



UNCOVER

Usher Network for COVID-19
Evidence Reviews

Review: Does the use of face masks in the
general population make a difference
to spread of infection?

Date: 7 April 2020

Version: 003-01



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

usher
institute

Review Question: Does the use of face masks in the general population make a difference to spread of infection?

Date of review: 7 April 2020

Answer

- Based on the evidence from three recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses [including our re-analysis focusing on community trials] wearing face masks in the community was not significantly associated with a reduction in episodes of influenza-like illness [ILI]; the overall assessment of the quality was classified as low.
- Jefferson 2020 [re-analysed]: 7 RCTs in the general population with ILI outcome [OR (95% CI) 0.92 (0.87, 1.07)]
- Xiao 2020: 10 RCTs in non-healthcare settings with pandemic influenza outcomes [OR (95% CI) 0.97 (0.79, 1.18)]
- Brainard 2020: various study designs with respiratory illness outcome; OR (95% CI): 0.94 (0.75, 1.19)
- SARS-CoV-2 is transmissible by contact and droplets [aerodynamic diameter >5µm]. SARS-CoV-2 can be detectable and viable in aerosols [aerodynamic diameter ≤5µm], suggesting possible transmission routes by aerosols. However, there is little current evidence demonstrating actual aerosol transmission episodes by SARS-CoV-2.
- The quality of the evidence on face mask effectiveness is moderate to low. See table 1. Many of the cohort and cross-sectional studies rely on self-reported symptoms not confirmed clinically or using lab tests. There is very little information on duration or frequency of use or correct usage of masks.
- Whilst some of the RCTs specify the type of mask used, many of the studies do not define the type of mask or the materials masks are made from. This makes it difficult to evaluate the evidence.
- Mask-wearing alone, in the absence of other preventive measures, is unlikely to be effective, yet most studies do not take this into account. Many studies did not gather information on general hygiene and other relevant health behaviours (e.g. hand sanitiser, hand-washing). Many of the studies do not make a distinction between indoor and outdoor settings.
- Much of the evidence is not generalizable to a UK community setting. For example, 8 of the 24 studies focus on face mask use during the annual hajj pilgrimage in Saudi Arabia – a very specific context in very different climatic conditions. The influence of cultural and socio-behavioural factors (e.g. fear, stigma, altruism) on levels of compliance during a pandemic may differ meaningfully from other circumstances.
- There is little evidence on the behavioural aspects of facemask use. The most-studied aspect relates to frequency / consistency of use, with more consistent use linked to a greater reported protective effect (although this must be taken in the context of our overall findings which failed to find a clear protective effect of facemasks). One study found that facemasks contribute to an increased sense of isolation.
- Public health awareness campaigns [Aiello-2010], specific education [Barasheed-2016] and provision of free facemasks [Alabdeen-2005] all appeared to incentivise greater uptake of facemasks. There were little data on how long people can be expected to comply with requirements to wear a facemask. One review reported that “in one study, rates of self-reported adherence were found to decline over a 5-day period” [PHE-2014].

Conclusion

- **This review found mixed and low quality evidence on the use of face masks to prevent community transmission of respiratory illness, with much of the evidence generated in very different contexts from the UK. Key issues are the need for better quality research in community settings, which focuses not only on evaluating different types of mask but also on evaluating adherence (duration and frequency of mask use, correct procedure for putting on and removing masks) and the use of masks in conjunction with hand hygiene.**

Note: This review was conducted very quickly, and as such has the following weaknesses: full text screening, extracted data and quality assessment were not checked by a second reviewer, thus introducing a risk of bias. We will continue to update and refine this review going forward.

Reviewers note that the WHO Expert Panel reported on 6/4/2020 that “the wide use of masks by healthy people in the community setting is not supported by current evidence and carries uncertainties and critical risks”.

Background and Aims

Current UK advice advises that “respiratory etiquette when coughing or sneezing” and social distancing of at least 2m apart should give sufficient protection against transmission from viruses carried in droplets which evaporate or fall to the ground within that distance. However, recent data has suggested that exhalation, coughing and sneezing can carry liquid droplets / aerosols over larger distances and has led to renewed interest in the role of facemasks to limit transmission risk. If there were a general recommendation to wear face masks indoor when symptomatic, or outdoors in public is there evidence to suggest that this may help slow the spread of coronavirus? Could wearing a mask be as effective as social distancing? The WHO Expert Panel on this topic reported on 6/4/2020 that “the wide use of masks by healthy people in the community setting is not supported by current evidence and carries uncertainties and critical risks”. This is in contrast to US CDC who recommended the US public wear cloth coverings in pharmacies, groceries and other public places where social distancing is hard to maintain.

Background policy relevance

- Can the use of masks prevent transmission of SARS-COV-2?
- Do masks reduce the virus shedding in respiratory droplets and/or aerosols?
- Is there a difference between different types of masks (eg surgical or home-made masks)?
- Are there behavioural aspects of face mask wearing by the general population that relate to compliance or risk taking behaviour that are relevant?

Methods:

We adapted rapid review methods outlined by the Cochrane Collaboration. We sought publications in four main inter-connected areas:

- sub-review 1: what is the effectiveness of face masks in preventing respiratory transmission in the community?
- sub-review 2: what is the relative effectiveness of medical masks versus non-medical masks or equivalent barriers?
- sub-review 3: what important behavioural aspects of wearing masks in terms of compliance with advice and impact on risk taking behaviour can be identified?
- sub-review 4: what is known about the nature and spread of respiratory airway particles?

