

22 Abstract

23 Background

24 Within-household transmission of Covid-19 is responsible for a significant number of infections.
25 Efforts to protect at risk communities are needed. This study explored the acceptability of offering
26 accommodation to support self-isolation among at risk populations, to prevent transmission of Covid-
27 19 within vulnerable households.

28 Methods

29 Mixed methods design structured in two phases. Phase 1: Survey of 545 individuals who had provided
30 consent to be contacted about ongoing research projects into infection control. Phase 2: Semi-
31 structured interviews with 19 participants from ethnic minority and low income communities.

32 Results

33 Many survey and interview participants viewed the provision of accommodation as important and
34 necessary in certain contexts. Of the 110 survey respondents, 85 (77%) said that they were not able to
35 isolate at home. Among this group, 24 (28%) said they would accept accommodation and 23 (27%)
36 said that they would probably accept. Of those unable to isolate at home, and at high risk if they
37 caught the virus (N = 36) or living with someone at high risk (N 18), 19 (35%) said that they would
38 accept, and 12 (22%) said they would probably accept accommodation.

39 Factors influencing uptake of accommodation included perceived 1) household vulnerability 2) virus
40 exposure and 3) lack of isolation at home options. Barriers to accepting the accommodation offer
41 included 1) able to isolate at home 2) wanting to be with family 3) caring responsibilities 4) mental
42 wellbeing concerns 5) concerns about moving when ill and 6) infection control concerns. Participants
43 raised issues that should be addressed before accommodation is offered, including questions regarding
44 who should use temporary accommodation and when, and how infection control in temporary
45 accommodation would be managed.

46 Conclusion

47 The provision of accommodation to prevent within household transmission of Covid-19 is viewed as
48 acceptable, feasible and necessary by some people who are concerned about infection transmission in

49 the home and are unable to self-isolate or socially distance at home. Different households will have
50 different requirements, e.g., those with caring responsibilities, and to overcome these challenges
51 additional support may be needed for the provision of accommodation to be feasible to those who
52 could benefit most.

53 Key words: Covid-19; self-isolation; quarantine; infection control; participatory research

54 Background

55 Human behaviour is central to the transmission of Covid-19. To reduce transmission , a series of
56 behavioural interventions were suggested and implemented (1). Whilst the introduction of social
57 distancing behaviours can reduce the spread of Covid-19 within the community (2), people with
58 symptoms of the virus are instructed to remain in the home; potentially with cohabiting families and
59 friends. This has led to clusters of infection within households (3), and within household transmission
60 being highlighted as a dominant route of infection (4, 5). In order to avoid within household
61 transmission of Covid-19, excellent infection control measures are needed (4). This includes
62 introducing hygiene protocols, appropriate use of personal protective equipment (e.g., face mask use
63 when necessary), and within household distancing and segregation – or ‘self-isolation’ - of infected
64 individuals (5-7). Although effective for reducing within household transmission (2, 8), there is
65 substantial variation in the extent to which the public are able and willing to adhere to these
66 behavioural solutions (9-11).

67 Innovative solutions to prevent the spread of the virus within households should be considered.

68 One potential solution to preventing the transmission of the virus within the home is isolation outside
69 the home. Centralised – as opposed to individual - isolation has been suggested (3) and implemented
70 successfully in locations such as China and Korea (12). In Wuhan, for example, existing public
71 venues were rapidly converted into what are termed ‘Fangcang shelter hospitals’. Individuals with
72 symptoms of Covid-19 would isolate within these shelters, away from friends and family. In addition
73 to providing food and medical care, these locations ensured adherence to self-isolation guidance,
74 keeping the families and household members of the infected individual safe from infection, and
75 provided social engagement, reducing psychological distress associated with self-isolation (13).
76 Indeed, a key difference between Fangcang shelters and makeshift or emergency hospitals is the
77 social space provided, allowing residents to engage and socialise with others during the isolation
78 period (13). However, although cost effective and acceptable to residents living in Wuhan, the
79 substantial differences in culture and living conditions mean that Fangcang style accommodation may
80 be less likely to be accepted by individuals in many European countries.

81 A small number of European countries have converted some hotels, hostels, dormitories or
82 specialised facilities into special facilities to accommodate people who are experiencing symptoms of
83 the virus (14). This strategy has not been widely implemented, and most of Europe and the United
84 States continue to encourage individuals with symptoms to self-isolate within the home. In the United
85 Kingdom, National Health Service (NHS) workers were offered, on a voluntary basis, the option of
86 staying in NHS reimbursed hotel accommodation to enable them to continue to work if they were
87 living with others who may be vulnerable. For those who can afford it, self-funded luxury hotel
88 “quarantine packages” are available (15-17), but, funded accommodation has not yet been offered in
89 the UK to individuals or communities outside the NHS, who may be at risk.

90 Whilst the offer of funded accommodation within which to self-isolate or quarantine is a potentially
91 viable strategy, it is critical that interventions are culturally appropriate and acceptable to the
92 communities that they serve to protect. This requires extensive input from target users to understand
93 the environmental and cultural context within which the intervention could be introduced, as well as
94 the psychological and social factors likely to influence uptake (9). In particular, we were keen to
95 explore participants’ views about how the initiative could work in practice; for example, whether the
96 person with Covid-19 should be offered accommodation or the vulnerable members of the household.
97 The aim of this research is therefore to understand whether or not offers of accommodation would be
98 acceptable and feasible for people concerned about reducing infection transmission in the home, to
99 elicit discussions regarding how this scheme could work in practice, and explore what we can do to
100 improve advice and approaches to reduce transmission of the virus within the home.

101 Methods

102 Study design

103 Our study used a mixed methods design structured in two phases. In phase 1, we conducted a survey
104 study of a sample of volunteers from our existing database of 545 individuals who had been recruited
105 through their engagement with Germ Defence, a website aiming to reduce infection risks in the home
106 (Supplement 1). These individuals had provided consent to be contacted about ongoing research
107 projects. In phase 2, we conducted semi-structured interviews with 19 participants from ethnic

108 minority and low income communities. These interviews were designed to help us explore further
109 concepts identified in phase 1, and to elicit discussions regarding how accommodation could best be
110 utilised.

111 Phase 1

112 Data collection

113 Volunteers who had previously provided consent to be contacted and invited to take part in research
114 were recruited via email distribution lists between June and July 2020. Participants were invited to
115 complete a confidential online survey regarding their ability and willingness to isolate within the
116 home, and the acceptability of accommodation to isolate outside the home. Informed consent was
117 collected online before starting the survey.

