

1 **Title:** Evaluation of Facial Protection Against Close-Contact Droplet Transmission

2 **Running Title:** Simulated Close Contact Source Control Study

3

4 **Authors:** Thomas B. Stephenson (MS), Courtney Cumberland (BS), Geoff Kibble (MS),  
5 Christopher Church (MS), Sheila Nogueira-Prewitt (BS), Sebastian MacNamara (BS), Delbert A.  
6 Harnish (MS), Brian K. Heimbuch (MS)

7 **Corresponding Author:** Delbert Harnish, 430 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Panama City, FL 32401;  
8 [dharnish@ara.com](mailto:dharnish@ara.com); 850-914-3188

9

10 **Affiliation for all authors:** Applied Research Associates, Engineering Science Division,  
11 Respiratory Protection Research Center of Excellence, 430 W 5<sup>th</sup> St, Suite 700, Panama City, FL  
12 32401

13

14 **Funding:** Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) under Prime contract  
15 #1605DC□19□A□0010 with Project Enhancement Corporation (PEC) and Task Order #ARA  
16 20-775-01 with Applied Research Associates.

17

18 **Word Count:** 3,686

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background:** Face shields are used as an alternative to facemasks, but their effectiveness in  
22 mitigating the spread of SARS-CoV-2 is unclear. The goal of this study is to compare the  
23 performance of face shields, surgical facemasks, and cloth facemasks for mitigation of droplet  
24 transmission during close contact conditions.

25 **Methods:** A novel test system was developed to simulate droplet transmission during close  
26 contact conditions using two breathing headforms (transmitter and receiver) placed 4 feet apart  
27 with one producing droplets containing a DNA marker. Sampling coupons were placed  
28 throughout the test setup and subsequently analyzed for presence of DNA marker using  
29 quantitative PCR.

30 **Results:** All PPE donned on the transmitter headform provided a significant reduction in  
31 transmission of DNA marker to the receiver headform: cloth facemask (78.5%), surgical  
32 facemask (89.4%), and face shield (96.1%). All PPE resulted in increased contamination of the  
33 eye region of the transmitter headform (9,525.4% average for facemasks and 765.8% for the face  
34 shield). Only the face shield increased contamination of the neck region (207.4%), with the cloth  
35 facemask and surgical facemask resulting in reductions of 85.9% and 90.2%, respectively.

36 **Conclusions:** This study demonstrates face shields can provide similar levels of protection  
37 against direct droplet exposure compared to surgical and cloth masks. However, all PPE tested  
38 resulted in release of particles that contaminated surfaces. Contamination caused by deflection of  
39 the user's exhalation prompts concerns for contact transmission via surfaces in exhalation flow  
40 path (e.g., face, eyeglasses, etc.).

- 41 **Key Words:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Droplet, Mask, Facemask, Face Shield, Aerosol,  
42 Transmission

## 43 **Evaluation of Facial Protection Against Close-Contact Droplet Transmission**

### 44 **Introduction**

45 The COVID-19 pandemic has elevated attention for facial protection to a level previously unseen  
46 in the United States. American workers in many occupational settings are required to wear face  
47 coverings to mitigate virus transmission by asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic individuals.  
48 SARS-CoV-2, the causative agent for COVID-19, is primarily transmitted via respiratory  
49 droplets.<sup>1</sup> While the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has provided guidance  
50 that facemasks are effective for source control and droplet protection,<sup>2</sup> the utility of face shields  
51 is still in question.<sup>3</sup>

52 Studies to assess the effectiveness of different types of face coverings tend to focus on cough or  
53 sneeze simulations that produce high velocity droplets and obtain measurements close to the  
54 mask after a short duration.<sup>4,5,6</sup> Such simulated coughing studies have demonstrated face shields  
55 can reduce user exposure to droplets by 96%, but do not contain all aerosols expelled by the  
56 user.<sup>7,8</sup> However, it remains unclear how face shields and other types of face coverings perform  
57 under normal respiration conditions, which better represent asymptomatic/pre-symptomatic  
58 spreaders of SARS-CoV-2. In these cases, transmission can occur via droplets produced through  
59 normal respiration and/or conversation during close contact conditions, which the CDC defines  
60 as exposure to a symptomatic, asymptomatic, or pre-symptomatic carrier at a distance of less  
61 than 6 feet for at least 15 minutes over a 24 hour period.<sup>9</sup> Thus, it is critical to simulate close  
62 contact conditions to fully understand the effectiveness of face shields and other face coverings  
63 at preventing droplet spread from a carrier to other individuals.

