Effects of voluntary event cancellation and school closure as countermeasures against COVID-19 outbreak in Japan

Yoshiyuki Sugishita[1)], Junko Kurita[2)], Tamie Sugawara[1)], Yasushi Ohkusa[2)]

1) National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan

2) Department of Nursing, Tokiwa University, Ibaraki, Japan

Corresponding author: Yoshiyuki Sugishita yoshiyuk@gmail.com

Keywords: COVID-19, voluntary event cancellation, outbreak in Japan, SIR model, asymptomatic case

Abstract

Background: To control the COVID-19 outbreak in Japan, sports and entertainment events were canceled and schools were closed throughout Japan from February 26 through March 19. That policy has been designated as voluntary event cancellation and school closure (VECSC).

Object: This study assesses VECSC effectiveness based on predicted outcomes.

Method: A simple susceptible–infected–recovery model was applied to data of patients with symptoms in Japan during January 14 through March 25. The respective reproduction numbers were estimated before VECSC (R), during VECSC (R_e), and after VECSC (R_a).

Results: Results suggest R before VECSC as 1.987 [1.908, 2.055], R_e during VECSC as 1.122 [0.980, 1.260], and R_a after VECSC as 3.086 [2.529, 3.739].

Discussion and Conclusion: Results demonstrated that VECSC can reduce COVID-19 infectiousness considerably, but the value of R rose to exceed 2.5 after VECSC.

Introduction

The initial case of COVID-19 in Japan was a patient returning from Wuhan, China who showed symptoms on January 3, 2020. Subsequently, as of April 6, 2020, the Ministry of Labour, Health and Welfare (MLHW) in Japan reported 3,906 cases in Japan, including asymptomatic cases but excluding those from a large cruise ship, the Diamond Princess [1].

Sports and entertainment events were canceled in Japan for two weeks from February 26 through March 11 in compliance to a government advisory. At the same time, it was advised that small business and private meetings be cancelled voluntarily, meaning that the measure was not enforced by law. Therefore, people were not arrested even if they did not comply with this government requirement [2]. Nevertheless, the effort depends on voluntary compliance of individuals. Moreover, this was the first time necessitating voluntary event cancellation. Those reasons complicate the *ex ante* prediction of the proportion of events that were cancelled and the extent to which contact among people was reduced. Moreover, as announced March 3, almost all schools were closed from the middle of March through spring vacation as a measure to control the spread of COVID-19. Even though young people can be infected and can transmit the virus to adults, school closure effects were questionable *ex ante* because

schoolchildren are not the most susceptible age class for COVID-19 [3–5]. Therefore, these policies must be evaluated *ex post*. The policies are known collectively as voluntary event cancellation (VECSC). After the VECSC period, VECSC was ceased, but continuous cancellation of large events was extended. Schools nationwide began their spring vacation.

If the reproduction number under VECSC (R_e) is less than one, then the outbreak can be expected to be contained. Alternatively, even if R_e is markedly less than R_0 but greater than one, it can be expected instead that the outbreak will be prolonged.

This study was conducted to evaluate VECSC based on the epidemic curve because no evidence exists for the number of cancelled events. The obtained result might be expected to contribute to a government's decision to implement VECSC as a countermeasure in Japan.

Method

We applied a simple deterministic susceptible–infected–recovery (SIR) model [6] to the epidemic curve in Japan for its population of 120 million. We assume an incubation period following the empirical distribution from the early stage of the outbreak. A person on the *i*-th day of incubation will move to a symptomatic or

asymptomatic state with probability of $p(i)/\Pi_{k=i}^{s-1}(1-p(k))$, where $p(i)$ represents the proportion of the i-th day on the empirical distribution of the incubation period or moving to the $i+1$th day in the incubation state with one minus $p(i)/\Pi_{k=i}^{s-1}(1-p(k))$. The maximum length of the incubation period was assumed to be 14 days.