Literature Search: We excluded publications focusing only on health care settings, modelling data, animal models, and articles providing commentary but no data. We focused on studies reporting on COVID-19 but included data from other related respiratory viruses, where appropriate. We became aware that a number of recent existing reviews on related relevant topics. Since there is currently no register of existing reviews we compiled this from websites of partners taking part in the WHO Evidence Collaborative and identified ~170 COVID-19 evidence reviews, including some on use of face masks. We searched the literature for prior reviews and evidence summaries on facemasks to prevent transmission of infection. We appraised the 14 prior reviews/summaries found, and for this update rapid review selected the three most recent, on-topic, and robust quality [Jefferson 2020, Brainard 2020, Xiao 2020] for updating and re-analysis. We sought publications with data on face masks of any study design and of published or pre-published status by updating the literature searches of three systematic reviews. The search was limited to publications from the date onward that each of the systematic review had stopped their search. We searched the databases used in the prior reviews (PubMed, Medline, Embase, Scopus, CENTRAL, CINAHL) and augmented the methods by including a search for pre-prints on medRxiv. The searches were carried out by one reviewer (MD). From the updated search results set, we excluded publications published before 2020, from nosocomial settings, modelling data, animal models, providing commentary but no data. All component studies of the three systematic reviews were included in this update. There were no language limitations as part of the search, but due to time and resource constraints, non-English publications were not included in analysis

Sub-review 1: What is the effectiveness of face masks in preventing respiratory transmission in the community?

Background

Community face mask use was part of successful control policies in China, South Korea and Vietnam, but it is not possible to disentangle their separate contribution to reducing transmission. This rapid review was carried out to establish whether there is evidence for the use of face masks in the general population to reduce the spread of infection with SARS-COV-2.

Methods

We adapted rapid review methods outlined by the Cochrane Collaboration. We searched the literature for prior reviews and evidence summaries on facemasks to prevent transmission of infection. We appraised the 14 prior reviews/summaries found, and for this update rapid review selected the three most recent, on-topic, and robust quality [Jefferson 2020, Brainard 2020, Xiao 2020] for updating and re-analysis. We sought publications with data on face masks of any study design and of published or pre-published status by updating the literature searches of three systematic reviews. The search was limited to publications from the date onward that each of the systematic review had stopped their search. We searched the databases used in the prior reviews (PubMed, Medline, Embase, Scopus, CENTRAL, CINAHL) and augmented the methods by including a search for pre-prints on medRxiv. The searches were carried out by one reviewer (MD). From the updated search results set, we excluded publications published before 2020, from nosocomial settings, modelling data, animal models, providing commentary but no data. All component studies of the three systematic reviews were included in this update.

Screening was shared between three reviewers (MG, XL, WX). Each new title, abstract and full text was screened by one reviewer (MG). References of previous systematic reviews were searched by two reviewers (XL, WX). No new studies meeting the inclusion criteria were identified.

Results

- A total of 766 new results was found from the database searching, reduced to 81 after removal of duplicates and pre-2020 publications. We excluded 72 records by screening titles and abstracts and a further 9 at the full text screen/quality assessment phase, leaving 0 new articles for inclusion in the final review. The key findings from this rapid review were:
- Of the three high quality recent reviews we scrutinised in detail, two included only RCTs [Jefferson 2020, Xiao 2020], whereas Brainard 2020 included population studies too. We ran updated literature searches for these reviews to identify new studies. No new studies meeting inclusion criteria were identified.
- All component studies of the three systematic reviews were included for analysis in this update.
- Jefferson 2020 included 9 RCTs (7 in the general population and 2 in health care workers) and reported that there was no reduction of Influenza-like illness (ILI) for masks compared to no masks [Random effects OR (95% CI): 0.93 (0.83, 1.05)].
- We re-ran a random effects meta-analysis restricting to the 7 RCTs conducted in the general population from Jefferson 2020 and also found no significant reduction of ILI [OR (95% CI): 0.92 (0.87, 1.07)]. Risk of bias analysis using the Cochrane tool done by Jefferson et al indicated that there was high or unknown risk of bias in relation to performance, detection and reporting bias.
- Xiao 2020 evaluated environmental and personal protective measures for pandemic influenza in non-healthcare settings. They ran a fixed effect meta-analysis of 10 RCTs of community use of face masks (with or without hand hygiene measures) and they reported a no significant reduction of ILI [Fixed effect OR (95% CI): 0.92 (0.75, 1.12)]. We repeated the analysis using random effects meta-analysis and the result was similar [Random effects OR (95%CI): 0.97 (0.79, 1.18)]. The study quality of the included studies was evaluated using GRADE by Xiao et al and the overall assessment of the quality was classified as low.
- Brainard 2020 included all study designs on facemasks and similar barriers to prevent respiratory illness. Based on random effects meta-analyses on RCTs, they concluded that

wearing face masks can be very slightly protective against primary infection from casual community contact, but this was not significant, and the evidence was classified as low certainty-evidence using the Cochrane risk assessment [Random effects OR (95% CI): 0.94 (0.75, 1.19)]. Similar were the findings for the prevention of household infections when both infected and uninfected members wear face masks.

Conclusion

Based on the evidence from three recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses wearing face masks in the community is not significantly associated with a reduction in ILI and the overall assessment of the quality was classified as low.

Lead reviewers [with contact details of lead]

Prof Evropi Theodoratou, e.theodoratou@ed.ac.uk

Marshall Dozier, Margaret Guyan, Dr Xue Li, Wei Xu

Sub-review 2: what is the relative effectiveness of medical masks versus non-medical masks or equivalent barriers?

Background

This review evaluates the evidence on the effectiveness of facemasks for preventing respiratory infection in community settings.

Method

We adapted rapid review methods outlined by the Cochrane Collaboration. We sought published or pre-published observational or intervention studies, investigating face masks or respirators to prevent the transmission of respiratory viruses in community settings. Facemasks could be surgical, medical, N95 respirators, homemade, improvised or repurposed (e.g. DIY masks) made of any material. Included studies had to report a measure of respiratory virus infection and/or its consequences (e.g. days off work, complications, hospital admission, deaths). We excluded case series, case reports, review articles, guidelines, discussions, regulations, debates, and commentaries. We also excluded publications which investigated the prevention of transmission to/from clinically trained persons in clinical settings, studies based on mathematical modelling, and studies investigating transmission from non-humans

We searched the literature for prior reviews and evidence summaries on facemasks to prevent transmission of infection. We appraised the 14 prior reviews/summaries found, and for this update rapid review selected the three most recent, on-topic, and robust quality [Jefferson 2020, Brainard 2020, Xiao 2020] for updating and re-analysis. We sought publications with data on face masks of any study design and of published or pre-published status by updating the literature searches of three systematic reviews. The search was limited to publications from the date onward that each of the systematic review had stopped their search. We searched the databases used in the prior reviews (PubMed, Medline, Embase, Scopus, CENTRAL, CINAHL) and augmented the methods by including a search for pre-prints on medRxiv. The searches were carried out by one reviewer (MD). From the updated search results set, we excluded publications published before 2020, from nosocomial settings, modelling data, animal models, providing commentary but no data. All component studies of the three systematic reviews were included in this update.

