

1 **Effect of familiarity with COVID-19 infection—history of infection or close contact—on**  
2 **outing behaviors when a state of emergency is declared**

3  
4 Takahiro Mori <sup>a</sup>, Tomohisa Nagata <sup>a</sup>, Kazunori Ikegami <sup>b</sup>, Ayako Hino <sup>c</sup>, Seiichiro Tateishi <sup>d</sup>,  
5 Mayumi Tsuji <sup>e</sup>, Shinya Matsuda <sup>f</sup>, Yoshihisa Fujino <sup>g</sup>, Koji Mori <sup>a\*</sup>, for the CORoNaWork  
6 project

7  
8 Affiliations:

9 <sup>a</sup> Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial  
10 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, 1-1 Iseigaoka  
11 Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 807-8555, Japan

12 <sup>b</sup> Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,  
13 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka Yahatanishi-ku,  
14 Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 807-8555, Japan

15 <sup>c</sup> Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of  
16 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu,  
17 Fukuoka, 807-8555, Japan

18 <sup>d</sup> Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and  
19 Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 807-8555,  
20 Japan

21 <sup>e</sup> Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and  
22 Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 807-8555,  
23 Japan

24 <sup>f</sup> Department of Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and  
25 Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 807-8555,  
26 Japan

27 <sup>g</sup> Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,  
28 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1 Iseigaoka Yahatanishi-ku,  
29 Kitakyushu, Fukuoka, 807-8555, Japan

30  
31 \*Correspondence author: Koji Mori, MD, PhD

32 Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial  
33 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, 1-1  
34 Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu 807-8555, Japan.

35 E-mail: kmori@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp; Tel: +81-93-603-1611; Fax: +81-93-603-2155

36 **Abstract**

37 **Background:** Restricting the movement of the public to gathering places and limiting close  
38 physical contact are effective measures against COVID-19 infection. In Japan, states of  
39 emergency have been declared in specific prefectures to reduce public movement and control  
40 COVID-19 transmission. We investigated how familiarity with the COVID-19 infection  
41 affected self-restraint related to outing behaviors during state of emergency declarations in  
42 Japan.

43 **Methods:** A prospective cohort study was conducted among workers aged 20–65 years using  
44 data from an internet survey. The baseline survey was conducted on December 22–25, 2020,  
45 and a follow-up survey was on February 18–19, 2021. There were 19,941 participants who  
46 completed both surveys and were included in the final analysis. We set self-restraint regarding  
47 outing behaviors after the second state of emergency was declared in January 2021 as the  
48 dependent variable, and levels of familiarity with COVID-19 infection as independent  
49 variables. Odds ratios were estimated using multilevel logistic analyses.

50 **Results:** Significant differences by familiarity with COVID-19 infection were identified:  
51 compared with people without a history of COVID-19 or close contact with cases of  
52 confirmed COVID-19, and those whose acquaintances had not been diagnosed with  
53 COVID-19, people with a history of COVID-19 did not refrain from most outing behaviors.  
54 People with an acquaintance diagnosed with COVID-19 were significantly more likely to  
55 refrain from most outing behaviors. There was no significant difference in any outing  
56 behavior for people with a history of close contact only.

57 **Conclusions:** To maximize the effect of emergency declarations, health authorities should  
58 disseminate information for each person in the target population, taking into account potential  
59 differences related to the familiarity with the infection.

60  
61 **Key words:** familiarity, COVID-19, self-restraint, outing behaviors, emergency declaration

62

## 63 **1. Introduction**

64 An effective control measure for coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection is to reduce  
65 opportunities for people to go to places where people gather or have close physical contact  
66 with others [1,2], and the most powerful measure is a nationwide restriction of behavior, the  
67 so-called lockdown. The known routes of COVID-19 infection include droplet infection,  
68 aerosol infection, and contact infection, so many infections occur in places where people  
69 gather or are in close physical contact. Lockdowns have been implemented in many countries  
70 during the COVID-19 pandemic with varying degrees of success in terms of strength and  
71 duration. In China [3], Italy [4], and France [5], the movement of people in various places and  
72 the distance traveled in daily life were significantly reduced after lockdown. In the United  
73 States as well, the number of customers visiting retail stores decreased after lockdown  
74 measures were implemented [6]. A study using data from 202 countries reported that the  
75 reduction in outings due to lockdown reduced the number of newly infected people, especially  
76 after 10 days post- declaration, and the effect was maintained until 20 days post-declaration  
77 [7].

78 Japan has also declared a state of emergency to reduce the movement of people and  
79 thereby control COVID-19 infections. A total of four states of emergency have been declared  
80 due to the epidemic situation of COVID-19; the first was declared to all prefectures, and the  
81 second and subsequent were declared only to those prefectures where the infection situation  
82 was worsening. The first was from April to May 2020, when the first wave arrived in Japan;  
83 the second was from January to March 2021 when the third wave arrived; the third was from  
84 April to June 2021; the fourth was from July 2021, when the fourth wave arrived. However,  
85 Japan's declarations of a state of emergency did not have penal provisions as did some other  
86 countries and were merely requests that citizens refrain from movement and social gatherings  
87 [8]. Nonetheless, these requests led to similar effects on reduction of outing behaviors as did  
88 such declarations in the United States, which did provide penal provisions [9].

