

Measuring the fitted filtration efficiency of cloth masks, medical masks and respirators

Amanda A Tomkins¹, Gurleen Dulai¹, Ranmeet Dulai³, Sarah Rassenberg¹, Darren Lawless^{2,4}, Scott Laengert¹, Rebecca S Rudman⁵, Shiblul Hasan⁶, Charles-Francois de Lannoy^{1,6}, Ken G Drouillard⁷, Catherine M Clase^{2,3}

1. Department of Chemical Engineering, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada
2. Centre of Excellence in Protective Equipment and Materials, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada
3. Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada
4. Office of the Vice President Research, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada
5. Windsor-Essex Sewing Force, Windsor, Ontario, Canada
6. School of Computer Science, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, Canada
7. Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, Canada

Corresponding author:

Catherine Clase

ORCID 0000-0002-4538-5958

clase@mcmaster.ca

St Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton

Hamilton ON Canada

L8N 4A6

ORCID

Charles de Lannoy ORCID ID: [0000-0001-6451-5626](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6451-5626)

Gurleen Dulai ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2771-3444

Ranmeet Dulai ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3188-4833

Shiblul Hasan ORCID 0000-0002-0285-3926

Short title: Mask types, mask hacks and overmasking

Key points: 95 words

Abstract: 346 words

Body: 3000 words

Table: 1

Figures: 4


Key Points

Question: How well do medical and non-medical masks filter aerosols when worn?

Findings: Well-fitting 2-layer cotton masks, and level 1 medical masks were similar, both filtering around 50% of aerosols. Level 3 masks and KN95/KF94s were similar, filtering around 70%. N95s and CaN99s, without formal fit testing, filtered 97-98%.

Meaning: Level 1 medical masks were not better than the well-fitting 2-layer cotton masks we tested. KN95/KF94s are not as efficient, when worn, as N95s and CaN99s. Overmasking and the use of external braces improve filtration: these are potentially useful strategies when N95s are not available.

See infographic, supplementary figure 7, supplementary material p35. Thumbnail:



Key Words

Aerosol, masks, respirators, cloth masks, mask braces, mask hacks, filtration, particles, SARS-CoV2, COVID-19

Abstract

Importance: Masks reduce transmission of SARS-CoV2 and other respiratory pathogens. Comparative studies of the fitted filtration efficiency of different types of masks are few.

Objective: To describe the fitted filtration efficiency against small aerosols (0.02 – 1 μm) of medical and non-medical masks and respirators when worn, and how this is affected by user modifications (hacks) and by overmasking with a cloth mask.

Design: We tested a 2-layer woven-cotton cloth mask of a consensus design, ASTM-certified level 1 and level 3 masks, a non-certified mask, KF94s, KN95s, an N95 and a CaN99.

Setting: Closed rooms with ambient particles supplemented by salt particles.

Participants: 12 total participants; 21 – 55 years, 68% female, 77% white, NIOSH 1 to 10.

Main Outcome and Measure: Using standard methods and a PortaCount 8038, we counted 0.02–1 μm particles inside and outside masks and respirators, expressing results as the percentage filtered by each mask. We also studied level 1 and level 3 masks with earguards, scrub caps, the knot-and-tuck method, and the effects of braces or overmasking with a cloth mask.

Results: Filtration efficiency for the cloth mask was 47-55%, for level 1 masks 52-60%, for level 3 masks 60-77%. A non-certified KN95 look-alike, two KF94s, and three KN95s filtered 57-77%, and the N95 and CaN99 97-98% without fit testing. External braces and overmasking with a well-fitting cloth mask increased filtration, but earguards, scrub caps, and the knot-and-tuck method did not.

Limitations: Limited number of masks of each type sampled; no adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Conclusions and Relevance: Well-fitting 2-layer cotton masks filter in the same range as level 1 masks when worn: around 50%. Level 3 masks and KN95s/KF94s filter around 70%. External braces or overmasking with a cloth-mask-on-ties produced filtration around 90%. Only N95s and CaN99s, both of which have overhead elastic, performed close to the occupational health and safety standards for fit tested PPE (>99%), filtering at 97-99%, without fit testing. These findings inform public health messaging about relative protection from aerosols from different mask types and increase understanding of findings of studies of implementation of masks and respirators.

Introduction

The global shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE) during the COVID-19 pandemic motivated inquiry into the effectiveness of public use of cloth masks.¹⁻¹⁶ Current WHO guidance recommends wearing a mask as a normal part of being around other people.¹⁷ With increased manufacturing of masks and PPE, a variety of masks and respirators are available, including home-sewn and commercial cloth masks, certified medical masks and non-certified disposable masks, KN95/KF94s and N95/CaN99s.

Aerosol transmission of COVID-19 is now widely accepted.¹⁸⁻²³ Systematic evaluation of the filtration of aerosols, from the perspective of the wearer, across the whole range of masks and non-fit-tested respirators is highly relevant to public health advice. Descriptions of cloth masks as effective only against droplets²⁴ or as source control reflects and perpetuates public misunderstanding. We extend knowledge in this area by using an adequately-powered sample and a variety of masks, and by fully characterizing participants, masks, materials and modifications.

Methods

Population and Sampling strategy

Between May 2020 and Feb 2022, we recruited adults (≥ 16 y), purposively sampling people of non-European ancestry, excluding people with respiratory diseases or allergic to latex. Investigators were included as participants. The Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board approved the study, safety procedures were developed, and participants gave informed consent.

