

24 § authors contributed equally to the manuscript

25

26 * corresponding authors: sbianco@us.ibm.com, Raul.Andino@ucsf.edu

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 **Abstract**

36 The COVID-19 global crisis is facilitated by high virus transmission rates and high percentages of
37 asymptomatic and presymptomatic infected individuals. Containing the pandemic hinged on combinations
38 of social distancing and face mask use. Here we examine the efficacy of these measures, using an agent-
39 based modeling approach that evaluates face masks and social distancing in realistic confined spaces
40 scenarios. By explicitly considering different fractions of asymptomatic individuals, as well as a realistic
41 hypothesis of face mask protection during inhaling and exhaling, we find that face masks are more
42 effective than social distancing in curbing the infection. Importantly, combining face masks with even
43 moderate social distancing provides optimal protection. The finding that widespread usage of face masks
44 limits COVID-19 outbreaks can inform policies to reopening of social functions.

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53 Keywords: epidemic, virus, agent-based simulation

54

55 **Author summary:**

56 The COVID-19 outbreak has created an enormous burden on the worldwide population. Among the
57 various ways of preventing the spread of the virus, face masks have been proposed as a main way of
58 reducing transmission. Yet, the interplay between the usage of face mask and other forms of Non-
59 Pharmaceutical Intervention is still not completely clear. In this paper we introduce a stochastic individual-
60 based model which aims at producing realistic scenarios of disease spread when mask wearing with
61 different inward and outward efficacy and social distancing are enforced. The model elucidates the
62 conditions which make the two forms of intervention synergistic in preventing the spread of the disease.

63

64 **Introduction**

65 The COVID-19 outbreak has caused a catastrophic mortality and economic damage around the world.
66 The causative agent of COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, is an airborne pathogen that can be transmitted
67 between humans through droplets and aerosols that can travel 1–8 meters¹. The virus is transmitted by
68 both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals. COVID-19 causes severe symptoms that require
69 hospitalization, as well as severe long-term sequels and death. Accordingly, the outbreak has seriously
70 impacted healthcare systems around the world². One of the major difficulties to contain the COVID-19
71 pandemic has been detection of infected asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals, who are
72 estimated to be responsible for as much as 95% of all transmissions^{3 4}. As these individuals carry and
73 spread the virus without manifesting any sign of the disease, they represent a crucial variable in
74 managing the outbreak.

75 In the absence of an effective vaccine or antiviral, most countries have implemented non-
76 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to curb the spread of COVID-19⁵. These include closure of schools,
77 workplaces, churches, offices, factories and other social venues, while encouraging preventative
78 measures ranging from maintaining social distancing (SD, usually 2 m/6 ft between individuals) to total
79 quarantine and societal lockdowns. These measures aim to reduce the effective contact rate of the
80 population, which in turn decreases the disease reproductive number R_0 . These NPIs limit the epidemic,
81 but they present important drawbacks. Total lockdown can only be implemented for short periods, due to

82 its severe impact on the social fabric and economy of a country. Meanwhile, essential workers remain
83 vulnerable to infection and transmission due to the frequent encounters with infected, often
84 asymptomatic, individuals. Because of their social and economic impact, lockdowns and SD measures
85 have been lifted in some countries, leading to reactivation of virus spread and ensuing increased
86 morbidity and mortality.

87 Face masks covering the nose and mouth area also provide a level of filtration that blocks virus
88 transmission to a certain extent⁶⁻⁸. Masks prevent the spread of droplets and aerosols generated by an
89 infected individual¹, reducing viral transmission by 95%. Uninfected individuals wearing a mask are
90 about 85% protected against infection⁹. Masks may be more effective to control the source of infectious
91 virus because they prevent the larger expelled droplets from being converted into smaller droplets that
92 can travel farther. Accordingly, face masks reduce the spread of influenza¹⁰ and coronaviruses^{11,12}.

93 In the past, several papers have used theoretical models to study how efficacious mask wearing
94 is in avoiding the spread of airborne viruses. In 2010 at least two studies were focused on the effect of
95 face mask usage to contrast the diffusion of Novel Influenza A (H1N1)^{13,14}. Although these works are not
96 on COVID-19 or another Coronavirus disease, they underline the necessity of developing more accurate
97 models to describe similar diseases and reinforce their results in the light of new diseases. Specifically on
98 COVID-19, the efficacy of mask wearing has recently been studied using an ordinary differential
99 equations (ODE) model¹⁵, which considered also a varying percentage of asymptomatic individuals,
100 compliance with mandate to wear masks, and a different inward and outward efficacy of protection.
101 However, the authors consider face masks as the sole preventative, excluding additional NPIs like SD or
102 shelter in place.

103 Additionally, the problem has been studied in several papers using ABMs, each being focuses on
104 a specific part of the problem. In some cases, the presence of asymptomatic infected individuals was not
105 considered^{16,17}. In other studies, the efficacy of wearing masks was not analyzed when combined with
106 other NPIs¹⁸. Finally, the difference in inward and outward protection given by a face mask was often
107 neglected or parametrized with a single value¹⁹. A rather comprehensive data-driven investigation of all
108 these effects has been performed by Hoertel et al.²⁰. However, their results are specific to the country of

109 France, and the high dimensionality of the parameter space makes it difficult to disentangle the effect of
110 the various interventions.

111 In our current study, we analyzed the relative efficacy of wearing face masks and/or exercising
112 SD to reducing the spread of COVID-19 in the presence of asymptomatic individuals. Face masks have
113 distinct inward and outward protection, parameterized using a Gamma function (see Methods). Through
114 stochastic computer simulations of infection spread, we modeled realistic outbreak scenarios and found
115 that SD only yields beneficial effects if accompanied by a widespread population lockdown. In contrast,
116 wearing face masks is a highly effective strategy to reduce the spread of infection. Our results are
117 general, and suggest that, even when a large fraction of infected individuals is asymptomatic, mask
118 wearing is the most effective strategy to control virus spread and alleviate the impact of COVID-19
119 outbreak, particularly when combined with conditions of partial SD compatible with the function of society.

