

1 Community-level face mask usage in Boston, MA

2
3 Meera McLane, MPH[¶], Sharon M. Casey, MS[¶], Allison Gallagher¹, Maame Akosua Ohemeng-
4 Tinyase¹, Sabina Yosif¹, Sree Ramya Chaparala¹, Sarah Lincoln¹, Eleanor J. Murray, ScD^{1*}

5 6 7 **Affiliations**

8 ¹Department of Epidemiology, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston,
9 Massachusetts, USA.

10
11
12 *Corresponding author

13 Email: ejmurray@bu.edu (EJM)

14
15
16 ¶ MM and SMC are joint first authors

17 18 19 **Summary**

20 **What is already known about this topic?**

21 Community-level face mask use is encouraged as an important preventive measure against
22 COVID-19 transmission, and evidence suggests that jurisdictions which implement face mask
23 mandates see a subsequent decline in COVID incidence.

24 **What is added by this report?**

25 In the Greater Boston area when a face mask mandate is in effect, 95% of people observed were
26 wearing some type of face covering. Most of which were wearing fabric/cloth coverings (51%)
27 or single use surgical masks (40%). Of those wearing a face covering, 85% were appropriately
28 fitted. Indoor locations have higher adherence of appropriately worn face masks, compared to
29 outdoor locations.

30 **What are the implications for public health practice?**

31 Adherence with face mask mandates was very high, but many individuals wore fabric face masks
32 with unknown filtration efficacy. In addition, it was common for individuals to mis-wear, adjust,
33 or remove their masks. Public health policies requiring mask use should include messaging about
34 appropriate type and best practices for use.

35 **Introduction**

36
37 Early strategies to reduce the spread of SARS-CoV-2 focused on non-pharmaceutical
38 interventions, including personal protective equipment (PPE) [1,2]. While evidence supports the
39 use of face coverings in high-risk settings [3], data from community-level settings are limited.
40 Recent data suggests that jurisdictions with mask mandates experienced a decrease in COVID-19
41 incidence [3]. The high transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2, combined with asymptomatic and pre-
42 symptomatic transmission, strengthens the recommendation for universal use of face coverings
43 [4,5], but an ongoing shortage of medical-grade masks has led to advocacy for cloth face
44 coverings among the general public.

45
46 Several challenges are associated with the use of fabric face coverings. First, due to unknown
47 design and filtration capacity, the efficacy of cloth masks is unclear [6]. Second, there has been a
48 lack of guidance on appropriate mask wearing techniques. Third, concerns exist about risk
49 compensation behavior associated with mask use. This study observed the use and adherence of
50 masks among communities in the Greater Boston area of Massachusetts. Ninety-five percent of
51 people observed were wearing masks and 85% wore them appropriately. Interestingly, our
52 results show a high level of agreement between levels and appropriateness of mask wearing in
53 the Boston area with those reported for Louisville Kentucky [7]. Results of our study will
54 contribute to understanding the heterogeneity and adherence of mask wearing in the community
55 and how this might reduce COVID-19 transmission.

56 57 **Methods**

58
59 Data were collected by in-person observations between October and December 2020 at both
60 outdoor and indoor locations with safe areas for observation, including public areas, grocery
61 stores, an airport, and public transportation (buses and trains). Six study personnel recorded data
62 from adults and adolescents of perceived mask-wearing age according to CDC guidelines, either
63 on paper or electronically, on varying days and times, including mornings, afternoons, and
64 evenings, on weekdays and weekends. Each observer recorded data at a single location for 10
65 minutes per session. Study personnel recorded face covering data for individuals they could
66 directly see. Observers remained stationary in locations, where possible, however several indoor
67 locations required the observer to move to maintain safe distance. Individuals were recorded as
68 one observation per session. Each observer pre-specified observation rules at the start of the
69 observation session, which were location and setting specific. Some examples include “record
70 every individual in the enclosed space” or “individuals that enter this space during the session”.
71 For indoor sessions, individuals observed inside or walking outside directly towards the observer
72 were included. Decision factors also depended on how busy the area being recorded was.

73

74 Data recorded included 1) if an individual was wearing any face covering (yes/no), 2) type of
75 covering (N-95-type; surgical type; fabric/cloth; neck buff/gaiter; t-shirt/scarf; or other), 3)
76 number of face coverings worn, 4) how the covering was worn/fitted (appropriately - according
77 to CDC guidelines, completely covered the nose and mouth and was secured under the chin;
78 appropriate but loose - may not cover nose appropriately; below the nose; below the mouth/on
79 chin; or other), 5) touching of the face covering (pulling on/off). Other PPE, including face-
80 shields and goggles, was also recorded. Data on children perceived by the study member to be
81 less than 2 years were not collected as they were exempt from these local guidelines. No data on
82 perceived gender identity/sex, race/ethnicity, or age were collected in an effort to avoid
83 stigmatization of any sub-populations, and due to challenges with observer-perception of these
84 characteristics. The Institutional Review Board at Boston University determined this study as
85 non-human subject research. Data were compiled into a Google Sheet document and verified for
86 accuracy. Analyses were conducted using SAS (version 9.4; SAS Studio) and figures were
87 generated using GraphPad Prism version 8.4 (GraphPad Software Inc, San Diego, CA).


