The impact of COVID-19 lockdown restrictions on missing person reports

Karen Shalev Greene, Freya O'Brien, Craig Collie & Susan Giles

November 2020

Corresponding Authors:
Karen Shalev Greene- Karen.shalev-greene@port.ac.uk tel: 023 9284 3938
Freya O'Brien- f.obrien@liverpool.ac.uk tel: 0151 794 1408

Executive Summary

Missing persons is among the most challenging issues for modern police forces, with the number of reported cases to the police reaching 382,960 in 2018/2019 (NCA, 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic (a new strain of Corona virus) and the resultant national as well as localised lockdowns placed unique demands on the emergency services (WHO, 2020). As such, it is crucial to understand the extent to which the period of lockdown in early 2020 has impacted the profile of UK missing persons reports.

Therefore, this study aimed to compare the characteristics of missing persons cases reported to participating forces during the period of the COVID-19 lockdown in England with sample of cases taken from the same time period last year. This research is concerned with the *change* that has occurred between these periods, rather than on the difference between responding forces at each point in time.

The sample comprised of reports of adults and children who went missing between 23rd March 2020 until 20th May 2020 (the first period of full 'lockdown' in England), and the same time period in 2019 recorded by six UK[1] police forces (see table 1). The data included all solved cases that meet the criteria of 'a missing person' as described by College of Policing (2020). Cases, rather than persons, were adopted as the unit of analysis.

As expected, the lockdown period led to a substantial reduction in the overall number of missing persons. There was a 35% decrease in missing children reports and 36% reduction in missing adult reports. The report present findings from the overall analysis of the data. The results of analysis of individual forces and comparison between forces can be found in the appendices.

There were several significant changes comparing characteristics of <u>missing children</u> reports in lockdown compared with the same period in 2019. Missing children were:

- ❖ 5.82 times more likely to be found 41-80 miles from where they went missing.
- ❖ Transgender children were 4.91 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Children living in residential care homes were twice more likely to be found by Staff.
- ❖ Missing children were 1.50 times more likely classified as low risk.
- ❖ Children who had gone missing before were 1.52 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Children with an alcohol and/or drug dependency were 1.47 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Children were 1.41 times more likely to have gone missing from a care home than in 2019.
- ❖ Those children who had suffered from violent, racial, transphobic, or domestic abuse were 1.34 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Boys were 1.19 times more likely to go missing than girls.
- ❖ Children who had mental health issues were 1.19 times more likely to go missing

---

[1] It was only possible to retrieve 80% of the reported cases to Force D in both 2019 and 2020

❖ Children from a black, Asian or minority ethnic background were 1.10 times more likely to go missing.
❖ Children who went missing in lockdown were missing for shorter periods[2], and were slightly older.

Compared to 2019, in 2020, missing children were:

❖ 0.17 times less likely to go missing from the street.
❖ 0.60 times less likely to be found by family, a friend or an acquaintance.
❖ 0.72 times less likely to be found at their home address.
❖ 0.76 times less likely to have had school or college problems.
❖ 0.77 times less likely to have been deemed as medium risk
❖ 0.88 times less likely to be female
❖ 0.91 times less likely to be white

There were several significant changes comparing characteristics of <u>missing adult</u> reports in lockdown compared with the same period in 2019. Missing adults were:

❖ 1.83 times more likely to suffer harm in lockdown compared to 2019
❖ 1.42 times more likely to be at risk of suicide/self-harm
❖ 1.41 times more likely to be found by the police
❖ 1.34 times more likely to be deemed as high risk
❖ 1.34 times more likely to have suffered violent, racial, transphobic or domestic abuse
❖ 1.28 times more likely to be alcohol or drug dependent
❖ 1.23 times more likely to have relationship issues
❖ 1.22 time more likely to have mental health issues (such as depression or anxiety)

Missing adults were:

❖ 0.29 times less likely to have gone missing from a children's residential home[3]
❖ 0.72 times less likely to be found at home
❖ 0.85 times less likely to be classified as a medium risk

It must be noted that individual forces reported somewhat different patterns of change. This report deals primarily with aggregate patterns taken from examining these together, however specific force information can be found in the appendices. It is unclear whether such differences represent true variance, or if these observations can be explained by differences in reporting.

Based on these findings, we makes the following recommendations:

1. With regional differences in mind, each force should study the patterns of missing in their force and consider local context.

---

[2] This finding should be treated with caution (see 'Limitations')

[3] Examining the ages of these adults, the majority are aged 18. It is therefore assumed that these cases are those who are leaving or who have left care. There may be a few cases within these figures where the adult is supported living (e.g. if their ages are above 18). This figure should therefore be treated with caution.

2. Given that high risk adults and low risk children were more likely to go missing during lockdown, the level of risk assigned to missing individuals during lockdown should be explored more in-depth by forces.
3. Particular attention should be given to understanding the reasons why children from care homes went missing frequently during lockdown and why children travelled long distances. A multi-agency approach is particularly important in order to prevent repeat cases and offer support and aftercare to children as they return.
4. Multi agency response may also be beneficial in preventing high risk missing adults from going missing. Efforts should also focus on after care and support once adults return.

1   Background, aims, and objectives

Missing persons is among the most challenging issues for modern police forces, with the number of reported cases to the police reaching 382,960 in 2018/2019 (NCA, 2020). For UK policing, a conservative annual cost of reporting Missing Persons is estimated to be around £916 million (Shalev Greene & Pakes, 2013). The COVID-19 pandemic (a new strain of Corona virus) and national as well as localised lockdowns have been challenging to all services and has placed unique demands on the emergency services (WHO, 2020). Even in this landscape of lockdown, police retain responsibility for missing people in the UK (Fyfe, Stevenson & Woolnough, 2015). Given that the College of Policing's Authorised Professional Practice (CoP, 2020) guidelines specifically highlight the need to understand the reasons why people go missing, it is crucial to understand the extent to which the period of lockdown in early 2020 has impacted the profile of UK missing persons reports.

The research body relating to COVID-19 is still emerging (see Ali et al., 2020). However, it is clear that the lockdown imposed by the Government on citizens across the UK, in an effort to beat the disease and protect health services, had several unintended negative consequences, such as isolation, loneliness, financial hardship as well as an increase in domestic abuse (Bradbury-Jones, & Isham, 2020). While one might expect that lockdown would reduce the overall rates of missing persons through sheer oversight and enforcement (see Collie, 2019), there was concern that suicide rates may increase (Gunnell et al., 2020; Ho, Chee & Ho, 2020), which would relate to the so-called "despondent" type of missing person (Koester, 2008) as well as missing incidents by those who are particularly vulnerable, such as victims of domestic abuse.

Therefore, this research seeks to examine the profile of cases during lockdown in order to urgently highlight the risks exhibited by missing persons, with a view to providing local and national pictures of how best to respond in this difficult, resource stretched time. Further restrictions across high risk areas and discussions of a second 'circuit-breaker' lockdown highlight the significance and timeliness of this research for helping the police to understand vulnerable populations and how their needs might best be served. Comparing data from police databases from the period of lockdown with the same period last year will enable exploration of changes in this landscape and will produce recommendations for action.

Aim: The study aimed to compare the characteristics of missing persons cases reported to participating forces during the period of the COVID-19 lockdown in England with sample of cases taken from the same time period last year.

Primary objective: To ascertain the extent to which missing persons cases have _changed_ in nature and character during the COVID-19 lockdown.

2 Method

Sample

The sample comprised of reports of adults and children who went missing between 23rd March 2020 until 20th May 2020 (the initial period of 'lockdown' in England as designated by the government), and the same time period in 2019 recorded by six UK[4] police forces (see table 1). All participating forces are referred to using an assigned letter, e.g., Force A, to provide anonymity. The data included all solved cases that meet the criteria of 'a missing person' as defined by College of Policing (2020), which identifies *'Anyone whose whereabouts cannot be established will be considered as missing until located, and their well-being or otherwise confirmed*.' Cases, rather than persons, were adopted as the unit of analysis as it was not possible to distinguish individuals. Therefore, the current data set inevitably included repeat incidents.

Table 1: *Number of missing children and adults reports in 2019 (23rd March-20th May) compared with 2020 (23rd March-20th May) for each force.*

Force	Children		Adults	
	2019	**2020**	**2019**	**2020**
A	174	185	256	125
B	326	269	205	165
C	5307	3602	2500	1766
D[5]	249	131	110	46
E	855	466	785	478
F	443	155	416	145
Total	**7354**	**4808**	**4272**	**2725**

Data collection

Following ethical approval by the FHSS ethics committee at the University of Portsmouth and the ethics committee at the University of Liverpool, data was requested in the format of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, already anonymised by each force. The requested data fields included: level of risk assigned to the case (initial and latest risk levels); date/time the person was reported missing; date/time the person was located; age when reported missing: ethnicity: gender: any known vulnerabilities (e.g., mental health difficulties; at risk of suicide; living with dementia; alcohol/drug use, etc); where the person went missing from/venue last seen (e.g., home address; hospital; etc)' location where found' who found the missing person (e.g., family, police); distance from missing to found; circumstances or

---

[4] It was only possible to retrieve 80% of the reported cases to Force D in both 2019 and 2020

[5] It was only possible to retrieve approx. 80% of reports from Force D for both 2019 and 2020.

antecedents of going missing (e.g., following an argument; misunderstanding); any antecedents to the missing episode (e.g. family conflict/abuse); any harm outcome; and whether the person had been missing before.

Forces were asked to retrieve this information by running queries within their IT systems. Forces were specifically directed NOT to provide open-text fields in order to avoid the issue of names being inadvertently provided in non-anonymised format. In some cases, forces were not able to provide all the requested fields; in other cases, they provided additional fields. The Appendices show the fields derived by each force.

