

1

2 **Dynamics of mask use as a prevention strategy against SARS-Cov-2 in Panama**

3

4

5 Hermógenes Fernández-Marín^{1,9*}, Gaspar Bruner-Montero², Ana Portugal-Loayza³, Virginia
6 Miranda⁴, Alcibíades Villareal^{1,9}, Eduardo Ortega⁵, Virginia Núñez-Samudio^{6,9}, Iván
7 Landires^{6,9}, Luis C. Mejía^{1,9}, Sandra López-Vergès^{7,9}, William T. Wcislo⁸, Jagannatha Rao
8 K.S.^{1,9}

9

10 ¹ Centro de Biodiversidad y Descubrimiento de Drogas, Instituto de Investigaciones
11 Científicas y Servicios de Alta Tecnología (INDICASAT AIP), P.O. Box 0843-01103,
12 Clayton, República de Panamá

13 ² Department of Genetics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

14 ³ Gamboa, Clayton, Corregimiento de Ancón, Panamá

15 ⁴ Complejo Hospitalario Arnulfo Arias Madrid, Caja de Seguro Social, Panamá

16 ⁵ Secretaria Nacional de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación (SENACYT), Panamá

17 ⁶ Instituto de Ciencias Médicas, Las Tablas, Los Santos, Panamá

18 ⁷ Gorgas Memorial Institute of Health Studies, Panamá

19 ⁸ Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Panamá

20 ⁹ Sistema Nacional de Investigación, Panamá

21

22 *Author for correspondence: Hermógenes Fernández-Marín, Centro de Biodiversidad y
23 Descubrimiento de Drogas, Instituto de Investigaciones Científicas y Servicios de Alta
24 Tecnología (INDICASAT AIP), P.O. Box 0843-01103, Clayton, República de Panamá

25 e-mail: HFernandez@indicasat.org.pa

26

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background:** Early in the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, many national public health authorities
29 implemented non-pharmaceutical interventions to mitigate disease outbreaks. Panamá
30 established mandatory mask use two months after its first documented case. Initial
31 compliance was high, but diverse masks were used in public areas. We studied behavioral
32 dynamics of mask use through the first two COVID waves in Panama, to improve
33 implementation of effective, low-cost public health containment measures, when populations
34 are exposed to novel air-borne pathogens.

35 **Methods:** Mask use behavior was recorded from pedestrians in four Panamanian populations
36 (August to December 2020). We recorded facial coverings; and if used, the type of mask, and
37 gender and estimated age of the wearer.

38 **Findings:** People were highly compliant (> 95%) with mask mandates, and demonstrated
39 important population-level behaviours: 1) decreasing use of cloth masks over time, and
40 increasing use of surgical masks; 2) mask use was 3-fold lower in sub-urban neighborhoods
41 than other public areas; and 3) young people were least likely to wear masks.

42 **Interpretation:** Results help focus highly-effective, low-cost, public health interventions for
43 managing and controlling a pandemic. Considerations of behavioural preferences for
44 different masks, relative to pricing and availability, are essential for optimizing public health
45 policies. Policies to increase availability of effective masks, and behavioral nudges to
46 increase acceptance, and to facilitate mask usage, during the on-going SARS-CoV-2
47 pandemic, and for future pandemics of respiratory pathogens, are key tools, especially for
48 nations lagging in access to expensive vaccines and pharmacological approaches.

49 **Funding:** 11-2020 SNI Grant, SENACYT.

50

51 **Introduction**

52 During December 2019, an acute respiratory disease known as Coronavirus disease
53 (COVID-19) was detected in the Chinese city of Wuhan, and the causative agent of the
54 outbreak was named severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).
55 SARS-CoV-2 has affected the public health systems of every country in the world (1),
56 infecting more than 200 million people and causing over 4.3 million deaths since reported at
57 December 2019 through August 2021. The COVID-19 pandemic has forced world-leading
58 health organizations to provide recommendations on how public health systems should
59 operate generally across the globe (2-3). A recommendation to minimize the transmission of
60 the virus, for which the main transmission mechanism is via aerosol droplets (4-5), was the
61 use of personal protective equipment (PPE) to protect healthcare workers and infected
62 people. Not surprisingly, many governments adopted these recommendations, and further
63 included mask usage for the general population with the integration of other non-
64 pharmacological interventions to prevent the rapid transmission of the virus in the population.