120

121 **Results**

122 **Stochastic model description and calibration.** We developed an agent-based model (ABM) to examine
123 the effectiveness of wearing masks and SD on the rate of infections and viral spread during the
124 pandemic. Unlike ODE models of the spread of COVID-19 disease^{15,21}, ABMs are stochastic models that
125 allow the description of non-homogeneous distributions of agents that act individually^{12,22}. In ABMs, each
126 individual behaves dynamically and independently in response to environmental changes²³ according to
127 rules that describe their interactions. To model the COVID-19 pandemic, we used a SEAIR system in
128 which each agent represents an individual who can be susceptible (S), exposed (E), asymptotically
129 infected (A), symptomatically infected (I), or recovered (R). To obtain a realistic model of virus spread, we
130 chose parameters that describe the spread of SARS-CoV2: transmission events occur through contacts
131 made between susceptible and infectious individuals in close proximity (distance $\leq 2r$, Fig. 1A), and
132 exposed individuals undergo an incubation period of 5.1 days to become infectious (Fig. 1, spheres with
133 red border). This incubation time represents the interval required to increase viral loads to levels sufficient
134 for transmission^{3 4,24}. We assume that recovered individuals (Fig. 1, spheres with black border), who

135 resolve the infection, cannot be re-infected or infect others, which is a reasonable assumption for the
136 duration of our models (45 days).

137 To define the probabilities of infection, we used reported COVID-19 parameters²⁴. The probability
138 of transmission follows a Γ (*gamma*) distribution (see Methods) whose shape is described by a constant
139 (α), estimated to be 0.25. Wearing masks reduces this probability (Fig. 1, probability of infection). To
140 estimate the protective effect of masks, we used parameters determined for FDA-approved surgical
141 masks, whose efficacy has been experimentally verified to inhibit virus transmission¹⁰. Based on previous
142 studies (Leung et al.)⁹, we assumed that, if an infectious individual wears a mask, the effective probability
143 of transmission is reduced by a factor of 0.05. If a susceptible individual wears a mask, α is reduced by a
144 factor of 0.15 (Fig. 1A). Our assumption that wearing masks is more effective to reduce transmission than
145 to prevent getting infected is supported by experimental data²⁵. However, if both infectious and
146 susceptible individuals wear masks the probability of transmission is the product of these probabilities
147 (0.0075) and, thus, sufficiently low such that transmission is effectively null. We calibrated our model by
148 running simulations without any individuals wearing a face mask or practicing SD and considering that
149 50% of infected individuals are asymptomatic (Movie 1). In this way, we determined the simulation
150 parameters, such as velocity and density of individuals, to obtain a value of $R_0 = 2.5$, consistent with what
151 was reported early on as the infection rate of the epidemic in Wuhan⁹.

152 **Percentage of population wearing masks determines the daily infection incidence and cumulative**
153 **number of cases.** We started each simulation with one individual being infected and all others
154 susceptible and assuming that 50% of COVID-19 infections are asymptomatic (or pre-symptomatic). Non-
155 infected and asymptomatic individuals circulate in the population without any restriction (i.e., they do not
156 isolate themselves or become hospitalized) (see Methods). In contrast, symptomatic individuals no longer
157 move after 12 hours of the symptom onset, simulating hospitalization or self-isolation. Thus, symptoms
158 are assumed to manifest after the incubation time of 5.1 days (Fig. 2B). Using these assumptions and
159 model calibration, we carried out a set of simulations in which we gradually increased the percentage of
160 individuals in the population that wear masks. Individuals, who are assigned randomly to wear a mask at
161 the beginning of the simulation, keep on the mask for the entire duration of the simulation. Increasing the

162 fraction of the population wearing face masks has a highly significant effect on the spread of the virus
163 (Fig. 1B, 1C and Movie 2). Mask wearing reduces the cumulative number of infected individuals at the
164 end of the simulation (Fig. 1B). Strikingly, this effect negatively correlates with the fraction of the
165 population using masks without any other intervention, suggesting that masks are effective for reducing
166 the overall number of cases (Fig. 1B). The description of the dynamics of infection generated by this
167 model is consistent with previous clinical studies^{9,25} and highlights the benefit of wearing masks (Fig. 1C,
168 Movie 1).

169 If the daily incidence surpasses the treatment capacity, it will overwhelm the healthcare system
170 with detrimental consequences for medical care of infected individuals and increased mortality and
171 morbidity. Thus, we examined the effects of face masks on the daily incidence of infection over time (Fig.
172 2B). If all individuals move freely and randomly interact with others (i.e., 0% SD), the rate of daily infection
173 through the population depends on the percentage of individuals wearing masks. The average number of
174 new daily infection varies considerably, according to the number of individuals wearing face masks. When
175 0% of individuals wear face masks (Fig. 2b, red line), the number of daily infections peaks sharply at day
176 27 with a maximum of 54.8 ± 18.1 infections per day for a population of 500 individuals. No additional
177 infections are observed after day 39, when the entire population (100%) has been infected. Thus, without
178 any intervention, the infection quickly reaches every individual through an epidemic characterized by a
179 very sharp infection peak. Note that, in these original models, we assume all individuals recover after ~11
180 days post-infection and cannot be re-infected. When 40% of all individuals wear masks, the number of
181 individuals infected at any given day is reduced by approximately 30% (maximum of infected individuals
182 35.1 ± 12.8 , Fig. 2A, blue line), both flattening the curve and extending the duration of the outbreak by
183 more than 10 days, with a peak maximum at day 32. By day 52, an average of 472 individuals has been
184 infected, and none of the individuals is infectious or exposed any longer. Even more significantly, if 80%
185 of the population wear masks, we observed a significant flattening of the curve, with a substantial
186 reduction in the maximum number of infected individuals per day, 5.9 ± 6.8 (Fig. 2A, green line), and the
187 number of new infected individuals reached zero by day 57.8 ± 35.0 . Thus, the shape of the outbreak
188 changes from a curve characterized by a sharp peak when no intervention is considered to a broader
189 peak when 80% of the individuals wear masks. By increasing the percentage of the individuals wearing

190 masks, the number of newly infected individuals per day substantially decreases, which will reduce
191 mortality and morbidity. Moreover, since the use of masks eliminates the sharp peak that characterizes
192 SARS CoV2 epidemics, the overall impact of the outbreak on the health system is alleviated. These
193 results highlight the importance of widespread mask wearing as an effective intervention that can be
194 implemented as soon as the first cases are reported.