Coding & Derived Variables

For the analysis of data from each source, data was cleaned and prepared for coding. For the overall analysis using all six forces, a coding frame was developed.[6] Variables used for this analysis represented common variables across the forces; it was possible to derive information for particular variables for all six forces (e.g. gender, age, risk). However, there were a few variables which were only seen in two forces (e.g. harm, found deceased). The overall analysis is therefore shown in descending order, whereby results are shown for variables common to all six forces first, then for variables common to all five forces, and so on. Results for individual forces are shown in the Appendices.

Design & Analysis

The study used a comparative design comparing missing reports in the lockdown period in 2019 with the same dates in 2020. The coded data was transferred to IBM SPSS Statistics version 26 to carry out analyses. Dichotomous variables depicting the characteristics of the cases (e.g. gender) were compared across the 2019 and 2020 timeframes using cross-tabulations and Pearson's Chi-Square Test for significance (χ^2). Due to the large number of Chi-square tests that were carried out, Bonferroni corrections were applied to the critical p value to control for a Type I error.[7] For continuous variables (e.g. age, number of times missing), the non-parametric Mann Whitney U test was adopted (Pallant, 2007) to examine the differences between 2019, compared with 2020. The phi coefficient (ϕ) was used to measure effect sizes for the cross-tabulations (Sheskin, 1997). The effect size was calculated using the formula $r = Z/\sqrt{N}$ for the Mann-Whitney U tests (Newcombe, 2006). Effect sizes of ±0.1 indicate a small effect size, while values of ±0.3 and ±0.5 indicate medium- and large-effect sizes, respectively (Cohen, 1977).[8] Effect sizes show the strength of an association. Odds ratios[9] were also calculated for each cross-tabulation.

Limitations

As stated previously, cases, rather than persons, were adopted as the unit of analysis which may mean that people who are reported missing very frequently skew the results. This study is also not a representation of all the missing cases reported to UK police forces within

---

[6] We can provide information on the development of this coding dictionary on request.

[7] The p values used for each set of Chi-Squares can be given on request.

[8] Phi and values can be provided on request. All effect sizes were small.

[9] These are explained in the results tables.

the time periods requested given that not all forces provided data to the project. In addition, the number of variables derived from each of the participating police forces varied considerably. It was also only possible to retrieve approximately 80% of the reported cases to Force D. Findings relating to time spent from missing need to be treated with caution. The 2019 cases were likely to have been updated after the time period requested in longer running cases. Therefore, it is expected that the average time people were missing for in 2019 would be greater than 2020. There may also be variations in terms of recording information across forces, the effects of which may mask certain trends and patterns. It is lastly important to note that, for the overall analysis, effect sizes were small, showing low strength in terms of the association between the characteristics examined and the two time frames. However, there are some stronger associations to be seen within the separate analyses of the individual forces.

Although the authors recognise the limitations of this study, it provides a unique insight into how missing reports changed over the period of lockdown within these six forces.

3   Results

As expected, the lockdown period led to a substantial reduction in overall number of missing persons. There was a 35% decrease in missing children reports from 7,354 to 4,808 (N=2,546 fewer cases) and 36% reduction in missing adult reports from 4,272 to 2,725 (N=1,547 fewer cases).

Please note that the findings below are results from the overall analysis of all data received. There are, however, differences in patterns between forces. Please see the appendices for more detailed analysis of patterns in each force and comparisons between the six forces.

Children

Across the six forces, there were 7,354 missing children in 2019 and 4,808 in 2020. Table 2 shows characteristics of missing reports across two or more forces, comparing the lockdown period in March-May 2019, with the same period the previous year (for individual force's results, please see the Appendices). For each variable, we show the percentage of cases reporting a particular characteristic across both time periods, indicate whether there is a positive or negative change in percentages from 2019 to 2020, whether any change is statistically significant, and, where applicable, the odds ratio[10]. The colours assigned to each characteristic highlight how many forces were able to be included in the overall analysis.

Table 2: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within missing children reports in 2019 compared with 2020, with odds ratios*

	No. of forces	2019 % or mean	2020 % % or mean	Change	OR[11]
Gender					
Male	6	50.1	52.9*	+	1.12
Female		49.8	46.7*	-	0.88
Transgender		0.1	0.3*	+	4.91
Risk	6				
Low		8.8	12.6*	+	1.50
Medium		86.3	82.8*	-	0.77
High		4.9	4.5	-	0.92
Age	6	*M*=15.24 (*SD*=2.03)	*M*=15.53* (*SD*=1.94)	+	
Ethnic background	6				
BAME		47.9	50.1*	+	1.10
White		52.1	49.7*	-	0.91
Hours missing	5	*M*=57.65 (*SD*=320.02)	*M*=46.03* (*SD*=106.88)	-	
Missing before	4	80.7	86.4*	+	1.52

---

[10] This figure indicates how many times more or less likely a missing person was reported as having one of these characteristics in 2020, compared to 2019. A figure of above 1 indicates that they were X time more likely to have this characteristic, whilst a figure below 1 indicates that they were less likely to have this characteristic. For example, a figure of 2.06 would indicate that they were 2.06 times more likely.

[11] Where applicable

Missing from:					
Children's residential care	4	29.6	37.2*	+	1.41
Home/residence	4	57.0	56.7	-	1.00
Hospital	4	1.7	0.7	-	0.37
Street	4	1.1	0.2*	-	0.17
Found by:					
Family/friend/acquaintance	4	14.8	9.4*	-	0.60
Police	4	34.6	38.4	+	1.17
Care home staff	4	11.8	21.1*	+	2.00
Found at					
Home address	3	30.9	24.3*	-	0.72
Number of times previously missing	2	M=13.99 (SD=18.98)	M=12.10 (SD=14.35)	-	
Suffered harm whilst missing	2	1.6	1.8	+	1.09
Risk factors:					
Modern day slavery exploitation, trafficking	2	3.9	5.0	+	1.30
School/college problems	2	25.1	20.3*	-	0.76
Gang-related	2	1.8	3.5	+	2.02
Violent, racial, transphobic, or domestic abuse	2	7.6	9.9*	+	1.34
Suicide/self-harm	2	12.0	13.5	+	1.15
Mental health issues including depression/anxiety	2	18.4	21.2*	+	1.19
Alcohol/drug dependency	2	21.3	28.4*	+	1.47
Relationship problems	2	25.7	24.3	-	0.93
Employment problems	2	7.2	7.8	+	1.08
Financial problems	2	7.5	9.1	+	1.22
Unaccompanied juvenile	2	13.3	13.8	+	1.05
Distance from missing to found (in miles)					
0-5	2	71.7	73.4	+	1.09
6-10	2	11.5	8.5	-	0.72
11-20	2	8.2	6.0	-	0.71
21-40	2	5.8	4.1	-	0.69
41-80	2	1.0	5.7*	+	5.82
Over 80 miles	2	1.7	2.2	+	1.30

*Significant change

There were several statistically significant changes comparing characteristics of missing children reports in 2019 compared with lockdown period in 2020. Statistical significance enables us to draw tentative conclusions that these changes can be attributed to the

independent variable- in this case, the lockdown time period compared to the . In 2020 children were[12]:

- ❖ 5.82 times more likely to be found 41-80 miles from where they went missing.
- ❖ Transgender children were 4.91 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Children living in residential care homes were twice more likely to be found by Staff.
- ❖ Missing children were 1.50 times more likely classified as low risk.
- ❖ Children who had gone missing before were 1.52 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Children with an alcohol and/or drug dependency were 1.47 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Children were 1.41 times more likely to have gone missing from a care home than in 2019.
- ❖ Children those who had suffered from violent, racial, transphobic, or domestic abuse were 1.34 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Boys were 1.19 times more likely to go missing than girls.
- ❖ Children who had mental health issues were 1.19 times more likely to go missing
- ❖ Children from a black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) background were 1.10 times more likely to go missing.
- ❖ Children who went missing in lockdown were missing for shorter periods[13], and were slightly older.

Compared to 2019, in 2020, missing children were:

- ❖ 0.17 times less likely to go missing from the street.
- ❖ 0.60 times less likely to be found by family, a friend or an acquaintance.
- ❖ 0.72 times less likely to be found at their home address.
- ❖ 0.76 times less likely to have had school or college problems.
- ❖ 0.77 times less likely to have been deemed as medium risk
- ❖ 0.88 times less likely to be female
- ❖ 0.91 times less likely to be white

Information about harm suffered whilst missing could only be derived from two forces' data (Forces A & F). Across these forces, there were 10 cases of children coming to harm in the period within 2019, and 16 cases in 2020. The only significant change seen was for 'Hours missing.' Children who came to harm whilst missing in lockdown were missing for a shorter period than those who came to harm whilst missing in 2019. Information about whether the missing person was found deceased could only be derived from two forces' data (Forces C & E). However, no children were found deceased across either time periods across these two forces.

---

[12] For changes relating to missing children in specific Force areas, please see Appendix 1. The * symbol denotes statistically significant increases or decreases.

[13] This finding should be treated with caution (see 'Limitations')

Adults

Across the six forces, there were 4,272 missing adults in 2019. There was a decrease in 2020, with 1,547 adults reported missing in 2020. As above, Table 3 shows the analysis of characteristics of missing adults across two or more forces, comparing the lockdown period in March-May 2019, with the same period the previous year (for individual force's results, please see the Appendices). For each variable, we show the percentage of cases reporting a particular characteristic across both time periods, indicate whether there is a positive or negative change in percentages from 2019 to 2020, whether any change is statistically significant, and, where applicable, the odds ratio. The colours assigned to each characteristic highlight how many forces were able to be included in the overall analysis.

