# A delayed SEIQR epidemic model of COVID-19 in Tokyo

Kazuo Maki*

MediEco R & D Corporation
Hieidaira, Ohtsu 520-0016, Japan

*To whom correspondence should be addressed; E-mail: flute@music.email.ne.jp

The rapid expansion of COVID-19 has caused a global pandemic. In order to avoid excessive restriction to the social activity, a good strategy of quarantine is needed. Several epidemic models with a quarantine compartment such as susceptible-exposed-infectious-quarantined-removed (SEIQR) model have been applied. However, in the actual situation, the infection test and quarantine is often delayed from the beginning of the infectious stage. This article presents a delayed SEIQR model to analyze the effect of the delay of quarantine, and to suggest a guideline for the measure. The latency period (compartment E) was assumed to be 3 days, and the start of quarantine action was assumed to be delayed by 4 to 10 days from infection. The actual PCR test-positive number data from March 10th to July 18th in 2020 was analyzed to estimate a transmission rate and the basic reproduction number. The area where the infection expansion is restrained was displayed in the two parameter space (transmission rate and quarantine rate) for several possible lengths of the delay of quarantine. As a result, it was shown to be very hard to restrain the expansion of infection only by a simple quarantine action retaining the delay. As a short term measure, it was found to be necessary to reduce the transmission rate through some kind of restriction of social activity, but as a long term measure, it was found to be possible to maintain the social activity by shortening the delay of quarantine through expanding the infection test system to find earlier stage patients, including asymptomatic infectious patients. In order to shed light to this conclusion from a different viewpoint, this model was applied in another case that an additional quarantine was taken into account before the delay. The result was shown to have a similar effect as that of the shortening of the delay.

## 1. Introduction

The novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has caused the infection expansion all over the world current as of July 2020. A deterministic mathematical modeling of the outbreak of infection is expected to be a useful tool to analyze the situation and to suggest a plausible measure. In the SIR model [1], whole population $N$ of the area under consideration is divided into three compartments: susceptible ($S$), infectious ($I$), and recovered ($R$) individuals. In the SEIR model [2], another compartment, exposed individuals ($E$), is added to take a latency period into account. However, COVID-19 is different from most conventional infection cases in the point that unique symptom is not well established yet and that asymptomatic patients may be infectious [3]. Since an infectious patient cannot be identified clearly, we have to restrain contact between the others in daily life. Influence to social activity is enormous. It is necessary to find and quarantine an infectious patient by some kind of test, and this quarantine measure deeply affects the situation of the infection expansion.

Models including a compartment for quarantined individuals are called SIQR model [4] or SEIQR model [5], [6], [7]. The occurrence of the transition from the component I to Q, which is observed as a newly found infected patient number, is usually assumed to be proportional to the number of infectious patients, and this proportionality coefficient is called "quarantine rate". The outbreak of COVID-19 has been analyzed by many authors in terms of quarantine [8], [9], [10], [11], [12]. The quarantine rate was estimated from available data under some simple assumptions or using statistical method [9] or AI model [10]. However in the actual situation, the PCR (polymerase chain reaction) test followed by a quarantine action was limited to those who spend some time from the infection. As a result, the actual infection situation has been said to be reflected on the daily confirmed PCR test positive number [13] by a delay of about two weeks in Japan. If we assume the incubation period to be 5 days [14] and that the patient is infectious before development of symptom by 2 days [3], the two week delay means that infectious patients might not be quarantined for about 11 (=14-5+2) days, if the test reporting delay is not counted in. Young et al. developed a delayed SEIQR model [15] including this delay effect, which was applied to COVID-19 by Vysarayani and Chatterjee [16]. However, in their model, the patient that has passed an assumed period is quarantined once with an assumed probability, but if not quarantined, a chance of being quarantined is not left any longer. On the other hand, Utamura et al. [17] developed a model named as "Apparent Time Lag Model (ATLM)" in that

all the infectious patients are quarantined after passing an assumed period (14 days). Here, I have developed a new model introducing a compartment for quarantine possible infectious patients, where patients have a chance to be quarantined with a quarantine rate. The quarantine rate defined in this model is a natural extension of that of non-delayed SIQR or SEIQR models.