65 Throughout the first year of the pandemic, the global public health system lacked the
66 pharmacological tools for the prophylactic and therapeutic management of COVID-19.
67 However, the implementation of non-pharmacological public health measures has allowed
68 the containment, management, and control of the disease to varying degrees. Non-
69 pharmacological measures, such as social distancing, self-isolation (including quarantine),
70 changes in hygienic behavior (e.g., increased frequency of hand washing), and face-covering
71 in public areas were preventive strategies suggested by international health agencies. Perhaps
72 the use of face masks has been the most controversial strategy of prevention. There are many
73 types of masks, and where, when, and how to use them can be complicated to evaluate, and
74 for some individuals, mask use is perceived to impair individual freedom.

75 Face-covering of the general population was quickly adopted and recommended as
76 one of the most important elements for preventing the spread of COVID-19 (6-8). The use of
77 a facial mask was recommended because the social distance among persons (more than 1.5
78 meters) was difficult to maintain in indoor settings and crowded areas, and particularly given
79 the high prevalence of presymptomatic and non-symptomatic cases. More importantly, the
80 use of a facial mask may reduce the aerosol transmission of the virus from infected and non-
81 symptomatic patients to the healthy population (8). Furthermore, high public compliance with
82 mask usage is an effective and low-cost collective action that reduces viral transmission at the
83 public and community level (9, 10). However the prevalence of different types of masks on
84 the population and their different levels of protection can affect the impact of the
85 transmission (8).

86 There is limited information about the prevalence of different types of masks at the
87 population level (8-11). No study has reported how the usage of different types of masks has
88 changed throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, or previous pandemics (10-11). Understanding
89 behavioural responses to the received information about mask efficacy as well as to the
90 supply and demand of masks during the pandemic can improve the efficiency of the system,
91 facilitating transport logistics, mitigating the volatility of wholesale prices, and reducing the
92 shortage of supplies between the general population and healthcare workers (12-15). Here we
93 describe the behaviour of mask wearing during the end of the first wave and the beginning of
94 the second wave of SARS-CoV2 infections in Panama.

95 **Materials and Methods**

96 *Data collection*

97 Observations of the type of mask used were recorded in urban areas of four provinces of the
98 Republic of Panama, including the Provinces of Panama (Amelia Denis de Icaza in San

99 Miguelito’s districts, and Felipillo (Pacora) at Panama’s districts), Cocle (city of Penonome),
100 Veraguas (city of Santiago), and Chiriqui (city of David), between August 28th and
101 December 12th, 2020. In each locality, data were recorded 4 to 6 days per month. Each day
102 the observations were conducted in each one of the following places from August to
103 December 2020: i) from 7:00 am to 8:00 am in bus and train terminals, ii) from 8:30 to 9:30
104 along public walkways of main avenues, iii) and from 10:00 to 11:00 am in supermarkets.
105 From November to December 2020, additional data were collected in neighborhood areas
106 from 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm. The data were recorded as i) biological gender (man or woman), ii)
107 use of mask (correct or incorrect), iii) type of mask wearing (cloth, surgical, KN95, valve, or
108 other types of masks, which included all type of masks that were not aforementioned), iv) the
109 estimated range of the age (early adulthood < 19, middle adulthood 20 to < 40, late-middle
110 adulthood 40 to < 60, and late adulthood > 60 (16-17). Masks were classified as follows:
111 cloth masks are any fabric masks with cotton or synthetic cloth; surgical masks are
112 dispensable colored non-medical masks of 3 layers; KN95 masks are non-medical masks of
113 four or five layers curved design with contour adapted to the face; valved masks are
114 considered any type of masks that used an exhalation valve; and the “others” category
115 included any other facial covering, including scarves and kerchiefs. Initial observations in
116 August and September indicated that some people wore masks incorrectly, which was
117 tabulated as missing data. In October, November, and December, we scored mask use as
118 “correct” or not, with the former defined as the mask covered the nose and mouth of the
119 observed person; otherwise, it was tabulated as incorrect use. The price of masks in the
120 market was quoted in Panama Compra (<https://www.panamacompra.gob.pa>) and local
121 commercial shops, such as hardware stores, warehouses, pharmacies, supermarkets, and
122 shopping malls.

