

**Title: The Efficacy of Facemasks in the Prevention of COVID-19: A Systematic Review**

**Authors:** Bedir Alihsan<sup>1</sup>, Arrianna Mohammed<sup>1</sup>, Yash Bisen<sup>1</sup>, Janice Lester MLS<sup>2</sup>, Christian Nouryan MA<sup>1,3</sup>, Joseph Cervia MD<sup>1,4,5</sup>

[Balihsan1@pride.hofstra.edu](mailto:Balihsan1@pride.hofstra.edu), [amohammed1@pride.hofstra.edu](mailto:amohammed1@pride.hofstra.edu), [ybisen1@pride.hofstra.edu](mailto:ybisen1@pride.hofstra.edu)

**Institutional affiliations:**

1. Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell, Hempstead, NY, USA
2. Clinical Medical Library, Northwell Health, New Hyde Park, NY, USA
3. Feinstein Institute for Medical Research, Manhasset, NY, USA
4. Departments of Medicine and Pediatrics, Donald and Barbara Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell, Manhasset, New York, USA
5. Healthcare Partners IPA & MSO, Garden City, New York, USA

**Word count:** 1579 (not including abstract and references)

## Abstract

Facemasks have become a symbol of disease prevention in the context of COVID-19; yet, there still exists a paucity of collected scientific evidence surrounding their epidemiological efficacy in the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. This systematic review sought to analyze the efficacy of facemasks, regardless of type, on the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in both healthcare and community settings.

The initial review yielded 1732 studies, which were reviewed by three study team members. Sixty-one full text studies were found to meet entry criteria, and 13 studies yielded data that was used in the final analysis.

In all, 243 subjects were infected with COVID-19, of whom 97 had been wearing masks and 146 had not. The probability of getting COVID-19 for mask wearers was 7% (97/1463,  $p=0.002$ ), for non-mask wearers, probability was 52% (158/303,  $p=0.94$ ). The Relative Risk of getting COVID-19 for mask wearers was 0.13 (95% CI: 0.10-0.16).

Based on these results, we determined that across healthcare and community settings, those who wore masks were less likely to contract COVID-19. Future investigations are warranted as more information becomes available.

## Introduction

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), a member of the Coronaviridae family, is the causative agent of COVID-19. It is the seventh known coronavirus to infect humans: others include SARS-CoV-1, the causative agent of SARS, MERS-CoV, the causative agent of MERS, as well as HCoV-229E, -NL63, -OC43, and -HKU1 which are endemic human coronaviruses and are among the causative agents of the common cold.<sup>1</sup> SARS-CoV-2 is reported to have emerged from the Huanan South China Seafood Market in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China in late 2019. The virus quickly spread throughout the country, and then across the world. In response, the WHO declared a global health emergency on January 31, 2020, and later a pandemic on March 11, 2020.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the swiftness with which the virus spread, responses to the pandemic varied greatly by country. Throughout the course of the pandemic, the use of facemasks in prevention of the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 has remained one of the most contentious topics. Many East Asian countries, who had experience with the SARS epidemic in the early 2000s were quick to recommend that their citizens wear facemasks in public. Many of these countries had a public which remembered the SARS epidemic and had experience using facemasks in the prevention of viral transmission.<sup>3</sup> The Chinese government issued guidelines recommending the personal use of facemasks on January 31, 2020.<sup>4</sup> The government of Hong Kong recommended that its citizens use facemasks as early as January 24, 2020.<sup>5</sup> In contrast to this, the CDC did not recommend that U.S. citizens wear facemasks until early April<sup>6</sup> and the WHO did not officially recommend that members of the public wear masks until June 5, 2020.<sup>7</sup>

At the beginning of the pandemic, disruption of supply chains and increased use of personal protective equipment (PPE) caused concerns of widespread shortages, including facemasks.<sup>8</sup> These concerns may have influenced some of the initial recommendations by the CDC and WHO, as officials

feared that widespread use of facemasks might exacerbate PPE shortages, thus limiting supplies for healthcare workers treating COVID-19 in hospital settings. These initial conflicting guidelines by government and international bodies became a source of confusion in the general public, and contributed to the politicization of facemask use in places like the U.S.<sup>9</sup>

Despite disparity in facemask use by country early in the pandemic, many public policy decisions were made in the absence of guidance from peer-reviewed scientific sources. Even though the facemask has become a symbol of disease prevention in the context of COVID-19, there still exists a paucity of collected scientific evidence surrounding the epidemiological efficacy of facemasks in the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. This systematic review sought to analyze the efficacy of facemasks, regardless of type, on the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in both healthcare and community settings. It was hypothesized that wearing a facemask would be associated with lower rates of COVID-19.