118 Data analysis

119 Frequencies and descriptive statistics are presented for closed survey questions. Free text answers
120 were used to offer further insight into, and explanations for, answers given to closed survey questions.
121 We identified barriers and facilitators related to the provision of accommodation with qualitative
122 content analysis in three stages (18, 19). First, responses to the survey were coded by two authors
123 independently. During stage two, codes were categorised into a unique list of barriers and facilitators,
124 which were discussed and refined by the same two authors. Data were then assigned to each category,
125 and counts of text assigned to each category were generated.

126 Phase 2

127 Data collection

128 Volunteers were recruited via existing contacts with community groups, social media advertisements,
129 and snowball sampling. We targeted individuals from ethnic minority and low income groups because
130 data have shown that those from ethnic minority communities have a markedly higher risk of
131 infection (20, 21) and worse clinical outcomes, including intensive therapy unit admission and
132 mortality (22, 23). Likewise, those living in the most deprived areas are more likely to be diagnosed
133 with Covid-19, and have worse outcomes than those living in the least deprived areas (23). The
134 reasons underpinning the disproportionate impact of the virus on these populations are multiple and

135 complex, but include increased risk of occupational and geographical exposure (21, 23-25) paired
136 with reduced opportunities for social distancing and self-isolation (9). Interested individuals
137 responded to an invitation to take part in research to understand experiences and interpretations of
138 self-isolation and protection during the pandemic. Participants were over the age of 18 years and
139 residing in the UK. We purposely sampled for diversity in key factors, including ethnicity, living
140 arrangements, occupation, and vulnerability. Sample size was informed by the concept of
141 ‘information power’, (26) with analysis and sampling conducted in parallel and continuous
142 assessment of the suitability of the information within the sample with regard to study objectives.
143 Potential participants contacting the research team were provided with a study information sheet and
144 given an opportunity to ask any questions. Participants were informed of the voluntary nature of
145 participation in the study, and assured of the confidentiality of the data collected. Interviews were
146 conducted throughout June and July 2020 by the lead author who is a trained qualitative researcher.
147 As all interviews were conducted via the telephone or online, audio recorded (rather than written)
148 verbal consent was obtained.

149 The semi-structured topic guide (Supplement 2) was informed by data collected during phase 1 as
150 well as existing literature, and conversations with experts in public health, behaviour change and
151 intervention development. Questions were designed to explore participants’ current living situation,
152 their experiences of isolation within the home, perceptions relating to the provision of accommodation
153 to reduce transmission in the home, and suggestions regarding how accommodation may be used and
154 facilitated. The topic guide was deliberately flexible enough to allow participants to consider and
155 discuss both the option of accommodation being offered to the person with Covid-19, or the
156 household contacts, and to discuss the pros and cons of each.

157 Analysis

158 Data from the interviews were analysed using a thematic approach aimed at identifying issues raised
159 by the participants and ways in which these issues may be mitigated (27). Following the stages of
160 thematic analysis, two researchers independently read transcripts to assign codes to the data and
161 identify possible themes. These themes were discussed and refined through discussion. An initial

162 framework was developed, checked against the data, and refined as necessary. Charts were developed
163 for each theme in the framework, and relevant text from the transcripts were be copied or summarised
164 under each theme in the chart. Charts were then used to compare data within and between individuals.
165 Participants were invited to discuss the analysis and interpretations with the researchers via skype or
166 email.

167 Results

168 Phase 1

169 A total of 110 respondents (20% of those invited) completed the survey (Table 1), 96% were over the
170 age of 41 years and 94% were white. The distribution of age ranges and level of education amongst
171 survey respondents were similar to the distributions amongst those who were invited but not complete
172 the survey. A similar proportion (approximately 20%) of survey respondents and non respondents
173 lived with someone at increased risk.

174 (Table 1)

175 Of all respondents, 24 (22%) stated that they would accept an offer of accommodation if it was
176 available, 25 (22%) said that they would probably accept, 21 (19%) said they would probably not
177 accept and 39 (35%) said that they would not accept. Of the 85 (77%) participants who said they were
178 not able to isolate at home, 24 (28%) said they would accept, 23 (27%) said that they would probably
179 accept, 18 (21%) said that they would probably not accept, and 16 (18%) said they would not accept.
180 Of those unable to isolate at home, and who also considered themselves to be of high risk if they catch
181 the virus (N = 36) or living with someone who is high risk (N 18), a total of 19 (35%) said that they
182 would accept, 12 (22%) would probably accept, 14 (26%) would probably not accept, and 8 (14%)
183 would not accept.

184 Three factors were coded as facilitators influencing decisions to accept an offer of accommodation to
185 reduce transmission in the home (Table 2). These were to protect others within the household, to
186 control the virus, and to avoid using shared spaces. Seven barriers to accepting the offer of
187 accommodation included 1) the ability to isolate within the home, 2) not wanting to be apart from
188 family 3) having caring responsibilities (4) concerns about the impact of isolation on mental

189 wellbeing and relationships (5) concerns about the upheaval of moving when ill, (6) perceived risk of
190 catching or spreading coronavirus if leaving the building, and (7) unfeasible for unspecified reasons
191 (Table 2).

192 Phase 2

193 A total of 19 participants took part in the interviews from Black African (N=2), Black British (N=1),
194 Mixed White / Black Caribbean (N=1) Indian (N=5), British Indian (N=2) Asian (N=1) British Asian
195 Pakistani (N=1) and White (N=6) ethnic groups (Table 1). The participants had varied feelings about
196 the acceptability of accommodation outside the home, with most feeling they would accept it if
197 needed or as a last resort, and very few feeling they would be unlikely to accept. One participant had
198 moved a family member out of the home for 11 weeks during the pandemic. Interviews lasted
199 between 21 and 55 minutes (mean duration 38 minutes).

200 Protecting the household

201 Participants were positive about the idea of accommodation being offered to reduce transmission of
202 the virus in the home. It was considered to be a highly effective way of preventing the spread of the
203 virus among those who were unable to isolate within their current homes.

204 *“If I was offered accommodation which meant that my family were kept safe, then absolutely I would,
205 I would welcome it” (Participant 14, White, female).*

206 Critically, participants thought that it had the potential to save lives:

207 *“Wow that would probably have saved a lot of lives actually. Yeah” (Participant 03, British Asian
208 Pakistani, male).*

209 Risk

210 The decision to accept, or not, the offer of accommodation appeared to be influenced by how at risk
211 the person considered themselves or their household to be. Perceived risk was influenced by how
212 vulnerable the participant (or their household) were perceived to be, level of exposure to the virus,
213 and level of contact with household members.

