

1

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

3

4

5 Hermógenes Fernández-Marín<sup>1,9\*</sup>, Gaspar Bruner-Montero<sup>2</sup>, Ana Portugal-Loayza<sup>3</sup>, Virginia  
6 Miranda<sup>4</sup>, Alcibíades Villareal<sup>1,9</sup>, Eduardo Ortega<sup>5</sup>, Virginia Núñez-Samudio<sup>6,9</sup>, Iván  
7 Landires<sup>6,9</sup>, Luis C. Mejía<sup>1,9</sup>, Sandra López-Vergès<sup>7,9</sup>, William T. Wcislo<sup>8</sup>, Jagannatha Rao  
8 K.S.<sup>1,9</sup>

9

10 <sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> Department of Genetics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

14 <sup>3</sup> Gamboa, Clayton, Corregimiento de Ancón, Panamá

15 <sup>4</sup> Complejo Hospitalario Arnulfo Arias Madrid, Caja de Seguro Social, Panamá

16 <sup>5</sup> Secretaria Nacional de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación (SENACYT), Panamá

17 <sup>6</sup> Instituto de Ciencias Médicas, Las Tablas, Los Santos, Panamá

18 <sup>7</sup> Gorgas Memorial Institute of Health Studies, Panamá

19 <sup>8</sup> Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Panamá

20 <sup>9</sup> 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

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

### *Data processing and analyses*

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

We conducted all statistical analyses in R ([www.r-project.org](http://www.r-project.org)) (18). The GLMMs were generated using the 'glmmTMB()' function in the 'glmmTMB' package (19). The model selection was based on the Akaike Information Criteria comparing all models via the 'AICtab()' function in the 'bbmle' package (20). To validate our model, a residual diagnostic analysis was performed by simulating 1 000 times the model's residuals using the 'simulateResiduals()' function in the DHARMA package (21). Overdispersion was tested with the 'overdisp\_fun()' function and multicollinearity with the 'check\_collinearity()' function in the 'performance' package. We used the Wald  $\chi^2$  tests with a type III sum of squares to estimate the significant effects of our model using the 'Anova()' function in the 'car' package (22), and odds ratios (OR) were subtracted by exponentiating the coefficients of the model.

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

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

## Results


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

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


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

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







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



**Figure 2. Wearing mask probability during the COVID-19 pandemic.** (A) Interaction plot showing the probability of face mask-wearing between genders at different public areas, and (B) the probability of wearing masks between gender at different ages. The probabilities were estimated from a binomial GLMM across observations ( $n = 36\,441$ ). Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.



**Figure 3. Usages of different types of face mask protection during the COVID-19 pandemic.** Percentage of people wearing different types of masks in public areas between August and December 2020. A total of 64 650 observations were documented.



**Figure 4. Different types of face mask protection over time during the COVID-19 pandemic.** (A) Daily confirmed cases in Panama as a function of time across the observational study. (B) Multinomial logistic regression showing the predicted probability associated with the frequency of use for different types of face masks (cloth, KN95, surgical, and valve) in public areas over time. The model was performed with 64 006 observations, the categorical variable “other” was omitted from the model. A strict gender-based quarantine was mandated by the Panamanian government from April 1<sup>st</sup>, 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

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

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

**Table 2. Information about prices per unit of cloth, surgical and KN95 non-medical face 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

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

## Discussion

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

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

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



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

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

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Anna Melao for helping to collect some information on prices of masks. The Sistema Nacional de Investigación of the Republic of Panama granted funds to conduct

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

#### **Author Contributions:**

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

#### **Conflicts of interest**

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

#### **Data sharing statements**

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

#### **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

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

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, Czypionka 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.