In the next section, I will formulate a delayed SEIQR model. In Section 3, I will analyze the data of the daily found PCR positive patient in Tokyo [13]. In Section 4, I will discuss a guideline of appropriate infection measure. The last section will be devoted to a summary.

## 2. A delayed SEIQR model

Here, a delayed SEIQR model will be formulated. As a compartment model, this model is similar to the delayed SEIQR model proposed by Young [15]. As Young's model, I assumed that a patient stays in the compartment E for a definite period $\sigma$. As for the compartment I, which is the point of difference to Young's model, this compartment was divided into J and K, and only those belonging to K were assumed to be quarantined. The patient stays in the compartment J for a period $\tau$ and automatically moves to the compartment K. Here, a quarantine rate $q$ was introduced as an extension of that of non-delayed SIQR or SEIQR model. All the members in K were assumed to be continuously quarantined with a rate $q$ if not recovered. In Figure 1, six kinds of quarantine rate are plotted in the time domain to clarify the conceptual difference. The parameter $\tau$ means an averaged delay period of the actual delay period distribution. If we expand the test to check earlier stage patient, $\tau$ can be decreased. The quarantine in the case of non-delayed models is expressed by imposing a constant value on $q$, which means that $\tau$=0. The flow chart is shown in Fig.2.




**Figure 1:** Comparison of different kinds of quarantine rate. Six kinds of quarantine rate are compared in view of their dependence on time. A person is exposed to virus at $t$= -3, becomes infectious at $t$=0, develops symptoms at around $t$=2, and is quarantined with the rate indicated by (a). In the present model, (a) is approximated to (b). The delay $\tau$ =10 days in this case. For example, if we test earlier stage patients, actual curve moves to (c), which means that in this model it will be approximated to (d), i.e. shorten the delay of quarantine. Another way of approximation is shown as (e), which is explained in Section 4. The non-delayed quarantine case is shown as (f).




**Figure.2:** Flow chart of a delayed SEIQR model. Here, the infectious compartment I is divided into J and K. Only the member in K is possible to move into Q. A susceptible individual is infected with rate $\beta SI/N$, stays in the compartment E for $\sigma$ days, moves into the compartment J, stays there for $\tau$ days while recovered with rate $\gamma$, moves into the compartment K, and moves into the compartment Q with rate $q$ while recovered with rate $\gamma$. Compartments R and Q are irrelevant to this study of early stage of infection expansion.

Thus, the delay differential equations are given as follows. The argument of the function is explicitly indicated, but it should be noted that coefficients $\beta$ and $q$ also have time dependence in general.

$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = -\beta \frac{S(t)I(t)}{N} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\frac{dE(t)}{dt} = \beta \frac{S(t)I(t)}{N} - \beta \frac{S(t-\sigma)I(t-\sigma)}{N} \tag{2.2}$$

$$\frac{dJ(t)}{dt} = \beta \frac{S(t-\sigma)I(t-\sigma)}{N} - \beta \frac{S(t-\sigma-\tau)I(t-\sigma-\tau)}{N} e^{-\gamma\tau} - \gamma J(t) \tag{2.3}$$

$$\frac{dK(t)}{dt} = \beta \frac{S(t-\sigma-\tau)I(t-\sigma-\tau)}{N} e^{-\gamma\tau} - qK(t) - \gamma K(t) \tag{2.4}$$

$$\frac{dQ(t)}{dt} = qK(t) - \gamma' Q(t) \tag{2.5}$$

$$\frac{dR(t)}{dt} = \gamma I(t) + \gamma' Q(t) \tag{2.6}$$

, where

$$I(t) = J(t) + K(t) \tag{2.7}$$

$$N = S(t) + E(t) + J(t) + K(t) + R(t) \tag{2.8}$$

The parameters $\beta$, $\gamma$, $\gamma'$, $q$, $\sigma$, and $\tau$ represent transmission rate, rate of losing infectiousness, recovering rate in a medical sense, quarantine ratio, latency period, and delay of quarantine, respectively. The transmission rate may be interpreted as the average number of daily contact with others multiplied by the transmission risk from an infectious patient. Birth and death processes are neglected here. The factor exp($-\gamma t$) in Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4) is necessary to take into account the decay with the rate $\gamma$ during the compartment J. The daily quarantined patient count is denoted by $\Delta Q(t)$ as,

$$\Delta Q(t) = qK(t) \tag{2.9}$$

If we set $\sigma$=0, the compartment E can be neglected, i.e. this model becomes a delayed SIQR model. If we set $\tau$=0, compartment J can be neglected, i.e. SEIQR model. If we set $q$=0, the compartment Q can be neglected, i.e. SEIR model. If we set $\sigma$=$\tau$=0, this model becomes SIQR model. If we set $\sigma$=$\tau$=$q$=0, this model becomes SIR model.

