

## 1 Title

2 Changing social contact patterns among US workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: April 2020  
3 to December 2021.

## 4 Authors

5 Moses C. Kiti PhD<sup>1\*†</sup>, Obianuju G. Aguolu PhD<sup>2,3†</sup>, Alana Zelaya MPH<sup>1</sup>, Holin Y. Chen MPH<sup>1</sup>,  
6 Noureen Ahmed<sup>2</sup>, Jonathan Battross MPH<sup>1</sup>, Carol Y. Liu MSc<sup>1</sup>, Kristin N. Nelson PhD<sup>1</sup>, Samuel  
7 M. Jenness PhD<sup>1</sup>, Alessia Melegaro PhD<sup>4</sup>, Faruque Ahmed PhD<sup>5</sup>, Fauzia Malik PhD<sup>2</sup>, Saad B.  
8 Omer PhD<sup>2,3‡</sup>, Ben A. Lopman PhD<sup>1‡</sup>

9  
10  
11 † These first authors contributed equally to this article.

12 ‡ These authors were co-principal investigators.

## 13 Affiliations

14  
15 <sup>1</sup> Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Georgia, USA

16 <sup>2</sup> Yale Institute for Global Health, Yale University, Connecticut, USA

17 <sup>3</sup> Yale School of Medicine, Yale University, Connecticut, USA

18 <sup>4</sup> DONDENA Centre for Research in Social Dynamics and Public Policy, Bocconi University,  
19 Italy

20 <sup>5</sup> Division of Global Migration and Quarantine, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,  
21 Atlanta, Georgia

## 22 Corresponding author

23 Moses C. Kiti PhD

24 Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Georgia, USA

25 Email: [mkiti@emory.edu](mailto:mkiti@emory.edu)

## 26 Abstract

27  
28 Non-pharmaceutical interventions minimize social contacts, hence the spread of SARS-CoV-2.  
29 We quantified two-day contact patterns among USA employees from 2020–2021 during the  
30 COVID-19 pandemic. Contacts were defined as face-to-face conversations, involving physical  
31 touch or proximity to another individual and were collected using electronic diaries. Mean  
32 (standard deviation) contacts reported by 1,456 participants were 2.5 (2.5), 8.2 (7.1), 9.2 (7.1) and  
33 10.1 (9.5) across round 1 (April–June 2020), 2 (November 2020–January 2021), 3 (June–August  
34 2021), and 4 (November–December 2021), respectively. Between round 1 and 2, we report a 3-  
35 fold increase in the mean number of contacts reported per participant with no major increases  
36 from round 2–4. We modeled SARS-CoV-2 transmission at home, work, and community. The  
37 model revealed reduced relative transmission in all settings in round 1. Subsequently,  
38 transmission increased at home and in the community but remained very low in work settings.  
39 Contact data are important to parameterize models of infection transmission and control.

## 40 Teaser

41 Changes in social contact patterns shape disease dynamics at workplaces in the USA.

## 42 Introduction

43 Over the last two years, estimation of empirical social contact patterns has been reinvigorated  
44 following the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome-corona virus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), the  
45 virus that causes coronavirus disease-19 (COVID-19). Social contact pattern data are critical to  
46 understand spread of respiratory pathogens such as SARS-COV-2 and assess the effectiveness of  
47 control efforts. Contact studies mainly use self-reported data via contact surveys to quantify  
48  
49  
50

51 “who-contacts-whom”, with typical stratifications by age, setting, and other disease-related  
52 attributes (1, 2). These patterns vary at multiple geographic scales primarily due to population  
53 structure, culture, and socio-economic activities (3, 4). Epidemiologically, workers represent an  
54 important population due to potential exposure to respiratory pathogens such as flu and SARS-  
55 CoV-2 at work (5), increased risk of severe infection with age (6), and the potential to transmit  
56 infections to household members during lockdowns (7, 8). Mathematical models have been  
57 widely used to simulate the transmission of SARS-COV-2 and examine the impact of different  
58 patterns of social contacts on control (9). However, patterns and rates of contacts at workplaces  
59 are poorly understood in the US (10).

60  
61 Population-based contact studies conducted during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic  
62 reported significant reductions in contact rates compared to periods before March 2020 (11). In  
63 the Spring and Summer of 2020, contact rates in North America, Western Europe and Asia  
64 dropped to 2–5 contacts per person from 7 to 26 contacts reported during pre-pandemic periods.  
65 In March 2020, local, state, and federal authorities in the US recommended non-pharmaceutical  
66 interventions (NPIs), including stay-at-home orders and closures of schools and nonessential  
67 workplaces, to decrease contact rates aiming to reduce transmission of SARS-COV-2 (12).  
68 Between April and December 2020, telework accounted for an estimated 50% of paid work hours  
69 (13), and more than 98% (n=304) of respondents in a survey targeting 3 companies reported ever  
70 working from home during the period April through June (2). Non-Hispanic Blacks, those aged  
71 <45 years, and males, reported higher contact rates and longer duration interactions with other  
72 household members compared to other groups [9]. When lockdowns were relaxed in Fall 2020  
73 and Spring 2021, workplace contacts in retail, hospitality and transportation sectors reported a  
74 rebound in the number of contacts (14), as demonstrated by the drop in the Stringency Index (15)  
75 (range 0 to 100 depending on how stringent the physical distancing containment measures were).  
76 However, the mechanisms and impact of physical distancing interventions on SARS-CoV-2  
77 transmission across time remains poorly understood.

