

1 CoMix: Changes in social contacts as measured by the contact survey during the  
2 COVID-19 pandemic in England between March 2020 and March 2021

3 *Authors:* Amy Gimma<sup>1</sup>, James D Munday<sup>1</sup>, Kerry LM Wong<sup>1</sup>, Pietro Coletti<sup>2</sup>, Kevin  
4 van Zandvoort<sup>1</sup>, Kiesha Prem<sup>1</sup>, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Petra Klepac<sup>1</sup>, G.  
5 James Rubin<sup>3</sup>, Sebastian Funk<sup>1</sup>, W John Edmunds<sup>1</sup>, Christopher I Jarvis<sup>1</sup>

6 Corresponding author: Amy.Gimma@lshtm.ac.uk

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

10 2 UHasselt, Data Science Institute and I-BioStat, Hasselt 3500, Belgium

11 3 Department of Psychological Medicine, King's College London, Denmark Hill,  
12 London, UK

## 13 **Abstract**

### 14 **Background:**

15 During the COVID-19 pandemic, the UK government imposed public health policies in England  
16 to reduce social contacts in hopes of curbing virus transmission. We measured contact patterns  
17 weekly from March 2020 to March 2021 to estimate the impact of these policies, covering three  
18 national lockdowns interspersed by periods of lower restrictions.

### 19 **Methods:**

20 Data were collected using online surveys of representative samples of the UK population by age  
21 and gender. We calculated the mean daily contacts reported using a (clustered) bootstrap and  
22 fitted a censored negative binomial model to estimate age-stratified contact matrices and estimate  
23 proportional changes to the basic reproduction number under controlled conditions using the  
24 change in contacts as a scaling factor.

### 25 **Results:**

26 The survey recorded 101,350 observations from 19,914 participants who reported 466,710  
27 contacts over 53 weeks. Contact patterns changed over time and by participants' age, personal  
28 risk factors, and perception of risk. The mean of reported contacts among adults have reduced  
29 compared to previous surveys with adults aged 18 to 59 reporting a mean of 2.39 (95% CI 2.20 -  
30 2.60) contacts to 4.93 (95% CI 4.65 - 5.19) contacts, and the mean contacts for school-age  
31 children was 3.07 (95% CI 2.89 - 3.27) to 15.11 (95% CI 13.87 - 16.41). The use of face coverings  
32 outside the home has remained high since the government mandated use in some settings in July  
33 2020.

### 34 **Conclusions:**

35 The CoMix survey provides a unique longitudinal data set for a full year since the first lockdown  
36 for use in statistical analyses and mathematical modelling of COVID-19 and other diseases.  
37 Recorded contacts reduced dramatically compared to pre-pandemic levels, with changes  
38 correlated to government interventions throughout the pandemic. Despite easing of restrictions in  
39 the summer of 2020, mean reported contacts only returned to about half of that observed pre-  
40 pandemic.

## 41 **Key words**

42 Covid-19, Contact survey, Pandemic, Disease Outbreak, Reproduction Number, CoMix

## 43 **Background**

44 Since early 2020, governments across the world have asked or required people to change their  
45 behaviour in an attempt to slow transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. In England, the  
46 government has implemented a variety of measures over the course of the pandemic, including  
47 three separate national “lockdowns” [1–5] as well as other local and national measures [6]. In  
48 addition, guidance has been issued on risk mitigation measures during social interactions,  
49 including meeting outdoors, maintaining space between people, frequent handwashing or use of  
50 hand sanitiser, and the use of face coverings (masks).

51 We conducted a weekly longitudinal survey on the social contacts, behaviours, and attitudes of  
52 people in the UK to quantify social interactions over time. We have previously described early  
53 findings during the first week of lockdown in England (24th to 27th March 2020) [7]. In this  
54 paper, we describe observed contact patterns and behaviour in England based on the CoMix  
55 social contact survey collected between 24th March 2020 (the first day of the first national  
56 lockdown in the UK) and 29th March 2021 (the final day of the third national lockdown in  
57 England). We present descriptive analyses showing the mean number of contacts people  
58 reported and how these differed during three national lockdowns, periods with more relaxed  
59 restrictions, and over the Christmas holiday period. We provide a one-year detailed longitudinal  
60 account of contact behaviour in England during the first year of the pandemic, create a historical  
61 record for future study and policy-making, and improve understanding of the patterns of disease  
62 spread and the effectiveness of different policies on reducing contacts to suppress transmission.

## 63 **Methods**

### 64 **Ethics statement**

65 Participation in this opt-in study was voluntary, and all analyses were carried out on anonymised  
66 data. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the London School of Hygiene &  
67 Tropical Medicine Reference number 21795.

## 68 Study design

69 CoMix is an international online behavioural survey that has been running weekly since it  
70 launched on the 24th of March 2020. In the UK, participants are invited to the survey and  
71 subsequently asked to respond once every two weeks, with two panels of participants who  
72 respond in alternating weeks. Initially, each panel consisted of roughly 1,500 participants,  
73 increasing to about 2,500 participants each week from August 2020 (Figure 1D). In May 2020,  
74 we launched two additional panels (each of approximately 500 participants) designed to collect  
75 data on children's contact patterns. Parents completed the surveys on behalf of one of their  
76 children (<18 years old) who lived in the same household, based on which child had the closest  
77 upcoming birthday.

78 A UK-representative sample was recruited by the market research company Ipsos-MORI using  
79 quota sampling, with quotas based on age, gender, and region. Ipsos-MORI recruits through a  
80 combination of social media and web advertising and email campaigns, and partners with other  
81 companies when necessary to meet quotas. New panels were recruited in August 2020, after  
82 the initially planned period of the study was completed and there was a high turnover of  
83 participants throughout January 2021 as participants reached their survey limit or dropped out of  
84 the study and new participants were recruited. Participants were included for a maximum of 10  
85 survey rounds in the first group of panels (before 9 August) and 8 in the second group (after 8  
86 August) to reduce the burden of participating on individuals. Because different policies were  
87 employed by the four nations of the UK, in this paper we restrict analysis to participants who  
88 reported living in England.

89 The survey design is based on the POLYMOD contact survey [8] with additional questions  
90 about work and school attendance, household composition, use of public transportation, and a  
91 variety of others. Details of the early rounds of the CoMix study including the protocol and  
92 survey instrument have been published previously [7] and details of the updated protocol and  
93 survey instruments are provided in the supplementary material.

## 94 Reporting of contacts

95 Contacts that occurred on the day prior to the survey were reported in two ways: individual  
96 contacts and group contacts. First, participants were asked to list each contact and their

97 characteristics separately ('individual contacts'). Second, we asked participants to report the  
98 total number of contacts they had at work, school, or other settings for the age groups 0 to 17,  
99 18 to 59, and 60+, both overall and for physical contacts only ('group contacts'). We define direct  
100 contact as anyone who met the participant in person with whom at least a few words were  
101 exchanged or physical contact was made. Questions on group contacts were included at the end of  
102 the survey, and they were added to surveys from the 14th May 2020 to accommodate individuals –  
103 such as those working in patient- or public-facing roles – who could not record details of all individual  
104 contacts that they made. Since August 2020, participants were also asked to describe the  
105 average time spent with group contacts and any transmission-related precautions they  
106 implemented, including distancing, wearing face-coverings, and performing hand hygiene.

#### 107 Demographic information

108 The survey captures information about participant demographics, employment status and  
109 whether participants attended work (or school/university for participants <18 years old and self-  
110 reported students) in the previous week and on the day they recorded contacts.

#### 111 Risk perception, status, and mitigation

112 Participants were asked questions about their performance of risk mitigating activities and  
113 asked to respond to statements regarding their perception of risk. Participants were asked to  
114 respond to the statements: i) "I am likely to catch coronavirus", ii) "I am worried that I might  
115 spread coronavirus to someone who is vulnerable", and iii) "coronavirus would be a serious  
116 illness for me" with the likert scale of "Strongly Agree", "Tend to Agree", "Neutral", "Tend to  
117 Disagree", "Strongly Disagree". Participants self-reported whether or not they considered  
118 themselves to be high risk based on definitions given in the survey, which changed between  
119 survey versions as government advice changed (see questionnaires for details). Participants  
120 were also asked whether they wore a face covering and in which settings, whether they had  
121 washed their hands in the three hours prior to the survey, and whether they sanitized their  
122 hands in the three hours prior to the survey.

#### 123 Analysis time periods

124 We categorised the dates of contacts in our survey into nine time periods to compare  
125 descriptive statistics and calculate contact matrices. The nine time periods were selected to

126 reflect five stringency levels of non-pharmaceutical interventions we defined as lockdown,  
127 lockdown with schools open, lockdown easing, relaxed restrictions (school holiday) and relaxed  
128 restrictions (schools open) based on guidance released by the UK Government (Table 1) [1–5].

