

1 Network analysis of England's single parent household COVID-19 control policy impact:

2 a proof-of-concept study

3

4 Edelman N.L.*^{1,2} Simon, P.³ Cassell J.A.² Kiss I.Z.⁴

5 [*N.Edelman@brighton.ac.uk](mailto:N.Edelman@brighton.ac.uk) (corresponding author)

6 1 School of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Brighton, UK

7 2 Primary Care & Public Health, Brighton & Sussex Medical School, UK

8 3 Department of Applied Analysis and Computational Mathematics, Institute of Mathematics,

9 Hungary

10 4 Department of Mathematics, School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of Sussex,

11 Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QH, UK

12

13 **Word count:** 3943

14

15 **Summary**

16 Lockdowns have been a key infection control measure for many countries during the COVID-19
17 pandemic. In England's first lockdown, children of single parent households (SPHs) were permitted
18 to move between parental homes. By the second lockdown, SPH support bubbles between
19 households were also permitted, enabling larger within-household networks. We investigated the
20 combined impact of these approaches on household transmission dynamics, to inform policymaking
21 for control and support mechanisms in a respiratory pandemic context.

22 This network modelling study applied percolation theory to a base model of SPHs constructed with
23 population survey estimates of SPH family size. To explore putative impact, varying estimates were
24 applied regarding extent of bubbling and proportion of Different-parentage SPHs (DSPHs) (in which
25 children do not share both the same parents). Results indicate that the formation of giant
26 components (in which Covid-19 household transmission accelerates) are more contingent on DSPHs
27 than on formation of bubbles between SPHs; and that bubbling with another SPH will accelerate
28 giant component formation where one or both are DSPHs. Public health guidance should include
29 supportive measures that mitigate the increased transmission risk afforded by support bubbling
30 among DSPHs. Future network, mathematical and epidemiological studies should examine both
31 independent and combined impact of policies.

32

33 Introduction

34 The COVID-19 pandemic has had a devastating impact around the World; with politicians
35 implementing population infectious disease control measures including ‘lockdowns’, defined by the
36 Cambridge dictionary as: *‘a period of time in which people are not allowed to leave their homes
37 or travel freely, because of a dangerous disease’.*

38 After reporting its first case in January 2020, the UK has gone on to have one of the highest excess
39 death rates in Europe (7.7% above the five-year average by the end of that year) (1). The first
40 national lockdown was imposed on 23rd March 2020, and eased through June/July of that year. The
41 ‘Stay at Home’ rules exempted children from ‘single parent households’ (SPHs) who routinely stayed
42 with or visited both parents such that they could continue to do so. After a flattening and decline in
43 the epidemic curve through the summer a second English lockdown was imposed on 3rd November
44 2020 and re-introduced on 6th January 2021 after being briefly lifted through December using a
45 tiered system of restrictions. Other social-distancing measures implemented to varying degrees
46 across the UK and other countries include disallowing and/or limiting individuals being inside others’
47 homes.

48

49 Following the first lockdown evidence emerged of the negative impact of social-distancing on mental
50 well-being (2). Social support was found to have an important protective effect against this (3).

51 Therefore, from September 2020 some households in England were permitted to form a ‘support
52 bubble’ with another household (4). SPHs were among these designated household types, defined
53 as *‘a single adult living with one or more children who are under the age of 18 or were under that
54 age on 12 June 2020’* (4). The Office for National Statistics (ONS) estimates there were 2.9 million
55 lone parent families (LPF) in the UK in 2020 (14.7% of all families). This calculation attributes each
56 child to *one* household based on which parent receives the child maintenance. In 86% of LPFs the

57 child(ren) resides predominantly with the mother (5). Estimates of LPF size differ greatly. ONS
58 Families and Household data for 2018 found that 55% of LPFs had one child, 32% had two and 13%
59 comprised three or more (<18 years of age); while 2020 data found 30.17% had one child, 37.34%
60 had two and 32.49% had three or more. Amongst LPFs there is no available data on discordant
61 parentage (in which the children of that household do not share all the same parents/caregivers),
62 although US data suggests that 28% of all women with two or more children had those children by
63 more than one father (6).

