

1

1

1 Social contact patterns following the COVID-19 pandemic: a snapshot of post-pandemic
2 behaviour from the CoMix study

3 Authors: Christopher I Jarvis*¹, Pietro Coletti*², Jantien A Backer³, James D
4 Munday^{1,4}, Christel Faes², Philippe Beutels^{2,5}, Christian L. Althaus⁶, Nicola Low⁶,
5 Jacco Wallinga^{3,7}, Niel Hens^{2,5}, W John Edmunds¹

6 * Contributed equally

7 Corresponding author: pietro.coletti@uhasselt.be

8 1 Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, Department of Infectious Disease
9 Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, WC1E 7HT
10 London, UK

11 2. Data Science Institute, I-Biostat, Hasselt University, Agoralaan Gebouw D, Diepenbeek,
12 3590, Belgium

13 3 Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the
14 Environment, Bilthoven, the Netherlands

15 4 Department of Biosystems Science and Engineering, ETH Zürich, Switzerland

16 5. Centre for Health Economics Research and Modelling Infectious Diseases, Vaccine and
17 Infectious Disease Institute, University of Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, Wilrijk, 2610, Belgium

18 6 Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

19 7 Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the
20 Netherlands

2

2

21 Abstract

22 Background

23 The COVID-19 pandemic led to unprecedented changes in behaviour. To estimate if these
24 persisted a final new round of the CoMix survey was conducted in four countries at a time when
25 all societal restrictions had been lifted for several months.

26 Methods

27 We conducted a survey on a nationally representative sample in the UK, Netherlands (NL),
28 Belgium (BE), and Switzerland (CH). Participants were asked about their contacts and
29 behaviours on the previous day. We calculated contact matrices and compared the contact
30 levels to a pre-pandemic baseline to estimate R_0 .

31 Results

32 Data collection occurred from 17 November to 7 December 2022. 7,477 participants were
33 recruited. Some were asked to undertake the survey on behalf of their children. Only 14.4% of
34 all participants reported wearing a facemask on the previous day, varying between 6.7% in NL
35 to 17.8% in CH. Self-reported vaccination rates in adults were similar for each country at around
36 86%. Trimmed mean recorded contacts were highest in NL with 9.9 (95% confidence interval
37 [CI] 9.0 to 10.8) contacts per person per day and lowest in CH at 6.0 (95% CI 5.4 to 6.6). The
38 number of contacts at home were similar between the countries. Contacts at work were lowest
39 in the UK (1.4 contacts per person per day) and highest in NL at 2.8 contacts per person per
40 day. Other contacts were also lower in the UK at 1.6 per person per day (95% CI 1.4 to 1.9) and

3

3

41 highest in NL at 3.4 recorded per person per day (95% CI 4.0 to 4.0). Using the next-generation
42 approach suggests that R_0 for a close-contact disease would be roughly half pre-pandemic
43 levels in the UK, 80% in NL and intermediate in the other two countries.

44 Conclusions

45 The pandemic appears to have resulted in lasting changes in contact patterns that would be
46 expected to have an impact on the epidemiology of many different pathogens. Further post-
47 pandemic surveys are necessary to confirm this finding.

48 Key words

49 COVID-19 pandemic, post-pandemic, contact survey, social contacts, social distance, physical
50 distancing, Europe

51 Background

52 Pandemics do not end with a bang [1, 2] but if you've seen one pandemic, then you've seen one
53 pandemic [3]! The much-desired return to normality following the COVID-19 pandemic was
54 always going to be difficult to determine both in what it means and when, if ever, it might
55 happen. The expectation that things will be the same as before is also complicated by the
56 pandemic leaving an indelible mark on society. The demonstration for the capacity of remote
57 working, where possible, may mean the number of people in offices will be lower. Socialising
58 when ill could become taboo. Facemasks may become routine for some. Sentiments towards
59 vaccines, perhaps more complex. One way we can assess the return is by conducting contacts
60 surveys [4] to measure who mixes with whom.

61 During the pandemic, the CoMix study recorded epidemiologically relevant (i.e. face-to-face)
62 social interactions in representative samples of individuals from a number of European countries
63 (21 countries in total collected data as part of the project) [5–11]. Different countries collected
64 data at different points during the pandemic[12–15]. However, the UK, Netherlands and Belgium
65 initiated their surveys during the first lockdowns in Spring 2020 and collected data more or less
66 continually for about two years. Switzerland collected data between January 2021 and May
67 2022. The surveys were used to provide rapid insights on how social contact behaviour adapted
68 as a result of the pandemic and the restrictions that governments put in place. Data collection
69 was wound up at different times, the Netherlands stopped in September 2021 and the rest of
70 the countries in this study all stopped their CoMix surveys by Spring or early Summer 2022, as
71 pandemic-specific restrictions were being lifted across Europe.

5

5

73 In this study, we return to measure epidemiologically relevant social contacts during late
74 November and early December 2022 in the UK, Netherlands, Belgium, and Switzerland, using
75 identical methods as for the main CoMix study. Moreover, we provide quantitative estimates of
76 contact patterns some months after all restrictions were lifted. We compare estimates of contact
77 patterns in this post-pandemic period (in which high rates of infection with Omicron subvariants
78 as well as other respiratory infections was relatively common) with those measured prior to and
79 during the pandemic. We compare the levels of mixing across the four countries and in different
80 settings. We may not yet be at a stable post-pandemic period of behaviour, with adaptations still
81 to come, but this study provides a bridge between how we behaved during 2020, the acute
82 phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the evolving picture of where we might be heading in the
83 years to come.

84 Methods

85 Ethics Statement

86 Participation in this opt-in study was voluntary, and all analyses were carried out on anonymised
87 data. The study was approved in the UK by the ethics committee of the London School of
88 Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Reference number 21795. The study to collect CoMix data in
89 Belgium was approved by the Ethics Committee of UZA with reference 3236 - BUN
90 B3002020000054. The Medical Research Ethics Committee (MREC) NedMec confirmed that
91 the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (WMO) does not apply to the CoMix study
92 in the Netherlands (research protocol number 22/917). Therefore an official approval of this
93 study by the MREC NedMec is not required under the WMO. The study to collect CoMix data in

6

6

94 Switzerland was approved by the ethics committee of the Canton of Bern (project number 2020-
95 02926).

96 Study design

97 We conducted an online behavioural survey called CoMix where individuals recorded details of
98 direct contacts in the day prior to the survey. We defined a direct contact as anyone who was
99 met in person and with whom at least one word was exchanged, or anyone with whom the
100 participants had any sort of skin-to-skin contact. Contacts of individuals under the age of 18
101 were collected by asking parents to answer on behalf of their child.