214 Vulnerability

215 Eight participants considered themselves or a member of their household to be vulnerable, and this
216 was strongly influential in decisions regarding the use of temporary accommodation. One participant,
217 whose husband had moved out of family home for 11 weeks over the pandemic, explained how
218 keeping her vulnerable daughter safe was their main priority:

219 *“It’s just something that has to be done, you know, and he actually didn’t come back inside the house,*
220 *he left for work that morning and then didn’t come back for 11 weeks. His bags were packed, his bags*
221 *were packed and the hotel was booked by the evening and gone” (Participant 18, White, female).*

222 Participants who did not consider themselves (or their household) to be vulnerable reported that they
223 would be more willing to accept the offer of accommodation outside the home if they or their family
224 were vulnerable:

225 *“Yeah maybe if I had my older relatives with me, or I had somebody who um, you know had any*
226 *underlying health condition, probably yeah I would have offered to go out, but in the current situation*
227 *I wouldn’t have, so. If I had somebody who was living with me who was over 65 years old or who had*
228 *heart disease or was diabetic, I would offered to go out yes of the house” (Participant 06, Indian,*
229 *female).*

230 Due to the severity of the virus, any one could consider themselves to be vulnerable, regardless of age
231 and health status:

232 *“I even read on the net or so, I’m not sure if this information is credible or not, but still what I saw on*
233 *the net is even if you get the virus even if you recover from it, it can have detrimental consequences on*
234 *your health. For example I read somewhere on the net I read that if you have the virus it can damage*
235 *your lungs, like, forever, it can have impact on your lungs forever, so this bit of information is quite*
236 *scary” (Participant 07, Indian, female).*

237 Exposure to the virus

238 Accommodation was considered to be particularly important for those who are in situations in which
239 there is potential for high exposure to the virus. There was wide understanding that those from ethnic

240 minority and low income communities were more likely to be in situations in which exposure to the
241 virus is probable:

242 *“Lots of people of colour, and not just, Bangladeshi etcetera, who work in jobs where they have no*
243 *choice but to go in. You know, if someone said isolate, they would say ‘well how will I feed my*
244 *family?’ They have to go in. So they’re in jobs where they have to go in, they have to mix with the*
245 *public” (Participant 11, Black African, female).*

246 Participants even described situations in which people from ethnic minority communities were asked
247 to leave accommodation due to increased exposure to the virus:

248 *“When he got back [from work] the door locks were changed and she [the landlady] said ‘I’m really*
249 *sorry but I can’t have you in here because I’m too frightened, you’re a cab driver, you’re seeing all*
250 *these people you’re going to infect the whole house you know, I’m sorry I can’t have you in here”*
251 *(Participant 11, Black African, female).*

252 Whilst recognising the value of accommodation, those who were not exposed to the virus thought that
253 accommodation would be unnecessary for their household:

254 *“If I’m not taking the precaution for example, if I have to go to work, then yeah I would suggest for*
255 *him to isolate somewhere else because I might have the virus in transfer it to him, so yeah. But my*
256 *case is different because I work from home and I’m not going out and I’m not meeting people, so*
257 *yeah. There would be no point for him to self-isolate somewhere else when I’m not going out”*
258 *(Participant 07, Indian, female).*

259 Contact with household members

260 Accommodation was viewed as being important for those who are unable to isolate from their
261 household due to the size of the house and / or the size of the household. Participants described how
262 they would be willing to move out of the home as the amount of shared space would make isolation
263 within the home difficult:

264 *“Well personally, I wouldn’t have been any choice, I think it’s the best way to prevent either him or*
265 *me from getting the virus because living in the same house, it would be, uh the risk would be very high*

266 *because we are sharing the same bathroom, the same kitchen, uh you know, so it would be very*
267 *difficult” (Participant 07, Indian, female).*

268 Among those from ethnic minority communities in particular, this was considered to be a substantial
269 problem as multigenerational households were common:

270 *“That idea was a very good idea. I mean in [home town] there are areas where you have three*
271 *generations living in a terraced house, grandparents, parents and the children yeah. Okay yeah now*
272 *the reason why there is such a high rate of the virus here in [home town] is because of the housing*
273 *here. Yeah outdated housing, and you know, because the family unit is very good, they look after each*
274 *other, but because of COVID it’s come back to haunt us big time” (Participant 12, Asian, male).*

275 However, even those who had sufficient space for isolation highlighted difficulties in containing the
276 virus and preventing the spread of viruses within the household:

277 *“I think personally that’s a really really good idea. Because going back to what I was saying about*
278 *infection control I know how hard it must be to limit exposure if one of you’s got a virus, not just*
279 *Covid, but any virus” (Participant 14, White, female).*

280 Key concerns

281 Participants raised a series of issues and concerns surrounding the provision of accommodation
282 outside the home that should be addressed before such a scheme could be offered. Participants were
283 keen to understand who should use temporary accommodation, at what stage, and for how long.
284 Concerns were also raised among those with caring duties and responsibilities, and questions were
285 asked regarding who would fund the scheme.

286 Timing and duration

287 Participants wanted clarification regarding the stage at which people should move into temporary
288 accommodation, and for how long. Participants were concerned that it would be too late to move out
289 of the home once symptoms had presented.

290 *“It’s, the, to me, because all the guidance and information that we’ve had is that you’re contagious*
291 *before you start showing symptoms, I wouldn’t want to, because in my opinion if that is all true, you*

292 *would already been exposed to it, he'd have already had it or already have it, um it just it feels like*
293 *that would be too late” (Participant 15, White, female).*

294 Despite concerns about leaving it too late, participants were not willing to move out of the home for
295 long and unspecified periods of time:

296 *“I will be very very reluctant to go and live somewhere else. If it's for about a week or something I*
297 *don't mind, but uh, but still yes it's just a matter of change because we have always lived in our*
298 *houses, so to go out and live somewhere else it's quite a bit of a change” (Participant 13, Indian,*
299 *male).*

300 In the case of the extremely clinically vulnerable, the duration was deemed necessary to protect the
301 family:

302 *“You've just got to get through it, and it was only like, well it could have been 12 weeks, but in a*
303 *lifetime it's not that long, really” (Participant 18, White, female).*

304 Who should use temporary accommodation?

305 Participants raised questions about whether the intention would be for symptomatic persons or
306 vulnerable persons to leave the home for temporary accommodation. Concerns were expressed
307 regarding the potential of infected individuals to spread the virus should they leave the home to stay,
308 for example, with a family member:

309 *“I think I would probably self-isolate too at my own house, rather than, because I might already have*
310 *symptoms unknowingly, and then if I go to another household I might spread it to say, like my mum,*
311 *so I think I would actually stay put” (Participant 02, Mixed White/ Black Caribbean, female).*

312 In addition, concerns were also raised regarding the potential for those who are not infected to catch
313 the virus in temporary accommodation:

314 *“Again I would kind of feel I would be safer at home... You go into somewhere else that I couldn't*
315 *guarantee would be as clean as I would you know, me cleaning it” (Participant 17, White, female).*

316 Participants suggested schemes in which exposed workers were asked to move into temporary
317 accommodation as a preventative measure, thus saving infection from entering the household in the
318 first place:

319 *“I think almost, you’re better offering it to the workers who might go back, so like, a lot of people still*
320 *worked throughout, where they couldn’t, so actually, were they the ones taking it back into their own*
321 *homes, so actually would it be better targeting the workers and saying right if this happens again, if*
322 *you are a key worker and you’ve got people at home, then you go to the hotel, like the NHS staff did,*
323 *rather than let’s have it for people who are sick” (Participant 19, White, male).*

324 For healthy individuals moving out to protect vulnerable residents, the ability to continue to work was
325 important, and accommodation with internet access and / or within commuting distance of their work
326 site would be necessary:

327 *“You know, if you were the person who was Covid free and leaving your family in the house, I don’t*
328 *know which way round you suggest because if I was Covid free I’d still want to work, so it would have*
329 *to be close to work” (Participant 14, White, female).*

330 *“If it was me going to self-isolate, for example, um, and I work from home you know, I would want,*
331 *you know, I would like to be able to still have my internet and be able to carry on with my work”*
332 *(Participant 01, Black African, female).*

333 Caring responsibilities

334 Among those who had caring responsibilities or were dependent on others, concerns were raised as to
335 who would care for the family in their absence:

336 *“Um, it would be hard and difficult because you’re used to living with each other you’re reliant on*
337 *each other as a family, you know, I do the shopping for the house most of the time so you know,*
338 *cooking and things like that, so if I wasn’t there, or my husband wasn’t there, you know, because of*
339 *the kids and all that” (Participant 04, Black British, female).*

340 Participants described defined roles and responsibilities for each household member, and removal of
341 key persons was viewed as problematic:

342 *I’m just wondering now what would have happened if she [participant’s wife] had the Covid 19,*
343 *because she is the main person who drives the house, because she does the cooking and looks after my*
344 *mum, so if she was made to go out and live somewhere else then my mum would have problems, we*
345 *would have problems” (Participant 13, Indian, male).*

346 Among ethnic minority communities in particular, the need and desire to care for family members
347 was a considerable cause for concern. Allowing others to care for their relatives was something that
348 was only to be considered as a last resort:

349 *“I wouldn’t like to move out from my house, but if it is really essential then I would move, but I would*
350 *try to fight it off (laughs) yeah, and I guess uh, if it happened to my mum then my mum would be the*
351 *same, she wouldn’t like to live elsewhere, this was her home for the last 40 years. So because, with*
352 *Indians we are very close knitted families, we tend to stick by each other, so to her it would probably*
353 *do more damage going away from us than uh, and then uh, yes, than living not here” (Participant 13,*
354 *Indian, male).*

355 Concerns were raised about having to leave vulnerable members, potentially putting them at increased
356 risk of exposure to the virus:

357 *“If I worked within the NHS and I was a key worker in that respect then possibly, but I still think just*
358 *would be very difficult for me to leave the family home because of [son’s name] and again, husband*
359 *and his medical condition, because he wouldn’t be able to look after my son, our son the way I would*
360 *like, picking up food and medication and what not, and then he’d have to, if I wasn’t there he’d have*
361 *to take the lift and sort of opening up more risk to, he’d be more in contact with people too, so I would*
362 *say no in that respect” (Participant 17, White, female).*

363 However, there was recognition that despite best efforts carers may contract the virus and participants
364 had started to make tentative plans for how they would cope should this happen:

365 *“But that was constantly at the back of my mind like, I am going to the shops and say if I caught the*
366 *virus on the handle of a trolley and then I touch my nose or my eyes and I have caught the virus now*
367 *and will I have to relocate or move to my bothers house and who would care for my mother? And*
368 *these were all questions at the back of my mind, but I do know my house is a 4 bedroom house and I*
369 *could have self-isolate in another room and not put my mother to more risk or more harm... I would*
370 *go into a separate room in the house and then sleep in the bed and then ideally move, um, not have*
371 *any contact at all with my mother in the house and call my brother and ask him to intervene”*
372 *(Participant 05, British Indian, male).*

373 Social and emotional support

374 Despite recognising the value and need for accommodation outside the home, participants struggled
375 with the idea of having to leave the family and home:

376 *“If you’re forced to stay at home at least you have all of your belongings, all things that bring you*
377 *comfort and people around you. But if you’re in a hotel room by yourself with just the TV and yeah, I*
378 *would be so bored I think. Probably very anxious as well and quite upset. I’m such an over thinker as*
379 *well so I would just be overthinking everything. But also at the same time if it meant that my partner*
380 *doesn’t catch it, then I think that’s probably the main thing on my mind, if it’s temporarily a solution*
381 *and hopefully that would stop the spread so I would try to look at the positive side of things, but if it*
382 *was more than two weeks then yeah I really don’t know how I would deal with that” (Participant 02,*
383 *Mixed White/ Black Caribbean).*

384 It was thought that it would be emotionally challenging to be alone and in unfamiliar surroundings:

385 *“I think that would be quite scary like having to do, like I mean I can’t imagine having to do this*
386 *entire lockdown period by myself, like, obviously I would have to manage but there would have been a*
387 *lot of different struggles with that kind of thing and I know people who have done it have been lonely*
388 *and it would have taken a while to adapt, it would be really difficult” (Participant 10, Asian British,*
389 *female).*

390 Participants highlighted the need for facilities to enable them to continue to communicate with their
391 friends and family throughout:

392 *“I have a lot of, all my social stuff is now online, so my theatre group, we rehearse online, we have*
393 *various support groups and stuff, so for me it would be very important to still be able to have that”*
394 *(Participant 01, Black African, female).*

395 Essential requirements

396 Whilst all participants reported requiring only the basics, further detail regarding food, washing and
397 cleaning facilities were needed:

398 *“I think a room with internet, and uh a bathroom and then just an understanding of how the uh meal*
399 *system will work” (Participant 08, Indian, male).*

400 Food in particular was a key concern:

401 *“Um, to be able to cook my own food, for me food is very important to me, it is to everybody, but not*
402 *everyone has the kind of attention to what they eat, I don’t eat meat, um, so um, you know, I eat fish*
403 *but I, yeah I like to have my own space to cook my food” (Participant 01, Black African, female).*

404 Indeed, there were reports of food related complaints from other locations within which this system is
405 widely implemented:

406 *“Well in the beginning they [residents in isolation facilities in [country]] were really complaining*
407 *about the food that they were getting in the centres... and yeah after one or three weeks, I mean, I*
408 *guess maybe they changed the types of food they were getting” (Participant 07, Indian, female).*

409 Those who had used accommodation to avoid transmitting the virus to vulnerable members of the
410 household described how they had had to work hard to ensure food and cooking facilities were
411 available:

412 *“He had local chip shops offering to cook him food, especially in the early days when we didn’t really*
413 *know, we hadn’t really found our routine, so like the local fish and chip shop were feeding him, to be*
414 *fair the people who run the hotel were feeding him, because they live on site, he had work colleagues*
415 *bringing him plates of food, people dropping him food off, and then we kind of found routine,*
416 *somebody gave him a microwave, somebody else gave him a fridge, somebody else gave him a*
417 *toaster. It was a real community effort. Yeah after about 3 or 4 weeks he fell into a routine and he*
418 *could cook himself stuff so it wasn’t so bad” (Participant 18, White, female).*

419 Those in temporary accommodation could also provide tangible support for vulnerable members of
420 the family at home:

421 *“So for that rocky stage when people were struggling [to secure priority slots], yeah I had a little*
422 *servant on the outside” (Participant 18, White, female).*

423 Participants also described a need for outside space to maintain physical and emotional health:

424 *“I’d need to be able to get outside, to have, like here I have a garden here, so it’s just to be able to,*
425 *you know, even when it’s raining I walk out to the garden just to get some air” (Participant 01, Black*
426 *African, female)*

427 Indeed, outside space for physical activity was considered invaluable to those who had moved out of
428 the home:

429 *“He runs. A lot. An awful lot. So yeah that is how he coped. Yeah, and like initially we thought it was*
430 *going to be a lot harder the lockdown, so the first week he thought I’m just going to run when I can*
431 *because we thought exercise was going to be stopped. So he kind of hit the 50 mile a week mark, and*
432 *then it didn’t stop, so he just kept that up really. Just running every day” (Participant 18, White*
433 *female).*

434 Funding

435 Participants were concerned about costs associated with temporary accommodation. Participants were
436 unable to cover the costs themselves, and the one participant whose husband had used accommodation
437 to prevent transmission of the virus to her vulnerable daughter described how it was only possible
438 because it was free of charge. Although the costs were later covered by the National Health Service
439 (NHS), she described how it would not have been possible to pay for accommodation without the
440 goodwill of the community:

441 *“He was really lucky because I know a lot of NHS workers had to wait to move out because NHS*
442 *trusts and health boards took a while to get their system working, but one of the local hotels, because*
443 *we live in quite a small area, one of the local hotels offered free rooms, so he was actually able to*
444 *move out straight away, on that very first Monday he was out. So, yeah. And the health board did pay*
445 *in the end, but it was right at the end that they decided they were going to pay for it, but the hotel*
446 *would have given him free room for like 10 weeks, 10, 11 weeks” (Participant 18, White, female).*

447 Despite the lifesaving potential of the scheme, many were unconvinced that it would be funded by the
448 current government:

449 *“I mean, in all honesty I would be like incredibly surprised if um that was like, if this current*
450 *government were offering that to people” (Participant 03, British Asian/ Pakistani).*

451 *“Yeah. So that is a very splendid idea if that was possible, but economically it’s not viable is it? It’s a*
452 *good option but economically I don’t think this government would go for it anyway. But yeah it’s a*
453 *very good system that if it was in place. Yeah.” (Participant 12, Asian, male).*

454 Discussion

455 Summary of findings

456 To our knowledge, this is the first study to have explored issues surrounding the option of
457 accommodation to prevent transmission of the virus in vulnerable households. This work reveals that
458 the offer of accommodation to protect vulnerable households is viewed positively by some people
459 who feel their household is at risk. Data collected from both survey and interview participants
460 highlighted concerns regarding the spread of the virus within the household, and a need for solutions
461 to prevent this. Interviews provided insight into populations who would be likely to accept and benefit
462 from the offer; and it was suggested that those who are vulnerable, are likely to be exposed to the
463 virus, and who are unable to isolate within the home would benefit most. Participants who met one or
464 more of these criteria appeared very willing to accept the offer of accommodation compared with
465 those who consider themselves or their household not to be vulnerable, were not employed in public
466 facing occupations, and/or had capacity to isolate within the home. Crucially, and in line with existing
467 research (20), those from ethnic minority and low income communities were considered to be more
468 exposed and less able to isolate than those from high income backgrounds.

469 Participants questioned who should use temporary accommodation and at what stage, with legitimate
470 concerns being raised regarding the utility of isolating outside the home once symptoms are present.

471 In locations in which accommodation has successfully been used to support self-isolation outside the
472 home, it is often the symptomatic persons who are offered accommodation for isolation (13, 14). In
473 the UK, NHS staff who are living with vulnerable family members have been offered accommodation
474 to protect the family whilst allowing those not at high risk to continue to work (28). Our study
475 suggests that both approaches could be feasible and acceptable to high risk audiences, but the offer of
476 accommodation must be timely, and appropriate infection control measures must be in place.

477 Different households will have different requirements - there is no 'one size fits all'. However, as
478 lockdown restrictions are lifted, and test, trace and isolate becomes a key strategy in controlling the
479 virus, making support available to allow certain individuals to isolate safely could make a potentially
480 valuable contribution to reducing transmission, morbidity and mortality.

481 Implications of this study

482 This study revealed some important issues that would need to be addressed to ensure the acceptability
483 and feasibility of any offer of accommodation for those who need it. Drawing together findings from
484 the survey and interviews we consider below some of the options available, key concerns associated
485 with isolating outside the home, and ways in which these may be mitigated.

486 In locations in which accommodation is provided, it is the individual with the virus who would isolate
487 outside the home in order to protect vulnerable household members (14). Participants were concerned
488 that, by the time symptoms were evident, transmission of the virus to other household members would
489 already have occurred. However, with a test, trace and isolate system firmly in place, it would be
490 possible for those who have been in contact with virus to be offered accommodation to quarantine
491 before symptoms emerge. Indeed, individuals who are informed that they have been in contact with
492 the virus may not be willing to return to their homes to await test results if they are living with
493 vulnerable relatives. The offer of accommodation for individuals in this situation could be highly
494 effective.

495 A second option for utilising accommodation to prevent transmission of the virus within the
496 household involves moving vulnerable people out of the home should household members become
497 symptomatic. Although this was seen as a viable option, again, there were concerns that it would be
498 too late to make use of temporary accommodation at the stage at which infected persons are showing
499 symptoms. There is however, emerging evidence to suggest that viral load is associated with disease
500 severity (29), and initial viral load is likely to be a contributing factor (30). Interventions aiming to
501 reduce exposure to the virus in the home have been successful (31, 32). However, it is not easy to
502 avoid contact with infected individuals, and more needs to be done to support vulnerable people (33).
503 In particular, vulnerable individuals living in large households may be at risk of exposure to a high
504 viral load from multiple sources if support is not available. In such situations, offering
505 accommodation to vulnerable individuals, with appropriate care and support, could substantially
506 reduce their exposure to the virus.