Title and abstract screening was by three people, each person screening a third of the studies. A second person checked all rejected studies. Where the second reviewer disagreed with the decision of the first reviewer, the paper was retained for full text screening. Full text screening was again split between the three reviewers. Data extraction and quality appraisal were conducted by a different reviewer from the reviewer who conducted the screening. We used the following quality assessment checklists: CASP checklist for randomised controlled trials, cohort and case-control studies and Joanna Briggs checklists for case series and cross-sectional studies.

Results

We identified a total of 182 studies (107 were primary studies from the 3 key systematic reviews and 78 were studies identified in our update search. We rejected 125 through screening titles and abstracts and a further 32 when reviewing full texts. Reasons for rejection at full text screen were: not meeting inclusion and exclusion criteria (n=18), not primary studies (n=6), full text not available (n=8). We retained 25 studies for detailed analysis and quality appraisal. Key findings were that:

- The quality of the evidence on face mask effectiveness is moderate to low. See table 1.
- Many of the cohort and cross-sectional studies rely on self-reported symptoms not confirmed clinically or using lab tests.
- There is very little information on duration or frequency of use or correct usage of masks.
- Whilst some of the RCTs specify the type of mask used, many of the studies do not define the type of mask or the materials masks are made from. This makes it difficult to evaluate the evidence.
- Mask-wearing alone, in the absence of other preventive measures, is unlikely to be effective, yet most studies do not take this into account. Many studies did not gather information on general hygiene and other relevant health behaviours (e.g. hand sanitiser, hand-washing)
- Many of the studies do not make a distinction between indoor and outdoor settings.
- Much of the evidence is not generalizable to a UK community setting. For example, 8 of the 24 studies focus on face mask use during the annual hajj pilgrimage in Saudi Arabia – a very specific context in very different climatic conditions. Only one lack of transferability between different populations.
- Of the seven studies of moderate quality (table 3) – i.e. the strongest evidence found – three reported no evidence of effectiveness of face masks, whilst 4 reported some evidence of effectiveness. However a key consideration is the difference between evidence of effectiveness in a controlled study and the evidence of effectiveness in real life situations, where compliance may not be optimum.

Table 1: Summary of study designs and evidence quality (GRADE criteria)

Study ID	Study design	Quality assessment
Aiello-2010	RCT	Moderate
Aiello-2012	cRCT	Moderate
Alfelali-2019	cRCT	Moderate
MacIntyre-2009	cRCT	Moderate
MacIntyre-2016	cRCT	Moderate
Simmerman-2011	RCT	Moderate
Suess-2012	cRCT	Moderate
Barasheed-2014	cRCT	Low
Cowling-2009	cRCT	Low
Al-Jasser-2013	Cohort	Low
Balaban-2012	Cohort	Low
Choudhry-2006	Cohort	Low
Gautret-2011	Cohort	Low
Gautret-2015	Cohort	Very low
Larson-2010	Cohort	Very low
Wu-2004	Case-control	Low
Emamian-2013	Case-control	Very low
Zhang-2013b	Case-control	Very low
Kim-2011	Cross-sectional	Low
Uchida-2017	Cross-sectional	Low
Deris-2010	Cross-sectional	Very low
Hashim-2016	Cross-sectional	Very low
Wu-2016	Cross-sectional	Very low
Ma-2020	Experiment	Difficult to evaluate

Conclusions

This review found mixed and low quality evidence on the use of face masks to prevent community transmission of respiratory illness, with much of the evidence generated in very different contexts from the UK. Key issues are the need for better quality research in community settings, which focuses not only on evaluating different types of mask but also on evaluating adherence (duration and frequency of mask use, correct procedure for putting on and removing masks). This review was conducted very quickly, and as such has the following weaknesses: full text screening, extracted data and quality assessment were not checked by a second reviewer, thus introducing a risk of bias; We will continue to update and refine this review going forward.

Lead reviewers [with contact details of lead]

- Ruth McQuillan, Ruth.McQuillan@ed.ac.uk
- Marshall Dozier, Lara Goodwin, Yasmin Benylles

Sub-review 3 - what evidence is there for the role of behavioural factors on the effectiveness of face mask use in the community?

Background

We looked at behavioural factors that are linked directly to facemask use: Is the facemask put on and taken off correctly? How often do people wear facemasks? Does this change over time? Do the population comply with advice on their use?

Methods

For the full review, we adapted rapid review methods outlined by the Cochrane Collaboration. We searched the literature for prior reviews and evidence summaries on facemasks to prevent transmission and appraised the 14 prior reviews and summaries found.

These reviews were screened by three reviewers (EMS, MP, AN) for relevance to our sub-question (behavioural aspects of facemask use) and 11 were identified that met our inclusion criteria. The primary studies within these reviews were then taken forward for title & abstract, and subsequent full-text, screening.

Screening Criteria: We included studies that considered:

- How masks are used (e.g. whether people are putting them on or taking them off safely) and whether this alters their effectiveness;
 - How mask use affects other relevant protective or risk-taking behaviours;
 - Whether mask use changes in the long term; and
 - What behavioural interventions (e.g. training, communications) may affect mask use.
- We excluded studies that considered:
- Mask use among healthcare workers or in care settings only.