195 **Effect of social distancing on viral infection spread.** Next, we evaluated the effect of SD in shaping
196 the spread of infection. Practicing SD does not affect the probability of infection but reduces the chances
197 of encounters leading to transmission. Thus, SD was introduced into the model by limiting the proportion
198 of individuals in the population that move freely in the field. This simulates a scenario in which a given
199 proportion of individuals in the population quarantine or shelter-in-place, thereby reducing the probability
200 of contacts and transmission (Fig. 2A). As reported, if a percentage of individuals practice SD, even
201 without any other non-pharmacological intervention, the number of infections and daily infection rate are
202 reduced (compare Fig. 2B, SD 0, 40, and 80%, red line). However, if no one wears masks but 40% of
203 individuals practice SD, we observed a very small effect in the shape of the infection curve (Fig. 2B, the
204 peak maximum decreases from 51.0 ± 13.3 to 45.7 ± 5.9). When 80% of the population practices SD, a
205 more significant reduction in the number of new daily infections was observed (Fig. 2B, 80%). Notably,
206 the shape of the new daily infection curve broadens considerably upon increasing the percentage of
207 individuals wearing face masks (Fig. 2B, compare blue and green curves with red curve). For instance, if
208 80% of the population wears masks with 40% SD, the peak maximum decreases to one-tenth (from 51.0
209 ± 13.3 to 5.7 ± 5.9) and is slightly delayed (Fig. 2B). At 80% SD, the peak of new daily infections is no
210 longer observed, and the number of new infected individuals per day averages 1.6 ± 1.3 (Fig. 2B). Thus,
211 the effects of individuals wearing face masks and practicing SD are synergistic, with the most pronounced
212 effects occurring when 60% or 80% of individuals wear masks.

213 **Effectiveness of combining mask wearing and social distancing to control infection in populations**
214 **with high proportions of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic cases.** Asymptomatic or pre-
215 symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection is emerging as possibly the most common clinical manifestation of
216 COVID-19²⁶⁻³⁰. This finding could only be revealed once mass testing campaigns were performed,
217 regardless of symptoms (e.g., universal testing campaigns). One of the earliest studies documenting

218 clinical manifestations in a testing campaign (which still focused testing mainly on symptomatic
219 individuals) was on the *Diamond Princess* cruise ship, where the rate of asymptomatic infection was
220 18%^{31,32}. In a mass testing campaign in Iceland, where testing was offered to a segment of the general
221 population (regardless of symptoms), 43% of individuals were asymptomatic at the time of testing³³. Thus,
222 the actual percentage of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic cases is currently unknown, but it is clear
223 that a large number of SARS CoV2 new infections derive from undetected infections. Controlling the
224 outbreaks by isolation or even by increased population testing is a big challenge and may be difficult to
225 implement. We thus determined the efficacy of mask wearing and SD in the context of different
226 proportions of asymptomatic incidence. We assume that asymptomatic individuals are less infectious than
227 symptomatic individuals: asymptomatic individuals may have lower viral loads and reduced coughing,
228 sneezing, and nasal secretions, all of which may facilitate transmission³⁴⁻³⁶. The model considers that
229 symptomatic infected individuals isolated themselves 12 hours after the onset of symptoms, because they
230 get hospitalized or self-isolated. In contrast, asymptomatic individuals remain infectious, circulate and
231 transmit for a period of 7 days (Fig. 3A). Because some individuals can be pre-symptomatic (i.e.,
232 symptoms emerge later after the initial incubation time (Fig. 2B, $t = 5.1$ days)), we modelled infectivity of
233 asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic as linearly declining until the individual is no longer infectious, after 7
234 days³⁷. Using these assumptions, we carried out simulations, varying the percent of asymptomatic/pre-
235 symptomatic cases to determine the efficiency of non-pharmacological interventions in populations with
236 25, 50, and 75% pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic infected individuals (Fig. 3).

237 Our simulations demonstrate that the total number of infected individuals increases linearly with
238 the increase of the percentage of asymptomatic individuals in the population (Fig. 3B). To compare each
239 condition, we normalized the peak of new daily infected individuals to conditions in which no one
240 practiced SD or wore masks. Strikingly, increasing the percentage of individuals wearing masks linearly
241 reduces the normalized peak number of infected individuals per day (Fig. 3B). For instance, when 40% of
242 the individuals wear face masks, the peak number of infected decreases similarly independently of the
243 percent of asymptomatic cases considered (to 0.6–0.7, Fig. 3B). Furthermore, the linear relationship
244 between the decrease in peak number of newly infected individuals per day and increase in percent
245 individuals wearing masks is independent of the proportion of asymptomatic individuals in the population

246 (Fig. 3B). This finding indicates that, when the fraction of asymptomatic cases is high, as in the case for
247 COVID-19, wearing face masks is as effective to reduce the peak number of infected as when a low
248 percentage of individuals are asymptotically infected.

