Estimating social contact rates for the COVID-19 pandemic using Google mobility and pre-pandemic contact surveys

Authors: Em Prestige[1], Pietro Coletti[2], Jantien Backer[3], Nicholas G. Davies[1], W. John Edmunds[1], Christopher I. Jarvis[1]*

1. *Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom*
2. *Data Science Institute, I-BioStat, Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium*
3. *National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, The Netherlands*

**Corresponding author*

E-mail: em.prestige@lshtm.ac.uk

Short title: Using Google mobility to estimate social contact rates for the COVID-19 pandemic

Keywords: social mobility data; social contact rates; COVID-19 pandemic; prediction methods

Abstract

During the COVID-19 pandemic, aggregated mobility data was frequently used to estimate changing social contact rates. By taking contact matrices estimated pre-pandemic, and transforming these using pandemic-era mobility data, epidemiologists attempted to predict the number of contacts individuals were expected to have during large-scale restrictions. This study explores the most effective method for this transformation, comparing it to the accuracy of pandemic-era contact surveys. We compared four methods for scaling synthetic contact matrices: two using fitted regression models and two using "naïve" mobility or mobility squared models. The regression models were fitted using CoMix contact survey and Google mobility data from the UK over March 2020 – March 2021. The four models were then used to scale synthetic contact matrices—a representation of pre-pandemic behaviour—using mobility data from the UK, Belgium and the Netherlands to predict the number of contacts expected in "work" and "other" settings for a given mobility level. We then compared partial reproduction numbers estimated from the four models with those calculated directly from CoMix contact matrices across the three countries. The accuracy of each model was assessed using root mean squared error. The fitted regression models had substantially more accurate predictions than the naïve models, even when the regression models were applied to Belgium and the Netherlands. Across all countries investigated, the naïve model using mobility alone was the least accurate, followed by the naïve model using mobility squared. When attempting to estimate social contact rates during a pandemic without the resources available to conduct contact surveys, using a model fitted to data from another pandemic context is likely to be an improvement over using a "naïve" model based on raw mobility data. If a naïve model is to be used, mobility squared may be a better predictor of contact rates than mobility per se.

Author Summary

Amidst the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, our research delves into the use of aggregated mobility data to understand shifting social contact rates. We focused on predicting changes to contacts during large-scale restrictions by transforming pre-pandemic contact matrices with pandemic-era mobility data. To ascertain the most effective transformation method, we compared four approaches: two utilising regression models and two employing "naïve" mobility or mobility squared models. Our regression models, developed with CoMix contact survey and Google mobility data from the UK, proved notably more accurate in predicting contacts than the naïve models. Notably, even when applied to Belgium and the Netherlands, our regression models outperformed the naïve models. The study underscores the importance of employing publicly-available data from pandemic contexts when estimating social contact rates without the resources for contact surveys. Importantly, our findings suggest that, if a simplified model is necessary, mobility squared may offer a more reliable prediction of contact rates compared to raw mobility data. This work contributes valuable insights for both scientists and non-scientists, emphasising the nuanced considerations in understanding and predicting changes to social behaviour during a pandemic.

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic led to millions of deaths worldwide (1) and motivated the implementation of a huge number of non-pharmaceutical interventions in order to control viral transmission, alongside the deployment of large-scale contact surveys and measurement of mobility data across the world. Both contact surveys and mobility data can give us insights into changes in interpersonal contact, which drives transmission. Contact rates are a way of measuring transmission potential and contact surveys can be used to ascertain these rates. Contact surveys are conducted to measure who people come into physical or conversational contact with over a period of time, typically a 24-hour period. One such survey was the CoMix survey (2) which began in the UK (3), Belgium (4) and the Netherlands (5) in 2020 and was subsequently rolled out to other countries in Europe (6). The CoMix survey aimed to monitor behavioural changes during the unfolding of the pandemic, with a particular attention at estimating the impact of large scale mitigation strategies, such as lockdowns.

Contact surveys provide measures of contact rates, which are used as a proxy of epidemiological risk behaviour, and are often designed so that the results can be directly used to parameterise infectious disease models which take social contact rates as an input (7,8). Studies such as CoMix undertook repeated social contact surveys during the pandemic, aiming at population representativity. However, these surveys are expensive and difficult to undertake, so data was collected only in a limited number of countries. In early 2020, several companies started to release aggregated "mobility" data with the stated aim of helping public health professionals to understand behavioural change in response to the pandemic, as mobility is considered a valid proxy of risk behaviour (9). In the most common instances, this mobility data quantified the time spent in different locations by mobile phone users, was made freely available, and covered participants in nearly all countries. These advantages led to the heavy use of mobility data during the pandemic to assess the impact of social distancing measures and to parameterise mathematical models, with Google's "Community Mobility Reports" (10) being particularly widely used (11–14). However, as the use of mobility data as a proxy for social contact rates has not been formally assessed, it remains unclear how precisely to transform relative changes in mobility in different locations into changes in contact rates, and how well such transformations predict measured contact rates.