Procedures

Facial Measurement

We measured participants' faces²⁵ according to the US National Institute of Occupational Health and Safety (NIOSH) Bivariate Panel (supplementary materials, p1-11).²⁶

Masks

We studied level 1 masks (Polar Bear and O2) and level 3 masks (Halyard and Primed), certified to the standards of ASTM International²⁷⁻²⁹ and donated by Hamilton Health Sciences, Hamilton, ON, Canada; these are worn on elastic earloops (supplementary figure 1). A two-layer pleated mask of woven cotton without a nose wire, the Essex mask, designed by a consensus

panel for the Windsor-Essex Sewing Force (WESF) was studied both on ¼ inch elastic earloops and on overhead cloth ties (<https://maskevidence.org/patternsinstruction>).^{30, 31} We purposively sampled non-certified masks, KN95s, KF94s (supplementary materials, p18). We purchased 3M N95 Aura 1870+ respirators from Steripro Canada PPE Store and Vitacore CaN99 respirators from Vitacore Industries Inc, Burnaby, BC. We did not formally fit-test the respirators using occupational health and safety protocols.

Ambient Particle Count

We used a TSI 8026 Particle Generator (TSI, Shoreview, MN), placed at least 2m from the measuring device and participant. This aerosolises dissolved sodium chloride, producing a polydisperse aerosol that dries to solid sodium chloride particles with a diameter in the range of 0.02 µm to 0.60 µm, supplementing naturally-occurring particles in the room. We proceeded with testing if the total particle count was between 2000 and 20,000. If the ambient particle count at the end of a test was not ±30% of the count at the start, we retested.

Filtration efficiency testing

We fitted each mask with a sampling probe (a short aluminium tube with a flange) using a TSI model 8025-N95 Fit Test Probe Kit (TSI, Shoreview, MN). For cloth masks, if we could not penetrate the mask with the probe kit, we first used a scalpel to create a mask puncture of 1 mm. We placed the sampling port at the center of the mask; for masks with a central seam, we placed the port in the lateral flat surface. The probe attaches to a plastic tube that samples air from inside the mask. A second tube is suspended by a lanyard around the participant's neck so that its opening is at chest height. Air sampled through this second tube reflects ambient particle counts (supplementary materials, rationale, p19-20; supplementary figure 2).

Both tubes were connected to a PortaCount 8038 (TSI Inc, Shoreview, MN).³² We used CSA-Z94.4-2002 protocol in all-particles mode (ie, with the N95 classifier off) to detect particles in the range 0.02-1 µm.^{32, 33} Participants donned masks and adjusted them to achieve the best subjective fit. Participants rated each mask or combination for subjective leak, and for glasses fog (using their own or safety glasses). After removing eyewear, participants conducted each of the following exercises, for 37 seconds each, according to protocol: normal breathing, deep breathing, head turning, head nodding, talking, bending and a second period of normal breathing. Finally, participants rated each mask or combination for discomfort, using Likert scales with anchors developed for this study (supplementary material, p 22). Participants also reported specific issues with masks and provided subjective free-form comments.

Fit factor for each exercise is a dimensionless number, defined as the ratio of ambient to within-mask particle count, and calculated as the geometric mean of the fit factor across all

exercises for one participant. We transformed individual fit factor value to fitted filtration efficiency, as a percentage, using:²

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{fit\ factor}\right) * 100\%$$

Fitted filtration efficiency describes the percentage of particles filtered by the mask. A fit factor of 4, reflecting four times the particles outside compared with inside, has a fitted filtration efficiency of 75%.

Community and participant involvement

The Cloth Mask Knowledge Exchange is a stakeholder group formed by the Centre of Excellence in Protective Equipment and Materials at McMaster in 2020 (supplementary materials, p23-24). This group gave input throughout the design and conduct of the experiments.

Statistical methods

We used SYSTAT v13, Inpixon, Palo Alto, CA for statistical analyses. We analyzed the transformed variable filtration efficiency. We used parametric tests (ANOVA with post hoc Tukey's honestly significant difference) when data met normality assumptions by Lilliefors test; and non-parametric tests (Kruskal-Wallis with post-hoc Conover-Inman pairwise comparisons) when they did not, estimating mean and 95% confidence intervals or median and interquartile range, respectively, and regarding $p < 0.05$ as statistically significant.

Studies

Mask types. On 4 participants, we studied the filtration efficiency of cloth masks on earloops and on overhead ties, level 1 and level 3 certified medical masks (two of each, on earloops), a KN95, two KN94s, a non-certified KN-95-lookalike mask, an N95 and a CaN99 (supplementary figure 1).

Mask hacks. On 10 participants, we studied the filtration efficiency of ASTM level 1 (Polar Bear) and level 3 (Halyard) masks, worn as intended, and with minor modifications or hacks (supplementary figure 1).^{5, 34-36} Three participants had short beards.^{37, 38}

Overmasking. On 6 participants, in triplicate, we studied overmasking, using an Essex mask on earloops, a level 1 (Polar Bear) and a level 3 (Halyard) certified mask as the base mask, and overmasking with either an Essex mask on earloops or an Essex mask with overhead ties (supplementary figure 1).

Power calculation

In preliminary data, mean filtration efficiency was 50%, standard deviation 10%, for level 1 masks and cloth masks. For the study of mask types, the aim was to show the range of absolute filtration for each; using 4 participants gives 95% confidence intervals of 50-70% around a mean of 60% and 80-100% around a mean of 90%. For mask hacks and overmasking, we were interested in detecting differences of 10%; at alpha 0.05 and 80% power, we calculated that 6 people were needed to test each mask.³⁹ To improve power and generalizability, we recruited 10 participants to the study of mask hacks, and to improve power, we performed measurements in triplicate on 6 participants in the overmasking study.

