Interim estimation for the effect of the third COVID-19 emergency status declaration 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, 2nd emergency status declaration

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: On April 25, 2021, the third state of emergency was declared in Japan.

Object: We evaluated effects of the third emergency status declaration controlling other countermeasures, climate conditions, and mobility through January 21, 2020, until May 4, 2021 as of May 25, 2021.

Method: We regressed the effective reproduction number R(t) on temperature, humidity, mobility, and countermeasures such as the three emergency status declarations.

Results: Estimation results indicate that the three emergency status declarations significantly reduced infectiousness. Climate condition, both of temperature and humidity, were not significant.

Discussion and Conclusion: The three emergency statuses significantly reduced infectiousness by almost same amount. The estimated effect of the third emergency status probably may change.

Introduction

As of April 28, 2021, there had been about 583 thousand COVID-19 cases and 10.1 thousands cases of mortality reported in Japan. As a countermeasure against the COVID-19 outbreak in Japan, school closure and voluntary event cancellation was enacted from February 27, 2020 to the end of March. Large commercial events were cancelled. Subsequently, a state of emergency was declared on April 7 through 25 May, requiring voluntary restrictions against leaving home. Consumer businesses such as retail shops and restaurants were shut down. During this period, the first peak of infection was reached on April 3. Infections then decreased until July 29, as shown in Figure 1. The so-called “Go To Travel Campaign” (GTTC) started on July 22 as a 50% subsidized travel program aimed at supporting sightseeing businesses with the government-issued coupons for use in shopping at tourist destinations. It was expected that the campaign might expand the outbreak. Thereafter, GTTC continued to the end of December, by which time the third wave of infection had emerged. The third wave was larger than either of the preceding two waves in December and reached highest peak on the end of December. Therefore, GTTC was inferred as the main reason underlying the third wave [1].

So as to decline the third wave, the second emergency status was declared on January 8, 2021 to March 15, 2021. However, the fourth wave emerged probably due to

spreading variant strain in the end of February. Moreover, so as to hold the Olympics and Paralympics games in Tokyo in July, the third emergency state was declared on April 25, 2021.

Nevertheless, although results were mixed, some studies suggest that COVID-19 might be associated with climate conditions, at least in China [2–4]. If that were true for Japan, then GTTC might not be the main reason for the third wave.

Moreover, mobility was inferred as the main cause of the outbreak dynamics, at least in the first wave in Japan [5] and throughout the world [6]. Therefore, for this study, we evaluate the GTTC effects on infectiousness and the effective reproduction number R(t) while considering climate conditions and mobility.

The object of this study was evaluation the effects of the third emergency status declaration controlling other countermeasures, climate conditions, and mobility through January 21, 2020 until May 4, 2021 as of May 25,2021.

Methods

The number of symptomatic patients reported by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) for January 14 –May 4, published [7] as of May 21, 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 is 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 described hereinafter. 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 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 were period s as of the current period t.

We defined R(t) as the number of 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 for whom the onset date was period t. 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 the 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 data were not available. We obtained data from the Japan Meteorological Agency (https://www.data.jma.go.jp/gmd/risk/obsdl/index.php). However, we identified

remarkable countermeasures in Japan: two emergency status declarations, GTTC, and school closure and voluntary event cancellation (SCVEC). The latter, SCVEC, extended from February 27 through March: it required school closure and cancellation of voluntary events, including private meetings. Then the first state of emergency was declared April 7. It ceased at the end of May. It required voluntary restriction against going out, school closures, and shutdown of businesses. To subsidize travel and shopping at tourist destinations, GTTC started on July 22 and ceased temporarily at the end of December. The second state of emergency was declared on January 7, 2021 for the most affected 11 prefectures. It required restaurant closure at 8:00 p.m. and voluntary restriction against going out, but did not require school closure. It will continue until March 21, 2021. The third state of emergency was declared on April 25, 2021 for 4 prefectures, Tokyo, Osaka, Hyogo and Kyoto prefectures. Then, application areas were extended gradually, but not covered the whole of Japan.

To clarify associations among R(t) and climate, mobility, and countermeasures, we regressed the daily R(t) on daily climate, mobility, and countermeasures using ordinary least squares. Temperatures were measured in degrees Celsius, humidity, and mobility as percentage in regression, not as standardized. When we found that some variables were not significant, we dropped them and estimated it again. If some variables were

not significant in the full specification estimation, we estimate it again without those insignificants variables, step wisely.

The study period extended from January 14, 2020, when the initial case was detected in Japan, to April 27, 2021, when three days after since 3rd emergency status was declared, as of May 18, 2021 because R(*t*) usually develops over time for one week. We adopted 5% as the significance level.