102 The design of the CoMix survey is based on the POLYMOD contact survey. The POLYMOD
103 survey was a self-administered paper survey in the form of a daily diary recording participants'
104 social contacts [16]. In the CoMix study, participants consented to self-report their social
105 contacts made on the day prior to survey participation. Other survey questions in CoMix
106 included participants' work attendance, self-reported risk status, use of facemasks, presence of
107 recent symptoms, and vaccination history. Details of the CoMix study including the protocol,
108 methodology, and survey instrument have been published previously [5, 8, 17].

109 CoMix was conducted in 21 European countries between March 2020 and July 2022. In this
110 paper, we present the final additional round of data collected between Nov 2022 and Dec 2022
111 in the UK, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Switzerland. In each study country, a nationally
112 representative sample was recruited using quota sampling based on age, gender, geographic
113 region, and where possible, socioeconomic status to reflect the distribution within the national
114 population. The market research company Ipsos recruited participants through a combination of
115 social media, web advertising, and email campaigns to meet quotas.

116 Study participants

117 The final round of CoMix ran from 17 November 2022 to 7 December 2022. Data was collected
118 at similar times for all countries; starting first in the UK (17 Nov to 29 Nov), then the
119 Netherlands (21 Nov to 3 Dec), Switzerland (22 Nov to 7 Dec), and finally Belgium (23 Nov to 5
120 Dec). As per prior rounds of CoMix and due to differing funding levels, the UK panel was double
121 the size of the other countries with 2,991 participants (Netherlands 1,491, Switzerland 1,495,
122 Belgium 1,500). Most of the data was collected in adults, with a proportion of parents reporting
123 on behalf of their children.

124 Data

125 Reporting of contacts

126 The participants reported their contacts from the day prior to the survey in two ways: individual
127 contacts and group contacts. Individual contacts were recorded by asking the participant to list
128 each contact and their characteristics separately. Following this, we asked whether they had
129 recorded all their contacts. If they had not, then they provided details of the total number of
130 contacts they had at work, school, or other settings for the age groups 0 to 17, 18 to 59, and
131 60+, both overall and for physical contacts only ('group contacts'). They were also asked how
132 often they met each contacted person, how much time was spent with them, and their
133 relationship with the contacted person. Further details of the CoMix survey have been reported
134 extensively previously [5, 6, 8, 9].

135 Demographic information

136 The survey captures information about participants' demographics. Participants' ages were
137 grouped into categories of 0-4, 5-11, 12-17, 18-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, and 70 years
138 and above. Participants were asked to report how they describe their gender, with the options of

8

8

139 “Female”, “Male”, “In another way”, or “Prefer not to answer”. Participants were also asked
140 about their household size.

141 Risk perception, status, and mitigation

142 Participants reported about their uptake of risk mitigating activities and responded to statements
143 regarding their perception of risk. Participants were asked to rate the following statements: (i) “I
144 am likely to catch coronavirus”; (ii) “I am worried that I might spread coronavirus to someone
145 who is vulnerable”; and (iii) “Coronavirus would be a serious illness for me” with the Likert scale
146 of “Strongly agree,” “Tend to agree”, “Neutral”, “Tend to disagree” and “Strongly disagree”.
147 Participants self-reported whether they considered themselves to be high risk, whether they
148 wore a face covering at least once on the prior day, and their COVID-19 vaccination status.

149 Presentation of COVID-like symptoms

150 Participants reported COVID-19-compatible symptoms in the 7 days prior to survey
151 participation. These symptoms included: fever or chills, cough, shortness of breath (or difficulty
152 breathing), fatigue (or extreme tiredness), muscle or body aches or headache, congestion (or
153 runny nose), and sore throat.

154 Work status and attendance

155 Participants were asked to report if they were employed, and if so, whether they were full time,
156 part time, or self-employed. They reported whether their work place was open and whether they
157 attended work on the day prior to responding to the survey (the day on which they reported
158 contacts for).

159 **Statistical analysis**

160 R version 4.1.1 [18] was used for all analyses, and the code and data are available online (see
161 Data Availability Statement). The code for the analyses conducted in this study are available on
162 https://github.com/jarvisc1/cmix_post_pandemic.

163 Descriptive

164 We calculated the counts and percentages for contacts, risk perceptions, mitigations,
165 symptoms, and employment related questions stratified by age, gender, household size, day of
166 the week. While parents answer as proxies for children in the study, we describe the designated
167 child as the “participant” where applicable. We restricted the analysis to adults only for risk
168 perception, mitigation, symptoms, and employment questions, as we consider the data to be
169 more reliable than those reported for children by their parents. For risk perception, we present
170 the number and percentage of adults who strongly agreed with the statements asked.

171 Mean number of contacts

172 We calculated the mean number of contacts for each of the characteristics presented in the
173 descriptive analysis. We used a cut-off value of 100 as the maximum for contacts. This means
174 we counted any individual who reported more than 100 contacts as if they reported 100 contacts
175 to reduce the weight of individuals reporting high numbers of contacts on the mean. Previous
176 publications, specifically for the UK papers for CoMix have used a cut-off of 50 [8]. The value of
177 100 was chosen for two reasons, 1) Over 99.9% of participants reported contacts of less than
178 100, 2) The previous publication of CoMix comparing 21 countries [17] used a cut-off of 100, so
179 for sake of consistency we used this threshold. For mean contacts by setting and country we
180 calculated 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) using bootstrapping, similar to the approach used
181 in a previous CoMix publication [17]. For mean contacts by characteristics we present means

10

10

182 with standard deviations, as this makes comparison easier with those presented in POLYMOD
183 [16] and in other social contact surveys [4] . As per previous studies, the sample was also
184 weighted by 2/7 for weekends and 5/7 for weekdays to account for differences in sampling of
185 weekend and weekend days and the difference between weekend and weekday contacts.

186 Frequency and time spent with contacts

187 We explored types of behaviour with the frequency that participants met a contacted person,
188 and with how long they spent with them. For this, we calculated the proportion of contacts that
189 were physical, where a 2 metre distance was maintained, where a face-mask was used, and
190 where they met outside. These were presented visually using stacked percentage bar charts.
191 This approach was chosen as it allows for more direct comparison with the original POLYMOD
192 paper [16] which explored duration and frequency with physical contact. We extend that
193 analysis to include more pandemic specific behaviours.