Symptomatic and asymptomatic states were assumed to continue for seven days, followed by transition to a recovery state with probability of one [7]. This model ignores outcomes and necessary medical resources: states of death and hospitalization were not incorporated into the model.

Asymptomatic cases are not observable unless complete laboratory-based surveillance is performed. One exceptional study indicated them as 3/23 from a sample of elderly people [7]. We checked its robustness for the proportion of asymptomatic cases assuming a ratio of 4/19 from experiences of Japanese residents of Wuhan up to the outbreak [8].

Infectivity by severely infected patients and by mild patients was assumed to be equal. Moreover, we assumed that asymptomatic cases have the same power of infectivity as symptomatic cases [7]. That is merely an assumption. Therefore, we verified its robustness through sensitivity analysis of the infectiousness of asymptomatic cases, such as 50% assumed for simulation studies for influenza [9–13]. The distribution

of infectiousness in symptomatic and asymptomatic cases was assumed to be 30% on the onset day, 20% on the following day, and 10% for the subsequent five days [7]. Regarding its robustness, we also applied a uniform distribution for a week.

Because VECSC was conducted during February 27 through March 19, we divided the data period into three periods of those before VECSC, during VECSC, and after VECSC, with corresponding reproduction numbers represented as R_0, R_e, and R_a. We modeled the change in the reproduction number given the prior day's reported number of persons susceptible, incubation, symptomatic, asymptomatic, and in a recovered state.

For this study, R_0 was defined as the number of newly infected persons from one person infected over the infectious period when all persons were susceptible with no countermeasures. Also, R_e and R_a were defined, respectively, as the numbers of newly infected persons from one person infected over the infectious period when all persons were susceptible under VECSC or during a time of countermeasures after the VECSC period. For the estimation, the number of the newly infected persons was calculated using R_0 (R_e or R_a) × the proportion of susceptible persons among the population × the number of persons with infectiousness weighted by their infectiousness.

The values of R_0, R_e, and R_a were sought to fit the data to minimize the sum of

absolute values of discrepancies among the bootstrapped epidemic curve and the fitted values. The estimated distribution of three reproduction numbers was calculated using 10,000 iterations of bootstrapping for empirical distribution of the data for symptomatic patients. In this sense, though this model is a deterministic at each bootstrapping iteration, we can estimate its range through 10,000 iterations.

The bootstrapping procedure we used fully replicated bootstrapping with a fixed number of initial cases. There were N patients in the data, with numbering of the patients from the initial case to the last case. Initially, no patient was on the bootstrapped epidemic curve. If a random variable drawn from a uniform distribution of (0,1) was t included in the internal $[i/(N\text{-}1), (i+1)/(N\text{-}1)$, then we added one to the onset date of i+1th patient to the bootstrapped epidemic curve. We replicated this procedure N-1 times. Thereby we obtain the bootstrapped epidemic curve with N-1 patients. Finally, we added the initial patient, whose onset date was January 14, to the bootstrapped epidemic curve. Consequently, we obtained a bootstrapped epidemic curve with N patients starting from January 14.

We estimated the curve sequentially as follows. First, we estimated R_0 as the best fit to bootstrapped data for the pre-VECSC period. Then, based on the obtained R_0 and the course of the outbreak before the VECSC period, we estimated R_e as the best fit to

bootstrapped data in the VECSC period. Finally, based on the obtained R_0 and R_e, we estimated R_a as the best fit to bootstrapped data for the post-VECSC period. In each step, reproduction numbers were grid searched in the interval of (0,10) by 0.001.

We conducted three sensitivity analyses for one way in addition to the base case as explained above: the infectiousness power of asymptomatic cases represented 50% of symptomatic cases; the proportion of asymptomatic cases was 4/19 as symptomatic cases; infectiousness and infectious patterns showed a uniform distribution for one week. We also estimated the parameters by minimizing the sum of the squared residuals instead of the difference in absolute values and using the fitted incubation period as a log normal distribution instead of the empirical distribution.

