Original Investigation

FREE

September 3, 2019

N95 Respirators vs Medical Masks for Preventing Influenza Among Health Care Personnel

A Randomized Clinical Trial

Lewis J. Radonovich Jr, MD[1]; Michael S. Simberkoff, MD[2,3]; Mary T. Bessesen, MD[4,5]; et al

Author Affiliations | Article Information

JAMA. 2019;322(9):824-833. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.11645

Key Points

Question Is the use of N95 respirators or medical masks more effective in preventing influenza infection among outpatient health care personnel in close contact with patients with suspected respiratory illness?

Findings In this pragmatic, cluster randomized clinical trial involving 2862 health care personnel, there was no significant difference in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza among health care personnel with the use of N95 respirators (8.2%) vs medical masks (7.2%).

influenza.

Abstract

Importance Clinical studies have been inconclusive about the effectiveness of N95 respirators and medical masks in preventing health care personnel (HCP) from acquiring workplace viral respiratory infections.

Objective To compare the effect of N95 respirators vs medical masks for prevention of influenza and other viral respiratory infections among HCP.

Design, Setting, and Participants A cluster randomized pragmatic effectiveness study conducted at 137 outpatient study sites at 7 US medical centers between September 2011 and May 2015, with final follow-up in June 2016. Each year for 4 years, during the 12-week period of peak viral respiratory illness, pairs of outpatient sites (clusters) within each center were matched and randomly assigned to the N95 respirator or medical mask groups.

Interventions Overall, 1993 participants in 189 clusters were randomly assigned to wear N95 respirators (2512 HCP-seasons of observation) and 2058 in 191 clusters were randomly assigned to wear medical masks (2668 HCP-seasons) when near patients with respiratory illness.

Main Outcomes and Measures The primary outcome was the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza. Secondary outcomes included incidence of acute respiratory illness, laboratory-detected respiratory infections, laboratory-confirmed respiratory illness, and influenzalike illness. Adherence to interventions was assessed.

Results Among 2862 randomized participants (mean [SD] age, 43 [11.5] years; 2369 [82.8%]) women), 2371 completed the study and accounted for 5180 HCP-seasons. There were 207 laboratory-confirmed influenza infection events (8.2% of HCP-seasons) in the N95 respirator group and 193 (7.2% of HCP-seasons) in the medical mask group (difference, 1.0%, [95% CI, −0.5% to 2.5%]; $P = .18$) (adjusted odds ratio [OR], 1.18 [95% CI, 0.95-1.45]). There were 1556 acute respiratory illness events in the respirator group vs 1711 in the mask group (difference, −21.9 per 1000 HCP-seasons [95% CI, −48.2 to 4.4]; $P = .10$); 679 laboratory-detected respiratory infections in the respirator group vs 745 in the mask group (difference, −8.9 per 1000 HCP-seasons, [95% CI, −33.3 to 15.4]; $P = .47$); 371 laboratory-confirmed res-

piratory illness events in the respirator group vs 417 in the mask group (difference, −8.6 per 1000 HCP-seasons [95% CI, −28.2 to 10.9]; *P* = .39); and 128 influenzalike illness events in the respirator group vs 166 in the mask group (difference, −11.3 per 1000 HCP-seasons [95% CI, −23.8 to 1.3]; *P* = .08). In the respirator group, 89.4% of participants reported "always" or "sometimes" wearing their assigned de-

as worn by participants in this trial resulted in no significant difference in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza.

Trial Registration ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01249625

Introduction

Health care personnel (HCP) who are routinely exposed to viral respiratory infections in the workplace[1] may transmit infection to others. It is widely recognized that HCP, as a group, incompletely adhere to infection prevention recommendations and practice standards. Inpatient respiratory protection studies suggest adherence rates vary from 10% to 84%.[2-4] While laboratory studies designed to achieve 100% intervention adherence have shown that N95 filtering facepiece respirators are more efficacious than medical masks at reducing exposure to aerosols,[5] comparative clinical effectiveness studies have been inconclusive.[3,4,6] Some experts argue that N95 respirators and medical masks are equivalent in clinical settings.[2,7] Pragmatic effectiveness trials are increasingly recognized as an essential component of medical evidence, in part because efficacy studies may overestimate effectiveness and true adherence.[8]

Disposable N95 respirators and medical masks are both worn by HCP for self-protection; however, these masks have different intended uses. N95 respirators are designed to prevent the wearer from inhaling small airborne particles,[9] must meet filtration requirements,[10] and fit tightly to the wearer's face, limiting facial seal leakage. Medical masks, frequently called surgical masks, are intended to prevent microorganism transmission from the wearer to the patient. Medical masks fit the face loosely and do not reliably prevent inhalation of small airborne particles. However, medical masks prevent hand-to-face contact and facial contact with large droplets and sprays.[11]

Clinical evidence is inconclusive regarding whether N95 respirators are more effective than medical masks for preventing viral respiratory infection among HCP, including influenza,[3,4,6,12] accounting for differing practices[2] and positions held by clinical,[7] public health,[13,14] and regulatory organizations.[15] The objective of this study was to compare[13] the effectiveness of N95 respirators vs medical masks

worn by HCP in clinical practice for prevention of workplace-acquired influenza and other viral respiratory infections in geographically diverse, high-exposure, outpatient settings.