Screening and Data Extraction

- 84 primary studies were identified from the reference lists of the relevant reviews. 8 studies were excluded because full-text was unavailable, and 2 because they were not in English, by the team who retrieved the studies (RMQ, LG and YB).
- 74 studies remained to be screened. Of these, 9 were prioritised by MP for data extraction, based on our full-text screening of the existing reviews. Data extraction was carried out by two reviewers (MP and AN).
- Title and abstract screening was carried out by one reviewer (EMS) for the other 65 studies, based on our inclusion criteria. 30 studies were included at this stage. Exclusions were checked by a second reviewer (MP), and one further study was included for data extraction.
- Data extraction on these 31 studies was carried out by three reviewers (EMS, AN and MP). 9 further studies were excluded as a result of full-text screening, principally because they did not include any investigation of the behavioural aspects of mask use.

Quality assessment

We carried out a quality assessment of the remaining 22 reviews based on templates adapted from the CASP checklists for critical appraisal.

Results

The key findings from this rapid review were:

- Behavioural aspects of mask use have not been a primary focus of any study on the effectiveness of facemasks. A small number of studies compare the effectiveness of occasional vs regular facemask use, but these terms are not clearly defined and the studies depend on self-reporting of compliance.
- The limited evidence base suggests that regular/consistent use of masks may be more protective than irregular use (but within the context of a wider literature which is inconclusive about the general protective effect of masks). However, the difference between 'consistent' and 'irregular' use is not clearly defined in existing studies, and is therefore of limited use in developing guidance.
- One review found that adherence to facemask use tended to drop off after five days. Another found that adherence depended on health beliefs and perception of risk.
- Reported concerns that people may wear masks 'incorrectly', and therefore ineffectively, in the community are a feature of the literature, but there do not appear to be any studies which assess the extent to which this actually happens, nor how it impacts on effectiveness.

- One study found that people who wore facemasks appeared to have increased compliance with hand hygiene practices. Of concern, however, the same study found an increased rate of respiratory infection among non-vaccinated people who wore facemasks. The evidence is not strong enough to allow us to conclude that facemask use encourages either protective or risk-taking behaviours, but these findings certainly suggest that a degree of caution should be applied.
- A small number of studies found that behavioural incentives – including specific training, public health awareness campaigns, and provision of free face masks – encouraged uptake of masks.
- One study addressed the barriers to use of facemasks, and found that masks contributed to a sense of isolation from others (as well as discomfort and difficulty breathing). This study was not carried out in the context of a pandemic, with mass distancing and ‘lockdown’, but the possible mental health implications of this finding may require some consideration in this context.
- Most of the studies looking at the use of masks in community settings relate to very specific contexts: schools, university halls of residence, and, most frequently, the Hajj. The Hajj in particular is a unique, time-limited event. Care should be taken when generalising from these studies to the community in general.

Conclusions

- There is little evidence on the behavioural aspects of facemask use, and most studies relate to unique, defined contexts (predominantly the Hajj). The aspect most frequently studied relates to frequency / consistency of use, and it is suggested that more consistent use is linked with a more protective effect (although this must be taken in the context of overall findings about the [limited] protective effect of facemasks).
- One study found that facemasks contribute to an increased sense of isolation, while another found higher rates of respiratory infection among some participants who wore a facemask, which may hint at a link between facemask use and risk-taking behaviours. Neither of these findings is supported by substantial or robust evidence, but both might merit further research in order to inform a full appraisal of the costs vs benefits of facemask use in community settings.

Lead reviewers [with contact details of lead]

- Emilie McSwiggan, v1emcswwi@exseed.ed.ac.uk
- Marshall Dozier, Ambika Narain, Miranda Pierre

Sub-review 4: what is the mode of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and other common respiratory pathogens?

Background

This rapid review was conducted to address the question of whether an understanding of SARS-CoV-2 transmission routes can help inform decisions regarding community use of face masks.

Methods

Two working strands were conducted in parallel to address the question.

- Strand 1 searched for original studies and reviews that reported the mode of transmission of coronaviruses, including SARS-CoV-2, MERS-CoV, SARS-CoV-1, and seasonal coronaviruses (i.e. NL63, 229E, OC43 and HKU1).
- Strand 2 searched for existing reviews that reported the mode of transmission of common human respiratory pathogens.

Selection criteria are in the Appendix. As studies applied different approaches to infer mode of transmission, we grouped the approaches into three levels based on the strength of the evidence:

- Level 1. Pathogen being detectable (in aerosols, droplets or surfaces);
- Level 2. Pathogen being detectable and viable;

- Level 3. Actual transmission events being confirmed. All studies were extracted to an extraction template attached in Appendix.2.

Results

A total of 25 studies were included and their findings were summarised in Table 1. Key findings include:

- All respiratory pathogens included in the review can be transmitted by direct/indirect contact and droplets.
- Measles, influenza virus and adenovirus are known to be transmissible by aerosols.
- SARS-CoV-2 can be detected and is viable in aerosols but with no direct evidence of transmission via aerosols.

Conclusions

- SARS-CoV-2 is transmissible by contact and droplets.
- SARS-CoV-2 can be detectable and viable in aerosols, suggesting possible transmission routes by aerosols. However, little evidence is available so far demonstrating actual aerosol transmission episode by SARS-CoV-2.

