First peak of COVID-19 outbreak in Japan might pass as of April 26, 2020

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

1) Department of Nursing Tokiwa University, Ibaraki, Japan

2) National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan

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

Corresponding author: Junko Kurita, kuritaj@tokiwa.ac.jp

Keywrds: peak, COVID-19, SIR model, proportion of asymptomatic cases

Abstract

Background: The COVID-19 outbreak has two inconsistent phenomena: its reproduction number is almost two; and it shows earlier and lower peaks for new cases and the total number of patients.

Object: To resolve this difficulty, we constructed a mathematical model that can explain these phenomena.

Method: We applied a susceptible–infected–recovery model with the proportion of asymptomatic patients among the infected (q) as a key parameter for estimation as well as the basic reproduction number (R_0).

Results: We observed the first outbreak peak in Japan on April 3 for those infected on March 29 .Their R_0 and q were estimated respectively as 2.048 and 99.987%.

Discussion and Conclusion: By introducing a very high proportion of asymptomatic cases, two inconsistent phenomena might be resolved. This hypothesis should be verified through additional study.

Introduction

The initial case of COVID-19 in Japan was a patient who showed symptoms when returning from Wuhan, China on January 3, 2020. Subsequently, as of April 26, 2020, the Ministry of Labour, Health and Welfare (MLHW) in Japan announced that there were 7,741 cases in Japan, including asymptomatic people, but excluding those infected on a large cruise ship: the Diamond Princess [1]. In fact, the first peak was observed at the end of March. Subsequently, despite a declining epidemic curve, the Japanese government declared a state of emergency on April 7.

The COVID-19 outbreak has two associated and inconsistent phenomena: its reproduction number is almost two; and it shows earlier and lower peaks of new cases and the total number of patients. That reproduction number of two indicates that the peak will be reached when half of the population is infected. However, the total number of patients in Japan until the peak has been approximately 7000. A similar phenomenon was confirmed in Wuhan, China. How can one reconcile these two inconsistent characteristics of the outbreak of COVID-19? To resolve the difficulty, we constructed a mathematical model to explain the two phenomena.

Methods

We applied a simple susceptible–infected–recovery (SIR) model [2–4] to the epidemic curve of Japan and its 120 million population. We assume an incubation period that conforms to the empirical distribution in the early stage of the outbreak.

The proportion of asymptomatic people among those infected (q) is a crucially important parameter for estimation in the model, as is the basic reproduction number (R_0). For simplicity, we assumed no infectiousness among asymptomatic cases.

As data, we used the number of symptomatic patients reported by MLHW for January 14 – April 24 published [1] as of April 26. We excluded some patients who were presumed to be persons infected abroad or as passengers on the Diamond Princess. They were presumed not to be community-acquired in Japan. For onset dates of some symptomatic patients that were unknown, we estimated their onset date from an empirical distribution with duration extending from the onset to the report date among patients for whom the onset date had been reported.

Onset dates were sometimes unreported. Therefore, we estimated the onset date. To do so, we inferred a distribution extending from onset to reporting based on patients for whom onset dates were available. Then we applied this empirical distribution to patients for whom onset dates were not available. Letting $f(k)$ represent this empirical

distribution and letting N_t denote the number of patients for whom onset dates were not available published at date t, then the number of patients for whom the onset date was known is t-1. The number of patients for whom onset dates were not available was estimated as $f(1)N_t$. Similarly, the number of patients with onset date t-2 and whose onset dates were not available were estimated as $f(2)N_t$. Therefore, the total number of patients for whom the onset date was not available, given an onset date of s, was estimated as $\Sigma_{k=1} f(k)N_s+k$ for the long duration passing from s.

Moreover, the reporting delay for published data from MHLW might be considerable. In other words, if $s+k$ was larger than that in the current period t, then $s+k$ represents the future for period t: therefore, $Ns+k$ was not observable. Such a reporting delay leads to underestimation bias in the number of patients. Therefore, it must be adjusted as $\Sigma_{k=1}^{t-s} f(k)N_s+k / \Sigma_{k=1}^{t-s} f(k)$. Similarly, patients for whom the onset dates were available are expected to be affected by the reporting delay. Therefore, we have $M_s|t / \Sigma_{k=1}^{t-s} f(k)$, where $M_s|t$ represents the reported number of patients for whom onset dates were within period s, extending until the current period t.