249 In contrast, SD was only effective in populations with high incidence of asymptomatic infections
250 when a very high fraction of the population practice SD (more than 60%) (Fig. 3B). Furthermore, the low
251 efficacy of SD as a containment strategy is more pronounced when the proportion of asymptomatic
252 individuals increase (compare 25, 50, and 75%). Of note, if the number of individuals wearing face masks
253 is high, increasing the number of individuals practicing SD has negligible effects on the daily number of
254 infected individuals (see supplementary materials). One noteworthy observation from our model is that, at
255 high rates of SD (e.g. 80 %), there is more variability.

256 Our analysis uncovers a linear relationship between the fraction of a population wearing masks
257 and the reduction in infection rate. In contrast, we find SD requires a high fraction of compliance to be
258 effective. These findings indicate that having a high percentage of individuals wearing face masks is more
259 beneficial in preventing virus spread and reducing the peak number of infected individuals than having a
260 high percent of people practicing SD. Notably, the benefit of wearing masks is not affected if the percent
261 of pre-symptomatic and asymptomatic increases.

262 **Interplay of face masks and social distancing for controlling infection spread and protecting from**
263 **COVID-19.** Next, we determined the average cumulative incidence as a function of the percentage of
264 individuals wearing masks and practicing SD (standard deviation described in Fig. SM3-A). When neither
265 SD nor masks were used our simulations indicate that up to 99% of the population will end up infected,
266 leading to unacceptable levels of mortality and morbidity. When the proportion of the population wearing
267 masks was increased, no significant effect on the total number of infected people was noted until more
268 than 40% of the population wore masks. However, if 80% of people use masks, the average cumulative
269 incidence of infection decreased to around 35%. Therefore, wearing face masks alone would greatly limit
270 the spread of the virus. In contrast, SD alone does not have a significant effect. Increasing SD
271 compliance to 80% only reduced total infections by 8%, and 87% of the population was eventually
272 infected. Importantly, the combination of wearing masks and practicing SD by a high proportion of the

273 population dramatically reduces the total number of infected individuals to 10% of the population (Fig. 4A;
274 and Fig. SM2-C).

275 To gain additional insights into the characteristics of the epidemic in response to these mitigation
276 strategies, we studied the shape of the epidemic curve by calculating the peak and full-width half-
277 maximum (FWHM) of the peak of the new daily infections (Methods). While the peak reports on the
278 maximum number of daily infections at the height of the epidemic, the FWHM is a simple way to represent
279 the duration of the characteristic peak of new daily infections. Indeed, FWHM reports on the extinction
280 time of the infection within the population (number of days until no individual is still infected) (Fig. 4A, and
281 Fig. SM3-B standard deviation). A larger FWHM corresponds to a flatter but longer epidemic curve. A
282 flatter epidemic curve enables better management of the epidemic, as the healthcare system is not
283 overwhelmed by the number of cases at a given time. Initially, the FWHM was calculated assuming no
284 individual practice SD. FWHM was ~8.3 days if none of the individuals wears masks, ~12.8 if 40% of
285 individuals wear masks, and but increases dramatically to 85.4 when 80% of the population wears masks
286 (Fig. 2B). Our data indicate that wearing masks has a more profound effect than SD on flattening the
287 epidemic curve. For instance, when 80% of the population wears masks, the epidemic curve is eight
288 times flatter than without any non-pharmacological intervention (Fig. 4B). In contrast, if 80% of the
289 population practices SD, the flattening of the curve is less than threefold. The most dramatic effect on
290 flattening of the curve is observed when wearing masks is combined with SD; for instance, if 80% of the
291 population wears masks and 80% practices SD, the curve is flattened over 10-fold, compared to no
292 intervention.

293 We also find that the reduction in the number of infected individuals per day correlates with a
294 lengthening of the outbreak. Broadening of the peak affects the extinction time of the infection (Fig. 4C).
295 For instance, when the percentage of individuals wearing face masks rises from 0 to 80% of the
296 population, the extinction time increases from ~39.0 to ~58 days (Fig. 4C). Similarly, as a higher
297 proportion of individuals practice SD, the time to extinction of the infection also increases (Fig. 4C, ~39 to
298 ~54 days for 0% to 80% of SD). Importantly, even though the time to epidemic extinction is extended, the
299 total number of infected individuals dramatically decreases (Fig. 4A). If a higher proportion of the
300 population (80%) wears face masks and practices SD, the time to epidemic extinction is reduced (Fig. 4C)

301 because the total number of infected individuals is dramatically reduced (Fig. 4A). Thus, stochastic effects
302 dominate, and this can be appreciated by the wider error bars (Fig. 4F).

303 To relate the impact of these interventions to their societal impact, we determined the number of
304 deaths per million after each mitigation strategy, assuming a mortality rate of $\sim 3\%$ ³⁸. This analysis
305 illustrates the heavy cost of lives of the virus, but also demonstrates that a high level of mask wearing
306 compliance is the most effective non-pharmacological approach to protect human lives, particularly when
307 combined with even moderate SD measures (Fig. 4D). In contrast, SD, without masks wearing is not
308 effective to reduce mortality (Fig. 4E). Finally, our simulations predict that increasing the proportion of the
309 population wearing masks will increase the time to outbreak extinction (from ~ 40 to ~ 60 days) (Fig. 4F).
310 Together with the broadening of the peak (Fig. 4C), this shows an effective flattening of the curve.
311 Importantly, with 80% mask wearing, we observed an increase in the statistical distribution from the
312 average time to extinction (Fig. 4F, see 95% confidence intervals). Thus, a generally low disease
313 incidence triggers stochastic events leading to extinction of the infection. Our simulations represent real
314 outbreak scenarios and reveal that as the outbreak approaches its extinction there is an increase in the
315 uncertainty of whether or not the infection has been completely eliminated, which argue to be prudent
316 before society reopening can be done safely.

