

1 Limited impact of lifting universal masks on SARS-COV-2 transmission in schools: The  
2 crucial role of outcome measurements

3

4 **Authors**

5 Mingwei Li<sup>1,2</sup>, Bingyi Yang<sup>1</sup>, Benjamin Cowling<sup>1,2</sup>

6 **Affiliations:**

7 <sup>1</sup>WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of  
8 Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong  
9 Special Administrative Region, China

10 <sup>2</sup> Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health Limited, Hong Kong Science and Technology  
11 Park, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China

12 **Corresponding author:**

13 Bingyi Yang

14 School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, 7  
15 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong

16 Email: [yangby@hku.hk](mailto:yangby@hku.hk)

17 Tel: +852 39716911

18 **Word count:** (Abstract: 122)

19 (Main text: 1148)

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 As the pandemic's dynamics changed, many municipalities lifted face wearing  
22 requirement in school which was initially implemented to mitigate the transmission of  
23 COVID-19. This study examines the effects of lifting mask mandates on COVID-19  
24 transmission within Massachusetts school districts. We first replicated previous  
25 research by Cowger et al. (2022) utilizing a Difference-in-Difference (DID) model. Then,  
26 we back project the case infection and calculate the  $R_t$  value to redo the DID analysis.  
27 However, when shifting the outcome measurement to the reproductive number ( $R_t$ ),  
28 our findings suggest that lifting mask mandates can only significantly influence the  $R_t$   
29 first two weeks post-intervention. This implies that while mask mandate plays a role in  
30 mitigation, its lifting does not drastically influence COVID-19 transmissibility in the long  
31 term.

## 32 INTRODUCTION

33 Non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) have played a critical role in reducing  
34 transmission during the COVID-19 pandemic and “flattening the curve”, spreading out  
35 infections over a longer period of time to reduce pressure on healthcare systems. One  
36 such NPI, recommending or even requiring people to wear face masks in certain  
37 settings or locations, was commonly used during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although  
38 challenges exist in examining the effectiveness of face masks in preventing disease  
39 transmissions that caused by the heterogeneity in mask materials, inconsistency in user  
40 compliance and the coincidental implementation of other NPIs, it was later suggested to  
41 be effective in mitigating COVID-19 transmissions and adopted by schools (Boutzoukas  
42 et al., 2022; Kim et al., 2020; Sharma et al., 2020). As the pandemic progresses, many  
43 local authorities relaxed mask mandates during periods when the pandemic appears to  
44 be receding, while the impact of lifting these mandates on transmission remains under-  
45 investigated. It's critical to understand both the potential reduction in transmission  
46 when a mask mandate is introduced, as well as the possible increase in transmission  
47 when such interventions are relaxed or removed.

48

49 Cowger *et al.* found significantly lower incidence in schools which maintained universal  
50 masking compared to those without in the subsequent surge after mask mandates were  
51 lifted in Massachusetts school in February 2021 (Cowger et al., 2022), However, the  
52 outcome measurement (i.e., incidence) alone cannot fully reflect the transmission  
53 process since it does not account for the exponential changes in case numbers during  
54 the transmission. For instance, initial incidence discrepancies between two locations  
55 can magnify over time, even if the reproductive number remains constant. Similar  
56 oversights of transmission outcomes have been identified in studies about effectiveness

57 of other COVID-19 control measures (Auger et al., 2020), which may have impacted the  
58 accuracy of the findings and their implications.

59

60 In this study, we used the same data source as Cowger *et al.* to examine the impact of  
61 outcome measure (i.e., transmission and/or incidence) on the estimated effectiveness of  
62 lifting masks mandates on COVID-19 transmission. After replicating the original  
63 analyses using a difference-in-difference model on incidence rate, we replaced the  
64 outcome measurement with the effective reproductive number ( $R_t$ ).  $R_t$  is estimated as  
65 the average number of secondary infections resulting from one infected individual,  
66 measuring the transmissibility in a population (Nash et al., 2022). The  $R_t$  reductions are  
67 often used to evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures in limiting the virus  
68 transmission, with  $R_t$  below one indicating non-sustainable transmission under existing  
69 measures.