Methods

Methods

Study Sites and Institutional Review Boards

The Respiratory Protection Effectiveness Clinical Trial (ResPECT) was approved by the human subjects

pants were permitted to participate for 1 or more years and gave written consent for each year of participation. Study intervention sites included outpatient settings at the Children's Hospital Colorado (Aurora), Denver Health Medical Center (Denver, Colorado), Johns Hopkins Health System (Baltimore, Maryland), Michael E. DeBakey Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Center (Houston, Texas), VA Eastern Colorado Healthcare System (Denver), Washington DC VA Medical Center, and VA New York Harbor Healthcare System (New York). Sample storage and data analysis sites were the VA St Louis Healthcare System and St Louis University (St Louis, Missouri), University of Florida (Gainesville), University of Massachusetts (Amherst), and University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (Dallas).

Design and Oversight

This cluster randomized, multicenter, pragmatic effectiveness trial[16] conducted between September 2011 and May 2015, with final follow-up on June 28, 2016, compared the effect of N95 respirators, used as recommended during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic,[13] and medical masks, used as recommended to prevent seasonal influenza[17,18] and other viral respiratory infections and illnesses, among HCP.[17] The investigators were blinded to the randomization until completion of the study and analysis. An independent data and safety monitoring board assessed the data. Additional details are included in **Supplement 1**, including the statistical analysis plan and the full protocol that was previously published in an abridged format.[16]

Participants and Setting

This trial was conducted in diverse outpatient settings serving adult and pediatric patients with a high prevalence of acute respiratory illness, including primary care facilities, dental clinics, adult and pediatric clinics, dialysis units, urgent care facilities and emergency departments, and emergency transport services.

All participants in a cluster worked in the same outpatient clinic or outpatient setting. A cluster randomized design was used to improve adherence and increase indirect effects associated with participants in a cluster using the same intervention. Participants were aged at least 18 years, employed at

one of the 7 participating health systems, and self-identified as routinely positioned within 6 feet (1.83 m) of patients. Participants were full-time employees (defined as direct patient care for approximately ≥24 hours weekly) and worked primarily at the study site (defined as ≥75% of working hours). Exclusion

criteria were medical conditions precluding safe participation or anatomic features that could interfere with respirator fit, such as facial hair or third-trimester pregnancy. Participants self-identified race and sex using fixed categories; these variables were collected because facial anthropometrics related to race and sex may influence N95 respirator fit.

also recorded their participation in aerosol-generating procedures and exposure to patients, coworkers, or both with respiratory illness daily. Participants were categorized for exposure risk by occupational roles.

Procedures, Interventions, and Group Allocation

Each year, participating sites were cluster randomized to have participants wear N95 respirators[13] or medical masks,[17,18] as previously described.[16] N95 respirator models studied were the 3M Corporation 1860, 1860S, and 1870 (St Paul, Minnesota) and the Kimberly Clark Technol Fluidshield PFR95-270, PFR95-274 (Dallas, Texas); medical mask models were the Precept 15320 (Arden, North Carolina) and Kimberly Clark Technol Fluidshield 47107 (Dallas, Texas).

Within each medical center, for each study year, pairs of clusters (clinics and other settings) were matched by the number of participants, health services delivered, patient population served, and additional personal protective equipment. One cluster was randomly assigned to the medical mask group and one to the N95 respirator group. Random allocation of clusters required using constrained randomization, a process that maintains random assignment and balance between groups.[19] Computer-generated random sequences of group assignments were generated by an individual not involved in the study implementation and data analyses. Random sequences of assignment assured that every participant in each season had an equal probability of being assigned to the N95 respirator and medical mask groups and allowed participants to switch groups between seasons. Occupational Safety and Health Administration–accepted fit testing[15] of N95 respirators was conducted annually for all study participants.

Participants were instructed to wear their assigned protective devices (ie, N95 respirators or medical masks) during the 12-week period (the intervention period) during which the incidence of viral respiratory illness and infections was expected to be highest that year, as predicted by the ALERT algorithm[20] developed for this trial. Participants were instructed to put on a new device whenever they were positioned within 6 feet (1.83 m) of patients with suspected or confirmed respiratory illness. Hand hygiene was recommended to all participants in accordance with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guidelines.[13,17,18] Infection prevention policies were followed at each study site. Participants volunteered to participate for up to 12 weeks each intervention period, for a total of 48 weeks of intervention spanning 4 consecutive viral respiratory seasons.