317

318 **Discussion**

319 Here we use realistic simulations rooted in experimentally measured parameters of SARS-Cov2 spread,
320 contagion mode and mortality, to evaluate two available NPIs that reduce the spread of a respiratory
321 infection, such as COVID-19. In our simulation, we assumed proper use of FDA-approved face masks.
322 We showed that a high degree of compliance in the use of masks, regardless of whether the wearer
323 displays symptoms, slows the spread of infection. Face masks substantially reduce the transmission of
324 respiratory droplets and aerosols containing viral particles⁹⁻¹¹. Increasing the fraction of the population
325 wearing face masks reduces the number of new infected individuals per day and flattened the curve of
326 total individuals infected (Fig. 2A and 4A). These two effects should reduce mortality and morbidity,
327 alleviate the current stress on healthcare systems, and enable a more effective management of severe

328 cases. However, solely wearing masks cannot entirely prevent an outbreak from occurring. It cannot by
329 itself extinguish the virus, since as long as a small fraction of the population is non-compliant, the virus
330 can persist in the population. Our models show that combining proper use of masks with practices such
331 as SD, indisputably decreases the number of new infected individuals per day (Fig. 2). This conclusion
332 agrees with that of ODE models³⁹. In addition, our model was demonstrated to be scalable and able to
333 describe realistic situations such as interactions between 5000 agents (see supplementary materials).

334 Our analysis provides guidance for policies to protect the population from COVID-19. Optimizing
335 the use of masks with SD practices effectively limits the virus spread and reduces several parameters in
336 the epidemic, including cumulative incidence, shape of the peak, and the extinction rate (Fig. 3). In
337 particular, we observed that wearing masks is more effective than SD. Even in a population with a high
338 number of asymptomatic infections, increasing the use of masks up to 80% results in a significant
339 reduction in infection (Fig. 4A). Meanwhile, even 80% of individuals practicing SD has only a marginal
340 effect (Fig. 4D). This result can be understood in terms of contact rate, since we assume that
341 asymptomatic infectious individuals have higher mobility than symptomatic infectious ones. If the vast
342 majority of the population is asymptomatic, then high compliance with face mask use is a key factor for
343 curbing the epidemic.

344 Our simulations also provide insights into how enforcing different mitigation practices affects the
345 length of the epidemic. Assuming a homogenous population, the trajectory of epidemic extinction lasts
346 50–60 days, when 80% of the population either wears masks or practices SD (Fig. 4C). However, when
347 80% of the population is wearing masks and 0% of the population is practicing SD, the cumulative
348 incidence is reduced three times (~35%), and the peak is very broad (FWHM of ~ 85 days). In contrast,
349 when the population solely practices SD (80%), the majority of the population (93%) will end up infected,
350 and the peak of daily infected individuals will be sharper (FWHM of ~ 20 days).

351 Our model indicates that the synergistic utilization of face mask wearing and social distancing
352 practice is most effective in controlling SARS-CoV-2 spread. We observed that wearing masks in
353 combination with some degree of SD relaxes the need for a complete lockdown, leading to a potential
354 suggestion for an intervention policy based on a mix of the two measures. The effectiveness of mask

355 wearing to control virus spread is not reduced if a large fraction of the population is asymptomatic. This
356 suggests that, in the absence of universal testing, widespread use of face masks is necessary and
357 sufficient to prevent a large outbreak. Our results are supported by the real data of Korea³³ and Taiwan³⁴,
358 where an early mandate to requiring face mask usage, in combination with SD, severely limited the
359 spread of the virus. While more work is necessary to specifically assess the impact of other variables
360 shaping COVID-19 outbreaks, such as increased mobility, age stratification, testing a fraction of the
361 population, our study can accurately inform strategies to reduce the spread of the virus. In particular, our
362 results may be highly relevant toward informing specific realistic situations, such as the spread of the
363 disease in a confined space, where effective SD may not be easily achievable (e.g., schools, essential
364 businesses, correctional facilities, public transportation, hospitals). These strategies, if effectively
365 implemented, will save countless lives from the SARS-Cov2 infection. According to our model, if the
366 United States (330 million people) does not implement any NPIs, then ~627,000 people are expected to
367 die. Contrastingly, if 80% of the population wear face masks, that number would significantly shrink to
368 about 250,000. If both face masks and SD were practiced by 80% of the population from the start of a
369 pandemic, the mortality rate decreases to 65,600 people.

370 **Materials and Methods**

371 We developed and used our python codes using the NumPy library version 1.15.4⁴⁰ to carry out ABM and
372 describe the dynamic evolution of a SEAIR system affected by COVID-19 disease, in which each
373 individual can be in a susceptible (S), exposed (E), asymptomatic infected (A), symptomatic infected (I),
374 or recovered (R) status. In addition, each individual can wear a face mask (M) or can practice social
375 distancing (SD), where wearing face masks or practicing SD are independent binary values of an
376 individual. In the simulations, each individual was represented by a position in a 2-D lattice of 21x21
377 dimension with periodic boundary conditions. Individual initial positions are assigned randomly by
378 NumPy's random module, and the simulations start with all susceptible individuals and only one exposed.
379 During the simulation, each individual move along a randomly oriented trajectory at a constant velocity,
380 moves the same distance between each time step of the simulation, and interacts with individuals whose
381 position is within a fixed diameter of another individual. The data from each individual are saved as
382 vectors of attributes, including position, velocity, state (S, E, A, I, R, M, SD), and number of individuals

383 they come into contact with at every simulation time step. A time step corresponds to 1 hour. We
384 implemented the state of M by defining sub-routine during the interaction between two individuals where
385 the probability of infection was reduced by an amount corresponding to which of the two individuals is
386 wearing a mask. For the SD state, we assigned the individual to be stationary and not follow along a
387 randomly assigned trajectory.