78  
79 Starting in April 2020, we conducted a cross-sectional study to collect data on social contact  
80 patterns among employees in 3 companies in Atlanta, Georgia, USA (2). In subsequent rounds,  
81 these companies plus 2 others provided data at three additional timepoints up to December 2021.  
82 In this report, we describe the changing contact patterns among employees during the ongoing  
83 COVID-19 pandemic in the US.

## 84 85 **Results**

### 86 87 *Description of study participants*

88 Across four rounds of data collection, 1,456 respondents reported a total of 12,198 contacts.  
89 Participation increased modestly from R1 (N=304) to R4 (N=433) with no major fluctuations  
90 observed in the proportions across rounds by age, sex, race, and ethnicity. However, only 16  
91 individuals participated in all four rounds. In total, about one third of participants (n = 442) were  
92 aged 20–29 years and 5% (n = 80) were 60 years and older. Among all participants, 64% (n =  
93 933) were female. The majority (n = 1,293; 89%) of participants had a bachelor’s degree or  
94 higher. The family structure varied from living alone (n = 222; 15%), in a nuclear family (n =  
95 919; 63%), 9% in extended families, with roommates (10%) and the rest in other arrangements.  
96 Close to two-thirds of the participants were white (n = 909; 62%) and 7% (n = 95) of Hispanic  
97 ethnicity. At the time of the study for each round, >95% of all participants reported ever working  
98 from home. In R4, 14% (60/433) of individuals reported ever having COVID-19 confirmed by a  
99 test. Out of all participants in R4, 97% (n=420) reported having received any COVID-19 vaccine.  
00 A summary of the participants’ characteristics is provided in Table 1.

01

02 *Contact patterns*

03 Across all rounds, the least contacts were reported at the workplace (1,647, 14%), while a third of  
04 the contacts were reported at home (4515, 37%) and about half in the community (6036, 49%)  
05 (see SI.3). The median (IQR) number of contacts over both days reported in R1, R2, R3 and R4  
06 was 2 (1–4), 7 (4–10), 7 (4–12) and 8 (4–13), respectively (Table 2). The median number of  
07 contacts in R2 was 3.5 times higher than R1 and this was sustained to R4. Corresponding mean  
08 (standard deviation) values over both days for each round are 2.5 (2.5), 8.2 (7.1), 9.2 (7.1) and  
09 10.1 (9.5), respectively. The increase was consistent across age, sex, and education level.  
10 Between R1 and R4, however, we observed a 6–fold and 2.5–fold increase in median number of  
11 workplace and community contacts, respectively, whereas no change was reported at the  
12 household. We also present a summary of median contacts by setting in SI.4.

13


14  
15  
16  
17

**Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study participants.** This shows the number of participants across 4 rounds of data collection in five US companies, April 2020 – December 2021. NH refers to non-Hispanic ethnicity.

	<b>Total (N (%))</b> <b>N = 1,456</b>	<b>Round 1</b> <b>N = 304</b>	<b>Round 2</b> <b>N = 343</b>	<b>Round 3</b> <b>N = 376</b>	<b>Round 4</b> <b>N = 433</b>
<b>Sex</b>					
Female	933 (64)	184 (61)	227 (66)	248 (66)	274 (63)
Male	518 (36)	116 (38)	115 (34)	128 (34)	159 (37)
Not reported	5 (0)	4 (1)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
<b>Age (years)</b>					
20–29	442 (30)	90 (30)	87 (25)	120 (32)	145 (33)
30–39	413 (28)	76 (25)	109 (32)	104 (28)	124 (29)
40–49	320 (22)	60 (20)	86 (25)	80 (21)	94 (22)
50–59	201 (14)	49 (16)	39 (11)	56 (15)	57 (13)
60+	80 (5)	29 (10)	22 (6)	16 (4)	13 (3)
<b>Education</b>					
Lower than Bachelors	162 (11)	17 (6)	35 (10)	51 (14)	59 (14)
Bachelors or higher	1,293 (89)	286 (94)	308 (90)	325 (86)	374 (86)
<b>Family structure</b>					
Live alone	222 (15)	44 (14)	43 (13)	60 (16)	75 (17)
Nuclear	919 (63)	173 (57)	241 (70)	236 (63)	269 (62)
Extended	138 (9)	26 (9)	27 (8)	40 (11)	45 (10)
With roommates	146 (10)	39 (13)	28 (8)	37 (10)	42 (10)
Other	31 (2)	22 (7)	4 (1)	3 (1)	2 (0)
<b>Race/ Ethnicity</b>					
Hispanic	95 (7)	14 (5)	20 (6)	24 (6)	37 (9)
Asian, NH	281 (20)	48 (16)	37 (11)	75 (20)	121 (28)
Black, NH	133 (9)	25 (8)	30 (9)	35 (9)	43 (10)
White, NH	847 (59)	169 (56)	240 (70)	226 (60)	212 (55)
Mixed, NH	71 (5)	46 (15)	12 (4)	13 (3)	0 (0)
Other, NH	29 (2)	2 (1)	4 (1)	3 (1)	20 (5)
<b>Working from home</b>					
	1396 (96)	288 (95)	329 (96)	368 (98)	411 (95)

18  
19  
20  
21  
22

A 9-fold increase in median number of contacts was also noted in individuals who lived alone, from a median of 1 (IQR 0–3) to 9 (4–14) in R1 to R4, respectively, as shown in Table 2.



23  
24  
25  
26

**Figure 1. Median (IQR) contacts over two days by various participant attributes in five US companies, April 2020 – December 2021.** Panels (A), (B), (C) and (D) show the distribution of reported contact by age group, sex, education level and race for R1–R4.


27 **Table 2. Distribution of contacts.** This shows the median and interquartile range (IQR) of contacts  
 28 reported by participants across four rounds of data collection in five US companies, April 2020 –  
 29 December 2021. NH refers to non-Hispanic ethnicity.