2. Materials and Methods

In this study, we compare trends in mean contacts recorded in the CoMix social contact survey with Google mobility data and assess the performance of different methods used to relate mobility to social contacts. Specifically, we investigated the relationship between specific Google mobility indicators and corresponding contact types from the CoMix dataset for the UK, and developed a series of statistical and mechanistic models to relate the data to one another. We then used these models to estimate contact rates from mobility data for the UK, Belgium, and the Netherlands, in order to estimate the predictive accuracy of each model. Our

results serve as a tool for epidemiologists and infectious disease modellers to understand better how mobility data might relate to contact rates in a population.

2.1 Study Design

The study design and method of informed consent for the CoMix study were approved by the Ethics Committee of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (reference number 21795) in the UK, the Ethics Committee of Antwerp University Hospital (reference 3236 - BUN B3002020000054) in Belgium and need for approval was waived by the Medical Research Ethics Committee NedMec (research protocol number 22/917) in the Netherlands. All analyses were carried out on anonymised participant data. Additionally, Google mobility data was obtained from publicly available sources (10).

2.1.1 Mobility data

Google's Community Mobility Reports data uses the median value from a 5-week baseline period of 02/01/2020 to 06/02/2020 to compare changes in the number of visits to specific services/areas. The raw data is expressed as a percentage change relative to the baseline, e.g. -50% for half as many daily visits as during the baseline period and +100% for twice as many daily visits as during the baseline period. We transformed this to a scale which expresses the change from baseline as a multiple, e.g. 0.5 for half as many visits as compared to baseline and 2 for twice as many visits as compared to baseline. We included the following mobility indicators in analyses that measure the number of visits:

- Retail and recreation
- Grocery and pharmacy
- Public transit
- Workplaces

Data is available between 23/03/2020 to 13/10/2022. We were unable to find clear information in regard to how Google classified visits into the above categories (15).

2.1.2 Survey data

The CoMix survey collected information on contacts weekly in the UK from 23/03/2020 to 01/03/2022 (2). The present study includes weekly survey results for the entire study period and subsequent statistical analyses were limited to between 23/03/2020 to 31/03/2021 as correlations between mean contact numbers and mobility became weaker in the second year (see supplementary Table S5.1). Adult panels at first contained 1500 participants, and increased to include 2500 participants from August 2020. Participants from each panel were surveyed once every 2 weeks, with panels alternating so that each week was covered. Ipsos MORI used quota sampling, for age, gender, and region, to recruit a representative sample of the UK (16). The survey followed the design of the 2005/2006 POLYMOD survey (17) with some additional

questions. More details on the CoMix survey can be found in Gimma et al. and Jarvis et al. (3,16). Survey participants were asked to report the number of people they met on the day prior to the survey in various settings. Participants had the option of recording any of their contacts in one of two ways: either individually (i.e. reporting details about contact made with one individual), or as mass contacts (i.e. reporting a summary of contact made with a group of several people). We processed these two contact types differently, as detailed below.

Traditionally, social contact surveys report aggregated contact data as contacts having occurred at "home", "work", "school" or "other" settings; the CoMix data was also processed to reflect this usual categorisation. We chose to focus on "work" and "other" contacts, as Google mobility does not capture changes in school contacts and residential mobility is measured in such a way that does not allow for comparison to home contacts - by measuring time spent in the home, as opposed to number of visits to the home. We excluded children's contacts as they were reported by their parents. We did not assess home contacts as that is more plausibly related to household size as opposed to number of visits.

2.2 Data Preparation

We included participants aged 18 and over, but did not restrict contact ages. As per previous CoMix analyses (16), we excluded survey rounds six and seven because of data collection issues due to an ad-hoc change to the questionnaire resulting in fewer contacts reported for those weeks. To average out differences in behaviour between panels, we averaged daily "work" and "other" contacts over a two-week moving window to smooth out panel effects. We reweighted the sample based on age and social class (see supplementary material for visualisations of how survey participants' characteristics changed over time, Figures S1-S3). This was to ensure that changes in the recruitment process over the course of the survey did not influence the investigation, and to improve the generalizability of the study. We also reweighted the sample so that contacts made on weekends comprised 2/7ths of the total sampling weight. This was done as slightly fewer than 2/7ths (25%) of observations were on a Saturday or Sunday and the number of contacts on these days was generally lower.

Occasionally, some participants reported mass contacts in extremely high numbers, such as 3000 and higher. These occasional large mass-contact events introduced substantial noise into our estimates of the mean contact rate over time. To stabilise these estimates, mass contacts were capped at 50 contacts per participant, per date, for each contact type, resulting in the reduction of 6% in the total number of "work" contacts and of 7% in the total number of "other" contacts. We capped contacts by randomly sampling 50 contacts in each contact type for each participant for each date, when the contacts were listed as 'mass'. Less than 1% of participants had their "work" contacts capped and less than 0.5% of participants had their "other" contacts capped. Other analyses performed on this data implemented a similar approach and hence for consistency it was applied to this investigation (16).