Lead reviewers [with contact details of lead]

- You Li, you.li2@ed.ac.uk
- Marshall Dozier, Durga Kulkarni, Rima Nundy

Table 2. Summary of findings on mode of transmission of common human respiratory pathogens

Pathogen	Contact ¹	ref	Droplets	ref	Aerosols			Transmission events ²	ref	
					Detectable	ref	Viable			ref
Measles	yes	Kutter, 2019; Shiu, 2019	mixed	Kutter, 2019; Shiu, 2019	not known		not known		yes	Kutter, 2019; Shiu, 2019
Parainfluenza virus	yes	Kutter, 2019	yes	Kutter, 2019	not known		not known		not known	
Human metapneumovirus	yes	Kutter, 2019; Shiu, 2019	yes	Kutter, 2019	not known		not known		not known	
Respiratory syncytial virus	yes	Nam, 2019; Shiu, 2019; Kutter, 2019	yes	Nam, 2019; Shiu, 2019; Kutter, 2019; Shiu, 2019; Moghadami, 2017; Kutter, 2019; Otter, 2016; Saunders, 2017; Public Health England-2014, 2014; mackintosh, 2015; Leung, 2020; Cowling, 2010	not known		not known		not known	
Influenza virus	yes	Public Health England-2014, 2014; Saunders, 2017; Otter, 2016; Kutter, 2019; Moghadami, 2017	yes	Public Health England-2014, 2014; mackintosh, 2015; Leung, 2020; Cowling, 2010	yes	Leung, 2020	yes	Cowling, 2010; mackintosh, 2015; Public Health England-2014, 2014	mixed	Shiu, 2019
Human rhinovirus	yes	Kutter, 2019	yes	Leung, 2020; Kutter, 2019	yes	Leung, 2020; Kutter, 2019	not known		yes	Kutter, 2019
Coronavirus (CoV), seasonal	not known	–	yes	Leung, 2020	yes	Leung, 2020	not known		not known	
Adenovirus	yes	Kutter, 2019	yes	Kutter, 2019	not known		not known		yes	Kutter, 2019
SARS-CoV-1	yes	Shiu, 2019; Kutter, 2019; Adhikari, 2020; Huggonet, 2004; Otter, 2016; Shapira, 2016; Adhikari, 2020; Otter, 2016	yes	Shiu, 2019; Kutter, 2019; Huggonet, 2004; Otter, 2016	not known		yes	Huggonet, 2004; Shiu, 2019; Kutter, 2019; Doremales, 2020	not known	
MERS-CoV	yes	Adhikari, 2020; Otter, 2016	Yes	Raouf, 2020; Klerby, 2020; Shapiro, 2016; Otter, 2016	yes	Shapiro, 2016	not known		not known	
SARS-CoV-2	yes	Di Wu, 2020; Peng, 2020; Hui, 2020; Adhikari, 2020; Rothan, 2020; Jeffersen, 2020; Greenhalgh, 2020	yes	Di Wu, 2020; Wang, 2020; Raouf, 2020; Liu, 2020; Peng, 2020; Hui, 2020; adhikari, 2020; Rothan, 2020; Wilder-Smith, Jeffersen, 2020; Greenhalgh, 2020; Bourouiba, 2020	yes	Liu, 2020; Bourouiba, 2020	yes	van Doremalen, 2020; Adhikari, 2020	not known	

SARS = Severe acute respiratory syndrome; MERS = Middle East respiratory syndrome; ref = reference

¹ Transmission by contact includes direct contact (person to person) and indirect contact via a contaminated object.

² Transmission event is defined by the transmission of a pathogen via a specific route (e.g. aerosols), causing human infection

The UNCOVER network is committed to responding quickly and impartially to requests from policymakers for evidence reviews. This document has therefore been produced in a short timescale and has not been externally peer-reviewed.

RR- face mask review keywords and key references

Sub-review 1 What is the effectiveness of face masks in preventing respiratory transmission in the community?

Keywords

Masks, Respiratory Protective Devices, Personal Protective Equipment, Primary Prevention.

Key references

1. Jefferson T, Jones MA, Al-Ansary L, et al. Physical Interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Part 1 – Face masks, eye protection and person distancing: systematic review and meta-analysis. medRxiv.2020; 2020.03.30.20047217. doi: 10.1101/2020.03.30.20047217
2. Brainard J, Jones N, Lake I, et al. Facemasks and similar barriers to prevent respiratory illness such as COVID-19: A rapid systematic review. 2020
3. Xiao J, Shiu EYC, Gao H, et al. Nonpharmaceutical Measures for Pandemic Influenza in Nonhealthcare Settings-Personal Protective and Environmental Measures [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 17]. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;26(5):10.3201/eid2605.190994. doi:10.3201/eid2605.190994
4. Aiello AE, Coulborn RM, Perez V, et al. A randomized intervention trial of mask use and hand hygiene to reduce seasonal influenza-like illness and influenza infections among young adults in a university setting. International Journal of Infectious Diseases 2010;14:E320-E20. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2010.02.2201
5. Cowling BJ, Fung RO, Cheng CK, et al. Preliminary findings of a randomized trial of non-pharmaceutical interventions to prevent influenza transmission in households. PLoS One. 2008;3(5):e2101. Published 2008 May 7. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0002101
6. Jacobs JL, Ohde S, Takahashi O, Tokuda Y, Omata F, Fukui T. Use of surgical face masks to reduce the incidence of the common cold among health care workers in Japan: a randomized controlled trial. Am J Infect Control. 2009;37(5):417–419. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2008.11.002
7. Suess T, Remschmidt C, Schink SB, et al. The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of influenza transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial; Berlin, Germany, 2009-2011. BMC Infect Dis. 2012;12:26. Published 2012 Jan 26. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-12-26
8. Aiello AE, Perez V, Coulborn RM, Davis BM, Uddin M, Monto AS. Facemasks, hand hygiene, and influenza among young adults: a randomized intervention trial. PLoS One. 2012;7(1):e29744. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0029744
9. Barasheed O, Almasri N, Badahdah AM, et al. Pilot Randomised Controlled Trial to Test Effectiveness of Facemasks in Preventing Influenza-like Illness Transmission among Australian Hajj Pilgrims in 2011. Infect Disord Drug Targets. 2014;14(2):110–116. doi:10.2174/1871526514666141021112855
10. Canini L, Andréoletti L, Ferrari P, et al. Surgical mask to prevent influenza transmission in households: a cluster randomized trial. PLoS One. 2010;5(11):e13998. Published 2010 Nov 17. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013998
11. MacIntyre CR, Seale H, Dung TC, et al. A cluster randomised trial of cloth masks compared with medical masks in healthcare workers. BMJ Open. 2015;5(4):e006577. Published 2015 Apr 22. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006577
12. MacIntyre CR, Zhang Y, Chughtai AA, et al. Cluster randomised controlled trial to examine medical mask use as source control for people with respiratory illness. BMJ Open. 2016;6(12):e012330. Published 2016 Dec 30. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012330
13. Loeb M, Dafoe N, Mahony J, et al. Surgical mask vs N95 respirator for preventing influenza among health care workers: a randomized trial. JAMA. 2009;302(17):1865–1871. doi:10.1001/jama.2009.1466
14. MacIntyre CR, Wang Q, Cauchemez S, et al. A cluster randomized clinical trial comparing fit-tested and non-fit-tested N95 respirators to medical masks to prevent respiratory virus infection in health