Table 3: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within missing adult reports in 2019 compared with 2020, with odds ratios.*

	No. of forces	2019 % or mean	2020 % % or mean	Change	OR[14]
Gender					
Male	6	60.5	59.4	-	.96
Female		38.9	39.6	+	1.03
Transgender		0.6	0.9	+	1.57
Risk					
Low	6	19.4	19.4	=	1.00
Medium		67.2	63.5*	-	0.85
High		12.9	16.6*	+	1.34
Age	6	*M*=32.26 (*SD*=17.22)	*M*=31.74* (*SD*=17.43)	-	
Ethnic background	6				
BAME		37.0	39.6	+	1.12
White		63.0	60.4	-	0.89
Hours missing	5	*M*=70.53 (*SD*=291.01)	*M*=50.72 (*SD*=198.61)	-	
Missing before	4	53.2	50.6	-	0.90
Missing from:					
Children's residential care	4	5.2	1.5*	-	0.29
Home/residence	4	62.6	72.4	+	1.57
Hospital	4	20.7	18.6	-	0.88
Mental health	4	2.6	1.9	-	0.71
Residential care home/nursing home	4	2.3	2.4	+	1.06
Street	4	1.4	0.4	-	0.30
Found by:					
Family/friend/acquaintance	4	11.4	9.8	-	0.84
Police	4	47.3	55.8*	+	1.41
Care home staff	4	10.8	8.6	-	0.78
Found at					

---

[14] If applicable

Home address	3	30.9	24.3*	-	0.72
Number of times previously missing	2	*M*=6.68 (*SD*=10.43)	*M*=3.86* (*SD*=7.01)	-	
Found deceased	2	0.5	0.6	+	1.27
Suffered harm whilst missing	2	7.7	13.3*	+	1.83
Risk factors:					
Modern day slavery exploitation, trafficking	2	0.3	0.4	+	1.25
School/college problems	2	10.6	12.0	+	1.15
Gang-related	2	0.4	0	-	1.00
Violent, racial, transphobic, or domestic abuse	2	7.6	9.9*	+	1.34
Suicide/self-harm	2	18.6	24.5*	+	1.42
Mental health issues including depression/anxiety	2	41.9	46.7*	+	1.22
Alcohol/drug dependency	2	32.8	38.5*	+	1.28
Relationship problems	2	21.6	25.4*	+	1.23
Employment problems	2	14.2	15.8	+	1.13
Financial problems	2	14.8	17.5	+	1.23
Unaccompanied juvenile	2	1.8	0	-	0.98
Distance from missing to found (in miles):					
0-5	2	61.8	64.5	+	1.21
6-10	2	11.5	10.5	-	0.91
11-20	2	6.7	8.6	+	1.31
21-40	2	5.1	5.1	=	0.99
41-80	2	4.2	3.9	-	0.93
Over 80 miles	2	4.2	3.9	-	0.93

*Significant change

There were several significant changes comparing characteristics of missing adult reports in lockdown compared with the same period in 2019. Missing adults were[15]:

❖ 1.83 times more likely to suffer harm in lockdown compared to 2019
❖ 1.42 times more likely to be at risk of suicide/self-harm
❖ 1.41 times more likely to be found by the police
❖ 1.34 times more likely to be deemed as high risk
❖ 1.34 times more likely to have suffered violent, racial, transphobic or domestic abuse
❖ 1.28 times more likely to be alcohol or drug dependent
❖ 1.23 times more likely to have relationship issues
❖ 1.22 time more likely to have mental health issues (such as depression or anxiety)

---

[15] For changes relating to missing adults in specific Force areas, please see Appendix 2. The * symbol denotes statistically significant increases or decreases.

Missing adults were significantly less likely in 2020 compared to 2019:

- ❖ 0.29 times less likely to have gone missing from a children's residential home[16]
- ❖ 0.72 times less likely to be found at home
- ❖ 0.85 times less likely to be classified as a medium risk

Information about harm suffered whilst missing could only be derived from two forces' data (Forces A & F). Across these forces, there were 52 cases of adults coming to harm in the period within 2019, and 36 cases in 2020. Table 4 shows the characteristics of those cases where the adult came to harm whilst missing in both time periods, and indicate whether there is a positive or negative change in percentages from 2019 to 2020.

Table 4: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within cases of harm[17] amongst missing adults in 2019 (n= 52) compared with 2020 (n = 36), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or mean	2020 % % or mean	Change	OR[18]
Gender				
Male	63.5	52.8	-	0.64
Female	32.7	41.7	+	1.47
Transgender	3.8	5.6	+	1.47
Risk				
Low	7.7	13.9	+	1.94
Medium	38.5	30.6	-	0.70
High	53.8	55.6	+	1.07
Age	*M*=36.44 (*SD*=16.78)	*M*=35.94 (*SD*=14.42)	-	
Ethnic background				
BAME	5.8	9.4	+	1.69
White	94.2	90.6	-	0.59
Hours missing	*M*=57.27 (*SD*=280.02)	*M*=211.21 (*SD*=1196.98)	+	
Missing before	50.0	36.1	-	0.57
Missing from:				
Children's residential care	3.8	0	-	0.96
Home/residence	90.4	97.2	+	3.72
Hospital	1.9	0	-	0.98
Place of employment	1.9	0	-	0.98
Number of times previously missing	*M*=2.81 (*SD*=3.02)	*M*=2.61 (*SD*=4.17)	-	

---

[16] Examining the ages of these adults, the majority are aged 18. It is therefore assumed that these cases are those who are leaving or who have left care. There may be a few cases within these figures where the adult is supported living (e.g. if their ages are above 18). This figure should therefore be treated with caution.
[17] From two police forces
[18] If applicable

Information about whether the missing person was found deceased could only be derived from two forces' data (Forces C & E). Across these forces, there were 15 cases of adults being found deceased in the period within 2019, and 13 cases in 2020. Table 5 shows the characteristics of those cases where the adult was found deceased in both time periods, and indicate whether there is a positive or negative change in percentages from 2019 to 2020.

Table 5: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within cases of fatalities[19] amongst missing adults in 2019 (n= 15) compared with 2020 (n = 13), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or mean	2020 % % or mean	Change	OR[20]
Gender				
Male	73.3	69.2	-	0.82
Female	26.7	30.8	+	1.22
Risk				
Low	6.7	9.1	+	1.40
Medium	53.3	30.0	-	0.38
High	40.0	60.0	+	2.25
Age	*M*=42.60 (*SD*=20.84)	*M*=50.85 (*SD*=25.64)	+	
Ethnic background				
BAME	20.0	38.5	+	2.50
White	80.0	61.5	-	0.40
Hours missing	*M*=35.06 (*SD*=32.29)	*M*=30.99 (*SD*=35.32)	-	

There were no significant changes in terms of the characteristics of those found deceased over lockdown compared with the same time period in 2019.

4   Conclusions and Recommendations

Whilst the overall numbers of missing people decreased, lockdown increased the likelihood of certain groups of people going missing. The study highlights the need to explore reasons why people with particular demographics (i.e. BAME, male, and older children; younger adults) are more likely to go missing when restrictions are in place. It is clear that particular antecedents and on-going issues which usually relate to going missing such as alcohol and drug dependency, mental health issues, suffering abuse (in both children and adults), and the risk of suicide and self-harm, and relationship problems (in adults) may have been exacerbated by the restrictions. The level of risk assigned to a case in lockdown periods needs also to be considered; high risk adults were more likely to go missing in lockdown compared with the same period in 2019. However, this pattern was different among the cases relating to missing children. For children, low risk children were more likely to go

---

[19] From two police forces
[20] If applicable

missing during lockdown compared with 2019. Furthermore, variance in missing persons reports, behaviours and response between force areas all merit further consideration[21].

Of particular note among the findings of the study was that children were going missing from care homes, indicating potential issues at such premises. This finding is potentially exacerbated when taken alongside the additional observation that children who had been missing before, which has an historic association with children in care, were even more likely to go missing during lockdown than before. It will be necessary to consider whether this is due to reduced levels of oversight, stretched resources by those providing care, and whether the lockdown exacerbated already acute risk factors among this population.

The study also highlights resource implications for the police, with a greater number of adults being found by officers, and fewer children being found by their family, friends, and acquaintances. The restrictions will have meant a limited number of searches by missing persons' loved ones, and fewer possible sightings from members of the public.

5   References

Ali, S. A., Baloch, M., Ahmed, N., Ali, A. A., & Iqbal, A. (2020). The outbreak of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)—An emerging global health threat. *Journal of infection and public health, 13*(4), 644-646.

Bradbury-Jones, C., & Isham, L. (2020). The pandemic paradox: The consequences of COVID-19 on domestic violence. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 29(13-14), 2047-2049. doi:10.1111/jocn.15296

Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (revised edition). New York: Academic.

College of Policing. (2020). *Major investigation and public protection- Risk assessment.* Retrieved on 19.10.20 from https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/major-investigation-and-public-protection/missing-persons/risk-assessment/

Collie, C. J. (2019). Exploring the boundaries of missing persons: hidden interplay between policing and private entities in relation to cases on the periphery. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice.* https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paz061

Fyfe, N. R., Stevenson, O., & Woolnough, P. (2015). Missing persons: the processes and challenges of police investigation. *Policing and Society*, *25*(4), 409-425. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2014.881812

Gunnell, D., Appleby, L., Arensman, E., Hawton, K., John, A., Kapur, N et al. (2020). Suicide risk and prevention during the COVID-19 pandemic, *The Lancet Psychiatry,* 7(6), 468-471.

---

[21] Representative from individual force areas are welcome to contact the report authors for further discussion.