2.3 Statistical Analysis

R version 4.2.1 was used for all analyses (18), code and data are available through Github and Zenodo (see Data Availability Statement). We conducted two broad analyses: comparing Google mobility to contact rates, and investigating ways to use Google mobility data to scale pre-pandemic contact rates. Through the second analysis we used four methods to scale contacts, comparing methods using Google mobility alone (naïve models) and methods built using CoMix data and Google mobility data.

2.3.1 Comparing Mobility Indicators to Contacts

We first visually compared the mobility indicators to the relevant contacts (see section 3.2.1): "work" contacts were compared against the "workplaces" mobility indicator and "other" contacts against a composite "other" mobility indicator which we calculated as the mean of the "retail and recreation", "transit stations", and "grocery and pharmacy" mobility indicators. Here we looked at whether contact rates rose at similar time points as when mobility indicators increased. We also looked at whether restriction periods had similar impacts on both contact rates and Google mobility indicators.

2.3.2 Creating Relative Contact Rates

The aim of this investigation is to determine how to use Google mobility as a proxy for social contact rates during a pandemic, specifically by comparing four different models - two "naïve" models and two regression models (see section S.1 in supplementary material) - relating mobility to relative contact rates. The two naïve models are commonly encountered in the literature (12–14), while the regression approach is less commonly used (19) and the specific regression models we analyse are fitted in this paper.

The two "naïve" models are based on first principles, namely that contacts are either directly proportional to mobility ("mobility" model) or to mobility squared ("mobility squared" model). The "mobility" model assumes that given a visit is made to a particular type of venue, a person makes the same number of contacts. An example of this would be going on a date: the amount of social contact you might have during a date may not strongly depend upon how many other people are going on dates. The "mobility squared" model assumes that, given a visit is made to a particular type of venue, the number of contacts depends upon the number of other people making visits to the same type of venue. An example of this might be using public transport, where your risk might depend upon how many other people are using public transport. In other words, the "mobility" model assumes that contacts are made through coordinated activities, and the "mobility squared" model assumes that contacts are made at random with other people at the same venues. There are instances where both a linear (12) and a quadratic (13,14) relationship between contacts and mobility have been assumed. This does not assume a fully u-shaped relationship as we enforce the reality that a mobility of zero would

correspond with zero contacts. For each of the naïve models, a mobility value of 1 corresponds to a relative contact rate of 1, and the relative contact rate is then multiplied by the pre-pandemic contact rate estimated for a given setting to produce an estimate of the during-pandemic contact rate.

The two regression models were fitted to contact rates for the UK as measured by CoMix, with Google mobility as the independent variable. We contrasted two regression models, one with an intercept and linear term (the "linear model") and one with an intercept, a linear term, and a quadratic term (the "quadratic model"). Like the naïve models, the regression models produce an estimate of relative contact rates from an input of mobility, which are then scaled up by a pre-pandemic "baseline" contact rate, or used as a multiplicative factor on a pre-pandemic "baseline" contact matrix, to yield contact rates or a contact matrix. The pre-pandemic "baseline" was provided by estimates for the UK as measured by the 2006 POLYMOD survey (17) - see supplementary material for a more detailed description. The naïve models were each fitted separately to "work" contacts from CoMix, using Google mobility "workplace" visits as the predictor, and to "other" contacts from CoMix, using the composite Google mobility "other" visits measure as the predictor, for the UK.

The four models obtained above were used to predict relative contact rates from Google mobility data for the UK, Belgium, and the Netherlands. To assess the performance of the four models in the context of methods people may use during an emergency when there is no contact data available, we used synthetic contact matrices (20). We chose the synthetic matrices to increase generalisability as these matrices are available for 177 countries and therefore can be used in the majority of the countries of the world. These matrices were then scaled by the relative contact rates yielded by each model. We assumed that the estimated relative contact rate we have estimated for adults can be extended to children without adjustment. As this investigation focuses on "work" and "other" we assumed that transmission drivers would be similar for adults and children.

From the subsequent scaled matrices, we then calculated the dominant eigenvalues for each fortnight in the study period. In order to translate these results into something understandable, we transformed the dominant eigenvalues into "partial" reproduction numbers. This was done by comparing early (07/03/2020-13/03/2020) estimates of R_t (number of secondary infections generated by one infected person) from the EpiForecast work (21) and the dominant eigenvalue for the synthetic matrix for 'all' contacts for the UK (20). This gave us a multiplicative factor to use to transform the dominant eigenvalues we calculated, into partial reproduction numbers. This multiplicative factor was calculated as follows:

$$multiplicative\ factor\ = \frac{R_t\ average}{dominant\ eigenvalue}.$$

This transformation is done to put our results on a comprehensible scale, but note that in general it is not the case that partial reproduction numbers calculated in this fashion will sum to the overall reproduction number.

