






# BMJ Open Cohort profile: the British Columbia COVID-19 Population Mixing Patterns Survey (BC-Mix)

Prince A Adu,<sup>1,2</sup> Mawuena Binka,<sup>1</sup> Bushra Mahmood,<sup>3</sup> Dahn Jeong <sup>1,2</sup>, Terri Buller-Taylor,<sup>1</sup> Makuza Jean Damascene,<sup>1,2</sup> Sarafa Iyaniwura,<sup>1,4</sup> Notice Ringa,<sup>1,2</sup> Héctor A Velásquez García,<sup>1,2</sup> Stanley Wong <sup>1</sup>, Amanda Yu,<sup>1</sup> Sofia Bartlett,<sup>1,5</sup> James Wilton <sup>1</sup>, Mike A Irvine,<sup>1,6</sup> Michael Otterstatter <sup>1,2</sup>, Naveed Zafar Janjua <sup>1,2,7</sup>

**To cite:** Adu PA, Binka M, Mahmood B, *et al.* Cohort profile: the British Columbia COVID-19 Population Mixing Patterns Survey (BC-Mix). *BMJ Open* 2022;**12**:e056615. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-056615

► Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-056615>).

Received 20 August 2021  
Accepted 28 July 2022

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose** Several non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as physical distancing, handwashing, self-isolation, and school and business closures, were implemented in British Columbia (BC) following the first laboratory-confirmed case of COVID-19 on 26 January 2020, to minimise in-person contacts that could spread infections. The BC COVID-19 Population Mixing Patterns Survey (BC-Mix) was established as a surveillance system to measure behaviour and contact patterns in BC over time to inform the timing of the easing/re-imposition of control measures. In this paper, we describe the BC-Mix survey design and the demographic characteristics of respondents.

**Participants** The ongoing repeated online survey was launched in September 2020. Participants are mainly recruited through social media platforms (including Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, WhatsApp). A follow-up survey is sent to participants 2–4 weeks after completing the baseline survey. Survey responses are weighted to BC's population by age, sex, geography and ethnicity to obtain generalisable estimates. Additional indices such as the Material and Social Deprivation Index, residential instability, economic dependency, and others are generated using census and location data.

**Findings to date** As of 26 July 2021, over 61 000 baseline survey responses were received of which 41 375 were eligible for analysis. Of the eligible participants, about 60% consented to follow-up and about 27% provided their personal health numbers for linkage with healthcare databases. Approximately 83.5% of respondents were female, 58.7% were 55 years or older, 87.5% identified as white and 45.9% had at least a university degree. After weighting, approximately 50% were female, 39% were 55 years or older, 65% identified as white and 50% had at least a university degree.

**Future plans** Multiple papers describing contact patterns, physical distancing measures, regular handwashing and facemask wearing, modelling looking at impact of physical distancing measures and vaccine acceptance, hesitancy and uptake are either in progress or have been published.

## INTRODUCTION

The novel COVID-19, caused by SARS-CoV-2, has spread worldwide since December 2019.

## STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- ⇒ The sample size for this study is larger than comparable studies.
- ⇒ Our methodology allows us to consider many auxiliary variables to enhance the representativeness of our sample to the general population.
- ⇒ We employ an efficient and cost-effective recruitment strategy providing real-time data.
- ⇒ Some population groups are under-represented in the survey possibly due to lack of access to social media.
- ⇒ Our survey responses may be subject to recall bias since we ask respondents to recall contacts and other behaviours or activities from the previous day.

A global pandemic was declared by the WHO in March 2020 and, as of July 2021, there have been over 200 million cases of COVID-19 infections and over 4.3 million resultant deaths globally.<sup>1</sup> As the roll-out of COVID-19 vaccines continues at varying rates worldwide, physical distancing measures<sup>2</sup> remain among the most effective methods for COVID-19 prevention and control.<sup>3</sup> Many governments have put in place physical distancing measures such as travel restrictions, closure of schools and workplaces, and the banning of large group gatherings to interrupt the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. These measures attempt to reduce contact between infected and healthy individuals in order to minimise disease spread and the impact on the healthcare system.

British Columbia (BC) is located on the West Coast of Canada and covers almost a million square kilometres. It has a diverse population of approximately 5.15 million as of 1 July 2020.<sup>4</sup> Public health officials in BC began urging the public to practise physical distancing and avoid any non-essential travel in early March 2020. By 17 March 2020, a



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

## Correspondence to

Dr Naveed Zafar Janjua;  
[naveed.janjua@bccdc.ca](mailto:naveed.janjua@bccdc.ca)

public health emergency was declared in the province and various physical distancing measures were implemented.<sup>5</sup> These included restriction of indoor and outdoor gatherings, closure of businesses that were unable to meet physical distancing measures, self-isolation requirements after travelling outside the country and general physical distancing in all public space.

Assessing the impact of physical distancing measures on person-to-person contact can provide valuable information for refining control measures and help minimise both COVID-19-related disease burden and the related economic, social, and mental health impacts. Although methods such as mathematical modelling can estimate the potential for resurgence, these methods often lack population-based empirical data on contact patterns, especially on the varying levels of contact patterns exhibited by different demographic groups in the population. These population-specific data could better inform mathematical models by incorporating explicit knowledge of contact patterns that are driving transmission rather than inferring these from reported cases and hospitalisation.<sup>6–8</sup> Ultimately, they serve as an evidence base to guide targeted measures that are amenable to actions by the government to ensure that the COVID-19 cases remain below the resurgence thresholds.

Various studies have assessed the impact of physical distancing measures imposed by governments on local contact patterns and behaviours during the COVID-19 pandemic in Belgium,<sup>8</sup> Greece,<sup>9</sup> Kenya,<sup>10</sup> Luxembourg,<sup>11</sup> the Netherlands<sup>12</sup> and the UK.<sup>13</sup> Others include Verelst *et al*'s SOCRATES-CoMix Study<sup>14</sup> and a rapid review of social contact patterns by Liu *et al*.<sup>15</sup> Such surveys can measure the public's compliance with physical distancing measures and provide valuable information to inform other public health measures that may be necessary to avoid further waves of COVID-19 infections. In addition, the impact of physical distancing measures on mixing patterns and contact behaviours may vary across different age groups, and by individuals' primary place of activity such as schools or workplaces.<sup>9 16–18</sup>

Here, we describe the development of the BC COVID-19 Population Mixing Patterns Survey (BC-Mix), an ongoing online survey to monitor and assess social contact behaviours and mixing patterns in BC, Canada, during the COVID-19 pandemic. We detail the development of the survey and recruitment of respondents, as well as the characteristics of the participants.

## COHORT DESCRIPTION

### Survey design and methodology

The BC-Mix (<http://www.bccdc.ca/our-research/projects/bc-mix-covid-19-survey>; <https://a4ph.med.ubc.ca/projects-and-initiatives/bc-mix/>) uses a cross-sectional survey design with longitudinal follow-up. Eligible population includes residents of BC who are at least 18 years of age. The survey began on 4 September 2020, and as at the time of this publication, is still ongoing. Once a

participant has completed the survey for the first time, they are invited for repeated follow-up. The first-time responses are referred to as the 'baseline'. Participants responding to the baseline survey are invited to complete the first follow-up survey after 2 weeks. Subsequent follow-up surveys are then sent in 4-week intervals, following the completion of the previous survey.

### Participant recruitment

To capture participants from a broad demographic range, the survey invitation is disseminated through Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, WhatsApp, Twitter and Google search engine results pages. The Google Ads Audience manager and Facebook Ads manager allow for paid advertisements to be targeted at specific audiences. We use these tools to target the survey advertisement campaigns to only residents of BC who are 18 years and above. We also monitor the demographic profile of survey participants and occasionally use these functions to target recruitment of certain age groups or sex that may be under-represented using the BC population as our point of reference.<sup>19</sup>

To help capture under-represented groups, we promote the survey to various ethnic populations. For instance, a South Asian community organisation promotes the survey on their social media pages and also sends the survey to individuals on their mailing list. Although the survey is in English, it is also promoted in different languages (specifically, Korean and Farsi) to members of minority community groups in BC on their social media pages. Flyers are also distributed at grocery stores and restaurants particularly including those frequented by minority groups.

### Patient and public involvement

The initial version of the BC-Mix was first piloted with a randomly selected sample of the BC population and feedback received was incorporated in the final version before the official launch of the survey. Methods of recruitment and priority of research questions were also informed by discussions with members of the public and with a community group. We also receive input from survey participants on an ongoing basis through a dedicated email address. We plan to create dashboards and other infographics of the study results on the study's website.