Surveillance, Outcomes, and Measures of Effectiveness

Surveillance, Outcomes, and Measures of Effectiveness

Study personnel obtained swabs of the anterior nares and oropharynx[21] (FLOQSwabs UTM, Diagnostic Hybrids) from participants who self-reported symptoms of respiratory illness (**Box 1**). Symptomatic swabs were collected within 24 hours of self-report, and again if signs or symptoms persisted beyond 7

were obtained from all participants, typically while asymptomatic. Additionally, each year, paired serum samples obtained from all participants were assayed for influenza hemagglutinin levels before and after peak viral respiratory season.

Box 1. Criteria for Acute Respiratory Illness[a]

Signs

- Coryza
- Fever (temperature >37.8 °C)
- Lymphadenopathy
- Tachypnea (respiratory rate >25/min)

Symptoms

- Arthralgias/myalgias/body aches
- Chills
- Cough
- Diarrhea
- Dyspnea
- Fatigue
- Headache
- Malaise
- Other gastrointestinal systems
- Sore throat
- Sputum production
- Sweats

Vomiting/nausea

[a] An acute respiratory illness was defined as the presence of at least 1 sign or 2 symptoms listed, representing a change from baseline.

tection of influenza A or B virus by reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction[22] in an upper respiratory specimen collected within 7 days of symptom onset; detection of influenza from a randomly obtained swab from an asymptomatic participant; or influenza seroconversion (symptomatic or asymptomatic), defined as at least a 4-fold rise in hemagglutination inhibition antibody titers to influenza A or B virus between preseason and postseason serological samples deemed not attributable to vaccination. Individuals experiencing seroconversion were not required to have a detected symptomatic illness to meet the defined outcome. Influenza reagents used in the hemagglutination inhibition antibody assays were obtained from the International Reagent Resource Program, established by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Secondary outcome measures were the incidence of 4 measures of viral respiratory illness and infection: (1) acute respiratory illness (**Box 1**) with or without laboratory confirmation; (2) laboratory-detected respiratory infection, defined as detection of a respiratory pathogen by polymerase chain reaction or serological evidence of infection with a respiratory pathogen during the study surveillance period(s), which was added to the protocol prior to data analysis; (3) laboratory-confirmed respiratory illness, identified as previously described,[23] defined as self-reported acute respiratory illness plus the presence of at least 1 polymerase chain reaction–confirmed viral pathogen (**Box 2**) in a specimen collected from the upper respiratory tract within 7 days of the reported symptoms and/or at least a 4-fold rise from preintervention to postintervention serum antibody titers to influenza A or B virus; and (4) influenzalike illness, defined as temperature of at least 100°F (37.8°C) plus cough and/or a sore throat, with or without laboratory confirmation.

Box 2. Respiratory Pathogens Assayed by Polymerase Chain Reaction

Adenoviruses

Coxsackie/echoviruses

Coronavirus HKU1

Coronavirus NL63

Coronavirus OC43

Coronavirus 229E

Human metapneumovirus

Human rhinovirus

Parainfluenza virus type 1

Parainfluenza virus type 2

Parainfluenza virus type 3

Parainfluenza virus type 4a

Parainfluenza virus type 4b

Respiratory syncytial virus type A

Respiratory syncytial virus type B

Adherence to Group Assignment and Infection Prevention and Control Practices

Participants were reminded to adhere to protective device and hand hygiene instructions by signage posted at study sites, email, and by study personnel in person. Adherence to assigned devices were reported daily by participants as "always," "sometimes," "never," or "did not recall." In addition, study personnel observed participants' device-wearing behaviors as they entered and exited patient care rooms by conducting unannounced, inconspicuous visits to randomly selected study sites throughout the intervention period. However, to preserve patient confidentiality, monitors were not permitted to enter patient care rooms.

Statistical Analyses

Although we identified no standard definition of a "clinically significant difference," this study[16] was designed to detect a 25% relative reduction in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza or respiratory illness, based on expert opinion, rather than an absolute reduction, which has been described in a previous study.[6] The total sample size required to provide 80% power to show a 25% reduction in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza in the N95 respirator group compared with the medical mask group, with a type I error rate of .05, was 10 024 participant-sessions, and the sample size needed

to provide 80% power to show a 25% reduction in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed respiratory illness was 5104 participant-seasons.