Variable	Total* (N (%))	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4
Overall	12,198	2 (1–4)	7 (4–10)	7 (4–12)	8 (4–13)
<b>Sex</b>					
Female	7,755 (64)	2 (1–4)	6 (4–10)	7 (4–12)	8 (4–13)
Male	4,423 (36)	3 (1–4)	7 (4–10)	7 (4–13)	7 (4–13)
Not reported	20 (0)	1 (0–1)	8 (8–8)	NA	NA
<b>Age Group</b>					
20–29	3,481 (29)	2 (1–3)	6 (3–9)	8 (4–12)	7 (3–12)
30–39	3,198 (26)	2 (1–4)	6 (4–9)	6 (4–10)	7 (4–12)
40–49	3,001 (25)	3 (2–5)	9 (5–12)	9 (4–14)	9 (4–14)
50–59	1,875 (15)	2 (1–4)	6 (4–9)	10 (5–14)	7 (4–15)
60+	643 (5)	2 (1–4)	8 (4–12)	7 (4–10)	10 (6–16)
<b>Family structure</b>					
Live alone	1,597 (14)	1 (0–3)	6 (3–9)	6 (3–10)	9 (4–14)
Nuclear	7,865 (63)	2 (1–4)	7 (4–11)	7 (4–12)	7 (4–13)
Extended	1,263 (11)	3 (2–5)	8 (6–9)	10 (6–13)	8 (4–12)
With roommates	1,259 (11)	3 (1–4)	6 (4–9)	9 (5–14)	6 (3–13)
Other	214 (2)	2 (1–4)	10 (4–19)	5 (3–9)	7 (6–8)
<b>Setting of contact</b>					
Community	6,036 (50)	2 (1–4)	4 (2–7)	5 (2–9)	5 (2–9)
Home	4,515 (37)	3 (2–6)	4 (2–6)	3 (2–5)	3 (2–5)
Work	1,647 (13)	1 (1–10)	6 (3–9)	4 (2–8)	6 (4–10)
<b>Race/ Hispanic</b>					
Hispanic	898 (7)	3 (1–4)	6 (4–11)	7 (5–11)	10 (6–19)
Asian, NH	2,400 (20)	2 (1–3)	8 (3–9)	7 (3–11)	7 (3–13)
Black, NH	1,187 (9)	2 (1–4)	7 (5–10)	8 (5–11)	6 (3–12)
White, NH	7,024 (60)	3 (1–4)	7 (4–10)	8 (4–13)	7 (4–12)
Mixed, NH	440 (5)	2 (1–4)	4 (3–9)	6 (3–10)	0
Other, NH	249 (4)	3 (1–4)	4 (3–5)	5 (3–9)	8 (5–13)

30 \* Each stratification refers to the number of contacts reported by the participant per strata. The values in the table  
 31 refer to the two study days combined.  
 32

33 *Contact matrices across rounds*

34 Figure 2 shows changing age-specific contact patterns across the four rounds on a graduated scale  
 35 in employees of five US companies.




36  
37 **Figure 2. Contact matrices showing the mean number of contacts over two days for each round in**  
38 **employees of five US companies.** Panel (A) shows contacts in R1 (Apr–Jun 2020), (B) shows R2 (Nov  
39 2020–Jan 2021), (C) shows R3 (Jun–Aug 2021), and (D) shows R4 (Nov–Dec 2021). The gray column on  
40 ages 0–19 years indicates no contacts reported since all participants are employees aged >20 years. The  
41 gray bar between age 60+ and 0–19 years in panel C indicates that no contacts were reported.

42 Across all rounds, we observe two key characteristics. The first is the presence of the prominent  
43 diagonal (assortative contacts), signifying a higher number of contacts between people of the  
44 same age. The number of assortative contacts increased subtly through the rounds. The second  
45 observation is the presence of interactions between 30–39 and 40–59-year-olds with children and  
46 young adults aged 0–19 years old. These contacts remain relatively stable across rounds. Lastly,  
47 in later rounds, we observed more contacts off the diagonal, indicating that contacts become less  
48 assortative as individuals started interacting more across different ages.

#### 50 *Difference of contact patterns between rounds*

51 In Figure 3, we show the net difference in the age specific average number of contacts occurring  
52 only at the workplace between consecutive rounds (panel A–C) and the first and last rounds (R1–  
53 R4, panel D). The highest net positive change was observed in ages 30–39 years and the least to  
54 no change was observed in the oldest group (60+ years). An increase in the average number of

55 contacts was observed from rounds 1–2 and 2–3, while some ages (20–29 and 40+ years) showed  
56 net decreases.  
57




58  
59 **Figure 3. Matrices of difference in contacts between rounds in employees of five US companies.** The  
60 panels show differences between R1–R2 (A), R2–R3 (B), R3–R4 (C), and R1–R4 (D), respectively.

61 *Contact patterns by setting*

62 We also assess the mixing patterns by age in Figure 4 separately for work (panel A–D), home  
63 (E–H) and community (I–L) across the four rounds. We observed differences in the number and  
64 structure of contacts across settings and rounds. Work contacts increase marginally across rounds  
65 and occur across all age groups. Home contacts displayed distinct assortative mixing patterns that  
66 increased marginally in R2 compared to R1 and do not change thereafter. We also observed the  
67 presence of intergenerational contacts between parents (30–59 years) and children (0–19 years).  
68 Community contacts displayed the highest net increase from R1–R4 with both assortative  
69 contacts and contacts between people of different ages. At home and in the community, contacts  
70 were generally high among young adults aged 20–29 years.