### Survey domain and case definitions

The BC-Mix survey instrument was adapted from the POLYMOD Study<sup>17</sup> and the Berkeley Interpersonal Contact Study (BICS),<sup>20</sup> and was administered through Qualtrics,<sup>21</sup> an online survey tool. The baseline survey comprises 94 questions across six key domains:

1. Demographic information: this domain includes age, sex, gender, ethnicity, education, employment, household characteristics and postal code.
2. COVID-19 testing and results, symptoms and health behaviours: this domain captures COVID-19 testing information, symptoms and behaviours such as doctor visits following symptoms.

3. Activities and behaviour in and outside of the home: this domain captures social contact and mixing behaviours such as number of contacts, location and duration of contact during the past 24 hours. Other questions in this domain include age and sex of contact, and relationship of respondent to the contact persons, physical distancing behaviour (eg, handwashing) and personal protective equipment use. Initially, respondents were asked to provide this information for up to three of their reported contacts. We began collecting data on the characteristics of up to 10 contacts from 11 December 2020. Also from 11 December 2020, we began collecting general information about greater than 10 contacts, that is, if a participant reports more than 10 contacts per day, they are asked general questions about these contacts for, for example, age group, duration and location of the majority of those contacts. If majority of contacts took place at a workplace setting, a follow-up question asks respondents to report the type of work setting where the contacts occurred.
4. Internet and social media use: this domain captures information on internet and social media use, such as most frequently used platform and frequency of use.
5. Perceptions and attitudes around COVID-19: this domain measures the respondent's perception of physical distancing measures, and their self-confidence or ability to carry them out.
6. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance subquestionnaire: this subquestionnaire was added on 8 March 2021. Items from this domain were developed using a vaccine acceptance behavioural framework, which synthesises constructs from the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA),<sup>22</sup> Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)<sup>23 24</sup> and the Health Belief Model (HBM),<sup>25</sup> to understand and predict the uptake of COVID-19 vaccine. According to the TRA, the best single predictor of behaviour is an individual's intention.<sup>26</sup> Intentions, in turn, are an outcome of the individual's attitude toward performing the behaviour in question, and/or the individual's perceptions of support from family and friends (subjective norms) for engaging in the behaviour.<sup>27</sup> Perceived control or self-efficacy, the confidence that one has the ability to perform the intended behaviour,<sup>28</sup> is another important construct taken from TPB. The TPB assumes that an individual's perception of whether they can successfully engage in a particular behaviour often has a direct effect on their intentions, such as getting a vaccine.<sup>29</sup> The widely used HBM has previously been used to evaluate beliefs and attitudes toward seasonal influenza and pandemic swine influenza vaccines as well as the COVID-19 vaccine.<sup>30–33</sup> Relevant constructs from HBM were applied to develop questionnaire items to assess perceived threat of contracting the COVID-19, perceived severity of disease if infected and belief in the safety and effectiveness of getting the vaccine. Overall, this subquestionnaire is meant to provide an understanding of some of the individual-level health beliefs, perceptions and attitudes that may influence vaccine

uptake. The vaccine acceptance subquestionnaire has the following domains: Attitude (perceived susceptibility, severity, benefits and barriers), Descriptive and Subjective Norms, Perceived Control and Intention.

Location data are used to generate other indicators at the area level. For example, the Quebec Material and Social Deprivation combines six indicators related to health and welfare that represent material or social deprivation based on Canadian Census data, including (1) proportion of persons without high school diploma; (2) ratio of employment to population; (3) average income; (4) proportion of persons separated, divorced, widowed; (5) proportion of single-parent families and (6) proportion of people living alone.<sup>34</sup>

A full list of key variables in the survey and definitions is presented in online supplemental table 1.

### Analysis, data cleaning and weighting

Quota sampling has been used by other studies to achieve representativeness.<sup>8 35</sup> We used two approaches to achieve the same goal: adaptive recruitment through promotion and targeting to specific populations, and post hoc weighting. Our survey tool does not set quotas on recruitment but uses targeted advertisements to improve representativeness.

All suspected duplicate responses are removed (ie, a participant filling the survey more than once in a survey round). For suspected duplicates, the most recent record is retained, and others are removed. A survey completion rate of at least 33% of questions, and valid non-missing responses for the sex and age questions are required for inclusion for weighting the survey data and further analysis. To ensure that the BC-Mix sample is representative of the BC population, survey data are weighted using the weighting adjustment technique<sup>36</sup> to obtain generalisable estimates (table 1). Using the 2016 Census data,<sup>37</sup> the survey is weighted with the following auxiliary variables: age, sex, geography and ethnicity in the following hierarchy: as our first criterion, we consider age, sex, geography and ethnicity as our auxiliary variables. If a record has valid responses for all these variables except the ethnicity variable, then the survey weight is generated using only age, sex and geography (second criterion). If a record does not meet the first and second criteria, then we apply the third criterion which uses age, sex and ethnicity as the auxiliary variables. Finally, we use only age and sex as auxiliary variables, if a record does not satisfy the first three criteria.

Survey weights are estimated separately for baseline and for each follow-up. To assess participant profile, we computed unweighted and weighted frequency and percentages of key demographic variables using SAS software V.9.4. Baseline survey data were used to provide the survey participant profile and in comparison with the BC population profile (table 1). To assess potential systematic differences between eligible and ineligible responses, a comparison of the baseline eligible participants versus ineligible participants is presented in online

**Table 1** Participant profile of BC-Mix baseline data (n=41 375), 4 September 2020–26 July 2021

	Survey			British Columbia population		
	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted % (excl missing)	Weighted frequency	Weighted %	Population frequency	Population %
Sex						
Male	6823	16.5	21293	50.0	1 805 105	48.5
Female	34 552	83.5	21 261	50.0	1 914 755	51.5
Missing						
Age						
18–34	4978	12.0	11 575	27.2	1 002 745	27
35–54	12 110	29.3	14 194	33.4	1 251 835	33.7
55+	24 287	58.7	16 784	39.4	1 465 280	39.4
Race/ethnicity						
Indigenous	1757	4.4	2180	5.3	186 705	5
Chinese	882	2.2	4451	10.9	418 035	11.2
White	35 026	87.5	26 383	64.6	2 448 155	65.8
South Asian	606	1.5	3473	8.5	280 470	7.5
Other	1766	4.4	4352	10.7	386 495	10.4
Missing/unknown	1338	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Health region						
Fraser Health	8451	26.1	11 793	36.2	1 347 410	36.2
Interior Health	6143	19.0	5336	16.4	595 105	16
Northern Island	1825	5.6	1828	5.6	213 235	5.7
Vancouver Coastal	7315	22.6	8118	24.9	934 055	25.1
Vancouver Island	8640	26.7	5535	17.0	630 055	16.9
Missing/unknown	9001	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Education						
Below high school	807	2.5	1096	3.0	2301 030	12.5
Below bachelor	16 928	51.7	15 176	47.0	466 295	61.9
University degree	15 029	45.9	16 273	50.0	952 535	25.6
Missing/unknown	8611	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Employment status						
Employed full time (30 hours or more/ week)	10 654	32.0	13 608	40.8	n/a	n/a
Employed part time	2993	9.0	3131	9.4	n/a	n/a

Continued

**Table 1** Continued

	Survey		British Columbia population		
	Unweighted frequency	Unweighted % (excl missing)	Weighted frequency	Weighted %	Population frequency Population %
Self-employed	2704	8.1	3013	9.0	n/a n/a
Unemployed but looking for a job	952	2.9	1522	4.6	n/a n/a
Unemployed and not looking for a job	406	1.2	510	1.5	n/a n/a
Full-time parent, homemaker	879	2.6	740	2.2	n/a n/a
Retired	12 757	38.3	8096	24.3	n/a n/a
Student/pupil	566	1.7	1197	3.6	n/a n/a
Long-term sick or disabled	968	2.9	914	2.7	n/a n/a
Prefer not to answer	424	1.3	619	1.9	n/a n/a
Missing/unknown	8072	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a
Material Deprivation Index					
1 (privileged)	6407	22.3	6100	21.8	n/a n/a
2	6475	22.5	5873	21.1	n/a n/a
3	6972	24.2	6010	21.6	n/a n/a
4	4822	16.8	5187	18.7	n/a n/a
5 (deprived)	4085	14.2	4656	16.8	n/a n/a
Missing	1,2614	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a
Follow-up consent					
Yes	20 633	63.8	19051	58.9	n/a n/a
No	11 689	36.2	13275	41.1	n/a n/a
Missing	9053	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a
Data linkage consent					
Yes	7290	27.3	7318	26.4	n/a n/a
No	19 467	72.8	20 362	73.6	n/a n/a
Missing	14 618	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a n/a
BC-Mix, BC COVID-19 Population Mixing Patterns Survey; n/a, not applicable.					



supplemental table 2. Participant profile of follow-up surveys is also presented in online supplemental table 3.

