



Open Letter

Delivered via email to: ewong@hwdsb.on.ca; ddanko@hwdsb.on.ca; bbuck@hwdsb.on.ca; mfmiller@hwdsb.on.ca; ptut@hwdsb.on.ca; gnoble@hwdsb.on.ca; afehrman@hwdsb.on.ca; kaarcher@hwdsb.on.ca; remulhol@hwdsb.on.ca; twhite@hwdsb.on.ca; sdahab@hwdsb.on.ca; mayor@hamilton.ca; ward1@hamilton.ca; ted.mcmeekin@hamilton.ca; elizabeth.richardson@hamilton.ca; sylvia.jones@pc.ola.org; Stephen.Lecceco@pc.ola.org; Kieran.Moore@ontario.ca; doug.ford@pc.ola.org

Re: Ending “Strong Recommendation” for Masking of Children at Schools in Ontario

Dear local trustees and public servants from the City of Hamilton and the Province of Ontario,

As a father of two daughters attending local elementary schools in Westdale (Hamilton, ON), and research scientist/professor at McMaster University with expertise in bioanalytical chemistry and data analytics, I together with members of the Scientific and Medical Advisory Committee of the Canadian COVID Care Alliance (CCCA) urge you to advocate on behalf of students in our province and *put an end to the ineffective and harmful mask policy* in schools. It certainly is a relief that mask mandates, including the shaming and bullying of students into compliance, have ended, and most school staff/students are sensibly *not* abiding by the so-called ‘strong recommendations’ for facial masking as dictated by unaccountable medical health officers. Yet, it is still concerning that there is an on-going campaign to normalize schools as a “mask-friendly environment” while continuing a misleading narrative indicating that student mask wearing is a societal virtue rather than an act of *self-harm*. For instance, community masking is still *falsely* promoted by the City of Hamilton as a means to “*protect yourself and others while preventing COVID-19 spread.*”¹

Please sincerely reflect on the *plethora of disproportionate COVID-19 medical countermeasures* that have been recklessly perpetrated on minors for the ‘greater good’. These include school closures, social distancing, remote learning, Plexiglass barriers, face shields/hand sanitizers, asymptomatic testing, quarantine restrictions, and student pod formations with daily symptom check-ins. The collective physical and psychological trauma of such policies on our children has been a colossal failure for public health, further exacerbating health inequities, educational attainment, misery and chronic disease burden notably in vulnerable groups. In fact, nearly all measures decreed by ‘trusted’ health experts have contradicted **2019 WHO guidelines for non-pharmaceutical interventions** for pandemic influenza,² as they were *known to be ineffective for transmissible respiratory viruses while causing incalculable societal harms*. Fear-based narratives and behavioral modification methods (i.e., nudging) must be repudiated as they have formed the basis of costly and inane policies using *children as shields* to appease hysterical and narcissistic adults.

Yet, one visible reminder of the many COVID-19 absurdities is the belief in facial masking of children within school settings. For instance, the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board, like elsewhere across Ontario, needlessly extended mask requirements last March 2022 stating that “*masking is a health and safety measure that has reduced the spread of COVID-19.*”³ This unproven assertion contradicts decades of studies demonstrating that masks *do not* halt aerosolized viral transmission or infection with *no* credible studies performed on children. The DANMASK-19 study was one of the largest randomized control trials

¹ <https://www.hamilton.ca/people-programs/public-health/diseases-conditions/coronavirus-covid/protect-yourself-and-others>

² <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/non-pharmaceutical-public-health-measures-for-mitigating-the-risk-and-impact-of-epidemic-and-pandemic-influenza>

³ <https://www.hwdsb.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Extension-of-Mask-Requirement-in-Schools.pdf>

during COVID-19 and concluded that surgical masks *did not* reduce the SARS-CoV-2 infection rate in a community setting.⁴ This outcome is consistent with *decades of physical interventions* to reduce respiratory viral infections in healthcare workers, including N95/P2 respirators, that have shown *inconclusive results* with a high risk of bias (*i.e.*, low quality evidence).⁵ Similarly, a *pooled meta-analysis* recently published in the *Cochrane Database for Systemic Reviews*⁶ confirms that mask wearing **does not interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses** (refer to Appendix). This study is considered the gold standard in evidence-based medicine based on their methodology, thoroughness, independence, and transparency to provide *definitive answers on masking* unlike the arbitrary guidelines of the COVID-19 era, namely:

“Wearing masks in the community makes *little or no difference* to laboratory-confirmed influenza/SARS-CoV-2 compared to not wearing masks...Harms were *rarely measured and poorly reported.*”

However, there are *numerous immunological and psychological harms from prolonged face mask wearing* on top of other coercive COVID-19 interventions,⁷ including **increased irritability and headaches**,⁸ **face mask dermatitis**,⁹ **bacterial and fungal contamination**,¹⁰ **deteriorating mental health from social deprivation with lower cognitive test scores and developmental deficits in children**.¹¹ Through interference of air flow, masks impede inhalation of oxygen and exhalation of carbon dioxide, resulting in elevated carbon dioxide (hypercapnia) and reduced oxygen (hypoxia) in blood, which impair learning and increase fatigue.¹² Alarming, there is evidence that users of *poorly regulated* surgical masks may **inhale fiber-like microplastics, silver-based biocides, and titanium dioxide nanoparticle coatings**.¹³ In fact, titanium dioxide is a *suspected human carcinogen* whose exposure is reported to enhance respiratory syncytial virus (RSV)-induced airway epithelial barrier dysfunction in children.¹⁴ Thus, continued ‘strong recommendations’ for general use of facial masks on children **do harm with no plausible benefit**. This harm also includes widespread *microplastic pollution* from countless discarded masks in the environment, which require proper sterilization after intensive use as they are a *bacteria-related biosafety hazard*.¹⁰ In fact, facial masks may also be described as ‘compliance instruments’ since they have been used as *dehumanizing* psychological weapons to break down detainees¹⁵ along with sensory deprivation, social isolation, and cycles of terror/gaslighting – all hallmarks of a militaristic lockstep COVID-19 operation.

As a result, **elected trustees and political leaders must abandon mask theatre** after years of entrainment and fear mongering of minors about contagions especially when medical health officers do not adhere with their own advice.¹⁶ There is ample evidence to demonstrate that wearing facial masks in schools is unnecessary, ineffective and harmful to children. Individuals are free to wear masks (even during physical intimacy as advocated by Dr. Teresa Tam¹⁷) no matter how misguided this ritual may be. Yet, propaganda stating masks protect the wearers and others from viral infection/disease with *no* risks to the user must end. Not doing so would imply an intent to harm and malfeasance with *no* excuse for plausible deniability.

⁴ Bundgard *et al. Ann. Intern. Med.* **2021** 174:335-343. PMID: 33205991.

⁵ Jefferson *et al. Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **2020** 11:CD006207. PMID: 33215698.

⁶ <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD006207.pub6/epdf/full>

⁷ <https://www.bmj.com/content/370/bmj.m3021/rr-6>

⁸ Schwartz *et al. Monatsschr. Kinderheilkd.* **2021** 69: 353-365. PMID: 33642617.; Ong *et al. Headache* **2020** 60: 864-877. PMID: 32232837.

⁹ Niesert *et al. Eur. J. Dermatol.* **2021** 31: 199-204. PMID: 33814358.

¹⁰ Zhiqing *et al. J. Orthop. Translat.* **2018** 14: 57-62. PMID: 30035033; Delanghe *et al. Front. Med.* **2021** 8:732047. PMID: 34540873.

¹¹ Galea *et al. JAMA Intern. Med.* **2020** 180: 817-818. PMID: 32275292; Dyer *BMJ* **2021** 374:n2031. PMID: 34400436.

¹² <https://researchsquare.com/article/rs-124394/v1>

¹³ *J. Hazard Mater.* **2021** 411:124955. PMID: 33445045; *Sci. Total Environ.* **2023** 870:161889. PMID: 36731552; *Sci. Rep.* **2022** 12:2529. PMID: 35169246.

¹⁴ Smallcombe *et al. Am. J. Physiol. Lung Cell. Mol. Physiol.* **2020** 319:L481-L496. PMID: 32640839

¹⁵ Dyer *BMJ* **2002** 324:187. PMID: 11809632.