Comparative effects of the interventions were estimated for the primary and secondary outcomes by

Comparative effects of the interventions were estimated for the primary and secondary outcomes by calculating odds ratios (ORs; for binary outcomes) and incidence rate ratios (IRRs; for count outcomes) between participant clusters randomly assigned to wear N95 respirators or medical masks. Laboratory-confirmed influenza was modeled using logistic regression and viral respiratory infection and illness

justed analyses included age, sex, race, number of household members younger than 5 years, occupation risk level (defined as low, medium, or high), binary season-specific influenza vaccination status, the proportion of daily exposures to others with respiratory illness, categorical self-reported adherence to hand hygiene, and intervention group assignment. Prespecified adherence rates were calculated as the proportion of reports of adherence in each group reporting "always," "sometimes," "never," or "did not recall." Comparison of proportions between groups were done using χ^2 statistics and comparisons of binomial proportions. Analyses included random effects to account for correlation of outcomes at site-level and individual-level random effects to account for correlation of outcomes at the individual level for participants who participated for multiple seasons.

The primary analysis used available data on all randomized participants for the primary comparison of the intervention. A per-protocol analysis, conducted at the same time as the primary analysis, included only individuals who completed at least 8 weeks of study participation.

A sensitivity analysis was conducted using imputation to assign outcomes to participants who did not complete the study. Missing outcomes were imputed using standard multiple imputation techniques, creating multiple imputed data sets with no missing values for each analysis.[23] Details of this analysis are described in **Supplement 2**. Intervention group withdrawal rates and time to withdrawal were compared to assess for potential bias. In an additional sensitivity analysis, observed and self-reported exposures and adherence were compared using Pearson χ^2 tests. Mean workplace and household rates of exposure to respiratory illness were compared using mixed-effects logistic regression. For all calculations, a 2-sided type I error probability of .05 was used. Because of the potential for type I error due to multiple comparisons, findings for analyses of secondary end points should be interpreted as exploratory. All statistical analyses were performed in R version 3.3.3 (R Foundation).

Results

Participants

The study sites were randomized to provide 380 cluster-seasons of observation over 4 consecutive intervention periods. Of the 2862 participants, 1416 participated for more than 1 year or intervention period. Among 2862 unique randomized participants (mean [SD] age, 43 [11.5] years; 2369 [82.8%]

women), 2371 completed the ResPECT protocol over the course of 48 weeks of intervention spanning 4 years. Among these individuals, 1446 participated in one 12-week intervention period, 723 participated in two 12-week intervention periods, and 693 participated in 3 or more 12-week intervention periods, accounting for 5180 HCP-seasons enrolled and randomized from 137 medical centers. Following ran-

the N95 respirator group and 2446 in the medical mask group; Figure 1). Some members of the primary analytic cohort did not complete all weeks of the study and were missing serological outcomes. Data were missing because of early withdrawal in 189 of 2512 participants (7.5%) in the N95 respirator group and 145 of 2668 (5.4%) in the medical mask group. In the per-protocol analysis, data were missing from 16 of 2243 participants (0.7%) in the N95 respirator group and 28 of 2446 (1.1%) in the medical mask group.

Baseline characteristics of the participants in the N95 respirator and medical mask groups were similar (Table 1). Daily workplace exposure to respiratory illness was reported 22.5% of the time in the N95 group and 21.6% of the time in the medical mask group, while weekly household exposure to respiratory illness was reported 3.6% of the time in the N95 respirator group and 3.4% of the time in the medical mask group (Table 1).

Illness Surveillance and Effectiveness

In the primary analysis, the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza infection events occurred in 207 of 2512 HCP-seasons (8.2%) in the N95 respirator group and 193 of 2668 HCP-seasons (7.2%) in the medical mask group, (difference, 1.0% [95% CI, −0.5% to 2.5%]; $P = .18$) (adjusted OR, 1.18 [95% CI, 0.95-1.45]).

Regarding secondary outcomes, there were 1556 acute respiratory illness events in the N95 respirator group (incidence rate [IR], 619.4 per 1000 HCP-seasons) vs 1711 in the medical mask group (IR, 641.3 per 1000 HCP-seasons) (difference, −21.9 per 1000 HCP-seasons [95% CI, −48.2 to 4.4]; $P = .10$; adjusted IRR, 0.99 [95% CI, 0.92-1.06]). There were 679 laboratory-detected respiratory infection events in the N95 respirator group (IR, 270.3 per 1000 HCP-seasons) vs 745 in the medical mask group (IR, 279.2 per 1000 HCP-seasons) (difference, −8.9 per 1000 HCP-seasons [95% CI, −33.3 to 15.4]; $P = .47$; adjusted IRR, 0.99 [95% CI, 0.89-1.09]) (Table 2 and Figure 2). Overall, 371 laboratory-confirmed respiratory illness events occurred in the N95 respirator group (IR, 147.7 per 1000 HCP-seasons) vs 417 in the medical mask group (IR, 156.3 per 1000 HCP-seasons) (difference, −8.6 per 1000 HCP-seasons [95% CI, −28.2 to 10.9]; $P = .39$; adjusted IRR, 0.96 [95% CI, 0.83-1.11]). There were 128 influenzalike illness

events in the N95 respirator group (IR, 51.0 per 1000 HCP-seasons) vs 166 in the medical mask group (IR, 62.2 per 1000 HCP-seasons) (difference, −11.3 per 1000 HCP-seasons [95% CI, −23.8 to 1.3]; $P = .08$; adjusted IRR, 0.86 [95% CI, 0.68-1.10]). Results were similar in the adjusted primary analysis and

per-protocol analyses (**Figure 2**).