388 We refer to Ferguson et al. for defining the rules governing the interactions among individuals²⁴.
389 For the interaction between symptomatic infected and susceptible individuals, the infection probability
390 was randomly sampled from a gamma distribution with a mean of 1 and a shape of 2.5, whereas for that
391 between asymptomatic infected and susceptible individuals, the infection probability is reduced by 33 %.
392 We assume this reduction of infectivity for the asymptomatic, based on the absence of transmission-
393 aiding symptoms, such as coughing, sneezing, and a runny nose²⁴. The time between a susceptible
394 individual being exposed to being in the infectious infected state is 5.1 days²⁴. Pre-symptomatic agents
395 are defined as infected agents during the incubation period. Symptomatic infected individuals are
396 infectious for 12 hours before self-isolating. After this time, we assume that these individuals no longer
397 infect those around them because they are hospitalized or self-isolating. Asymptomatic infected
398 individuals are infectious for 7 days, and the infectivity linearly declines until the individual is no longer
399 infectious on day 7³⁷. If an infected, a susceptible, or both individuals are wearing a mask their probability
400 of another individual being infected is reduced to 5, 15, or 0%, respectively, from the original gamma
401 distribution.

402 First, we carried out a simulation with 500 individuals with 0% of individuals wearing face masks
403 and 0% practicing SD to optimize parameters as velocities and individual density to obtain a basic
404 reproduction number, R_0 , equal to 2.5, based on reported values. The basic reproduction number was
405 computed from the mean number of symptomatic cases, resulting from a single symptomatic individual.
406 Then, we carried out four more sets of simulations in which we increased the percentage of individuals
407 wearing masks by the 20, 40, 60, and 80%. Finally, for each of these simulation sets we carried out four
408 more sets in which we increased the percentage of individuals practicing SD by the 20, 40, 60, and 80%.
409 Simulations are stochastic, and we simulated each condition 100 times to increase the statistical power of
410 the analysis. In total, we simulated 25 different conditions for a total of 2500 simulations, 100 for each

411 condition. In all these simulations, the probability of a new infection being asymptomatic was 50%.
412 Simulations were run until there were no individuals either infected or exposed. Summary values were
413 computed by methods in the NumPy module. Error bars were calculated by the standard deviation
414 method in NumPy and for figure 3 and 4 the error bars were calculated by 95% confidence interval. The
415 full-width half-maximum (FWHM) was calculated for each simulation from the newly infected per day data
416 by taking the maximum and using it to find the days that intersect the value of half the maximum value.
417 The first and last days of this intersection were then used to calculate the number of days of the FWHM.
418 From the set of FWHM for each simulation, an average and standard deviation were calculated using the
419 NumPy module. FWHM error bars are large due to a large variation in how flat the curves are. Graphs
420 were created by using the Matplotlib⁴¹ and Seaborn⁴² modules in python.

421 We followed the same protocol described above to perform simulations, varying the probability of
422 a new infection being asymptomatic from 25 to 75%. Finally, to monitor the reproducibility of our results
423 with a larger population and contrast with real data, we ran four sets of 30 simulations with 5000
424 individuals in the combinations of 0 or 80% SD and 0 or 80% wearing masks. All 5000 individual
425 simulations were done with 50% asymptomatic infection rates.

426 As the position, trajectory, and state of each individual in the simulation are explicitly known,
427 using the matplotlib library's animation package, we converted each time step of the simulation to an
428 image in a movie, representing 1 day as a second spanning the length of the simulation.

429 For each simulation, we saved in a .csv in tidy data format the summary values of the
430 simulations, which we used for the analysis. The simulation was written in python and all scripts are
431 available on GitHub at https://github.com/adamcatching/SARS_SEIR_Simulation, simulations were
432 generated using script mask_single_sim.py.

433

434

435 **Acknowledgments**

436 We acknowledge the use of the UCSF Computing Cluster Wynton
437 (<https://wynton.ucsf.edu/hpc/index.html>). We thank Judith Frydman, Alma Andino-Frydman, and Patrick
438 Dolan for their suggestions on the manuscript.

439

440 **Author contributions**

441 A. C., S. C., and M. T. Y. conceived the study. A. C. and S. C. designed the simulations. A. C. wrote and
442 executed the simulations. A. C., S. C., and S. B. analyzed the data. S. B. and R. A. provided guidance
443 and support. All authors wrote the manuscript.

444

445 **Competing interest statement**

446 The authors declare no competing interests.

447

448

449 **References**

450

451

452 1 Bourouiba, L. Turbulent Gas Clouds and Respiratory Pathogen Emissions: Potential
453 Implications for Reducing Transmission of COVID-19. *Jama* **323**, 1837,
454 doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4756 (2020).

455 2 Miller, I. F., Becker, A. D., Grenfell, B. T. & Metcalf, C. J. E. Disease and healthcare
456 burden of COVID-19 in the United States. *Nature Medicine*, 1, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-
457 0952-y (2020).

458 3 Bai, Y. *et al.* Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *Jama* **323**,
459 1406, doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2565 (2020).

460 4 Wölfel, R. *et al.* Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019.
461 *Nature* **581**, 465, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x (2020).

462 5 Schwartz, I. B., Kaufman, J., Hu, K. & Bianco, S. Predicting the impact of asymptomatic
463 transmission, non-pharmaceutical intervention and testing on the spread of COVID19.

464 6 Feng, S. *et al.* Rational use of face masks in the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Lancet*
465 *Respiratory Medicine* **8**, 434, doi:10.1016/s2213-2600(20)30134-x (2020).

466 7 Ng, K. *et al.* COVID-19 and the Risk to Health Care Workers: A Case Report. *Annals of*
467 *Internal Medicine*, doi:10.7326/120-0175 (2020).

468 8 Suess, T. *et al.* The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of influenza
469 transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial; Berlin, Germany,
470 2009-2011. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **12**, 1, doi:10.1186/1471-2334-12-26 (2012).