507 Participants recognised the significant practical and emotional challenges associated with utilising
508 accommodation to prevent transmission of the virus, and it is critical that those who are in quarantine
509 or isolating outside (and inside) the home are adequately supported. Both practical (e.g., food) and
510 emotional support will be required, for example through community support networks, similar to
511 those that were established at the start of the pandemic. Participants also raised critically important
512 concerns about exposure to infection in temporary accommodation that must be addressed. Strategies
513 must be put in place to ensure that those in temporary accommodation are not exposed, or exposing
514 others, to the virus.

515 There were concerns over who would fund accommodation, and indeed, it would not be cost effective
516 to provide accommodation for all populations. However, we suggest that offering accommodation in a
517 targeted way to those who are vulnerable, exposed to the virus, and/or unable to quarantine or isolate
518 safely within their home would reduce these costs, and could even lead to a potential reduction in
519 healthcare costs if the number of vulnerable individuals exposed to the virus is reduced.

520 Limitations

521 The main limitation associated with this work is the extent to which the views of our sample are
522 representative of the UK population. Our recruitment for phase one occurred via a mailing list of
523 individuals who had previously used and provided feedback on a website aiming to reduce infection
524 within the home. Our sample comprises predominantly white participants who have completed at least
525 basic education, and are over the age of 40 years. Findings should be interpreted in light of this
526 limitation. This group are likely to be a group of individuals who are highly motivated to engage in
527 infection control behaviours and their views may not be representative of the wider population. Whilst
528 every effort was made to recruit a diverse sample of participants for interviews, our primary use of
529 social media to recruit participants may still have resulted in individuals with certain characteristics
530 being missed. For example, those from non-English speaking communities, those without internet
531 access, and those without social media are unlikely to have been recruited. Despite attempts to recruit
532 participants through existing networks with community group leaders, engagement through these

533 networks was minimal and could not be pursued further due to the need for timely completion of this
534 initial study.

535 Whilst it is likely that participants recruited to phase 1 of the study have a particular interest in
536 infection control, those who took part in the interview phase of the study had not shown any prior
537 interest in infection control practices. Interestingly, the two populations (phase 1 and 2) presented
538 similar views relating to motivations to engage in infection control behaviour (to keep themselves,
539 their families and their communities safe) and willingness to consider an offer of accommodation in
540 specific circumstances. For example, both phase 1 and phase 2 participants describe a willingness to
541 consider the offer of accommodation if they were unable to isolate within their current home.

542 However, participants with caring responsibilities described greater concerns and challenges that
543 would need to be overcome in order for the option to be feasible. Both groups raised legitimate
544 questions about the location of accommodation and cleanliness of the accommodation, and the
545 facilities and level of support that would be available.

546 The rapidly changing nature of the pandemic and government advice limits the interpretation of our
547 findings. As perceptions of risk within and outside the home change, the acceptability of
548 accommodation to prevent transmission of the virus in the home may also shift. Our findings must be
549 interpreted with this in mind.

550 Conclusions

551 Within-household transmission is likely to be a leading cause of morbidity and mortality (31) and we
552 present just some of the ways in which accommodation may be viewed and utilised. We recognise the
553 complexities associated with these options, and acknowledge that different households will require
554 very different provisions. The concerns raised by participants must be addressed before such a scheme
555 could be offered. Specific concerns relating to caring duties and responsibilities emphasises the fact
556 that this must be an optional offer made available to those who could benefit, and want to make use of
557 accommodation. However, we suggest that offering accommodation to vulnerable households
558 following a potential exposure to the virus, or during the early stages of an outbreak within the home
559 could be acceptable and feasible.

561 Abbreviations

562 Covid-19: Coronavirus disease 2019

563 NHS: National Health Service

564 UK: United Kingdom

565 Declarations

566 Ethics approval and consent to participate

567 Ethical approval for Phase 1 was provided by Southampton Research Ethics Committee (56445). All
568 survey participants consented online to take part in the study.

569 Ethical approval for Phase 2 was provided by the NHS Health Research Authority London – Queen
570 Square Research Ethics Committee (20/HRA/2549). Due to some participants not having access to
571 printers or other technology required for written/online consent all interview participants verbally
572 consented to take part in the study. Consent statements were read aloud to each participant by the
573 researcher and participants were asked to confirm agreement. The process was audio-recorded and
574 documented by the researcher taking consent. This procedure for obtaining verbal consent was
575 reviewed and approved by the ethics committee.

576 Consent for publication

577 All participants provided verbal or written consent for data to be included in publications.

578 Availability of data and materials

579 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding
580 author on reasonable request.

581 Competing interests

582 None declared

583 Funding

584 This study was funded by the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection
585 Research Unit in Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the University of Bristol, in partnership with
586 Public Health England (PHE) and by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) / Department of Health
587 and Social Care (DHSC) Covid-19 Rapid Response Call 2 (grant number MC_PC 19071).

588 The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR, the Department
589 of Health and Social Care, or PHE. The funders had no role in the design of the study, collection,
590 analysis, and interpretation of the data, or in writing the manuscript.

591 Authors' contributions

592 Conceived the study: LY, SD, JH

593 Study design: LY, SD, JH

594 Analysed the data: SD, KM, RdG

595 Interpreted the data: All authors

596 Drafted the manuscript: SD

597 Reviewed the manuscript and approved content: All authors

598 Met authorship criteria: All authors

599 Acknowledgements

600 Lucy Yardley is an NIHR Senior Investigator and her research programme is partly supported by
601 NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC)-West, NIHR Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU)
602 in Behavioural Science and Evaluation, and the NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre
603 (BRC). Jeremy Horwood is partly supported by NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC)-West,
604 and NIHR Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) for Behavioural Science and Evaluation at the
605 University of Bristol. Rachel de Garang is a BME Engagement Worker for the Voice & Influence
606 Partnership at The Care Forum.