Intervention, Adherence, and Adverse Events

Adherence was reported on daily surveys 22 330 times in the N95 respirator group and 23 315 times in

group and 5855 (25.1%) times in the medical mask group; "never," 2272 (10.2%) times in the N95 respirator group and 2207 (9.5%) times in the medical mask group; and "did not recall," 85 (0.4%) times in the N95 respirator group and 69 (0.3%) times in the medical mask group. Participant-reported adherence could not be assessed in 784 participants (31.2%) in the N95 respirator group and 822 (30.8%) in the medical mask group ($P = .84$) because of lack of response to surveys or lack of adherence opportunities (ie, participants did not encounter an individual with respiratory signs or symptoms).

Analyzed post hoc, participant adherence was reported as always or sometimes 89.4% of the time in the N95 respirator group and 90.2% of the time in the medical mask group. Additional details about adherence are included in **Supplement 1**. No serious study-related adverse events were reported. Nineteen participants reported skin irritation or worsening acne during years 3 and 4 at one study site in the N95 respirator group.

Per-Protocol Analysis and Sensitivity Analysis

Results of the per-protocol analysis can be seen in **Figure 2**. A sensitivity analysis assessed whether there was evidence for bias in self-reported outcomes based on group assignment. In a prespecified multiple-imputation analysis, the rates of laboratory-confirmed influenza infection events were 204 of 2243 HCP seasons (9.1%) in the N95 respirator group and 190 of 2446 HCP-seasons (7.8%) in the medical mask group. Quantitative data are available in **Supplement 3**.

Discussion

In this pragmatic, cluster randomized trial that involved multiple outpatient sites at 7 health care delivery systems across a wide geographic area over 4 seasons of peak viral respiratory illness, there was no significant difference between the effectiveness of N95 respirators and medical masks in preventing laboratory-confirmed influenza among participants routinely exposed to respiratory illnesses in the workplace. In addition, there were no significant differences between N95 respirators and medical masks in the rates of acute respiratory illness, laboratory-detected respiratory infections, laboratory-confirmed respiratory illness, and influenzalike illness among participants. A sensitivity analysis suggested that the primary analysis reported was fairly robust to the missing outcome data with quantitative outcomes varying by less than 5%. This supports the finding that neither N95 respirators nor medical masks were more effective in preventing laboratory-confirmed influenza or other viral respiratory infection or illness among participants when worn in a fashion consistent with current US clinical

practice.

Respiratory viruses are primarily transmitted by large droplets. Because a fraction of respiratory viruses may be transmitted by aerosol, N95 respirators have been presumed to provide better protection than

was limited by small sample size. Two additional studies[3,4] (and a pooled analysis[12]) concluded that N95 respirators may be more effective than medical masks; however, these studies were limited by uncertain clinical significance of end points.[24] The current study was undertaken because of remaining uncertainty based on previous studies, which made it challenging for infection control clinicians to effectively implement respiratory protection programs in health care settings.[2,7,13,18,24,25]

This trial was designed to assess clinical effectiveness, taking into account many challenges of working in outpatient health care settings. This study had several strengths, including the pragmatic design; wide US geographic and climatic distribution; varied adult and pediatric outpatient settings, including emergency departments; and enrollment spanning 4 seasons of peak viral respiratory illness. Respiratory samples were obtained from symptomatic and asymptomatic participants to determine the incidence of viral respiratory infection, including individuals that were subclinical but still potentially transmissible. Influenza vaccination status information was collected. This trial was cluster randomized to avoid mixing of interventions in each clinic and clinical setting and to minimize cross-contamination from different HCP behaviors, conducted at 7 medical centers among frontline HCP in varied clinical settings with high exposure risk, and sufficiently powered to detect the predefined difference in laboratory-confirmed respiratory illness. Previous effectiveness studies[3,4,6,12,26-28] have met some, but not all, of these characteristics and have been inconclusive, contributing to the uncertainty and controversy among experts determining public health guidance, regulatory requirements, and health care delivery practices.[2,7,14,17,29] In the current study, findings were consistent across all laboratory-based outcomes and clinical syndromes. Results for the primary and secondary outcomes were in opposite directions (ie, one IRR was associated with increased risk and the other with decreased risk), although the differences were nonsignificant, further supporting a finding of no significant difference in the effectiveness of N95 respirators vs medical masks for prevention of influenza or other respiratory illness.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the criteria for viral polymerase chain reaction testing may have missed participants who were infected but asymptomatic. Unrecognized infections may have increased

the probability of finding no difference between interventions, even if a difference existed. Second, self-reporting of symptoms in daily diaries likely underestimated illness among HCP who often work while ill.[30] Third, despite being intentionally conducted as a pragmatic effectiveness trial,[8] incomplete

participant adherence to assigned protective devices could have contributed to more unprotected exposures, increasing the probability of finding no difference between interventions even if a difference existed. However, participant-reported data indicates this did not differ by study group. Fourth, participants were not instructed to wear protective devices outside the workplace, which may have biased the