64 Simulating normal respiratory output requires that both droplet size distribution and  
65 concentration adequately represent conditions produced by humans. Though characterization of

66 respiratory secretions has been studied for almost 80 years, the results of these studies are wide-  
67 ranging and can be influenced by a number of factors.<sup>10,11</sup> Peer-reviewed literature generally  
68 supports a droplet size distribution for respiratory secretions ranging from 10 – 100  $\mu\text{m}$  in  
69 size.<sup>12,13</sup> The number of droplets produced during respiration is another critical factor. Xie *et al.*  
70 quantifies total droplet mass output to be  $\sim 0.08$  g when speaking for  $\sim 1$  minute, which would  
71 yield approximately 1.2 g over 15 minutes.<sup>12</sup>

72 The objective of this study was to assess the performance of three types of PPE – cloth facemask,  
73 surgical facemask, and face shield – for their ability to mitigate droplet transmission during close  
74 contact transmission conditions as defined by the CDC. The intended droplet size distribution  
75 will range from 10 – 100  $\mu\text{m}$  in size and volume output will target 0.08 g/min during low work  
76 rate respiratory conditions. The results of this study will be used to inform the general public  
77 regarding effectiveness of different PPE types against droplet transmission.

## 78 **Methods**


### 79 *Test Samples*

80 Three types of PPE were evaluated during this study: cloth facemasks (RN15763, Hanes,  
81 Winston-Salem, NC); surgical facemasks (B087YPTXT3, Alertcare, San Francisco, CA); and  
82 face shields (PPE USA, Hunt Valley, MD).

### 83 *Test System*

84 The experimental setup consisted of two ISO Medium 3D-printed plastic headforms,<sup>14</sup> with one  
85 headform producing droplets (transmitter) expelled towards the other headform (receiver) to  
86 simulate droplet transmission (Figure 1). Each headform has a 1-in orifice at the mouth through  
87 which breathing occurred. The transmitter headform was connected to a breathing machine

88 designed to inhale/exhale using a low work rate (minute ventilation = 25 liters per minute,  
89 breathing rate = 21 breaths per minute, tidal volume = 1.2 L).<sup>15</sup> En route to the headform, the air  
90 passed through 1-in diameter flexible PVC tubing into a cylindrical spray chamber measuring 15  
91 cm in diameter and 70 cm in length. The spray chamber was fitted with a full-cone misting  
92 nozzle (3178K62, McMaster-Carr, Atlanta, GA) having an orifice of 0.025 cm and an 80° spray  
93 angle to introduce droplets into the spray chamber. The misting nozzle was connected to a valved  
94 tank pressurized to 60 psi and pre-filled with 0.3% mucin solution inoculated with a DNA  
95 marker. Air flow exited the spray chamber through the mouth orifice during exhalation only. A  
96 Spraytec droplet sizer (Malvern Panalytical, Westborough, MA) was positioned at the orifice of  
97 the transmitter to measure the droplet size distribution. The receiver headform was connected to  
98 a QuickLung BREATHER™ System (IngMar Medical, Pittsburgh, PA) operating in the Eupnea  
99 mode (24 breaths per minute, 720 mL tidal volume).




100  
101 **Figure 1. Droplet Transmission Test System Overview**  
102

103 *Test Analyte*

104 The DNA marker used for this study was a 111-bp DNA fragment ( $\lambda$ -111) amplified from the  
105 lambda bacteriophage ( $\lambda$  phage) genome using a previously published qPCR primer set.<sup>16</sup>**Error!**  
106 **Bookmark not defined.**  $\lambda$ -111 was purified using a DNA Clean and Concentrator-100 kit  
107 (D4029, Zymogen) and the identity of the DNA fragment was confirmed using gel  
108 electrophoresis. DNA concentration was determined using a Synergy LX multi-mode plate  
109 reader with a Take3 plate (Biotek, Winooski, VT).

