

# Social Contact Patterns and Implications for Infectious Disease Transmission: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Contact Surveys

Andria Mousa<sup>1\*</sup>, Peter Winskill<sup>1</sup>, Oliver J Watson<sup>1</sup>, Oliver Ratmann<sup>2</sup>, Mélodie Monod<sup>2</sup>, Marco Ajelli<sup>3,4</sup>,  
Aldiouma Diallo<sup>5</sup>, Peter J Dodd<sup>6</sup>, Carlos G Grijalva<sup>7</sup>, Moses Chapa Kiti<sup>8</sup>, Anand Krishnan<sup>9</sup>, Rakesh  
Kumar<sup>9</sup>, Supriya Kumar<sup>10</sup>, Kin On Kwok<sup>11,12,13</sup>, Claudio F Lanata<sup>14,15</sup>, Olivier Le Polain de Waroux<sup>16</sup>,  
Kathy Leung<sup>17,18</sup>, Wiriya Mahikul<sup>19</sup>, Alessia Melegaro<sup>20</sup>, Carl D Morrow<sup>21,22</sup>, Joël Mossong<sup>23</sup>, Eleanor  
FG Neal<sup>24,25</sup>, David J Nokes<sup>8,26</sup>, Wirichada Pan-ngum<sup>27</sup>, Gail E Potter<sup>28,29</sup>, Fiona M Russell<sup>24,25</sup>,  
Siddhartha Saha<sup>30</sup>, Jonathan D Sugimoto<sup>31,32,33</sup>, Wan In Wei<sup>11</sup>, Robin R Wood<sup>21</sup>, Joseph T Wu<sup>17,18</sup>,  
Juanjuan Zhang<sup>34</sup>, Patrick GT Walker<sup>1</sup> & Charles Whittaker<sup>1\*</sup>

\*For correspondence: [a.mousa17@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:a.mousa17@imperial.ac.uk); [charles.whittaker16@imperial.ac.uk](mailto:charles.whittaker16@imperial.ac.uk)

<sup>1</sup> MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis; and the Abdul Latif Jameel Institute for Disease and Emergency Analytics (J-IDEA), School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London, London, UK.

<sup>3</sup> Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Indiana University School of Public Health, Bloomington, IN, USA.

<sup>4</sup> Laboratory for the Modeling of Biological and Socio-technical Systems, Northeastern University, Boston, MA.

<sup>5</sup> VITROME, Institut de Recherche pour le Developpement, Senegal.

<sup>6</sup> School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, UK.

<sup>7</sup> Division of Pharmacoepidemiology, Department of Health Policy, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA.

<sup>8</sup> KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Kilifi, Kenya.

<sup>9</sup> Centre for Community Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India.

<sup>10</sup> Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, USA.

<sup>11</sup> JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

<sup>12</sup> Stanley Ho Centre for Emerging Infectious Diseases, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

<sup>13</sup> Shenzhen Research Institute of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China.

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

Instituto de Investigación Nutricional, Lima, Peru.

<sup>15</sup> Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA.

<sup>16</sup> London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

<sup>17</sup> WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China.

<sup>18</sup> Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health (D24H), Hong Kong Science Park, New Territories, Hong Kong SAR, China.

<sup>19</sup> Faculty of Medicine and Public Health, HRH Princess Chulabhorn College of Medical Science, Chulabhorn Royal Academy, Bangkok 10210, Thailand.

<sup>20</sup> Dondena Centre for Research on Social Dynamics and Public Policy, Department of Social and Political Sciences, Bocconi University, Milan, Italy.

<sup>21</sup> Desmond Tutu HIV Centre, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

<sup>22</sup> Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Research (CIDER), School of Public Health and Family Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Cape Town South Africa.

<sup>23</sup> Health Directorate, Luxembourg.

<sup>24</sup> Infection & Immunity, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

<sup>25</sup> Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia.

<sup>26</sup> School of Life Sciences, University of Warwick, Coventry UK.

<sup>27</sup> Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>28</sup> National Institute for Allergies and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Rockville MD, USA.

<sup>29</sup> The Emmes Company, Rockville MD, USA.

<sup>30</sup> Influenza Programme, US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, India Office, US Embassy, New Delhi.

<sup>31</sup> Seattle Epidemiologic Research and Information Center, Cooperative Studies Program, Office of Research and Development, United States Department of Veterans Affairs, USA.

<sup>32</sup> Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington, USA.

<sup>33</sup> Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA, USA.

<sup>34</sup> School of Public Health, Fudan University, Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education, Shanghai, China.

## 1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Transmission of respiratory pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2 depends on patterns of  
3 contact and mixing across populations. Understanding this is crucial to predict pathogen spread and  
4 the effectiveness of control efforts. Most analyses of contact patterns to date have focussed on high-  
5 income settings.

6 **Methods:** Here, we conduct a systematic review and individual-participant meta-analysis of surveys  
7 carried out in low- and middle-income countries and compare patterns of contact in these settings to  
8 surveys previously carried out in high-income countries. Using individual-level data from 28,503  
9 participants and 413,069 contacts across 27 surveys we explored how contact characteristics (number,  
10 location, duration and whether physical) vary across income settings.

11 **Results:** Contact rates declined with age in high- and upper-middle-income settings, but not in low-  
12 income settings, where adults aged 65+ made similar numbers of contacts as younger individuals and  
13 mixed with all age-groups. Across all settings, increasing household size was a key determinant of  
14 contact frequency and characteristics, but low-income settings were characterised by the largest,  
15 most intergenerational households. A higher proportion of contacts were made at home in low-  
16 income settings, and work/school contacts were more frequent in high-income strata. We also  
17 observed contrasting effects of gender across income-strata on the frequency, duration and type of  
18 contacts individuals made.

19 **Conclusions:** These differences in contact patterns between settings have material consequences for  
20 both spread of respiratory pathogens, as well as the effectiveness of different non-pharmaceutical  
21 interventions.

22 **Funding:** This work is primarily being funded by joint Centre funding from the UK Medical Research  
23 Council and DFID (MR/R015600/1).

24

## 25 **Introduction**

26 Previous outbreaks of Ebola(Mbala-Kingebeni et al., 2019), influenza(Khan et al., 2009), and the  
27 ongoing COVID-19 pandemic have highlighted the importance of understanding the transmission  
28 dynamics and spread of infectious diseases, which depend fundamentally on the underlying patterns  
29 of social contact between individuals. Together, these patterns give rise to complex social networks  
30 that influence disease dynamics(Eubank et al., 2004; Ferrari et al., 2006; Firth et al., 2020; Zhang et  
31 al., 2020), including the capacity for emergent pathogens to become endemic(Ghani and Aral, 2005;  
32 Jacquez et al., 1988), the overdispersion of the offspring distribution underlying the reproduction  
33 number(Delamater et al., 2019) and the threshold at which herd-immunity is reached(Fontanet and  
34 Cauchemez, 2020; Mistry et al., 2021). They can similarly modulate the effectiveness of non-  
35 pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs), such as school closures and workplace restrictions, that are  
36 typically deployed to control and contain the spread of infectious diseases (Prem et al., 2020).

37  
38 Social contact surveys provide insight into the features of these networks, which is typically achieved  
39 through incorporating survey results into mathematical models of infectious disease transmission  
40 frequently used to guide decision making in response to outbreaks(Chang et al., 2021; Davies et al.,  
41 2020). Such inputs are necessary for models to have sufficient realism to evaluate relevant policy  
42 questions. However, despite the known importance of contact patterns as determinants of the  
43 infectious disease dynamics, our understanding of how they vary globally remains far from complete.  
44 Reviews of contact patterns to date have focussed on High-Income countries (HICs)(Hoang et al.,  
45 2019). This is despite evidence that social contact patterns differ systematically across settings in ways  
46 that have material consequences for the dynamics of infectious disease transmission and the  
47 evolution of epidemic trajectories(Prem et al., 2017; Walker et al., 2020). Previous reviews has also  
48 primarily explored the total number of contacts made by individuals(Hoang et al., 2019) and/or how  
49 these contacts are distributed across different age/sex groups(Horton et al., 2020). Whilst these  
50 factors are a vital component underpinning disease spread, recent work has also underscored the

51 importance of the characteristics of contacts (such as the location, duration and extent of physical  
52 contact) in determining transmission risk(Thompson et al., 2021).