Results

The 12 participants were 21 – 55 years, 58% female, 25% non-European, NIOSH 1 to 10 (table and supplementary table 1).

Mask types. Tested on 4 participants, the 2-layer cotton pleated Essex mask resulted in a mean fitted filtration efficiency of 47% when worn on earloops and 54% on overhead ties ($p > 0.05$; figure 1). These were comparable with results for the certified level 1 masks, at 52 and 56%, and one of the level 3 masks at 60% ($p > 0.05$), but a second level 3 mask filtered at 75% ($p < 0.05$). The KF94 and KN95s, and the KN95-lookalike mask filtered between 57% and 77%. The certified respirators (not fit-tested) filtered at 97-98%. The lowest value for an individual for either respirator was 95%.

Mask hacks. Tested on 10 participants, median filtration efficiency of the level 1 and level 3 mask was not improved by wearing on ear guards, scrub cap or by knot-and-tuck ($p < 0.05$, figure 2). Both masks were improved by braces designed to improve edge seal, reaching median filtration values of 85-90% for level 1 mask-and-brace combinations and 93–94% for level 3 mask-and-brace combinations ($p < 0.05$).

Overmasking. Tested on 6 participants (3 replicates per individual), mean filtration efficiency for the Essex mask on earloops was 47%, for the Essex on overhead ties 55%, and the level 1 mask 52%, $p > 0.05$; the level 3 mask filtered 70%, $p < 0.05$ (figure 3). Overmasking the Essex-on-earloops with another on earloops did not improve filtration but overmasking with an Essex-on-ties improved filtration to 66% ($p < 0.05$). For both the level 1 and level 3 masks, overmasking with an Essex mask improved filtration. The level 1 mask overmasked with Essex-on-ties (84%) performed better than level-1–Essex-on-earloops (73%), both exceeding the level 1 mask control (all $p < 0.05$). The level 3 mask overmasked with Essex-on-earloops (83%) exceeded the control ($p < 0.05$) as did level-3–Essex-on-ties (92%; $p < 0.05$), but the difference between the two was not statistically significant.

Subjective assessment. Data on subjective assessment of leaks, glasses fogging, and discomfort are shown in the supplementary tables 2–3 and supplementary figures 3–5. Leak scores varied by mask type, but not with hacks or overmasking. Glasses fogging showed few statistically significant differences in any substudy. Discomfort scores ranged from 2 (comfortable) to 6 (uncomfortable) and differed across mask/respirator types. By category respirators and medical masks had better comfort than some KF94 and KN95s ($p < 0.05$) but within in each category there were high- and low-comfort masks. Braces, knot-and-tuck and overmasking generated lower comfort compared with controls (all $p < 0.05$). For braces this represented a trade-off

between fitted filtration efficiency and comfort. Comfort scores were not related to fitted filtration efficiency.

Subjective assessment of mask leaks and glasses fogging were both significantly related to fitted filtration efficiency ($p < 0.05$, figure 4). Leak assessment was the stronger predictor, explaining 22% of fitted filtration efficiency, whereas glasses fogging explained 4% of variation. Trials across masks with scores of 1 (no leaks detected) achieved mean filtration efficiencies of 85%, scores of 2 (imperfect seal to face) 75%, 3 (minor leaks) 72%, 4 (minor leaks in multiple areas) 65% and scores between 5-7 (major to severe leaks) averaged 59-60%.

Facial measurements. There was no association between the facial distances bizygomatic distance and menton-sellion length, measured as if for clothing, with a piece of cord that traversed the bridge of the nose and the tip of the nose, respectively, and the same distance measured with calipers: R^2 0.03; $p=0.53$ and R^2 0.09; $p=0.27$, respectively (supplementary figure 6).

Discussion

We found that well-fitting cloth masks on earloops and ties filtered at 47-55%; this was comparable with level 1 certified masks (51-60%; infographic, supplementary figure 7). This is not widely known: the filtration properties of the materials are very different.²⁹ The better edge seal of the well-designed cloth mask makes up for the relatively poor filtration of woven cotton;^{7, 29} the excellent filtration (>95%) of the material used in level 1 masks^{27, 29} is let down by poor fit and edge leak. Level 3 masks were variable (60-77%).

In the media,⁴⁰ in CDC messaging,⁴¹ and in epidemiologic research,¹³ KF94/KN95-type masks are often conflated with N95s, FFP3s, and CaN99s. We observed 57-77% filtration for the KF94/KN95s. The previous literature is limited to two masks, one with 55% filtration efficiency (7 participants, 1 replicate),⁴² and the other 84% (≥ 8 participants).⁴³ We found most, but not all, KN95/KF94s performed better than cloth and level 1 masks, similar to level 3 masks, but not as well as the N95 and CaN99. The material in KF94/KN95s is an excellent filter; the Chengde and the GZHarley masks were tested by NIOSH and passed, with all masks providing greater than 95% filtration when tested with the edges glued to a flat plate in keeping with NIOSH Standard Test Procedure (STP) TEB-APR-STP-0059.⁴⁴ The difference between them when worn must result from design and fit, including the type of head attachment: N95s and CaN99s have overhead elastic.