89 The reason why similar effects were obtained may be that information on the  
90 infection situation, such as announcements of measures by the government and daily reports  
91 on the number of infected people and deaths, contribute to increased voluntarily restraint on  
92 going out, in addition to the intervention effect of the emergency declaration [6,9]. However,  
93 because the effect of this information is large, even during periods when a state of emergency  
94 is declared, if the number of infected people decreases, the number of people going out  
95 increases, and as a result, the number of infections will stop declining [8].

96 Age and sex have been investigated as factors affecting responses to declarations of a

97 state of emergency in Japan and lockdowns in other countries. In Japan, young people and  
98 women were reported to have been more responsive to the declarations and more likely to  
99 refrain from going out [10]. Similarly, in Europe, young people and women refrained from  
100 going out [11,12]. Elderly people in Japan were more likely to respond to information such as  
101 daily reports on the number of infected people and deaths [10]. In addition, in Japan, the  
102 states of emergency were declared in areas where the number of infected people was  
103 particularly high, most of which were in major cities, but nearly equivalent effects on  
104 refraining from going out were obtained in areas where states of emergency were declared [9,  
105 13]. In the United States as well, there was little difference between areas under lockdown and  
106 areas not under lockdown in terms of restricting movement [6].

107 Familiarity with COVID-19 infections may be another factor affecting propensity to  
108 restrict movement. The familiarity of infection can be classified into (1) people with a history  
109 of infection, (2) people with a history of close contact, and (3) people with acquaintances who  
110 have been infected. For people with a history of infection, re-infection is unlikely because of  
111 the development of neutralizing antibodies [14,15], so these individuals may be less likely to  
112 take measures against infection or refrain from going out in public. Conversely, people with a  
113 history of close contact or acquaintances who have been infected may consider themselves to  
114 have a high possibility of self-infection, further strengthening their likelihood to take  
115 measures against infection and refrain from outing behaviors. However, to our knowledge,  
116 these effects have not yet been investigated.

117 We therefore investigated how familiarity with COVID-19 infection affected  
118 self-restraint in outing behaviors when the second state of emergency was declared in Japan in  
119 January 2021.

120

## 121 **2. Material and methods**


### 122 **2.1 Study design and participants**

123 This prospective cohort study was undertaken by a research group from the University of  
124 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, called the Collaborative Online Research on  
125 Novel-coronavirus and Work study (CORoNaWork study). This survey was conducted as a  
126 self-administrated questionnaire by the internet survey company Cross Marketing Inc. (Tokyo,  
127 Japan). The baseline survey was conducted on December 22–25, 2020, and the follow-up  
128 survey was on February 18–19, 2021; both periods were during the third wave of the  
129 pandemic in Japan. Details of the study protocol have been previously reported [16].  
130 Participants (n = 33,087) were aged 20–65 years and employed at the time of the baseline

131 survey. Respondents to the CORoNaWork study were stratified by cluster sampling according  
132 to sex, age, and region of residence. After excluding 6,051 initial subjects who provided  
133 invalid responses, we ultimately included 27,036 in the database. These subjects were given a  
134 follow-up survey, and 19,941 people responded (74% follow-up rate). The flow diagram is  
135 shown in Figure 1.

136 The present study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of  
137 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (Approval numbers: R2-079 and R3-006).  
138 Informed consent was obtained in the form of the website from all participants.

139



140

141

142 Figure 1. Flow chart of the study participants.

## 143 **2.2 Assessment of outing behaviors**

144 We identified eight outing behaviors: (1) eating out (4 people or fewer); (2) eating out (5  
145 people or more); (3) gathering with friends and colleagues; (4) day trip; (5) overnight trip  
146 (excluding visiting home); (6) visiting home; (7) shopping for daily necessities; and (8)  
147 shopping for other than daily necessities. We divided eating out into four people or fewer and  
148 five or more to identify any difference based on the number of people, particularly because  
149 the Japanese government has emphasized that drinking or dining with five or more people  
150 carries a particularly high risk of infection [8]. For each of the eight behaviors, we asked  
151 participants in the follow-up survey, “Has your self-restraint changed in response to the  
152 second declaration of a state of emergency in January 2021?” Respondents chose one of the  
153 following five options: very increased, a little increased, no change, a little decreased, or very  
154 decreased. We created a binary variable by defining “a little decreased” or “very decreased”  
155 as having self-restraint behavior, and the others as not having self-restraint behavior.

