures have been lifted in some countries,
72 leading to reactivation of virus spread and ensuing increased morbidity and mortality.

73 Face masks covering the nose and mouth area also provide a level of filtration that blocks virus
74 transmission to certain extent⁶⁻⁸. Masks prevent the spread of droplets and aerosols generated by an
75 infected individual¹, reducing viral transmission by 95%. Uninfected individuals wearing a mask are
76 about 85% protected against infection⁹. Masks may be more effective to control the source of infectious
77 virus because they prevent the larger expelled droplets from being converted into smaller droplets that can
78 travel farther. Accordingly, face masks reduce the spread of influenza¹⁰ and coronaviruses^{11,12}.

79 In our current study, we analyzed the relative efficacy of wearing face masks and/or exercising SD
80 to reducing the spread of COVID-19. Through stochastic computer simulations of infection spread, we
81 modeled realistic outbreak scenarios and found that SD only yields beneficial effects if accompanied by a
82 widespread population lockdown. In contrast, wearing face masks is a highly effective strategy to reduce
83 the spread of infection. Our results suggest that, even when a large fraction of infected individuals is
84 asymptomatic, mask wearing is the most effective strategy to control virus spread and alleviate the impact
85 of COVID-19 outbreak, particularly when combined with conditions of partial SD compatible with the
86 function of society.

87

88 Results

89 **Stochastic model description and calibration.** We developed an agent-based model (ABM) to examine
90 the effectiveness of wearing masks and SD on the rate of infections and viral spread during the pandemic.
91 Unlike other computational approaches to model the spread of COVID-19 disease^{13,14}, ABMs are stochastic
92 models that allow the description of non-homogeneous distributions of agents that act individually^{12,15}. In
93 ABMs, each individual behaves dynamically and independently in response to environmental changes¹⁶
94 according to rules that describe their interactions. To model the COVID-19 pandemic, we used a SEAIR
95 system in which each agent represents an individual who can be susceptible (S), exposed (E),
96 asymptotically infected (A), symptomatically infected (I), or recovered (R). To obtain a realistic model of
97 virus spread, we chose parameters that describe the spread of SARS-CoV2: transmission events occur
98 through contacts made between susceptible and infectious individuals in close proximity (distance $\leq 2r$, Fig.
99 1A), and exposed individuals undergo an incubation period of 5.1 days to become infectious (Fig. 1, spheres
100 with red border). This incubation time represents the interval required to increase viral loads to levels
101 sufficient for transmission (REF). We assume that recovered individuals (Fig. 1, spheres with black border),

102 who resolve the infection, cannot be re-infected or infect others, which is a reasonable assumption for the
103 duration of our models (45 days).

104 To define the probabilities of infection, we used reported COVID-19 parameters¹⁷. The probability
105 of transmission follows a Γ (*gamma*) distribution (see Methods) whose shape is described by a constant
106 (α), estimated to be 0.25. Wearing masks reduces this probability (Fig. 1, probability of infection). To
107 estimate the protective effect of masks, we used parameters determined for FDA-approved surgical masks,
108 whose efficacy has been experimentally verified to inhibit virus transmission¹⁰. Based on previous studies
109 (Ferguson et al.), we assumed that, if an infectious individual wears a mask, the effective probability of
110 transmission is reduced by a factor of 0.05. If a susceptible individual wears a mask, α is reduced by a
111 factor of 0.15 (Fig. 1A). Our assumption that wearing masks is more effective to reduce transmission than
112 to prevent getting infected is supported by experimental data¹⁸. However, if both infectious and susceptible
113 individuals wear masks the probability of transmission is the product of these probabilities (0.0075) and,
114 thus, sufficiently low such that transmission is effectively null. We calibrated our model by running
115 simulations without any individuals wearing a face mask or practicing SD and considering that 50% of
116 infected individuals are asymptomatic (Movie 1). In this way, we determined the simulation parameters,
117 such as velocity and density of individuals, to obtain a value of $R_0 = 2.5$, consistent with what was reported
118 early on as the infection rate of the epidemic in Wuhan⁹.

119 **Percentage of population wearing masks determines the daily infection incidence and cumulative**
120 **number of cases.** We started each simulation with one individual being infected and all others susceptible
121 and assuming that 50% of COVID-19 infections are asymptomatic (or pre-symptomatic). Non-infected and
122 asymptomatic individuals circulate in the population without any restriction (i.e., they do not isolate
123 themselves or become hospitalized) (see Methods). In contrast, symptomatic individuals no longer move
124 after 12 hours of the symptom onset, simulating hospitalization or self-isolation. Thus, symptoms are
125 assumed to manifest after the incubation time of 5.1 days plus 12 hours (Fig. 2B). Using these assumptions
126 and model calibration, we carried out a set of simulations in which we gradually increased the percentage
127 of individuals in the population that wear masks. Individuals assigned randomly to wear a mask keep on
128 the mask for the entire duration of the simulation. Increasing the fraction of the population wearing face
129 masks has a highly significant effect on the spread of the virus (Fig. 1B, 1C and Movie 2). Mask wearing
130 reduces the cumulative number of infected individuals at the end of the simulation (Fig. 1B). Strikingly, this
131 effect negatively correlates with the fraction of the population using masks without any other intervention,
132 suggesting that masks are effective for reducing the overall number of cases (Fig. 1B). The description of
133 the dynamics of infection generated by this model is consistent with previous clinical studies^{9,18} and
134 highlights the benefit of wearing masks (Fig. 1C, Movie 1).