In contrast, we found 97-98% filtration for N95 and CaN99 respirators that were not formally fit-tested: this is close to the fit-testing threshold of $\geq 99\%$ (ie, fit factor ≥ 100). Other studies of non-fit-tested respirators have reported 82% to 98% filtration.^{42, 45-49} Both our respirators were of the novel 3D design, which may fit a wider variety of faces than the cup designs in common use before the pandemic. In terms of the fraction reaching the participant, the respirators let through up to 3% of particles and the KF94/95s up to 43%: a 14-fold difference in exposure. We argue that this difference should be more widely known and that, provided PPE supply for frontline workers is secure, N95s and CaN99 should be recommended for community use.

Previous studies of fitted filtration efficiency for medical and non-medical masks have been limited by very small sample sizes and incomplete descriptions of the masks. For cloth masks, our data (47-55%) are in keeping with the higher end of reported fitted filtration efficiencies: 27% (3-ply cotton on earloops, 0.02-3 μ m particles, 1 participant, 4 replicates)⁵; 28% (2-ply, 3-ply and 4-ply polyester, cotton and poly-cotton masks on earloops, 0.1 μ m particles; 3-4 participants, 1 replicate)⁵⁰; 50% (2-ply cotton T-shirt fabric, on overhead elastic ties, <0.1 μ m particles, 21 participants, 1 replicate)⁵¹⁻⁵³; 52% (head attachments and material not reported, 5 designs including 1-ply and bandana fabric, <0.1 μ m particles, 3 participants, 1 replicate).⁴² This

likely reflects the carefully-designed Essex mask, in contrast with random variation from haphazard sampling.^{5, 42, 50}

Level 1 masks were associated with filtration of 52-60%, and level 3 masks with filtration of 60-77%. Previous studies have included a single mask, often incompletely specified, and with a limited number of observations: 39% (procedure mask on earloops, 0.02-3 μ m particles, 1 participant, 4 replicates)⁵; 72% (surgical mask with ties, 0.02-3 μ m particles, 1 participant, 4 replicates)⁵; 69% (unknown design, 0.1 μ m particles, 7 participants, 1 replicate)⁴²; 80% (level 1 equivalent on ties, 0.1 μ m particles, 21 participants).⁵⁴ The difference in fitted filtration we observed between some level 3 and level 1 masks has not previously been reported and likely results from better fit: the difference in material flat filtration for these two standards is small (98% v 95% for 0.1 μ m latex).^{27, 28} The level 3 masks we studied were larger top-to-bottom than the level 1 masks, had foam at the nose piece, were softer, and appeared to conform better to participants' faces.

Ours is the largest study to date to examine a comprehensive range of minor modifications (mask hacks), and overmasking; and the first to examine the effects on both level 1 and level 3 masks. With a larger sample size than any previous study (10 participants), we were not able to confirm the improvements seen for earguard and knot-and-tuck in previous studies (1 participant, 4 replicates⁵; 3-4 participants⁵⁰), though these methods may increase fitted filtration for some individuals. We confirmed the findings (1 participant, 4 replicates⁵; 11 participants⁵⁵ and 3-4 participants⁵⁰) that external braces greatly improve the efficiency of certified masks (infographic, supplementary figure 7). We have previously shown that braces have little effect over cloth masks.⁵⁶

We found that overmasking with a carefully-designed cloth mask was associated with increases in filtration efficiency. Our study of 6 participants with 3 replicates is a significant addition to previous studies (1 participant, 4 replicates, using nylon hosiery⁵; 3-4 participants, overmasking⁵⁰) which also found overmasking effective. Overmasking should be encouraged when N95s are not available.

Our work provides the first direct comparison of earloops and ties, finding ties superior when used as an overmask with a level 1 mask, and a non-significant tendency to superiority when worn alone or over a level 3 mask. This is in keeping with the idea that though earloops are convenient for donning and doffing, overhead attachments produce a closer fit and less edge leak, and with the observed differences between KF94/KN95s which have earloops, and N95/CaN99s which have overhead elastic.

Our KN95/KF94 sampling strategy simulated an informed non-expert purchaser: we recognize that our sample is small.⁵⁷ It is a limitation of our work that we did not include non-certified pleated disposable masks or CaN95s.

We recognize additional limitations (supplementary material, p 36). We studied one cloth mask, a design that was created and refined by a panel of community experts, optimized, and produced at scale (55,000 masks) by non-expert sewists for distribution to marginalized communities. The ASTM standard for barrier face coverings, F3502, which is a source-control standard, not designed to assess the degree of protection for the wearer, defines filtration efficiency of a mask edge-sealed to a plate, not worn⁵⁸; we did not perform this test. Finally, we examined masks through the lens of wearer protection; we provide no data on source control, for which there is a wealth of data⁵⁹ but no standard methodology.⁶⁰ However, previous studies suggest a relationship between the two,^{45, 50, 61} and F3502 recognizes Portacount testing as the only available quantitative standard for assessing fit for source control.⁶⁰

Strengths of our study are the large number of participants compared with previous studies, the characterization of the participants, the characterization of the masks, and the inclusion of a variety of different masks, including KN95/KF94s, and variety of mask hacks, in the same study. We used human participants and studied 0.02 to 1 μm particles, which is the smaller end of the particle size range that is thought to be most clinically relevant.⁶²⁻⁶⁶

Conclusions. Well-designed cloth masks exhibited fitted filtration for submicron aerosols similar to that of level 1 masks: around 50%. Level 3 masks and KN95/KF94s performed around 70%. Overmasking of certified level 1 and 3 masks with cloth masks was effective and external braces over level 1 and 3 masks were highly effective in improving filtration efficiency. Filtration at or close to occupational health standards for PPE was observed only for N95s and CaN99s. Increased clarity on the relative aerosol filtration properties of masks other than respirators will be useful to public messaging about masks and in the interpretation of implementation studies.