123 *Data processing and analyses*

124 To evaluate face mask usage (correct or incorrect) in public areas, we used a
125 Generalized Linear Mixed Model (GLMM) with a binomial distribution and logit link
126 function. After removing the missing data from 64 650 observations, the GLMM model was
127 performed with 36 441 observations. The model included the predictor variables gender
128 (male and female), place (main streets, market, neighborhood, and terminal station), and age
129 (early, middle, late-middle, and late adulthood), and the interactions between gender \times place,
130 and gender \times age. Region was included as a random effect to account for differences among
131 populations, with the predictor variable place nested within region. A total of 64 650
132 observations were documented during the study.

133 We conducted all statistical analyses in R (www.r-project.org) (18). The GLMMs
134 were generated using the 'glmmTMB()' function in the 'glmmTMB' package (19). The
135 model selection was based on the Akaike Information Criteria comparing all models via the
136 'AICtab()' function in the 'bbmle' package (20). To validate our model, a residual diagnostic
137 analysis was performed by simulating 1 000 times the model's residuals using the
138 'simulateResiduals()' function in the DHARMA package (21). Overdispersion was tested with
139 the 'overdisp_fun()' function and multicollinearity with the 'check_collinearity()' function in
140 the 'performance' package. We used the Wald χ^2 tests with a type III sum of squares to
141 estimate the significant effects of our model using the 'Anova()' function in the 'car' package
142 (22), and odds ratios (OR) were subtracted by exponentiating the coefficients of the model.

143 To determine whether the frequency of use of different types of masks changed over
144 time, we used a multinomial logistic regression model (MLRM), which can help to
145 characterize observations when the response variable has multiple categories. Mask type
146 (cloth, KN95, surgical, valve, and others) was evaluated as a function of gender, place, and
147 time period (continuous predictor variable) in the MLRM using the 'multinom' function in
148 the *nnet* package (23). The MLRM was performed with 64 006 observations after removing

149 missing data and variable “other masks”. Model selection, multicollinearity, and ORs were
150 estimated as mentioned above. All graphs were generated with the function ‘ggplot()’ in the
151 ‘ggplot2’ package (24), and final editions were performed in the program Inkscape
152 (www.inkscape.org).

153 **Results**


154 To evaluate face mask usage in the population, we analyzed 36 266 observations in
155 different public areas. Among these observations, 34 266 (94%) people were observed
156 wearing a mask, and 2 175 (6%) people were not wearing a mask. Men (93%, n = 20 122)
157 and women (95%, n = 16 319) did not differ in the use of mask (GLMM, $\chi^2 = 1.04$, p=0.306).
158 In contrast, face mask use differed at different places (GLMM, $\chi^2 = 29.19$, p < 0.0001): mask
159 use was more prevalent among people at transport terminals (94 %, n = 15 810), main streets
160 (95.1%, n = 13 894), and supermarkets (98.3%, n = 4 763), decreasing to 75% (n = 1 974) in
161 neighborhood areas. Also, mask use differed with age (GLMM, $\chi^2 = 18.94$, p = 0.0002),
162 used more frequently by middle (93.5%, n = 19 442), late-middle (95%, n = 11 673), and
163 elderly ages (95.6%, n = 3 134), relative to young adults (90%, n = 2 192).

