Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Michael H. Haischer^{1,2}, Rachel N. Beilfuss^{1,2}, Meggie Rose Hart¹, Lauren Opielinski¹, Emma Schmit¹, David Wrucke³, Helena Zhao², Toni D. Uhrich^{1,2}, Sandra K. Hunter^{1,2*}

¹Department of Physical Therapy, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.

²Athletic and Human Performance Research Center, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

³Department of Biomedical Sciences, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA.

*Corresponding author

E-mail: sandra.hunter@marquette.edu

Abstract

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

Introduction

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

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

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Materials and Methods

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

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Results and Discussion

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

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

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

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

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

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Conclusions

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

References

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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

Short Title: Who was wearing a mask in 2021?

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