The expression of the basic reproduction number $R_0$ of this model was derived from time integration of the probability of maintaining infectiousness multiplied by the transmission rate $\beta$.

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta\left\{\gamma + q\left(1 - e^{-\gamma\tau}\right)\right\}}{\gamma(\gamma + q)} \tag{2.10}$$

Since I will consider only the early stage of outbreak, I made an approximation as $S$=$N$, and only Eqs. (2.3), (2.4), and (2.7) will be used. In order to make a numerical calculation, $P$ and $H$ are used instead of $K$ and $I$ as follows.

$$P(t) = K(t)e^{\gamma t} \tag{2.11}$$

$$H(t) = I(t)e^{\gamma t} \tag{2.12}$$

Then the delay differential equations (2.3) and (2.4) are rewritten as

$$\frac{dP(t)}{dt} = \beta e^{\gamma\sigma} H(t - \tau - \sigma) - qP(t) \tag{2.13}$$

$$\frac{dH(t)}{dt} = \beta e^{\gamma\sigma} H(t - \sigma) - qP(t) \tag{2.14}$$

Here, if $\beta$ and $q$ depend on time, the time arguments are the same as those of the following unknown function $H$ and $P$, respectively.

Equations (2.13) and (2.14) have a stationary solution proportional to $\exp((\lambda+\gamma)t)$, which means that $K$ and $I$ are proportional to $\exp(\lambda t)$. The time coefficient $\lambda$ is called "expansion rate" hereafter. We can deduce a relation among $\lambda$, $\gamma$, $\beta$, $q$, $\tau$, and $\sigma$, which will be useful in the following sections.

$$\beta e^{-\lambda\sigma} = \lambda + \gamma + \frac{q(\lambda + \gamma)e^{-(\lambda+\gamma)\tau}}{\lambda + \gamma + q\left(1 - e^{-(\lambda+\gamma)\tau}\right)} \tag{2.15}$$

We can also deduce the following relation, which can be used to estimate the number of infectious patients at large.

$$I(t-\tau)=\left\{\frac{\lambda+\gamma+q\left(1-e^{-(\lambda+\gamma)\tau}\right)}{q(\lambda+\gamma)e^{-\gamma\tau}}\right\}\Delta Q(t) \tag{2.16}$$

Note that if $\tau$=0, as in the case of non-delayed SIQR or SEIQR model, the right hand side of Eq. (2.15) becomes $\lambda+\gamma+q$, and that of Eq.(2.16) becomes $1/q$.

## 3. Analysis of the PCR test positive person number data in Tokyo [13]

In this section, I will estimate values of $\beta$ and $q$ while comparing with the PCR test positive person number change in Tokyo [13]. (Here, I assumed that all the PCR test positive persons were infectious.) As discussed in Section 1, the latency period of COVID-19 was estimated to be 3 days, and the infectious and asymptomatic period was estimated to be 2 days. Since the symptomatic and infectious period was estimated to be 7-10 days [3], whole infectious period was estimated to be 9-12 days. In view of these numbers and for simplicity, the latency period ($\sigma$) was set to be 3 days, and the rate of losing infectiousness of the infectious patient ($\gamma$) was set to be 0.09 days$^{-1}$. As for the delay of quarantine ($\tau$), two cases were chosen: $\tau$=10 days and $\tau$=4 days. Numerical calculations were made by the fourth order Runge-Kutta method with time step=0.1 days.