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



**Figure 4.** Matrices of evolution of contacts occurring exclusively at work, home, and community across rounds in employees of five US companies. The top panel shows contacts at work, middle panel shows contacts at home, and bottom panel contacts in the community across study rounds.

#### *Impact of changing contacts on SARS-CoV-2 transmission potential*

We estimate the impact of changing social contact on SARS-CoV-2 transmission. In round 1, reductions in contact relative to pre-pandemic periods suppressed the relative transmissibility to substantially below 1 at work and in the community but had a smaller effect at home. Increases in age-specific contacts between rounds 1 and 4 led to an increase in the relative transmissibility with varying effects across settings (Figure 5). We estimated relative transmission to increase more at community settings such as stores, parks, and gyms than at work settings across study rounds. For all rounds, we observed that the relative transmissibility at work remained below 1. On the other hand, relative transmissibility in community settings rose after round 1 but stayed similar between rounds 2 through 4 and remained below one.



86  
87 Figure 5. Changes in transmissibility due to changes in age-specific contact patterns alone in  
88 employees of five US companies. The relative transmissibility is inferred by comparing rounds 1–  
89 4 of age-specific contact patterns to projected baseline age-specific matrices for the US (16). On  
90 the x-axis, 1.0 denotes no change in relative transmissibility, values <1.0 denote reduced  
91 transmissibility and values >1.0 denote increased transmissibility. The y-axis denotes the  
92 probability density.

## 93 Discussion

94 This study quantified social contact patterns among workers in selected companies in the US at  
95 multiple timepoints during the COVID-19 pandemic period from April 2020 to December 2021.  
96 Participants in our study reported a large increase in the median number of contacts between April  
97 2020–June 2020 and November 2020–January 2021 across all age groups and in both workplace  
98 2020–June 2020 and November 2020–January 2021 across all age groups and in both workplace  
99 and community (non-household) settings. Contacts remained high after January 2021. We  
00 leveraged these data to estimate the impact of changing social contact patterns on SARS-CoV-2  
01 transmission. In our model, we observed reduced transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 compared to  
02 transmission that would have occurred in the absence of physical distancing policies. The extent  
03 of reduction differed by setting of contact (home, school, or community). Our new findings  
04 suggest that workers reported substantial increases in the rates of contact during the study period  
05 which were an independent driver of SARS-CoV-2 transmission.

06  
07 Overall, contacts were very low between April–June 2020 (median = 2) coinciding with the  
08 stringent containment measures at that time. Employees from all companies we surveyed were  
09 working from home and interactions were largely limited to family members or roommates.  
10 Contacts peaked in round 2 of data collection from November 2020 to January 2021 (median 8)  
11 with the highest percentage increase noted at work. However, the reported average number of  
12 contacts remained lower than that compared to pre-pandemic periods captured by the European  
13 POLYMOD study with mean contacts ranging between 8 (Germany) to 20 (Italy) (3). Similarly,  
14 by Spring 2021, multiple studies in the US (17, 18) reported high number of contacts reported at  
15 work. Community contacts also increased and became more heterogeneous across time as  
16 workers interacted with a wider pool of individuals. However, despite the relaxation of physical

17 distancing policies, the average number of contacts reported per person did not rise above pre-  
18 pandemic levels.

19  
20 We observed reduced transmission potential in the workplace when more stringent containment  
21 measures were in place (April–June 2020) compared to later periods with rollback (round 2–4,  
22 from November 2020). Our model suggests increased transmissibility in the home (transmission  
23 rate above 1 relative to pre-pandemic periods) and marginally in the community (remaining less  
24 than 1) after restrictions were rolled back. Transmissibility at work increased marginally despite  
25 significant increases in the number of contacts at work. Increased mobility outside the home and  
26 corresponding increases in heterogeneous number of contacts at work compared to earlier  
27 pandemic periods have also been observed due to easing of restrictions (17, 19). Despite bans on  
28 gathering in US states including Georgia, we expected that contacts would have been higher than  
29 reported in this study after November 2020 due to increased mobility and home visits, potentially  
30 resulting in the infection surges observed after the 2020 Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday  
31 periods (20). Our results, highlighting low contact numbers during early phase of the pandemic,  
32 are consistent with previous studies in the US (17, 21), UK (19) and China (22). Studies that  
33 collect data on changing contact patterns over time and in various settings remains important at  
34 this stage in the pandemic. With the persistence of individuals hesitant to get vaccinated (23) and  
35 the emergence of more transmissible variants (24), and limited understanding of the extent of  
36 SARS-CoV-2 immunity (25), there remains the need to use empirical social contact data and  
37 mathematical models to better inform workplace infection prevention policies such as frequency  
38 of testing, work-from-home, and mandated adequate protection for those who cannot telework.  
39 This research has some limitations. First, this was an opt-in survey administered online to  
40 employees of five companies, thus subject to selection bias. This was different from some other  
41 surveys that have used existing population panels (18) or conducted random sampling of the  
42 population (17, 19). We were unable to get the exact number of individuals and demographic  
43 composition to whom the survey links was sent so we could not compare the demographic  
44 composition of our respondents to the company workforce. Our respondents were highly  
45 educated, majority White individuals working in private companies. Thus, we cannot claim  
46 representativeness of the study sample to the US workforce. However, some of the findings have  
47 been shown in other studies, which suggest that the current sample does not appear to differ in a  
48 meaningful way from a general sample of people in the USA. To encourage higher survey uptake,  
49 we offered a \$40.00 gift card upon completion of each survey and held meetings with employees  
50 to inform them of study progress and explain the importance of our studies. Lastly, we assumed  
51 that the change in transmissibility was due to changes in contact patterns only despite the  
52 implementation of other public health interventions including mask wearing and availability of  
53 vaccines from round 2 (Nov–Dec 2020). In our estimates for relative transmissibility, we assume  
54 a fully susceptible population and that transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 is invariable by age.  
55 Moreover, as no empirical data from the US were available prior to the pandemic, we used  
56 published estimates inferred from European contact structure (16) which may be less reflective  
57 of pre-pandemic contacts in the US. Despite these limitations, our findings on reduced  
58 transmission were similar to previous modeling studies.