¹⁶ <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/dr-kieran-moore-no-mask-toronto-life-1.6656714>

¹⁷ <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-wear-a-mask-while-having-sex-dr-theresa-tam-suggests/>

“It is no measure of health to be well adjusted to a profoundly sick society” – Jiddhu Krishnamurti.

We expect an *immediate retraction* of all messaging related to the unfounded benefits attributed to the wearing of facial masks in a school setting that completely ignores their documented harms in children. This has been an utter betrayal of the precautionary principle, evidence-based medicine and medical ethics as it targets the most innocent and vulnerable, and only promotes ill health to our future generation.

Respectfully submitted by members of the Canadian COVID Care Alliance:

Dr. Philip Britz-McKibbin, PhD, Professor, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, McMaster University

Dr. Byram W. Bridle, MSc, PhD, Associate Professor of Viral Immunology, Department of Pathobiology, University of Guelph

Dr. Claudia Chaufan, MD, PhD, Associate Professor, Health Policy and Global Health, York University

Dr. L. Maria Gutschi, BSc Pharm, Pharm D, Pharmacy Consultant, ex-Scientific Officer

Dr. John Hardie, BDS, MSc, PhD, FRCDC, Oralpathologist (retired), former Head of the Department of Dentistry at the Vancouver General Hospital

Dr. York N. Hsiang, M.B. MHSc., FRCSC, Professor Emeritus of Surgery, University of British Columbia

Dr. Bonnie Mallard, MSc, PhD, Professor of Immunogenetics, Department of Pathobiology, University of Guelph

Dr. Bernard Massie, Retired, Independent Biotech Consultant; Associate Professor of Microbiology and Immunology at the Université de Montréal

Dr. Kanji Nakatsu, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Department of Pharmacology, Queen's University

Dr. Susan Natsheh, MD, Pediatrician (retired), former Associated Professor, Dalhousie University

Dr. Steven Pelech, PhD, Professor, Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia; President and Chief Scientific Officer, Kinexus Bioinformatics Corporation

Dr. Patrick Provost, PhD, Full Professor, Department of Microbiology, Infectious Diseases and Immunology, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval

Dr. Christopher A. Shaw, PhD, Professor, Department of Ophthalmology, University of British Columbia

Dr. David J. Speicher, PhD, DTM, Assistant Professor of Biology and Health Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Redeemer University

Appendix

Jefferson et al. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2023, Issue 1. CD006207. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006207.pub6.



Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

[Intervention Review]

Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses

Tom Jefferson^{1a}, Liz Dooley², Eliana Ferroni³, Lubna A Al-Ansary⁴, Mieke L van Driel^{5,6}, Ghada A Bawazeer⁷, Mark A Jones², Tammy C Hoffmann², Justin Clark², Elaine M Beller², Paul P Glasziou², John M Conly^{8,9,10}

¹Department for Continuing Education, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 2JA, UK. ²Institute for Evidence-Based Healthcare, Bond University, Gold Coast, Australia. ³Epidemiological System of the Veneto Region, Regional Center for Epidemiology, Veneto Region, Padova, Italy. ⁴Department of Family and Community Medicine, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. ⁵General Practice Clinical Unit, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. ⁶Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium. ⁷Department of Clinical Pharmacy, College of Pharmacy, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. ⁸Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Room AGW5, SSB, Foothills Medical Centre, Calgary, Canada. ⁹O'Brien Institute for Public Health and Synder Institute for Chronic Diseases, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada. ¹⁰Calgary Zone, Alberta Health Services, Calgary, Canada

^aFull affiliation: Senior Associate TutorDepartment for Continuing EducationUniversity of OxfordRewley House1 Wellington Square Oxford OX1 2JA, UK - tom.jefferson@conted.ox.ac.uk

Contact: John M Conly, john.conly@albertahealthservices.ca.

Editorial group: Cochrane Acute Respiratory Infections Group.

Publication status and date: New search for studies and content updated (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 1, 2023.

ABSTRACT

Background

Viral epidemics or pandemics of acute respiratory infections (ARIs) pose a global threat. Examples are influenza (H1N1) caused by the H1N1pdm09 virus in 2009, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in 2003, and coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) caused by SARS-CoV-2 in 2019. Antiviral drugs and vaccines may be insufficient to prevent their spread. This is an update of a Cochrane Review last published in 2020. We include results from studies from the current COVID-19 pandemic.

