

1 **Nationally Representative Social Contact Patterns in the United States, August 2020-April 2021**

2  
3 Kristin N. Nelson  
4 Aaron J Siegler  
5 Patrick S Sullivan  
6 Heather Bradley  
7 Eric Hall  
8 Nicole Luisi  
9 Palmer Hipp-Ramsey  
10 Travis Sanchez  
11 Kayoko Shioda  
12 Benjamin A Lopman

13  
14 Affiliations

15 Department of Epidemiology, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University (Nelson, Siegler,  
16 Sullivan, Sanchez, Luisi, Lopman)  
17 Department of Population Health Sciences, Georgia State University School of Public Health (Bradley)  
18 Gangarosa Department of Environmental Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University  
19 (Shioda)  
20 School of Public Health, Oregon Health & Science University (Hall)

21  
22 Contact information for corresponding author

23 Kristin N. Nelson, MPH, PhD  
24 1518 Clifton Road NE  
25 Room CNR 4007  
26 Atlanta GA, 30322  
27 Email: [knbratt@emory.edu](mailto:knbratt@emory.edu)

28  
29 Declarations of interest: none

30  
31 Author statement of roles:  
32 KNN conceptualized the study, conducted data analysis, and write the original draft, EH and NL curated  
33 and analyzed data, PH was responsible for project administration, AJS, PSS, HB, TS, and BAL designed  
34 the larger COVIDVu study and acquired funding, all authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

35  
36  
37 Funding source: All were funded by the COVIDVu study, NIAID 3R01AI143875-02S1, the Woodruff  
38 Foundation, and the California Department of Public Health. KNN and BAL were funded by GlobalMix  
39 NIH/NICHD R01 HD097175 and CorporateMix CDC U01CK000572.

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102

**Abstract**

The response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S prompted abrupt and dramatic changes to social contact patterns. Monitoring changing social behavior is essential to provide reliable input data for mechanistic models of infectious disease, which have been increasingly used to support public health policy to mitigate the impacts of the pandemic. While some studies have reported on changing contact patterns throughout the pandemic., few have reported on differences in contact patterns among key demographic groups and none have reported nationally representative estimates. We conducted a national probability survey of US households and collected information on social contact patterns during two time periods: August-December 2020 (before widespread vaccine availability) and March-April 2021 (during national vaccine rollout). Overall, contact rates in Spring 2021 were similar to those in Fall 2020, with most contacts reported at work. Persons identifying as non-White, non-Black, non-Asian, and non-Hispanic reported high numbers of contacts relative to other racial and ethnic groups. Contact rates were highest in those reporting occupations in retail, hospitality and food service, and transportation. Those testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies reported a higher number of daily contacts than those who were seronegative. Our findings provide evidence for differences in social behavior among demographic groups, highlighting the profound disparities that have become the hallmark of the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Keywords**

COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, transmission, mathematical models, social contact, health disparities

103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152

## Introduction

The response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S., including the closing of schools, workplaces, and businesses, prompted abrupt and dramatic changes to social contact patterns. In the first months of 2020, reducing social contact was the only measure available to ‘flatten the curve’ and blunt the severity of the early pandemic. A synchronous, near-universal decline in contact rates occurred across countries in North America, Western Europe, and Asia in the Spring and Summer of 2020, with mean daily contacts dropping from 7-26 contacts pre-pandemic to 2-5 contacts per person in the early ‘lockdown’ period. [1] Through Summer and Fall, as restrictions began to ease, contact patterns slowly rebounded. A key inflection point occurred in November 2020, when the first COVID-19 vaccines became available, signaling the start of a massive national vaccination campaign. Widespread vaccination reduced individuals’ risks of infection and led to declining case rates and hospitalizations, contributing to perceptions of reduced pandemic severity and leading to further relaxation of social distancing policies. [2] Characterizing changing social contact patterns across this time period is critical to better understand behavioral drivers of the trajectory of the pandemic and inform ongoing efforts to estimate the impact of interventions. Systematic data collected in other countries has helped to explain the interplay between contact patterns and transmission dynamics [3, 4], but studies of contact patterns in the U.S. during this period draw primarily from convenience samples which survey unrepresentative segments of the population. [5, 6]

While some studies have reported on changing contact patterns throughout the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S. [1], few have reported on differences in contact patterns among key demographic groups. This is particularly important since the burden of the COVID-19 pandemic has disproportionately fallen on low-income and minority populations, with a heavier burden of COVID-19 cases and deaths in low-income and minority populations. [7-10] To date, research has suggested that such disparities reflect limited capacity for these groups to markedly change their contact patterns to protect themselves and their communities from SARS-CoV-2 infection due to social and structural factors. [11-13] Indeed, studies on neighborhood-level mobility support the notion that certain demographic groups were more likely to self-isolate than others during the early pandemic. [14, 15] Disparities in the impact of COVID-19 persisted as vaccines became available. Inequities in vaccine access and uptake have resulted in suboptimal vaccination rates in many U.S. communities. [16-18] A person’s vaccination status, as well as the vaccination coverage in their broader community, influences the real and perceived risk of infection, shaping differences in social contact patterns across demographic groups as the pandemic continues.