164 The odds ratios of people wearing masks between supermarkets, transport terminals
165 station, and main streets did not differ (p > 0.05), but people in sub-urban neighborhood areas
166 were 20 times (OR 0.05 [95% CI 0.01–0.16], p < 0.0001, figure 1) less likely to wear a mask.
167 While the odd ratios of middle, late-middle, and late adulthood groups did not differ in face
168 mask-wearing (p > 0.05), people in the early adulthood group are 1.49 times (OR 0.67 [95%
169 CI 0.54–0.84], p < 0.0001, figure 1) less likely to wear a mask. For the interactions, there
170 were no differences in odds between women and men at supermarkets and main streets areas
171 (p > 0.05). In contrast, women at neighborhood areas (OR 1.78 [95% CI 1.34–2.38], p <
172 0.0001, figure 2A) and transport terminals (OR 1.46 [95% CI 1.18–1.81], p = 0.001, figure
173 2A), respectively, had a 78% and 56% increase in the odds of wearing a mask compared to

174 men (figure 2B). While women in early, late-middle, and late adulthood groups were more
175 likely to wear a mask than men (figure 2B).

176 Different types of face mask protection were recorded (n = 64 650) from four areas of
177 Panama (figure 3) during a rapid rise period of the COVID-19 pandemic (figure 4A). We
178 found substantial differences in the use of difference types of masks in the population, with
179 most people wearing surgical (68%, n = 44 184) and cloth (27.2%, n = 17 627) masks, and
180 fewer people wearing KN95 (2.36%, n = 1527), valve masks (1.16%, n = 735), and other
181 masks (0.89%, n = 577). Women were 3.5 times more likely to wear cloth (OR 3.54 [95% CI
182 2.96–4.25], p < 0.0001), KN95 (OR 3.61 [95% CI 2.94–4.44], p < 0.001), and surgical (OR
183 3.71 [95% CI 3.10–4.44], p < 0.001) masks than men, relative to people wearing valve masks
184 (table 1). There was a significant decrease in people wearing cloth masks over time (OR 0.98
185 [95% CI 0.96–0.99], p = 0.001), figure 4B). Conversely, the odds of people wearing surgical
186 masks over time increased 2% compared to people wearing valve masks (OR 1.02 [95% CI
187 1.01–1.04], p = 0.002), figure 4B). In neighborhood areas, people are 1.98 and 1.83 times
188 more likely to wear cloth (OR 1.98 [95% CI 1.10–3.58], p = 0.023, table 1) and surgical (OR
189 1.83 [95% CI 1.02–3.29], p = 0.043, table 1) masks than valve masks, respectively. The late
190 adulthood group is 1.53 and 2.17 times more likely of wearing cloth (OR 1.53 [95% CI 1.02–
191 3.29], p = 0.043) and KN95 (OR 2.17 [95% CI 1.60–2.94], p < 0.001) masks than valve
192 masks (table 1).

193




194

195 **Figure 1. Odds ratios for people wearing a mask during the COVID-19 pandemic.** Odds
 196 ratios and 95% confidence intervals for the group terms gender (men and women), place
 197 (mean street, market, neighborhood, and terminal), and age (early, middle, late-middle, and
 198 late adulthood). We included the interactions gender \times place, and gender \times age using a
 199 GLMM with binomial distribution, accounting for the random effect of region, and place
 200 nested within region. There were 36 441 observations included in the model. P-values denote
 201 the statistical significance of the model. Men, main streets, and middle adulthood were used
 202 as reference term within their groups denoted as Ref. The vertical dashed line represents the
 203 null value (odds ratio=1.0).

204

205



206

207 **Figure 2. Wearing mask probability during the COVID-19 pandemic.** (A) Interaction

208 plot showing the probability of face mask-wearing between genders at different public areas,

209 and (B) the probability of wearing masks between gender at different ages. The probabilities

210 were estimated from a binomial GLMM across observations (n = 36 441). Error bars


211 represent the standard error of the mean.

