

1 Age-specific social mixing of school-aged children in a US setting using proximity detecting
2 sensors and contact surveys

3
4 Kyra H. Grantz^{1,2,3}, Derek A.T. Cummings^{1,2,3}, Shanta Zimmer^{4,5}, Charles Vukotich Jr.⁴, David
5 Galloway⁶, Mary Lou Schweizer⁴, Hasan Guclu^{6†}, Jennifer Cousins^{6†}, Carrie Lingle^{6†}, Gabby
6 M.H. Yearwood⁷, Kan Li^{6†}, Patti Calderone⁴, Eva Noble³, Hongjiang Gao⁸, Jeanette Rainey^{8†},
7 Amra Uzicanin⁸, Jonathan M. Read^{9, 10*}

8
9
10 ¹ Department of Biology, University of Florida, Gainesville FL USA 32611

11 ² Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville FL USA 32611

12 ³ Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore
13 MD USA 21205

14 ⁴ Division of General Internal Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh
15 PA USA 15213

16 ⁵ Department of Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Denver CO USA 80045

17 ⁶ Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA USA 15213

18 ⁷ Department of Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA USA 15213

19 ⁸ Division of Global Migration and Quarantine, US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention,
20 Atlanta GA USA 30033

21 ⁹ Centre for Health Informatics Computing and Statistics, Lancaster Medical School, Lancaster
22 University, Lancaster UK LA1 4YW

23 ¹⁰ Institute of Infection and Global Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool UK L69 7BE

24
25 † Current affiliations: HG Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics, School of
26 Medicine, Istanbul Medeniyet University, Istanbul, Turkey; JC Department of Psychology,
27 University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA USA; CL Toledo Lucas County Health Department,
28 Toledo OH USA; KL Merck Pharmaceuticals, Philadelphia PA USA; JR Division of Global
29 Health Protection, US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta GA USA

30
31 *corresponding author: JMR jonathan.read@lancaster.ac.uk

32
33 Keywords: social mixing, proximity sensors, contact survey, respiratory virus transmission,
34 school

35

36 **Abstract**

37

38 Comparisons of the utility and accuracy of methods for measuring social interactions relevant to
39 disease transmission are rare. To increase the evidence base supporting specific methods to
40 measure social interaction, we compared data from self-reported contact surveys and wearable
41 proximity sensors from a cohort of schoolchildren in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area. Although
42 the number and type of contacts recorded by each participant differed between the two
43 methods, we found good correspondence between the two methods in aggregate measures of
44 age-specific interactions. Fewer, but longer, contacts were reported in surveys, relative to the
45 generally short proximal interactions captured by wearable sensors. When adjusted for
46 expectations of proportionate mixing, though, the two methods produced highly similar,
47 assortative age-mixing matrices. These aggregate mixing matrices, when used in simulation,
48 resulted in similar estimates of risk of infection by age. While proximity sensors and survey
49 methods may not be interchangeable for capturing individual contacts, they can generate highly
50 correlated data on age-specific mixing patterns relevant to the dynamics of respiratory virus
51 transmission.

52

53 **Introduction**

54
55 Social interactions or person-to-person contacts can influence the transmission of many
56 infectious diseases. Respiratory viruses, such as influenza, are transmitted primarily through
57 large infectious droplets when an ill person coughs or sneezes within relatively short distances
58 of others (1, 2). Close contact facilitates transmission of respiratory diseases, but the extent to
59 which various populations are connected by these potential transmission events remains
60 unclear. Identifying more precisely the routes of disease transmission therefore has important
61 implications for public health policy and pandemic response, and can direct resources to most
62 efficiently target groups at high risk of transmission.

63
64 The POLYMOD study (3) was the first large-scale, survey-based study aimed at quantifying
65 social contact patterns in eight European countries, showing differential contact rates by age
66 and age-assortative mixing. The empirical data on social interactions and contact behaviours
67 collected through POLYMOD and other survey-based studies have improved efforts to explain
68 and predict spread of infectious disease, including mumps and influenza (4–10). Many studies
69 since have sought to characterize social mixing patterns in a variety of populations using
70 contact surveys (11–28) as well as wearable proximity sensors (11, 22, 23, 29–33), social
71 media or mobile phone data (22, 34, 35), direct observation (36), and model-based approaches
72 incorporating demographic and time-use data (37–39). Few studies, though, have considered
73 the use of non-survey social contact data in parameterizing mathematical models (9, 40).

74
75 There has been particular interest in the role of school-aged children (approximately 5–18 years
76 of age) in transmission of many respiratory infections (41). Schoolchildren are at high risk of
77 infection by influenza and other respiratory pathogens (42, 43). The local nature of geographic
78 spread during the 2009 A/H1N1 pandemic, the strong associations between pandemic onset
79 and school openings, and the high attack rates observed within schools all confirm the critical

80 role schoolchildren play in facilitating transmission (44–47). Schoolchildren generally display
81 highly assortative mixing by age (i.e., they preferentially interact with children of the same age)
82 and high contact rates with adults and the elderly (their parents and grandparents) which may
83 facilitate transmission among schoolchildren and within their surrounding communities (3, 4, 13,
84 16, 25, 48). Many public health interventions, including school closures and vaccination
85 campaigns, focus on the role of schoolchildren in the spread of respiratory infections (49, 50).

86
87 One challenge in drawing links between patterns of social contacts and respiratory disease
88 transmission is the difficulty in empirically measuring patterns of proximal social
89 interaction. Social contacts that can lead to transmission of pathogens can potentially be
90 transient, non-synchronous (i.e., through contamination of the environment), and of varying
91 intensity (2, 51). Multiple methods have been used to measure social contact, the relative
92 disadvantages and advantages of which have been described elsewhere (51). The majority
93 have used interviews or surveys to collect data on self-reported contacts, raising the possibility
94 of significant recall bias (52). These contacts may or may not involve conversation, physical
95 touch, or other features that may make them more memorable and thus more likely to be
96 reported. Proximity-detecting wearable sensors, or motes, offer an alternative to self-reported
97 data by automatically logging other sensors when nearby (31). These proximal interactions,
98 though, may differ in important ways from self-reported interactions and may not capture
99 aspects of social interactions that are critical to the transmission of respiratory pathogens. Little
100 information is available on the comparative reliability and limitations of these methods in
101 characterizing epidemiologically important social contacts (11, 52–56).