135 If the daily incidence surpasses the treatment capacity, it will overwhelm the healthcare system
136 with detrimental consequences for medical care of infected individuals and increased mortality and
137 morbidity. Thus, we examined the effects of face masks on the daily incidence of infection over time (Fig.
138 2B). If all individuals move freely and randomly interact with others (i.e., 0% SD), the rate of daily infection
139 through the population depends on the percentage of individuals wearing masks. The average number of
140 new daily infection varies considerably, according to the number of individuals wearing face masks. When
141 0% of individuals wear face masks (Fig. 2b, red line), the number of daily infections peaks sharply at day
142 27 with a maximum of 54.8 ± 18.1 infections per day for a population of 500 individuals. No additional
143 infections are observed after day 39, when the entire population (100%) has been infected. Thus, without
144 any intervention, the infection quickly reaches every individual through an epidemic characterized by a very
145 sharp infection peak. Note that, in these original models, we assume all individuals recover after ~11 days
146 post-infection and cannot be re-infected. When 40% of all individuals wear masks, the number of individuals
147 infected at any given day is reduced by approximately 30% (maximum of infected individuals 35.1 ± 12.8 ,
148 Fig. 2A, blue line), both flattening the curve and extending the duration of the outbreak by more than 10
149 days, with a peak maximum at day 32. By day 52, an average of 472 individuals has been infected, and
150 none of the individuals is infectious or exposed any longer. Even more significantly, if 80% of the population
151 wear masks, we observed a significant flattening of the curve, with a substantial reduction in the maximum
152 number of infected individuals per day, 5.9 ± 6.8 (Fig. 2A, green line), and the number of new infected
153 individuals reached zero by day 57.8 ± 35.0 . Thus, the shape of the outbreak changes from a curve
154 characterized by a sharp peak when no intervention is considered to a broader peak when 80% of the
155 individuals wear masks. By increasing the percentage of the individuals wearing masks, the number of

156 newly infected individuals per day substantially decreases, which will reduce mortality and morbidity.
157 Moreover, since the use of masks eliminates the sharp peak that characterizes SARS CoV2 epidemics, the
158 overall impact of the outbreak on the health system is alleviated. These results highlight the importance of
159 widespread mask wearing as an effective intervention that can be implemented as soon as the first cases
160 are reported.

161 **Effect of social distancing on viral infection spread.** Next, we evaluated the effect of SD in shaping the
162 spread of infection. Practicing SD does not affect the probability of infection but reduces the chances of
163 encounters leading to transmission. Thus, SD was introduced into the model by limiting the proportion of
164 individuals in the population that move freely in the field. This simulates a scenario in which a given
165 proportion of individuals in the population quarantine or shelter-in-place, thereby reducing the probability of
166 contacts and transmission (Fig. 2A). As reported, if a percentage of individuals practice SD, even without
167 any other non-pharmacological intervention, the number of infections and daily infection rate are reduced
168 (compare Fig. 2B, SD 0, 40, and 80%, red line). However, if no one wears masks but 40% of individuals
169 practice SD, we observed a very small effect in the shape of the infection curve (Fig. 2B, the peak maximum
170 decreases from 51.0 ± 13.3 to 45.7 ± 5.9). When 80% of the population practices SD, a more significant
171 reduction in the number of new daily infections was observed (Fig. 2B, 80%). Notably, the shape of the new
172 daily infection curve broadens considerably upon increasing the percentage of individuals wearing face
173 masks (Fig. 2B, compare blue and green curves with red curve). For instance, if 80% of the population
174 wears masks with 40% SD, the peak maximum decreases to one-tenth (from 51.0 ± 13.3 to 5.7 ± 5.9) and
175 is slightly delayed (Fig. 2B). At 80% SD, the peak of new daily infections is no longer observed, and the
176 number of new infected individuals per day averages 1.6 ± 1.3 (Fig. 2B). Thus, the effects of individuals
177 wearing face masks and practicing SD are synergistic, with the most pronounced effects occurring when
178 60% or 80% of individuals wear masks.