64 The risk of household transmission of SARS-Cov-2 is estimated to be ten times greater than for
65 transmission via non-household contacts (7); and thought to account for 70% of all transmission (8).
66 The household secondary attack rate (the percentage of contacts of an index case who are also
67 infected) has been estimated at 16.6% - varying by age, relationship type, presence of symptoms and
68 number of household members (9). Network analysis has aided understanding of transmission
69 dynamics where household living arrangements are combined with movement of actors between
70 homes; a recent study of domiciliary care demonstrating the impact on COVID-19 transmission of
71 that movement (10).

72 Infectious disease transmission amongst individuals connected via a contact network, can be
73 mapped using percolation theory (11) (12). Put simply, the transmission of an epidemic between
74 network nodes requires 'activation' of links along which infection has spread. Keeping such links and
75 discarding all other, also referred to as 'bond percolation', results in a network with fewer links,
76 since not all existing links will transmit. The severity of an epidemic is directly related to the size of
77 connected components (i.e. a subset of nodes where any two nodes are connected in both
78 directions) in this sparser network. A giant component is a subset of nodes (e.g. adults and children
79 in SPHs) such that any two nodes (people) in this subset can be connected using the available links
80 (such as those afforded from OHL and/or support bubbling); and where the number of nodes in this
81 subset scale with the size of the full network. Where a giant component is formed, a severe

82 epidemic is likely as the infection can ‘percolate’ through the network. Conversely, if the sparser
83 network comprises many disconnected components, the likelihood of a severe epidemic is small. In
84 percolation theory, one is interested in the point at which the extent of connectivity between people
85 leads to the formation of a ‘giant component’. From a public health perspective, this is particularly
86 valuable in identifying the critical percolation threshold at which an infection (such as SARS-CoV-2) is
87 likely to affect a large proportion of individuals. Percolation theory has already been applied to
88 investigate putative impact on COVID-19 transmission of forming household bubbles, finding that
89 reduced contact outside the bubble mitigated the transmission impact of bubbles with more than
90 two members (13). Network analysis has also explored the potential impact on COVID-19
91 transmission of ‘contact clustering’ in social bubbles (as part of an imagined exit strategy), similarly
92 finding negligible impact where those bubbles remained contained (14). However, both studies
93 assume exclusivity between bubbling households, not accounting for domiciliary movement
94 between households such as that afforded by care workers or the children of SPHs. To the authors’
95 knowledge, no studies have investigated the cumulative impact on COVID-19 transmission of SPH
96 support bubbles in the context of SPH child movement between parental residences.

97 This proof-of-concept study aimed to examine the impact of two mechanisms by which a network of
98 SPHs in which children are spending time with parents who live in different households can become
99 more connected, leading to larger giant components with a higher probability of a large outbreak.
100 (Here we use the term “parent” to include all primary care givers regularly resident in the same
101 household with the child). The first mechanism was the extent of discordant parentage within SPHs
102 (i.e., SPHs that comprise two or more children who only share one parent (having different parents
103 in other SPHs with whom they also stay with regularly). We define households of this type as
104 Discordant-Parentage Single Parent Households (DSPHs); for example, a DSPH might comprise a
105 foster carer, Child A and Child B (who are not related and each stay with their own different paternal
106 grandmother regularly). The second mechanism was the extent of bubble formation between one

107 SPH and another SPH (that does not include the other parent of any of the offspring). For example,
108 SPH1 may bubble with SPH2 while the two offspring of SPH1 each have a parent they stay with
109 regularly who reside in SPH3 and SPH4 respectively rather than in SPH2 with whom the bubble is
110 formed. Investigation of this issue offers important insights for our understanding of Covid-19
111 household transmission rates and for future decisions about the deployment of multiple and co-
112 occurring infection control measures concerning contact between households in response to the
113 COVID-19 pandemic as it progresses.

