

Title page

SARS-CoV-2 infections in migrants and the role of household overcrowding: A causal mediation analysis of Virus Watch data

Authors:

Yamina Boukari, PhD¹

Sarah Beale, MPhil^{1,2}

Vincent Grigori Nguyen, MPhil^{1,2,3}

Wing Lam Erica Fong, MSc¹

Rachel Burns, MSc¹

Alexei Yavlinsky, PhD¹

Susan Hoskins, PhD²

Kate Marie Lewis, PhD⁴

Cyril Geismar, MSc²

Annalan M D Navaratnam, MRCP^{1,2}

Isobel Braithwaite, MSc¹

Thomas E Byrne, MPhil¹

Youssof Oskrochi, MSc¹

Sam Tweed, MSc¹

Jana Kovar, PhD¹

Parth Patel, MB BChir¹

Andrew C Hayward, MD²

Robert W Aldridge, PhD¹

¹Institute of Health Informatics, University College London, London, UK

²Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London, London, UK

³Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, UK

⁴Department of Population, Policy and Practice, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK

Corresponding author:

Professor Robert W. Aldridge
Institute of Health Informatics
University College London
222 Euston Road, London
United Kingdom
NW1 2DA
r.aldridge@ucl.ac.uk
020 3549 5541

Abstract

Background: Migrants are over-represented in severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections globally; however, evidence is limited for migrants in England and Wales. Household overcrowding is a risk factor for SARS-CoV-2 infection, with migrants more likely to live in overcrowded households than UK-born individuals. We aimed to estimate the total effect of migration status on SARS-CoV-2 infection and to what extent household overcrowding mediated this effect.

Methods: We included a sub-cohort of individuals from the Virus Watch prospective cohort study during the second SARS-CoV-2 wave (1st September 2020–30th April 2021) who were aged ≥ 18 years, self-reported the number of rooms in their household and had no evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection pre-September 2020. We estimated total, indirect and direct effects using Buis' logistic decomposition regression controlling for age, sex, ethnicity, clinical vulnerability, occupation, income and whether they lived with children.

Results: In total, 23,478 individuals were included. 9.07% (187/2,062) of migrants had evidence of infection during the study period versus 6.27% (1,342/21,416) of UK-born individuals. Migrants had 22% higher odds of infection during the second wave (total effect; OR:1.22, 95%CI:1.01–1.47). Household overcrowding accounted for approximately 32% of these increased odds (indirect effect, OR:1.07, 95%CI:1.03–1.12; proportion accounted for: indirect effect[7]/total effect[22]=0.32).

Conclusion: Migrants had higher odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection during the second wave compared with UK-born individuals and household overcrowding explained 32% of these increased odds. Policy interventions to reduce household overcrowding for migrants are needed as part of efforts to tackle health inequalities during the pandemic and beyond.

Key words: migrant; household overcrowding; severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2); causal mediation; covid-19; second wave.

Key messages

What is already known on this topic

- Migrants in England and Wales may be at greater risk of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 due to unique risk factors, including over-representation in front-line jobs, an increased likelihood of living in multigenerational households and difficulties in accessing primary care. Research shows that migrants in high-income countries have been disproportionately infected with SARS-CoV-2. It is likely that, due to their pre-existing vulnerabilities, this is similarly the case for migrants in England and Wales; however, quantitative evidence addressing this is lacking.

What this study adds

- We investigated the effect of being a migrant on SARS-CoV-2 infection during the second wave of the pandemic in a cohort in England and Wales. We also determined the proportion of the effect mediated by household overcrowding after controlling for age, sex, ethnicity, clinical vulnerability, occupation, income and the presence of children in the household. Migrants had 22% higher odds of being infected with SARS-CoV-2 than their UK-born counterparts, and household overcrowding accounted for approximately 32% of these increased odds.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy

- Our findings highlight the role of household overcrowding in the disproportionate impact of SARS-CoV-2 infections on migrants. They also demonstrate the urgent need for policy interventions that improve housing conditions as part of efforts to reduce health inequalities. Further research investigating other causes of migrants' over-representation in infection cases is also needed to inform further targeted policy interventions.

Background

Globally, the UK has the fifth largest migrant (non UK-born) population comprising approximately 9.57 million people in 2020^{1, 2}. Migrants in the UK may be at greater risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection due to pre-existing vulnerabilities such as their over-representation in front-line jobs (e.g. in healthcare, hospitality, retail and delivery sectors), increased use of public transport and increased likelihood of living in multi-generational households^{3, 4}. Barriers to accessing primary care are well documented for migrants⁵⁻⁹ and may negatively impact vaccine uptake, thus potentially putting migrants at greater risk of infection and severe outcomes from the combination of greater exposure and under-vaccination¹⁰. Migrants in high-income countries have been over-represented in SARS-CoV-2 infections, hospitalisations and deaths¹¹⁻¹³. UK-focused quantitative evidence is limited but does suggest inequalities. In England, a study showed a greater increase in all-cause mortality for migrants versus non-migrants from 21 March to 8 May 2020 when compared with previous years' deaths¹⁴.

The built environment is a wider determinant of health¹⁵. Household overcrowding is associated with a risk to physical and mental health, and is a potential marker of social deprivation¹⁶. Growing UK-focused evidence links household overcrowding to SARS-CoV-2 infection and other COVID-19-related outcomes^{17, 18}. In England and Wales, individuals who participated in the Virus Watch study and lived in overcrowded households had higher odds of testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection via polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and antibody tests than individuals living in underoccupied households¹⁷. Similar findings were reported from the COVIDENCE UK study¹⁸ and studies that utilised related measures such as household size when controlling for various demographic, social, behavioural and comorbidity characteristics¹⁹⁻²² or area-level housing indicators²³. Household size also played a role in differences in COVID-19 outcomes for South Asian groups after adjusting for sociodemographic and clinical factors^{24, 25}.

