

Measuring and increasing rates of self-isolation in the context of infectious diseases: A systematic review with narrative synthesis

Louise E Smith (0000-0002-1277-2564),^{1,2} Alex F Martin (0000-0003-1097-1137),^{1,2} Samantha K Brooks (0000-0003-3884-3583),^{1,2} Rachel Davies (0000-0002-3498-172X),^{1,2} Madeline V Stein (0000-0001-7612-6089),^{1,4} Richard Amlôt (0000-0003-3481-6588),^{1,3} Theresa M Marteau (0000-0003-3025-1129),⁵ G James Rubin (0000-0002-4440-0570)^{1,2}

1 King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience

2 NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emergency Preparedness and Response

3 UK Health Security Agency, Behavioural Science and Insights Unit

4 Department of Psychology, King's College London

5 University of Cambridge, Department of Public Health and Primary Care

Corresponding author: Louise E Smith, Research Fellow. Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London, Weston Education Centre, Cutcombe Road, London, SE5 9RJ, UK. Email: louise.e.smith@kcl.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: Self-isolation was used to prevent the spread of COVID-19 and will likely be used in future infectious disease outbreaks.

Method: We conducted a systematic review following PRISMA and SWiM guidelines. MEDLINE, PsycINFO, Embase, Web of Science, PsyArXiv, medRxiv, and grey literature sources were searched (1 January 2020 to 13 December 2022) using terms related to COVID-19, isolation, and adherence. Studies were included if they contained original, quantitative data of self-isolation adherence during the COVID-19 pandemic. We extracted definitions of self-isolation, measures used to quantify adherence, adherence rates, and factors associated with adherence. The review was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022377820).

Findings: We included 45 studies. Self-isolation was inconsistently defined. Only four studies did not use self-report to measure adherence. Of 41 studies using self-report measures, only one reported reliability; another gave indirect evidence for a lack of validity of the measure. Rates of adherence to self-isolation ranged from 0% to 100%. There was little evidence that self-isolation adherence was associated with socio-demographic or psychological factors.

Interpretation: There was no consensus in defining, operationalising, or measuring self-isolation. Only one study presented evidence of the psychometric properties of the measure highlighting the significant risk of bias in included studies. This, and the dearth of scientifically rigorous studies evaluating the effectiveness of interventions to increase self-isolation adherence, is a fundamental gap in the literature.

Funding: This study was funded by Research England Policy Support Fund 2022-23; authors were supported by the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emergency Preparedness and Response.

Words: 248/250

Keywords: COVID-19; isolation; quarantine; definitions; measures; adherence; factors associated

Introduction

Isolation is the separation of those who are ill from those who are well, while quarantine is the separation of those at risk of developing an illness from those who are well. [1] During the COVID-19 pandemic, many countries implemented isolation and quarantine orders which required people to stay at home (or in supported isolation such as a hotel) and not leave except for very few reasons (e.g., to take or return a COVID-19 test). These differed to population-wide “stay-at-home” or “lockdown” orders (also known as “mass quarantine”), where people were required to stay at home, but could leave to buy essentials (groceries / pharmacy) and for exercise. In this paper we refer to both isolation and quarantine as “self-isolation”.

Self-isolation of suspected COVID-19 cases and their household members could substantially reduce transmission. [2] However, self-isolation only succeeds when people adhere to it. A rapid review of adherence to self-isolation in 14 studies (all conducted before the COVID-19 pandemic) found rates of 0% to 93% adherence. [3] Low adherence may be partly explained by self-isolation’s significant financial, psychological and practical implications. [3] The COVID-19 pandemic caused researchers, public health practitioners, and policy-makers to focus on self-isolation as a prevention measure for infection, [4] revealing several uncertainties. [5]

First, it remains unclear how adherence should be defined and operationalised. Should the denominator be everyone in the population with relevant symptoms who has not tested negative, or only the subset who are in contact with public health teams (e.g., who have received a positive test)? Similarly, which forms of non-adherence should we be concerned about? For research and surveillance purposes, it may be easiest to have a clear-cut definition in which any infraction of the guidance counts as non-adherence. However, qualitative research suggests that while people may break self-isolation rules, they often do so in ways that do not pose a substantial transmission risk. [6] Definitions of non-adherence need to be clear as to whether they are measuring complete adherence to guidelines, or avoidance of behaviours that pose a more than trivial risk of transmission.

Second, adherence can be measured in different ways. During the pandemic, online surveys were a common way to collect data quickly, cheaply, and safely, despite limitations in sampling strategies and representativeness of participants. [7] Self-report measures are subject to response bias, and rates of self-reported and observed behaviour often differ. [8] Other measures of self-isolation included geofencing, [9] in-person spot checks, [10] and assessment of contact tracing data for contacts who later became cases. Each has advantages and disadvantages in terms of cost, acceptability, reliability, and validity.

Third, improving adherence to self-isolation while also reducing its burden on individuals and society is a scientific and policy priority. [11] Research into how best to do this depends upon reducing the uncertainties described above.

This systematic review describes and appraises 1) definitions of self-isolation used in studies during the COVID-19 pandemic, 2) measures used to quantify adherence and their reliability, validity, and acceptability, 3) rates of self-isolation adherence, and 4) factors associated with adherence.

Methods

We conducted a systematic review in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist (see Supplement S1) and guidance by Cochrane. [12]

A protocol was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022377820). Deviations from the protocol are outlined in Supplement S2.

Search strategy and selection criteria

Databases (MEDLINE, PsycINFO, Embase, Web of Science, PsyArXiv, medRxiv) were searched from 1 January 2020 to 13 December 2022. The search strategy included terms for COVID-19, isolation and quarantine (combined with NOT social isolation), and adherence and compliance. The search was also used for another systematic review carried out in parallel, investigating the effect of self-isolation on wellbeing (full search terms in Supplement S3). [13] Screening for both reviews was conducted together until the full-text screening stage.

We conducted grey literature searches, including a) five grey literature databases, b) relevant UK Government public health agency and statistical agency pages, and other behavioural studies, c) Google searches, and d) making enquiries with relevant UK Government agencies (Supplement S3). References of included citations were also searched.

LES, AFM, SKB, RD, MVS, and GJR screened citations. To ensure consistency, all authors initially screened the same 300 citations, discussing queries and discrepancies until agreement on included studies was reached. Authors then independently screened citations, meeting weekly to discuss queries and reaching group agreement through discussion.

Studies were included in the review if they contained original, quantitative data of adherence to self-isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic. For this review, we defined self-isolation as anyone advised (either directly by a public health team, or via widely disseminated public health guidance) to avoid contact with others because they were known or suspected to have COVID-19 or because they were suspected to be incubating COVID-19. Studies that reported attitudes or intentions to self-isolate (vs completed behaviour), or adherence to other social mobility rules (e.g., lockdown, physical distancing) were excluded. Studies were excluded if more than 5% of the sample were reported to be isolating in hospital. No exclusions were made based on participant characteristics or language of publication. Where studies were not published in English, relevant full texts were translated. Where queries around inclusion were not solved by discussion, the corresponding author of the study was contacted for clarification. If no response was received, the study was excluded.

Data analysis

Study characteristics (country, dates of data collection, study design, inclusion criteria, response rate), self-isolation characteristics (reason, duration, location), participant characteristics (gender, age), definition of self-isolation, adherence measure (reliability, validity, acceptability), rates of adherence, and factors associated with adherence were extracted by LES. Where studies reported different methods to measure adherence, we treated each as a separate study.

Risk of bias for rates of adherence to self-isolation was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute Prevalence Critical Appraisal Tool, [14, 15] a recommended tool for prevalence estimates. [16, 17] We made some amendments to the tool (Supplement S4). Associations with adherence to self-isolation were appraised using the Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies - of Exposure (ROBINS-E) tool [18] or the Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies - of Interventions (ROBINS-I) tool, depending on study design. [19] For each study, we assessed the most rigorous analysis conducted (e.g., multivariable regressions, over unadjusted regressions). Studies were rated as having low risk of bias (ROBINS-I “low”), some concerns (ROBINS-I “moderate”), high risk of bias (ROBINS-I “serious”), or very high risk of bias (ROBINS-I “critical”) based on the algorithms provided by the tools. LES completed risk of bias ratings.

Results were narratively synthesised for each of the review aims separately. Results are reported in line with synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) reporting guidelines. [20] A meta-analysis was not planned due to likely heterogeneity between studies (methods and materials) and definitions of self-isolation used. For brevity, details of analysis for each outcome are reported in Supplement S5.


Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Results

The search identified 15,277 reports (citations). Sixty-five reports were included; 35 from database and register searches and 30 from other searches (Figure 1). Two manuscripts each described two separate methods to measure adherence to self-isolation (Hood et al 2022 [21]: case interview, survey. Rubio et al 2021 [22]: survey, random home visits and calls). We treated these as separate studies. In total, reports described results from 45 studies.

Figure 1. Flowchart of study selection



*At this stage, citation screening was completed for this systematic review and the systematic review investigating the effect of self-isolation on wellbeing. Therefore, these totals include citations screened for the systematic review investigating the effect of self-isolation on wellbeing as well as for this systematic review.

Study characteristics

Thirty studies used a cross-sectional design, with a further four using a series of cross-sectional studies (Table 1). Seven studies used a longitudinal design, one was a non-randomised comparative design, one a case series, one a retrospective chart review, and one was secondary data analysis. In 18 studies participants were COVID-19 cases (or suspected cases), five studies investigated contacts of cases, six studies investigated cases and contacts, five studies investigated people with COVID-19-like symptoms, and three studies investigated people returning from travel (Table 1). Other studies used a combination of self-isolation reasons (Table 1). Seventeen studies were conducted in Europe, eight in the Middle East, seven in North America, three each in Africa, South Asia and East Asia, two in West Asia, and one each in Australasia and Southeast Asia (Table 1).