607

608

- 609 1. Wilder-Smith A, Freedman M. Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community
610 containment: pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV)
611 outbreak. *Journal of Travel Medicine*. 2020;1-4.
- 612 2. Pan A, Liu L, Wang C. Association of Public Health Interventions With the Epidemiology of
613 the COVID-19 Outbreak in Wuhan, China. *JAMA*. 2020;323(19):1915-23.
- 614 3. Zhu Y, Wang C, Dong L, Xiao M. Home quarantine or centralised quarantine, which is more
615 conducive to fighting COVID-19 pandemic. *Brain, Behaviour, and Immunity*. 2020;S0889-
616 1591(20):30729-7.
- 617 4. Shen M, Peng Z, Guo Y, Rong L, Li Y, Xiao Y, et al. Assessing the effects of metropolitan-
618 wide quarantine on the spread of COVID-19 in public spaces and households. *International journal of*
619 *infectious diseases*. 2020;S1201-9712:30326-X.
- 620 5. Wang Z, Ma W, Zheng X, Wu G, Zhang R. Household transmission of SARS-CoV-2. *Journal*
621 *of Infection*. 2020;81(1):179-82.
- 622 6. Sjodin H, Wilder-Smith A, Osman S, Farooq Z, Rocklov J. Only strict quarantine measures
623 can curb the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak in Italy, 2020. *Euro Surveill*.
624 2020;25(13):200280.
- 625 7. Mao Z, Wan R, He L, Hu Y, Chen W. The enlightenment from two cases of asymptomatic
626 infection from SARS-CoV-2: Is it safe after 14 days of isolation? *International journal of infectious*
627 *diseases*. 2020;95(174-5)
- 628 8. Wang Y, Tian H, Zhang L, Zhang M, Guo D, Wu W, et al. Reduction of secondary
629 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in households by face mask use, disinfection and social distancing: a
630 cohort study in Beijing China. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020;5(5):e002794.
- 631 9. Atchison C, Bowman L, Vriten C, Redd R, Pristera P, Eaton J, et al. Perceptions and
632 behavioural responses of the general public during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional survey
633 of UK adults. *medRxiv*. 2020; 04.01.20050039; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.01.20050039>
- 634 10. Machida M, Nakamura I, Saito R, Nakaya T, Hanibuchi T, Takamiya T, et al. Adoption of
635 personal protective measures by ordinary citizens during the COVID-19 outbreak in Japan.
636 *International journal of infectious diseases*. 2020;94(139-144)

- 637 11. Bodas M, Peleg K. Self-isolation compliance in the COVID-19 era influenced by
638 compensation: Findings from a recent survey in Israel. *Health Affairs*. 2020;39(6):936-41.
- 639 12. Yang M, Hung P, Wu Y, Peng M, Chao Y, Su W. A three generation family cluster with
640 COVID-19 infection: Should quarantine be prolonged? *Public Health*. 2020;S0033-3506(20):30205-5.
- 641 13. Chen S, Zhang Z, Yang J, Wang J, Zhai X, Barnighausen T, et al. Fangcang shelter hospitals:
642 a novel concept for responding to public health emergencies. *The Lancet Health Policy*.
643 2020;395:1305-14.
- 644 14. Public Health England. Understanding the impact of COVID-19 on BAME groups (2020)
645 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-understanding-the-impact-on-bame-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-understanding-the-impact-on-bame-communities)
646 [communities](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-understanding-the-impact-on-bame-communities).
- 647 15. Niedzwiedz C, O'Donnell C, Jani B, Demou E, Ho F, Celis-Morales C, et al. Ethnic and
648 socioeconomic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection: prospective cohort study using UK Biobank.
649 *BMC Medicine*. 2020;18(1):1-14.
- 650 16. Pan D, Sze S, Minhas J, Bangash M, Pareek N, Divall P, et al. The impact of ethnicity on
651 clinical outcomes in COVID-19: A systematic review. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020; Online First 100404.
- 652 17. Public Health England. Disparities in the risk of outcomes of COVID-19. 2020. Accessed
653 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/892](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/892085/disparities_review.pdf)
654 [085/disparities_review.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/892085/disparities_review.pdf)
- 655 18. Razaq A, Harrison D, Karunanithi S, Barr B, Asaria M, Routen A, et al. BAME COVID-19
656 deaths - what do we know? Rapid data and evidence review. "Hidden in plain sight". 2020. Accessed
657 [https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/bame-covid-19-deaths-what-do-we-know-rapid-data-evidence-](https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/bame-covid-19-deaths-what-do-we-know-rapid-data-evidence-review/)
658 [review/](https://www.cebm.net/covid-19/bame-covid-19-deaths-what-do-we-know-rapid-data-evidence-review/)
- 659 19. Bhala N, Curr G, Martineau A, Agyemang C, Bhopal R. Sharpening the global focus on
660 ethnicity and race in the time of COVID-19. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10238):1673-6.
- 661 20. COVID-19 Health System Response Monitor. Cross Country Analysis. How do measures for
662 isolation, quarantine and contract tracing differ among countries? 2020 [Available from:
663 [https://analysis.covid19healthsystem.org/index.php/2020/05/19/how-do-measures-for-isolation-](https://analysis.covid19healthsystem.org/index.php/2020/05/19/how-do-measures-for-isolation-quarantine-and-contact-tracing-differ-among-countries/)
664 [quarantine-and-contact-tracing-differ-among-countries/](https://analysis.covid19healthsystem.org/index.php/2020/05/19/how-do-measures-for-isolation-quarantine-and-contact-tracing-differ-among-countries/)].

- 665 21. Estrin D, Warner G. "Everybody's getting along here": How Hotel Corona united Israelis and
666 Palestinians. NPR. 2020. Accessed from [https://www.npr.org/2020/06/09/860182244/everybodys-
668 getting-along-here-how-hotel-corona-united-israelis-and-palestinians](https://www.npr.org/2020/06/09/860182244/everybodys-
667 getting-along-here-how-hotel-corona-united-israelis-and-palestinians)
- 668 22. Walker V. Need to self-isolate? These hotels are offering "quarantine packages". 2020.
669 Accessed from <https://thepointsguy.co.uk/news/hotel-quarantine-packages-coronavirus/>
- 670 23. Wira N. Hotels, apartments offer sanctuary for self-isolation. The Jakarta Post 2020.
671 Accessed from [https://www.thejakartapost.com/life/2020/04/03/hotels-apartments-offer-sanctuary-
673 for-self-isolation.html](https://www.thejakartapost.com/life/2020/04/03/hotels-apartments-offer-sanctuary-
672 for-self-isolation.html)
- 673 24. Vaismoradi M, Jones J, Turunen H, Snelgrove S. Theme development in qualitative content
674 analysis and thematic analysis Journal of Nursing Education and Practice. 2016;6:100.
- 675 25. Vaismoradi M, Turunen H, Bondas T. Content analysis and thematic analysis: implications
676 for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. Nursing Health Science. 2013;15:398-405.
- 677 26. Malterud K, Siersma V, Guassora A. Sample Size in qualitative interview studies: guided by
678 information power. Qualitative Health Research. 2016;26(13):1753-60.
- 679 27. Green J, Thorogood N. Qualitative methods for health research 2nd edition ed. London Sage
680 Publications; 2004.
- 681 28. National Health Service. NHS Staff - hotel accomodation. 2020. Accessed from
682 [https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/03/hotel-accommodation-
684 for-nhs-staff-20-march-2020.pdf](https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/03/hotel-accommodation-
683 for-nhs-staff-20-march-2020.pdf)
- 684 29. Pujadas E, Chaudhry F, McBride R, Richter F, Zaho S, Wajnberg A, et al. SARS-COV-2
685 viral load predicts COVID-19 mortality. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. 2020.
686 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30354-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30354-4)
- 687 30. Xu TC, C, Zhu Z. Clinical features and dynamics of viral load in imported and non imported
688 patients with COVID-19. International journal of infectious diseases. 2020;94(68-71; Epub ahead of
689 print).
- 690 31. Little P, Read R, Amlot R, Chadborn T, Rice C, Bostock J. Reducing risks from coronavirus
691 transmission in the home- the role of viral load. BMJ [Internet]. 2020;269; Available from:
692 <https://www.bmj.com/content/369/bmj.m172>.