Moreover, we examined infection during the incubation period of the infected persons two days before onset: $\Sigma_{i=2}^{13} p(i)/\Pi_{k=i}^{s-1}(1-p(k))x(i-1,t-1) + (1-p(i)/\Pi_{k=i}^{s-1}(1-p(k)))$ $p(i+1)/\Pi_{k=i}^{1}(1-p(k))\, x(i-1,t-2) + p(14)/\Pi_{k=1}^{13}(1-p(k))x(13,t-1)$, where $x(i,t)$ represents the number of persons at the i-th incubation period on day t. They were assumed to have the same infectiousness in the first two days of symptomatic period. To keep the definition of the reproduction number, infectiousness in the incubation and (a) symptomatic period were adjusted such that the sum of infectiousness from two days before to one week later from onset should be one.

We adopted 5% as the level for which we inferred significance. We used Matlab 2014a to code difference equations for estimation, as explained above.

Data source

The numbers of symptomatic patients during January 14 – March 25 were published by the MLHW [1] as of April 6. During this period, 1516 cases were recorded with onset dates. We excluded imported cases and those presumed to have been infected persons from the Diamond Princess because they were presumed not to be community-acquired in Japan.

Ethical considerations

All information used for this study has been published elsewhere [1]. There is therefore no ethical issue related to this study.

Results

Figure 1 depicts the empirical distribution of the incubation period among 91 cases for which the exposed date and onset date were published by MHLW. Its mode was six days. The average was 6.6 days. The maximum length of the incubation period was assumed to be 14 days. However, patients whose incubation period was longer than 14

days was just about 4%.

The value of R_0 before VECSC was introduced was estimated as 1.992; its range was [1.892, 2.088]. However, R_e during the VECSC period was estimated as 1.125 [0.933, 1.345]. After VECSC, R_a was estimated as 3.083 [2.375, 4.067]. The null hypothesis that R_0, R_e, and R_a were the same was therefore rejected.

Figure 2 depicts the observed epidemic curve and predicted epidemic curve based on the estimated R_0, R_e, and R_a. It showed goodness of fit that was pretty good. The small bump around February 26 reflects overshooting caused by the sharp decline of the reproduction number from R_0 to R_e.

One-way sensitivity analysis revealed that if the infectiousness of asymptomatic cases was 50% of symptomatic cases instead of 100%, then R_0 would be estimated as 2.187 [2.033, 2.287], R_e would be 1.182 [1.001, 1.485], and R_a would be 3.271 [2.571, 4.360].

If the asymptomatic cases were 4/19 as symptomatic cases instead of 3/32, then R_0 would be estimated as 2.019 [1.892, 2.104], R_e would be 1.114 [0.933, 1.345], and R_a would be 3.061 [2.189, 4.000]. If the infectious pattern formed a uniform distribution for a week instead of the base case, then R_0 would be estimated as 2.210 [2.060, 2.314], R_e would be 1.138 [0.962, 1.361], and R_a would be 3.206 [2.354, 4.367]. If we introduce

infectiousness in the incubation period, then R_0 would be estimated as 2.287 [2.207, 2.353], R_e would be 1.313 [1.187, 1.471], and R_a would be 3.383 [2.743, 4.073].

When we estimate the parameters by minimizing the sum of the squared residuals instead of the absolute difference, R_0 was estimated as 2.026 [1.973, 2.079], R_e was 1.104 [1.013, 1.204], and R_a was 3.165 [2.764, 3.814]. However, when we estimate the parameters using a log normal distribution with mean of 1.66 and standard deviation ofs 0.558 truncated as 14 days as incubation period instead of the empirical distribution, R_0 was estimated as 2. 778 [2. 660, 2.890], R_e was 1.118 [0.916, 1.346], and R_a was 4.366 [3.420, 5.720].

Because the ranges of R_e and R_a were overlapped, these factors might not affect the results so much, at least in the considered and reasonable region of the parameters and distribution. Especially, the estimated R_e and R_a were similar among the seven scenarios considered herein. The estimated R_0 was the most sensitive. In the case of introduction of infectiousness before onset and log normal distribution as incubation period, R_0 was significantly higher than in base case. In other scenarios, ranges of R_0 were overlapped.

