

Analysis of Mask Studies & The Danish Mask Study
<https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M20-6817>

Before the Covid outbreak, masks had been looked at in a number of controlled trials well reviewed by the **Center for Evidence Based Medicine** <https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/masking-lack-of-evidence-with-politics/> and by **Dennis Rancourt PhD** <https://www.sott.net/article/434796-The-Science-is-Conclusive-Masks-and-Respirators-do-NOT-Prevent-Transmission-of-Viruses>

Additionally, the **Centers for Disease Control (CDC)** itself published a controlled study of the transmission of Influenza and masking in May 2020, demonstrating no benefit of masks in controlling the spread of influenza--a similar disease in size of virus and transmission characteristics. https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/5/19-0994_article No controlled study showed that masks decreased transmission of small size virus infection.

In other words, long before Covid-19, the science was well established that masks do not prevent the transmission of viruses the size of Covid-19.

Since Covid-19, we know of at least one well done randomly controlled study on masks during Covid-19, that has been rejected from all mainstream scientific publications, which is very odd given that it is a randomized controlled study "The Gold Standard". That study which is reputed to demonstrate once again, consistent with all studies prior to Covid-19, that masks don't work to prevent the transmission of viruses, has clearly been censored.

Since Covid-19 papers are presented with more popular views, papers which are published attempting to justify masking the world against the SARS CoV2 virus, but none actually demonstrate real world data to support the practice. The current Danish study just published by the American College of Physicians online journal is no exception. <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M20-6817>

The article suffers from several flaws which the authors themselves admit: Inconclusive results, missing data, variable adherence, patient-reported findings on home tests, no blinding, and no assessment of whether masks could decrease disease transmission from mask wearers to others." The authors' own assessment should dampen enthusiasm for using this article for any public policy decision.

Specifically, the study compared 3030 masked people to 2994 unmasked people. This group of 6024 people was selected from a larger group of 17,258, and no reason for the selection was given. The masked group wore ear loop paper masks, which are the least effective for actually being occlusive. Furthermore, 20% of the entire group failed to complete the study-- 22% of the masked and 18% of the unmasked and 7% of masked people were reportedly non-compliant.

The authors themselves concluded in their primary outcome section that “we did not find a subgroup where face masks were effective at conventional levels of statistical significance (data not shown)”.

Even more to the point, of the people who reported SARS CoV2 in the household, two participants in the face mask group and only one in the unmasked group developed SARS-CoV-2 infection.

The group with the lower infection, the unmasked group, actually had more smokers and more nursing home employees, which should have made that group more susceptible to disease. But, report of actual illness outcome for the groups was not reported. Instead, “Infection” as an “outcome” was based on a flawed mix of positive PCR tests or Antibody tests and/ or clinical disease. In short, when you read this paper, you cannot discern how many people got sick in the two groups--which is really the point of all this mask wearing in the first place.

In short, this paper is a headline in search of data to back it up. Science should be clear and not obfuscatory. This study was painful to read, is anything but controlled, and is one more paper in a long line of recent publications desperately trying to reverse decades of well-done science demonstrating that masks do not prevent the transmission of viruses.