114

115

116 **Methods**

117 For the purposes of this study we defined a single parent as a parent (under the definition above)
118 who does not live with the other primary caregiver of their child or children, irrespective of whether
119 they are living with a new partner or not. We therefore defined a single parent household (SPH) as a
120 household in which a single parent (using our definition) resides with one or more of children at
121 least 10% of the time. Thus, a child who stays with each parent at least one night in every fortnight is
122 considered a member of two SPHs. This can be seen in the top-left panel of Figure 1 where for
123 example a child (blue dot) is connected to two parents (green dots), where the parents themselves
124 are not connected. As the study aimed to produce a static model we henceforth use the term
125 ‘offspring household linkage’ to denote the movement of children between the two SPHs in which
126 their parents’ reside. We hypothesized that the combined effects of SPHs bubbling with each other
127 *in addition to* offspring household linkage of SPHs outside of those bubbles (i.e. children alternating
128 time with each parent) would contribute to Covid-19 household transmission.

129 We further hypothesized that where a SPH is a DSPH (comprising two or more children who have
130 parents in other SPHs with whom they also stay with regularly as described above), this would
131 additionally contribute to network transmission and the formation of a giant component. We
132 defined households of this type as Discordant-Parentage Single Parent Households (DSPHs). These
133 definitions of SPH, DSPH and Offspring Household Linkage (OHL) support the analysis of COVID-19
134 transmission by placing focus on children spending time with parents in different SPHs and on
135 eligibility for support bubble formation, rather than on legal residency of the child or current
136 relationship status of the parent. In this study we developed a simple mechanistic network model
137 upon which to explore the impact of DSPHs and bubbling as mechanisms that that can increase the
138 connectivity in the network and thus the risk of larger outbreaks.

139 Relevant parameters for base model construction were drawn from population survey estimates,
140 where these existed. UK data on rates of parent contact among dependent children of separated or
141 divorced parents is difficult to obtain. A 2013 survey of non-resident fathers found that 13%
142 reported no contact with their child with 59% reporting contact at least once a week; this data did
143 not specify whether that contact was face-to-face but 49% reported their children staying with them
144 on a weekly basis (15). An earlier 2007 study using ONS data found that approximately 35% children
145 in SPHs stayed with both parents on a weekly basis with a further 25% staying less than once a week
146 but more than once a month (16). We used this data as context, developing our model with the
147 assumption that 80% of children would spend time at both their parents' SPHs once a fortnight or
148 more frequently.

149 Given the variation in distribution of number of children in SPHs (as reported in the Introduction)
150 and the lack of direct comparability between the ONS definition of lone parent families and our own
151 definition of SPHs we used parameter estimates representing mid-points such that 42% of SPHs had
152 one child, 35% had two children and 23% had three or more.

153 We therefore defined a base model such that the number of SPHs with one, two and three children
154 is 420, 350 and 230, respectively. To account for circumstances where contact between one parent
155 and their offspring has ceased, the model was constructed such that 20% of all SPHs did not have an
156 OHL to another SPH. Such households are visible in the top-left panel of Figure 1 where parents are
157 denoted by red dots and all children are represented by blue dots. These are in line with the figures
158 reported above. These offspring linkages (i.e. the connections between SPHs that arise from children
159 staying in each parent's SPH at least once a fortnight) are hard-wired into the model on ethical
160 grounds. I.e., this was considered a 'non-negotiable' aspect of public health directives because it
161 would be unethical to prevent children from visiting or staying with both parents regardless of the
162 modelled impact on COVID-19 transmission.