- 471 9 Leung, N. H. L. *et al.* Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face
472 masks. *Nature Medicine* **26**, 676, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2 (2020).
- 473 10 Offeddu, V., Yung, C. F., Low, M. S. F. & Tam, C. C. Effectiveness of Masks and
474 Respirators Against Respiratory Infections in Healthcare Workers: A Systematic Review
475 and Meta-Analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **65**, 1934, doi:10.1093/cid/cix681
476 (2017).
- 477 11 Konda, A. *et al.* Aerosol Filtration Efficiency of Common Fabrics Used in Respiratory
478 Cloth Masks. *ACS Nano* **14**, 6339, doi:10.1021/acsnano.0c03252 (2020).
- 479 12 Howard, J. *et al.* Face Masks Against COVID-19: An Evidence Review.
480 doi:10.20944/preprints202004.0203.v1 (2020).
- 481 13 Tracht, S. M., Valle, S. Y. D. & Hyman, J. M. Mathematical Modeling of the
482 Effectiveness of Facemasks in Reducing the Spread of Novel Influenza A (H1N1). *Plos*
483 *One* **5**, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0009018 (2010).
- 484 14 Brienen, N. C. J., Timen, A., Wallinga, J., Steenbergen, J. E. V. & Teunis, P. F. M. The
485 Effect of Mask Use on the Spread of Influenza During a Pandemic. *Risk Analysis* **30**,
486 1210, doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2010.01428.x (2010).
- 487 15 Ngonghala, C. N. *et al.* Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical
488 interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Mathematical Biosciences* **325**,
489 doi:10.1016/j.mbs.2020.108364 (2020).
- 490 16 Mahdizadeh Gharakhanlou, N. & Hooshangi, N. Spatio-temporal simulation of the novel
491 coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak using the agent-based modeling approach (case study:
492 Urmia, Iran). *Informatics in Medicine Unlocked* **20**, doi:10.1016/j.imu.2020.100403
493 (2020).

- 494 17 Chang, S. L., Harding, N., Zachreson, C., Cliff, O. M. & Prokopenko, M. Modelling
495 transmission and control of the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. (2020).
- 496 18 Kai, D., Goldstein, G.-P., Morgunov, A., Nangalia, V. & Rotkirch, A. Universal Masking
497 is Urgent in the COVID-19 Pandemic: SEIR and Agent Based Models, Empirical
498 Validation, Policy Recommendations. *arXiv:2004.13553 [physics, q-bio]* (2020).
- 499 19 Silva, P. C. L. *et al.* COVID-ABS: An agent-based model of COVID-19 epidemic to
500 simulate health and economic effects of social distancing interventions. *Chaos, Solitons*
501 *& Fractals* **139**, doi:10.1016/j.chaos.2020.110088 (2020).
- 502 20 Hoertel, N. *et al.* A stochastic agent-based model of the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic in
503 France. *Nature Medicine* **26**, 1417, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1001-6 (2020).
- 504 21 Kuniya, T. Prediction of the Epidemic Peak of Coronavirus Disease in Japan, 2020.
505 *Journal of Clinical Medicine* **9**, doi:10.3390/jcm9030789 (2020).
- 506 22 Bauer, A. L., Beauchemin, C. A. A. & Perelson, A. S. Agent-based modeling of host-
507 pathogen systems: The successes and challenges. *Information Sciences* **179**, 1379,
508 doi:10.1016/j.ins.2008.11.012 (2009).
- 509 23 Rahmandad, H., Hu, K., Tebbens, R. J. D. & Thompson, K. M. Development of an
510 individual-based model for polioviruses: implications of the selection of network type
511 and outcome metrics. *Epidemiology and Infection* **139**, 836,
512 doi:10.1017/s0950268810001676 (2011).
- 513 24 Ferguson, N. *et al.* Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-
514 19 mortality and healthcare demand.

- 515 25 Liang, M. *et al.* Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus transmission: A
516 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Medicine and Infectious Disease*,
517 doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101751 (2020).
- 518 26 Oran, D. P. & Topol, E. J. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Annals*
519 *of Internal Medicine*, doi:10.7326/m20-3012 (2020).
- 520 27 Ing, A. J., Cocks, C. & Green, J. P. COVID-19: in the footsteps of Ernest Shackleton.
521 *Thorax* **75**, 693, doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215091 (2020).
- 522 28 Arons, M. M. *et al.* Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Transmission in a
523 Skilled Nursing Facility. *New England Journal of Medicine* **382**, 2081,
524 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2008457 (2020).
- 525 29 Day, M. Covid-19: four fifths of cases are asymptomatic, China figures indicate. *Bmj*
526 **369**, doi:10.1136/bmj.m1375 (2020).
- 527 30 Cline, S. *Cases at seafood plant cause spike in Oregon COVID numbers | News Break*,
528 <[https://www.newsbreak.com/oregon/salem/news/1581086288035/cases-at-seafood-](https://www.newsbreak.com/oregon/salem/news/1581086288035/cases-at-seafood-plant-cause-spike-in-oregon-covid-numbers)
529 [plant-cause-spike-in-oregon-covid-numbers](https://www.newsbreak.com/oregon/salem/news/1581086288035/cases-at-seafood-plant-cause-spike-in-oregon-covid-numbers)> (
- 530 31 Moriarty, L. F. Public Health Responses to COVID-19 Outbreaks on Cruise Ships —
531 Worldwide, February–March 2020. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **69**,
532 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6912e3 (2020).
- 533 32 Mizumoto, K., Kagaya, K., Zarebski, A. & Chowell, G. Estimating the asymptomatic
534 proportion of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) cases on board the Diamond
535 Princess cruise ship, Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Euro Surveillanc: Bulletin Europeen Sur*
536 *Les Maladies Transmissibles = European Communicable Disease Bulletin* **25**,
537 doi:10.2807/1560-7917.es.2020.25.10.2000180 (2020).