Data are needed on contact patterns over the period of the COVID-19 pandemic in the U.S.; ideally these data should be both nationally representative and investigate differences by demographic groups. Such data are critical to illustrate a national picture of contact patterns driving the changing epidemiology of COVID-19 and provide robust data on the behavioral patterns that may be perpetuating inequities in the impact of the pandemic. Specifically, unbiased estimates of contact will be useful in parameterizing mechanistic models of infectious disease transmission, informing underlying assumptions about the rate at which individuals come into contact with one another which are necessary to accurately simulate spread of infection and the potential impact of interventions. In particular, it is important to capture contact patterns in the period during which restrictions began to be substantially relaxed but before the availability of vaccination in the general population and after in order to guide models aiming to understand the role of vaccines in altering population-level transmission dynamics. With infectious disease models increasingly informing both domestic and global policy, it is essential that the data underlying models maintains fidelity to rapidly changing contact patterns, which represents one of the key sources of uncertainty in COVID-19 transmission models.

153 We conducted a national probability survey of US households (The COVIDVu Study) with the  
154 primary aim to generate nationally representative estimates of the cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2  
155 infection. [19-21] As a part of this study, we collected information on social contact patterns during two  
156 time periods: August-December 2020 (before widespread vaccine availability) and March-April 2021  
157 (during national vaccine rollout). We calculate nationally representative contact rates for the U.S. by  
158 demographic group and assess the relationship between contact rates and SARS-CoV-2 serostatus in both  
159 periods.

160  
161

## 162 **Methods**

### 163 Sampling

164 Sampling methods for the COVIDVu study have been previously described. [19] Briefly, we used a  
165 national address-based household sample derived from the USPS Computerized Delivery Sequence File,  
166 which covers all residential delivery points in the US. To achieve a total sample of at least 4,000  
167 responding households, a total of 39,500 addresses were sampled. We oversampled households in census  
168 tracts with >50% Black residents and households with surnames likely to represent Hispanic ethnicity.  
169 [22] One household member aged  $\geq 18$  years was randomly selected and offered participation in the study.  
170 Baseline surveys were conducted from August-December 2020 and a follow-up survey was conducted in  
171 March – April 2021.

172

173 Sample weights were used to estimate key parameters that represent the non-institutionalized, housed  
174 adult population in the U.S. The COVIDVu study was approved by the Emory University Institutional  
175 Review Board (STUDY00000695).

176

### 177 Survey and specimen collection

178 Consenting participants completed an online survey, which collected the age, sex, race, ethnicity, income,  
179 household size, and occupation of participants. We also included questions about person-to-person  
180 contacts on the previous day, which we adapted from previous, similar surveys. [6, 23, 24] We defined a  
181 physical contact as any contact involving physical touch, such as a handshake, hug, or kiss and a non-  
182 physical contact by an interaction in which the participant was within 6 feet of the other person and  
183 exchanged three or more words. For each contact reported in the survey, participants were asked to record  
184 the age of the contact and the location where contact occurred (home, work, school, or other). Occupation  
185 categories were adapted from those used in the 2018 American Community Survey and based on the  
186 North American Industry Classification System. [25]

187

188 Participants self-collected and returned a dried blood spot (DBS) specimen to a central laboratory via  
189 prepaid mailer. DBS specimens were tested using the BioRad Platelia Total Antibody test that targets the  
190 nucleocapsid protein (i.e., IgA, IgM, IgG; BioRad, Hercules, California). [26, 27]

191

### 192 Statistical Analysis

193

194 We restricted our analysis to participants who completed the baseline and follow-up surveys and returned  
195 DBS specimens from each period with valid total Ig result. Where missing, we imputed responses for all  
196 variables involved in calculation of weights, including age, gender, race/ethnicity, and income. [19, 28]  
197 Using the survey weights, we calculated the mean and median daily number of contacts reported in each  
198 time period, overall and by age, sex, location of contact, race/ethnicity, income, occupation, and SARS-  
199 CoV-2 serostatus. We performed two-sample t-tests and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for the difference in  
200 contacts reported at baseline and follow-up, which assess differences in the mean and overall distribution,  
201 respectively, of highly skewed data. For comparability with analyses of social contact from other  
202 countries, we truncated data at 50 contacts per day per contact age group to report total contacts [4],  
203 though we explored other cutoffs to assess how the impact on our findings. All analysis was conducted in

204 R version 3.5.3 and all code is available on GitHub at [https://github.com/kbratnelson/covidvu-](https://github.com/kbratnelson/covidvu-socialcontact)  
205 socialcontact.

206

## 207 **Results**

208 39,500 registration materials and kits were mailed to sampled US households. 4,654 (12.6% of sampled  
209 households) returned a baseline survey and a DBS specimen with a valid total Ig result during the period  
210 August 9-December 8, 2020. Of these, 3,112 (66.9% of participants in the baseline survey) returned a  
211 follow-up survey and a DBS specimen with a valid total Ig result during the period March 2-April 18,  
212 2021.

213

214 Overall, the mean number of daily contacts was 13.9 (IQR: 2, 10) at baseline and 14.5 (IQR: 2, 11) at  
215 follow-up ( $p$  of two-sample  $t$ -test = 0.552). (Table 1) Physical contacts increased slightly from 5.9 (IQR:  
216 1, 4) to 7.8 (IQR: 0, 5) contacts ( $p=0.322$ ), and non-physical contacts stayed similar (10.2 (IQR: 0, 5) at  
217 baseline and 9.6 (IQR: 0, 6) at follow-up,  $p=0.722$ ). Most contacts in both survey periods were reported at  
218 work (65% at baseline and 54% at follow-up), with fewer contacts reported at home (17% at baseline and  
219 21% at follow-up) and other locations (17% at baseline and 22% at follow-up); the fewest contacts were  
220 reported at school (1% at baseline and 3% at follow-up). (Figure 1) (Of note, nearly all participants were  
221 adults, so contacts at school were not expected to be common.) While the distribution of contacts in all  
222 locations was skewed, this skew was particularly apparent among workplace contacts (90<sup>th</sup> percentile of  
223 the distribution: 16 and 15 for baseline and follow-up, respectively).