194 Contact matrices

195 For each country, we constructed age-stratified contact matrices for nine age groups (0 to 4, 5
196 to 11, 12 to 17, 18 to 29, 30 to 39, 40 to 49, 50 to 59, 60 to 69, and 70+ years old). For child
197 participants and contacts, we did not record exact ages and therefore sampled from the
198 reported age-group with a weighting consistent with the age distribution of contacts for the
199 participants' own age group, according to the POLYMOD survey methods [16]. Observations
200 were weighted by 2/7 for weekends and 5/7 for weekdays. We fitted a negative binomial model
201 censored to 50 per matrix cell, due to dispersion of the reported number of contacts, to calculate
202 mean contacts between each participant and contact age groups. The value for censoring was
203 chosen to be consistent and to ease comparison with previously published contact matrix

11

11

204 estimates [8, 19]. To find the population normalised reciprocal contact matrix, we first multiplied
205 the columns of the matrix by the mean-normalised proportion of the relevant country population
206 in each age-group [16, 20]. Then we took the cross-diagonal mean of each element of the
207 contact matrix. Finally, we divided the resulting symmetrical matrix by the population mean-
208 normalised proportion of the country's population in each age-group.

209 Comparison to pre-pandemic and pandemic contact levels

210 We estimated the potential relative change in basic reproduction number R_0 of an infection (that
211 spreads along the contacts, assuming everyone would be susceptible to that infection) due to
212 change in contact levels compared to pre-pandemic levels by calculating the ratio of the
213 dominant eigenvalues of the CoMix matrices to those from POLYMOD, using the same
214 approach as previously published [5]. Switzerland did not participate in the POLYMOD study
215 and we therefore used an average of the eight countries for which data was collected to provide
216 the pre-pandemic dominant eigenvalue for Switzerland. We also considered as an alternative
217 the projected synthetic contact matrix for Switzerland from Prem et al[21], as a sensitivity
218 analysis. Uncertainty for the ratios were provided by calculating the dominant eigenvalues from
219 1,000 bootstrap samples for the CoMix matrices for each country and the dominant eigenvalue
220 from 1,000 bootstrap samples for the POLYMOD matrices for each country.

221 We further compared POLYMOD to the earliest estimates of contact levels during the 1st
222 lockdown in the UK and BE. This estimate was not repeated for Switzerland and the
223 Netherlands as data from children in these countries was not collected until later (December
224 2020).

12

12

225 Comparison of post-pandemic and pandemic behaviours

226 We compared several of the measurements made during this final round of CoMix to those
227 previously published from the prior rounds of the survey in order to frame the current findings in
228 relation to those during the pandemic. We provide an exploratory but non-comprehensive
229 comparison in order to reduce the burden for the reader to compare across multiple
230 publications.

231 Results

232 Participant characteristics

233 Overall, we recorded observations on 7,477 participants who reported 74,534 contacts between
234 16 November 2022 and 6 December 2022 in the UK, Belgium, Netherlands, and Switzerland
235 (Table 1). Just under 20% (1,336) were proxy respondents (i.e. the survey was completed by
236 parents on behalf of children), and 6,141 were adults. The UK has the highest number of
237 participants at 2,991, almost double the number of the other countries.

238 The age distributions were broadly similar across the four countries, with Switzerland the most
239 different with slightly more over 70s and fewer 60-69, and more 5-11s and fewer 12-17 year
240 olds. There were 3,781 (50.8%) females and 3,667 (49.2%) males, with a similar roughly equal
241 split in all countries. The majority of households consisted of 3-5 people in total with less than
242 2.5% of participants in any country being in a household size of six or more. Contact data was
243 collected on every day of the week for all countries, though some days had lower participation
244 such as 24 (0.8%) and 32 (1.1%) responses in the UK on Friday and Saturday, and 41 (2.7%) in
245 Belgium on Monday, and 26 (1.7%) in the Netherlands on Tuesdays.

13

13

246 Risk Perception

247 Overall, 7.6% of the sample (ranging from 6.2% in the UK to 10.3% in the Netherlands) strongly
248 agreed that they were at risk of catching coronavirus and 9.5% strongly agreed that they were at
249 high risk of severe disease if they did catch coronavirus (ranging from 6.3% in Switzerland to
250 13.4% in the Netherlands). A slightly higher fraction (12.4%) strongly agreed that they were
251 likely to spread the virus to someone vulnerable, varying from 7.7% in Belgium to 15.3% in the
252 UK.

253 Risk Mitigation

254 Only 14.4% of participants reported wearing a facemask on the previous day. The Netherlands
255 had the lowest with 6.7% participants wearing a facemask and Switzerland the highest with
256 17.8% (Table 1). Self-reported vaccination in adults was similar for each country at around 85%
257 vaccinated. The UK had the lowest percentage of people self-reporting as being high risk at
258 17.2% versus 31.2% in the Netherlands.

259 Symptoms

260 Nearly 40% of participants reported at least one of the following symptoms: fever or chills,
261 cough, shortness of breath (or difficulty breathing), fatigue (or extreme tiredness), muscle or
262 body aches or headache, congestion (or runny nose), and sore throat.

263 Employment

264 About 43% of adult participants were employed, though this includes individuals who may be
265 retired as unemployed in the denominator. Of those that were employed, the majority (between
266 60 to 80%) in each country were in full time employment, and around 5% were self employed.

267 For those in employment the vast majority (~90%) reported their workplaces were open and
268 around two thirds attended work in person on the day they made their contacts (Table 1).

269 Mean Contacts by country and setting

270 Participants from the Netherlands recorded considerably more contacts than the other three
271 countries with 9.9 (95% CI 9.0 to 10.8) contacts per person per day, as compared to 6.5 (95% CI
272 6.0 to 7.0) contacts in UK, 6.7 (95% CI 6.0 to 7.3) in Belgium and 6.0 (95% CI 5.4 to 6.6) in
273 Switzerland. (Table 2). This pattern was also seen for adults and children (8.8, 95% CI 7.9 to 9.8
274 for adults; 14.8, 95% CI 12.6 to 16.8 for children in the Netherlands). As well as overall contacts,
275 we measured contacts for the four settings of home, work, school, and other. Contacts at home
276 were very similar between the countries, with an average of about 1.5 contacts per person per
277 day recorded, which is consistent with the household sizes seen in Table 1 (a mean of 2.6
278 overall for the study). Contacts at work for adults were lowest in the UK (a mean of 1.5 contacts
279 recorded per person per day, 95% CI 1.2 to 1.9) and highest in the Netherlands at 3.3 contacts
280 per person per day (95% CI 2.7 to 4.0). Other contacts (mostly in social settings) were also
281 lowest in the UK at 1.6 per person per day (95% CI 1.4 to 1.9) and highest in the Netherlands at
282 3.3 recorded per person per day (95% CI 2.7 to 4.0).

283 Frequency and time spent with contacts

284 Higher frequency contacts (1-2 days) were more likely to include physical touch (> 50%)
285 compared to less frequent contacts (e.g. never met <25%) (Figure 1). Similarly, physical contact
286 was more likely for those spending 4 hours or more with a contact, with the proportion of
287 physical contacts observed in the data reducing as the duration of contact reduced (Figure 2).