102
103 To support the use of social contact data to inform epidemic models, we conducted paper and
104 online contact surveys and deployed proximity sensors in a population of US schoolchildren. We
105 compared individual-level and aggregate age-specific mixing patterns captured by both methods

106 and considered qualitative and quantitative differences in predicted attack rates from
107 transmission models of respiratory pathogens using these data.

108 109 **Results**

110 111 *Study population and average contact patterns*

112 The Social Mixing and Respiratory Transmission (SMART) study was conducted in eight
113 schools in the Pittsburgh standard metropolitan statistical area from February 2012 to June
114 2012. Students in kindergarten (K) to 12th grade were eligible to participate. At least one contact
115 survey distribution overlapped with a proximity sensor deployment in each school, and students
116 could participate in more than one contact survey distribution.

117
118 Of the 2,337 students enrolled in the eight participating schools, 1,325 (56.7%) completed 2,155
119 contact surveys, and 1,834 (78.5%) participated in a school-based sensor deployment (Table
120 1). Of the students who participated in a sensor deployment, 1,125 (61.3%) completed at least
121 one contact survey, 826 (45.0%) students completed a survey about a day on which they also
122 wore a sensor, and 730 (39.8%) completed two surveys. Generally, younger students were
123 overrepresented in the sensor deployment populations and underrepresented in the survey-
124 completing populations (Fig. 1, Supp. Table 1).

125
126 Proximity sensors on average captured more contacts, defined as the total number of
127 participants with whom an individual recorded at least one sensor interaction, per student than
128 self-reported surveys, which captured self-reported social contacts with all students, including
129 interactions which involved speaking, playing, or touching (Table 1, Supp. Table 1). The range
130 in the number of survey-reported contacts, particularly for total contacts, was large (Fig. 1). Few
131 paper surveys reported more than 30 contacts per day (0.5%, 8/1760), compared to web-
132 completed surveys (3.0%, 12/395). The distribution of the number of unique sensor-recorded

133 contacts was less skewed, but the presence of several high-degree nodes (individuals with
134 many contacts) became increasingly apparent as the minimum number of cumulative contacts
135 (an approximation of contact duration) required to be considered a unique contact was
136 increased. The average duration of a survey-reported contact was 124.3 minutes, compared to
137 just 7.5 minutes for sensor-recorded contacts. There was marked similarity between the
138 distribution of survey-reported in-school contacts (Fig. 1C) and unique sensor-recorded contact
139 events with at least 100 cumulative contacts (Fig. 1G), but the association at an individual level
140 was unclear.

141

142 *Individual-level concordance of contact surveys and sensors*

143 In multivariate regression analysis adjusted for participant age, sex, and survey design, sensor-
144 recorded and survey-reported contacts rarely served as significant predictors of one another
145 (Fig. 2, Supp. Fig. 1). Increasing the cumulative contact threshold for sensor contacts did not
146 improve these associations. Generally, the number of survey-reported contacts increased with
147 age. Duration of survey-reported contacts increased with age as well, but the effect size was
148 reduced compared to the number of contacts. Survey type or method of administration was not
149 associated with number or duration of recorded contacts. Male students were less likely than
150 female students to report contacts and reported shorter contacts on average in contact surveys.

151

152 Results using multiple thresholds of cumulative sensor contact are shown in the supplement
153 (Supp. Fig. 2). We found significant associations between sensor outcomes and number of
154 survey-recorded contacts; however, the effect size was small relative to other factors (e.g., age).

155

156 *Age-specific mixing patterns*

157 Age-specific contact patterns derived from both data collection methods showed highly
158 assortative mixing. For example, in contact surveys, participants reported up to eight times as
159 many in-school contacts with students of the same grade than would be expected under

160 proportionate mixing assumptions (Fig. 3A). There was also a striking consistency between
161 pairwise survey- and sensor-recorded contact ratios as a function of the difference in grade. The
162 average departure from proportionate mixing expectations for participants in the same grade
163 was 4.07, compared to just 0.72 for participants one grade apart and 0.15 for participants two or
164 more grades apart (Fig. 3E).

165
166 Assortativity of age-specific matrices based on contact surveys and sensor data ranged from q
167 = 0.68 to $q = 0.95$ (Fig. 3). The range was partially due to the structure of the participating
168 schools; in this study, there were no schools with both high school and non-high school
169 students. However, even within each school, mixing patterns showed high degrees of
170 assortative mixing (e.g., in-school contact survey-based matrices range from $q = 0.62$ to $q =$
171 0.99 , Supp. Fig. 2).

172
173 The effect of school structure on mixing patterns was most apparent in matrices based on
174 unique sensor contacts, which revealed three elementary grade clusters (K–2, 3–4, 5–8) within
175 which there was strong assortative mixing (Fig. 3B). High school students (grades 9 to 12)
176 represented a well-mixed, modular cluster ($q = 0.05$ and 0.12 for HS1 and HS2, Supp. Fig. 3).
177 Assortativity increased when a threshold of cumulative sensor contacts was applied (Fig. 3C,
178 3D), as did the correlation between the age-specific contact ratios of survey- and sensor-based
179 matrices (Mantel correlation coefficients 0.63 to 0.88). Matrices based on rate of contact (that is,
180 unadjusted for proportionate mixing expectations) were qualitatively similar to ratio-based
181 matrices but, as they did not account for school demography and participation rates across
182 grades, were poor correlates between the two methods. Age-specific matrices based on survey-
183 recorded contact events lasting longer than 10 minutes, contact events reported on days of
184 sensor deployments, and survey- and sensor-recorded contact durations displayed similar
185 patterns of age assortativity (Supp. Fig. 4, 5).