53

54 Here, we carry out a systematic review of contact surveys (conducted prior to the emergence of  
55 COVID-19) in Lower-Income, Lower-Middle and Upper-Middle-Income countries (LICs, LMICs and  
56 UMICs, respectively). Alongside previously published data from HICs(Kwok et al., 2018, 2014; Leung  
57 et al., 2017; Mossong et al., 2008), we collate individual participant data (IPD) on social contacts from  
58 published work spanning 27 surveys from 22 countries and over 28,000 individuals. We use a Bayesian  
59 framework to explore drivers and determinants of contact patterns across a wider range of settings  
60 and at a more granular scale than has previously been possible. Specifically, we assess the influence  
61 of key factors such as age, gender and household structure on both the total number and  
62 characteristics (such as duration, location and type) of contact made by an individual, and explore how  
63 the comparative importance of different factors varies across different settings. We additionally  
64 evaluate the extent and degree of assortativity in contact patterns between different groups, and how  
65 this varies across settings.

66

## 67 **Results**

### 68 **Systematic Review and Individual-Participant-Data (IPD) Meta-analysis**

69 A total of 3,409 titles and abstracts were retrieved from the databases, and 313 full-text articles were  
70 screened for eligibility (Supplementary Figure 1). This search identified 19 studies with suitable contact  
71 data from LIC, LMIC and UMIC settings– individual-level data were obtained from 16 of these studies,  
72 including one study from a LIC, six studies from a LMIC and nine studies from an UMIC. These were  
73 analysed alongside four HIC studies from Hong Kong and Europe. Details of the identified studies and  
74 a full description of the systematic review findings can be found in Supplementary Text 1 and  
75 Supplementary Table 1. In total, this yielded 28,503 participants reporting on 413,069 contacts. All

76 studies contained information on main demographic variables such as age and gender. Availability of  
77 other variables analysed here for each study are listed in Supplementary Table 2. All studies reported  
78 the number of contacts made in the past 24 hours of (or day preceding) the survey. The definitions of  
79 contacts were broadly similar across studies (Supplementary Table 1). Specifically, contacts were  
80 defined as skin-to-skin (physical) contact or a two-way conversation in the physical presence of  
81 another person. All studies scored above 65% of the items on the AXIS risk of bias tool, suggesting  
82 good or fair quality (Supplementary Table 3). Among all participants 47.5% were male, 30.1% were  
83 aged under 15 years and 7.2% were aged over 65 years. The majority (83.4%) of participants were  
84 asked to report the number of contacts they made on a weekday. A large proportion (34.1%) of  
85 respondents lived in large households of 6 or more people but this was largely dependent on income  
86 setting (LIC/LMIC=63.2%, UMIC=35.9%, HIC=4.9%). Among school-aged children (5 to 18 years), 88.1%  
87 were students, and 59.1% of adults aged over 18 were employed.

88

### 89 **Total number of contacts and contact location**

90 The median number of contacts made per day across all the studies was 9 (IQR= 5-17), and was similar  
91 across income strata (LIC/LMIC=10[5-17], UMIC=8[5-16], HIC=9[5-17]; Table 1). There was a large  
92 variation in contact rates across different studies, with the median number of daily contacts ranging  
93 from 4 in a Zambian setting(Dodd et al., 2015) to 24 in an online Thai survey(Stein et al., 2014). When  
94 stratifying by study methodology, median daily contacts was higher in diary-based surveys compared  
95 to interview-/questionnaire- based surveys, which was true across all income strata (Table 1,  
96 Supplementary Figure 2).

97

98 Overall, children aged 5 to 15 had the highest number of daily contacts (Figure 1A-C), although there  
99 was substantial variation between studies and across income-strata in how the number of daily  
100 contacts varied with age (Figure 1A-C). Across UMICs and HICs, the number of daily contacts made by  
101 participants decreased with age, with this decrease most notable in the oldest age-groups (adjCRR for

102 65+ vs. <15 years [95%CrI]: UMIC=0.67[0.63-0.71] and HIC=0.57[0.54-0.60]). By contrast, there was no  
103 evidence of contact rates declining in the oldest age-groups in LICs/LMICs (adjCRR for 65+ vs. <15 years  
104 [95%CrI]=0.94[0.89-1.00]). We observed contrasting effects of gender on the number of daily  
105 contacts, with men making more daily contacts compared to women in LICs/LMICs after accounting  
106 for age (adjCRR=1.17, 95%CrI:1.15-1.20; Figure 1D), but no effect of gender on total daily contacts for  
107 other income strata (CRR[95%CrI]: UMIC=1.01[0.98-1.04], HIC=0.99[0.97-1.02]). There were also  
108 differences in the number of daily contacts made according to the methodology used and whether  
109 the survey was carried out on a weekday or over the weekend – in both instances, contrasting effects  
110 of these factors on the number of daily contacts according to income strata were observed (Figures  
111 1D-1F).

112

113 We also examined the influence of factors that might influence both the total number and location  
114 (home, work, school and other) of the contacts individuals make. Across all income-strata, students  
115 (defined as those currently in education, attending school and aged between 5 and 18 years) made  
116 more daily contacts than non-students aged between 5 and 18 (adjCRR [95%CrI]: LIC/LMIC=1.26[1.16-  
117 1.37], UMIC=1.18[1.03-1.35] and HIC=1.54[1.42-1.66]; Figure 1D-F). Similarly, we observed strong and  
118 significant effects of employment in all income strata, with adults who were employed having a higher  
119 number of total daily contacts compared to those not in employment (adjCRR [95%CrI]: LIC/LMIC=  
120 1.17[1.12-1.23], UMIC= 1.07[1.03-1.13], HIC= 1.60[1.54-1.65]; Figure 1D-F). Total daily contacts  
121 increased with household size (Figure 2A, Supplementary Figure 2) across all income-strata;  
122 individuals living in large households (6+ members) had 1.47 (95%CrI:1.32-1.64) (LIC/LMICs), 2.58  
123 (95%CrI:2.37-2.80) (UMICs) and 1.51 (95%CrI:1.40-1.63) (HICs) times more daily contacts than those  
124 living alone, after accounting for age and gender (Figure 1E-F). Sensitivity analyses excluding additional  
125 contacts (as defined in Methods), showed little difference in effect sizes, and were strongly correlated  
126 with the effect sizes shown in Figure 1D-F (Supplementary Figure 3).

127

128 Motivated by this suggestion of strong, location-related (school, work and household) effects on total  
129 daily contact rates, we further explored the locations in which contacts were made. Contact location  
130 was known for 314,235 contacts, 42.7% of which occurred at home (13.1% at work, 12.5% at school  
131 and 31.7% in other locations). Across income-strata, there was significant variation in the proportion  
132 of contacts made at home – being highest in LICs/LMICs (68.3%) and lowest in HICs (37.0%) (Figure  
133 2B). Age differences were also observed in the number of contacts made at home, particularly for  
134 LICs/LMICs (Figure 2C-2D). Relatedly, a higher proportion of contacts occurred at work and school  
135 (14.6 % and 11.3%) in HICs compared to LICs/LMICs (3.9% and 5.2%, respectively; Supplementary  
136 Figure 4). Strong, gender specific patterns of contact location were also observed. Across all income  
137 strata males made a higher proportion of their contacts at work compared to females, although this  
138 difference was largest for LICs/LMICs (Supplementary Figure 4). Further, we found significant variation  
139 between income strata in median household size (7 in LICs/LMICs, 5 in UMICs and 3 in HICs). This trend  
140 of decreasing household size with increasing country income was consistent with global data (Figure  
141 2E). The larger households observed for LIC/LMIC settings were also more likely to be  
142 intergenerational – in LICs/LMICs, 59.4% of participants aged over 65 lived in households of at least 6  
143 members compared to 17.5% in UMICs and only 2.2% in HICs.