The "partial reproduction number" can be expressed through the following equation:

$$multiplicative\ factor\ \times\ dominant\ eigenvalue(contact\ scaling\ factor\ \times\ synthetic\ matrix)$$

We assess the accuracy of the four models in predicting partial reproduction numbers both visually (Figures 4-6) and quantitatively (Tables S6-S11), in the latter case using root mean squared error. As a 'true' value for the partial reproduction numbers we calculated the partial reproduction number for the CoMix contact matrices for the respective contact type and country.

2.3.3 Work Flow Diagram



Figure 1: work flow diagram describing process of comparing regression based and naïve models

3. Results

Here we present the results of the broad analyses, as well as the characteristics of the participants used in this investigation.

3.1 Participant Characteristics

For the UK there were 121,057 surveys completed in the study period, filled out by 17,497 participants. Characteristics of both the surveys completed and the individual participants are provided in Table 1. As participants were surveyed multiple times, we see that characteristic distributions are slightly different between participants and observations. Overall, characteristics were broadly representative of the British population. Males were slightly underrepresented in the survey. There was also a slightly larger proportion of middle class and lower middle class participants and a slightly smaller proportion of skilled working class and working class participants, when compared to the population distribution. Unemployed individuals appear overrepresented in the survey due to the inclusion of older participants who are likely retired. When restricted to participants under 65 (see supplementary material) the proportion of employed versus unemployed matches the population proportions (which is for those of employment age).

Characteristic	*Number of Participants (%)*	*Number of Observations (%)*	*Population Proportion %*
Gender			
Female	8,591 (49.1)	49,826 (50.8)	50.75
Male	7,832 (44.8)	45,367 (46.3)	48.75
Other	48 (0.3)	259 (0.3)	0.5
Missing	1,026 (5.9)	2,629 (2.7)	-
Age-group			
18-29	3,039 (17.4)	12,552 (12.8)	18.8
30-39	3,035 (17.3)	15,401 (15.7)	17.2
40-49	2,883 (16.5)	16,279 (16.6)	16
50-59	3,206 (18.3)	19,396 (19.8)	17.3
60-69	3,213 (18.4)	20,691 (21.1)	13.6

70+	2,121 (12.1)	13,762 (14.0)	17.2
Employment Status			
Employed	7,508 (42.9)	44,007 (44.9)	75
Unemployed	9,989 (57.1)	54,074 (55.1)	25
Social Class			
A - upper middle class	806 (4.6)	4,554 (4.6)	4
B - middle class	4,638 (26.5)	25,820 (26.3)	23
C1 - lower middle class	5,626 (32.2)	32,450 (33.1)	29
C2 - skilled working class	2,889 (16.5)	15,561 (15.9)	21
D - working class	2,479 (14.2)	14,100 (14.4)	15
E - lower level of subsistence	1,059 (6.1)	5,596 (5.7)	8
Area			
East Midlands	1,350 (7.7)	7,634 (7.8)	7
East of England	1,664 (9.5)	9,504 (9.7)	9
Greater London	2,248 (12.8)	12,889 (13.1)	13
North East	757 (4.3)	4,267 (4.4)	4
North West	1,205 (6.9)	6,571 (6.7)	11
Northern Ireland	473 (2.7)	2,410 (2.5)	3
Scotland	1,592 (9.1)	8,799 (9.0)	8
South East	2,510 (14.3)	13,875 (14.1)	14
South West	1,632 (9.3)	9,259 (9.4)	9
Wales	922 (5.3)	4,939 (5.0)	5
West Midlands	1,625 (9.3)	9,165 (9.3)	9
Yorkshire and The Humber	1,519 (8.7)	8,769 (8.9)	8
Household size group			

1	3,712 (21.2)	23,211 (23.7)	30
2	7,152 (40.9)	42,874 (43.7)	35
3-5	6,276 (35.9)	30,629 (31.2)	30
6+	357 (2)	1,367 (1.4)	5

Table 1: Participant characteristic summary; an observation is a complete survey response; percentages rounds to 1 decimal place so may not add to 100. Most population proportions were from the 2021 census (22) aside from social class which comes from a 2008 IPSOS social class report (23).

Table 1 illustrates why we reweighted samples based on participant age and social class, as these were the characteristics least representative of the British population. Household size was not adjusted for as the population reference proportions were estimated from census results which contained a lot of variation geographically, in addition, census household sizes were grouped differently (1, 2, 3, 4, 5+) to that in CoMix (1, 2, 3-5, 6+) (24). Therefore we were not concerned that the samples were under or over representing anyone.

3.2 Statistical Analysis

3.2.1 Comparing Mobility Indicators to Contacts



Figure 2: Contacts against mobility over time. Plot A shows mean "work" contacts (solid line) and "workplace" mobility (dashed line) and plot B shows mean "other" contacts (solid line) and "other" mobility (dashed line), over time respectively.

In Figure 2 we see similar trends over time between contact rates and mobility metrics when we compare the mean daily number of "work" contacts from CoMix to the number of visits to "workplaces" in Google Mobility, and compare the mean daily number of "other" contacts

from CoMix to the "other" visits in Google Mobility (see methods). For equivalent figures for Belgium and the Netherlands see supplementary Figures S4 and S5.

