Effects of climate conditions, mobility trends, and countermeasures on the COVID-19 outbreak in Japan

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

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

Keywords: COVID-19, climate condition, mobility, effective reproduction number, counter measure, Go To Travel Campaign

ICMJE Statement

Contributors JK was responsible for the coordination of the study and responsible for the data setting. YO developed the model and TS illustrated the results. All authors contributed to the writing of the final manuscript.

Abstract

Background: As of end of 2020, the third wave of COVID-19 infection in Japan was larger than the prior two waves. On the other hand, travel subsiding policy “Go To Travel Campaign” (GTTC) was activated on July 22 and continued until December 28. Therefore, GTTC was presumed as the main cause of the third wave.

Object: We evaluated GTTC effects considering climate conditions and mobility.

Method: We regressed effective reproduction number, R(t), on temperature, humidity, mobility, and countermeasures such as the emergency state declaration or GTTC.

Results: Estimation results indicate that temperature was significantly negative, mobility was significantly positive. The emergency state and GTTC were significantly negative but school closure and voluntary even cancellation in February and March was significantly boost infectiousness.

Discussion and Conclusion: Estimation results show that R(t) would increase by 0.24 if the temperature were to decline by 20°C. To cancel this effect, going out should be reduced by 20%. We conclude that GTTC did not raise infectiousness.

Introduction

As of the end of 2020, there were 236 cases and 3,414 mortality cases were reported in Japan. As a countermeasure against the COVID-19 outbreak in Japan, school closure and voluntary event cancellation were required from February 27 to the end of March. Large commercial events also cancelled. After that, an emergency statestate was declared on April 7 until 25 May, requiring voluntary restriction to going out and business for consumers were shut down. During this period, the first peak was achieved on April 3. It then reemerged until July 29, as shown in Figure 1. However, the so-called "Go To Travel Campaign" (GTTC) started on July 22 50% subsidized travel and issuing coupons for shopping at tourist destinations which aims to enforce sightseeing business even though it may expand the outbreak. GTTC continued to the end of December, by which time the third wave had emerged. The third wave was larger than either of the prior two waves in December. Therefore, GTTC was inferred as the main reason underlying the third wave [1].

However, although results were mixed, some research suggests that COVID-19 might be associated with climate conditions, at least in China [2–4]. Conversely, some researched no association among climate condition and surging date of COVID-19 outbreak from cross sectional international comparison[in Europe countries [5]. If the

association was true for Japan, then GTTC might not be the main reason for the third wave in winter.

Moreover, mobility was inferred as the main cause of the outbreak dynamics, at least in the first wave in Japan [6] as well as in the world [7]. On the other hand, a study [8] showed that non-pharmaceutical interventions including lockdown had a large effect on reducing transmission at least in 11 European countries until April. However, tanother study [9] of 131 countries found the introduction and relaxation of lock down or movement restrictions had limited effects on infectiousness, except for public events ban, though their data was limited until the end of July, 2021. Other study [10] showed that strict movement restrictions in Argentina from March were effective in reducing mobility but not in the outbreak. These mixing result might suggest that those counter-measures might not affect mobility significantly.

Therefore, for the present study, we evaluate the effects of counter-measure including GTTC on infectiousness, effective reproduction number R(t), while considering climate conditions and mobility.

Methods

The number of symptomatic patients reported by the Ministry of Health, Labour

and Welfare (MHLW) for January 14 – December 31, published [7] as of January 28, 2021 was used. Some patients were excluded from data for Japan: those presumed to be persons infected abroad or infected as Diamond Princess passengers. Those patients were presumed not to represent community-acquired infection 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.

The following procedure was similar to that used for our earlier research [8,9]. We estimated the onset date of patients for whom onset dates were not reported as follows: Letting $f(k)$ represent this empirical distribution of incubation period 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 with onset date t-1 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 for whom 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 extending from s.

Moreover, the reporting delay for published data from MHLW might be

considerable. In other words, if $s+k$ is larger than that in the current period t, then $s+k$ represents the future for period t. For that reason, N_{s+k} is not observable. Such a reporting delay engenders underestimation of the number of patients. For that reason, 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 was period s as of the current period t.