70

## 71 **RESULTS**

72 We replicated Cowger et al. (2022) analysis using population-weighted COVID-19  
73 incidence as the outcome measurement in a difference-in-difference model. We  
74 analysed data from 70 school districts in Massachusetts, with 46 lifting the mask  
75 mandates in the first reporting week (type 1), and 15 and 9 districts lifting in the second  
76 (type 2) and third (type 3) reporting week, respectively. Chelsea and Boston retained  
77 their mandates (type 4). We only replicated results for students, as data on school staff  
78 were not available.

79

80 Our replication results were consistent with those reported by Cowger et al.'s. We found  
81 that lifting the masking mandates in schools was associated with a notable increase in

82 COVID-19 incidence across all district types (Figure 2A), with the lowest incidence in  
83 type 4 district that did not lifted the mask mandate. We observed an average treatment  
84 effect (ATT) of 39.1 (95% CI: 20.4-57.4) COVID-19 cases per 1,000 students associated  
85 with lifting masking mandates, compared to 39.9 (95% CI: 24.3-55.4) in the original  
86 analysis (Cowger et al., 2022). Analyses using incidence as outcomes suggested that  
87 lifting the masking mandates in schools was associated with 39.1 additional cases per  
88 1,000 students within a 15-week period (Figure 2C).

89

90 We further analysed the impact of lifting masks mandates on changes in  $R_t$ , which  
91 measures COVID-19 transmission intensity.  $R_t$  was estimated using method by Cori *et*  
92 *al.*'s method with a mean serial interval of 4.4 days (standard deviation 3.0 days) (Alene  
93 et al., 2021). Contrary to the original results using incidence rates, we found no  
94 significant difference in  $R_t$  across district types, except for type 4 district, which showed  
95 a slightly higher  $R_t$  in the first two weeks after lifting the mask mandates (Figure 2B).

96 There was no association between lifting mask mandates and reductions in  $R_t$  (ATT  
97 0.04, 95% CI, -0.11 to 0.20) throughout the entire post-lifting period (Figure 2D).

98 Moreover,  $R_t$  remained below 1 from February to May, indicating a general decline in  
99 the epidemic during that time until a new wave of the pandemic in late April. (Figure  
100 2B).

101

102 Sensitivity analysis yielded consistent results when using longer serial intervals (Bi et  
103 al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020) (Table S1) and weighting difference-in-difference model with  
104 populations (Brantly Callaway, 2022; Callaway & Sant'Anna, 2021) (Table S2). Our  
105 difference-in-difference analysis satisfied the parallel trend assumption and, according

106 to Cowger *et al.* (2022), other time-varying variables including vaccination rate and  
107 community transmission remained stable during the study period.

108

## 109 **DISCUSSION**

110 We found no evidence that lifting mask mandates in Massachusetts schools significantly  
111 affected COVID-19 transmission rates, which is contrary to the findings reported by  
112 Cowger *et al.* Our findings demonstrate that substantial changes in incidence or case  
113 numbers do not necessarily reflect substantial changes in underlying transmission.  
114 Additionally, we found non-sustainable transmission (i.e.,  $R_t < 1$ ) across all school  
115 districts before masks mandates were lifted, suggesting that factors other than lifting  
116 mask mandates impacted COVID-19 transmission in these schools, such as community  
117 transmission and the implementation of other measures (e.g., extensive testing) (Braga  
118 *et al.*, 2022; Falk *et al.*, 2021; Head *et al.*, 2022; Juutinen *et al.*, 2023).

119

120 Our findings highlight the importance of considering transmissibility outcomes when  
121 assessing the effectiveness of interventions against disease transmission (Cowger *et al.*,  
122 2022). While as counts-based outcomes (e.g., incidence) can serve as proxies for the  
123 difficult-to-measure transmission process, it is crucial to note that nonpharmaceutical  
124 interventions work by reducing person-to-person transmission, reducing subsequent  
125 incidence from what it would have been without the interventions. Due to exponential  
126 case growth and delays in disease development (e.g., incubation periods), changes in  
127 case counts may exaggerate and lag changes in transmission. Therefore, caution is  
128 necessary when interpreting the effects of interventions based on solely on analyses of  
129 incidence rates.