## Methods

A systematic review was conducted to identify relevant studies. A medical librarian conducted a literature search utilizing Pubmed, Web of Science, Embase and Cochrane library from April 2020 to August 2020. Citations were deduplicated using Covidence.org. Only English language articles were retrieved, and conference proceedings were omitted. Results were reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) criteria. The following broad strategy was utilized:

Masks: Mask[text word(tw)] OR masks[tw] OR facemask[tw] OR facemasks[tw] OR “face mask”[tw] OR “face masks”[tw] OR “face covering”[tw] OR “face coverings”[tw] OR “masks[medical subject headings (mesh)].”

COVID-19: "COVID-19"[Supplementary Concept] OR "severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2"[Supplementary Concept] OR "Coronavirus Infections"[Mesh] OR “COVID-19”[tw] OR “covid19”[tw] OR “covid2019”[tw] OR “ncov2019”[tw] OR “ncov-2019”[tw] OR “2019-nCoV”[tw] OR “2019nCoV”[tw] OR “nCoV”[tw] OR “2019 ncov”[tw] OR “2019nCoV”[tw] OR "COV 2"[tw] OR “CoV2”[tw] OR “SARS-CoV-2”[tw] OR “SARSCoV2”[tw] OR “sars cov 2”[tw] OR "sars coronavirus 2"[tw] OR “HCoV-19”[tw] OR “novel coronavirus”[tw] or “covid”[tw] OR "coronavirus disease 2019"[tw] OR 2019 “novel coronavirus disease”[tw] OR “covid-19 pandemic”[tw] OR “2019 novel coronavirus infection”[tw] OR “SARS-CoV-2 infection”[tw] or “2019-nCoV infection”[tw] or “COVID-19 virus disease”[tw] or “2019 novel coronavirus infection”[tw] or “2019-nCoV disease”[tw].

The initial review yielded 1732 studies, which were reviewed by three study team members. Sixty-one full text studies were found to meet the criteria, and 13 studies were used in the final analysis. (Figure 1) Frequencies, relative risk, confidence intervals and t-tests were calculated where appropriate, to measure differences between groups who reported wearing masks vs. not wearing masks for the overall study group, as well as health care, and community settings.

## Results

*Figure 2* - We analyzed 1539 overall subjects from 13 studies (4 community-based, 9 health care-based, Table 1) which reported the full amount of data required. In all, 243 subjects were infected with COVID-19, of whom 97 had been wearing masks and 146 had not. The probability of getting COVID-19 for mask wearers was 7% (97/1463,  $p=0.002$ ), for non-mask wearers, probability was 52% (158/303,  $p=0.94$ ). Relative Risk of getting COVID-19 for mask wearers was 0.13 (95% CI: 0.10-0.16).

*Figure 3* - For subjects in health care settings ( $n=1076$ ), 74/873 (9%) of mask wearers received a positive COVID test while 67/203 (33%) of non-mask wearers received a positive test. Relative Risk of getting COVID-19 for mask wearers in the health care setting was 0.20 (95% CI: 0.15-0.27).

*Figure 4* - In community settings ( $n=475$ ), 23/365 (6%) of mask wearers received a positive COVID test while 91/110 (83%) of non-mask wearers received a positive test. Relative Risk of getting COVID-19 for mask wearers was 0.08 (95% CI: 0.05-0.11).

## Discussion

Based on these results, we determined that across healthcare and community settings, those who wore masks were less likely to contract COVID-19. In health care settings, a smaller percentage of individuals contracted COVID-19 than in the community (13.8 versus 30.7 percent), and of those who contracted COVID-19, a smaller percentage wore face coverings (43.9 versus 56.1 percent).