212

213

214

215




216

217 **Figure 3. Usages of different types of face mask protection during the COVID-19**

218 **pandemic.** Percentage of people wearing different types of masks in public areas between

219 August and December 2020. A total of 64 650 observations were documented.

220



221

222 **Figure 4. Different types of face mask protection over time during the COVID-19**

223 **pandemic.** (A) Daily confirmed cases in Panama as a function of time across the

224 observational study. (B) Multinomial logistic regression showing the predicted probability

225 associated with the frequency of use for different types of face masks (cloth, KN95, surgical,

226 and valve) in public areas over time. The model was performed with 64 006 observations, the

227 categorical variable “other” was omitted from the model. A strict gender-based quarantine

228 was mandated by the Panamanian government from April 1st, 2020 to February 2021, was

229 lifted at different moments depending of the province and Rt. A relaxation of this policy with
230 flexibility of movement (FM) in leaving homes is denoted by dark grey, and the reopening of
231 economic activities is in light grey (RA); the arrow indicates the end of gender-based
232 restrictions (GRE).

233

234 **Table 1. Odds ratio based on the multinomial logistic regression model.**

Response	Predictors	Odds ratio	95% C.I.	Wald-test	P-value
Cloth vs valve					
	Women	3.54	2.96 – 4.25	13.69	<0.001
	Time period	0.98	0.96 – 0.99	-3.39	0.001
	Market neighborhood	1.04	0.84 – 1.28	0.35	0.723
	Terminal	1.98	1.10 – 3.58	2.27	0.023
	Early adulthood	1.1	0.93 – 1.31	1.14	0.253
	Late middle adulthood	1.24	0.85 – 1.82	1.12	0.263
	Late adulthood	1.01	0.86 – 1.18	0.09	0.931
		1.53	1.17 – 2.01	3.06	0.002
KN95 vs valve					
	Women	3.61	2.94 – 4.44	12.25	<0.001
	Time period	1.02	1.00 – 1.03	1.9	0.057
	Market neighborhood	1.07	0.84 – 1.37	0.56	0.578
	Terminal	1.17	0.57 – 2.37	0.42	0.672
	Early adulthood	0.9	0.74 – 1.10	-1.01	0.312
	Late middle adulthood	0.46	0.27 – 0.79	-2.82	0.005
	Late adulthood	1.12	0.93 – 1.36	1.17	0.242
		2.17	1.60 – 2.94	4.96	<0.001
Surgical vs valve					
	Women	3.71	3.10 – 4.44	14.3	<0.001
	Time period	1.02	1.01 – 1.04	3.15	0.002
	Market neighborhood	0.96	0.78 – 1.18	-0.4	0.69
	Terminal	1.83	1.02 – 3.29	2.02	0.043
	Early adulthood	1.02	0.86 – 1.21	0.24	0.813
	Late middle adulthood	0.95	0.65 – 1.38	-0.29	0.773
	Late adulthood	0.8	0.69 – 0.94	-2.71	0.007
		1.19	0.91 – 1.56	1.27	0.204

235

236 Analysis was performed using a multinomial logistic regression model. The model included
 237 the response variable mask type (cloth, KN95, surgical, and valve) as a function of gender,
 238 place, and time period (continuous predictor variable).

239

240

241

242 **Table 2. Information about prices per unit of cloth, surgical and KN95 non-medical face**
243 **masks selling in Panama from August to December 2020.**

Month (2020)	Prices per unit of surgical masks mean \pm SD	Prices range per unit of cloth masks	Prices per unit of KN 95 masks mean \pm SD
August	0.19 \pm 0.08	1.50-3.50	1.86 \pm 0.95
September	0.08 \pm 0.04	1.50-3.50	1.65 \pm 0.97
October	0.09 \pm 0.04	1.50-3.50	1.82 \pm 0.91
November	0.07 \pm 0.05	1.50-3.50	1.12 \pm 0.28
December	0.07 \pm 0.03	1.00-3.50	1.05 \pm 0.88

244

245 Face mask prices in US\$ per unit (mean \pm SD) or range. Prices were obtained from Panama
246 Compra website (<https://www.panamacompra.gob.pa/Inicio/#!/>), and information from
247 Instagram accounts of established commercial outlets.