186
187 *Transmission models*

188 When used in age-specific simulation, sensor- and survey-based mixing matrices produced
189 similar attack rates when adjusted by proportionate mixing expectations (Fig. 4). Increasing the
190 contact threshold resulted in more heterogeneity relative to the proportionate mixing baseline.
191 There was discordance between the sensor- and survey-based predicted attack rates in
192 particular schools, which increased with cumulative sensor contact threshold and disjuncture in
193 contact matrices. However, in other schools, there was a marked degree of similarity between
194 attack rates regardless of contact matrix employed. In simulations based on unadjusted contact
195 rate matrices, predicted attack rates were lower in younger children when using survey-based
196 matrices, a reflection of the different reporting rates by age and specific demography of each
197 school (Supp. Fig. 6). We explored multiple parameters in our transmission model, assuming
198 reproductive numbers of 1.5, 2 and 3. We found little qualitative difference between these
199 simulations (Supp. Fig. 7).

200
201 **Discussion**

202 The utility of social contact data to the study of infectious diseases has been limited in part by
203 questions of how to best measure social interactions relevant to transmission. In this project, we
204 found that, while the two commonly used methods captured different information at the
205 individual level, they gave similar results in several aggregate patterns of contact that are
206 thought to be relevant to pathogen transmission, namely, patterns of age-specific mixing and
207 probability distributions of the total number of contacts. As in other work, we found evidence for
208 strong assortativity of contacts by grade (32). This work has important implications for the
209 empirical parameterization of mathematical models of transmission, particularly of respiratory
210 pathogens. This work suggests that either empirical approach could be used to characterize
211 age-specific interactions suitable for use in modelling to inform policy.

212

213 Previous studies (11, 22, 23, 57) which compared contact surveys to proximity sensors also
214 found poor individual-level concordance between the two methods: anywhere from 15% to 96%
215 of contacts captured through proximity sensors were not recorded in contact surveys. Despite
216 the poor individual-level comparisons in these studies, some found agreement in aggregate
217 patterns across age ranges using two different methods (30, 57).

218
219 We also observed substantial absolute differences in the number and type of contacts recorded
220 by self-reported contact surveys and proximity sensors. We found either metric was a poor
221 predictor of the other, even when adjusting for age, sex, and study factors. However, we found
222 stronger individual-level correspondence between the measures when we restricted sensor data
223 to contacts with longer cumulative duration (true for 3-minute and 30-minute minimum
224 thresholds), consistent with earlier work which found longer contacts were more likely to be
225 reported in surveys (11, 22, 23). In practice, the two methods are designed to capture different
226 social interactions. Per the study protocol, survey-recorded contacts should only have included
227 those with interactions that involved talking, playing, or touching, while sensors recorded all
228 other sensors within proximity regardless of whether participants were socially interacting. That
229 the correspondence increased when limiting sensor information to proximal contacts with longer
230 duration suggests that these were more likely to be contacts which include social interactions. It
231 is unclear which type of contact (proximal or social interaction) is most relevant for the spread of
232 respiratory pathogens.

233
234 To determine whether contact patterns measured using different empirical approaches lead to
235 different transmission dynamics, we simulated transmission using models parameterized with
236 data from the two empirical techniques. In simulations using mixing matrices adjusted by
237 proportionate mixing expectations, similar age-specific infection patterns were found using
238 sensor and survey data. Previous work has similarly found that, while simulations using

239 unadjusted contact data from surveys and proximity sensors differ, appropriate adjustment to
240 survey data which capture key structural elements of the contact network (e.g., age
241 assortativity) leads to consistent simulation results using both kinds of contact data (57). Here,
242 differences in attack rates appear to be driven by increasing disjuncture between grades and
243 age assortativity in certain mixing matrices.

244
245 Importantly, the metric we used to compare age-specific contact patterns from survey- and
246 sensor-recorded data did not account for absolute differences in the overall contact rates of
247 children in each grade. In simulation, the β estimation procedure (see *Supplementary Methods*)
248 scaled the overall rate of contact between age-specific contact matrices, but did not account for
249 possible age-specific differences in average contact rates. Absolute difference in contact
250 probability may have important epidemiological consequences, particularly when considering
251 onward transmission to the community. Transmission to family and community members
252 outside school is a critical component of schoolchildren's key role in respiratory disease
253 transmission which we do not consider here. Furthermore, contact patterns are likely to be
254 different on school holidays, weekends, or even when a child has symptomatic illness (13, 58,
255 59); the feasibility of electronic sensors in these contexts has yet to be shown. Future studies
256 linking the mixing patterns and incidence of respiratory disease among schoolchildren with
257 disease risk in their communities would provide valuable evidence for planning and control
258 measures.

259
260 Our study has some important limitations. Though we adjusted for the demographics of the
261 specific schools and deployments that we conducted, our results may not be generalizable to
262 other settings. The physical and architectural environment of our schools, the density of sensors
263 that we were able to deploy in our schools, and the specific days that we deployed our study
264 may all have affected our results. Technical issues, though not common, did occur with the

265 sensors, resulting in lost data for some sensors. Similarly, recall bias and misclassification by
266 participants when completing contact surveys may have obscured the relationship between our
267 two methodological measurements. We found that the design and administration of contact
268 surveys led to some censoring in the number of contacts reported (Fig. 1). Nonetheless, we
269 believe that the relationships we found were robust to the misclassifications and biases that may
270 be generated by these sources.

271
272 Previous work has indicated that risk of infection with influenza is more closely linked to the
273 average mixing patterns of an individual's age group, rather than the individual's contact
274 behaviour (7). We found that two common methods of collecting social contact data, self-
275 reported surveys and proximity sensors, recorded qualitatively and quantitatively different
276 individual social mixing behaviour but could still generate similar aggregate age-specific social
277 contact patterns. The collection of high-quality social contact data through either method has
278 important implications for surveillance, prediction, and prevention of respiratory virus
279 transmission. Our finding that these two methods found some commonality in aggregate age-
280 specific social contact patterns suggests that these phenomena are not an artefact of either
281 specific empirical method but attributes of these study populations.