110 *Droplet Transmission Tests*

111 Both headforms were positioned in a non-ventilated room (~11' × 11' × 10') lined with anti-  
112 static polyethylene film (ASFR612, Americover, Escondido, CA). Sampling coupons were  
113 circular, 2.5-cm diameter, 0.4- $\mu$ m polycarbonate filters (PCT0425100; Sterlitech) on top of a  
114 3.2-cm diameter diameter cellulose filter paper backing (CFP1-032; Sterlitech, Kent, WA).  
115 Coupons were placed at 1, 2, 3, and 4 feet directly in front of the transmitter headform (~18.5"  
116 below the headform mouth) in addition to the headform locations (Figure 2). Coupons were  
117 placed onto the headforms using double-sided tape, and metal pins were used to hold the  
118 coupons to the cellulose backing when needed; coupons placed between and behind headforms  
119 were each held in an aluminum weighing dish. Four PPE conditions were tested: 1) Cloth  
120 facemask on the transmitter headform, 2) Surgical facemask on the transmitter headform, 3) Face  
121 shield on the transmitter headform, and 4) no PPE on the transmitter headform (positive control).  
122 For all tests, no PPE was donned onto the receiver headform. Three replicates were performed  
123 for each condition.



124

125 **Figure 2. Headform Coupon Locations: 1) Forehead, 2) Left Eye, 3) Right Eye, 4) Left**

126 **Cheek Bone, 5) Right Cheek Bone, 6) Neck, 7) Behind Left Shoulder, 8) Behind Right**

127 **Shoulder, 9) Left Cheek, 10) Right Cheek, 11) Mouth.**

128 A mucin solution (0.3%) was prepared using deionized ultra-filtered water and subsequently

129 steam sterilized. The sterile mucin solution was cooled to room temperature and inoculated with

130 a DNA marker at a concentration of ~1 ng/mL and transferred into the pressure tank. Once the

131 breathing machines reached their respective breathing rates, the valve on the pressure tank was

132 opened to initiate droplet production. Droplets were produced for 15 minutes, then the pressure

133 tank valve was closed, and both breathing machines were turned off. Coupons were collected

134 into sterile 1.5-mL microcentrifuge tubes using sterile forceps and subsequently extracted into 1

135 mL of IDTE (11-01-02-05; Integrated DNA Technologies). A 1-mL sample of residual mucin

136 solution was also collected from the spray chamber. Coupon samples were vortexed vigorously

137 for 5 seconds and mixed gently on the orbital rocker for 1 hour before being stored at 4 °C.



138 *DNA Marker Analysis*

139 The presence of  $\lambda$ -111 DNA was analyzed from 5  $\mu$ L of each sample using a TaqMan-based  
140 absolute qPCR assay with a previously published primer-probe set.<sup>16</sup> The presence of  $\lambda$ -111  
141 DNA was analyzed from 5  $\mu$ L of each sample using a TaqMan-based absolute qPCR assay with  
142 a previously published primer-probe set.<sup>17</sup> Double-stranded genomic DNA from a different  
143 phage (PhiX174) was used as an exogenous positive control, also using a previously published  
144 primer-probe set.<sup>17</sup> Absolute qPCR reactions were assembled using Brilliant III Ultra-Fast Probe  
145 qPCR Master Mix with low ROX (600890; Agilent, Santa Clara, CA) and were run on the  
146 Agilent AriaMX real-time PCR system. Three fluorescent dyes were monitored in multiplex  
147 reactions: 6-FAM-labelled  $\lambda$  DNA probe, Cy5-labelled PhiX174 DNA probe, and ROX as the  
148 passive reference dye. All reactions (singleplex and multiplex) were performed with 200-nM  
149 primer concentrations, 250-nM probe concentrations, and  $10^2$  copies of PhiX174 DNA. A  
150 standard curve for absolute quantitation of  $\lambda$ -111 DNA was included in each 96-well plate and  
151 was constructed with serial dilutions of  $\lambda$  phage genomic DNA (10746782001; Sigma-Aldrich)  
152 ranging from  $10^8$  to  $10^0$  copies/ $\mu$ L. Two technical replicates were performed for each sample and  
153 duplicates with a variance greater than 1  $C_q$  were excluded from further analysis and repeated  
154 until a lower variance was achieved.