- care workers. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2011;5(3):170–179. doi:10.1111/j.1750-2659.2011.00198.x
15. MacIntyre CR, Wang Q, Seale H, et al. A randomized clinical trial of three options for N95 respirators and medical masks in health workers. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013;187(9):960–966. doi:10.1164/rccm.201207-1164OC
16. Radonovich LJ Jr, Simberkoff MS, Bessesen MT, et al. N95 Respirators vs Medical Masks for Preventing Influenza Among Health Care Personnel: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2019;322(9):824–833. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.11645
17. MacIntyre CR, Cauchemez S, Dwyer DE, et al. Face mask use and control of respiratory virus transmission in households. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2009;15(2):233–241. doi:10.3201/eid1502.081167
18. Alfelali M, Haworth EA, Barasheed O, et al. Facemask versus No Facemask in Preventing Viral Respiratory Infections During Hajj: A Cluster Randomised Open Label Trial. SSRN (Lancet preprints). 2019
19. Barasheed O, Alfelali M, Mushta S, et al. Uptake and effectiveness of facemask against respiratory infections at mass gatherings: a systematic review. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2016;47:105–111. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2016.03.023
20. Choudhry AJ, Al-Mudaimigh KS, Turkistani AM, Al-Hamdan NA. Hajj-associated acute respiratory infection among hajjis from Riyadh. *East Mediterr Health J*. 2006;12(3-4):300–309.
21. Deris ZZ, Hasan H, Sulaiman SA, Wahab MS, Naing NN, Othman NH. The prevalence of acute respiratory symptoms and role of protective measures among Malaysian hajj pilgrims. *J Travel Med*. 2010;17(2):82–88. doi:10.1111/j.1708-8305.2009.00384.x
22. Larson EL, Ferng YH, Wong-McLoughlin J, Wang S, Haber M, Morse SS. Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on URIs and influenza in crowded, urban households. *Public Health Rep*. 2010;125(2):178–191. doi:10.1177/003335491012500206
23. Lau JT, Lau M, Kim JH, Tsui HY, Tsang T, Wong TW. Probable secondary infections in households of SARS patients in Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;10(2):235–243. doi:10.3201/eid1002.030626
24. Simmerman JM, Suntarattiwong P, Levy J, et al. Findings from a household randomized controlled trial of hand washing and face masks to reduce influenza transmission in Bangkok, Thailand. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2011;5(4):256–267. doi:10.1111/j.1750-2659.2011.00205.x
25. Tahir MF, Abbas MA, Ghafoor T, et al. Seroprevalence and risk factors of avian influenza H9 virus among poultry professionals in Rawalpindi, Pakistan. *J Infect Public Health*. 2019;12(4):482–485. doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2018.11.009
26. Zein, U. The role of using masks to reduce acute upper respiratory tract infections in pilgrims. 4th Asia Pacific travel health conference, Oct 20 2002 Shanghai, PR China
27. Aiello AE, Murray GF, Perez V, et al. Mask use, hand hygiene, and seasonal influenza-like illness among young adults: a randomized intervention trial. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201(4):491–498. doi:10.1086/650396
28. Jolie R, Bäckström L, Thomas C. Health problems in veterinary students after visiting a commercial swine farm [published correction appears in *Can J Vet Res* 1998 Apr;62(2):155]. *Can J Vet Res*. 1998;62(1):44–48.
29. Kim CO, Nam CM, Lee DC, Chang J, Lee JW. Is abdominal obesity associated with the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in Korean school-aged children?. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2012;6(5):313–317. doi:10.1111/j.1750-2659.2011.00318.x
30. Lau JT, Tsui H, Lau M, Yang X. SARS transmission, risk factors, and prevention in Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;10(4):587–592. doi:10.3201/eid1004.030628
31. Shin K, Wakabayashi H, Sugita C, et al. Effects of orally administered lactoferrin and lactoperoxidase on symptoms of the common cold. *Int J Health Sci (Qassim)*. 2018;12(5):44–50.
32. Uchida M, Kaneko M, Hidaka Y, et al. Effectiveness of vaccination and wearing masks on seasonal influenza in Matsumoto City, Japan, in the 2014/2015 season: An observational study among all elementary schoolchildren. *Prev Med Rep*. 2016;5:86–91. Published 2016 Dec 6. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2016.12.002
33. Uchida M, Kaneko M, Hidaka Y, et al. High vaccination coverage is associated with low epidemic level of seasonal influenza in elementary schools: an observational study in Matsumoto City, Japan. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2018;18(1):128. Published 2018 Mar 13. doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3025-9
34. Wu J, Xu F, Zhou W, et al. Risk factors for SARS among persons without known contact with SARS patients, Beijing, China. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2004;10(2):210–216. doi:10.3201/eid1002.030730