Table 1. Study characteristics

Citation	Country (dates of data collection)	Study design	Study inclusion criteria (sample frame; sampling method; response rate)	Reason for self-isolation	Participant characteristics: total n; percentage female; age	Location of self-isolation
Ali-Saleh & Obeid 2022 [23]	Israel (16 to 19 October 2020)	Cross-sectional	People aged 18 years or older, who identified as Muslims, Christians, or Druze, living in Israel (social media e.g., Facebook and WhatsApp; self-selected response to adverts, snowballing; not reported)	Positive COVID-19 test, been exposed to a confirmed case, or returned from abroad	N=810; 79.1%; 17.9% 18 to 25 years, 22.5% 26 to 35 years, 56.8% 36 to 45 years, 2.8% 46 to 55 years Of these, n=262 reported "being required to be in quarantine at some point"	Not reported, presumed most at home
Almaghrabi 2021 [24]	Saudi Arabia (1 to 25 April 2020)	Cross-sectional	"All accessible Saudi population" (not reported; consecutive sampling; not reported)	"You or family member was abroad during the last 2 weeks"	N=1988; 33.9%; 33.9% less than 25 years, 29.7% 25 to 34 years, 24.0% 35 to 44 years, 12.3% 44 to 88 years Of these, n=126 had been abroad or family member had been abroad during the last 2 weeks	Item measuring adherence said "stayed at home"
Almayahi & Al Lamki 2022 [25]	Oman (15 November to 22 December 2020)	Cross-sectional	People belonging to South Batinah Governorate who were aged 18 years and over, had a positive PCR test for COVID-19 prior to 6 November 2020, and who were listed in the South Batinah Governorate disease surveillance database ("complete list of all patients was provided by the Department of Disease Surveillance and Control"; systematic random sampling; 95%)	Positive PCR case	N=379; 39.1%; 39.3% 30 years or under, 39.3% 31 to 40 years, 21.4% over 40	93.1% home isolation. 6.9% governmental, work or separate isolation
Aslaner et al 2022 [26]	Turkey (not reported)	Cross-sectional	People aged 65 to 80 years who had tested positive (PCR) for COVID-19, or who had been in contact with a positive case between 30 September 2020 and 10 January 2021 ("COVID-19 cases between the ages of 65 and 80 whose RT-PCR test results are	Positive PCR test, or negative PCR test and contact with confirmed case	N=656; 50.5%; mean age 69.9 years (± 5.7)	"At home"

			positive/negative according to the records of the Kayseri Provincial Health Directorate Public Health Services”; not reported; 81% of those reached [not reported how many people were attempted to be reached])			
Bannour et al 2021 [27]	Tunisia (November 2020)	Prospective longitudinal	Patients with COVID-19 isolated at home (new declared cases in the governorate of Sousse; random sampling; not reported)	COVID-19 case	N=375; 60%; median age 40 years, interquartile range 29.75 to 54.25	“At home”
Bara’a et al 2021 [28]	Sudan (November to December 2020)	Cross-sectional	People aged 18 years or over, of Sudanese nationality (not reported; not reported; not reported)	“Having symptoms suggesting COVID-19 infection in the middle of the second wave”	N=3399; 68%; 80.6% 18 to 32 years, 13.0% 33 to 47 years, 5.1% 48 to 62 years, 1.2% over 62 years Of these, n=2075 had symptoms suggesting COVID-19 infection	Not reported, presumed most at home
Carlsen et al 2020 [29]	Norway (MoBa. 18 August to 13 October 2020. NorFlu. 14 August to 8 October 2020)	Longitudinal cohorts (The Norwegian Mother, Father and Child Cohort Study [MoBa]. The Norwegian Influenza Pregnancy Cohort [NorFlu])	MoBa. Not reported (children and their parents, recruited during weeks 15-18 of gestation between 1999 and 2008; not reported; 55% to 83% for different survey waves). NorFlu. Not reported (pregnant women during the swine flu pandemic in 2009/10; not reported; 72% to 75% for different survey waves).	Being ill “with symptoms from the airways, had been feeling ill or had fever”. Having been tested for COVID-19. If tested, having a positive COVID-19 test. Having confirmed or suspected diagnosis of COVID-19 from a physician.	Round 11. N=64,318; 70%; 0.9% 25 to 34 years, 9.8% 35 to 39 years, 28.6% 40 to 44 years, 37.0% 45 to 49 years, 18.9% 50 to 54 years, 4.5% 55 to 59 years, 1.0% 60+ years. Round 12. N=91,109; 63%; 0.8% 25 to 34 years, 8.6% 35 to 39 years, 28.2% 40 to 44 years, 37.1% 45 to 49 years, 19.4% 50 to 54 years, 4.8% 55 to 59 years, 1.2% 60+ years. Round 13. N=83,795; 62%; 0.8% 25 to 34 years, 8.5% 35 to 39 years, 28.0% 40 to 44 years, 37.0% 45 to 49 years, 19.6% 50 to 54 years, 4.9%	Not reported, presumed most at home

					<p>55 to 59 years, 1.2% 60+ years.</p> <p>Round 12. N=88,566; 63%; 0.8% 25 to 34 years, 8.5% 35 to 39 years, 28.0% 40 to 44 years, 37.0% 45 to 49 years, 19.5% 50 to 54 years, 4.9% 55 to 59 years, 1.2% 60+ years.</p> <p>III. N=10,676 men. M=25,757 women.</p> <p>Tested for COVID-19. N=5960 men. N=13,946 women.</p> <p>Positive COVID-19 test. N=501 men. N=1222 women.</p> <p>Doctor diagnosis. N=52 men. N=64 women.</p>	
Domenghino et al 2022 [30]	Switzerland (6 August 2020 to 19 January 2021)	Prospective observational, population-based cohort	People with positive PCR test between 6 August 2020 and 19 January 2021, aged 18 years or older, living in Canton of Zurich, with sufficient knowledge of German language (Department of Health of the Canton of Zurich list of all SARS-CoV-2 cases diagnosed between 6 August 2020 and 19 January 2021; age-stratified random sample; 34.5%)	PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection	N=1105; 55.1%; 31.1% 18 to 39 years, 40.5% 40 to 64 years, 28.3% 65+ years	95.0% at home, 1.8% at someone else's home, 2.4% in hospital, 0.1% at a social institution, 0.2% in a hotel, 1.7% other, 1.2% missing [participants could select more than one answer]
Dowthwaite et al 2021 [31, 32]	United Kingdom (11 to 21 December 2020)	Cross-sectional	People aged 16 to 75 years living in the UK (Ipsos MORI panel; quota sampling; not reported)	People who had tested positive for COVID-19, had a household member test positive, or who had been asked to self-isolate in any form via the app or other means	N=1001; 50.0%; 87.3% under 65 years, 12.7% 65+ years Of these, n=434 had been asked to self-isolate (n=40 tested positive for COVID-19, n=141 household member tested positive [n=64 close member of my family, n=87 nonfamily member], n=85	Not reported, presumed most at home

					had been asked to self-isolate by any means; NB – participants could select more than one response, therefore individual ns may not add up to the total) Of participants with the app, n=66/490 had been notified to self-isolate	
Elaraby et al 2022 [33]	Egypt (November 2020 to April 2021)	Retrospective longitudinal	People aged 18 years or older, diagnosed with traumatic spinal cord injury and permanently using a wheelchair living in Egypt in July to December 2019 and November 2020 to April 2021 (social media; convenience and snowballing, self-selected response to adverts; not reported)	“Even if have minor symptoms such as cough, headache, mild fever”	N=115; 4.3%; mean age=29.89 years, SD=6.70	“At home”
Enticott et al 2021 [34]	Australia (1 to 5 May 2020, 1 to 7 July 2020)	Longitudinal	People aged 18 years or older who resided in Australia (cross-panel market research provider; quota sampling [sample of second survey consisted of people who had completed the first survey and new responses]; survey 1, 10%. Survey 2, 63% [completed both surveys])	“You have or you believe you have the virus” “If you have been in contact for over 15 min with others who are awaiting test results” “If you have symptoms and are awaiting a COVID-19 result” “If you have had close contact with a confirmed case”	First survey wave. N=1005; 49.7%; 9% 18 to 29 years, 19.2% 30 to 39 years, 16.1% 40 to 49 years, 20.2% 50 to 59 years, 19.1% 60 to 69 years, 16.7% + years, 0.1% missing Of these, data were available for n=395 for adherence to self-quarantine Second survey wave. N=1051; 48.2%; 25.3% 18 to 29 years, 16.0% 30 to 39 years, 14.7% 40 to 49 years, 15.7% 50 to 59 years, 12.6% 60 to 69 years, 15.8% + years, 0.0% missing Of these, data were available for n=373 for adherence to self-quarantine if you have	Item about quarantining if you have symptoms and are awaiting test results mentions self-quarantining “at home”. Not reported for other items, presumed most at home

					or believe you have the virus, n=343 if you have been in contact for over 15 min with others who are awaiting test results, n=416 if you have symptoms and are awaiting a COVID-19 result, n=379 if you have had close contact with a confirmed case	
Eraso & Hills 2021 [35]	England (1 to 31 May 2020)	Cross-sectional	People aged 18 years or older, and resident in selected North London boroughs (authors' university website and social media accounts, local newspapers, North London Facebook community groups; self-selected response to adverts; not reported)	People who had experienced COVID-19 symptoms or those who lived with someone who had COVID-19 symptoms	N=255; 82.7%; mean age 40.68 years, SD = 12.492, range 21 to 75 years Of these n=209 experienced COVID-19 symptoms oneself and n=150 lived with someone who had experienced symptoms (NB – participants could select more than one response, therefore individual ns may not add up to the total)	Not reported, presumed most at home
Eslamzadeh et al 2022 [36]	Iran (June to November 2020)	Cross-sectional	People aged 18 to 70 years old and able to fill in internet-based questionnaires. People with a psychiatric diagnosis were excluded (COVID-19 patients in three public hospitals in Mashad who were referred to outpatient services; convenience sampling; 68%)	Diagnosed with mild to moderate COVID-19	N=97; 44.3%; mean age = 39.21 years, SD = 10.27	"At home"
Farooq et al 2021 [37]	Pakistan (23 July to 22 August 2020)	Cross-sectional	Adult patients with COVID-19 admitted to one of the "Corona wards" at the Pakistan Institute of Medical Sciences (all adult COVID-19 patients admitted to one of the "Corona wards" at the Pakistan Institute of Medical Sciences, Islamabad, during May 2020 to August 2020. Paediatric contacts defined as "any child from 1 month	Paediatric contact of adult COVID-19 patient	Adult index case. N=100; 33%; mean age, 51.4 years, SD = 14.2 Paediatric contacts. N=137; 45%; mean age 6.6 years, SD = 3.6, range 6 months to 13 years	Not reported, presumed most at home

			to 13 years of age exposed from 2 to 14 days to a patient who was positive for COVID-19 and the contact occurred while they were ill as outlined by the National Institute of Health, Pakistan”; all eligible invited; 88%)			
Foroozanfar et al 2020 [38]	Iran (23 February to 28 April 2020)	Cross-sectional	People living in Qazvin province with a laboratory confirmed PCR test for COVID-19 who isolated at home after being discharged from hospital in Qazvin province (patients with a positive PCR test for COVID-19 who were hospitalized in Qazvin province from 23 February to 28 April 2020; random sampling; not reported)	Positive PCR test for COVID-19	N=320; 45·3%; 26·3% less than 39 years, 20·0% 40 to 49 years, 14·7% 50 to 59 years, 20·0% 60 to 69 years, 19·1% 70 years or over (mean age 52·25 years ±17·36)	“At home”
Fuchs et al 2021 [39]	United States of America (19 to 31 March 2020)	Retrospective cohort chart review	People with confirmed or suspected COVID-19 who were experiencing homelessness or unstable housing or living in dense congregate settings and were eligible for temporary stays in 5 designated isolation/quarantine hotels under the County of San Francisco’s alternative housing program (all those with records included; not applicable; not applicable)	People “who had COVID-19, were persons under investigation, or were close contacts with known SARS-CoV-2 exposures”	N=1009; 24%; 39% less than 40 years, 25% 40 to 49 years, 21% 50 to 59 years, 15% 60 years or over Of these, n=955 were included in analysis of retention and voluntary premature discontinuation	Isolation and quarantine hotel
Gasparini et al 2022 [40]	Italy (7 May to 30 June 2020)	Cross-sectional observational	People in home isolation or quarantine for COVID-19 between 7 May and 30 June 2020 (patients in home isolation or quarantine for COVID-19 and their relatives under the Nursing Home Service in Ancona and Pesaro Urbino; not reported; 97%)	People with COVID-19 or who had been in close contact with a COVID-19 case	N=32; 46·9%; mean age = 71·16 years, SD = 13·6, range 39 to 91 years	“Home isolation”
Hood et al 2022 [21]	United States of America (July 2020 to June 2021)	Cross-sectional	King County residents who were diagnosed with COVID-19 between July 2020 and June 2021 (people with a positive PCR or antigen test for	Positive COVID-19 test (PCR or antigen)	N=42,900; not reported; not reported	Not reported, presumed most at home

