

Supplementary material to “Contact behaviour before, during and after the COVID-19 pandemic in the Netherlands: evidence from contact surveys in 2016-2017 and 2020-2023”

Jantien A. Backer¹, Eric R. A. Vos¹, Gerco den Hartog¹, Cheyenne C. E. van Hagen¹, Hester E. de Melker¹, Fiona R. M. van der Klis¹, Jacco Wallinga^{1,2}

¹ National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

² Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

S1 Study design and data

S2 Study population weighted by age group and sex

S3 Sensitivity analysis for transmission potential

S4 Working from home

S5 Contact type by medical risk group

S1 Study design and data

Most questions on participant and contact characteristics remained the same over the course of all rounds, including the baseline survey. Some survey questions however changed during the study period, summarised in Table 1.

Contacts' ages were reported in age groups: 0–4, 5–9, 10–19, 20–29, 30–39, 40–49, 50–59, 60–69, 70–79, 80–89 and ≥ 90 , but from PiCo round 3 onwards the contact age group 10-19 was subdivided in 10-14 and 15-19. Participants could further distinguish their contacts, but this distinction changed from round to round. In the baseline survey and Pico rounds 1 and 8, the number of men and women in each contact age group was reported. In PiCo rounds 2, 3, and 10 this distinction was replaced by whether contacts took place within or outside 1.5 meters. In all other PiCo rounds, the category for contacts within 1.5 meters, was further subdivided in whether the contact occurred with or without personal protective equipment, such as a face mask.

A question about working from home was included in the PiCo survey. To obtain a baseline value, participants of rounds 1 and 2 were also asked about working from home in the period preceding the COVID-19 pandemic.

Valid household composition

Participants were asked about their household size and composition, i.e. the age and sex of all household members. In the baseline survey and round 1 of the PiCo survey, the participants should include themselves, but from round 2 of the PiCo survey they should exclude themselves. As a consequence, from round 2 onwards the household composition could be empty, either because the participant lived in a single-person household or because they skipped the question. All non-empty household compositions were indicated to be valid, as well as empty household compositions of participants that reported to live in a single-person household from round 2 onwards. To harmonize the different surveys, persons with the same age and sex as the participant were deleted from the reported household composition in the baseline survey and round 1 of the PiCo survey. Participants without a valid household composition are only excluded for the analysis of contacts with household members, but they are included for the analysis of community contacts.

Medical risk status

In the baseline survey and PiCo rounds 1 and 2, the participant was asked about current and previous medical conditions. From PiCo round 4 onwards, the question was restricted to current medical conditions. In PiCo round 3 no medical questions were posed.

Using these medical conditions, the medical risk status of each participant was based on whether they would be indicated for influenza vaccination. Following the current guidelines [1] these conditions include diabetes (any kind), respiratory disease, liver disease, immunocompromised condition, cancer, asplenia, renal disease, cardiovascular disease, neurological condition, transplant patients, and/or morbid obesity (Body Mass Index ≥ 40 ,

calculated from the length and weight of the participant). When at least one of these conditions applied, the participant was classified in the high medical risk category. When none of the medical condition questions were answered (or posed), the medical risk status was imputed. Because the medical risk questions changed around PiCo round 3, we imputed the missing medical risk status for the periods before round 3 and from round 3 onwards separately. For each period, it was determined whether a participant had an unambiguous risk status, i.e., only high or only low, apart from the missing data. If so, the missing risk status was replaced by the unambiguous risk status. For instance, a participant with a medical risk status of high, missing and missing in round 0, 1 and 2 would have an unambiguous high risk status, and the missing risk status would be replaced by high medical risk. On the other hand, a participant with a medical risk status of high, low and missing in round 0, 1 and 2 would have an ambiguous risk status, and the missing risk status is not imputed.

Valid contact data

Only participants that provided valid contact data are included in the data. In the PiCo survey, participants were first asked whether they had had any contacts outside the household on the previous day, before filling out the actual number of contacts. Participants that did not answer this first question nor filled out any contacts, were omitted from the data. Also participants that indicated having had contacts, but did not fill out any contacts, were omitted from the data. The baseline survey lacked the question to check whether a participant had any contacts on the previous day. From this survey, participants were excluded that did not fill out the contact day nor any contacts, presuming they skipped the question.

Table 1: Survey questions that have changed during the study period of the baseline survey (indicated as round 0) and the PiCo survey (rounds 1 to 10). An 'x' denotes which version of the survey question was posed in that round.

Survey question		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Household composition	including participant	x	x									
	excluding participant			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Medical conditions	currently or in past	x	x	x								
	currently					x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Working from home	before COVID-19		x	x								
	last week		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Check on contacts			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Contact age group 10-19	10-19	x	x	x								
	10-14 and 15-19				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Contact distinction	men / women	x	x							x		
	close / distant			x	x							x
	close with/out protection / distant					x	x	x	x		x	

S2 Study population corrected for confounding by age group and sex

Table 2: Study population characteristics corrected for confounding, using the age group and sex of the general population [5]. The survey month, the number of participants per survey round and stratified in percentages by household size, medical risk group and education level. The baseline survey from 2016-2017 is indicated as survey round 0. Before weighting the missing values were omitted. The final column contains reference percentages for the household size [7], medical risk group [8], and education level for 15-90 year olds [6].