35. Wu S, Ma C, Yang Z, et al. Hygiene Behaviors Associated with Influenza-Like Illness among Adults in Beijing, China: A Large, Population-Based Survey. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(2):e0148448. Published 2016 Feb 3. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0148448
36. Zhang L, Peng Z, Ou J, et al. Protection by face masks against influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 virus on trans-Pacific passenger aircraft, 2009. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2013;19(9):1403–1410. doi:10.3201/eid1909.121765
37. Suess T, Remschmidt C, Schink S, et al. Facemasks and intensified hand hygiene in a German household trial during the 2009/2010 influenza A(H1N1) pandemic: adherence and tolerability in children and adults. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2011;139(12):1895–1901. doi:10.1017/S0950268810003006
38. Al-Jasser FS, Kabbash IA, Almazroa MA, Memish ZA. Patterns of diseases and preventive measures among domestic hajjis from Central, Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Med J*. 2012;33(8):879–886.
39. Balaban V, Stauffer WM, Hammad A, et al. Protective practices and respiratory illness among US travelers to the 2009 Hajj. *J Travel Med*. 2012;19(3):163–168. doi:10.1111/j.1708-8305.2012.00602.x
40. Emamian MH, Hassani AM, Fateh M. Respiratory Tract Infections and its Preventive Measures among Hajj Pilgrims, 2010: A Nested Case Control Study. *Int J Prev Med*. 2013;4(9):1030–1035.
41. Gautret P, Vu Hai V, Sani S, Douchi M, Parola P, Brouqui P. Protective measures against acute respiratory symptoms in French pilgrims participating in the Hajj of 2009. *J Travel Med*. 2011;18(1):53–55. doi:10.1111/j.1708-8305.2010.00480.x
42. Hashim S, Ayub ZN, Mohamed Z, et al. The prevalence and preventive measures of the respiratory illness among Malaysian pilgrims in 2013 Hajj season. *J Travel Med*. 2016;23(2):tav019. Published 2016 Feb 8. doi:10.1093/jtm/tav019
43. Sung AD, Sung JAM, Corbet K, et al. Surgical mask usage reduces the incidence of parainfluenza virus 3 in recipients of stem cell transplantation: Blood. Conference: 54th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Hematology, ASH 2012. Atlanta, GA United States. Conference Publication: (var.pagings). 120 (21) (no pagination), 2012. Date of Publication: 16 Nov 2012.
44. Cowling BJ, Chan KH, Fang VJ, et al. Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent influenza transmission in households: a cluster randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;151(7):437–446. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-151-7-200910060-00142
45. Casas L, Espinosa A, Borràs-Santos A, et al. Domestic use of bleach and infections in children: a multicentre cross-sectional study. *Occup Environ Med*. 2015;72(8):602–604. doi:10.1136/oemed-2014-102701
46. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine*. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2

Sub-review 2: what is the relative effectiveness of medical masks versus non-medical masks or equivalent barriers?

Keywords

COVID-19; coronavirus; SARS-CoV-2; transmission; face masks; community

Key references

- Aiello et al. (2010). Mask use, hand hygiene, and seasonal influenza-like illness among young adults: a randomized intervention trial. *The Journal of infectious diseases*, 201(4), pp.491-498.
- Aiello et al. (2012). Facemasks, hand hygiene, and influenza among young adults: a randomized intervention trial. *PloS one*, 7(1).
- Alfelali et al. (2019). Facemask versus No Facemask in Preventing Viral Respiratory Infections During Hajj: A Cluster Randomised Open Label Trial.
- Al-Jasser et al. (2012). Patterns of diseases and preventive measures among domestic hajjis from Central, Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Med J*, 33(8), pp.879-86.
- Balaban et al. (2012). Protective practices and respiratory illness among US travelers to the 2009 Hajj. *Journal of travel medicine*, 19(3), pp.163-168.

- Barasheed et al. (2014) Pilot Randomised Controlled Trial to Test Effectiveness of Facemasks in Preventing Influenza-like Illness Transmission among Australian Hajj Pilgrims in 2011, *Infectious Disorders - Drug Targets*, 14(2), pp. 110-116.
- Choudhry et al. (2006). Hajj-associated acute respiratory infection among hajjis from Riyadh. WHO. *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal*
- Cowling et al. (2009). Facemasks and hand hygiene to prevent influenza transmission in households: a cluster randomized trial. *Annals of internal medicine*, 151(7), pp.437-446.
- Deris et al. (2010). The prevalence of acute respiratory symptoms and role of protective measures among Malaysian hajj pilgrims. *Journal of travel medicine*, 17(2), pp.82-88.
- Emamian et al. (2013) Respiratory Tract Infections and its Preventive Measures among Hajj Pilgrims, 2010: A Nested Case Control Study
- Gautret P1, Vu Hai V, Sani S, Douthi M, Parola P, Brouqui P (2011) Protective measures against acute respiratory symptoms in French pilgrims participating in the Hajj of 2009. *J Travel Med.* 18(1):53-5. doi: 10.1111/j.1708-8305.2010.00480.x.
- Kim, C. O., Nam, C. M., Lee, D. C., Chang, J., & Lee, J. W. (2012). Is abdominal obesity associated with the 2009 influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in Korean school-aged children?. *Influenza and other respiratory viruses*, 6(5), 313–317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-2659.2011.00318.x>
- Larson EL, Ferng YH, Wong-McLoughlin J, Wang S, Haber M, Morse SS (2010). Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on URIs and influenza in crowded, urban households. *Public Health Rep.* 125(2):178-91.
- Ma QX; Shan H; Zhang HL et al (2020) Potential utilities of mask wearing and instant hand hygiene for fighting SARS-CoV-2
- MacIntyre CR, Cauchemez S, Dwyer DE, Seale H, Cheung P, Browne G, Fasher M, Wood J, Gao Z, Booy R, Ferguson N. (2009) Face mask use and control of respiratory virus transmission in households. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 15(2):233-41.
- MacIntyre CR, Zhang Y, Chughtai AA, Seale H, Zhang D, Chu Y, Zhang H, Rahman B, Wang Q (2016) Cluster randomised controlled trial to examine medical mask use as source control for people with respiratory illness. *BMJ Open.* 6(12):e012330. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012330
- Philippe Gautret, Samir Benkouiten, Karolina Griffiths, Shruti Sridhar (2015) The inevitable Hajj cough: Surveillance data in French pilgrims, 2012–2014, *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease.* 13(6):485-489.
- Simmerman et al. (2011) Findings from a household randomized controlled trial of hand washing and face masks to reduce influenza transmission in Bangkok, Thailand. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses* 5(4), 256–267
- Suess et al. (2012) The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of influenza transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial; Berlin, Germany, 2009-2011, *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 12(26), pp. 12-26.
- Suhana Hashim, Zeti N. Ayub, Zeehaida Mohamed, Habsah Hasan, Azian Harun, Nabilah Ismail, Zaidah A. Rahman, Siti Suraiya, Nyi Nyi Naing, Aniza A. Aziz, (2016) The prevalence and preventive measures of the respiratory illness among Malaysian pilgrims in 2013 hajj season, *Journal of Travel Medicine*, 23(2): <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/tav019>
- Uchida et al. (2017) Effectiveness of vaccination and wearing masks on seasonal influenza in Matsumoto City, Japan, in the 2014/2015 season: An observational study among all elementary schoolchildren. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 5, pp. 86-91.
- Wu et al. (2004) Risk factors for SARS among persons without known contact with SARS patients, Beijing, China. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 10(2), pp. 210-216.