129 Previously published analyses considered the period between the 2nd of September and the 5th  
130 of November 2020 (i.e., when the second Lockdown started), when England was under a range  
131 of local and less stringent restrictions, and therefore this time period has not been included as a  
132 study period for this paper [6].

### 133 Statistical analysis

#### 134 Descriptive

135 R version 4.0.5 was used for all analyses and the code and data are available on GitHub (see  
136 Availability of data and materials section) [9].

137 We calculated summary statistics of the age, gender, socio-economic status, household size,  
138 and National Health Service (NHS) Region for participants for each analysis time period and  
139 survey panel. While parents answer as proxies for children in the study, we describe the  
140 designated child as the “participant” where applicable. We calculated the number and  
141 percentage of participants that completed one, two to three, four to five, and six or more rounds  
142 of the survey by participant characteristics.

#### 143 Mean contacts

144 We calculated the mean number of contacts and associated confidence intervals with 1000  
145 samples using clustered bootstrapping [10]. Each participant was sampled with replacement  
146 and then all observations for selected participants were included in a bootstrapped sample to  
147 account for dependency from repeated observations of the same participants. We calculated the  
148 mean number of contacts with a moving window over two-week, overlapping intervals to  
149 increase the sample size per estimate and to include all participants from simultaneously  
150 running panels. While the initial panels were recruited to be representative of the UK population,  
151 we used post-stratification weights of the mean by age group and gender (if available) to  
152 address bias introduced by differences between each sample and the UK population [11]. We

153 report contacts by age groups for preschool aged children (<5 years old), school-aged children  
154 (5 to 17 years old), adults (18 to 59 years old) and the elderly (60+ years old).

155 Weights were assigned by the age groups 0 to 4, 5 to 11, 12 to 17, 18 to 29, in 10 year age  
156 bands from 30 to 69, and 70 years old and over. We used the World Population Prospects 2019  
157 standard projections overall and by gender for the 2020 UK population [12]. Estimates of the  
158 two-week intervals are presented with the data points aligned to the central time point of each  
159 survey round and therefore each data point shown is derived from information up to one week  
160 before and after the labelled date. We plotted hospitalised cases of COVID-19 alongside mean  
161 contact data by age and setting to illustrate the relationship between mean contacts and cases.  
162 We used hospitalisation data from the UK government online coronavirus dashboard [13], which  
163 we acquired using the *covidregionaldata* R package [14].

164 We calculated the mean number of contacts in various settings: home, work and school (all  
165 educational establishments, including childcare, nurseries and universities and colleges), and  
166 “other” (mostly leisure and social contacts, including shopping). The mean number of contacts  
167 was influenced by a few participants who reported very high numbers of contacts (often in a  
168 work context) relative to the rest of the panel. The distribution of reported contacts are right-  
169 skewed with high variance. The mean number of contacts shown here were calculated by  
170 censoring the maximum number of contacts recorded at 50 per individual per day to reduce the  
171 variance, meaning we counted any individual who reported more than 50 contacts as if they  
172 reported 50 contacts to reduce the weight of individuals reporting high numbers of contacts on  
173 the mean. We have found in previous analyses that censoring at 50 contacts most closely  
174 reflects changes in contacts relative to changes in  $R_t$  over time as estimated by the Real-time  
175 Assessment of Community Transmission (REACT) study, a large home testing study conducted  
176 in the UK with the aim of quantifying COVID-19 transmission and infections [15,16].

177 We report bootstrapped mean contacts using the method previously described by responses to  
178 questions about reported risk and risk perception, and by employment and income categories.  
179 For likert-style questions we group participant responses of “Tend to Agree”, and “Strongly  
180 Agree” into one category of “Agree”, and we group the responses of “Tend to Disagree”, and  
181 “Strongly Disagree” into one category of “Disagree”. Only adult participants are included in  
182 these analyses. For contacts by employment, we only include participants who recorded  
183 working on the day in which they were reporting contacts.



184 Study periods

185 We calculated relative differences in mean contacts between study periods using an individual-  
186 level generalised additive model (GAM) [17,18]. We assumed reported contacts followed a  
187 negative binomial distribution, modelled using a log link function, with a random effect for  
188 participants by age group (0 to 4, 5 to 17, 18 to 59, and 60 years and over) with post-  
189 stratification weights for age and gender (when available) based on the UK population.

190 Face coverings

191 We present the bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals of the proportions of participants who  
192 reported wearing a face covering in any setting for all participants and separately for only those  
193 participants who reported contacts outside the household on the day of the survey.

194 Contact matrices

195 We constructed age-stratified contact matrices for nine age groups (0 to 4, 5 to 11, 12 to 17, 18  
196 to 29, 30 to 39, 40 to 49, 50 to 59, 60 to 69, and 70+ years old). For child participants and  
197 contacts, we did not record exact ages and therefore sampled from the reported age-group with  
198 a weighting consistent with the age distribution of contacts for the participants' own age group,  
199 according to the POLYMOD survey methods [8]. We fitted a negative binomial model censored  
200 to 50 per matrix cell, due to dispersion of the reported number of contacts, to calculate mean  
201 contacts between each participant and contact age groups. To find the population normalised  
202 reciprocal contact matrix, we first multiplied the columns of the matrix by the mean-normalised  
203 proportion of the UK population in each age-group [8,19]. Then we took the cross-diagonal  
204 mean of each element of the contact matrix. Finally, we divided the resulting symmetrical matrix  
205 by the population mean-normalised proportion of the UK population in each age-group.

206 We used this approach to construct a contact matrix for each of the analysis periods by filtering  
207 the contact data by date. For each time period (table 1) we calculated the dominant eigenvalue  
208 of the infectiousness and susceptibility corrected contact matrix ( $\mathbf{C}_{SI}$ ), calculated from the  
209 measured contact matrix  $\mathbf{C}_t$  and assumed age-dependent relative susceptibility and  
210 infectiousness vectors  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\mathbf{i}$ :

211 
$$\mathbf{C}_{SI} = \mathbf{C}_t \circ (\mathbf{i} \otimes \mathbf{s})$$



212 We calculated the relative difference in the basic reproduction number under controlled  
213 conditions to Lockdown 1 by taking the ratio of the dominant eigenvalue of the effective contact  
214 matrices from the period in question and the dominant eigenvalue from Lockdown 1 [7,20,21].  
215 The value of  $R_c$ , the basic reproduction number under controlled conditions, is defined as the  
216 expected number of secondary cases resulting from an initial infection in a completely  
217 susceptible population adjusted to changing conditions, in this case the change in social  
218 contacts over time. This value does not account for immunity in the population, and will  
219 therefore be higher than the actual reproduction number at a given time.

$$\Delta R = \frac{C_{t \circ (i \otimes s)}}{C_{LD1 \circ (i \otimes s)}}$$

220  
221 We applied two assumptions of age-dependent susceptibility and infectiousness. First, we  
222 assumed that all age-groups are equally infectious and susceptible. Second, we applied a  
223 weight for relative susceptibility and infectiousness by age as estimated by Davies et. al.[22]  
224 (Supplementary information).

## 225 **Results**

### 226 **Participants characteristics**

227 Overall, we recorded 101,350 observations from 19,914 participants who reported 466,710  
228 contacts over 53 weeks (23rd March 2020 to 29th March 2021). About a quarter of the  
229 participants ( $n=4,574$ ) were proxy respondents (i.e. the survey was completed by parents on  
230 behalf of children), and 15,340 were adults. The median number of responses per participant  
231 was 6 (min-max 1-9) with 20.6% (4,098) responding only once.

232 The sample consisted of 8,714 (52.8%) females and 7,790 (47.2%) males. Participants were  
233 assigned social grade based on occupation by the Ipsos-MORI company (see map in  
234 supplementary materials), which categorised 11,743 (63.1%) participants in social grades A, B,  
235 or C1 and 6,880 (36.9%) in C2, D or E. The NHS England region with the most participants was  
236 the Midlands with 4,029 (20.2%) participants and the North West had the fewest with 1,931  
237 (9.7%). The characteristics of the participants were consistent over the different analysis  
238 periods, with slight variations over the course of the study, particularly in gender balance and

239 household size (Table 2). For instance, around 14% of the participants lived in a single person  
240 household in the initial recruitment round versus around 16 to 17% for later recruitment periods.