130

131 Our study has some limitations. Firstly, we were unable to account for unobserved  
132 heterogeneities, such as mask types and compliance with mask mandates. Therefore,  
133 our findings reflect the impact of the lifting of masks mandate policies rather than the  
134 direct effects of mask-wearing (Gettings et al., 2022; Tupper & Colijn, 2021). Secondly,  
135 we only estimated  $R_t$  using student cases, and we were unable to account for factors  
136 such as transmission between student and staff and external community due to data  
137 availability. Consequently, our results may partially capture the within-school  
138 transmission dynamics.

139

140 In summary, we found limited impact of lifting mask mandates on reducing COVID-19  
141 transmission in Massachusetts schools in February 2021. Future assessments of the  
142 effects of interventions against transmission should consider including transmissibility  
143 outcomes.

144 **REFERENCES**

- 145 1. Alene, M., Yismaw, L., Assemie, M. A., Ketema, D. B., Gietaneh, W., & Birhan, T. Y.  
146 (2021). Serial interval and incubation period of COVID-19: a systematic review  
147 and meta-analysis. *BMC Infect Dis*, 21(1), 257. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-05950-x)  
148 [021-05950-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-05950-x)
- 149 2. Auger, K. A., Shah, S. S., Richardson, T., Hartley, D., Hall, M., Warniment, A.,  
150 Timmons, K., Bosse, D., Ferris, S. A., Brady, P. W., Schondelmeyer, A. C., &  
151 Thomson, J. E. (2020). Association Between Statewide School Closure and  
152 COVID-19 Incidence and Mortality in the US. *Jama*, 324(9), 859-870.  
153 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.14348>
- 154 3. Bi, Q., Wu, Y., Mei, S., Ye, C., Zou, X., Zhang, Z., Liu, X., Wei, L., Truelove, S. A., Zhang,  
155 T., Gao, W., Cheng, C., Tang, X., Wu, X., Wu, Y., Sun, B., Huang, S., Sun, Y., Zhang,  
156 J., . . . Feng, T. (2020). Epidemiology and transmission of COVID-19 in 391 cases  
157 and 1286 of their close contacts in Shenzhen, China: a retrospective cohort study.  
158 *Lancet Infect Dis*, 20(8), 911-919. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5)  
159 [3099\(20\)30287-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30287-5)
- 160 4. Boutzoukas, A. E., Zimmerman, K. O., Inkelas, M., Brookhart, M. A., Benjamin, D. K.,  
161 Sr., Butteris, S., Koval, S., DeMuri, G. P., Manuel, V. G., Smith, M. J., McGann, K. A.,  
162 Kalu, I. C., Weber, D. J., Falk, A., Shane, A. L., Schuster, J. E., Goldman, J. L.,  
163 Hickerson, J., Benjamin, V., . . . Benjamin, D. K., Jr. (2022). School Masking Policies  
164 and Secondary SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. *Pediatrics*, 149(6).  
165 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2022-056687>
- 166 5. Braga, P. P., Souza, M. S., Oliveira, P. P., Romano, M. C. C., Rocha, G. M., & Gesteira,  
167 E. C. R. (2022). Children wearing face masks to prevent communicable diseases:



- 168           scoping review. *Rev Paul Pediatr*, 41, e2021164. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984->  
169           [0462/2023/41/2021164](https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-0462/2023/41/2021164)
- 170           6. Brantly Callaway, P. H. C. S. A. (2022). did: Treatment Effects with Multiple  
171           Periods and Groups. In (Version R package version 2.1.2 <https://cran.r->  
172           [project.org/web/packages/did/index.html](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/did/index.html) ed.).
- 173           7. Callaway, B., & Sant'Anna, P. H. C. (2021). Difference-in-Differences with multiple  
174           time periods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2), 200-230.  
175           <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.12.001>
- 176           8. Cowger, T. L., Murray, E. J., Clarke, J., Bassett, M. T., Ojikutu, B. O., Sanchez, S. M.,  
177           Linos, N., & Hall, K. T. (2022). Lifting Universal Masking in Schools - Covid-19  
178           Incidence among Students and Staff. *N Engl J Med*, 387(21), 1935-1946.  
179           <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2211029>
- 180           9. Falk, A., Benda, A., Falk, P., Steffen, S., Wallace, Z., & Høeg, T. B. (2021). COVID-19  
181           Cases and Transmission in 17 K-12 Schools - Wood County, Wisconsin, August  
182           31-November 29, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 70(4), 136-140.  
183           <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7004e3>
- 184           10. Gettings, J. R., Gold, J. A. W., Kimball, A., Forsberg, K., Scott, C., Uehara, A., Tong, S.,  
185           Hast, M., Swanson, M. R., Morris, E., Oraka, E., Almendares, O., Thomas, E. S.,  
186           Mehari, L., McCloud, J., Roberts, G., Crosby, D., Balajee, A., Burnett, E., . . .  
187           Vallabhaneni, S. (2022). Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2  
188           Transmission in a Georgia School District-United States, December 2020-January  
189           2021. *Clin Infect Dis*, 74(2), 319-326. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab332>
- 190           11. Head, J. R., Andrejko, K. L., & Remais, J. V. (2022). Model-based assessment of  
191           SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant transmission dynamics within partially vaccinated K-