Discussion

We applied a simple deterministic SIR model including asymptomatic cases. A

deterministic model might be simpler but more appropriate than stochastic model for the present study including changing parameters and policy evaluation [14].

An earlier study [15–17] estimated R_0 for COVID-19 as 2.24–3.58 in Wuhan. Our R_0 obtained for the period before VECSC was similar. However, an earlier study [18] found the average number of secondarily infected persons COVID-19 in Japan as 0.6 before the VECSC period, with 80% of patients who had not infected anyone. Although it did not use the term of R_0, and in the early stage of outbreak almost all persons were presumed to be susceptible, the average number of secondarily infected persons represented a similar concept to that of R_0. If the average number of secondarily infected persons was less than one, then the outbreak would never have emerged and no countermeasures would have been required.

However, based on results of the study uploaded on the site of Japanese Public Health Association, health authorities in the public health sector or local government were urged to conduct contact tracing to detect clusters [19]. Because only a few patients infected another person, as shown in the study, then if clusters were suppressed, the outbreak might be controlled. Nevertheless, R_0 at that time was estimated as approximately two. Therefore, cluster detection alone might have been insufficient to avert an outbreak. Moreover, after the VECSC period, reproduction number increased to

three: efforts at contact tracing to detect clusters might have been insufficient to control an outbreak, aside from providing lessons in averting clusters.

Infectiousness two days before symptom onset has been described in the literature [7, 20]. We applied it as sensitivity analysis. It showed slightly higher reproduction numbers than the base model. It probably compensated decreased infectiousness per day by extending the period of infectiousness from seven days to nine days.

Moreover, when using a log normal distribution to represent the incubation period instead of the empirical distribution, R_0 alone was markedly higher than in the base case. Although the difference was not large, it might lead to some bias attributable to the use of a parametric distribution.

Among children and younger adults, the proportion of asymptomatic infected people might be larger than among elderly people, but that point remains uncertain. Less susceptibility among children [3–5] might imply a higher proportion of asymptomatic cases in children. In this sense, 3/23 among elderly people might be the lower bound of the proportion for the general population. Overall, sensitivity analysis led to similar estimation with the base case. Therefore, one might conclude that the obtained results were more or less robust.

Two weeks had already passed since the end of the study period. Therefore, the lag

in reporting had almost disappeared. If timely estimation is necessary, meaning estimation using data from a day prior, we used adjusted delay for reported data [8, 18, 19].

We used the minimized sum of the absolute values of discrepancies for the bootstrapped epidemic curve and the fitted values, instead of the minimized sum of squared residuals such as maximum likelihood estimation based on a normal distribution. In general, minimization of the sum of the absolute values is more robust than minimization of the sum of squares because the absolute value is less sensitive than squared values to the effects of outliers [20–21]. The daily epidemic curve sometimes exhibits spikes according to the day of the week and for other reasons. Especially, few patients per day were reported during the early stage of the outbreak. Therefore, spikes might be quite large. These spikes are probably outliers. They might overly affect the estimator. For this reason, we prefer minimization of the sum of the absolute values to minimization of the sum of squared values when analyzing daily data in the earlier stage of the outbreak. Sensitivity analysis using minimum least squares of errors showed results that were very similar to those of the base case. Although R_0 and R_a were slightly higher, R_e was slightly lower. That result might indicate that some outlier in the pre-VECSC and post-VECSC periods might pull the estimator in the sensitive analysis.

Moreover, we chose non-parametric approaches using actual data in preference to parametric approaches assuming a particular distribution. Such an assumption might affect results through miss-specification. Therefore, we prefer to use the actual distribution of incubation periods or epidemic curves with no unnecessary or restrictive assumption.