[case interview]			COVID-19 and who were assigned to Public Health – Seattle & King County case investigation and contact tracing program team [53% cases]; contact tracers prioritised attempts to contact cases based on geography and socio-demographics, program capacity, and epidemiologic trends; 87% in July to September 2020, 76% in April to June 2021)			
Hood et al 2022 [21] [survey]	United States of America (March 2021)	Cross-sectional	Cases aged 18 years and older who had completed their isolation period the prior day (COVID-19 cases assigned to the Public Health – Seattle & King County case investigation and contact tracing program; random sampling; 53%)	Positive COVID-19 test (PCR or antigen)	N=304; not reported; not reported	Not reported, presumed most at home
Kriens 2022 [41]	Netherlands (“weeks 43 through 53”)	Cross-sectional	People who tested positive by the Veiligheids-en Gezondheidsregio Gelderland-Midden or “GGD NOG” [abbreviation not spelled out]. People who were aged 15 years or under or who did not test positive were excluded (all those who tested positive invited; self-selected into study; not reported)	People who tested positive for COVID-19	N=13,135; 59.1%; 2.7% 16 to 17 years, 10.6% 18 to 24 years, 21.6% 25 to 39 years, 31.7% 40 to 45 years [NB – question states 40 to 54 years], 26.7% 55 to 69 years, 6.7% 70 to 81 years [NB – question states 70 to 84 years], 0.3% 85 years and older	Not reported, presumed most at home
Kyle et al 2021 [42, 43]	Wales (12 November and 1 December 2020)	Cross-sectional	People who had been successfully reached by NHS Wales Test Trace Protect after forward contact tracing and informed to self-isolate between 12 September 2020 and 22 October 2020, were aged 18 or over, and had completed a period of self-isolation of up to 14 days (adults in the NHS Wales Test Trace Protect database who had been forward contact traced and informed to self-isolate; quota sampling; 19.9%)	Contacts of confirmed COVID-19 cases	N=1011; 53.1%; 37.9% 18 to 29 years, 17.8% 30 to 39 years, 16.2% 40 to 49 years, 19.5% 50 to 59 years, 8.9% 60 to 69 years, 5.7% 70 years and older	“Home”

Li et al 2021 [44]	China (1 January to 8 February 2020)	Cross-sectional	People with mild COVID-19 who underwent home isolation under the guidance of doctors between 1 January to 8 February 2020 (adults who “obtained positive results for nucleic acids of SARS-CoV-2 or who were “confirmed by clinical symptoms and CT scans”; not reported; 100%)	Diagnosed with COVID-19	N=108; 46·3%; median age=49 years, range 20 to 82 years	“Home isolation”
Lou et al 2020 [45]	China (6 to 27 February 2020)	Cross-sectional	Paediatric patients admitted to the general fever clinic at Xiamen Children’s Hospital from 6 to 27 February 2020 with respiratory tract infection with body temperature over 37·3°C; mild disease that can be treated at home; fever without an epidemiological history of COVID-19 or fitting clinical diagnostic criteria for suspected COVID-19 cases; and who were informed of quarantine measures [general or intensive]. Children who were hospitalised within 7 days were excluded (paediatric patients admitted to the general fever clinic at Xiamen Children’s Hospital; not reported; n=82 did not co-operate with follow-up, n=19 excluded due to hospitalisation)	Experiencing fever and is suspected COVID-19 case	N=495; caregivers 42·22%. Patients 41·01%; caregivers 28·28% “young”, 34·75% “middle-aged”, 36·97% “elderly”. Patients 26·46% baby, 27·08% child, 24·44% pre-school child; 22·02 school-age child	“At home”
Martin et al 2021 [46]	England (recruited 11 to 23 December 2020 and 4 to 12 January 2021)	Non-randomised comparative cross-sectional	Adult contacts of confirmed COVID-19 cases who were invited to participate in seven days post exposure daily testing as an alternative to 10–14 days isolation, who had agreed to further contact from NHS Test & Trace. People who were eligible for inclusion in the daily testing trial but who were not offered it for capacity reasons and who had agreed to further contact	Contacts of COVID-19 case	Daily testing, at least one positive test result. N=54; 39%; 0% 18 to 24 years, 13% 25 to 34 years, 30% 35 to 44 years, 30% 45 to 54 years, 26% 55+ years, 2% no response Daily testing, only negative test results. N=265; 44%; 8% 18 to 24 years, 19% 25 to 34	“Home”

			from NHS Test & Trace (all eligible contacts of a confirmed COVID-19 case reported to NHS Test & Trace who were and were not offered daily testing invited; self-selected; 36.2% daily testing, 24.0% not offered daily testing)		years, 22% 35 to 44 years, 26% 45 to 54 years, 21% 55+ years, 5% no response Not offered daily testing. N=205; 63%; 6% 18 to 24 years, 18% 25 to 34 years, 16% 35 to 44 years, 20% 45 to 54 years, 38% 55+ years, 2% no response	
Mijovic et al 2021 [47]	England (June 2020, September 2020)	Retrospective cohort	Patients undergoing elective surgery at Princess Royal University Hospital (patients undergoing elective surgery; not reported; not reported)	Required to isolate before elective surgery	June cohort. N=25; not reported; not reported September cohort. N=36; not reported; not reported	Not reported, presumed most at home
Office for National Statistics 2021, 2022 [48-61]	England (1 to 13 February 2021, 8 to 13 March 2021, 12 to 16 April 2021, 10 to 15 May 2021, 7 to 12 June 2021, 5 to 10 July 2021, 27 September to 2 October 2021, 1 to 6 November 2021, 29 November to 4 December 2021, 4 to 8 January 2022, 7 to 12 February 2022, 28 February to 8 March 2022, 17 to 26 March 2022, 28 March to 2 April 2022)	Series of cross-sectional	Adults who had tested positive for COVID-19 and who reached day 10 of their self-isolation period [NB – dates for day 10 of self-isolation differed for different dates of data collection. See original publications for details] (Contact Tracing and Advice Service database, held by NHS Test and Trace [NB – this was no longer updated from 24 February 2022, so the sample was limited to those who had provided a valid phone number and who had been entered onto the database at the point of sampling]; random; 45% to 66% [77% to 78% after database no longer updated and sampling strategy changed; 13% to 20% of those when including cases where contact was attempted but not made, 20% to 28% after database no longer updated and sampling strategy changed])	Tested positive for COVID-19	1 to 13 February 2021. N=2552; 55%; 18% 18 to 29 years, 22% 30 to 39 years, 19% 40 to 49 years, 24% 50 to 59 years, 13% 60 to 69 years, 3% 70 to 79 years, 1% 80 years or over 8 to 13 March 2021. N=1122; 54%; 30% 18 to 34 years, 41% 35 to 54 years, 28% 55 years or over 12 to 16 April 2021. N=1168; 53%; 36% 18 to 34 years, 44% 35 to 54 years, 19% 55 years or over 10 to 15 May 2021. N=1044; 50%; 38% 18 to 34 years, 44% 35 to 54 years, 19% 55 years or over 7 to 12 June 2021. N=1090; 49%; 49% 18 to 34 years, 38% 35 to 54 years, 13% 55 years or over	Not reported, presumed most at home

5 to 10 July 2021. N=936;
51%; 52% 18 to 34 years,
32% 35 to 54 years, 15% 55
years or over

27 September to 2 October
2021. N=881; 60%; 15% 18 to
34 years, 49% 35 to 54 years,
35% 55 years or over

1 to 6 November 2021.
N=976; 54%; 13% 18 to 34
years, 46% 35 to 54 years,
42% 55 years or over

29 November to 4 December
2021. N=895; 52%; 16% 18 to
34 years, 50% 35 to 54 years,
34% 55 years or over

4 to 8 January 2022. N=792;
54%; 29% 18 to 34 years,
35% 35 to 54 years, 36% 55
years or over

7 to 12 February 2022.
N=1006; 57%; 24% 18 to 34
years, 43% 35 to 54 years,
34% 55 years or over

28 February to 8 March
2022. N=1369; 57%; 23% 18
to 34 years, 38% 35 to 54
years, 39% 55 years or over

17 to 26 March 2022.
N=1286; 59%; 14% 18 to 34
years, 38% 35 to 54 years,
48% 55 years or over

28 March to 2 April 2022.
N=765; 58%; 14% 18 to 34
years, 34% 35 to 54 years,
52% 55 years or over

Office for National Statistics 2021 [62-67]	England (1 to 6 March 2021, 15 to 20 March 2021, 1 to 10 April 2021, 19 to 24 April 2021, 4 to 8 May 2021, 1 to 5 June 2021, 28 June to 3 July 2021, 9 to 16 August 2021)	Series of cross-sectional	Adults who had been notified as being in contact with someone who has tested positive for COVID-19 and were required to self-isolate [NB – dates when started self-isolation differed for different dates of data collection. See original publications for details]. For data collected 15 to 30 March 2021, there was an additional inclusion criterion that participants lived in the three most deprived deciles [IMD deciles 1 to 3] (Contact Tracing and Advice Service database, held by NHS Test and Trace; random; 50% to 59% [14% to 19% of those when including cases where contact was attempted but not made])	Contact with someone who had tested positive for COVID-19	<p>1 to 6 March 2021. N=1212; 52%; 24% 18 to 29 years, 22% 30 to 39 years, 22% 40 to 49 years, 17% 50 to 59 years, 11% 60 to 69 years, 4% 70 to 79 years, 1% 80 years or over</p> <p>15 to 20 March 2021. N=1104; 52%; 28% 18 to 29 years, 25% 30 to 39 years, 21% 40 to 49 years, 15% 50 to 59 years, 7% 60 to 69 years, 2% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p> <p>1 to 10 April. N=1100; 42%; 26% 18 to 29 years, 24% 30 to 39 years, 23% 40 to 49 years, 14% 50 to 59 years, 9% 60 to 69 years, 2% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p> <p>19 to 24 April 2021. N=1194; 40%; 25% 18 to 29 years, 22% 30 to 39 years, 26% 40 to 49 years, 16% 50 to 59 years, 7% 60 to 69 years, 3% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p> <p>4 to 8 May 2021. N=918; 39%; 25% 18 to 29 years, 29% 30 to 39 years, 23% 40 to 49 years, 14% 50 to 59 years, 7% 60 to 69 years, 2% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p> <p>1 to 5 June 2021. N=968; 42%; 27% 18 to 29 years, 20% 30 to 39 years, 28% 40 to 49 years, 16% 50 to 59</p>	Not reported, presumed most at home
--	---	---------------------------	---	---	--	-------------------------------------

