

Supplementary Information:

Infection dynamics model (Figure 1a-c):

To demonstrate the effect of masks, we used a simple SIR model of the dynamics of infection taking several populations into account: S: susceptible individuals, I: infected, R: resistant, CI: critically ill, D: dead. The goal of the model is not to predict any particular infection in a completely realistic way, but rather to illustrate the impact of reducing infectivity at high versus low R0 values.

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \beta \cdot I \cdot \frac{S}{N_t} - \rho \cdot I - \gamma \cdot I \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \rho \cdot I \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{dCI}{dt} = \gamma \cdot I - \delta \cdot (1 + 8\theta(CI - CI_{max})) - \rho' \cdot CI \quad (3)$$

$$D = N_t - I - CI - R \quad (4)$$

Where $\theta(CI - CI_{max})$ is the Heaviside function changing the death rate when the critically ill number saturates ICU beds. Parameters are defined in Table S1.

Wearing of masks was implemented in the model as a reduction of infectivity between 8-16%¹⁻⁸.

Total population size was taken as 8×10^6

Parameter name	Symbol	Units	Values
Infection rate	β	day ⁻¹	0.17-0.4
Recovery rate	ρ	day ⁻¹	0.16
Critical deterioration rate	γ	day ⁻¹	0.003
Death rate	δ	day ⁻¹	0.0036
Recovery of critically ill	ρ'	day ⁻¹	0.0025-0.005
Total population size	N_t	Individuals	8×10^6

Max. number of ICU beds	CI_{max}	Beds	4000
-------------------------	------------	------	------

In the absence of ICU beds, 86% of the critical care patients die, whereas if ICU beds are not limiting, only 40% of critical care patients would die. The total fraction of critical care patients is 1.8% of the total number of infected cases⁹.

Data for (Figure 1d and 1e) was adapted from Ferguson *et al*⁹ (16/3/2020- Table 4) The wearing of masks is assumed to reduce infectivity by 10%. We, therefore, compared the results of Ferguson *et al* (Table 4) at different R0 and for different social-distancing policy measures.

Supplementary References

1. Suess T, Remschmidt C, Schink SB, et al. The role of facemasks and hand hygiene in the prevention of influenza transmission in households: results from a cluster randomised trial; Berlin, Germany, 2009-2011. *BMC Infect Dis* 2012;12:26.
2. MacIntyre CR, Cauchemez S, Dwyer DE, et al. Face mask use and control of respiratory virus transmission in households. *Emerging infectious diseases* 2009;15:233-41.
3. Xiao J, Shiu EYC, Gao H, et al. Nonpharmaceutical Measures for Pandemic Influenza in Nonhealthcare Settings-Personal Protective and Environmental Measures. *Emerging infectious diseases* 2020;26.
4. Davies A, Thompson KA, Giri K, Kafatos G, Walker J, Bennett A. Testing the efficacy of homemade masks: would they protect in an influenza pandemic? *Disaster Med Public Health Prep* 2013;7:413-8.
5. Aiello AE, Perez V, Coulborn RM, Davis BM, Uddin M, Monto AS. Facemasks, hand hygiene, and influenza among young adults: a randomized intervention trial. *PLoS One* 2012;7:e29744.
6. Tracht SM, Del Valle SY, Hyman JM. Mathematical modeling of the effectiveness of facemasks in reducing the spread of novel influenza A (H1N1). *PLoS One* 2010;5:e9018.
7. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks. *Nature medicine* 2020.
8. Dharmadhikari AS, Mphahlele M, Stoltz A, et al. Surgical face masks worn by patients with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis: impact on infectivity of air on a hospital ward. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine* 2012;185:1104-9.
9. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. 2020. (Accessed 8 April 2020, 2020, at <http://hdl.handle.net/10044/1/77482>.)