Household overcrowding is particularly relevant to migrants. In London, 13–16% of migrant households were overcrowded compared to just 4% of UK-born households between 2016 to 2018²⁶. Outside of London, the overcrowding rates were lower with 2% of UK-born households being overcrowded compared to 5–8% of migrant households. Despite the lack of UK-focused studies, in Europe and the US, household overcrowding is a reported risk factor for SARS-CoV-2 exposure in migrants²⁷⁻²⁹, thus highlighting the need for investigation in a UK-based sample. We aimed to examine the odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection for migrants versus UK-born individuals during the second COVID-19 wave, and whether household overcrowding mediated the effect of migration status on SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Method

Study setting

We used data from Virus Watch, a prospective community cohort study of COVID-19 in England and Wales from 1st June 2020³⁰. Virus Watch included 58,628 individuals as of 28th July 2022. Our analysis was restricted to the second wave, from 1st September 2020–30th April 2021³¹, as migrants were likely to have high exposure risk early in the pandemic and because testing was not widespread during the first wave. Households were recruited from 24th June 2020 to March 2022 and asked to complete a post-enrolment baseline survey containing demographic, medical history, financial and occupation questions. Individuals received a weekly illness survey via email to collect information on self-reported acute symptoms, vaccination status and PCR or lateral flow test results. Households also received a monthly survey of demographic, health-related, environmental and behavioural/psychosocial questions. Within the larger study, a sub-cohort of adults (the laboratory cohort) received monthly antibody testing.

Virus Watch cohort data were linked to the Second-Generation Surveillance System (SGSS) containing laboratory SARS-CoV-2 test results from swabs taken during hospitalisation (Pillar 1) and community testing (Pillar 2)^{32, 33}. The linkage period was March 2020–August 2021 for Pillar 1, and June 2020–November 2021 for Pillar 2. Linkage was conducted by NHS Digital using the name, date of birth, address and NHS number variables, which were sent in March 2021.

Participants

Participants were aged ≥ 18 years and reported the number of rooms in their household in the February 2021 survey. Participants with evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection before the start of the second wave (September 2020) were excluded as first infection, rather than reinfection, was our focus.

Exposure and outcome

Country of birth was the exposure, defined as migrant (i.e. a non-UK country of birth reported at enrolment) or UK-born (a UK country of birth). The outcome was evidence of first SARS-CoV-2 infection during the analysis period defined as either a PCR or lateral flow test self-reported during a weekly survey, a positive test for SARS-CoV-2 anti-nucleocapsid antibodies, a positive test for anti-spike antibodies or a positive PCR test identified via the SGSS.

Potential mediator: Household overcrowding status

In the February 2021 survey, participating households were asked how many rooms were available for their exclusive use (excluding bathrooms, toilets, halls, landings and cupboards). Persons per

room (PPR) was calculated by dividing the total number of people in the household (including children) by the number of available rooms, excluding bathrooms or kitchens. For households reporting ≥ 2 rooms, one room was subtracted from the total, assuming that one of the rooms was a kitchen. For households reporting one room, it was assumed that this room is likely to be a bedroom/studio. Households with PPRs less than one were defined as 'under-occupied', equal to one as 'balanced' and greater than one as 'overcrowded'¹⁷. The PPR approach is a validated overcrowding measure that has fair agreement with other measures³⁴ and has previously been used to determine overcrowding status in Virus Watch¹⁷.

Confounders

Potential confounders were identified using a directed acyclic graph (DAG; Supplementary Figure 1)³⁵. To provide minimally adjusted unbiased estimates of the total, indirect and direct effects, we controlled for baseline age, sex at birth, ethnicity (White British, White Irish, White Other, Mixed, South Asian, Other Asian, Black, Other and Unknown), clinical vulnerability ("Not clinically vulnerable", "Clinically vulnerable", "Clinically extremely vulnerable" and "Missing" based on self-reported conditions or medications indicating vulnerability using government criteria, adapted for the clinical variables collected at baseline^{36, 37}), baseline total household income (£0–9,999, £10,000–24,999, £25,000–49,000, £50,000–74,999, £75,000–99,999 and £100,000+) and occupation (see Supplementary Box 1 for details).

Other demographic and clinical characteristics

Households were assigned a geographic region (nine English regions and Wales)³⁸ and a local area-level Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) quintile (where one represents the most deprived and five the least) by linking their postcode to the May-2020 ONS Postcode Lookup³⁹.

Statistical analysis

We found no evidence of co-linearity between ethnicity and migrant status (Supplementary Box 2). We used Buis' logistic decomposition regression with bootstrapped standard errors to estimate the total and direct effects of migration status on infection, and the indirect effect mediated through household overcrowding⁴⁰ (see Supplementary Box 2 for further methodological information). The percentage of the total effect mediated by household overcrowding was estimated using the indirect effect odds ratio (OR) as the numerator and the total effect OR as the denominator. As the model derives the total effect coefficient by summing the direct and indirect effects on the log scale, the percentage is an approximation only (i.e. indirect and direct effect ORs do not sum to give exactly the total effect).

Sensitivity analyses

As eligibility was not dependent on households responding to all weekly surveys throughout the analysis period, we conducted a sensitivity analysis including only participants who had either linked data or, for those without linked data, self-reported follow-up for every full week of the analysis period (although this may also bias towards households who were healthy enough to respond each week). Positive SARS-CoV-2 anti-nucleocapsid antibody or anti-spike antibody tests during the study period may indicate evidence of older SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to the second wave or post-vaccination seroconversions. Therefore, we carried out a sensitivity analysis using only swab-confirmed infections. We also conducted a sensitivity analysis where household overcrowding was represented by the continuous PPR variable.

Individuals with missing country-of-birth responses were classified as UK-born; however, in a sensitivity analysis, we excluded these individuals. There were no missing age data and 363 participants (1.5%) had missing data for sex, 478 (2.0%) for ethnicity, 1,405 (6.0%) for clinical vulnerability, 4,120 (17.5%) for household income and 3,400 (14.5%) for occupation. All missing values were included in the model under a 'Missing' category. We conducted sensitivity analyses to assess the effect of missing data using a complete case analysis and multivariate imputation by chained equations using the *mice* package with 5 datasets and 50 iterations per dataset (see Supplementary Box 2 for the included predictor variables).

Based on *a priori* assumptions, we modelled ethnicity as a confounder of the effect of migration status on infection. However, ethnicity is complex and can encompass country of birth⁴¹, which creates overlap with our migrant exposure. To explore this, we conducted a sensitivity analysis without adjusting for ethnicity.

Tools

R version 4.1.2 was used for data cleaning and multiple imputation. Mediation analysis was carried out using the *ldecomp* command in Stata version 17.0.