### Preliminary results

As of 26 July 2021, there were 61 183 respondents who participated in the baseline survey of which 41 375 were eligible for analysis. There were 15 194 (eligible=10 993) participants in the first follow-up survey, 11 343 (eligible n=8164) in the second, 8521 (eligible n=6375) in the third, 6487 (eligible n=4981) in the fourth, 5014 (eligible=3891) in the fifth, 4094 (eligible=3184) in the sixth, 3125 (eligible n=2417) in the seventh and 2317 (eligible n=1760) participants in the eighth follow-up survey (figure 1). Examining the eligible baseline sample by month recruited, June 2021 recorded the highest proportion (19.9%) of recruited participants (online supplemental table 4).

Whereas the survey completion rate for the baseline survey was 64.7%, the least completion rate in the follow-up surveys was 96.6% (online supplemental table 3). Also, excluding duplicates, although 72.5% of the baseline records were eligible, all the follow-up surveys had more than 94% eligible (online supplemental table 5).

Considering the baseline sample (table 1), there were approximately equal number of male and female (weighted % of female=50.0%). Majority of participants were 55 years or older (weighted %=39.4%), self identified as white (weighted %=64.6%), had at least a university degree (weighted %=50.0%) and lived in the Fraser Health region (weighted %=36.2%).

Almost 63.8% (unweighted n=20 633) consented to a follow-up after the baseline survey and at least 94.2% (unweighted n=10 357) consented to receiving subsequent follow-up surveys (table 1 and online supplemental table 3). Approximately 27.3% (unweighted n=7290) of respondents in the baseline provided their personal health numbers for linkage with other healthcare utilisation databases.

After weighting, the distribution of the baseline survey sample was similar to the general BC population in terms of age, sex, health region and ethnicity (table 1). The distribution of the eligible participants was also similar to the distribution of ineligible participants in terms of sex, age, race/ethnicity and geography/health region (online supplemental table 2). Moreover, in a sensitivity analysis, we used a cut-off threshold of 67% instead of 33% and observed that the distribution of this sample was similar to the distribution obtained in our current eligible sample (online supplemental table 6). In addition, we compared the characteristics of a sample with 100% completion and <100% completion and found no systematic differences in demographic characteristics between the two samples (online supplemental table 7).

### Findings to date

Following the identification of COVID-19 cases in BC, several interventions including physical distancing


measures were implemented to limit the spread of COVID-19 in the province. Subsequently, the BC-Mix was developed by the BC Centre for Disease Control<sup>41</sup> as part of an early warning system for monitoring social and physical interactions between individuals of different age groups and demography, and to help predict when COVID-19 transmission might further increase. This paper describes the BC-Mix survey methods and the profile of survey respondents.

Recent studies similar to the BC-Mix have assessed social contact patterns relevant to the spread and control of COVID-19 in different countries,<sup>8-13 42 43</sup> many of which have adapted features of the POLYMOD Project.<sup>17</sup> The 2020 Belgian CoMix Survey<sup>8</sup> is an online longitudinal survey that closely monitors changes in social mixing behaviours among a sample of Belgian adults (aged 18 years and above). The UK CoMix Survey assesses contact patterns of a representative sample of UK adults. Launched on 24 March 2020, participants are followed up every 2 weeks to monitor changes in their self-reported behaviours.<sup>13</sup> In Canada, the Quebec-based CONNECT Study uses population-based survey to assess social contacts and mixing patterns.<sup>42</sup> Brankston *et al*<sup>43</sup> also used paid panel representative of Canadian adults to construct contact patterns and determine the impact of physical distancing measures on COVID-19 transmission. Most of these studies commissioned market research companies or used survey panels to recruit participants.<sup>8 13 20 43</sup> While market companies or survey panels offer a convenient approach to sampling, they have some challenges. Panels are made of membership in loyalty programmes or other panels constituting a select group of the population, and therefore, may not represent complete random recruitment from a population of interest.

The use of targeted social media advertisement for participant recruitment has gained prominence in health research,<sup>19 44</sup> having been applied in areas such as mental health,<sup>45</sup> cannabis use,<sup>46</sup> smoking behaviour<sup>47</sup> and other health-related studies.<sup>48</sup> For our survey, we use social media advertisement and other recruitment strategies. Although social media-based recruitment does not necessarily generate a random sample of the general population given the characteristics of people who are on social media may differ from those who are not, social media channels like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and others have powerful targeting capabilities that allow researchers to target advertisements to users with specific demographic characteristics. They also have the advantage of reaching hard-to-reach populations.<sup>49</sup>

### Strengths and limitations

The following issues should be considered for interpretation of results from BC-Mix. Some population groups are under-represented in the survey, possibly due to the lack of access to social media. These are people who are economically marginalised and less likely to have access to a computer/electronic device or to have access to the internet or cellular data, for example, people living in



**Figure 1** Participant flow chart for British Columbia COVID-19 Population Mixing Patterns Survey (baseline and first eight follow-up data).

poverty, people who are unemployed, people who are unhoused, etc. Additionally, people who are in prison (sentenced or on remand) or people who are under immigration detention may not have access to the internet or cellular devices. Our survey responses may also be subject to recall bias since we ask respondents to recall contacts and other behaviours or activities from the previous day. Other studies have used diaries<sup>17</sup> to overcome this weakness but this may be logistically challenging and attrition with this method may be quite high. Another potential bias inherent in our survey is the issue of reporting bias, as respondents may respond in ways consistent with the laws around physical distancing. In addition, the BC-Mix is available only in English, thus excluding individuals who cannot communicate in English. This notwithstanding, according to the 2016 Census, 96.6% of BC's population indicated that they can converse in English.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, we do not believe that any bias associated with language would be significant. Another limitation is the large number of recruits that were ineligible and the attrition between successive rounds of survey. This could be related to survey fatigue, or the time required to complete the survey. Also, although we used survey weights to improve the representativeness of our sample, this was by no means perfect as some differences in the distribution of some characteristics can still be observed between our weighted sample and the BC population. This limits representativeness of the sample. Additionally, although weighting ensures that a survey sample is similar to the reference population in terms of some known demographic characteristics, this does not guarantee that the weighted data on a particular outcome measure are representative, particularly in situations where the outcome measure is related to unknown factors that were not considered during weighting.

Our survey has several strengths. Web-based surveys like the BC-Mix provide timely information for pandemic response.<sup>49</sup> Also, during an infectious disease pandemic, web-based surveys offer a more convenient approach to data collection compared with in-person or other modes of data collection. We also found paid advertisements to be more cost-effective compared with the cost of panel data from survey companies.<sup>44</sup> An additional strength of our study is its large sample size. Our total recruited sample of over 61 000 participants compares with the 1356 participants in the UK CoMix Study,<sup>13</sup> the 9743 participants in the BICS,<sup>20</sup> 1542 participants in the Belgian CoMix Study<sup>8</sup> and the 7290 participants in the POLYMOD Study.<sup>17</sup> In addition, because we opted to achieve representativeness post-data collection (at the analysis stage), we were able to consider geography and ethnicity in our weighting strategy. It would have been logistically challenging to consider these variables together with other variables had we used quota-sampling given that many market research company panels were limited in terms of recruitment by age, sex and geography. Using many auxiliary variables in our weighting strategy increased the representativeness of the BC population.

## Collaboration

The BC-Mix will continue to collect relevant data on behaviour and contact patterns in BC to reflect the changing dynamics of the COVID-19 pandemic. The BC-Mix has an overarching governance structure. We welcome further collaboration from interested researchers. Data requests should be sent to the Principal Investigator, Dr Naveed Z Janjua (corresponding author).

## CONCLUSION

To our knowledge, the BC-Mix is the first and largest surveillance tool providing real-time quantitative data on mixing patterns and contact characteristics in BC and one of the largest in North America. Tools such as the BC-Mix are integral to the COVID-19 pandemic response as they provide critical data that can be used to inform the timing of loosening or re-imposition of physical distancing measures. Further analyses on contact patterns, relationship of contact patterns with transmission, disparities in contact patterns and facemask use are either in progress or have been published.<sup>39 40</sup>

## Author affiliations

<sup>1</sup>BC Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>2</sup>School of Population and Public Health, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>3</sup>Department of Medicine, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>4</sup>Department of Mathematics, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>5</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>6</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>7</sup>Centre for Health Evaluation & Outcome Sciences, St. Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

**Twitter** Bushra Mahmood @bushramahmood

**Acknowledgements** The authors would like to express their gratitude to Dr Joan Hu, Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, Simon Fraser University, and Mei Chong of British Columbia Centre for Disease Control for their methodological guidance. We are also grateful to all residents of British Columbia who participated in the British Columbia COVID-19 Population Mixing Patterns Survey (BC-Mix).

