

1 **Limits of lockdown: characterising essential contacts during strict physical**
2 **distancing**

3 Amy Thomas^{1*}, Leon Danon^{2,3,4}, Hannah Christensen^{4,5}, Kate Northstone⁶,
4 Daniel Smith^{6,7}, Emily Nixon^{1,8}, Adam Trickey⁴, Gibran Hemani⁴, Sarah Sauchelli⁹,
5 Adam Finn^{4,10}, Nicholas Timpson^{6,7}, Ellen Brooks-Pollock^{1,5*}

6

7 ¹ Bristol Veterinary School, University of Bristol, Langford Campus, BS40

8 ² Engineering Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

9 ³ Alan Turing Institute, British Library, NW1 2DB, London UK

10 ⁴ Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, BS8 2BN

11 ⁵ National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural
12 Science and Evaluation at the University of Bristol, UK

13 ⁶ ALSPAC, Department of Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University
14 of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN

15 ⁷ MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit at University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 2BN

16 ⁸ School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, UK

17 ⁹ National Institute for Health Research Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University
18 Hospitals of Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and University of Bristol, Bristol,
19 United Kingdom

20 ¹⁰ Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

21 *Corresponding author

22

23

24

25

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 COVID-19 has exposed health inequalities within countries and globally.
29 The fundamental determining factor behind an individual's risk of infection is the number
30 of social contacts they make. In many countries, physical distancing measures have
31 been implemented to control transmission of SARS-CoV-2, reducing social
32 contacts to a minimum. Characterising unavoidable social contacts is key
33 for understanding the inequalities behind differential risks and planning vaccination
34 programmes. We utilised an existing English longitudinal birth
35 cohort, which is broadly representative of the wider population (n=6807), to explore
36 social contact patterns and behaviours when strict physical distancing measures were in
37 place during the UK's first lockdown in March-May 2020. Essential workers, specifically
38 those in healthcare, had 4.5 times as many contacts as non-essential workers
39 [incident rate ratio = 4.42 (CI_{95%}: 3.88–5.04)], whilst essential workers in other
40 sectors, mainly teaching and the police force had three times as many contacts
41 [IRR = 2.84 (2.58–3.13)]. The number of individuals in a household, which is conflated
42 by number of children, increases essential social contacts by 40%. Self-isolation
43 effectively reduces numbers of contacts outside of the home, but not entirely. Together,
44 these findings will aid the interpretation of epidemiological data and impact the design of
45 effective SARS-CoV-2 control strategies, such as vaccination, testing and contact
46 tracing.

47 **Keywords:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, contact patterns, ALSPAC, occupation, household
48 structure

49

50

51

52 **MAIN**

53 The novel coronavirus, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-
54 CoV-2) causes a severe respiratory disease, termed COVID-19 [1]. The virus, first
55 reported in the Hubei province of China in December 2019, spread rapidly across the
56 globe [2]. SARS-CoV-2 is an airborne infectious disease transmitted between persons in
57 close contact through respiratory droplets [3] [4]. Physical distancing measures have
58 been implemented in many countries to reduce transmission, often at substantial
59 economic and social cost. In the short-term, this has been a successful mitigation
60 strategy, but vaccination and effective drug treatments are needed for long-term
61 sustainable prevention of transmission and disease.

62 Quantifying the way that people interact, and the networks they form is important
63 for understanding the speed and extent of infectious disease spread [5] [6]. Mathematical
64 models that predict the impact of proposed interventions, often rely on data from social
65 contact surveys to inform realistic transmission parameter choices [7] [8] [9]. In turn,
66 determining the effectiveness of many interventions also relies on accurate and timely
67 contact pattern information [7]. Moreover, rich participant data can help identify those
68 who may be at increased risk of infection or identify those more likely to be involved in
69 transmission events.

70 To reduce the number of social contacts, the UK government implemented strict
71 physical distancing measures on March 23rd. Individuals were instructed to stay at home
72 and only leave for essential work, daily exercise or purchasing of essential
73 food/medicines. Many establishments were closed, including schools (open only to
74 children of essential workers or those deemed vulnerable), non-essential shops, bars,
75 restaurants, and sporting and entertainment venues. Only one published UK survey
76 captured social contact patterns during the first COVID-19 lockdown [7]. Consequently,

77 we have limited understanding on how social demographics and behaviours may
78 influence contact patterns during times of physical distancing.

79 To address this data gap, we rapidly deployed a COVID-19 questionnaire to
80 participants enrolled in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC):
81 a prospective population-based cohort study in Avon, UK which recruited pregnant
82 women in 1990–1992. This unique three-generational study comprises of three cohorts
83 who have been followed for the last 30 years - a wealth of biological, genetic and
84 phenotypic data has been collected [10] [11] [12] [13]. Utilising this resource, we aimed
85 to quantify and investigate social contact patterns in the ALSPAC cohorts during the
86 COVID-19 epidemic, when the first physical distancing restrictions were in place.

87

88 **METHODS**

89 **Ethics**

90 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law
91 Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees. Informed consent for the use of
92 data collected via questionnaires and clinics was obtained from participants following the
93 recommendations of the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee at the time. Participation
94 was voluntary and analyses were performed on anonymised data.