156

## 157 **2.3 Assessment of the familiarity of infection**

158 In the baseline survey, we asked participants three questions about their familiarity with  
159 infection: “Have you ever been infected with COVID-19?”, “Have you ever been in close  
160 contact with someone with COVID-19?”, and “Do you have an acquaintance who has been  
161 infected with COVID-19?” Respondents answered each question with “Yes” or “No”, and  
162 were classified into the four following types: people with a history of COVID-19; people  
163 without history of COVID-19 but with a history of close contact with cases of confirmed  
164 COVID-19 (hereinafter referred to as people with a history of close contact); people without a  
165 history of COVID-19 or close contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19 but who had an  
166 acquaintance who had been diagnosed with COVID-19 (hereinafter referred to as people  
167 whose acquaintance was diagnosed); and people without history of COVID-19 or close  
168 contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19, and who did not have an acquaintance diagnosed  
169 with COVID-19 (hereinafter referred to as people without history of COVID-19 or close  
170 contact).

171

## 172 **2.4 Assessment of covariates**

173 Covariates included demographics, socioeconomic factors, job type, and prefectures with and  
174 without the second declaration of a state of emergency. Age was expressed as a continuous  
175 variable. Education was classified into three categories: junior high or high school, vocational  
176 school or college, and university or graduate school. Marital status was classified into three

177 categories: married, divorced or widowed, and never married. Equivalent income was  
178 classified into four categories: <2.50 million Japanese yen (JPY); 2.50–3.74 million JPY;  
179 3.75–5.24 million JPY; and  $\geq 5.25$  million JPY (1 USD was equal to 106.78 JPY, using 2020  
180 conversion rates) [17]. Job type was classified into three categories: mainly desk work, jobs  
181 mainly involving interpersonal communication, and mainly physical work. There were 11  
182 prefectures that had the second declaration of a state of emergency, and 36 prefectures without  
183 this declaration.

184

## 185 **2.5 Statistical analyses**

186 Multilevel logistic regression analyses were used to examine the association between  
187 familiarity with infection and self-restraint from outing behaviors after the second declaration  
188 of a state of emergency. An analysis was performed on each of the eight outing behaviors. We  
189 estimated an age-sex adjusted odds ratio (OR) for each (Model 1), then additionally adjusted  
190 for education, marital status, equivalent income, and job type (Model 2), along with  
191 prefectures with and without the second declaration of a state of emergency (Model 3). A  
192 p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were conducted  
193 using Stata Statistical Software (Release 16; StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA).

194

## 195 **3. Results**

196 Table 1 shows the participant characteristics for each category of familiarity of infection.  
197 There were 18,208 people without history of COVID-19 or close contact, 154 people with a  
198 history of COVID-19, 141 people with a history of close contact, and 1438 people who had an  
199 acquaintance who was diagnosed. The mean age was youngest for people with a history of  
200 COVID-19. People without history of COVID-19 or close contact had a lower rate of being  
201 married than did other groups. In prefectures with the emergency declaration, there were  
202 fewer people without history of COVID-19 or close contact and more people with a history of  
203 COVID-19, with a history of close contact, and whose acquaintance was diagnosed than in  
204 prefectures without the declaration.

205 Table 2 shows the association between familiarity with infection and refraining from  
206 outing behaviors during declaration of the second state of emergency. In multivariate analysis  
207 adjusted for age, sex, education, marital status, equivalent income and job type (Model 2),  
208 among people with a history of COVID-19, the odds ratios were significantly lower than  
209 people without history of COVID-19 or close contact, for eating out (4 people or less) (OR  
210 0.50), eating out (5 people or more) (OR 0.50), gathering with friends and colleagues (OR

211 0.41), day trip (OR 0.51), overnight trip (OR 0.49), and shopping other than daily necessities  
212 (OR 0.68). There was no significant difference in visiting home or in shopping for daily  
213 necessities, but there was a tendency to refrain from visiting home (OR 0.75,  $p = 0.080$ ).  
214 Conversely, the odds ratio in people whose acquaintance had been diagnosed was  
215 significantly higher for eating out (4 people or fewer) (OR 1.42), eating out (5 people or  
216 more) (OR 1.49), gathering with friends and colleagues (OR 1.56), day trip (OR 1.36),  
217 overnight trip (OR 1.37), visiting home (OR 1.27), and shopping other than daily necessities  
218 (OR 1.32), but there was no significant difference for shopping for daily necessities. People  
219 with a history of close contact showed no significant difference in any of the outing behaviors  
220 compared with people without history of COVID-19 and close contact. After additional  
221 adjustment for prefectures with and without declaration of the second state of emergency  
222 (Model 3), the results were similar to those for Model 2.