59  
60 In conclusion, we present a unique study that observed changing contact patterns among members  
61 of a specific sector of the U.S. workforce during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. We found  
62 that the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 was dependent on setting-specific contact patterns. While  
63 the social contact patterns were used to understand changes in human behavior during the SARS-  
64 CoV-2 outbreak and its impact on SARS-CoV-2 transmission, these data are also relevant for  
65 other endemic pathogens such as influenza that are transmitted through close contacts.  
66

## 67 **Materials and Methods**

### 68 *Experimental design*

69 The objective of this study was to characterize the patterns of social contact and mixing in non-  
70 healthcare workplace settings in select large companies in the United States using standardized  
71 social contact diaries. This was an online cross-sectional study recruiting participants from five  
72 private companies based in Georgia, US. These companies include workers falling under the  
73 “educational services”, “management occupations”, “business and financial operations  
74 occupations”, “computer and mathematical occupations” and “life physical and social science  
75 occupations” sectors as defined by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (26). Between April 2020  
76 and December 2021, we conducted four rounds of data collection: April–June 2020 (Round 1,  
77 abbreviated as R1), November 2020–January 2021 (R2), June–August 2021 (R3), and  
78 November–December 2021 (R4). Individuals could participate in multiple rounds. R1 represents a  
79 transition period of non-pharmaceutical interventions leading to the Stringency Index dropping  
80 from highs of 70 in April to <60 in June (15). On 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020, mandatory stay-at-home orders  
81 were lifted for persons at low risk of infection in the state of Georgia (27) where most of our  
82 participants resided and 98% had reported working from home (2). R2 occurred during the large  
83 SARS-COV-2 winter wave in 2020 when schools were closed, and masking was mandatory in  
84 selected spaces (15). R3 and R4 occurred when most of the containment measures had been rolled  
85 back, and the latter round occurred during the Omicron surge in the winter of 2021 (24). During  
86 R3 and R4, vaccinations were widely available in the US (28).

87

### 88 *Data collection*

89 Recruitment procedures were as described previously for R1 (2). Individuals voluntarily opted  
90 into the study. On enrolment, we collected data on participant demographics (age, sex, education,  
91 race, job role, family size and composition, current residence, and work setting) and company  
92 details (name, office size, teleworking schedule).

93 One day following enrollment, each participant received a weblink to complete a survey to report  
94 the number of individuals with whom they had a contact with over two continuous workdays  
95 (Monday to Friday). All contacts irrespective of setting were reported. We defined a contact as  
96 either proximate (no conversation and no physical contact but within 6 feet of another person for  
97 more than 20 seconds, e.g., sitting next to someone in public transport or standing in line),  
98 conversational (a two-way conversation with three or more words exchanged in the physical  
99 presence of another person), or physical (directly touching someone (skin-to-skin contact) or the  
00 clothes they are wearing, intentionally or unintentionally, including a handshake, fist bump,  
01 elbow bump, foot bump, hug, and kiss). The 20-second duration was selected to capture the  
02 fastest social interactions between individuals in a social setting (29). For each contact,  
03 participants recorded their age in years (0–9, 10–19, 20–29, 30–39, 40–59, 60+), sex (male,  
04 female), relationship to participant, setting of contact, and participation in perceived higher-risk  
05 activities such as attending school, work, indoor/ outdoor gatherings, gym, going to restaurants,  
06 living in a nursing home, or air travel. Setting of contact was categorized as home, work, and  
07 community, whereby community represented all other areas apart from home and work. All other  
08 definitions remain the same as reported in R1 (2). The full questionnaire is available in  
09 Supplementary Information 1 (SI.1).

10

### 11 *Statistical analyses*

12 All analyses were performed with R v4.1.2. All code and data are available on SOCRATES (30),  
13 an online platform for sharing social contact data.

### 14 **Descriptive statistics**

15 We described characteristics of participants by age (20–29, 30–39, 40–49, 50–59 and 60+ years  
16 old), sex (male, female), race (Asian, Black, White, Mixed or Other), ethnicity (Hispanic or not),

17 and family structure. Family structure was categorized as living alone, nuclear family  
18 (combination of respondent, spouse, and children), extended family (nuclear family plus  
19 relatives), or living with unrelated roommates. All companies circulated the survey link to their  
20 employees living and working in the USA.

### 21 **Average contacts**

22 We calculated the median number of contacts per person and their associated interquartile ranges  
23 (IQR). We report contacts by age groups, sex, race, ethnicity, family structure and setting of  
24 contact. Unless otherwise stated, all analyses in the main text include contact made cumulatively  
25 over both survey days; single day contacts are reported in SI.2.

### 26 **Contact matrices by age**

27 We divided the age group-specific number of contacts by the number of participants in that age  
28 group. Contact matrices were stratified by round and setting of contact. We used four age groups  
29 for the participants (20–29, 30–39, 40–59, 60+ years) consistent with R1 data and six age groups  
30 for the contacts (0–9, 10–19, 20–29, 30–39, 40–59, 60+ years) (2).