We defined R(t) as the number of the infected patients on day t divided by the number of patients who were presumed to be infectious. The number of infected patients was calculated from the epidemic curve by the onset date using an empirical distribution of the incubation period, which is $\Sigma_{k=1} f(k) E_{t+k}$ where E_t denotes the number of patients whose onset date was period t. Of course, $t+k$ might be the current period. In this case, we replaced E_{t+k} as 0. The distribution of infectiousness in symptomatic and asymptomatic cases, $g(k)$, was assumed to be 30% on the onset day, 20% on the following day, and 10% for the subsequent five days [10]. Then number of infectiousness patients was $\Sigma_{k=1} g(k) E_{t-k}$. Therefore, R(t) was defined as $\Sigma_{k=1} f(k) E_{t+k} / \Sigma_{k=1} g(k) E_{t-k}$.

We use average temperature and relative humidity data for Tokyo during the day as

climate data because national average was not available. We obtained the data from the Japan Meteorological Agency (https://www.data.jma.go.jp/gmd/risk/obsdl/index.php). However, we identified remarkable countermeasures in Japan: the emergency state declaration, GTTC, and school closure and voluntary event cancellation (SCVEC). The emergency state was declared April 7. It ceased at the end of May. It required voluntary restriction of going out, school closures, and shutdown of businesses. GTTC, which started on July 22 and ceased passingly at the end of December, subsidized travel and shopping at tourist destinations. SCVEC extended from February 27 through the end of March: it required school closure and cancellation of voluntary events, including private meetings.

To clarify associations among R(t) and climate, mobility, and countermeasures, we regressed the daily R(t) on daily climate, mobility, and countermeasures by using ordinally least square. Temperature was measured as Celsius degree, humidity and mobility were measured as % in regression, not standardized one.

The study period extended from January 14, when the initial case was detected in Japan, to the end of 2020, as of January 28, 2021. Because R(t) usually develops over time during the last one month. We adopted 5% as significance level.

Results

During January 14 – December 31 in Japan, 213,295 community-acquired symptomatic COVID-19 cases were identified as of January 28. Figure 2 presents an empirical distribution of the duration of onset to reporting in Japan. The maximum delay was 31 days. Figure 3 depicts the empirical distribution of incubation periods among 91 cases for which the exposed date and onset date were published by MHLW in Japan. The mode was six days. The average was 6.6 days.

Figure 4 depicts the estimated R(t), climate, and mobility in Japan. It is noteworthy that R(t) is shown on the right axis; climate and mobility are on the left axis. The latter was normalized to have a zero average and one standard deviation.

Figure 4 showed that R(t) was very volatile until the mid of February due to very few cases, but it reached the first peak on March 19. After that it declined smaller than one under emergency state declaration. After emergency state declaration, it gradually increased and reached the second peak on June 20. Then it declined smaller than one but it increased higher than one since the mid of September and reached the third peak on October 30. After that it declined but was not smaller than one.

Mobility was very similar with R(t) until the second peak of R(t), but after that it increased but R(t) decreased. It was very high from August to November, but not o high

in R(t). Temperature appeared to associate positively since May to the second peak of R(t), but in summer appeared to associate negatively with R(t). Humidity was highly volatile and difficult to find out some association from Figure

Table 1 presents the estimation results. Temperatures were negative and significant; mobility was positive and significant. Humidity was not significant. The emergency state and GTTC were negative and significant, but SCVEC was significantly positive. Adjusted coefficient of determinant was 0.5605, and thus it was not fit very well. Figure 5 showed that R(t) and its fitted value. The fitted values was too volatile comparison with R(t). It probably caused by day-of-the-week pattern in mobility or periodically change in weather.

Discussion

Estimation results indicate that R(t) will increase by 0.24 if the temperature declines by 20°C. To cancel this effect, leaving on trips from the residence should be reduced by 20% (=0.0121*20/0.0122). Therefore, temperature probably affects the outbreak dynamics.

As described above, an international comparison found no association climate condition and infectiousness [5]. However, we found some association at least with

temperature. This inconsistency might be cause by study design such as cross sectional analysis in [5] or time series analysis in the present study. Or, the former study focused on timing, surging date, not infectiousness itself. Moreover, its analysis was limited to European countries, and thus variation in sugeing date or climate condition or location might not be sufficient to find some significance. If it enlarged to world wide including Russia, Canada, and US or tropican countries, the results might be different.