179 **Effectiveness of combining mask wearing and social distancing to control infection in populations**
180 **with high proportions of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic cases.** Asymptomatic or pre-
181 symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection is emerging as possibly the most common clinical manifestation of
182 COVID-19¹⁹⁻²³. This finding could only be revealed once mass testing campaigns were performed,
183 regardless of symptoms (e.g., universal testing campaigns). One of the earliest studies documenting clinical
184 manifestations in a testing campaign (which still focused testing mainly on symptomatic individuals) was on
185 the *Diamond Princess* cruise ship, where the rate of asymptomatic infection was 18%^{24,25}. In a mass testing
186 campaign in Iceland, where testing was offered to a segment of the general population (regardless of
187 symptoms), 43% of individuals were [[infected but? If you don't include this, it would imply that 57% were
188 showing symptoms.]] asymptomatic at the time of testing²⁶. Thus, the actual percentage of pre-symptomatic
189 and asymptomatic cases is currently unknown, but it is clear that a large number of SARS CoV2 new
190 infections derive from undetected infections. Controlling the outbreaks by isolation or even by increased
191 population testing is a big challenge and may be difficult to implement. We thus determined the efficacy of
192 mask wearing and SD in the context of different proportions of asymptomatic incidence. We assume that
193 asymptomatic individuals are less infectious than symptomatic individuals: asymptomatic individuals may
194 have lower viral loads and reduced coughing, sneezing, and nasal secretions, all of which may facilitate
195 transmission²⁷⁻²⁹. However, the model considers that symptomatic infected individuals isolated themselves
196 12 hours after the onset of symptoms, because they get hospitalized or self-isolated. In contrast,
197 asymptomatic individuals remain infectious, circulate and transmit for a period of 7 days (Fig. 3A). Because
198 some individuals can be pre-symptomatic (i.e., symptoms emerge later after the initial incubation time (Fig.
199 2B, $t = 5.1$ days)), we modelled infectivity of asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic as curve that declines linearly
200 until the individual is no longer infectious, after 7 days³⁰. Using these assumptions, we carried out
201 simulations, varying the percent of asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic cases to determine the efficiency of non-
202 pharmacological interventions in populations with 25, 50, and 75% pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic
203 infected individuals (Fig. 3).

204 Our simulations demonstrate that the total number of infected individuals increases linearly with
205 the increase of the percentage of asymptomatic individuals in the population (Fig. 3B). To compare each
206 condition, we normalized the peak of new daily infected individuals to conditions in which no one practiced
207 SD or wore masks. Strikingly, increasing the percentage of individuals wearing masks linearly reduces the
208 normalized peak number of infected individuals per day (Fig. 3B). For instance, when 40% of the individuals
209 wear face masks, the peak number of infected decreases similarly independently of the percent of

210 asymptomatic cases considered (to 0.6–0.7, Fig. 3B). Furthermore, the linear relationship between the
211 decrease in peak number of newly infected individuals per day and increase in percent individuals wearing
212 masks is independent of the proportion of asymptomatic individuals in the population (Fig. 3B). This finding
213 indicates that, when the fraction of asymptomatic cases is high, as in the case for COVID-19, wearing face
214 masks is as effective to reduce the peak number of infected as when a low percentage of individuals are
215 asymptotically infected.

216 In contrast, SD was only effective in populations with high incidence of asymptomatic infections
217 when a very high fraction of the population practice SD (more than 60%) (Fig. 3C). Furthermore, the low
218 efficacy of SD as a containment strategy is more pronounced when the proportion of asymptomatic
219 individuals increase (compare 25, 50, and 75% Fig. 3C). Of note, if the number of individuals wearing face
220 masks is high, increasing the number of individuals practicing SD has negligible effects on the daily number
221 of infected individuals (not shown). One noteworthy observation from our model is that, at high rates of
222 asymptomatic infection (e.g. 75 %), there is more variability in the protective effect of SD (Figure 3C, note
223 larger 95% confidence intervals if 80% practice SD). This suggests that stochastic nature of epidemics
224 affects the efficiency of SD more significantly than the efficiency of mask wearing.

225 Our analysis uncovers a linear relationship between the fraction of a population wearing masks and
226 the reduction in infection rate. In contrast, we find SD requires a high fraction of compliance to be effective.
227 These findings indicate that having a high percentage of individuals wearing face masks is more beneficial
228 in preventing virus spread and reducing the peak number of infected individuals than having a high percent
229 of people practicing SD. Notably, the benefit of wearing masks is not affected if the percent of pre-
230 symptomatic and asymptomatic increases.

231 **Interplay of face masks and social distancing for controlling infection spread and protecting from**
232 **COVID-19.** Next, we determined the average cumulative incidence as a function of the percentage of
233 individuals wearing masks and practicing SD (standard deviation described in Fig. SM3-A). When neither
234 SD nor masks were used our simulations indicate that up to 95% of the population will end up infected,
235 leading to unacceptable levels of mortality and morbidity. When the proportion of the population wearing
236 masks was increased, no significant effect on the total number of infected people was noted until more than
237 60% of the population wore masks. However, if 80% of people use masks, the average cumulative
238 incidence of infection decreased to around 35%. Therefore, wearing face masks alone would greatly limit
239 the spread of the virus. In contrast, SD alone does not have a significant effect. Increasing SD compliance
240 to 80% only reduced total infections by 8%, and 87% of the population was eventually infected. Importantly,
241 the combination of wearing masks and practicing SD by a high proportion of the population dramatically
242 reduces the total number of infected individuals to 1–10% of the population (Fig. 4A; and Fig. SM2-C).