144

#### 145 **Type and duration of contact**

146 Data on the type of contacts (physical and non-physical) were recorded for 20,910 participants. The  
147 mean percentage of physical contacts across participants was 56.0% and was the highest for  
148 LICs/LMICs (64.5%). At the study level, the highest mean percentage of physical contacts was observed  
149 for a survey of young children and their caregivers conducted in Fiji (Neal et al., 2020) (84.0%) and the  
150 lowest in a Hong Kong contact survey (Leung et al., 2017) (18.9%). Physical contact was significantly  
151 less common among adults compared to children under 15 years in all settings (ORs ranged between  
152 0.22 to 0.48) (Figure 3A-F). Despite the proportion of physical contacts generally decreasing with age,  
153 there was a higher proportion observed for adults aged 80 or over (Figure 3A-C). Contacts made by

154 male participants were more likely to be physical compared to female participants in UMICs (adjOR=  
155 1.13, 95%CrI=1.10-1.16) and HICs (adjOR= 1.09, 95%CrI=1.07-1.12), but in LICs/LMICs men had a lower  
156 proportion of physical contacts than women (adjOR= 0.81, 95%CrI=0.79-0.83; Figure 3D-F). Most  
157 physical contacts made by women in LICs were made at home (73.5%), whilst for HICs this was just  
158 41.4% - similar differences across income-strata were observed for men, although the proportions  
159 were always lower than observed for women (62.4% for LIC/LMICs and 36.4% for HICs). Increasing  
160 household size was generally associated with a higher proportion of contacts being physical (for  
161 households of 6+ members compared to 1 member: adjCRR[95%CrI]: LIC/LMIC=1.73[1.48-2.02],  
162 UMIC= 1.30[1.12-1.52], HIC= 1.57[1.48-1.67]; Figure 3D-F). Employment was associated with having a  
163 significantly lower proportion of physical contacts in LICs/LMICs (adjOR=0.83, 95%CrI:0.79-0.87) and  
164 HICs (adjOR=0.71, 95%CrI:0.69-0.73), but not in UMICs (adjOR=1.11, 95%CrI:1.03-1.19). The  
165 proportion of physical contacts among all contacts was the highest for households (70.4%), followed  
166 by schools (58.5%), community (55.7%) and work (33.6%) (Supplementary Figure 5).

167  
168 Data on the duration of contact (<1 or ≥1hr) were available for 22,822 participants. The percentage of  
169 contacts lasting at least 1 hour was 63.2% and was highest for UMICs (76.0%) and lowest for  
170 LICs/LMICs (53.1%). Across both UMICs and HICs, duration of contacts was lower in individuals aged  
171 over 15 years compared to those aged 0-15, with the extent of this disparity most stark for HICs (for  
172 ages 65+ compared to <15 years: adjCRR [95%CrI]: LIC/LMIC= 0.61[0.57-0.64], UMIC= 0.61[0.58-0.65],  
173 HIC= 0.35[0.33-0.37]; Figure 4A-F). We observed contrasting effects of gender across income-strata:  
174 males made longer-lasting contacts than females in UMICs (adjOR=1.11, 95%CrI=1.08-1.14); Figure  
175 4D-F), but not in LIC/LMICs (adjOR=0.92, 95%CrI=0.90-0.95) or HICs (adjOR=0.98, 95%CrI=0.97-1.00).  
176 Participants reported shorter contacts on weekends compared to weekdays in LICs/LMICs  
177 (adjOR=0.91, 95%CrI: 0.88-0.95), and HICs (adjOR=0.95, 95%CrI: 0.92-0.97), but not in UMICs  
178 (adjOR=1.12, 95%CrI=1.03-1.21). Contacts lasting over an hour as a proportion of all contacts was  
179 highest for households (72.7%), followed by schools (67.9%), community (47.0%) and work (44.0%).

180 However, it was only in HICs that there was a significant effect of being a student (adjOR=1.18, 95%CrI:  
181 1.09-1.27; Figure 4D-F) on the proportion of contacts lasting  $\geq 1$  hour. For all income strata, the  
182 proportion of contacts  $>1$ h increased with increasing household size (Figure 4D-F).

183

#### 184 **Assortativity by age and gender**

185 Twelve studies collected information on the gender of the contact and eight studies contained  
186 information on age allowing assignment of contacts to one of the three age-groups described in  
187 Methods (Supplementary Table 2, Supplementary Text 2). We found evidence to suggest that contacts  
188 were assortative by gender for all income strata, as participants were more likely to mix with their  
189 own gender (Supplementary Text 2). Mixing was also assortative by age, with participants more likely  
190 to contact individuals who belonged to the same age group this degree of age-assortativity was lowest  
191 for LICs/LMICs, where only 29% of contacts made by adults were with individuals of the same age  
192 group. By contrast, in HICs we observed a higher degree of assortative mixing, with most contacts  
193 (51.4%) made by older adults occurring with individuals belonging to the same age group.

194

#### 195 **Discussion**

196 Understanding patterns of contact across populations is vital to predicting the dynamics and spread  
197 of infectious diseases, as well understanding the control interventions likely to have the greatest  
198 impact. Here, using a systematic review and individual-participant data meta-analysis of contact  
199 surveys, we summarise research exploring these patterns across a range of populations spanning  
200 28,503 individuals and 22 countries. Our findings highlight substantial differences in contact patterns  
201 between income settings. These differences are driven by setting-specific sociodemographic factors  
202 such as age, gender, household structure and patterns of employment, which all have material  
203 consequences for transmission and spread of respiratory pathogens.

204 Across the collated studies, the total number of contacts was highest for school-aged children. This is  
205 consistent with previous results from HICs(Béraud et al., 2015; Fu et al., 2012; Hoang et al., 2019;  
206 Ibuka et al., 2016; Lapidus et al., 2013) and shown here to be generally true for LICs/LMICs and UMICs  
207 also. Interestingly however, we observed differences in patterns of contact in adults across income  
208 strata. Whilst contact rates in HICs declined in older adults, this was not observed in LICs/LMICs, where  
209 contact rates did not differ in the oldest age-group compared to younger ages. This is consistent with  
210 variation in household structure and size across settings, with nearly two thirds of participants aged  
211 65+ in included LIC/LMIC surveys living in large, likely intergenerational, households (6+ members),  
212 compared to only 2% in HICs. HICs were also characterised by more assortative mixing between age-  
213 groups, with older adults in LICs/LMICs more likely to mix with individuals of younger ages, again  
214 consistent with the observed differences between household structures across the two settings. These  
215 results have important consequences for the viability and efficacy of protective policies centred  
216 around shielding of elderly individuals (i.e. those most at risk from COVID-19 or influenza) in these  
217 settings.

218 Our results support the idea of households as a key site for transmission of respiratory  
219 pathogens(Thompson et al., 2021), with the majority of contacts made at home. However, its relative  
220 importance compared to other locations is likely to vary across settings. Our results highlighted  
221 significant differences across income settings in the distribution of contacts made at home, work and  
222 school. The proportion of contacts made at home was highest for LIC/LMICs, where larger average  
223 household sizes were associated with more contacts, more physical contacts, and longer lasting  
224 contacts. By contrast, participants in HICs tended to report more contacts occurring at work and  
225 school. The lower number of contacts at work in LIC/LMIC may be explained by the types of  
226 employment (e.g agriculture in rural surveys) and a selection bias (women at home/homemakers  
227 more likely to be surveyed in questionnaire-based surveys). Such differences would have  
228 consequences for which locations contribute most to transmission and in turn modulate the efficacy  
229 of different NPIs, such as workplace closures. Our analyses similarly highlighted significant variation in

230 the duration and nature of contacts across settings. Contacts made by female participants in  
231 LICs/LMICs were more likely to be physical compared to men, whilst the opposite effect was observed  
232 for HICs and UMICs, potentially reflecting context-specific gender roles. In all settings, we observed a  
233 general decline of physical contacts with age, except in the very old(Mossong et al., 2008), potentially  
234 reflecting higher levels of dependency and the need for physical care.

235 There are important caveats to these findings. Data constraints limited the numbers of factors we  
236 were able to explore – for example, despite evidence(Kiti et al., 2014) suggesting that contact patterns  
237 differ across rural and urban settings, only 3 studies(Kiti et al., 2014; O. le Polain de Waroux et al.,  
238 2018; Neal et al., 2020) contained information from both rural and urban sites, allowing classification.  
239 Similarly, we were unable to examine the impact of socioeconomic factors such as household wealth,  
240 despite experiences with COVID-19 having highlighted strong socio-economic disparities in both  
241 transmission and burden of disease(De Negri et al., 2021; Routledge et al., 2021; Ward et al., 2021;  
242 Winskill et al., 2020) and previous work suggesting that poorer individuals are less likely to be  
243 employed in occupations amenable to remote working(Loayza, 2020). A lack of suitably detailed  
244 information in the studies conducted precludes analysis of these factors but highlights the importance  
245 of incorporating economic questions into future contact surveys, such as household wealth and house  
246 square footage. Other factors also not controlled for here, but that may similarly shape contact  
247 patterns include school holidays or seasonal variations in population movement and composition that  
248 we are unable to capture given the cross-sectional nature of these studies.