248

249 **Discussion**

250 Panama is a developing country with a high income *per capita*, but with strong
251 socioeconomic inequality such that a high percentage of the population live below the
252 poverty line (25). The nation is a world-wide logistical and regional transportation hub,
253 where more than 18 million people transit annually (26). Socioeconomic characteristics are
254 not fundamentally different from many countries of the Latin American region. As
255 pharmacological approaches are lagging in the region, due to global inequities in vaccine
256 availability (10-11), encouraging hygienic prophylactic behaviour, mask usage and social
257 distancing are key strategies to manage the COVID-19 pandemic. Panama reported its first
258 positive cases of COVID-19 in early March 2020, and rapid community transmission was
259 documented with a great diversity of strains (27). Severe containment and mobility-restriction
260 measures were quickly implemented by the national government (27), reducing labor activity
261 over 70%, with mandatory use of masks, enforced with fines. The prevalence and dynamics
262 of mask use in Panama observed between August and December 2020, after the first and

263 during the second epidemiological waves of SARS-CoV-2 positive cases, provide insights
264 into the challenges faced and should facilitate preparedness for future pandemics.

265 The rapid spread of the COVID-19 pathogen created a huge demand world-wide for a
266 limited supply of personal protective equipment (both for the general public and health care
267 systems) and hospital equipment (respirators). The use of face masks during the first and
268 second epidemiological SARS-CoV-2 waves in Panama showed a change in the behavior of
269 the population in the use of types of masks. From August to December 2020, the use of
270 surgical masks increased from 58% to 79%, while the use of cloth masks was reduced from
271 37% to 19%, while no changes were observed to the use of KN95 and valved masks in this
272 period, both types of masks used by less than 3% of the people analyzed in this study. During
273 the same period of time, a continuous decrease of the prices of non-medical surgical and
274 KN95 masks was observed, whereas the price of cloth masks decreased only in December
275 2020 (table 2). Two non-competitive hypotheses can explain this change in strategy at the
276 population level. The first hypothesis is the change in the purchasing power of people. Our
277 data were taken in bus and subway terminals, and in main avenues in the different cities,
278 which suggests that people with low and medium purchasing power were observed, so that
279 work suspension could influence mask use at the population level. While a gradual economic
280 recovery could change people's purchasing power, enabling them to acquire surgical masks.
281 Additionally, at the beginning of the pandemic cloth masks became part of a fashion culture,
282 and producing them became a means of financial support for family businesses, but later
283 information in the media and from public health authorities about the relative inefficiency of
284 cloth masks, may have induced a decrease of their use as soon as people have learned that
285 cloth masks did not offer them the best protection to prevent the spread of SARS-CoV-2
286 relative to surgical masks (10, 11). Surgical and KN95 particulate masks protect better from
287 transmission by aerosols and large particles than fabric masks, but cloth masks protect better

288 than no masks or improper use of them (11). However, it is possible that the knowledge about
289 the protection efficacy conferred by the type of masks used was not reflected in an increased
290 proportion of use of KN95 masks in the population, possibly because even with a decrease of
291 its price, it remained 15 times more expensive than surgical masks. Subjectively, people
292 report impressions that it was more difficult to breathe when using KN95 or N95 masks than
293 surgical masks in the hot and humid weather in the tropics (28).

294 Of relevance for public health strategies in reducing contagion rate is to identify
295 elements in the behavior of the population that may shape dynamics of disease transmission,
296 and then create policies around them to achieve public health objectives. Our study identified
297 that people under the estimated age of 20, and at the neighborhood level, used masks less
298 frequently. Patterns of mask use were similar among different sites in Panama, with lower
299 compliance among the youth, which will be the last age group to be vaccinated, and should
300 be targets of outreach and education, as they can be spreaders during the epidemic, especially
301 with the origin and spread of new variants of SARS-CoV-2 like the Delta variant, with a
302 higher risk to develop severe symptoms than at the beginning of the epidemic with the wild
303 type virus. Scientific communication is crucial to keeping the population up-dated about the
304 efficiency of the different strategies of prevention and the importance of protecting
305 themselves, but also the role they could play in viral transmission and thus, the responsibility
306 each person has in protecting others. Public health programs to make masks widely available,
307 and mandate their use, represent highly effective, cost-efficient, solutions to decrease the
308 spread of air-borne infectious diseases.