Objectives

To assess the effectiveness of physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of acute respiratory viruses.

Search methods

We searched CENTRAL, PubMed, Embase, CINAHL, and two trials registers in October 2022, with backwards and forwards citation analysis on the new studies.

Selection criteria

We included randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster-RCTs investigating physical interventions (screening at entry ports, isolation, quarantine, physical distancing, personal protection, hand hygiene, face masks, glasses, and gargling) to prevent respiratory virus transmission.

Data collection and analysis

We used standard Cochrane methodological procedures.

Main results

We included 11 new RCTs and cluster-RCTs (610,872 participants) in this update, bringing the total number of RCTs to 78. Six of the new trials were conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic; two from Mexico, and one each from Denmark, Bangladesh, England, and Norway. We identified four ongoing studies, of which one is completed, but unreported, evaluating masks concurrent with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Many studies were conducted during non-epidemic influenza periods. Several were conducted during the 2009 H1N1 influenza pandemic, and others in epidemic influenza seasons up to 2016. Therefore, many studies were conducted in the context of lower respiratory viral circulation and transmission compared to COVID-19. The included studies were conducted in heterogeneous settings, ranging from suburban schools to hospital wards in high-income countries; crowded inner city settings in low-income countries; and an immigrant neighbourhood in a high-income country. Adherence with interventions was low in many studies.

The risk of bias for the RCTs and cluster-RCTs was mostly high or unclear.

Medical/surgical masks compared to no masks

We included 12 trials (10 cluster-RCTs) comparing medical/surgical masks versus no masks to prevent the spread of viral respiratory illness (two trials with healthcare workers and 10 in the community). Wearing masks in the community probably makes little or no difference to the outcome of influenza-like illness (ILI)/COVID-19 like illness compared to not wearing masks (risk ratio (RR) 0.95, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.84 to 1.09; 9 trials, 276,917 participants; moderate-certainty evidence). Wearing masks in the community probably makes little or no difference to the outcome of laboratory-confirmed influenza/SARS-CoV-2 compared to not wearing masks (RR 1.01, 95% CI 0.72 to 1.42; 6 trials, 13,919 participants; moderate-certainty evidence). Harms were rarely measured and poorly reported (very low-certainty evidence).

N95/P2 respirators compared to medical/surgical masks

We pooled trials comparing N95/P2 respirators with medical/surgical masks (four in healthcare settings and one in a household setting). We are very uncertain on the effects of N95/P2 respirators compared with medical/surgical masks on the outcome of clinical respiratory illness (RR 0.70, 95% CI 0.45 to 1.10; 3 trials, 7779 participants; very low-certainty evidence). N95/P2 respirators compared with medical/surgical masks may be effective for ILI (RR 0.82, 95% CI 0.66 to 1.03; 5 trials, 8407 participants; low-certainty evidence). Evidence is limited by imprecision and heterogeneity for these subjective outcomes. The use of a N95/P2 respirators compared to medical/surgical masks probably makes little or no difference for the objective and more precise outcome of laboratory-confirmed influenza infection (RR 1.10, 95% CI 0.90 to 1.34; 5 trials, 8407 participants; moderate-certainty evidence). Restricting pooling to healthcare workers made no difference to the overall findings. Harms were poorly measured and reported, but discomfort wearing medical/surgical masks or N95/P2 respirators was mentioned in several studies (very low-certainty evidence).

One previously reported ongoing RCT has now been published and observed that medical/surgical masks were non-inferior to N95 respirators in a large study of 1009 healthcare workers in four countries providing direct care to COVID-19 patients.