2 N95 respirator and medical mask models were studied, limiting the ability to generalize about the protectiveness of other models. Sixth, the sample size required to definitively determine whether N95 respirators or medical masks are more effective for protection from laboratory-confirmed influenza in the health care setting required approximately 10 000 participant-seasons, which was not feasible with the available funding or resources. However, the morbidity and mortality associated with a wide range of viral respiratory infections, including novel and emerging pathogens, renders a secondary outcome in this study, laboratory-confirmed respiratory illness, important.

Conclusions

Among outpatient HCP, N95 respirators vs medical masks as worn by participants in this trial resulted in no significant difference in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza.

Article Information

Back to top

Corresponding Author: Lewis J. Radonovich Jr, MD, National Personal Protective Technology Laboratory, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 626 Cochrans Mill Rd, B141, R108, Pittsburgh, PA 15236 (mto5@cdc.gov).

Accepted for Publication: July 25, 2019.

Author Contributions: Drs Perl and Radonovich had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Radonovich, Simberkoff, Cummings, Gaydos, Gorse, Reich, Perl.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Radonovich, Simberkoff, Cummings, Gaydos, Nyquist, Reich, Perl.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Radonovich, Bessesen, Brown, Cummings, Gaydos, Los, Krosche, Gibert, Gorse, Nyquist, Reich, Rodriguez-Barradas, Price, Perl.

Statistical analysis: Brown, Cummings, Reich.

Obtained funding: Cummings, Perl.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Radonovich, Simberkoff, Bessesen, Cummings, Gaydos, Los, Krosche, Gorse, Nyquist, Rodriguez-Barradas, Price, Perl.

Supervision: Radonovich, Simberkoff, Cummings, Los, Nyquist, Reich, Price, Perl.

Other - Site principal investigator for conduct of study and also contributed ongoing input on conduct and analysis of study: Gibert.

Other - laboratory testing support: Gaydos.

Other - recruiting patients: Price.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Bessesen reported receiving grants from the Department of Veterans Affairs during the conduct of the study. Dr Brown reported receiving grants from the US Department of Veterans Affairs during the conduct of the study. Dr Cummings reported receiving grants from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and MedImmune outside the submitted work and the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority during the conduct of the study. Ms Los reported receiving grants from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Veterans Health Administration, and the Biodefense Advanced Research and Development Agency during the conduct of the study. Dr Gibert reported receiving financial support for the conduct of the study, including research personnel, from the Veterans Health Administration during the conduct of the study. Dr Gorse reported receiving grants from the US Department of Veterans Affairs during the conduct of the study. Dr Nyquist reported receiving grants from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention/Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and the Veterans Health Administration during the conduct of the study; personal fees and nonfinancial support from Sequirus outside the submitted work; and serving on a policy making committee regarding infectious disease for the American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Infectious Diseases. Dr Reich reported receiving grants from Veterans Health Administration during the conduct of the study. Dr Rodriguez-Barradas reported receiving grants from Veterans Affairs Central Office during the conduct of the study. Dr Perl reported receiving grants from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority during the conduct of the study and grants from Medimmune outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Funding/Support: This trial was funded by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Veterans Health Administration, and the Biodefense Advanced Research and Development Agency.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor. The sponsors were not involved in data collection, analysis, or interpreta

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The sponsors were not involved in data collection, analysis, or interpretation; writing of the manuscript; or the decision to submit the manuscript. The sponsors reviewed and made technical comments about the study protocol prior to enrollment and the final manuscript prior to submission for publication.

