

1 **Contacts and behaviours of university students during the COVID-19**
2 **pandemic at the start of the 2020/21 academic year**

3
4 * Emily Nixon^{1,5},
5  Adam Trickey⁶,
6 Hannah Christensen^{2,3},
7 Adam Finn^{4,2,3},
8 Amy Thomas⁵,
9 Caroline Relton²,
10 Clara Montgomery¹,
11 Gibran Hemani²,
12 Jane Metz⁵,
13 Josephine G. Walker²,
14 Katy Turner^{5,3},
15 Rachel Kwiatkowska²,
16 Sarah Sauchelli⁷,
17 Leon Danon^{8,9},
18 Ellen Brooks-Pollock^{5,3}

19
20  Joint first authors
21 * Corresponding author

22
23 Corresponding author email: emily.nixon@bristol.ac.uk
24 Corresponding author address: School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol
25 Bristol Life Sciences Building, 24 Tyndall Avenue, Bristol, BS8 1TQ

26 Corresponding author ORCID-ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-1626-9296

- 27 1. *School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*
28 2. *Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*
29 3. *NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at*
30 *University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*
31 4. *School of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*
32 5. *Bristol Veterinary School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*
33 6. *Bristol Children's Vaccine Centre, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom*
34 7. *National Institute for Health Research Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University*
35 *Hospitals of Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and University of Bristol*
36 8. *Computer Science, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK*
37 9. *Alan Turing Institute, British Library, London, UK*
38

39

40 **Abstract (172 words)**

41

42 CONQUEST (COroNavirus QUESTionnaire) is an online survey of contacts, behaviour, and
43 COVID-19 symptoms for University of Bristol (UoB) staff/students. We analysed survey
44 results from the start of the 2020/2021 academic year, prior to the second national lockdown
45 (14/09/2020-01/11/2020), where COVID-19 outbreaks led to lockdown of some student halls
46 of residence. The aim of these analyses was to enhance knowledge of student contact
47 patterns to inform infection disease mathematical modelling approaches.

48

49 Responses captured information on demographics, contacts on the previous day, symptoms
50 and self-isolation during the prior week, and COVID-19 status.

51

52 740 students provided 1261 unique records. Of 42 (3%) students testing positive in the prior
53 fortnight, 99% had been self-isolating. The median number of contacts on the previous day
54 was 2 (interquartile range: 1-5), mode: 1, mean: 6.1; 8% had ≥ 20 contacts. 57% of student
55 contacts were other UoB students/staff.

56

57 Most students reported few daily contacts but there was heterogeneity, and some reported
58 many. Around 40% of student contacts were with individuals not affiliated with UoB,
59 indicating potential for transmission to non-students/staff.

60

61

62 **Background**

63 By November 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic had caused 1.2 million deaths globally(1) and
64 in many countries had forced the temporary closure of educational institutions, including
65 universities(2). In the Autumn of 2020, with reported daily COVID-19 cases rising
66 nationally(3) students at UK universities began to return for the start of the 2020/2021 term.
67 Whilst university students, due to their young age, are less affected by COVID-19 morbidity
68 and mortality than other groups(4), up to one third still may be medically vulnerable to severe
69 COVID-19(5) and all infected students still have the potential to transmit the virus to others.
70 University students often travel from across the country and the globe to their place of
71 education and raise the possibility of onward transmission of infection carried from their
72 home locations. In addition to the national COVID-19 restrictions in place during Autumn
73 2020, UK universities implemented a range of measures to reduce transmission such as
74 reducing the amount of in person teaching through delivery of lectures online and restricting
75 student living circles(6). However, despite these measures, large outbreaks of COVID-19
76 occurred across many UK universities(6, 7).

77 At the University of Bristol (UoB), there was an online induction week from 28th September to
78 the 2nd October and the first teaching block started on the 30th September. The UoB adopted
79 a “blended” teaching approach based upon a mixture of in-person and online teaching. In
80 university-owned halls of residence, students were divided into households (“living circles”)
81 ranging from 1 to 44 individuals per household (median = 5, interquartile range [IQR]: 1-
82 7)(8). Students were instructed not to host any non-residents in their household but could
83 meet others outside of their household provided they conformed to the government social
84 distancing guidelines and other relevant infection control measures such as use of face
85 coverings where appropriate to do so(9).

86 The UoB has reported positive test results daily since the 14th October(10), with 1722
87 positive tests among UoB students being reported up until the 1st November, roughly 7% of
88 students, compared with 48 positive tests among staff (<1%) over the same period. On the
89 9th October, 300 students in one University-owned hall of residence were requested to begin
90 a 14-day period of mass self-isolation(11) and then on the 13th October an additional 40
91 students in a block of four flats in a separate location were also asked to start a 14-day
92 period of self-isolation(12). The vast majority of students living in these large halls of
93 residence are first year undergraduates(13). Students that tested positive in other
94 accommodation types are required to isolate along with their household, in line with national
95 guidelines(10).

96 Although there have been previous studies prior to the COVID-19 pandemic that have
97 collected data on contact patterns(14-17), only a small sample of these were relevant to
98 students(14, 15) or participants could not be identified as students(16, 17). Furthermore, the
99 behaviour of students may have changed in light of the pandemic and in response to
100 government regulations. Understanding more about the contact patterns, COVID-19 related
101 symptoms and behaviour of students is important to inform public health action and
102 mathematical models. We aimed to investigate the reported behaviours and contact patterns
103 among students of the UoB during the start of the 2020/2021 academic term by carrying out
104 an online survey.

105

106

107 **Methods**

108 CONQUEST (COroNavirus QUESTionnaire) is an ongoing survey on contacts, behaviour,
109 and potential SARS-Cov-2 symptoms for staff and students at UoB. This survey has been
110 live since the 23rd June 2020. Participants completed an initial questionnaire which included
111 questions on background demographics and then were given the option to fill out a shorter
112 version of the questionnaire on contacts, symptoms, and whether they had had COVID-19;
113 repeating this every 8 days. Initially there was high participation from staff members, but very
114 low participation from students, principally because the survey date started near the end of
115 the 2019/2020 academic year when most students had returned home. From the start of the
116 2020/2021 academic year, there were a number of initiatives to recruit more students to
117 complete the survey. Here, we present a subset of the survey data from the 14th September
118 2020 to the 1st November 2020, mainly focusing on the student data.

119 *Survey*

120 The survey data were collected and managed using REDCap Electronic Data Capture tools
121 hosted at the UoB(18, 19). The survey captured demographic information, information about
122 participant's contacts on the previous day, information about symptoms during the previous
123 week, whether participants had been self-isolating during the previous week, and COVID-19
124 status if known.

125 Demographic information on participants was captured when they completed the initial
126 survey. This included data on age, gender, ethnicity, whether they were part of a high-risk
127 group, whether they were a student, a member of staff, or both, whether they were an
128 undergraduate or postgraduate, their study year, their UoB department, their residence, and
129 the age of their household members.