- Wu et al. (2016) Hygiene Behaviors Associated with Influenza-Like Illness among Adults in Beijing, China: A Large, Population-Based Survey. PLoS One, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0148448.
- Zhang et al. (2013b) Factors Associated with Household Transmission of Pandemic (H1N1) 2009 among Self-Quarantined Patients in Beijing, China, PLoS One, 8(10), p. e77873.

Key references

Sub-review 3 - what evidence is there for the role of behavioural factors on the effectiveness of face mask use in the community?

Key references

Sub-review 4: what is the mode of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and other common respiratory pathogens?

Inclusion criteria

- Reviews and commentaries that reported evidence-based findings of the mode of transmission of coronaviruses (including SARS-CoV-1, SARS-CoV-2, MERS-CoV and seasonal CoVs) and other respiratory pathogens among general human population; OR
- Any published original studies that reported findings of the mode of transmission of coronaviruses

Exclusion criteria

- Animal-based models

Key references

- 1Adhikari SP, Meng S, Wu Y-J, Mao Y-P, Ye R-X, Wang Q-Z, et al. Epidemiology, causes, clinical manifestation and diagnosis, prevention and control of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) during the early outbreak period: a scoping review. *Infectious Diseases of Poverty*. 2020;9:1-12.
- 2Bourouiba L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 3Cowling BJ, Zhou Y, Ip DK, Leung GM, Aiello AE. Face masks to prevent transmission of influenza virus: a systematic review. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2010;138:449-56.
- 4Dixon M, Phin N. The use of facemasks and respirators during an influenza pandemic: scientific evidence base review. Department of Health and Public Health England. 2014.
- 5Greenhalgh T, Chan XH, Khunti K, Durand-Moreau Q, Straube S, Devane D, et al. What is the efficacy of standard face masks compared to respirator masks in preventing covid-type respiratory illnesses in primary care staff? Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford. 2020.
- 6Hugonnet S, Pittet D. Transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome in critical care: do we need a change? : American Thoracic Society; 2004.
- 7Hui DS, Zumla A. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome: Historical, Epidemiologic, and Clinical Features. *Infectious Disease Clinics*. 2019;33:869-89.
- 8Jefferson T, Jones M, Al Ansari LA, Bawazeer G, Beller E, Clark J, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Part 1-Face masks, eye protection and person distancing: systematic review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*. 2020.
- 9Killerby ME, Biggs HM, Midgley CM, Gerber SI, Watson JT. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus transmission. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2020;26:191.
- 10Kutter JS, Spronken MI, Fraaij PL, Fouchier RA, Herfst S. Transmission routes of respiratory viruses among humans. *Current opinion in virology*. 2018;28:142-51.

- 11Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, Chan K-H, McDevitt JJ, Hau BJP, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature Medicine*. 2020.
- 12Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, et al. Aerodynamic Characteristics and RNA Concentration of SARS-CoV-2 Aerosol in Wuhan Hospitals during COVID-19 Outbreak. *bioRxiv*. 2020.
- 13MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. Facemasks for the prevention of infection in healthcare and community settings. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2015;350:h694.
- 14Moghadami M. A narrative review of influenza: a seasonal and pandemic disease. *Iranian journal of medical sciences*. 2017;42:2.
- 15Nam HH, Ison MG. Respiratory syncytial virus infection in adults. *bmj*. 2019;366:l5021.
- 16Otter J, Donskey C, Yezli S, Douthwaite S, Goldenberg S, Weber D. Transmission of SARS and MERS coronaviruses and influenza virus in healthcare settings: the possible role of dry surface contamination. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2016;92:235-50.
- 17Peng X, Xu X, Li Y, Cheng L, Zhou X, Ren B. Transmission routes of 2019-nCoV and controls in dental practice. *International Journal of Oral Science*. 2020;12:1-6.
- 18Raoult D, Zumla A, Locatelli F, Ippolito G, Kroemer G. Coronavirus infections: Epidemiological, clinical and immunological features and hypotheses. *Cell Stress*. 2020.
- 19Rothan HA, Byrareddy SN. The epidemiology and pathogenesis of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. *Journal of autoimmunity*. 2020:102433.
- 20Saunders-Hastings P, Crispo JAG, Sikora L, Krewski D. Effectiveness of personal protective measures in reducing pandemic influenza transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemics*. 2017;20:1-20.
- 21Shapiro M, London B, Nigri D, Shoss A, Zilber E, Fogel I. Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus: review of the current situation in the world. *Disaster and military medicine*. 2016;2:9.
- 22Shiu EY, Leung NH, Cowling BJ. Controversy around airborne versus droplet transmission of respiratory viruses: implication for infection prevention. *Current opinion in infectious diseases*. 2019;32:372-9.
- 23van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson BN, et al. Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020.
- 24Wang W, Xu Y, Gao R, Lu R, Han K, Wu G, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 25Wilder-Smith A, Chiew CJ, Lee VJ. Can we contain the COVID-19 outbreak with the same measures as for SARS? *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2020.