We can see visually in Figure 2 that the correlation between mobility and contacts changes over time, with a notable difference between "work" contacts and "workplace" mobility in the second year of data available.

3.2.2 Comparing Methods of Scaling Contacts

Here we compare four possible ways of estimating contact rates based on mobility data to determine the most appropriate method to use when contact data is not available.

3.2.2.1 Regression models

For both "work" and "other" contacts, the models which had the most evidence were the quadratic models as shown by the results of *t*-tests assessing evidence supporting the quadratic term in the model ("work": *t*-test p-value = 0.0009, "other": *t*-test p-value = 1.95e-7). When we compare AIC values, it is shown that both for "work" contacts (linear regression: -32.43, quadratic regression: -42.64) and "other" contacts (linear regression: -29.94, quadratic regression: -57.81) the quadratic regression model best fits the data when compared to the linear regression model. However, this was evidence of the best model for UK data, and hence it was important to compare both linear and quadratic relative contact rates for other countries.



Figure 3: Comparison of the four models to contact data from the UK. (A) "Work" contacts; (B) "other" contacts. Shaded areas show the confidence intervals for the regression model predictions and the black points show the raw data used in the regression models. The "naïve" curves are calculated by

multiplying the mobility for a specific date by the POLYMOD estimate for that contact type ("work" for "workplace" mobility and "other" for "other" mobility).

Figure 3 shows that when using the naïve models (mobility and mobility squared) the estimated number of mean contacts is larger than the number predicted by the regression models. We see that the mobility model predicts the highest numbers of contacts, and the mobility squared model appears to closely follow the regression models for "work" contacts but not for "other" contacts. Confidence intervals are calculated using the `confint` R command, which for `lm` models are computed directly from the t-values (25).

3.2.2.2 Creating the relative contact rate

The parameter estimates from the regression models described above were used with the corresponding mobility data ("workplace" indicator for the "work" models and "other" indicator for the "other" models) to predict a number of contacts for a given mobility. These were then scaled by the relevant POLYMOD number of contacts. For "work" contacts this was 1.95 contacts, and for "other" contacts this was 3.48 contacts. Parameter estimates are given in the supplementary material (Tables S1-S4).

3.2.2.3 Comparing the relative contact rates to Google mobility

After scaling the synthetic matrices (20), we calculated the dominant eigenvalues of these scaled matrices. We then transformed the dominant eigenvalues into partial reproduction numbers using a multiplicative factor of 0.158, calculated using the formula given in the methods section.

3.2.2.4 Reproduction numbers: UK



Figure 4A: Partial reproduction numbers over time for each estimate type, UK. The green line indicates the partial reproduction number calculated from the CoMix data; other coloured lines indicate partial reproduction numbers estimated from the four mobility models.

Figure 4A shows that the regression model estimates appear to more accurately approximate the estimates from the CoMix data. Comparing root MSE can determine the best model quantitatively. The model with the smallest root MSE was the quadratic regression model ("work": 0.0626, "other": 0.0264) and the model with the largest root MSE was the naïve mobility model ("work": 0.203, "other": 0.307). (See Tables S5 and S6 for the root MSEs for all models).

If we extend the prediction period to include the second year of data available with CoMix, we can determine out of sample prediction ability within the UK - as this data was not used within the regression models.



Figure 4B: Partial reproduction numbers over time for each estimate type, UK, for a longer time period. The green line indicates the partial reproduction number calculated from the CoMix data; other coloured lines indicate partial reproduction numbers estimated from the four mobility models.

Figure 4B shows how both the regression models and naïve models lose predictive power in the second year of data. The model with the smallest root MSE is now the linear model ("work": 0.290, "other": 0.051) and the model with the largest was the mobility model ("work": 2.237, "other": 5.367). (See Tables S5 and S6 for the root MSEs for all models). All root MSE values have increased and the quadratic model is no longer best.

3.2.2.5 Reproduction numbers: Belgium



Figure 5A: Partial reproduction numbers over time for each estimate type, Belgium. The green line indicates the reproduction number calculated from the CoMix data; other coloured lines indicate partial reproduction numbers estimated from the four mobility models. There is missing data between August 2020 and December 2020 during which time CoMix surveys were not conducted.

Figure 5A shows that where a comparison can be made, the regression model scaled estimates appear closer than the naïve model scaled estimates. When looking at the root MSE (see Tables S7 and S8) the best-performing model is the linear regression model ("work": 0.113, "other": 0.0962) and the worst is the naïve mobility model ("work": 0.283, "other": 0.552).

Again this can be extended to include the second year of data.



Figure 5B: Partial reproduction numbers over time for each estimate type, Belgium, for a longer time period. The green line indicates the reproduction number calculated from the CoMix data; other coloured lines indicate partial reproduction numbers estimated from the four mobility models. There is missing data between August 2020 and December 2020 during which time CoMix surveys were not conducted.