The PCR test positive person number data of Tokyo $\Delta Q(t)$ from March 10th through to July 18th [13] can be partitioned into four periods each of which can be approximated as a simple exponential behavior ($\exp(\lambda t)$), which means that parameters $\beta$ and $q$ can be treated as constants within the corresponding periods earlier by $\tau+\sigma$ days. It is known that in principle we can determine $\beta$ and $q$ from the very early stage data, for there should be no effect of quarantine when $t$ is less than $\tau+\sigma$ days [12]. However, I could not determine parameters because of scattered small numbers. Thus I took a different approach. Taking a wide range value of $q$, I determined appropriate parameter set of $\beta$ to reproduce the data utilizing Eq. (2.15). Examples are shown in Fig.3 and in Table 1 in the case that $\tau$=10 days. Here, I arbitrarily put a small change in $q$ from period to period to show how a parameter change is reflected on the calculated result. (Although there is no quantitative meaning, I tried to reflect the PCR test positive ratio data [13] on this change, because higher PCR test positive ratio means that the PCR test system is more tight, which means that the quarantine rate is lower.) Parameter set of $q$ was then doubled twice to cover a wide range of $q$. Figure 3 clearly shows that a small change of $q$ produces a small jump directly in calculated $\Delta Q(t)$. The change in parameters (mainly that in $\beta$) is reflected on the

trend of $I(t)$ with a delay of $\sigma$ (3 days), and on the trend of $\Delta Q(t)$ with a delay of $\tau+\sigma$ (13 days). The parameter $\beta$ and calculated number of infectious patients at large ($I$) do not undergo much influence of $q$. Thus, in this case that $\tau$=10 days, we can conclude that the transmission rate $\beta$ is about 0.22 days$^{-1}$ during the last period (May 9th to July 18th), and that the number of infectious patient at large ($I$) is about 6,500 to 11,000 on July 18th.




**Figure 3:** The daily confirmed new cases of COVID-19 in Tokyo [13]. Vertical axis is a common logarithm. Data are disclosed openly in the homepage of Tokyo [13]. Three parameter sets described in Table 1 are used for the calculation. Whole period under consideration is divided into four periods, and turns of the parameter set are indicated by three arrows. On top right, numbers of infected patients at large ($I$) on July 18th are mentioned.

**Table 1:** Parameter set used in Fig.3. The delay of quarantine is assumed to be 10 days. The symbol $\beta$ denotes transmission rate (days$^{-1}$); $q$ denotes quarantine rate (days$^{-1}$); $R_0$ denotes the basic reproduction number; $I$ denotes calculated number of infectious patients at large. The period is 13 days earlier than that is expected from the trend of daily PCR test positive number.

| | Case (1) | | | Case(2) | | | Case(3) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Period | $\beta$ | $q$ | $R_0$ | $\beta$ | $q$ | $R_0$ | $\beta$ | $q$ | $R_0$ |
| Feb 26 to Mar 28 | 0.343 | 0.12 | 2.93 | 0.359 | 0.24 | 2.81 | 0.363 | 0.48 | 2.66 |
| Mar 28 to Apr 20 | 0.078 | 0.1 | 0.68 | 0.095 | 0.2 | 0.76 | 0.105 | 0.4 | 0.78 |
| Apr 20 to May 9 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.022 | 0.24 | 0.17 | 0.031 | 0.48 | 0.22 |
| May 9 to Jul 18 | 0.21 | 0.2 | 1.68 | 0.219 | 0.4 | 1.62 | 0.225 | 0.8 | 1.59 |
| $I$ on Jul 18 | 11,100 | | | 8,200 | | | 6,500 | | |

In the case that $\tau$=4 days, the result is shown in Table 2. We can see that the estimated value of $\beta$ is larger and that of the number of infectious patient at large is smaller.

**Table 2:** Parameter set for the shorter delay $\tau$=4 days. The symbols are the same meaning as Table 1. The period is 7 days earlier than that is expected from the trend of daily PCR test positive number.

| | Case (1) | | | Case(2) | | | Case(3) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Period | $\beta$ | $q$ | $R_0$ | $\beta$ | $q$ | $R_0$ | $\beta$ | $q$ | $R_0$ |
| Mar 3 to Apr 3 | 0.381 | 0.12 | 2.54 | 0.410 | 0.24 | 2.24 | 0.442 | 0.48 | 2.03 |
| Apr 3 to Apr 24 | 0.108 | 0.1 | 0.76 | 0.139 | 0.2 | 0.80 | 0.174 | 0.4 | 0.83 |
| Apr 24 to May 15 | 0.026 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.059 | 0.24 | 0.32 | 0.090 | 0.48 | 0.41 |
| May 15 to Jul 18 | 0.266 | 0.2 | 1.53 | 0.303 | 0.4 | 1.45 | 0.339 | 0.8 | 1.40 |
| $I$ on Jul 18 | 3,430 | | | 2,400 | | | 1,730 | | |

One might think that a simple SIR model would be enough to explain the data in Fig.3. However, in that case, for the period of May 3rd to May 22nd, the transmission rate $\beta$ becomes negative (-0.07 days$^{-1}$), suggesting that one should take a quarantine term in. A complicated model advantage is not just to explain the data but to be able to do the realistic proposition that the real state of affairs was considered.