Results

Of 58,628 individuals in the Virus Watch cohort on 28th July 2022, 23,478 (40.0%) individuals met our inclusion criteria (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Flow diagram of participant eligibility

Demographic characteristics

Migrants were generally younger (median age: 53 versus 63 years in migrants and non-migrants, respectively) with a higher percentage identifying as female (59.1% female migrants versus 54.1% female non-migrants). Migrants identified predominantly with a minority ethnic group (75.6%) versus White British (23.5%) and were less likely to have missing ethnicity data than UK-born individuals. Over 40% of migrants were situated in London compared with only 9.5% of UK-born individuals, whilst over 40% of the UK-born individuals were in the East or South East of England. Migrants generally lived in more deprived areas compared with the UK-born group, but more migrants lived in households with higher total incomes. Missing income data were more common for UK-born individuals. The percentages of clinically and extremely clinically vulnerable individuals in each group were similar, with more missing data in the UK-born group. Higher percentages of migrants worked in all occupations versus UK-born individuals, apart from in outdoor trade- and transport and machines-related occupations. More UK-born individuals were not in employment versus migrants and missing occupation data were more common in the UK-born versus migrant group.

In the migrant group, the median number of rooms per household was 5 compared to 6 in the UK-born group (Table 1). 10.9% of migrants lived in overcrowded housing compared with 2.0% of the UK-born group. Migrants were less likely to live in under-occupied housing than UK-born individuals (71.4% versus 91.8%, respectively).

Table 1: Cohort demographic and household characteristics

Characteristic	Overall N = 23,478	UK-born N = 21,416	Migrant N = 2,062
Age			
Mean (SD)	59 (15)	59 (15)	53 (16)
Median (IQR)	62 (19)	63 (19)	53 (26)
<30	1,379 (5.9%)	1,241 (5.8%)	138 (6.7%)
30-39	1,718 (7.3%)	1,341 (6.3%)	377 (18.3%)
40-49	2,537 (10.8%)	2,163 (10.1%)	374 (18.1%)
50-59	4,397 (18.7%)	4,022 (18.8%)	375 (18.2%)
60+	13,447 (57.3%)	12,649 (59.1%)	798 (38.7%)
Sex			
Female	12,810 (54.6%)	11,592 (54.1%)	1,218 (59.1%)
Male	10,276 (43.8%)	Omitted to avoid disclosure	Omitted to avoid disclosure
Other or unknown	392 (1.7%)	Omitted to avoid disclosure	Omitted to avoid disclosure
Ethnicity			

Characteristic	Overall N = 23,478	UK-born N = 21,416	Migrant N = 2,062
White British	20,456 (87.1%)	19,972 (93.3%)	484 (23.5%)
Minority ethnic*	2,544 (10.8%)	986 (4.6%)	1,558 (75.6%)
Missing	478 (2.0%)	458 (2.1%)	20 (1.0%)
Geographical region			
East Midlands	2,057 (8.8%)	1,971 (9.2%)	86 (4.2%)
East of England	5,208 (22.2%)	4,889 (22.8%)	319 (15.5%)
London	2,933 (12.5%)	2,044 (9.5%)	889 (43.1%)
North East	1,153 (4.9%)	1,105 (5.2%)	48 (2.3%)
North West	2,500 (10.6%)	2,409 (11.2%)	91 (4.4%)
South East	4,524 (19.3%)	4,147 (19.4%)	377 (18.3%)
South West	1,752 (7.5%)	1,641 (7.7%)	111 (5.4%)
Wales	540 (2.3%)	521 (2.4%)	19 (0.9%)
West Midlands	1,276 (5.4%)	1,218 (5.7%)	58 (2.8%)
Yorkshire and The Humber	1,153 (4.9%)	1,106 (5.2%)	47 (2.3%)

Characteristic	Overall N = 23,478	UK-born N = 21,416	Migrant N = 2,062
Missing	382 (1.6%)	365 (1.7%)	17 (0.8%)
IMD quintile			
1 (most deprived)	1,909 (8.1%)	1,679 (7.8%)	230 (11.2%)
2	3,384 (14.4%)	2,948 (13.8%)	436 (21.1%)
3	4,770 (20.3%)	4,297 (20.1%)	473 (22.9%)
4	6,124 (26.1%)	5,675 (26.5%)	449 (21.8%)
5 (least deprived)	6,909 (29.4%)	6,452 (30.1%)	457 (22.2%)
Missing	382 (1.6%)	365 (1.7%)	17 (0.8%)
Total household income			
£0-9,999	806 (3.4%)	712 (3.3%)	94 (4.6%)
£10,000-24,999	4,453 (19.0%)	4,158 (19.4%)	295 (14.3%)
£25,000-49,999	7,080 (30.2%)	6,570 (30.7%)	510 (24.7%)
£50,000-£74,999	3,568 (15.2%)	3,173 (14.8%)	395 (19.2%)
£75,000-£99,999	1,726 (7.4%)	1,504 (7.0%)	222 (10.8%)

Characteristic	Overall N = 23,478	UK-born N = 21,416	Migrant N = 2,062
£100,000+	1,725 (7.3%)	1,410 (6.6%)	315 (15.3%)
Missing	4,120 (17.5%)	3,889 (18.2%)	231 (11.2%)
Number of rooms in household			
Mean (SD)	6 (2)	6 (2)	5 (2)
Median (IQR)	6 (2)	6 (2)	5 (3)
Number of householders			
1	4,640 (19.8%)	4,230 (19.8%)	410 (19.9%)
2	13,571 (57.8%)	12,538 (58.5%)	1,033 (50.1%)
3	2,647 (11.3%)	2,345 (10.9%)	302 (14.6%)
4	1,983 (8.4%)	1,738 (8.1%)	245 (11.9%)
5	540 (2.3%)	478 (2.2%)	62 (3.0%)
6	97 (0.4%)	87 (0.4%)	10 (0.5%)
Household overcrowding status			
Under occupied	21,134 (90.0%)	19,662 (91.8%)	1,472 (71.4%)