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250


251

252

253

254

255  
256 Figure 1. Frequency of reported contacts per day by location of contact for a probability sample of 3,112  
257 households representing the population aged  $\geq 18$  years at study baseline, United States, August-  
258 December 2020



259  
260 Contacts reported in each location are truncated at 100 to display the lower end of the distribution for  
261 each plot. Vertical dotted line shows the mean for each location (as reported in Table 1).  
262  
263  
264


265  
266 Trends in contact varied by age group (Figure 2). The number of contacts did not substantially change  
267 among 18-24 year-olds ( $p=0.461$ ), 35-44 year-olds ( $p=0.097$ ), and 45-54 year-olds ( $p=0.796$ ) from  
268 baseline to follow-up; comparatively, contact increased among 25-34 year-olds (mean of 16 contacts at  
269 baseline and 23.3 contacts at follow-up,  $p=0.030$ ). Contact rates among the elderly (65+) were the lowest  
270 of all age groups and remained similar from baseline to follow-up (mean of 5.5 and 6.0 contacts at  
271 baseline and follow-up, respectively,  $p=0.592$ ). The number of contacts among men were generally higher  
272 than among women and were similar from baseline to follow-up (15.0 to 17.2,  $p=0.251$ ), contacts  
273 reported among women were also similar between the two surveys (mean of 12.5 and 11.3 at baseline and  
274 follow-up, respectively,  $p=0.158$ ).

275  
276 Contact patterns were distinct across socioeconomic and racial groups in both surveys (Figure 2), but  
277 showed little change from baseline to follow-up. Those identifying as Asian reported the lowest contact  
278 rates (6.8 and 11.3 mean contacts at baseline and follow-up, respectively,  $p=0.019$ ), and those who  
279 identified as non-White, non-Black, non-Asian, and non-Hispanic ('Other') reported the highest contact  
280 rates (baseline mean: 25.5, follow-up mean 28.2,  $p=0.838$ ). Number of reported contacts was highest  
281 among those reporting annual incomes from \$10,000-\$49,999. The number of contacts reported at work  
282 varied substantially by industry, with jobs in retail (mean 92 contacts), accommodation and food service  
283 (mean 29 contacts at baseline), transportation (mean 24 contacts at baseline), healthcare (mean 16  
284 contacts at baseline), manufacturing (mean 12.3 contacts at follow-up), and education (mean 12 contacts  
285 at follow-up) accounting for the highest levels of contact.

286  
287 Participants with a positive serostatus had slightly higher number of contacts than those with a negative  
288 serostatus in both periods (16.6 compared to 13.3 contacts at baseline and 19.6 compared to 13.7 contacts  
289 at follow-up). (Figure 2) Those who were seronegative at both surveys reported a lower mean number of  
290 contacts than those who were seropositive at either survey (13.4 and 16.8 contacts at baseline and follow-  
291 up, respectively). Those who seroconverted from baseline to follow-up reported a higher number of  
292 contacts at both surveys (17.0 and 18.2 contacts) than those who did not (13.6 and 14.1 contacts).

293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315

316 Figure 2. Mean reported contacts per day by demographic group and serostatus for a probability sample  
317 of 3,112 households representing the population aged  $\geq 18$  years at study baseline, United States, August-  
318 December 2020



319 Violin plots show the distribution of the non-zero numbers of contacts reported by group and grey dots  
320 indicate each individual data point. Black dots show the mean for each group (as reported in Table 1).  
321  
322  
323

324 We chose to truncate contacts at 50 per day per contact age group (total of 450 contacts) to enable  
325 comparison with other pandemic-focused studies of contact. Moreover, we reasoned that the nature of  
326 some occupations could reasonably lead to several hundred contacts a day. Very few participants reported  
327 above the 50 per day per group limit of contacts (5, or 0.2% of participants, at baseline and 10, or 0.3% of  
328 participants, at follow-up). When we used a truncation limit of 29 total contacts per day, consistent with  
329 other previous studies of contact [23], we found qualitatively similar results to those reported (mean 7.7  
330 contacts (IQR: 2, 10) at baseline to 8.1 contacts (IQR: 2, 11) at follow-up. A moderate number of  
331 participants reported more than 29 contacts (220 participants (7%) at baseline and 249 participants (8%)  
332 at follow-up). In general, those reporting a very high number of contacts reported them at work or at  
333 ‘other’ locations.

## 335 Discussion

337 Overall, national contact rates in Spring 2021 were similar to those in Fall 2020, with most contacts in  
338 both surveys reported at work. The number of contacts reported was not uniform across groups, with  
339 those identifying as non-White, non-Black, non-Asian, and non-Hispanic reporting high rates of contact  
340 relative to other racial and ethnic groups. Contact rates were highest among those with lower incomes and  
341 in specific occupational categories, including retail, hospitality and food service, and transportation.  
342 While the number of contacts reported were mostly similar from baseline to follow-up, younger adults  
343 (aged 25-34) reported higher numbers of contacts at follow-up as compared to baseline. Finally, we found  
344 that those testing positive for SARS-CoV-2 antibodies reported a higher number of daily contacts than  
345 those who were seronegative. Collectively, these findings provide robust empirical evidence for  
346 differences in social behavior among demographic groups, highlighting the profound disparities that have  
347 become the hallmark of the COVID-19 pandemic.