130 Participants were asked about three types of contacts they had had on the previous day:

- 131 1. Individual contacts - those who they spoke to in person one-on-one, including those
132 in their household and support bubble.
- 133 2. Other contacts - if they spoke in person to many people one-on-one in the same
134 setting (but they did not have the opportunity to speak to each other), for example, as
135 part of working in a customer service role in a shop.
- 136 3. Group contacts - large groups of individuals in the same setting (for example, sports
137 teams, tutorials, lectures, religious services, large gatherings with friends and family).

138 For "individual" contacts (contact type 1), participants were asked about where this contact
139 was made, whether this contact was indoors, outdoors or both, the duration of this contact,
140 whether this contact involved touch, whether this contact studied/worked at the university
141 (and if so which faculty and school they were associated with), their age, whether they were
142 part of their household, and how often they would usually have contact with this person.

143 For "other" contacts (contact type 2), no additional questions were asked, as it was expected
144 that there often would be a large number of "other" contacts and participants would not be
145 motivated to answer additional questions on them.

146 For "group" contacts (contact type 3), participants were asked how many individuals this
147 involved, their ages, whether the majority were from UoB (and if so the main faculty and
148 school this group was associated with), where the group met, whether this was indoors,
149 outdoors or both, whether the members of the group talked to each other and how long the
150 contact with this group was for.

151 Additionally, participants were asked about symptoms in the last 7 days (listed in Table 5),
152 whether they had sought medical attention for these symptoms, whether they had been self-
153 isolating in the last 7 days, and their COVID-19 status. For some analyses, the variable on
154 whether people have had COVID-19 (no, yes confirmed by a test, yes a doctor suspected
155 so, yes my own suspicions) was combined with the date that they had been tested or were
156 suspected to have COVID-19. This was to create new variables on whether they had
157 COVID-19 in the two weeks prior to survey completion, or before this.

158 Participants who had signed up to repeat questionnaires were sent an email every 8 days
159 with a unique link that allowed their responses to be anonymously connected to those from
160 previous CON-QUEST questionnaires that they had responded to. The reminder emails with
161 the survey links were sent every 8 days regardless of whether participants had filled in
162 surveys from previous reminder emails or when they responded to them.

163 The full questionnaire has been provided in the supplementary materials. The anonymised
164 raw data can be accessed upon request by contacting the corresponding author.

165 *Analyses*

166 We include records from the 14th September 2020 - 1st November 2020 in order to capture
167 student behaviours at the beginning of term. For some analyses, a comparator population of
168 staff (not including those listed as staff/students) was created taking the same survey
169 dates. We calculated the mean prevalence of behaviours, symptoms, or contacts, stratified
170 by population subgroups.

171 To investigate the associations between the overall number of contacts on the previous day
172 and demographics and behaviours, univariable and multivariable negative binomial
173 regression modelling was used. These models included variables on: age group (17-24, 25-
174 44, 45-64, 65-79, 80+ years of age), gender (male, female/other - the "other" category had
175 too few individuals and so were grouped with the largest category), under/postgraduate
176 status, current study year (1, 2, 3, 4+), symptoms during the previous week, cardinal
177 symptoms (loss of taste or smell, fever, persistent cough(20)) during the previous week, self-
178 isolating in the prior week, self-reporting being in a high-risk group, household size (1, 2-3, 4-
179 5, 6-9, 10+, missing), and COVID-19 status (never had, previously thought they had it,
180 previously tested positive for it, thought they had it in the last 2 weeks, tested positive for it in
181 the last 2 weeks). Note that all postgraduates were assigned to the 4+ year group to
182 differentiate them from undergraduates in their first year of study.

183 *Weighting*

184 Initial analyses suggested males and undergraduates were underrepresented in the survey
185 responses. We therefore weighted analyses, with weights based on publicly available UoB
186 data on student demographics, to make the dataset more representative of the university's
187 student population - see Supplementary table 1. All tables specify whether weighting was
188 used.

189 *Ethical approval*

190 Ethical approval was granted on the 14th May 2020 by the Health Sciences University
191 Research Ethics Committee at the University of Bristol (ID = 104903), with four amendment
192 requests approved on the 22nd May 2020, 9th June 2020, 27th August 2020 and 7th
193 September 2020. The purpose of the amendments were either to update the relevance of
194 the questions or to make the survey faster and easier to complete.
195

196 **Results**

197 *Demographics*

198 From the 14th September 2020 to the 1st November 2020 there were 740 students that
199 completed the questionnaire 1261 times. For a comparator population there were 1655
200 records from 433 staff.

201 Most students were aged 17-24, with a median age of 21 (IQR: 19-24) years and a mean
202 age of 23.3 (standard deviation [SD] = 6.8) years. 26.2% of our student sample (42.5%
203 before weighting) were postgraduates, so many participants were aged 25-64. 37 (3%) of
204 the students also listed themselves as staff. 59.3% of our sample lived in households of 2-5
205 people. First years have higher mean and maximum household sizes (8.0 - SD: 30.4, max:
206 400) compared to the other years: 4.3 (SD: 2.4, max: 14), 3.9 (SD: 2.5, max: 20), 3.1 (SD:
207 4.3, max: 60), for years 2, 3, and 4+, respectively (Table 1).

208 *Symptoms and behaviours*

209 437 (35%) had had symptoms in the week prior to survey, and 93 (7%) had cardinal
210 symptoms, whilst 179 (14%) student participants had been self-isolating in the week prior to
211 the survey (Table 2). Of those with symptoms, 30 (7%) sought medical attention (this could
212 have included: contacting NHS 111, a pharmacist or GP/Practice nurse; visiting a walk-in
213 centre, Accident and Emergency or other hospital). 152 (12%) students thought that they
214 had had COVID-19 (but did not report having had a positive test) more than two weeks prior
215 to filling in the survey, whilst 20 (2%) had tested positive more than two weeks prior to the
216 survey. 56 (4%) students thought that they had had (but had not tested positive for) COVID-
217 19 within the two weeks before completing the survey. 42 (3%) of respondents had tested
218 positive in the two weeks prior to survey completion. Students in their first year of study more
219 commonly reported isolating and having cardinal COVID-19 symptoms in the last 7 days
220 before taking the survey, compared to students not in their first year (24% and 15%,
221 respectively), and having tested positive for COVID-19 in the two weeks before the survey
222 (10%), than the overall student sample (14% isolating, 7% with cardinal symptoms, and 3%,
223 testing positive).

224 Table 3 presents the most common symptoms in the last week reported by students,
225 stratified by their COVID-19 status. All of those that had tested positive in the two weeks
226 prior to the survey reported at least one symptom in the prior week but none of these
227 participants reported chilblains, vomiting, or unusual abdominal pain. The most common
228 symptoms among those that had tested positive in the two weeks before the survey were a
229 runny nose/sneezing (73%), loss or altered sense of smell (59%), a headache (53%),
230 unusual fatigue (51%), loss or altered sense of taste (49%), and a sore throat (42%).
231 Meanwhile, 36% reported a fever, and 35% a persistent cough; both considered cardinal
232 symptoms of COVID-19.