**Contributors** Conceptualisation—NZJ and PAA. Survey design—NZJ, PAA, TB-T and BM. Data curation—PAA, AY and SW. Statistical analysis—PAA. Funding acquisition—NZJ. Methodology—NZJ, PAA, MB, TB-T, BM, SI and MO. Writing (first draft)—PAA, DJ, MB, TB-T, SI and NR. Writing (review and editing)—NZJ, HAVG, BM, MJD, MB, JW, SB, MO and MAI. Overall content and guarantor—NZJ.

**Funding** This work was supported by Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research COVID-19 Research Response Fund (Award #: COV-2020-1183).

**Competing interests** None declared.

**Patient and public involvement** Patients and/or the public were involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research. Refer to the Methods section for further details.

**Patient consent for publication** Not required.

**Ethics approval** Informed consent was sought on the survey start page. The study was reviewed and approved by the University of British Columbia Behavioral Research Ethics Board (No: H20-01785). Data from BC-Mix contribute to modelling projections to inform COVID-19 control measures in BC (ref. 38). Multiple papers describing contact patterns, physical distancing measures, regular handwashing and facemask wearing, modelling looking at impact of physical distancing



measures and vaccination levels, vaccine acceptance, hesitancy, and uptake are either in progress or have been published (ref. 39 and 40).

**Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

**Data availability statement** Data are available upon reasonable request.

**Supplemental material** This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

**Open access** This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

# ORCID iDs

Dahn Jeong <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5958-044X>

Stanley Wong <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0886-9889>

James Wilton <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2295-7511>

Michael Otterstatter <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5489-014X>

Naveed Zafar Janjua <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5681-719X>

# REFERENCES

- Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. COVID-19 Map [Internet]. Available: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html> [Accessed 23 May 2021].
- Lu H, Stratton CW, Tang Y-W. Outbreak of pneumonia of unknown etiology in Wuhan, China: the mystery and the miracle. *J Med Virol* 2020;92:401–2.
- Islam N, Sharp SJ, Chowell G, et al. Physical distancing interventions and incidence of coronavirus disease 2019: natural experiment in 149 countries. *BMJ* 2020;370:m2743.
- BC Stats. 2020 Sub-Provincial population estimates highlights, 2020. Joint statement on Province of B.C.'s COVID-19 response, latest updates [BC Gov News [Internet], 2020. Available: <https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2020HLTH0089-000505> [Accessed 23 May 2021].
- Ferguson N, Laydon DJ, Nedjati Gilani G. Report 9: impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand, 2020. Available: <https://www.scienceopen.com/document?vid=4e6290c9-0ded-40ed-b858-ba18119863c0> [Accessed 19 Jul 2021].
- Zhang J, Litvinova M, Liang Y, et al. Changes in contact patterns shape the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. *Science* 2020;368:1481–6.
- Coletti P, Wambua J, Gimma A, et al. CoMix: comparing mixing patterns in the Belgian population during and after lockdown. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:21885.
- Sypsa V, Roussos S, Paraskevis D, et al. Effects of social distancing measures during the first epidemic wave of severe acute respiratory syndrome infection, Greece. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;27:452–62.
- Quaife M, van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, et al. The impact of COVID-19 control measures on social contacts and transmission in Kenyan informal settlements. *BMC Med* 2020;18:316.
- Latsuzbaia A, Herold M, Bertemes J-P, et al. Evolving social contact patterns during the COVID-19 crisis in Luxembourg. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0237128.
- Backer JA, Mollema L, RAE V. The impact of physical distancing measures against COVID-19 transmission on contacts and mixing patterns in the Netherlands: repeated cross-sectional surveys in 2016/2017, April 2020 and June 2020. *medRxiv* 2020.
- Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Med* 2020;18:124.
- Verelst F, Hermans L, Vercruyssen S, 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;19:254.
- Liu CY, Berlin J, Kiti MC, et al. Rapid review of social contact patterns during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Epidemiology* 2021;32:781–91.
- Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, et al. Age-Dependent effects in the transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *Nat Med* 2020;26:1205–11.
- Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* 2008;5:e74.
- Wallinga J, Teunis P, Kretzschmar M. Using data on social contacts to estimate age-specific transmission parameters for respiratory-spread infectious agents. *Am J Epidemiol* 2006;164:936–44.
- Grow A, Perrotta D, Del Fava E, Fava ED, et al. Addressing public health emergencies via Facebook surveys: advantages, challenges, and practical considerations. *J Med Internet Res* 2020;22:e20653.
- Feehan DM, Mahmud AS. Quantifying population contact patterns in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nat Commun* 2021;12:893.
- Qualtrics. Qualtrics [Internet]. Provo, Utah, USA, 2021. <https://www.qualtrics.com>
- Ajzen I, Fishbein M. *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc, 1980.
- Ajzen I. From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior. In: Kuhl J, Beckmann J, eds. *Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior* [Internet]. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 1985: 11–39.
- Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process* 1991;50:179–211.
- Becker MH. The health belief model and personal health behavior. *Health Educ Monogr* 1974;2:324–473.
- Fishbein M, Belief AI, Attitude I. *Behavior: an introduction to theory and research*. reading. MA: Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- Sheppard BH, Hartwick J, Warshaw PR. The theory of Reasoned action: a meta-analysis of past research with recommendations for modifications and future research. *J Consum Res* 1988;15:325–43.
- Bogoch II, Watts A, Thomas-Bachli A, et al. Pneumonia of unknown aetiology in Wuhan, China: potential for international spread via commercial air travel. *J Travel Med* 2020;27. doi:10.1093/jtm/taaa008. [Epub ahead of print: 13 03 2020].
- Fisher WA, Kohut T, Salisbury CMA, et al. Understanding human papillomavirus vaccination intentions: comparative utility of the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior in vaccine target age women and men. *J Sex Med* 2013;10:2455–64.
- Santos AJ, Kislaya I, Machado A, et al. Beliefs and attitudes towards the influenza vaccine in high-risk individuals. *Epidemiol Infect* 2017;145:1786–96.
- Teitler-Regev S, Shahrabani S, Benzion U. Factors affecting intention among students to be vaccinated against A/H1N1 influenza: a health belief model approach. *Adv Prev Med* 2011;2011:1–8.
- Wong MCS, Wong ELY, Huang J, et al. Acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine based on the health belief model: a population-based survey in Hong Kong. *Vaccine* 2021;39:1148–56.
- Wambua J, Hermans L, Coletti P. The influence of risk perceptions on close contact frequency during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic [Internet]. Available: <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-996488/v1> [Accessed 16 Mar 2022].
- Bureau d'information et d'études En Santé Des Populations (BIESP). Deprivation Index [Internet]., 2019. INSPQ. Available: <https://www.inspq.qc.ca/en/deprivation/material-and-social-deprivation-index> [Accessed 27 May 2021].
- Leung K, Jit M, Lau EHY, et al. Social contact patterns relevant to the spread of respiratory infectious diseases in Hong Kong. *Sci Rep* 2017;7:7974.
- Bethlehem JG. *Applied survey methods: a statistical perspective*. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley, 2009: 375.
- Government of Canada SC. Census Profile, 2016 Census - British Columbia [Province] and Canada [Country] [Internet], 2017. Available: <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=59&Geo2=PR&Code2=01&SearchText=Canada&SearchType=Begin&SearchPR=01&B1=All&type=0> [Accessed 25 Jul 2021].
- BC Centre for Disease Control. Epidemiology & Modelling Presentations [Internet]. Available: <http://www.bccdc.ca/health-info/diseases-conditions/covid-19/modelling-projections> [Accessed 12 Apr 2022].
- Iyaniwura SA, Falcão RC, Ringa N, et al. Mathematical modeling of COVID-19 in British Columbia: an age-structured model with time-dependent contact rates. *Epidemics* 2022;39:100559.
- Ringa N, Iyaniwura SA, David S, et al. Social contacts and transmission of COVID-19 in British Columbia, Canada. *Front Public Health* 2022;10:867425.
- BC Centre for Disease Control. What We Do [Internet]. Available: <http://www.bccdc.ca/about/what-we-do> [Accessed 10 Jun 2021].
- Institut national de, santé publique du Québec. CONNECT : étude des contacts sociaux des Québécois - 27 avril 2021 [Internet].