349 The ‘opening up’ of much of the U.S. in mid-2020 saw the lifting of restrictive social distancing  
350 measures put into place across much of the country at the beginning of the epidemic. Social contact  
351 reached a nadir in Spring 2020, began to rebound by Fall 2020, and according to our findings stayed  
352 largely consistent through Spring 2021. Although pre-pandemic data on social contact is limited,  
353 available data suggest that contact rates have rebounded to pre-pandemic levels, estimated at 12-14  
354 contacts per day for the average adult. [29, 30] The consistency of overall contact rates across these two  
355 periods is ostensibly the result of a complex interplay of factors. The expiration of many local mitigation  
356 policies in late Summer 2020 [31] likely prompted increases in contact, before the severe wintertime  
357 ‘wave’ arrived in November caused contact rates to decline once again. Optimism about the introduction  
358 of vaccines in early 2021 gradually began to counterbalance the caution prompted by rising case counts in  
359 winter [2]. Together, these factors likely led to largely consistent social contact rates across the two  
360 survey periods.

362 Our finding that social contact rates varied by demographic group in the U.S. has been shown in  
363 smaller, less broadly representative studies [5] We found high contact rates among the youngest age  
364 group, 18-24 year-olds, consistent with other data showing that this group typically reported lowest  
365 prevalence of mitigation behaviors. [32-34] We also found that adults 24-35 increased their contact rates  
366 the most from baseline to follow-up, which may reflect the opening of schools and workplaces over this  
367 period, and later, increased contacts after becoming partially or fully vaccinated. Minority populations  
368 and those with lower incomes reported high mean rates of contact. Together with the fact that the majority  
369 of contacts at both baseline and follow-up were reported in the workplace, this is consistent with reports  
370 that lower-income and minority groups were more likely to be classified as ‘essential’ workers, a  
371 designation which may have required them to continue working in-person or to return to work shortly  
372 after the most strict social distancing restrictions were lifted and prior to our baseline survey. [13] At least  
373 some of this disparity in contact rates is likely due to inflexible and unstable employment situations that  
374 are less likely to allow for remote work. Differential contact rates by job type were expected but striking

375 in magnitude. We found contact rates up to ten times the population average in occupations which involve  
376 working environments that place employees in close contact with many other people, such as retail,  
377 transportation, and food processing. Notably, workplaces in general are an important source of infection  
378 and transmission risk for respiratory infections [35-37] and the industries associated with high contact  
379 rates in our survey were the settings of several highly publicized outbreaks in 2020. [38, 39] Ensuring that  
380 effective prevention measures are enacted in workplaces, where exposure rates are high, may  
381 disproportionately reduce infection risk.

382  
383 Finally, we found that seropositive individuals were more likely to report higher contact rates at  
384 both survey rounds. Many studies have reported on risk factors for infection related to social  
385 environment, which have included poverty and crowding. [40-42] We coupled behavioral information  
386 with serological status in nationally representative sample to show that higher rates of contact are indeed  
387 linked with previous infection status. Linking information on mitigation behaviors and serostatus will be  
388 important in understanding epidemic dynamics as population-level immunity increases, which are  
389 predicted to be characterized by highly localized outbreaks in space and time driven by ‘pockets’ of  
390 susceptible persons. [43, 44]

391  
392 The availability of nationally representative data on contact patterns by demographic group fills  
393 an important gap in efforts to accurately forecast and explain the trajectory of the COVID-19 pandemic.  
394 Traditionally, infectious disease models have rarely incorporated social factors, though they are  
395 instrumental in determining disease risk. This is partially because of limited availability of data to  
396 properly formulate models that track many population groups, but also because average population  
397 models are often favored for their simplicity and greater ease of computation. However, accounting for  
398 exposure differences between groups is a critical component of accurately modeling disease dynamics by  
399 population segment. To date, most models that have aimed to explain differences in the burden of cases  
400 and deaths by demographic group have used proxies of contact, such as mobility measured by mobile  
401 phone location data, to represent the frequency of person-person interactions rather than data on direct  
402 interactions. However, recent work has shown that during ‘lockdowns’, mobility was likely to be a poor  
403 indicator of contact patterns, calling into question the validity of this assumption. [45] Data on contact  
404 patterns by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic group, and occupation provides the necessary granularity to  
405 investigate disease dynamics driving sociodemographic inequities in disease burden. Indeed, modeling  
406 studies that have investigated these questions have noted the lack of longitudinal social contact surveys  
407 that would provide data to allow proper parameterization of models. [46] Systematically collected data  
408 that is finely stratified by demographic group has to date been a major barrier to COVID-19 research  
409 efforts. [47] Collecting and making this data available to the modeling community can support the  
410 development of more accurate models to inform public health policymaking on continued use of vaccines  
411 as well as non-pharmaceutical interventions. As vaccine rollout continues and transmission becomes  
412 increasingly concentrated among unvaccinated and undervaccinated populations, understanding between  
413 and within-group interactions will be particularly critical to track trends in transmission over time and to  
414 understand the potential utility of targeted interventions to mitigate population-level risk.