Ho, C. S., Chee, C. Y., & Ho, R. C. (2020). Mental health strategies to combat the psychological impact of COVID-19 beyond paranoia and panic. *Annals, Academy of Medicine, Singapore*, *49*(1), 1-3. Retrieved on 19.10.20 from http://www.anmm.org.mx/descargas/Ann-Acad-Med-Singapore.pdf

Koester, R. J. (2008). Lost Person Behavior: A Search and Rescue Guide on Where to Look for Land, Air and Sea. Charlottesville, Virginia: dbS Productions LLC.

National Crime Agency (2020). Missing Persons Data Report 2018/2019. UK Missing Persons Unit. Retrieved 19.20.20 from https://missingpersons.police.uk/en-gb/resources/downloads/missing-persons-statistical-bulletins

Newcombe, R. G. (2006). Confidence intervals for an effect size measure based on the Mann-
Whitney statistic: Part 1: General issues and tail-area-based methods. *Statistics in Medicine, 25*, 543-557. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.2323

Pallant, J. (2007). (2nd Ed). SPSS Survival Manual. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Shalev Greene, K., & Pakes, F. (2013). The cost of missing person investigations: Implications for current debates. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, *8*(1), 27-34. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pat036

Sheskin, D. J. (1997). *Handbook of parametric and nonparametric statistical procedures.* London: Chapman & Hall/CRC.

World Health Organization. (2020). *Critical preparedness, readiness and response actions for COVID-19: Interim guidance, 7 March 2020* (No. WHO/2019-nCoV/Community_Actions/2020.3). World Health Organization. Retrieved on 19.10.20 from https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331422/WHO-COVID-19-Community_Actions-2020.1-eng.pdf

Appendix 1

Breakdown of changes in number of missing children report from 2019 to 2020 by police force

	Number of forces	Overall Change	Force A	Force B	Force C	Force D	Force E	Force F
Gender	6							
Male		+*	-	+*	+	=	-	+
Female		-*	=	-*	-	=	+	-
Transgender		+*	+	n/a	+*	n/a	+	n/a
Risk	6							
Low		+*	-	-	+*	+	-	=
Medium		-*	+*	+	-*	+	+	-*
High		-	-*	-	-	-	-	+*
Age	6	+*	+	-*	-*	-	+*	-
Ethnic background	6							
BAME		+*	+	+	-	-	+*	
White		-*	-	-	+	+	-*	
Hours missing	5	-*	+*	n/a	+	n/a	-	-
Missing before	4	+*	+*	+*	n/a	n/a	+*	-*
Missing from:	4							
Children's residential care		+*	-*	+*	n/a	n/a	+	+*
Home/residence		-	+*	-	n/a	n/a	-	-*
Hospital		-	-*	-	n/a	n/a	+	-
Street		-*	-	+	n/a	n/a	-	-
Found by:	4							
Family/friend/acquaintance		-*	-*	-	n/a	n/a	-	-*
Police		+	+	+*	n/a	n/a	-	+
Care home staff		+*	+	+*	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
Found at Home address	3	-*	+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
Number of times previously missing	2	-	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-*
Suffered harm whilst missing	2	+	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
Risk factors:	2							
Modern day slavery exploitation, trafficking		+	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
School/college problems		-*	n/a	n/a	-*	n/a	n/a	-*
Gang-related		+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
Violent, racial, transphobic, or domestic abuse		+*	n/a	n/a	+*	n/a	n/a	+
Suicide/self-harm		+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
Mental health issues including depression/anxiety		+*	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	+

Alcohol/drug dependency		+*	n/a	n/a	+*	n/a	n/a	+
Relationship problems		-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
Employment problems		+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
Financial problems		+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
Unaccompanied juvenile		+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
	2							
Distance from missing to found (in miles)								
0-5		+	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
6-10		-	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
11-20		-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
21-40		-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
41-80		+*	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
Over 80 miles		+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+

The following is provided if there is insistence that variance between forces be included:

When examining the data at force level, it should be noted that statistically significant trends were not always universally observed.

-While forces C and F reported a statistically significant decrease in the number of missing child cases classified as medium risk, Force A reported a statistically significant increase.

-Force F reported an increase in the number of cases classified as high risk, which is contrary to the pattern observed elsewhere. It should be noted, though, that only Force A's decrease for this metric was statistically significant. The national change here was not significant either.

-Force F's data indicated that fewer children reported missing during lockdown had been missing before. All other participating forces reported a statistically significant increase.

-Force A reported that fewer children had been reported missing from residential care. All other participating forces reported an increase, with this being statistically significant except in Force E's case.

-Force A reported that more children were reported missing from their home address or residence. However, the national trend here was not statistically significant, and while all other forces reported a decrease, this was significant for Force F only.

There were additional differences between forces; however these were not to vary to a statistically significant extent.

Appendix 2

Breakdown of changes in number of missing adults report from 2019 to 2020 by police force

	Number of forces	Overall Change	Force A	Force B	Force C	Force D	Force E	Force F
Gender	6							
Male		-	-	+	-	+	+	+
Female		+	-	-	+	-	-	-
Transgender		+	+	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
Risk	6							
Low		=	+	+	-	-	-	-
Medium		-*	-	-	-	+	=	-
High		+*	+	+	+*	-	+	+*
Age	6	-*	+	-	-*	-	+	+*
Ethnic background	6							
BAME		+	-	+	+	n/a	+	-
White		-	+	-	-	+	-	+
Hours missing	5	-	-*	n/a	-	n/a	-	-*
Missing before	4	-	-*	-	n/a	n/a	+*	-*
Missing from:	4							
Children's residential care		-*	-*	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-*
Home/residence		+	+*	+	n/a	n/a	-*	+*
Hospital		-	-	+	n/a	n/a	-	-
Mental health		-	-	-	n/a	n/a	-	-
Residential care home/nursing home		+	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	+	=
Street		-	-	-	n/a	n/a	-	-
Found by:	4							
Family/friend/acquaintance		-	-	+	n/a	n/a	-	-
Police		+*	-	+	n/a	n/a	+*	-
Care home staff		-	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
Found at Home address	3	-*	-	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Number of times previously missing	2	-*	-*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-*
Found deceased		+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	+	n/a
Suffered harm whilst missing	2	+*	+*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+

	2							
Risk factors:								
Modern day slavery exploitation, trafficking		+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
School/college problems		+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	-
Gang-related		-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
Violent, racial, transphobic, or domestic abuse		+*	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	+
Suicide/self-harm		+*	n/a	n/a	+*	n/a	n/a	+
Mental health issues including depression/anxiety		+*	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	+
Alcohol/drug dependency		+*	n/a	n/a	+*	n/a	n/a	-
Relationship problems		+*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
Employment problems		+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
Financial problems		+	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	=
Unaccompanied juvenile		-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
Distance from missing to found (in miles):	2							
0-5		+	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
6-10		-	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
11-20		+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
21-40		=	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
41-80		-	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
Over 80 miles		-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+
Out of UK		=	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-

As was the case with the data relating to children, there was some variance between forces where the direction of statistically significant effects in relation to missing adults were not universal. These are as follows:

-Force F reported a statistically significant increase in 'age', which is contrary to the national picture.

-Force E reported a statistically significant increase in the number of adults who had been missing before, whereas all other forces reported a decrease in missing before.

-Force E reported a decrease among adults who had gone from their home or residence, whereas this increased for all other participating forces.

There were additional differences between forces, however these were not to vary to a statistically significant extent.

Appendix 3

Force A

Key findings

During lockdown in 2020, compared with 2019, children were *more* likely to be/have:

- Medium risk
- Gone missing from their home and neighbourhood
- Gone missing for a longer period of time
- Gone missing before
- Been involved in County Lines

During lockdown, children were *less* likely to be/have:

- High risk
- Gone missing from children's residential care
- Gone missing from hospital
- Been found by their family, friend, acquaintances (including foster/guardians)

During lockdown, adults were *more* likely to be/have:

- Gone missing fewer times previously
- Gone missing from their home and neighbourhood
- Gone missing for a shorter period of time
- Suffered harm whilst missing

During lockdown, adults were *less* likely to be/have:

- Gone missing from children's residential care

*Table 1: Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing children reports recorded by Force A** in 2019 (n = 174) compared with 2020 (n = 185), with odds ratios[22]*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[23]
Gender					
Male	51.1	50.3	-	-.01	1.00
Female	47.7	47.6	=	0	1.00
Transgender	1.1	2.2	+	.04	1.90
Age	Mdn=16 (2-17)	Mdn=16 (8-17)	-	-.08	
Risk					
Low	0.6	0	-	-.05	0.99
Medium	72.4	84.9*	+	.15	2.14
High	27.0	15.1*	-	-.15	0.48
No of times missing	Mdn=4 (1-57)	Mdn=6 (1-108)	+	-.22	
Absent from:					
Children's residential care	16.7	0.0*	-	-.31	0.83
Home/Neighbourhood	71.8	100*	+	.41	0.72
Hospital	9.8	0*	-	-.23	0.90
Street	1.7	0	-	-.10	0.98
Number of hours missing	Mdn = 2.98 (0.02-382.32)	Mdn = 4.37* (0.02-503.17)	+	-.11	
Ethnic description:					
Any other Asian background	2.1	4.3	+	.06	2.15
Any other black background	2.1	4.9	+	.08	2.48
Any other ethnic group	4.1	1.9	-	-.07	0.44
Any other mixed background	5.5	5.6	+	0	1.02
Any other white background	7.5	14.2	+	.11	2.03
Black African	2.7	2.5	-	-.01	0.90
Black Caribbean	0	0.6	+	.05	1.01
Pakistani	2.7	0.6	-	-.08	0.22
White and Asian	0	0.6	+	.05	1.01
White and black African	0.7	0	-	-.06	0.99
White British	72.6	63.6	-	-.10	0.66
White Irish	0	1.2	+	.08	1.01

---

[22] Three cases have been excluded from the analysis of Force A's reports as age of the missing person was not known.