					<p>years, 5% 60 to 69 years, 3% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p> <p>28 June to 3 July 2021. N=990; 52%; 35% 18 to 29 years, 16% 30 to 39 years, 23% 40 to 49 years, 16% 50 to 59 years, 7% 60 to 69 years, 3% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p> <p>9 to 16 August 2021. N=946; 54%; 27% 18 to 29 years, 17% 30 to 39 years, 26% 40 to 49 years, 18% 50 to 59 years, 7% 60 to 69 years, 3% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p>	
Office for National Statistics 2021 [68]	England (24 to 29 May 2021, 14 to 19 June 2021, 12 to 17 July 2021)	Series of cross-sectional	Adults arriving in England from an amber list country or territory, were not exempt from quarantine requirements, and were isolating at an address in England (Passenger Locator Forms completed on arrival; random sampling; 12 to 17 June 2021. 50.8% of those successfully contacted [13.4% of those when including cases where contact was attempted but not made])	International travel	<p>24 to 29 May 2021. N=747; 45%; 29% 18 to 29 years, 26% 30 to 39 years, 18% 40 to 49 years, 17% 50 to 59 years, 7% 60 to 69 years, 4% 70 to 79 years, <1% 80 years or over</p> <p>14 to 19 June 2021. N=944; 47%; 27% 18 to 29 years, 25% 30 to 39 years, 19% 40 to 49 years, 15% 50 to 59 years, 10% 60 to 69 years, 3% 70 to 79 years, 1% 80 years or over</p> <p>12 to 17 July 2021. N=848, 48%; 28% 18 to 29 years, 24% 30 to 39 years, 17% 40 to 49 years, 15% 50 to 59 years, 12% 60 to 69 years, 4% 70 to 79 years, 1% 80 years or over</p>	Not reported, presumed most at home

Pinheiro et al 2022 [69, 70]	India (May to September 2020)	Cross-sectional	People returning to Kerala from abroad or from other states and who were in quarantine in the district of Alappuzha, Kerala, India (not reported; not reported; not reported)	International or domestic travel	N=182; 22%; mean age=35-92 years, SD=11-54 Of these, n=152 reported being in home quarantine at one point	16-5% institutional quarantine at COVID-19 care centres, 17-5% institutional quarantine first then home quarantine, 65-9% home quarantine only
Rifa'i et al 2022 [71]	Indonesia (10 to 15 August 2021)	Cross-sectional	People with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19, people who were self-isolating for COVID-19, people who had completed COVID-19 self-isolation (social media such as WhatsApp, Line, Instagram; convenience sampling; not reported)	People with COVID-19	N=165; 58-79%; 33-33% aged 10 to 29 years, 41-82% aged 30 to 49 years, 23-64% 50 to 69 years, 1-21% 70 to 89 years	"At home"
Ripon et al 2020 [72]	Bangladesh (10 to 29 May 2020)	Cross-sectional	Bangladeshi citizens with a positive PCR test who were 18 years or older and "were in quarantine then went home with cure during the COVID-19". Participants who did not have a job or who did not complete 10 th grade of school were excluded (social media, e.g., Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn; self-selected response to adverts; not reported)	Positive PCR test for COVID-19	N=5792; not reported; 17-3% 18 to 30 years, 32-5% 31 to 45 years, 30-1% 46 to 55 years, 19-8% over 55 years	68-2% home, 31-8% institutional
Robin et al 2022 [73]	England (July to November 2020)	Cross-sectional	COVID-19 cases and contacts who were contacted by Public Health England (all cases and contacts who were contacted by PHE's Health Protection Teams and who were recorded on Public Health England's case management system ["HPZone"] invited; all eligible invited; 9%)	COVID-19 cases or contacts, who were advised to self-isolate	N=322; 62-1%; median age = 48 years, inter-quartile range 35 to 58 Of these, n=250 were advised to self-isolate	"Home"
Rosca et al 2020 [74]	Israel (February to March 2020)	Case series	Patients and staff who were in contact with a COVID-19 infected employee (patients and staff who were in contact with a COVID-19 infected employee in an in-patient	Contact with confirmed COVID-19 case	Patients. N=22; 13-6%; not reported Staff. N=9; not reported; not reported.	Patients. 54-5% quarantined in the centre, 45-5%

			drug detoxification centre in the town of Eilaboon in northern Israel; all patients and staff in contact with the COVID-19 case; 100%)			released to quarantine at home Staff. 100% private homes
Rubio et al 2021 [22] [survey]	United States of America (29 July to 7 August 2020)	Cross-sectional	People with a positive PCR test for COVID-19 who were symptomatic. People who were asymptomatic and who had a known prior positive PCR test were excluded (all eligible people who took a test at the twice-weekly outdoor walk-up testing at the 24th and Mission Bay Area Rapid Transit station in the Mission District of San Francisco, California invited; all eligible invited; n=21 not reached by phone, n=4 declined clinical assessment)	Symptomatic COVID-19 case (not febrile)	N=145; 41%; not reported Of these, n=32 people “called for the 3-day self-reported adherence to isolation survey”	“Home”
Rubio et al 2021 [22] [random home visits and calls]	United States of America (29 July to 7 August 2020)	Cross-sectional	People with a positive PCR test for COVID-19 who were symptomatic. People who were asymptomatic and who had a known prior positive PCR test were excluded (all eligible people who took a test at the twice-weekly outdoor walk-up testing at the 24th and Mission Bay Area Rapid Transit station in the Mission District of San Francisco, California invited; all eligible invited; n=21 not reached by phone, n=4 declined clinical assessment)	Symptomatic COVID-19 case (not febrile)	N=145; 41%; not reported Random home visits and calls were made to a randomly selected subsample of 13 households	“Home”
Ryu et al 2022 [75]	South Korea (22 March to 10 June 2020)	Secondary data analysis	People with suspected or confirmed COVID-19, and people travelling from a country with high COVID-19 infection risk (people known to be in quarantine by the Korean Ministry of Interior and Safety; all published data; not applicable)	COVID-19 case, suspected COVID-19 case, people travelling from a country with high COVID-19 infection risk	Median number of individuals quarantined per day = 36,561 (IQR 34,408 to 41,961); not reported; not reported	“Quarantined place”

Sahin et al 2022 [76]	Turkey (August 2021)	Cross-sectional	People aged 18 to 65 years who used smartphones (not reported; snowballing; not reported)	When “you have symptoms of a cold” Return from travel abroad	N=1069; 68.5%; median age = 37 years, range 18 to 65 years) Of these, n=50 had travelled abroad in first period of pandemic, n=64 had travelled abroad in mid of pandemic, and n=59 had travelled abroad currently	“At home”
Scottish Government 2021 [77, 78]	Scotland (19 to 31 March 2021, 12 April to 5 May 2021, 10 May to 2 June 2021)	Cross-sectional	People aged 16 years or older and who were on /close to day 8 of isolation for being a COVID-19 case, contact or international traveller when invitations were issued (all eligible on Test and Protect system invited; self-selected into study; 7% to 9%)	COVID-19 case, close contact of a COVID-19 case, people returning from outside of UK (international travellers)	19 to 31 March 2021. N=917; not reported; not reported 12 April to 5 May 2021. N=1749; not reported; not reported 10 May to 2 June 2021. N=1660; not reported; not reported For total sample: 67% female; 14% 16 to 24 years, 18% 25 to 34 years, 23% 35 to 44 years, 24% 45 to 54 years, 21% 55 years or older From totals reported in data tables: n=915 COVID-19 cases, n=1161 contacts, n=2249 international travellers.	Not reported, presumed most at home for COVID-19 cases and contacts. Presumed at home and in supported isolation for international travellers
Senol & Avci 2022 [79]	Turkey (15 September to 30 November 2020)	Cross-sectional	Households in Afyonkarahisar that had more than one person living there, and where one adult had a positive PCR test for COVID-19 between 24 and 31 August 2020 [primary case had to be the first person in the household with COVID-19 and at least 48 hours had to have passed after symptom onset] (not	COVID-19 case or household contact of case	Primary case. N=701; 55.6%; 86.0% 18 to 59 years, 14.0% 60 years or older Household contact. N=1112; 50.3%; 83.5% 18 to 59 years, 16.5% 60 years or older Secondary case. N=485; 56.9%; 83.9% 18 to 59 years, 16.1% 60 years or older	Not reported, presumed most at home

			reported; not reported; not reported)			
			Secondary cases were household contacts who reported onset of symptoms 2 to 14 days after the onset of symptoms of the primary case			
Shewasinad Yehualashet et al 2021 [80]	Ethiopia (1 to 30 May 2020)	Cross-sectional	“Community based” (“family folders (list of households taken from health extension workers)”); multi-stage sampling – stratified into urban and rural and 30% districts selects, 27 kebeles selected randomly, systematic random sampling of family folders; not reported)	“When I have a fever, cough, and headache”	N=683; 42·9%; 53·3% 39 years or younger, 38·8% 40 to 59 years, 7·9% 60 years or older	Not reported, presumed most at home
Smith et al 2020 [81]	United Kingdom (6 to 7 May 2020)	Cross-sectional	People aged 18 years or older and living in the UK (YouGov’s online research panel; quota sampling; not reported)	Household symptoms	N=2162; 51·9%; 4·0% 18 to 24 years, 13·6% 25 to 34 years, 17·8% 35 to 44 years, 18·2% 45 to 54 years, 46·4% 55 and older Of people with symptoms in the household. N=217; 42·9%; 4·6% 18 to 24 years, 16·1% 25 to 34 years, 17·1% 35 to 44 years, 14·3% 45 to 54 years, 47·9% 55 and older	“Home”
Smith et al 2021 [82]	United Kingdom (2 March 2020 to 27 January 2021; duration adjusted self-isolation 9 November 2020 to 27 January 2021; full self-isolation 14 April 2020 to 27 January 2021)	Series of cross-sectional	People aged 16 years or older and living in the UK (Respondi and Savanta’s online research panels; quota sampling; not reported)	Reported COVID-19 symptoms (high temperature or fever, cough, or loss of sense of smell or taste) in last 7 days	N=74,699 responses from 45,957 participants; not reported; not reported Duration adjusted self-isolation. N=1102 responses from 1066 participants; 44·9%; not reported Full self-isolation. N=3397 responses from 2967 participants; 44·6%; not reported	“Home”

Steens et al 2020 [83]	Norway (24 April to 27 July 2020)	Prospective cohort	People aged 18 years and older (internet panel, people from previous waves invited to take part in subsequent waves. If necessary, additional panel participants were recruited; population-representative random sampling; 7% for first wave, 74% to 86% for subsequent waves)	Confirmed or probably COVID-19	Whole sample. N=1704; 49%; 14% 18 to 29 years, 34% 30 to 49 years, 38% 50 to 69 years, 14% 70 to 89 years Of these, n=574 received a quarantine / isolation request	Not reported, presumed most at home
Tseng et al 2021 [84]	United States of America (15 March to 15 April 2020)	Cross-sectional	People who had possible symptoms of COVID-19 or who had exposure to someone who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 (all eligible people attending the primary care clinic affiliated with the University of Hawai'i John A. Burns School of Medicine Department of Family Medicine and Community Health who had possible symptoms of COVID-19 or who had exposure to someone who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 invited; self-selected into study; 77%)	Suspected COVID-19 or exposure to COVID-19	N=69; 68%; mean age 43 years, range 8 months to 82 years	"At home"
Yang et al 2022 [85]	Canada (May to June 2020)	Cross-sectional	Discharged emergency department patients with confirmed or suspected COVID-19, surveying individuals discharged from three emergency departments in Vancouver. People who were institutional residents, who did not have stable housing, were unable to communicate in English, were not residents of British Columbia, and who were undergoing asymptomatic COVID-19 screening were excluded (all eligible people discharged from emergency department patients with confirmed or suspected COVID-19 invited; self-selected into study; 40.4% patients	Confirmed or suspected COVID-19	N=65; 52%; 75% under the age of 60 years	Not reported, presumed most at home

reached, 19% completed [of eligible;
47% if patients reached completed]

Risk of bias

All but one study reported a prevalence estimate for rate of adherence to self-isolation. [41] One study reported two prevalence estimates. [76] Twenty prevalence estimates were at very high risk of bias, [21, 23, 24, 28, 29, 31-37, 40, 47, 69-72, 74, 76-78] 14 were at high risk, [21, 22, 27, 38, 44-46, 73, 79, 81-83, 85] ten had some concerns, [25, 26, 30, 39, 42, 43, 48-68, 80, 84] and one was at low risk. [75] Full details for each study are reported in Supplement S6.