We sought R_0 and q to fit the data to minimize the sum of the absolute values of discrepancies among the bootstrapped epidemic curve and the fitted values. The estimated distributions of the three reproduction numbers were calculated using 10,000

fully replicated iterations of bootstrapping for the empirical epidemic curve of symptomatic patients.

Results

During January 14 – April 26 in Japan, 12,936 community-acquired cases were identified, excluding asymptomatic cases. Figure 1 depicts the empirical distribution of incubation period among 91 cases for which the exposure date and onset date were published by MHLW. The mode of the distribution was six days; the average was 6.6 days.

Figure 1 presents the epidemic curve and infection dates of onset patients inferred from the empirical distribution of the incubation period depicted in Figure 2. The curve implies that the first peak of the outbreak began in Japan on April 3, with those infected on March 29.

Figure 3 depicts an empirical distribution of the duration of onset to report. The maximum delay was 30 days.The R_0 was estimated as 2.048, with a range of [2.048, 2.024]. However, q was estimated as 99.987142%, with a range of [99.986819%, 99.987142%]. Figure 4 portrays a fitted line based on estimated R_0 and q and their ranges.

Discussion

We observed the first peak of the outbreak as occurring with the April 3 onset date and March 29 infection date. Because Figure 3 depicts almost all cases reported up to 30 days, the first peak might not change over time. Therefore, we conclude that the first peak has already passed.

It is noteworthy that no countermeasure was implemented when the peak was reached. In fact, during February 27 – March 20, schools were closed; events were cancelled voluntarily. Moreover, a state of emergency was declared on April 7. During March 21 through April 6, the only measure was a recommendation that large events be cancelled. Therefore, the peak infection date of the end of March was not regarded as a result of strong countermeasures. Nevertheless, school closure and voluntary event cancellations have apparently been effective because the epidemic curve is below the fitted line, as shown by the model in Figure 4.

We applied a simple SIR model including the proportion of asymptomatic cases that had not been incorporated into the model to date. Earlier studies [5–7] have estimated R_0 for COVID-19 as 2.24–3.58 in Wuhan. Our obtained R_0 was similar but slightly smaller. Conversely, an earlier study [8] estimated R_0 in Japan as 0.6. That figure might lead to misguided policies for countermeasures in Japan. If results of the

present study are correct, then they would necessitate adherence to contact tracing to detect clusters when more than 60 million people would become infected.

We estimated the proportion of asymptomatic cases among infected people as 99.985%, which means that the ratio of asymptomatic cases to symptomatic cases was 6482:1. In other words, for every symptomatic patient confirmed, 6482 asymptomatic cases are assumed to exist.

An earlier study [9] revealed the proportion of asymptomatic cases among infected people as 3/23. That proportion represents a huge difference from our results presented herein. A possible reason might be laboratory test procedures. Earlier studies used PCR tests that detected infection at the time of specimen collection. Therefore, a negative PCR test result does not contradict a past infection. To confirm our results through laboratory testing, complete laboratory-based surveillance using an IgG antibody test, not PCR, in the community is expected to be necessary.

Such a trail had started in New York City and found that about 15% of residents were positive by the antibody testing [10]. At that time, In New York State, the prevalence was reported as 0.88%. Therefore, q was 94% in New York state. It may be similar with our results of q.

Recently, Keio University Hospital reported that about 6% of newly administrated

and non-COVID-19 patients were infected asymptomatically during April 13–19, 2020 [11]. During that period, Figure 1 implies that 2095 patients were reported, representing 11% (=2095 × 6985/120 millions) of the total population. The figure was slightly higher than 6%. However, they were not healthy people. Therefore, their protection against infection might be more of a concern; their usual activity might be less than that of healthy people. Therefore, incidence among those patients might be lower.

The present study has some limitations. First, these results obtained with a very high proportion of asymptomatic cases are merely hypothetical. This hypothesis should be verified through additional study.