15

15

288 The percentage of contacts met every 1-2 days that were physical was similar to those seen in
289 POLYMOD for the UK, Netherlands, and Belgium (Figure 1). Though for those meeting less
290 often, the percentage of physical contacts appears lower than POLYMOD for the UK and
291 Belgium but similar for the Netherlands (Figure 1). The patterns were somewhat consistent for
292 time spent with contacts and percentage of physical contact, the Netherlands had near identical
293 percentages, Belgium had slightly lower for all but the shortest durations of contacts, and the
294 UK had slightly lower for all but the longest duration of contacts (Figure 2).

295 The percentage of participants staying at least 2 metres away was slightly higher in the
296 Netherlands though still less than 25% for all countries, with only those who were met every 1-2
297 days being less likely to wear a mask compared to when meeting a less frequent contact
298 (Figure 1). Maintenance of a two metre distance appears to be more common for shorter
299 interactions (Figure 2),

300 Mask wearing was infrequent (<15%) in all countries and for all types of contact, with
301 participants less likely to wear a mask when meeting someone often and for shorter periods
302 (<5m) or longer (4h+) periods of time (Figures 1 and 2).

303 The fraction of contacts who met outside were similar for all frequency of contact and across the
304 four countries (Figure 1). There was a slight trend (in each country) for longer-duration contacts
305 to have occurred outside (Figure 2).

306 Mean contacts by characteristics

307 Age, Gender, Households size

308 The reported mean contacts for school-aged (5-11 and 12-17 years of age) in the UK and
309 Netherlands were similar at around 14 contacts per person per day, whereas Belgium and

16

16

310 Switzerland were lower with both at around 10 contacts (Table 3). This pattern was different
311 amongst adults, with the UK reporting the lowest levels of contacts in most adult age groups.
312 Young adults (18-29 years old) in Belgium and the Netherlands reported the highest mean
313 contact rates (7.6 and 10.4 per person per day, respectively, as compared to 4.8 in the UK and
314 5.9 in Switzerland).

315 Females generally reported more contacts than males, though this pattern was not consistent in
316 each country. As expected, household size was positively correlated with the number of
317 reported contacts with some slight departures from this pattern in Belgium and the Netherlands.

318 Day of the week

319 Contacts by day suggest a strong weekend effect for all countries, with far lower contacts on the
320 weekend and also on a day either side of the weekend for the UK (Friday) and Belgium and the
321 Netherlands (Monday) (Table 3).

322 Risk mitigation

323 Those who reported wearing a facemask tended to report fewer contacts in all countries other
324 than Belgium. Those self reporting as high risk reported lower contacts across all four countries.
325 Those who were vaccinated tended to report fewer contacts than those who said they had not
326 been vaccinated (except for in Belgium), though it should be stressed that this is a univariate
327 analysis and the unvaccinated tended to be younger in age.

328 Employment

329 Number of contacts were highest for employed people in the Netherlands, with self employed
330 people in Belgium and the Netherlands reporting about 20 contacts per person per day. With the
331 vast majority of workplaces being open now, contacts still tended to be higher for people whose

332 workplace was open. As expected, there was still a considerable difference in the mean
333 contacts for those who attended work versus those who did not.

334 Contact matrices and changes in pre-pandemic and post- 335 pandemic R_0

336 Contact matrices were similar across the four nations, with high rates of recorded contacts
337 along the leading diagonal (suggesting that contact is age-assortative) and the highest rates of
338 recorded contacts being for children (Figure 3A). The Netherlands had the highest levels of
339 contacts overall. There were comparatively high levels of contact between over 70s in all
340 countries, except Belgium.

341 Using the next-generation approach [22], these contact matrices can be used to estimate R_0 for
342 close-contact infections spread through physical or conversational contacts (as measured here),
343 assuming that everyone is susceptible to infection. The relative change in R_0 for reported
344 contacts, compared to contacts at pre-pandemic levels (as measured in the POLYMOD study)
345 is shown in Figure 3B (Table S1). The reduction in contacts, compared with POLYMOD, would
346 lead to a significant reduction in the reproduction number R_0 in each of the four countries, with
347 the UK's R_0 being roughly half of pre-pandemic levels and the Netherlands about 80% of the
348 pre-pandemic level (with the other two countries being intermediate). For context, Figure 3B
349 also shows the relative reduction in R_0 during the first lockdown in the UK, which was 25% of
350 the pre-pandemic level and Belgium which was 20% of pre-pandemic levels (Figure 3B and
351 Table S1) [6]. Using the projected contact matrix for Switzerland by Prem et al. [21] instead of
352 the POLYMOD average leads to comparable results (Figure SI1).

353 Comparison of post-pandemic and pandemic behaviours and 354 contacts

355 In this section comparisons are made between the results from this round and those found for
356 the UK, Netherlands, Belgium, and Switzerland in the analysis of the 2-year 21 country study by
357 Wong et al [9].

358 Risk Perception, Mitigation, and Symptoms

359 It appears that risk perceptions may have slightly changed since the pandemic with participants
360 reporting a slightly higher belief that they will catch coronavirus (6-10% versus 4-5% in Wong),
361 and a lower concern that it would be a serious illness for them (6 to 13% versus 14 to 25% in
362 Wong), or that they will pass it on to someone considered vulnerable (8 to 15% versus 19 to
363 26% in Wong).

364 The percentage of individuals wearing facemasks (7 to 18%) were considerably lower than
365 levels measured in each individual country over the course of the pandemic (UK, 58.2%, BE
366 61.4%, NL 34.3%, CH 76.7%) [9].

367 The percentage of participants reporting at least one symptom (38 to 43%) was quite a bit
368 higher than reported over the two years of the pandemic which was between 21 to 26% [17].
369 (Table 1 in this paper versus Table 1 in Wong et al [9]) .

370 Contacts

371 The mean contacts measured in this survey were somewhat higher at between 6-10 for the
372 mean contacts for the four countries compared to 3-4 contacts per day measured during the
373 pandemic [9]. Apart from a general increase in the level of contacts the main change appears to
374 be in those 70+, an age group with very few contacts made during the pandemic, especially in

375 the UK (see Figure 6A in Gimma et al [8]). In contact matrices measured during the pandemic in
376 the UK, those aged 70 or older never had more than 1 contact on average with those also aged
377 70+ and less than 0.4 for contacts with other age groups. In contrast, we estimate a value of 1.7
378 for 70+ year olds mixing with 70+ year olds and values as high as 0.7 for mixing with other age
379 groups.

380 Discussion

381 We estimate that contact levels have increased compared to those measured during the
382 pandemic but still remain lower than those measured prior to the pandemic. These reduced
383 levels are likely to have a big impact on transmission with a reduction of R_0 of between 20% to
384 50% compared to pre-pandemic levels across the four nations. The consequences of this
385 change in behaviour extends well beyond Covid and would be expected to have an impact on a
386 range of infections that are spread person-to-person.