- INSPQ. Available: <https://www.inspq.qc.ca/covid-19/donnees/connect/27-avril-2021> [Accessed 17 Jun 2021].
- 43 Brankston G, Merkley E, Fisman DN, *et al.* Quantifying contact patterns in response to COVID-19 public health measures in Canada. *BMC Public Health* 2021;21:2040.
  - 44 Thornton L, Batterham PJ, Fassnacht DB, *et al.* Recruiting for health, medical or psychosocial research using Facebook: systematic review. *Internet Interventions* 2016;4:72–81.
  - 45 Choi I, Milne DN, Glozier N, *et al.* Using different Facebook advertisements to recruit men for an online mental health study: engagement and selection bias. *Internet Interv* 2017;8:27–34.
  - 46 Borodovsky JT, Marsch LA, Budney AJ. Studying cannabis use behaviors with Facebook and web surveys: methods and insights. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* 2018;4:e9408:e48.
  - 47 Ramo DE, Prochaska JJ. Broad reach and targeted recruitment using Facebook for an online survey of young adult substance use. *J Med Internet Res* 2012;14:e1878.
  - 48 Fazzino TL, Rose GL, Pollack SM, *et al.* Recruiting U.S. and Canadian college students via social media for participation in a web-based brief intervention study. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* 2015;76:127–32.
  - 49 Hlatshwako TG, Shah SJ, Kosana P, *et al.* Online health survey research during COVID-19. *Lancet Digit Health* 2021;3:e76–7.

## Supplementary files

### Quantifying contact patterns: development and characteristics of the British Columbia COVID-19 population mixing patterns survey (BC-Mix)

Prince A. Adu<sup>1,2</sup>, Mawuena Binka<sup>1</sup>, Bushra Mahmood,<sup>3</sup> Dahn Jeong<sup>1,2</sup>, Terri Buller-Taylor<sup>1</sup>, Makuza Jean Damascene<sup>1,2</sup>, Sarafa Iyaniwura<sup>1,4</sup>, Notice Ringa<sup>1,2</sup>, Héctor A. Velásquez García<sup>1,2</sup>, Stanley Wong<sup>1</sup>, Amanda Yu<sup>1</sup>, Sofia Bartlett<sup>1,6</sup>, James Wilton<sup>1</sup>, Mike A. Irvine<sup>1,7</sup>, Michael Otterstatter<sup>1,2</sup>, Naveed Z. Janjua<sup>1,2,8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>2</sup>School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>3</sup>Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>4</sup>Department of Mathematics and Institute of Applied Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>5</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>6</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>7</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>8</sup>Centre for Health Evaluation & Outcome Sciences, St. Paul's Hospital, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

**S1 Table:** BC-Mix variable names and definitions

Domain	Variable	Definition	Included in follow up? (Yes/No)
Demographic information			Yes (First name, last name, E-mail only)
	Age, sex, gender, ethnicity, first name, last name, personal health number, postal code, employment status, education, occupation	Age, sex, gender, ethnicity, first name, last name, E-mail, personal health number, postal code, employment status, education, occupation of respondent	
	Number of adults living in respondent's household	How many adults live in your household?	
	Number of children living in respondent's household	How many children (under 18 years) live in your household?	
Perceptions and attitudes around COVID-19			No
	Satisfaction with provincial COVID-19 response	How satisfied are you with how COVID-19 has been managed in the province?	
	Knowledge of COVID-19	How much do you know about COVID-19?	
	Attitude to COVID-19 #1	To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? - 1) COVID-19 would be a serious illness for me if I caught it 2) I think I am likely to catch COVID-19 3) If I don't follow government advice, I might spread COVID-19 to someone who is vulnerable. 4) My boss expects me to work when I am feeling unwell or sick 5) If I could not work because of COVID-19, I would still get paid 6) If I had to isolate myself for 14 days because of COVID-19, I would have enough food and supplies for 14 days 7) If I had to isolate myself for 14 days because of COVID-19... - Someone else would be able to look after my children	
	Attitude to COVID-19 #2	How effective do you think the following are at slowing the spread of COVID-19? -1) Meeting up with fewer people than normal 2) Avoiding crowded spaces 3) Staying at home for 14 days if you have ... - Severe symptoms (e.g., severe cough or high temperature).	
	Attitude to COVID-19 #3	How much, if at all, have you changed the number of face-to-face interactions with other people as a result of the COVID19 pandemic?	
	Attitude to COVID-19 #4	How well do you think you are doing at keeping physically distanced from people outside your home?	
	Attitude to COVID-19 #5	How concerned are you personally about the spread of COVID19?	
Attitude toward COVID-19 vaccine			Yes
	Vaccination status (1st or 2nd shot)	Have you received the COVID-19 vaccine (either 1st or 2nd shot)?	
	Date of 1st shot	When did you receive your 1st COVID-19 vaccine shot?	
	Vaccination status (2nd shot)	Have you received your 2nd COVID-19 vaccine shot?	



	Date of 2nd shot	When did you receive your 2nd COVID-19 vaccine shot?	
	Perceived risk	I believe I am at risk of becoming infected with COVID-19.	
	Perceived susceptibility	With the way my life is, I believe I am at a high risk of getting COVID-19 (e.g., risks at my work, recreational activities, people I live with, etc.)	
	Perceived protection 1	I believe a COVID-19 Vaccine will protect me from getting the virus.	
	Perceived protection 2	I believe a COVID-19 vaccine will decrease my chance of getting seriously ill from COVID-19.	
	Trust	I do not trust the COVID-19 vaccine.	
	Effectiveness	I am concerned about the effectiveness of the COVID-19 vaccination.	
	Safety	I am concerned about the safety of the COVID-19 vaccination.	
	Subjective norm 1	Most of the people I know are getting or have received the COVID-19 vaccine.	
	Subjective norm 2	Most of the people who are important to me (my family, relatives and/or friends) think I should get the COVID-19 vaccine.	
	Access	If I choose to get the COVID-19 vaccine, I believe it will be easy to get it.	
	Intention	I plan to get the COVID-19 vaccine.	
COVID-19 testing and results, symptoms, and health behaviours			Yes
	COVID symptoms	Since, January 2020, have you had any of the following symptoms? Check all that apply: headache, fever, stuffy nose/congestion, loss of smell or taste, new or worsening cough, difficulty breathing/shortness of breath, confusion, vomiting, chills, weakness, muscle pain, fatigue, nausea, diarrhea	
	Date of first symptoms	When did your first symptom start? (date)	
	Action following symptoms	Have you done any of the following for these symptoms? (Please check all that apply). Called family doctor/ GP, visited family doctor's /GP office, visited community/public health clinic, been admitted to hospital etc.	
	Actions before symptoms	Before these symptoms, had you been in close contact with anyone who either: (A) had any of those symptoms [fever, new or worsening cough, headache, chills, weakness, muscle pain, stuffy nose/congestion, sore throat, difficulty breathing/shortness of breath, nausea, diarrhea, fatigue, loss of smell or taste, confusion, vomiting]; OR (B) was diagnosed positive for COVID-19 within 14 days before you felt sick?	
	Isolation before symptoms	Did you isolate, or stay away from your workplace or educational facility?	
	COVID-19 test	Have you been tested for COVID-19?	
	Test results	Did you test positive for COVID-19?	