155 A single qPCR reaction included either 5  $\mu$ L of a sample or 1  $\mu$ L of a standard, and all reactions  
156 included 1  $\mu$ L of PhiX174 DNA at  $10^2$  copies/ $\mu$ L to serve as the exogenous positive control. A  
157 negative control consisting of an unused coupon extracted into 1 mL IDTE was included in every  
158 experiment. A no-template control (NTC) assembled with IDTE was included in every 96-well  
159 plate. The quantity of  $\lambda$ -111 DNA copies was estimated for each reaction using AriaMX  
160 software. Reactions with  $C_q$  values greater than or equal to the negative control were assumed to

161 have no  $\lambda$ -111 DNA. Quantity estimates less than 1 DNA copy were defined as below detection  
162 limit (BDL), which was 200 DNA copies/coupon.

### 163 *Data Analysis*

164 The relative effectiveness of each PPE type was determined by calculating the percent reduction  
165 of DNA marker recovered from test coupons compared to positive control coupons collected in  
166 the same location. Percent reduction was calculated using Equation 1 followed by Equation 2.  
167 Samples that were below detection limit (BDL) were assigned half the detection limit (100 DNA  
168 copies).<sup>18</sup> For statistical analysis, one-way ANOVA tests with Tukey's post-test using non-log  
169 values were performed through Prism 9 (GraphPad; LaJolla, CA).

$$\text{Log Reduction (L)} = \log_{10}(\bar{C}) - \log_{10}(\bar{T}) \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

Where:

$\bar{C}$  = Average DNA copies per control coupon


$\bar{T}$  = Average DNA copies per test coupon

$$\text{Percent Reduction (P)} = (1 - 10^{-L}) \times 100 \quad (\text{Equation 2})$$

## 170 **Results**

171 The droplet size across all three control runs ranged from 0.1 – 200  $\mu\text{m}$  with a median diameter  
172 of  $\sim 27 \mu\text{m}$  (Figure 3). Over 90% of droplets by volume ranged from 10 – 100  $\mu\text{m}$ . The droplet  
173 mass output over the course of each run was estimated to be  $\sim 1.2 \text{ g}$  based on the volume output  
174 from the Spraytec droplet sizer data. The system only released droplets during exhalation and not  
175 during inhalation (data not shown). The mean DNA marker concentration sampled from the


176 spray chamber was  $6.46 \pm 0.31 \log_{10}$  DNA copies/ $\mu\text{L}$  across all tests performed. DNA marker  
177 was detected on 97% of all coupons evaluated, excluding negative control samples.



178  
179

**Figure 3. Mean Droplet Distribution for Triplicate Control Runs**

180 DNA was recovered from all coupons collected from the three control runs (no PPE), with the  
181 average number of DNA copies recovered per coupon being  $5.17 \pm 0.21 \log_{10}$  DNA  
182 copies/coupon (Figure 4). The most contaminated control coupons were in the 1-ft position in  
183 front of the transmitter headform ( $5.42 \pm 1.22 \log_{10}$  DNA copies/coupon), followed by a decrease  
184 in contamination as the distance away from the transmitter increased up to 4 feet ( $4.87 \pm 0.20$   
185  $\log_{10}$  DNA copies/coupon). DNA was not recovered from any of the negative control coupons.



186

187

**Figure 4. DNA Recovered from Sample Coupons after Droplet Transmission Tests**

188

All three types of PPE – face shield, cloth facemask, and surgical facemask – resulted in

189

significant reductions of DNA contamination of the receiver headform ( $p < 0.0001$ ,  $p = 0.0001$ ,  $p$

190

$= 0.0002$ , respectively) and between headforms ( $p = 0.04$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ,  $p = 0.03$ , respectively)

191

(Table 1); no significant difference was found between PPE types. As distance from the

192

transmitter increased, the significant difference also increased for all PPE types compared to the

193

control.