[23] Where applicable

Risk factors:					
Gang-related	3.4	3.2	-	-.01	0.94
Modern slavery	1.7	0	-	-.10	0.98
County lines	0.0	6.5*	+	.18	1.07
Criminal exploitation	0.0	3.2	+	.13	1.03
Unaccompanied juvenile	13.2	10.3	-	.75	0.75
Found details:					
Address of friend/acquaintance	15.5	15.1	-	-.01	0.97
Address of relative	8.0	3.8	-	-.09	0.45
Home address (non-residence)	0.6	1.6	+	.05	2.85
Hospital/health service	1.1	0	-	-.07	1.00
Other	18.4	9.7			
Street/public place	21.3	25.4	-	-.13	0.48
Home address (place of residence)	35.1	44.3	+	.05	1.26
Found by:			+	.10	1.48
Care home staff	5.7	11.4	+	.10	2.10
Family (including foster/guardians)	23.6	11.4*	-	-.16	0.42
Friend/acquaintance of missing person	3.4	1.6	-	-.06	0.46
Health services staff	0	0.5	+	.05	1.01
Other	3.4	1.6	-	-.06	0.46
Other agency	1.1	1.1	=	0	0.94
Police	35.1	45.9	+	.11	1.58
Returned of own free will	26.4	24.9	-	-.02	0.92
Social services	1.1	1.6	+	.15	0.02
Found How:					
Arrested	4.6	2.2	-	-.07	0.46
Other	29.9	28.6	-	-.01	0.94
Presented to the police	14.4	20.0	+	.07	1.49
Returned after negotiation	2.9	2.2	-	-.02	0.75
Returned to police at the request of misper	1.1	1.6	-	.02	1.42
Returned of own accord	47.1	45.4	-	-.02	0.93
Harm	0	1.6	+	.09	1.02
Circumstances:					
Met up with a friend/acquaintance	57.0	60.6	+	.04	1.16
Met up with other	3.5	4.2	+	.02	1.21
Other circumstance	21.0	19.0	-	-.03	0.88
Stayed with a friend	4.9	4.9	+	0	1.00
Went to location no	2.1	4.2	+	.06	2.04

known connections					
Went to a place previously lived/frequented	7.0	2.8	-	-.10	0.38
With person/location known from original info	4.2	4.2	=	0	1.00
Distance from home to found (in miles):					
0-5	71.6	77.5	+	.07	1.37
6-10	7.4	8.9	+	.03	1.22
11-20	11.1	4.1	-	-.13	0.35
21-40	5.6	2.4	-	-.08	0.41
41-80	1.2	5.3	+	.11	4.50
Over 80	3.1	1.8	-	-.04	0.57

*Significant change

Table 2: Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing adult reports recorded by Force A** in 2019 (n = 256) compared with 2020 (n = 125), with odds ratios[24]

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[25]
Gender					
Male	58.6	56.8	-	-.02	0.93
Female	32.8	25.6	-	-.07	0.71
Transgender	8.6	17.6	+	.13	2.27
Age	Mdn=27 (18-96)	Mdn=32 (18-93)	+	-.17	
Risk					
Low	19.9	20.0	+	0	1.01
Medium	60.9	49.6	-	-.11	0.63
High	19.1	30.4	+	.13	1.85
No of times missing	Mdn = 2 (1-50)	Mdn= 1* (1-30)	-	-.16	
Absent from:					
Children's residential care	10.2	0*	-	-.19	0.90
Home/Neighbourhood	85.5	100*	+	.23	0.86
Hospital	1.6	0	-	-.07	0.98
Street	1.6	0	-	-.07	0.98
Place of employment	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Licensed premises	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
MHA Patient (sectioned)	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Number of hours missing	Mdn = 6.77	Mdn = 3.78*	-	-.10	

[24] Three cases have been excluded from the analysis of Force A reports as age of the missing person was not known.
[25] Where applicable

	(0.23-6571.73)	(0.05-719187)			
Ethnic description:					
Any other Asian background	5.0	0.9	-	-.10	0.17
Any other black background	2.9	0	-	-.10	0.97
Any other ethnic group	2.1	0	-	-.08	0.98
Any other mixed background	0.8	1.7	+	.04	2.10
Any other white background	6.3	7.8	+	.03	1.27
Black African	2.1	1.7	-	-.01	0.83
Black Caribbean	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Chinese	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Indian	0.4	0.9	+	.03	2.09
Pakistani	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
White and Asian	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
White and black African	0.4	0.9	+	.03	2.09
White and black Caribbean	0.4	0.9	+	.03	2.09
White British	77.8	85.2	+	.09	1.64
Risk factors:					
Gang-related	0.8	0.5	-	-.05	0.98
Criminal exploitation	0	0.8	+	.07	1.01
Unaccompanied juvenile	1.6	0	-	-.07	0.98
Found details:					
Address of friend/acquaintance	14.1	9.6	-	-.06	0.65
Address of relative	3.5	4.8	+	.03	1.38
Home address (non-residence)	0.8	0.8	=	0	1.02
Hospital/health service	3.5	3.2	+	-.01	0.91
Other	17.2	19.2	+	.03	1.15
Street/public place	24.6	37.6	+	.14	1.85
Home address (place of residence)	36.3	24.8	-	-.12	0.58
Found by:					
Care home staff	7.0	1.6	-	-.11	0.22
Family (including foster/guardians)	10.2	9.6	-	-.01	0.94
Friend/acquaintance of missing person	2.0	1.6	-	-.01	0.82
Health services staff	1.6	1.6	=	0	1.02
Other	4.7	4.8	+	0	1.03
Other agency	1.6	2.4	+	.03	1.55
Police	51.2	64.0	+	.12	1.70
Returned of own free will	21.5	14.4	-	-.09	0.62
Social services	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Found how:					
Arrested	4.3	4.0	-	-.01	0.93

Other	32.4	47.2*	+	.14	1.86
Presented to the police	21.1	18.4	-	-.03	0.84
Returned after negotiation	2.3	1.6	-	-.02	0.68
Returned to police at the request of misper	2.7	4.0	+	.03	1.48
Returned of own accord	37.1	24.8	+	-.12	0.56
Harm	6.3	16.0*	+	.16	2.86
Circumstances:					
Met up with a friend/acquaintance	38.1	26.7	-	-.11	0.59
Met up with other	4.5	4.0	-	-.01	0.88
Other	29.7	35.6	+	.06	1.31
Slept rough	7.4	9.9		.04	1.37
Stayed in a hotel/other commercial premises	2.0	0	+	-.08	0.98
Stayed with a friend	3.0	5.9	+	.07	2.06
Went to location	2.5	1.0	-	-.05	0.39
Went to a location – no known connections	6.4	10.9	+	.08	1.78
Went to place previously lived/frequented	6.4	5.9	+	-.01	0.92
Distance from home to found (in miles)					
0-5	65.8	67.8	+	.02	1.08
6-10	11.4	14.4	+	.02	1.12
11-20	6.1	5.4	-	-.02	0.87
21-40	6.1	3.6	-	-.05	0.57
41-80	4.4	5.4	+	.02	1.25
Over 80	4.8	1.8	-	-.07	0.36
Out of UK	1.3	1.8	+	.02	1.38

*Significant change

Appendix 4

Force B

Key findings

During lockdown, compared with 2019, children were *more* likely to be/have:

- Male
- Gone missing from between 24 to 48 hours
- Gone missing from between 48 hours to 7 days
- Gone missing before
- Younger
- Gone missing from children's residential care
- Found by care home staff
- Found by the police

During lockdown, children were *less* likely to be/have:

- Female
- Gone missing from between 8-16 hours
- Gone missing from a leisure facility

There were no significant differences for adults.

Table 1: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing children reports recorded by Force B** in 2019 (n = 326) compared with 2020 (n = 269), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size (phi or r = Z/√N)	OR[26]
Gender					
Male	45.7	64.3*	+	.19	2.14
Female	54.3	35.7*	-	-.19	0.47
Ethnicity					
Any other Asian background	0.7	1.1	+	.03	1.73
Any other black background	2.3	2.7	+	.01	1.15
Any other ethnic group	3.3	4.6	+	.03	1.40
Any other mixed background	0	2.3	+	.11	1.02
Any other white background	0	1.1	+	.08	1.01
Black African	1.0	0.8	-	-.01	0.76
Black Caribbean	1.3	0	-	-.08	0.99
Indian	0.3	0	-	-.04	1.00
White black African	2.0	0	-	-.10	0.98
White black Caribbean	1.0	3.4	+	.08	3.45
White British	87.7	82.1	-	-.08	0.64
White Irish	0.3	0	-	-.04	1.00
Risk					
Low	3.7	3.3	-	-.01	0.91
Medium	90.8	92.2	+	.03	1.20
High	5.5	4.5	-	-.02	0.80
Time missing					
8-16 hours	81.0	64.7*	-	-.19	0.43
24 to 48 hours	13.1	23.0*	+	.13	1.99
48 hours to 7 days	4.6	11.9*	+	.14	2.82
More than 7 days	1.3	0.4	-	-.05	0.28
Age	Mdn=15.22 (6-17)	Mdn= 15.2(3-17)*	-	-.09	
Absent from:					
Children's residential home	35.9	51.3*	+	.16	1.88
Home/Neighbourhood	57.7	48.0	-	-.10	0.68
Hospital	1.2	0	-	-.08	1.00
Leisure facilities	0.3	0	-	-.04	1.00
Place of education	3.7	0*	-	-.13	0.96
Street	1.2	0.4	-	-.05	0.30
Youth custody	0	0.4	+	.05	1.00
Found at:					
Address of relative	2.2	5.6	+	.09	2.68