	Household symptoms	Has anyone in your household either: (A) had any of the following symptoms: fever, new or worsening cough, headache, chills, weakness, muscle pain, stuffy nose/congestion, sore throat, difficulty breathing/shortness of breath, nausea, diarrhea, fatigue, loss of smell or taste, confusion, vomiting; OR (B) tested positive for COVID-19 since January 2020?	
	First symptoms date	When did their first symptom start? If you don't remember, please make your best guess.	
	Household isolation	Has anyone in your household been told to quarantine, isolate, or limit time at their school or workplace since January 2020 because: they were sick or exposed to someone with COVID-19?	
	Adherence	Did they follow the advice and isolate, quarantine, or stay away from their workplace or educational facility?	
Activities and behaviour in and outside of the home			Yes
	Movement out of home	How many times did you leave your home (or property, apartment) yesterday?	
	Place of movement	Where did you go when you left your home? (Check all that apply) - Another person's home, a workplace, a hospital, doctor's office etc.	
	Distance	What is the farthest distance that you went from your home yesterday?	
	Means of transport	How did you travel when you left your home? (Check all that apply) - Selected Choice - I only walked (I did not use other transportation)	
	Face mask use	Did you use a face mask yesterday?	
	Face mask use location	Where did you use your face mask yesterday? (Check all that apply) - Selected Choice - Everywhere outside my house	
	Mask use duration	Take your best guess for the total amount of time you wore a mask yesterday (hours and minutes)?	
	Presence at home	In the last 3 hours, have you been in your home?	
	Handwashing	In the last 3 hours, have many times did you wash your hands with soap?	
	Hand sanitizer	In the last 3 hours, how many times did you use hand sanitizer?	
	Transport type	Yesterday, which type of public transportation did you use? (Please check all that apply) - Selected Choice - Airplane, bus, taxi etc	
	Transport duration	Yesterday, for about how long were you on public transportation?	
	PPE use during transportation	Yesterday, did you wear any of the following while on public transportation? (Please check all that apply) - Selected Choice - A face mask or other covering over your nose and mouth (e.g., face shield, bandana), gloves, etc.	
	Travel outside Canada	Have you travelled outside Canada at all since Jan 2020? And if so, to where? - Selected Choice	

	Number of contacts	Now we would like to ask you some questions about people you had in-person, face-to-face contact with yesterday. By in-person, face-to-face contact, we mean EITHER: A. An in-person two-way conversation with three or more words OR B. Physical skin-to-skin contact (for example, a handshake, hug, kiss, or contact sports). This includes family members, friends, co-workers, people you spoke to in shops, bus drivers, strangers, etc... and people of ALL ages. Please do not count people you contacted only with things like telephone, text, or online. How many people did you have in-person contact with between 5 am yesterday and 5 am today?	
	Contact identifier #1 to #10	Please add a non-identifying "nickname" for each of the people you had face-to-face or physical contact with (e.g., DG, checkout person, bus driver, child #2). This "nickname" will help you to answer questions about this contact. - 1st person label	
	Characteristics of contact #1 (gender, age, relationship to respondent)	For the people you "nicknamed" and had in-person contact with between 5am yesterday and 5am today... - I believe this person identifies as... [indicate gender, age, relationship to you, location of contact,	
	Characteristics of contact #2	Distance during contact, duration of contact, contact prior to COVID-19, PPE use during contact, distance during contact)	
	Location of contact of 10+ contacts	You said you had more than 10 in-person contacts. Where did majority of these contacts take place?	
	Occupational setting of 10+ contact	You said you had more than 10 in-person contacts. Which of these best describes your work/occupation or the other person's workplace where these contacts took place?	
	Age-group of contacts of 10+ contacts	You said you had more than 10 in-person contacts. What was the age-group for most of these contacts you interacted with?	
	Duration of 10+ contact	You said you had more than 10 in-person contacts. For most of these contacts, about how long did each contact last?	
Internet and social media use and other information			No
	Internet use	About how often do you use the internet?	
	Social media use	Thinking about the social media sites that you use; about how often do you visit or use each of the following? - Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Snapchat, YouTube	
	Survey start date, survey end date, IP address, survey duration, response ID, recorded date, respondent's first and last name, location latitude, location longitude, follow up consent, draw consent	Survey start date, survey end date, IP address, survey duration, response ID, recorded date, respondent's first and last name, location latitude, location longitude, follow up consent, draw consent	
Derived variables			Yes

	Health Authority	The health authority of respondent. This was derived using respondents postal code or location data.	
	Quebec material index	The material deprivation involves deprivation of the goods and conveniences that are part of modern life, such as adequate housing, possession of a car, access to high-speed internet, or a neighbourhood with recreational areas. This deprivation marks the consequences of lack of material resources associated with low education, insecure job situation and insufficient income (1,2).	
	Quebec social index	Social deprivation refers to a fragile social network, starting with the family and encompassing the community. It is characterized by individuals living alone, being a lone parent and being separated, divorced, or widowed (1,2).	
	Ethnocultural composition	Ethno-cultural composition refers to the community make-up of immigrant populations, and at the British Columbia-level takes into consideration factors such as the proportion of population who self-identify as visible minority, the proportion of population that is foreign-born, the proportion of population with no knowledge of either official language (linguistic isolation), and the proportion of population who are recent immigrants (arrived in five years prior to Census). (1)	
	Situational vulnerability	Situational vulnerability speaks to variations in socio-demographic conditions in the areas of housing and education, while taking into account other demographic characteristics. The indicators in this dimension at the British Columbia-level measure concepts such as the proportion of population that identifies as Aboriginal, the proportion of population aged 25-64 without a high school diploma, the proportion of dwellings needing major repairs, the proportion of population that is low-income, and the proportion of single parent families (1).	
	Economic dependency	Economic dependency relates to reliance on the workforce, or a dependence on sources of income other than employment income. Indicators included in this dimension at the British Columbia-level measure concepts such as the proportion of population participating in labour force (aged 15 and older), the proportion of population aged 65 and older, the ratio of employment to population, and the dependency ratio (population aged 0-14 and aged 65 and older divided by population aged 15-64)(1).	
	Residential instability	Residential instability speaks to the tendency of neighbourhood inhabitants to fluctuate over time, taking into consideration both housing and familial characteristics. The indicators in this dimension at the British Columbia-level measure concepts such as the proportion of dwellings that are apartment buildings, the proportion of persons living alone,	



		the proportion of dwellings that are owned, and the proportion of the population who moved within the past five years (1).	
--	--	--	--

References

1. Government of Canada SC. Canadian Index of Multiple Deprivation: Dataset [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/45-20-0001/452000012019002-eng.htm>

2. Bureau d'information et d'études En Santé Des Populations (BIESP). Deprivation Index [Internet]. INSPQ. 2019 [cited 2021 May 27]. Available from: <https://www.inspq.qc.ca/en/deprivation/material-and-social-deprivation-index>

**S2 Table.** Comparison of baseline eligible and ineligible participants, frequencies and proportions

		Eligible (n=41,375)			Ineligible (n=15, 702) ‡		
		Frequency	Percent (incl. missing)	Percent (excl. missing)	Frequency	Percent (incl. missing)	Percent (excl. missing)
Sex	Male	6,823	16.5	16.5	1,697	10.8	18.6
	Female	34,552	83.5	83.5	7,442	47.4	81.4
	Missing	n/a	n/a	n/a	6,563	41.8	n/a
Age	18-34	4,978	12.0	12.0	1,726	11.0	17.7
	35-54	12,110	29.3	29.3	3,039	19.4	31.2
	55+	24,287	58.7	58.7	4,981	31.7	51.1
	Missing	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,956	37.9	n/a
Race/ethnicity	Indigenous	1,757	4.3	4.4	666	4.2	7.2
	Chinese	882	2.1	2.2	238	1.5	2.6
	White	35,026	84.7	87.5	7,439	47.4	79.9
	South Asian	606	1.5	1.5	315	2.0	3.4
	Other	1,766	4.3	4.4	649	4.1	7.0
	Missing/Unknown	1,338	3.2	n/a	6,395	40.7	n/a
Health region	Fraser Health	8,451	20.4	26.1	1,802	11.5	31.0
	Interior Health	6,143	14.8	19.0	1,061	6.8	18.3
	Northern Island	1,825	4.4	5.6	312	2.0	5.4
	Vancouver Coastal	7,315	17.7	22.6	1,329	8.5	22.9
	Vancouver Island	8,640	20.9	26.7	1,300	8.3	22.4
	Missing	9,001	21.8	n/a	9,898	63.0	n/a
Education	Below high school	807	2.0	2.5	41	0.3	7.1
	Below bachelor	16,928	40.9	51.7	245	1.6	42.5
	University degree	15,029	36.3	45.9	290	1.8	50.3
	Missing/Unknown	8,611	20.8	n/a	15,126	96.3	n/a
Employment status	Employed full-time (30 hours or more/week)	10,654	25.7	32.0	210	1.2	31.6
	Employed part-time	2,993	7.2	9.0	75	0.4	11.3
	Self-employed	2,704	6.5	8.1	64	0.4	9.6