163 The network is constructed by first focusing on the 80% of the SPHs. Knowing these numbers, say
164 N_{SPH1} , N_{SPH2} and N_{SPH3} , determine the number of children in the network at this stage, that is
165 $N_{CH} = (N_{SPH1} + 2 \times N_{SPH2} + 3 \times N_{SPH3})/2$. A proportion of r_1 , r_2 and $1 - (r_1 + r_2)$ of the children
166 are then allocated to SPHs with one, two and three children, respectively. **This is done**
167 **proportionally to the number of stubs starting from SPHs, that is $r_1 = N_{SPH1}/N_{CH}^{Stubs}$, $r_2 =$**
168 **$2 \times N_{SPH2}/N_{CH}^{Stubs}$ and $r_3 = 3 \times N_{SPH3}/N_{CH}^{Stubs}$, where $N_{CH}^{Stubs} = 2 \times N_{CH}$. This means that for**
169 **example, $r_1 \times N_{CH}$ children will be allocated to SPHs with one child, and the same approach is**
170 **applied to SPHs with two and three children. At this point, all children will have exactly one spare**
171 **stub remaining, that is the stub needing a second parent. Equally, there will be parents with no**
172 **children allocated to them at this point.** This leaves us with a good degree of flexibility to vary the
173 discordant-parentage in SPHs. E.g., one can impose that a stub from a child already allocated to a
174 SPH connects to a parent with one single stub, i.e. to a parent who is in the pool of SPHs with one
175 child. Conversely, the spare stub from this same child could be connected to a spare stub from a
176 parent in the pool of SPHs with two or three children. The degree to which DSPHs is enforced is
177 captured by the probability p_{mp} , where a value of zero means that all spare stubs from children in

178 SPHs with one, two or three children are allocated to parents that are in the pool of SPHs with one,
179 two or three children, respectively. When this probability is close to one, the degree of MPSPHs is
180 pushed to maximum within the constraints of being able to construct the network.

181 This process is followed by supplementing the network with an extra 20% of SPHs (for all three types
182 of SPHs) with one parent only. These are isolated fully connected ‘cliques’ comprising two, three or
183 four nodes, respectively (see Fig. 1 top-left panel) with parents (red dots) and children (blue dots).
184 Such households do not contribute to the extent of DSPHs.

185 Next, we form bubbles between pairs of parents that do not share offspring. All permissible pairs are
186 chosen at random and connected with probability p_b , i.e. the probability of bubble formation across
187 a given pair.

188 Once the network model is implemented, we vary (p_{mp}, p_b) and measure the size of the giant
189 component across many realisations. We also measure the average degree in the network and
190 consider the distribution of connected components to understand how the giant component
191 emerges.

192


193


194 **Results**

195 First, we demonstrate the effect of the two mechanisms by explicitly plotting the contact network
196 for networks of relatively small size, in this case individuals.

197

198 Figure 1 top left-hand panel depicts the baseline model. The network consists of isolated clusters
199 where children (blue dots) are connected to siblings and to one (red nodes) or two (green nodes)
200 parents. Figure 1 bottom-left panel illustrates connectivity from DSPHs alone, and in the top-right
201 panel bubbling alone. Greatest connectivity occurs where DSPHs and bubbling are combined
202 (bottom-right panel). Bubbling alone forms multiple chains of smaller sizes (top-right panel) from
203 which emergence of a large chain is unlikely. However, when discordant-parentage is more
204 common, the opportunities for linkage creation between SPHs increase. For example, three children
205 in a SPH with their father may have three different mothers, each of whom is a part of another SPH,
206 creating more chances to connect up isolated chains of SPHs. These trends are clearer in the
207 simulations performed on larger networks (Figure 2).





208 **Figure 1:** Plots of ‘toy’ contact networks (representing a reduced number of nodes for visual
209 illustration of N=186) with different levels of DSPHs and Bubbling. **(Top-left)** Baseline model without
210 any discordant-parentage and without any bubbling, **(Top-right)** bubbling only. **(Bottom-left)**
211 discordant-parentage only, and **(Bottom-right)** both discordant-parentage and bubbling. Nodes are
212 colour code as follow: **Blue dots** – children, **Green dots** – parents in households where both parents
213 retain contact with offspring, and **Red dots** – parents who are the sole parent having regular contact
214 with their offspring.


215

216 We now move on to report on results run on networks of N=2086 nodes (this seemingly arbitrary
217 number arises as SPHs with one, two and three children and their numbers lead to some conditions
218 that are necessary to construct the network). We studied the full spectrum of values, with
219 special focus on values which seems to be close to some of the estimates in the
220 literature described above. These demonstrate how several networks were created with a given
221 parameter set and the measured values averaged across these realizations.