282

283 **Methods**

284 *Study description*

285 Enrolment in the Social Mixing and Respiratory Transmission (SMART) study operated on an
286 opt-out basis, and all students registered in a participating school before the start of the study
287 were eligible to participate. Students in kindergarten (typically aged 5 years) to 12th grade
288 (typically aged 18 years) from two elementary (K to 4th grade, K to 5th grade), two middle (5th to
289 6th grade, 7th to 8th grade), two elementary-middle (K to 8th grade), and two high (both 9th to 12th
290 grade) schools were eligible to participate in SMART. Participation rates were high in all schools

291 (82 to 99%). Each school provided aggregate demographic information about the school
292 population, and individual grade and sex of participating students.

293 *Proximity sensor deployments*

294 The details of proximity sensor deployments have been described in detail elsewhere (60). In
295 brief, participating students were given proximity sensors in plastic pouches and instructed to
296 wear the pouch around their neck for the duration of the school day without removing or
297 otherwise tampering with the sensor. In six of the eight schools, all participating students were
298 given a sensor; in two schools, the large student population limited the deployment to randomly
299 selected classrooms in each grade. Deployments typically lasted from the first class period
300 (08:00 – 09:00) to the last class period (14:00 – 15:00). Deployment days in each school were
301 chosen to be representative of a typical school day, without any special schoolwide or grade-
302 specific activities that could modify normal contact patterns.

303
304 We used TelosB wireless sensors (61) programmed in the NesC language to send beacons
305 every 20 seconds (beacon frequency 3 per minute). The receiving sensor recorded the
306 contacting sensor's identity, an internal time stamp, and a radio strength signal indicator (RSSI).
307 Signal strength provided an estimate of physical proximity, but was highly dependent on the
308 orientation of the two sensors and any obstructions between them and therefore could not be
309 used to define an exact distance between contacts. Based on pilot studies and previous work on
310 effective distances of respiratory virus transmission (29, 62), we chose a signal threshold (-80
311 dBm) that should correspond to contacts of relevance to respiratory disease transmission.

312
313 The number of unique proximity sensor contacts recorded for a participant was defined as the
314 total number of other participants with whom their proximity sensor recorded at least one
315 interaction during each deployment. To explore patterns of contacts of varying length, we

316 considered several values of the contact threshold, or the minimum number of recorded
317 interactions between two proximity sensors required to be considered a unique contact. The
318 number of interactions between any given pair of sensors was taken to be the maximum
319 number of interactions recorded by either sensor, to account for battery failure, measurement
320 error, or other malfunctions.

321
322 *Contact survey design*

323 Contact surveys were completed by participants in school under the supervision of project staff
324 and teachers. Each sheet of the paper version allowed for information on up to 30 contacts to
325 be recorded; additional sheets could be requested. Two versions were designed: one for
326 middle- and high-school students, and a simplified version for elementary school students
327 (although some elementary school children completed the middle- and high-school version,
328 upon consultation with school administrators and teachers). Classrooms were randomly
329 selected to participate from each grade, and students of several classrooms completed more
330 than one contact survey over the course of the study period.

331
332 Participants were asked to report information about any individual they talked with, played with,
333 or touched the previous day, including the contact's age and sex, whether they attended the
334 same school as the participant, the context in which the contact was made, whether the contact
335 involved direct or indirect (through a shared object) touch, and approximate duration of the
336 contact. Students reported the total number of contacts made in the previous day, without
337 detailed information, and additional demographic information about themselves and their
338 household. The surveys were completed either on paper or by computer, depending on
339 resources available in each school.

340

341 We defined total survey contacts as the total number of individuals a student reported having
342 interacted with on the day before the survey was completed. Detailed contacts were the subset
343 of total contacts for which the student reported contact age, sex, duration, and context. We
344 considered further subsets of detailed survey contacts, including those occurring within school,
345 those reported to have lasted more than 10 minutes over the course of the day, and those
346 occurring on the same day as a sensor deployment.

347
348

349
350 *Statistical analysis of individual contact patterns*

351 Transmission risk is likely dependent on both the type and length of interaction. We therefore
352 estimated contact durations for survey- and sensor-recorded contacts using an exponential
353 fitting method, following the work of Read and Danon (12, 18) (*Supplementary Methods*).
354 Briefly, each sensor interaction was assumed to represent an independent contact of between 0
355 to 20 seconds; the total interactions between a pair of participants were summed to compute the
356 total duration of contact in one deployment. Participants were asked to record the approximate
357 durations of survey-reported contacts.

358

359 We used negative binomial regression to investigate which factors were associated with the
360 number of reported contacts for each student who participated in a sensor deployment and
361 completed at least one contact survey. Each model included participant grade, gender, and a
362 random intercept term for day of survey completion or sensor deployment. Survey
363 administration and sensor deployment days were unique to each school. Terms for the type and
364 method of survey administration were added to models of survey-recorded outcomes.

365
366 *Age-specific mixing matrices*

367 We estimated two metrics of age-specific contact patterns: an average per-capita mixing rate,
368 and the age-specific mixing ratio of observed contact rates to those expected under the
369 assumption of proportionate mixing.

370

371 *Average per-capita mixing rate*

372 The first metric is the average number or duration of contacts recorded or reported by a
373 participant in any grade i with a student in grade j :

374
$$m_{ij} = \frac{c_{ij}}{r_i}, \quad i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 12\},$$

375 where c_{ij} is the total number or duration of contacts recorded by participants of grade i with
376 individuals in grade j , divided by the number of participants in grade i , r_i . In sensor deployments,
377 contacts could only be recorded with other participants (sensor-wearers) in grade j . If a certain
378 grade was underrepresented among participants relative to other grades, fewer contacts would
379 be recorded with individuals in that grade because of the low sensor coverage. Therefore, the
380 sensor contact rate was adjusted by the ratio of the proportion of the total school population in
381 grade j to the proportion of sensor participants in grade j , $\frac{n_j/n}{r_j/r}$, where n_j is the number of
382 students in grade j regardless of participation.