95 **Cohorts**

96 ALSPAC is an intergenerational prospective birth cohort from the southwest of
97 England. The study recruited 14,541 pregnant women with expected dates of delivery
98 between 1st April 1991 to 31st December 1992 in the county of Avon (eligible sample).
99 This cohort of original pregnant women, the biological fathers and other carers/partners
100 are known as the 'G0' cohort. Of the pregnancies initially enrolled, 13,988 children were
101 alive at 1 year of age. When the oldest children were approximately 7 years of age, this
102 initial sample was bolstered with cases who would have been eligible to join the study

103 but originally failed to. Following this additional recruitment, 14,901 children were alive
104 at 1 year of age [10] [11] [12]. This cohort of index children are known as the ‘G1’ cohort
105 and have been followed since birth with measures obtained through clinical visits and
106 questionnaires. The G1 cohort now includes their partners, referred to as G1 partners of
107 offspring; the cohort of offspring of these index children are known as ‘G2’ [13]. Full
108 details of the cohort and study design have been described previously and are available
109 at <http://www.alspac.bris.ac.uk>.

110

111 **Data collection**

112 An online questionnaire was developed to capture information on COVID-19
113 infection and behaviours in ALSPAC participants when physical distancing measures
114 were first implemented in the UK, known as ‘lockdown’. The questionnaire was launched
115 on 9th April 2020, shortly after the announcement of official lockdown in the UK on 23rd
116 March. All participants enrolled in the ALSPAC G0 and G1 cohorts for whom we had a
117 valid email address were invited to complete the questionnaire. Invitees were emailed a
118 reminder two weeks after the original invite went out. The questionnaire was deployed
119 and hosted using REDCap (Research Electronic Data CAPture tools) [14] [15], running
120 for 5 weeks until 15th May 2020. Full details on the questionnaire development and
121 deployment can be found in the Wellcome Open Research data note [16].

122 The questionnaire was comprised of four sections recording information on: a)
123 general health, recent travel, COVID-19 and/or influenza-like-illness symptoms; b) self-
124 isolation, activities and contacts; c) pandemic impact (worries and feelings); d)
125 accommodation and household structure, keyworker and healthcare worker (HCW)
126 status, COVID-19 awareness/knowledge. The contact section of the questionnaire was
127 based on that used in [17]. Participants were asked one question: “How many people,
128 apart from those you live with, did you speak to yesterday in the following ways (for

129 personal and for work reasons)?” Participants were asked to record four types of
130 contacts: face-to-face (in person); over the phone; via video media; and physical (skin-
131 to-skin touching). Participants recorded the number of each contact types in four different
132 age groups: 0–4; 5–17; 18–69; and ≥70 years of age. Participants’ sex, date of
133 birth and ethnicity (defined as ‘White’ or ‘Non-white’) were collected at the time of
134 enrolment into ALSPAC. Information on participant occupation was collected from a
135 separate questionnaire conducted in December 2019 as part of the ALSPAC regular data
136 collection exercise. Occupational titles were coded according to the Standard
137 Occupational Classification 2010 Coding Index [18]. Current address was assumed to
138 be that recorded in the ALSPAC administrative database as of April 2020. Please note
139 that the study website contains details of all the data that is available through a fully
140 searchable data dictionary and variable search tool
141 (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/>).

142

143 **Data analysis**

144 The number of daily contacts, consisting either of face-to-face or physical contacts
145 per person was measured. Contacts involving physical touch were considered
146 independent of those with face-to-face contact only. The total number of daily contacts
147 per person was taken as the sum of face-to-face and physical contacts. The average
148 number of contacts (face-to-face, physical and total) were stratified by age, sex, cohort,
149 household size, presence of children in household (household composition), day of the
150 week, occupation and self-isolation status. For age, participants were categorised into
151 six age bands: 23–29; 30–39; 40–49; 50–59; 60–69; and 70+. We analysed answers
152 related to symptoms and behaviours descriptively. We present the number and
153 percentage or mean and standard deviation where appropriate.

154 We investigated the occupational profile of questionnaire participants self-
155 identifying as essential and non-essential workers. Participants self-identified according
156 to government guidelines [19] as either: a keyworker; a healthcare worker (HCW); or
157 neither (classified as 'Other'). We re-classified participants identifying as both keyworkers
158 and HCWs as HCWs only to give mutually exclusive groups used in subsequent
159 analyses. Next, we mined available occupational data categorised according to ONS
160 occupational groups (available through data linkage described above) to determine the
161 top five group job titles for participants identified as HCWs, keyworkers and other (non-
162 essential) workers. The frequency of reported COVID-19 symptoms and those of
163 influenza like illness were calculated.

164 We assessed representativeness of the study sample by comparing the
165 distributions of variables (sex, age, ethnicity) observed for participants to those in south
166 west England and the UK using the UK Office for National Statistics (ONS) estimates
167 (2019 ONS mid-year estimates [20]; 2011 census data [21]).