Definitions of self-isolation

Self-isolation was inconsistently defined (Supplementary Table S7). Seven studies defined self-isolation solely as staying at home, [22, 41, 68, 73, 81, 82] with another two studies specifying that self-isolation involved staying at home apart from a limited number of reasons. [46, 48-61] Where studies defined self-isolation using multiple behaviours, these are summarised in Table 2. In conjunction with other behaviours, the most mentioned behaviour was avoiding contact with others, followed by wearing a mask, and maintaining good hand hygiene. Five studies reported following official guidance in the country where the study was conducted, but did not specify what the guidance was. [21, 36, 37, 39] One study defined self-isolation as following “isolation measures (e.g., avoiding contact with others, hygiene measures, wearing a mask)”. [30] Twelve studies reported “self-isolate” or “quarantine” (or some such variant), but did not define required behaviours. [25, 33, 34, 42, 43, 47, 74, 75, 79, 80, 83-85] There was no mention of a definition of self-isolation in eight studies. [23, 24, 26-29, 31, 32]

Table 2. Summary table of definitions of self-isolation where studies specified multiple behaviours.

Citation	Stay at home / isolation location	Not have visitors	Avoid contact with others	Wear a mask	Wash hands / hand hygiene	Stay in a separate room	Ventilate room	Disinfect room	Monitor condition / contact hospital if symptoms worsen
Eraso & Hills 2021 [35]	✓		✓						
Foroozanfar et al 2020 [38]			✓			✓			
Gasperini et al 2022 [40]			✓	✓	✓	✓			
Li et al 2021 [44]			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
Lou et al 2020 [45]			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Office for National Statistics 2021 [62-67]	✓	✓							
Pinheiro et al 2022 [69, 70]			✓	✓	✓				
Rifa'i et al 2022 [71]			✓				✓		
Ripon et al 2020 [72]	✓			✓	✓				✓
Sahin et al 2022 [76]	✓		✓	✓					
Scottish Government 2021 [77, 78]	✓	✓	✓						

Measures of self-isolation

Only four studies did not use self-report to measure adherence to self-isolation. One study used a retrospective cohort chart review, with data about self-isolation adherence (reasons for leaving self-isolation early) extracted from clinical data. [39] One study used publicly available violation data (for self-isolation) from the Korean Ministry of Interior and Safety records. [75] Violation data were ascertained by actively monitoring mobile phone location data or phone calls twice a day, together with random visits to the self-isolating person. Another study used random home visits and calls to measure adherence to self-isolation. [22] People were categorised as non-adherent if they did not answer the door after three attempts or if external noise was heard on the telephone. Data were reported for seven participants, though the methods indicated that thirteen households were selected for this measure. One study did not report how they measured adherence to self-isolation. [74]

Thirty-nine studies used self-report measures of adherence to self-isolation (19 online surveys, 12 telephone surveys or interviews, 2 online and telephone, 6 did not report mode; Supplementary Table S7). One study used an in-person survey conducted by a nurse, the self-isolation adherence measure was “the general opinion of the home care nurses about the adherence to isolation/quarantine rules”. [40] Another study reported that data were collected by health care workers using an online survey platform. [80] Only one study reported psychometric characteristics of the adherence measure (Cronbach’s α ; Table 3). [23] One other study commented that authors were “uncertain” whether their adherence measure had been correctly understood, indicating indirect evidence for a lack of validity of this measure. [83] Generally, studies reported little to no missing data (Table 3; Supplementary Table S7). Exceptions to this were online surveys which reported 13% to 67% missing data, [24, 30, 34] and a case interview that reported 23% missing data. [21] Only eleven studies reported verbatim the items and response options used to measure adherence to self-isolation, allowing reproduction in future studies. [29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 44, 68, 76, 79-81, 84] Measures often relied on presumed knowledge to be able to answer an item accurately (e.g., knowledge of self-isolation guidance) and used subjective scales (Table 3).

Table 3. Properties of self-report measures for self-isolation adherence. Crosses indicate that no information was reported

Citation	Item reported verbatim	Measure asks about	Presumed knowledge needed to answer item accurately	Response options reported verbatim	Type of response option	Reliability	Validity	Missing data
Ali-Saleh & Obeid 2022 [23]	No	Multiple items about rate of adherence	×	No	Frequency scale	Cronbach's α = 0.80	×	0%
Almaghrabi 2021 [24]	No	If stayed at home	None	×	×	×	×	13%
Almayahi & Al Lamki 2022 [25]	No	×	×	×	×	×	×	0%
Aslaner et al 2022 [26]	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	0%
Bannour et al 2021 [27]	×	×	×	Yes	Frequency scale	×	×	0%
Bara'a et al 2021 [28]	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	0%
Carlsen et al 2020 [29]	Yes	Being in self-isolation	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Yes / no	×	×	0%
Domenghino et al 2022 [30]	×	×	×	Yes	Frequency scale	×	×	15%
Dowthwaite et al 2021 [31, 32]	Yes	Following advice	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Frequency scale	×	×	0%
Elaraby et al 2022 [33]	Yes	Staying at home and self-isolating	Self-isolation guidance	No	Scale (anchors not reported)	×	×	×
Enticott et al 2021 [34]	Yes	Self-isolating	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Frequency scale	×	×	60-4% to 67-4%
Eraso & Hills 2021 [35]	Yes	How often left home / had visitors	None	Yes	Free text entry (number)	×	×	0%
Eslamzadeh et al 2022 [36]	No	Multiple items about different behaviours	None	Yes	Frequency scale	×	×	×
Farooq et al 2021 [37]	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Foroozanfar et al 2020 [38]	No	Multiple items about different behaviours	×	×	×	×	×	0-6%
Gasperini et al 2022 [40]	No	Multiple items about different behaviours	×	×	×	×	×	0%
Hood et al 2022 [21] [case interview]	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	23%
Hood et al 2022 [21] [survey]	Yes	Multiple items about different behaviours	None	×	×	×	×	×

Kriens 2022 [41]	Yes	How often left home	None	No	Yes / no / I don't know	*	*	*
Kyle et al 2021 [42, 43]	No	How often left home	Length of self-isolation period	No	Frequency scale	*	*	0%
Li et al 2021 [44]	Yes	Multiple items about different behaviours	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Fully complied / partially complied / not complied	*	*	0%
Lou et al 2020 [45]	No	Multiple items about different behaviours	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	No adherence / occasional adherence / basic adherence / full adherence	*	*	0%
Martin et al 2021 [46]	No	How often left home	None	Yes	Reasons for leaving home	*	*	0%
Mijovic et al 2021 [47]	No	Multiple items about outings and activities	Self-isolation guidance	*	*	*	*	0%
Office for National Statistics 2021, 2022 [48-61]	No	Reasons for leaving home	None	No	Reasons for leaving home	*	*	0%
Office for National Statistics 2021 [62-67]	No	Reasons for leaving home	None	No	Reasons for leaving home	*	*	0%
Office for National Statistics 2021 [68]	Yes	How often left home	End of quarantine period	Yes	Yes / no / don't know / prefer not to say	*	*	0%
Pinheiro et al 2022 [69, 70]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0%
Rifa'i et al 2022 [71]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0%
Ripon et al 2020 [72]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0%
Robin et al 2022 [73]	No	How often left home	None	Yes	Reasons for leaving home	*	*	0-4%
Rubio et al 2021 [22] [survey]	No	How often left home	None	*	*	*	*	0%
Sahin et al 2022 [76]	Yes	Self-isolating	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Symptomatic: yes / sometimes / no Travel: Duration of self-isolation	*	*	0%
Scottish Government 2021 [77, 78]	No	Multiple items about how soon started self-isolating, how often left home, duration of self-isolation	Date when advised to start self-isolating	*	*	*	*	*
Senol & Avci 2022 [79]	Yes	Self-isolating	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Yes / no	*	*	0%
Shewasinad Yehualashet et al 2021 [80]	Yes	Self-isolating	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Frequency scale	*	*	0%
Smith et al 2020 [81]	Yes	How often left home	None	Yes	Free text entry (number)	*	*	0%
Smith et al 2021 [82]	No	How often left home	None	Yes	Reasons for leaving home	*	*	0%


Steens et al 2020 [83]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	3%
Tseng et al 2021 [84]	Yes	Leaving self-isolation	Self-isolation guidance	Yes	Reasons for leaving home	x	x	0%
Yang et al 2022 [85]	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

x = no information reported.

Adherence to self-isolation

For COVID-19 cases, rates of adherence to self-isolation ranged between 0% and 100% (Figure 2, Supplementary Table S8). Studies with some concerns of bias reported rates between 51% and 86%; these studies generally had small confidence intervals (<5%). Studies with high or very high risk of bias had wider ranging estimates of adherence, and often had wider confidence intervals often due to smaller sample sizes. Self-isolation adherence for people with COVID-19-like symptoms ranged between 6.2% and 91.2% (Figure 2, Supplementary Table S8). The only study rated at some concerns of bias reported 16.4% adherence. [80]


Figure 2. Forest plot showing rates of adherence to self-isolation in COVID-19 cases and people with symptoms suggestive of COVID-19 by risk of bias rating. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.



*95% confidence intervals could not be calculated accurately from the information given in the study

Self-isolation adherence in contacts of COVID-19 cases ranged from 26·6% to 94%. Studies at some concerns of bias reported adherence between 77·8% to 94% (Figure 3, Supplementary Table S8). Studies at high and very high risk of bias reported wider-ranging adherence rates and wider confidence intervals. Where cases and contacts were analysed together, adherence rates were between 24·9% and 97·4%; for studies rated as some concerns of bias, this was 53·6% to 97·4%. Self-isolation adherence for people returning from travel ranged between 15·3% to 86%, with rates in studies at some concerns of bias being between 78% and 86%. Other studies investigating this outcome were all at very high risk of bias and estimates had wide confidence intervals.

Figure 3. Forest plot showing rates of adherence to self-isolation in contacts of COVID-19 cases, COVID-19 cases and contacts together, and people returning from travel by risk of bias rating. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.



*95% confidence intervals could not be calculated accurately from the information given in the study

Studies investigating adherence to self-isolation for other reasons are reported in Supplementary Figure S9.

Factors associated with self-isolation

Twenty-five studies investigated factors associated with adherence to self-isolation. [23, 29, 30, 34-43, 45-68, 73, 75-78, 81-83] Of these, 24 were assessed using the ROBINS-E. Analyses of associations from seven studies were at very high risk of bias, [30, 34, 37, 38, 73, 77, 78, 83], 15 were at high risk of bias, [23, 29, 35, 36, 40-43, 47-68, 75, 76, 81, 82] and two had some concerns (Supplement S6). [39, 45] One study was assessed using the ROBINS-I and was rated as very high risk of bias. [46] No analyses were at low risk of bias.

For brevity, few results are narratively summarised here; full details are in Supplement S10. Unless stated, all studies were high or very high risk of bias.

