

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

Yoshiyuki Sugishita<sup>1)</sup>, Junko Kurita<sup>2)</sup>, Tamie Sugawara<sup>1)</sup>, Yasushi Ohkusa<sup>2)</sup>

1) National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan

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

Corresponding author: Yoshiyuki Sugishita [yoshiyuk@gmail.com](mailto: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.

1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

31

## 32 Method

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

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

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

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

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

55 of infectiousness in symptomatic and asymptomatic cases was assumed to be 30% on  
56 the onset day, 20% on the following day, and 10% for the subsequent five days [7].

57 Regarding its robustness, we also applied a uniform distribution for a week.

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

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

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

73 absolute values of discrepancies among the bootstrapped epidemic curve and the fitted  
74 values. The estimated distribution of three reproduction numbers was calculated using  
75 10,000 iterations of bootstrapping for empirical distribution of the data for symptomatic  
76 patients. In this sense, though this model is a deterministic at each bootstrapping  
77 iteration, we can estimate its range through 10,000 iterations.

78 The bootstrapping procedure we used fully replicated bootstrapping with a fixed  
79 number of initial cases. There were  $N$  patients in the data, with numbering of the  
80 patients from the initial case to the last case. Initially, no patient was on the  
81 bootstrapped epidemic curve. If a random variable drawn from a uniform distribution of  
82  $(0,1)$  was  $t$  included in the interval  $[i/(N-1), (i+1)/(N-1)]$ , then we added one to the onset  
83 date of  $i+1$ th patient to the bootstrapped epidemic curve. We replicated this procedure  
84  $N-1$  times. Thereby we obtain the bootstrapped epidemic curve with  $N-1$  patients.  
85 Finally, we added the initial patient, whose onset date was January 14, to the  
86 bootstrapped epidemic curve. Consequently, we obtained a bootstrapped epidemic curve  
87 with  $N$  patients starting from January 14.

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

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

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

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

109 We adopted 5% as the level for which we inferred significance. We used Matlab

110 2014a to code difference equations for estimation, as explained above.

111

112 Data source

113 The numbers of symptomatic patients during January 14 – March 25 were

114 published by the MLHW [1] as of April 6. During this period, 1516 cases were recorded

115 with onset dates. We excluded imported cases and those presumed to have been infected

116 persons from the Diamond Princess because they were presumed not to be

117 community-acquired in Japan.

118

119 Ethical considerations

120 All information used for this study has been published elsewhere [1]. There is

121 therefore no ethical issue related to this study.

122

123 Results

124 Figure 1 depicts the empirical distribution of the incubation period among 91 cases

125 for which the exposed date and onset date were published by MHLW. Its mode was six

126 days. The average was 6.6 days. The maximum length of the incubation period was

127 assumed to be 14 days. However, patients whose incubation period was longer than 14

128 days was just about 4%.

129 The value of  $R_0$  before VECSC was introduced was estimated as 1.992; its range  
130 was [1.892, 2.088]. However,  $R_e$  during the VECSC period was estimated as 1.125  
131 [0.933, 1.345]. After VECSC,  $R_a$  was estimated as 3.083 [2.375, 4.067]. The null  
132 hypothesis that  $R_0$ ,  $R_e$ , and  $R_a$  were the same was therefore rejected.

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

137 One-way sensitivity analysis revealed that if the infectiousness of asymptomatic  
138 cases was 50% of symptomatic cases instead of 100%, then  $R_0$  would be estimated as  
139 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,  
140 4.360].

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

146 infectiousness in the incubation period, then  $R_0$  would be estimated as 2.287 [2.207,  
147 2.353],  $R_e$  would be 1.313 [1.187, 1.471], and  $R_a$  would be 3.383 [2.743, 4.073].