168 We examined the association between covariates (age, sex, household size,
169 presence of children in household, occupation, day of the week and self-isolation status)
170 and numbers of daily total contacts, electing to use a negative binomial regression
171 appropriate for the observed data (Supplementary Figure 2). Motivated by the high
172 proportion of zero counts (41.5%; 2825/6807) observed, we contrasted the negative
173 binomial regression analysis with its zero-inflated version. A lower AIC score was
174 observed for the zero-inflated (29124) model vs the negative binomial (29263). When the
175 predicted number of zero counts were inspected, both models performed similarly and
176 when plotting the observed vs predicted counts, the models almost overlapped with each
177 other (Supplementary Figure 2). The more parsimonious negative binomial model was
178 used in further analyses. R version 4.0 was used for all analyses.

179

180 **RESULTS**

181 **Responses and participants**

182 Invitations to participate were sent to 12,520 individuals. The questionnaire was
183 completed by 6807 (54%) participants between 9th April 2020 and 14th May 2020. The
184 bulk of responses occurred in two waves, each one week in duration: the first 7 days
185 (3981/6807; 58.5%) and the second 10 days later (1487/6807; 21.8%). Peaks in
186 responses coincided with the invitation and reminder emails (Supplementary Figure 1).
187 Most contacts were reported for interactions occurring on weekdays (5016/6807; 73.7%)
188 versus the weekend (1791/6807; 26.3%).

189 Participants were aged between 23 and 81 years of age and belonged to four
190 ALSPAC participant types: G0 mothers, G0 fathers/partners, G1 offspring and G1
191 partners of offspring. Participants were mostly female (4895/6807; 72%) and either aged
192 23–29 (3039/6807; 44.7%) or 50–69 (3562/6807; 52.3%), reflective of the ALSPAC G1
193 and G0 cohorts respectively (Figure 1a). Most participants were white (6040/6807;
194 88.7%), with only 2% non-white (137/6807). Ethnicity was unknown for 9.4% of
195 participants (630/6807). Participant characteristics (sex and age) were dissimilar to that
196 of southwest England and the UK. Ethnicity was broadly similar to southwest England
197 but dissimilar to the UK (Supplementary Table 1). We assumed 70% of participants lived
198 in the Bristol/Avon area based on addresses recorded in the ALSPAC administrative
199 database (as of April 2020 based on the G1 cohort); 3.7% (254/6807) of participants
200 reported living outside the UK at the time of questionnaire completion.

201

202 **Associations with essential contacts**

203 All participants recorded information on their daily contacts occurring outside of
204 the household. At least one face-to-face or physical contact was recorded for 3944
205 (57.9%) and 900 (13.2%) participants respectively. No contact of either type was

206 reported for 2825 participants (41.5%). Overall, a daily average of 3.7 [standard deviation
207 (SD) = 10.6] total contacts outside the household were reported. The maximum number
208 of face-to-face and physical contacts reported was 250 and 100 respectively. These
209 contacts were reported for individuals aged between 23–29 years. Total contacts were
210 higher on weekdays (mean = 4.0, SD = 11.4) compared to weekends (mean = 3.0, SD =
211 7.7).

212 Contacts were mostly face-to-face (mean = 3.4, SD = 10.0), with many fewer involving
213 physical touch (mean = 0.3, SD = 2.1). We observed small differences in the number of
214 contacts reported for G0 and G1 cohorts: on average, G0s reported increased face-to-
215 face, but fewer physical contacts compared to G1s (

216 Table 1). This observation was reflective of participant age, with a greater number of
217 daily face-to-face contacts observed for individuals aged 50–59 (mean = 3.9, SD = 10.1)
218 compared to participants aged 23–29 (mean = 3.4, SD = 11.3). Participants aged ≥70
219 years reported the fewest daily contacts (mean = 2.6, SD = 3.0).

220

221 **Household structures**

222 The average household size was 2.6 persons (SD = 1.3, max = 29), with 10.6%
223 (712/6807) of participants living alone. On average, household size was highest for the
224 40–49 age group (mean = 2.43, SD = 2.0, max = 11), thereafter household size
225 decreased as participants aged (Figure 2a). The greatest heterogeneity in the total
226 number of daily contacts was observed for households ranging from 1 to 4 persons in
227 size (Figure 2c) – contact numbers tended to increase as household size increased. We
228 observed increased household sizes to coincide with cohabiting with children aged 0 to
229 17 years old (Figure 2b). Adults living with children, on average, had 16% higher total
230 contacts (

231 Table 1) compared to those not living with children. Of note, those living with
232 children had twice the number of contacts involving touch (mean = 0.6, SD = 3.9)
233 compared to those living without children (mean = 0.3, SD = 1.6). Of the participant ages
234 investigated, daily contacts were higher for participants aged 30–39 who lived with
235 children compared to those who did not (Figure 2d).

236

237 **Occupation and health behaviours**

238 We observed a clear occupational contact profile for HCW and keyworkers.
239 Specifically, the number of face-to-face contacts and physical contacts appear positively
240 correlated for HCWs. The majority of keyworkers had high numbers of face-to-face
241 contacts but rarely reported physical contacts (Figure 3). There are outliers to this
242 relationship: participants reporting a high number of face-to-face contacts only and
243 individuals reporting a high number of physical contacts only. Mining available
244 occupational group job titles showed nurses and medical practitioners were the largest
245 groups of HCWs surveyed. Keyworkers were predominately teachers and school staff,
246 with police officers identified as the fifth top group. The majority of participants not self-
247 identifying as a HCW or keyworker ('Other') worked in office-based roles: administration,
248 programming, sales, marketing and business (Table 2).