383

384 *Age-specific mixing ratio*

385 We also estimated the ratio of the observed age-specific contact rate to the expected contact
386 rate if the probability of contact were dependent solely on the availability of potential contacts in
387 a given grade (proportionate mixing assumption).

388

389

$$K_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{c_{ij}}{c_{i^*} \frac{x_j}{x-1}}, & i \neq j \\ \frac{c_{ij}}{c_{i^*} \frac{x_j-1}{x-1}}, & i = j \end{cases},$$

390

391

392 where x_j is the number of individuals in grade j with whom participants in grade i could record a
393 contact, and all other terms are as defined above. Values greater than 1 indicate more contacts
394 were recorded by participants in grade i with individuals of grade j than would be expected
395 under proportionate mixing. Proportionate mixing assumes that an individual in grade i mixing at
396 random will contact individuals in grade j with a probability equal to the proportion of the
397 population in grade j , but no assumption is made on the probability of individuals in grade i
398 making any contact relative to other groups.

399
400 By design, r_j , the participant population, is equal to x_j , the contact population, in sensor
401 deployments. For within-school contacts, we used the demographic information of all registered
402 students in each school to define the potential contact population. Combined K-12 matrices
403 were generated by averaging age-specific matrices from all participating schools, weighted by
404 the number of participants in each school.

405
406 Confidence intervals were calculated using 1,000 resampled bootstrap replicates of contact
407 events. Mantel correlation coefficients were used to compare mixing matrices. The degree of
408 assortative mixing, q , was calculated as the ratio of the first minor eigenvalue to the dominant
409 eigenvalue (63), where q ranges from -1, representing completely disassortative mixing, to 1,
410 completely assortative mixing.

411
412 *Transmission models*

413 To explore the expected transmission dynamics under different assumptions of social mixing
414 patterns, we used an age-structured stochastic Susceptible-Exposed-Infectious-Recovered
415 (SEIR) transmission model to age-specific attack rates (*Supplementary Methods*). We used
416 transmission parameters consistent with influenza taken from the literature (64) and simulated
417 multiple stochastic realizations of a single outbreak in a closed population. Recognizing that

418 proximity sensors and self-reported surveys were likely to record contacts with different
419 transmission potential, we fitted β for each set of parameters, including the age-specific mixing
420 matrix, using the next-generation matrix to give an R_0 of 2.0, a moderate estimate of pandemic
421 influenza (64, 65) (*Supplementary Methods*). Stochastic simulations were conducted using
422 Gillespie's direct algorithm.

423

424 *Ethical considerations and approvals*

425 Informed consent was obtained through an opt-out process, where parents and legal guardians
426 of students in participating schools were sent study information (including an opt-out declaration
427 to return), prior to study activities and data collection in the schools. All study design of The
428 SMART study, including the opt-out consenting process, was approved by the ethics
429 committees at the University of Pittsburgh (PRO1102050), the University of Florida
430 (IRB201701941), the University of Liverpool, and the Centers for Disease Control and
431 Prevention (IRB00000319). Participating students were able to opt out at any time by simply
432 saying that they did not wish to participate in a study activity. Non-participating students were
433 given the option to wear non-operative electronic sensors to avoid any stigma associated with
434 not participating in study activity. All research was performed in accordance with the protocol
435 approved by the above institutions and in accordance with the relevant guidelines and
436 regulations.

437 *Data availability*

438 De-identified dataset is available through the Zenodo Repository doi:10.5281/zenodo.3940772.

439 Acknowledgements

440 We are sincerely grateful to all students, teachers, administrators, and school district officials for
441 their participation in and support of the SMART study. This research was supported by the US
442 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC Cooperative Agreement 1U01CK00179-01).
443 DATC and KHG received additional support from the US NIH MIDAS program U54 GM088491.
444 JMR acknowledges support from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council

445 (EP/N014499/1). The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not
446 necessarily represent the official position of CDC.

447

448

449 Additional Information

450 We declare no competing interests.

451

452

453 Author Contributions

454 KHG, DATC, SZ, CVJ, JMR designed research. DATC, SZ, CVJ, DG, MLS, HG, JC, CL,
455 GMHY, KL, PC, EN, JMR performed research. KHG, DATC, JMR analysed data and wrote
456 manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