223 Table 1. Characteristics of participants

	People without history of COVID-19 or close contact* n=18208	People with a history of COVID-19 n=154	People with a history of close contact† n=141	People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡ n=1438
Age, mean (SD)	48.0 (10.1)	43.8 (11.5)	45.7 (10.6)	47.9 (10.2)
Sex, men	10195 (56.0%)	85 (55.2%)	87 (61.7%)	803 (55.8%)
Education				
Junior high or high school	4951 (27.2%)	37 (24.0%)	23 (16.3%)	349 (24.3%)
Vocational school or college	4221 (23.2%)	35 (22.7%)	37 (26.2%)	292 (20.3%)
University or graduate school	9036 (49.6%)	82 (53.2%)	81 (57.4%)	797 (55.4%)
Marital status				
Married	10134 (55.7%)	96 (62.3%)	85 (60.3%)	870 (60.5%)
Divorced or bereaved	1848 (10.1%)	14 (9.1%)	10 (7.1%)	164 (11.4%)
Never married	6226 (34.2%)	44 (28.6%)	46 (32.6%)	404 (28.1%)
Equivalent income				
<2.50 million JPY	3976 (21.8%)	33 (21.4%)	17 (12.1%)	207 (14.4%)
2.50-3.74 million JPY	4588 (25.2%)	35 (22.7%)	31 (22.0%)	344 (23.9%)
3.75-5.24 million JPY	4822 (26.5%)	37 (24.0%)	38 (27.0%)	384 (26.7%)
≥5.25 million JPY	4822 (26.5%)	49 (31.8%)	55 (39.0%)	503 (35.0%)
Job type				
Mainly desk work	9381 (51.5%)	72 (46.8%)	61 (43.3%)	754 (52.4%)
Jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication	4425 (24.3%)	46 (29.9%)	44 (31.2%)	422 (29.3%)
Mainly physical work	4402 (24.2%)	36 (23.4%)	36 (25.5%)	262 (18.2%)
Prefectures with and without the second declaration of a state of emergency				
Prefectures with the declaration	7746 (42.5%)	81 (52.6%)	92 (65.2%)	783 (54.5%)
Prefectures without the declaration	10462 (57.5%)	73 (47.4%)	49 (34.8%)	655 (45.5%)

224 \* People without history of COVID-19 or close contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19, and whose  
225 acquaintance was not diagnosed with COVID-19

226 † People with a history of close contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19 and without history of  
227 COVID-19

228 ‡ People without a history of COVID-19 or close contact with confirmed cases of COVID-19 whose  
229 acquaintance was diagnosed with COVID-19

230 JPY, Japanese yen

231 Table 2. Association between familiarity with infection and self-restraint from outing behaviors during the second declaration of a state of emergency

	Self-restraint from going out		Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	n	%	OR	95% CI	P	OR	95% CI	P	OR	95% CI	P
(1) Eating out (4 people or fewer)											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	9921	54	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	60	39	0.53	0.38-0.73	<0.001	0.50	0.36-0.70	<0.001	0.49	0.35-0.68	<0.001
People with a history of close contact†	86	61	1.33	0.95-1.88	0.097	1.25	0.88-1.76	0.210	1.19	0.84-1.68	0.328
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	924	64	1.50	1.35-1.68	<0.001	1.42	1.27-1.59	<0.001	1.39	1.24-1.55	<0.001
(2) Eating out (5 people or more)											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	10516	58	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	65	42	0.54	0.39-0.75	<0.001	0.50	0.36-0.70	<0.001	0.50	0.36-0.69	<0.001
People with a history of close contact†	90	64	1.33	0.94-1.88	0.105	1.22	0.86-1.73	0.265	1.19	0.84-1.68	0.340
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	986	69	1.60	1.42-1.79	<0.001	1.49	1.33-1.68	<0.001	1.47	1.31-1.65	<0.001
(3) Gathering with friends and colleagues											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	11904	65	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	69	45	0.45	0.32-0.61	<0.001	0.41	0.30-0.57	<0.001	0.41	0.29-0.56	<0.001
People with a history of close contact†	92	65	1.05	0.74-1.48	0.802	0.96	0.67-1.36	0.800	0.93	0.66-1.33	0.705
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	1090	76	1.67	1.47-1.89	<0.001	1.56	1.37-1.77	<0.001	1.54	1.36-1.74	<0.001
(4) Day trip											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	10740	59	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	68	44	0.55	0.40-0.76	<0.001	0.51	0.37-0.70	<0.001	0.50	0.37-0.70	<0.001
People with a history of close contact†	86	61	1.11	0.79-1.57	0.538	1.02	0.72-1.44	0.901	1.01	0.71-1.42	0.967
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	972	68	1.45	1.30-1.63	<0.001	1.36	1.21-1.53	<0.001	1.35	1.20-1.52	<0.001

232 Model 1: adjusted for sex, age

233 Model 2: Model 1 additionally adjusted for education, marital status, equivalent income and job type

234 Model 3: Model 2 additionally adjusted for prefectures with and without the second declaration of a state of emergency

235 \* People without history of COVID-19 or close contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19, and whose acquaintance was not diagnosed with COVID-19

236 † People with a history of close contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19 and without history of COVID-19

237 ‡ People without a history of COVID-19 or close contact with confirmed cases of COVID-19 whose acquaintance was diagnosed with COVID-19