249 At the time of questionnaire completion, 11.1% of participants (755/6807) reported
250 to be self-isolating, with a further 10.1% reported to have self-isolated previously
251 (689/6807). The duration of self-isolation ranged from less than a week, up to more than
252 13 weeks. The majority of participants reported not to be currently self-isolating
253 (5125/6807; 75.3%). We observed a 59% reduction in the average daily number of
254 contacts for individuals self-isolating compared to those not (from 4.1 to 1.7) (Table 1).
255 Some individuals preferred to not disclose their status (43/6807; 0.6%) or left the
256 question blank (195/6807; 2.9%). Individuals who preferred to not disclose their isolation

257 status had similar contacts to those currently self-isolating. Individuals who reported to
258 self-isolate previously had similar numbers of contacts to those who had not self-isolated
259 (4.0 vs 4.1).

260 Eighty-four participants (1.2%) had a confirmed positive test or were suspected to
261 have had COVID-19 by their doctor. Of these cases, 8 were confirmed by a positive test
262 result [16]. The top five symptoms most frequently reported were difficulty sleeping
263 (20.1%), sneezing (18.3%), tiredness (14.7%), runny nose (12.8%) and sore eyes (10.2).

264

265 **Regression analyses of total number of contacts**

266 Analysis of the total number of daily contacts with a multivariable negative
267 binomial regression model shows a striking pattern of contact frequency by occupation
268 – peak contacts were observed for healthcare workers, followed by keyworkers, with
269 comparatively fewer contacts among non-essential workers (Table 3). Weekdays were
270 associated with increased contacts compared to weekends. In the univariable model
271 (Table 1), there was a rise in the number of contacts with age, peaking at 40–49 years
272 and declining to the lowest number of contacts reported for adults aged ≥ 70 years. When
273 controlling for covariates in the multivariable model, peak contacts occurred in adults
274 aged over ≥ 70 years. Contacts were increased for females in the univariable model.
275 Higher contacts were associated with living in a larger household and living with children.
276 Self-isolation was associated with reduced contacts and for those that preferred not to
277 disclose their isolation status or if the status was unknown.

278

279 **DISCUSSION**

280 In this paper, we demonstrate that social contacts dropped dramatically during the
281 first lockdown in the UK, as measured in the ALSPAC cohort in 2020. Contact numbers
282 were found to be much lower than pre-pandemic estimates, but exhibited a lower, non-

283 zero, limit, associated with occupation, household size and presence of children living at
284 home. This limit and its drivers partly explain patterns of transmission and COVID-19
285 reproduction rates during lockdown in the UK [22] [7]].

286 Social contact surveys have mainly been conducted as stand-alone studies by
287 recruiting new participants [6] [7] [5]. Here, we surveyed an existing longitudinal cohort.
288 This approach has several strengths. With ethics approval, consent and communications
289 mechanisms in place it was possible to get a rapid assessment of mixing patterns.
290 Participant engagement is high, evidenced by the high response rate. Using an existing
291 cohort provides a more in-depth understanding of contacts and behaviours. Linkage with
292 existing data provides the opportunity to understand social contact patterns in the context
293 of other correlates such as occupation, household size, internet use, pet ownership, as
294 well as subsequent follow-up to look at the long-term impact of COVID-19. Another
295 example is the impact of COVID-19 on mental health, this has been explored in two
296 longitudinal cohorts (ALSPAC and Generation Scotland) [23]. Young adults in the
297 ALSPAC cohort were shown to experience a rise in magnitude of anxiety and reduction
298 in well-being. The authors suggest this is possibly reflective of mitigation measures (i.e.,
299 lockdown and physical distancing) as opposed to risk of COVID-19 infection, with the
300 latter determined as factor for higher depression and anxiety among older adults.
301 Consequently, COVID-19 has differentially affected mental health in young and old
302 adults, which may further be explained by contact patterns resulting from mitigation
303 measures.

304 A limitation of the longitudinal cohort approach is that our survey is not
305 demographically or geographically representative. As a birth cohort, participants were
306 either born in 1991/1992 or they are parents of children born in those years, therefore
307 we had few participants aged between 30 to 50 years old. Furthermore, the majority of

308 participants are from the Bristol/Avon area and are less ethnically diverse than the UK
309 as a whole. Given only 2% of the sample was non-white, and a further 9.4% were of
310 unknown ethnicity, we were unable to investigate the association between ethnicity and
311 contact patterns. However, evidence now strongly suggests that people from black,
312 Asian, and minority ethnic (BAME) communities are disproportionately affected by
313 COVID-19, with both racism and social determinants of health (e.g., high risk occupation,
314 socioeconomic status, increased burden of comorbidities) identified as causes [24].