---

[26] Where applicable

Home	15.1	14.5	-	-.01	0.95
Other	82.7	79.9	-	-.04	0.83
Found by :					
Care home staff	22.7	34.3*	+	.13	1.78
Family (including guardians)	15.6	14.6	-	-.02	0.92
Other	24.8	9.3*	-	-.20	0.31
Other agency	3.1	4.1	+	.03	1.35
Police	27.3	37.7*	+	.11	1.61
Repeat indicator	79.4	88.1*	+	.12	1.92

*Significant change

Table 2: Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing adult reports recorded by Force B** in 2019 (n = 205) compared with 2020 (n = 165), with odds ratios

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[27]
Gender					
Male	70.2	70.3	+	0	1
Female	29.8	29.7	-	0	1
Ethnicity					
Any other Asian background	3.5	0.6	-	-.10	0.18
Any other black background	0	1.9	+	.10	1.02
Any other ethnic group	1	0	-	-.07	0.99
Any other mixed background	0.5	0.6	+	.01	1.26
Any other white background	2.0	3.8	+	.05	1.93
Black African	0.5	1.3	+	.04	2.54
Black Caribbean	2.0	1.9	-	0	0.95
Indian	0.5	0	-	-.05	1.00
Chinese	0	0.6	+	.06	1.01
Pakistani	1.0	0	-	-.07	0.99
White black African	0.5	0	-	-.05	1.00
White black Caribbean	2.0	2.5	+	.02	1.22
White British	85.4	82.2	-	-.04	0.79
White Irish	1.0	1.2	+	.01	1.22
Risk					
Low	15.6	16.4	+	.01	1.06
Medium	56.6	54.5	-	-.02	0.92
High	27.8	29.1	+	.01	1.07
Time missing:					
8-16 hours	75.1	68.4	-	-.08	0.72
24 to 48 hours	11.1	17.4	+	.09	1.69
48 hours to 7 days	11.1	7.1	-	-.07	0.61
More than 7 days	2.6	7.1	+	.11	2.81
Age	Mdn=	Mdn=35.23	-	-.09	

[27] Where applicable

	40.19 (18-86)	(18-90)			
Absent from:					
Children's residential home	1.5	1.2	-	-.01	0.83
Home/Neighbourhood	72.2	75.8	+	.04	1.20
Hospital	7.8	8.5	+	.01	1.10
MHA Sectioned	6.8	7.3	+	.01	1.07
MHA Voluntary	2.9	1.8	-	-.04	0.61
Place of employment	0.5	0.6	+	.09	1.24
Residential Care Home Elderly	5.4	3.0	-	-.06	0.55
Street	1.5	1.2	-	-.01	0.83
Town centre	1.5	0.6	-	-.04	0.41
Found at:					
Address of relative	7.2	8.8	+	.03	1.24
Home	8.7	16.8	+	.12	2.12
Other	84.1	74.3	-	-.12	0.55
Found by:					
Care home staff	15.6	13.9	-	-.02	0.88
Family (including guardians)	20.0	24.8	+	.06	1.32
Other	18.5	13.9	-	-.06	0.71
Other agency	8.8	5.5	-	-.06	0.60
Police	37.1	41.8	+	.05	1.22
Repeat indicator	47.8	46.7	-	-.01	1.00

*Significant change

Appendix 5

Force C

Key findings

During lockdown, compared with 2019, children were *more* likely to be/have:

- Transgender
- Younger
- Located/returned by the police
- Low risk
- A child protection risk factor
- In need of essential medication
- A lack of ability to interact with others
- Drug dependency
- Alcohol dependency
- Suffered violent/racial/transphobic/domestic violence

During lockdown, children were *less* likely to be/have:

- Found by next of kin
- Medium risk
- School or college problems

During lockdown, adults were *more* likely to be/have:

- Younger
- Located/returned by the police
- High risk
- A child protection risk factor
- Drug dependency
- At risk of suicide/self-harm
- Previously disappeared suffered harm whilst missing

During lockdown, adults were *less* likely to be:

- From an 'oriental' background

Table 1: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing children reports recorded by Force C** in 2019 (n = 5307) compared with 2020 (n = 3602), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[28]
Gender					
Male	50.2	52.8	+	0.03	1.11
Female	49.8	46.9	-	-.03	0.89
Transgender	0	0.3*	+	.04	17.74
Hours missing	Mdn = 18.41 (0-8306.45)	Mdn = 18.74 (0-1745.12)	+	-0.01	
Age	Mdn = 16 (0-17)	Mdn = 16* (0-17)	=	-0.11	
Misper found cancel					
Found by next of kin 1	1.3	0.2*	-	-.06	0.15
Misper –Arrested 2	3.2	3.8	+	.02	1.18
Misper -Found - Other Reason 3	7.9	5.6*	-	-.04	0.70
Misper -Located/Returned by 4 police	15.6	18.2*	+	.03	1.21
Misper -Returned of own accord 5	71.9	71.8	-	0	0.99
Misper -Transferred out of MPS 6	0.1	0.4	+	.03	3.24
Risk					
Low	11.0	15.9*	+	.07	1.48
Medium	84.3	80.2*	-	-.05	0.79
High	4.4	3.9	-	-.01	0.89
Ethnic appearance					
Afro Caribbean	44.6	44.2	-	0	0.98
Arab	2.4	2.3	+	0	0.95
Asian	10.0	9.5	-	-.01	0.94
Dark European	4.9	5.3	+	.01	1.08
Oriental	0.5	0.3	-	-.01	0.65
White European	37.5	38.4	+	.01	1.04
Risk factors					
Child protection	19.1	26.4*	+	.09	1.52
Essential medication	16.1	20.2*	+	.05	1.32
Lacks ability to interact	9.3	11.8*	+	.04	1.30
Mental illness/psychological disorder	19.7	21.9	+	.03	1.15
Drug dependency	21.5	28.7*	+	.08	1.47
Alcohol dependency	11.7	14.8*	+	.05	1.31

---

[28] Where applicable

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR
Suspicion abduction/murder	5.8	6.5	+	.01	1.12
Suspicion – self harm/murder	13.0	14.1	+	.02	1.10
Violent/racial/transphobic/domestic violence	8.2	10.3*	+	.04	1.29
Out of character	35.3	35.3	=	0	1.00
Family conflict/abuse	26.7	24.7	-	-.02	0.90
Employment problems	7.8	8.1	+	.01	1.04
Financial problems	8.2	9.5	+	.02	1.17
School/college problems	26.3	21.1*	-	-.06	0.75
Ongoing bullying/harassment	11.2	10.4	-	-.01	0.92
Previously disappeared/suffered harm	13.8	15.1	+	.02	1.11
Other factor	19.8	23.0*	+	.04	1.21
UK resident travelled abroad	5.8	5.5	-	-.01	0.94
International missing in UK	4.4	4.3	-	0	0.98
Special factors	8.0	8.6	+	.01	1.09

*Significant change

*Table 2: Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing adult reports recorded by Force C** in 2019 (n = 2500) compared with 2020 (n = 1766), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[29]
Gender					
Male	58.6	55.2	-	-.03	0.87
Female	41.2	44.6	+	.03	1.15
Transgender	0.1	0.2	+	.01	1.42
Hours missing	Mdn = 18.10 (0-600956)	Mdn = 17.45 (.01-1746.58)	-	-1.71	
Age	Mdn = 19 (18-99)	Mdn = 18* (18-92)	-	-0.06	
Misper found cancel					
Found by next of kin 1	1.0	0.8	-	-.01	0.81
Misper –Arrested 2	3.4	3.3	-	0	0.97
Misper -Found - Other Reason 3	11.1	8.6	-	-.04	0.75
Misper -Located/Returned by 4 police	21.5	25.7*	+	.05	1.27
Misper -Returned of own accord 5	61.9	60.7	-	-.01	0.95
Misper -Transferred out of MPS 6	0	0.1	+	0	1.43
Hosper – Discharged from hospital 7	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Hosper - Friend/relation informed 8	0.1	0.1	=	0	0.95
Hosper - Other Reason show in DETS 9	0.3	0.2	-	-.01	0.61
Misper -Found Dead - Blvd. Homicide	0	0.1	+	.03	1.00
10	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00

[29] Where applicable

Misper -Found Dead - Blvd. Natural 11	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Misper -Found Dead - Blvd. Suicide 12	0	0.1	+	.01	2.86
Misper -Found Dead - Unknown Cause 13	0	0	=	-.01	1.00
	0	0.1	+	.03	1.00
Misper -Found Dead-Blvd. Accidental 14	0	0.1	+	.03	1.00
Suddeath – Next of kin informed 15					
Suddeath-Other Reason show in DETS 16					
Risk					
Low	24.2	23.8	-	0	1.00
Medium	65.9	62.8	-	-.03	0.87
High	9.9	13.4*	+	.05	1.41
Ethnic appearance					
Afro Caribbean	36.2	38.7	+	.02	1.11
Arab	1.6	1.5	-	-.01	0.92
Asian	9.1	9.4	+	.01	1.04
Dark European	5.2	4.9	-	-.01	0.93
Oriental	1.0	0.3*	-	-.04	0.29
White European	46.7	45.2	-	-.02	0.94
Risk factors:					
Child protection	11.8	18.9*	+	.10	1.73
Essential medication	33.6	36.6	+	.03	1.14
Lacks ability to interact	16.2	19.9	+	.05	1.28
Mental illness/psychological disorder	44.1	46.9	+	.03	1.12
Drug dependency	31.6	36.4*	+	.05	1.24
Alcohol dependency	23.2	26.8	+	.04	1.21
Suspicion abduction/murder	6.8	7.9	+	.02	1.18
Suspicion – self harm/suicide	21.0	25.7*	+	.06	1.31
Violent/racial/transphobic/domestic violence	10.2	13.1	+	.05	1.34
Out of character	38.2	41.2	+	.03	1.14
Family conflict/abuse	22.4	25.2	+	.03	1.16
Employment problems	16.3	16.8	+	.01	1.04
Financial problems	16.7	18.7	+	.03	1.15
School/college problems	12.3	13.0	+	.01	1.06
Ongoing bullying/harassment	10.3	11.8	+	.02	1.17
Previously disappeared/suffered harm	13.5	17.2*	+	.05	1.34
Other factor	19.1	22.8	+	.05	1.25
UK resident travelled abroad	7.1	7.5	+	-.01	0.94
International missing in UK	5.5	5.3	-	0	0.96
Special factors	9.5	10.5	+	.02	1.12

*Significant change

Appendix 6

Force D

Key findings

During lockdown, compared with 2019, children were *more* likely to be/have:

- Less likely to be from a white British background

There were no other significant changes in the children or adult samples.