Acknowledgements

The Centre of Excellence in Protective Equipment and Materials and McMaster University are built on the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe first nations, recognized in the 1701 Dish with One Spoon Wampum.

We thank Bryan Herechuk, Jeff Mallany, Anna Dorey, Seema Sharma, Hamilton Health Sciences, Hamilton, St Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton, Hamilton, ON for mask donations, materials, advice and encouragement.

Windsor Essex Sewing Force (WESF) provided cloth masks, advice and encouragement. They place their pattern in the public domain with this publication.^{30, 31}

We thank the stakeholder group Cloth Mask Knowledge Exchange (CMKE) for advice and encouragement at every stage of this work.

We dedicate this work to the memory of our CMKE colleague Helen Brunet.

Disclosures

Amanda Tomkins is a member of Dr Qiyin Fang's research group which worked on the silicone mask brace. She is also a member of the cloth mask knowledge exchange, a stakeholder group that includes cloth mask manufacturers and fabric distributors.

Catherine Clase has received consultation, advisory-board membership, honoraria, or research funding from the Ontario Ministry of Health, Sanofi, Pfizer, Leo Pharma, Astellas, Janssen, Amgen, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Baxter and, through LiV Academy, AstraZeneca. In 2018 she co-chaired a KDIGO potassium controversies conference sponsored at arm's length by Fresenius Medical Care, AstraZeneca, Vifor Fresenius Medical Care, Relypsa, Bayer HealthCare and Boehringer Ingelheim. She co-chairs the cloth mask knowledge exchange, a stakeholder group that includes cloth mask manufacturers and fabric distributors. She is editor-in-chief of MaskEvidence.org.

Ken G Drouillard is a member of the WE-SPARK Health Institute, University of Windsor and receives funding from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada and Ontario Ministry of Conservation, Environment

and Parks. In 2020-2022 he acted as science consultant to the Windsor-Essex Sewing Force, a community group engaged in the design, sewing and donation of cloth masks to healthcare providers and vulnerable populations of Southern Ontario. He is a member of the cloth mask knowledge exchange.

Charles-Francois de Lannoy has received funding from various branches of The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), Ontario Centre of Innovation (OCI), formerly Ontario Centres of Excellence (OCE), Ontario Water Consortium (OWC) formerly Southern Ontario Water Consortium (SOWC), Canada First Research Excellence Fund (CFREF), Ontario Together Fund, and Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario (FedDev). He is a member of cloth mask knowledge exchange, a stakeholder group that includes cloth mask manufacturers and fabric distributors.

Darren Lawless co-chairs the cloth mask knowledge exchange, and all authors are members.

Other authors have no additional disclosures.

Table. Summary demographic and anthropometric data on participants


Study	Mask Types	Mask Hacks	Overmasking
Number of Participants	4	10	6
Number of Replicates	1	1	3
Age, y (mean, SD)	30, 17	35, 17	38, 18
Women/Men	4/0	5/5	5/1
Facial hair (n, %)	0	3	0
Self-identified Ethnicity (n, %)			
European	2	9	4
West Central Asian and Middle Eastern	2	1	2
Height, m (mean, SD)	1.67, 0.08	1.76, 0.08	1.67, 0.08
Weight, kg (mean, SD)	63, 12	77, 14	63, 16
Bizygomatic distance, calipers, cm (mean, SD)	12.3, 0.9	13.7, 1.1	12.3, 1.1
Menton-sellion distance, calipers, cm (mean, SD)	11.0, 0.8	11.5, 1.3	11.0, 1.0
Bizygomatic distance, cord, cm (mean, SD)	15.7, 1.1	15.2, 2.3	15.7, 2.2
Menton-sellion distance, cord, cm (mean, SD)	14.5, 2.5	15.5, 2.2	14.5, 2.0
NIOSH Bivariate Panel Size (n, %)			
1 (small)	1	2	1
2-4 (medium)	1	2	2
5-7, 9 (large)	*2	4	*3
8, 10 (X-large)	0	2	0

SD standard deviation. NIOSH related to small, medium, large, X-large sizing according to ASTM 3502:22a⁶⁰

* Includes 2 participants with face width narrower than smallest face width on the NIOSH panel, classified in the nearest cell at NIOSH 6.


We studied participants with facial hair only in the mask hacks study. Facial hair was classified according to CDC NIOSH³⁷

Figure 1. Fitted filtration efficiency for cloth (2), L1 (2) and L3 (2) certified medical masks, a non-certified Kegis 3D mask (purchased as a KN95 look-alike), KF94s (2), KN95s (3), and for respirators, N95 and CaN99.




Footnote: N = 4. Bars present mean and standard deviation (SD) and whiskers showing 5 - 95 confidence values. Data were normal by Lillefor's test. Letters above whiskers indicate statistical groupings according to Tukey's post hoc comparisons. A shared letter for two mask types signifies no difference between those types; absence of a shared letter signifies a significant difference $p < 0.05$.

Figure 2. Box and whisker plot showing the effect of minor modifications, or hacks, to a certified level 1 Polar Bear mask and to a certified level 3 Halyard mask. 10 participants, 1 replicate.