Characteristic	Overall N = 23,478	UK-born N = 21,416	Migrant N = 2,062
Balanced	1,686 (7.2%)	1,320 (6.2%)	366 (17.7%)
Overcrowded	658 (2.8%)	434 (2.0%)	224 (10.9%)
Persons per room			
Mean (SD)	0.49 (0.33)	0.47 (0.29)	0.71 (0.53)
Median (IQR)	0.40 (0.31)	0.40 (0.29)	0.50 (0.67)
Living with any children			
No	20,246 (86.2%)	18,647 (87.1%)	1,599 (77.5%)
Yes	3,232 (13.8%)	2,769 (12.9%)	463 (22.5%)
Occupation			
Administrative and secretarial	1,378 (5.9%)	1,238 (5.8%)	140 (6.8%)
Healthcare	735 (3.1%)	629 (2.9%)	106 (5.1%)
Indoor trades, process and plant	660 (2.8%)	587 (2.7%)	73 (3.5%)
Leisure and personal Service	484 (2.1%)	412 (1.9%)	72 (3.5%)
Managers, directors and senior officials	855 (3.6%)	760 (3.5%)	95 (4.6%)

Characteristic	Overall N = 23,478	UK-born N = 21,416	Migrant N = 2,062
Other professional and associate	3,345 (14.2%)	2,829 (13.2%)	516 (25.0%)
Outdoor trades	254 (1.1%)	232 (1.1%)	22 (1.1%)
Sales and customer service	521 (2.2%)	474 (2.2%)	47 (2.3%)
Social care and community protective services	543 (2.3%)	485 (2.3%)	58 (2.8%)
Teaching, education and childcare	1,150 (4.9%)	1,019 (4.8%)	131 (6.4%)
Transport and mobile machine	229 (1.0%)	210 (1.0%)	19 (0.9%)
Not in employment [†]	9,924 (42.3%)	9,247 (43.2%)	677 (32.8%)
Missing	3,400 (14.5%)	3,294 (15.4%)	106 (5.1%)
Clinical vulnerability status			
Not clinically vulnerable	12,964 (55.2%)	11,715 (54.7%)	1,249 (60.6%)
Clinically vulnerable	6,395 (27.2%)	5,846 (27.3%)	549 (26.6%)
Clinically extremely vulnerable	2,714 (11.6%)	2,470 (11.5%)	244 (11.8%)
Missing	1,405 (6.0%)	1,385 (6.5%)	20 (1.0%)

Characteristic	Overall	UK-born	Migrant
-----------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

	N = 23,478	N = 21,416	N = 2,062
--	-------------------	-------------------	------------------

*All minority ethnic groups were combined to avoid statistical disclosure. †Represents individuals who are retired, students, looking after the household/family and not looking for work, permanently sick or disabled, or unemployed.

Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection

From 1st September 2020 to 30th April 2021, 1,529/23,478 individuals had evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection (Table 2). In both groups, evidence of infection was identified via a swab test in >50% of positive cases, with a slightly higher percentage of swab tests in migrants versus UK-born individuals (55.1% versus 53.1%, respectively).

Table 2: Source of positive test results for all participants with first evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection within the analysis period (1st September 2020 to 30th April 2021)

Source of positive test result	Overall <i>N</i> = 1,529	UK-born <i>n</i> =1,342 (87.8%)	Migrant <i>n</i> =187 (12.2%)
Antibody tests*	713 (46.6%)	629 (46.9%)	84 (44.9%)
Swab tests (PCR or lateral flow)	816 (53.4%)	713 (53.1%)	103 (55.1%)

*Tests for SARS-CoV-2 anti-nucleocapsid antibodies and anti-spike antibodies.

In the migrant group, 9.07% (187/2,062) of individuals had evidence of infection compared with 6.27% (1,342/21,416) of UK-born individuals (Table 3). In both groups, the percentage of participants with evidence of infection was highest in individuals living in overcrowded housing (migrant: 15.2% [34/224]; UK-born: 9.9% [43/434]) compared with individuals living in under-occupied housing (migrant: 6.9% [102/1,472]; UK-born: 6.0% [1,185/19,662]).

Table 3: Percentage of participants with evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the second wave (1 September 2020 to 30 April 2021)

Characteristic	UK-born			Migrant		
	Overall, N=21,416 ¹	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection		Overall, N = 2,062	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection	
		No n=20,074 (93.7%)	Yes n=1,342 (6.27%)		No n=1,875 (90.9%)	Yes n=187 (9.07%)
Age						
<30	1,241	1,125 (90.7%)	116 (9.3%)	138	123 (89.1%)	15 (10.9%)
30-39	1,341	1,235 (92.1%)	106 (7.9%)	377	332 (88.1%)	45 (11.9%)
40-49	2,163	1,969 (91.0%)	194 (9.0%)	374	322 (86.1%)	52 (13.9%)
50-59	4,022	3,691 (91.8%)	331 (8.2%)	375	343 (91.5%)	32 (8.5%)
60+	12,649	12,054 (95.3%)	595 (4.7%)	798	755 (94.6%)	43 (5.4%)
Sex						
Male	9,435	8,877 (94.1%)	558 (5.9%)	841	770 (91.6%)	71 (8.4%)
Female	11,592	10,823 (93.4%)	769 (6.6%)	1,218	1,102 (90.5%)	116 (9.5%)
Ethnicity						
White British	19,972	18,723 (93.7%)	1,249 (6.3%)	484	451 (93.2%)	33 (6.8%)

Characteristic	UK-born			Migrant		
	Overall, N=21,416 ¹	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection		Overall, N = 2,062	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection	
		No n=20,074 (93.7%)	Yes n=1,342 (6.27%)		No n=1,875 (90.9%)	Yes n=187 (9.07%)
Minority ethnic	986	910 (92.3%)	76 (7.7%)	1,558	1,404 (90.1%)	154 (9.9%)
Missing	458	441 (96.3%)	17 (3.7%)	20	20 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Geographical region¹						
East of England	4,889	4,611 (94.3%)	278 (5.7%)	319	297 (93.1%)	22 (6.9%)
London	2,044	1,830 (89.5%)	214 (10.5%)	889	769 (86.5%)	120 (13.5%)
South East	4,147	3,927 (94.7%)	220 (5.3%)	377	358 (95.0%)	19 (5.0%)
IMD quintile						
1 (most deprived)	1,679	1,526 (90.9%)	153 (9.1%)	230	211 (91.7%)	19 (8.3%)
2	2,948	2,730 (92.6%)	218 (7.4%)	436	375 (86.0%)	61 (14.0%)
3	4,297	4,054 (94.3%)	243 (5.7%)	473	435 (92.0%)	38 (8.0%)
4	5,675	5,334 (94.0%)	341 (6.0%)	449	417 (92.9%)	32 (7.1%)
5 (least deprived)	6,452	6,075 (94.2%)	377 (5.8%)	457	420 (91.9%)	37 (8.1%)