The results have shown a correlation between wearing a mask and contracting COVID-19 (regardless of healthcare or community setting) with more than 92% of people in the included studies not getting COVID-19 when they were wearing a mask (figure 2 - right graph). The correlation between not wearing a mask and contracting COVID-19 is more variable between healthcare settings and community settings. Overall, about 50% of individuals not wearing a mask in the included studies did not get COVID-19 (figure 2 - left graph). However, there was a much larger correlation with not wearing a mask and contracting COVID-19 in the community setting compared to the healthcare setting. In the community setting 83% of individuals contracted COVID-19 when not wearing a mask (figure 4 - right graph) as compared to 33% of individuals in healthcare settings (figure 3 - right graph).

One possible explanation for this disparity is that individuals in healthcare settings are more cautious with identifying and isolating infected individuals because of higher perceived risk. It is also possible that individuals in the healthcare setting may be tested more often, and thus more likely to be aware of infection before the onset of symptoms, allowing quarantine prior to exposing additional people.

Since our systematic review included studies of all types, we also considered that in the healthcare setting there is greater access to N95 masks, which are usually used in conjunction with other masks such as surgical masks or masks with face shields, all of which decreased the risk of contracting COVID-19 for healthcare workers.


Articles that were considered included case reports, cross-sectional studies, case-control studies, and randomized controlled trials. Case-control studies and randomized controlled trials did not contain human subjects but rather tested particle transmission on specific types of masks. Inclusion based on date of publication included all studies published through July 2020 with studies that were predominantly published between April 2020 and July 2020. Only peer reviewed or pre-print studies were considered.

We used this data to make an evidence-based correlation between wearing masks of any type and the incidence of COVID-19 disease or positive COVID-19 test.

Some limitations include the fact that studies differed in terms of type of mask used/tested, inability to control for all circumstances wherein an individual subject could have been exposed to COVID-19, and inability to control for proper mask usage. There are also limitations based on the cutoff period for studies considered for statistical analysis (i.e. publication through July 2020). In addition, ethical standards precluded randomized controlled trials to determine rates of COVID-19 based upon mask usage.

Facemasks are rarely used as a sole means for infection prevention. Other preventative measures, such as distancing and hand hygiene, for example are typically used in conjunction with them. A possible avenue of future research would involve analysis of which measures are most effective when used in combination with facemasks. Additionally, there is considerable variability in regional laws that govern the use of facemasks. In some areas, facemasks are simply recommended by officials; whereas, in other areas there are legal and financial penalties for not wearing a facemask. Future investigations may study the effects of such legal mandates. Finally, this initial sample size was relatively small, and additional analysis will be warranted as more information becomes available.

**Figure 1. Flow chart of systematic review**



**Table 1. Summary of Included Studies**

Source	Month/Year	Country	Site	Infected/Total	Study Design	Results
Chang <sup>17</sup>	7/2020	South Korea	HC	3/303	Combination of surveys, (of patients and staff), EMR, and recordings of closed-circuit television were reviewed	Staff and patients exposed to 29 cases. Infections occurred when recommendations (including masks) were not followed
Chaovavanich <sup>10</sup>	10/2004	Thailand	HC	0/70	Full PPE policy enacted for all staff when entering room of infected patient	No infections
Caruhel <sup>22</sup>	8/2020	France	HC	0/20	Eleven subjects on a charter flight - all wearing masks with one positive case	Low risk for transmission when wearing masks
Çelebi <sup>21</sup>	8/2020	Turkey	HC	47/181	Upper respiratory samples of HCWs were tested. A case-control study was conducted to explore risk factors that lead to COVID-19 transmission	Risk factors included inappropriate use of PPE while caring for COVID-19 patients, and staying in a break room without a mask for >15 minutes
Guo <sup>14</sup>	5/2020	China	HC	24/72	Survey of orthopaedic surgeons collecting clinical manifestations	Not wearing an N95 respirator and severe fatigue were risk factors, wearing respirators or


					, exposure history, awareness, infection control training and protection practices	masks all of the time was protective
<b>Hendrix<sup>19</sup></b>	7/2020	USA	C	0/104	139 clients were exposed to two symptomatic hair stylists with confirmed COVID-19 while both the stylists and the clients wore face masks	No symptomatic secondary cases were reported; among 67 clients tested for COVID-19, all tests were negative
<b>Kang<sup>11</sup></b>	5/2020	South Korea	C	2/25	Masks and gloves worn by family members of infected patients in the home	Low infection rate
<b>Nir-Paz<sup>20</sup></b>	7/2020	Israel	C	1/11	Eleven subjects on a charter flight - all wearing masks with one positive case among them	Low risk for transmission when wearing masks
<b>Rolland<sup>18</sup></b>	7/2020	France	HC	24/99	Questionnaires from 124 LTCFs on preventive measures (masks, etc.) implemented before area contaminations	LTCFs reporting high adherence to the preventive measures were more likely to avoid contamination