309

310 **Acknowledgments**

311 We are grateful to Anna Melao for helping to collect some information on prices of masks.

312 The Sistema Nacional de Investigación of the Republic of Panama granted funds to conduct

313 the study. The study has the approval of the Ministry of Health and Bioethics permit from
314 Comité Nacional de Bioética de la Investigación, Panamá.

315

316 **Author Contributions:**

317 Conceptualization: HFM, APL, VM; Study design and Methodology: HFM, APL; Literature
318 search: HFM, JRKS, SLV, WTW; Data collection: HFM; Data analyses: GBM, HFM; Data
319 interpretation: HFM, APL, VM, GBM, AV, LCM, SLV, WTW; Writing (first draft): HFM,
320 GBM, APL, VM, AV, EO, VNS, IL, LCM, SLV, WTW, JRKS; Writing (Review and
321 Editing): SLV, WTW; Funding acquisition: HFM. All authors have read and agreed to the
322 published version of the manuscript.

323

324 **Conflicts of interest**

325 The authors report no conflicts of interest.

326 **Data sharing statements**

327 Fernandez-Marin, Hermogenes (2021), “Dynamics of mask use as a prevention strategy
328 against SARS-CoV-2 in Panama”, Mendeley Data, V1, doi: 10.17632/92wp53s8sn.1

329 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

330 An exemption review of our study was approved by Comité Nacional de Bioética de la
331 Investigación de Panamá. All observations performed in this study not involving human
332 participants, and was in accordance with the ethical standards, and the 1964 Helsinki
333 declaration and its later amendments.

334

335

336

337 **References**

338 1. Reid M, Abdool-Karim Q, Geng E, Goosby E. How will COVID-19 transform global
339 health post-pandemic? Defining research and investment opportunities and priorities. *PLOS*
340 *Medicine* 2021; **18**: e1003564.

341 2. Gostin LO, Moon S, Meier BM. Reimagining global health governance in the age of
342 COVID-19. *Am J Public Health* 2020; **110**: 1615-1619.

343 3. World Health Organization. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Situation Report-71
344 (World Health Organization, accessed 31 March 2020); [https:// www.who.int/docs/default-](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200331-sitrep-71-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=4360e92b_8)
345 [source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200331-sitrep-71-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=4360e92b_8](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200331-sitrep-71-covid-19.pdf?sfvrsn=4360e92b_8).

346 4. Liu Y, Ning Z, Chen Y, Guo M, Liu Y, Gali NK, Sun L, Duan Y, Cai J, Westerdahl D, Liu
347 X, Xu K, Ho K-f, Kan H, Fu Q, Lan K. Aerodynamic analysis of SARS-CoV-2 in two
348 Wuhan hospitals. *Nature* 2020; **582**: 557–560.

349 5. Zhang X, Ji Z, Yue Y, Liu H, Wang J. Infection Risk Assessment of COVID-19 through
350 aerosol transmission: a case study of South China Seafood Market. *Environmental Science &*
351 *Technology* 2021; **55**: 4123–4133.

352 6. Feng S, Shen C, Xia N, Song W, Fan M, Cowling BJ. Rational use of face masks in the
353 COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet Respir Med* 2020; **8**:434-436.

354 7. National Health Service (UK). Are face masks useful for preventing coronavirus? 2020.
355 <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/common-questions/>

356 8. Greenhalgh T, Schmid M B, Cypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. Face masks for the public
357 during the covid-19 crisis. *BMJ* 2020; **369**: m1435.

358 9. Chu, D., Akl E, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schunemann H. Physical
359 distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission

360 of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis, *Lancet* 2020;
361 **395**:1973-1987.