Hand hygiene compared to control

Nineteen trials compared hand hygiene interventions with controls with sufficient data to include in meta-analyses. Settings included schools, childcare centres and homes. Comparing hand hygiene interventions with controls (i.e. no intervention), there was a 14% relative reduction in the number of people with ARIs in the hand hygiene group (RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.81 to 0.90; 9 trials, 52,105 participants; moderate-certainty evidence), suggesting a probable benefit. In absolute terms this benefit would result in a reduction from 380 events per 1000 people to 327 per 1000 people (95% CI 308 to 342). When considering the more strictly defined outcomes of ILI and laboratory-confirmed influenza, the estimates of effect for ILI (RR 0.94, 95% CI 0.81 to 1.09; 11 trials, 34,503 participants; low-certainty evidence), and laboratory-confirmed influenza (RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.63 to 1.30; 8 trials, 8332 participants; low-certainty evidence), suggest the intervention made little or no difference. We pooled 19 trials (71, 210 participants) for the composite outcome of ARI or ILI or influenza, with each study only contributing once and the most comprehensive outcome reported. Pooled data showed that hand hygiene may be beneficial with an 11% relative reduction of respiratory illness (RR 0.89, 95% CI 0.83 to 0.94; low-certainty evidence), but with high heterogeneity. In absolute terms this benefit would result in a reduction from 200 events per 1000 people to 178 per 1000 people (95% CI 166 to 188). Few trials measured and reported harms (very low-certainty evidence).

We found no RCTs on gowns and gloves, face shields, or screening at entry ports.

Authors' conclusions

The high risk of bias in the trials, variation in outcome measurement, and relatively low adherence with the interventions during the studies hampers drawing firm conclusions. There were additional RCTs during the pandemic related to physical interventions but a relative paucity given the importance of the question of masking and its relative effectiveness and the concomitant measures of mask adherence which would be highly relevant to the measurement of effectiveness, especially in the elderly and in young children.

There is uncertainty about the effects of face masks. The low to moderate certainty of evidence means our confidence in the effect estimate is limited, and that the true effect may be different from the observed estimate of the effect. The pooled results of RCTs did not show a clear reduction in respiratory viral infection with the use of medical/surgical masks. There were no clear differences between the use of medical/surgical masks compared with N95/P2 respirators in healthcare workers when used in routine care to reduce respiratory viral infection. Hand hygiene is likely to modestly reduce the burden of respiratory illness, and although this effect was also present when ILI and laboratory-confirmed influenza were analysed separately, it was not found to be a significant difference for the latter two outcomes. Harms associated with physical interventions were under-investigated.

There is a need for large, well-designed RCTs addressing the effectiveness of many of these interventions in multiple settings and populations, as well as the impact of adherence on effectiveness, especially in those most at risk of ARIs.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Do physical measures such as hand-washing or wearing masks stop or slow down the spread of respiratory viruses?

Key messages

We are uncertain whether wearing masks or N95/P2 respirators helps to slow the spread of respiratory viruses based on the studies we assessed.

Hand hygiene programmes may help to slow the spread of respiratory viruses.

How do respiratory viruses spread?

Respiratory viruses are viruses that infect the cells in your airways: nose, throat, and lungs. These infections can cause serious problems and affect normal breathing. They can cause flu (influenza), severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), and COVID-19.

People infected with a respiratory virus spread virus particles into the air when they cough or sneeze. Other people become infected if they come into contact with these virus particles in the air or on surfaces on which they land. Respiratory viruses can spread quickly through a community, through populations and countries (causing epidemics), and around the world (causing pandemics).

Physical measures to try to prevent respiratory viruses spreading between people include:

- washing hands often;
- not touching your eyes, nose, or mouth;
- sneezing or coughing into your elbow;
- wiping surfaces with disinfectant;
- wearing masks, eye protection, gloves, and protective gowns;
- avoiding contact with other people (isolation or quarantine);
- keeping a certain distance away from other people (distancing); and
- examining people entering a country for signs of infection (screening).

What did we want to find out?

We wanted to find out whether physical measures stop or slow the spread of respiratory viruses from well-controlled studies in which one intervention is compared to another, known as randomised controlled trials.

What did we do?

We searched for randomised controlled studies that looked at physical measures to stop people acquiring a respiratory virus infection.

We were interested in how many people in the studies caught a respiratory virus infection, and whether the physical measures had any unwanted effects.

What did we find?