238

239 Table 2. (continued)

	Self-restraint from going out		Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	n	%	OR	95% CI	P	OR	95% CI	P	OR	95% CI	P
(5) Overnight trip (excluding visiting home)											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	10983	60	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	69	45	0.54	0.39-0.74	<0.001	0.49	0.36-0.68	<0.001	0.49	0.35-0.68	<0.001
People with a history of close contact†	90	64	1.20	0.85-1.69	0.312	1.08	0.76-1.53	0.667	1.07	0.75-1.52	0.717
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	994	69	1.48	1.31-1.66	<0.001	1.37	1.22-1.54	<0.001	1.36	1.21-1.53	<0.001
(6) Visiting home											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	8539	47	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	65	42	0.82	0.59-1.13	0.228	0.75	0.54-1.04	0.080	0.72	0.52-1.00	0.051
People with a history of close contact†	75	53	1.30	0.93-1.81	0.125	1.19	0.85-1.67	0.316	1.12	0.80-1.57	0.526
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	785	55	1.36	1.22-1.52	<0.001	1.27	1.14-1.41	<0.001	1.23	1.10-1.37	<0.001
(7) Shopping for daily necessities											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	4980	27	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	53	34	1.35	0.97-1.89	0.078	1.32	0.94-1.85	0.106	1.31	0.93-1.83	0.121
People with a history of close contact†	45	32	1.26	0.88-1.80	0.213	1.24	0.86-1.77	0.247	1.21	0.84-1.73	0.300
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	437	29	1.10	0.98-1.24	0.108	1.08	0.96-1.22	0.185	1.07	0.95-1.21	0.253
(8) Shopping other than daily necessities											
People without history of COVID-19 or close contact*	7973	44	reference			reference			reference		
People with a history of COVID-19	55	36	0.71	0.51-0.99	0.044	0.68	0.49-0.95	0.025	0.67	0.48-0.94	0.020
People with a history of close contact†	61	43	1.01	0.72-1.42	0.933	0.97	0.69-1.36	0.844	0.94	0.67-1.32	0.707
People whose acquaintance was diagnosed‡	741	52	1.37	1.23-1.53	<0.001	1.32	1.18-1.47	<0.001	1.30	1.16-1.45	<0.001

240 Model 1: adjusted for sex, age

241 Model 2: Model 1 additionally adjusted for education, marital status, equivalent income and job type

242 Model 3: Model 2 additionally adjusted for prefectures with and without the second declaration of a state of emergency

243 \* People without history of COVID-19 or close contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19, and whose acquaintance was not diagnosed with COVID-19

244 † People with a history of close contact with cases of confirmed COVID-19 and without history of COVID-19

245 ‡ People without a history of COVID-19 or close contact with confirmed cases of COVID-19 whose acquaintance was diagnosed with COVID-19

#### 246 **4. Discussion**

247 We examined the impact of familiarity with infection on self-restraint from outing behaviors  
248 during the second declaration of a state of emergency. People with a history of COVID-19  
249 reported significantly lower self-restraint from outing behavior than did people without a  
250 history of COVID-19 or close contact, except regarding shopping for daily necessities. People  
251 with an acquaintance who had been diagnosed were significantly more likely to refrain from  
252 outing behavior except for shopping for daily necessities. There was no significant difference  
253 in any outing behavior for people with a history of close contact with COVID-19 cases.  
254 Similar results were observed after adjustment for prefectures with and without the  
255 declaration.

256 The results of people with a history of COVID-19 and people with acquaintances  
257 who were diagnosed were similar to what we had expected. It has been shown that risk  
258 perception for infection is involved in infection prevention behavior [18-20]. Risk perception  
259 for infection includes perceptions of the possibility and severity of infection [21]. The  
260 association between risk perception and preventive behavior was also reported in various  
261 countries during the 2009 H1N1 influenza epidemic [22-28].

262 The reason why people with a history of COVID-19 did not refrain from outing  
263 behaviors may result from their perception that they were less likely to be infected with  
264 COVID-19 again and their perception of the severity of the infection. At the time of this  
265 survey, the number of infected people in Japan was less than 0.5% of the total population [8].  
266 This infection rate was so low that infected people might have thought that they were unlucky  
267 even once infected, and infected persons often acquire neutralizing antibodies, so they might  
268 also have thought that re-infection was unlikely to occur [14,15]. In addition, because past  
269 experiences have been reported to be less associated with concerns about voluntary risk  
270 behavior [24], a COVID-19 diagnosis might not lead to refraining from outing behavior that  
271 may have caused them to become infected in the past or increase their risk of infection. As for  
272 the perception of severity, if their infection was relatively mild or asymptomatic, they may  
273 have had perceived the severity of COVID-19 infection to be lesser. Accordingly, even when  
274 a state of emergency was declared, there was no change in self-restraint from outing  
275 behaviors.

276 Conversely, people who had an acquaintance who was diagnosed were considered to  
277 have increased risk perception. A survey of Japanese people has shown that the risk to oneself  
278 is underestimated compared with the risk to society as a whole [29]. If a close acquaintance  
279 was infected or even became seriously ill, it is probable that the risk perception to oneself

280 increased, leading to refraining from outing behavior.