241 While participants were recruited to fill quotas by age and gender, participation varies by wave.  
242 32.0% of participants 18 to 29 completed six or more rounds of the survey, while 27.9%  
243 completed only one round (Table S1). 60 to 69 year olds had the highest percentage of  
244 participants complete six or more rounds at 64.8% and the lowest percentage of participants  
245 completing only one round at 10.0%. In children's panels 36.6% to 38.7% of participants in the  
246 child's age group completed six or more rounds and 18.9% to 22.5% completed only one round,  
247 not including those with an unknown age group (Table S2).

248

#### 249 **Mean contacts, risk perception, and face coverings**

250 Overall, mean daily contacts for working-aged adults (18 to 59 years) recorded over the study  
251 period varied from 2.39 (95% CI 2.20-2.60) during periods of lockdown to 4.93 (95% CI 4.65-  
252 5.19) during the summer of 2020, when many restrictions were relaxed (supplementary table 3).  
253 Contacts for older adults (60+ years) were consistently lower throughout the study period  
254 ranging from 1.55 (95% CI 1.42-1.69) to 3.09 (95% CI 2.82-3.39) contacts per person per day.  
255 Mean recorded contacts for school-age children were more variable, between 2.87 (95% CI  
256 1.59-4.74) contacts per day for 0 to 4 year olds during lockdown when their schools were fully or  
257 partially closed to 15.11 (95% CI 13.87-16.41) contacts per day for 5 to 17 year olds in  
258 September 2020 when schools were open (Figure 1B). Baseline surveys, conducted before the  
259 COVID-19 pandemic give an indication of normal levels of contact. The POLYMOD study in  
260 2005/06 reported a mean of 11.7 (standard deviation (sd) 7.7) contacts per participant per day,  
261 with the highest mean contacts per day recorded by children aged 10 to 14 (18.2, sd 12.2) while  
262 the lowest were in adults over 70 years old (6.9, sd 5.8 contacts per day). The more recent BBC  
263 Pandemic social contact study in 2017/18 had similar results, with a mean of 10.5 contacts  
264 overall [19].

265 Following the lifting of Lockdown 1 from late May to early July 2020, recorded contacts  
266 remained low until August 2020 (Figure 1B). Contact patterns rebounded much more quickly  
267 after the second lockdown in December 2020, despite the continuing imposition of restrictions (a

268 tiered system of restrictions was in place in England, which was strengthened after the second  
269 lockdown). Reported contacts were very low during the Christmas period, with a modest easing  
270 of restrictions over the holiday period in some parts of England and tighter restrictions in others.  
271 Finally, adult contact rates remained low during the third lockdown, with substantial restrictions  
272 remaining in place through the end of the study period in March 2021. The patterns of schools  
273 opening and closing was the main determinant of children's contacts (Figure 1B and 1C).

#### 274 Contacts by setting

275 For adults, contacts made at home mostly reflected household size (Figure S1) and were  
276 consistently below a mean of two contacts per day over the study period, with little change in  
277 reported contacts across each of the analysis time periods (Figure 1C). Work and other contacts  
278 followed a similar pattern to adults: staying low but steadily increasing towards the end of the  
279 Lockdown 1, increasing in August 2020, decreasing slightly and then returning to levels similar  
280 to the Lockdown 1 during the Lockdown 2 in November, and then reducing again over  
281 Christmas and throughout Lockdown 3.

282 During the first Lockdown schools were closed to all except vulnerable children and the children  
283 of essential workers, and recorded childrens' contact rates were very low (Figure 1B and 1C).  
284 From early June 2020 until the third week of July 2020 (when schools were closed for the  
285 summer vacation) there was a limited reopening of schools, but most parents reported that their  
286 children continued to be educated from home. Average recorded contact patterns amongst  
287 children remained very low during this period (Figure 1B and 1C). When schools re-opened fully  
288 in September 2020, the number of contacts rapidly increased for both school-aged (5 to 17) and  
289 preschool-aged children (0 to 4), though the increase in contacts in the latter age group was  
290 smaller. Children's contacts declined significantly during the "half-term" vacation at the end of  
291 October 2020 but remained high during the second national lockdown (November 2020) as  
292 schools remained open. Schools were closed for the Christmas period, remained closed during  
293 the third national lockdown, and reopened on 8th March 2021. However preschools were the  
294 first educational setting to reopen during the relaxation of the first lockdown and were not closed  
295 during the third lockdown. The contact patterns of 0-4 year olds reflect this, with mean rates of  
296 contact for this age group being higher than other children during the periods when preschools  
297 were open but primary and secondary schools were closed.

298    Contacts by study period

299    Contacts remained at similar levels to Lockdown 1 (the reference period) through Lockdown 1  
300    easing for all age groups until the Reduced restrictions study period (Figure 2; Table 3). The  
301    relative difference was highest for adults over the 12 month study period during the period of  
302    Reduced restrictions with the relative difference of 1.59 (95% CI 1.54 to 1.64) for adults ages 18  
303    to 59 years and 1.51 (95% CI 1.45 to 1.57) for adults ages over 60 years. For children, the  
304    relative difference was highest while schools were open during the Schools open, Lockdown 2,  
305    Lockdown 2 easing, and Lockdown 3 with schools open study periods, ranging from 1.74 (95%  
306    CI 1.54 to 1.97) for ages 0 to 4 to 3.03 (95% CI 2.82 to 3.26) for ages 5 to 17.

307    Precautionary behaviours and risk perception

308    The majority (around 50%) of participants answered “Neutral” to a statement indicating that they  
309    were likely to catch coronavirus and this remained fairly consistent over the course of the study  
310    (Figure S1), amongst all adult age groups. Survey participants who agreed with a statement that  
311    they were likely to catch coronavirus recorded higher mean contacts (Figure 3A), especially in  
312    August 2020 and during the period following the second lockdown. Mean contacts for those who  
313    disagreed or were neutral were very similar.

314    Participants who agreed with a statement indicating that they were worried that they might  
315    spread coronavirus to others generally had slightly higher mean contacts between the first and  
316    second lockdowns than those who disagreed with the same statement (Figure 3B). During all  
317    three lockdowns, the mean contact confidence intervals overlap for participants in all three  
318    categories (Agree, Neutral, Disagree) responding to this question.

319    Survey participants aged 18 to 59 years who disagreed that coronavirus would be serious for  
320    them reported slightly higher contacts than those who agreed with the statement, while  
321    participants over 60 years of age who disagreed were few in number and reported a wide range  
322    of contact behaviours (Figure 3C). Participants who were not high risk generally reported more  
323    contacts on average than those who were high risk in both age groups, especially during  
324    periods outside of lockdown and towards the end of the third lockdown, with the differences  
325    being more pronounced in the over 60 age group (Figure 3D).

326 In terms of protective behaviour, the reported use of facemasks at least once on the previous  
327 day was low (~12% for 18–59-year-olds, ~3% for 60+ years olds) at the end of March 2020 in  
328 participants who reported contacts outside of the household (Figure 4). The proportion who self-  
329 reported wearing masks increased gradually for both age groups through June 2020, and a  
330 sharp increase in mask use was reported in late July and early August 2020, shortly after mask-  
331 wearing became mandatory for entering shops on 24th July 2020 [23]. From the 1st of August  
332 through 26 March 2021, mask wearing ranged between 73% and 86% for adults 18 to 59 and  
333 between 70% and 84% for adults over 60 amongst participants with contacts outside the home.

#### 334 Employment and income

335 Participants who were employed part-time consistently reported more contacts on average than  
336 full-time or self-employed participants with a wider range of contacts, and full-time workers  
337 reported contact means similar or slightly higher than self-employed workers in between  
338 lockdowns (Figure 5A).

339 Mean contacts for adult participants over 18 years of age grouped by annual income levels (less  
340 than £20k, £20k to £44.9k, and over £45k), were similar, and follow consistent patterns of  
341 decreasing during lockdowns and increasing slightly between the first and second lockdown  
342 (Figure 5B).

#### 343 Contact matrices

344 The contact matrices showed overall higher contacts between all age groups in every period  
345 compared to Lockdown 1, with increased clustering around the diagonal matrix elements  
346 indicating higher rates of contact between those of similar ages (Figure 6, Supplementary  
347 Figure C1, C2 and C3). This resulted in higher estimates of the basic reproduction number  
348 under controlled conditions ( $R_c$ ). The periods with the highest  $R_c$  were between July and August  
349 2020, which corresponds to lockdown easing and government incentives encouraging the public  
350 to dine in restaurants, where contacts particularly increased in 18 to 49 year olds and older  
351 adults (>60 year olds). As schools reopened in September 2020 following the summer vacation,  
352 an increase in contacts between children increased  $R_c$  by a factor of 3.17 (95% CI 3.06 - 3.27)  
353 relative to Lockdown 1, or 2.12 (95% CI 2.05 - 2.18) when assuming equal transmissibility in all

354 age groups or assuming age-dependent transmissibility estimates relevant to SARS-CoV-2,  
355 respectively.