	Unemployed but looking for a job	952	2.3	2.9	24	0.1	3.6
	Unemployed and not looking for a job	406	1.0	1.2	10	0.1	1.5
	Full-time parent, homemaker	879	2.1	2.6	10	0.1	1.5
	Retired	12,757	30.8	38.3	87	0.5	13.1
	Student/Pupil	566	1.4	1.7	67	0.4	10.1
	Long-term sick or disabled	968	2.3	2.9	31	0.2	4.7
	Prefer not to answer	424	1.0	1.3	87	0.5	13.1
	Missing/Unknown	8,072	19.5	n/a	15,037	84.8	n/a
Quebec Material Deprivation Index							
	1 (Privileged)	6,407	15.5	22.3	690	4.4	13.8
	2	6,475	15.6	22.5	1,041	6.6	20.9
	3	6,972	16.9	24.2	1,538	9.8	30.8
	4	4,822	11.7	16.8	751	4.8	15.1
	5 (Deprived)	4,085	9.9	14.2	969	6.2	19.4
	Missing	12,614	30.5	n/a	10,713	68.2	n/a
Quebec Social Deprivation Index							
	1 (Privileged)	4,932	11.9	17.2	1,018	6.5	20.4
	2	4,756	11.5	16.5	696	4.4	14.0
	3	6,311	15.3	21.9	1,275	8.1	25.6
	4	5,932	14.3	20.6	897	5.7	18.0
	5 (Deprived)	6,830	16.5	23.8	1,103	7.0	22.1
	Missing	12,614	30.5	n/a	10,713	68.2	n/a
Follow up consent							
	Yes	20,633	49.9	63.8	245	1.6	39.6
	No	11,689	28.3	36.2	373	2.4	60.4
	Missing	9,053	21.9	n/a	15,084	96.1	n/a
Data linkage consent							
	Yes	7,290	17.6	27.3	95	0.6	17.3
	No	19,467	47.1	72.8	454	2.9	82.7
	Missing	14,618	35.3	n/a	15,153	96.5	n/a

‡Does not include 4,106 duplicates

**S3 Table.** Participant profile of BC-Mix follow up surveys: frequencies and proportions (%)

	Follow up #1 (n=10,993)	Follow up #2 (n=8,164)	Follow up #3 (n=6,375)	Follow up #4 (n=4,981)	Follow up #5 (n=3,891)	Follow up #6 (n=3,184)	Follow up #7 (n=2,417)	Follow up #8 (n=1,760)
<b>Complete responses</b>	10619 (96.6)	7935 (97.2)	6265 (98.3)	4906 (98.5)	3836 (98.6)	3137 (98.5)	2397(99.2)	1733 (98.5)
<b>Sex</b>								
Male	1590 (14.5)	1115 (13.7)	843 (13.2)	646 (13.0)	495 (12.7)	404 (12.17)	312 (12.9)	217 (12.3)
Female	9403 (85.5)	7049 (86.3)	5532 (86.8)	4335 (87.0)	3396 (87.3)	2780 (87.3)	2105 (87.1)	1543 (87.7)
<b>Age</b>								
18-34	1128 (10.3)	731 (9.0)	497 (7.8)	363 (7.3)	257 (6.6)	199 (6.3)	152 (6.3)	109 (6.2)
35-54	3013 (27.4)	2105 (25.8)	1533 (24.1)	1127 (22.6)	846 (21.7)	662 (20.8)	495 (20.5)	343 (19.5)
55+	6852 (62.3)	5328 (65.3)	4345 (68.2)	3491 (70.1)	2788 (71.7)	2323 (73.0)	1770 (73.2)	1308 (74.3)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>								
Indigenous	342 (3.1)	229 (2.8)	162 (2.5)	130 (2.6)	91 (2.3)	71 (2.2)	54 (2.2)	38 (2.2)
Chinese	199 (1.8)	124 (1.5)	98 (1.5)	66 (1.3)	48 (1.2)	39 (1.2)	25 (1.0)	16 (0.9)
White	9870 (89.8)	7415 (90.8)	5833 (91.5)	4586 (92.1)	3602 (92.6)	2959 (92.9)	2254 (93.3)	1642 (93.3)
South Asian	79 (0.7)	39 (0.5)	30 (0.5)	20 (0.4)	15 (0.4)	14 (0.4)	12 (0.5)	12 (0.7)
Other	316 (2.9)	229 (2.8)	154 (2.4)	108 (2.2)	86 (2.2)	63 (2.0)	45 (1.9)	35 (2.0)
Missing/Unknown	187(1.7)	128 (1.6)	98 (1.5)	71 (1.4)	49 (1.3)	38 (1.2)	27 (1.1)	17 (1.0)
<b>Health region</b>								
Fraser Health	2748 (25.0)	2039 (25.0)	1590 (24.9)	1243 (25.0)	964 (24.8)	792 (24.9)	613 (25.4)	462 (26.3)
Interior Health	1926 (17.5)	1435 (17.6)	1156 (18.1)	907 (18.2)	703 (18.1)	579 (18.2)	432 (17.9)	317 (18.0)
Northern Island	506 (4.6)	374 (4.6)	280 (4.4)	212 (4.3)	162 (4.2)	116 (3.4)	88 (3.6)	63 (3.6)
Vancouver Coastal	2706 (24.6)	1992 (24.4)	1540 (24.2)	1178 (23.7)	932 (24.0)	758 (23.8)	577 (23.9)	403 (22.9)
Vancouver Island	3059 (27.8)	2303 (28.2)	1794 (28.1)	1430 (28.7)	1122 (28.8)	934 (29.3)	703 (29.1)	513 (29.2)
Missing/Unknown	48 (0.4)	21 (0.3)	15 (0.2)	11 (0.2)	8 (0.2)	5 (0.2)	4 (0.2)	2 (0.1)
<b>Education</b>								
Below high school	173 (1.5)	123 (1.5)	89 (1.4)	68 (1.4)	51 (1.3)	37 (1.2)	26 (1.1)	16 (0.9)
Below bachelor	5236 (47.6)	3835 (47.0)	2979 (46.7)	2303 (46.2)	1771 (45.5)	1453 (45.6)	1108 (45.8)	802 (45.6)



	Follow up #1 (n=10,993)	Follow up #2 (n=8,164)	Follow up #3 (n=6,375)	Follow up #4 (n=4,981)	Follow up #5 (n=3,891)	Follow up #6 (n=3,184)	Follow up #7 (n=2,417)	Follow up #8 (n=1,760)
University degree	5529 (50.3)	4169 (51.1)	3283 (51.5)	2594 (52.1)	2057 (52.9)	1683 (52.9)	1278 (52.9)	939 (53.4)
Missing/Unknown	55 (0.5)	37 (0.5)	24 (0.4)	16 (0.3)	12 (0.3)	11 (0.4)	5 (0.2)	31 (0.2)
<b>Quebec Material Deprivation Index</b>								
1 (Privileged)	1547 (14.1)	1072 (13.75)	896 (14.1)	720 (14.5)	569 (14.6)	435 (13.7)	344 (14.2)	253 (14.4)
2	2078 (18.9)	1547 (19.0)	1198 (18.8)	1008 (20.2)	806 (20.7)	665 (20.9)	500 (20.7)	366 (20.8)
3	2994 (27.3)	2184 (26.8)	1674 (26.3)	1273 (25.6)	973 (25.0)	835 (26.2)	642 (26.6)	450 (25.6)
4	1277 (11.6)	942 (11.64)	748 (11.7)	580 (11.6)	475 (12.2)	379 (11.9)	285 (11.8)	215 (12.2)
5 (Deprived)	1668 (15.2)	1290 (15.8)	1033 (16.2)	728 (15.7)	609 (15.7)	504 (15.8)	375 (15.5)	278 (15.8)
Missing	1429 (13.0)	1069 (13.1)	826 (13.0)	616 (12.4)	459 (11.8)	366 (11.5)	271 (11.2)	198 (11.3)
<b>Quebec Social Deprivation Index</b>								
1 (Privileged)	2188 (19.9)	1641 (20.1)	1286 (20.2)	1063 (21.3)	830 (20.3)	658 (20.7)	509 (21.1)	368 (20.9)
2	1441 (13.1)	1051 (12.9)	787 (12.4)	603 (12.1)	480 (12.3)	411 (12.9)	314 (13.0)	225 (12.8)
3	2478 (22.5)	1831 (22.4)	1480 (23.2)	1148 (23.1)	922 (23.7)	769 (24.2)	574 (23.8)	419 (23.8)
4	1601 (14.6)	1236 (15.1)	945 (14.8)	743 (14.9)	578 (14.9)	488 (15.3)	370 (15.3)	290 (16.5)
5 (Deprived)	1856 (16.9)	1336 (16.4)	1051 (16.5)	808 (16.2)	622 (16.0)	392 (15.5)	379 (15.7)	260 (14.8)
Missing/Unknown	1429 (13)	1069 (13.1)	826 (13.0)	616 (12.4)	459 (11.8)	492 (11.5)	271 (11.2)	198 (11.3)
<b>Follow up consent</b>								
Yes	10357 (94.2)	7793 (95.5)	6182 (97.0)	4857 (97.5)	3789 (97.4)	3106 (97.6)	2380 (98.5)	1714 (97.4)
No	262 (2.4)	142 (1.7)	83 (1.3)	49 (1.0)	47 (1.2)	31 (1.0)	17 (0.7)	19 (1.1)
Missing	374 (3.4)	229 (2.8)	110 (1.7)	75 (1.5)	55 (1.4)	47 (1.5)	20 (0.8)	27 (1.5)