### 31 **Impact of social contacts on SARS-COV-2 transmission**

32 We estimated the impact of changing social contact patterns on SARS-CoV-2 transmission by  
33 comparing age-specific contact patterns for each round to synthetic pre-pandemic contact rates  
34 (henceforth called “baseline”) for the US as derived from the POLYMOD study (3, 16). We used  
35 a published method (31) to derive the relative changes in transmission due to changes in social  
36 contacts from the ratio of dominant eigenvalues of the age-specific contact matrix. This approach  
37 assumed that infectiousness and susceptibility did not vary by age group. We also assumed that  
38 schools remained closed during our study data collection periods and thus did not account for  
39 contacts that may have occurred at school.

40 Since children <18 years of age did not participate in our study, we generated square matrices by  
41 imputing child-child and child-adult contacts. Imputation was done by using the ratio between the  
42 dominant eigenvalues of matrices from each study round to the baseline matrix. Bootstrapping  
43 was done using the socialmixr R package (32).

### 45 *Ethics statement*

46 Ethical approval was given by Yale University (IRB# 2000026906). All participants signed an  
47 electronic informed consent form. Participants received a \$40 gift card upon completion and  
48 submission of the questionnaire. All data were de-identified before analysis.

## 51 **References**

- 52 1. J. Mossong, N. Hens, M. Jit, P. Beutels, K. Auranen, R. Mikolajczyk, M. Massari, S. Salmaso,  
53 G. S. Tomba, J. Wallinga, J. Heijne, M. Sadkowska-Todys, M. Rosinska, W. J. Edmunds,  
54 Social Contacts and Mixing Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLoS*  
55 *Med.* **5**, e74 (2008).
- 56 2. M. C. Kiti, O. G. Aguolu, C. Y. Liu, A. R. Mesa, R. Regina, M. Woody, K. Willebrand, C.  
57 Couzens, T. Bartelsmeyer, K. N. Nelson, S. Jenness, S. Riley, A. Melegaro, F. Ahmed, F.  
58 Malik, B. A. Lopman, S. B. Omer, Social contact patterns among employees in 3 U.S.  
59 companies during early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic, April to June 2020. *Epidemics.*  
60 **36**, 100481 (2021).
- 61 3. J. Mossong, N. Hens, M. Jit, P. Beutels, K. Auranen, R. Mikolajczyk, M. Massari, S. Salmaso,  
62 G. S. Tomba, J. Wallinga, J. Heijne, M. Sadkowska-Todys, M. Rosinska, W. J. Edmunds,

- 63 Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS*  
64 *Medicine*. **5**, 0381–0391 (2008).
- 65 4. F. Verelst, L. Hermans, S. Vercruyse, A. Gimma, P. Coletti, J. A. Backer, K. L. M. Wong, J.  
66 Wambua, K. van Zandvoort, L. Willem, L. Bogaardt, C. Faes, C. I. Jarvis, J. Wallinga, W. J.  
67 Edmunds, P. Beutels, N. Hens, SOCRATES-CoMix: a platform for timely and open-source  
68 contact mixing data during and in between COVID-19 surges and interventions in over 20  
69 European countries. *BMC Medicine*. **19**, 1–7 (2021).
- 70 5. Z. Contreras, V. Ngo, M. Pulido, F. Washburn, G. Meschyan, F. Gluck, K. Kuguru, R.  
71 Reporter, C. Curley, R. Civen, D. Terashita, S. Balter, U.-A. Halai, Industry Sectors Highly  
72 Affected by Worksite Outbreaks of Coronavirus Disease, Los Angeles County, California,  
73 USA, March 19–September 30, 2020. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **27**, 1769–1775 (2021).
- 74 6. G. M. Massetti, B. R. Jackson, J. T. Brooks, C. G. Perrine, E. Reott, A. J. Hall, D. Lubar, I. T.  
75 Williams, M. D. Ritchey, P. Patel, L. C. Liburd, B. E. Mahon, Summary of Guidance for  
76 Minimizing the Impact of COVID-19 on Individual Persons, Communities, and Health Care  
77 Systems — United States, August 2022. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **71**, 1057–1064  
78 (2022).
- 79 7. Z. J. Madewell, Y. Yang, I. M. Longini, M. E. Halloran, N. E. Dean, Household Transmission  
80 of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. **3**, e2031756  
81 (2020).
- 82 8. K. Sun, W. Wang, L. Gao, Y. Wang, K. Luo, L. Ren, Z. Zhan, X. Chen, S. Zhao, Y. Huang, Q.  
83 Sun, Z. Liu, M. Litvinova, A. Vespignani, M. Ajelli, C. Viboud, H. Yu, Transmission  
84 heterogeneities, kinetics, and controllability of SARS-CoV-2. *Science*. **371**, eabe2424  
85 (2021).
- 86 9. T. Chin, D. M. Feehan, C. O. Buckee, A. S. Mahmud, *medRxiv*, in press (available at  
87 <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/09/27/2021.09.25.21264082.abstract>).
- 88 10. S. Beale, S. Hoskins, T. Byrne, W. L. E. Fong, E. Fragaszy, C. Geismar, J. Kovar, A. M. D.  
89 Navaratnam, V. Nguyen, P. Patel, A. Yavlinsky, A. M. Johnson, M. Van Tongeren, R. W.  
90 Aldridge, A. Hayward, Workplace contact patterns in England during the COVID-19  
91 pandemic: Analysis of the Virus Watch prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Regional*  
92 *Health - Europe*. **16**, 100352 (2022).
- 93 11. C. Y. Liu, J. Berlin, M. C. Kiti, E. Del Fava, A. Grow, E. Zagheni, A. Melegaro, S. M.  
94 Jenness, S. B. Omer, B. Lopman, K. Nelson, Rapid Review of Social Contact Patterns  
95 During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Epidemiology*. **32**, 781–791 (2021).
- 96 12. A. Schuchat, C. Covid, Public Health Response to the Initiation and Spread of Pandemic  
97 COVID-19 in the United States, February 24–April 21, 2020. **69**, 6 (2020).
- 98 13. Barrero, Jose Maria, Bloom, Nicholas, Davis, Stephen J., Why Working from Home Will  
99 Stick (2021), doi:10.3386/w28731.
- 00 14. K. Nelson, A. J. Siegler, P. S. Sullivan, H. Bradley, E. Hall, N. Luisi, P. Hipp-Ramsey, T.  
01 Sanchez, K. Shioda, B. Lopman, *medRxiv*, in press (available at  
02 <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/09/23/2021.09.22.21263904.abstract>).