457

458

459

460

461

462 References

- 463
- 464 1. T. P. Weber, N. I. Stilianakis, Inactivation of influenza A viruses in the environment and
465 modes of transmission: A critical review. *J. Infect.* **57**, 361–373 (2008).
 - 466 2. G. Brankston, L. Gitterman, Z. Hirji, C. Lemieux, M. Gardam, Transmission of influenza A
467 in human beings. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **7**, 257–265 (2007).
 - 468 3. J. Mossong, *et al.*, Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of
469 infectious diseases. *PLoS Med.* **5**, 0381–0391 (2008).
 - 470 4. J. Wallinga, P. Teunis, M. Kretzschmar, Using data on social contacts to estimate age-
471 specific transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents. *Am. J.*
472 *Epidemiol.* **164**, 936–944 (2006).
 - 473 5. P. Rohani, X. Zhong, A. A. King, Contact Network Structure Explains the Changing
474 Epidemiology of Pertussis. *Science (80-)*. **330**, 982–985 (2010).
 - 475 6. B. Ogunjimi, *et al.*, Using empirical social contact data to model person to person
476 infectious disease transmission: An illustration for varicella. *Math. Biosci.* **218**, 80–87
477 (2009).
 - 478 7. A. J. Kucharski, *et al.*, The Contribution of Social Behaviour to the Transmission of
479 Influenza A in a Human Population. *PLoS Pathog.* **10**, e1004206 (2014).
 - 480 8. N. Goeyvaerts, *et al.*, Estimating infectious disease parameters from data on social
481 contacts and serological status. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. C Appl. Stat.* **59**, 255–277 (2010).
 - 482 9. E. De Cao, E. Zagheni, P. Manfredi, A. Melegaro, The relative importance of frequency of
483 contacts and duration of exposure for the spread of directly transmitted infections.
484 *Biostatistics* **15**, 470–483 (2014).
 - 485 10. A. Melegaro, M. Jit, N. Gay, E. Zagheni, W. J. Edmunds, What types of contacts are
486 important for the spread of infections? Using contact survey data to explore European
487 mixing patterns. *Epidemics* **3**, 143–151 (2011).
 - 488 11. T. Smieszek, *et al.*, How should social mixing be measured: comparing web-based
489 survey and sensor-based methods. *BMC Public Health* **14** (2014).
 - 490 12. J. M. Read, *et al.*, Social mixing patterns in rural and urban areas of southern China.
491 *Proc. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.* **281** (2014).
 - 492 13. R. T. Mikolajczyk, M. K. Akmatov, S. Rastin, M. Kretzschmar, Social contacts of school
493 children and the transmission of respiratory-spread pathogens. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **136**
494 (2008).
 - 495 14. C. G. Grijalva, *et al.*, A household-based study of contact networks relevant for the
496 spread of infectious diseases in the highlands of peru. *PLoS One* **10**, e0118457 (2015).
 - 497 15. L. Danon, J. M. Read, T. A. House, M. C. Vernon, M. J. Keeling, Social encounter
498 networks: Characterizing great Britain. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **280** (2013).
 - 499 16. M. Ajelli, M. Litvinova, Estimating contact patterns relevant to the spread of infectious
500 diseases in Russia. *J. Theor. Biol.* **419**, 1–7 (2017).
 - 501 17. M. C. Kiti, *et al.*, Quantifying age-related rates of social contact using diaries in a rural
502 coastal population of Kenya. *PLoS One* **9**, e104786 (2014).
 - 503 18. L. Danon, T. A. House, J. M. Read, M. J. Keeling, Social encounter networks: Collective
504 properties and disease transmission. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **9**, 2826–2833 (2012).
 - 505 19. C. H. Watson, *et al.*, Social mixing in Fiji: Who-eats-with-whom contact patterns and the
506 implications of age and ethnic heterogeneity for disease dynamics in the Pacific Islands.
507 *PLoS One* **12**, e0186911 (2017).
 - 508 20. K. Leung, M. Jit, E. H. Y. Lau, J. T. Wu, Social contact patterns relevant to the spread of
509 respiratory infectious diseases in Hong Kong. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 7974 (2017).
 - 510 21. J. M. Read, K. T. Eames, W. J. Edmunds, Dynamic social networks and the implications
511 for the spread of infectious disease. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **5**, 1001–1007 (2008).
 - 512 22. R. Mastrandrea, J. Fournet, A. Barrat, Contact patterns in a high school: A comparison

- 513 between data collected using wearable sensors, contact diaries and friendship surveys.
514 *PLoS One* **10**, e0136497 (2015).
- 515 23. M. Leecaster, *et al.*, Estimates of social contact in a middle school based on self-report
516 and wireless sensor data. *PLoS One* **11**, e0153690 (2016).
- 517 24. Y. Ibuka, *et al.*, Social contacts, vaccination, decisions and influenza in Japan. *J*
518 *Epidemiol Community Heal.* **70**, 162–167 (2016).
- 519 25. L. M. Glass, R. J. Glass, Social contact networks for the spread of pandemic influenza in
520 children and teenagers. *BMC Public Health* **8**, 61 (2008).
- 521 26. W. J. Edmunds, G. Kafatos, J. Wallinga, J. R. Mossong, Mixing patterns and the spread
522 of close-contact infectious diseases. *Emerg. Themes Epidemiol.* **3**, 10 (2006).
- 523 27. G. Béraud, *et al.*, The French Connection: The First Large Population-Based Contact
524 Survey in France Relevant for the Spread of Infectious Diseases. *PLoS One* **10**,
525 e0133203 (2015).
- 526 28. A. J. K. Conlan, *et al.*, Measuring social networks in British primary schools through
527 scientific engagement. *Proc. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.* **278**, 1467–1475 (2011).
- 528 29. M. Salathé, *et al.*, A high-resolution human contact network for infectious disease
529 transmission. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **107**, 22020–22025 (2010).
- 530 30. J. Fournet, A. Barrat, Contact patterns among high school students. *PLoS One* **9**,
531 e107878 (2014).
- 532 31. C. Cattuto, *et al.*, Dynamics of person-to-person interactions from distributed RFID sensor
533 networks. *PLoS One* **5**, e11596 (2010).
- 534 32. J. Stehlé, *et al.*, High-resolution measurements of face-to-face contact patterns in a
535 primary school. *PLoS One* **6**, e23176 (2011).
- 536 33. L. Ozella, *et al.*, Close encounters between infants and household members measured
537 through wearable proximity sensors. *PLoS One* **13**, e0198733 (2018).
- 538 34. A. Stopczynski, *et al.*, Measuring Large-Scale Social Networks with High Resolution.
539 *PLoS One* **9**, e95978 (2014).
- 540 35. N. Eagle, A. Pentland, D. Lazer, Inferring friendship network structure by using mobile
541 phone data. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 15274–15278 (2009).
- 542 36. T. R. Talbot, *et al.*, Influenza Vaccination of Healthcare Workers and Vaccine Allocation
543 for Healthcare Workers During Vaccine Shortages. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **26**,
544 882–890 (2005).
- 545 37. F. Iozzi, *et al.*, Little italy: An agent-based approach to the estimation of contact patterns-
546 fitting predicted matrices to serological data. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **6**, e1001021 (2010).
- 547 38. S. Y. Del Valle, J. M. Hyman, H. W. Hethcote, S. G. Eubank, Mixing patterns between
548 age groups in social networks. *Soc. Networks* **29**, 539–554 (2007).
- 549 39. K. Prem, A. R. Cook, M. Jit, Projecting social contact matrices in 152 countries using
550 contact surveys and demographic data. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **13**, e1005697 (2017).
- 551 40. D. J. A. Toth, *et al.*, The role of heterogeneity in contact timing and duration in network
552 models of influenza spread in schools. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **12** (2015).
- 553 41. W. P. Glezen, Emerging infections: Pandemic influenza. *Epidemiol. Rev.* **18**, 64–76
554 (1996).
- 555 42. C. J. Worby, *et al.*, On the relative role of different age groups in influenza epidemics.
556 *Epidemics* **13**, 10–16 (2015).
- 557 43. E. Goldstein, *et al.*, On the Relative Role of Different Age Groups during Epidemics
558 Associated with Respiratory Syncytial Virus. *J. Infect. Dis.* **217**, 238–244 (2018).
- 559 44. S. Cauchemez, *et al.*, Role of social networks in shaping disease transmission during a
560 community outbreak of 2009 H1N1 pandemic influenza. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
561 **108**, 2825–2830 (2011).
- 562 45. J. Lessler, N. G. Reich, D. A. T. Cummings, Outbreak of 2009 Pandemic Influenza A
563 (H1N1) at a New York City School. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **361**, 2628–2636 (2009).