387 The use of facemasks has dropped considerably compared to the levels measured during the
388 pandemic. We estimated around 15% of people wore a face mask on the day of the study
389 across the four countries which is considerably lower than the 64% average observed during the
390 pandemic across 21 European countries [17].

391 Contacts amongst the individuals over the age of 70 were consistently low during the pandemic
392 and we observed a bounce back in the number of contacts over 70s make especially in the
393 social setting.

394 Contact patterns were broadly similar across the four countries, with the Netherlands generally
395 reporting a higher level of contacts. The patterns of the frequency of contacts, whether they're
396 physical or not, and the duration of contacts were somewhat similar to those seen prior to the
397 pandemic.

398 We also observed that the proportion of individuals who think they are likely to get Covid was
399 higher than those measured during the pandemic but there has potentially been a shift that it is
400 considered less serious for them and there is less concern about giving it to someone
401 vulnerable. Given the relationship between perceived severity and contacts measured during
402 the pandemic, this is one of the potential explanation for the increase in contacts that we
403 observed [23].

404 The CoMix study was nearly identical in the four countries, with the same questionnaire (apart
405 from translation issues) and a similar sampling frame, and collected by the same survey
406 organisation at the same calendar time. The study design was also the same as those used for
407 the previous rounds of CoMix which allows for more straightforward comparison to the estimate
408 calculated during the pandemic. We also structured our analyses to be consistent with previous
409 analyses conducted for POLYMOD and CoMix.

410 A difficulty of our study design is that it is retrospective (individuals were asked about their
411 contacts on the previous day), so may miss contacts, particularly those that would be short
412 lasting. Furthermore, the children's contacts are a proxy with parents reporting on behalf of
413 those under-18. We also allow individuals to estimate mass contacts that they were unable to
414 report individually, which results in skewed distributions of contacts and is why a maximum
415 threshold value of 100 contacts per person is used for estimates of the mean.

416 This research provides a snapshot picture of contacts in four European nations during the return
417 to post-pandemic patterns of behaviour. We have measurements that are higher than those
418 seen during the pandemic but are still considerably lower than those prior to the pandemic. It
419 may be that the huge changes we saw during the pandemic are not over, and it will be important
420 to monitor changes in contacts that may occur over the coming years.

21

21

421 It appears that the pandemic, at least in terms of behaviour, is ending very slowly and we are
422 seeing a long return to contact level prior to 2019. However, it could be that we may never
423 return to the levels of contacts seen before the pandemic. The changes in work patterns, and
424 behaviour may have resulted in long-lasting impacts with implications on the epidemiology of a
425 wide range of infections, as well as on important societal and economic outcomes.

426 Conclusions

427 Despite the number of contacts being higher compared to pandemic levels, we are not back to
428 the levels seen prior to the pandemic. The Netherlands and Belgium appear closer to pre-
429 pandemic levels with the UK further behind. These divergences between countries may
430 represent long-term changes and measuring the level of social interactions in the years to come
431 will allow this to be assessed. Pandemics may not end with a bang but perhaps rather a slow
432 and cautious trudge back to newly considered risky behaviour that was previously part of
433 everyday life.

22

22


434

435

436 Figure 1: Frequency of meeting the contacts for each country by: **A**. Whether it was a physical

437 contact or not, **B** whether they were further than 2 metres from the contact, **C** Whether they

438 wore a mask when meeting the contact, **D** whether they met outside when meeting the contact



439

440

441


23

23

442

443

444 Figure 2: Time spent with contacts for each country by: **A**. Whether it was a physical contact or
445 not, **B** whether they were further than 2 metres from the contact, **C** Whether they wore a mask
446 when meeting the contact, **D** whether they met outside when meeting the contact





447

448

449

450 Figure 3: **A:** Contact matrices for each country. **B:** Points show relative change in R_0
 451 (compared to POLYMOD) based on the dominant eigenvalues of contact matrices.