FULL TEXT

Amanda Krosche, BS; Meghan Kubala, MS, MD: Jenna Los, MLA; Liandra Presser, MD; Kathleen Pulice, MS; Margaret Spach, DDS. VA New York Harbor Healthcare System (New York, NY): Michael S. Simberkoff, MD; Cynthia Akagbosu, BA, MA; Madeline Dansky, BA; Benedict J. Frederick, BA; Marilyn Last, RN; Scott Laverie, RN; Courtney Pike, BA; Shefali Rikhi, BS; Nicole Spector, RN; Christine A. Reel-Brander, RN. Denver Health & Hospital Authority (Denver, CO): Connie Price, MD; Katie Gorman, BS; Amy Irwin, DNP, RN; Sean O'Malley; Kevin Silva, BS. UT Southwestern Medical Center (Dallas, TX) Trish M. Perl, MD, MSc; Deepa Raj, MPH; VA Eastern Colorado Healthcare System (Aurora, CO): Mary Besseesen, MD; Jill C. Adams BSN, BA; Shannon Kingery, BS; Stefanie Tuder, BS; Erron Fritchman-Palmer, MPH. Children's Hospital Colorado (Denver, CO): Ann-Christine Nyquist, MD, MSPH; Megan Gorski, BA. VA Washington DC Medical Center (Washington, DC): Cynthia Gibert, MD, MSc; Laura Chopko, BA; Kathy Haines, MSW, MPH; Caitlin Langhorne, MPH; Dana Silver, BA; Courtney Southard, MPH. VA Michael C. DeBakey Medical Center (Houston, TX): Maria C. Rodriguez-Barradas MD; Barbara Kertz, MS; Mahwish Mushtaq, MD, MPH; Blanca Vargas, MD. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety & Health (Pittsburgh, PA): Edward Fisher, MS; Ronald Shaffer, PhD; Lewis J. Radonovich, MD. Veteran's Health Administration Office of Public Health (Gainesville, FL): Aaron Eagan, MPH, RN; Lewis J. Radonovich, MD. HandyMetrics Corporation (Toronto, Ontario, Canada): Melanie Lipka, BS; Michael Tsang, PhD. Laboratory Core at Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, MD): Charlotte Gaydos, DrPH, Jeffrey Holden, MA; Alexandra Valsamakis, MD, PhD. Laboratory Core at VA St Louis Healthcare System and St Louis University School of Medicine (St Louis, MO): Geoffrey J. Gorse, MD; Michelle Mitchell, BS; Gira B. Patel, MS; Yinyi Yu, BS. REDCap Core at Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, MD): Andre Hackman, BA, Michael Sherman, BS. Statistical and Epidemiologic Core (University of Florida, Gainesville): Brooke A. Borgert MS., Derek A.T. Cummings, PhD, MPH, MSc.; Susan Rattigan (University of Massachusetts, Amherst): Alexandria C. Brown, PhD; Nicholas G. Reich, PhD (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD); Justin Lessler, PhD, MHS, MS.

Disclaimer: The findings and conclusions in this article are the authors' own and do not necessarily represent the views of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of Veterans Affairs, or other affiliates. Mention of product names does not imply endorsement. All information and materials in this article are original.

Data Sharing Statement: See Supplement 4.

Additional Contributions: We thank the members of the data and safety monitoring board, Daniel Morgan, MD (University of Maryland, Baltimore), Elizabeth Colantuoni, PhD (Johns Hopkins Bloomberg

gan, MD (University of Maryland, Baltimore), Elizabeth Colantuoni, PhD (Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore), and Tia Powell, MD (Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx). We also thank David Weissman, MD (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health) and Michael Hodgson, MD (Occupational Safety and Health Administration). None of our consults were financially

References

1. Goins WP, Talbot HK, Talbot TR. Health care-acquired viral respiratory diseases. *Infect Dis Clin North Am*. 2011;25(1):227-244. doi:10.1016/j.idc.2010.11.010
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

2. Institute of Medicine. *Preparing for an Influenza Pandemic: Personal Protective Equipment for Healthcare Workers*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2008.

3. MacIntyre CR, Wang Q, Cauchemez S, et al. A cluster randomized clinical trial comparing fit-tested and non-fit-tested N95 respirators to medical masks to prevent respiratory virus infection in health care workers. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2011;5(3):170-179. doi:10.1111/j.1750-2659.2011.00198.x
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

4. MacIntyre CR, Wang Q, Seale H, et al. A randomized clinical trial of three options for N95 respirators and medical masks in health workers. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013;187(9):960-966. doi:10.1164/rccm.201207-1164OC
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

5. Noti JD, Lindsley WG, Blachere FM, et al. Detection of infectious influenza virus in cough aerosols generated in a simulated patient examination room. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2012;54(11):1569-1577. doi:10.1093/cid/cis237
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

6. Loeb M, Dafoe N, Mahony J, et al. Surgical mask vs N95 respirator for preventing influenza among health care workers: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2009;302(17):1865-1871. doi:10.1001/jama.2009.1466
Article | PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

7. Rupp ME, Whitley R, Nutty C. *Letter on Federal PPE Guidance*. Washington, DC: Infectious Diseases Society of America/Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America/Association of Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology. https://www.idsociety.org/globalassets/idsa/policy--advocacy/current_topics_and_issues/infection-prevention--control/comments/1100509-shea-idsa-apic-letter-re-ppe-guidance.pdf. Published November 5, 2009. Accessed March 28, 2019.

2019.