- 564 46. D. L. Chao, M. Halloran, I. M. Longini, School Opening Dates Predict Pandemic Influenza
565 A(H1N1) Outbreaks in the United States. *J. Infect. Dis.* **202**, 877–880 (2010).
- 566 47. J. R. Gog, *et al.*, Spatial Transmission of 2009 Pandemic Influenza in the US. *PLoS*
567 *Comput. Biol.* **10**, e1003635 (2014).
- 568 48. N. Hens, *et al.*, Estimating the impact of school closure on social mixing behaviour and
569 the transmission of close contact infections in eight European countries. *BMC Infect. Dis.*
570 **9**, 187 (2009).
- 571 49. T. House, *et al.*, Modelling the impact of local reactive school closures on critical care
572 provision during an influenza pandemic. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **278**, 2753–2760
573 (2011).
- 574 50. L. A. Grohskopf, *et al.*, Prevention and Control of Influenza with Vaccines:
575 Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, United States,
576 2015-16 Influenza Season. *MMWR. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **64**, 818–25 (2015).
- 577 51. J. M. Read, W. J. Edmunds, S. Riley, J. Lessler, D. A. T. Cummings, Close encounters of
578 the infectious kind: Methods to measure social mixing behaviour. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **140**,
579 2117–2130 (2012).
- 580 52. T. Smieszek, E. U. Burri, R. Scherzinger, R. W. Scholz, Collecting close-contact social
581 mixing data with contact diaries: Reporting errors and biases. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **140**,
582 744–752 (2012).
- 583 53. T. Smieszek, *et al.*, Contact diaries versus wearable proximity sensors in measuring
584 contact patterns at a conference: Method comparison and participants' attitudes. *BMC*
585 *Infect. Dis.* (2016) <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-016-1676-y>.
- 586 54. P. Beutels, Z. Shkedy, M. Aerts, P. Van Damme, Social mixing patterns for transmission
587 models of close contact infections: Exploring self-evaluation and diary-based data
588 collection through a web-based interface. *Epidemiol. Infect.* (2006)
589 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268806006418>.
- 590 55. R. T. Mikolajczyk, M. Kretzschmar, Collecting social contact data in the context of
591 disease transmission: Prospective and retrospective study designs. *Soc. Networks* (2008)
592 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2007.09.002>.
- 593 56. J. M. McCaw, *et al.*, Comparison of three methods for ascertainment of contact
594 information relevant to respiratory pathogen transmission in encounter networks. *BMC*
595 *Infect. Dis.* (2010) <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-10-166>.
- 596 57. R. Mastrandrea, A. Barrat, How to Estimate Epidemic Risk from Incomplete Contact
597 Diaries Data? *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **12** (2016).
- 598 58. K. T. D. Eames, N. L. Tilston, W. J. Edmunds, The impact of school holidays on the social
599 mixing patterns of school children. *Epidemics* **3**, 103–108 (2011).
- 600 59. K. Van Kerckhove, N. Hens, W. J. Edmunds, K. T. D. Eames, The impact of illness on
601 social networks: Implications for transmission and control of influenza. *Am. J. Epidemiol.*
602 **178**, 1655–1662 (2013).
- 603 60. H. Guclu, *et al.*, Social contact networks and mixing among students in K-12 Schools in
604 Pittsburgh, PA. *PLoS One* **11**, e0151139 (2016).
- 605 61. J. Polastre, R. Szewczyk, D. Culler, Telos: Enabling ultra-low power wireless research in
606 *2005 4th International Symposium on Information Processing in Sensor Networks, IPSN*
607 *2005*, (IEEE, 2005), pp. 364–369.
- 608 62. X. Xie, Y. Li, A. T. Y. Chwang, P. L. Ho, W. H. Seto, How far droplets can move in indoor
609 environments? Revisiting the Wells evaporation falling curve. *Indoor Air* **17**, 211–225
610 (2007).
- 611 63. M. J. Keeling, P. Rohani, *Modeling Infectious Diseases in Humans and Animals* (2011)
612 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ede.0000254692.80550.60>.
- 613 64. W. Yang, M. Lipsitch, J. Shaman, Inference of seasonal and pandemic influenza
614 transmission dynamics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **112**, 2723–2728 (2015).