315 We acknowledge that the presented analyses are susceptible to collider bias since
316 they have been restricted to ALSPAC participants who volunteered to respond to
317 the COVID-19 questionnaire [25]. Participation in ALSPAC questionnaires by cohort
318 participants has previously been demonstrated to be non-random; respondents are likely
319 to be highly educated and health conscious (non-smokers) [26]. In addition, the COVID-
320 19 questionnaire was completed online which may favour responses from those with
321 internet access and engagement in technology [27] [28]. Consequently, the associations
322 relating to the number of contacts could be biased due to colliders on participation. Ideally
323 one would perform these associations using inverse probability weighting in which we
324 estimate the probability of being selected into the sample using at least the exposure and
325 outcome variables; however, this is not possible in our data because we do not have
326 information on numbers of contacts outside of the selected sample. Instead, we reported
327 the representativeness of the sample by comparing variable distributions outside the
328 sample, and we observed that questionnaire participants were more likely to be female,
329 white and aged 23–29 and 50–69. Similarly, analysis of variable distributions within the
330 sample demonstrated that females, particularly younger females, and individuals with
331 higher educational level (\geq A level) were more likely to respond [16]. Despite these
332 differences in sample representation, the distribution of the number of contacts was

333 comparable to pre-pandemic social contact surveys (right skewed, with a small fraction
334 having the most contacts) [5] [29] [30].

335 Although we took an alternative approach to recruitment, our results are
336 comparable to other social contact surveys. Compared to pre-pandemic surveys, we
337 measured a significantly reduced number of social contacts per person. Our estimates
338 are broadly consistent with other pandemic era surveys, such as CoMix, which reported
339 an average of 2.8 contacts per person (*cf.* 3.7) at the height of the UK lockdown in May
340 2020 [5]. We modelled the distribution of contacts with a negative binomial model; a pre-
341 pandemic contact survey found that a negative binomial distribution was unable to
342 capture large groups [5], which are largely absent with physical distancing measures.

343 We observed striking occupational trends, with high numbers of contacts for
344 healthcare workers and other keyworkers. Contacts of healthcare workers were more
345 likely to involve touch, increasing their risk of exposure. The majority of keyworkers were
346 identified as teachers in nursery, primary and secondary school settings, during a time
347 of partial school closures. Interestingly, the group also included police officers. In line
348 with contact surveys pre- and post-pandemic, essential contacts were higher for
349 individuals living in larger households and with children [31] [6] [7]). Since these variables
350 are related, associated contacts could be explained by lockdown placing pressures on
351 parents and carers to seek non-household support, which necessarily involves contacts
352 [32]. Finally, self-isolation was demonstrated to reduce daily contacts by 59%, suggesting
353 that although effective in reducing contacts, some level of essential contacts outside of
354 the household are maintained. These essential contacts may reflect financial pressures
355 to continue work and/or caring responsibilities, necessity to obtain supplies or perceived
356 risk of COVID-19 [32].

357 Understanding the drivers of contact patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic is
358 informative for designing testing and vaccination strategies. For the latter, this will

359 depend largely on whether a vaccine will interrupt transmission, prevent disease or both.
360 As COVID-19 vaccines are rolled out in the UK and worldwide, priority groups are being
361 determined; however, it is essential we look for evidence in informing these campaigns.

362

363 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

364 We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for
365 their help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers,
366 computer and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers,
367 managers, receptionists and nurses. We are grateful to colleagues in the University of
368 Bristol COVID-19 Emergency Research Group (UNCOVER) and ALSPAC COVID-19
369 Analysis Group for discussions supporting the manuscript. The UK Medical Research
370 Council and Wellcome (Grant ref: 217065/Z/19/Z) and the University of Bristol provide
371 core support for ALSPAC. This publication is the work of the authors and ACT, LD, HC,
372 KN, DS, EN, AT, GH, SST, AF, NT, EBP will serve as guarantors for the contents of this
373 paper. A comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the ALSPAC website
374 (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf>); This
375 research was specifically funded by the Wellcome Trust, Medical Research Council and
376 University of Bristol Elizabeth Blackwell Institute for Research (102215/2/13/2). ACT and
377 GH are funded by the Wellcome Trust (217509/Z/19/Z and 208806/Z/17/Z). HC and EBP
378 would like to acknowledge support from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)
379 Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the
380 University of Bristol. HC is additionally funded through an NIHR Career Development
381 Fellowship [CDF-2018-11-ST2-015]. The views expressed are those of the authors and
382 not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. EN, LD
383 and EBP are supported by the MRC (MR/V038613/1). LD and EBP are also supported

384 by the MRC (MC/PC/19067) and LD is further supported by EPSRC (EP/V051555/1) and
385 The Alan Turing Institute under the EPSRC grant EP/N510129/1. NJT is a Wellcome
386 Trust Investigator (202802/Z/16/Z), is the PI of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents
387 and Children (MRC & WT 217065/Z/19/Z), is supported by the University of Bristol NIHR
388 Biomedical Research Centre (BRC-1215-2001), the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit
389 (MC_UU_00011) and works within the CRUK Integrative Cancer Epidemiology
390 Programme (C18281/A19169).