This study has some limitations. The first is that even though we evaluated VECSC, the respective effects of voluntary event cancellation and school closure cannot be discerned. To separate their effects, one would have to develop a model with several age classes. School closure mainly affects contact patterns among schoolchildren; voluntary event cancellation mainly affects patterns among adults. Therefore, studies of those respective age groups might elucidate the separate effects of these policies. That stands as a challenge for our future study.

The second point is underascertainment. Although the epidemic curves of COVID-19 in all countries are subject to underascertainment, it might be very difficult to evaluate the degree to which they are affected. It might bias the estimation result.

A third point is estimation of the outcomes or necessary medical resources for the care of COVID-19 patients. We particularly examine how policies affect the

reproduction number under countermeasures. Therefore, we ignore prediction of the entire course of the outbreak and its outcomes such as the number of deaths. Nevertheless, outcomes are expected to be a primary concern for modelling. Moreover, the collapse of medical services can be expected to engender worse outcomes even if the reproduction number remains unchanged. Prediction of the effects of severe policies including lockdowns is anticipated as a challenge to be addressed in our future research.

Conclusion

Results have demonstrated that VECSC can reduce the infectiousness of COVID-19 considerably: approximately to one. However, the figure is probably greater than one. Outbreaks might continue for a long time. Therefore, lockdown policies are expected to be as effective as VECSC if they are executed carefully. After VECSC, the reproduction number escalated again beyond that before VECSC. Similar phenomena might be observed after a lockdown. We hope that results of the present study can contribute to governmental policy-making related to lockdown measures or other countermeasures to combat the spread and destruction of COVID-19.

The present study was based on the authors' opinions. Neither the results nor implications reflect any stance or policy of professionally affiliated bodies.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the great efforts of all staff at public health centers, medical institutions, and other facilities who are fighting the spread and destruction associated with COVID-19.

Reference

1. Japan Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Press Releases. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage_10723.html (in Japanese) [accessed on April 10, 2020]
2. Japan Times on February 29 https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2020/02/29/national/politics-diplomacy/japan-shinzo-abe-coronavirus-2/#.Xr4T9meP604 [accessed on May 15, 2020]
3. Lee PI, Hu YL, Chen PY, HuanYC, Hsueh PR.Lee PI, et al. Are children less susceptible to COVID-19 ? J Microbiol Immunol Infect. 2020 Feb 25:S1684-1182;30039-6.
4. Kelvin A, Halperin S. COVID-19 in children: the link in the transmission chain. The Lancet Infectious Diseases(https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30236-X
5. Qiu H, Wu J, Liang H, Yunling L, Song Q, Chen D. Clinical and epidemiological features of 36 children with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Zhejiang, China: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; published online March 25. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30198-5.
6. Ohkusa Y, Sugawara T, Taniguchi K, Okabe N. Real-time estimation and prediction for pandemic A/H1N1(2009) in Japan. J Infect Chemother. 2011;17:468-72.
7. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, James A, Taylor J, Spicer K, Bardossy AC, Oakley LP, Tanwar S, Chisty Z, Bell JM, Methner M, Harney J, Jacobs JR, Carlson CM, McLaughlin HP, Stone N, Clark S, Brostrom-Smith C, Page LC, Kay M, Lewis J, Russell D, Hiatt B, Gant J, Duchin JS, Clark TA, Honein MA, Reddy SC, Jernigan JA; Public Health ? Seattle & King County; CDC COVID-19

Investigation Team. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility - King County, Washington, March 2020. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020 Apr 3;69(13):377-381. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6913e1.

Kurita J, Sugawara T, OhkusaY.