233 Those with cardinal symptoms in the week prior to taking the survey were far more likely to
234 have been isolating in that week (61%) than those without these symptoms (11%). 99% of
235 those that had tested positive for COVID-19 during the two weeks before survey completion
236 had been isolating within the last week (Table 4). 81% of those that had tested positive for
237 COVID-19 during the two weeks prior to the survey had had the cardinal COVID-19
238 symptoms within the week prior to the survey and 14% of these had sought medical
239 treatment. Of those that suspected that they had had COVID-19 during the two weeks prior
240 to the survey but that had not received a positive test, 52% had been self-isolating and 21%
241 reported having the cardinal COVID-19 symptoms within the week prior to the survey.

242 *Contacts*

243 The mean number of contacts reported by students for the previous day was 6.1 (SD: 15.0),
244 with a median of 2 (IQR: 1-5). Fewer respondents filled out the survey on Saturdays and
245 Sundays, (10% combined - Supplementary table 2) compared to weekdays, meaning that
246 data are relatively sparse regarding Fridays and Saturdays. Figure 1 and Supplementary
247 figures 1-7 show the distribution of the number of contacts on the previous day for students,
248 staff, and various sub-groups of students, as well as different types of contacts. The
249 weighted mean number of responses where participants had 20 or more contacts on the
250 previous day was 8% (SD: 27%). Numbers of contacts reported for the previous day are
251 shown in Supplementary figure 8, stratified by week. The mean number of contacts appears
252 to be higher from the 5th October onwards; however, there were few survey responses
253 during the first 3 weeks.

254 Supplementary table 3 presents a matrix of the mean contacts for the students on the
255 previous day by age-group, with the majority of contacts happening among their own age
256 groups for those aged 18-24 and 25-44. Of the 1261 survey responses, 63 (5%) recorded a
257 contact with someone aged 65 or older, with 27 of these occurring among those aged 17-24,
258 27 among those aged 25-44, 8 among those aged 45-64, and 1 among those aged 65-79.

259 The number of contacts on the previous day and the proportion of participants isolating
260 within the last week by residence type are shown in Figure 2. Whilst 31% and 29% of those
261 in catered and self-catered halls, respectively, (the majority of which will be first years) were
262 isolating within the last 7 days, the mean number of contacts on the previous day appeared
263 higher in the self-catered halls (5.6) than in the catered halls (2.3). Those living in other
264 accommodation types were less likely to have been isolating in the prior week. Participants
265 living with their family appeared to have had the highest mean number of contacts on the
266 previous day (7.5).

267 Students that reported isolating within the last week had a lower mean number of contacts
268 on the previous day (4.5) than those not isolating (6.4) (Table 5). The number of "individual"
269 contacts appeared to be similar between those not isolating (2.3) and those isolating (2.1),
270 however the "group" contacts were higher among those not isolating (2.5) than those
271 isolating (1.8), as were "other" contacts (1.6 vs 0.6). Staff had lower mean numbers of
272 overall contacts on the previous day than students (5.2 vs 6.1), which was driven by having
273 lower numbers of "group" (1.8 vs 2.4) and "other" contacts (0.6 vs 1.5).

274 The mean percentage of "individual" contacts on the previous day that involved touch was
275 39% (SD: 41.0%) overall, 35% (SD: 42%) for males, and 42% (SD: 41%) for females.
276 Overall, the mean percentage of "individual" contacts on the previous day that were with
277 household members was 64% (Table 5). There was a higher percentage of household
278 contacts on the previous day for those who had been isolating within the last 7 days, than for
279 those who had not been isolating within the last 7 days (84% and 61% respectively). Similar
280 results are seen for the percentage of contacts that were frequent (where the person would
281 usually meet that particular contact ≥ 4 times a week) as for those seen for household
282 contacts. 62% of "individual and group" contacts on the previous day were made at the
283 home of the respondent, and this percentage was lower among those not isolating within the
284 last 7 days (59%) than among those that had been isolating (80%). Whilst the percentage of
285 contacts on the previous day made at the university were similar between those that had and
286 had not been isolating within the last 7 days (10% vs 7%), the percentage of contacts at
287 other locations was higher among those that had not been isolating in the prior week (35%)
288 than those that had been isolating (18%). 57% of "individual and group" contacts on the
289 previous day were with other UoB students or staff - this percentage was lower among those
290 not isolating within the past week (54%) than those isolating (81%). In comparison to
291 students, staff had a higher number of contacts on the previous day that involved touch
292 (57% for staff vs 39% for students). Similar numbers of their "individual and group" contacts
293 on the previous day were made at home for staff (61%) and students (62%), whilst far fewer

294 of the contacts of staff on the previous day were either UoB staff or students (16% for staff
295 vs 54% for students). The mean percentage of the student's "individual" non-UoB contacts
296 that were household members was 50%.

297 Participants that had not been isolating in the prior week had shorter mean contact durations
298 with their contacts at home (3.3 hours) than those that had been isolating (3.9 hours), and
299 longer durations of their contacts on the previous day in a location other than home or
300 university (1.1 vs 0.3 hours), with both groups have a similar duration of contacts at
301 university (0.2 vs 0.3 hours).

302 In unweighted analyses looking at repeat records from participants, there were 37 records
303 where a participant self-reported not isolating in the 7 days before one survey completion
304 date but then isolating in the 7 days before their next survey completion. For these records,
305 the mean number of contacts was 7.1 (SD: 7.1) for the first survey (when not isolating) and
306 8.4 (SD: 15.4) at the second (when isolating). There were 20 records where participants
307 went from isolating to not isolating, where the mean number of contacts on the previous day
308 went from 8.7 (SD: 19.6) at the first survey to 9.2 (SD: 13.3) at the second.

309 There were 17 records where a participant reported a new suspected infection or a positive
310 test within the last two weeks, having previously said they had no history of suspected or
311 confirmed infection with COVID-19 (i.e. new cases). For these records, the mean number of
312 contacts on the previous day was 7.8 (SD: 8.2) at the first survey and 6.2 (SD: 6.1) at the
313 second. Only 6 individuals reported current infection, and subsequently reported a previous
314 infection at the next survey. The mean number of contacts reported by these individuals was
315 3.9 (SD: 4.0) at the first survey and 5.6 (SD: 6.1) at the second.

316 *Regression analysis*

317 In the multivariable regression analysis of the number of contacts for the previous day (Table
318 6), older ages were associated with a lower number of contacts when compared with those
319 aged 17-24 years. Students in their 4th (or higher) year of study reported higher numbers of
320 contacts for the previous day than students in their 1st year. Reporting the cardinal COVID-
321 19 symptoms within the last week was associated with a higher number of contacts on the
322 previous day (versus not having the cardinal COVID-19 symptoms), whilst isolating within
323 the week before the survey was associated with having fewer contacts on the previous day.