243 To gain additional insights into the characteristics of the epidemic in response to these mitigation
244 strategies, we studied the shape of the epidemic curve by calculating the peak and full-width half-maximum
245 (FWHM) of the peak of the new daily infections (Methods). While the peak reports on the maximum number
246 of daily infections at the height of the epidemic, the FWHM is a simple way to represent the duration of the
247 characteristic peak of new daily infections. Indeed, FWHM reports on the extinction time of the infection
248 within the population (number of days until no individual is still infected) (Fig. 4A, and Fig. SM3-B standard
249 deviation). A larger FWHM corresponds to a flatter but longer epidemic curve. A flatter epidemic curve
250 enables better management of the epidemic, as the healthcare system is not overwhelmed by the number
251 of cases at a given time. Initially, the FWHM was calculated assuming no individual practice SD. FWHM
252 was ~8.3 days if none of the individuals wears masks, ~12.8 if 40% of individuals wear masks, and but
253 increases dramatically to 85.5 when 80% of the population wears masks (Fig. 2B). Our data indicate that
254 wearing masks has a more profound effect than SD on flattening the epidemic curve. For instance, when
255 80% of the population wears masks, the epidemic curve is eight times flatter than without any non-
256 pharmacological intervention (Fig. 4B). In contrast, if 80% of the population practices SD, the flattening of
257 the curve is less than threefold. The most dramatic effect on flattening of the curve is observed when
258 wearing masks is combined with SD; for instance, if 80% of the population wears masks and 80% practices
259 SD, the curve is flattened over 10-fold, compared to no intervention.

260 We also find that the reduction in the number of infected individuals per day correlates with a
261 lengthening of the outbreak. Broadening of the peak affects the extinction time of the infection (Fig. 4C).
262 For instance, when the percentage of individuals wearing face masks rises from 0 to 80% of the population,

263 the extinction time increases from ~39.0 to ~53 days (Fig. 4C). Similarly, as a higher proportion of
264 individuals practice SD, the time to extinction of the infection also increases (Fig. 4C, ~39 to 51 days for
265 0% to 80% of SD). Importantly, even though the time to epidemic extinction is extended, the total number
266 of infected individuals dramatically decreases (Fig. 4A). However, if a higher proportion of the population
267 (80%) wears face masks and practices SD, the time to epidemic extinction is reduced because the total
268 number of infected individuals is dramatically reduced (Fig. 4A).

269 To relate the impact of these interventions to their societal impact, we determined the number of
270 deaths per million after each mitigation strategy, assuming a mortality rate of ~3%³¹. This analysis illustrates
271 the heavy cost of lives of the virus, but also demonstrates that a high level of mask wearing compliance is
272 the most effective non-pharmacological approach to protect human lives, particularly when combined with
273 even moderate SD measures (Fig. 4D). In contrast, SD, without masks wearing is not effective to reduce
274 mortality (Fig. 4E). Finally, our simulations predict that increasing the proportion of the population wearing
275 masks will increase the time to outbreak extinction (from ~40 to ~60 days) (Fig. 4F). Together with the
276 broadening of the peak (Fig. 4C), this shows an effective flattening of the curve. Importantly, with 80% mask
277 wearing, we observed an increase in the statistical distribution from the average time to extinction (Fig. 4F,
278 see 95% confidence intervals). Thus, a generally low disease incidence triggers stochastic events leading
279 to extinction of the infection. Our simulations represent real outbreak scenarios and reveal that as the
280 outbreak approaches its extinction there is an increase in the uncertainty of whether or not the infection has
281 been completely eliminated, which argue to be prudent before society reopening can be done safely.

282

283 Discussion

284 Here we use realistic simulations rooted in experimentally measured parameters of SARS-Cov2 spread,
285 contagion mode and mortality, to evaluate two available NPIs that reduce the spread of a respiratory
286 infection, such as COVID-19. In our simulation, we assumed proper use of FDA-approved face masks. We
287 showed that a high degree of compliance in the use of masks, regardless of whether the wearer displays
288 symptoms, slows the spread of infection. Face masks substantially reduce the transmission of respiratory
289 droplets and aerosols containing viral particles³¹. Increasing the fraction of the population wearing face
290 masks reduces the number of new infected individuals per day and flattened the curve of total individuals
291 infected (Fig. 2A and 4A). These two effects should reduce mortality and morbidity, alleviate the current
292 stress on healthcare systems, and enable a more effective management of severe cases. However, solely
293 wearing masks cannot entirely prevent an outbreak from occurring. It cannot by itself extinguish the virus,
294 since as long as a small fraction of the population is non-compliant, the virus can persist in the population.
295 Our models show that combining proper use of masks with practices such as SD, indisputably decreases
296 the number of new infected individuals per day (Fig. 2). This conclusion is in agreement with that of ODE
297 models³².