Footnote: N = 10. Data were not normal by Lillefor's test. Kruskal-Wallis with Conover-Inman post hoc comparisons. Boxes show interquartile range and whiskers minimum and maximum. Letters denote groups which are statistically similar and dissimilar: a shared letter for two mask types signifies no difference between those types; absence of a shared letter signifies a significant difference $p < 0.05$. Neoprene brace made using downloadable, public domain, template from Fix The Mask and recommended materials; silicone brace designed at McMaster University; FTM brace - proprietary Fix-The-Mask brace. L1 and L3 controls were retested on these participants as part of this panel; estimates differ slightly from those in figure 1.

Figure 3. Effects of overmasking with Essex masks on earloops and on overhead ties on fitted filtration efficiency. The top graph shows (left) the Essex mask on earloops (Earloop) and on ties (Ties) worn alone, followed by Essex-on-earloop with a second Essex-on-earloop as an overmask (Earloop-Earloop), and by Essex-on-earloop with a second Essex mask on ties as an overmask (Earloop-Ties). The centre panel shows the level 1 certified Polar Bear mask worn alone (L1), with an Essex-on-earloop as an overmask (L1- Earloop), and with an Essex-on-ties as an overmask (L1-Ties). The right panel shows the level 3 certified Halyard mask worn alone (L3), with an Essex-on-earloop as an overmask (L3- Earloop), and with an Essex-on-ties as an overmask (L3-Ties).



Footnote: N = 6, 3 replicates. Data were normal by Lillefor's test. ANOVA with Tukey's honestly significant difference for post hoc comparisons was used. Mean and median; boxes show one standard deviation (SD); whiskers show 95% confidence intervals. Letters denote groups which are statistically similar and dissimilar: a shared letter for two mask types signifies no difference between those types; absence of a shared letter signifies a difference. Earloop: Essex mask worn on elastic earloops. Ties: Essex mask worn on overhead cloth ties. L1 level 1; L3 level 3.

Figure 4. Relationship between fitted filtration efficiency and glasses fog, and between fitted filtration efficiency and subjective leak. Glasses fog and subjective leak were assessed before fitted filtration efficiency was measured.



Top graphic fitted filtration efficiency against glasses fog score across data generated for each sub-study. Open circles are raw data, squares are means and whiskers are standard deviations for each score category. Dashed line is the linear regression fit: $FFE = -1.78 \pm 0.48 * \text{Glasses Fog Score} + 79.3 \pm 1.7$; $R^2 = 0.04$; $p < 0.001$, $df = 338$. Bottom graphic presents data against leak score. Dashed line regression fit: $FFE = -5.5 \pm 0.6 * \text{Leak Score} + 88.5 \pm 1.7$; $R^2 = 0.22$; $p < 0.001$, $df = 338$.

References

1. Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, et al. Face masks for the public during the covid-19 crisis. *BMJ* 2020; 369: m1435. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m1435.
2. Clase CM, Fu EL, Jardine M, et al. Cloth Masks May Prevent Transmission of COVID-19. *Ann Intern Med* 2021; 174: 580. 2021/04/20. DOI: 10.7326/l21-0091.
3. Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, et al. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2020. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9.
4. Clase CM, Fu EL, Ashur A, et al. Forgotten technology in the COVID-19 pandemic. Filtration properties of cloth and cloth masks: a narrative review. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 2020; 95: 2204-2224.
5. Clapp PW, Sickbert-Bennett EE, Samet JM, et al. Evaluation of Cloth Masks and Modified Procedure Masks as Personal Protective Equipment for the Public During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA internal medicine* 2020. DOI: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.8168.
6. Konda A, Prakash A, Moss GA, et al. Correction to Aerosol Filtration Efficiency of Common Fabrics Used in Respiratory Cloth Masks. *ACS Nano* 2020.
7. Zangmeister CD, Radney JG, Vicenzi EP, et al. Filtration Efficiencies of Nanoscale Aerosol by Cloth Mask Materials Used to Slow the Spread of SARS-CoV-2. *ACS Nano* 2020; 14: 9188-9200. DOI: 10.1021/acsnano.0c05025.
8. Czypionka T, Greenhalgh T, Bassler D, et al. Masks and Face Coverings for the Lay Public : A Narrative Update. *Ann Intern Med* 2021; 174: 511-520. 2020/12/29. DOI: 10.7326/m20-6625.
9. Abaluck J, Kwong LH, Styczynski A, et al. Normalizing Community Mask-Wearing: A Cluster Randomized Trial in Bangladesh. Working paper, <https://www.nber.org/papers/w28734>.
10. Bundgaard H, Bundgaard JS, Raaschou-Pedersen DET, et al. Effectiveness of Adding a Mask Recommendation to Other Public Health Measures to Prevent SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Danish Mask Wearers : A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2021; 174: 335-343. 2020/11/19. DOI: 10.7326/m20-6817.
11. Li Y, Liang M, Gao L, et al. Face masks to prevent transmission of COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *American journal of infection control* 2021; 49: 900-906. 2020/12/22. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajic.2020.12.007.
12. Talic S, Shah S, Wild H, et al. Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of covid-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and covid-19 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bmj* 2021; 375: e068302. 2021/11/19. DOI: 10.1136/bmj-2021-068302.
13. Andrejko KL, Pry JM, Myers JF, et al. Effectiveness of Face Mask or Respirator Use in Indoor Public Settings for Prevention of SARS-CoV-2 Infection - California, February-December 2021. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2022; 71: 212-216. 20220211. DOI: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7106e1.
14. Cowger TL, Murray EJ, Clarke J, et al. Lifting Universal Masking in Schools - Covid-19 Incidence among Students and Staff. *N Engl J Med* 2022 20221109. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2211029.
15. Loeb M, Bartholomew A, Hashmi M, et al. Medical Masks Versus N95 Respirators for Preventing COVID-19 Among Health Care Workers. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2022. DOI: 10.7326/M22-1966.

