Erratum

Vol. 70, No. 6

The report "Decline in COVID-19 Hospitalization Growth Rates Associated with Statewide Mask Mandates — 10 States, March–October 2020" contained several errors.

On page 212, in the first paragraph, the fifth sentence should have read "After mask mandates had been implemented for ≥ 3 weeks, hospitalization growth rates declined by **5.6** percentage points among persons aged 18–39 years (95% CI = **0.9**–10.4) and those aged 40–64 years (95% CI = **1.0**–10.2)."

On page 213, in the first complete paragraph of the right-hand column, the second sentence should have read "The overall COVID-19—associated hospitalization growth rates among all adults declined 2.4 percentage points (p-value = 0.04) <3 weeks after the implementation week and declined **5.0** percentage points (p-value <0.01) during the period ≥3 weeks after the implementation week (Table 2)."

On pages 213–214, the second complete paragraph of the right-hand column should have read "Among persons aged 18–39 years, the hospitalization growth rates <3 weeks after the

implementation week were lower than were those during the <4 weeks before the implementation week and the implementation week (reference period) when no mask mandate existed, but the estimated percentage point difference (-2.2) was not statistically significant (p-value = **0.30**) (Figure) (Table 2). However, in this population, mask mandates were associated with a statistically significant 5.6 percentage-point decline in COVID-19 hospitalization growth rates (p-value = **0.02**) ≥3 weeks after the implementation week. Among adults aged 40-64 years, mask mandates were associated with a 2.9 percentage-point reduction in COVID-19 hospitalization growth rates (p-value = 0.03) < 3 weeks after the implementation week. Hospitalization growth rates declined by **5.6** percentage points (p-value = 0.02) during ≥ 3 weeks after the implementation week. Among adults aged ≥65 years, COVID-19 hospitalization growth rates declined <3 weeks after the implementation week (1.2 percentage points) and ≥3 weeks after the implementation week (0.7 percentage points); however, the declines were not statistically significant."

On page 214, there were multiple errors in Table 2. The corrected table is as follows:

TABLE 2. Estimated association between mask mandates and COVID-19-associated hospitalization growth rates in sites with statewide mask mandates, by age group — 10 COVID-19-Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network sites,*,† March-October 2020

	All (≥18 yrs)		18-39 yrs		40-64 yrs		≥65 yrs	
Time relative to week mask mandate was implemented	Percentage point change* (95% CI)	p-value						
≥4 weeks before	-4.3 (-10.6 to 1.9)	0.17	-4.8 (-17.0 to 7.5)	0.43	-4.0 (-13.3 to 5.3)	0.38	-5.3 (-15.0 to 4.4)	0.27
<4 weeks before§	Referent	_	Referent	_	Referent	_	Referent	_
<3 weeks after	-2.4 (-4.7 to -0.1)	0.04	-2.2 (-6.4 to 2.1)	0.30	-2.9 (-5.5 to -0.3)	0.03	-1.2 (-3.9 to 1.5)	0.38
≥3 weeks after	−5.0 (−8.6 to −1.4)	< 0.01	−5.6 (−10.4 to −0.9)	0.02	−5.6 (−10.2 to −1.0)	0.02	-0.7 (-5.3 to 3.9)	0.76

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019.

On page 215, the second paragraph of the Summary should have read "During March 22–October 17, 2020, 10 sites participating in the COVID-19–Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network in states with statewide mask mandates reported a decline in weekly COVID-19–associated hospitalization growth rates by up to **5.6** percentage points for adults aged 18–64 years after mandate implementation, compared with growth rates during the 4 weeks preceding implementation of the mandate."

The Supplementary Table (https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/101127) should have listed the date of statewide reopening for Michigan as **June 1, 2020**.

^{*} Percentage points are coefficients from the regression models. Reported numbers are from regression models, which controlled for state, age group, time (week), and statewide closing and reopening.

[†] California, Colorado, Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, and Oregon.

[§] This period includes the implementation week (i.e., week zero).