Correcting COVID-19 Risk Misperceptions via Information Provision

Asako Chiba
Kazuya Haganuma
Taisuke Nakata
Thuy Linh Nguyen
Reo Takaku

March 2026

TCER

TOKYO CENTER FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1-7-10-703 Iidabashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-0072, Japan

Abstract

We conducted an information provision experiment in April 2023 in Japan to investigate how different types of information affect people's subjective assessment of COVID-19 risks. The majority of respondents overestimate infection and fatality risks. Recent infection-related statistics lower risk perceptions if presented as percentages, but do not affect them if presented as levels. A pessimistic narrative about the infection outlook raises risk perceptions. We also find substantial heterogeneity in the response to information provision across various individual characteristics, such as age, gender, education, marital status, health status, COVID-19-related experiences, and vaccination status.

Asako Chiba
University of Tokyo
Graduate School of Economics
-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033
asakochiba@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Kazuya Haganuma
Massey University
School of Veterinary Science, College of Sciences
Tennent Drive Palmerston North 4472 New Zealand
Kazuya.Haganuma.1@uni.massey.ac.nz

Taisuke Nakata
TCER
and
University of Tokyo
Graduate School of Economics
7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033
taisuke.nakata@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Thuy Linh Nguyen
University of Tokyo
Graduate School of Economics
7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033
thuylinh.nguyen@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Reo Takaku
Hitotsubashi University
Graduate School of Economics
2-1 Naka, Kunitachi, Tokyo 186-8601
reo.takaku@r.hit-u.ac.jp

Correcting COVID-19 Risk Misperceptions via Information Provision[*]

Asako Chiba[†]   Kazuya Haganuma[‡]   Taisuke Nakata[§]

Thuy Linh Nguyen[¶]   Reo Takaku[||]

March 5, 2026

Abstract

We conducted an information provision experiment in April 2023 in Japan to investigate how different types of information affect people's subjective assessment of COVID-19 risks. The majority of respondents overestimate infection and fatality risks. Recent infection-related statistics lower risk perceptions if presented as percentages, but do not affect them if presented as levels. A pessimistic narrative about the infection outlook raises risk perceptions. We also find substantial heterogeneity in the response to information provision across various individual characteristics, such as age, gender, education, marital status, health status, COVID-19-related experiences, and vaccination status.

Keywords: COVID-19, Pandemic, Risk Communication, Risk Perception

[†]University of Tokyo; Email: asakochiba@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[‡]Massey University; Email: Kazuya.Haganuma.1@uni.massey.ac.nz

[§]University of Tokyo; Email: taisuke.nakata@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[¶](Corresponding Author) University of Tokyo; Email: thuylinh.nguyen@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp

[||]Hitotsubashi University; Email: reo.takaku@r.hit-u.ac.jp

1 Introduction

The extent to which people engage in preventive behaviors—such as social distancing, mask wearing, and vaccination—depends importantly on how they perceive the associated risks. During the COVID-19 pandemic, governments provided various information to help the public accurately assess COVID-19-related risks. However, different kinds of information—such as absolute numbers, percentages, or qualitative statements—may shape people's subjective risk assessments in different ways. Understanding these effects is therefore crucial for designing effective risk-communication strategies.

In this paper, we examine how different types of information affect COVID-19 risk perceptions via an information provision experiment. We conducted our experiment in April 2023 in Japan, shortly before the official end of the COVID-19 public health emergency. On May 8, the government reclassified COVID-19 from Category II to Category V, which meant that COVID-19 would be in the same category as seasonal influenza (flu). Figure 1 shows the trend in COVID-19 infections in Japan throughout the pandemic, highlighting both the reclassification of COVID-19 and the timing of our survey.