324 In the multivariable regression analysis, participants having a household size of 1 was
325 associated with higher numbers of contacts than participants having a household size of 2-3.
326 Similarly, in comparison to having a household size of 2-3, a household size of 4-5 was
327 associated with more contacts, whilst not reporting household size was associated with
328 reporting fewer contacts. COVID-19 status was associated with number of contacts. Those
329 that had not tested positive for or did not suspect themselves to have had COVID-19 had
330 lower numbers of contacts on the previous day than those that suspected themselves to
331 have had COVID-19 more than two weeks prior to the survey. Those testing positive within
332 the last 2 weeks before survey completion had fewer contacts. Students in catered and self-
333 catered halls had fewer contacts on the previous day than those living in a shared house/flat
334 but students living in a shared house/flat had fewer contacts than those living with their
335 family. Supplementary table 4 shows contact numbers stratified by isolation status and
336 under/postgraduate status, with both undergraduates and postgraduates that had been
337 isolating in the previous week having lower numbers of contacts than that had not been
338 isolating.

339

340

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

341

342

343 Discussion

344 Our survey results from the start of the 2020/2021 academic year give insight into the
345 behaviour of students in this unique and important time period in the COVID-19 pandemic.
346 First year undergraduates were more likely to be isolating within the prior 7 days and to have
347 tested positive for COVID-19 in the prior two weeks than other year groups, with higher
348 percentages of respondents isolating that lived in catered and self-catered halls than other
349 accommodation types. This observation confirms that the COVID-19 epidemic among UoB
350 students has been concentrated among first years living in large, shared living residences
351 (as predicted by Brooks-Pollock et al., 2020(13)). There was high compliance to isolation
352 guidelines among students who had a positive test for COVID-19 in the previous two weeks
353 before survey completion, while half of the students who only suspected they had COVID-19
354 (but did not have this confirmed by a test) isolated. Some of these students may have been
355 required to isolate due to a member of their household or living circle having a positive test,
356 rather than isolating voluntarily. Just over half of those who reported cardinal symptoms self-
357 isolated, indicating that some students that should have been isolating had not been doing
358 so. Students that had been isolating in the prior week had fewer contacts than those that had
359 not been isolating, with a higher percentage of contacts among those isolating being
360 contacts within their home than for those not isolating. This suggests that whilst the number
361 of contacts of the isolating students was often not as low as might be expected, the majority
362 of contacts that took place were with people they lived with, who were also likely to be
363 isolating.

364 Whilst most students reported a low number of daily contacts on the previous day (mode=1,
365 median=2), 8% of students reported over 20, indicating that these could be individuals with
366 increased likelihood of catching COVID-19 and infecting others (so-called “super
367 spreaders”(21)). Over a third of reported contacts involved touch, whilst around a half of
368 contacts among the students were with other UoB students or staff. When comparing the
369 contacts of students with those of staff, we found that students had slightly higher mean
370 numbers of contacts overall, with the difference driven by having higher numbers of group
371 contacts, possibly due to involvement with university societies, face-to-face teaching (as not
372 all staff are delivering this) and socialising. We also found that staff were far less likely to mix
373 with other university staff and students compared to the students and that staff had higher
374 proportions of contacts that involved touch, possibly as staff are more likely to live with their
375 families. Whilst students appear to mix mostly with other students, our results indicate that
376 there is still potential for considerable crossover of COVID-19 from students to the non-
377 student population.

378 Our regression analysis results showed that students in their 4th year of study had higher
379 numbers of contacts than those in year 1, despite living in households with fewer members
380 and adjusting for isolation status. This may be due to students in later years already having
381 established social networks that are less disturbed by the COVID-19 guidelines than the
382 nascent social networks being formed by the first years. It could also be because so many
383 first years were isolating that this reduced the number of contacts for first years that were not
384 isolating. Students that reported having had the cardinal COVID-19 symptoms in the last
385 week were more likely to report a higher number of contacts on the previous day than those
386 without these symptoms, which may be due to consistently higher contact patterns leading to
387 infection and exhibiting symptoms. Students in larger households tended to have more
388 contacts than those in households of sizes 2-3, possibly due to an increased pool of readily
389 available contacts, whilst those in one person households also had higher numbers of
390 contacts than those in 2-3 person households, perhaps because they were required to go
391 out to seek social activities. In the multivariable regression analyses, those that tested
392 positive within the 2 weeks prior to survey completion had fewer contacts than those that
393 had not tested positive or suspected themselves to be positive, indicating attempts to adhere

394 with the COVID-19 guidelines. Students living with their family appeared to report the highest
395 number of contacts, with those living in catered and self-catered halls reporting lower
396 numbers of contacts.

397 Unsurprisingly given the COVID-19 restrictions in place at the time of our survey, we found a
398 lower mean number of daily contacts among our student population (6.1) than was found in
399 the Warwick social contacts survey from 2009(14, 15), either among their entire sample
400 (26.8) or among the students in that sample (29.9). However, that study also found a large
401 amount of heterogeneity in the number of contacts. In the Warwick social contacts survey
402 data, students have more home contacts (3.5) than other participants (2.3), whilst they found
403 that the majority of contacts for students (82%, 95% confidence interval: 79%-86%) were
404 either at home or associated with the university, and that students reported 20 (95%
405 confidence interval: 14.1-28.8) university-related contacts. We also found that a high
406 percentage of student contacts were either at home or university (around 72%). However,
407 we found that both students and our comparator sample of staff had 1.6 contacts at home
408 and that there were only 3.1 university contacts for students on average, with these
409 differences likely due to university and government's COVID-19 restrictions in place at the
410 time of our survey. Meanwhile, the POLYMOD social contacts survey(17) found a mean of
411 11.7 contacts per day per person in their Great Britain sample (with an average age around
412 30), lower than the Warwick social contacts survey, but still much higher than our mean
413 value (6.1). The POLYMOD survey found that people of the same age tended to mix with
414 each other and that people in the main student age group (18-24) have more contacts than
415 older adults, both of which are corroborated by our findings. In the POLYMOD survey,
416 around 75% of contacts at home and 50% of school and leisure contacts involved touch,
417 results that seem closer to our findings for staff (57% of contacts involving touch) than
418 students (39%), which is likely both down to physical distancing measures and due to
419 students being less likely to live with family members than staff or other adults.

420 The strengths of this survey include the sample size, longitudinal format, and anonymous
421 nature that enable us to capture self-reported behaviours of a large number of students
422 during a key period in the UK's COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, it provides a unique data
423 source on student behaviour during the pandemic, which will be useful in informing public
424 health action and mathematical models. Our results are likely generalisable to other UK city-
425 based universities, as well as to some city-based universities in other countries which are
426 similar in structure and COVID-19 status to UoB. Many of the questions were designed to be
427 comparable to existing contact surveys(14, 15, 17).