148       When we estimate the parameters by minimizing the sum of the squared residuals  
149 instead of the absolute difference,  $R_0$  was estimated as 2.026 [1.973, 2.079],  $R_e$  was  
150 1.104 [1.013, 1.204], and  $R_a$  was 3.165 [2.764, 3.814]. However, when we estimate the  
151 parameters using a log normal distribution with mean of 1.66 and standard deviation of  
152 0.558 truncated as 14 days as incubation period instead of the empirical distribution,  $R_0$   
153 was estimated as 2.778 [2.660, 2.890],  $R_e$  was 1.118 [0.916, 1.346], and  $R_a$  was 4.366  
154 [3.420, 5.720].

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

161

## 162 Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

184 Infectiousness two days before symptom onset has been described in the literature  
185 [7, 20]. We applied it as sensitivity analysis. It showed slightly higher reproduction  
186 numbers than the base model. It probably compensated decreased infectiousness per day  
187 by extending the period of infectiousness from seven days to nine days.

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

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

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

200 in reporting had almost disappeared. If timely estimation is necessary, meaning  
201 estimation using data from a day prior, we used adjusted delay for reported data [8, 18,  
202 19].

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

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

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

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

233

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

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

242

## 243 Conclusion

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

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

254

255 Acknowledgments

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

259

260 Reference


- 261 1. Japan Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Press Releases.  
262 [https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage\\_10723.html](https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage_10723.html) (in Japanese) [accessed on  
263 April 10, 2020]
- 264 2. Japan Times on February 29  
265 <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2020/02/29/national/politics-diplomacy/japan-s-hinzo-abe-coronavirus-2/#.Xr4T9meP604> [accessed on May 15, 2020]
- 267 3. Lee PI, Hu YL, Chen PY, Huan YC, Hsueh PR, Lee PI, et al. Are children less  
268 susceptible to COVID-19? *J Microbiol Immunol Infect.* 2020 Feb  
269 25:S1684-1182;30039-6.
- 270 4. Kelvin A, Halperin S. COVID-19 in children: the link in the transmission chain.  
271 *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30236-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30236-X))
- 272 5. Qiu H, Wu J, Liang H, Yunling L, Song Q, Chen D. Clinical and epidemiological  
273 features of 36 children with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Zhejiang,  
274 China: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; published online  
275 March 25. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30198-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30198-5).
- 276 6. Ohkusa Y, Sugawara T, Taniguchi K, Okabe N. Real-time estimation and  
277 prediction for pandemic A/H1N1(2009) in Japan. *J Infect Chemother.*  
278 2011;17:468-72.
- 279 7. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, James A, Taylor J, Spicer K, Bardossy AC,  
280 Oakley LP, Tanwar S, Chisty Z, Bell JM, Methner M, Harney J, Jacobs JR, Carlson  
281 CM, McLaughlin HP, Stone N, Clark S, Brostrom-Smith C, Page LC, Kay M,  
282 Lewis J, Russell D, Hiatt B, Gant J, Duchin JS, Clark TA, Honein MA, Reddy SC,  
283 Jernigan JA; Public Health ? Seattle & King County; CDC COVID-19

- 284 Investigation Team. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in  
285 Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility - King County,  
286 Washington, March 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020 Apr 3;69(13):377-381.  
287 doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6913e1.
- 288 Kurita J, Sugawara T, Ohkusa Y.
- 289 Forecast of the COVID-19 outbreak and effects of self-restraint in going out in Tokyo,  
290 Japan. <https://medrxiv.org/cgi/content/short/2020.04.02.20051490v3>
- 291 8. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.12.20035220v1>
- 292 9. Ferguson NM, Cummings DA, Cauchemez S, Fraser C, Riley S, Meeyai A, et al. :  
293 Strategies for containing an emerging influenza pandemic in Southeast Asia.  
294 *Nature*2005; 437:209-214.
- 295 10. Longini IM Jr, Nizam A, Xu S, Ungchusak K, Hanshaoworakul W, Cummings DA,  
296 Halloran ME: Containing Pandemic Influenza at the Source. *Science*2005;  
297 309:1083-1087.
- 298 11. Germann TC, Kadau L, Longini IM Jr, Macken CA: Mitigation strategies for  
299 pandemic influenza in the United States. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2006; 103:  
300 5935-5940.
- 301 12. Ferguson NM, Cummings DA, Fraser C, Cajka JC, Cooley PC, Burke DS:  
302 Strategies for mitigating an influenza pandemic. *Nature*2006; 442: 448-452.
- 303 13. Ohkusa Y, Sugawara T: Simulation Model of Pandemic influenza in the Whole of  
304 Japan, *Journal of Japanese Infectious Disease*2009; 62:98-106.
- 305 14. Britton T. Stochastic model review. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/0910.4443> [accessed on  
306 May 16]