8. Ford I, Norrie J. Pragmatic trials. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(5):454-463. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1510059
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

FULL TEXT

doi:10.1080/15459624.2013.799964
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

10. Determination of particulate filter efficiency level of N95 series filters against solid particulates for non-powered, air-purifying respirators standard testing procedure. Pittsburgh, PA: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; 2016.https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/npptl/stps/pdfs/TEB-APR-STP-0059-508.pdf.

11. Lipp A, Edwards P. Disposable surgical face masks for preventing surgical wound infection in clean surgery. The Cochrane Library website. http://www.cochranelibrary.com/. Published April 26, 2016. Accessed March 28, 2019.

12. MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA, Rahman B, et al. The efficacy of medical masks and respirators against respiratory infection in healthcare workers. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2017;11(6):511-517. doi:10.1111/irv.12474
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

13. Interim recommendations for facemask and respirator use to reduce 2009 influenza A (H1N1) virus transmission. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website. https://www.cdc.gov/h1n1flu/masks.htm. Published September 24, 2009. Accessed December 6, 2016.

14. Infection control webinar. World Health Organization website. http://www.who.int/gpsc/5may/news/webinars/infection_control_webinar_20100413.ppt. Published April 10, 2010. Accessed March 28, 2019.

15. US Department of Labor. 1910.134 -Respiratory protection standard. Washington, DC: Occupational Safety and Health Administration. https://www.osha.gov/pls/oshaweb/owadisp.show_document?p_table=standards&p_id=12716. Accessed March 28, 2019.

16. Radonovich LJ Jr, Bessesen MT, Cummings DA, et al. The respiratory protection effectiveness clinical trial (ResPECT): a cluster-randomized comparison of respirator and medical mask effectiveness against respiratory infections in healthcare personnel. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2016;16:243. doi:10.1186/s12879-016-1494-2
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

17. Siegel JD, Rhinehart E, Jackson M, Chiarello L; Health Care Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee. 2007 Guideline for isolation precautions: preventing transmission of infectious agents in health care settings. *Am J Infect Control*. 2007;35(10)(suppl 2):S65-S164. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2007.10.007

al influenza in healthcare setting. Government Publishing Office website. https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2010-06-22/html/2010-15015.htm. Published June 22, 2010. Accessed March 28, 2019.

19. Moulton LH. Covariate-based constrained randomization of group-randomized trials. *Clin Trials*. 2004;1(3):297-305. doi:10.1191/1740774504cn024oa
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

20. Reich NG, Cummings DA, Lauer SA, et al. Triggering interventions for influenza: the ALERT algorithm. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(4):499-504. doi:10.1093/cid/ciu749
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

21. de la Tabla VO, Masiá M, Antequera P, et al. Comparison of combined nose-throat swabs with nasopharyngeal aspirates for detection of pandemic influenza A/H1N1 2009 virus by real-time reverse transcriptase PCR. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2010;48(10):3492-3495. doi:10.1128/JCM.01105-10
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

22. Tang YW, Lowery KS, Valsamakis A, et al. Clinical accuracy of a PLEX-ID flu device for simultaneous detection and identification of influenza viruses A and B. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2013;51(1):40-45. doi:10.1128/JCM.01978-12
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

23. Azur MJ, Stuart EA, Frangakis C, Leaf PJ. Multiple imputation by chained equations: what is it and how does it work? *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2011;20(1):40-49. doi:10.1002/mpr.329
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

24. Bessesen MT, Savor-Price C, Simberkoff M, Reich NG, Pavia AT, Radonovich LJ. N95 respirators or surgical masks to protect healthcare workers against respiratory infections: are we there yet? *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013;187(9):904-905. doi:10.1164/rccm.201303-0581ED
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

25. Sartor C, Zandotti C, Romain F, et al. Disruption of services in an internal medicine unit due to a nosocomial influenza outbreak. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2002;23(10):615-619. doi:10.1086/501981
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

26. Jacobs JL, Ohde S, Takahashi O, Tokuda Y, Omata F, Fukui T. Use of surgical face masks to re-

duce the incidence of the common cold among health care workers in Japan: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Infect Control*. 2009;37(5):417-419. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2008.11.002
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

28. Smith JD, MacDougall CC, Johnstone J, Copes RA, Schwartz B, Garber GE. Effectiveness of N95 respirators versus surgical masks in protecting health care workers from acute respiratory infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *CMAJ*. 2016;188(8):567-574. doi:10.1503/cmaj.150835
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

29. Peterson K, Novak D, Stradtman L, Wilson D, Couzens L. Hospital respiratory protection practices in 6 U.S. states: a public health evaluation study. *Am J Infect Control*. 2015;43(1):63-71. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2014.10.008
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

30. Chiu S, Black CL, Yue X, et al. Working with influenza-like illness: presenteeism among US health care personnel during the 2014-2015 influenza season. *Am J Infect Control*. 2017;45(11):1254-1258. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2017.04.008
PubMed | Google Scholar | Crossref

Sign Up

Privacy Policy | Terms of Use

FULL TEXT