Forecast of the COVID-19 outbreak and effects of self-restraint in going out in Tokyo, Japan. https://medrxiv.org/cgi/content/short/2020.04.02.20051490v3

8. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.12.20035220v1
9. Ferguson NM, Cummings DA, Cauchemez S, Fraser C, Riley S, Meeyai A, et al. : Strategies for containing an emerging influenza pandemic in Southeast Asia. Nature2005; 437:209-214.
10. Longini IM Jr, Nizam A, Xu S, Ungchusak K, Hanshaoworakul W, Cummings DA, Halloran ME: Containing Pandemic Influenza at the Source. Science2005; 309:1083-1087.
11. Germann TC, Kadau L, Longini IM Jr, Macken CA: Mitigation strategies for pandemic influenza in the United States. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2006; 103: 5935-5940.
12. Ferguson NM, Cummings DA, Fraser C, Cajka JC, Cooley PC, Burke DS: Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic. Nature2006; 442: 448-452.
13. Ohkusa Y, Sugawara T: Simulation Model of Pandemic influenza in the Whole of Japan, Journal of Japanese Infectious Disease2009; 62:98-106.
14. Britton T. Stochsitic model review. https://arxiv.org/pdf/0910.4443 [accessed on May 16]

15. Zhao S, Lin Q, Ran J, Musa SS, Yang G , Wang W, Lou Y, Gao D, Yang L, He D, Wang M. Preliminary Estimation of the Basic Reproduction Number of Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China, From 2019 to 2020: A Data-Driven Analysis in the Early Phase of the Outbreak. Int J Infect Dis 2020[Online ahead of print]

16. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rockly J. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. J Travel Med. 2020.DOI: 10.1093/jtm/taaa021

17. Lai C, Shih T, Ko W, Tang H, Hsueh P. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): The Epidemic and the Challenges. Int J Antimicrob Agents. DOI:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105924

18. Nishiura H, Oshitani H, Kobayashi T, Saito T, Sunagawa T, Wakita T, MHLW COVID-19 Response Team, Suzuki M. Closed environments facilitate secondary transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20029272

19. Maeda H, Oshitani H. Overview of cluster-aware strategies (Preliminary version on marhc 10, 2020) https://www.jsph.jp/covid/files/gainen_0402.pdf (in Japanese) [accessed on My 16, 2020]

20. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X, Mo X, Yanqing Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Yanrong Wu Y, Zhao L , Zhang F, Cowling BJ, Li F, Leung GM.Temporal Dynamics in Viral Shedding and Transmissibility of COVID-19. Nat Med 2020;26:672-5.

21. Hohle M, an der Heiden M. Bayesian nowcasting during the STEC O104: H4 outbreak in Germany, 2011. Biometrics. 2014;70(4):993.1002.
22. Glockner S, Krause G, Hohle M. Now-casting the COVID-19 epidemic: The use case of Japan, March 2020. medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20037473.
23. Subhash C. Narula and John F. Wellington. The Minimum Sum of Absolute Errors Regression: A State of the Art Survey. International Statistical Review 1982. 50: 317-26. doi:10.2307/1402501. JSTOR 1402501.
24. Robert F. Phillips. Least absolute deviations estimation via the EM algorithm. Statistics and Computing 2002. 12: 281-5. doi:10.1023/A:1020759012226.
25. Enno Siemsen & Kenneth A. Bollen . Least Absolute Deviation Estimation in Structural Equation Modeling. Sociological Methods & Research 2007. 36: 227-65. doi:10.1177/0049124107301946
26. Omori R, Mizumoto K, Ascertainment rate of novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in Japan. medRxiv 2020.03.09.20033183; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.09.20033183

Figure 1: Empirical distribution of incubation period published by Ministry of Labour, Health and Welfare, Japan

(%)



(days)

Notes: Bars showed distribution of incubation period among 91 cases whose exposed date and onset date were published by Ministry of Labour, Health and Welfare, Japan. Because the patients whose incubation was longer than 14 days were just 4%, they were included as bars on 14.

Figure 2: Observed epidemic curve of COVID-19 patients and predicted epidemic curve from the model based on the estimated reproduction number

(patients)



(Date)

Note: Bar indicated the observed epidemic curve and bold line indicates the predicted line based on the estimated reproduction numbers. Thin lines indicate range of the best fit line at each bootstrapping iteration. Between two vertical lines indicates voluntary event cancellation and school closure period.