249 Another important limitation to the results presented here is that we are only able to consider a  
250 limited set of contact characteristics (the location and duration of the contact and whether it was  
251 physical). Previous work has highlighted the importance of these factors in determining the risk of  
252 respiratory pathogen transmission(Chang et al., 2021; Dunne et al., 2018; Olivier le Polain de Waroux  
253 et al., 2018; Neal et al., 2020; Thompson et al., 2021), but only a limited number of studies reported  
254 whether a contact was “close” or “casual”(Kwok et al., 2018, 2014; O. le Polain de Waroux et al., 2018)

255 and whether the contact was made indoors or outdoors(Wood et al., 2012); both factors likely to  
256 influence transmission risk(Bulfone et al., 2021; Chu et al., 2020). More generally, the relevance and  
257 comparative importance of different contacts to transmission likely varies according to the specific  
258 pathogen and its predominant transmission modality (e.g. aerosol, droplet, fomite etc). It is therefore  
259 important to note that these results do not provide a direct indication of explicit transmission risk, but  
260 rather an indicator of factors likely to be relevant to transmission. Relatedly, it is also important to  
261 note that the studies collated here were all conducted prior to the onset of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.  
262 Previous work has documented significant alterations to patterns of social contact in response to  
263 individual-level behaviour changes or government implemented NPIs aimed at controlling SARS-CoV-  
264 2 spread, but detailed analysis of changing contact patterns is contingent on both an understanding  
265 of baseline contact patterns as detailed in the studies collated here as well as longitudinal sampling of  
266 how contacts patterns change over time, which is available for only a limited number of settings(Jarvis  
267 et al., 2021, 2020; Liu et al., 2021). Description of contact location was also coarse and precluded more  
268 granular analyses of specific settings, such as markets, which have previously been shown to be  
269 important locations for transmission in rural areas(Grijalva et al., 2015).

270 Heterogeneity between studies was larger for LICs/LMICs and UMICs, which we partly accounted for,  
271 through fitting random study effects. These study differences may be attributed to the way individual  
272 contact surveys were conducted, making comparisons of contact patterns among surveys more  
273 difficult (e.g. prospective/retrospective diary surveys, online/paper questionnaires, face-to-  
274 face/phone interviews, and different contact definitions). For instance, there is evidence suggesting  
275 that prospective reporting, which is less affected by recall bias, can often lead to a higher number of  
276 contacts being reported(Mikolajczyk and Kretzschmar, 2008) and a lower probability of casual or  
277 short-lasting contacts being missed. The relatively high contact rates observed in HICs may be  
278 explained by the fact that all but two HIC surveys used diary methods. Our study highlights that a  
279 unified definition of “contact” and standard practice in data collection could help increase the quality  
280 of collected data, leading to more robust and reliable conclusions about contact patterns. Whilst we

281 aggregate results by income strata due to the limited availability of data (particularly in lower- and  
282 middle-income countries), it is important to note that the outcomes considered here are likely to be  
283 shaped by several different factors other than country-level income. Whilst some of these factors will  
284 be correlated with a country's income status (e.g. household size(Walker et al., 2020)), many others  
285 however will be unique to a particular setting or geographical area or correlate only weakly with  
286 country-level data. Examples include patterns of employment, the role of women, and other  
287 contextual factors. These analyses are therefore intended primarily to provide indications of prevailing  
288 patterns, rather than a definitive description of contact patterns in a specific context and highlight the  
289 significant need for further studies to be carried out in a diversity of different locations.

290 Despite these limitations however, our results highlight significant differences in the structure and  
291 nature of contact patterns across settings. These differences suggest that the comparative importance  
292 of different locations and age-groups to transmission will likely vary across settings and have critical  
293 consequences for the efficacy and suitability of strategies aimed at controlling the spread of  
294 respiratory pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2. Most importantly, our study highlights the limited amount  
295 of work that has been undertaken to date to better understand and quantify patterns of contact across  
296 a range of settings, particularly in lower- and middle-income countries, which is vital in informing  
297 control strategies reducing the spread of such pathogens.

298

## 299 **Methods**

### 300 **Systematic Review**

301 **Data sources and search strategy:** Two databases (Ovid MEDLINE and Embase) were searched on 26<sup>th</sup>  
302 May 2020 to identify studies reporting on contact patterns in LICs, LMICs and UMICs (Supplementary  
303 Table 4). Collated records underwent title and abstract screening for relevance, before full-text  
304 screening using pre-determined criteria. Studies were included if they reported on any type of face-  
305 to-face or close contact with humans and were carried out in LICs, LMICs or UMICs only. No restrictions

306 on collection method (e.g. prospective diary-based surveys or retrospective surveys based on a face-  
307 to-face/phone interview or questionnaire) were applied. Studies were excluded if they did not report  
308 contacts relevant to air-borne diseases (e.g. sexual contacts), were conducted in HICs, were contact  
309 tracing studies of infected cases, or were conference abstracts. All studies were screened  
310 independently by two reviewers (AM and CW). Differences were resolved through consensus and  
311 discussion. The study protocol can be accessed through PROSPERO (registration number:  
312 CRD42020191197). Income group classification (LIC/LMIC, UMIC, or HIC) was based on 2019 World  
313 Bank data (fiscal year 2021)(World Bank Group, 2020).

314

315 **Data extraction:** Individual-level data were obtained from publication supplementary data, as well as  
316 online data repositories such as Zenodo, figshare and OSF. When not publicly available, study authors  
317 were contacted to request data. Extracted data included the participant's age, gender, employment,  
318 student status, household size and total number of contacts, as well as the day of the week for which  
319 contacts were reported. Some studies reported information at the level of individual contacts and  
320 included the age, gender, location and duration of the contact, as well whether it involved physical  
321 contact. Individual-level data from HICs, not systematically identified, were used for comparison, and  
322 included three studies from Hong Kong(Kwok et al., 2018, 2014; Leung et al., 2017) and the 8 European  
323 countries from the POLYMOD study(Mossong et al., 2008). Data were collated, cleaned and  
324 standardised using Stata version 14. Country-specific average household size were obtained from the  
325 United Nations Database on Household Size and Composition(United Nations Department of  
326 Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, 2019). Gross domestic product based on purchasing  
327 power parity (GDP PPP) was obtained from the World Data Bank database(World Bank International  
328 Comparison Programme, 2021). Findings are reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting  
329 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist of items specific to IPD meta-  
330 analyses (Supplementary Table 5). Risk of bias was assessed using the AXIS critical appraisal tool used  
331 to evaluate quality of cross-sectional studies(Downes et al., 2016), modified to this study's objectives

332 (Supplementary Table 3). Each item was attributed a zero or a one, and a quality score was assigned  
333 to each study, ranging from 0% (“poor” quality) to 100% (“good” quality). The individual-level data  
334 across all studies and analysis code are available at [https://github.com/mrc-ide/contact\\_patterns](https://github.com/mrc-ide/contact_patterns) (see  
335 Supplementary Text 3 for data dictionary).

336

### 337 **Statistical analysis**

338 The mean, median and interquartile range of total daily unique contacts were calculated for subgroups  
339 including country income status, individual study, survey methodology (diary-based or  
340 questionnaire/interview-based), survey day (weekday/weekend), and respondent characteristics such  
341 as age, sex, employment/student status and household size. Detailed description of data assumptions  
342 for each study can be found in Supplementary Text 3.

343

344 A negative binomial regression model was used to explore the association between the total number  
345 of daily contacts and the participant’s age, sex, employment/student status and household size, as  
346 well as methodology and survey day. Incidence rate ratios from these regressions are referred to as  
347 “Contact Rate Ratios” (CRRs). A sensitivity analysis was carried out that excluded additional contacts  
348 (such as additional work contacts, group contacts, and number missed out, which were recorded  
349 separately and in less detail by participants compared to their other contacts(Ajelli and Litvinova,  
350 2017; Kumar et al., 2018; Leung et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2020)). Logistic regressions were used to  
351 explore determinants of contact duration (<1hr/1hr+) and type (physical/non-physical), using the  
352 same explanatory variables as in the total contacts analyses. The proportion of contacts made at each  
353 location (home, school, work and other) was explored descriptively and contacts made with the same  
354 individual in separate locations/instances were considered as separate contacts.