Figure 5B shows that the linear model consistently has better predictive power, even in the second year of data where there is more to compare to. Importantly, we can see that there appears to have been no "other" contacts recorded after March 2021. We were unable to ascertain a reason for why this was the case but this means no clear conclusions can be drawn from this part of the analysis. When looking at the root MSE for "work" contacts (see Table S8) we see that the best model remains the linear model (0.114) and the actual error has not changed much at all when we include the second year of data. The worst model is still the naïve model using only mobility (0.300).

3.2.2.6 Reproduction numbers: Netherlands



Figure 6A: partial reproduction numbers over time for each estimate type, Netherlands. The green line indicates the reproduction number calculated from the CoMix data; other coloured lines indicate partial reproduction numbers estimated from the four mobility models. There is missing data between August 2020 and December 2020 during which time CoMix surveys were not conducted.

Figure 6A shows that as with Belgium (Figure 5A), in the Netherlands where a comparison can be made the estimates using the regression models are closer to the estimates from the CoMix data. The model with the smallest root MSE was the linear regression model ("work": 0.270, "other": 0.121) and, as with the UK and Belgium, the model with the largest root MSE was the naïve mobility model ("work": 0.595, "other": 0.693).

As with the UK and Belgium, it is possible to extend this analysis for the Netherlands for the second year of data.



Figure 6B: partial reproduction numbers over time for each estimate type, Netherlands, for a longer time period. The green line indicates the reproduction number calculated from the CoMix data; other coloured lines indicate partial reproduction numbers estimated from the four mobility models. There is missing data between August 2020 and December 2020 during which time CoMix surveys were not conducted.

As with "work" contacts in Figure 6A, Figure 6B shows that the CoMix estimates are lower than the estimates produced by all four models. The best performing model remains the linear regression model ("work": 0.312, "other": 0.162) and the worst performing model remains the naïve mobility model ("work": 0.653, "other": 0.806). Including the second year of data does not increase these errors by much, further showing the out of sample predictive power of these models does not change in the second year (see supplementary Tables S10 and S11 for more).

4. Discussion

During the COVID-19 pandemic, mobility data has been widely used to get insights into the spread of SARS-CoV-2 (26). Two main approaches have been used: some studies have tried to establish a relation between mobility and transmission (27), while others have been trying to relate mobility to contact rates (28,29). While the former approach is suitable for identifying the mobility data that better provide insights into epidemic spread (e.g. mobile phone data), the latter approach has the advantage of an easier implementation within mathematical models of infectious diseases (30,31) and is the one we focus our attention on in this work.

When comparing mobility and contact rates, we see that there was an apparent association between both the respective contacts and mobility indicators (see Figure 2), although this was

stronger for the first year of data available. For both "work" and "other" contacts, the mean number of contacts is lower in the second year of the study relative to the corresponding mobility. This may indicate that there was a change in participant behaviour, a change in the relationship between mobility and contacts or a change in participant recruitment. This was the motivation for using the first year of data for this investigation. Indeed, the relationship between contacts and mobility is expected to be time-varying and although mobility has been found to be very predictive of social contacts during lockdown in China, this was not the case in the post-lockdown scenario (32). Also, several factors such as risk perception do affect both mobility and contacts to a different degree (33,34), therefore potentially affecting their mutual relationship.

We explored different regression models that could quantify the link between mobility and contacts using UK data. We then used the best-fit model to generate synthetic contact data from mobility alone and compared it with the results coming from collected contact data. We then extended this approach to the Netherlands and Belgium, to see how our regression model could be generalizable to other countries. While the quadratic models were best when assessing the model fit itself, there was no guarantee this would hold for out-of-sample predictive accuracy. We then used both model types to create relative contact rates in order to determine which best predicted the behaviour across different countries.

When looking at results from the UK, we see that the most accurate approximations to the partial reproduction numbers from the CoMix survey are those produced by the quadratic regression model as seen in Figure 4A (see supplementary material for further figures). The root MSE is also smaller for the linear model. However, for both Belgium and the Netherlands we see the most accurate approximations are those produced by the linear regression model, as shown in Figures 5 and 6 (see supplementary material for further figures). When we include the second year of data available in predictions, the linear model becomes a better predictor of the contact rates seen in the CoMix contact surveys. There is a tendency for the linear regression model to provide the most accurate approximations out of sample, this may be due to the fact that the quadratic model includes more mobility information which is less informative to the model. For all countries and contact types, using just Google mobility produced the worst approximations, with the mobility squared producing the second worst approximations. This is reflected in Figures 4-6, with the mobility approximation being clearly less accurate than any other method as well as having the largest root mean squared error. In addition, for "work" contacts in Belgium and the Netherlands the approximations for any method were not as close to those for the UK. Approximations for the UK are generally better as the models used to form the relative contact rates were created using UK data.