Figure 1: COVID-19 Infections and the Timing of Our Survey

Notes: This figure plots the number of new COVID-19 infections in Japan. The blue line (left y-axis) shows the weekly average of daily new infections from 2020 through May 2023. Following the reclassification of COVID-19 from Category II to Category V on May 8, 2023 (red vertical line), nationwide case counts were replaced by sentinel surveillance (Teiten Kansoku), under which designated medical institutions report new infections. The orange line (right y-axis) shows the weekly number of cases per sentinel site from May 2023 to December 2023. Grey shaded areas indicate periods with a state-of-emergency order in Tokyo, and the green shaded area marks the survey period (April 25–27, 2023). The data used for the calculations are obtained from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW (2023a), MHLW (2023b)) and the Japan Institute for Health Security (JIHS (2023)).

We analyze how the following three information treatments affect the public's perceptions of infection and fatality risks.[1] The first treatment is the recent actual total new infection cases and deaths—which we call "level" information. The second treatment is the recent actual probabilities of getting infected and actual case fatality rate (CFR)—which we call "percentage" information. The third treatment is a pessimistic narrative about infection outlook without mentioning any specific numbers—which we call "qualitative" information. We compare risk perceptions of these three treatment groups with those of a control group that received no information to quantify the causal effect of information provision on risk perceptions. We also examine whether there is a significant association between subjective risk perceptions and other attributes through multivariate logistic and multiple regression analysis.

We focus on these three types of information because they represent typical ways in which infection-related information was communicated to the public during the COVID-19 crisis. For example, the government frequently reported level information—such as the daily number of new infections, severe cases, or deaths (MHLW (2023b))—which was probably the most frequent type of information for the public. Some communications relied on percentage information such as case fatality rates (Asahi (2022b); Asahi (2022a)). Qualitative information was also common in Japan: public health experts often expressed concerns about waves of infection without referring to specific data (Mainichi (2022)). Notably, qualitative information tended to highlight the risks of COVID-19 and was mostly pessimistic rather than optimistic.

We emphasize the following three results. First, regardless of whether respondents are provided with information or not, they on average overestimate both infection and fatality risks. Across all groups, the median perception of infection risk is 4.05%, substantially higher than the actual infection risk of 0.35%.[2] Across all groups, the median perception of fatality risk is 0.55%, substantially higher than the actual CFR of 0.24%.[3]

Second, "percentage" and "qualitative" information led to lower and higher subjective risks, respectively, whereas "level" information did not alter risk perceptions in a

---

[1]In this study, fatality risk refers to the probability of dying if infected with COVID-19.

[2]To estimate the actual infection risk, we use the two COVID-19 infection series shown in Figure 1, based on data from MHLW (2023a), MHLW (2023b), and JIHS (2023). We regress the weekly average number of new infections (left y-axis) on the number of cases per sentinel site (right y-axis) using data from December 2022 to May 2023. The estimated coefficient is then applied to sentinel-site data to compute the weekly average number of new infections during May 8–May 24, 2023. These estimates are aggregated and combined with the number of newly confirmed cases from April 25–May 7, 2023 to obtain the total number of infections. This total is divided by the total population reported by the Statistics Bureau of Japan (MIAC (2023)) to obtain the actual infection risk.

[3]To compute the actual CFR, we used (i) daily data on the newly confirmed deaths published by MHLW (2023b) and (ii) data on the population of Japan published by MIAC (2023).

statistically significant way. The median infection and fatality risks among those with "percentage" information are 1.25% and 0.13%, lower than 4.42% and 0.68% in the control group. The median infection and fatality risks among those with "qualitative" information are 6.44% and 0.97%, higher than 4.42% and 0.68% in the control group. These patterns remain robust when we utilize multiple regression analyses that control for various individual characteristics.

Third, there was substantial heterogeneity in both risk perceptions and responses to information provision. Infection risk tends to be overestimated more by females, people with chronic diseases, previously infected people, people with acquaintances who died from COVID-19, and vaccinated people, but less by older people and college graduates. Fatality risk tends to be overestimated more by older people, those with chronic diseases, and those with acquaintances who died from COVID-19, but less by college graduates, married individuals, previously infected people, and the vaccinated. Responses to information provision also differ depending on individual characteristics: the effects of "percentage" and "qualitative" information on risk perceptions differ across age, gender, health status, COVID-19-related experiences, and vaccination status. Although level information has little effect on average, it affects certain groups—such as females, college graduates, and those with acquaintances who died from COVID-19—differently from their counterparts.