Results

During January 14, 2020 –May 4, 2021 in Japan, approximately 485 thousands community-acquired symptomatic COVID-19 cases were identified as of May 18, 2021. Figure 2 presents an empirical distribution of the duration of onset to reporting in Japan. The maximum delay was 31 days. Figure 3 depicts an 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. It shows that R(*t*) was very volatile until mid-February because there were very few cases, but it reached

the first peak on March 19, 2020. Later it declined to less than one under the first emergency status period. After that period, it increased gradually and reached the second peak on June 20. Subsequently, it declined to become smaller than one. Thereafter, it increased to more than one from mid-September and reached the third peak on October 30. It later declined, but it did not become smaller than one until the end of 2020. Since January 5, 2021, it has remained less than one.

Mobility was very similar with R(t) until the second peak of R(t). Thereafter, it increased, but R(t) decreased. It was very high during August–November, but not so high in R(t). The temperature appeared to be associated positively from May to the second peak of R(t), but in summer it appeared to associate negatively with R(t). Humidity was highly volatile. It was difficult to infer some association, as the figure shows.

Table 1 presents estimation results. The left-hand side of Table 1 presents estimation results for the full specification with climate condition as an explanatory variable. The four columns at the mid of the table show the estimation results without temperature or humidity because these were not significant in the full specification on the left-hand side. Because temperature or humidity was not significant, we also estimated without climate condition and showed the result on the right hand side of the

table. All explanatory variables of the right-hand side were significant. Therefore, we use the estimation results on the right-hand side hereinafter.

Mobility was positive and significant. Climate condition was not significant. The three emergency statuses and GTTC were found to be negative and significant, but SCVEC was significant and positive. The adjusted coefficient of determination was 0.4955: the model did not fit very well. Figure 5 shows R(*t*) and its fitted values, which were too volatile in comparison with R(*t*). It was probably caused by the day-of-the-week pattern in mobility or by a periodic change in the weather.

Discussion

Even though the third emergency status had been declared on April 25, 2021, because there were some incubation period and reporting delay as Figure 2 and 3, we waited for about three weeks to analysis for the third emergency status. We used the data until May 4, 2021 as of May 25, 2021, when only ten days after since third emergency status declared. Therefore, the present study may be interim evaluation for the third emergency status. Nevertheless, the ultimate evaluation for the third emergency status may change reflecting dynamic of the outbreak under the third emergency status.

Estimation results showed that climate condition was not significant. The emergency status decreased R(t) by about 1 both the first and second time, as expected. Actually, the effect was stronger the second time than the first time. However, GTTC also reduced R(t) by about the same magnitude. Many observers have presumed that GTTC raised infectiousness, but it might have instead reduced infectiousness. At least, one can infer that it did not raise infectiousness.

This counterintuitive result might reflect the situation for July. Before GTTC was started on July 22, even though temperatures were high, a second peak occurred, indicating that the non-GTTC period had been affected by high infectiousness. By contrast, in November or December, R(t) was not so high as either the first and second wave. Of course, temperatures then were lower than they had been for either of the prior two peaks.

It is noteworthy that R(t) does not represent the number of newly infected patients. It is a ratio divided by the number of patients with infectiousness. The number of newly infected patients in the third wave around the end of 2020 was much higher than either of the two prior waves, as shown in Figure 1. Therefore, the greater number of patients in the third wave resulted from the greater number of patients with infectiousness, and not larger R(t). Larger numbers of patients with infectiousness occurred because of the

fact that R(t) was not so high, but higher than one for a long time: about three months. One must be reminded for interpretation of the obtained result that climate conditions, mobility, and countermeasures affect infectiousness R(t), but do not directly affect the number of patients.

Reportedly [11], travel-associated COVID-19 incidence during July 22–26, when GTTC started, was much higher than during either the 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 earlier study also compares the period of August 8–31. Patient data of two types were used: the onset date and the date of a positive test result.

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 comparable to those of people during the two prior periods. Especially, when the earlier period was defined as July 15–19, the proportion of people with a travel history among patients with an available onset date was smaller for the GTTC period than during the prior period. However, the authors of that report found significantly higher incidence at the time when GTTC started. The findings of that other study might merely reflect the fact that the total number of patients 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 results and conclusions from that earlier study 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 in 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 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 using the same procedure in earlier studies [8,9], we used publicly reported information [7] to ascertain the peak of newly infected persons as July 23: the GTTC starting date. Therefore, we infer that GTTC possibly reduced infectiousness. We also consider climate conditions. At around the end of July, the rainy season in Japan ceased; summer began, bringing with it 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 increase the number of patients without a travel history if GTTC has a strong effect on the outbreak. For example, a patient travelling while using GTTC on July 22 and 23 and then showing onset on July 24 had a travel history with GTTC, but would not be included in a group of patients with a travel history whose onset date was included in the GTTC start period of July 27–31. However, presymptomatic patients are well known to be infectious during the symptomatic period [12]. Such a patient might infect hotel staff members or persons in visiting areas. They

did not have a travel history. Their onset dates were July 27 and 28. Actually, they included a group of patients with no travel history in the GTTC starting period of July 27–31. Therefore, GTTC certainly increased the number of patients without a travel history, but it did not increase patients with a travel history in this case. For that reason, when considering GTTC effects, the number of patients must be checked irrespective of their travel history.