16. Leech G, Rogers-Smith C, Monrad JT, et al. Mask wearing in community settings reduces SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2022; 119: e2119266119. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2119266119.
17. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the public: When and how to use masks, <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public/when-and-how-to-use-masks> (2022, accessed 2022-07-18).
18. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): How is it transmitted?, <https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-covid-19-how-is-it-transmitted#:~:text=Current%20evidence%20suggests%20that%20the,%2C%20speak%2C%20sing%20or%20breathe.> (2021, accessed 2023-02-15).
19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-2 Transmission, <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/sars-cov-2-transmission.html> (2021, accessed 2023-02-15).
20. Dugdale CM and Walensky RP. Filtration Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Availability of N95 Face Masks for COVID-19 Prevention. *JAMA internal medicine* 2020; 180: 1612-1613. DOI: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4218.
21. Nardell EA and Nathavitharana RR. Airborne Spread of SARS-CoV-2 and a Potential Role for Air Disinfection. *JAMA* 2020; 324: 141-142. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.7603.
22. Wilson N, Corbett S and Tovey E. Airborne transmission of covid-19. *BMJ* 2020; 370: m3206. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.m3206.
23. Greenhalgh T, Jimenez JL, Prather KA, et al. Ten scientific reasons in support of airborne transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *The Lancet* 2021; 397: 1603-1605. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(21)00869-2.
24. Liu IT, Prasad, V., Darrow, J.J., How Effective Are Cloth Face Masks?, <https://www.cato.org/regulation/winter-2021/2022/how-effective-are-cloth-face-masks#masks-interrupt-droplet-transmission-but-does-that-slow-covid> (2022, accessed 2023-02-15).
25. Clauser C, Tebbetts I, Bradtmiller B, et al. *Measurer's Handbook: U.S. Army Anthropometric Survey, 1987-1988*. 1987.
26. ASTM International. ASTM F3407-21 Standard Test Method for Respirator Fit Capability for Negative-Pressure Half-Facepiece Particulate Respirators, <https://www.astm.org/f3407-21.html> (2021, accessed 2022-07-20 (paywall)).
27. ASTM International. ASTM F2100-19e1, Standard Specification for Performance of Materials Used in Medical Face Masks, <https://doi.org/10.1520/F2100-19E01> (2019, accessed 2022-07-20 (paywall)).
28. ASTM International. ASTM F2299/F2299M-03(2017), Standard Test Method for Determining the Initial Efficiency of Materials Used in Medical Face Masks to Penetration by Particulates Using Latex Spheres, https://doi.org/10.1520/F2299_F2299M-03R17 (2017, accessed 2022-07-20 (paywall)).
29. LaRue RJ, Morkus P, Laengert S, et al. Navigating Performance Standards for Face Mask Materials: A Custom-Built Apparatus for Measuring Particle Filtration Efficiency. *Glob Chall* 2021: 2100052. 2021/09/14. DOI: 10.1002/gch2.202100052.
30. Patterns & Instructions: Essex Pleated Mask, <https://maskevidence.org/patternsinstruction> (2022, accessed 2023-02-15).
31. Clothmasks.org. Clothmasks Patterns & Instructions: Essex Pleated Mask, <https://www.clothmasks.org/patternsinstruction> (2022, accessed 2022-07-20).

32. TSI Incorporated. TSI Incorporated PORTACOUNT PRO+ 8038 Operation And Service Manual, <https://www.manualslib.com/products/Tsi-Incorporated-Portacount-ProPlus-8038-6889864.html> (accessed 2022-07-20).
33. CSA group. Performance of filtering respirators, <https://www.csagroup.org/store/product/CSA%20Z94.4.1%3A21/?format=PDF> (2021, accessed 2022-07-20 (paywall)).
34. Fix The Mask. Get the most out of your surgical mask, <https://www.fixthemask.com/> (accessed 2022-02-05).
35. Fix The Mask. DIY Mask Brace from Rubber Sheet Downloadable Template, <https://www.fixthemask.com/products/v2-diy-rubber-sheet-brace> (accessed 2022-02-05).
36. Sickbert-Bennett EE. UNC Health: Pro Tip to Help Your Earloop Mask Fit More Tightly, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UANi8Cc71A0> (accessed 2022-02-05).
37. CDC Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. To Beard or not to Beard? That's a good Question!, <https://blogs.cdc.gov/niosh-science-blog/2017/11/02/noshave/> (2017, accessed 2022-11-13).
38. Prince SE, Chen H, Tong H, et al. Assessing the effect of beard hair lengths on face masks used as personal protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of exposure science & environmental epidemiology* 2021; 31: 953-960. 20210518. DOI: 10.1038/s41370-021-00337-1.
39. UCSF. Sample Size Calculators for designing clinical research, <https://sample-size.net/> (accessed 2022-02-06).
40. Szalinski C. N95s and KN95s Offer the Most Protection. But Some Cloth Masks Come Close, <https://www.nytimes.com/wirecutter/blog/cloth-masks-kids-covid-protection/> (2022, accessed 2022-11-14).
41. CDC Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Types of Masks and Respirators, <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/types-of-masks.html#respirators> (2022, accessed 2022-11-14).
42. O'Kelly E, Arora A, Pirog S, et al. Comparing the fit of N95, KN95, surgical, and cloth face masks and assessing the accuracy of fit checking. *PloS one* 2021; 16: e0245688. 2021/01/23. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0245688.
43. Duncan S, Bodurtha P and Naqvi S. The protective performance of reusable cloth face masks, disposable procedure masks, KN95 masks and N95 respirators: Filtration and total inward leakage. *PloS one* 2021; 16: e0258191. 20211006. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0258191.
44. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. NPPTL Respirator Assessments to Support the COVID-19 Response, <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/respirators/testing/NonNIOSHresults.html> (2021, accessed 2023-01-30).
45. Lindsley WG, Blachere FM, Beezhold DH, et al. A comparison of performance metrics for cloth masks as source control devices for simulated cough and exhalation aerosols. *Aerosol Sci Technol* 2021; 55: 1125-1142. DOI: 10.1080/02786826.2021.1933377.
46. Reponen T, Lee SA, Grinshpun SA, et al. Effect of fit testing on the protection offered by n95 filtering facepiece respirators against fine particles in a laboratory setting. *The Annals of occupational hygiene* 2011; 55: 264-271. 2010/12/24. DOI: 10.1093/annhyg/meq085.
47. Du J, Zhang L, Liu Y, et al. Determination of the optimal time for N95 respirator for aerosol infection control. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2020; 99: e23709. DOI: 10.1097/md.00000000000023709.