222

223 The plots in Figure 2 demonstrate the incremental impact of the two mechanisms by which the
224 contact network can lead to the formation of a larger giant component and thus a higher probability
225 of a large outbreak. Plots in the left-hand column depict the probability of SPHs of two or more
226 children comprising Discordant-Parentage SPHs, described by the value ρ , and assessing the
227 impact of this on network connection for various fixed probabilities of bubble formation (β)

228 (depicted with different coloured lines). Plots in the right-hand column depict the probability of SPHs
 229 forming bubbles with other SPHs (that do not include the other parent of that SPH's offspring),
 230 described by the value (p_b) and assessing the impact of this on network connections for various fixed
 231 probabilities of DSPHs (p_{mp}) (depicted again with coloured lines).



232

233

234 **Figure 2:** Plots of the giant component size (top row), average degree (middle row) and distribution
235 of connected component sizes (bottom row) as a function of increasing levels of DSPHs (left column)
236 and bubbling (right column). The last row gives the distribution of component size for $(p_{mp}, p_b) =$
237 $(1,0)$ (left panel) and $(p_{mp}, p_b) = (0,1)$ (right panel). The red circles in the top row correspond to
238 $(p_{mp}, p_b) = (0.28,0.5)$, values that have been observed in practice.

239

240 The top row of Figure 2 illustrates that the growth of the giant component is much slower for
241 bubbling without DSPHs than for DSPHs without bubbling. DSPHs create bigger components such
242 that addition of bubbling events allows for a giant component to emerge. This is clearly visible if we
243 inspect the black curves in top row of Figure 2. It appears that bubbling by non-discordant parentage
244 SPHs forms a giant component only very slowly, with many smaller components emerging that
245 nonetheless do not easily percolate into a single giant component. However, as p_{mp} increase, and
246 with no bubbling, the giant component grows faster. This is despite the average number of links
247 staying constant under various values of p_{mp} and increasing as p_b increases, see middle row of
248 Figure 2. The intuition behind this is provide by looking at the bottom row of Figure 2. It is clear that
249 as p_{mp} approaches its maximum value a giant component can emerge. This is not the case for value
250 of p_b close to 1, where all components remain of small size.

251

252 Figure 2 includes a point estimate (see red circles) that represents the most likely UK scenario
253 regarding prevalence of DSPHs and of bubbling. This point estimate assumes that 28% of SPHs
254 comprise two children or more are DSPHs (based on US data and making the conservative
255 assumption in the case of three or more children each child would not have a different other
256 parent), and that 50% of SPHs would form a support bubble. The growth of the giant component is
257 faster as the level of MPSHPs increases compared to when bubbling increases. Furthermore, the
258 lines in the top-left panel correspond to networks with the same average degree. On the one hand,
259 this is because the level of MPSHPs does not change the number of links in the network; it simply re-

260 distributes links. However, when bubbling is acting then the network gains more links. On the other
261 hand, this means that the same number of links can be distributed in order to increase or decrease
262 the size of the giant component. In the top-right panel, it is evident that fixing $p_b = 0.5$ leads to an
263 average degree of about 2.55 but with giant component sizes ranging from 0.1 to 0.8
264 approximatively.

265

266 **Discussion**

267 This proof-of-concept study demonstrates how support bubbles between SPHs has little impact on
268 formation of giant components that may cause Covid-19 outbreaks, except where one or more are
269 DSPHs as offspring household linkages from DSPHs have a greater impact on giant component
270 formation than does support bubbling with another SPH. The cumulative effect of DSPHs forming
271 bubbles with other SPHs or DSPHs likely speeds up the formation of giant components through
272 which COVID-19 transmission would occur.

273 This is the first study to model the combined effects of two SPH-related UK Covid-19 infection
274 control measures; examining the added impact of bubble formation *between* SPHs against a
275 backdrop of SPH network linkage created by OHL. It used prevalence estimates of SPH number of
276 children and rates of contact with both parents for children of SPHs. In the absence of good
277 estimates for rates of discordant parentage and extent of bubbling between SPHs, the study design
278 allowed exploration of the variable impact of each on giant component formation – modelling
279 separate and combined impacts.