355

356 All analyses were done in a Bayesian framework using the probabilistic programming language Stan,  
357 using uninformative priors in all analyses and implemented in R via the package *brms*(Bürkner, 2018,

2017). All analyses were stratified by three income strata (LICs and LMICs were combined to preserve statistical power) and included random-study effects, apart from models adjusting for methodology which did not vary by study. The effect of each factor was explored in an age- and gender-adjusted model. All models exploring the effect of student status or employment status were restricted to children aged between 5 and 18 years and adults over 18, respectively. In the remaining models including all ages, age was adjusted as a categorical variable (<15, 15 to 65 and over 65 years). CRRs, Odds Ratios (ORs) and their associated 95% Credible Intervals are presented for all regression models. Here, we report estimates adjusted for age and gender (referred to as adjCRR or adjOR). Studies which collated contact-level data were used to assess assortativity of mixing by age and gender for different country-income strata by calculating the proportions of contacts made by participants that are male or female and those that belong to three broad age groups (children, adults, and older adults; Supplementary Text 2).

370

### 371 **Ethics statement**

372 All original studies included were approved by an institutional ethics review committee. Ethics  
373 approval was not required for the present study.

374

### 375 **Acknowledgements**

376 We would like to acknowledge the Fiji Ministry of Health and Medical Services for their contribution  
377 to the study set in Fiji, M. Elizabeth Halloran for sharing the Senegal data, and Nickson Murunga for  
378 processing the data request for the Kenyan survey.

379

### 380 **Competing interests**

381 M.A. has received research funding from Seqirus outside the submitted work. G.E.P. was employed  
382 by the Emmes Company while analyzing the Niakhar Senegal social contact network data included in

383 this study. The Emmes Company was contracted to perform data cleaning and data analysis of the  
384 Niakhar, Senegal clinical trial data (but not the social contact network data) for this study before  
385 G.E.P. joined the Emmes Company (in October 2015). After G.E.P. joined the Emmes Company, the  
386 sole support from Emmes for this manuscript was in the form of salary support for G.E.P. All other  
387 authors declare no conflicts of interest. Outside of the submitted work C.G.G. has received grants,  
388 contracts, or consulting fees from the following bodies: CDC, AHRQ, FDA, NIH, Campbell  
389 Alliance/Syneos Health, Sanofi, Pfizer and Merck.

390

### 391 **Financial disclosures**

392 A.M. P.W., P.G.T.W. and C.W acknowledge joint Centre funding from the UK Medical Research  
393 Council and DFID (MR/R015600/1). The funder had no role in study design, data collection and  
394 analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. O.J.W. acknowledges funding from  
395 the UK Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office. The funder had no role in study design,  
396 data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. K.O.K  
397 acknowledges support by CUHK Direct grant for research (2019.020), Health and Medical Research  
398 Fund (reference number: INF-CUHK-1, 17160302, 18170312), General Research Fund (reference  
399 number: 14112818), Early Career Scheme (reference number: 24104920) and Wellcome Trust (UK,  
400 200861/Z/16/Z). P.J.D. was supported by a fellowship from the UK Medical Research Council  
401 (MR/P022081/1); this UK-funded award is part of the European and Developing Countries Clinical  
402 Trials Partnership 2 (EDCTP2) programme supported by the EU. E.F.G.N. holds an Australian  
403 Government Research Training Program Scholarship. F.M.R. receives funding from the Australian  
404 National Health and Medical Research Council, WHO, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation;  
405 Wellcome Trust, DFAT. M.M. acknowledges funding from the EPSRC through the EPSRC Centre for  
406 Doctoral Training in Modern Statistics and Statistical Machine Learning. J.D.S received funding for  
407 this work from the University of Washington and a grant from US National Institutes of Health,

408 NIAID. C.G.G. declares funding from NIH (K24AI148459). G.E.P. was supported previously by General  
409 Medical Sciences / National Institute of Health U01-GM070749. G.E.P was employed by the Emmes  
410 Company while analyzing the Niakhar Senegal social contact network data included in this study. The  
411 Emmes Company was contracted to perform data cleaning and data analysis of the Niakhar, Senegal  
412 clinical trial data (but not the social contact network data) for this study before G.E.P. joined the  
413 Emmes Company (in October 2015). After G.E.P. joined the Emmes Company, the sole support from  
414 Emmes for this manuscript was in the form of salary support for G.E.P.

## References

- Ajelli M, Litvinova M. 2017. Estimating contact patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases in Russia. *J Theor Biol* **419**:1–7. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2017.01.041
- Béraud G, Kazmerczak S, Beutels P, Levy-Bruhl D, Lenne X, Mielcarek N, Yazdanpanah Y, Boëlle P-Y, Hens N, Dervaux B. 2015. The French Connection: The First Large Population-Based Contact Survey in France Relevant for the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLoS One* **10**:e0133203. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133203
- Bulfone TC, Malekinejad M, Rutherford GW, Razani N. 2021. Outdoor Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Other Respiratory Viruses: A Systematic Review. *J Infect Dis* **223**:550–561. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa742
- Bürkner PC. 2018. Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. *R J* **10**:395–411. doi:10.32614/rj-2018-017
- Bürkner PC. 2017. brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *J Stat Softw* **80**:1–28. doi:10.18637/jss.v080.i01
- Chang S, Pierson E, Koh PW, Gerardin J, Redbird B, Grusky D, Leskovec J. 2021. Mobility network

models of COVID-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. *Nature* **589**:82–87.

doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2923-3

Chu DK, Akl EA, Duda S, Solo K, Yaacoub S, Schünemann HJ, El-harakeh A, Bognanni A, Lotfi T, Loeb M, Hajizadeh A, Bak A, Izcovich A, Cuello-Garcia CA, Chen C, Harris DJ, Borowiack E, Chamseddine F, Schünemann F, Morgano GP, Muti Schünemann GEU, Chen G, Zhao H, Neumann I, Chan J, Khabsa J, Hneiny L, Harrison L, Smith M, Rizk N, Giorgi Rossi P, AbiHanna P, El-khoury R, Stalteri R, Baldeh T, Piggott T, Zhang Y, Saad Z, Khamis A, Reinap M. 2020. Physical distancing, face masks, and eye protection to prevent person-to-person transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* **395**:1973–1987.

doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31142-9

Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Gimma A, Edmunds WJ, Jombart T, O’Reilly K, Endo A, Hellewell J, Nightingale ES, Quilty BJ, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, Klepac P, Bosse NI, Funk S, Abbott S, Medley GF, Gibbs H, Pearson CAB, Flasche S, Jit M, Clifford S, Prem K, Diamond C, Emery J, Deol AK, Procter SR, van Zandvoort K, Sun YF, Munday JD, Rosello A, Auzenberg M, Knight G, Houben RMGJ, Liu Y. 2020. Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Heal* **5**:e375–e385.

doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30133-X

De Negri F, Galiezz R, Miranda P, Koeller P, Zucoloto G, Costa J, Farias CM, Travassos GH, Medronho RA. 2021. Socioeconomic factors and the probability of death by Covid-19 in Brazil. *J Public Health (Bangkok)* 1–6. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdaa279

Delamater PL, Street EJ, Leslie TF, Yang YT, Jacobsen KH. 2019. Complexity of the basic reproduction number (R0). *Emerg Infect Dis* **25**:1–4. doi:10.3201/eid2501.171901

Dodd PJ, Looker C, Plumb ID, Bond V, Schaap A, Shanaube K, Muyoyeta M, Vynnycky E, Godfrey-Faussett P, Corbett EL, Beyers N, Ayles H, White RG. 2015. Age- and Sex-Specific Social Contact

Patterns and Incidence of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* Infection. *Am J Epidemiol* **183**:kwv160.

doi:10.1093/aje/kwv160

Downes MJ, Brennan ML, Williams HC, Dean RS. 2016. Development of a critical appraisal tool to assess the quality of cross-sectional studies (AXIS). *BMJ Open* **6**. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016

Dunne EM, Satzke C, Ratu FT, Neal EFG, Boelsen LK, Matanitobua S, Pell CL, Nation ML, Ortika BD, Reyburn R, Jenkins K, Nguyen C, Gould K, Hinds J, Tikoduadua L, Kado J, Rafai E, Kama M, Mulholland EK, Russell FM. 2018. Effect of ten-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine introduction on pneumococcal carriage in Fiji: results from four annual cross-sectional carriage surveys. *Lancet Glob Heal* **6**:e1375–e1385. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30383-8