As CoMix data was not available for some of the study period outside of the UK it is difficult to determine the accuracy of the predictions made outside of the UK. This also means that residuals (given in the supplementary material) and the root mean squared error do not account for predictions in this period as there is no 'true' value to compare to. For the times

where data was available for Belgium and the Netherlands the countries were for the most part under some restrictions, this is why the CoMix estimates were often consistently low. Therefore, it is difficult to determine whether the accuracy of the approximations would be better or worse when no restrictions were in place. For the UK, when restrictions were not in place the accuracy of the approximations remained consistent with their accuracy during restriction periods. Assuming this is true outside of the UK, then the recommendation would be to use the linear regression model relative contact rate instead of Google mobility, to scale pre-pandemic contacts. This method could also be used to calculate contact matrices outside of the data collection period.

This investigation is limited by the fact that Google mobility data is difficult to define, not much information is available on how the indicators are defined. In addition, CoMix surveys were not available throughout the entire study period for countries other than the UK, this limited the amount we were able to determine the accuracy of the results outside of the UK. As CoMix panels were surveyed repeatedly over extended periods it is likely that a certain amount of survey fatigue began to impact responses. This is a limitation in the analysis for the UK data especially, given the number of surveys collected. In addition to this, a limitation of the study is that POLYMOD UK estimates were used to scale regression model results, in addition to informing the construction of the synthetic matrices from Prem et al. leading to potentially circular reasoning. However, the POLYMOD estimates for Belgium and the Netherlands are not used and so this limitation does not apply to estimates outside of the UK. In addition to this, we also compared the POLYMOD estimates with estimates from a survey conducted by Warwick university (35) and found both provided similar levels of baseline contacts. This study uses the UK POLYMOD contact matrix to scale estimates and therefore assumes a lot of similar underlying behaviours between the UK and whichever country the method is being applied to - in the case, Belgium and the Netherlands. This assumption is difficult to test due to the lack of contact surveys conducted in countries with substantially different behaviours. A final limitation is that the relationship between contacts and Google mobility appears to change in the second year of data (March 2021 onwards) particularly in work contacts. It is difficult to determine whether this change was due to mobility data becoming less accurate over time, contact data being less accurate towards the later surveys, or a genuine change in the relationship between mobility in contacts. It was for this reason we decided to focus on the first year of data (March 2020-March 2021) when building the regression models.

4.1 Conclusions

If given the choice between mobility and mobility squared to scale pre-pandemic contacts, the best approximation comes from mobility squared. However, the relative contact rates produced using the parameter estimates given above do provide better approximations than from using mobility data on its own. The results for Belgium and the Netherlands, and the second year from the UK, suggest that the linear regression model provides best approximations for partial reproduction number estimates out-of-sample. This investigation is the first to compare

mobility indicators and contact matrices and shows that mobility data can be improved upon as a method to measure transmission potential.

References

1. Mathieu E, Ritchie H, Rodés-Guirao L, Appel C, Giattino C, Hasell J, et al. Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). Our World Data [Internet]. 2020 Mar 5 [cited 2023 Jan 13]; Available from: https://ourworldindata.org/covid-deaths
2. CMMID Repository [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Jan 13]. CoMix study - Social contact survey in the UK. Available from: https://cmmid.github.io/topics/covid19/comix-reports.html
3. Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, Prem K, Klepac P, Rubin GJ, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. BMC Med. 2020 May 7;18:124.
4. Coletti P, Wambua J, Gimma A, Willem L, Vercruysse S, Vanhoutte B, et al. CoMix: comparing mixing patterns in the Belgian population during and after lockdown. Sci Rep. 2020 Dec 14;10(1):21885.
5. Backer JA, Bogaardt L, Beutels P, Coletti P, Edmunds WJ, Gimma A, et al. Dynamics of non-household contacts during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021 in the Netherlands. Sci Rep. 2023 Mar 30;13(1):5166.
6. Verelst F, Hermans L, Vercruysse S, Gimma A, Coletti P, Backer JA, et al. SOCRATES-CoMix: a platform for timely and open-source contact mixing data during and in between COVID-19 surges and interventions in over 20 European countries. BMC Med. 2021 Sep 29;19(1):254.
7. Weidemann F, Remschmidt C, Buda S, Buchholz U, Ultsch B, Wichmann O. Is the impact of childhood influenza vaccination less than expected: a transmission modelling study. BMC Infect Dis. 2017 Apr 11;17(1):258.
8. Meyer S, Held L. Incorporating social contact data in spatio-temporal models for infectious disease spread. Biostat Oxf Engl. 2017 Apr;18(2):338–51.
9. Tizzoni M, Bajardi P, Decuyper A, King GKK, Schneider CM, Blondel V, et al. On the Use of Human Mobility Proxies for Modeling Epidemics. PLOS Comput Biol. 2014 Jul 10;10(7):e1003716.
10. COVID-19 Community Mobility Reports [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 13]. Available from: https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/
11. Nouvellet P, Bhatia S, Cori A, Ainslie KEC, Baguelin M, Bhatt S, et al. Reduction in mobility and COVID-19 transmission. Nat Commun. 2021 Feb 17;12(1):1090.
12. Real-time nowcasting and forecasting of COVID-19 dynamics in England: the first wave | Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences [Internet]. [cited 2023 May 31]. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rstb.2020.0279#d1e3299
13. Gozzi N, Chinazzi M, Dean NE, Longini IM, Halloran ME, Perra N, et al. Estimating the impact of COVID-19 vaccine allocation inequities: a modeling study [Internet]. medRxiv; 2022 [cited 2023 May 31]. p. 2022.11.18.22282514. Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.11.18.22282514v1
14. Gozzi N, Tizzoni M, Chinazzi M, Ferres L, Vespignani A, Perra N. Estimating the effect of social inequalities on the mitigation of COVID-19 across communities in Santiago de Chile. Nat Commun. 2021 Apr 23;12(1):2429.
15. Overview - Community Mobility Reports Help [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jan 13]. Available from: https://support.google.com/covid19-mobility/answer/9824897?hl=en&ref_topic=9822927