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201 **Table 1. Percent Reduction of Recovered DNA Compared to Positive Control.**

System Location	Coupon Location	Cloth Facemask		Surgical Facemask		Face Shield	
		% Reduction	P-value	% Reduction	P-value	% Reduction	P-value
Transmitter headform	Behind shoulders	90.9%	0.32	93.8%	0.81	92.0%	0.99
	Forehead	-161.8%	0.39	-108.3%	0.96	99.3%	0.99
	Eyes	-10360.8%	<0.0001	-8690.0%	0.007	-765.8%	0.34
	Cheek bones	81.2%	0.98	74.8%	0.99	-458.1%	0.29
	Neck	85.9%	0.87	90.2%	0.84	-207.4%	0.12
Between headforms	1 foot	97.8%	0.08	99.0%	0.08	99.7%	0.08
	2 feet	94.1%	0.09	98.8%	0.06	98.4%	0.06
	3 feet	98.1%	0.006	99.5%	0.006	99.7%	0.007
	4 feet	94.4%	0.005	98.1%	0.004	99.3%	0.003
Receiver headform	Cheeks	80.9%	<0.0001	87.3%	<0.0001	94.5%	<0.0001
	Mouth	73.5%	0.047	93.4%	0.008	99.3%	0.006

202

203 An increase in contamination was observed on the transmitter headform for all three PPE types,  
 204 but in varying locations. Both the cloth facemasks and surgical facemasks resulted in  
 205 significantly higher contamination of the transmitter’s eye region relative to the control ( $p <$   
 206  $0.0001$ ,  $p = 0.007$ , respectively) and relative to the face shield ( $p = 0.0001$  and  $p = 0.001$ ,  
 207 respectively). Higher contamination of the eye region was also observed with the face shield  
 208 when compared to the control, but was not statistically significant ( $p = 0.34$ ). Higher  
 209 contamination of the transmitter’s forehead was observed for both facemasks, but the face shield  
 210 resulted in lower contamination compared to the control; no statistically significant differences  
 211 observed.

212 Conversely, the face shield produced a 458% increase in contamination of the transmitter's  
213 cheek bone areas compared to the control, while both facemasks provided an average reduction  
214 of 78.0%; no statistically significant differences observed relative to the control or between the  
215 PPE tested. The face shield resulted in a 207.4% increase in contamination of the transmitter's  
216 neck compared to the control, while the cloth facemask and surgical facemask demonstrated an  
217 average reduction of 88.1% – no statistically significant differences observed relative to the  
218 control; however, the neck contamination from face shield use was significantly higher  
219 compared to both the cloth facemask ( $p = 0.04$ ) and the surgical facemask ( $p = 0.04$ ).

## 220 **Discussion**

221 The primary goal of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of PPE at mitigating the spread  
222 of respiratory droplets when simulating the CDC close contact condition: a minimum of 15  
223 minutes of contact at less than 6 feet. All three types of PPE – face shield, cloth facemask, and  
224 surgical facemask – demonstrated similar reductions in droplet transmission to the receiver  
225 headform.

226 For control testing (no PPE), a baseline level of contamination was recovered across all samples,  
227 which can likely be attributed to deposition of both droplets and aerosol particles (dried  
228 droplets). The highest contamination observed from control samples occurred at the 1-ft position  
229 in front of the transmitter headform, which then decreased as the distance away from the  
230 transmitter increased to 4 feet. This reduction in contamination can likely be attributed to droplet  
231 deposition onto coupons with larger droplets settling closer to the transmitter headform.  
232 Interestingly, higher levels of contamination were observed on the receiver headform relative to  
233 the 4-ft coupons. It is unclear why this occurred, however the breathing of the receiver headform  
234 may have influenced air patterns and caused aerosol particles (dried droplets) to interact with the

235 coupons on the receiver. Because the testing was performed in a sealed room without ventilation,  
236 this likely allowed larger aerosol particles to interact with the sampling coupons, resulting in a  
237 baseline of detectable contamination for all tests.