391

392 **DATA AVAILABILITY**

393 Full details of the cohort and study design have been described previously and are
394 available at <http://www.alspac.bris.ac.uk>. Please note that the study website contains
395 details of all the data that is available through a fully searchable data dictionary and
396 variable search tool (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/>). ALSPAC
397 data access is managed through a system of open access. The steps below highlight
398 how to apply for access to the data included in this project (accessed under the project
399 number B3514) and all other ALSPAC data:

- 400 1. Please read the [ALSPAC access policy](#), which describes the process of accessing the
401 data and samples in detail, and outlines the costs associated with doing so.
- 402 2. You may also find it useful to browse our fully searchable [research proposals](#)
403 [database](#), which lists all research projects that have been approved since April 2011.
- 404 3. Please [submit your research proposal](#) for consideration by the ALSPAC Executive
405 Committee. You will receive a response within 10 working days to advise you whether
406 your proposal has been approved.

407 Please note that a standard COVID-19 dataset will be made available at no charge (see
408 description below); however, costs for required paperwork and any bespoke datasets
409 required additional variables will apply.

410

411 **CODE AVAILABILITY**

412 The code used to conduct data analyses is available at
413 <https://github.com/amythomas/AlspacContactsQ1.git>

414 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

415 EBP and LD contribute to the Scientific Pandemic Influenza Group on Modelling (SPI-
416 M). AF contributes to the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI).

417

418 **AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS**

419 ACT, EBP and LD wrote the first draft of the manuscript. EBP, LD, NT and ACT had the
420 original idea for the manuscript. ACT, LD, HC, KN, DS, EN, AT, GH, SST, AF, NT and
421 EBP designed analyses, interpreted the results, and critically reviewed the manuscript.
422 ACT, EBP and LD conducted the analyses.

423 REFERENCES

- 424 1. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients
425 infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. (1474-547X (Electronic)).
- 426 2. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen Y-M, Wang W, Song Z-G, et al. A new coronavirus
427 associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature*. 2020;579(7798):265-9.
- 428 3. van Doremalen N, Bushmaker T, Morris DH, Holbrook MG, Gamble A, Williamson
429 BN, et al. Aerosol and Surface Stability of SARS-CoV-2 as Compared with SARS-CoV-
430 1. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(16):1564-7.
- 431 4. Meselson M. Droplets and Aerosols in the Transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *New*
432 *England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(21):2063-.
- 433 5. Danon L, Read J, House T, Vernon M, Keeling M. Social encounter networks:
434 characterizing Great Britain. *Proc R Soc B*. 2013;280.
- 435 6. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social
436 Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLOS*
437 *Medicine*. 2008;5(3):e74.
- 438 7. Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Prem K, Auzenbergs M, O'Reilly K, et al.
439 Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19
440 in the UK. *BMC Medicine*. 2020;18(1):124.
- 441 8. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, Pearson CAB, et al. Age-dependent
442 effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nature Medicine*. 2020.
- 443 9. Goeyvaerts N, Santermans E, Potter G, Torneri A, Van Kerckhove K, Willem L, et
444 al. Household members do not contact each other at random: implications for infectious
445 disease modelling. *Proc R Soc B*. 2018;285(1893).
- 446 10. Boyd A, Golding J Fau - Macleod J, Macleod J Fau - Lawlor DA, Lawlor Da Fau -
447 Fraser A, Fraser A Fau - Henderson J, Henderson J Fau - Molloy L, et al. Cohort Profile:
448 the 'children of the 90s'--the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents
449 and Children. (1464-3685 (Electronic)).
- 450 11. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C Fau - Tilling K, Tilling K Fau - Boyd A, Boyd A Fau
451 - Golding J, Golding J Fau - Davey Smith G, Davey Smith G Fau - Henderson J, et al.
452 Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers
453 cohort. (1464-3685 (Electronic)).
- 454 12. Northstone KA-O, Lewcock M, Groom A, Boyd AA-O, Macleod J, Timpson NA-O,
455 et al. The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC): an update on the
456 enrolled sample of index children in 2019. 2019(2398-502X (Print)).
- 457 13. Lawlor DA LM, Rena-Jones L The second generation of The Avon Longitudinal
458 Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC-G2): a cohort profile. *Wellcome Open Res*
459 2019.
- 460 14. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research
461 electronic data capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow
462 process for providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical*
463 *Informatics*. 2009;42(2):377-81.
- 464 15. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The
465 REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners.
466 *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. 2019;95:103208.
- 467 16. Northstone K, Haworth S, Smith D, Bowring C, Wells N, Timpson NJ. The Avon
468 Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children - A resource for COVID-19 research:
469 Questionnaire data capture April-May 2020 [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer
470 review]. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2020;127(5).