Secondly, the peak on April 2 might be only the first peak: a second and third wave might occur. Moreover, a second or third wave peak might be higher than the first peak. In fact, the peak of the entire outbreak might eventually be that second or third peak. One must particularly consider that April is the first month of the school year and the fiscal year in Japan. Consequently, the population in Japan reshuffles many of its activities at this time. Many new students and new employees move to Tokyo from outside Tokyo. Also, residents of Tokyo move away from the city. Therefore, the outbreak can be expected to increase again in middle or late April. Evaluation of the outbreak of COVID-19 in Japan in its entirety will have to be postponed until the

outbreak ends.

Thirdly, as described above, school closure and voluntary event cancellation are apparently effective. Therefore, their effects must be incorporated as effects influencing the model. Assessment of those effects constitutes our next challenge for future research efforts.

Fourthly, for simplicity, we assumed no infectiousness of asymptomatic cases. However, another earlier study [9] found that such cases have equal infectiousness to that of symptomatic cases. We must modify the model for future studies.

Fifthly, though we obtained very high proportion of asymptomatic cases, it may include some effect of under-ascertainment [12]. In other words, very mild cases probably were included as asymptomatic cases those who were not counted as infected in the present study. Isolation of those very mild cases and truly asymptomatic cases should be the next challenge.

Conclusion

We found that the first peak of COVID-19 outbreak was April 2. The central government of Japan declared an emergency on April 7. However, as shown in Figure 1,

the number of symptomatic patients had already declined. Probably, the declaration served to mitigate the outbreak.

By introducing a very high proportion of asymptomatic cases, two inconsistent phenomena might be resolved as a result of this study: the high reproduction number and low peak. The results also explain aspects of the outbreak in Wuhan. Nevertheless, it is currently only a hypothesis. Its validity must be verified using data of outbreaks in other countries including China and the United States, or prefectures in Japan.

The present study is based on the authors' opinions, but does not reflect any stance or policy of their 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 26 March, 2020]
2. Kurita J, Sugawara T Ohkusa Y. Preliminary evaluation of voluntary event cancellation as a countermeasure against the COVID-19 outbreak in Japan as of 11 March, 2020. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.12.20035220v1
3. Kurita J, Sugawara T Ohkusa Y. Forecast of the COVID-19 outbreak, collapse of medical facilities, and lockdown effects in Tokyo, Japan. https://medrxiv.org/cgi/content/short/2020.04.02.20051490v1
4. 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.
5. 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]

6. 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

7. 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

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

9. 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. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020 Apr 3;69(13):377-381. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6913e1.

10. Reuter. New York survey suggests nearly 14% in state may have coronavirus antibodies. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-usa-new-york/new-york-survey-suggests-nearly-14-in-state-may-have-coronavirus-antibodies-idUSKCN2252WN [accessed on April 26, 2020]
11. The Asahi Shimbun. Number of new patients testing positive for virus alarms hospital. http://www.asahi.com/ajw/articles/13321354 [accessed on April 26, 2020]
12. 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: Epidemic curve and infection dates published by the Ministry of Labour, Health and Welfare (MLHW), Japan

(Number of patients)



Notes: Bars represent the number of new patients by onset date. Onset dates of patients for whom the onset date was not reported were inferred from the empirical distribution of duration between onset to report, as depicted in Figure 2. Infection dates were inferred as the figure shows. Figure 3 data are shown as a red line. The vertical bar shows April 8, when the state of emergency was declared.

Figure 2: Empirical distribution of duration from onset to report by MLHW, Japan.

(%)



Note: Bars represent the probability of duration from onset to report based on 657 patients for whom the onset date was available in Japan. Data were from MLHW, Japan.

Figure 3: Empirical distribution of incubation period published by MLHW, Japan.

(%)



(days)

Notes: Bars show the distribution of incubation periods for 91 cases for which the exposure date and onset date were published by MLHW, Japan. The patients for whom incubation was longer than 14 days were included in the bar on day 14.

Figure 4: Fitted line base on the model and epidemic curve.
(Number of patients)



Notes: The curve represents the fitted line by the model. Bars represent the number of patients by onset date. The onset date of patients for whom the onset date was not reported were inferred from the empirical distribution of duration between onset to report depicted in Figure 2. The vertical line represents April 8, when the state of emergency was declared.