281 For people with a history of close contact, the results were different from our  
282 assumptions, and no significant difference was observed in any of outing behaviors. The  
283 reasons for this result are not clear from this survey, but it is possible that there were both  
284 those who refrained from outing behaviors and those who did not. In Japan, epidemiological  
285 surveys are conducted by health centers on each infected person, and close contacts are  
286 identified. After certification, close contacts undergo a real-time reverse  
287 transcription–polymerase chain reaction (rt-PCR) test to check for infection and are  
288 quarantined at home for 14 days, even if negative [16]. As mentioned above, people with a  
289 history of close contact felt close to the infection, so it is probable that they may have adopted  
290 the same behaviors as people whose acquaintance was diagnosed. Conversely, it seems that  
291 there were a number of people who did not refrain from outing behavior. Some people may  
292 think that they have already been infected because of the possibility of false negatives even if  
293 the rt-PCR test is negative, or from the experience of being isolated at home for 14 days. In  
294 addition, many people are recognized as close contacts as a result of their family members  
295 living together being infected [30-32], and often make decisions about outing behaviors with  
296 their family members. These people therefore may have not refrained from outing behaviors  
297 like people with a history of COVID-19.

298 Regarding the specific aspects of outing behaviors, for shopping for daily necessities,  
299 neither people with a history of COVID-19 nor people whose acquaintance was diagnosed  
300 showed a significant difference compared with people without history of COVID-19 and  
301 close contact. This may be because shopping for daily necessities is a daily activity necessary  
302 for daily life, unlike other outing behaviors. Regarding eating out, similar results were seen in  
303 eating out with four people or fewer and with five or more, suggesting that they have a similar  
304 perception of the risk of infection.

305 After adjusting for prefectures with and without declaration (Model 3), the results did  
306 not change. This suggests that people in prefectures with and without declarations showed  
307 similar reactions when the state of emergency was declared. Previous studies in Japan and the  
308 United States have investigated the difference in the degree of self-restraint from outing  
309 behavior between the areas with declarations and areas without, with results were similar to  
310 those in this study [6,9]. In Japan, the prefectures with a declaration included major cities, and  
311 people living in prefectures without a declaration often go to or pass through the major cities.  
312 In addition, in many prefectures without a declaration, the number of newly infected people  
313 increased during the same period [8]. Information on the number of infected people and

314 deaths in the prefectures with the declaration was also reported daily on television and the  
315 internet. This information may have influenced the self-restraint of outing behavior in the  
316 prefectures without the declaration because in addition to the intervention effect of the  
317 declaration of the state of emergency, it has been shown that the information effect is large as  
318 well [9].

319 It is necessary to pay attention not only to age and sex factors that have already been  
320 investigated [10-12], but also to the familiarity of infection. Since it has been shown that the  
321 information effect is large [9], it is necessary to disseminate information that makes the  
322 infection more familiar, and also that refraining from outing behaviors is beneficial to society  
323 as a whole, including the national health care system. In addition, individual risk preference is  
324 known to be influenced by the decision-making of surrounding individuals [34], and it will be  
325 easier to make the choice to go out if many people go out when self-restraint is requested. It is  
326 therefore necessary to provide appropriate information to people with a history of COVID-19,  
327 such as the possibility of re-infection and the effects of new variants of COVID-19 virus [35].

328 There are several limitations to this study. First, we conducted an internet survey,  
329 which includes the possibility of selection bias. However, sampling was balanced by sex, age,  
330 occupation, and area of residence at the start of the study to reduce the potential for bias.  
331 Second, the follow-up survey was conducted two months after the baseline survey. We  
332 classified the familiarity of infection using data from the baseline survey, so there may have  
333 been new people infected in the intervening two months. However, the ratio in each category  
334 implies that the number of newly applicable people was very small, and unlikely to  
335 significantly affect the results. Third, the outcome of interest in this survey was a decrease in  
336 self-restraint, but those who were not originally outing at all before the second state of  
337 emergency was declared were included in the group who did not respond to self-restraint.  
338 However, the movement of people during the non-declaration period does not appear to have  
339 been significantly suppressed compared with before the COVID-19 epidemic [13]. This  
340 implies that there would have been few people in this category who did not go out at all  
341 during the non-declaration period.

342

## 343 **5. Conclusion**

344 Our results show that the level of self-restraint from outing behaviors due to the declaration of  
345 a state of emergency differs depending on a subject's familiarity with COVID-19 infection.  
346 When declaring a state of emergency, in order to maximize the effect of the declaration,  
347 officials must disseminate information to each person in the target population, taking into

348 account the differences due to the familiarity of the infection.

349

### 350 **Acknowledgements**

351 The current members of the CORoNaWork Project, in alphabetical order, are as follows: Dr.  
352 Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the study group), Dr. Akira Ogami, Dr. Arisa Harada,  
353 Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr. Kazunori Ikegami, Dr. Kei  
354 Tokutsu, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kosuke Mafune, Dr. Kyoko Kitagawa, Dr.  
355 Masako Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Ms. Ning Liu, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr. Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr.  
356 Seiichiro Tateishi, Dr. Shinya Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru, and Dr. Tomohisa Nagata. All  
357 members are affiliated with the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan.