415  
416 There were several limitations to this study. First, our response rates were low (<15%) but  
417 standard for address-based surveys. For certain groups at risk of being underrepresented by our initial  
418 survey responses, we intentionally oversampled to ensure that such groups were adequately represented,  
419 and survey weights were used to help ensure the sample represented the underlying population. Second,  
420 contact patterns may have changed over the period spanned by our survey (four months in the baseline  
421 survey, one month in the follow-up). In addition, our surveys were conducted before and after the winter  
422 holidays, which likely saw transient increases in travel and contact rates; we could not capture these  
423 changes with our surveys. Third, differences in contact patterns on the state and local levels are likely to  
424 be significant due to variation in the nature of and adherence to distancing and other mitigation policies as  
425 well as differences in the speed of vaccine rollout and eligibility criteria. The national focus of our survey

426 limits the inferences we can make about contact patterns at a finer geographic scale. With respect to the  
427 contact survey, we asked participants to record contacts from one day (the day prior to completing the  
428 survey) and we do not know to what extent this day might represent general patterns of contact.  
429 Moreover, this prevents an analysis of whether reported contacts were unique on that day, or repeated  
430 across days. Generally, a higher number of unique contacts would represent higher infection and  
431 transmission risk. Fourth, we do not have information on mitigation measures relevant for each contact,  
432 which impact the likelihood of transmitting infection during an interaction. Lastly, the age range of the  
433 surveyed population limits the generalizability of these results to only adults, as there were not aa  
434 sufficient number of participants under 18 to make conclusions about contact rates among younger  
435 people. This also limits our view into school-based contact, which is potentially an important setting of  
436 transmission.

437  
438 As the pandemic continues, continued collection of curation of data on behavioural indicators by  
439 key demographic groups can support the development of detailed COVID-19 models that accurately  
440 represent disease dynamics in varied sociodemographic contexts. Continued, systematic collection and  
441 analysis of social contact data is critical to understand the past and future trajectory of the epidemic as  
442 well as explain differences in disease burden by population segment and through time. Longitudinal  
443 social contact data is particularly powerful alongside seropositivity estimates that are finely stratified by  
444 demographic group, and can further support efforts to properly fit dynamic models aiming assess  
445 interventions to mitigate the continuing impacts of the pandemic.

446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476

477 **References**

- 478 1. Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, et al. Rapid review of social contact patterns during the COVID-19  
479 pandemic. medRxiv **2021**:2021.03.12.21253410.
- 480 2. Trends in Number of COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in the US Reported to CDC, by State/Territory.  
481 Accessed July 29 2021.
- 482 3. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-  
483 19 outbreak in China. *Science* **2020**; 368:1481-6.
- 484 4. Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on  
485 the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Medicine* **2020**; 18:124.
- 486 5. Feehan DM, Mahmud AS. Quantifying population contact patterns in the United States during the  
487 COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Communications* **2021**; 12:893.
- 488 6. Kiti MC, Aguolu OG, Liu CY, et al. Social contact patterns among employees in 3 U.S. companies  
489 during early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic, April to June 2020. *Epidemics* **2021**; 36:100481.
- 490 7. Escobar GJ, Adams AS, Liu VX, et al. Racial Disparities in COVID-19 Testing and Outcomes :  
491 Retrospective Cohort Study in an Integrated Health System. *Ann Intern Med* **2021**; 174:786-93.
- 492 8. Macias Gil R, Marcelin JR, Zuniga-Blanco B, Marquez C, Mathew T, Piggott DA. COVID-19  
493 Pandemic: Disparate Health Impact on the Hispanic/Latinx Population in the United States. *The Journal*  
494 *of Infectious Diseases* **2020**; 222:1592-5.
- 495 9. Yehia BR, Winegar A, Fogel R, et al. Association of Race With Mortality Among Patients  
496 Hospitalized With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) at 92 US Hospitals. *JAMA Network Open*  
497 **2020**; 3:e2018039-e.
- 498 10. Jung J, Manley J, Shrestha V. Coronavirus infections and deaths by poverty status: The effects of  
499 social distancing. *J Econ Behav Organ* **2021**; 182:311-30.
- 500 11. Chang S, Pierson E, Koh PW, et al. Mobility network models of COVID-19 explain inequities and  
501 inform reopening. *Nature* **2021**; 589:82-7.
- 502 12. Selden TM, Berdahl TA. Risk of Severe COVID-19 Among Workers and Their Household Members.  
503 *JAMA Internal Medicine* **2021**; 181:120-2.
- 504 13. Roberts JD, Dickinson KL, Koebele E, et al. Clinicians, cooks, and cashiers: Examining health equity  
505 and the COVID-19 risks to essential workers. *Toxicology and Industrial Health* **2020**; 36:689-702.
- 506 14. Kissler SM, Kishore N, Prabhu M, et al. Reductions in commuting mobility correlate with geographic  
507 differences in SARS-CoV-2 prevalence in New York City. *Nature Communications* **2020**; 11:4674.
- 508 15. Kishore N, Kahn R, Martinez PP, De Salazar PM, Mahmud AS, Buckee CO. Lockdown related travel  
509 behavior undermines the containment of SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv **2020**:2020.10.22.20217752.
- 510 16. COVID-19 Vaccination Equity. Accessed July 29 2021.
- 511 17. M Reitsma SA, J Goldhaber-Fiebert , N Joseph , J Kates, L Levitt , A Rouw,, Salomon J. Disparities  
512 in Reaching COVID-19 Vaccination Benchmarks: Projected Vaccination Rates by Race/Ethnicity as of  
513 July 4: Kaiser Family Foundaation, **2021**.
- 514 18. Disparities in COVID-19 Vaccination Rates across Racial and Ethnic Minority Groups in the United  
515 States. Washington, D.C.: U.s. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant  
516 Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Office of Science and Data Policy, **2021**.
- 517 19. Siegler AJ, Sullivan PS, Sanchez T, et al. Protocol for a national probability survey using home  
518 specimen collection methods to assess prevalence and incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection and antibody  
519 response. *Ann Epidemiol* **2020**; 49:50-60.
- 520 20. Lamba K, Bradley H, Shioda K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Cumulative Incidence and Period  
521 Seroprevalence: Results From a Statewide Population-Based Serosurvey in California. *Open Forum*  
522 *Infect Dis*. Vol. 8, **2021**:ofab379.
- 523 21. Sullivan PS, Siegler AJ, Shioda K, et al. SARS-CoV-2 cumulative incidence, United States, August-  
524 December 2020. *Clin Infect Dis* **2021**.
- 525 22. Lavange LM, Kalsbeek WD, Sorlie PD, et al. Sample design and cohort selection in the Hispanic  
526 Community Health Study/Study of Latinos. *Ann Epidemiol* **2010**; 20:642-9.