**S3 Table.** Participant profile of BC-Mix follow up surveys: frequencies and proportions (%) [continued]

		Follow up#9 (n=1,200)	Follow up #10 (n=488)
<b>Complete responses</b>		1,178 (98.2)	483 (99.0)
<b>Sex</b>			
	Male	136 (11.3)	54 (11.1)
	Female	1064 (88.7)	434 (88.9)
<b>Age</b>			
	18-34	70 (5.8)	30 (6.2)
	35-54	226 (18.8)	87 (17.8)
	55+	904 (75.3)	371 (76.0)
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>			
	Aboriginal	49 (4.1)	18 (3.7)
	Chinese	12 (1.0)	8 (1.6)
	Not a visible minority (White)	1117 (93.1)	453 (92.8)
	South Asian	8 (0.7)	3 (0.6)
	Other	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Missing/Unknown	14 (1.2)	6 (1.2)
<b>Health region</b>			
	Interior Health	223 (18.6)	88 (18.0)
	Fraser Health	319 (26.6)	129 (26.4)
	Vancouver Coastal	268 (22.3)	106 (21.7)
	Vancouver Island	355 (29.6)	152 (31.2)
	Northern Island	33 (2.7)	12 (2.5)
	Missing/Unknown	2 (0.2)	1 (0.2)
<b>Education</b>			
	Below high school	7 (0.6)	3 (0.6)

<b>Quebec Material Deprivation Index</b>	Below bachelor	549 (45.7)	205 (42.0)
	University degree	643 (53.6)	279 (57.2)
	Missing/Unknown	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)
<b>Quebec Social Deprivation Index</b>	1 (Privileged)	166 (13.8)	71 (14.6)
	2	257 (21.4)	94 (19.3)
	3	296 (24.7)	125 (25.6)
	4	142 (11.8)	50 (10.3)
	5 (Deprived)	192 (16.0)	85 (17.4)
	Missing	147 (12.3)	63 (12.9)
<b>Follow up consent</b>	1 (Privileged)	253 (21.1)	88 (12.9)
	2	165 (13.8)	63 (12.9)
	3	276 (23.0)	123 (25.2)
	4	192 (16.0)	80 (16.4)
	5 (Deprived)	167 (13.9)	71 (14.6)
	Missing	147 (12.2)	63 (12.9)
	Yes	1170 (97.5)	475 (97.3)
	No	8 (0.7)	8 (1.6)
	Missing	22 (1.8)	5 (1.0)

**S4 Table.** BC-Mix eligible sample (baseline) by month recruited

Month	Number of eligible (n=41,375)	% of sample
September, 2020	6,488	15.68
October, 2020	3,516	8.5
November, 2020	1,653	4
December, 2020	3,335	8.1
January, 2021	2,460	6
February, 2021	994	2.4
March, 2021	1,353	3.3
April, 2021	2,507	6.1
May, 2021	4,696	11.4
June, 2021	8,238	19.9
July, 2021	6,135	14.8



**S5 Table.** Comparison of participant eligibility across survey rounds

	Baseline survey	Follow up#1	Follow up #2	Follow up #3	Follow up #4	Follow up #5	Follow up#6	Follow up#7	Follow up#8	Follow up#9	Follow up#10
Total (eligible+ineligible)	57,077	11,677	8,624	6,657	5,173	4,037	3,309	2,503	1,815	1,234	513
Eligible	41,375	10,993	8,164	6,375	4,981	3,891	3,184	2,417	1,760	1,200	488
% eligible	72.5	94.1	94.7	95.8	96.3	96.4	96.2	96.6	97.0	97.2	95.1

**S6 Table.** Participant profile of BC-Mix baseline data (n=33, 650), using at least 67% survey completion threshold

		Survey			
		Un-weighted frequency	Un-weighted %	Weighted frequency	Weighted %
Sex	Male	5,362	15.9	16680	49.4
	Female	28, 288	84.1	17058	50.6
	Missing				
Age	18-34	3,957	11.8	9,063	26.9
	35-54	9,674	28.8	11,111	32.9
	55+	20,019	59.5	13564	40.2
Race/ethnicity	Indigenous	1,394	4.1	1,718	5.1
	Chinese	711	2.1	3,601	10.7
	White	28,728	85.4	21,216	62.9
	South Asian	405	1.2	2,478	7.3
	Other	1,385	4.1	3,429	10.2
	Missing/Unknown	1,027	3.1	1300	3.9
Health region	Fraser Health	8038	26.1	11327	33.6
	Interior Health	5,806	118.9	5023	14.9
	Northern Island	1735	5.6	1732	5.1

		Survey			
		Un-weighted frequency	Un-weighted %	Weighted frequency	Weighted %
Education	Vancouver Coastal	6993	22.7	7739	22.9
	Vancouver Island	8234	26.7	5308	15.7
	Missing/Unknown	2844	n/a	2610	7.7
	Below high school	807	2.4	1,096	3.2
	Below bachelor	16,928	50.3	15,176	45.0
	University degree	15,029	44.7	16,273	48.2
	Missing/Unknown	886	2.6	1,193	3.1
Employment status	Employed full-time (30 hours or more/week)	10,654	32.0	1308	40.8
	Employed part-time	2,993	9.0	3,131	9.4
	Self-employed	2,704	8.1	3,013	9.0
	Unemployed but looking for a job	952	2.9	1,522	4.6
	Unemployed and not looking for a job	406	1.2	511	1.5
	Full-time parent, homemaker	879	2.6	740	2.2
	Retired	12,757	38.3	8,096	24.3
	Student/Pupil	566	1.7	1,197	3.6

		Survey			
		Un-weighted frequency	Un-weighted %	Weighted frequency	Weighted %
Material Deprivation Index	Long-term sick or disabled	968	2.9	914	2.7
	Prefer not to answer	424	1.3	620	1.9
	Missing/Unknown	347	n/a	n/a	n/a
	1 (Privileged)	6,219	22.8	6,106	22.1
	2	6,199	22.6	5,850	21.1
	3	6,565	24.0	5935	21.4
	4	4,616	16.8	5,179	18.7
	5 (Deprived)	3,810	13.9	4,612	16.7
	Missing	6,241	n/a	n/a	n/a
Follow up consent	Yes	20,633	68.8	19,051	58.9
	No	11,689	36.1	13,275	41.1
	Missing	1,328	n/a	n/a	n/a
Data linkage consent	Yes	7,290	27.3	7,318	20.4
	No	19,467	72.8	20,362	73.6
	Missing	6,893	n/a	n/a	n/a

**S7 Table. Comparison of participants with 100% survey completion versus those less than 100% completion (baseline data)**

		100% completion (n=26, 757)		< 100% completion (n=14,618)	
		Un-weighted Frequency	Un-weighted %	Un-weighted Frequency	Un-weighted %
Sex					
	Male	4,407	16.5	2,416	16.5
	Female	22,350	83.5	12,202	83.5
Age					
	18-34	3,383	12.6	1,595	10.9
	35-54	8,056	30.1	4,054	27.7
	55+	15,318	57.3	8,969	61.4
Race/ethnicity					
	Indigenous	1,072	4.1	685	4.7
	Chinese	627	2.3	255	1.7
	White	22,842	85.4	12,184	83.4
	South Asian	305	1.1	301	2.1
	Other	1,123	4.2	643	4.4
	Missing/Unknown	788	3.0	550	3.8
Health region					
	Fraser Health	6,928	26.1	1,523	26.3
	Interior Health	4,923	18.5	1,220	21.1
	Northern Island	1,465	5.5	360	6.2
	Vancouver Coastal	6,175	23.2	1,140	19.7
	Vancouver Island	7,095	26.7	1,545	26.7

Education	Missing/Unknown	171	n/a	8,830	n/a
	Below high school	585	2.2	222	1.5
	Below bachelor	13,155	49.2	3,773	25.8
	University degree	12,634	47.2	2,395	16.4
	Missing/Unknown	383	1.4	8,228	56.3
Follow up consent					
	Yes	16,404	61.3	4,229	76.0
	No	10,353	38.7	1,336	24.0
	Missing	n/a	n/a	9,053	n/a