238 Although the facial protection evaluated as part of this study demonstrated significant reductions  
239 in droplet transmission relative to the control, some level of contamination was detected on  
240 96.5% of coupon samples across all tests where PPE was used. Similar to the control testing, this  
241 baseline level of detectable marker can likely be attributed to deposition of large aerosol particles  
242 (not droplets) over the course of each 15-minute test, which aligns with previous findings that  
243 face shields reduce user exposure to droplets by 96%, but do not contain all aerosols expelled by  
244 the user.<sup>7,8</sup> The data from this study suggests this conclusion can be extended to surgical and  
245 cloth masks, and likely any face covering that does not provide a seal around the nose and mouth  
246 to mitigate the release of a user's deflected exhalation. Although all PPE tested released some  
247 level of aerosol particles, they appear to reduce overall particulate aerosol contamination  
248 compared to the controls. The impact this finding has on the COVID-19 pandemic is relevant as  
249 demonstrated by the CDC acknowledgement that airborne transmission can occur under special  
250 circumstances (enclosed spaces, inadequate ventilation), and the use of all PPE tested may not  
251 allow for adequate source control.<sup>1</sup> This highlights a need to better understand SARS-CoV-2  
252 transmission by aerosols in addition to droplets.

253 Another trend for all three face coverings evaluated in this study is contamination detected on the  
254 transmitter headform during PPE use. With the face shield, higher contamination of all exposed  
255 surfaces of the transmitter headform (i.e., eyes, cheek bones, neck) was observed compared to  
256 the control, except for the forehead which is covered by a tight-fitting foam piece of the face  
257 shield. For both facemasks, higher contamination of the forehead and eyes of the transmitter

258 headform were observed relative to the control. These results indicate the face shield forced the  
259 exhalation downward, while the facemasks forced the exhalation upwards. Both observations  
260 raise concern for self-contamination of contagious individuals, where the user's face, facial  
261 accessories (e.g., eyeglasses), and/or nearby surfaces may become a source of contact  
262 transmission depending on the air flow path of the user's exhalation. The concept of deflected  
263 exhaled air flow is intuitive as observed by users who experience fogging of their glasses when  
264 wearing facemasks. Moreover, during normal use, users would be expected to move their heads  
265 up and down, which could enlarge the contaminated area, especially for face shield users. When  
266 properly donned, facemasks are expected to be less affected by movement due to their more  
267 tight-fitting nature to the user's face. More research is needed to better characterize the effect of  
268 head movement/position on localized contamination resulting from use by contagious  
269 individuals.

270 All simulation studies have limitations based on the conditions and test parameters selected.  
271 Breathing patterns and droplets produced by individuals will vary dramatically from person to  
272 person in real-world settings. A manikin was used for PPE use in this study, where actual fit on  
273 humans may impact the amount of air leakage around the devices. The study was performed in a  
274 non-ventilated setting, which may have influenced transmission of particles and to a lesser  
275 degree, droplets. Samples were also taken directly in front of the transmitter headform only –  
276 additional research is needed to assess the spread of droplets at various angles. Larger sample  
277 sizes would likely improve the statistical robustness and help overcome the inherent variability  
278 of aerosol testing. An assessment of PPE on the receiver headform would also likely produce  
279 informative results for public health measures. For this study, the simulation of droplet



280 transmission in a real-world scenario was balanced with designing a reproducible method,  
281 enabling comparisons of various types of PPE.

282 The focus of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of PPE at mitigating the spread of  
283 respiratory droplets when simulating the CDC close contact condition: a minimum of 15 minutes  
284 of contact at less than 6 feet. All PPE tested were shown to be similarly effective at reducing  
285 droplet transmission up to 4 feet directly in front of the source, but were also shown to cause  
286 self-contamination. Variation in the location and severity of self-contamination observed  
287 suggests devices with differences in fit and form will likely result in different areas of the face  
288 being contaminated. However, the data from this study supports significant facial contamination  
289 should be expected with any PPE that does not provide a tight seal around the mouth and nose of  
290 the user. These findings have considerable implications for infection control procedures, drawing  
291 attention to the user's face and nearby surfaces as potential sources of contact transmission when  
292 using such devices.