Overall, there was mixed evidence that socio-demographic factors were associated with adherence to self-isolation (Table 4, Supplementary Table S8). There was mixed evidence for an association between age and adherence. Five analyses found an association between adherence and older age (one at some concerns of bias), [34, 39, 41, 77, 78] three found an association with younger age, [29, 48-61, 83] and 12 found no evidence for an association. [23, 29, 30, 35, 36, 42, 43, 62-68, 73, 81, 82] There was weak evidence for an association with female gender and adherence, with six of 18 analyses finding an association. [29, 34, 41, 76-78, 81] Eleven analyses found no evidence for an association. [23, 30, 35, 36, 42, 43, 62-68, 76-78, 82] One analysis (some concerns of bias) found an association between being male and higher adherence. [39] This study investigated people experiencing homelessness or unstable housing and included a low percentage of women (24%). Therefore, results are unlikely to be generalisable to the general population. There was weak evidence that lower education was associated with adherence with three analyses finding an association, [29, 41] and eight analyses finding no evidence for an association [30, 35, 36, 76, 81, 82]; one analysis found adherence to be associated with higher education. [37]

Table 4. Summary table of personal and clinical characteristics associated with adherence to self-isolation by risk of bias. Colours relate to risk of bias. Studies in orange were rated at some concerns of bias (S), studies in red were rated as high risk of bias (H), and studies in black were rated as very high risk of bias (VH). Arrows indicate the direction of the association. Up arrows indicate a statistically significant positive association, down arrows indicate a statistically significant negative association, horizontal arrows indicate mixed evidence for an association, and crosses indicate that there is no evidence for an association.

	COVID-19 cases	Symptoms suggestive of COVID-19	Contact	COVID-19 case or contact	Returning from travel	Case, contact, or travel
	Effect (citation)	Effect (citation)	Effect (citation)	Effect (citation)	Effect (citation)	Effect (citation)
Personal characteristics						
Older age (vs younger)	↑H [41], ↓H [48-61], *H [36], ↑VH [34], ↓VH [83], *VH [30]	*H men [29], ↓H women [29], *H [35], *H [82]	*H [35], *H [42, 43], *H [62-67]	↑S [39], *H [81], ↑VH [77, 78], *VH [73]	*H [68], ↑VH [77, 78]	*H [23]
Female gender (vs male)	↑H [41], *H [36], ↑VH [34], *VH [30]	↑H [29], ↑H [76], *H [35], *H [82]	*H [35], *H [42, 43], *H [62-67]	↓S [39], ↑H [81], ↑VH [77, 78]	*H [68], *H [76], *VH [77, 78]	*H [23]
Earlier timepoint in pandemic	↔H [48-61], ↑VH [77, 78], ↑VH [83], *VH [34]	↑H [29], ↑H [76], *H [82]	↔H [62-67], ↑VH [77, 78]		↔H [68], *H [76], *VH [77, 78]	
Lower level of education (vs higher)	↑H [41], *H [36], *VH [30]	↑H men [29], ↑H women [29], *H [35], *H [76], *H [82]	*H [35], ↓VH [37]	*H [81]	*H [76]	
Living in a less deprived area (vs more)	*H [48-61]	*H [35], *H [82]	*H [35], *H [42, 43], *H [62-67]	*H [81]		
Being employed (vs not)	*H [36], *VH [30]	*H [35], *H [82]	*H [35]	*H [81]		
Working in a key sector (vs not)		*H [35], *H [76], *H [82]	*H [35], ↑VH [37]		*H [76]	
White ethnicity (vs Black)		*H [35], *H [82]	*H [35]	↑S [39], ↓VH [73]		
Living alone (vs with others)		*H [35], *H [82]	*H [35], *H [42, 43]	*H [81]		
Living in an urban area (vs rural)	*VH [34]	*H [76]		*H [81]	*H [76]	
Being partnered (vs not)	↑H [36]	*H [82]		*H [81]		
Having a dependent child in the household (vs not)	↓VH [30]	*H [82]		*H [81]		
Having pets (vs not)	↓VH [30]			*H [81], *VH [73]		
Religion		*H [35]	*H [35]			*H [23]
Lower social grade		*H [82]		*H [81]		
Region		↔H [29], *H [82]				
Housing situation e.g., owning home, renting, multiple occupancy		*H [35]	*H [35]			
Having outdoor space				*H [81], *VH [73]		
“Lockdown phase”		*H [35]	*H [35]			
Clinical characteristics						
Being clinically vulnerable to COVID-19 / having a medical condition (vs not)		*H [35], *H [82]	*H [35]	*S [39], *H [81]		
Having a household member who has a chronic illness (vs not)		*H [35], *H [82]	*H [35]	*H [81]		

Having a mental health condition / mental health worsening				*S [39], ↓H [81], *VH [73]	
Perceiving yourself to be more healthy / better self-reported general health	↓H [41]			*H [81]	
Physical health worsening				*H [81], ↓VH [73]	
Having received more COVID-19 vaccine doses		*H [62-67]			*H [68]
COVID-19 infection					
Thinking you had ever had COVID-19		*H [76], *H [82]		*H [81]	*H [76]
Having COVID-19 symptoms (vs not having symptoms)	↑VH [83], ↔VH [38]		↑H [62-67], ↑VH [37]	↑VH [73]	
Testing positive for COVID-19	↑H [48-61]		↑VH [46]	↑S [39]	
Having a COVID-19 patient in the family / family or relatives who had COVID-19	↓VH [38]	*H [76]			*H [76]
Having family or relatives who have died from COVID-19		*H [76]			*H [76]
Isolation characteristics					
Opted into / being offered test to release schemes (for early release from self-isolation)	*H [48-61]		*VH [46]		*H [68]
Being in isolation [case] (vs quarantine [contact])				*H [40], *VH [77, 78]	
Self-isolation being a legal requirement / introduction of legal penalties for breaching isolation	↑H [48-61]				*H [75]
Psychological factors					
Higher knowledge about COVID-19, measures and need to self-isolate	↑H [48-61]	*H [35]	↓H [35], ↔H [62-67], *H [42, 43]	*H [81], ↑VH [77, 78]	
Higher trust in formal institutions / government		*H [35]	↑H [62-67], *H [35]		↑H [68] *H [23]
Believing that self-isolation is effective			*H [42, 43]	*H [81], ↑VH [73], ↑VH [77, 78]	↑VH [77, 78]
Higher perceived susceptibility to COVID-19		*H [35]	↑H [35]	↑H [81]	*H [23]
Higher subjective norms towards adherence		*H [35]	*H [35]	*H [81]	*H [23]
Higher perceived risk of COVID-19			↑H [62-67], *H [42, 43]		*H [68]
Higher perceived ease of self-isolation	↔H [48-61]		↑H [62-67]		*H [68]
Receiving more support / help during self-isolation			↑H [42, 43]	↑H [81], *VH [73]	
Receiving community / local authority support		*H [35]	↑H [35]	↑VH [77, 78]	
Higher perceived social responsibility		*H [35]	*H [35]		
Higher perceived severity of COVID-19				*H [81]	↑H [23]
Higher worry about COVID-19	*H [48-61]			↑H [81]	
Higher perceived importance of following self-isolation guidance			↑H [62-67]		↑H [68]
Thinking that could pass on the virus if went out				*H [81], *VH [73]	
Higher perceived knowledge about measures	*H [41], *VH [30]				
Higher perceived control over leaving the home		↑H [35]	↑H [35]		
Higher perceived control over responsibilities		↑H [35]	*H [35]		
Receiving financial support		*H [35]	*H [35]		

Receiving support from family, friends or others	*H [35]	*H [35]
Thinking would lose touch with family/friends		*H [81], ↓VH [73]

Risk of bias. Orange colour = some concerns (S). Red colour = high risk of bias (H). Black colour = very high risk of bias (VH).

Direction of the association. ↑ = statistically significant positive association. ↓ = statistically significant negative association, ↔ = mixed evidence for an association. * = no evidence for an association.

There was good evidence that adherence to self-isolation was associated with having COVID-19 symptoms, [37, 38, 62-67, 73, 83] and testing positive for COVID-19 (vs being a contact, testing negative; association found by one analysis at some concerns of bias; Table 4). [39, 46, 48-61] Taken together, there was some evidence that practical support may be associated with adherence to self-isolation (Table 4). The nature of an association between adherence to self-isolation and knowledge about COVID-19 and measures was unclear, with two analyses finding that higher knowledge was associated with adherence, [48-61, 77, 78] one analysis finding that lower knowledge was associated with adherence, [35] one analysis finding mixed evidence, [62-67] and three analyses finding no evidence for an association. [35, 42, 43, 81] There was weak evidence for an association between adherence to self-isolation and higher trust in the government and formal institutions, believing that self-isolation was effective, higher perceived importance of following self-isolation guidance, higher perceived susceptibility to COVID-19, higher perceived control over leaving home, and higher perceived ease of self-isolation (Table 4). There was little to no evidence for an association with adherence to self-isolation and clinical or isolation characteristics (Table 4).

Discussion

This systematic review identified 45 studies investigating self-isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic. Most studies defined self-isolation as “staying at home”. Few studies included not receiving visitors, though this should have been an important consideration. The important parameters of self-isolation for a given illness depend on the clinical characteristics of infection. Future definitions of self-isolation, by public health agencies, policy makers and in academic research, should clearly specify behaviours that need to be enacted and for how long.

There was no standardized measure of self-isolation. Only four studies did not use self-report. [22, 39, 74, 75] While observing behaviour may result in more accurate rates of behaviour (higher external validity), observational studies may encounter other issues such as small sample sizes (e.g., n=7 in [74]), and time- and resource-consuming data collection (e.g., for door knocking). Of 41 studies using self-report data, only one reported on the reliability of the measure, [23] while another gave indirect evidence for the lack of validity of their measure, [83] highlighting the substantial risk of bias in self-isolation measurements. Studies often relied on participants’ understanding of self-isolation guidance – which was low [86] – to answer items accurately. While growing internet use means that online surveys are increasingly able to reach groups that previously did not use the internet (e.g., older adults), [87] more research is needed to quantify how self-report data from the quota samples often used in these studies match up to less biased methods. [8]

Rates of self-isolation adherence ranged between 0% and 100%. Studies with higher risk of bias often had more varied estimates and were more imprecise. Studies that used multiple rounds of data collection often reported similar prevalence estimates across rounds [48-68, 76] suggesting that study design, in particular sampling methods and phrasing of items, play a large role in adherence estimates. Using only studies with some concerns of bias, estimates of adherence were approximately 85% for COVID-19 cases (confirmed by a test), contacts, and people returning from travel, but only 16% for people with COVID-19-like symptoms who had not tested. While this may be due to individual study characteristics, [88] the next lowest risk of bias estimates for the COVID-19-like symptoms group reported 43% adherence. [82] This may be due to low knowledge of COVID-19 symptoms and the non-specific nature of cardinal COVID-19 symptoms (cough, high temperature), meaning that participants may not have attributed their symptoms to COVID-19. [89] Population-wide measures that rely on people self-isolating when symptomatic may be ineffective at controlling

outbreaks, especially if symptoms are mild and non-specific, due to low adherence. Taken together, evidence suggests that public health messages should clearly specify symptoms and behaviours that should be enacted to increase adherence to self-isolation.