356 Severe restrictions remained in place over the Christmas holidays (for much of the population)  
357 and during Lockdown 3. However, because early childhood education institutions remained  
358 open during Lockdown 3, higher contact rates were reported between <4-year-olds  
359 (Supplementary Figure C3). An increase in contacts between school-aged children and a slight  
360 increase in contacts amongst adults were found during the periods when schools reopened during  
361 Lockdowns 2 and 3 (Supplementary Figure C2, C3). This resulted in an  $R_c$  much greater than  
362 other lockdown periods, for example during Lockdown 2 we estimated  $R_c$  to be 2.42 (2.31 -  
363 2.53, 95%CI) and 1.60 (1.54 - 1.66, 95% CI) times higher than Lockdown 1, for equal and  
364 COVID-like transmissibility by age, respectively.

## 365 **Discussion**

366 Summary of findings

367 We conducted a large, detailed longitudinal social contact survey that has quantified temporal  
368 changes in contacts from a representative sample of the English population over the first year of  
369 the COVID-19 pandemic. This period (from late March 2020 to late March 2021) encapsulates  
370 three periods of national lockdowns interspersed with periods in which fewer restrictions were in  
371 place. Mean contact rates have remained low throughout the year - even at the period of  
372 minimum restrictions they were only about half of that observed in pre-pandemic surveys,  
373 conducted using similar questionnaires [8,19]. These large reductions in contacts have helped  
374 reduce the reproduction number, although only during periods of lockdown has the reproduction  
375 number been maintained below one [16,24,25].

376 The survey results suggest that government action was a major factor in the mean number of  
377 social contacts, with contact rates dropping markedly during every lockdown. However, it was  
378 not the only determinant. Age was clearly associated with contacts, with children reporting the  
379 greatest average number of contacts during periods of school opening. Among adults, younger  
380 individuals (18 to 30 years) reported the highest mean numbers of contacts throughout the year  
381 and the elderly the fewest - a pattern that is consistent with pre-pandemic data, albeit at much  
382 lower levels of contact.



383 In addition, there appeared to be some association with actual or perceived risk: those who  
384 were not in a risk group or did not perceive coronavirus as likely to be severe for them reported  
385 higher rates of contact. Employment status was also associated with contact patterns, with part-  
386 time workers documenting more contacts than others. Income levels were not strongly  
387 associated with mean contacts, nor is there any evidence of seasonality in contacts - the  
388 observed temporal changes in contacts corresponded to government action and advice.  
389 Although easing of restrictions did lead to an increase in contacts, this did not necessarily occur  
390 immediately. In particular, the easing of the first lockdown was not associated with a rapid rise in  
391 the mean number of contacts until August when the government introduced an incentive  
392 scheme to encourage individuals to dine in restaurants, cafes and bars.

393 The use of face coverings was also strongly associated with changes in government policy.  
394 Although the proportion of individuals reporting having worn a face covering increased gradually  
395 over time, the rates of mask-wearing increased significantly when it became mandatory for entry  
396 into shops on the 24th July 2020.

#### 397 Limitations

398 The survey is conducted online, using a quota-based sample of individuals who have agreed to  
399 participate in marketing surveys. This recruitment method is biased towards people with access  
400 to the internet and who may be reached by banner ads, email campaigns, and social media  
401 advertisements. Participants only received guidance through the text in the questionnaires, and  
402 may interpret questions differently. This may be especially evident in the reporting of group  
403 contacts. Responses are also subject to recall bias, which may under- or over-estimate contacts  
404 depending on the nature of the contacts. Additionally, due to child protection concerns and age-  
405 dependent ability to complete the survey, children's contacts are collected through a parent  
406 acting as a proxy for a child, which may lead to inaccurate reporting. Mean contacts are  
407 sensitive to a few participants who report many contacts, which we have addressed by  
408 assigning all reports of over 50 contacts to 50 contacts. Further research is needed to create  
409 standardised methods for analysing highly dispersed contact data, although a standardised  
410 approach may not be feasible as it may be context dependent.



411 CoMix in context

412 The CoMix survey contributes to the growing study of social contacts and their implication in  
413 disease transmission. Studies prior to the COVID-19 pandemic provide a baseline of contacts in  
414 several countries which have been used to project estimates of contacts in other countries  
415 [26,27]. Many surveys implemented during the pandemic, conducted in countries throughout the  
416 world, provide data on behaviour and social contacts during periods of heightened risk of  
417 transmission and with restrictions on social behaviour and have been summarized in a recent  
418 review of the literature [28]. CoMix is the largest longitudinal survey in comparison to other  
419 surveys in the review and appears to be the only survey to have recorded data every week for  
420 at least a year. All surveys in the review reflect fewer social contacts during periods of social  
421 restrictions throughout 2020 and 2021. A number of mobility indices such as google and  
422 facebook have been made available during the pandemic, which also provide an indication of  
423 movement based on monitoring mobile phones. However, these are less direct measures that  
424 reflect less epidemiologically-relevant contacts, and although previous work has suggested that  
425 google mobility data correlates well with the CoMix data [29] the data is usually shared at  
426 aggregate level and therefore is impossible to analyse by factors such as age and working  
427 status.

428 Conclusion


429 This study quantifies changes in epidemiologically relevant contact behaviour for one full year of  
430 the COVID-19 pandemic in England. Contacts have remained suppressed far below normal  
431 levels throughout the year, though changes in contact have occurred following relaxation or  
432 tightening of social distancing measures.

433 The CoMix survey is unique in both length and frequency of the data and in its longitudinal study  
434 design, which provides a detailed historical record of social behaviour during the COVID-19  
435 pandemic. Importantly, CoMix contact data is age-stratified for both participants and contacts  
436 and can be used to construct social contact matrices for age-stratified modelling. This data can  
437 be used to inform future outbreak response and can be applied to transmission of other  
438 infectious diseases, particularly for a large scale pandemic.


439

440 **Tables and figures**

441 **Figure 1. Mean contacts over time by age, and by age and setting with timeline of survey participation with**  
442 **95% confidence interval of bootstrapped mean. A) Hospitalisations due to COVID-19 in England; B) Mean**  
443 **contacts and 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals in adults and children in age groups of 0 to 4, 5 to 17, 18 to 59,**  
444 **and 60 or more year; C) Mean contacts and 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals by age group and setting; and D)**  
445 **The number of participants and when they respond by panel over time.**




447 **Figure 2. Relative difference in mean contacts by study period and age group with 95% confidence intervals.**  
448 Relative differences calculated using a generalised additive model with Lockdown 1 as the reference period for each  
449 age group adjusted to the UK population by age and gender (when available) for the age groups 0 to 4, 5 to 17, 18 to  
450 59, and over 60 years old. Note the facets have different scales on the y-axes.




451

**Figure 3. Mean contacts by risk perception or risk category by adult age groups of 18 to 59 and 60 or more years with 95% confidence interval of bootstrapped mean weighted by age, gender, and weekday.** Participants answered a series of questions about their risk perception with likert scale response options. Answers of “Strongly agree” and “Somewhat agree” were combined into a category of “Agree”, as were answers of “Strongly disagree” and “Somewhat disagree” to “Disagree”. **A)** Answers to the statement “I am likely to catch coronavirus”; **B)** Answers to the statement “I am worried I might spread coronavirus to someone who is vulnerable”; **C)** Answers to the statement “Coronavirus would be a serious illness for me”; and **D)** Participant reported they were an individual at high risk for complications as defined in the questionnaire.




**Figure 4. Proportion of adult participants who report wearing a mask by age category with 95% confidence interval of bootstrapped proportion.** Proportions plotted for all participants and for participants who reported any non-household contacts, with the start date of face covering mandates in some settings indicated on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2020.



**Figure 5. Mean contacts by employment and income status.** Mean contacts of participants who worked on the previous day and their workplace was open on the previous day weighted by age, gender, and weekday. **A)** By employment type: full-time, part-time, or self-employed; **B)** By annual income level: less than £20k, £20k to £44.9k, and over £45k.



**Figure 6. Contact matrices and their dominant eigenvalues for England in each period considered.** A) Contact matrices for England across the nine periods (1. Lockdown 1, 2. Lockdown 1 easing, 3. Relaxed restrictions, 4. School reopening, 5. Lockdown 2, 6. Lockdown 2 easing, 7. Christmas, 8. Lockdown 3, 9. Lockdown 3 + schools), B) Points show relative change in  $R_0$  (compared to Lockdown 1) based on the dominant eigenvalues of effective contact matrices calculated for periods 1 - 9, with equal transmissibility in all age groups and age-stratified transmissibility based on Davies et. al. for SARS-CoV-2. Coloured blocks show durations of each period as annotated.