- 527 23. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of  
528 Infectious Diseases. *PLOS Medicine* **2008**; 5:e74.
- 529 24. Gimma A, Munday JD, Wong KL, et al. CoMix: Changes in social contacts as measured by the  
530 contact survey during the COVID-19 pandemic in England between March 2020 and March 2021.  
531 medRxiv **2021**:2021.05.28.21257973.
- 532 25. Industry and Occupation Code Lists and Crosswalks. Available at:  
533 <https://www.census.gov/topics/employment/industry-occupation/guidance/code-lists.html>. 2021.
- 534 26. Sullivan PS, Sailey C, Guest JL, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and Antibodies in Diverse  
535 Samples: Protocol to Validate the Sufficiency of Provider-Observed, Home-Collected Blood, Saliva, and  
536 Oropharyngeal Samples. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* **2020**; 6:e19054.
- 537 27. Guest JL, Sullivan PS, Valentine-Graves M, et al. Suitability and Sufficiency of Telehealth Clinician-  
538 Observed, Participant-Collected Samples for SARS-CoV-2 Testing: The iCollect Cohort Pilot Study.  
539 *JMIR public health and surveillance* **2020**; 6:e19731-e.
- 540 28. Andridge RR, Little RJA. A Review of Hot Deck Imputation for Survey Non-response. *Int Stat Rev*  
541 **2010**; 78:40-64.
- 542 29. Prem K, Cook AR, Jit M. Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact surveys  
543 and demographic data. *PLOS Computational Biology* **2017**; 13:e1005697.
- 544 30. Feehan DM, Cobb C. Using an Online Sample to Estimate the Size of an Offline Population.  
545 *Demography* **2019**; 56:2377-92.
- 546 31. J Raifman KN, D Jones, J Bor, S Lipson, J Jay, M Cole, N Krawczyk, E Benfer, P Chan, S Galea  
547 COVID-19 US State Policy Database. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and  
548 Social Research.
- 549 32. Coroiu A, Moran C, Campbell T, Geller AC. Barriers and facilitators of adherence to social distancing  
550 recommendations during COVID-19 among a large international sample of adults. *PLOS ONE* **2020**;  
551 15:e0239795.
- 552 33. Ingram M, Zahabian A, Hur C. Prediction of COVID-19 Social Distancing Adherence (SoDA) on the  
553 United States county-level. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* **2021**; 8:87.
- 554 34. HJ Hutchins BW, R Leeb, JY Ko, E Odom, J Willey, A Friedman, R Bitsko. COVID-19 Mitigation  
555 Behaviors by Age Group — United States, April–June 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Vol. 69.  
556 Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, **2020**:1584-90.
- 557 35. Edwards CH, Tomba GS, de Blasio BF. Influenza in workplaces: transmission, workers' adherence to  
558 sick leave advice and European sick leave recommendations. *European Journal of Public Health* **2016**;  
559 26:478-85.
- 560 36. Lan F-Y, Wei C-F, Hsu Y-T, Christiani DC, Kales SN. Work-related COVID-19 transmission in six  
561 Asian countries/areas: A follow-up study. *PLOS ONE* **2020**; 15:e0233588.
- 562 37. Murti M, Achonu C, Smith BT, et al. COVID-19 Workplace Outbreaks by Industry Sector and Their  
563 Associated Household Transmission, Ontario, Canada, January to June, 2020. *Journal of Occupational  
564 and Environmental Medicine* **2021**; 63:574-80.
- 565 38. MA Waltenburg TV, CE Rose, et al. Update: COVID-19 Among Workers in Meat and Poultry  
566 Processing Facilities — United States, April–May 2020. In: *Prevention CfDCA*, ed. *MMWR Morb Mortal  
567 Wkly Rep*. Vol. 69. Atlanta, GA, **2020**:887-92.
- 568 39. Contreras Z, Ngo V, Pulido M, et al. Industry Sectors Highly Affected by Worksite Outbreaks of  
569 Coronavirus Disease, Los Angeles County, California, USA, March 19-September 30, 2020. *Emerg  
570 Infect Dis* **2021**; 27:1769-75.
- 571 40. Saloner B, Parish K, Ward JA, DiLaura G, Dolovich S. COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in Federal and  
572 State Prisons. *JAMA* **2020**; 324:602-3.
- 573 41. Ahmad K, Erqou S, Shah N, et al. Association of poor housing conditions with COVID-19 incidence  
574 and mortality across US counties. *PLOS ONE* **2020**; 15:e0241327.
- 575 42. Emeruwa UN, Ona S, Shaman JL, et al. Associations Between Built Environment, Neighborhood  
576 Socioeconomic Status, and SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Pregnant Women in New York City. *JAMA*  
577 **2020**; 324:390-2.