- 192 12 school populations. *Lancet Reg Health Am*, 5, 100133.
- 193 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lana.2021.100133>
- 194 12. Juutinen, A., Sarvikivi, E., Laukkanen-Nevala, P., & Helve, O. (2023). Face mask
- 195 recommendations in schools did not impact COVID-19 incidence among 10-12-
- 196 year-olds in Finland - joinpoint regression analysis. *BMC Public Health*, 23(1),
- 197 730. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15624-9>
- 198 13. Kim, M. C., Bae, S., Kim, J. Y., Park, S. Y., Lim, J. S., Sung, M., & Kim, S. H. (2020).
- 199 Effectiveness of surgical, KF94, and N95 respirator masks in blocking SARS-CoV-
- 200 2: a controlled comparison in 7 patients. *Infect Dis (Lond)*, 52(12), 908-912.
- 201 <https://doi.org/10.1080/23744235.2020.1810858>
- 202 14. Nash, R. K., Cori, A., & Nouvellet, P. (2022).
- 203 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.08.22283241>
- 204 15. Sharma, S. K., Mishra, M., & Mudgal, S. K. (2020). Efficacy of cloth face mask in
- 205 prevention of novel coronavirus infection transmission: A systematic review and
- 206 meta-analysis. *J Educ Health Promot*, 9, 192.
- 207 [https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp\\_533\\_20](https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_533_20)
- 208 16. Tupper, P., & Colijn, C. (2021). COVID-19 in schools: Mitigating classroom
- 209 clusters in the context of variable transmission. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 17(7),
- 210 e1009120. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009120>
- 211 17. Xu, X. K., Liu, X. F., Wu, Y., Ali, S. T., Du, Z., Bosetti, P., Lau, E. H. Y., Cowling, B. J., &
- 212 Wang, L. (2020). Reconstruction of Transmission Pairs for Novel Coronavirus
- 213 Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Mainland China: Estimation of Superspreading
- 214 Events, Serial Interval, and Hazard of Infection. *Clin Infect Dis*, 71(12), 3163-3167.
- 215 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa790>
- 216

217 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

218 This work was financially supported by a grant from the Research Grants Council of the  
219 Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No. T11-705/21-N).

220

221 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

222 All authors meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship. The study was conceived by ML, BY  
223 and BJC. Data analyses were done by ML. ML and BY wrote the first draft of the  
224 manuscript, and all authors provided critical review and revision of the text and  
225 approved the final version.

226

227 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT**


228 B.J.C consults for AstraZeneca, Fosun Pharma, GlaxoSmithKline, Haleon, Moderna,  
229 Novavax, Pfizer, Roche, and Sanofi Pasteur. All other authors report no potential  
230 conflicts of interest.

231 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

232 **Figure1. Hypothetical Demonstration of epidemic dynamic of 2 locations with**  
233 **identical  $R_t$ .**


234

235 **Figure 2. Difference-in-difference (DID) model analyses of COVID-19 incidence**  
236 **and effective reproductive number ( $R_t$ ). (A) Weekly COVID-19 case trend by types of**  
237 **school district. (B) Daily COVID-19  $R_t$  estimated from back projected incidence of**  
238 **students, stratified by types of school districts. (C) Average treatment effects (ATT) of**  
239 **the lifting masks mandates on cumulative incidence in students. (D) Average treatment**  
240 **effects (ATT) of the lifting mask mandates on  $R_t$ .**



A


## Weekly Cases



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.28.23294658>; this version posted August 28, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).


B

## Reproduction Number



C

## DID Result-Weekly Cases



D

## DID Result-Reproduction Number