298 Our analysis provides guidance for policies to protect the population from COVID-19. Optimizing
299 the use of masks with SD practices effectively limits the virus spread and reduces several parameters in
300 the epidemic, including cumulative incidence, shape of the peak, and the extinction rate (Fig. 3). In
301 particular, we observed that wearing masks is more important than SD. Even in a population with a high
302 number of asymptomatic infections, increasing the use of masks up to 80% results in a significant reduction
303 in infection (Fig. 4A). Meanwhile, even 80% of individuals practicing SD has only a marginal effect (Fig.
304 4D). This result can be understood in terms of contact rate, since we assume that asymptomatic infectious
305 individuals have higher mobility than symptomatic infectious ones. If the vast majority of the population is
306 asymptomatic, then high compliance with face mask use is a key factor for curbing the epidemic.

307 Our simulations also provide insights into how enforcing different mitigation practices affects the
308 length of the epidemic. Assuming a homogenous population, the trajectory of epidemic extinction lasts 50–
309 60 days, when 80% of the population either wears masks or practices SD (Fig. 4C). However, when 80%
310 of the population is wearing masks and 0% of the population is practicing SD, the cumulative incidence is
311 reduced three times (~35%), and the peak is very broad (FWHM of ~ 85 days). In contrast, when the
312 population solely practices SD (80%), the majority of the population (93%) will end up infected, and the
313 peak of daily infected individuals will be sharper (FWHM of ~ 20 days).

314 Our model indicates that the synergistic utilization of face masks wearing and social distancing
315 practice is most effective controlling SARS-CoV-2 spread. We observed that wearing masks in combination
316 with some degree of SD relaxes the need for a complete lockout, leading to a partial reopening of the
317 society. The effectiveness masks wearing to control virus spread is not reduced if a large fraction of the
318 population is asymptomatic. This suggests that, in the absence of universal testing, widespread use of face
319 masks is necessary and sufficient to prevent a large outbreak. Our results are supported by the real data
320 of Korea³³ and Taiwan³⁴, where an early mandate to requiring face mask usage, in combination with SD,
321 severely limited the spread of the virus. While more work is necessary to specifically assess the impact of
322 other variables shaping COVID-19 outbreaks, such as increased mobility, age stratification, testing a
323 fraction of the population, our study can accurately inform strategies to reduce the spread of the virus. In
324 particular, our results may be highly relevant toward informing specific realistic situations, such as the
325 spread of the disease in a confined space, where effective SD may not be easily achievable (e.g., schools,
326 essential businesses, correctional facilities, public transportation, hospitals). These strategies, if effectively
327 implemented, will save countless lives from the SARS-Cov2 infection. According to our model, if the United
328 States (330 million people) does not implement any NPIs, then ~627,000 people are expected to die.
329 Contrastingly, if 80% of the population wear face masks, that number would significantly shrink to about
330 250,000. If both face masks and SD were practiced by 80% of the population from the start of a pandemic,
331 the mortality rate decreases to 65,600 people.

332 **Materials and Methods**

333 We developed and used our python codes using the NumPy library version 1.15.4³⁶ to carry out ABM and
334 describe the dynamic evolution of a SEAIR system affected by COVID-19 disease, in which each individual
335 can be in a susceptible (S), exposed (E), asymptomatic infected (A), symptomatic infected (I), or recovered
336 (R) status. In addition, each individual can wear a face mask (M) or can practice social distancing (SD),
337 where wearing face masks or practicing SD are independent binary values of an individual. In the
338 simulations, each individual was represented by a position in a 2-D lattice of 21x21 dimension. Individual
339 initial positions are assigned randomly by NumPy's random module, and the simulations start with all
340 susceptible individuals and only one exposed. During the simulation, each individual move along a
341 randomly oriented trajectory at a constant velocity, moves the same distance between each time step of
342 the simulation, and interacts with individuals whose position is within a fixed diameter of another individual.
343 The data from each individual are saved as vectors of attributes, including position, velocity, state (S, E, A,
344 I, R, M, SD), and number of individuals they come into contact with at every simulation time step. A time
345 step corresponds to 1 hour. We implemented the state of M by defining sub-routine during the interaction
346 between two individuals where the probability of infection was reduced by an amount corresponding to
347 which of the two individuals are wearing a mask. For the SD state, we assigned the individual to be
348 stationary and not follow along a randomly assigned trajectory.

349 We refer to Ferguson et al. for defining the rules governing the interactions among individuals¹⁷.
350 For the interaction between symptomatic infected and susceptible individuals, the infection probability was
351 randomly sampled from a gamma distribution with a mean of 1 and a shape of 2.5, whereas for that between
352 asymptomatic infected and susceptible individuals, the infection probability is reduced by 33 %. We assume
353 this reduction of infectivity for the asymptomatic, based on the absence of transmission-aiding symptoms,
354 such as coughing, sneezing, and a runny nose¹⁷. The time between a susceptible individual being exposed
355 to being in the infectious infected state is 5.1 days¹⁷. Symptomatic infected individuals are infectious for 12
356 hours before self-isolating. After this time, we assume that these individuals no longer infect those around
357 them because they are hospitalized or self-isolating. Asymptomatic infected individuals are infectious for 7
358 days, and the infectivity linearly declines until the individual is no longer infectious on day 7³⁷. If an infected,
359 a susceptible, or both individuals are wearing a mask their probability of another individual being infected
360 is reduced to 5, 15, or 0%, respectively, from the original gamma distribution.