*Table 1L Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing children reports recorded by Force D** in 2019 (n = 249) compared with 2020 (n = 131), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[30]
Gender					
Male	55	55	=	0	1.00
Female	45	45	=	0	1.00
Ethnicity					
Black African	0.5	0	-	-.04	1.00
Black Caribbean	0	1.1	+	.09	1.01
White British	93.6	82.2*	-	-.18	0.32
White Irish	0.5	0	-	-.04	1.00
Other White background	0	1.1	+	.09	1.01
Other ethnic group	0.5	0	-	-.04	1.00
Other mixed ethnicity	0.5	0	-	-.04	1.00
Risk					
Low	2.1	3.3	+	.04	1.57
Medium	92.4	93.5	+	.02	1.18
High	5.5	3.3	-	-.05	0.58
Age	Mdn= 15 (1-17)	Mdn= 15(1-17)	-	0	n/a

*Significant change

*Table 2: Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing adult reports recorded by Force D** in 2019 (n = 110) compared with 2020 (n = 46), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[31]
Gender					
Male	62.7	71.7	+	.09	1.51
Female					
	37.3	28.3	-	-.09	0.66
Ethnicity					
White British	96.3	100	+	.10	0.96
White Irish	1.2	0	-	-.06	0.99
Other White background	2.5	0	-	-.08	0.98
Risk					
Low	13.3	11.1	-	-.03	0.81
Medium	75.2	82.2	+	.08	1.52
High	11.4	6.7	-	-.07	0.55

[30] Where applicable
[31] Where applicable

		Mdn= 37 (18-94)	Mdn= 36 (18-81)	-	-0.01
Age					

*Significant change

Appendix 7

Force E

Key findings

During lockdown, compared with 2019, children were *more* likely to be/have:

- Older
- A vulnerability
- Returned of their own accord
- Gone missing before

During lockdown, children were *less* likely to be/have:

- Gone missing from a place of education
- Found by staff/social worker

During lockdown, adults were *more* likely to be/have:

- Gone missing from their residential address
- Found by the police
- Gone missing before

Table 1: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing children reports recorded by the Force E** in 2019 (n = 855) compared with 2020 (n = 466), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[32]
Gender					
Male	48.8	47.9	-	-.01	0.96
Female	50.8	51.9	+	.01	1.04
Transgender	0.2	0	+	-.03	1.00
Ethnicity					
White	94.9	96.1	+	.03	1.32
Irish traveller	0.7	1.7	+	.05	2.41
Other Asian	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Black Caribbean	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Black African	0.4	1.1	+	.04	3.01
Black Other	0.5	0	-	-.04	1.00
Chinese	0.6	0	-	-.05	0.99
Other ethnic group	0.7	0.2	-	-.03	0.30
Mixed	1.8	0.9	-	-.04	0.47
Gypsy	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Final risk					
Low	0.7	0.3	-	-.02	0.46
Medium	97.5	97.7	+	.01	1.07
High	1.8	2.0	-	.01	1.12
Hours	7.97(34.04)	5.94(11.79)	-	0	
Age	Mdn=15 (0-17)	Mdn=15 (2-17)*	+	0	
Missing from					
Business	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Care leavers	10.2	7.3	-	-.05	0.70
Cemetery	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Children's home	34.6	43.1	+	.08	1.43
Court	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Day centre	0.2	1.3	+	.07	5.56
Education	3.5	0.2*	-	-.10	0.06
Entertainment/shop/leisure	1.3	0	-	-.07	0.99
Foster	8.2	8.6	+	.01	1.05
Hospital	1.1	1.5	+	.02	1.43
Hostel	0.1	1.5	+	.09	13.02
Hotel	1.1	0.4	-	-.03	0.41
Medical	0.1	0.4	+	.03	3.68
Nursing/residential home	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Other	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Residential address	37.0	35.6	-	-.01	0.94
Services	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00

---

[32] Where applicable

	2019	2020	Change	Effect size	OR
Street	0.9	0	-	-.06	0.99
Transport	0.6	0	-	-.05	0.99
Vulnerability	63.9	71.9*	+	.08	1.45
Found by					
Different force	0.1	0.2	+	.01	1.84
Family/friend	8.4	4.9	-	-.06	0.57
Member of public	1.1	0.2	-	-.05	0.20
Ambulance Service	0.4	0.2	-	-.01	0.61
Not missing	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Other	0.4	0	-	-.04	1.00
Police	36.6	32.6	-	-.04	0.84
Presented self to police	3.7	1.9	-	-.05	0.51
Returned of own accord	28.5	42.1*	+	.14	1.82
Staff	0.8	0.6	-	-.01	0.79
Staff/social worker	4.2	1.3*	-	-.08	0.30
Missing before	80.9	88.3*	+	.10	1.79
Found deceased	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00

*Significant change

Percentage/average of particular characteristics within missing adult reports recorded by Force E in 2019 (n = 785) compared with 2020 (n = 478), with odds ratios

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect size	OR[33]
Sex					
Male	64.9	70.3	+	.06	1.28
Female	35.1	29.7	-	-.06	0.78
Missing from					
Care leavers	2.2	2.1	-	0	0.97
Court	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Education	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Entertainment, shop, leisure	0.8	0.4	-	-.02	0.55
Foster	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Hospital	34.1	27.8	-	-.07	0.74
Hospital (not Emergency Department)	2.9	4.0	+	.03	1.37
Hostel	9.6	6.1	-	-.06	0.61
Hotel/B&B	0.4	0.4	=	0	1.10
Medical	0.3	0.2	-	-.01	0.82
Mental health	2.0	0.2	-	-.08	0.10
Nursing/Residential home	2.2	2.7	+	.02	1.26
Other	0.1	0.4	+	.03	3.29
Religion	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Residential address	42.7	53.3*	+	.10	1.54
Residential care home	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Services	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Social housing	0.5	2.3	+	.08	4.60

---

[33] Where applicable

Street	0.9	0	-	-06	0.99
Ethnicity					
White	98.4	98.2	-	-.01	0.89
Irish traveller	0.3	1.4	+	.06	5.09
Indian	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Pakistani	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Other Asian	0.3	0	-	-.03	1.00
Black African	0.1	0.2	+	.01	1.68
Black Other	0.1	0.2	+	.01	1.68
Chinese	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Other ethnic group	0.1	0	-	-.02	1.00
Mixed	0.3	0	-	-.03	1.00
Risk					
Low	11.2	8.1	-	-.05	0.69
Medium	78.2	78.2	=	0	1.01
High	10.6	13.7	+	.05	1.34
Hours	Mdn = 2.26 0-1513	Mdn = 1.93 0-533.58	-	-.03	
Age	Mdn = 32 (18-91)	Mdn = 33 (18-85)	+	0	
Vulnerability	59.0	54.6	-	-.04	0.84
Found by					
Actively avoiding police	0.2	0.5	-	.03	3.09
Coast guard	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Family/friend	9.6	7.5	-	-.04	0.77
Member of public	1.2	1.6	+	.02	1.32
Ambulance Service	0.8	0.3	-	-.04	0.31
Not missing	0.5	0	-	-.05	1.00
Other	1.7	0	-	-.08	0.98
Police	48.1	58.8*	+	.10	1.54
Different force	1.0	0.3	-	-.04	0.26
Presented self to police	8.2	3.6	-	-.09	0.42
Rescue Service	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Returned of own accord	25.4	25.9	+	.01	1.03
Search & Rescue / mountain rescue	0.3	0.8	+	.03	2.32
Staff	0.3	0.5	+	.01	1.54
Staff/social worker	2.2	0.3	-	-.08	0.12
Missing before	51.7	59.0*	+	.07	1.34
Found deceased	0.5	1.0	+	.03	2.06

*Significant change

Appendix 8

Force F

Key findings

During lockdown, compared with 2019, children were *more* likely to be/have:

- Younger
- High risk
- Gone missing fewer times previously
- Gone missing from children's residential care
- Of white and Black Caribbean ethnicity
- Found between 41 and 80 miles from where they went missing

During lockdown, children were *less* likely to be/have:

- Medium risk
- Gone missing from their home/neighbourhood
- White British
- Gone missing from school
- Been found by their family (including guardians)

During lockdown, adults were *more* likely to be/have:

- Older
- High risk
- Gone missing fewer times previously
- Gone missing from their home/neighbourhood
- Gone missing for a shorter period of time
- Found by a friend or acquaintance

During lockdown, adults were *less* likely to be/have:

Gone missing from children's residential care

Table 1: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics within **missing children reports recorded by Force F** in 2019 (n = 443) compared with 2020 (n = 155), with odds ratios*