[3] There was good evidence that having symptoms (vs not) and having a positive COVID-19 test (vs negative or no test) were associated with adherence to self-isolation among identified cases and contacts. These associations are intuitive, with people with more signs of illness being more likely to adopt self-isolation. There was some evidence that receiving practical support is associated with adherence to self-isolation, in line with a previous systematic review. [3] Rigorously conducted randomised controlled trials of provision of support on adherence to self-isolation, investigating both practical (e.g., delivering groceries) and financial support, would strengthen the evidence base. There was little consistent evidence that socio-demographic factors were associated with adherence to self-isolation. A previous systematic review of factors associated with adherence to self-isolation also found little to no evidence for associations between adherence and socio-demographic factors. [3] Generally, evidence for associations between adherence to self-isolation and psychological factors was weak. Factors associated with adherence – higher trust in governments or formal institutions, believing self-isolation to be an effective way to prevent the spread of infection, and higher perceived susceptibility to COVID-19 – were similar to findings from a previous systematic review. [3] These factors are potentially modifiable, and could be targeted by public health campaigns in future outbreaks.

Most studies in the review were surveys using non-probabilistic sampling methods, therefore results may not be generalisable to the wider population. Most studies were cross-sectional, therefore causation is uncertain. The overall quality of included studies was low. Data were mainly self-report and may have been subject to social desirability and recall bias. Studies used a range of items to measure self-isolation and different cut-offs for what constituted “adherence”, with a significant minority of studies using items that relied on participants’ understanding of self-isolation. There is a good chance that participants misunderstood these items. There was a notable absence of randomised controlled trials investigating self-isolation adherence.

Human error means that we may have missed studies that should have been included. Studies in the review were heterogeneous in methods, materials, and definitions of self-isolation and adherence, meaning we were unable to conduct a meta-analysis. Through our grey literature search, we identified other studies that investigated adherence to self-isolation. However, these were not included as they did not investigate factors associated with adherence (an inclusion criterion for grey literature). [90-92] Other data reporting self-isolation adherence and associated factors exist but are not publicly available [93-95]; these were not included.

This systematic review describes and appraises definitions of self-isolation used by studies during the COVID-19 pandemic, measures of adherence, rates of adherence, and factors associated with adherence. Definitions and measures of self-isolation were wide-ranging, with no consensus on how self-isolation should be operationalized and no standardized measures. Only one study reported reliability data for their measure, highlighting the significant risk of bias in studies of self-isolation. More scientifically rigorous studies investigating adherence to self-isolation, especially randomized controlled trials of interventions to promote self-isolation, are needed.

Contributors

LES, AFM, TMM and GJR conceptualised the study. AFM ran the systematic searches and curated the data. LES, AFM, SKB, RD, MVS and GJR screened citations. LES completed data extraction, risk of bias ratings and wrote the original draft. AFM, SKB, RD, MVS, RA, TMM and GJR reviewed and edited the manuscript. LES, AFM, SKB, RD, MVS, RA, TMM and GJR approved the final manuscript. LES and AFM are guarantors. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Declaration of interests

GJR advised the UK's Office for National Statistics on its work relating to self-isolation; papers relating to this work were included as part of the review. LES, AFM, SKB, RD, MVS, RA, TMM, and GJR co-authored papers that were either included in this review or considered during the review process. RA is an employee of the UK Health Security Agency. LES, RA, TMM and GJR were participants of the UK's Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies or its subgroups. AFM, SKB, RD, and MVS report no competing interests.

Data sharing

No novel data were collected as part of this study. All data are already publicly available.

Funding statement

This study was funded by Research England Policy Support Fund 2022-23 (from the allocation to King's College London). LES, AFB, SKB, RA and GJR are supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emergency Preparedness and Response, a partnership between the UK Health Security Agency, King's College London and the University of East Anglia. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR, UKHSA, or the Department of Health and Social Care. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.

Ethics

All data used were in the public domain, therefore ethical approval was not required.

References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Quarantine and Isolation. 29 September 2017. <https://www.cdc.gov/quarantine/index.html> (accessed 17 August 2023).
2. Kucharski AJ, Klepac P, Conlan AJK, et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2020; 20(10): 1151-60.
3. Webster RK, Brooks SK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Rubin GJ. How to improve adherence with quarantine: rapid review of the evidence. *Public Health* 2020; 182: 163-9.
4. UK Health Security Agency. Coronavirus (COVID-19): What is self-isolation and why is it important? 20 February 2020. <https://ukhsa.blog.gov.uk/2020/02/20/what-is-self-isolation-and-why-is-it-important/> (accessed 16 November 2022).
5. Littlecott H, Herd C, O'Rourke J, et al. Effectiveness of testing, contact tracing and isolation interventions among the general population on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2: a systematic review. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 2023; 381(2257): 20230131.
6. Denford S, Morton KS, Lambert H, et al. Understanding patterns of adherence to COVID-19 mitigation measures: a qualitative interview study. *Journal of Public Health* 2021; 43(3): 508-16.
7. Hlatshwako TG, Shah SJ, Kosana P, et al. Online health survey research during COVID-19. *The Lancet Digital Health* 2021; 3(2): e76-e7.
8. Davies R, Mowbray F, Martin AF, Smith LE, Rubin GJ. A systematic review of observational methods used to quantify personal protective behaviours among members of the public during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the concordance between observational and self-report measures in infectious disease health protection. *BMC Public Health* 2022; 22(1): 1436.
9. Nageswaran G, Harris RC, Guerche-Seblain CE. Review of the role of big data and digital technologies in controlling COVID-19 in Asia: Public health interest vs. privacy. *Digit Health* 2021; 7: 205520762111002953.
10. Police Scotland. Operation Talla Weekly Update. 2021. <https://www.spa.police.uk/spa-media/bthbvvin/weekly-spa-report-18-06-2021.pdf> (accessed 16 November 2022).
11. Patel J, Fernandes G, Sridhar D. How can we improve self-isolation and quarantine for covid-19? *BMJ* 2021; 372: n625.
12. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.3 (updated February 2022): Cochrane, 2022.
13. Smith LE, Brooks SK, Martin AF, Amlôt R, Marteau TM, Rubin GJ. Measuring and increasing rates of self-isolation in the context of infectious diseases: a systematic review [protocol]. 12 December 2022. https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospéro/display_record.php?RecordID=377820 (accessed 30 August 2023).
14. Munn Z, Moola S, Lisy K, Riitano D, Tufanaru C. Methodological guidance for systematic reviews of observational epidemiological studies reporting prevalence and cumulative incidence data. *Int J Evid Based Healthc* 2015; 13(3): 147-53.

15. Munn Z, Moola S, Riitano D, Lisy K. The Development of a Critical Appraisal Tool for Use in Systematic Reviews: Addressing Questions of Prevalence. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* 2014; 3(3): 123-8.
16. Ma L-L, Wang Y-Y, Yang Z-H, Huang D, Weng H, Zeng X-T. Methodological quality (risk of bias) assessment tools for primary and secondary medical studies: what are they and which is better? *Military Medical Research* 2020; 7(1): 7.
17. Migliavaca CB, Stein C, Colpani V, Munn Z, Falavigna M. Quality assessment of prevalence studies: a systematic review. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2020; 127: 59-68.
18. ROBINS-E Development Group (Higgins J MR, Rooney A, Taylor K, et al.). Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies - of Exposure (ROBINS-E). 20 June 2023.
<https://www.riskofbias.info/welcome/robins-e-tool> (accessed 30 August 2023).
19. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ* 2016; 355: i4919.
20. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline. *BMJ* 2020; 368: l6890.
21. Hood JE, Kubiak RW, Avoundjian T, et al. A Multifaceted Evaluation of a COVID-19 Contact Tracing Program in King County, Washington. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2022; 28(4): 334-43.
22. Rubio LA, Peng J, Rojas S, et al. The COVID-19 Symptom to Isolation Cascade in a Latinx Community: A Call to Action. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2021; 8(2).
23. Ali-Saleh O, Obeid S. Compliance with COVID-19 Preventive Guidelines Among Minority Communities: the Case of Israeli Arabs. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities* 2022.
24. Almaghrabi MK. Public Awareness, Attitudes, and Adherence to COVID-19 Quarantine and Isolation in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of General Medicine* 2021; 14: 4395-403.
25. Almayahi ZK, Al Lamki N. Psychological effects of, and compliance with, self-isolation among COVID-19 patients in South Batinah Governorate, Oman: a cross-sectional study. *Egyptian Journal of Neurology, Psychiatry and Neurosurgery* 2022; 58(1).
26. Aslaner H, Ozen B, Erten ZK, Gokcek MB. Death and COVID-19 Anxiety in Home-Quarantined Individuals Aged 65 and Over During the Pandemic. *Omega (Westport)* 2022; 85(1): 246-58.
27. Bannour R, Zammit N, Ghammam R, et al. Compliance with preventive measures before and during home quarantine among a Tunisian cohort of COVID-19 patients. *Antimicrobial Resistance and Infection Control Conference: 6th International Conference on Prevention and Infection Control, ICPIC 2021*; 10(SUPPL 1).
28. Bara'a HMI, Nori MMM, Abdallah WS, Ali SM. Coronavirus 2019-like illness and public adherence to preventive measures, Sudan 2020. *Journal of Preventive Medicine & Hygiene* 2021; 62(2): E305-E10.
29. Carlsen EØ, Caspersen IH, Trogstad L, Gjessing HK, Magnus P. Public adherence to governmental recommendations regarding quarantine and testing for COVID-19 in two Norwegian cohorts. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.12.18.20248405.

30. Domenghino A, Aschmann HE, Ballouz T, et al. Mental health of individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 during mandated isolation and compliance with recommendations-A population-based cohort study. *PLoS ONE* 2022; 17(3 March): (no pagination).
31. Dowthwaite L, Fischer J, Perez Vallejos E, et al. Public Adoption of and Trust in the NHS COVID-19 Contact Tracing App in the United Kingdom: Quantitative Online Survey Study. *J Med Internet Res* 2021; 23(9): e29085.
32. Dowthwaite L. Public Adoption of and Trust in the NHS COVID-19 Contact Tracing App in the United Kingdom: Quantitative Online Survey Study. Personal communication.
33. Elaraby A, Shahein M, Bekhet AH, Perrin PB, Gorgey AS. The COVID-19 pandemic impacts all domains of quality of life in Egyptians with spinal cord injury: a retrospective longitudinal study. *Spinal Cord* 2022; 60(8): 757-62.
34. Enticott J, Slifirski W, Lavoie KL, Bacon SL, Teede HJ, Boyle JA. Knowledge, Attitude, and Self-Reported Practice Towards Measures for Prevention of the Spread of COVID-19 Among Australians: A Nationwide Online Longitudinal Representative Survey. *Frontiers in Public Health* 2021; 9: 630189.
35. Eraso Y, Hills S. Self-Isolation and Quarantine during the UK's First Wave of COVID-19. A Mixed-Methods Study of Non-Adherence. *International Journal of Environmental Research & Public Health* [Electronic Resource] 2021; 18(13): 30.
36. Eslamzadeh M, Bordbar MRF, Ghalibaf AM, Modaresi F, Emadzadeh M, Farhoudi F. The role of personality traits in following quarantine orders during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Clinical Psychopharmacology* 2022; 37(4): 173-8.
37. Farooq A, Sheikh TK, Syed F, Mustafa T. Paediatric Contacts of Adult COVID-19 Patients: Clinical Parameters, Risk Factors, and Outcome. *International Journal of Pediatrics* 2021; 2021: 2141128.
38. Foroozanfar Z, Zamanian M, Moradzadeh R, Hajiabadi F, Ahmadzadeh J, Hosseinkhani Z. Isolation compliance and associated factors among covid-19 patients in north-west iran: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of General Medicine* 2020; 13: 1697-703.
39. Fuchs JD, Carter HC, Evans J, et al. Assessment of a Hotel-Based COVID-19 Isolation and Quarantine Strategy for Persons Experiencing Homelessness. *JAMA Network Open* 2021; 4(3): e210490.
40. Gasperini B, Sarti D, Rondina T, et al. COVID-19 isolation/quarantine rules in home care patients. *Epidemiol Infect* 2022; 150: e206.
41. Kriens W. Individual, social and structural factors underlying compliance to COVID-19 related self-isolation: Utrecht University; 2022.
https://studenttheses.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/20.500.12932/43026/Kriens_6014690_Master%27s%20Thesis.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 5 June 2023).
42. Kyle RG, Isherwood KR, Bailey JW, Davies AR. Self-isolation confidence, adherence and challenges: Behavioural insights from contacts of cases of COVID-19 starting and completing self-isolation in Wales Cardiff: Public Health Wales, 2021.
<https://phw.nhs.wales/publications/publications1/self-isolation-confidence-adherence-and-challenges-behavioural-insights-from-contacts-of-cases-of-covid-19-starting-and-completing-self-isolation-in-wales/> (accessed 5 June 2023).