361 First, we carried out a simulation with 500 individuals with 0% of individuals wearing face masks
362 and 0% practicing SD to optimize parameters as velocities and individual density to obtain a basic
363 reproduction number, R_0 , equal to 2.5, based on reported values. The basic reproduction number was
364 computed from the mean number of symptomatic cases, resulting from a single symptomatic individual.
365 Then, we carried out four more sets of simulations in which we increased the percentage of individuals
366 wearing masks by the 20, 40, 60, and 80%. Finally, for each of these simulation sets we carried out four
367 more sets in which we increased the percentage of individuals practicing SD by the 20, 40, 60, and 80%.

368 Simulations are stochastic, and we simulated each condition 100 times to increase the statistical power of
369 the analysis. In total, we simulated 25 different conditions for a total of 2500 simulations, 100 for each
370 condition. In all these simulations, the probability of a new infection being asymptomatic was 50%.
371 Simulations were run until there were no individuals either infected or exposed. Summary values were
372 computed by methods in the NumPy module. Error bars were calculated by the standard deviation method
373 in NumPy. The full-width half-maximum (FWHM) was calculated for each simulation from the newly infected
374 per day data by taking the maximum and using it to find the days that intersect the value of half the maximum
375 value. The first and last days of this intersection were then used to calculate the number of days of the
376 FWHM. From the set of FWHM for each simulation, an average and standard deviation were calculated
377 using the NumPy module. FWHM error bars are large due to a large variation in how flat the curves are.
378 Graphs were created by using the Matplotlib³⁸ and Seaborn³⁹ modules in python.

379 We followed the same protocol described above to perform simulations, varying the probability of
380 a new infection being asymptomatic from 25 to 75%. Finally, to monitor the reproducibility of our results
381 with a larger population and contrast with real data, we ran four sets of 30 simulations with 5000 individuals
382 in the combinations of 0 or 80% SD and 0 or 80% wearing masks. All 5000 individual simulations were
383 done with 50% asymptomatic infection rates.

384 As the position, trajectory, and state of each individual in the simulation are explicitly known, using
385 the matplotlib library's animation package, we converted each time step of the simulation to an image in a
386 movie, representing 1 day as a second spanning the length of the simulation.

387 For each simulation, we saved in a .csv in tidy data format the summary values of the simulations,
388 which we used for the analysis. The simulation was written in python and all scripts are available on GitHub
389 at https://github.com/adamcatching/SARS_SEIR_Simulation, simulations were generated using script
390 mask_single_sim.py.

391

392

393 **Acknowledgments**

394 We acknowledge the use of the UCSF Computing Cluster Wynton (<https://wynton.ucsf.edu/hpc/index.html>).
395 We thank Judith Frydman, Alma Andino-Frydman and Patrick Dolan for his encouraging discussions.

396

397 **Author contributions**

398 A. C., S. C., and M. T. Y. conceived the study. A. C. and S. C. designed the simulations. A. C. wrote and
399 executed the simulations. A. C., S. C., and S. B. analyzed the data. S. B. and R. A. provided guidance and
400 support. All authors wrote the manuscript.

401

402 **Competing interest statement**

403 The authors declare no competing interests.

404

405

406 **References**

407

408


- 409 1 Bourouiba, L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential
410 Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. *Jama* **323**, 1837,
411 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4756 (2020).
- 412 2 Miller, I. F., Becker, A. D., Grenfell, B. T. & Metcalf, C. J. E. Disease and healthcare
413 burden of COVID-19 in the United States. *Nature Medicine*, 1, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-
414 0952-y (2020).
- 415 3 Bai, Y. *et al.* Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *Jama* **323**,
416 1406, doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2565 (2020).
- 417 4 Wölfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*
418 **581**, 465, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x (2020).
- 419 5 Schwartz, I. B., Kaufman, J., Hu, K. & Bianco, S. Predicting the impact of asymptomatic
420 transmission, non-pharmaceutical intervention and testing on the spread of COVID19.
- 421 6 Feng, S. *et al.* Rational use of face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*
422 *Respiratory Medicine* **8**, 434, doi:10.1016/s2213-2600(20)30134-x (2020).
- 423 7 Ng, K. *et al.* COVID-19 and the Risk to Health Care Workers: A Case Report. *Annals of*
424 *Internal Medicine*, doi:10.7326/l20-0175 (2020).
- 425 8 Suess, T. *et al.* The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of influenza
426 transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial; Berlin, Germany, 2009-
427 2011. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **12**, 1, doi:10.1186/1471-2334-12-26 (2012).
- 428 9 Leung, N. H. L. *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face
429 masks. *Nature Medicine* **26**, 676, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2 (2020).
- 430 10 Offeddu, V., Yung, C. F., Low, M. S. F. & Tam, C. C. Effectiveness of Masks and
431 Respirators Against Respiratory Infections in Healthcare Workers: A Systematic Review
432 and Meta-Analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **65**, 1934, doi:10.1093/cid/cix681 (2017).
- 433 11 Konda, A. *et al.* Aerosol Filtration Efficiency of Common Fabrics Used in Respiratory
434 Cloth Masks. *ACS Nano* **14**, 6339, doi:10.1021/acsnano.0c03252 (2020).
- 435 12 Howard, J. *et al.* Face Masks Against COVID-19: An Evidence Review.
436 doi:10.20944/preprints202004.0203.v1 (2020).
- 437 13 Kuniya, T. Prediction of the Epidemic Peak of Coronavirus Disease in Japan, 2020. *Journal*
438 *of Clinical Medicine* **9**, doi:10.3390/jcm9030789 (2020).
- 439 14 Ngonghala, C. N. *et al.* Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical
440 interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Mathematical Biosciences* **325**,
441 doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2020.108364 (2020).