	2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect sizes	OR[34]
Sex					
Male	52.4	53.5	+	.01	1.05
Female	47.6	46.5	-	-.01	.95
Age	Mdn = 16 (3-17)	Mdn=16* (11-17)	=	-.01	
Risk					
Low	0	0	=		
Medium	94.6	88.3*	-	-.11	0.46
High	5.4	11.7*	+	.11	2.31
No of times missing	Mdn = 10 (1-138)	Mdn = 6* (1-50)	-	-.12	
Absent from:					
Children's residential care	20.3	39.4*	+	.19	2.55
Home/Neighbourhood	73.4	57.4*	-	-.15	0.49
Hospital	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Street	1.1	0.6	-	-.02	0.57
Town centre	0.7	0.0	-	-.04	0.99
Place of education	4.3	1.3	-	-.07	0.29
Public transport	0	0.6	+	.07	1.01
Number of hours missing	Mdn = 5.40 (0.42-13519.63)	Mdn = 4.87 (0.02-289.88)	-	0	
Ethnic description					
Any other Black background	1.1	0.6	-	-.02	.57
Any other ethnic group	0.7	0	-	-.04	.99
Any other mixed background	5.3	9.1	+		
Black African	0.5	0.6			
Black Caribbean	0.7	1.9	+	.01	1.42
Indian	0	1.9	+	.06	2.87
Pakistani	0.2	0	+	.12	1.02
White and Asian	0	0.6	-	-.02	1.00
White and black African	0.7	0.6	+	.07	1.01
White and black Caribbean	0.7	11.7*	-	0	.95
White British	90.2	72.7*	+	.26	19.15
			-	-.22	.29
Risk factors					
Misunderstanding	2.3	2.6	+	.01	1.15

---

[34] Where applicable

Thrown out	1.1	0.6	-	-.02	0.57
Honour based violence	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Forced to leave	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Lost	0.9	0	-	-.05	0.99
Disorientated	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Sexual exploitation	4.1	1.9	-	-.05	0.47
School	11.5	0.6*	-	-.17	0.50
Gang-related	1.1	3.9	+	.09	3.53
Domestic abuse	0.7	1.3	+	.03	1.92
Other	46.5	37.4	-	-.08	0.69
Other medical	0.7	0.6	-	0	0.95
Transient lifestyle	0.2	0.6	+	.03	2.87
Suicide attempt	0.5	0	-	-.03	1.00
Relationship	13.5	14.8	+	.02	1.11
Homeless	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Depression/anxiety	1.8	4.5	+	.08	2.57
Mental health	2	1.3	-	-.02	0.63
Drugs/Alcohol	7.7	11.6	+	.06	1.58
Trafficking	0.5	1.3	+	.05	2.88
Unaccompanied juvenile	13.3	18.1	+	.06	1.44
Female genital mutilation	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Modern slavery	0.5	0	-	-.03	1.00
Found details					
Address of friend/acquaintance	14.7	16.9	+	.03	1.18
Address of relative	5.2	5.2	=	0	.99
Home address (non-residence)	0.7	1.3	+	.03	1.93
Hospital/health service	0.2	0.6	+	.03	2.89
Other	12.9	8.4	-	-.06	.62
Street/public place	29.3	35.1	+	.05	1.30
Home address (place residence)	37.0	32.5	-	-.04	.82
Found by:					
Care home staff	6.1	9.7	+	.06	1.65
Family (including foster/guardians)	19.0	6.5*	-	-.15	.30
Friend/acquaintance of missing person	2.9	3.2	+	.01	1.10
Health services staff	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Other	2.3	5.2	+	.07	2.36
Other agency	1.4	0	-	-.06	.99
Police	35.9	47.1	+	.10	1.59
Returned of own free will	30.9	27.7	-	-.03	.86
Social services	0.2	0	-	-.02	1.00
Other individual	1.1	0.6	-	-.02	.57
Returned by:					

Ambulance	0.2	1.3	+	.07	5.78
Carers	10.8	5.8	-	-.08	.51
Not required	49.7	43.2	-	-.06	.77
Other	11.5	14.2	+	.04	1.27
Police	27.8	35.5	+	.07	1.43
Harm	2.3	1.9	-	-.01	0.86
Criminality	4.3	3.9	-	-.01	0.90
Distance from home to found (in miles)					
0-5	71.8	68.7	-	-.03	.86
6-10	13.0	8.2	-	-.07	.59
11-20	7.1	8.2	-	.02	1.16
21-40	5.9	6.1	-	0	1.04
41-80	0.9	6.1*	+	.15	6.82
Over 80	1.2	2.7	+	.05	2.33

*Significant change

Table 2: *Percentage/average of particular characteristics **within missing adult reports recorded by Force F** in 2019 (n = 416) compared with 2020 (n = 145), with odds ratios*

		2019 % or median (min-max)	2020 % or median (min-max)	Change	Effect sizes	OR[35]
Sex						
	Male	59.6	61.4	+	.02	1.08
	Female	40.4	38.6	-	1.08	0.93
Age		Mdn=29 (18-90)	Mdn=36* (18-65)	+	-.21	
Risk						
	Low	9.4	3.4	-	-.10	0.34
	Medium	68.4	60.0	-	-.08	0.69
	High	22.2	35.9*	+	.14	1.96
No. of times missing		Mdn = 2 (1-66)	Mdn=1* (1-56)	-	-.17	
Absent from:						
Children's residential care		9.6	1.4*	-	-.14	0.13
Home/Neighbourhood		75.9	93.1*	+	.19	4.29
Hospital		8.0	2.8	-	-.09	0.33
MHA Sectioned		1.0	0	-	-.05	0.99
MHA Voluntary		0.5	0.7	+	.012	1.43
Military establishment		0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Place of employment		0.5	0	-	-.04	1.00
Public transport		0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00

[35] Where applicable

Residential care home	0.7	0.7	=	0	0.95
Street	2.4	1.4	-	-.03	0.57
Town centre	1.0	0	-	-.05	0.99
Number of hours missing	Mdn=10.73 (0.37-2001.20)	Mdn=5.57* (0.35-338.53)	-	-.20	
Ethnic description					
Any other Asian background	2.2	1.4	-	-.03	0.61
Any other Black background	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Any other ethnic group	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Any other mixed background	1.5	0	-	-.06	0.99
Any other white background					
Black African	1.2	2.8	+	.05	2.26
Black Caribbean	0.5	0.7	+	.01	1.40
Indian	0.2	1.4	+	.07	5.63
Pakistani	1.0	0.7	-	-.01	0.69
White and Asian	0.2	0.7	+	.03	2.80
White and black Caribbean	1.2	0.7	-	-.02	0.55
White British	2.2	0	-	-.08	0.98
White Irish	88.3	91.7	+	.05	1.46
	0.7	0	-	-.05	0.99
Reasons					
Misunderstanding	5.8	4.1	-	-.03	0.71
Financial	3.4	3.4	=	0	1.03
Thrown out	0.5	1.4	+	.03	2.90
Injured	0.5	0	-	.05	1.00
Forced to leave	0.2	0.7	+	-.04	2.88
Lost	0.2	0.7	+	.03	2.88
Disorientated	1.0	2.1	+	.03	2.18
Dementia	1.4	0	-	.04	0.99
Sexual exploitation	0.2	0	-	-.06	1.00
School	0.5	0	-	-.03	1.00
Gang-related	0.2	0	-	-.04	1.00
Domestic abuse	1.2	1.4	+	-.01	1.15
Asylum	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Other	33.7	26.2	-	-.07	0.70
Other medical	1.2	1.4	+	.01	1.15
Transient lifestyle	1.0	2.8	+	.07	2.92
Suicide attempt	4.3	9.7	+	.10	2.36
Relationship	16.8	27.6	+	.12	1.88
Homeless	1.9	5.5	+	.10	2.98
Depression/anxiety	13.7	24.8	+	.13	2.08
Mental health	20.7	30.3	+	.10	1.67
Drugs/Alcohol	15.4	15.2	-	0	0.98
Unaccompanied juvenile	1.9	0	-	-.07	0.98
Modern slavery	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Found details:					
Address of					

friend/acquaintance	13.7	20.0	+	.08	1.58
Address of relative					
Home address (non-	6.0	3.4	-	.05	0.56
residence)	0.7	1.4	+	.03	1.93
Home address (place					
residence)	34.9	29.7	-	.05	0.79
Hospital/health service					
Other	4.3	5.5	+	.03	1.29
Street/public place	16.1	9.0	-	-.91	0.51
	24.3	31.0	+	.07	1.40
Found by:					
Care home staff	3.8	0.7	-	-.08	.17
Family (including	11.3	4.1	-	-.11	.34
foster/guardians)					
Friend/acquaintance of	2.9	9.0*	+	.13	3.32
missing person					
Health services staff	1.9	2.1	+	.01	1.08
Other	3.1	2.8	-	-.01	.88
Other agency	3.4	1.4	-	-.05	.40
Other individual	0.2	0	-	-.03	1.00
Police	47.4	54.5	+	.06	1.33
Returned of own free will	25.0	25.5	+	.01	1.03
Social services	1.0	0	-	-.05	0.99
Returned by:					
Ambulance	7.0	12.4	+	.09	1.89
Carers	2.2	0	-	-.08	0.98
Not required	63.0	57.9	-	-.05	.81
Other	12.3	12.4	+	0	1.01
Police	15.6	17.2	+	.02	1.13
Harm	8.7	11.0	+	.04	1.31
Criminality	4.1	2.1	-	-.05	0.50
Distance from home to found					
(in miles)					
0-5	59.6	62.1	+	.02	1.11
6-10	11.5	9.0	-	-.04	0.76
11-20	7.0	11.0	+	.07	1.66
21-40	4.6	6.2	+	.03	1.38
41-80	4.1	2.8	-	-.03	0.67
Over 80	3.8	5.5	+	.04	1.46
Out of UK	0.5	0	-	-.04	1.00

*Significant change