Eubank S, Guclu H, Kumar VSA, Marathe M V., Srinivasan A, Toroczkai Z, Wang N. 2004. Modelling disease outbreaks in realistic urban social networks. *Nature* **429**:180–184.

doi:10.1038/nature02541

Ferrari MJ, Bansal S, Meyers LA, Björnstad ON. 2006. Network frailty and the geometry of herd immunity. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* **273**:2743–2748. doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3636

Firth JA, Hellewell J, Klepac P, Kissler S, Jit M, Atkins KE, Clifford S, Villabona-Arenas CJ, Meakin SR, Diamond C, Bosse NI, Munday JD, Prem K, Foss AM, Nightingale ES, Zandvoort K van, Davies NG, Gibbs HP, Medley G, Gimma A, Flasche S, Simons D, Auzenbergs M, Russell TW, Quilty BJ, Rees EM, Leclerc QJ, Edmunds WJ, Funk S, Houben RMGJ, Knight GM, Abbott S, Sun FY, Lowe R, Tully DC, Procter SR, Jarvis CI, Endo A, O'Reilly K, Emery JC, Jombart T, Rosello A, Deol AK, Quaife M, Hué S, Liu Y, Eggo RM, Pearson CAB, Kucharski AJ, Spurgin LG. 2020. Using a real-world network to model localized COVID-19 control strategies. *Nat Med* **26**:1616–1622.

doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1036-8

Fontanet A, Cauchemez S. 2020. COVID-19 herd immunity: where are we? *Nat Rev Immunol*.

doi:10.1038/s41577-020-00451-5

- Fu Y, Wang D-W, Chuang J-H. 2012. Representative Contact Diaries for Modeling the Spread of Infectious Diseases in Taiwan. *PLoS One* **7**:e45113. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0045113
- Ghani AC, Aral SO. 2005. Patterns of sex worker - Client contacts and their implications for the persistence of sexually transmitted infections. *J Infect Dis* **191**:S34–S41. doi:10.1086/425276
- Grijalva CG, Goeyvaerts N, Verastegui H, Edwards KM, Gil AI, Lanata CF, Hens N. 2015. A Household-Based Study of Contact Networks Relevant for the Spread of Infectious Diseases in the Highlands of Peru. *PLoS One* **10**:e0118457. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118457
- Hoang T, Coletti P, Melegaro A, Wallinga J, Grijalva CG, Edmunds JW, Beutels P, Hens N. 2019. A Systematic Review of Social Contact Surveys to Inform Transmission Models of Close-contact Infections. *Epidemiology* **30**:723–736. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000001047
- Horton KC, Hoey AL, Béraud G, Corbett EL, White RG. 2020. Systematic review and meta-analysis of sex differences in social contact patterns and implications for tuberculosis transmission and control. *Emerg Infect Dis*. doi:10.3201/eid2605.190574
- Ibuka Y, Ohkusa Y, Sugawara T, Chapman GB, Yamin D, Atkins KE, Taniguchi K, Okabe N, Galvani AP. 2016. Social contacts, vaccination decisions and influenza in Japan. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **70**:162–167. doi:10.1136/jech-2015-205777
- Jacquez JA, Simon CP, Koopman J, Sattenspiel L, Perry T. 1988. Modeling and analyzing HIV transmission: the effect of contact patterns. *Math Biosci* **92**:119–199. doi:10.1016/0025-5564(88)90031-4
- Jarvis CI, Gimma A, van Zandvoort K, Wong KLM, Abbas K, Villabona-Arenas CJ, O'Reilly K, Quaife M, Rosello A, Kucharski AJ, Gibbs HP, Atkins KE, Barnard RC, Bosse NI, Procter SR, Meakin SR, Sun FY, Abbott S, Munday JD, Russell TW, Flasche S, Sherratt K, Eggo RM, Davies NG, Quilty BJ, Auzenbergs M, Hellewell J, Jombart T, Jafari Y, Leclerc QJ, Lowe R, Foss AM, Jit M, Deol AK, Hué S, Knight GM, Endo A, Prem K, Emery JC, Clifford S, Medley G, Funk S, Sandmann FG, Tully DC,

- Pearson CAB, Gore-Langton GR, Showering A, Houben RMGJ, Nightingale ES, Klepac P, Waterlow NR, Chan YWD, Rudge JW, Simons D, Diamond C, Williams J, Brady O, Liu Y, Edmunds WJ. 2021. The impact of local and national restrictions in response to COVID-19 on social contacts in England: a longitudinal natural experiment. *BMC Med* **19**:1–12. doi:10.1186/s12916-021-01924-7
- Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Prem K, Auzenbergs M, O'Reilly K, Medley G, Emery JC, Houben RMGJ, Davies N, Nightingale ES, Flasche S, Jombart T, Hellewell J, Abbott S, Munday JD, Bosse NI, Funk S, Sun F, Endo A, Rosello A, Procter SR, Kucharski AJ, Russell TW, Knight G, Gibbs H, Leclerc Q, Quilty BJ, Diamond C, Liu Y, Jit M, Clifford S, Pearson CAB, Eggo RM, Deol AK, Klepac P, Rubin GJ, Edmunds WJ. 2020. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Med* **18**:1–10. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01597-8
- Khan K, Arino J, Hu W, Raposo P, Sears J, Calderon F, Heidebrecht C, Macdonald M, Liauw J, Chan A, Gardam M. 2009. Spread of a Novel Influenza A (H1N1) Virus via Global Airline Transportation. *N Engl J Med* **361**:212–214. doi:10.1056/nejmc0904559
- Kiti MC, Kinyanjui TM, Koech DC, Munywoki PK, Medley GF, Nokes DJ. 2014. Quantifying Age-Related Rates of Social Contact Using Diaries in a Rural Coastal Population of Kenya. *PLoS One* **9**:e104786. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104786
- Kumar S, Gosain M, Sharma H, Swetts E, Amarchand R, Kumar R, Lafond KE, Dawood FS, Jain S, Widdowson M-A, Read JM, Krishnan A. 2018. Who interacts with whom? Social mixing insights from a rural population in India. *PLoS One* **13**:e0209039. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0209039
- Kwok KO, Cowling B, Wei V, Riley S, Read JM. 2018. Temporal variation of human encounters and the number of locations in which they occur: A longitudinal study of Hong Kong residents. *J R Soc Interface* **15**. doi:10.1098/rsif.2017.0838
- Kwok KO, Cowling BJ, Wei VW, Wu KM, Read JM, Lessler J, Cummings DA, Malik Peiris JS, Riley S.

2014. Social contacts and the locations in which they occur as risk factors for influenza infection. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* **281**. doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.0709

Lapidus N, de Lamballerie X, Salez N, Setbon M, Delabre RM, Ferrari P, Moyen N, Gougeon M-L, Vely F, Leruez-Ville M, Andreoletti L, Cauchemez S, Boëlle P-Y, Vivier É, Abel L, Schwarzingler M, Legeas M, Le Cann P, Flahault A, Carrat F. 2013. Factors Associated with Post-Seasonal Serological Titer and Risk Factors for Infection with the Pandemic A/H1N1 Virus in the French General Population. *PLoS One* **8**:e60127. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0060127

le Polain de Waroux O., Cohuet S, Ndazima D, Kucharski AJ, Juan-Giner A, Flasche S, Tumwesigye E, Arinaitwe R, Mwanga-Amumpaire J, Boum Y, Nackers F, Checchi F, Grais RF, Edmunds WJ. 2018. Characteristics of human encounters and social mixing patterns relevant to infectious diseases spread by close contact: A survey in Southwest Uganda. *BMC Infect Dis* **18**:172. doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3073-1

le Polain de Waroux Olivier, Flasche S, Kucharski AJ, Langendorf C, Ndazima D, Mwanga-Amumpaire J, Grais RF, Cohuet S, Edmunds WJ. 2018. Identifying human encounters that shape the transmission of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and other acute respiratory infections. *Epidemics* **25**:72–79. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2018.05.008

Leung K, Jit M, Lau EHY, Wu JT. 2017. Social contact patterns relevant to the spread of respiratory infectious diseases in Hong Kong. *Sci Rep* **7**:4–8. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-08241-1

Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, Fava E Del, Grow A, Zagheni E, Melegaro A, Jenness SM, Omer S, Lopman B, Nelson K. 2021. Rapid review of social contact patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv* 2021.03.12.21253410. doi:10.1101/2021.03.12.21253410

Loayza N V. 2020. Costs and Trade-Offs in the Fight Against the COVID-19 Pandemic, Costs and Trade-Offs in the Fight Against the COVID-19 Pandemic. World Bank, Washington, DC. doi:10.1596/33764

Mbala-Kingebeni P, Aziza A, Di Paola N, Wiley MR, Makiala-Mandanda S, Caviness K, Pratt CB, Ladner JT, Kugelman JR, Prieto K, Chitty JA, Larson PA, Beitzel B, Ayouba A, Vidal N, Karhemere S, Diop M, Diagne MM, Faye M, Faye O, Aruna A, Nsio J, Mulangu F, Mukadi D, Mukadi P, Kombe J, Mulumba A, Villabona-Arenas CJ, Pukuta E, Gonzalez J, Bartlett ML, Sozhamannan S, Gross SM, Schroth GP, Tim R, Zhao JJ, Kuhn JH, Diallo B, Yao M, Fall IS, Ndjoloko B, Mossoko M, Lacroix A, Delaporte E, Sanchez-Lockhart M, Sall AA, Muyembe-Tamfum JJ, Peeters M, Palacios G, Ahuka-Mundeke S. 2019. Medical countermeasures during the 2018 Ebola virus disease outbreak in the North Kivu and Ituri Provinces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo: a rapid genomic assessment. *Lancet Infect Dis* **19**:648–657. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(19)30118-5

Mikolajczyk RT, Kretzschmar M. 2008. Collecting social contact data in the context of disease transmission: Prospective and retrospective study designs. *Soc Networks* **30**:127–135. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2007.09.002

Mistry D, Litvinova M, Pastore y Piontti A, Chinazzi M, Fumanelli L, Gomes MFC, Haque SA, Liu QH, Mu K, Xiong X, Halloran ME, Longini IM, Merler S, Ajelli M, Vespignani A. 2021. Inferring high-resolution human mixing patterns for disease modeling. *Nat Commun* **12**:1–12. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-20544-y

Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, Massari M, Salmaso S, Tomba GS, Wallinga J, Heijne J, Sadkowska-Todys M, Rosinska M, Edmunds WJ. 2008. Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLoS Med* **5**:e74. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074

Neal EFG, Flasche S, Nguyen CD, Ratu FT, Dunne EM, Koyamaibole L, Reyburn R, Rafai E, Kama M, Ortika BD, Boelsen LK, Kado J, Tikoduadua L, Devi R, Tuivaga E, Satzke C, Mulholland EK, Edmunds WJ, Russell FM. 2020. Associations between ethnicity, social contact, and pneumococcal carriage three years post-PCV10 in Fiji. *Vaccine* **38**:202–211. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.10.030

Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. 2017. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys and demographic data. *PLoS Comput Biol* **13**:e1005697.

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005697

Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Davies N, Flasche S, Clifford S, Pearson CAB, Munday JD, Abbott S, Gibbs H, Rosello A, Quilty BJ, Jombart T, Sun F, Diamond C, Gimma A, van Zandvoort K, Funk S, Jarvis CI, Edmunds WJ, Bosse NI, Hellewell J, Jit M, Klepac P. 2020. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Heal* **5**:e261–e270. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30073-6

Routledge I, Epstein A, Takahashi S, Hakim J, Janson O, Duarte E, Turcios K, Vinden J, Sujishi K, Rangel J, Coh M, Besana L, Ho W-K, Oon C-Y, Ong CM, Yun C, Lynch K, Wu A, Wu W, Karlon W, Thornborrow E, Peluso M, Henrich T, Pak J, Briggs J, Greenhouse B, Rodriguez-Barraquer I. 2021. Citywide serosurveillance of the initial SARS-CoV-2 outbreak in San Francisco. *Res Sq*. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-180966/v1

Stein ML, van Steenbergen JE, Buskens V, van der Heijden PGM, Chanyasanha C, Tipayamongkhogul M, Thorson AE, Bengtsson L, Lu X, Kretzschmar MEE. 2014. Comparison of Contact Patterns Relevant for Transmission of Respiratory Pathogens in Thailand and the Netherlands Using Respondent-Driven Sampling. *PLoS One* **9**:e113711. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0113711

Thompson HA, Mousa A, Dighe A, Fu H, Arnedo-Pena A, Barrett P, Bellido-Blasco J, Bi Q, Caputi A, Chaw L, De Maria L, Hoffmann M, Mahapure K, Ng K, Raghuram J, Singh G, Soman B, Soriano V, Valent F, Vimercati L, Wee LE, Wong J, Ghani AC, Ferguson NM. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 setting-specific transmission rates: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab100

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division. 2019. Database on

Household Size and Composition 2019.

<https://population.un.org/Household/index.html#/countries/840>

Walker PGT, Whittaker C, Watson OJ, Baguelin M, Winskill P, Hamlet A, Djafaara BA, Cucunubá Z, Mesa DO, Green W, Thompson H, Nayagam S, Ainslie KEC, Bhatia S, Bhatt S, Boonyasiri A, Boyd O, Brazeau NF, Cattarino L, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Dighe A, Donnelly CA, Dorigatti I, Van Elsland SL, FitzJohn R, Fu H, Gaythorpe KAM, Geidelberg L, Grassly N, Haw D, Hayes S, Hinsley W, Imai N, Jorgensen D, Knock E, Laydon D, Mishra S, Nedjati-Gilani G, Okell LC, Unwin HJ, Verity R, Vollmer M, Walters CE, Wang H, Wang Y, Xi X, Lalloo DG, Ferguson NM, Ghani AC. 2020. The impact of COVID-19 and strategies for mitigation and suppression in low- And middle-income countries. *Science (80- )* **369**:413–422. doi:10.1126/science.abc0035

Ward H, Cooke G, Whitaker M, Redd R, Eales O, Brown JC, Collet K, Cooper E, Daunt A, Jones K, Moshe M, Willicombe M, Day S, Atchison C, Darzi A, Donnelly CA, Riley S, Ashby D, Barclay WS, Elliott P. 2021. REACT-2 Round 5: increasing prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies demonstrate impact of the second wave and of vaccine roll-out in England. *medRxiv* 2021.02.26.21252512. doi:10.1101/2021.02.26.21252512

Winskill P, Whittaker C, Walker P, Watson O, Laydon D, Imai N, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, Bhatt S, Boonyasiri A, Cattarino L, Ciavarella C, Cooper L V, Coupland H, Cucunuba Z, Van Elsland SL, Fitzjohn R, Flaxman S, Gaythorpe K, Green W, Hallett T, Hamlet A, Hinsley W, Knock E, Lees J, Mellan T, Mishra S, Nedjati-Gilani G, Nouvellet P, Okell L, Parag K V, Thompson HA, Juliette H, Unwin T, Vollmer M, Wang Y, Whittles L, Xi X, Ferguson N, Donnelly C, Ghani A. 2020. Report 22: Equity in response to the COVID-19 pandemic: an assessment of the direct and indirect impacts on disadvantaged and vulnerable populations in low-and lower middle-income countries. doi:10.25561/78965

Wood R, Racow K, Bekker L-G, Morrow C, Middelkoop K, Mark D, Lawn SD. 2012. Indoor Social Networks in a South African Township: Potential Contribution of Location to Tuberculosis

Transmission. *PLoS One* **7**:e39246. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039246

World Bank Group. 2020. World Bank Country and Lending Groups – World Bank Data Help Desk.

<https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups>

World Bank International Comparison Programme. 2021. World Development Indicators database

Eurostat-OECD PPP Programme.

Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Wang Y, Wang W, Zhao S, Wu Q, Merler S, Viboud C, Vespignani A,

Ajelli M, Yu H. 2020. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science (80- )* **368**:1481–1486. doi:10.1126/science.abb8001

**Figure 1 – Total number of contacts.** Sample median total number of contacts shown by gender (right) and 5-year age groups up to ages 80+ shown for A) LICs/LMICs, B) UMICs and C) HICs. Grey lines denote individual studies, and the solid black line is the median across all studies of within that income group. Studies with a diary-based methodology are represented by a solid grey line and those with a questionnaire or interview design are shown as a dashed line. For UMICs, one study outlier with extremely high number of contacts is excluded (online Thai survey with a “snowball” design by Stein et al., 2014). Contact Rate Ratios and associated 95% Credible intervals from a negative binomial model with random study effects are shown in D (LICs/LMICs), E (UMICs) and F (HICs).