The third wave of the outbreak, much larger than the second wave which struck around July, showed its peak as around the end of the 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, then climate conditions can be inferred as the main factor driving the outbreak. The GTTC effects might be supplemental. In fact, even through 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, maintaining social distance, and cancellation of group dining. In other words, persons at leisure venues might feel higher risk from tourists; tourists might also feel higher risk of infecting others by starting GTTC. Ceasing GTTC might then induce feelings of even higher risk among the general population.

Actually, some countermeasures in addition to those considered in the present study were used, such as quarantine, isolation, PCR testing, treatment, and vaccine and drug administration. However, to examine their specific effects on infectiousness at a community level, the three considered countermeasures might be the most important policies. Moreover, the periods of the three countermeasures were not overlapped. Therefore, we can isolate the effects of the respective countermeasures more easily.

Among efforts undertaken in Japan, GTTC was one of the “Go To Campaigns (GTC).” Measures supporting GTC include “Go To Eat”, which subsidized customer bills at restaurants from the end of September through November 24 and “Go To Shopping Malls”, which subsidized shopping malls to encourage events, product

development, and PR activities from October 19 through January 11, 2021, other than GTTC. However, because these were similar subsidy policies and because their periods overlapped, we cannot isolate each branch of GTC separately. Of those, GTTC was the first and longest campaign among GTC. It was inferred as the main cause of the third wave [1]; we examined the effects of GTTC as a representative of GTC, on infectiousness. In this sense, the effects of GTTC might 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 assess such an association, a formal mathematical model incorporating temperature and mobility must be developed. Producing that model is anticipated as a challenge for future research.

Secondly, as described above, we analyzed the effect of the third emergency status only for three days. Therefore, estimation results about the effect of the third emergency status probably change in the near future.

Thirdly, we examined this problem only for the entirety of Japan. Because the third emergency status were applied to Tokyo, Osaka and other area but not for the whole of Japan. Fortunately, Apple Inc. and the Japan Meteorological Agency provide

information by prefecture. Hence, we can analyze the similar analysis for the prefectures where third emergency status was not applied. It may provide insightful evaluation for evaluation f emergency status.

Conclusion

Results of this study demonstrated that the three emergency statues reduced infectiousness significantly by almost the same amount. Moreover, GTTC was found not to have raised infectiousness.

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 published data on the web were 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 until May 4, 2021 as of May 25, 2021 in Japan

(Number of cases)



Date

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 until May 4, 2021

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 by the right hand side in Table 1.

Table 1: Estimation results of estimate R(t) for the climate condition, mobility, and countermeasures under the full specification and excluding temperature and/or humidity

Explanatory variables	Full specification		Excluding humidity		Excluding temperature		Excluding climate condition	
	Estimated coefficients	*p*-values	Estimated coefficients	*p*-values	Estimated coefficients	*p*-values	Estimated coefficients	*p*-values
Temperature	-0.00538	0.253	-0.004673	0.268	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Humidity	0.00060	0.741	N.A.	N.A.	-0.00027	0.868	N.A.	N.A.
Mobility	0.00793	0.000	0.00787	0.000	0.00777	0.000	0.00780	0.000
SCVEC	0.94328	0.000	0.94399	0.000	0.97154	0.000	0.97305	0.000
1st Emergency status	-0.72500	0.000	-0.72660	0.000	-0.729478	0.000	-0.72889	0.000
GTTC	-0.71835	0.000	-0.71693	0.000	-0.72690	0.000	-0.72826	0.000
2nd Emergency status	-0.82598	0.000	-0.82982	0.000	-0.795601	0.000	-0.7914365	0.000
3rd	-0.82578	0.000	-0.83015	0.000	-0.83133	0.000	-0.82929	0.0009

Emergency status								
Constant	0.93579	0.000	0.97411	0.000	0.92556	0.000	0.90351	0.000
Adjusted R^2	0.4939		0.4949		0.4935		0.4946	
Number of observations	450							

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, 2020 to May 4, 202 as of May 25, 2021..