Characteristic	UK-born			Migrant		
	Overall, N=21,416 ¹	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection		Overall, N = 2,062	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection	
		No n=20,074 (93.7%)	Yes n=1,342 (6.27%)		No n=1,875 (90.9%)	Yes n=187 (9.07%)
Missing	365	355 (97.3%)	10 (2.7%)	17	17 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total household income						
£0-9,999	712	666 (93.5%)	46 (6.5%)	94	81 (86.2%)	13 (13.8%)
£10,000-24,999	4,158	3,915 (94.2%)	243 (5.8%)	295	271 (91.9%)	24 (8.1%)
£25,000-49,999	6,570	6,140 (93.5%)	430 (6.5%)	510	474 (92.9%)	36 (7.1%)
£50,000-£74,999	3,173	2,914 (91.8%)	259 (8.2%)	395	360 (91.1%)	35 (8.9%)
£75,000-£99,999	1,504	1,391 (92.5%)	113 (7.5%)	222	198 (89.2%)	24 (10.8%)
£100,000+	1,410	1,308 (92.8%)	102 (7.2%)	315	277 (87.9%)	38 (12.1%)
Missing	3,889	3,740 (96.2%)	149 (3.8%)	231	214 (92.6%)	17 (7.4%)
Household overcrowding status						
Under-occupied	19,662	18,477 (94.0%)	1,185 (6.0%)	1,472	1,370 (93.1%)	102 (6.9%)
Balanced	1,320	1,206 (91.4%)	114 (8.6%)	366	315 (86.1%)	51 (13.9%)

Characteristic	UK-born			Migrant		
	Overall, N=21,416 ¹	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection		Overall, N = 2,062	Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection	
		No n=20,074 (93.7%)	Yes n=1,342 (6.27%)		No n=1,875 (90.9%)	Yes n=187 (9.07%)
Overcrowded	434	391 (90.1%)	43 (9.9%)	224	190 (84.8%)	34 (15.2%)
Lives with any children						
No	18,647	17,530 (94.0%)	1,117 (6.0%)	1,599	1,472 (92.1%)	127 (7.9%)
Yes	2,769	2,542 (91.8%)	227 (8.2%)	463	403 (87.0%)	60 (13.0%)
Clinical vulnerability status						
Not clinically vulnerable	11,715	10,946 (93.4%)	769 (6.6%)	1,249	1,123 (89.9%)	126 (10.1%)
Clinically vulnerable	5,846	5,457 (93.3%)	389 (6.7%)	549	513 (93.4%)	36 (6.6%)
Clinically extremely vulnerable	2,470	2,345 (94.9%)	125 (5.1%)	244	219 (89.8%)	25 (10.2%)
Missing	1,385	1,326 (95.7%)	59 (4.3%)	20	20 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)

¹Only the geographical areas with the highest proportion of individuals are included to avoid statistical disclosure.

Causal mediation analysis

Migrants had 22% higher odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection during the second wave versus UK-born individuals (total effect), determined using logistic decomposition regression adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, clinical vulnerability, baseline total household income and occupation (OR:1.22, 95%CI:1.01–1.47, p=0.041; Table 4). An OR of 1.07 (95%CI: 1.03–1.12, p=0.002) for the indirect effect indicates that household overcrowding partially mediated the relationship between migration status and SARS-CoV-2 infection, accounting for approximately 32% of the total effect (7/22 multiplied by 100). A positive, but statistically insignificant direct effect of migration status on SARS-CoV-2 infection remained after accounting for the indirect effect of household overcrowding status (OR: 1.13, 95%CI: 0.94–1.37, p=0.198).

Table 4: ORs for total, indirect and direct effects of migration status on SARS-CoV-2 infection

Effect	OR	95% CI	P value
Total	1.22	1.01–1.47	0.041
Indirect	1.07	1.03–1.12	0.002
Direct	1.13	0.94–1.37	0.198

Sensitivity analyses

Consistent indirect effect sizes were observed in all the sensitivity analyses, with varying statistical significance (Table 5). Total effects and direct effects were also generally consistent across sensitivity analyses, with the exception of the complete case analysis and after excluding individuals with missing country of birth, likely due to power issues with the reduced sample size (Table 5).

Table 5: Total, indirect and direct effects from sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analysis	N	Effect	OR	95% CI	P value
Outcome-related					
Restricted denominator	22,496	Total	1.17	0.97–1.41	0.098
		Indirect	1.07	1.02–1.12	0.003
		Direct	1.09	0.90–1.32	0.368
Positive swab tests only	23,479	Total	1.20	0.92–1.56	0.174
		Indirect	1.12	1.07–1.18	<0.001
		Direct	1.07	0.83–1.37	0.609
Exposure-related					
Excluding individuals with unknown country of birth	20,748	Total	1.04	0.85–1.28	0.687
		Indirect	1.06	1.02–1.10	0.002
		Direct	0.98	0.81–1.20	0.872
Mediator-related					
Use of PPR as mediator	23,478	Total	1.23	1.03–1.46	0.023
		Indirect	1.07	1.03–1.11	<0.001
		Direct	1.14	0.96–1.36	0.132
Confounder-related					
Multiple imputation of missing confounder data	23,478	Total	1.21	0.99–1.48	0.067
		Indirect	1.07	1.03–1.11	0.001
		Direct	1.13	0.92–1.38	0.238
Complete case analysis	18,466	Total	1.07	0.86– 1.33	0.550
		Indirect	1.07	1.01–1.12	0.011
		Direct	1.00	0.80–1.26	0.982
Without adjusting for ethnicity	23,478	Total	1.24	1.05–1.47	0.011
		Indirect	1.08	1.03–1.12	<0.001
		Direct	1.16	0.97–1.37	0.095

Discussion

We present findings indicating that migrants had 22% higher odds of being infected with SARS-CoV-2 during the second wave of the pandemic compared to UK-born individuals after controlling for baseline demographic, socioeconomic and clinical confounders. This increased odds of infection aligns with findings from other high-income countries showing migrants' over-representation in SARS-CoV-2 infections¹¹ and is likely due to amplified pre-pandemic inequalities. These findings, alongside evidence showing migrants' low COVID-19 vaccine uptake^{10, 42}, highlight the need to carefully consider delivery and prioritisation of booster COVID-19 vaccines.