16. Gimma A, Munday JD, Wong KLM, Coletti P, Zandvoort K van, Prem K, et al. Changes in social contacts in England during the COVID-19 pandemic between March 2020 and March 2021 as measured by the CoMix survey: A repeated cross-sectional study. PLOS Med. 2022 Mar 1;19(3):e1003907.
17. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. PLoS Med. 2008 Mar 25;5(3):e74.
18. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. [cited 2023 Sep 21]. Available from: https://www.r-project.org/
19. Davies NG, Barnard RC, Jarvis CI, Russell TW, Semple MG, Jit M, et al. Association of tiered restrictions and a second lockdown with COVID-19 deaths and hospital admissions in England: a modelling study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021 Apr;21(4):482–92.
20. Prem K, Zandvoort K van, Klepac P, Eggo RM, Davies NG, Centre for the Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases COVID-19 Working Group, et al. Projecting contact matrices in 177 geographical regions: An update and comparison with empirical data for the COVID-19 era. PLoS Comput Biol. 2021 Jul;17(7):e1009098.
21. epiforecasts/covid-rt-estimates: National and subnational estimates of the time-varying reproduction number for Covid-19 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 17]. Available from: https://github.com/epiforecasts/covid-rt-estimates/tree/master
22. Census - Office for National Statistics [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 22]. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/census
23. Ipsos [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2023 Aug 22]. Social Grade. Available from: https://www.ipsos.com/en-uk/social-grade
24. Household and resident characteristics, England and Wales - Office for National Statistics [Internet]. [cited 2024 Apr 5]. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/householdcharacteristics/homeinternetandsocialmediausage/bulletins/householdandresidentcharacteristicsenglandandwales/census2021
25. confint function - RDocumentation [Internet]. [cited 2024 Apr 5]. Available from: https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/stats/versions/3.6.2/topics/confint
26. Alessandretti L. What human mobility data tell us about COVID-19 spread. Nat Rev Phys. 2022 Jan;4(1):12–3.
27. Bergman NK, Fishman R. Correlations of mobility and Covid-19 transmission in global data. PLOS ONE. 2023 Jul 19;18(7):e0279484.
28. Tomori DV, Rübsamen N, Berger T, Scholz S, Walde J, Wittenberg I, et al. Individual social contact data and population mobility data as early markers of SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics during the first wave in Germany—an analysis based on the COVIMOD study. BMC Med. 2021 Oct 14;19(1):271.
29. Lajot A, Wambua J, Coletti P, Franco N, Brondeel R, Faes C, et al. How contact patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic are related to pre-pandemic contact patterns and mobility trends. BMC Infect Dis. 2023 Jun 16;23(1):410.
30. Hoang T, Coletti P, Melegaro A, Wallinga J, Grijalva CG, Edmunds JW, et al. A Systematic Review of Social Contact Surveys to Inform Transmission Models of Close-contact Infections. Epidemiol Camb Mass. 2019 Sep;30(5):723–36.
31. Keeling MJ, Rohani P. Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals [Internet]. Princeton University Press; 2008 [cited 2023 Sep 22]. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvcm4gk0
32. Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, Zheng W, Shi H, Vespignani A, et al. The impact of relaxing interventions on human contact patterns and SARS-CoV-2 transmission in China. Sci

Adv. 2021 May 7;7(19):eabe2584.
33. Wu S, Grant-Muller S, Yang L. Modelling the Mobility Changes Caused by Perceived Risk and Policy Efficiency. ISPRS Int J Geo-Inf. 2022 Aug;11(8):453.
34. Wambua J, Loedy N, Jarvis CI, Wong KLM, Faes C, Grah R, et al. The influence of COVID-19 risk perception and vaccination status on the number of social contacts across Europe: insights from the CoMix study. BMC Public Health. 2023 Jul 13;23(1):1350.
35. Danon L, Read JM, Keeling MJ, House TA, Vernon MC. Social contact study [Internet]. University of Warwick, Department of Biological Sciences; 2009 [cited 2023 Mar 16]. Available from: http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/54273