578 43. Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the transmission dynamics of  
579 SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science* **2020**; 368:860-8.  
580 44. Baker RE, Park SW, Yang W, Vecchi GA, Metcalf CJE, Grenfell BT. The impact of COVID-19  
581 nonpharmaceutical interventions on the future dynamics of endemic infections. *Proceedings of the*  
582 *National Academy of Sciences* **2020**; 117:30547-53.  
583 45. Buckee C, Noor A, Sattenspiel L. Thinking clearly about social aspects of infectious disease  
584 transmission. *Nature* **2021**; 595:205-13.  
585 46. Ma KC, Menkir TF, Kissler S, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Modeling the impact of racial and ethnic  
586 disparities on COVID-19 epidemic dynamics. *eLife* **2021**; 10:e66601.  
587 47. Krieger N, Testa C, Hanage WP, Chen JT. US racial and ethnic data for COVID-19 cases: still  
588 missing in action. *The Lancet* **2020**; 396:e81.  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606

Table 1. Mean, median, and quantiles of reported contacts per day by contact location, type, demographic group, and serostatus for a probability sample of 3,112 households representing the population aged  $\geq 18$  years, United States, 2020-2021

Characteristic	Baseline			Follow-up			Sample		Weighted Sample		Statistical tests**	
	Mean contacts	Median contacts	(25th, 75th, 90th percentiles)	Mean contacts	Median contacts	(25th, 75th, 90th percentiles)	N	% (column)	N	% (column)	T-test p-value***	K-S test p-value***
Overall	13.9	4.0	2.0, 10.0, 27.0	14.5	5.0	2.0, 11.0, 26.0	3112	100	252117112	100	0.552	0.180
Nature of contact												
Physical	5.9	4.0	1.0, 4.0, 10.0	7.8	2.0	0.0, 5.0, 10.0	-	-	-	-	0.322	0.654
Non-physical	10.2	2.0	0.0, 5.0, 16.0	9.6	2.0	0.0, 6.0, 15.0	-	-	-	-	0.722	0.685
Contact Location												
Home	2.7	1.0	0.0, 3.0, 5.0	3.7	2.0	1.0, 3.0, 5.0	-	-	-	-	0.410	0.596
Work	10.4	0.0	0.0, 1.0, 16.0	9.4	0.0	0.0, 2.0, 15.0	-	-	-	-	0.568	0.993
School	0.2	0.0	0.0, 0.0, 0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0, 0.0, 0.0	-	-	-	-	0.243	1.000
Other	2.7	0.0	0.0, 2.0, 6.0	3.8	0.0	0.0, 2.8, 7.0	-	-	-	-	0.674	1.000
Age category												
18 - 24	20.9	5.0	3, 20, 60	17.7	7.0	3, 16, 62	169	5.4	24823133	9.8	0.461	0.768
25 - 34	16	6.0	3, 13, 35	23.3	7.0	3, 14, 40	448	14.4	42037821	16.7	0.030	1.000
35 - 44	18.3	5.0	3, 13, 35	14.5	6.0	3, 14, 23	503	16.2	43010914	17.1	0.097	1.000
45 - 54	17.7	5.0	2, 11, 32	16.8	5.0	2, 12, 29	509	16.4	41649386	16.5	0.796	1.000
55 - 64	10.7	3.0	1, 7, 26	12.7	4.0	1, 10, 20	649	20.9	44192201	17.5	0.283	0.999
65+	5.5	2.0	1, 5, 10	6.0	2.0	1, 6, 12	834	26.8	56403657	22.4	0.592	1.000
Sex												
Female	12.5	4.0	2, 9, 26	11.3	5.0	2, 10, 20	1907	61.3	115127131	45.7	0.158	0.576
	15	4.0	2, 10, 32	17.2	5.0	2, 12, 32	1205	38.7	136989980	54.3	0.251	1.000