We found a significant positive indirect effect, with household overcrowding explaining approximately 32% of the increased odds of SARS-CoV-2 infection in migrants compared with UK-born individuals, which is consistent with Norwegian and American studies linking household overcrowding and SARS-CoV-2 infections^{27, 28}. A direct effect was found after accounting for mediation by household overcrowding, consistent with complementary mediation whereby the investigated mediator has a significant causal role alongside other unmeasured variables⁴³.

A strength of this analysis is the focus on a causal mechanism underlying migrants' increased SARS-CoV-2 infection odds in a substantial group of over 2,000 migrants, allowing for specific policy recommendations to help reduce health inequalities. The use of a DAG-informed model facilitated comprehensive adjustment for confounders and interpretation of the mediated effects. Other strengths are the inclusion of self-reported and linked data on SARS-CoV-2 infection, which reduced reliance on participant recall, and the use of multiple sensitivity analyses.

A limitation is that migrants in Virus Watch are not representative of England's migrant population. Lead householders who spoke English and had internet access were eligible, whereas evidence suggests that vulnerable, marginalised migrants have limited access to technology and experience English difficulties⁴⁴. Additionally, only households of ≤ 6 people were eligible, which may induce selection bias given that migrants are more likely to live in larger, multi-generational households³. We also focused on infections that occurred during the second wave and excluded individuals who were infected in the first wave, which could potentially induce bias given the risk factors for higher exposure faced by migrants versus UK-born individuals early in the pandemic¹². Consequently, it is likely that we underestimated the effect of migration status on infection and the household overcrowding-mediated indirect effect.

Individuals whose country of birth was unknown ($n=2,730$) were classified as UK-born. Whilst this could introduce misclassification bias whereby true migrants are classified as being UK-born, the impact is likely small and would underestimate the effect of migration status on infection.

Additionally, results from the sensitivity analysis excluding individuals with a missing country of birth were generally consistent with the main analysis.

We did not adjust for vaccination status at baseline as no individuals had been vaccinated at the start of the analysis period (roll-out began in England on 8th December 2021). However, by 25th April 2021, 91.5% (22,644,679) of individuals aged ≥ 45 years had received at least one dose⁴⁵. Evidence suggests that vaccination status is a separate mediator of SARS-CoV-2 infection in migrants, with differential uptake of COVID-19 vaccines across migrant and UK-born groups and under-immunisation in migrants in Europe for both COVID-19 and routine vaccinations⁴². Consequently, adjustment for vaccination status should not influence the indirect effect through household overcrowding.

Other limitations are the exclusion of children (<18 years), a group which requires further research. Additionally, Virus Watch enrolled more individuals aged over 60 years or of White British ethnicity versus England's and Wales's general population, and included more higher income households. These biases likely contribute to an underestimation of the effect of migration status on infection.

The disproportionate effect of household overcrowding on individuals in the migrant group compared with UK-born individuals builds upon previous Virus Watch results showing household overcrowding as a risk factor for SARS-CoV-2 infection¹⁷. Household overcrowding has become more common over recent years, particularly in the private and social rental sectors^{46, 47}. Migrants are more likely to privately rent their homes and have lower rates of homeownership than non-migrants²⁶, which may explain the differential impact on this group. Findings from the two analyses demonstrate the health implications of existing housing inequalities. They highlight the importance of addressing overcrowding as part of a public health strategy to reduce health inequalities, and to ensuring the UK's preparedness for any subsequent waves or future pandemics. Future research is required to examine other potential mediators of the total effect of migration status on infection to better inform targeted policy interventions across the wider determinants of health.

Efforts to address overcrowding are complex and require engagement with multiple stakeholders, including both in government and the private sector. Short-term efforts to prevent spread include providing hotel accommodation for infected individuals⁴⁸ and ensuring that existing advice on preventing spread within the household (e.g. masking, adequate ventilation etc.)⁴⁹ is accessible to migrant communities. In the medium-term, the statutory overcrowding standard that was introduced in 1935 should be revised as the threshold for breaching it is high, with relatively few households found to be statutorily overcrowded, which limits the ability of local authorities to act⁵⁰. In the long-term, the current housing stock should be reformed. A policy focus in recent years has

been on boosting the supply of privately owned homes and increasing home ownership, with a substantial drop in the availability of social housing⁴⁷. Increasing the social housing supply could provide more regulated, secure and affordable housing, whilst enabling swifter improvements in response to policy interventions compared with private housing.

To conclude, we show that migrants were over-represented in SARS-CoV-2 infections early in the pandemic, with household overcrowding playing a significant role in driving over-representation. Our findings highlight the implications of inadequate housing on health and underscore the importance of policy interventions for tackling household overcrowding. As we continue to live with COVID-19, it will be important to address these inequalities in health outcomes and housing to ensure that we build back fairer⁵¹ and that we are better prepared for future waves and pandemics.

Contributors

Conceptualization: YB, RWA. Methodology: YB, SB, VGN, WLEF, KML, AY, SH. Formal Analysis: YB.

Data curation: VGN, SB, WLEF, SH. Writing—original draft preparation: YB. Writing—review and editing: YB, SB, VGN, WLEF, RB, AY, SH, KML, CG, IB, TEB, YO, ST, JK, PP, AMDN, ACH, RWA.

Visualization: YB. Supervision: RWA, SB, VGN. Project administration: YB. Funding acquisition: RWA, ACH.

Funding

This study forms part of the larger Virus Watch study and has been supported by The Wellcome Trust (206602; a Wellcome Clinical Research Career Development Fellowship to Robert Aldridge), and the Medical Research Council (MC_PC 19070; to UCL [30 March 2020]), and MR/V028375/1 [17 August 2020]). The study also received \$15,000 of Facebook advertising credit to support a pilot social media recruitment campaign on 18th August 2020.

