

# Social risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 acquisition in University students: cross sectional survey

Eleanor Blakey<sup>1</sup>, Lucy Reeve<sup>1</sup>, Neville Q Verlander<sup>2</sup>, David Edwards<sup>3</sup>, David Wyllie<sup>1,4</sup>, Mark Reacher<sup>1</sup>

## Affiliations

1. Public Health England, East of England Field Service, Cambridge Institute of Public Health, Robinson Way, Cambridgeshire, CB2 0SR, UK.
2. Public Health England, Statistics, Modelling and Economics Department, 61 Colindale Ave, London, NW9 5EQ, UK.
3. Public Health England, East of England Health Protection Team, The Mildenhall Civic Hub, Sheldrick Way, Mildenhall, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP28 7JX, UK.
4. East of England, National Mycobacterial Reference Service South

# Authors' details

## Listed authors

Name	Job Title	Affiliation	Email address	ORCID
Eleanor Blakey	Epidemiological Scientist	Public Health England	<a href="mailto:eleanor.blakey@phe.gov.uk">eleanor.blakey@phe.gov.uk</a>	0000-0001-8317-5452
Lucy Reeve	Epidemiological Scientist	Public Health England	<a href="mailto:lucy.reeve@phe.gov.uk">lucy.reeve@phe.gov.uk</a>	
Neville Verlander	Statistician	Public Health England	<a href="mailto:neville.verlander@phe.gov.uk">neville.verlander@phe.gov.uk</a>	
David Edwards	Consultant in Health Protection	Public Health England	<a href="mailto:david.s.edwards@phe.gov.uk">david.s.edwards@phe.gov.uk</a>	
David Wyllie	Consultant Microbiologist	Public Health England	<a href="mailto:david.wyllie@phe.gov.uk">david.wyllie@phe.gov.uk</a>	000-0002-9155-6228
Mark Reacher	Consultant Epidemiologist	Public Health England	<a href="mailto:mark.reacher@phe.gov.uk">mark.reacher@phe.gov.uk</a>	

# Highlights

- In a population of University students, a large increase in individuals testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 occurred in the days following a national lockdown.
- Attendance at particular social gatherings was strongly linked to the development of disease, independent of other risk factors.
- By contrast, a range of risk factors including age, gender, ethnicity, accommodation type, shared kitchen facilities, attendance at supermarkets, and attending teaching sessions were not significantly associated with SARS-CoV-2 risk.
- These data emphasise the increased risk associated with University students attending social settings with large numbers of others, even when other risks associated with university attendance are well controlled.

# Abstract

## Objectives

To define risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection in University of Cambridge students during a period of increased incidence in October and November 2020.

## Study design

Survey

## Methods

Routine public health surveillance identified a marked increase in the numbers of University of Cambridge students with respiratory illness and SARS-CoV-2 positivity in the 10 days after a national lockdown was announced in the UK on 5 November 2020. Cases were identified both through symptom-triggered testing and a universal asymptomatic testing program. An online questionnaire was sent to all University of Cambridge students on 25 November to investigate risk factors for testing positive in the period after 30<sup>th</sup> October 2020. This asked about symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 test results, in-person teaching settings, other aspects of University life, and attendance at social events in the period just prior to lockdown, from 30<sup>th</sup> October and 4<sup>th</sup> November 2020. Univariate and multivariable analyses were undertaken evaluating potential risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 positivity.

## Results

Among 3,980 students responding to the questionnaire, 99 (2.5%) reported testing SARS-CoV-2 positive in the period studied; 28 (28%) were asymptomatic. We found strong independent associations with SARS-CoV-2 positivity were attendance at two social settings in the City of Cambridge (adjusted odds ratio favouring disease 13.0 (95% CI 6.2,26.9) and 14.2 (95% CI 2.9,70)), with weaker evidence of association with three further social settings. By contrast, we did not observe strong independent associations between disease risk and type of accommodation or attendance at, or participation in, a range of activities associated with the University curriculum.

## Conclusions

Attendance at social settings can facilitate widespread SARS-CoV-2 transmission in University students. Constraint of transmission in higher education settings needs to emphasise risks outside University premises, as well as a COVID-safe environment within University premises.

# Introduction

Universities have been identified as sites where SARS-CoV-2 transmission can readily occur. Along with other sectors of the economy, social distancing and other non-pharmaceutical interventions were mandated by the UK government in higher education during the coronavirus pandemic[1]. These measures were informed by disease transmission modelling[2] and by experiences gained earlier in the pandemic[3].

The University of Cambridge used the guidelines outlined by the UK government to create its own set of guidelines that could be implemented in its 31 constituent colleges. Each of these colleges range in geographical size, and in the demographic of their annual intakes. It is in these colleges that students reside, undertake most if not all of their in-person teaching, and attend college-led formal and informal social events.

At the point the University of Cambridge student year began in October 2020[4], the B.1.1.7 SARS-CoV-2 variant was transmitting widely in parts of the UK[5]. Students returning to Universities found themselves studying in 'COVID-safe' environments featuring many changes on the pre-SARS-CoV-2 regime, included altered housing arrangements with students mixing in small groups ('bubbles'), the wearing of masks, social distancing during tuition, and the use of distance learning approaches. In addition, some universities put in place free voluntary PCR-based screening programs for students; the UoC was one, offering an asymptomatic screening programme which is described elsewhere[6]. Such programs complemented the provision of PCR testing for symptomatic individuals by the state, free of charge at the point of use.

Despite the control measures described, outbreaks occurred among students across the UK Higher education sector, which includes over 2.3 million students in 160 institutions. The determinants of these outbreaks are still being studied; residence in larger halls of residence has been identified as one risk factor[3], but determinants of successful COVID-safety in higher education settings are still unclear.

We address this by analysing risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 acquisition in one UK university in Cambridge in the period prior to England's second national lockdown (which commenced 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020). Up to this time, rates among individuals aged under 60 years were generally increasing across England[7] but in Cambridge local authority these case rates were stable[8]. Public Health England, a statutory body tasked with outbreak surveillance, became aware of increased incidence in a number of University of Cambridge (UoC) Colleges, identified through both the national symptom-derived SARS-CoV-2 testing and through the work of the University of Cambridge asymptomatic screening programme which screened asymptomatic students weekly[6, 9]. PHE conducted an analytical epidemiological survey into the determinants of SARS-CoV-2 incidence, results of which we present and discuss here.

# Methods

## Participants

The study population targeted were University of Cambridge (UoC) students resident in Cambridge during the study period. This was a subset of the 25,256 UoC students who would reside in Cambridge City during Michaelmas term 2020 under normal circumstances. However, the pandemic situation meant not all students in the study population were residing in Cambridge at that time. We identified the study population from the 25,256 student group as part of a questionnaire sent to all students: residency was determined through a student's response to the initial survey question. Students who answered as not residing in Cambridge City during this period were taken to the finishing page of the survey and excluded from analytical epidemiological studies.

## Survey

Cases were defined as individuals testing positive for SARS-CoV-2, with or without symptoms, between 30<sup>th</sup> October 2020 and the date of questionnaire completion, which was 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> November in almost all cases (see below). All other respondents were considered controls; this included individuals with SARS-CoV-2 like symptoms who either had no test result or a non-positive test result.

Risk factors assessed by the questionnaire administered (included in Supplementary Materials) included: age, gender, ethnicity, UoC college, student type (undergraduate or postgraduate), symptoms of COVID-19 and SARS-CoV-2 test results, term time accommodation, food shopping habits, travel habits, and in-person teaching settings. We also asked about attendance, queueing and social distancing at social events attended between Friday 30<sup>th</sup> October and Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> November 2020. We focused on these exposures because of anecdotal observations by colleagues that a number of affected students may have visited such venues.

It was decided to conduct the questionnaire on a de-identified (unnamed) basis in order to encourage full and honest responses from students. Thus, results of tests are self-reported. While questionnaires asked about attendance at a defined set of named social settings and venues for event attendance, the identities of which have been anonymised as 'social setting' or 'SS' followed by a number.

The study population were contacted by email with a link to the online questionnaire, which was hosted in Snap Survey, a commercial questionnaire software, on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2020. The questionnaire was live for one week before it closed to responses at 12:00pm on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2020.

## Data analysis

### Descriptive analysis

Age, gender, ethnicity, UoC college and symptoms of cases and non-cases were described.

### Data cleaning

Prior to inferential analysis, we generated numerical fields created from open-ended text fields describing other exposures not listed in the questionnaire whereby those individuals not explicitly

mentioning the exposure had their values changed from missing to 'No'. This applied to the fields of 'college catering', 'attended labs', 'attended seminar(s)', 'medical student placement' and 'met in other accommodation'. All other data entries were analysed as entered.

Mixed effects logistic regression was used with the binary response (SARS-CoV-2 positive/negative) as the outcome and student college as the random effect to allow for possible non-independence between student outcomes. The odds ratio (OR) as the measure of effect was used and it, together with its 95% confidence interval (CI), are quoted in the results. The p-values were obtained by means of the likelihood ratio test or, if not possible, the Wald test. A statistical significance level of  $p \leq 0.05$  was chosen.

The analysis began by conducting a univariate analysis. This involved fitting a series of models, each with just one fixed effect without regards to other explanatory variable and considering each factor in turn. Those variables with p-value of 0.2 or less, odds ratio larger than 1.0 and the variables of queueing and social distancing at events were then considered further in a multivariable model in a backwards stepwise procedure wherein, at each step, a fixed effect with the most missing values among those not considered by that stage and p-value larger than 0.1 was considered for removal from the model. It was removed if it was not substantially confounding. A variable was considered to be substantially confounding if its removal resulted in a change of 10% or more in one or more of the odds ratios for the variables still in the model. The process concluded with the final model when each of the variables in the model met one or more of the following: had been found to be substantially confounding in the one of the preceding steps, had a p-value of 0.1 or less, or removal would not increase the number of available observations with which to perform a complete-case analysis. The adequacy of excluding the variables dropped during the model building process was checked by adding them one at a time to the final model (and removing it before adding another) to see that each remained non-significant and was not substantially confounding.

For the continuous variable in the dataset (age), a stepwise procedure was performed by beginning with a cubic function (on the logit scale) and simplifying to the next simplest function if the deterioration in fit was not statistically significant until either the function was linear or the least complex function not fitting significantly worse. This was done in the single variable analysis as well as the first step in the multivariable modelling procedure. After this first step, implausible protective factors were removed one at a time until there were no such fixed effects. The subsequent multivariable modelling steps followed the process described above.

All analyses were performed in Stata (StataCorp) versions 15 and 16.1.

# Results

## Cohort studied

The online questionnaire was deployed to 25,256 UoC students. In total 4,447 questionnaires were returned, which contained 1,151 incomplete responses giving a response rate of 17.6%. We excluded 78 ineligible responses from individuals other than students, and 389 incomplete responses without details of symptoms or key demographic data, leaving 3,980 responses in the final analysis (15.8% analysable rate) (Figure 1).

Out of the 3,980 responses used in the final analysis, 99 individuals met the case definition (2.5%) of a positive individual test result for SARS-CoV-2 on or after 30<sup>th</sup> October 2020, while 3,617 individuals did not (264 individuals were unable to be categorised as either – they did not answer any specimen questions). As expected, the reported durations of illness in these individuals matched a spike in incidence reported in Cambridge local authority between 8<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> November 2021[8], detected by national surveillance systems (see supplementary Figure 1).

Responses, and positive cases, were received from across Cambridge's colleges (Figure 2, Appendix 1). The demographic details of respondents is typical of Cambridge students (Figure 3); the median age was 20 years, with respondents being predominantly white (2,935, 74%), while 60% (2,386) were undergraduate students (2,386) (Table 1, Figure 3). For more demographic details, see Appendix 2.

## Individuals testing positive

Ninety-nine individuals reported testing positive. The majority of cases reported that their positive result was part of the University of Cambridge screening programme (66.7%), with smaller proportions detected by NHS testing (21.2%) and the Cambridge University Hospital screening programme (11.1%). Nearly half of cases (45.5%) reported having had face to face contact with another known case of COVID-19 since 16<sup>th</sup> October 2020, compared to 9.8% of non-cases.

The earliest date of symptom onset was 27<sup>th</sup> October, with the majority of cases reporting onset after the start of national lockdown on 5<sup>th</sup> November, peaking at 15 cases with onset on 10<sup>th</sup> November (Figure 4). Table 2 shows the frequency of symptoms reported among cases, of which the most commonly reported symptoms were COVID-like illness (77.8%) of fever or cough or loss/change of sense of taste/smell, headache (76.8%), sore throat (67.7%), fatigue (64.6%) and runny nose (61.6%). More than one quarter of cases were asymptomatic (28.3%). The median duration of illness was 7 days, ranging from 0 to 38 days, with the full distribution shown in Figure 5. The majority of cases (60) recovered within ten days of symptom onset. For all symptoms except vomiting, the frequency of self-reported symptoms in cases was much higher than in non-cases (Table 2). Details of healthcare consultations following COVID-19 diagnosis are in Table 3.

## Risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 test positivity

In univariate analyses, we observed strong associations between testing positive and attendance at some social settings (most notably attendance at SS7 or SS23). An association with SS3 (representing attendance at Formal Hall) was also noted (OR 2.73, 95% CI 1.2, 6.4). Depending on the college, formal hall is an all college weekly tradition where attendees dine together in a communal dining hall. Attendees are seated by academic rank with senior academics dining at a 'high' or separated table. Other University associated activities (Appendix 3, Teaching section, as well as Social Settings 1,4,6 and 35, which were University related) were not significantly associated with disease. In univariate analyses, we also noted disease association with being a



postgraduate vs. undergraduate, and with type of accommodation (see Table 4 for variables subsequently included the multivariable analysis, and Appendix 3 for all other exposures).

## Multivariable Analysis

Following univariate analysis, nineteen variables were considered in the multivariable model (see Methods for selection criteria, and Table 5). We removed terms making minimal contributions to the model (see Methods), eliminating the terms '*go to supermarket*', '*shared kitchen*', '*gender*', '*other teaching*', '*social setting (SS)*' 4 '*SS21*', '*SS22*', '*walking*', and '*student type*'. We also removed the variable on *Queuing at social events*. We did this because it is possible that outdoor queueing is a marker of COVID-19 safe environments to which access is restricted, making interpretation difficult without stratification by venue, something we explore further below. The final model is shown in Table 6.

In the final multivariable model (Table 6) and univariable analysis (Table 5) both the strongest independent associations with positivity were attendance at SS7 (unadjusted OR 13.9 (95% CI: 5.52, 57.2); adjusted OR (aOR) 13.0 (6.25, 26.9)) and SS23 (OR 17.3 (95% CI: 3.01, 99.4); aOR 14.2 (2.90, 69.9)). There is also some evidence of independent association with positivity, of attendance at social settings SS3 (Formal Hall), and with SS17 and SS30, which are commercial venues at which socialisation occurred. The strength of the observed effect differed slightly depending on the model used (Table 5 vs. Table 6).

Interestingly, of the students that attended SS7 and answered questions about queuing and social distancing (n=68), there were variable reports about the extent of social distancing, with 33 respondents stating that social distancing was practiced all the time (33 responses) and 39 responding that it was practiced some of the time. In SS23, 17 of the respondents reported social distancing being practiced all (8 responses), or some of the time (5 responses). See Appendix 4 for full tabulation.

It is notable that neither undergraduate/postgraduate status, nor attendance at University teaching form part of the final model, and that the contribution of accommodation type is not significant. It appears that the associations of SARS-CoV2 acquisition with these risk factors is captured by other risk factors, notably the attendance at social events.

# Discussion

This investigation has found strong evidence of independent association with SARS-CoV-2 detection and attendance at two social venues, with weaker evidence at others. The highest odds was with attendance at SS7 and SS23 (aOR 13.9 (95% CI 5.5,57) and aOR 17.3 (3,99) respectively, both were primarily settings where food and drink were served and consumed indoors. This is also a feature of SS3 (Formal Hall) which was similarly, but more weakly, associated with odds of disease (aOR 3.0, 95% CI 0.96, 9.5). Such indoor settings are recognised to represent a risk[10, 11]. In the time period of this study the wearing of face coverings in certain indoors setting was a mandatory legal requirement[12] unless sat at an assigned table. However, it would be expected, due to the consumption of food and beverages, that constant wearing of a face covering or mask would be difficult to maintain; adding to this point, respondents indicated inconstant social distancing. In contrast, it was notable that neither university attendance, type of residence, or student category contributed significantly to odds of positivity, and neither did attendance at the majority of university organised or based settings (SS1, SS2, SS4, SS6, and SS35). Responses received, and the timing of illness, suggests that socialising between students in non-university settings occurred shortly before a national lockdown was imposed, and in the context of a rapidly spreading SARS-CoV-2 epidemic. Our work also suggests that the control measures put in place by the university[13] were largely effective at minimising the odds of infection, with the possible exception of Formal Hall related dining.

This research study has several notable limitations. Firstly, by design it was anonymous, and so the responses obtained could not be checked against national information systems. Secondly, the survey was retrospective, so attendance at events or recording of symptoms may be subject to recall bias. Finally, we received 3,980 responses to the questionnaire from a potential study population of 25,256, a response rate of 15.8%. While there is evidence of external validity of the responses obtained – in particular, the time course of the development of illness reported matches what actually happened – the low response rates mean that the conclusions require external validation. Such external validation has recently been published, in the form of a genomic analysis of sequences from individuals with SARS-CoV-2 infection[9], which also strongly implicates social mixing outside of university settings as a key risk factor for SARS-CoV-2 infection. Further external validation can be seen through comparison of the cases reported in Cambridge local authority[8], and those by specimen date reported by the University of Cambridge cohort (see supplementary Figure 1). The cases in both figures peak around the same time period (8<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> November 2021).

This work builds on studies from elsewhere identifying indoor social settings as sites of SARS-CoV-2 transmission[11]. For example, at the start of the pandemic, nightclubs in Seoul reported multiple cases associated with venues of this type[14], and since the easing of social distancing and lockdown measures in South Korea, nightclubs have been highlighted as venues of concern, where cases could easily spread to the wider community[15]. Our results indicate that, in University settings, infection control measures aimed at establishing a low transmission 'COVID-safe' learning environment can readily be compromised by attendance at social gatherings.

## **Ethics**

This protocol was subject to a review by the PHE Research Ethics and Governance Group. It was classified as an outbreak investigation undertaken as part of PHE's responsibility to respond to the COVID-19 current pandemic, and to inform the multi-agency response to the large rise in cases and future response. The study is anonymous and consent was requested to publish non-identifiable aggregate information derived from the study.

As such this work fell outside the remit for ethical review and as no regulatory issues were identified the protocol was approved.

## **Acknowledgements**


We thank the members of the University of Cambridge Outbreak Management Team, for their support and contribution to facilitating the questionnaire dissemination: Gillian Weale, Ian Jones and Robert Henderson from The University of Cambridge; Linda Sheridan, and Vickie Braithwaite from Cambridgeshire County Council; Yvonne O'Donnell from Cambridge City Council; Heidi Eagle from the East of England PHE East Health Protection Team; and The University of Cambridge communications team.

# References

1. Department for Education, *Updated guidance for universities ahead of reopening*. 2020: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/updated-guidance-for-universities-ahead-of-reopening>.
2. Brooks-Pollock, E., et al., *High COVID-19 transmission potential associated with re-opening universities can be mitigated with layered interventions*. medRxiv, 2020.
3. Enright, J., et al., *SARS-COV-2 INFECTION IN UK UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: LESSONS FROM SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER 2020 AND MODELLING INSIGHTS FOR FUTURE STUDENT RETURN*. 2021.
4. University of Cambridge. *Term dates*. 20/05/2021]; Available from: <https://www.cam.ac.uk/about-the-university/term-dates-and-calendars>.
5. Volz, E., et al., *Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B.1.1.7 in England: Insights from linking epidemiological and genetic data*. medRxiv, 2021.
6. Warne, B., et al., *Feasibility and efficacy of mass testing for SARS-CoV-2 in a UK university using swab pooling and PCR*. Research Square, 2021.
7. Public Health England. *GOV.UK Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK*. Cases in England 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/cases?areaType=nation&areaName=England>].
8. Public Health England. *GOV.UK Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK*. Cases in Cambridge 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/cases?areaType=ltla&areaName=Cambridge>].
9. Dinesh, A., et al., *Genomic epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in the University of Cambridge identifies dynamics of transmission*. The Lancet, 2021.
10. Meyerowitz, E.A., et al., *Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Review of Viral, Host, and Environmental Factors*. Ann Intern Med, 2021. **174**(1): p. 69-79.
11. Qian, H., et al., *Indoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2*. Indoor Air, 2020.
12. HM Government., *The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Wearing of Face Coverings in a Relevant Place) (England) Regulations 2020*. 2020.
13. University of Cambridge., *University of Cambridge Outbreak Response Plan*. 2021.
14. Kang, C.R., et al., *Coronavirus Disease Exposure and Spread from Nightclubs, South Korea*. Emerg Infect Dis, 2020. **26**(10): p. 2499-2501.
15. Jung, J., et al., *Coronavirus Disease 2019 Outbreak at Nightclubs and Distribution Centers after Easing Social Distancing: Vulnerable Points of Infection*. J Korean Med Sci, 2020. **35**(27): p. e247.

# Figures and Tables

**Figure 1: Questionnaire responses, University of Cambridge cohort**




**Table 1: Characteristics of cases and non-cases, University of Cambridge cohort (n=3,980)**


Characteristic		Overall		Cases		Non-cases	
Gender	Male	1666	41.9%	38	38.4%	1522	42.1%
	Female	2193	55.1%	57	57.6%	1989	55.0%
	Other	43	1.1%	0	0.0%	41	1.1%
	Missing	78	2.0%	4	4.0%	65	1.8%
Age (years)	Median	21		20		21	
	Range	16-50		18-42		16-50	
Ethnicity	White	2935	73.7%	84	84.8%	2659	73.5%
	Indian	130	3.3%	3	3.0%	120	3.3%
	Pakistani	25	0.6%	0	0.0%	21	0.6%
	Other Asian/Asian	457	11.5%	2	2.0%	431	11.9%
	British	44	1.1%	1	1.0%	38	1.1%
	Black	172	4.3%	6	6.1%	154	4.3%
	Mixed	73	1.8%	2	2.0%	68	1.9%
	Missing	144	3.6%	1	1.0%	126	3.5%
Student type	Undergraduate	2386	59.9%	78	78.8%	2108	58.3%

Postgraduate	1581	39.7%	20	20.2%	1499	41.4%
Missing	13	0.3%	1	1.0%	10	0.3%


**Figure 2: Distribution of cases and non-cases among University of Cambridge colleges (n=3,980)**



**Figure 3: Age and gender distribution among cases, University of Cambridge cohort (n=94)**



**Figure 4: Distribution of cases by date of symptom onset reported, University of Cambridge cohort (n=90)**




**Table 2: Frequency of symptoms among cases and non-cases, University of Cambridge cohort (n=3,980)**

Symptoms	Cases		Non-cases	
Asymptomatic	28	28.3%	-	-
COVID-like illness*	77	77.8%	214	5.9%
Fever	46	46.5%	115	3.2%
Cough	34	34.3%	105	2.9%
Loss or change of sense of taste or smell	54	54.5%	65	1.8%
Shortness of breath	42	42.4%	129	3.6%
Sore throat	67	67.7%	644	17.8%
Runny nose	61	61.6%	810	22.4%
Headache	76	76.8%	951	26.3%
Muscle aches	54	54.5%	308	8.5%
Fatigue	64	64.6%	398	11.0%
Diarrhoea	13	13.1%	247	6.8%
Vomiting	2	2.0%	64	1.8%
Other symptoms	18	18.2%	43	1.2%

\*Fever or cough or loss/change of sense of taste/smell

**Figure 3: Distribution of the duration of symptoms among cases, University of Cambridge cohort (n=72)**



**Table 3: Type of healthcare consulted by cases, University of Cambridge cohort (n=91)**

Type of healthcare consulted	Cases	
College nurse	17	18.7%
NHS 111	5	5.5%
GP or another doctor	3	3.3%
Visited A&E	0	0.0%
Other healthcare	2	2.2%
Admitted to hospital	0	0.0%

**Table 4: Single variable analysis of demographics, lifestyle and social event exposures among cases and non-cases, University of Cambridge cohort**

Variable	Category or measure	Cases	Non-cases	OR	95% CI	p-value
<b>Demographics</b>						
Age (years)	Minimum	18	16	Quadratic		<b>0.048</b>
	25 <sup>th</sup> centile	19	19			
	Median	20	21			
	75 <sup>th</sup> centile	21	24			
	Maximum	42	50			
Gender	Male	38	1522	1.00	0.62, 1.51 n.e.	<b>0.13</b>
	Female	57	1989	0.97		
	Other	0	41	0.00		
Ethnicity	White	84	2659	1.00	0.24, 2.57 n.e. 0.04, 0.59 0.12, 6.61 0.55, 3.05 0.23, 3.98	<b>0.008</b>
	Indian	3	120	0.79		
	Pakistani	0	21	0.00		
	Other Asian/Asian British	2	431	0.14		
	Black	1	38	0.88		
	Mixed	6	154	1.30		
	Other	2	68	0.94		



Variable	Category or measure	Cases	Non-cases	OR	95% CI	p-value
Term time accommodation						
Accommodation type	College flat	7	379	1.00	0.59, 3.65 1.02, 5.14 0.20, 2.47 0.09, 1.32	<0.001
	College House	19	653	1.47		
	College staircase/block	65	1594	2.29		
	Private flat	4	303	0.71		
	Private house	3	486	0.33		
Shared kitchen	Yes	95	3124	2.67	0.83, 8.56	0.054
	No	3	286	1.00		
Food shopping habits						
Go to supermarket	Yes	94	3142	2.58	1.04, 6.42	0.02
	No	5	475	1.00		
Term time travel						
Walk	Yes	83	2776	1.53	0.88, 2.65	0.11
	No	16	841	1.00		
Teaching						
Attended other teaching	Yes	7	121	1.88	0.80, 4.46	0.18
	No	91	3288	1.00		
Event attendance between Friday 30 October and Wednesday 4 November 2020						
Queueing at social events	Did not attend	35	1247	1.00	0.44, 1.56 1.21, 3.73 0.18, 2.16 0.56, 5.10	0.03
	No queue	14	625	0.83		
	Queue only outside	23	369	2.13		
	Queue only inside	2	124	0.50		
	Queue outside and inside	4	63	1.70		
Social distancing at social events	Did not attend	35	1247	1.00	0.30, 1.34 0.90, 2.57 0.49, 2.21 0.64, 2.72	0.2
	All/most of time	10	490	0.64		
	Some of time	26	613	1.52		
	Mixture some/none of time	10	284	1.04		
	None of time	10	262	1.31		
Student type	Postgraduate	20	1499	2.73	1.62, 4.59	<0.001
	Undergraduate	78	2108	1.00		
Social setting 3	Yes	7	78	2.73	1.17, 6.41	0.04
	No	90	3314	1.00		
Social setting 4	Yes	30	805	1.35	0.86, 2.13	0.20
	No	67	2587	1.00		
Social setting 7	Yes	18	69	13.3	7.21, 24.6	<0.001
	No	79	3323	1.00		
Social setting 17	Yes	2	24	3.77	0.83, 17.1	0.14
	No	95	3368	1.00		
Social setting 21	Yes	2	6	11.2	1.92, 65.2	0.02
	No	95	3386	1.00		
Social setting 22	Yes	6	59	3.86	1.55, 9.59	0.01
	No	91	3333	1.00		
Social setting 23	Yes	3	14	9.45	2.48, 35.9	0.007
	No	94	3378	1.00		
Social setting 30	Yes	5	47	4.04	1.50, 10.9	0.02
	No	92	3345	1.00		

n.e. not estimable

**Table 5: Multivariable model (n=2252), University of Cambridge cohort**

Variable	Category or measure	OR	95% CI	p-value
Age	Per year	0.94	0.84, 1.04	0.5
Ethnic group	White	1.00		0.02
	Indian	1.01	0.23, 4.51	
	Pakistani	0.00	n.e.	
	Other Asian/Asian British	0.10	0.01, 0.77	
	Black	0.00	n.e.	
	Mixed	1.34	0.44, 4.06	
	Other	1.09	0.14, 8.61	
Accommodation type	College flat	1.00		0.6
	College House	1.11	0.40, 3.11	
	College staircase/block	1.29	0.50, 3.30	
	Private flat	0.69	0.16, 3.01	
	Private house	0.35	0.07, 1.91	
Queueing at events	Not attended	1.00		0.8
	No queueing	0.71	0.26, 1.97	
	Queueing only outside	0.60	0.20, 1.83	
	Queueing only inside	0.38	0.07, 2.17	
	Queueing inside and outside	0.41	0.09, 1.89	
Social distancing (SD) at events	Not attended	1.00		0.15
	SD all/most of time	0.40	0.12, 1.39	
	SD some of time	1.17	0.45, 3.08	
	Mixture of SD some/none of time	0.57	0.17, 1.87	
	SD none of time	n.e.	n.e.	
Social setting 3	Yes	3.03	0.96, 9.53	0.08
	No	1.00		
Social setting 7	Yes	13.9	5.52, 57.2	<0.001
	No	1.00		
Social setting 17	Yes	10.0	1.76, 57.2	0.09
	No	1.00		
Social setting 23	Yes	17.3	3.01, 99.4	0.004
	No	1.00		
Social setting 30	Yes	3.81	1.02, 14.2	0.06
	No	1.00		

n.e. not estimable

**Table 6: Final multivariable model without “queueing at social events” (n=2825), University of Cambridge cohort**

Variable	Category or measure	OR	95% CI	p-value
Age	Per year	0.96	0.87, 1.05	0.4
Ethnic group	White	1		0.03
	Indian	0.94	0.27, 3.21	
	Pakistani	0	n.e.	
	Other Asian/Asian British	0.18	0.04, 0.76	
	Black	0.91	0.11, 7.17	
	Mixed	1.84	0.75, 4.55	
	Other	1.57	0.35, 6.99	
Accommodation type	College flat	1		0.3
	College House	1.33	0.51, 3.46	
	College staircase/block	1.56	0.65, 3.77	
	Private flat	0.88	0.24, 3.29	
	Private house	0.46	0.11, 1.93	
Social distancing (SD) at events	Not attended	1		0.01
	SD all/most of time	0.32	0.14, 0.75	
	SD some of time	0.7	0.38, 1.31	

	Mixture of SD some/none of time	0.37	0.15, 0.89	
	SD none of time	0.64	0.29, 1.43	
Social setting 3	Yes	3.1	1.22, 7.90	0.02
	No	1		
Social setting 7	Yes	13	6.25, 26.9	<0.001
	No	1		
Social setting 17	Yes	7.73	1.54, 38.8	0.04
	No	1		
Social setting 23	Yes	14.2	2.90, 69.9	0.005
	No	1		
Social setting 30	Yes	2.78	0.85, 9.10	0.11
	No	1		

n.e. not estimable

# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Distribution of questionnaire responses by University of Cambridge college

University of Cambridge college	Overall		Cases		Non-cases	
Christ's	169	4.2%	8	8.1%	150	4.1%
Churchill	133	3.3%	2	2.0%	124	3.4%
Clare	108	2.7%	3	3.0%	101	2.8%
Clare Hall	13	0.3%	0	0.0%	13	0.4%
Corpus Christi	99	2.5%	0	0.0%	96	2.7%
Darwin	110	2.8%	1	1.0%	103	2.8%
Downing	127	3.2%	2	2.0%	116	3.2%
Emmanuel	185	4.6%	15	15.2%	160	4.4%
Fitzwilliam	120	3.0%	6	6.1%	104	2.9%
Girton	174	4.4%	7	7.1%	154	4.3%
Gonville & Caius	157	3.9%	1	1.0%	143	4.0%
Homerton	141	3.5%	1	1.0%	131	3.6%
Hughes Hall	114	2.9%	2	2.0%	106	2.9%
Jesus	175	4.4%	4	4.0%	158	4.4%
King's	107	2.7%	1	1.0%	90	2.5%
Lucy Cavendish	80	2.0%	3	3.0%	71	2.0%
Madgelene	94	2.4%	3	3.0%	85	2.4%
Murray Edwards	136	3.4%	13	13.1%	115	3.2%
Newnham	162	4.1%	4	4.0%	147	4.1%
Pembroke	138	3.5%	2	2.0%	124	3.4%
Peterhouse	92	2.3%	0	0.0%	85	2.4%
Queen's	170	4.3%	4	4.0%	152	4.2%
Robinson	77	1.9%	2	2.0%	70	1.9%
Selwyn	120	3.0%	2	2.0%	109	3.0%
Sidney Sussex	87	2.2%	1	1.0%	77	2.1%
St Catharine's	127	3.2%	2	2.0%	114	3.2%
St Edmund's	72	1.8%	0	0.0%	70	1.9%
St John's	183	4.6%	4	4.0%	175	4.8%
Trinity	233	5.9%	2	2.0%	220	6.1%
Trinity Hall	108	2.7%	0	0.0%	98	2.7%
Wolfson	92	2.3%	1	1.0%	91	2.5%
Missing	77	1.9%	3	3.0%	65	1.8%

## Appendix 2: Characteristics of responses with incomplete symptom reporting (n=290)

Characteristic		Total	%
Sex	Male	49	16.9%
	Female	66	22.8%
	Missing	175	60.3%
Ethnicity	White	83	28.6%
	Indian	6	2.07%
	Pakistani	2	0.690%
	Other Asian/Asian British	17	5.86%
	Black	2	0.690%
	Mixed	3	1.03%
	Other	1	0.345%
	Missing	176	60.7%
College	Christ's	6	2.07%
	Churchill	5	1.72%
	Clare	4	1.38%
	Corpus Christi	2	0.69%
	Darwin	1	0.345%
	Downing	3	1.03%
	Emmanuel	5	1.72%
	Fitzwilliam	2	0.690%
	Girton	8	2.76%
	Gonville & Caius	5	1.72%
	Homerton	4	1.38%
	Hughes Hall	3	1.03%
	Jesus	3	1.03%
	King's	2	0.690%
	Lucy Cavendish	3	1.03%
	Magdalene	2	0.690%
	Murray Edwards	6	2.07%
	Newnham	5	1.72%
	Pembroke	5	1.72%
	Queen's	5	1.72%
	Robinson	4	1.38%
	Selwyn	5	1.72%
	Sidney Sussex	2	0.690%
	St Catharine's	2	0.690%
	St Edmund's	2	0.690%
	St John's	3	1.03%
	Trinity	10	3.45%
	Trinity Hall	5	1.72%
	Wolfson	2	0.690%
	Missing	176	60.7%
Course	Undergraduate	90	31.0%
	Postgraduate	25	8.62%
	Missing	175	60.3%

### Appendix 3: Full results of univariate analysis

Variable	Category or measure	Cases	Non-cases	OR	95% CI	p-value
Demographics						
Age (years)	Minimum	18	16	Quadratic		0.048
	25 <sup>th</sup> centile	19	19			
	Median	20	21			
	75 <sup>th</sup> centile	21	24			
	Maximum	42	50			
Gender	Male	38	1522	1.00	0.62, 1.51 n.e.	0.13
	Female	57	1989	0.97		
	Other	0	41	0.00		
Ethnicity	White	84	2659	1.00	0.24, 2.57 n.e. 0.04, 0.59 0.12, 6.61 0.55, 3.05 0.23, 3.98	0.008
	Indian	3	120	0.79		
	Pakistani	0	21	0.00		
	Other Asian/Asian	2	431	0.14		
	British					
	Black	1	38	0.88		
	Mixed	6	154	1.30		
Other	2	68	0.94			
Term time accommodation						
Accommodation type	College flat	7	379	1.00	0.59, 3.65 1.02, 5.14 0.20, 2.47 0.09, 1.32	<0.001
	College House	19	653	1.47		
	College staircase/block	65	1594	2.29		
	Private flat	4	303	0.71		
	Private house	3	486	0.33		
Shared kitchen	Yes	95	3124	2.67	0.83, 8.56	0.054
	No	3	286	1.00		
Shared Bathroom	Yes	68	2122	1.24	0.79, 1.96	0.4
	No	30	1280	1.00		
Shared Living Space	Yes	37	1640	0.64	0.41, 0.98	0.04
	No	61	1764	1.00		
Access to outside space	Yes	63	2333	0.71	0.45, 1.11	0.14
	No	35	1072	1.00		
Food shopping habits						
Go to supermarket	Yes	94	3142	2.58	1.04, 6.42	0.02
	No	5	475	1.00		
Click and Collect	Yes	1	85	0.43	0.06, 3.18	0.3
	No	98	3532	1.00		
Supermarket Delivery	Yes	9	524	0.48	0.22, 1.06	0.045
	No	90	3093	1.00		
Deliveroo/takeaway	Yes	13	643	0.64	0.34, 1.22	0.16
	No	86	2974	1.00		

Variable	Category or measure	Cases	Non-cases	OR	95% CI	p-value
Buy food (none of above)	Yes No	0 99	19 3598	0.00 1.00	n.e.	0.3
Buy food other	Yes No	0 99	37 3580	0.00 1.00	n.e.	n.e.
College catering	Yes No	1 98	63 3554	0.68 1.00	0.09, 5.00	0.7
<b>Term time travel</b>						
Walk	Yes No	83 16	2776 841	1.53 1.00	0.88, 2.65	<b>0.11</b>
Cycle	Yes No	52 47	1962 1655	0.98 1.00	0.64, 1.48	0.9
Bus	Yes No	3 96	146 3471	0.79 1.00	0.24, 2.57	0.7
Taxi/Uber	Yes No	4 95	81 3536	1.91 1.00	0.67, 5.41	0.3
Car	Yes No	3 96	185 3432	0.56 1.00	0.17, 1.80	0.3
Other travel	Yes No	0 99	21 3596	0.00 1.00	n.e.	0.3
<b>Teaching</b>						
In-person teaching	Yes No	38 60	1266 2143	1.07 1.00	0.70, 1.63	0.8
Attended lectures	Yes No	7 91	251 3158	0.85 1.00	0.36, 1.97	0.7
Attended practicals	Yes No	13 85	415 2994	0.99 1.00	0.53, 1.83	0.97
Attended supervisions	Yes No	22 76	811 2598	0.95 1.00	0.58, 1.55	0.8
Attended other teaching	Yes No	7 91	121 3288	1.88 1.00	0.80, 4.46	<b>0.18</b>
Labs	Yes No	0 99	14 3603	0.00 1.00	n.e.	0.5
Seminar	Yes No	1 98	12 3605	4.00 1.00	0.49, 32.4	0.3
Medical Student placement	Yes No	1 98	45 3572	0.67 1.00	0.09, 5.00	0.7
<b>Event attendance between Friday 30 October and Wednesday 4 November 2020</b>						
Attended social event	Yes No	62 35	2126 1266	0.97 1.00	0.63, 1.50	0.9
Queueing at social events	Did not attend No queue Queue only outside Queue only inside Queue outside and inside	35 14 23 2 4	1247 625 369 124 63	1.00 0.83 2.13 0.50 1.70	0.44, 1.56 1.21, 3.73 0.18, 2.16 0.56, 5.10	<b>0.03</b>

Variable	Category or measure	Cases	Non-cases	OR	95% CI	p-value
Social distancing at social events	Did not attend	35	1247	1.00		<b>0.2</b>
	All/most of time	10	490	0.64	0.30, 1.34	
	Some of time	26	613	1.52	0.90, 2.57	
	Mixture some/none of time	10	284	1.04	0.49, 2.21	
	None of time	10	262	1.31	0.64, 2.72	
Student type	Postgraduate	20	1499	2.73	1.62, 4.59	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
	Undergraduate	78	2108	1.00		
Social setting 1	Yes	8	211	1.63	0.76, 3.50	0.24
	No	89	3181	1.00		
Social setting 2	Yes	6	196	1.04	0.44, 2.49	0.9
	No	91	3196	1.00		
Social setting 3	Yes	7	78	2.73	1.17, 6.41	<b>0.04</b>
	No	90	3314	1.00		
Social setting 4	Yes	30	805	1.35	0.86, 2.13	<b>0.20</b>
	No	67	2587	1.00		
Social setting 5	Yes	19	560	1.08	0.64, 1.85	0.8
	No	78	2832	1.00		
Social setting 6	Yes	0	39	0.00	n.e.	0.15
	No	97	3353	1.00		
Social setting 7	Yes	18	69	13.3	7.21, 24.6	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
	No	79	3323	1.00		
Social setting 8	Yes	3	57	2.11	0.63, 6.99	0.3
	No	94	3335	1.00		
Social setting 9	Yes	1	23	1.89	0.24, 14.6	0.6
	No	96	3369	1.00		
Social setting 10	Yes	0	1	0.00	n.e.	0.8
	No	97	3391	1.00		
Social setting 11	Yes	0	7	0.00	n.e.	0.6
	No	97	3385	1.00		
Social setting 12	Yes	2	25	1.96	0.26, 15.1	0.6
	No	95	3367	1.00		
Social setting 13	Yes	1	41	1.04	0.14, 7.80	0.97
	No	96	3351	1.00		
Social setting 14	Yes	1	20	1.80	0.23, 14.0	0.6
	No	96	3372	1.00		
Social setting 15	Yes	0	0	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
	No	97	3392	1.00		
Social setting 16	Yes	1	88	0.38	0.05, 2.79	0.3
	No	96	3304	1.00		
Social setting 17	Yes	2	24	3.77	0.83, 17.1	<b>0.14</b>
	No	95	3368	1.00		
Social setting 18	Yes	0	23	0.00	n.e.	0.24
	No	97	3369	1.00		



Variable	Category or measure	Cases	Non-cases	OR	95% CI	p-value
Social setting 19	Yes No	2 95	25 3367	2.95 1.00	0.66, 13.3	0.21
Social setting 20	Yes No	1 96	68 3324	0.66 1.00	0.09, 4.86	0.7
Social setting 21	Yes No	2 95	6 3386	11.2 1.00	1.92, 65.2	<b>0.02</b>
Social setting 22	Yes No	6 91	59 3333	3.86 1.00	1.55, 9.59	<b>0.01</b>
Social setting 23	Yes No	3 94	14 3378	9.45 1.00	2.48, 35.9	<b>0.007</b>
Social setting 24	Yes No	0 97	23 3369	0.00 1.00	n.e.	0.22
Social setting 25	Yes No	1 96	13 3379	2.44 1.00	0.30, 19.9	0.5
Social setting 26	Yes No	1 96	54 3338	0.66 1.00	0.08, 4.88	0.7
Social setting 27	Yes No	0 97	19 3373	0.00 1.00	n.e.	0.4
Social setting 28	Yes No	2 95	37 3355	1.96 1.00	0.45, 8.48	0.4
Social setting 29	Yes No	3 94	99 3293	1.13 1.00	0.34, 3.70	0.8
Social setting 30	Yes No	5 92	47 3345	4.04 1.00	1.50, 10.9	<b>0.02</b>
Social setting 31	Yes No	0 97	27 3365	0.00 1.00	n.e.	0.2
Social setting 32	Yes No	14 83	395 2997	1.19 1.00	0.65, 2.18	0.6
Social setting 33	Yes No	22 75	633 2759	1.26 1.00	0.76, 2.07	0.4
Social setting 34	Yes No	3 94	359 3033	0.27 1.00	0.09, 0.88	0.007
Social setting 35	Yes No	0 99	104 3513	0.00 1.00	n.e.	n.e.

#### Appendix 4: Queuing and social distancing at social settings of interest.

Venue	Characteristic		Overall		Cases		Non-cases	
Social setting 7	Queueing at social events	Queueing only outside	63	1.6%	16	16.2%	47	1.3%
		Queueing only inside	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
		No queueing	4	0.1%	0	0.0%	4	0.1%
		Unknown queueing	19	0.5%	2	2.0%	17	0.5%
		Did not attend	3410	85.7%	79	79.8%	3323	91.9%
		Did not respond	483	12.1%	2	2.0%	225	6.2%
	Social distancing at events	All/most of time	33	0.8%	7	7.1%	26	0.7%
		Some of time	38	1.0%	9	9.1%	29	0.8%
		Mixture some/none of time	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
		None of time	7	0.2%	2	2.0%	5	0.1%
		Unknown social distancing	8	0.2%	0	0.0%	8	0.2%
		Did not attend	3410	85.7%	79	79.8%	3323	91.9%
		Did not respond	483	12.1%	2	2.0%	225	6.2%
Social setting 23	Queueing at social events	Queueing only outside	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Queueing only inside	5	0.1%	1	1.0%	4	0.1%
		No queueing	8	0.2%	2	2.0%	6	0.2%
		Unknown queueing	4	0.1%	0	0.0%	4	0.1%
		Did not attend	3480	87.4%	94	94.9%	3378	93.4%
		Did not respond	483	12.1%	2	2.0%	225	6.2%
	Social distancing at events	All/most of time	8	0.2%	1	1.0%	7	0.2%
		Some of time	5	0.1%	2	2.0%	3	0.1%
		Mixture some/none of time	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		None of time	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Unknown social distancing	4	0.1%	0	0.0%	4	0.1%
		Did not attend	3480	87.4%	94	94.9%	3378	93.4%
		Did not respond	483	12.1%	2	2.0%	225	6.2%