25

25

453

454 Table 1: Participants characteristics in the CoMix survey for each country

Category	Value	All	UK	BE	NL	CH
All		7,477	2,991	1,500	1,491	1,495
Adult	N (%)	6,141 (82.1%)	2,488 (83.2%)	1,200 (80.0%)	1,215 (81.5%)	1,238 (82.8%)
Child		1,336 (17.9%)	503 (16.8%)	300 (20.0%)	276 (18.5%)	257 (17.2%)
Age group (Children)	0-4	176 (15.4%)	49 (14.0%)	33 (11.3%)	42 (16.3%)	52 (21.4%)
	5-11	424 (37.1%)	127 (36.4%)	110 (37.7%)	81 (31.4%)	106 (43.6%)
	12-17	542 (47.5%)	173 (49.6%)	149 (51.0%)	135 (52.3%)	85 (35.0%)
	Unknown	194	154	8	18	14
Age group (Adult)	18-29	992 (17.0%)	373 (16.6%)	212 (17.7%)	205 (17.3%)	202 (16.9%)
	30-39	999 (17.1%)	411 (18.3%)	196 (16.3%)	188 (15.8%)	204 (17.1%)
	40-49	906 (15.5%)	325 (14.5%)	189 (15.8%)	193 (16.3%)	199 (16.7%)
	50-59	988 (16.9%)	403 (17.9%)	206 (17.2%)	190 (16.0%)	189 (15.8%)
	60-69	1,203 (20.6%)	474 (21.1%)	262 (21.8%)	264 (22.2%)	203 (17.0%)
	70+	743 (12.7%)	263 (11.7%)	135 (11.2%)	147 (12.4%)	198 (16.6%)
	Unknown	310	239		28	43
Gender	Female	3,781 (50.8%)	1,564 (52.5%)	733 (49.0%)	759 (51.1%)	725 (48.7%)
	Male	3,667 (49.2%)	1,414 (47.5%)	762 (51.0%)	726 (48.9%)	765 (51.3%)
	Other	29	13	5	6	5
Household size	1	1,508 (20.2%)	538 (18.0%)	295 (19.7%)	339 (22.7%)	336 (22.5%)
	2	2,520 (33.7%)	1,062 (35.5%)	473 (31.5%)	487 (32.7%)	498 (33.3%)
	3-5	3,292 (44.0%)	1,323 (44.2%)	699 (46.6%)	638 (42.8%)	632 (42.3%)
	6+	157 (2.1%)	68 (2.3%)	33 (2.2%)	27 (1.8%)	29 (1.9%)
Day of week	Sun	1,796 (24.0%)	533 (17.8%)	317 (21.1%)	656 (44.0%)	290 (19.4%)
	Mon	856 (11.4%)	357 (11.9%)	41 (2.7%)	111 (7.4%)	347 (23.2%)
	Tue	1,663 (22.2%)	676 (22.6%)	570 (38.0%)	26 (1.7%)	391 (26.2%)
	Wed	1,704 (22.8%)	950 (31.8%)	256 (17.1%)	322 (21.6%)	176 (11.8%)
	Thu	848 (11.3%)	419 (14.0%)	117 (7.8%)	234 (15.7%)	78 (5.2%)
	Fr	366 (4.9%)	24 (0.8%)	132 (8.8%)	88 (5.9%)	122 (8.2%)
	Sat	244 (3.3%)	32 (1.1%)	67 (4.5%)	54 (3.6%)	91 (6.1%)
Risk perception (Adults)	Catching coronavirus	441 (7.6%)	139 (6.2%)	89 (7.4%)	122 (10.3%)	91 (7.6%)
	Strongly agree only					
	Serious illness from coronavirus	554 (9.5%)	187 (8.3%)	133 (11.1%)	159 (13.4%)	75 (6.3%)
	Spreading coronavirus to vulnerable people	723 (12.4%)	344 (15.3%)	92 (7.7%)	157 (13.2%)	130 (10.9%)
Risk mitigation (Adults)	Face mask	886 (14.4%)	393 (15.8%)	191 (15.9%)	82 (6.7%)	220 (17.8%)
	Vaccinated	5,269 (85.8%)	2,196 (88.3%)	1,044 (87.0%)	1,044 (85.9%)	985 (79.6%)
	High risk	1,468 (24.2%)	423 (17.2%)	347 (29.3%)	372 (31.2%)	326 (26.8%)
Symptoms (Adults)	Fever	247 (4.2%)	84 (3.7%)	47 (3.9%)	46 (3.9%)	70 (5.9%)
	Cough	835 (14.3%)	326 (14.5%)	153 (12.8%)	157 (13.2%)	199 (16.7%)
	Shortness of breath	311 (5.3%)	146 (6.5%)	50 (4.2%)	67 (5.6%)	48 (4.0%)
	Congestion	892 (15.3%)	315 (14.0%)	180 (15.0%)	198 (16.7%)	199 (16.7%)
	Sore throat	554 (9.5%)	199 (8.8%)	118 (9.8%)	106 (8.9%)	131 (11.0%)
	Fatigue or tiredness	551 (9.4%)	237 (10.5%)	97 (8.1%)	115 (9.7%)	102 (8.5%)
	Any symptoms	2,324 (39.9%)	872 (38.8%)	462 (38.5%)	473 (39.8%)	517 (43.3%)
Employed (Adults)	Full time	1,772 (68.2%)	677 (69.1%)	379 (77.3%)	331 (59.4%)	385 (67.3%)
	Part time	682 (26.2%)	251 (25.6%)	87 (17.8%)	192 (34.5%)	152 (26.6%)
	Self employed	145 (5.6%)	52 (5.3%)	24 (4.9%)	34 (6.1%)	35 (6.1%)

Work open (Adults)	Closed	297 (9.1%)	148 (11.2%)	48 (8.0%)	51 (7.5%)	50 (7.5%)
	Open	2,980 (90.9%)	1,179 (88.8%)	552 (92.0%)	630 (92.5%)	619 (92.5%)
Attended work (Adults)	Yes	1,632 (61.6%)	598 (60.0%)	307 (61.5%)	299 (52.3%)	428 (73.8%)

455 Table 2: Mean contacts by country and setting

456

Category	Setting	UK	BE	NL	CH
All participants		Mean (95% CI*)			
	All	6.5 (6.0 to 7.0)	6.7 (6.0 to 7.3)	9.9 (9.0 to 10.8)	6.0 (5.4 to 6.6)
	Home	1.5 (1.5 to 1.6)	1.6 (1.5 to 1.6)	1.6 (1.5 to 1.7)	1.5 (1.4 to 1.5)
	Work	1.4 (1.1 to 1.7)	1.7 (1.3 to 2.1)	2.8 (2.3 to 3.3)	1.6 (1.3 to 1.9)
	School	2.2 (1.9 to 2.6)	1.7 (1.3 to 2.1)	3.0 (2.5 to 3.5)	1.1 (0.8 to 1.4)
	Other	1.6 (1.4 to 1.9)	2.2 (1.9 to 2.6)	3.4 (3.0 to 4.0)	2.2 (1.9 to 2.7)
Adults					
	All	5.4 (5.0 to 5.9)	5.5 (4.8 to 6.2)	8.8 (7.9 to 9.8)	5.3 (4.8 to 5.9)
	Home	1.4 (1.3 to 1.4)	1.3 (1.3 to 1.4)	1.4 (1.3 to 1.5)	1.3 (1.2 to 1.4)
	Work	1.5 (1.2 to 1.9)	2.1 (1.7 to 2.7)	3.3 (2.7 to 4.0)	1.9 (1.5 to 2.3)
	School	1.2 (1.0 to 1.5)	0.5 (0.3 to 0.8)	1.9 (1.4 to 2.4)	0.5 (0.3 to 0.7)
	Other	1.6 (1.4 to 1.9)	2.0 (1.6 to 2.3)	3.3 (2.7 to 4.0)	2.1 (1.7 to 2.5)
Children					
	All	11.1 (9.4 to 12.7)	10.4 (8.7 to 12.3)	14.8 (12.6 to 16.8)	9.1 (7.4 to 11.1)
	Home	2.2 (2.1 to 2.3)	2.2 (2.1 to 2.4)	2.6 (2.4 to 2.8)	2.1 (1.9 to 2.3)
	Work	0.9 (0.4 to 1.5)	0.1 (0.0 to 0.3)	0.3 (0.1 to 0.4)	0.4 (0.2 to 0.7)
	School	6.7 (5.3 to 8.1)	5.5 (4.3 to 6.9)	8.1 (6.6 to 9.6)	4.0 (2.8 to 5.2)
	Other	1.7 (1.2 to 2.3)	3.1 (2.2 to 4.0)	4.0 (3.1 to 4.9)	3.1 (2.1 to 4.2)

457 *Bootstrapped mean and 95% percentage confidence interval from 1,000 samples. Sample weighted by 2/7 for weekends and 5/7
458 for weekdays.