- 03 15. Hale, Thomas, Atab, Tilve, Hallas, Laura, Kira, Beatriz, Phillips, Toby, Petherick, Anna,  
04 Annalena, Pott, “Variation in US states’ responses to COVID-19” (3.0, University of  
05 Oxford), (available at [www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/covidtracker](http://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/covidtracker)).
- 06 16. K. Prem, A. R. Cook, M. Jit, Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using contact  
07 surveys and demographic data. *PLoS Computational Biology*. **13**, 1–21 (2017).
- 08 17. K. N. Nelson, A. J. Siegler, P. S. Sullivan, H. Bradley, E. Hall, N. Luisi, P. Hipp-Ramsey, T.  
09 Sanchez, K. Shioda, B. A. Lopman, Nationally representative social contact patterns among  
10 U.S. adults, August 2020–April 2021. *Epidemics*. **40**, 100605 (2022).
- 11 18. D. M. Feehan, A. S. Mahmud, Quantifying population contact patterns in the United States  
12 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Communications*. **12** (2021), doi:10.1038/s41467-  
13 021-20990-2.
- 14 19. A. Gimma, J. D. Munday, K. L. M. Wong, P. Coletti, K. van Zandvoort, K. Prem, CMMID  
15 COVID-19 working group, P. Klepac, G. J. Rubin, S. Funk, W. J. Edmunds, C. I. Jarvis,  
16 Changes in social contacts in England during the COVID-19 pandemic between March 2020  
17 and March 2021 as measured by the CoMix survey: A repeated cross-sectional study. *PLoS*  
18 *Med*. **19**, e1003907 (2022).
- 19 20. S. H. Mehta, S. J. Clipman, A. Wesolowski, S. S. Solomon, Holiday gatherings, mobility and  
20 SARS-CoV-2 transmission: results from 10 US states following Thanksgiving. *Sci Rep*. **11**,  
21 17328 (2021).
- 22 21. D. M. Feehan, A. Mahmud, Quantifying interpersonal contact in the United States during the  
23 spread of COVID-19: first results from the Berkeley Interpersonal Contact Study. *Nature*  
24 *Communications*. **12**, 8 (2021).
- 25 22. J. Zhang, M. Litvinova, Y. Liang, Y. Wang, W. Wang, S. Zhao, Q. Wu, S. Merler, C. Viboud,  
26 A. Vespignani, M. Ajelli, H. Yu, Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the  
27 COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science*. **368**, 1481–1486 (2020).
- 28 23. F. Yasmin, H. Najeeb, A. Moeed, U. Naeem, M. S. Asghar, N. U. Chughtai, Z. Yousaf, B. T.  
29 Seboka, I. Ullah, C.-Y. Lin, A. H. Pakpour, COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in the United  
30 States: A Systematic Review. *Front. Public Health*. **9**, 770985 (2021).
- 31 24. A. D. Iuliano, J. M. Brunkard, T. K. Boehmer, E. Peterson, S. Adjei, A. M. Binder, S. Cobb,  
32 P. Graff, P. Hidalgo, M. J. Panaggio, J. J. Rainey, P. Rao, K. Soetebier, S. Wacaster, C. Ai,  
33 V. Gupta, N.-A. M. Molinari, M. D. Ritchey, Trends in Disease Severity and Health Care  
34 Utilization During the Early Omicron Variant Period Compared with Previous SARS-CoV-2  
35 High Transmission Periods — United States, December 2020–January 2022. *MMWR Morb.*  
36 *Mortal. Wkly. Rep*. **71**, 146–152 (2022).
- 37 25. J. Fergie, A. Srivastava, Immunity to SARS-CoV-2: Lessons Learned. *Front. Immunol.* **12**,  
38 654165 (2021).
- 39 26. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2021), (available at <https://www.bls.gov>).
- 40 27. A. Moreland, C. Herlihy, M. A. Tynan, G. Sunshine, R. F. McCord, C. Hilton, J. Poovey, A.  
41 K. Werner, C. D. Jones, E. B. Fulmer, A. V. Gundlapalli, H. Strosnider, A. Potvien, M. C.  
42 García, S. Honeycutt, G. Baldwin, CDC Public Health Law Program, CDC COVID-19