Vera <sup>12</sup>	4/2020	Switzerland	HC	0/21	Unprotected healthcare workers were exposed to an undiagnosed case	No infections, but three reported cough/fever
Wang <sup>15</sup>	5/2020	China	C	111/335	Study of 335 people (124 families) with at least one confirmed case. Outcome was transmission within the family	Face mask use by primary case and family before the case developed symptoms was 79% effective in transmission reduction
Wang <sup>16</sup>	6/2020	China	HC	31/92	Infected and uninfected groups were compared. Social network analysis established influencing factors	Wearing a mask correctly (medical or surgical) was protective. Touching cheek/nose/ mouth was a risk factor
Xu <sup>13</sup>	4/2020	China	HC	0/206	Mask-wearing and disinfection rates were 100% in staff. Mask-wearing (74%) and hand hygiene (41%) by patients and families was lower	No hospital-acquired infections among staff
<b>Total</b>		<b>8 Countries</b>		<b>243/ 1539</b>		

**HC: Healthcare; C: Community; PPE: personal protective equipment, EMR: electronic medical record; P3: Particulate Filters with an efficiency of 99.95% for particles smaller than 0.5 micrometer; LTCFs: long term care facilities**




Figure 2. Total Subjects Infected and Not Infected with COVID-19




RR: 0.13, 95% CI: 0.10-0.16

Figure 3. Subjects in a Healthcare Setting Infected and Not Infected with COVID-19



RR: 0.20, CI: 0.15-0.27

Figure 4. Subjects in a Community Setting Infected and Not Infected with COVID-19



RR: 0.08, 95% CI: 0.05-0.11

## **Acknowledgements**

### ***Financial support***

None reported

### ***Conflict of interest***

None reported

## **References**

1. Corman VM, Muth D, Niemeyer D, Drosten C. (2018) Advances in Virus Research Volume 100. Chapter 8: Hosts and Sources of Endemic Human Coronaviruses. 163-188. doi.org/10.1016/bs.aivir.2018.01.001
2. Morens DM, Breman JG, Calisher CH, et al. The Origin of COVID-19 and Why It Matters. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020;103(3):955-959. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.20-0849. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7470595/>.
3. Tang CS, Wong CY. Factors influencing the wearing of face masks to prevent the severe acute respiratory syndrome among adult Chinese in Hong Kong. Prev Med. 2004;39(6):1187-1193. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.04.032. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7133369/>.
4. Notice on Issuing Guidelines for the Protection of People at Different Risks of New Coronavirus Infection and Guidelines for the Use of Pneumonia Masks for the Prevention of New Coronavirus Infection (2020). <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/jkj/s7916/202001/a3a261dabfcf4c3fa365d4eb07ddab34.shtml>.
5. Scientific Committee on Emerging and Zoonotic Diseases and Scientific Committee on Infection Control, Latest recommendations by Scientific Committee on Emerging and Zoonotic Diseases and Scientific Committee on Infection Control after reviewing cases of novel coronavirus infection (2020). <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202001/24/P2020012400762.htm>.
6. Notice on Issuing Guidelines for the Protection of People at Different Risks of New Coronavirus Infection and Guidelines for the Use of Pneumonia Masks for the Prevention of New Coronavirus Infection (2020). <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/jkj/s7916/202001/a3a261dabfcf4c3fa365d4eb07ddab34.shtml>.
7. Kelland, K. (2020, June 5). Wear masks in public says WHO, in update of COVID-19 advice. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-who-masks/wear-masks-in-public-says-who-in-update-of-covid-19-advice-idUSKBN23C27Y>.
8. Ahmed, J., Malik, F., Bin Arif, T., Majid, Z., Chaudhary, M. A., Ahmad, J., Malik, M., Khan, T. M., & Khalid, M. (2020). Availability of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) Among US and Pakistani Doctors in COVID-19 Pandemic. Cureus, 12(6). <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.8550>