428 However, this study has some limitations. Firstly, the number of contacts was asked for the
429 previous day, whilst the questions on self-isolation and symptoms asked about the previous
430 week, and a window of 14-days was used to define current COVID-19. This discrepancy in
431 time-windows used for different questions could lead to difficulties in interpreting results,
432 particularly regarding contact patterns for those that had previously been isolating during the
433 prior week but not on the previous day, possibly leading to higher reported contacts for this
434 group. Secondly, the survey questions were devised early in the pandemic when less was
435 known about the epidemiology and possible interventions. We did not capture whether
436 participants had a negative test for COVID-19, which would have been useful information.
437 Thirdly, in order to capture sufficient detail on contacts, the questionnaire is fairly long (5-10
438 minutes) and complicated, which may deter those with lots of contacts or with little available
439 time from completing it, which may mean it is not representative. Some participants have not
440 filled in their household sizes, which perhaps shows that some people struggled to answer
441 the questionnaires due to the complexity. We include clear instructions defining "contacts" in
442 the survey; however, some people may not read this text or interpret the instructions
443 differently and so there could be variation in what people considered a contact to be.

444 Selection bias for those who particularly engaged in health-seeking behaviours may have
445 occurred, as those that are less likely to abide by the guidelines may also be less likely to fill
446 out the survey. However, while we are not able to identify the proportion of the population
447 that are not complying with COVID-19 restrictions, we did capture individuals who did not
448 appear to be compliant that were reporting large numbers of contacts and not isolating when
449 experiencing the cardinal symptoms. Another type of selection bias that may have occurred
450 is for students who have had COVID-19. Almost one-fifth of our surveyed student population
451 had tested positive for COVID-19 or suspected that they had had COVID-19, however, only
452 around 7% students had had a positive test as of the 1st November(10). Nevertheless, the
453 true prevalence of COVID-19 in the student population may be greater than 7%, since
454 students with symptoms may not want to present for a test to avoid the potential of obligatory
455 isolation for them and their household. There will inevitably be issues regarding recall bias,
456 particularly when we are asking respondents to estimate when they first think they had
457 COVID-19 (if this hasn't been confirmed by a positive test), and there will also likely be
458 issues with response bias, leading to inaccurate or false responses.

459 Our study comes at a crucial time in the COVID-19 pandemic, Autumn 2020, when the
460 disease is resurgent with high numbers of daily cases, including among university
461 students(7). The second national UK lockdown, commenced on the 5th November 2020, has
462 not included the closing of universities(22) and therefore, it is vital that we continue to
463 investigate the contribution of universities to transmission, particularly around Christmas with
464 special measures being implemented for students to return home(23), but with plans for their
465 return post-Christmas currently unclear.

466 It is important to understand the epidemiology of COVID-19 among students due to high
467 transmission rates and their unique mixing patterns at this time, with thousands of young
468 people moving from all over the country and world to study, forming new social networks in
469 the process. Although the student population is mostly young and therefore unlikely to see
470 the worst effects of COVID-19 infection(4, 24), there is the potential for transmission from
471 students back to their families or to other members of the community. Our study is able to
472 provide novel data on student contacts, symptoms, and behaviours at the beginning of the
473 2020/21 term when several lockdowns of student residences occurred, enabling us to
474 examine adherence to COVID-19 control measures, as well as the outsized influence on the
475 student COVID-19 pandemic of first year undergraduates that mostly reside in very large
476 accommodation blocks with the potential for large scale indoor transmission(13). This study
477 provides important data for policy makers and mathematical modellers on a key population
478 in the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as crucial data for any future infectious disease
479 outbreaks. We found that the number of daily contacts for students was much lower than in
480 pre-COVID-19 studies, which is likely to be due to the COVID-19 restrictions in place. We
481 show that whilst the majority of students report low numbers of contacts on the previous day,
482 there are a sizeable minority that report large numbers of contacts, highlighting the
483 heterogeneity of transmission and role that individuals with large numbers of daily contacts
484 (potential "super spreaders") could be having on the spread of disease. Around 40% of
485 student contacts were with people not affiliated to the university, indicating the potential for
486 transmission to groups other than students.

487

488

489 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank the Elizabeth Blackwell Institute for funding
490 this research, our RedCap data manager Alison Horne and our PPI group for their feedback
491 during the development of the survey. We would also like to thank all the participants who
492 have taken part in this study.

493 **Competing interests:** JGW has received research funding from Gilead Sciences unrelated
494 to this research. All other authors declare no competing interests.

495 **Funding:** This study was funded and supported by the Elizabeth Blackwell Institute. HC, AF,
496 KT, and EBP would like to acknowledge support from the National Institute for Health
497 Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in Behavioural Science and
498 Evaluation at the University of Bristol. HC is additionally funded through an NIHR Career
499 Development Fellowship [CDF-2018-11-ST2-015]. The views expressed are those of the
500 author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social
501 Care. CR is a member of the MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit and receives support from
502 the MRC (MC_UU_00011/5) and the University of Bristol. EN and EBP are supported by the
503 EPSRC (MR/V038613/1). ATh is supported by Wellcome (217509/Z/19/Z).

504 **Author contributions:** AT and EN wrote the first draft of the manuscript. EN organised data
505 collection, whilst AT analysed the data. EBP had the original idea for the manuscript. HC,
506 AF, ATh, CR, CM, GH, JM, JGW, KT, RK, SS, and LD designed analyses, interpreted the
507 results, and critically reviewed the manuscript.

508 **Data Availability:** The datasets generated and analysed during the current study are
509 available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

1. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2020 [Available from: <https://covid19.who.int>.
2. United Nations Educational SaCO. School closures caused by Coronavirus (Covid-19). 2020 [Available from: <https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>.
3. Ourworldindata.org. UK: Daily new confirmed COVID-19 cases. 2020 [Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus/country/united-kingdom?country=~GBR>.
4. Felsenstein S, Hedrich CM. COVID-19 in children and young people. *Lancet Rheumatol*. 2020;2(9):e514-e6.
5. Adams SH, Park MJ, Schaub JP, Brindis CD, Irwin CE, Jr. Medical Vulnerability of Young Adults to Severe COVID-19 Illness-Data From the National Health Interview Survey. *J Adolesc Health*. 2020;67(3):362-8.
6. Department for Education. Higher education: reopening buildings and campuses. 2020 [Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/higher-education-reopening-buildings-and-campuses/higher-education-reopening-buildings-and-campuses>.
7. Adams R, Weale S, Pidd H. Covid: three universities halt face-to-face teaching as UK strategy unravels. *The Guardian*,. 2020 06/10/2020.
8. University of Bristol. Data on residential living circles for students. 2020.
9. University of Bristol. Living in University residences 2020 [Available from: <https://www.bristol.ac.uk/students/your-studies/study-2020/living-in-residences/>.
10. University of Bristol. Coronavirus (COVID-19) statistics 2020 [Available from: <https://www.bristol.ac.uk/coronavirus/statistics/>.
11. Roig EF. Bristol University coronavirus outbreak: Student halls to go into lockdown as Covid-19 cases double. *Bristol Post*. 2020 09/10/2020.
12. Roig EF. Coronavirus sees Bristol University put more students in halls into lockdown as cases rise. *Bristol Post*. 2020 13/10/2020.
13. Brooks-Pollock E, Christensen H, Trickey A, Hemani G, Nixon E, Thomas A, et al. High COVID-19 transmission potential associated with reopening universities can be mitigated with layered interventions. *medRxiv*. 2020.
14. Danon L, House TA, Read JM, Keeling MJ. Social encounter networks: collective properties and disease transmission. *J R Soc Interface*. 2012;9(76):2826-33.
15. Danon L, Read JM, House TA, Vernon MC, Keeling MJ. Social encounter networks: characterizing Great Britain. *Proc Biol Sci*. 2013;280(1765):20131037.
16. Klepac P, Kissler S, Gog J. Contagion! The BBC Four Pandemic - The model behind the documentary. *Epidemics-Neth*. 2018;24:49-59.
17. 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(3):e74.
18. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. 2019;95:103208.
19. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-81.
20. National Health Service. Check if you or your child has coronavirus symptoms 2020 [Available from: <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/symptoms/>.
21. Al-Tawfiq JA, Rodriguez-Morales AJ. Super-spreading events and contribution to transmission of MERS, SARS, and SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19). *J Hosp Infect*. 2020;105(2):111-2.
22. Merrick R. What time does lockdown in England start on Thursday? *The Independent*,. 2020 03/11/2020.
23. Quinn B, Weale S. Covid: England students to get six-day window to get home before Christmas. *The Guardian*. 2020 11/11/2020.