- 442 15 Bauer, A. L., Beauchemin, C. A. A. & Perelson, A. S. Agent-based modeling of host–
443 pathogen systems: The successes and challenges. *Information Sciences* **179**, 1379,
444 doi:10.1016/j.ins.2008.11.012 (2009).
- 445 16 Rahmandad, H., Hu, K., Tebbens, R. J. D. & Thompson, K. M. Development of an
446 individual-based model for polioviruses: implications of the selection of network type and
447 outcome metrics. *Epidemiology and Infection* **139**, 836, doi:10.1017/s0950268810001676
448 (2011).
- 449 17 Ferguson, N. *et al.* Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-
450 19 mortality and healthcare demand.
- 451 18 Liang, M. *et al.* Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus transmission: A
452 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*,
453 doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101751 (2020).
- 454 19 Oran, D. P. & Topol, E. J. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Annals of*
455 *Internal Medicine*, doi:10.7326/m20-3012 (2020).
- 456 20 Ing, A. J., Cocks, C. & Green, J. P. COVID-19: in the footsteps of Ernest Shackleton.
457 *Thorax* **75**, 693, doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215091 (2020).
- 458 21 Arons, M. M. *et al.* Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a Skilled
459 Nursing Facility. *New England Journal of Medicine* **382**, 2081,
460 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2008457 (2020).
- 461 22 Day, M. Covid-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. *Bmj* **369**,
462 doi:10.1136/bmj.m1375 (2020).
- 463 23 Cline, S. *Cases at seafood plant cause spike in Oregon COVID numbers | News Break*,
464 <[https://www.newsbreak.com/oregon/salem/news/1581086288035/cases-at-seafood-](https://www.newsbreak.com/oregon/salem/news/1581086288035/cases-at-seafood-plant-cause-spike-in-oregon-covid-numbers)
465 [plant-cause-spike-in-oregon-covid-numbers](https://www.newsbreak.com/oregon/salem/news/1581086288035/cases-at-seafood-plant-cause-spike-in-oregon-covid-numbers)> (
- 466 24 Moriarty, L. F. Public Health Responses to COVID-19 Outbreaks on Cruise Ships —
467 Worldwide, February–March 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **69**,
468 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6912e3 (2020).
- 469 25 Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A. & Chowell, G. Estimating the asymptomatic
470 proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond Princess
471 cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro Surveillanc: Bulletin Europeen Sur Les*
472 *Maladies Transmissibles = European Communicable Disease Bulletin* **25**,
473 doi:10.2807/1560-7917.es.2020.25.10.2000180 (2020).
- 474 26 Gudbjartsson, D. F. *et al.* Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *New*
475 *England Journal of Medicine* **382**, 2302, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2006100 (2020).
- 476 27 Buitrago-Garcia, D. C. *et al.* Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a living systematic
477 review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.04.25.20079103 (2020).
- 478 28 Sakurai, A. *et al.* Natural History of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *New England*
479 *Journal of Medicine* **0**, doi:10.1056/NEJMc2013020 (2020).