Number	Study period	Stringency	Date range
1	Lockdown 1	Lockdown	23rd March - 3rd June 2020
2	Lockdown 1 easing	Easing	4th June - 29th July 2020
3	Reduce restrictions	Relaxed restrictions	30th July - 3rd Sep 2020
4	Schools open	Relaxed restrictions with Schools open	4th Sept - 26th October 2020
5	Lockdown 2	Lockdown with schools open	5th November - 2nd December 2020
6	Lockdown 2 easing	Easing	3rd December - 19th December 2020
7	Christmas	Relaxed restrictions	20 December 2020 - 2nd January 2021
8	Lockdown 3	Lockdown	5th January - 8th March 2021
9	Lockdown 3 (with schools open)	Lockdown with schools open	9th March - 29th March 2021

Table 1. Study periods for contact matrices in England. Nine time periods reflect five stringency levels of non-pharmaceutical interventions we defined as lockdown, lockdown with schools open, lockdown easing, relaxed restrictions (school holiday) and relaxed restrictions (schools open) that we created based on guidance released by the UK government. Not all dates are included in a study period.



Group	Value	Initial recruitment	Second recruitment	New year
Dates	Start	23 Mar 20	09 Aug 20	02 Jan 21
	End	08 Aug 20	01 Jan 21	29 Mar 21
All	-	5080	13087	8455
Adult	-	3815	10230	6389
Child	-	1265	2857	2066
Age Group (Children)	0-4	190 (15.3%)	451 (16.3%)	311 (15.8%)
	5-11	469 (37.9%)	1076 (38.8%)	749 (38.0%)
	12-17	580 (46.8%)	1245 (44.9%)	909 (46.2%)
	Unknown age*	26	85	97
Age Group (Adults)	18-29	556 (14.6%)	1872 (18.3%)	1070 (16.7%)
	30-39	602 (15.8%)	1786 (17.5%)	1167 (18.3%)
	40-49	653 (17.1%)	1624 (15.9%)	1069 (16.7%)
	50-59	722 (18.9%)	1890 (18.5%)	1183 (18.5%)
	60-69	708 (18.6%)	1826 (17.8%)	1147 (18.0%)
	70+	574 (15.0%)	1232 (12.0%)	753 (11.8%)
Gender	Female	2580 (50.8%)	6864 (52.4%)	4475 (52.9%)
	Male	2477 (48.8%)	6162 (47.1%)	3937 (46.6%)
	Other	23	61	43
Household Size	1	698 (13.7%)	2276 (17.4%)	1398 (16.5%)
	2	1357 (26.7%)	4604 (35.2%)	2900 (34.3%)
	3-5	2769 (54.5%)	5894 (45.0%)	3968 (46.9%)
	6+	256 (5.0%)	313 (2.4%)	189 (2.2%)
Social Group	A - Upper middle class	247 (4.9%)	651 (5.0%)	420 (5.0%)
	B - Middle class	1278 (25.2%)	3423 (26.2%)	2305 (27.3%)
	C1 - Lower middle class	1535 (30.2%)	4357 (33.3%)	2816 (33.3%)
	C2 - Skilled working class	967 (19.0%)	1979 (15.1%)	1297 (15.3%)
	D - Working class	716 (14.1%)	1870 (14.3%)	1141 (13.5%)
	E - Lower level of subsistence	337 (6.6%)	807 (6.2%)	476 (5.6%)
NHS Region	East of England	552 (10.9%)	1511 (11.5%)	1009 (11.9%)
	Greater London	774 (15.2%)	2001 (15.3%)	1298 (15.4%)
	Midlands	1001 (19.7%)	2688 (20.5%)	1751 (20.7%)
	North East and Yorkshire	728 (14.3%)	2046 (15.6%)	1315 (15.6%)
	North West	630 (12.4%)	1093 (8.4%)	753 (8.9%)
	South East	802 (15.8%)	2263 (17.3%)	1438 (17.0%)
	South West	593 (11.7%)	1485 (11.3%)	891 (10.5%)

**Table 2. Participant characteristics.** The number and percentage of participants surveyed during the first two panels (Initial recruitment), the beginning of the next two panels (Second recruitment) and the period since the end of the Christmas study period (New year), as most of the sample was refreshed by this point. Number of participants presented overall and by sample type, age, gender, household size, social group, and NHS region. Participants are counted once per study period but may have participated in several waves within a study period. Adult and child samples were recruited separately, and percentages of age groups were calculated by sample type. The “Other” gender category includes participants who do not describe themselves as either male or female and those who declined to answer. \*Some parent participants may have incorrectly completed this question. We have included the observation in this dataset and record the ages as “unknown”.

Number	Study period	Relative difference in contacts (95% CI)			
		Ages 0-4 years	Ages 5-17 years	Ages 18-59 years	Ages 60+ years
1	Lockdown 1	ref	ref	ref	ref
2	Lockdown 1 easing	1.04 (0.94 to 1.16)	1.14 (1.06 to 1.22)	1.04 (1.01 to 1.08)	1.03 (0.98 to 1.08)
3	Reduced restrictions	1.52 (1.38 to 1.69)	1.36 (1.27 to 1.46)	1.59 (1.54 to 1.64)	1.51 (1.45 to 1.57)
4	Schools open	2.18 (1.97 to 2.42)	3.03 (2.82 to 3.26)	1.42 (1.38 to 1.47)	1.33 (1.28 to 1.38)
5	Lockdown 2	1.99 (1.78 to 2.22)	2.80 (2.59 to 3.02)	1.06 (1.03 to 1.10)	1.02 (0.98 to 1.07)
6	Lockdown 2 easing	1.74 (1.54 to 1.97)	2.36 (2.17 to 2.57)	1.29 (1.24 to 1.34)	1.25 (1.18 to 1.31)
7	Christmas	0.99 (0.87 to 1.13)	0.86 (0.79 to 0.94)	0.96 (0.92 to 1.00)	1.05 (0.99 to 1.10)
8	Lockdown 3	1.44 (1.29 to 1.60)	0.86 (0.80 to 0.93)	0.88 (0.85 to 0.90)	0.88 (0.84 to 0.91)
9	Lockdown 3 (with schools open)	1.85 (1.64 to 2.10)	2.19 (2.01 to 2.38)	0.96 (0.92 to 0.99)	0.87 (0.82 to 0.91)

**Table 3. Relative difference in mean contacts by study period with 95% confidence intervals.** Relative differences calculated using a generalised additive model with Lockdown 1 as the reference period for each age group adjusted to the UK population by age and gender (when available) for the age groups 0 to 4, 5 to 17, 18 to 59, and over 60 years old.

## References

1. Cabinet Office. National lockdown: Stay at Home. 4 Jan 2021 [cited 2 Feb 2021]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-lockdown-stay-at-home>
2. Cabinet Office. Coronavirus (COVID-19): What has changed – 22 September. In: GOV.UK [Internet]. 22 Sep 2020 [cited 2 Feb 2021]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/coronavirus-covid-19-what-has-changed-22-september>
3. Prime Minister's Office. Prime Minister's statement on coronavirus (COVID-19): 23 March 2020. In: GOV.UK [Internet]. 23 Mar 2020 [cited 2 Feb 2021]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-address-to-the-nation-on-coronavirus-23-march-2020>
4. Prime Minister's Office. PM announces easing of lockdown restrictions: 23 June 2020. In: GOV.UK [Internet]. 23 Jun 2020 [cited 2 Feb 2021]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-announces-easing-of-lockdown-restrictions-23-june-2020>
5. UK Government. Coronavirus Act 2020. In: UK.gov [Internet]. 25 Mar 2020 [cited 2 Feb 2021]. Available: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2020/7/contents>
6. Jarvis CI, Gimma A, van Zandvoort K, Wong KLM, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Edmunds WJ. The impact of local and national restrictions in response to COVID-19 on social contacts in England: a longitudinal natural experiment. *BMC Med.* 2021;19: 52.
7. Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Prem K, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Klepac P, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Med.* 2020;18: 124.
8. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med.* 2008;5: e74.
9. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020. Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>
10. Efron B. Bootstrap Methods: Another Look at the Jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics.* 1979. pp. 1–26. doi:10.1214/aos/1176344552
11. Introduction to post-stratification. World Food Programme VAM; 2017. Available: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000121326/download/>
12. WPP Annual Population by Age. World Population Prospects - Population Division - United Nations. 2019. Available: <https://population.un.org/wpp/Download/Standard/Interpolated/>