Concerning about counter-measure, the emergency state reduced R(t) by about 1, but SCVEC increased it. GTTC also reduced R(t) by about t1 GTTC was presumed to have raised infectiousness to date, but it significantly reduced the infectiousness. At least, one can conclude that it did not raise infectiousness.

Those mixed results may be consistent with international comparison study [8,9]. We found one counter-measure raise infectiousness, but another including GTTC reduced it. Even though we controlled mobility or climate condition other than counter-measure which were not taken into the model in the previous study [8,9], those mixing results still held even in the same country.

This counterintuitive result might reflect the situation for July. Before GTTC was started on July 22, even though the temperature was high, a second peak occurred, indicating that the non-GTTC period was affected by high infectiousness. By contrast,

in November or December, R(t) was not so high compared to the first and second wave. Of course, the temperature was lower than that it had been for the prior two peaks.

Note that R(t) does not mean the number of newly infected patients. It was ratio divided by the number of patients with infectiousness. Obviously, the number of newly infected patients in the third wave around the end of 2020 was much higher than the teo prior waves as shown in Figure 1. Therefore, larger number of patients in the third wave was caused by larger number of patients with infectiousness, and not larger R(t). Larger number of patients with infectiousness was made by that R(t) was not so high by higher than one for a long time, about three months. We have to remind for interpretation of the obtained result that climate condition, mobility or counter-measure affect infectiousness, R(t), but do not affect the number of patients, directly.

Some researchers [11] insisted that travel-associated COVID-19 incidence during July 22–26, when GTTC started, was much higher than during either earlier period of June 22 to July 21 or July 15–19 or June 22 – July 21 in terms of the incidence rate ratio (IRR). That study also compares the period of August 8–31. Patient data of two types were used: onset date and the date of testing positive.

We have identified some odd points in the report of that study. The first is that the proportion of people with a travel history during the GTTC period was almost

comparable to those of people during the two prior periods. Especially, when the earlier period was defined as July 15–19, the proportions of people with a travel history among patients with an available onset date were smaller for the GTTC period than during the prior period. However, the authors found statistically significant higher incidence in the GTTC started period. Their finding might merely reflect the fact that the total number of patents in the GTTC period was higher than during the prior period. In other words, they did not control the underlying outbreak situation and therefore found incorrect association. Use of the IRR would be valid if the underlying outbreak situation other than the examining point was the same in the two considered periods. Therefore, application of IRR might be inappropriate for this issue. At least, controlling the potential differences in the outbreak situation is expected to be necessary. The underlying outbreak situation, unrelated to GTTC, was reflected in the number of patients without a travel history or any sightseeing. To control the underlying outbreak situation, analysis of the share of patients with a travel history or sightseeing might be one procedure. However, that share did not increase markedly during the GTTC starting period. This fact indicates that the authors' result and conclusion are misleading.

A second point is that the authors of that report referred to the period of August 8–31, when GTTC was continuing. The proportion of patients with a travel history or

tourism was much smaller than in the GTTC period or the prior period. Although the authors did not compare incidence in the period with that of either the prior period or the GTTC period, the rate of incidence during the period in August was probably lower than in other periods. In fact, some patients using GTTC perhaps might have been included in the period, as described above. Their inclusion might be inconsistent with the authors' conclusion.

A third point is that, as shown in Figure 1 which was created by the same procedure in the previous study [8,9] using publicly reported information [7], we observed the peak of newly infected persons as July 23: the GTTC starting date. Therefore, we infer that GTTC might have reduced infectiousness. We also consider climate conditions. At around the end of July, the rainy season in Japan ceased; summer began, with high temperatures. At least, GTTC was insufficient to raise the number of patients and cancel out benefits from the improved climate conditions. Taken together, these points suggest that GTTC might not be the main factor determining the course of the outbreak.