- 693 32. Yardley L, Miller S, Schlotz WL, P. Evaluation of a web-based intervention to promote hand
694 hygiene: exploratory randomised controlled trial. Journal of medical internet research.
695 2011;13(4:e107).
- 696 33. Ainsworth B, Miller S, Denison-Day J, Stuart B, Groot J, Rice C, et al. Current infection
697 control behaviour patterns in the UK, and how they can be improved by "Germ Defence", an online
698 behavioural intervention to reduce the spread of COVID-19 in the home. medRxiv.
699 2020;<https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.22.20137406>.

700

701

702 Table 1: Participant characteristics

	Phase 1 (N=110)	Phase 2 (N=19)
Age		
18-25	0	2 (10%)
26-40	2 (2%)	8 (42%)
41-60	35 (32%)	8 (42%)
61-70	41 (37%)	1 (5%)
Over 70	30 (27%)	0
Missing	2 (2%)	0
Sex		
Male	Not collected	7 (37%)
Female	Not collected	12 (63%)
Ethnic group		
White	104 (94%)	6 (32%)
Mixed / multiple ethnic groups	1 (1%)	1 (5%)
Asian / Asian British	0	9 (47%)
Black / African / Caribbean /	1 (1%)	3 (16%)
Black British	4 (4%)	0
Missing		
Leaving full time education		
Before finishing school	1 (1%)	1 (5%)
After finishing school	42 (38%)	4 (21%)
After finishing university	36 (33%)	4 (21%)
After postgraduate studies	28 (25%)	1 (5%)
Missing	3 (3%)	9 (47%)
Experience with Covid-19		
I am at increased risk	48 (44%)	1 (5%)

I live with someone high risk	19 (17%)	7 (37%)
I have had the virus	7 (6%)	1 (5%)
I live with someone who had the virus	1 (1%)	0
None of the above	32 (29%)	10 (53%)
Missing	3 (3%)	0

703

704

Table 2: Facilitators and barriers to the uptake of accommodation for isolation – results of the content analysis of survey text

	Description	Example quote	N
Facilitators			
To protect others in my household/if someone at home was high risk	Includes both actual and hypothetical comments about having someone at high risk at home.	<i>If it was a case of protecting my wife, I would probably leave like a shot if it was to her advantage.</i>	25
To control the virus	Includes broader social sense of doing the right thing.	<i>I would be motivated by the compulsion to save others.</i>	5
To avoid using shared areas	To avoid needing to use shared rooms in the home	<i>I live in a big enough house to keep apart, but only one bathroom, so because of shared shower facility might go elsewhere</i>	1
Barriers			
Can self-isolate where I am	Includes having enough space to self-isolate at home, or living alone	<i>We live in the countryside and we are able to self-isolate</i>	28
Not wanting to be apart from family	Unwilling to be away from family	<i>I doubt if we could manage apart from each other we are so interdependent on each other.</i>	10
Caring for others	Having caring responsibilities at home, including children, spouse, parent or pets. Excludes	<i>Someone who is dependant on me. I would not be able to support them in any way if I were somewhere else.</i>	4

	comments where alternative caring options were considered (see below).		
Concerns about implications of isolation for mental well-being and relationships	Worried about negative impact on mental well-being, including loneliness and boredom, or missing family members	<i>Self-isolating can be lonely without contact with other people but doing it in your own home is more comforting with your own things around you</i>	4
Upheaval of moving when ill/want to be in own home when ill	Preference for being at home when feeling ill	<i>Would be better for others to be removed and leave sick person in familiar surroundings</i>	4
Perceived risk from others in the building	Concerned about risk of catching the virus from others in self-isolation accommodation	<i>Definitely would not accept accommodation situated in a building designated for multi occupancy or in an area with higher numbers of fatalities or cases.</i>	2
Unfeasible for unspecified reasons	Self-isolation elsewhere is perceived as unfeasible but no reason is given as to why	<i>There are no circumstances in which I could feasibly self-isolate away from home.</i>	3
Dependent on:			

Location of accommodation	Location of accommodation, focused on proximity to home to allow the person both to receive and provide care to those still at home.	<i>it would need to be relatively close by so that, should my son need care, I could return home as I would not want him to be on his own if he became ill and we have no other support nearby.</i>	22
Facilities available/suitability of accommodation	Includes requirements for accommodation e.g. comfort, outside space.	<i>Would depend on the quality of the facility - I would not like it to be Spartan, uncomfortable, with poor Wi-Fi, nowhere near a good hospital</i>	11
Support provided for those left at home	Includes considerations about what support would be provided for children, spouses or parents they care for	<i>It would depend on whether someone else who was not ill would be available to look after my son</i>	9
Medical care available at accommodation	Consideration of medical care available and who could look after them, either due to Covid-19 or due to other health conditions.	<i>I would isolate elsewhere especially if a close watch in a nursing capacity was available for me and other isolation participants</i>	7
Access to Wi-Fi	Needing Wi-Fi for staying in touch with people, or running business	<i>I would want to be able to use my PC, phone and tablet.</i>	6
Hygiene and cleanliness of accommodation	Concerned about germs in the self-isolation accommodation	<i>I am more confident in the cleaning regime I have at my own home than trusting it to someone else. I would not be comfortable</i>	5

		<i>living anywhere that I hadn't cleaned myself to my own high standards.</i>	
Special dietary needs being met/access to food	Unsure about how and what food would be provided	<i>I would also want vegetarian food, or ability to get vegetarian (ideally vegan) food.</i>	4
Taking my pet with me	Wanting to take a pet into self-isolation accommodation	<i>Whether I could take my dog with me</i>	1
How much fun it would be	Considering how much fun it would be	<i>Where it was, what facilities were available, whether I'd be able to get food, and how much fun it would be.</i>	1
Whether I have confirmed Covid-19 or just possible exposure	Considering how necessary it is to self-isolate depending on whether a confirmed diagnosis of the virus has been given.	<i>If I had been given a positive CV19 test result and was being asked to isolate remotely to protect my family, I would do so. I would not, however, go into precautionary remote self-isolation in a setting where CV19 was known to be present in other residents simply on the basis of suspected contact with a CV19 carrier.</i>	1