43. Public Health Wales. Self-isolation confidence, adherence and challenges: Behavioural insights from contacts of cases of COVID-19 starting and completing self-isolation in Wales. 2021. <https://phw.nhs.wales/publications/publications1/self-isolation-confidence-adherence-and-challenges-infographic/> (accessed 20 June 2023).
44. Li H, Peng YY, Lu JP. Investigation and Analysis of 108 Cases of Home Isolated Patients With Mild COVID-19. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep* 2021; 15(6): e8-e11.
45. Lou Q, Su DQ, Wang SQ, Gao E, Li LQ, Zhuo ZQ. Home quarantine compliance is low in children with fever during COVID-19 epidemic. *World Journal of Clinical Cases* 2020; 8(16): 3465-73.
46. Martin AF, Denford S, Love N, et al. Engagement with daily testing instead of self-isolating in contacts of confirmed cases of SARS-CoV-2. *BMC Public Health* 2021; 21(1): 1067.
47. Mijovic F, James S, Thomas B, et al. The myth of pre-operative isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Science Progress* 2021; 104(3): 368504211026155.
48. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 1 February to 13 February 2021. 26 March 2021. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/1februaryto13february2021> (accessed 29 June 2023).
49. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 8 March to 13 March 2021. 15 April 2021. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/8to13march2021> (accessed 30 June 2023).
50. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 12 April to 16 April 2021. 4 May 2021. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/12aprilto16april2021> (accessed 30 June 2023).
51. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 10 May to 15 May 2021. 2 June 2021. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/10mayto15may2021> (accessed 30 June 2023).
52. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 7 June to 12 June 2021. 28 June 2021. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/7juneto12june2021> (accessed 30 June 2023).
53. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 5 July to 10 July 2021. 29 July 2021. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/5julyto10july2021> (accessed 30 June 2023).

54. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 27 September to 2 October 2021. 1 November 2021.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/27septemberto2october2021>
(accessed 30 June 2023).
55. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 1 November to 6 November 2021. 24 November 2021.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/1novemberto6november2021>
(accessed 30 June 2023).
56. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 29 November to 4 December 2021. 23 December 2021.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/29novemberto4december2021>
(accessed 30 June 2023).
57. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 4 to 8 January 2022. 26 January 2022.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/4to8january2022> (accessed 30 June 2023).
58. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 7 to 12 February 2022. 1 March 2022.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/7to12february2022> (accessed 30 June 2023).
59. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 28 February to 8 March 2022. 29 March 2022.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/28februaryto8march2022>
(accessed 30 June 2023).
60. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 17 to 26 March 2022. 20 April 2022.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/17to26march2022> (accessed 30 June 2023).
61. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after testing positive in England: 28 March to 2 April 2022. 10 May 2022.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationaftertestingpositiveinengland/28marchto4april2022> (accessed 30 June 2023).
62. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a positive case in England: 1 April to 10 April 2021. 26 April 2021.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseas>

[es/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengland/1aprilto10april2021](#) (accessed 26 June 2023).

63. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a positive case in England: 19 to 24 April 2021. 14 May 2021.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengland/19to24april2021#data-on-self-isolation-after-contact-with-a-positive-case> (accessed 26 June 2023).

64. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a positive case in England: 4 to 8 May 2021. 26 May 2021.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengland/4to8may2021> (accessed 26 June 2023).

65. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a positive case in England: 1 to 5 June 2021. 18 June 2021.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengland/1to5june2021> (accessed 26 June 2023).

66. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a positive case in England: 28 June to 3 July 2021. 16 July 2021.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengland/28juneto3july2021> (accessed 26 June 2023).

67. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and self-isolation after being in contact with a positive case in England: 9 to 16 August 2021. 8 September 2021.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandselfisolationafterbeingincontactwithapositivecaseinengland/9to16august2021> (accessed 26 June 2023).

68. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and quarantine after arriving in England from an amber list country: 12 to 17 July 2021. 2 September 2021.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronavirusandquarantineafterarrivinginenglandfromanamberlistcountry/12to17july2021> (accessed 23 June 2023).

69. Pinheiro C, Thuruthiyath LR, Philip S, Viswabhadran AM, Sivadasan AM. Quarantine of Travellers during the Initial Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic- Experience from a Rural Setting in Kerala, India. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research* 2022; 16(9): LC27-LC31.

70. Pinheiro C. Quarantine of Travellers during the Initial Phase of the COVID-19 Pandemic- Experience from a Rural Setting in Kerala, India. Personal communication.

71. Rifa'i AS, Deneira CM, Utomo BS, Arasyi HAN, Sulistiawati. Adherence of COVID-19 patient activity during self-isolation/quarantine. *Journal Health and Science; Gorontalo Journal Health & Science Community* 2022; 6(3): 260-71.

72. Ripon RK, Mim SS, Puente AE, et al. COVID-19: psychological effects on a COVID-19 quarantined population in Bangladesh. *Heliyon* 2020; 6(11).

73. Robin C, Reynolds R, Lambert H, et al. Understanding adherence to self-isolation in the first phase of COVID-19 response. medRxiv 2022: 2022.03.14.22272273.
74. Rosca P, Shapira B, Neumark Y. Isolating the isolated: Implications of COVID-19 quarantine measures on in-patient detoxification treatment for substance use disorders. International Journal of Drug Policy 2020; 83: 102830.
75. Ryu S, Hwang Y, Yoon H, Chun BC. Self-Quarantine Noncompliance During the COVID-19 Pandemic in South Korea. Disaster med 2022; 16(2): 464-7.
76. Sahin I, Toluk O, Kaskir Kesin F, Uzunoglu A, Yabaci Tak A, Ercan I. Compliance with General Rules and Periodically Differences During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Turkiye: A Cross-Sectional Study. Turkiye Klinikleri Journal of Medical Sciences 2022; 42(4): 297-310.
77. Scottish Government. Coronavirus (COVID-19) support study experiences of and compliance with self-isolation: research findings. 19 August 2021. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/covid-19-support-study-experiences-compliance-self-isolation-research-findings/> (accessed 3 July 2023).
78. Scottish Government. Coronavirus (COVID-19) support study experiences of and compliance with self-isolation: main report. 19 August 2021. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/covid-19-support-study-experiences-compliance-self-isolation-main-report> (accessed 3 July 2023).
79. Senol Y, Avci K. Identification of risk factors that increase household transmission of COVID-19 in Afyonkarahisar, Turkey. Journal of Infection in Developing Countries 2022; 16(6): 927-36.
80. Shewasinad Yehualashet S, Asefa KK, Mekonnen AG, et al. Predictors of adherence to COVID-19 prevention measure among communities in North Shoa Zone, Ethiopia based on health belief model: A cross-sectional study. PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource] 2021; 16(1): e0246006.
81. Smith LE, Amlot R, Lambert H, et al. Factors associated with adherence to self-isolation and lockdown measures in the UK: a cross-sectional survey. Public Health 2020; 187: 41-52.
82. Smith LE, Potts HWW, Amlôt R, Fear NT, Michie S, Rubin GJ. Adherence to the test, trace, and isolate system in the UK: Results from 37 nationally representative surveys. BMJ 2021; 372.
83. Steens A, De Blasio BF, Veneti L, et al. Poor self-reported adherence to COVID-19-related quarantine/isolation requests, Norway, April to July 2020. Eurosurveillance 2020; 25(37).
84. Tseng CW, Roh Y, DeJong C, Kanagusuku LN, Soin KS. Patients' Compliance With Quarantine Requirements for Exposure or Potential Symptoms of COVID-19. Hawaii Journal of Health and Social Welfare 2021; 80(11): 276-82.
85. Yang L, Mitchell D, Clayton F, et al. Self-isolation among discharged emergency department patients with suspected COVID-19. CJEM 2022; 24(1): 97-8.
86. Smith LE, West R, Potts HWW, et al. Knowledge of Self-Isolation Rules in the UK for Those Who Have Symptoms of COVID-19: A Repeated Cross-Sectional Survey Study. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2023; 20(3).
87. Office for National Statistics. Internet users, UK: 2020. 6 April 2021. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/itandinternetindustry/bulletins/internetusers/2020> (accessed 24 May 2023).

88. Abeya SG, Barkesa SB, Sadi CG, et al. Adherence to COVID-19 preventive measures and associated factors in Oromia regional state of Ethiopia. PLOS ONE 2021; 16(10): e0257373.
89. Mowbray F, Woodland L, Smith LE, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ. Is My Cough a Cold or Covid? A Qualitative Study of COVID-19 Symptom Recognition and Attitudes Toward Testing in the UK. Front Public Health 2021; 9: 716421.
90. Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu. Applying behavioural science to COVID-19. 2022. <https://www.rivm.nl/en/coronavirus-covid-19/research/behaviour> (accessed 19 June 2023).
91. Centre MBM. iCARE; Cumulative Results – Surveys 1 to 15. 2023. <https://www.mbcm-cmcm.ca/2021/covid19/results-findings/results-1/> (accessed 19 June 2023).
92. Scottish Government. Public attitudes to coronavirus (COVID-19). <https://www.gov.scot/collections/public-attitudes-to-coronavirus/> (accessed 19 June 2023).
93. Scientific Pandemic Insights Group on Behaviours (SPI-B). The impact of financial and other targeted support on rates of self-isolation or quarantine [SPI-B: 16 September 2020]. 2020. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/925133/S0759_SPI-B_The_impact_of_financial_and_other_targeted_support_on_rates_of_self-isolation_or_quarantine_.pdf (accessed 19 June 2023).
94. Environmental Modelling Group (EMG), Scientific Pandemic Insights Group on Behaviours (SPI-B), Scientific Pandemic Influenza Group on Modelling (SPI-M). Reducing within- and between-household transmission in light of new variant SARS-CoV-2. 15 January 2021. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/952799/s1020-Reducing-within-between-household-transmission.pdf (accessed 19 June 2023).
95. Comptroller and Auditor General. Managing cross-border travel during the COVID-19 pandemic: National Audit Office, 5 April 2022. <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Managing-cross-border-travel-during-the-COVID-19-pandemic.pdf> (accessed 19 June 2023).