- 480 29 Fernandez, M. *WHO: Data suggests it's "very rare" for coronavirus to spread through*
481 *asymptomatics,* <[https://www.axios.com/who-coronavirus-asymptomatic-patients-](https://www.axios.com/who-coronavirus-asymptomatic-patients-08d84e31-1846-44d8-8fe1-2343ff850764.html)
482 [08d84e31-1846-44d8-8fe1-2343ff850764.html](https://www.axios.com/who-coronavirus-asymptomatic-patients-08d84e31-1846-44d8-8fe1-2343ff850764.html)> (
- 483 30 *Advice on the use of masks in the community, during home care and in healthcare settings*
484 *in the context of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak,*
485 <[https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)
486 [community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)
487 [coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)-outbreak](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)> (
- 488 31 *Mortality Risk of COVID-19 - Statistics and Research,*
489 <<https://ourworldindata.org/mortality-risk-covid>> (
- 490 32 Grover, C. Efficacy of face masks depends on spatial relation between host and recipient
491 and who is being protected. *Bmj* **369**, doi:10.1136/bmj.m2016 (2020).
- 492 33 Stutt, R. O. J. H., Retkute, R., Bradley, M., Gilligan, C. A. & Colvin, J. A modelling
493 framework to assess the likely effectiveness of facemasks in combination with ‘lock-down’
494 in managing the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical,*
495 *Physical and Engineering Sciences* **476**, doi:10.1098/rspa.2020.0376 (2020).
- 496 34 Cheng, V. C.-C. *et al.* The role of community-wide wearing of face mask for control of
497 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) epidemic due to SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of*
498 *Infection*, doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.024 (2020).
- 499 35 Yuan, E. J. *et al.* Where to buy face masks? Survey of applications using Taiwan’s open
500 data in the time of COVID-19. *Journal of the Chinese Medical Association Latest Articles*,
501 doi:10.1097/jcma.0000000000000325 (2020).
- 502 36 Van Der Walt, S., Colbert, S. C. & Varoquaux, G. The NumPy array: a structure for
503 efficient numerical computation. *Computing in Science & Engineering* **13**, 22,
504 doi:10.1109/mcse.2011.37 (2011).
- 505 37 He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19.
506 *Nature Medicine*, 1, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5 (2020).
- 507 38 *Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment - IEEE Journals & Magazine,*
508 <<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4160265>> (
- 509 39 *mwaskom/seaborn: v0.8.1 (September 2017) | Zenodo,*
510 <<https://zenodo.org/record/883859>> (
- 511
512
513
514

515


516 **Figures**



517

518 **Figure 1. Individual states and rules of interactions.** Using the same coloring system used in animated
 519 simulations, we show the different states an individual can be in during a simulation. Individuals keep the
 520 masked or not masked attribute assigned at initialization during the course of the simulation. **A)** Spread of
 521 infection is caused by interactions of overlapping trajectories between infected and susceptible individuals.
 522 If the distance between individuals, d , is less than the radius of the two individuals, r , then an interaction
 523 occurs. Interactions initiate the generation of a random number that determines if transmission occurs. The
 524 chance of infection is randomly generated, based on a gamma distribution with shape parameter, α , of
 525 0.25. This probability is further modulated by which individuals in the interactions are wearing face masks.


526 **B)** Agents are shown at their positions and states during snapshots of the simulation. Representative
 527 simulations of are shown of 0, 40, or 80% of the population wearing face masks. Snapshots are collected
 528 at days 0, 20, and 40 of the simulations. **C)** Progression of the outbreak, the trajectory of the number of
 529 new daily infected individuals (Currently infected) and cumulatively infected from a representative
 530 simulation are graphed in light blue and black, respectively.



531

532 **Figure 2. Average new infections per day when varying the population wearing masks and**
533 **practicing social distancing. A)** SD is implemented by assigning agents to not move along a trajectory
534 during the simulation. This lack of movement reduces the number of trajectories overlaps between agents
535 and subsequently reduces the number of transmission events. **B)** The number of new infections per day for
536 0, 40, or 80% of a population wearing face-masks are displayed by red, blue, or green trajectories,
537 respectively, for 0% of the population practicing SD, for the 40% and for the 80%. Simulations were
538 repeated 100 times for each condition, the curves and the highlighted regions around the curves represent
539 the mean value +/- one standard deviation.

540



541

542

543

544

545

546

547


548

549

550

551

Figure 3. Effects of the asymptomatic population on the infected peak number. **A)** The peak number of infected individuals is represented as a function of the percentage of the population wearing face masks and as a function of the percentage of asymptomatic individuals. 25% of asymptomatic individuals is colored gray, 50% bright blue, 75% dark blue as the legend reports. Sensitivity analysis reports how the peak number of infected individuals is affected by the 25% (**B**), 50% (**C**), and 75% (**D**) of asymptomatic individuals varying the percentage of the population wearing face masks and the percentage of the population practicing SD. The legend reports the percentage of individuals practicing SD: 0% is colored gray, 20% bright blue, 40% dark blue, 60% purple, 80% red. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals calculated for both B) and C).



552

553 **Figure 4. Summary values from 2500 simulations of varying percentages of population wearing**
 554 **masks or social distancing.** **A)** Proportion of infected population. The average cumulative incidence is
 555 represented as a function of the population practicing SD or wearing a mask, which are given by the x and
 556 y axis, respectively. **B)** The shape of the daily new infection curve. Full-width half-maximum (FWHM),
 557 denoting the number of days between the first day and last day of cases that have half the peak number of
 558 infected individuals. **C)** Extinction rate of the epidemic estimated as the average number of days for which
 559 the simulation reports no new infected individuals. In the figure, the numbers represent the mean value
 560 calculated over 100 of simulations carried out for each condition. For clarity, we reported the standard
 561 deviation of the mean for each value reported in this figure in Fig. SM5. **D)** and **E)** Number of death people.
 562 Extrapolated for one million individuals from the cumulative incidence of infections estimated from our
 563 model at a mortality rate of 3%. **F)** Number of days from the start of infection spread to the last infected
 564 agent recovering. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals calculated for **D)**, **E)** and **F)**.

565

566