Ethics

Virus Watch was approved by the Hampstead NHS Health Research Authority Ethics Committee (20/HRA/2320) and conformed to the ethical standards set out in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Participants provided written informed consent for the collection and use of data prior to study participation.

Competing interests

ACH serves on the UK New and Emerging Respiratory Virus Threats Advisory Group. The other authors declare no potential conflict of interests.

Data availability statement

Data from the Virus Watch cohort are available on the ONS Secure Research Service. The data are available under restricted access as they contain sensitive health data. Access can be obtained via the ONS Secure Research Service.

References

- 1 United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. International Migration 2020 Highlights 2020. Available from: <https://www.un.org/en/desa/international-migration-2020-highlights> [Accessed 23 August 2022].
- 2 Office for National Statistics. Population of the UK by country of birth and nationality: individual country data 2021. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/datasets/populationoftheunitedkingdombycountryofbirthandnationalityunderlyingdatasheets> [Accessed 27 December 2022].
- 3 Public Health England. Beyond the data: Understanding the impact of COVID-19 on BAME groups 2020. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/892376/COVID_stakeholder_engagement_synthesis_beyond_the_data.pdf [Accessed 1 August 2022].
- 4 Nezafat Maldonado BM, Collins J, Blundell HJ, Singh L. Engaging the vulnerable: A rapid review of public health communication aimed at migrants during the COVID-19 pandemic in Europe. *Journal of Migration and Health*. 2020;**1**:100004.
- 5 Weller SJ, Crosby LJ, Turnbull ER, Burns R, Miller A, Jones L, et al. The negative health effects of hostile environment policies on migrants: A cross-sectional service evaluation of humanitarian healthcare provision in the UK. *Wellcome Open Research*. 2019;**4**:109.
- 6 Kang C, Tomkow L, Farrington R. Access to primary health care for asylum seekers and refugees: a qualitative study of service user experiences in the UK. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2019;**69**(685):e537-e45.
- 7 Ciftci Y, Blane DN. Improving GP registration and access for migrant health. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2022;**72**(715):56-7.
- 8 Saunders CL, Steventon A, Janta B, Stafford M, Sinnott C, Allen L, et al. Healthcare utilization among migrants to the UK: cross-sectional analysis of two national surveys. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*. 2021;**26**(1):54-61.
- 9 Zhang CX, Boukari Y, Pathak N, Mathur R, Katikireddi SV, Patel P, et al. Migrants' primary care utilisation before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in England: An interrupted time series analysis. *The Lancet Regional Health - Europe*. 2022;**20**:100455.
- 10 Deal A, Hayward SE, Huda M, Knights F, Crawshaw AF, Carter J, et al. Strategies and action points to ensure equitable uptake of COVID-19 vaccinations: A national qualitative interview study to explore the views of undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees. *Journal of Migration and Health*. 2021;**4**:100050.
- 11 Hayward SE, Deal A, Cheng C, Crawshaw A, Orcutt M, Vandrevale TF, et al. Clinical outcomes and risk factors for COVID-19 among migrant populations in high-income countries: A systematic review. *Journal of Migration Health*. 2021;**3**:100041.
- 12 Jaljaa A, Caminada S, Tosti ME, D'Angelo F, Angelozzi A, Isonne C, et al. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in migrants and ethnic minorities compared with the general population in the European WHO region during the first year of the pandemic: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;**22**(1):143.
- 13 Warszawski J, Beaumont AL, Seng R, de Lamballerie X, Rahib D, Lydie N, et al. Prevalence of SARS-Cov-2 antibodies and living conditions: the French national random population-based EPICOV cohort. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2022;**22**(1):41.
- 14 Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19 2020. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/908434/Disparities_in_the_risk_and_outcomes_of_COVID_August_2020_update.pdf [Accessed 28 July 2022].

- 15 Public Health England. Chapter 6: Wider determinants of health 2018 Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/health-profile-for-england-2018/chapter-6-wider-determinants-of-health> [cited 1 August 2022].
- 16 World Health Organization. Report of the systematic review on the effect of household crowding on health. 2018. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/275838/WHO-CED-PHE-18.02-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> [Accessed 29 July 2022].
- 17 Aldridge R, Pineo H, Fragaszy E, Eyre M, Kovar J, Nguyen V, et al. Household overcrowding and risk of SARS-CoV-2: analysis of the Virus Watch prospective community cohort study in England and Wales [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]. Wellcome Open Research. 2021;**6**:347.
- 18 Holt H, Talaei M, Greenig M, Zenner D, Symons J, Relton C, et al. Risk factors for developing COVID-19: a population-based longitudinal study (COVIDENCE UK). *Thorax*. 2021;**77**:900-12.
- 19 Raisi-Estabragh Z, McCracken C, Bethell MS, Cooper J, Cooper C, Caulfield MJ, et al. Greater risk of severe COVID-19 in Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic populations is not explained by cardiometabolic, socioeconomic or behavioural factors, or by 25(OH)-vitamin D status: study of 1326 cases from the UK Biobank. *J Public Health-Uk*. 2020;**42**(3):451-60.
- 20 Chadeau-Hyam M, Bodinier B, Elliott J, Whitaker MD, Tzoulaki I, Vermeulen R, et al. Risk factors for positive and negative COVID-19 tests: a cautious and in-depth analysis of UK biobank data. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020;**49**(5):1454-67.
- 21 Martin CA, Jenkins DR, Minhas JS, Gray LJ, Tang J, Williams C, et al. Socio-demographic heterogeneity in the prevalence of COVID-19 during lockdown is associated with ethnicity and household size: Results from an observational cohort study. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;**25**:100466.
- 22 Niedzwiedz CL, O'Donnell CA, Jani BD, Demou E, Ho FK, Celis-Morales C, et al. Ethnic and socioeconomic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection: prospective cohort study using UK Biobank. *BMC Medicine*. 2020;**18**(1):160.
- 23 Soltan MA, Varney J, Sutton B, Melville CR, Lugg ST, Parekh D, et al. COVID-19 admission risk tools should include multiethnic age structures, multimorbidity and deprivation metrics for air pollution, household overcrowding, housing quality and adult skills. *BMJ Open Respiratory Research*. 2021;**8**:e000951.
- 24 Nafilyan V, Islam N, Ayoubkhani D, Gilles C, Katikireddi SV, Mathur R, et al. Ethnicity, household composition and COVID-19 mortality: a national linked data study. *J R Soc Med*. 2021;**114**(4):182-211.
- 25 Mathur R, Rentsch CT, Morton CE, Hulme WJ, Schultze A, MacKenna B, et al. Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19-related hospitalisation, intensive care unit admission, and death in 17 million adults in England: an observational cohort study using the OpenSAFELY platform. *The Lancet*. 2021;**397**(10286):1711-24.
- 26 The Migration Observatory. Migrants and housing in the UK: Experiences and impacts 2019. Available from: <https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/migrants-and-housing-in-the-uk-experiences-and-impacts/> [Accessed 29 July 2022].
- 27 Kjøllesdal M, Skyrud K, Gele A, Arnesen T, Kløvstad H, Diaz E, et al. The correlation between socioeconomic factors and COVID-19 among immigrants in Norway: a register-based study. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2021;**50**(1):52-60.
- 28 Lin Q, Paykin S, Halpern D, Martinez-Cardoso A, Kolak M. Assessment of Structural Barriers and Racial Group Disparities of COVID-19 Mortality With Spatial Analysis. *JAMA Network Open*. 2022;**5**(3):e220984.
- 29 Gosselin A, Warszawski J, Bajos N, EpiCov Study G. Higher risk, higher protection. COVID-19 risk among immigrants in France: results from the population-based EpiCov survey. *European Journal of Public Health*. 2022;**32**(4):655-63.
- 30 Hayward A, Fragaszy E, Kovar J, Nguyen V, Beale S, Byrne T, et al. Risk factors, symptom reporting, healthcare-seeking behaviour and adherence to public health guidance: protocol for Virus Watch, a prospective community cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2021;**11**(6):e048042.