round		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ref
Survey month			Apr 2020	Jun 2020	Oct 2020	Mar 2021	Jul 2021	Nov 2021	Apr 2022	Jul 2022	Nov 2022	May 2023	
Number of participants		5381	2594	6704	6086	5912	5231	8144	6347	5626	5248	4830	
Household size	1	22.0	13.5	11.3	11.0	11.2	11.4	11.9	12.1	13.0	11.9	12.2	18.1
	2	34.9	31.6	33.3	33.9	34.2	34.4	34.6	35.1	35.6	35.1	35.2	30.7
	3	12.4	15.6	14.6	14.6	14.1	13.6	13.8	13.4	13.1	13.3	13.4	16.6
	4	19.5	26.9	26.6	26.1	26.3	26.9	25.8	25.9	24.9	25.4	24.8	22.6
	5+	11.2	12.5	14.2	14.4	14.2	13.7	13.9	13.5	13.4	14.2	14.3	12.0
Medical risk group	Low	71.1	69.3	70.7	81.7	79.5	80.7	77.4	79.5	79.9	79.3	78.4	78.6
	High	28.9	30.7	29.3	18.3	20.5	19.3	22.6	20.5	20.1	20.7	21.6	21.4
Education level	Low	30.8	22.6	20.3	19.4	18.6	18.2	18.0	16.9	17.0	16.7	16.8	28.6
	Medium	33.5	34.4	32.3	32.9	32.9	33.1	31.8	31.6	31.5	31.8	32.2	37.8
	High	35.7	43.0	47.4	47.7	48.5	48.7	50.3	51.5	51.6	51.5	51.1	33.6

S3 Sensitivity analysis for transmission potential

To assess how sensitive the transmission potential is to assumptions on the relative susceptibility and infectiousness by age group for COVID-19, we tried several parameterisations from literature. Zhang et al. [2] estimated susceptibility by age group, while keeping infectiousness constant. Franco et al. [3] used an NGM approach fixing either infectiousness and estimating susceptibility (scenario A) or vice versa (scenario B). Finally, Klinkenberg et al. [4] assumed susceptibility and infectiousness were varying by age group but identical. Although these assumptions lead to slightly different estimates for the transmission potential, they all are distinctly different from the assumption that susceptibility and infectiousness are equal for all age groups (Fig. 1).




Figure 1: Transmission potential, expressed as the spectral radius of the next generation matrix (NGM) compared to the baseline value, for different assumptions of relative susceptibility and infectiousness over age groups. Shown is the ratio (horizontal line) and 95% bias-corrected bootstrap interval (shaded area). PICO rounds are shown from the start to end date, with the median survey date (vertical line).

Table 3: Assumptions for relative susceptibility and infectiousness by age group, for sensitivity analysis of transmission potential.

reference	type	0-4	5-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+
equal	sus	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.00	1.000	1.000	1.00	1.000	1.000	1.000
	inf	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.00	1.000	1.000	1.00	1.000	1.000	1.000
Franco et al. (2022) A	sus	0.182	0.550	0.603	1.00	1.172	1.009	0.88	0.869	0.846	0.805
	inf	0.540	0.550	0.560	0.59	0.700	0.760	0.90	0.990	0.990	0.990
Franco et al. (2022) B	sus	0.400	0.390	0.380	0.79	0.860	0.800	0.82	0.880	0.740	0.740
	inf	0.346	0.892	1.310	1.00	0.645	3.783	1.32	0.266	1.277	0.099
Klinkenberg et al. (2023)	sus	1.000	1.000	3.050	5.75	3.540	3.710	4.36	5.690	5.320	7.210
	inf	1.000	1.000	3.050	5.75	3.540	3.710	4.36	5.690	5.320	7.210
Zhang et al. (2020)	sus	0.340	0.340	0.670	1.00	1.000	1.000	1.00	1.235	1.470	1.470
	inf	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.00	1.000	1.000	1.00	1.000	1.000	1.000

S5 Contact type by medical risk group




Figure 3: Fraction of contacts per participant, stratified by contact type: distant (more than 1.5 m), close (less than 1.5 m), close unprotected (less than 1.5 m without protection), close protected (less than 1.5 m with protection) by survey round. In rounds 1 and 8 contacts were stratified by gender. Fractions are weighted by age group distribution of the general population.

References

1. Communicable Disease Control NCC for. Influenzavaccinatie, updated 3 May 2023 (accessed January 2024). 2023. Available: <https://lci.rivm.nl/richtlijnen/influenzavaccinatie>
2. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science*. 2020;368: 1481–1486. doi:[10.1126/science.abb8001](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb8001)
3. Franco N, Coletti P, Willem L, Angeli L, Lajot A, Abrams S, et al. Inferring age-specific differences in susceptibility to and infectiousness upon SARS-CoV-2 infection based on Belgian social contact data. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2022;18: e1009965. doi:[10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009965](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009965)
4. Klinkenberg D, Backer JA, Keizer NF de, Wallinga J. Projecting COVID-19 intensive care admissions in the netherlands for policy advice: February 2020 to january 2021. medRxiv. 2023. doi:[10.1101/2023.06.30.23291989](https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.30.23291989)
5. Statistics Netherlands. Population by sex and age (accessed August 2023). 2023. Available: <https://opendata.cbs.nl/#/CBS/nl/dataset/83482NED/table?dl=98643>
6. Statistics Netherlands. Population by education level and age group (accessed October 2023). 2023. Available: <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/85184NED/table?dl=984E1>
7. Statistics Netherlands. Household size distribution (accessed February 2024). 2024. Available: <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/37975/table?dl=9E579>
8. Heins MJ, Korevaar JC, Knottnerus BJ, Hooiveld M. Vaccine Coverage Dutch National Influenza Prevention Program 2021: brief monitor (accessed January 2023). Nivel; 2022. Available: <https://www.nivel.nl/sites/default/files/bestanden/1004308.pdf>