358

### 359 **Funding**

360 This study was supported and partly funded by the research grant from the University of  
361 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (no grant number); Japanese Ministry of  
362 Health, Labour and Welfare (H30-josei-ippan-002, H30-roudou-ippan-007, 19JA1004,  
363 20JA1006, 210301-1, and 20HB1004); Anshin Zaidan (no grant number), the Collabo-Health  
364 Study Group (no grant number), and Hitachi Systems, Ltd. (no grant number) and scholarship  
365 donations from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. (no grant number)

366

### 367 **Disclosure statement**

368 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

369

### 370 **Authors' contributions**

371 TM; data analysis and writing the manuscript, TN; creating the questionnaire, review of  
372 manuscript, and advice on interpretation, HA, AH, ST, MT, and SM; review of manuscripts,  
373 and advice on interpretation, YF; overall survey planning, creating the questionnaire, review  
374 of manuscripts, and advice on interpretation, KM; data analysis, drafting the manuscript,  
375 review of manuscripts, and advice on interpretation, and final approval of the version to be  
376 submitted by all authors

377 **References**

- 378 1. Honein MA, Christie A, Rose DA, Brooks JT, Meaney-Delman D, Cohn A, et al.  
379 Summary of Guidance for Public Health Strategies to Address High Levels of  
380 Community Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and Related Deaths, December 2020. *MMWR*  
381 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:1860–7. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6949e2>.
- 382 2. World Health Organization. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection  
383 prevention precautions.  
384 <https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions> [accessed 16 Aug 2021].
- 385 3. Fang H, Wang L, Ynag Y. Human mobility restrictions and the spread of the Novel  
386 Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in China. *Journal of Public Economics* 2020;191:104272.  
387 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104272>.
- 388 4. Pepe E, Bajardi P, Gauvin L, Privitera F, Lake B, Cattuto C, et al. COVID-19 outbreak  
389 response, a dataset to assess mobility changes in Italy following national lockdown. *Sci*  
390 *Data* 2020;7:3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-00575-2>.
- 391 5. Pullano G, Valdano E, Scarpa N, Rubrichi S, Colizza V. Evaluating the effect of  
392 demographic factors, socioeconomic factors, and risk aversion on mobility during the  
393 COVID-19 epidemic in France under lockdown: a population-based study. *Lancet Digit*  
394 *Heal* 2020;2:e638–49. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500\(20\)30243-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30243-0).
- 395 6. Goolsbee A, Syverson C. Fear, lockdown, and diversion: Comparing drivers of pandemic  
396 economic decline 2020. *J Public Econ* 2021;193:104311.  
397 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104311>.
- 398 7. Alfano V, Ercolano S. The Efficacy of Lockdown Against COVID-19: A Cross-Country  
399 Panel Analysis. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy* 2020;18:509–17.  
400 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-020-00596-3>.
- 401 8. Cabinet Secretariat. COVID-19 Information and Resources.  
402 <https://corona.go.jp/en/dashboard/> [accessed 16 Aug 2021].
- 403 9. Watanabe T, Yabu T. Japan’s Voluntary Lockdown 2020. *PLOS ONE* 2021;16:e0252468.  
404 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252468>.
- 405 10. Watanabe T, Yabu T. Japan’s voluntary lockdown: further evidence based on age-specific  
406 mobile location data. *Japanese Econ Rev* 2021;1:1–38.  
407 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42973-021-00077-9>.
- 408 11. Caselli, Francesca, Francesco Grigoli, Damiano Sandri, and Antonio Spilimbergo.  
409 Mobility under the COVID-19 pandemic: Asymmetric effects across gender and age. *IMF*  
410