48. Sharma A, Omidvarborna H and Kumar P. Efficacy of facemasks in mitigating respiratory exposure to submicron aerosols. *J Hazard Mater* 2022; 422: 126783. 20210808. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhazmat.2021.126783.
49. Li X, Ding P, Deng F, et al. Wearing time and respiratory volume affect the filtration efficiency of masks against aerosols at different sizes. *Environ Technol Innov* 2022; 25: 102165. 20211211. DOI: 10.1016/j.eti.2021.102165.
50. Blachere FM, Lemons AR, Coyle JP, et al. Face mask fit modifications that improve source control performance. *American journal of infection control* 2022; 50: 133-140. 2021/12/21. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajic.2021.10.041.
51. Davies A, Thompson KA, Giri K, et al. Testing the efficacy of homemade masks: would they protect in an influenza pandemic? *Disaster medicine and public health preparedness* 2013; 7: 413-418. DOI: 10.1017/dmp.2013.43.
52. Davies A, Thompson KA, Giri K, et al. Frequently asked questions - homemade facemasks study, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340253593_Frequently_asked_questions_-_homemade_facemasks_study/pdf (2020, 2020-06-10; requires membership).
53. Davies A, Thompson KA, Giri K, et al. Facemask instructions COVID-19.doc, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340023785_facemask_instructions_COVID-19doc (2020, accessed 2020-05-02; requires membership).
54. Product Catalogue 2014 - Mölnlycke Health Care, <https://manualzz.com/download/37121170> (accessed 2022-02-06).
55. Runde DP, Harland KK, Van Heukelom P, et al. The "double eights mask brace" improves the fit and protection of a basic surgical mask amidst COVID-19 pandemic. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open* 2021; 2: e12335. 2021/02/02. DOI: 10.1002/emp2.12335.
56. Drouillard KG, Tomkins A, Lackie S, et al. Fitted filtration efficiency and breathability of 2-ply cotton masks: Identification of cotton consumer categories acceptable for home-made cloth mask construction. *PloS one* 2022; 17: e0264090. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0264090.
57. CDC. Counterfeit Respirators / Misrepresentation of NIOSH-Approval, <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/nppt/usernotices/counterfeitResp.html> (accessed 2022-02-06).
58. ASTM International. ASTM Reading Room. COVID-19 Related Standards: Masks, <https://www.astm.org/READINGLIBRARY/VIEW/PHMSA.html> (2020, accessed 2020-04-27; behind paywall).
59. Asadi S, Cappa CD, Barreda S, et al. Efficacy of masks and face coverings in controlling outward aerosol particle emission from expiratory activities. *Scientific Reports* 2020; 10: 15665. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-020-72798-7.
60. International A. Standard Specification for Barrier Face Coverings. F3502:22a, <https://www.astm.org/f3502-22a.html> (2022, accessed 2022-11-24, paywall).
61. Asadi S, Cappa CD, Barreda S, et al. Efficacy of masks and face coverings in controlling outward aerosol particle emission from expiratory activities. *Sci Rep* 2020; 10: 15665. 20200924. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-020-72798-7.
62. Whyte HE, Montigaud Y, Audoux E, et al. Comparison of bacterial filtration efficiency vs. particle filtration efficiency to assess the performance of non-medical face masks. *Sci Rep* 2022; 12: 1188. 20220124. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-05245-4.
63. Alsvéd M, Nygren D, Thuresson S, et al. Size distribution of exhaled aerosol particles containing SARS-CoV-2 RNA. *Infectious Diseases* 2022: 1-6. DOI: 10.1080/23744235.2022.2140822.

64. Fennelly KP. Particle sizes of infectious aerosols: implications for infection control. *The Lancet Respiratory medicine* 2020; 8: 914-924. 2020/07/28. DOI: 10.1016/s2213-2600(20)30323-4.
65. Santarpia JL, Herrera VL, Rivera DN, et al. The size and culturability of patient-generated SARS-CoV-2 aerosol. *Journal of exposure science & environmental epidemiology* 2022; 32: 706-711. DOI: 10.1038/s41370-021-00376-8.
66. Alsved M, Nygren D, Thuresson S, et al. Size distribution of exhaled aerosol particles containing SARS-CoV-2 RNA. *Infectious Diseases* 2023; 55: 158-163. DOI: 10.1080/23744235.2022.2140822.