- 615 65. J. Lessler, D. A. T. Cummings, S. Fishman, A. Vora, D. S. Burke, Transmissibility of
616 swine flu at Fort Dix, 1976. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **4**, 755–762 (2007).
617
618
619
620
621

622 Figures and Tables

623 Table 1. Study population and average number of contacts recorded by self-reported contact
624 surveys and proximity-detecting sensors in a US school setting 24

625 Figure 1. Distribution of the number of contact events recorded in a US school setting by self-
626 reported contact surveys and proximity-detecting sensors: (A) total survey-reported contacts;
627 (B) detailed survey-reported contacts; (C) survey-reported in-school contacts; (E) all unique
628 contacts recorded by sensors; (F) all unique contacts with more than 10 cumulative contacts
629 (roughly 3 minutes of interaction); and (G) all unique contacts with more than 100 cumulative
630 contacts (roughly 30 minutes of interaction). Insets in (E)-(G) show the plot of in-school survey
631 contacts versus each metric of sensor-recorded contacts with a cubic smoothing spline. (D)
632 shows the population distribution by grade of participants who completed at least one contact
633 survey or participated in a sensor deployment, compared to the population distribution of the
634 Pittsburgh standard metropolitan statistical area (PSMSA) for 2012..... 25

635 Figure 2. Factors associated with the number and duration of survey-reported in-school contacts
636 in a US school setting. All models include a random intercept for day of survey completion. 26

637 Figure 3. Age-specific mixing matrices generated from in-school survey contacts and unique
638 sensor-recorded contacts in a US school setting at various cumulative contact thresholds.
639 Matrices are presented as log-10 ratio of observed contacts relative to expectation under
640 proportionate mixing assumptions for survey-reported in-school contacts (A) and sensor-
641 recorded unique contacts with thresholds of 0 (B), 10 (C), and 100 (D) cumulative contacts. Blue
642 colors indicate more contacts than expected under proportionate mixing assumptions, and red
643 colors indicate less mixing than expected. Bolded ratio values deviate significantly from the null
644 expectation, $\alpha=0.05$, and q equals the degree of assortative mixing. Scatterplots (F-H) show the
645 corresponding i,j values of the survey- and sensor-based mixing matrices at each threshold (0,
646 10, 100). (E) shows the average departure from proportionate mixing as a function of difference
647 between grade for each matrix. 27

648 Figure 4. Grade-specific final predicted attack rates of a respiratory virus in a US school setting,
649 based on stochastic simulation using mixing matrices of in-school survey contacts and unique
650 sensor-recorded contacts at various contact thresholds, adjusted by proportionate mixing
651 expectations, within each school (ELEM, elementary; MS, middle school; HS, high school)..... 28

652
653 Appendix 1. Contact survey administered to select participants in elementary schools (grades K
654 to 5), Pittsburgh PA, USA, 2012

655
656 Appendix 2. Contact survey given to participants in middle and high school (grades 6 to 12) and
657 select participants in elementary schools (grades K to 5), Pittsburgh PA, USA, 2012

658
659

Table 1. Study population and average number of contacts recorded by self-reported contact surveys and proximity-detecting sensors in a US school setting

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Completed ≥ 1 contact survey														
No. participants	49	46	75	91	100	97	81	146	108	134	171	119	108	1325
No. survey responses	53	55	110	175	143	175	139	219	176	197	302	212	199	2155
Mean no. detailed contacts (sd)	5.0 (2.2)	3.7 (2.3)	9.7 (6.5)	11.0 (7.2)	15.2 (8.0)	10.8 (8.2)	16.5 (9.5)	18.7 (9.7)	16.0 (9.4)	17.2 (9.3)	13.9 (9.0)	14.3 (9.0)	16.0 (10.7)	14.2 (9.4)
Participated in a sensor deployment														
No. participants	119	131	100	131	136	245	215	157	127	125	149	108	91	1834
Mean no. unique contacts (sd)	84.6 (31.4)	81.2 (22.6)	81.8 (29.0)	81.3 (28.0)	83.1 (24.5)	83.2 (25.6)	91.8 (28.4)	92.8 (25.8)	76.3 (33.7)	109.0 (32.9)	109.6 (35.1)	111.9 (38.2)	102.5 (36.0)	90.8 (31.9)
Completed ≥ 1 contact survey and participated in sensor deployment														
No. participants	43	43	65	84	88	81	55	129	82	119	143	106	87	1125
No. survey responses	46	51	99	163	131	149	104	192	134	179	258	190	159	1855
No. participants with sensor-day survey	0	0	28	66	65	68	53	56	61	118	129	99	83	826

Detailed survey-reported contacts are those interactions for which a student also reported contact age, sex, duration, and context. Unique sensor-recorded contacts for each participant is the total number of other participants with whom their proximity sensor recorded at least one interaction during a sensor deployment. Sd, standard deviation.

Figure 1. Distribution of the number of contact events recorded in a US school setting by self-reported contact surveys and proximity-detecting sensors: (A) total survey-reported contacts; (B) detailed survey-reported contacts; (C) survey-reported in-school contacts; (E) all unique contacts recorded by sensors; (F) all unique contacts with more than 10 cumulative contacts (roughly 3 minutes of interaction); and (G) all unique contacts with more than 100 cumulative contacts (roughly 30 minutes of interaction). Insets in (E)-(G) show the plot of in-school survey contacts versus each metric of sensor-recorded contacts with a cubic smoothing spline. (D) shows the population distribution by grade of participants who completed at least one contact survey or participated in a sensor deployment, compared to the population distribution of the Pittsburgh standard metropolitan statistical area (PSMSA) for 2012.




Figure 2. Factors associated with the number and duration of survey-reported in-school contacts in a US school setting. All models include a random intercept for day of survey completion.




Figure 3. Age-specific mixing matrices generated from in-school survey contacts and unique sensor-recorded contacts in a US school setting at various cumulative contact thresholds. Matrices are presented as log-10 ratio of observed contacts relative to expectation under proportionate mixing assumptions for survey-reported in-school contacts (A) and sensor-recorded unique contacts with thresholds of 0 (B), 10 (C), and 100 (D) cumulative contacts. Blue colours indicate more contacts than expected under proportionate mixing assumptions, and red colours indicate less mixing than expected. Bolded ratio values deviate significantly from the null expectation, $\alpha=0.05$, and q equals the degree of assortative mixing. Scatterplots (F-H) show the corresponding i, j values of the survey- and sensor-based mixing matrices at each threshold (0, 10, 100). (E) shows the average departure from proportionate mixing as a function of difference between grade for each matrix.




Figure 4. Grade-specific final predicted attack rates of a respiratory virus in a US school setting, based on stochastic simulation using mixing matrices of in-school survey contacts and unique sensor-recorded contacts at various contact thresholds, adjusted by proportionate mixing expectations, within each school (ELEM, elementary; MS, middle school; HS, high school).