13. Official UK Coronavirus Dashboard. [cited 21 Apr 2021]. Available: <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk>
14. Abbott S, Sherratt K, Palmer J, Martin-Nielsen R, Bevan J, Gibbs H, et al. covidregionaldata: Subnational Data for the COVID-19 Outbreak. -. 2020. p. -. doi:10.5281/zenodo.3957539
15. Jarvis C, Munday J, Gimma A, Wong K, Van Zandvoort K, Funk S, Edmunds WJ, CMMID working group. The effect of social distancing on the reproduction number and number of contacts in the UK from a social contact survey - Report for survey week 34. CMMID - London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; 2020 Nov. Available: <https://cmmid.github.io/topics/covid19/reports/comix/Comix%20Weekly%20Report%2034.pdf>
16. Real-time Assessment of Community Transmission findings. In: Imperial College London [Internet]. 2021 [cited 20 May 2021]. Available: <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/medicine/research-and-impact/groups/react-study/real-time-assessment-of-community-transmission-findings/>
17. Wood SN. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B)*. 2011. pp. 3–36.
18. Wood SN. *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2017.
19. Klepac P, Kucharski AJ, Conlan AJK, Kissler S, Tang ML, Fry H, et al. Contacts in context: large-scale setting-specific social mixing matrices from the BBC Pandemic project. *bioRxiv*. medRxiv; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.02.16.20023754
20. Wallinga J, Teunis P, Kretzschmar M. Using data on social contacts to estimate age-specific transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2006;164: 936–944.
21. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Roberts MG. The construction of next-generation matrices for compartmental epidemic models. *J R Soc Interface*. 2010;7: 873–885.
22. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, CMMID COVID-19 working group, et al. Age-dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nat Med*. 2020;26: 1205–1211.
23. Department of Health and Social Care. Face coverings to be mandatory in shops and supermarkets from 24 July. In: GOV.UK [Internet]. 14 Jul 2020 [cited 9 Mar 2021]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/face-coverings-to-be-mandatory-in-shops-and-supermarkets-from-24-july>
24. Jarvis C, Gimma A, Van Zandvoort K, Wong KLM, CMMID COVID-19 working group, Edmunds WJ. The impact of local and national restrictions in response to COVID-19 on social contacts in the UK: a longitudinal natural experiment. In: CMMID Repository

[Internet]. 19 Oct 2020 [cited 2 Feb 2021]. Available:

<https://cmmid.github.io/topics/covid19/comix-national-local-restrictions-in-the-UK.html>

25. Sherratt K, Abbott S, Meakin SR, Hellewell J, Munday JD, Bosse N, et al. Exploring surveillance data biases when estimating the reproduction number: with insights into subpopulation transmission of Covid-19 in England. *bioRxiv. medRxiv*; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.10.18.20214585
26. Hoang T, Coletti P, Melegaro A, Wallinga J, Grijalva CG, Edmunds JW, et al. A Systematic Review of Social Contact Surveys to Inform Transmission Models of Close-contact Infections. *Epidemiology*. 2019;30: 723–736.
27. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2017;13: e1005697.
28. Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, Fava ED, Grow A, Zagheni E, et al. Rapid review of social contact patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic. *bioRxiv. medRxiv*; 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.03.12.21253410
29. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Kucharski AJ, Munday JD, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science*. 2021;372. doi:10.1126/science.abg3055

## Additional information

### Abbreviations

CI: Confidence interval

GAM: Generalised additive model

IQR: Interquartile range

NHS: National Health Service

ONS UK: Office of National Statistics for the United Kingdom

$R_c$ : Basic reproduction number under controlled conditions

$R_t$ : Reproduction number at time  $t$

REACT Study: Real-time Assessment of Community Transmission Study

SD: Standard deviation

UK: United Kingdom

### Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Disease Working Group Authors

The following authors were part of the Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Disease COVID-19 Working Group. Each contributed in processing, cleaning and interpretation of data, interpreted findings, contributed to the manuscript, and approved the work for publication: Lloyd A C Chapman, Samuel Clifford, Thibaut Jombart, Kathleen O'Reilly, Jiayao Lei, Kaja Abbas, Fabienne Krauer, Stefan Flasche, Alicia Rosello, Gwenan M Knight, Damien C Tully, Katherine E. Atkins, Rachael Pung, Rosalind M Eggo, David Hodgson, Mihaly Koltai, Yalda Jafari, Timothy W Russell, Frank G Sandmann, Oliver Brady, Naomi R Waterlow, Mark Jit, Fiona Yueqian Sun, Carl A B Pearson, William Waites, Emilie Finch, Akira Endo, Graham Medley, Ciara V McCarthy, Adam J Kucharski, Paul Mee, Hamish P Gibbs, Nicholas G. Davies, Billy J Quilty, Sophie R Meakin, C Julian Villabona-Arenas, Nikos I Bosse, Joel Hellewell, Simon R Procter, Yang Liu, Rachel Lowe, Rosanna C Barnard, Sam Abbott, Matthew Quaife, Emily S Nightingale.

## Authors' contributions

AG, JDM, KLMW, CIJ, WJE conceived of and planned the analysis; AG, JDM, KLMW, and CIJ performed the main analysis with input from PC, KP, PK, GJR, SF and WJE; CIJ, KvZ, and WEJ designed the CoMix contact survey, CIJ, AG, KW, and KvZ cleaned and managed the contact survey data; All authors wrote and reviewed the manuscript. The CMMID COVID-19 Working Group provided discussion and comments.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the team at Ipsos-MORI, an international research agency which implemented the surveys, with particular thanks to Sean Doherty, Alexandru Toreanik, Lorena Iovu, Corneliu Caloian, Alina Pancu, Rares Eremia and Kim Brown for their work on coordinating and implementing multiple waves of the survey.

We would also like to thank the EpiPose management team and collaborating researchers, including Niel Hens, Jacco Wallinga, Philippe Beutels, Jantien Backer, James Wambua, Laurens Bogaardt, Veronika Jaeger, and Andre Karch.

## Ethics approval and consent to participate

Participation in this opt-in study was voluntary, and all analyses were carried out on anonymised data. The study and method of informed consent was approved by the ethics committee of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Reference number 21795.

## Consent for publication

Not applicable

## Availability of data and materials

The code and data used to conduct these analyses are found at:

[https://github.com/amygimma/comix\\_uk\\_summary\\_analysis](https://github.com/amygimma/comix_uk_summary_analysis)

Data will be available to download through the Socrates social contact tool website and Zenodo:

<http://www.socialcontactdata.org/socrates-comix/>



## Competing interests

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

## Funding

The following funding sources are acknowledged as providing funding for the named authors. This research was partly funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-003174: KP, PK). Elrha R2HC/UK FCDO/Wellcome Trust/This research was partly funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) using UK aid from the UK Government to support global health research. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the UK Department of Health and Social Care (KvZ). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme - project EpiPose (101003688: AG, KP, PK, PK, WJE). PC received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (Grant Agreement 682540 TransMID). FCDO/Wellcome Trust (Epidemic Preparedness Coronavirus research programme 221303/Z/20/Z: KvZ). This research was partly funded by the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) project 'RECAP' managed through RCUK and ESRC (ES/P010873/1: CIJ). NIHR (PR-OD-1017-20002: WJE). UK MRC (MC\_PC\_19065 - Covid 19: Understanding the dynamics and drivers of the COVID-19 epidemic using real-time outbreak analytics: WJE). Wellcome Trust (210758/Z/18/Z: JDM, SFunk). This research was partly funded by the Royal Society under award (RP\EA\180004: KP).