280 **Limitations**

281 This study modelled connectivity between individuals in SPHs, rather than Covid-19 transmission
282 itself. As a proof-of-concept study, this work did not take account of *all* variables likely to affect

283 household transmission and worked under certain hypotheses concerning family size and
284 constitution. For example, distribution of offspring age was not accounted for, even though younger
285 children are less likely to confer transmission (17) while older children are more likely to lose contact
286 with their fathers, which would reduce OHL. Nor did we account for variation in the amount or
287 frequency of time that a child spent with each parent.

288 In the interests of simplicity, our models did not account for the additional effect of childcare
289 bubbling (open to all households with children aged fourteen years or younger, but with close
290 contact minimised). The prevalence of this is not well documented and likely to have variable impact
291 on transmission depending on the extent of contact; Public Health England guidance advised that a
292 SPH could meet simultaneously with its childcare bubble and support bubble). As this study focused
293 on SPH connectivity rather than SPH-related Covid-19 transmission itself, the models did not account
294 for school-related infection control measures - when schools are open the differential impact of
295 DSPHs forming support bubbles may well be negligible.

296 Use of real-life data to test our hypothesis and validate the models is not currently possible as
297 surveillance has not captured uptake and type of support bubbles. Nor do population surveys
298 adequately capture the size and composition of SPHs and movement of offspring between them.
299 Surveillance data during health emergencies needs to better capture uptake of policies to inform
300 decision-making. This study demonstrates the importance of scientists and policy makers
301 considering the potential impact of not only *individual* infection control measures but their potential
302 *combined* effects. This supports not only accurate assessment of *overall* impact, but also
303 identification of differential impacts that require mitigations to better support specific sub-
304 populations. The findings indicate that support bubbles generally make little contribution to Covid-
305 19 transmission. However, potential for significant contribution to transmission is greater with
306 bubbling involving DSPHs.

307 Support bubbles are an important strategy for social and psychological support when social
308 interactions is restricted; the findings suggest that additional support strategies may be needed to
309 mitigate increased risk of transmission from support bubbling among DSPHs. Importantly, low
310 income is associated with dense living accommodation (18), and also with both parental separation
311 and higher numbers of children (for women, who are more often the primary carer) (19). Lower
312 income has also been found to be associated with reluctance to test for Covid-19 with significantly
313 lower testing rates in areas of economic deprivation, widely attributed to the economic impact of
314 self-isolation where individuals are on zero-hour contracts or in other unstable employment (20).
315 Strategies are therefore warranted to encourage frequent testing, including co-produced health
316 promotion messaging and adequate financial recompense for those self-isolating. The increased
317 potential for transmission where DSPHs bubble, also points to the need for effective mitigations
318 against household transmission - such as ventilation - that recognise the structural vulnerability of
319 these families.

320

321 **Bullet point summary**

- 322 • Support bubbles formed between single parent households are unlikely to contribute
323 significantly to household transmission except where these households comprise children of
324 different parentage who are each spending time with both of their parents
- 325 • SPHs that comprise children of different parentage who are moving between parental homes,
326 contribute more to Covid-19 transmission acceleration than support bubble formation with
327 another single parent household
- 328 • Measures to support frequent testing are warranted in single parent households comprising
329 children of different parentage, such as co-produced health promotion and more substantial
330 financial recompense to enable self-isolation following a positive result

- 331 • Infectious disease control strategies should be assessed regarding both individual and combined
332 effects in order to identify where additional supportive measures are needed to mitigate
333 interacting effects