Moreover, GTTC must also increase the number of patients without travel history if GTTC has strong impact to the outbreak, For example, a patient travel using GTTC on July 22 and 23 and then onset on July 24. This patient had travel history with GTTC but

not included a group of patients with travel history whose onset date was included in the GTTC started period, July 27-31. However, it is well known that presymptomatic patients have infectiousness as symptomatic period [12]. This patient might infect staffs of hotel or persons with visiting areas. They obviously did not have travel history. Their onset date were in July 27 and 28 and thus they were included a group of patients without travel history in the GTTC started period July 27-31. Therefore, GTTC certainly increased the number of patients without travel history, but did not increase patients with travel history in this case. Therefore, when we consider the effect of GTTC, we have to check the number of patients irrespectively travel history.

The third wave of the outbreak, much larger than the second wave which struck around July, had its peak at around the end of year. Almost simultaneously, GTTC ceased on December 28. These two facts imply that stopping GTTC reduced infectiousness. In other words, starting GTTC might have produced the second peak, whereas ceasing GTTC produced the third peak, which suggests that the GTTC effects depend on climate conditions. If so, climate conditions were the main factor driving the outbreak. The effects of GTTC might be supplemental. In fact, even though the end of November, GTTC significantly decreased the effective reproduction number controlling climate conditions and mobility [6]. If one extends the considered period to include the

end of December, the time at which the third peak occurred and at which GTTC ceased, then the suppressive effect of GTTC on infectiousness might be weaker or might disappear entirely.

Alternatively, GTTC itself might have had no effect on infectiousness, but news media reports about starting or ceasing GTTC might have stimulated a rise in risk perception among the general population and might have induced more precautionary behaviors such as more scrupulous mask wearing, keeping social distance and cancellation of group dining. In other words, persons at leisure venues might feel higher risk from tourists; tourists also might feel higher risk of infecting others by starting GTTC. Ceasing GTTC might then induce feelings of even higher risk among the general population.

Actually, there were some counter measure other than considered in the present study such as quarantine, isolation, PCR testing, treatmen, vaccine and drug administration and so on. However, so as to focus the effect to infectiousness at community, the considered counter-measure may be the most three important policy. Moreover, the period of the three counter-measure were not overlapped and thus we can isolate the effect of each counter-measure, more easily.

GTTC was one of the “Go To Campagn (GTC).”GTC has “Go To Eat” which

subsidized food cost at restaurants from the end of September to Novermber 24 and “Go To Shopping Mall” which subsidized to shopping mall to encourage events, product development and PR activities since October 19 until January 11, 2021, other than GTTC. However, because these were similar subsidizing policy and their periods were overlapped, we cannot isolate each branch of GTC separately. Of them, GTTC was the first and longer campaign among GTC, and it was inferred as main cause of the third wave [1], we examined the effect of GTTC as a representative of GTC, to infectiousness. In this sense, the effect of GTTC may be the effect of GTC.

The present study has some limitations. First, R(t) represents infectiousness, but not in the number of patients or cases of mortality. One must be reminded that temperature and mobility are associated with infectiousness, but the result does not reflect association with the number of patients. To approach the association, a formal mathematical model incorporating temperature and mobility is needed. Producing that model is anticipated as a challenge for future research.

Secondly, we examined this problem only for the entirety of Japan. Because Apple Inc. and the Japan Meteorological Agency provide information by prefecture, the data can be extended to affected prefectures such as Tokyo, Osaka, and Hokkaido.

Thirdly, we do not know whether our result can be extended other countries. That effort remains as a future research objective.

Conclusion

We demonstrated that GTTC did not raise infectiousness. Moreover, we found that mobility and temperature are associated with R(t).

The present study is based on the authors' opinions: it 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.

Ethical considerations

All information used for this study was collected under the Law of Infection Control, Japan and published data [7] was used. There is therefore no ethical issue related to this study.

Competing Interest

No author has any conflict of interest, financial or otherwise, to declare in relation to this study.

Reference

1. Japan Times. Japan to suspend Go To Travel program nationwide from Dec. 28 to Jan. 11 https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2020/12/14/national/suga-go-to-travel-coronavirus/ [accessed on December 25,2020]
2. Shi P, Dong Y, Yan H, Zhao C, Li X, Liu W, He M, Tang S, Xi S. Impact of temperature on the dynamics of the COVID-19 outbreak in China. Sci Total Environ. 2020 ;728:138890.
3. Tobias A, Molina T. Is temperature reducing the transmission of COVID-19 ? Environ Res. 2020 ;186:109553.
4. Yao Y, Pan J, Liu Z, Meng X, Wang W, Kan H, Wang W. No association of COVID-19 transmission with temperature or UV radiation in Chinese cities. Eur Respir J. 2020 ;55:2000517.