- 471 17. Eames KTD, Tilston NL, Brooks-Pollock E, Edmunds WJ. Measured Dynamic
472 Social Contact Patterns Explain the Spread of H1N1v Influenza. *PLOS Computational*
473 *Biology*. 2012;8(3):e1002425.
- 474 18. Office-for-national-statistics. The Standard Occupational Classification (SOC)
475 2010 Vol 2: Palgrave Macmillian UK; 2010.
- 476 19. Education Df. Guidance: Critical workers and vulnerable children who can access
477 schools or educational settings [Available from:
478 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-provision)
479 [educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-provision)
480 [maintaining-educational-provision](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-maintaining-educational-provision/guidance-for-schools-colleges-and-local-authorities-on-maintaining-educational-provision).]
- 481 20. Office-for-National-Statistics. Office for National Statistics. Population estimates
482 for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland: mid-2019, using April
483 2020 local authority district codes 2021 [
- 484 21. Office-for-national-statistics. Census 2011. KS201 UK, Ethnic group. 2011.
- 485 22. Challen R, Brooks-Pollock E, Tsaneva-Atanasova K, Danon L. Meta-analysis of
486 the SARS-CoV-2 serial interval and the impact of parameter uncertainty on the COVID-
487 19 reproduction number. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.11.17.20231548.
- 488 23. Kwong ASF, Pearson RM, Adams MJ, Northstone K, Tilling K, Smith D, et al.
489 Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in two longitudinal UK
490 population cohorts. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2020:1-10.
- 491 24. Razai MS, Kankam HKN, Majeed A, Esmail A, Williams DR. Mitigating ethnic
492 disparities in covid-19 and beyond. *BMJ*. 2021;372:m4921.
- 493 25. Griffith GJ, Morris TT, Tudball MJ, Herbert A, Mancano G, Pike L, et al. Collider
494 bias undermines our understanding of COVID-19 disease risk and severity. *Nature*
495 *Communications*. 2020;11(1):5749.
- 496 26. Taylor AE, Jones HJ, Sallis H, Euesden J, Stergiakouli E, Davies NM, et al.
497 Exploring the association of genetic factors with participation in the Avon Longitudinal
498 Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2018;47(4):1207-16.
- 499 27. Blom AG, Herzing JME, Cornesse C, Sakshaug JW, Krieger U, Bossert D. Does
500 the Recruitment of Offline Households Increase the Sample Representativeness of
501 Probability-Based Online Panels? Evidence From the German Internet Panel. *Social*
502 *Science Computer Review*. 2016;35(4):498-520.
- 503 28. Antoun C, Zhang C, Conrad FG, Schober MF. Comparisons of Online Recruitment
504 Strategies for Convenience Samples: Craigslist, Google AdWords, Facebook, and
505 Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Field Methods*. 2015;28(3):231-46.
- 506 29. Ibuka Y, Ohkusa Y, Sugawara T, Chapman GB, Yamin D, Atkins KE, et al. Social
507 contacts, vaccination decisions and influenza in Japan. *Journal of Epidemiology and*
508 *Community Health*. 2016;70(2):162.
- 509 30. Leung K, Jit M, Lau EHY, Wu JT. Social contact patterns relevant to the spread
510 of respiratory infectious diseases in Hong Kong. *Sci Rep*. 2017;7(1):7974.
- 511 31. Hens N, Goeyvaerts N, Aerts M, Shkedy Z, Van Damme P, Beutels P. Mining
512 social mixing patterns for infectious disease models based on a two-day population
513 survey in Belgium. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2009;9(1):5.
- 514 32. Smith LE, Amlôt R, Lambert H, Oliver I, Robin C, Yardley L, et al. Factors
515 associated with adherence to self-isolation and lockdown measures in the UK: a cross-
516 sectional survey. *Public Health*. 2020;187:41-52.
- 517

518 **Table 1: Daily contact numbers reported by participants (n=6807) stratified by age,**
 519 **sex, ALSPAC cohort, household size, household composition, day of the week,**
 520 **occupation and self-isolation status.** For each age group, the mean (standard
 521 deviation) and number of participants are shown.

Category	Value	Mean (SD) face-to-face contacts	Mean (SD) physical contacts	Mean (SD) total contacts	n
Age (years)	23–29	3.4 (11.3)	0.4 (2.6)	3.7 (12.1)	3039
	30–39	4.3 (15.6)	0.8 (3.8)	5.1 (17.3)	45
	40–49	5.9 (16.7)	0.7 (2.7)	6.6 (17.7)	90
	50–59	3.9 (10.1)	0.3 (1.6)	4.2 (10.5)	2107
	60–69	2.7 (5.2)	0.2 (0.9)	2.9 (5.5)	1455
	70+	2.5 (2.8)	0.1 (0.4)	2.6 (3.0)	71
Sex	Female	3.5 (10.1)	0.3 (1.9)	3.8 (10.7)	4895
	Male	3.2 (9.6)	0.3 (2.5)	3.5 (10.3)	1912
Cohort	G0	3.5 (8.7)	0.2 (1.4)	3.7 (9.1)	3720
	G1	3.4 (11.3)	0.4 (2.6)	3.8 (12.2)	3087
Household size	1	2.7 (7.7)	0.1 (0.9)	2.8 (7.9)	712
	2	3.4 (10.0)	0.3 (1.4)	3.7 (10.4)	3206
	3	3.6 (10.5)	0.3 (1.4)	3.8 (10.9)	1554
	4	3.8 (11.7)	0.6 (4.5)	4.4 (13.8)	859
	5+	3.6 (6.9)	0.4 (1.4)	3.9 (7.6)	477
Lives with children	Yes	3.8 (12.8)	0.6 (3.9)	4.3 (14.3)	893
	No	3.4 (9.5)	0.3 (1.6)	3.6 (9.92)	5914
Day	Weekday	3.7 (10.9)	0.3 (2.1)	4.0 (11.4)	5016
	Weekend	2.7 (6.8)	0.3 (2.0)	3.0 (7.7)	1791
Occupation	Health care worker	8.2 (14.3)	0.9 (4.1)	9.1 (16.4)	697
	Keyworker	5.8 (16.5)	0.4 (2.8)	6.1 (17.0)	1603
	Other	1.8 (3.8)	0.2 (1.0)	2.0 (4.0)	4507
Self-isolation	No	3.8 (10.8)	0.3 (2.1)	4.1 (11.4)	5125
	Previously	3.7 (10.2)	0.3 (2.5)	4.0 (11.2)	689
	Currently	1.5 (2.7)	0.2 (0.7)	1.7 (2.9)	755
	Prefer not to say	1.6 (2.2)	0.4 (1.0)	1.9 (2.7)	43
	Unknown	0.3 (2.3)	0.005 (0.072)	0.3 (2.4)	195