24. Christensen H, Turner K, Trickey A, Booton RD, Hemani G, Nixon E, et al. COVID-19 transmission in a university setting: a rapid review of modelling studies. medRxiv. 2020.

Tables and figures

Table 1: Unweighted and weighted demographics of the 740 student participants and 1261 student records

Characteristic	N (%) participants		N (%) records unweighted		N (%) records weighted	
Age						
17-24	557	(75.3%)	857	(68.0%)	994	(78.8%)
25-44	168	(22.7%)	368	(29.2%)	225	(19.4%)
45-64	12	(1.6%)	27	(2.1%)	17	(1.4%)
65-79	3	(0.4%)	9	(0.7%)	5	(0.4%)
Gender						
Female	520	(70.3%)	868	(68.8%)	675	(53.6%)
Male	207	(28.0%)	368	(29.2%)	564	(44.8%)
Other/prefer not to say	13	(1.8%)	25	(2.0%)	21	(1.7%)
Ethnicity						
White	559	(75.5%)	1003	(79.5%)	1004	(79.7%)
Mixed/multiple ethnic groups	33	(4.5%)	57	(4.5%)	56	(4.5%)
Asian/Asian British	117	(15.8%)	163	(12.9%)	160	(12.7%)
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British	7	(1.0%)	7	(0.6%)	6	(0.5%)
Other/prefer not to say	24	(3.2%)	31	(2.5%)	34	(2.7%)
No/don't know/other	664	(89.7%)	1113	(88.3%)	1137	(90.2%)
Yes	76	(10.3%)	148	(11.7%)	124	(9.8%)
Student type						
Undergraduate	474	(64.1%)	725	(57.5%)	931	(73.9%)
Postgraduate	266	(34.0%)	536	(42.5%)	330	(26.2%)
Year group						
1	180	(24.3%)	260	(20.6%)	344	(27.3%)
2	122	(16.5%)	205	(16.3%)	247	(19.6%)
3	95	(12.8%)	156	(12.4%)	199	(15.8%)
4+	343	(46.4%)	640	(50.8%)	470	(37.3%)
Household size						
1	117	(15.8%)	227	(18.0%)	170	(13.5%)
2-3	245	(33.1%)	449	(35.6%)	430	(34.1%)
4-5	194	(26.2%)	323	(25.6%)	362	(28.7%)
6-9	107	(14.5%)	153	(12.1%)	192	(15.3%)
10+	26	(3.5%)	36	(2.9%)	45	(3.6%)
Unknown	51	(6.9%)	73	(5.8%)	61	(4.8%)
Residence						
Catered halls	24	(3.2%)	34	(2.7%)	44	(3.5%)
Self-catered halls	161	(21.8%)	228	(18.1%)	280	(22.2%)
Shared house/flat	349	(47.2%)	613	(48.7%)	642	(51.0%)
Live with family	105	(14.2%)	196	(15.5%)	156	(12.4%)
Live alone	52	(7.0%)	96	(7.6%)	75	(6.0%)
Other	49	(6.6%)	94	(7.5%)	63	(5.0%)

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Table 2: Percentage (95% confidence intervals) of student participants isolating within the prior week, with symptoms within the prior week, or suspected of having/testing positive for COVID-19 (all weighted), overall and stratified by study year.

	Study year				Overall
	1	2	3	4+	
Isolating in the prior 7 days, N=179	24% (20-29%)	13% (9-18%)	11% (6-15%)	9% (6-11%)	14% (12-16%)
Symptoms in the prior 7 days, N=437	44% (38-49%)	36% (30-42%)	30% (24-37%)	29% (25-33%)	35% (32-37%)
Cardinal symptoms in the prior 7 days, N=93	15% (11-19%)	6% (3-9%)	3% (1-6%)	4% (2-6%)	7% (6-9%)
Seeking medical attention for reported symptoms, N=30	3% (1-5%)	3% (1-5%)	1% (0-2%)	2% (1-3%)	2% (2-3%)
Suspected of having COVID-19 more than 2 weeks before survey*, N=152	9% (6-12%)	16% (11-20%)	9% (5-14%)	13% (10-16%)	12% (10-14%)
Suspected of having COVID-19 last 2 weeks before survey*, N=56	5% (3-7%)	8% (4-11%)	6% (3-10%)	2% (0-3%)	4% (3-6%)
Tested COVID positive more than 2 weeks before survey, N=20	3% (1-5%)	2% (0-4%)	0% (0-1%)	1% (0-1%)	2% (1-2%)
Tested COVID positive last 2 weeks before survey, N=42	10% (7-13%)	2% (0-4%)	0% (0-0%)	1% (0-1%)	3% (2-4%)

*Medical professional's opinion or personal suspicion

Table 3: Number and percentage of students with symptom type within the week before survey completion, stratified by COVID-19 status

Symptom	No COVID-19 (N=992)	Tested positive more than two weeks before survey (N=20)	Think they have had COVID-19 more than two weeks before survey* (N=152)	Think they have had COVID-19 within prior two weeks before survey* (N=56)	Tested positive within the prior two weeks before survey (N=42)
None	688 (69%)	11 (56%)	96 (63%)	29 (51%)	0 (0%)
Fever	14 (1%)	2 (11%)	6 (4%)	1 (2%)	15 (35%)
Persistent cough	23 (2%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	9 (15%)	14 (34%)
Unusual shortness of breath	13 (1%)	5 (26%)	3 (2%)	5 (9%)	3 (8%)
Unusual chest pain or chest tightness	18 (2%)	2 (10%)	2 (2%)	3 (5%)	7 (16%)
Unusual abdominal pain	16 (2%)	2 (11%)	5 (3%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
Confusion, disorientation or drowsiness	13 (1%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	3 (6%)	4 (8%)
Headache	106 (11%)	1 (5%)	16 (11%)	16 (28%)	22 (52%)
Runny nose/sneezing	157 (16%)	5 (26%)	25 (17%)	13 (23%)	31 (73%)
Unusual fatigue	53 (5%)	0 (0%)	6 (4%)	12 (21%)	21 (51%)
Sore throat	114 (11%)	1 (5%)	17 (11%)	13 (24%)	18 (42%)
Unusual muscle aches	19 (2%)	0 (0%)	6 (4%)	5 (10%)	9 (20%)
Diarrhoea	27 (3%)	3 (15%)	6 (4%)	3 (5%)	5 (11%)
Vomiting	4 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Loss or altered sense of taste	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (4%)	6 (11%)	21 (49%)
Loss or altered sense of smell	2 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	6 (11%)	24 (58%)
Chilblains on toes or hands	8 (1%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Any unexpected rashes	6 (1%)	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)