334 **Conflict of Interest**

335 There are no conflicts of interest to declare.

336 **Funding**

337 There is no funding to declare in relation to this study

338 **Author contributions**

339 NE conceived the initial idea, consulted on the analysis design, and drafted the paper.

340 PS contributed to analysis design and execution and to publication drafts.

341 JC advised on study design and contributed to publication drafts.

342 IK led the design, implemented code, analysed results and wrote parts of the original draft.

343 **Data availability**

344 The data that support the findings are available by direct communication with Professor Istvan Kiss

345 I.Z.Kiss@sussex.ac.uk in line with University of Sussex policy.

346 **References**

- 347 1. Iacobucci G, Covid-19: UK had one of Europe's highest excess death rates in under 65s last
348 year. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n799.
- 349 2. Richter D, Riedel-Heller S, Zürcher SJ. Mental health problems in the general population
350 during and after the first lockdown phase due to the SARS-Cov-2 pandemic: rapid review of multi-
351 wave studies. *Epidemiology and psychiatric sciences*. 2021;30:e27.
- 352 3. Gloster AT, Lamnisos D, Lubenko J, Presti G, Squatrito V, Constantinou M, et al. Impact of
353 COVID-19 pandemic on mental health: An international study. *PloS one*. 2020;15(12):e0244809.
- 354 4. DHSC Making a support bubble with another household [Guidance]. online: UK Government;
355 2020 [updated 17/05/2021. Available from: [www.gov.uk/guidance/making-a-support-bubble-with-](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-a-support-bubble-with-another-household)
356 [another-household](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-a-support-bubble-with-another-household).
- 357 5. ONS Families and households in the UK: 2020. London, UK: Office for National Statistics;
358 2021.

- 359 6. Dorius C, Many U.S. women have children by more than one man Michigan, US: Institute for
360 Social Research, University of Michigan; 2013 [
- 361 7. Lei H, Xu X, Xiao S, Wu X, Shu Y, Household transmission of COVID-19-a systematic review
362 and meta-analysis. *The Journal of infection*. 2020;81(6):979-97.
- 363 8. Shen M, Peng Z, Guo Y, Rong L, Li Y, Xiao Y, et al. Assessing the effects of metropolitan-wide
364 quarantine on the spread of COVID-19 in public space and households. *International journal of
365 infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*.
366 2020;96:503-5.
- 367 9. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of SARS-
368 CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA network open*. 2020;3(12):e2031756.
- 369 10. Kiss I, Blyuss K, Kyrychko Y, Middleton J, Roland D, Bertini L, et al. How can risk of COVID-19
370 transmission be minimised in domiciliary care for older people: development, parameterisation and
371 initial results of a simple mathematical model2021.
- 372 11. Kenah E, Miller JC, Epidemic Percolation Networks, Epidemic Outcomes, and Interventions.
373 *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Infectious Diseases*. 2011;2011:543520.
- 374 12. Miller JC, Percolation and epidemics in random clustered networks. *Physical review E,
375 Statistical, nonlinear, and soft matter physics*. 2009;80(2 Pt 1):020901.
- 376 13. Danon L, Lacasa L, Brooks-Pollock E, Household bubbles and COVID-19 transmission: insights
377 from percolation theory. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B,
378 Biological sciences*. 2021;376(1829):20200284.
- 379 14. Leng T, White C, Hilton J, Kucharski A, Pellis L, Stage H, et al. The effectiveness of social
380 bubbles as part of a Covid-19 lockdown exit strategy, a modelling study. *Wellcome open research*.
381 2020;5:213.
- 382 15. Poole E, Speight S, O'Brien M, Connolly S, Aldrich M, What do we know about non-resident
383 fathers? London, UK: National Centre for Social Research; 2013.
- 384 16. Lader D, A report on research using the National Statistics Omnibus Survey produced on
385 behalf of the Ministry of Justice and the Department for Children, Schools and Families. Newport,
386 Wales: Office for National Statistics; 2008.
- 387 17. Siebach MK, Piedimonte G, Ley SH, COVID-19 in childhood: Transmission, clinical
388 presentation, complications and risk factors. *Pediatric pulmonology*. 2021;56(6):1342-56.
- 389 18. Cable N, Sacker A, Validating overcrowding measures using the UK Household Longitudinal
390 Study. *SSM Popul Health*. 2019;8:100439-.
- 391 19. Hopcroft RL, Sex differences in the relationship between status and number of offspring in
392 the contemporary U.S. *Evolution and human behavior*. 2015;36(2):146-51.
- 393 20. BBC, Covid-19: Liverpool testing 'may end up being missed opportunity' [News report
394]. Online: BBC; 2020 [updated 24.11.2020. Available from: [https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-
395 merseyside-55058382](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-merseyside-55058382).

396