88

89 **Results**

90

91 Observers conducted 40 10-minute sessions at 12 sites around the Greater Boston area (Fig 1),
92 during which 1,517 observations were recorded. Ninety-five percent of people observed were
93 wearing some type of face covering (n=1,447; Fig 2A). Fabric/cloth coverings (51%) and single
94 use surgical masks (40%) were the most prevalent, followed by N95-type masks (4%), neck buff
95 type (4%), or other face coverings such as bandanas (Table 1). Twelve people were recorded as
96 wearing more than one covering, 2 with goggles, and 1 with a face-shield.

97 **Figure 1. Map of data collection sites, Greater Boston area, Massachusetts.**



98
99

100 **Table 1. Frequency of Face Covering Type.**

Face Covering Type	(n=1,447/1,517, %)
N95/KN95-type	56 (3.9)
Surgical	572 (39.9)
Fabric or cloth	743 (51.7)
Neck buff	54 (3.7)
T-shirt or scarf	6 (0.4)
Other face covering*	4 (0.3)



101 *Bandana

102
103 Appropriately worn face masks were defined and recorded as fitted close to the face, covering
104 both the mouth and nose. In this sample, 85% wore appropriately fitted coverings; the remaining

105 15% wore the covering under their nose, too loosely, or below their mouth (Fig 2B). Most were
 106 not touching their face covering (94%). Slightly more people were touching the face covering
 107 and/or wore it inappropriately when outdoors versus indoors (Fig 2B).

108

109 **Figure 2B. Face mask adherence.** (A) Percentage of observations wearing a face covering,
 110 number of face coverings, and indoor/outdoor observation sessions. (B) Face covering fit and
 111 touching, stratified by indoor versus outdoor location.



112

113 **Discussion**

114
115 Evidence collected during the COVID-19 pandemic suggests that community mask wearing is an
116 effective strategy for controlling infectious diseases, including COVID-19 (4,6). However, most
117 research on the impacts of face mask use neglects to consider heterogeneity in mask use, type, or
118 method. This study collected these data in local settings to improve the ability to model the
119 impact of face mask policies on COVID-19 and other respiratory diseases.

120
121 Face mask usage was very high in the Boston area during the study period. However, the most
122 common type was fabric masks. The high proportion of individuals wearing these types of face
123 coverings highlights the importance of accounting for varying efficacy when studying the impact
124 of mask use. In addition, although mask use was generally good, many individuals were
125 observed to be wearing ill-fitting masks, wearing masks inappropriately, or adjusting or
126 removing their masks during our observation periods. This suggests a need for improved
127 messaging about the appropriate method for wearing, doffing, and donning face masks to ensure
128 maximum effectiveness, as well as the importance of considering imperfect use when modeling
129 the impact of mask mandates and other mask interventions.

130
131 Our data are an important contribution to the understanding of and practices related to mask
132 wearing. We encouraged that other researchers conduct similar surveys of their local
133 populations. Our survey tool can be found online at <https://osf.io/7dy54/> to facilitate other data
134 collection efforts. The dataset used in this study can be shared with researchers who have the
135 means to conduct larger-scale investigations of face mask wearing.

136
137 Face covering use is likely to vary widely between geographical regions and political
138 jurisdictions, and it is anticipated that the results are not widely generalizable outside the Boston,
139 MA area. However, our findings show a high degree of similarity between mask wearing
140 practices with previously reported mask wearing practices in indoor settings in Louisville
141 Kentucky [7]. Additional data on other jurisdictions is needed to understand how mask wearing
142 practices may change over the course of an outbreak, and how they vary by local political
143 environments.

144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152

153 **References**

154

155 1. CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
156 Published February 11, 2020. Accessed April 30, 2021.

157 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/masking-science-sars-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/masking-science-sars-cov2.html)
158 [cov2.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/masking-science-sars-cov2.html)

159 2. Honein MA. Summary of Guidance for Public Health Strategies to Address High Levels of
160 Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Related Deaths, December 2020. *MMWR*
161 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6949e2

162 3. Fischer CB, Adrien N, Silguero JJ, Hopper JJ, Chowdhury AI, Werler MM. Mask adherence
163 and rate of COVID-19 across the United States. *PLOS ONE.* 2021;16(4):e0249891.
164 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0249891

165 4. Lerner AM, Folkers GK, Fauci AS. Preventing the Spread of SARS-CoV-2 With Masks and
166 Other “Low-tech” Interventions. *JAMA.* 2020;324(19):1935. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.21946

167 5. Wang J, Pan L, Tang S, Ji JS, Shi X. Mask use during COVID-19: A risk adjusted strategy.
168 *Environ Pollut Barking Essex 1987.* 2020;266:115099. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2020.115099

169 6. Jefferson T, Jones M, Al-Ansary L, et al. *Physical Interventions to Interrupt or Reduce the*
170 *Spread of Respiratory Viruses. Part 1 - Face Masks, Eye Protection and Person Distancing:*
171 *Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.* Public and Global Health; 2020.
172 doi:10.1101/2020.03.30.20047217

173 7. Karimi, S, Salunkhe S, White K, et al. Prevalence of Unmasked and Improperly Masked
174 Behavior in Indoor Public Areas during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Analysis of a Stratified
175 Random Sample from Louisville, Kentucky. *PLOS ONE Rev.* Published online 2021.

176

177