### 293 **Acknowledgements**

294 We would like to thank the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) for funding  
295 this research under Prime contract #1605DC-19-A-0010. We would also like to thank the Air  
296 Force Civil Engineering Center (AFCEC) for providing a breathing machine for the study. We  
297 want to thank Mr. Mike McDonald for assistance setting up the test system.

### 298 **Reference**

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Scientific Brief: SARS-CoV-02 and potential airborne transmission. (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/more/scientific-brief-sars-cov-2.html>).
- <sup>2</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC calls on Americans to wear masks to prevent COVID-19 spread. 2020 (<https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2020/p0714-americans-to-wear-masks.html>).
- <sup>3</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Considerations for wearing masks. (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-face-cover-guidance.html>).
- <sup>4</sup> Asadi S, Cappa, CD, Bareda S, Wexler AS, Bouvier NM, Ristenpart WD. Efficacy of masks and face coverings in controlling outward aerosol particle emission from expiratory activities. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:15665.
- <sup>5</sup> Fischer EP, Fischer MC, Grass D, Henrion I, Warren WS, Westman E. Low-cost measurement of face mask efficacy for filtering expelled droplets during speech. *Sci Adv* 2020;6:eabd3083.
- <sup>6</sup> Konda A, Prakash A, Moss GA, Schmoltdt M, Grant GD, Guha S. Aerosol filtration efficiency of common fabrics used in respiratory cloth masks. *ACS Nano* 2020;14(5):6339-6347.
- <sup>7</sup> Lindsley WG, Noti JD, Blachere DN, Szalajda JV, Beezhold DH. Efficacy of face shields against cough aerosol droplets from a cough simulator. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2014;11:509-518.

- 
- <sup>8</sup> Siddhartha V, Dhanak M, Frankenfield J. Visualizing droplet dispersal for face shields and masks with exhalation valves. *Phys Fluids* 2020;32,091701.
- <sup>9</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Public health guidance for community-related exposure (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/public-health-recommendations.html>).
- <sup>10</sup> Duguid JP. The numbers and the sites of origin of the droplets expelled during expiratory activities. *Edinb Med J* 1945;52:385.
- <sup>11</sup> Duguid JP. The size and duration of air-carriage of respiratory droplets and droplet nuclei. *J Hyg (London)* 1946;44(6):471-479.
- <sup>12</sup> Xie X, Li Y, Sun H, Liu L. Exhaled droplets due to talking and coughing. *J R Soc Interface* 2009;6:S703-714.
- <sup>13</sup> Nicas M, Nazaroff WW, Hubbard A. Toward understanding the risk of secondary airborne infection: Emission of respirable pathogens. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2005;2(3):143-154.
- <sup>14</sup> ISO 19600-5:2016/AMD 1:2018 Respiratory protective devices – Methods of test and test equipment – Part 5: Breathing machine, metabolic Simulator, RPD headforms and torso, tools and verification tools – Amendment 1: PRD head forms front and side views. International Organization of Standards, Geneva, Switzerland.
- <sup>15</sup> Bergman MS, Basu R, Lei Z, Neizgoda G, Zhuang Z. Development of a manikin-based performance evaluation method for loose-fitting powered air-purifying respirator. *J Int Soc Respir Prot* 2017;34(1):40-57.

- 
- <sup>16</sup> Wang HY, Lu JJ, Chang C, et al. Development of a high sensitivity TaqMan-based PCR assay for the specific detection of Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex in both pulmonary and extrapulmonary specimens. *Sci Rep* 2019;9(1):113.
- <sup>17</sup> Turgeon N, Toulouse M, Martel B, Moineau S, Duchaine C. Comparison of five bacteriophages as models for viral aerosol studies. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2014; 80(14):4242-4250.
- <sup>18</sup> Singh A, Nocerino J. Robust estimation of mean and variance using environmental data sets with below detection limit observations. *Chemometr Intell Lab Syst* 2002;60(1):69-86.