- 31 Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey technical article: waves and lags of COVID-19 in England, June 2021 2021. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/articles/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveytechnicalarticle/wavesandlagsofcovid19inenglandjune2021> [Accessed 21 July 2022].
- 32 Navaratnam AMD, O'Callaghan C, Beale S, Nguyen V, Aryee A, Braithwaite I, et al. Glasses and risk of COVID-19 transmission - analysis of the Virus Watch Community Cohort study. medRxiv. 2022.
- 33 Public Health England. Sources of COVID-19 surveillance systems 2021. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-covid-19-surveillance-reports/sources-of-covid-19-systems> [Accessed 5 August 2022].
- 34 Cable N, Sacker A. Validating overcrowding measures using the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *SSM - Population Health*. 2019;**8**:100439.
- 35 Sauer B, VanderWeele TJ. Use of Directed Acyclic Graphs In: Velentgas P, Dreyer NA, Nourjah P, Smith SR, Torchia MM, editors. Developing a Protocol for Observational Comparative Effectiveness Research: A User's Guide. AHRQ Methods for Effective Health Care. Rockville (MD)2013.
- 36 Shrotri M, Navaratnam AMD, Nguyen V, Byrne T, Geismar C, Fragaszy E, et al. Spike-antibody waning after second dose of BNT162b2 or ChAdOx1. *The Lancet*. 2021;**398**(10298):385-7.
- 37 UK Health Security Agency, Department of Health and Social Care. COVID-19: guidance on protecting people defined on medical grounds as extremely vulnerable 2020. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-on-shielding-and-protecting-extremely-vulnerable-persons-from-covid-19> [Accessed 12 August 2022].
- 38 Office for National Statistics. Administrative geography 2022. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/administrativegeography> [Accessed 15 August 2022].
- 39 Office for National Statistics. National Statistics Postcode Lookup (May 2020) 2020. Available from: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/ab73ec2e38c04599b64b09b3fa1c3333/about> [Accessed 12 August 2022].
- 40 Buis ML. Direct and indirect effects in a logit model. *Stata Journal*. 2010;**10**(1):11-29.
- 41 Katikireddi SV, Lal S, Carrol ED, Niedzwiedz CL, Khunti K, Dundas R, et al. Unequal impact of the COVID-19 crisis on minority ethnic groups: a framework for understanding and addressing inequalities. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2021;**75**(10):970-4.
- 42 Crawshaw AF, Farah Y, Deal A, Rustage K, Hayward SE, Carter J, et al. Defining the determinants of vaccine uptake and undervaccination in migrant populations in Europe to improve routine and COVID-19 vaccine uptake: a systematic review. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2022;**Epub ahead of print**.
- 43 Zhao XS, Lynch JG, Chen QM. Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and Truths about Mediation Analysis. *J Consum Res*. 2010;**37**(2):197-206.
- 44 Lessard-Phillips L, Fu L, Lindenmeyer A, Phillimore J. Barriers to wellbeing: Migration and vulnerability during the pandemic 2021. Available from: <https://www.doctorsoftheworld.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Barriers-to-wellbeing-09.21.pdf> [Accessed 1 August 2022].
- 45 NHS England. COVID-19 Vaccination Statistics: Week ending Sunday 25th April 2021 2021. Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/04/COVID-19-weekly-announced-vaccinations-29-April-2021.pdf> [Accessed 12 August 2022].
- 46 Marmot M, Allen J, Boyce T, Goldblatt P, Morrison J. Health equity in England: The Marmot Review 10 years on. London: Institute of Health Equity; 2020.
- 47 Tinson A, Clair A. Better housing is crucial for our health and the COVID-19 recovery 2020. Available from: <https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/2021-01/2020%20-%20Better%20housing%20is%20crucial.pdf> [Accessed 4 August 2022].

- 48 Lopez M, Gallego C, Abos-Herrandiz R, Tobella A, Turmo N, Monclus A, et al. Impact of isolating COVID-19 patients in a supervised community facility on transmission reduction among household members. *J Public Health-Uk*. 2021;**43**(3):499-507.
- 49 UK Health Security Agency. People with symptoms of a respiratory infection including COVID-19 2022. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/people-with-symptoms-of-a-respiratory-infection-including-covid-19> [Accessed 17 August 2022].
- 50 Wilson W, Barton C. Overcrowded housing (England) 2021. Available from: <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN01013/SN01013.pdf> [Accessed 4 August 2022].
- 51 Marmot M, Allen J, Goldblatt P, Herd E, Morrison J. Build Back Fairer: The COVID-19 Marmot Review. The Pandemic, Socioeconomic and Health Inequalities in England. London: Institute of Health Equity; 2020.