- 538 33 Gudbjartsson, D. F. *et al.* Spread of SARS-CoV-2 in the Icelandic Population. *New*
539 *England Journal of Medicine* **382**, 2302, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2006100 (2020).
- 540 34 Buitrago-Garcia, D. C. *et al.* Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections: a living systematic
541 review and meta-analysis. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.04.25.20079103 (2020).
- 542 35 Sakurai, A. *et al.* Natural History of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *New*
543 *England Journal of Medicine* **0**, doi:10.1056/NEJMc2013020 (2020).
- 544 36 Fernandez, M. *WHO: Data suggests it's "very rare" for coronavirus to spread through*
545 *asymptomatics*, <[https://www.axios.com/who-coronavirus-asymptomatic-patients-](https://www.axios.com/who-coronavirus-asymptomatic-patients-08d84e31-1846-44d8-8fe1-2343ff850764.html)
546 [08d84e31-1846-44d8-8fe1-2343ff850764.html](https://www.axios.com/who-coronavirus-asymptomatic-patients-08d84e31-1846-44d8-8fe1-2343ff850764.html)> (
- 547 37 He, X. *et al.* Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19.
548 *Nature Medicine*, 1, doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5 (2020).
- 549 38 *Mortality Risk of COVID-19 - Statistics and Research*,
550 <<https://ourworldindata.org/mortality-risk-covid>> (
- 551 39 Kai, D., Goldstein, G.-P., Morgunov, A., Nangalia, V. & Rotkirch, A. Universal Masking
552 is Urgent in the COVID-19 Pandemic: SEIR and Agent Based Models, Empirical
553 Validation, Policy Recommendations. (2020).
- 554 40 Van Der Walt, S., Colbert, S. C. & Varoquaux, G. The NumPy array: a structure for
555 efficient numerical computation. *Computing in Science & Engineering* **13**, 22,
556 doi:10.1109/mcse.2011.37 (2011).
- 557 41 *Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment - IEEE Journals & Magazine*,
558 <<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4160265>> (
- 559 42 *mwaskom/seaborn: v0.8.1 (September 2017) | Zenodo*,
560 <<https://zenodo.org/record/883859>> (

561


562

563

564

565


566 **Figures**



567

568 **Figure 1. Individual states and rules of interactions.** Using the same coloring system used in animated
 569 simulations, we show the different states an individual can be in during a simulation. Individuals keep the
 570 masked or not masked attribute assigned at initialization during the course of the simulation. **A)** Spread of
 571 infection is caused by interactions of overlapping trajectories between infected and susceptible
 572 individuals. If the distance between individuals, d , is less than the radius of the two individuals, r , then an
 573 interaction occurs. Interactions initiate the generation of a random number that determines if transmission
 574 occurs. The chance of infection is randomly generated, based on a gamma distribution with shape
 575 parameter, α , of 0.25. This probability is further modulated by which individuals in the interactions are
 576 wearing face masks.

577 **B)** Agents are shown at their positions and states during snapshots of the simulation. Representative
578 simulations of are shown of 0, 40, or 80% of the population wearing face masks. Snapshots are collected
579 at days 0, 20, and 40 of the simulations. **C)** Progression of the outbreak, the trajectory of the number of
580 new daily infected individuals (Currently infected) and cumulatively infected from a representative
581 simulation are graphed in light blue and black, respectively.




582

583 **Figure 2. Average new infections per day when varying the population wearing masks and**
584 **practicing social distancing. A)** SD is implemented by assigning agents to not move along a trajectory
585 during the simulation. This lack of movement reduces the number of trajectories overlaps between agents
586 and subsequently reduces the number of transmission events. **B)** The number of new infections per day
587 for 0, 40, or 80% of a population wearing face-masks are displayed by red, blue, or green trajectories,
588 respectively, for 0% of the population practicing SD, for the 40% and for the 80%. Simulations were

589 repeated 100 times for each condition, the curves and the highlighted regions around the curves
 590 represent the mean value +/- one standard deviation.

591




592

593 **Figure 3. Effects of the asymptomatic population on the infected peak number. A)** Schematic
594 representation of the asymptomatic transmission during the simulations. After 5.1 days of coming into
595 contact with an infected individual, infectious agents can develop symptoms and after 12 hours will be
596 isolated. On the contrary, asymptomatic individuals don't develop symptoms of the disease so they are
597 not isolated but keep circulating thus contributing to spread the infection for 7 more days after the initial
598 contact with an infectious agent. **B)** The normalized peak of new daily infected is represented as a
599 function of the percentage of the population wearing mask (left panels, green solid circles) and as a
600 function of increasing the percentage of asymptomatic individuals (25% top left panel, 50% central left
601 panel, 75% bottom left panel). The normalized peak of new daily infected is represented as a function of
602 the percentage of the population practicing social distance (right panels, blue solid circles) and as a
603 function of increasing the percentage of asymptomatic individuals (25% top right panel, 50% central right
604 panel, 75% bottom right panel). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals calculated.

605

Figure 4



Andino 20,05D

606

607 **Figure 4. Summary values from 2500 simulations of varying percentages of population wearing**
 608 **masks or social distancing. A)** Proportion of infected population. The average cumulative incidence is
 609 represented as a function of the population practicing SD or wearing a mask, which are given by the x
 610 and y axis, respectively. **B)** The shape of the daily new infection curve. Full-width half-maximum (FWHM),
 611 denoting the number of days between the first day and last day of cases that have half the peak number
 612 of infected individuals. **C)** Extinction rate of the epidemic estimated as the average number of days for
 613 which the simulation reports no new infected individuals. In the figure, the numbers represent the mean
 614 value calculated over 100 of simulations carried out for each condition. For clarity, we reported the
 615 standard deviation of the mean for each value reported in this figure in Fig. SM5. **D)** and **E)** Number of
 616 death people. Extrapolated for one million individuals from the cumulative incidence of infections
 617 estimated from our model at a mortality rate of 3%. **F)** Number of days from the start of infection spread to

618 the last infected agent recovering. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals calculated for **D**), **E**) and
619 **F**).

620

621