We identified 78 relevant studies. They took place in low-, middle-, and high-income countries worldwide: in hospitals, schools, homes, offices, childcare centres, and communities during non-epidemic influenza periods, the global H1N1 influenza pandemic in 2009, epidemic influenza seasons up to 2016, and during the COVID-19 pandemic. We identified five ongoing, unpublished studies; two of them evaluate masks in COVID-19. Five trials were funded by government and pharmaceutical companies, and nine trials were funded by pharmaceutical companies.

No studies looked at face shields, gowns and gloves, or screening people when they entered a country.

We assessed the effects of:

- medical or surgical masks;
- N95/P2 respirators (close-fitting masks that filter the air breathed in, more commonly used by healthcare workers than the general public); and
- hand hygiene (hand-washing and using hand sanitiser).

We obtained the following results:

Medical or surgical masks

Ten studies took place in the community, and two studies in healthcare workers. Compared with wearing no mask in the community studies only, wearing a mask may make little to no difference in how many people caught a flu-like illness/COVID-like illness (9 studies; 276,917 people); and probably makes little or no difference in how many people have flu/COVID confirmed by a laboratory test (6 studies; 13,919 people). Unwanted effects were rarely reported; discomfort was mentioned.

N95/P2 respirators

Four studies were in healthcare workers, and one small study was in the community. Compared with wearing medical or surgical masks, wearing N95/P2 respirators probably makes little to no difference in how many people have confirmed flu (5 studies; 8407 people); and may make little to no difference in how many people catch a flu-like illness (5 studies; 8407 people), or respiratory illness (3 studies; 7799 people). Unwanted effects were not well-reported; discomfort was mentioned.

Hand hygiene

Following a hand hygiene programme may reduce the number of people who catch a respiratory or flu-like illness, or have confirmed flu, compared with people not following such a programme (19 studies; 71,210 people), although this effect was not confirmed as statistically significant reduction when ILI and laboratory-confirmed ILI were analysed separately. Few studies measured unwanted effects; skin irritation in people using hand sanitiser was mentioned.

What are the limitations of the evidence?

Our confidence in these results is generally low to moderate for the subjective outcomes related to respiratory illness, but moderate for the more precisely defined laboratory-confirmed respiratory virus infection, related to masks and N95/P2 respirators. The results might change when further evidence becomes available. Relatively low numbers of people followed the guidance about wearing masks or about hand hygiene, which may have affected the results of the studies.

What are the limitations of the evidence?

Our confidence in these results is generally low to moderate for the subjective outcomes related to respiratory illness, but moderate for the more precisely defined laboratory-confirmed respiratory virus infection, related to masks and N95/P2 respirators. The results might change when further evidence becomes available. Relatively low numbers of people followed the guidance about wearing masks or about hand hygiene, which may have affected the results of the studies.

How up to date is this evidence?

We included evidence published up to October 2022.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Summary of findings 1. Medical/surgical masks compared to no masks for preventing the spread of viral respiratory illness

Randomised studies: medical/surgical masks compared to no masks for preventing the spread of viral respiratory illness

Patient or population: general population
Setting: community and hospitals
Intervention: medical/surgical masks
Comparison: no masks

| Outcomes | Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI) | | Relative effect (95% CI) | N° of participants (studies) | Certainty of the evidence (GRADE) | Comments |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | Risk with no masks | Risk with randomised studies: masks | | | | |
| Viral respiratory illness - influenza/COVID-like illness | Study population | | RR 0.95 (0.84 to 1.09) | 276,917 (9 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ Moderate ^d | |
| | 160 per 1000 | 152 per 1000 (134 to 174) | | | | |
| Viral respiratory illness - laboratory-confirmed influenza/SARS-CoV-2 | Study population | | RR 1.01 (0.72 to 1.42) | 13,919 (6 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ Moderate ^b | |
| | 40 per 1000 | 40 per 1000 (29 to 57) | | | | |
| Adverse events | - | - | - | (3 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕⊕ Very low ^{a,c} | Adverse events were not reported consistently and could not be meta-analysed. → Adverse events reported for masks included warmth, discomfort, respiratory difficulties, humidity, pain, and shortness of breath, in up to 45% of participants. |

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the median observed risk in the comparison group of included studies and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: confidence interval; RCT: randomised controlled trial; RR: risk ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High certainty: we are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect.

Moderate certainty: we are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different.

Low certainty: our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect.