

1 Social mixing patterns in the UK following the relaxation of 2 COVID-19 pandemic restrictions: a cross-sectional online survey

3
4 Jessica RE Bridgen; Lancaster Medical School, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK, LA1 4YW
5 Chris P Jewell; Lancaster Medical School, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK, LA1 4YW
6 Jonathan M Read; Lancaster Medical School, Lancaster University, UK, LA1 4YW
7 jonathan.read@lancs.ac.uk (corresponding author)

8
9 Word Count: 3228

10

11 **Abstract**

12 *Background*

13 Since 23 March 2020, social distancing measures have been implemented in the UK to reduce
14 SARS-CoV-2 transmission. We conducted a cross-sectional survey to quantify and characterize
15 non-household contact and to identify the effect of shielding and isolating on contact
16 patterns.

17

18 *Methods*

19 Through an online questionnaire, the CoCoNet study measured daily interactions and mobility
20 of 5143 participants between 28 July and 14 August 2020. Negative binomial regression
21 modelling identified participant characteristics associated with contact rates.

22

23 *Results*

24 The mean rate of non-household contacts per person was 2.9 d⁻¹. Participants attending a
25 workplace (adjusted incidence rate ratio (aIRR) 3.33, 95%CI 3.02 to 3.66), self-employed (aIRR
26 1.63, 95%CI 1.43 to 1.87) or working in healthcare (aIRR 5.10, 95%CI 4.29 to 6.10) reported
27 significantly higher non-household contact rates than those working from home. Participants
28 self-isolating as a precaution or following Test and Trace instructions had a lower non-
29 household contact rate than those not self-isolating (aIRR 0.58, 95%CI 0.43 to 0.79). We found
30 limited evidence that those shielding had reduced non-household contacts compared to non-
31 shielders.

32

33 *Conclusion*

34 The daily rate of non-household interactions remains lower than pre-pandemic levels,
35 suggesting continued adherence to social distancing guidelines. Individuals attending a
36 workplace in-person or employed as healthcare professionals were less likely to maintain
37 social distance and had a higher non-household contact rate, possibly increasing their
38 infection risk. Shielding and self-isolating individuals required greater support to enable them
39 to follow the government guidelines and reduce non-household contact and therefore their
40 risk of infection.

41 **Summary box**

42 **What is already known on this subject?**

- 43 • The introduction of social distancing guidelines in March 2020 reduced social contact
- 44 rates in the UK.
- 45 • Evidence of low levels of adherence to self-isolation.

46

47 **What does this study add?**

- 48 • This study provides quantitative insight into the social mixing patterns in the UK at the
- 49 beginning of the second wave of SARS-CoV2 infection.
- 50 • Healthcare professionals and individuals attending their workplace in-person were
- 51 less able to follow social distancing guidelines and made more contact with people
- 52 outside their household than those working from home.
- 53 • Shielding individuals did not make fewer non-household contacts than those not
- 54 shielding.

55

56 **INTRODUCTION**

57

58 On 31 January 2020, the first two cases of COVID-19 were recorded in the United Kingdom
59 (UK), followed by a rapid rise in identified cases and hospitalised patients. On 23 March 2020,
60 a range of social distancing measures were implemented across the UK (lockdown), aiming to
61 reduce interpersonal contact between households and reduce transmission of SARS-CoV-2.
62 Schools were closed to pupils, with the exception of children of key workers. People were
63 only allowed to leave their homes to shop for basic necessities, to exercise once a day, for
64 medical reasons, and to travel to work if working from home was not possible.^[1] By July 2020,
65 many businesses, including shops, restaurants and pubs, had reopened. Support bubbles had
66 been introduced, allowing for a single-adult household to interact with another household of
67 any size.^[2] International travel was permitted, following the introduction of travel corridors
68 on 10 July 2020, which enabled passengers to travel to England from certain countries without
69 self-isolating.^[3] The UK government's 'Eat Out to Help Out' scheme, which ran from 3 to 31
70 August 2020, encouraged people to dine out.^[4] Some social distancing restrictions remained
71 in place, including maintaining a 2 metre distance between individuals (excluding household
72 members or members of a support bubble), the wearing of face coverings on public transport
73 and in shops, and limits on how many people could meet indoors and outdoors. ^[5–8] Whilst
74 some people in the UK began to return to work, schools remained closed. A marked decrease
75 in case incidence was seen during April 2020, and cases remained low until the onset of the
76 second wave in August 2020.

77

78 Epidemics are largely driven by social mixing patterns and their quantification is useful for
79 transmission modelling purposes, as well as assessing adherence to regulations and
80 identifying sociodemographic factors associated with heterogeneities in contact rate.^[9–11]
81 The apparent association between social distancing restrictions and reduced case incidence
82 indicates that a nuanced understanding of how individuals' contact patterns vary could
83 inform behavioural interventions for the remainder of the outbreak. Previous contact studies
84 have provided estimates for age-specific contact rates in Great Britain and the UK.^[11–13] A
85 cross-sectional survey of UK adults early on during the lockdown beginning in March found a
86 substantial reduction in daily contact between people.^[14]

87

88 We conducted a cross-sectional online survey between 28 July and 14 August 2020 to
89 measure the mobility of people living in the UK, which locations people were frequenting, and
90 the number of non-household contacts people were making. We aimed to quantify non-
91 household contact behaviour and adherence to self-isolation and shielding guidance. The
92 study period coincided with the start of the second wave of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the UK,
93 when hospital admissions for COVID-19 were at their lowest rate since April.^[15]

94

95 **METHODS**

96

97 **Survey Methodology**

98 Data collection was conducted through an anonymous online questionnaire; the study was
99 branded the CoCoNet (COVID-19 Contact Network) survey. The survey was open to anyone
100 living in the UK at the time of the survey. There was no lower age limit for participation, with
101 children under 13 required to complete the survey with a parent or guardian. The inclusion
102 criteria for participants were that they completed the question on residency location and that
103 they were resident in the UK at the time of the survey.

104 The survey was promoted through a university press release, engagement with the media,
105 and posts on social media directing potential participants to the study website:
106 <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/health-and-medicine/research/coconet-study/>.

107

108 Demographic information from participants, including age, sex, ethnicity, home location (first
109 part of postcode) and their employment or school situation, was collected. Participants were
110 asked about their household size, as well as the formation and size of support bubbles they
111 may belong to. Participants were asked about their activities on the previous day (the contact
112 reporting day), including whether they left their household and the number and
113 characteristics of non-household contacts encountered. The questionnaire is presented in
114 Supplementary Material.

115

116 To reduce participant burden, a triage question on how many people participants had met
117 the previous day determined the level of information collected on contacts. Participants
118 reporting fewer than 15 contacts were asked to estimate the age of each contact they made,
119 whether they met the contact indoors or outdoors, and if anyone from their household had
120 also met that contact the same day. Participants who reported 15 or more contacts were
121 asked to estimate the number of contacts made with different age groups, and whether they
122 had met most of their contacts indoors or outdoors.

123

124 Responses recorded between 00:00BST 28 July and 18:00BST 14 August 2020 were included
125 in the analysis. Partial responses to the survey were analysed if the first compulsory question
126 asking which part of the UK a participant resided in was answered. If a participant exited the
127 online survey early, we used their responses up to and including the last question they saw.

128

129 **Primary and secondary outcome measurements**

130 Our primary outcome was non-household contact rate. A non-household contact was defined
131 as someone with whom the participant had a face-to-face conversation with, excluding
132 members of their own household. A participant who remained at home could still make non-
133 household contacts by having visitors to their home.

134

135 Secondary outcomes were whether contacts occurred indoors or outdoors, propensity to
136 leave home over a 7 day period, ability to socially distance, locations visited, furthest distance
137 travelled from home, and membership of support bubble.

138

139 **Descriptive analysis**

140 Representativeness was assessed by visual comparison of participant demographics with
141 respective Office for National Statistics (ONS) 2019 mid-year estimates.[\[16,17\]](#) The mean
142 number of non-household contacts was calculated and stratified by age, sex and household
143 size, and was compared to reported values from other social contact surveys. Adherence to
144 social distancing guidance was assessed by calculating the proportion of participants who left
145 home in the past 7 days, the distribution of furthest distance travelled in the past 7 days, and
146 the proportion of participants who felt able to maintain a recommended physical distance
147 during contact with others. Non-responses were excluded from analyses.

148

149 **Predictors of contact frequency**

150 To identify characteristics of the participant associated with their rate of daily non-household
151 contact we fitted a negative binomial model to the daily number of non-household contacts
152 reported by participants. Explanatory variables included in the model a priori were: age; sex;
153 ethnicity; nation of residence (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland or Wales); household size;
154 dwelling type; whether the contact reporting day was a weekend or week day; whether the
155 participant had left their home on the contact reporting day; participant's working situation;
156 participant's COVID-19 circumstance. To support our hypothesis-driven choice of model
157 parameters, we also conducted a forward stepwise model selection process, with our
158 previously selected explanatory variables used as candidate variables; see supplementary
159 materials. Statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.0.2.[\[18\]](#)

160

161 **Ethics Statement**

162 This study was approved by the Faculty of Health and Medicine Ethics Committee at Lancaster
163 University (reference FHMREC19135). Participation in the study was voluntary, with each
164 participant (and where appropriate parent or guardian) giving their consent before
165 proceeding.

166

167 **RESULTS**

168

169 **Participant demographics**

170 We received 5,383 survey responses recorded between 28 July 2020 and 14 August 2020;
171 5,143 responses met our inclusion criteria.[\[19\]](#) Most participants were aged 40-59 (55.3%,
172 2813/5090); Table 1, Figure 1A. We recorded fewer responses from participants in the
173 youngest age groups, 0-9 year olds (0.1%, 5/5090) and 10-19 year olds (0.7%, 38/5090), and
174 in the oldest age group, aged 80+ (0.4%, 21/5090). Males, non-white ethnicities, and residents
175 of Northern Ireland and Wales were under-represented in our sample.

176 **Mobility**

177 We found 33.7% (95% confidence interval (CI) 32.4 to 35.0) of participants left their home
178 every day over a 7-day period; Table 2. Over the same time period, most participants travelled
179 less than 10 miles from home, but some longer-range travel (50+ miles) occurred.

180

181 **Non-household contacts**

182 A total of 14,388 non-household contacts were recorded by 5,037 participants. The mean rate
183 of non-household contacts was 2.9 d⁻¹ (95%CI 2.7 to 3.0). This is a notably lower rate of non-
184 household contact than recorded from pre-pandemic surveys; Table S2. We found 33.4%
185 (95%CI 32.1 to 34.7) of participants made no non-household contacts. The degree distribution
186 of non-household contacts has a long right-hand tail (95th percentile: 10 contacts d⁻¹,
187 maximum 130 contacts d⁻¹); Figure 1B. We also quantified the non-household contact rate of
188 household members of participants; see supplementary materials.

189

190 Mean non-household contact rate varied by age and was highest among 10-19 year olds
191 (mean 3.6, 95%CI 1.6 to 6.5); Figure 1C. We found moderate assortative mixing by age, in line
192 with both current and pre-pandemic contact studies; Figure S1A. We found that the mean
193 daily non-household contact rate by participant age group was substantially lower when
194 compared to pre-pandemic POLYMOD study; see supplementary materials, Figure S1B. A
195 notable decrease in contact rate was found between people aged under 60 mixing with others
196 aged under 60, with the largest reduction in contact rate seen across all age groups when
197 mixing with 0-19 year olds; Figure S1B.

198

199 **Participant characteristics and non-household contact rate**

200 We identified the association of participant characteristics with the rate of non-household
201 contact using a multiple regression model; Figure 2, Table S3. We found no association of
202 non-household contact rate with sex or day of the week. Contact rate varied by participant
203 age: participants aged 30-39 (adjusted incidence rate ratio (aIRR) 0.86, 95% CI 0.76 to 0.97),
204 aged 40-49 (aIRR 0.90, 95%CI 0.82 to 1.00) and those aged 60-69 (aIRR 0.89, 95%CI 0.79 to
205 1.00) reported a lower rate of contact than participants aged 50-59. We found that Asian and
206 Asian British participants had a lower rate of contact than White participants (aIRR 0.54,
207 95%CI 0.36 to 0.82). Participants residing in Scotland had a lower contact rate than those
208 living in England (aIRR 0.80, 95%CI 0.68 to 0.95), whereas participants in Wales had a higher
209 contact rate (aIRR 1.22, 95%CI 0.99 to 1.50).

210

211 Leaving home was associated with a higher non-household contact rate than staying at home
212 (aIRR 5.58, 95%CI to 4.92 to 6.33). Attending a workplace (aIRR 3.33, 95%CI 3.02 to 3.66),
213 being self-employed (aIRR 1.63, 95%CI 1.43 to 1.87) or working in healthcare (aIRR 5.10,
214 95%CI 4.29 to 6.10) was associated with a significantly higher rate of non-household contact
215 than working at home.

216

217 **Social distancing characteristics of shielding and self-isolating individuals**

218 There were 353 (6.9%, 353/5073) participants who reported their COVID circumstance to be
219 shielding, either due to being a vulnerable individual or living with a vulnerable individual.
220 Additionally, 136 (2.7%, 136/5073) participants reported their COVID circumstance as self-
221 isolating. Shielding individuals tended to be older than non-shielding individuals; Table S4.

222

223 Shielding and self-isolating participants were less likely to leave their home compared to
224 those reporting their situation to be ‘not self-isolating or shielding’: 58.6% (95%CI 53.2 to
225 63.8) of shielding individuals, 52.6% (95%CI 43.8 to 61.2) of self-isolating individuals, and
226 82.7% (95%CI 81.6 to 83.8) of other participants reported leaving their home during the
227 contact day; Table S4. The majority of shielding and self-isolating participants adhered to
228 contemporary social distancing guidelines: 70.1% (95%CI 62.5 to 76.9) of shielding
229 participants and 73.6% (95%CI 59.7 to 84.7) of self-isolating participants reported maintaining
230 social distance at all time with contacts met the previous day; Table S4.

231
232 Shielding and self-isolating individuals made fewer contacts per day outside of the household
233 than non-shielding or isolating individuals. The unadjusted rate of non-household contact was
234 1.3 d⁻¹ (95%CI 1.1 to 1.5) amongst shielding participants, 1.2 d⁻¹ (95%CI 0.7 to 2.1) for self-
235 isolating participants and 3.1 d⁻¹ (95%CI 2.9 to 3.2) for participants who were not self-isolating
236 or shielding. After adjusting for other variables, we found vulnerable individuals shielding had
237 a marginally lower non-household contact rate than those not shielding or self-isolating (aIRR
238 0.82, 95%CI 0.66 to 1.01). Those self-isolating as a precaution or under Test and Trace
239 instructions had a lower non-household contact rate than individuals not shielding or self-
240 isolating (aIRR 0.58, 95%CI 0.43 to 0.79); Figure 2. Individuals who reported as self-isolating
241 with symptoms had a higher rate of non-household contact than those not self-isolating or
242 shielding (aIRR 4.05, 95%CI 1.94 to 9.72). However, a single participant in this group reported
243 a very large number of contacts on their contact day. This is not necessarily an example of
244 non-adherence to social distancing guidance, as contact day and current day are different
245 days. Our questionnaire design asked about contact on the day prior to completing the
246 survey, which would be the day of their current COVID-19 situation. When we exclude this
247 individual from our analysis we found no significant difference in contact rate; see Table S5.

248
249 **Ability to maintain social distancing**

250 Participants were asked how much of the time they were able to maintain social distance
251 from everyone they had met the previous day, excluding members of their household and
252 support bubble. We found 58.8% (95%CI 57.1 to 60.5) of participants felt able to maintain
253 social distancing at all times, while 2.7% (95%CI 2.2 to 3.4) felt unable to maintain social
254 distance at any time. We found that age and employment situation were associated with
255 being able to ‘maintain social distance more than half of the time’; Table S6. Participants aged
256 30-39 felt less able to maintain social distance more than half of the time compared to 50-59
257 year olds (adjusted odds ratio (aOR) 0.66, 95%CI 0.46 to 0.95). Healthcare professionals (aOR
258 0.26, 95%CI 0.17 to 0.40) and those attending their workplace in-person (aOR 0.71, 95%CI
259 0.53 to 0.96) were less likely to be able to maintain social distance than those working from
260 home.

261
262 **Location of encounters**

263 Transmission risk of SARS-CoV-2 is thought to be greater in enclosed, non-ventilated spaces
264 and lower in outdoor environments.[20] To assess how interactions may be distributed by
265 these settings, we asked participants reporting fewer than 15 individual contacts whether
266 each contact was made indoors or outdoors, and asked all participants if they met all or the
267 majority of contacts indoors or outdoors. The distribution of contacts by indoor/outdoor
268 setting was bimodal: nearly half of participants reported meeting all of their non-household
269 contacts indoors (48.8%, 95%CI 47.0 to 50.6), while 33.7% (95%CI 32.1 to 35.4) of participants

270 reported meeting all of their non-household contacts outdoors. We also explored the non-
271 household contacts of participants that remained at home (visitors); see supplementary
272 materials.

273

274 **DISCUSSION**

275

276 We found the daily rate of social contact was considerably lower than that measured prior to
277 2020, despite our study period corresponding to a time when the COVID-19 pandemic social
278 distancing restrictions were at their most relaxed during 2020 in the UK.[\[11–13,21\]](#) The Comix
279 study of UK social contact rates reported a greatly reduced rate in March 2020 which
280 increased during summer 2020, with the highest rate of contact recorded in August remaining
281 markedly lower than pre-pandemic contact rate estimates.[\[22\]](#) A similar increase in contact
282 rate following lockdown was observed by Latsuzbaia *et al.* in Luxembourg.[\[23\]](#)

283

284 Contact rates and ability to follow social distancing guidelines was associated with age and
285 occupation. The older age groups (70-79, 80+), those at highest risk of severe COVID-19
286 outcomes, had the lowest non-household contact rates, and they mixed most often with 20-
287 59 year olds. Individuals attending a workplace, or those self-employed or working in
288 healthcare, had a higher daily non-household contact rate than those working from home,
289 representing additional potential infection risk. A small proportion of participants reported
290 making a large number (more than 50) of non-household contacts; these were exclusively
291 participants who reported their employment situation as either attending their workplace in-
292 person or working as a healthcare professional. Although the UK government was
293 encouraging people to return to work at this time, we found that a high proportion of
294 employed individuals (70.0%, excluding healthcare workers and those self-employed)
295 continued to work from home.[\[24\]](#) In contrast to pre-pandemic contacts surveys, we found
296 no association between non-household contact rate and day of the week.[\[11,13\]](#)

297

298 Black and Asian individuals have been shown to be at increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection
299 in comparison to White individuals, possibly due to larger households, being more likely to be
300 employed as essential workers, and less able to work from home.[\[25,26\]](#) However, after
301 accounting for home-working, we found that individuals of Asian and Asian British ethnicity
302 had a significantly lower non-household contact rate than White participants. This suggests
303 that workplaces may be more dominant as a source of infection for these individuals than
304 previously thought. [\[27\]](#)

305

306 The majority of participants reported being able to maintain social distance from others more
307 than half of the time and very few participants reported failing to maintaining social distance
308 at all, a similar observation made in a UK behavioural cohort.[\[28\]](#) Healthcare professionals
309 and employees attending their workplace in-person were less able to maintain physical
310 distance from people they encountered than people working from home. This highlights the
311 increased risk of infection that some workers may face; occupations which require employees
312 to interact closely with a large number of people are associated with an increased likelihood
313 of exposure to COVID-19 and clusters of cases developing at a workplace.[\[29–31\]](#)

314

315 We found some evidence of non-adherence to self-isolating and shielding guidelines, with a
316 high proportion of self-isolating and shielding participants leaving their home the previous

317 day. Smith *et al.* also found low adherence to isolation instructions among the UK population
318 during March through August 2020.^[32] We found that a large proportion of self-isolating and
319 shielding participants (including those living with vulnerable individuals) made non-
320 household contacts, suggesting shielding and self-isolating individuals needed greater
321 support to further reduce their number of interactions and to minimise infection risk.

322
323 Participants who were self-isolating as a precautionary measure, or after having been
324 contacted by Test and Trace, reported fewer contacts than those not shielding or self-
325 isolating. However, participants self-isolating due to experiencing symptoms or when a
326 member of their household had symptoms did not have reduced contact rate, possibly due
327 to the small number of participants reporting these circumstances. Participants who reported
328 ‘not sure’ as their COVID circumstance had a significantly lower non-household contact rate
329 than those not self-isolating or shielding. This may have been due to a pause in shielding
330 guidance coinciding with the release of the survey, which may have left participants unsure
331 of their current circumstance.^[33–35]

332
333 This survey captured the point in time where cases were starting to consistently rise for the
334 first time since March 2020, with the reproduction number estimated to be between 0.8 and
335 1.1.^[15,36–38] The level of social mixing in the UK at the time of this survey enabled epidemic
336 growth.

337
338 This study was likely subject to recruitment bias, as the survey was online and open to anyone
339 living in the UK with no active recruitment process. The survey was under-represented by
340 children, teenagers, young adults and the very elderly, as well as ethnic minorities. In
341 particular, underrepresentation of the very elderly (80+) limited our ability to gain insight into
342 mixing patterns of the age group at highest risk of severe COVID-19 disease. Additionally, as
343 we asked participants to report their contact rate, the study may have suffered from recall
344 bias. If a participant reported meeting 15 or more contacts, information was asked about their
345 contacts collectively rather than as individual interactions. When grouping contacts into age
346 groups, participants could select up to ‘20+’ contacts for each age group, which may have led
347 to us underestimating some participant’s non-household contact rates; see supplementary
348 materials. Participants were asked about their current COVID circumstance and contact
349 behaviour for consecutive days (contacts were those made the previous day), which may bias
350 the association of contact rate with COVID circumstance.

351 352 **Acknowledgements**

353 We would like to thank the participants of the study for providing their time and information,
354 and Prof Julia Gog OBE and Rev Richard Coles for helping to promote the survey.

355 356 **Contributions**

357 JREB, CPJ and JMR all conceived and designed the study. JREB conducted the analysis and
358 wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors edited the manuscript.

359 360 **Data Availability Statement**

361 Data are available in a public, open access repository. The survey data are available from
362 Lancaster University’s research directory at:

363 <https://doi.org/10.17635/lancaster/researchdata/476>. License: Creative Commons Attribution
364 licence (CC BY).

365

366 **Competing Interests**

367 We declare we have no competing interests.

368

369 **Funding**

370 JREB is supported by a Lancaster University Faculty of Health and Medicine doctoral
371 scholarship. JMR and CPJ were supported by UKRI through the JUNIPER modelling consortium
372 [grant number MR/V038613/1].

373

374 **References**

375

376 1 Cabinet Office. Staying at home and away from others (social distancing). Cabinet Office.
377 2020.[https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others)
378 [away-from-others/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others/full-guidance-on-staying-at-home-and-away-from-others) (accessed Aug
379 2020).

380 2 Department of Health and Social Care. Making a support bubble with another household.
381 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-a-support-bubble-with-another-household>
382 (accessed Sep 2020).

383 3 Department for Transport. Coronavirus (COVID-19): travel corridors.
384 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-travel-corridors> (accessed Sep 2020).

385 4 GOV.UK. Register your establishment for the Eat Out to Help Out Scheme. GOV.UK.
386 2020.[https://www.gov.uk/guidance/register-your-establishment-for-the-eat-out-to-help-out-](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/register-your-establishment-for-the-eat-out-to-help-out-scheme)
387 [scheme](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/register-your-establishment-for-the-eat-out-to-help-out-scheme) (accessed Feb 2021).

388 5 Cabinet Office. Staying alert and safe (social distancing).
389 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/staying-alert-and-safe-social-distancing>
390 (accessed Aug 2020).

391 6 NI direct government services. Coronavirus (COVID-19).
392 2020.<https://www.nidirect.gov.uk/campaigns/coronavirus-covid-19> (accessed Sep 2020).

393 7 Scottish government. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Phase 3: Scotland's route map update.
394 2020.[https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-framework-decision-making-](https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-framework-decision-making-scotlands-route-map-through-out-crisis-phase-3-update/pages/8/)
395 [scotlands-route-map-through-out-crisis-phase-3-update/pages/8/](https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-framework-decision-making-scotlands-route-map-through-out-crisis-phase-3-update/pages/8/) (accessed Sep 2020).

396 8 Welsh Government. Coronavirus (COVID-19) social distancing guidance for everyone in Wales.
397 2020.<https://gov.wales/coronavirus-social-distancing-guidance> (accessed Sep 2020).


398 9 Wallinga J, Teunis P, Kretzschmar M. Using data on social contacts to estimate age-specific
399 transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents. *Am J Epidemiol*
400 2006;**164**:936–44. doi:10.1093/aje/kwj317.

401 10 Read JM, Edmunds WJ, Riley S, *et al*. Close encounters of the infectious kind: methods to
402 measure social mixing behaviour. *Epidemiol Infect* 2012;**140**:2117–30.
403 doi:10.1017/S0950268812000842.

- 404 11 Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, *et al.* Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of
405 infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* 2008;**5**:e74. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074.
- 406 12 Danon L, Read JM, House TA, *et al.* Social encounter networks: characterizing Great Britain.
407 *Proc Biol Sci* 2013;**280**:20131037. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.1037.
- 408 13 Klepac P, Kucharski AJ, Conlan AJK, *et al.* Contacts in context: large-scale setting-specific social
409 mixing matrices from the BBC Pandemic project. *Epidemiology*. 2020.
- 410 14 Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, *et al.* Quantifying the impact of physical distance
411 measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Med* 2020;**18**:124.
412 doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01597-8.
- 413 15 Public Health England. Coronavirus (COVID-19) in the UK. 2020.<https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk>
414 (accessed Aug 2020).
- 415 16 Office for National Statistics. Estimates of the population for the UK, England and Wales,
416 Scotland and Northern Ireland, 2020.
417 2020.[https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/popu](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland)
418 [lationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernirela](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland)
419 [nd](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland) (accessed Aug 2020).
- 420 17 Office for National Statistics. Families and households.
421 2019.[https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/fa](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/families/datasets/familiesandhouseholds)
422 [milies/datasets/familiesandhouseholds](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/families/datasets/familiesandhouseholds) (accessed Aug 2020).
- 423 18 The R Project for Statistical Computing. <https://www.r-project.org/> (accessed 19 Aug 2020).
- 424 19 Bridgen J, Jewell C, Read J. CoCoNet manuscript data. 2021.
425 doi:10.17635/LANCASTER/RESEARCHDATA/476.
- 426 20 Nishiura H, Oshitani H, Kobayashi T, *et al.* Closed environments facilitate secondary
427 transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). *MedRxiv* Published Online First:
428 2020.<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.02.28.20029272v1.abstract>.
- 429 21 Eames KTD, Tilston NL, Brooks-Pollock E, *et al.* Measured dynamic social contact patterns
430 explain the spread of H1N1v influenza. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2012;**8**:e1002425.
431 doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002425.
- 432 22 Jarvis CI, Gimma A, van Zandvoort K, *et al.* The impact of local and national restrictions in
433 response to COVID-19 on social contacts in England: a longitudinal natural experiment. *BMC*
434 *Med* 2021;**19**:52. doi:10.1186/s12916-021-01924-7.
- 435 23 Latsuzbaia A, Herold M, Bertemes J-P, *et al.* Evolving social contact patterns during the COVID-
436 19 crisis in Luxembourg. *PLoS One* 2020;**15**:e0237128. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0237128.
- 437 24 GOV UK. Prime Minister's statement on coronavirus (COVID-19): 17 July 2020.
438 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-on-coronavirus-17-july-2020>
439 (accessed 2021).
- 440 25 Sze S, Pan D, Nevill CR, *et al.* Ethnicity and clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review
441 and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020;**29**:100630. doi:10.1016/j.eclim.2020.100630.


- 442 26 Public Health England. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19. 2020.
- 443 27 Office for National Statistics. Updating ethnic contrasts in deaths involving the coronavirus
444 (COVID-19), England and Wales: deaths occurring 2 March to 28 July 2020. ONS.
445 2020.<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/articles/updatingethniccontrastsindeathsinvolvingthecoronaviruscovid19englandandwales/latest> (accessed Jan 2021).
447
- 448 28 Fancourt D, Bu F, Mak HW, *et al.* Covid-19 Social Study Results Release 25. UCL 2020.
- 449 29 Office for National Statistics. Which occupations have the highest potential exposure to the
450 coronavirus (COVID-19)?
451 2020.<https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/articles/whichoccupationshavethehighestpotentialexposuretothecoronaviruscovid19/2020-05-11> (accessed Aug 2020).
452
453
- 454 30 European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. COVID-19 clusters and outbreaks in
455 occupational settings in the EU/EEA and the UK.
456 2020.<https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/covid-19-clusters-and-outbreaks-occupational-settings-eueea-and-uk> (accessed 2021).
457
- 458 31 Industrial Injuries Advisory Council. COVID-19 and occupation: position paper 48. 2021.
- 459 32 Smith LE, Potts HWW, Amlot R, *et al.* Adherence to the test, trace and isolate system: results
460 from a time series of 21 nationally representative surveys in the UK (the COVID-19 Rapid
461 Survey of Adherence to Interventions and Responses [CORSAIR] study). *MedRxiv* Published
462 Online First: 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.09.15.20191957.
- 463 33 Department of Health and Social Care. Updates to the shielding programme on national and
464 regional levels. 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/updates-to-the-shielding-programme-on-national-and-regional-levels> (accessed Sep 2020).
465
- 466 34 NI direct government services. Coronavirus (COVID-19): pausing of shielding for extremely
467 vulnerable people. 2020.<https://www.nidirect.gov.uk/articles/coronavirus-covid-19-pausing-shielding-extremely-vulnerable-people> (accessed Sep 2020).
468
- 469 35 Scottish government. Shielding to be paused. 2020.<https://www.gov.scot/news/shielding-to-be-paused/> (accessed Sep 2020).
470
- 471 36 Children’s Task and Finish Group. Update on Children, Schools and Transmission.
472 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/tfc-children-and-transmission-4-november-2020> (accessed May 2021).
473
- 474 37 Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies. SPI-M-O: Consensus statement on COVID-19, 12
475 August 2020. GOV.UK. 2020.<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/spi-m-o-consensus-statement-on-covid-19-12-august-2020> (accessed Jun 2021).
476
- 477 38 Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies. SPI-M-O Consensus Statement on COVID-19, 19
478 August 2020. GOV.UK.
479 2020.https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/916883/spi-m-o-consensus-statement-s0702-sage-52-200819.pdf (accessed Jun
480
481 2021).