- 43 Response Team, Mitigation Policy Analysis Unit, CDC Public Health Law Program, C.  
44 Clodfelter, M. Howard-Williams, G. Jeong, L. Landsman, J. Shelburne, CDC COVID-19  
45 Response Team, Mitigation Policy Analysis Unit, A. Brown, R. Cramer, S. Gilchrist, R.  
46 Hulkower, A. Limeres, A. Popoola, Timing of State and Territorial COVID-19 Stay-at-  
47 Home Orders and Changes in Population Movement — United States, March 1–May 31,  
48 2020. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **69**, 1198–1203 (2020).
- 49 28. C. Pingali, M. Meghani, H. Razzaghi, M. J. Lamias, E. Weintraub, T. A. Kenigsberg, N. P.  
50 Klein, N. Lewis, B. Fireman, O. Zerbo, J. Bartlett, K. Goddard, J. Donahue, K. Hanson, A.  
51 Naleway, E. O. Kharbanda, W. K. Yih, J. C. Nelson, B. J. Lewin, J. T. B. Williams, J. M.  
52 Glanz, J. A. Singleton, S. A. Patel, COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage Among Insured  
53 Persons Aged  $\geq 16$  Years, by Race/Ethnicity and Other Selected Characteristics — Eight  
54 Integrated Health Care Organizations, United States, December 14, 2020–May 15, 2021. **70**,  
55 6 (2021).
- 56 29. C. Cattuto, W. van den Broeck, A. Barrat, V. Colizza, J. F. Pinton, A. Vespignani, Dynamics  
57 of person-to-person interactions from distributed RFID sensor networks. *PLoS ONE.* **5**, 1–9  
58 (2010).
- 59 30. L. Willem, T. V. Hoang, S. Funk, P. Coletti, P. Beutels, N. Hens, SOCRATES: An online tool  
60 leveraging a social contact data sharing initiative to assess mitigation strategies for COVID-  
61 19, 11.
- 62 31. C. I. Jarvis, K. van Zandvoort, A. Gimma, K. Prem, P. Klepac, R. G. James, J. W. Edmonds,  
63 Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in  
64 the UK. *BMC Medicine.* **18**, 21 (2020).
- 65 32. S. Funk, L. Willem, socialmixr: Social Mixing Matrices for Infectious Disease Modelling.  
66 (2022), (available at <https://github.com/epiforecasts/socialmixr>).

67

## 68 **Acknowledgments**

69 We thank the employees of the five companies that participated in this study.

70

## 71 **Funding**

72 CDC/NCEZID grant 5U01CK00057 (MCK, OGA, AZ, NA, HC, JB, CYL, KNN, SJ, AM, FA,  
73 FM, BL, SBO)

74

75 NIH/NICHD grant 5R01HD097175 (MCK, OGA, AZ, NA, HC, JB, CYL, KNN, SJ, AM, FA,  
76 FM, BL, SBO)

77

78 European Research Council Consolidator Grant IMMUNE Project grant 101003183 (AM)

79

## 80 **Author contributions:**

81 Funding acquisition: SBO, BL, FA

82 Conceptualization: SBO, BL

83 Validation: MCK, AZ, FM

84 Methodology: MCK, OGA, AZ, NA, CYL, KNN, SJ, AM, FA, FM, BL, SBO

85 Investigation: MCK, OGA

86 Formal analysis: MCK, JB, HC, CYL

87 Visualization: MCK, JB, HC, CYL



88 Supervision: MCK, OGA, AZ, NA, HC  
89 Writing—original draft: MCK, OGA  
90 Writing—review & editing: MCK, OGA, AZ, NA, KNN, SJ, AM, FA, FM, BL, SBO  
91 Data curation: MCK, HC, JB  
92 Project administration: OGA, AZ, NA, FA

93

94 **Competing interests:**

95 None

96

97 **Disclaimer:**

98 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily  
99 represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

00

01 **Data and materials availability:**

02 All data and code are available via our GitHub repository.

03

04 **Figures and Tables:**

05

06 **Figure 6. Median (IQR) contacts over two days by various participant attributes in five US**  
07 **companies, April 2020 – December 2021.** Panels A, B, C and D show the distribution of  
08 reported contact by age group, sex, education level and race for R1–R4.

09

10 **Figure 7. Contact matrices showing the mean number of contacts over two days for each**  
11 **round in employees of five US companies.** Panel A shows contacts in R1 (Apr–Jun 2020), B  
12 shows R2 (Nov 2020–Jan 2021), C shows R3 (Jun–Aug 2021), and D shows R4 (Nov–Dec 2021).  
13 The gray column on ages 0–19 years indicates no contacts reported since all participants are  
14 employees aged >20 years. The gray bar between age 60+ and 0–19 years in panel C indicates  
15 that no contacts were reported.

16

17 **Figure 8. Matrices of difference in contacts between rounds in employees of five US**  
18 **companies.** The panels show differences between R1–R2 (A), R2–R3 (B), R3–R4 (C), and R1–  
19 R4 (D), respectively.

20

21 **Figure 9. Matrices of evolution of contacts occurring exclusively at work, home, and**  
22 **community across rounds in employees of five US companies.** The top panel shows contacts at  
23 work, middle panel shows contacts at home, and bottom panel contacts in the community across  
24 study rounds.

25

26 **Figure 10. Changes in transmissibility due to changes in age-specific contact patterns alone**  
27 **in employees of five US companies.** The relative transmissibility is inferred by comparing  
28 rounds 1–4 of age-specific contact patterns to projected baseline age-specific matrices for the US  
29 (16). On the x-axis, 1.0 denotes no change in relative transmissibility, values <1.0 denote reduced  
30 transmissibility and values >1.0 denote increased transmissibility. The y-axis denotes the  
31 probability density.

32

33 **Table 3. Baseline characteristics of study participants.** This shows the number of participants  
34 across 4 rounds of data collection in five US companies, April 2020 – December 2021.

35

36 **Table 4. Distribution of contacts.** This shows the median and interquartile range (IQR) of  
37 contacts reported by participants across four rounds of data collection in five US companies, April  
38 2020 – December 2021.

39  
40 **Supplementary Materials**