*Medical professional's opinion or personal suspicion

Table 4: Percentage (and standard deviation) of students reporting behaviours or COVID-19 characteristics (weighted), stratified by other behaviours and characteristics

Group	Isolating in the prior 7 days	Symptoms in the prior 7 days	Cardinal symptoms in the prior 7 days	Sought medical attention for reported symptoms	Suspected having COVID-19 more than 2 weeks before survey*	Suspected having COVID-19 prior 2 weeks before survey*	Tested positive for COVID-19 more than 2 weeks before survey	Tested COVID-19 positive prior 2 weeks before survey
No symptoms within prior week (N=824)	9% (29%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	12% (32%)	3% (18%)	1% (12%)	0% (0%)
Symptoms within prior week (N=437)	24% (43%)	100% (0%)	21% (41%)	7% (25%)	13% (33%)	6% (24%)	2% (14%)	10% (29%)
No cardinal symptoms within prior week (N=1168)	11% (31%)	29% (46%)	0% (0%)	2% (13%)	12% (32%)	4% (19%)	2% (12%)	1% (8%)
Cardinal symptoms within prior week (N=93)	61% (49%)	100% (0%)	100% (0%)	12% (33%)	13% (33%)	12% (33%)	2% (15%)	36% (48%)
Not had COVID (N=992)	9% (28%)	31% (46%)	3% (18%)	2% (13%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)
Suspected having COVID-19 more than two weeks before survey* (N=152)	13% (34%)	36% (48%)	8% (27%)	2% (14%)	100% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)
Suspected having COVID-19 prior 2 weeks before survey* (N=56)	52% (50%)	48% (50%)	21% (41%)	5% (22%)	0% (0%)	100% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)
Tested positive for COVID-19 more than two weeks before survey (N=20)	21% (42%)	45% (51%)	10% (31%)	5% (22%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	100% (0%)	0% (0%)
Tested positive for COVID-19 prior 2 weeks before survey (N=42)	99% (11%)	100% (0%)	81% (40%)	14% (35%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	100% (0%)

*Medical professional's opinion or personal suspicion

Table 5: Number of contacts types* overall and stratified by isolation status in the last week for students, and overall for staff.

*“Individual” contacts were the people that the participant spoke to in person one-on-one, including those in the participant’s household and support bubble. “Group” contacts were the contacts that the participant had with large groups of individuals in the same setting (for example, sports teams, tutorials, lectures, religious services, large gatherings with friends and family). “Other” contacts were the many people participants spoke to one-on-one in the same setting where the contacts did not have the opportunity to speak to each other (for example, as part of a customer service role in a shop). Not all of the contact types were asked for each category of contacts, so are only comparable to the associated categories indicated here.

	Mean (95% confidence interval), Median (IQR)			
	Students (weighted)			Staff (unweighted)
Contact type	Overall	Not isolating	Isolating	Overall
Overall contacts	6.1 (5.2-6.9), 2 (1-5)	6.4 (5.4-7.3), 2 (1-6)	4.5 (3.0-6.1), 2 (0-5)	5.2 (4.5-5.8), 3 (1.5)
“Individual” contacts	2.2 (2.1-2.4), 2 (1-3)	2.3 (2.2-2.4), 2 (1-3)	2.1 (1.7-2.4), 1 (0.4)	2.8 (2.7-2.9), 3 (1-4)
“Group” contacts	2.4 (2.0-2.8), 0 (0-0)	2.5 (2.0-2.9), 0 (0-0)	1.8 (0.6-3.1), 0 (0-0)	1.8 (1.2-2.3), 0 (0-0)
“Individual and group” contacts	4.6 (4.2-5.1), 2 (1-4)	4.8 (4.3-5.2), 2 (1-5)	3.9 (2.6-5.2), 2 (0-4)	4.6 (4.0-5.2), 3 (1-4)
“Other contacts”	1.5 (0.9-2.1), 0 (0-0)	1.6 (0.9-2.3), 0 (0-0)	0.6 (0.0-1.4), 0 (0-0)	0.6 (0.4-0.8), 0 (0-0)
Mean (95% confidence interval), Median (IQR), % of “individual” contacts (SD)				
“Individual” contacts	2.2 (2.1-2.4), 2 (1-3)	2.3 (2.2-2.4), 2 (1-3)	2.1 (1.7-2.4), 1 (0-4)	2.8 (2.7-2.9), 3 (1-4)
Contacts with touch	0.8 (0.7-0.8), 0 (0-1), 39% (SD: 41%)	0.8 (0.7-0.8), 0 (0-1), 39% (SD: 41%)	0.8 (0.6-1.0), 0 (0-1), 39% (SD: 44%)	1.4 (1.4-1.5), 1 (1-2), 57% (SD: 36%)
Household member contacts	1.4 (1.3-1.5), 1 (0-2), 64% (SD: 40%)	1.3 (1.3-1.4), 1 (0-2), 61% (SD: 40%)	1.8 (1.5-2.1), 1 (0-3), 84% (SD: 32%)	1.4 (1.3-1.4), 1 (1-2), 57% (SD: 35%)
Frequent contacts (≥4 times a week)	1.4 (1.3-1.5), 1 (0-2), 65% (SD: 39%)	1.4 (1.3-1.5), 1 (0-2), 63% (SD: 39%)	1.7 (1.4-2.1), 1 (0-3), 82% (SD: 32%)	1.5 (1.4-1.5), 1 (1-2), 60% (SD: 35%)
Mean (95% confidence interval), Median (IQR), % of “individual and group” contacts (SD)				
“Individual and group” contacts	4.6 (4.2-5.1), 2 (1-4)	4.8 (4.3-5.2), 2 (1-5)	3.9 (2.6-5.2), 2 (0-4)	4.6 (4.0-5.2), 3 (1-4)
Contacts made at home	1.6 (1.5-1.8), 1 (0-3), 62% (SD: 42%)	1.6 (1.5-1.7), 1 (0-3), 59% (SD: 42%)	2.2 (1.8-2.6), 1 (0-4), 80% (SD: 36%)	1.6 (1.6-1.7), 1 (1-3), 61% (SD: 38%)
Contacts made at university	1.0 (0.8-1.2), 0 (0-0), 10% (SD: 27%)	1.1 (0.8-1.4), 0 (0-0), 10% (SD: 28%)	0.3 (0.1-0.6), 0 (0-0), 7% (SD: 22%)	0.5 (0.3-0.7), 0 (0-0), 7% (SD: 21%)
Contacts made at other location	2.1 (1.7-2.5), 0 (0-1), 33% (SD: 40%)	2.2 (1.8-2.6), 0 (0-1), 35% (SD: 40%)	1.5 (0.4-2.5), 0 (0-0), 18% (SD: 35%)	2.8 (2.2-3.3), 1 (0-2), 38% (SD: 37%)
University of Bristol contacts _L	3.1 (2.7-3.5), 1 (0-3), 57% (SD: 45%)	3.1 (2.7-3.5), 1 (0-3), 54% (SD: 45%)	3.4 (2.2-4.7), 1 (0-4), 81% (SD: 37%)	0.7 (0.6-0.9), 0 (0-1), 16% (SD: 30%)