459 Table 3: Mean contacts by characteristics.

Category	Value	UK	BE	NL	CH
All	Mean (SD)	6.1 (13.6)	6.5 (13.5)	9.2 (17.1)	5.8 (11.3)
Adult		5.2 (12.1)	5.6 (12.5)	8.2 (16.8)	5.2 (10.0)
Child		10.9 (18.8)	10.4 (16.2)	14.1 (17.6)	9.0 (15.9)
Age group (Children)	0-4	10.2 (17.6)	11.8 (14.9)	12.4 (12.6)	6.2 (10.4)
	5-11	14.3 (18.7)	11.5 (16.7)	14.3 (17.7)	10.6 (18.5)
	12-17	14.2 (22.6)	9.8 (16.4)	15.4 (19.4)	9.7 (16.4)
	Unknown				
Age group (Adult)	18-29	4.8 (10.9)	7.6 (16.1)	10.4 (22.1)	5.9 (10.3)
	30-39	4.8 (13.1)	5.8 (12.6)	7.5 (13.1)	6.7 (12.3)
	40-49	4.4 (9.8)	6.9 (15.7)	8.5 (16.2)	5.6 (9.9)
	50-59	5.8 (15.1)	5.5 (12.5)	8.4 (17.6)	5.3 (12.0)
	60-69	2.7 (3.7)	3.9 (8.1)	7.0 (15.7)	3.6 (6.8)
	70+	4.0 (10.7)	3.3 (5.2)	5.5 (11.7)	3.3 (6.4)
	Unknown				
Gender	Female	7.1 (15.5)	6.2 (12.8)	9.7 (17.8)	6.3 (12.3)
	Male	5.1 (11.3)	6.9 (14.1)	8.9 (16.3)	5.5 (10.4)
	Other				
Household size	1	3.8 (13.7)	3.7 (11.1)	4.7 (12.1)	3.6 (8.2)
	2	4.4 (11.2)	5.1 (11.0)	8.0 (16.8)	5.1 (10.9)
	3-5	8.2 (15.0)	8.7 (15.6)	12.7 (19.0)	7.1 (11.9)
	6+	10.4 (14.2)	6.9 (6.2)	8.8 (11.5)	17.5 (22.2)
Day of week	Sun	3.3 (8.9)	6.3 (14.3)	7.6 (15.2)	4.0 (9.0)
	Mon	10.1 (16.8)	4.8 (5.9)	5.6 (9.0)	5.8 (11.5)
	Tue	5.6 (13.7)	5.5 (11.9)	17.2 (29.0)	5.9 (9.9)
	Wed	6.4 (14.1)	10.2 (16.7)	10.7 (18.7)	7.5 (13.5)
	Thu	7.1 (14.5)	7.2 (13.1)	10.6 (18.1)	5.0 (7.6)
	Fr	2.2 (2.6)	6.1 (13.4)	15.2 (22.7)	6.8 (15.1)
	Sat	2.5 (2.8)	3.9 (8.8)	9.0 (14.2)	7.5 (14.6)
Face mask	Yes	4.0 (6.7)	5.9 (14.8)	7.7 (18.9)	3.8 (4.7)
	No	5.4 (12.9)	5.5 (12.0)	8.2 (16.6)	5.5 (10.8)
	Unknown				
Vaccinated	Yes	4.0 (6.7)	5.9 (14.8)	7.7 (18.9)	3.8 (4.7)
	No	5.4 (12.9)	5.5 (12.0)	8.2 (16.6)	5.5 (10.8)
	Unknown				
High risk	Yes	4.5 (11.7)	4.1 (9.0)	7.6 (17.1)	4.9 (10.3)
	No	5.3 (12.3)	6.0 (12.9)	8.5 (16.8)	5.3 (9.9)
	Unknown				
Employed (Adults)	Full time	5.6 (13.7)	6.7 (13.1)	10.4 (18.8)	5.9 (9.6)
	Part time	7.6 (16.1)	7.4 (13.7)	10.4 (19.3)	7.1 (13.6)
	Self employed	2.9 (3.7)	19.7 (29.4)	19.9 (33.2)	4.1 (5.4)
Work open (Adults)	No	3.2 (8.8)	9.5 (24.7)	8.4 (19.5)	5.6 (8.2)
	Yes	5.4 (12.9)	7.6 (15.6)	10.6 (19.8)	6.1 (11.1)
Attended work (Adults)	No	3.2 (5.3)	4.7 (7.2)	9.1 (17.8)	4.4 (7.0)
	Yes	7.8 (17.2)	9.3 (18.2)	13.1 (22.7)	7.0 (12.5)

28

28

461 Abbreviations

462 CI confidence interval

463 UK United Kingdom

464 CH Switzerland

465 BE Belgium

466 NL Netherlands

467 Declarations

468 Authors' contributions

469 WJE, and CIJ designed the CoMix contact survey. CIJ conceived of and planned the analysis.
470 CIJ, PC, JAB, JDM, PB, NH, CLA, JW, CF, and WJE provided comments and discussions on
471 analytical methods. CIJ, JDM, and PC conducted the analysis. CIJ wrote the first draft of the
472 manuscript with feedback from all other authors.
473

474 Acknowledgements

475 We acknowledge support from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control
476 (ECDC) in setting up the collaborations between the EpiPose consortium, and universities and
477 public health institutions in all other countries. We gratefully acknowledge the tremendous
478 efforts put in all the steps by the EpiPose consortium, its collaborators and Ipsos.

479

480 We would also like to thank the team at Ipsos who have been excellent in running the survey,
481 collecting the data, and allowing for this study to, happen at a rapid speed. We acknowledge the
482 exceptional project management support given by Sarah Vercruyse, Bieke Vanhoutte and
483 Anna Carnegie.

29

29

484 Ethics approval and consent to participate

485 Participation in this opt-in study was voluntary, and all analyses were carried out on anonymised
486 data. The study was approved in the UK by the ethics committee of the London School of
487 Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Reference number 21795. The study to collect CoMix data in
488 Belgium was approved by the Ethics Committee of UZA with reference 3236 - BUN
489 B3002020000054. The Medical Research Ethics Committee (MREC) NedMec confirmed that
490 the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act (WMO) does not apply to the CoMix study
491 in the Netherlands (research protocol number 22/917). Therefore an official approval of this
492 study by the MREC NedMec is not required under the WMO. The study to collect CoMix data in
493 Switzerland was approved by the ethics committee of the Canton of Bern (project number 2020-
494 02926).

495 Consent for publication

496 Not applicable. We do not report individual patient data.

497 Availability of data and materials

498 The code and data used to conduct these analyses are found at
499 https://github.com/jarvisc1/cmix_post_pandemic

500 Competing interests

501 None

30

30

502 Funding

503 The EU have been the primary funder for this study. Over the course of the study CoMix
504 received funding from: EU Horizon 2020 Research and Innovations Programme - project
505 EpiPose (Epidemic Intelligence to Minimize COVID-19's Public Health, Societal and Economical
506 Impact, No 101003688); Medical Research Council (MC_PC_19065); the NIHR (CV220-088 -
507 COMIX); HPRU in Modelling & Health Economics (NIHR200908); and UKHSA. This work
508 reflects only the authors' view. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that
509 may be made of the information it contains

510

511 The following funding sources are acknowledged as providing funding for the named authors:
512 CIJ received funding from the LSHTM COVID-19 response fund. DFID/Wellcome Trust
513 (Epidemic Preparedness Coronavirus research programme 210758/Z/18/Z: JDM);
514 The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of
515 the NIHR or the UK Department of Health and Social Care NIHR (PR-OD-1017-20002: WJE).
516 UK MRC (MC_PC_19065: WJE)

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527 .