Figure 2- A) Sample median number of contacts by household size in review data, stratified by income strata. Shaded area denotes the interquartile range. B) sample mean % of contacts made at each location (home, school, work, other) by income group. C) total daily contacts (sample mean number) made at each location by 5-year age group. D) Sample median number of contacts made at home by 5-year age groups and income strata. Shaded area denotes the interquartile range. E) Average household size and GDP; red circles represent median household size in single studies from the review. GDP information was obtained from the World Bank Group and global household size data from the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, United Nations.



**Figure 3- Physical contacts.** Mean proportion of contacts that are physical shown by gender (right) and 5-year age groups up to ages 80+ shown for A) LICs/LMICs, B) UMICs and C) HICs. Grey lines denote individual studies, and the solid black line is the mean across all studies of within that income group. Studies with a diary-based methodology are represented by a solid grey line and those with a questionnaire or interview design are shown as a dashed line. Odds Ratios and associated 95% Credible intervals from a logistic regression model with random study effects are shown in D (LICs/LMICs), E (UMICs) and F (HICs).



**Figure 4- Contact duration.** Mean proportion of contacts that last at least an hour shown by gender (right) and 5-year age groups up to ages 80+ shown for A) LICs/LMICs, B) UMICs and C) HICs. Grey lines denote individual studies and the solid black line is the mean across all studies of within that income group. Studies with a diary-based methodology are represented by a solid grey line and those with a questionnaire or interview design are shown as a dashed line. Odds Ratios and associated 95% Credible intervals from a logistic regression model with random study effects are shown in D (LICs/LMICs), E (UMICs) and F (HICs).



**Table 1- Summary table of total daily contacts.** The total number of observations, as well as the mean, median and interquartile range (p25 and p75) of total daily contacts shown by participant and study characteristics.

|  |                     |                            | <b>N</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>p25</b> | <b>Median</b> | <b>p75</b> |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------|-------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| <b>Overall</b>                                     |                     |                            | 28,503   | 14.5        | 5          | 9             | 17         |
| <b>Gender</b>                                      |                     | <b>Male</b>                | 13,218   | 15.3        | 5          | 9             | 18         |
|  |                     | <b>Female</b>              | 14,598   | 13.7        | 5          | 9             | 16         |
| <b>Age</b>   |                     | <b>&lt;15</b>              | 8,561    | 14.6        | 6          | 10            | 19         |
|  |                     | <b>15 to 65</b>            | 17,841   | 14.9        | 5          | 9             | 17         |
|  |                     | <b>&gt;65</b>              | 2,047    | 10.4        | 3          | 6             | 12         |
| <b>Income status</b>                               |                     | <b>LIC/LMIC</b>            | 9,906    | 15.4        | 5          | 10            | 17         |
|  |                     | <b>UMIC</b>                | 8,330    | 14.4        | 5          | 8             | 16         |
|  |                     | <b>HIC</b>                 | 10,267   | 13.7        | 5          | 9             | 17         |
| <b>Survey Methodology</b>                          |                     | <b>Diary</b>               | 12,226   | 13.9        | 6          | 10            | 18         |
|  |                     | <b>Interview/Survey</b>    | 16,227   | 15.0        | 4          | 8             | 16         |
| <b>Day type</b>                                    |                     | <b>Weekend</b>             | 4,308    | 14.7        | 5          | 9             | 16         |
|  |                     | <b>Weekday</b>             | 21,579   | 14.1        | 5          | 9             | 17         |
| <b>Employment</b><br><i>(in those aged &gt;18)</i> |                     | <b>Yes</b>                 | 8,879    | 15.4        | 5          | 9             | 17         |
|  |                     | <b>No</b>                  | 6,158    | 9.8         | 4          | 7             | 12         |
| <b>Student</b><br><i>(in those aged 5 to 18)</i>   |                     | <b>Yes</b>                 | 4,438    | 18.4        | 8          | 14            | 24         |
|  |                     | <b>No</b>                  | 600      | 10.4        | 5          | 8             | 14         |
| <b>Household size</b>                              |                     | <b>1</b>                   | 1,479    | 10.4        | 3          | 6             | 12         |
|  |                     | <b>2</b>                   | 3,220    | 11.8        | 4          | 7             | 14         |
|  |                     | <b>3</b>                   | 4,130    | 12.0        | 4          | 7             | 14         |
|  |                     | <b>4</b>                   | 5,240    | 13.4        | 5          | 8             | 17         |
|  |                     | <b>5</b>                   | 3,109    | 12.5        | 4          | 8             | 14         |
|  |                     | <b>6+</b>                  | 8,873    | 17.7        | 7          | 11            | 20         |
| <b>Study</b>                                       | <b>Belgium</b>      | <b>Mossong</b>             | 750      | 11.8        | 5          | 9             | 15         |
|  | <b>China</b>        | <b>Read</b>                | 1,821    | 18.6        | 7          | 13            | 22         |
|  | <b>China</b>        | <b>Zhang</b>               | 965      | 18.8        | 4          | 10            | 30         |
|  | <b>Fiji</b>         | <b>Neal</b>                | 2,019    | 6.4         | 4          | 6             | 8          |
|  | <b>Finland</b>      | <b>Mossong</b>             | 1,006    | 11.1        | 5          | 9             | 15         |
|  | <b>Germany</b>      | <b>Mossong</b>             | 1,341    | 7.9         | 4          | 6             | 10         |
|  | <b>Hong Kong</b>    | <b>Kwok (2014)</b>         | 762      | 18.3        | 5          | 9             | 18         |
|  | <b>Hong Kong</b>    | <b>Kwok (2018)</b>         | 1,066    | 11.9        | 3          | 7             | 13         |
|  | <b>Hong Kong</b>    | <b>Leung</b>               | 1,149    | 14.4        | 3          | 7             | 15         |
|  | <b>India</b>        | <b>Kumar</b>               | 2,943    | 27.0        | 12         | 17            | 26         |
|  | <b>Italy</b>        | <b>Mossong</b>             | 849      | 19.8        | 10         | 17            | 27         |
|  | <b>Kenya</b>        | <b>Kiti</b>                | 568      | 17.7        | 10         | 15            | 23         |
|  | <b>Luxembourg</b>   | <b>Mossong</b>             | 1,051    | 17.5        | 8          | 14            | 24         |
|  | <b>Netherlands</b>  | <b>Mossong</b>             | 269      | 13.9        | 6          | 11            | 19         |
|  | <b>Peru</b>         | <b>Grijalva</b>            | 588      | 15.3        | 8          | 12            | 20         |
|  | <b>Poland</b>       | <b>Mossong</b>             | 1,012    | 16.3        | 7          | 13            | 22.5       |
|  | <b>Russia</b>       | <b>Ajelli</b>              | 502      | 18.0        | 6          | 11            | 19         |
|  | <b>South Africa</b> | <b>Dodd</b>                | 1,276    | 5.2         | 4          | 5             | 7          |
|  | <b>South Africa</b> | <b>Wood</b>                | 571      | 15.6        | 9          | 14            | 20         |
|  | <b>Senegal</b>      | <b>Potter</b>              | 1,417    | 19.7        | 10         | 15            | 25         |
|  | <b>Thailand</b>     | <b>Mahikul</b>             | 369      | 22.6        | 13         | 20            | 31         |
|  | <b>Thailand</b>     | <b>Stein</b>               | 219      | 58.5        | 15         | 24            | 55         |
|  | <b>Uganda</b>       | <b>Le Polain de Waroux</b> | 568      | 7.0         | 5          | 7             | 9          |
|  | <b>United</b>       | <b>Mossong</b>             | 1,012    | 11.7        | 6          | 10            | 16         |
|  | <b>Vietnam</b>      | <b>Horby</b>               | 865      | 7.7         | 5          | 7             | 9          |
|  | <b>Zambia</b>       | <b>Dodd</b>                | 2,300    | 4.8         | 3          | 4             | 6          |
|  | <b>Zimbabwe</b>     | <b>Melegaro</b>            | 1,245    | 10.7        | 6          | 9             | 14         |