Race/Ethnicity													
Hispanic	11.8	4.0	2, 12, 34	14.8	6.0	2, 13, 31	388	12.5	41498755	16.5	0.242	0.931	
Non-Hispanic White	14.3	4.0	2, 9, 26	14.0	5.0	2, 11, 23	2118	68.1	161730015	64.1	0.796	1.000	
Non-Hispanic Black	16.1	3.0	1, 10, 40	15.5	3.0	1, 9, 42	409	13.1	26371146	10.5	0.846	1.000	
Non-Hispanic Asian	6.8	3.0	2, 7, 19	11.3	5.0	2, 9, 26	145	4.7	16297586	6.5	0.019	0.626	
Non-Hispanic Other	25.5	6.0	1, 13, 40	28.2	6.0	2, 21, 208	52	1.7	6219608	2.5	0.838	0.999	
Income													
\$0 to \$9,999	9.9	4.0	2, 6, 23	14.1	5.0	1, 10, 54	156	5.0	9175348	3.6	0.235	0.624	
\$10,000 to \$24,999	28.9	4.0	1, 9, 71	19.2	4.0	1, 10, 31	282	9.1	21014175	8.3	0.102	1.000	
\$25,000 to \$49,999	16.7	4.0	1, 12, 39	24.5	5.0	2, 14, 43	594	19.1	42517322	16.9	0.020	0.998	
\$50,000 to \$74,999	9.8	4.0	2, 9, 21	12.1	5.0	2, 11, 20	540	17.4	40975725	16.3	0.214	1.000	
\$75,000 to \$99,999	14	4.0	2, 10, 35	12.9	4.0	2, 9, 24	454	14.6	34753959	13.8	0.614	1.000	
\$100,000 to \$149,999	12.9	4.0	2, 10, 32	9.2	4.0	2, 9, 17	534	17.2	44554817	17.7	0.009	1.000	
\$150,000 to \$199,999	12.2	4.0	2, 9, 26	11.8	4.0	2, 11, 30	246	7.9	25854439	10.3	0.871	1.000	
\$200,000 or higher	9.5	4.0	2, 9, 22	12.4	6.0	2, 12, 22	306	9.8	33271326	13.2	0.150	0.943	
Occupation*													
Utilities	1.3	0.0	0, 0, 4	10.1	0.0	0, 0, 75	16	0.5	1624138	0.6	0.205	1.000	
Construction	8.5	5.0	0, 16, 26	5.9	3.0	1, 10, 15	50	1.6	7468477	3.0	0.166	0.905	
Manufacturing	4.4	2.0	0, 8, 15	12.3	0.0	0, 6, 30	50	1.6	8095010	3.2	0.085	0.982	
Transportation and Warehousing	92	12.0	0, 65, 171	72.1	4.0	0, 30, 142	84	2.7	12398395	4.9	0.638	0.690	
Information Finance and Insurance	24.3	6.0	0, 26, 85	3.2	0.0	0, 4, 10	57	1.8	4028061	1.6	0.000	0.446	
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	0.8	0.0	0, 0, 2	0.8	0.0	0, 0, 4	55	1.8	4702720	1.9	0.926	1.000	
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	1.7	0.0	0, 0, 10	2.2	0.0	0, 0, 6	105	3.4	9429022	3.7	0.520	1.000	
	1.5	0.0	0, 3, 8	1.9	0.0	0, 5, 6	29	0.9	2407083	1.0	0.635	1.000	
	1.5	0.0	0, 0, 5	2.1	0.0	0, 0, 6	254	8.2	17627427	7.0	0.327	1.000	

Management of Companies and Enterprises	4	0.0	0, 0, 26	8.0	0.0	0, 0, 30	29	0.9	2279303	0.9	0.672	1.000
Administrative Services	4	0.0	0, 3, 15	2.1	0.0	0, 2, 7	25	0.8	1804659	0.7	0.380	1.000
Educational Services	8.5	0.0	0, 10, 20	12.2	0.0	0, 11, 30	227	7.3	11316238	4.5	0.160	1.000
Health Care and Social Assistance	16.4	2.0	0, 17, 46	10.0	2.0	0, 12, 29	313	10.1	24401663	9.7	0.003	1.000
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	4.7	0.0	0, 0, 10	3.6	0.0	0, 0, 5	50	1.6	3116292	1.2	0.717	1.000
Accommodation and Food Services	29.3	0.0	0, 10, 49	18.1	6.0	0, 26, 90	55	1.8	7428078	2.9	0.943	1.000
Other Services (except Public Administration)	10.4	0.0	0, 5, 10	4.2	0.0	0, 6, 13	75	2.4	6013537	2.4	0.292	1.000
Public Administration	3.7	0.0	0, 7, 12	2.3	0.0	0, 2, 9	37	1.2	2938101	1.2	0.326	1.000
Other	12.7	0.0	0, 3, 10	14.9	0.0	0, 5, 17	250	8.0	19646552	7.8	0.731	1.000
Household size												
1	6.8	2.0	0, 5, 12	8.7	2.0	0, 8, 19	850	27.3	40909934	16.2	0.104	0.956
2	11.5	3.0	1, 8, 23	12.0	3.0	1, 8, 21	1228	39.5	104424631	41.4	0.722	1.000
3	14.9	5.0	2, 12, 32	14.4	7.0	3, 14, 28	448	14.4	42787020	17.0	0.817	0.958
4	20.3	6.0	3, 14, 42	18.2	7.0	3, 14, 28	383	12.3	39212704	15.6	0.466	0.999
5+	23.6	7.0	4, 21, 40	28.7	7.0	3, 14, 39	203	6.5	24782822	9.8	0.464	1.000
Serostatus at baseline (August-December 2020)												
Positive	16.6	6.0	3, 36, 44	-	-	-	138	0.0	12316038	4.9	-	-
Negative	13.3	4.0	2, 9, 26	-	-	-	2974	1.0	239801073	95.1	-	-
Serostatus at follow-up (March-April 2021)												
Positive	-	-	-	19.6	8.0	3, 14, 31	350	0.1	31360651	12.4	-	-
Negative	-	-	-	13.7	4.0	2, 10, 25	2762	0.9	220756460	87.6	-	-

\* work, not total, contacts

\*\*Statistical tests performed on

weighted data

\*\*\*The t-test is sensitive to differences in means of the distributions; the K-S test is sensitive to shape of the distribution.

N, total participants. Weighted N: sum of the weights of participants. K-S: Kolmogorov-Smirnov.