- 411 Working Paper, WP/20/282.
- 412 12. Andersen, Asger Lau, Emil Toft Hansen, Niels Johannesen, and Adam Sheridan.  
413 Pandemic, shutdown and consumer spending: Lessons from Scandinavian policy  
414 responses to COVID-19. arXiv preprint 2020. arXiv:2005.04630.
- 415 13. Cabinet Secretariat. COVID-19 Information and Resources: The amount of people  
416 flowing between prefectures and their changes [In Japanese].  
417 [https://corona.go.jp/dashboard/pdf/flow\\_20210712.pdf](https://corona.go.jp/dashboard/pdf/flow_20210712.pdf) [accessed 16 Aug 2021].
- 418 14. Hansen CH, Michlmayr D, Gubbels SM, Mølbak K, Ethelberg S. Assessment of  
419 protection against reinfection with SARS-CoV-2 among 4 million PCR-tested individuals  
420 in Denmark in 2020: a population-level observational study. *Lancet* 2021;397:1204–12.  
421 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00575-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00575-4).
- 422 15. Yamayoshi S, Yasuhara A, Ito M, Akasaka O, Nakamura M, Nakachi I, et al. Antibody  
423 titers against SARS-CoV-2 decline, but do not disappear for several months.  
424 *EClinicalMedicine* 2021;32:100734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.100734>.
- 425 16. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, Tsuji M, Tateishi S, Ogami A, et al. Protocol for a  
426 nationwide Internet-based health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in  
427 2020. *J UOEH* 2021;43:217-225. doi:10.7888/juoeh.43.217.
- 428 17. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Exchange rates (indicator).  
429 [accessed 16 Aug 2021]. doi: 10.1787/037ed317-en
- 430 18. Brewer NT, Weinstein ND, Cuite CL, Herrington JE. Risk Perceptions and Their Relation  
431 to Risk Behavior. *Ann Behav Med* 2004;27:125–30.  
432 [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm2702\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm2702_7).
- 433 19. Weinstein ND. Testing four competing theories of health-protective behavior. *Health*  
434 *Psychol* 1993;12:324-33. <https://doi:10.1037//0278-6133.12.4.324>.
- 435 20. Sutton SR. Social-psychological approaches to understanding addictive behaviours:  
436 attitude-behaviour and decision-making models. *Br J Addict* 1987;82:355-70.  
437 <https://doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.1987.tb01492.x>.
- 438 21. Brewer NT, Chapman GB, Gibbons FX, Gerrard M, McCaul KD, Weinstein ND.  
439 Meta-analysis of the relationship between risk perception and health behavior: The  
440 example of vaccination. *Heal Psychol* 2007;26:136–45.  
441 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.26.2.136>.
- 442 22. Jones JH, Salathe M. Early assessment of anxiety and behavioral response to novel  
443 swine-origin influenza A(H1N1). *PLoS One* 2009;4:e8032.  
444 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0008032>.

- 445 23. Chor JSY, Ngai KLK, Goggins WB, Wong MCS, Wong SYS, Lee N, et al. Willingness of  
446 Hong Kong healthcare workers to accept pre-pandemic influenza vaccination at different  
447 WHO alert levels: Two questionnaire surveys. *BMJ* 2009;339:b3391.  
448 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b3391>.
- 449 24. Rubin GJ, Amlôt R, Page L, Wessely S. Public perceptions, anxiety, and behaviour  
450 change in relation to the swine flu outbreak: Cross sectional telephone survey. *BMJ*  
451 2009;339:b2651. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2651>.
- 452 25. Seale H, Heywood AE, McLaws ML, Ward KF, Lowbridge CP, Van D, et al. Why do I  
453 need it? I am not at risk! Public perceptions towards the pandemic (H1N1) 2009 vaccine.  
454 *BMC Infect Dis* 2010;10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-10-99>.
- 455 26. Lau JTF, Griffiths S, Choi KC, Tsui HY. Avoidance behaviors and negative psychological  
456 responses in the general population in the initial stage of the H1N1 pandemic in Hong  
457 Kong. *BMC Infect Dis* 2010;10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-10-139>.
- 458 27. Lau JTF, Griffiths S, Choi K chow, Lin C. Prevalence of preventive behaviors and  
459 associated factors during early phase of the H1N1 influenza epidemic. *Am J Infect*  
460 *Control* 2010;38:374–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2010.03.002>.
- 461 28. Setbon M, Raude J. Factors in vaccination intention against the pandemic influenza  
462 A/H1N1. *Eur J Public Health* 2010;20:490–4. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckq054>.
- 463 29. Inamasu T, Horiguchi I, Marui E. Vulnerability and risk perception to infectious diseases  
464 of Japanese [In Japanese]. *Journal of health and welfare statistics* 2013;60:40-44.
- 465 30. Koh WC, Naing L, Chaw L, Rosledzana MA, Alikhan MF, Jamaludin SA, et al. What do  
466 we know about SARS-CoV-2 transmission? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the  
467 secondary attack rate and associated risk factors. *PLoS One* 2020;15: e0240205.  
468 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240205>.
- 469 31. Miyahara R, Tsuchiya N, Yasuda I, Ko YK, Furuse Y, Sando E, et al. Familial Clusters of  
470 Coronavirus. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021;27:915-918.  
471 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2703.203882>.
- 472 32. National Institute of Infectious Diseases and Tuberculosis and Infectious Diseases  
473 Control Division, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Positive rate by basic genus  
474 and contact location among close contacts with coronavirus infection [In Japanese]. *IASR*  
475 2021;42:104-106.
- 476 33. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Running Essential Errands.  
477 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/essential-goods-services.ht](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/essential-goods-services.html)  
478 [ml](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/essential-goods-services.html) [accessed 16 Aug 2021].

- 479 34. Chung D, Christopoulos GI, King-Casas B, Ball SB, Chiu PH. Social signals of safety  
480 and risk confer utility and have asymmetric effects on observers' choices. *Nat Neurosci*  
481 2015;18:912–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4022>.
- 482 35. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. SARS-CoV-2 Variant Classifications and  
483 Definitions. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/variant-info.html>  
484 [accessed 16 Aug 2021].
- 485