## 4. Guideline to an infection measure

In this section, I will deduce a realistic infection measure from Eq. (2.15). In the stationary condition with constant parameters, the number of infectious patient at large ($I(t)$) is proportional to exp($\lambda t$). The aim of infection measure is to lower the expansion rate $\lambda$ to a negative value: i.e. $\lambda$<0. Equation (2.15) can be used to deduce a guideline. If we put $\lambda$=0, Eq. (2.15) gives the threshold, and from that, we can get the following condition for $\lambda$<0.

$$q > \frac{\gamma(\beta-\gamma)}{\gamma-\beta\left(1-e^{-\gamma\tau}\right)} \tag{4.1}$$

As expected, this condition is equivalent to that $R_0$ is less than one in Eq. (2.10). It should be noted that if $\tau$=0, this equation becomes $\beta$-$\gamma$-$q$<0, which is the condition in the case of non-delayed SIQR or SEIQR model. Figure 3 shows the

area where the expansion of infection is restrained ($\lambda$<0 or $R_0$<1) for several delay conditions ($\tau$). As an example three possible measures are shown by arrows for a virtual state: $\tau$=10 days, $\beta$=0.14 days$^{-1}$, and $q$=0.4 days$^{-1}$, where the arrow for $\tau$ means to move the boundary line. Apparently, if $\tau$=10 days, there is a region ($\beta$>0.143 days$^{-1}$) where the quarantine does not contribute to the ending of infection. In order to restrain the expansion of infection in Tokyo on July 18th (if $\tau$=10 days, $\beta$=0.22 days$^{-1}$), either the infection ratio $\beta$ should be lowered by restricting the social activity at least to about 0.13 days$^{-1}$(60%), or $\tau$ should be shortened by promoting earlier quarantine, or some intermediate measure of the preceding two. The first measure is apparently for short term, and the second measure is for long term. In the case that $\tau$=4 days, since the transmission rate $\beta$ is estimated to be about 0.3 days$^{-1}$ in Table 2, the rate should be decreased to about 0.21 days$^{-1}$ (70%) as a short term measure, but a quarantine is more effective measure compared to the case that $\tau$=10 days. As for the length of the actual delay of quarantine $\tau$, since I could not find reliable data, I assumed two extreme cases in Section 3, but the result here in the case of $\tau$=4 days suggests that it may not be short enough to maintain the normal social activity.




**Figure 4:** Area where the expansion of infection is restrained (1). Each line represents the condition that the expansion rate $\lambda$=0 or, equivalently, the basic reproduction number $R_0$=1 for each delay of quarantine $\tau$. The area on the left side of this line represents the area that $\lambda$<0 or $R_0$<1: i.e. where the infection does not expand more. Three examples of infection measure are indicated by arrows for a state ($\tau$=10 days, $\beta$=0.14 days$^{-1}$, and $q$=0.4 days$^{-1}$). The arrow indicated for $\tau$ means to shift the line to the right.

If the expansion rate $\lambda$= -0.05 or -0.1 days$^{-1}$, the number of infectious patients decreases by 30% or 50% in a week, respectively. These conditions are deduced from Eq. (2.15) and shown in Fig.5.




**Figure 5:** Conditions that the infection is ended. The number of patients decreases by 30% or 50% in a weak, if $\lambda$= -0.05 or -0.1 days$^{-1}$, respectively. These conditions are shown by dotted lines or broken lines, respectively, with the delay of quarantine $\tau$=10, 4, and 0 days.