The following funding sources are acknowledged as providing funding for the working group authors. This research was partly funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-001754: MQ; INV-003174: JYL, MJ, YL; INV-016832: SRP; NTD Modelling Consortium OPP1184344: CABP, GFM; OPP1139859: BJQ; OPP1183986: ESN; OPP1191821: KO'R). BMGF (INV-016832; OPP1157270: KA). CADDE MR/S0195/1 & FAPESP 18/14389-0 (PM). EDCTP2 (RIA2020EF-2983-CSIGN: HPG). ERC Starting Grant (#757699: MQ). ERC (SG 757688: CJVA, KEA). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme - project EpiPose (101003688: MJ, RCB, YL). FCDO/Wellcome Trust (Epidemic Preparedness Coronavirus research programme 221303/Z/20/Z: CABP). This research was partly funded by the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) project 'RECAP' managed through RCUK and ESRC (ES/P010873/1: TJ). HDR UK (MR/S003975/1: RME). HPRU (This research was partly funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) using UK aid from the UK Government to support global health research. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the UK Department of Health and Social Care200908: NIB, LACC). Innovation Fund (01VVF18015: FK). MRC (MR/N013638/1: EF, NRW; MR/V027956/1: WW). Nakajima Foundation (AE). NIHR

(16/136/46: BJQ; 16/137/109: BJQ, FYS, MJ, YL; 1R01AI141534-01A1: DH; Health Protection Research Unit for Modelling Methodology HPRU-2012-10096: TJ; NIHR200908: AJK, RME; NIHR200929: CVM, FGS, MJ, NGD; PR-OD-1017-20002: AR). Royal Society (Dorothy Hodgkin Fellowship: RL). Singapore Ministry of Health (RP). UK DHSC/UK Aid/NIHR (PR-OD-1017-20001: HPG). UK MRC (MC\_PC\_19065 - Covid 19: Understanding the dynamics and drivers of the COVID-19 epidemic using real-time outbreak analytics: NGD, RME, SC, TJ, YL; MR/P014658/1: GMK). Authors of this research receive funding from UK Public Health Rapid Support Team funded by the United Kingdom Department of Health and Social Care (TJ). UKRI (MR/V028456/1: YJ). Wellcome Trust (206250/Z/17/Z: AJK, TWR; 206471/Z/17/Z: OJB; 208812/Z/17/Z: SC, SFlasche; 210758/Z/18/Z: JH, SA, SRM; 221303/Z/20/Z: MK; UNS110424: FK). No funding for DCT.

## Additional Files

**Additional File 1: CoMix Contact Survey Questionnaires – Final Versions.** Final survey versions for panels A&B, C&D, and E&F.

**Additional File 2: CoMix study Proposal.** Original research proposal for the CoMix survey.


**Additional File 3. Ipsos-MORI Survey Recruitment and Social Grades.** Recruitment methods and social grades mapped to reported occupations.

**Additional File 4. Mean Contacts by Age and Date.** Bootstrapped mean contacts with 95% confidence interval in all settings.


## Supplementary Figures and Tables

### Contact matrices


**Figure C1: Contact matrices for all contacts in England for Lockdown 1, Lockdown 1 easing and Relaxed restrictions (Diagonal) and the element-wise absolute difference between the matrices (off diagonal).** Contacts censored to 50 contacts per participant. Lockdown 1 data from 23rd of March to 3rd of June 2020 Lockdown 3 data from 5th to 18th of January 2021



**Figure C2: Contact matrices for all contacts in England for Schools reopening, Lockdown 2 and Lockdown 2 easing (Diagonal) and the element-wise absolute difference between the matrices (off diagonal). Contacts censored to 50 contacts per participant. Lockdown 1 data from 23rd of March to 3rd of June 2020 Lockdown 3 data from 5th to 18th of January 2021**




**Figure C3: Contact matrices for all contacts in England for Christmas, Lockdown 3 and Lockdown 3 easing (Diagonal) and the element-wise absolute difference between the matrices (off diagonal).** Contacts censored to 50 contacts per participant. Lockdown 1 data from 23rd of March to 3rd of June 2020 Lockdown 3 data from 5th to 18th of January 2021




## Additional figures and tables

**Figure S1. Mean contacts by age group and household size.** Means weighted by age, gender, and weekday. Age and household size categories with fewer than 50 participants in total are not shown, and the age category 0 to 4 years old not shown as most participants were in household sizes of 3 to 5. Some time periods have very few participants in households 6 or more and should be interpreted with caution.




**Figure S2. Mean contacts and 95% confidence intervals by age group and socioeconomic groups combined into the groups ABC1 and C2DE.** Bootstrapped mean contacts of participants weighted by age, gender, and weekday.





**Figure S3. Risk perception by age group over time.** The raw proportion of likert scale responses and self-reported risk status amongst adult participants





Group	Value	Rounds completed			
		1	2 to 3	4 to 5	6 or more
Age Group (Adults)	18-29	703 (27.9%)	532 (21.1%)	479 (19.0%)	807 (32.0%)
	30-39	499 (20.2%)	425 (17.2%)	427 (17.3%)	1121 (45.3%)
	40-49	386 (16.5%)	306 (13.1%)	365 (15.6%)	1282 (54.8%)
	50-59	375 (13.9%)	296 (11.0%)	422 (15.6%)	1610 (59.6%)
	60-69	262 (10.0%)	251 (9.6%)	408 (15.6%)	1695 (64.8%)
	70+	235 (12.8%)	168 (9.1%)	321 (17.4%)	1116 (60.7%)
Gender	Female	1307 (16.9%)	1123 (14.6%)	1335 (17.3%)	3953 (51.2%)
	Male	1139 (17.0%)	842 (12.6%)	1075 (16.0%)	3647 (54.4%)
	Other	14 (20.0%)	13 (18.6%)	12 (17.1%)	31 (44.3%)
NHS Region	East of England	256 (15.6%)	215 (13.1%)	281 (17.1%)	888 (54.1%)
	Greater London	370 (16.3%)	296 (13.1%)	405 (17.9%)	1197 (52.8%)
	Midlands	504 (16.8%)	449 (15.0%)	481 (16.1%)	1560 (52.1%)
	North East and Yorkshire	331 (14.7%)	316 (14.0%)	407 (18.1%)	1200 (53.2%)
	North West	238 (20.3%)	147 (12.5%)	156 (13.3%)	634 (54.0%)
	South East	440 (17.6%)	355 (14.2%)	427 (17.1%)	1273 (51.0%)
	South West	321 (19.3%)	200 (12.0%)	265 (15.9%)	879 (52.8%)
Social Group	A - Upper middle class	115 (16.7%)	93 (13.5%)	113 (16.4%)	367 (53.3%)
	B - Middle class	606 (16.4%)	480 (13.0%)	660 (17.8%)	1952 (52.8%)
	C1 - Lower middle class	729 (15.8%)	607 (13.1%)	747 (16.1%)	2545 (55.0%)
	C2 - Skilled working class	471 (19.1%)	382 (15.5%)	403 (16.4%)	1208 (49.0%)
	D - Working class	331 (16.0%)	289 (13.9%)	362 (17.5%)	1092 (52.7%)
	E - Lower level of subsistence	208 (22.2%)	127 (13.5%)	137 (14.6%)	467 (49.7%)
Household Size	1	439 (14.4%)	357 (11.7%)	490 (16.0%)	1769 (57.9%)
	2	853 (14.5%)	713 (12.1%)	1020 (17.3%)	3303 (56.1%)
	3-5	1074 (20.5%)	838 (16.0%)	870 (16.6%)	2452 (46.8%)
	6+	94 (30.0%)	70 (22.4%)	42 (13.4%)	107 (34.2%)

Table S1. Number and percentage of participants in the adult panel who completed 1 round, 2 to 3 rounds, or 5 or more rounds, stratified by gender, age, country, NHS England region, household size, and day of week.

Group	Value	1	2 to 3	4 to 5	6 or more
Age Group (Child)	0-4	134 (20.6%)	139 (21.4%)	137 (21.1%)	240 (36.9%)
	5-11	354 (22.5%)	321 (20.4%)	321 (20.4%)	574 (36.6%)
	12-17	353 (18.9%)	411 (22.1%)	378 (20.3%)	721 (38.7%)
	Unknown age	23 (20.5%)	25 (22.3%)	20 (17.9%)	44 (39.3%)
Gender	Female	536 (19.9%)	574 (21.3%)	527 (19.6%)	1057 (39.2%)
	Male	327 (21.9%)	318 (21.3%)	327 (21.9%)	521 (34.9%)
	Other	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)
NHS Region	East of England	85 (18.1%)	101 (21.5%)	97 (20.6%)	187 (39.8%)
	Greater London	142 (24.1%)	119 (20.2%)	109 (18.5%)	219 (37.2%)
	Midlands	158 (19.7%)	177 (22.1%)	161 (20.1%)	305 (38.1%)
	North East and Yorkshire	116 (19.3%)	122 (20.3%)	135 (22.5%)	227 (37.8%)
	North West	119 (20.5%)	121 (20.8%)	116 (20.0%)	225 (38.7%)
	South East	140 (20.4%)	136 (19.8%)	150 (21.9%)	260 (37.9%)
	South West	104 (22.2%)	120 (25.6%)	88 (18.8%)	156 (33.3%)
Social Group	A - Upper middle class	68 (29.3%)	37 (15.9%)	44 (19.0%)	83 (35.8%)
	B - Middle class	209 (18.8%)	226 (20.3%)	222 (20.0%)	455 (40.9%)
	C1 - Lower middle class	247 (17.5%)	315 (22.3%)	303 (21.4%)	548 (38.8%)
	C2 - Skilled working class	131 (21.9%)	140 (23.4%)	122 (20.4%)	206 (34.4%)
	D - Working class	147 (24.7%)	121 (20.3%)	114 (19.2%)	213 (35.8%)
	E - Lower level of subsistence	62 (25.4%)	57 (23.4%)	51 (20.9%)	74 (30.3%)
Household Size	1	7 (20.0%)	7 (20.0%)	14 (40.0%)	7 (20.0%)
	2	91 (19.3%)	108 (22.9%)	130 (27.5%)	143 (30.3%)
	3-5	711 (20.3%)	745 (21.3%)	678 (19.4%)	1366 (39.0%)
	6+	55 (29.3%)	36 (19.1%)	34 (18.1%)	63 (33.5%)

**Table S2. Number and percentage (by number of rounds completed) of parent participants who completed 1 round, 2 to 3 rounds, or 5 or more rounds, overall and stratified by gender, age, country, NHS England region, household size, and day of week.** Parents of children report gender by answering the question “As far as you know, which of the following describes how [NAME OF CHILD] thinks of themselves?”, with the options “Male”, “Female”, “In another way”, “Don’t know” and “Prefer not to answer”.