5. Walrand S. Autumn COVID-19 surge dates in Europe correlated to latitudes, not to temperature-humidity, pointing to vitamin D as contributing factor. Scientific Reports volume 11, Article number: 1981 (2021) Cite this article https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-81419-w

6. Kurita J, Sugawara T, Ohkusa Y. Mobility data can reveal the entire COVID1-19 outbreak course in Japan. MEDRXIV/2020/081315 https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.26.20081315v3

7. Bergman N, Fishman R. Mobility Reduction and Covid-19 Transmission Rates.**doi:** https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.06.20093039

8. Flaxman S, Mishra S, Gandy A, Unwin HJT, Mellan TA, Coupland H, Whittaker C, Zhu H, Berah T, Eaton JW, Monod M, Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team; Ghani AC, Donnelly CA, Riley S, Vollmer MAC, Ferguson NM, Okell LC, Bhatt S. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. Nature 2020 ;584(7820):257-61. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2405-7.

9. Li Y, Campbell H, Kulkarni D, Harpur A, Nundy M, Wang X, Nair H, for theUsher Network for COVID-19 Evidence Reviews (UNCOVER) group. The temporal association of introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with the time-varying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a modelling study across

131 countries. ***Lancet Infect Dis* 2021; 21: 193–202**

DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30785-4?

https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(20)30785-4/fulltext

10. Larrosa JMC. SARS-CoV-2 in Argentina: Lockdown, mobility, and contagion. J Med Virol 2020. doi: 10.1002/jmv.26659.

    https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jmv.26659

11. Japan Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Press Releases.

    https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage_10723.html (in Japanese) [accessed on January 28, 2021].

12. Kurita J, Sugawara T, Ohkusa Y. Estimated effectiveness of school closure and voluntary event cancellation as COVID-19 countermeasures in Japan. J Infect Chemother 2021, 27:62-4. doi: 10.1016/j.jiac.2020.08.012. Epub 2020 Aug 19.

13. Sugishita Y, Kurita J, Sugawara T, Ohkusa Y. Effects of voluntary event cancellation and school closure as countermeasures against COVID-19 outbreak in Japan. Plos one 2020. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239455

14. 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.

15. Anzai A, Nishiura H. “Go To Travel” Campaign and Travel-Associated Coronavirus Disease 2019 Cases: A Descriptive Analysis, July-August 2020. J. Clin. Med 2021, 10, 398. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10030398

16. Ferretti L, Ledda A, Wymant C, Zhao L, Ledda V, Abeler-Dorner L, Kendall M, Nurtay A, Cheng HY, Ng TC, Lin H, Hinch R, Masel J, Kilpatrick AM, Fraser C. The timing of COVID-19 transmission. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.20188516

Figure 1: Epidemic curve of COVID-19 in 2020 in Japan.



Note: Bars represent the epidemic curve showing the number of patients by onset date.

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

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

(%)



(days)

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

Figure 4: R(t), climate, and mobility in Japan.

Climate/mobility R(t)



Date

Note: Black line represents R(t). Orange and green lines respectively show humidity and temperature. Dots denote mobility. R(t) was measured by the right axis; climate and mobility were measured by the right axis. The latter was normalized to be zero average and one standard deviation.

Figure 5: R(t) and fitted values

(R(t))



Date

Note: Black line represents R(t) and orange line indicates its fitted values.

Table 1: Estimation results of estimate R(t) for the climate condition, mobility, and countermeasures

Explanatory variables	Estimate coefficients	*p*-values
Temperature	-0.0121	0.026
Humidity	-0.00268	0.256
Mobility	0.0122	0.000
Emergency State	-0.933	0.000
GTTC	-1.1385	0.000
SCVEC	0.469	0. 000
Constant	1.92	0.000
Adjusted R^2	0.5605	
Number of observations	335	

Note: The dependent variable was R(t): GTTC stands for “Go To Travel Campaign”; SCVEC denotes school closure and voluntary event cancellation. Sample period was from February 1 to the end of December, 2020.