528

529

530

531

532 **References**

533

- 534 1. Wilson C. “Pandemics don’t end with a bang’ - lessons from the “Spanish” Flu. 2022.
535 <https://www.rte.ie/news/primetime/2022/0125/1275848-spanish-flu-lessons-covid-19/>. Accessed
536 24 Aug 2023.
- 537 2. Milne I. Influenza, war and revolution in Ireland, 1918–19. Manchester University Press;
538 2018.
- 539 3. Osterholm MT. Pandemic preparedness after H1N1: Remember--If you’ve seen one
540 pandemic, you’ve seen one pandemic. CIDRAP. 2011. [https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/business-](https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/business-preparedness/pandemic-preparedness-after-h1n1-remember-if-youve-seen-one-pandemic-youve)
541 [preparedness/pandemic-preparedness-after-h1n1-remember-if-youve-seen-one-pandemic-](https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/business-preparedness/pandemic-preparedness-after-h1n1-remember-if-youve-seen-one-pandemic-youve)
542 [youve](https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/business-preparedness/pandemic-preparedness-after-h1n1-remember-if-youve-seen-one-pandemic-youve). Accessed 24 Aug 2023.
- 543 4. Hoang T, Coletti P, Melegaro A, Wallinga J, Grijalva CG, Edmunds JW, et al. A Systematic
544 Review of Social Contact Surveys to Inform Transmission Models of Close-contact Infections.
545 *Epidemiology*. 2019;30:723–36.
- 546 5. Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Prem K, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Klepac P,
547 et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in
548 the UK. *BMC Med*. 2020;18:124.
- 549 6. Coletti P, Wambua J, Gimma A, Willem L, Vercruysse S, Vanhoutte B, et al. CoMix:
550 comparing mixing patterns in the Belgian population during and after lockdown. *Sci Rep*.
551 2020;10:21885.
- 552 7. Steens A, Freiesleben de Blasio B, Veneti L, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Van Zandvoort K, et al.
553 Poor self-reported adherence to COVID-19-related quarantine/isolation requests, Norway, April
554 to July 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020;25.
- 555 8. Gimma A, Munday JD, Wong KLM, Coletti P, van Zandvoort K, Prem K, et al. Changes in
556 social contacts in England during the COVID-19 pandemic between March 2020 and March
557 2021 as measured by the CoMix survey: A repeated cross-sectional study. *PLoS Med*.
558 2022;19:e1003907.
- 559 9. Wong KLM, Gimma A, Coletti P, CoMix Europe Working Group, Faes C, Beutels P, et al.
560 Social contact patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic in 21 European countries - evidence
561 from a two-year study. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2023;23:268.
- 562 10. Reichmuth ML, Heron L, Riou J, Moser A, Hauser A, Low N, et al. Socio-demographic
563 characteristics associated with COVID-19 vaccination uptake in Switzerland: longitudinal
564 analysis of the CoMix study. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23:1523.
- 565 11. Backer JA, Bogaardt L, Beutels P, Coletti P, Edmunds WJ, Gimma A, et al. Dynamics of
566 non-household contacts during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021 in the Netherlands.
567 *Sci Rep*. 2023;13:5166.
- 568 12. Latsuzbaia A, Herold M, Bertemes J-P, Mossong J. Evolving social contact patterns during

- 569 the COVID-19 crisis in Luxembourg. *PLoS One*. 2020;15:e0237128.
- 570 13. Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, Del Fava E, Grow A, Zagheni E, et al. Rapid Review of Social
571 Contact Patterns During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Epidemiology*. 2021;32:781–91.
- 572 14. Trentini F, Manna A, Balbo N, Marziano V, Guzzetta G, O'Dell S, et al. Investigating the
573 relationship between interventions, contact patterns, and SARS-CoV-2 transmissibility.
574 *Epidemics*. 2022;40:100601.
- 575 15. Dorélien AM, Venkateswaran N, Deng J, Searle K, Enns E, Alarcon Espinoza G, et al.
576 Quantifying social contact patterns in Minnesota during stay-at-home social distancing order.
577 *BMC Infect Dis*. 2023;23:324.
- 578 16. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts and
579 mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5:e74.
- 580 17. Wong KLM, Gimma A, Coletti P, Faes C, Beutels P, Hens N, et al. Social contact patterns
581 during the COVID-19 pandemic in 21 European countries – evidence from a two-year study.
582 *bioRxiv*. 2022.
- 583 18. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. 2017.
- 584 19. Munday JD, Jarvis CI, Gimma A, Wong KLM, van Zandvoort K, CMMID COVID-19 Working
585 Group, et al. Estimating the impact of reopening schools on the reproduction number of SARS-
586 CoV-2 in England, using weekly contact survey data. *BMC Med*. 2021;19:233.
- 587 20. Klepac P, Kucharski AJ, Conlan AJK, Kissler S, Tang ML, Fry H, et al. Contacts in context:
588 large-scale setting-specific social mixing matrices from the BBC Pandemic project. *bioRxiv*.
589 2020.
- 590 21. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact
591 surveys and demographic data. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2017;13:e1005697.
- 592 22. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Roberts MG. The construction of next-generation matrices
593 for compartmental epidemic models. *J R Soc Interface*. 2010;7:873–85.
- 594 23. Wambua J, Loedy N, Jarvis CI, Wong KLM, Faes C, Grah R, et al. The influence of COVID-
595 19 risk perception and vaccination status on the number of social contacts across Europe:
596 insights from the CoMix study. *BMC Public Health*. 2023;23:1350.

33

33

597 Additional Files

598 Table S1: Estimates of R0 from Figure 3B

country	period	R ₀	2.5%	97.5%
UK	Final CoMix round	0.526	0.494	0.557
BE	Final CoMix round	0.682	0.631	0.741
NL	Final CoMix round	0.813	0.749	0.881
CH	Final CoMix round	0.583	0.543	0.627
UK	1st Lockdown	0.234	0.225	0.244
BE	1st Lockdown	0.186	0.171	0.203

599


600

601

34

34

602 Figure S1: Reduction in R_0 for Switzerland when using different baseline: Average of the
603 Polymod data (“CH (pmod)” bottom row) vs projected contact matrix from Prem et al [21] (“CH
604 (prem)”, bottom row).



605

606

607

608

609