523 **Table 2: Top five ONS group job titles for healthcare workers, keyworkers and**
524 **other participants.**


Healthcare workers	(n)	Keyworkers	(n)	Other	(n)
Nurses	(67)	Primary and nursery teachers	(89)	Administrative work	(73)
Medical practitioners	(46)	Secondary education teachers	(27)	Programmers and software developers	(50)
Care workers and home carers	(21)	Nursery school staff	(26)	Sales	(46)
Physiotherapists	(12)	Teaching assistants	(22)	Marketing	(40)
Nursing assistants	(11)	Police officers	(21)	Business/Financial project management	(37)

525

526 **Table 3: Relative number of daily total non-household contacts from univariable**
527 **and multivariable negative binomial regression**


Variable	Univariable			Multivariable		
	Incidence Rate Ratio	95% CI	p	Incidence Rate Ratio	95% CI	p
Age 23 - 29	1.00		<0.001	1.00		0.00729
Age 30 - 39	1.36	0.84 – 2.40		1.02	0.64 – 1.72	
Age 40 - 49	1.76	1.24 – 2.60		1.29	0.93 – 1.85	
Age 50 - 59	1.12	1.02 – 1.24		1.18	1.07 – 1.29	
Age 60 - 69	0.77	0.69 – 0.86		1.15	1.03 – 1.28	
Age 70+	0.69	0.46 – 1.08		1.42	0.97 – 2.16	
Female	1.00		0.0927	1.00		<0.001
Male	0.92	0.84 – 1.01		1.21	1.10 – 1.33	
Household size 1	1.00		<0.001	1.00		0.407
Household size 2	1.30	1.12 – 1.51		0.89	0.77 – 1.03	
Household size 3	1.36	1.16 – 1.60		0.95	0.81 – 1.12	
Household size 4	1.55	1.29 – 1.85		0.96	0.80 – 1.14	
Household size 5+	1.40	1.14 – 1.73		0.97	0.79 – 1.20	
No children in house	1.00		0.00424	1.00		0.183
Lives with children	1.20	1.06 – 1.36		1.10	0.96 – 1.26	
Weekday	1.00		<0.001	1.00		<0.001
Weekend	0.75	0.68 – 0.83		0.85	0.77 – 0.93	
Non-essential worker	1.00		<0.001	1.00		<0.001
Healthcare worker	4.54	4.00 – 5.17		4.42	3.88 – 5.04	
Keyworker	3.07	2.80 – 3.38		2.84	2.58 – 3.13	
Not self-isolating	1.00		<0.001	1.00		<0.001
Self-isolating currently	0.40	0.35 – 0.46		0.57	0.50 – 0.66	
Self-isolated previously	0.97	0.85 – 1.12		0.92	0.80 – 1.05	
Prefer not to say	0.47	0.28 – 0.84		0.73	0.45 – 1.26	
Unknown	0.07	0.05 – 0.11		0.12	0.08 – 0.16	

529 **Figure 1: Distribution of participant age, sex and total contacts.** a) Distribution of
530 participant age coloured by sex. b) Frequency of total daily non-household contacts
531 fitted to a negative binomial distribution ($NB(r=0.11, p=0.97)$) with 95% confidence
532 interval shown.



533


534



535

536 **Figure 2: Participant household size and composition by number of contacts.**

537 a) Relationship between age of participant and mean household size. Grey points
 538 represent the mean household size at each participant age, with size proportional to the
 539 number of individuals contributing to the mean. The smoothed conditional mean with
 540 95% confidence intervals is shown in blue. b) Effect of children in the household on mean
 541 household. Grey points represent the mean household size at each participants age,
 542 stratified by children in the household. Smoothed conditional mean with 95% confidence
 543 interval. c) Box and whiskers plot of the total daily contacts by household size; the middle
 544 line (hinge) corresponds to the median, the lower and upper hinges correspond to the
 545 interquartile range, and the whiskers extend to 1.5 times the interquartile range. The
 546 width of the boxplot is proportional to the number of observations. Outliers are shown as
 547 grey points and the geometric mean as red crosses. d) Box and whiskers plot of the total
 548 daily non-household contacts by children in the household (household composition). The
 549 number of observations contributing to each box is shown above.



550

551 **Figure 3: Total number of face-to-face contacts and physical contacts by**
552 **occupation.** Contacts stratified and coloured by occupational group: other (non-
553 essential worker), healthcare worker (HCW) and keyworker. Size of the point is
554 proportional to the count of individuals.