- 307 15. Zhao S, Lin Q, Ran J, Musa SS, Yang G, Wang W, Lou Y, Gao D, Yang L, He D,  
308 Wang M. Preliminary Estimation of the Basic Reproduction Number of Novel  
309 Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China, From 2019 to 2020: A Data-Driven Analysis in  
310 the Early Phase of the Outbreak. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020[Online ahead of print]
- 311 16. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rockly J. The reproductive number of  
312 COVID-19 is higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *J Travel Med.* 2020.DOI:  
313 10.1093/jtm/taaa021
- 314 17. Lai C, Shih T, Ko W, Tang H, Hsueh P. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome  
315 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and Coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19): The  
316 Epidemic and the Challenges. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.*  
317 DOI:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105924
- 318 18. Nishiura H, Oshitani H, Kobayashi T, Saito T, Sunagawa T, Wakita T, MHLW  
319 COVID-19 Response Team, Suzuki M. Closed environments facilitate secondary  
320 transmission of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). doi:  
321 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20029272>
- 322 19. Maeda H, Oshitani H. Overview of cluster-aware strategies (Preliminary version  
323 on marhc 10, 2020) [https://www.jsph.jp/covid/files/gainen\\_0402.pdf](https://www.jsph.jp/covid/files/gainen_0402.pdf) (in Japanese)  
324 [accessed on My 16, 2020]
- 325 20. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, Deng X, Wang J, Hao X, Lau YC, Wong JY, Guan Y, Tan X,  
326 Mo X, Yanqing Chen Y, Liao B, Chen W, Hu F, Zhang Q, Zhong M, Yanrong Wu Y,  
327 Zhao L, Zhang F, Cowling BJ, Li F, Leung GM. Temporal Dynamics in Viral  
328 Shedding and Transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020;26:672-5.


- 329 21. Hohle M, an der Heiden M. Bayesian nowcasting during the STEC O104: H4  
330 outbreak in Germany, 2011. *Biometrics*. 2014;70(4):993.1002.
- 331 22. Glockner S, Krause G, Hohle M. Now-casting the COVID-19 epidemic: The use  
332 case of Japan, March 2020. medRxiv preprint doi:  
333 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.18.20037473>.
- 334 23. Subhash C. Narula and John F. Wellington. The Minimum Sum of Absolute Errors  
335 Regression: A State of the Art Survey. *International Statistical Review* 1982. 50:  
336 317-26. doi:10.2307/1402501. JSTOR 1402501.
- 337 24. Robert F. Phillips. Least absolute deviations estimation via the EM algorithm.  
338 *Statistics and Computing* 2002. 12: 281-5. doi:10.1023/A:1020759012226.
- 339 25. Enno Siemsen & Kenneth A. Bollen . Least Absolute Deviation Estimation in  
340 Structural Equation Modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research* 2007. 36: 227-65.  
341 doi:10.1177/0049124107301946
- 342 26. Omori R, Mizumoto K, Ascertainment rate of novel coronavirus disease  
343 (COVID-19) in Japan. medRxiv 2020.03.09.20033183; doi:  
344 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.09.20033183>  
345

1 Figure 1: Empirical distribution of incubation period published by Ministry of Labour,  
2 Health and Welfare, Japan  
3 (%)



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

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



4

5

6

7 Note: Bar indicated the observed epidemic curve and bold line indicates the predicted

8 line based on the estimated reproduction numbers. Thin lines indicate range of the best

9 fit line at each bootstrapping iteration. Between two vertical lines indicates voluntary

10 event cancellation and school closure period.

11