Date	Mean contacts (95% CI)			
	Ages 0-4 years	Ages 5-17 years	Ages 18-59 years	Ages 60+ years
31/03/2020	-	-	2.92 (2.80-3.05)	2.01 (1.89-2.13)
07/04/2020	-	-	2.74 (2.60-2.88)	1.97 (1.86-2.09)
14/04/2020	-	-	2.59 (2.46-2.73)	2.06 (1.94-2.19)
20/04/2020	-	-	2.43 (2.29-2.58)	2.06 (1.95-2.19)
20/05/2020	3.11 (2.72-3.51)	3.23 (2.99-3.50)	3.08 (2.76-3.46)	1.89 (1.74-2.04)
27/05/2020	3.06 (2.57-3.57)	3.40 (3.12-3.72)	3.22 (2.86-3.61)	1.93 (1.77-2.09)
03/06/2020	3.37 (2.83-3.99)	3.49 (3.18-3.88)	3.06 (2.71-3.47)	1.86 (1.69-2.06)
10/06/2020	3.32 (2.78-3.92)	3.63 (3.23-4.07)	2.88 (2.54-3.27)	1.95 (1.74-2.18)
16/06/2020	3.41 (2.80-4.15)	3.68 (3.31-4.12)	2.78 (2.48-3.12)	1.95 (1.73-2.21)
23/06/2020	3.71 (2.98-4.56)	3.77 (3.41-4.17)	2.97 (2.61-3.31)	2.11 (1.88-2.37)
01/07/2020	3.31 (2.55-4.25)	4.07 (3.64-4.59)	3.12 (2.73-3.53)	2.09 (1.84-2.35)
08/07/2020	2.87 (2.10-3.85)	4.01 (3.53-4.55)	3.09 (2.69-3.48)	2.04 (1.80-2.36)
15/07/2020	2.87 (1.59-4.74)	3.80 (2.88-4.85)	2.89 (2.53-3.24)	2.01 (1.78-2.29)
21/07/2020	-	-	2.98 (2.61-3.37)	2.02 (1.81-2.26)
30/07/2020	3.32 (2.58-4.23)	3.14 (2.83-3.51)	3.28 (2.86-3.78)	2.37 (2.08-2.69)
08/08/2020	4.64 (3.90-5.44)	4.07 (3.77-4.42)	4.79 (4.43-5.14)	2.83 (2.56-3.13)
16/08/2020	4.82 (4.22-5.53)	4.75 (4.43-5.07)	4.93 (4.65-5.19)	3.07 (2.83-3.32)
22/08/2020	4.89 (4.16-5.83)	4.56 (4.26-4.87)	4.62 (4.34-4.91)	3.02 (2.78-3.28)
28/08/2020	5.30 (4.25-6.56)	4.18 (3.88-4.49)	4.24 (3.97-4.56)	3.08 (2.80-3.37)
03/09/2020	6.41 (5.18-7.74)	9.63 (8.55-10.75)	4.23 (3.91-4.58)	3.09 (2.82-3.39)
11/09/2020	7.90 (6.38-9.54)	15.11 (13.87-16.41)	4.39 (4.02-4.81)	2.71 (2.47-2.98)
15/09/2020	8.44 (6.85-10.27)	14.57 (13.44-15.71)	4.53 (4.19-4.92)	2.75 (2.49-3.03)
23/09/2020	7.97 (6.52-9.70)	12.85 (11.84-13.94)	4.34 (4.03-4.69)	2.85 (2.60-3.14)
30/09/2020	7.60 (6.08-9.37)	12.23 (11.13-13.41)	4.08 (3.76-4.42)	2.59 (2.37-2.80)
07/10/2020	7.44 (6.20-8.91)	10.45 (9.42-11.45)	3.72 (3.40-4.05)	2.46 (2.24-2.69)
13/10/2020	6.44 (5.28-7.75)	9.34 (8.42-10.21)	3.52 (3.23-3.79)	2.52 (2.29-2.79)
21/10/2020	4.88 (3.98-5.89)	6.97 (6.27-7.68)	3.56 (3.27-3.86)	2.43 (2.22-2.67)
28/10/2020	5.73 (4.50-7.11)	6.33 (5.65-7.09)	3.59 (3.30-3.89)	2.32 (2.09-2.61)
04/11/2020	6.75 (5.21-8.44)	10.06 (9.09-11.06)	3.44 (3.12-3.75)	2.29 (2.07-2.54)
11/11/2020	6.33 (4.80-8.00)	11.33 (10.38-12.33)	2.81 (2.55-3.09)	2.05 (1.87-2.24)
17/11/2020	6.16 (4.76-7.62)	10.58 (9.54-11.62)	2.79 (2.54-3.05)	1.84 (1.69-2.02)
23/11/2020	6.88 (5.39-8.48)	10.08 (9.11-11.12)	2.90 (2.64-3.16)	1.92 (1.74-2.11)
01/12/2020	6.93 (5.40-8.52)	11.20 (10.19-12.23)	3.47 (3.21-3.78)	2.23 (2.03-2.44)
08/12/2020	6.31 (5.00-7.68)	11.08 (10.05-12.09)	3.83 (3.53-4.14)	2.46 (2.24-2.73)
15/12/2020	5.20 (3.93-6.66)	7.08 (6.30-7.88)	3.43 (3.17-3.69)	2.44 (2.20-2.71)
24/12/2020	3.32 (2.87-3.84)	3.61 (3.32-3.95)	2.75 (2.56-2.95)	2.20 (2.00-2.41)
29/12/2020	3.26 (2.84-3.71)	3.11 (2.98-3.27)	2.67 (2.47-2.87)	1.92 (1.76-2.11)
03/01/2021	3.75 (2.96-4.79)	3.31 (3.03-3.62)	2.80 (2.57-3.04)	1.81 (1.65-1.99)
11/01/2021	5.26 (3.96-6.85)	3.38 (3.08-3.75)	2.60 (2.39-2.83)	1.68 (1.54-1.84)
19/01/2021	5.21 (3.93-6.76)	3.07 (2.89-3.27)	2.54 (2.33-2.75)	1.61 (1.48-1.77)
26/01/2021	4.35 (3.39-5.50)	3.16 (2.95-3.41)	2.40 (2.20-2.60)	1.63 (1.50-1.79)
02/02/2021	4.77 (3.72-6.06)	3.20 (2.97-3.48)	2.41 (2.21-2.62)	1.82 (1.64-2.03)
09/02/2021	4.86 (3.67-6.45)	3.44 (3.15-3.77)	2.48 (2.25-2.71)	1.87 (1.68-2.10)
17/02/2021	4.10 (3.13-5.36)	3.41 (3.13-3.72)	2.44 (2.22-2.69)	1.89 (1.72-2.07)
23/02/2021	4.22 (3.26-5.41)	3.11 (2.92-3.31)	2.39 (2.20-2.60)	1.82 (1.65-2.02)
03/03/2021	5.46 (4.16-6.98)	4.11 (3.67-4.61)	2.47 (2.26-2.69)	1.55 (1.42-1.69)
09/03/2021	5.95 (4.60-7.52)	7.38 (6.60-8.17)	2.63 (2.40-2.88)	1.67 (1.53-1.82)
17/03/2021	6.53 (5.09-8.21)	9.45 (8.50-10.45)	2.55 (2.32-2.81)	1.78 (1.63-1.94)
23/03/2021	6.08 (4.70-7.73)	8.96 (8.01-9.98)	2.90 (2.64-3.19)	1.67 (1.56-1.80)

**Table S3. Mean contacts over time by age with 95% confidence interval of bootstrapped mean.** Mean reported contacts of participants weighted by age, gender, and weekday.