362 10. Howard J., Huang A, Li Z, Tufekci Z, Zdimal V, van der Westhuizen H-M, von Delft
363 A, Price A, Fridman L, Tang L-H, Tang V, Watson GL, Bax CE, Shaikh R, Questier F,
364 Hernandez D, Chu LF, Ramirez CM, Rimoin AW. An evidence review of face masks against
365 COVID-19. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 2021; **118**: e2014564118; DOI:
366 10.1073/pnas.2014564118.

367 11. Cheng Y, Ma N, Witt C, Rapp S, Wild PS, Andreae MO, Pöschl U, Su H. Face masks
368 effectively limit the probability of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Science* 2021, **372**: 1439-
369 1443.

370 12. Worby, CJ, Chang, HH. Face mask use in the general population and optimal resource
371 allocation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat Commun* 2020; **11**, 4049.
372 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17922-x>.

373 13. Wu HL, Huang J, Zhang CJP, He Z, Ming WK. Facemask shortage and the novel
374 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak: Reflections on public health measures. *E Clinical*
375 *Medicine* 2020; **21**: 100329.

376 14. Dallas MP, Horner R, Li L. The mutual constraints of states and global value chains
377 during COVID-19: The case of personal protective equipment, *World Development* 2021:
378 139, 105324, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105324>.

379 15. Mahmood S, Crimbly F, Khan S, et al. Strategies for rational use of
380 personal protective equipment (PPE) among healthcare providers during the COVID-19
381 crisis. *Cureus* 2020; **12**: e8248. doi:10.7759/cureus.8248.

382 16. Borkan GA, SS Bachman, AH Norris. 1982. Comparison of visually estimated age
383 with physiologically predicted age as indicators of rates of aging. *Soc Sci Med* 1982; **16**:197-
384 204.

- 385 17. Olde Rikkert MG. Visual estimation of biological age of elderly subjects: good
386 interrater agreement. *Gerontology* 1999; **45**: 165-167.
- 387 18. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2013.
- 388 19. Brooks ME, Kristensen K, van Benthem KJ, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, et
389 al. glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated generalized
390 linear mixed modeling. *R J* 2017; **9**:378-400.
- 391 20. Bolker B. Maximum likelihood estimation and analysis with the bbmle package. R
392 package version. 2014; **1**:17.
- 393 21. Hartig F. DHARMA: residual diagnostics for hierarchical (multi-level/mixed)
394 regression models. R package version 01. 2017;**5**.
- 395 22. Fox J, Weisberg S. An R companion to applied regression: Sage publications; 2018.
- 396 23. Venables WN RB. Modern applied statistics with S: springer; 2002.
- 397 24. Wickham H. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis: Springer-Verlag New York;
398 2016.
- 399 25. The World Bank, Data, Panama. <https://data.worldbank.org/country/PA>.
- 400 26.[https://www.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2018/08/Logistics%20report%20Panama%202018.p](https://www.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2018/08/Logistics%20report%20Panama%202018.pdf)
401 [df](https://www.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2018/08/Logistics%20report%20Panama%202018.pdf)
- 402 27. Franco D, Gonzalez C, Abrego LE, Carrera JP, Diaz Y, Caicedo Y, Moreno A, Chavarria
403 O, Gondola J, Castillo M, Valdespino E, Gaitán M, Martínez-Mandiche J, Hayer L,
404 Gonzalez P, Lange C, Molto Y, Mojica D, Ramos R, Mastelari M, Cerezo L, Moreno L,
405 Donnelly CA, Pascale JM, Faria NR, Lopéz-Vèrges S, Martinez AA; Gorgas COVID19 team
406 and Panama COVID19 Laboratory Network. Early transmission dynamics, spread, and
407 genomic characterization of SARS-CoV-2 in Panama. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021; **27**: 612-615.
- 408 28. Scarano A, Inchingolo F, Lorusso F. Facial skin temperature and discomfort when
409 wearing protective face masks: thermal infrared imaging evaluation and hands moving the
410 mask. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020; **17**: 4624. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17134624.