So far I have assumed that there is no quarantine action for the compartment J. However, this model can be applied in another case that patients in J are also quarantined with another rate $q'$. This case is shown as the dash dotted line (e) in Fig.1. In this case, the parameter $\gamma$ is replaced by $\gamma+q'$, and the parameter $q$ is replaced by $q$-$q'$. This scheme provides another expression for the earlier test and quarantine measure. Equation (2.10) becomes,

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta\{\gamma+q'+(q-q')(1-e^{-\gamma\tau})\}}{(\gamma+q')(\gamma+q)} \tag{4.2}$$

Equation (2.17) becomes,

$$q > \frac{(\gamma+q')(\beta-\gamma-q')}{(\gamma+q')-\beta(1-e^{-(\gamma+q')\tau})}+q' \tag{4.3}$$

Figure 6 compares two cases: for $q'$=0 and for $q'$= 0.04 days$^{-1}$. It is evident that early stage quarantine is very effective.




**Figure 6:** Area where the expansion of infection is restrained (2). Lines and areas are the same meaning as those in Fig.4. Here, in addition to the quarantine for compartment K, an additional quarantine is introduced for compartment J where the infected patient stays for $\tau$ before moving to the compartment K. The quarantine rate for J is denoted by $q'$.

## 5. Summary

In order to analyze the COVID-19 situation in Tokyo, I have developed a delayed SEIQR epidemic model taking into account the actual delay of quarantine. This model was applied to an analysis of the data of the number of PCR test positive person in Tokyo [13], and I have estimated the actual transmission rate. The condition in that the expansion of infection is restrained was clarified with three parameters, transmission rate, quarantine rate, and quarantine delay. As a result, I have found that the quarantine effect to restraining infection becomes very limited if the quarantine is delayed. Thus the following guideline was indicated. As a short term measure, it is necessary to reduce the transmission rate through some kind of restriction of social activity, but as a long term measure, it is possible to maintain the social activity by shortening the delay of quarantine through expanding the infection test system to find earlier stage patients, including asymptomatic infected patients.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Drs. T. Odagaki and H. Mitsuishi for valuable discussion.

## References


[1] W.O. Kermack and A.G. McKendrick, Contributions to the mathematical theory of epidemics-I, Proceedings of the Royal Society 115A, 700-721 (1927)

[2] R.M. Anderson and R.M. May: Directly transmitted infections diseases: control by vaccination, Science 26 Feb Vol.215, Issue 4536, 1053-1060 (1982)

[3] X. He et al., Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19, Nat Med 26, 672–675 (2020), https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5

[4] H. Hethcote, et al., Effects of quarantine in six endemic models for infectious diseases, Mathematical Biosciences 180, 141–160 (2002)

[5] D.J. Gerberry and F.A. Milner, An SEIQR model for childhood diseases, J Math Biol. 59(4), 535-561 (2009), doi:10.1007/s00285-008-0239-2

[6] P. Yongzhena et al., A delayed SEIQR epidemic model with pulse vaccination and the quarantine measure, Computers and Mathematics with Applications 58, 135-145 (2009)

[7] T. Li and Y. Xue, Global Stability Analysis of a Delayed SEIQR Epidemic Model with Quarantine and Latent, Applied Mathematics, 4, 109-117 (2013)

[8] L. Peng et al., Epidemic analysis of COVID-19 in China by dynamical modeling, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.16.20023465

[9] H-Y. Yuan et al., Effectiveness of quarantine measure on transmission dynamics of COVID-19 in Hong Kong, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20059006

[10] R. Dandekar and G. Barbastathis, Quantifying the effect of quarantine control in Covid-19 infectious spread using machine learning, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.03.20052084

[11] M.S. Aronna et al., A model for COVID-19 with isolation, quarantine and testing as control measures, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.29.20116897

[12] T. Odagaki, Analysis of the outbreak of COVID-19 in Japan on the basis of an SIQR model, June 3(2020), doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.02.20117341

[13] Updates on COVID-19 in Tokyo, https://stopcovid19.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/en

[14] S. A. Lauer et al., The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and

Application, Ann Intern Med. 172(9), 577-582(2020)
[15] L. Young et al., Consequences of delays and imperfect implementation of isolation in epidemic control, Sci Rep 9, 3505 (2019), doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-39714-0Sci
[16] C.P. Vyasarayani and A. Chatterjee, New approximations, and policy implications, from a delayed dynamic model of a fast pandemic, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.09.20059436
[17] M. Utamura et al., Isolation Considered Epidemiological Model for the Prediction of COVID-19 Trend in Tokyo, Japan, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.31.20165829