9. Kahane, L.H. Politicizing the Mask: Political, Economic and Demographic Factors Affecting Mask Wearing Behavior in the USA. *Eastern Econ J* 47, 163–183 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41302-020-00186-0>
10. Chaovavanich A, Wongsawat J, Dowell SF, Inthong Y, Sangsajja C, Sanguanwongse N, Martin MT, Limpakarnjanarat K, Sirirat L, Waicharoen S, Chittaganpitch M, Thawatsupha P, Auwanit W, Sawanpanyalert P, Melgaard B. Early containment of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS); experience from Bamrasnaradura Institute, Thailand. *J Med Assoc Thai*. 2004 Oct;87(10):1182-7. PMID: 15560695.
11. Kang YJ. Lessons Learned From Cases of COVID-19 Infection in South Korea. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2020:1-8. doi: 10.1017/dmp.2020.141.
12. Canova V, Lederer Schläpfer H, Piso RJ, Droll A, Fenner L, Hoffmann T, Hoffmann M. Transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 to healthcare workers -observational results of a primary care hospital contact tracing. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2020;150:w20257. doi: 10.4414/smw.2020.20257.
13. Xu C, Jin J, Song J, Yang Y, Yao M, Zhang Y, Zhao R, Chen Z. Application of refined management in prevention and control of the coronavirus disease 2019 epidemic in non-isolated areas of a general hospital. *Int J Nurs Sci*. 2020;7(2):143-147. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnss.2020.04.003.
14. Guo X, Wang J, Hu D, Wu L, Gu L, Wang Y, Zhao J, Zeng L, Zhang J, Wu Y. Survey of COVID-19 Disease Among Orthopaedic Surgeons in Wuhan, People’s Republic of China. *J Bone Joint Surg*. 2020;102(10):847-854. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.20.00417.
15. Wang Y; Tian H; Zhang L; Zhang M; Guo D; Wu W; Zhang X; Kan GL; Jia L; Huo D; Liu B; Wang X; Sun Y; Wang Q; Yang P; MacIntyre CR. Reduction of secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a cohort study in Beijing, China. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020;5:e002794. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002794.
16. Wang Y; Wu W; Cheng Z; Tan X; Yang Z; Zeng X; Mei B; Ni Z; Wang X. Super-factors associated with transmission of occupational COVID-19 infection among healthcare staff in Wuhan, China. *J Hosp Infect*. 2020;106(1):25-34. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.06.023.
17. Chang MC, Hur J, Park D. Strategies for the Prevention of the Intra-Hospital Transmission of COVID-19: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Healthcare*. 2020; 8(3):195. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare8030195>
18. Rolland Y, Lacoste MH, de Mauleon A, Ghisolfi A, De Souto Barreto P, Blain H, Villars H. Guidance for the Prevention of the COVID-19 Epidemic in Long-Term Care Facilities: A Short-Term Prospective Study. *J Nutr Health Aging*. 2020;24(8):812-816. doi: 10.1007/s12603-020-1440-2
19. Hendrix MJ, Walde C, Findley K, Trotman R. Absence of Apparent Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from Two Stylists After Exposure at a Hair Salon with a Universal Face Covering Policy — Springfield, Missouri, May 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:930-932. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6928e2>

20. Nir-Paz R, Grotto I, Strolov I, Salmon A, Mandelboim M, Mendelson E, Regev-Yochay G. Absence of in-flight transmission of SARS-CoV-2 likely due to use of face masks on board. *Journal of Travel Medicine*. 2020; 27(8):taaa117. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa117>
21. Çelebi G; Pişkin N; Bekleviç AÇ; Altunay Y; Keleş AS; Tüz MA; Altınsoy B; Haciseyitoğlu D. Specific risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 transmission among health care workers in a university hospital. *Am J Infect Control*. 2020; 48(10):1225-1230.
22. Caruhel JB; Sigaux N; Crambert A; Donat N; Boddaert G; Haen P; Hoffmann C. Military gas mask to protect surgeons when performing tracheotomies on patients with COVID-19 *BMJ Mil Health* Published Online First: 04 August 2020. doi: 10.1136/bmjmilitary-2020-001547