_L This question asks whether the majority of the group work or study at the University of Bristol. If this was answered “yes”, then we assume here that all members of the group are University of Bristol contacts, if not then we assume that none are.


It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Table 6: Unweighted negative binomial regression analyses (95% confidence intervals [CI]) of number of contacts on the previous day.


VARIABLE	N: Mean (SD) contacts	UNIVARIABLE		MULTIVARIABLE	
		IRR (95%CI)	p-value	IRR (95%CI)	p-value
AGE 17-24	857: 6.4 (18.3)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
AGE 25-44	368: 4.5 (10.6)	0.71 (0.62, 0.81)	<0.001	0.54 (0.45, 0.66)	<0.001
AGE 45-64	27: 3.7 (4.4)	0.57 (0.37, 0.88)	0.011	0.29 (0.18, 0.47)	<0.001
AGE 65-79	9: 1.6 (1.0)	0.24 (0.10, 0.56)	0.001	0.34 (0.13, 0.90)	0.029
FEMALE/OTHER	893: 5.5 (15.9)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
MALE	368: 6.5 (16.7)	1.18 (1.03, 1.34)	0.014	1.16 (1.01, 1.35)	0.038
UNDERGRAD	725: 6.0 (11.1)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
POSTGRAD	536: 5.5 (21.2)	0.92 (0.81, 1.04)	0.171	0.76 (0.58, 1.00)	0.052
STUDY YEAR 1	260: 4.4 (8.0)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
STUDY YEAR 2	205: 7.5 (10.8)	1.71 (1.40, 2.09)	<0.001	1.11 (0.84, 1.46)	0.456
STUDY YEAR 3	156: 4.7 (8.9)	1.08 (0.87, 1.35)	0.480	0.76 (0.56, 1.02)	0.065
STUDY YEAR 4+	640: 6.0 (20.7)	1.38 (1.18, 1.62)	<0.001	1.45 (1.08, 1.95)	0.013
NO SYMPTOMS	833: 5.6 (17.8)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
SYMPTOMS	428: 6.2 (12.5)	1.11 (0.98, 1.26)	0.100	1.26 (1.09, 1.45)	0.002
NO CARDINAL SYMPTOMS	1186: 5.7 (15.8)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
CARDINAL SYMPTOMS	75: 7.3 (21.3)	1.38 (1.00, 1.64)	0.052	1.62 (1.17, 2.24)	0.003
NOT ISOLATED LAST WEEK	1087: 6.0 (16.9)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
ISOLATED LAST WEEK	167: 4.3 (10.6)	0.71 (0.60, 0.85)	<0.001	0.61 (0.48, 0.76)	<0.001
NOT HIGH RISK	1113: (5.8 (16.3)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
HIGH RISK	148: 5.8 (14.9)	1.02 (0.84, 1.22)	0.874	1.00 (0.81, 1.22)	0.984
HOUSEHOLD SIZE 1	227: 5.9 (16.9)	1.07 (0.90, 1.28)	0.420	1.24 (1.03, 1.50)	0.026
HOUSEHOLD SIZE 2-3	449: 5.5 (11.9)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
HOUSEHOLD SIZE 4-5	323: 7.2 (23.8)	1.31 (1.12, 1.53)	0.001	1.36 (1.15, 1.61)	<0.001
HOUSEHOLD SIZE 6-9	153: 5.7 (9.6)	1.04 (0.85, 1.26)	0.733	1.27 (1.01, 1.59)	0.041
HOUSEHOLD SIZE 10+	36: 3.3 (5.4)	0.60 (0.41, 0.88)	0.010	1.23 (0.78, 1.94)	0.381
HOUSEHOLD SIZE MISSING	73: 1.8 (4.0)	0.33 (0.24, 0.44)	<0.001	0.49 (0.34, 0.69)	<0.001
NO COVID-19	1009: 5.3 (16.3)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
PREVIOUSLY TESTED POSITIVE MORE THAN 2 WEEKS BEFORE SURVEY	14: 8.2 (10.5)	1.54 (0.88, 2.69)	0.130	1.30 (0.73, 2.31)	0.366
PREVIOUSLY SUSPECTED TO BE POSITIVE MORE THAN 2 WEEKS BEFORE SURVEY	150: 9.2 (19.0)	1.72 (1.43, 2.06)	<0.001	1.53 (1.26, 1.85)	<0.001
SUSPECTED TO BE POSITIVE IN LAST 2 WEEKS	55: 5.4 (8.4)	1.01 (0.75, 1.36)	0.956	1.28 (0.93, 1.76)	0.129
TESTED POSITIVE IN LAST 2 WEEKS	33: 2.9 (3.3)	0.55 (0.36, 0.81)	0.003	0.55 (0.33, 0.91)	0.020
CATERED HALLS	34: 2.0 (3.3)	0.32 (0.21, 0.48)	<0.001	0.34 (0.20, 0.56)	<0.001
SELF-CATERED HALLS	228: 4.6 (12.6)	0.73 (0.62, 0.87)	<0.001	0.68 (0.52, 0.88)	0.003
SHARED HOUSE/FLAT	613: 6.2 (11.5)	Reference	NA	Reference	NA
LIVE WITH FAMILY	196: 8.7 (32.1)	1.41 (1.19, 1.67)	<0.001	1.84 (1.50, 2.25)	<0.001
LIVE ALONE	96: 2.4 (4.9)	0.38 (0.30, 0.49)	<0.001	0.74 (0.54, 1.00)	0.051
OTHER	94: 4.4 (7.5)	0.70 (0.55, 0.89)	0.004	1.06 (0.80, 1.39)	0.698

Figure 1: Unweighted histograms of the number of overall contacts* on the previous day among **a)** students (including staff/students); **b)** staff (excluding staff/students)

a)



b)



*81 students had more than 20 contacts on the previous day; 58 staff had more than 20 contacts on the previous day - full histograms are shown in supplementary figure 1.

Figure 2: Mean number of contacts on the previous day and the proportion of people isolating within the prior week by residence type