482 Figures
483



485 **Figure 1.** (A) Age and sex distribution of participants with ONS 2019 mid-year estimates. (B) Degree distribution of non-zero contacts. (C)
486 Distribution of reported non-zero contact rate by age group. Note, log scale of x-axis in B and C.

487
488
489



491

492

Figure 2. Adjusted incidence rate ratios for number of non-household contacts reported for selected variables.

493 **Tables**

494

495 **Table 1:** Participant demography and UK ONS 2019 mid-year estimates. N is the number of
496 participants who provided a response to the question.

	Number of participants (%)	UK ONS mid-year estimates (2019)*
Age group (N = 5,090)[†]		
0-9	5 (0.1%)	12.0%
10-19	38 (0.7%)	11.4%
20-29	256 (5.0%)	13.0%
30-39	598 (11.7%)	13.3%
40-49	1183 (23.2%)	12.6%
50-59	1630 (32.0%)	13.6%
60-69	1065 (20.9%)	10.7%
70-79	294 (5.8%)	8.4%
80+	21 (0.4%)	5.0%
Sex (N = 5,090)[†]		
Female	4017 (78.9%)	50.6%
Male	1051 (20.6%)	49.4%
Prefer not to say	22 (0.4%)	-
Ethnicity (N = 5,090)		
White	4880 (95.9%)	86.0%
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups	49 (1.0%)	2.2%
Asian/Asian British	50 (1.0%)	7.5%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	11 (0.2%)	3.3%
Other ethnic groups	7(0.1%)	1.0%
Prefer not to say	16 (0.3%)	-
No response	77 (1.5%)	-
Nation (N = 5,143)[†]		
England	4714 (91.7%)	84.3%
Northern Ireland	33 (0.6%)	2.8%
Scotland	254 (4.9%)	4.7%
Wales	142 (2.8%)	8.2%
Household size (N = 5,073)[†]		
1	878 (17.3%)	29.5%
2	1911 (37.7%)	34.5%
3	987 (19.5%)	15.4%
4	907 (17.9%)	13.9%

	Number of participants (%)	UK ONS mid-year estimates (2019)*
5	287 (5.7%)	4.5%
6+	103 (2.0%)	2.1%

497 * Ethnicity estimates from 2011 census data.

498 † Question required a response from participants to progress through the online survey.

499

500 **Table 2:** Ability of participants to social distance, membership and size of support bubbles,
501 locations visited and mobility of participants. N is the number of participants who provided
502 a response to the question.

	Number of participants (%)
Maintaining social distance yesterday (N = 3,249) [†]	
All of the time	1910 (58.8%)
More than half of the time	934 (28.7%)
Less than half of the time	296 (9.1%)
None of the time	89 (2.7%)
Not sure	20 (0.6%)
Part of a support bubble (N = 5,066) [†]	
Yes	2029 (40.1%)
No	3037 (59.9%)
Support bubble size (N = 2,011)	
1	866 (43.1%)
2	560 (27.8%)
3	229 (11.4%)
4	201 (10.0%)
5+	155 (7.7%)
No response	18
Frequency of leaving home in past 7 days (N = 4,896)	
0 days	82 (1.7%)
1 day	281 (5.7%)
2 days	518 (10.6%)
3 days	605 (12.4%)
4 days	568 (11.6%)
5 days	650 (13.3%)
6 days	537 (11.0%)
7 days	1650 (33.7%)
Not sure	5 (0.1%)
No response	30
Locations visited yesterday (N = 4,034)	
Someone's home	615 (15.2%)
School or workplace	612 (15.2%)
Doctor's surgery or healthcare facility	182 (4.5%)
Supermarket or convenience store	1473 (36.5%)
Other shops or retail spaces	596 (14.8%)

	Number of participants (%)
Restaurant, café or pub	553 (13.7%)
For a walk or exercise	2178 (54.0%)
Other	808 (20.0%)
No response	0
Furthest distance travelled in past 7 days (N = 4,913)	
Under 2 miles	886 (18.0%)
2 - 9 miles	1682 (34.2%)
10 - 19 miles	848 (17.3%)
20 - 49 miles	669 (13.6%)
50+ miles	828 (16.9%)
No response	13

503 † Question required a response from participants to progress through the online survey.