Our work contributes to the following three strands of the literature. First, it is related to the literature on the public's subjective assessments of COVID-19 risks. Many studies have identified factors associated with risk perceptions (Adachi et al., 2022; Cipolletta et al., 2022; Dryhurst et al., 2020; Dyer et al., 2022; Gollust et al., 2020; Huynh, 2020; Vai et al., 2020; Wise et al., 2020), while a few have compared perceived and actual risks (Chiba et al., 2024; Graso, 2022). Others have examined the relationship between COVID-19 subjective risk and prevention behaviors (Bundorf et al., 2025; Bruine De Bruin and Bennett, 2020; Garfin et al., 2021; Sato et al., 2022; Savadori and Lauriola, 2022). We differ from these studies because we conduct an information provision experiment to investigate its effect on COVID-19 subjective risk assessments, whereas they did not involve any experiments.

Within this first strand of literature, our paper contributes to the analysis of subjective assessments of COVID-19 risks in Japan. See, for example, Adachi et al. (2022), Murakami et al. (2026), Sasaki et al. (2022), Sato et al. (2022), Shiina et al. (2020), Shimamoto and Ibuka (2024), Takemura et al. (2022), Yamagata et al. (2025). None of these papers—except for Kato et al. (2022)—conduct an information provision experiment. All papers—except Murakami et al. (2026)—conduct their surveys in 2020 or 2021. Our paper is unique because

4

we conduct an information provision experiment about risk perceptions in 2023 near the official end of the pandemic as a public health emergency—right before the reclassification of COVID-19 from Category II to V by the government on May 8, 2023.

Second, our work is closely related to a few studies investigating how information provision affects COVID-19 risk perceptions and behaviors (Akesson et al., 2022; Abel et al., 2021; Sinclair et al., 2021). Our work differs from theirs in that, while they focused on statistical information about actual risk, we consider other types of information that were commonly communicated to the public during the COVID-19 pandemic and analyze how the treatment effect varies based on different representations of information.

Third, our work contributes to the broad literature from various fields examining how information provision affects risk assessments. Examples include Greenaway and Fielding (2020), Hall and Madsen (2022), Komatsu et al. (2022), Linciano et al. (2018), Oviedo-Trespalacios et al. (2019), Wang et al. (2012), among many others. These studies analyze perceptions of risk across a wide range of areas—from recycled water and disposable plastics to health diseases, traffic crashes, and financial products. We contribute to this literature by focusing on the assessment of COVID-19 infection and fatality risks, providing novel implications for risk communication in public health.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the survey and methodology. Section 3 presents the summary statistics and the main results of our analyses. Section 4 examines heterogeneity in responses to information provision. Section 5 provides some discussion of our results. Section 6 concludes.

2 Survey Design

We conducted a large-scale online survey of adults between ages 20 and 79 nationwide from April 25th to April 27th, 2023, in collaboration with Cross Marketing Inc. Our target sample size was approximately 10,000 individuals. To ensure the representativeness of our sample, the proportions of gender (Male, Female), age cohort (20s-30s, 40s-50s, ≥60s), and geographic residence (Prefectures) were stratified to match the demographic distribution reported in the 2020 Population Census.[4] Respondents received redeemable "points" as compensation for their participation. A total of 10,008 valid responses were collected. Detailed summary statistics regarding individual attributes are presented in Table 1.

---

[4]There might be concerns that online users of the marketing company may differ from the general population. However, matching our sample's age, gender, and residence distributions to those in the population census helps mitigate this potential selection bias.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

	No Info.	Level	Percentage	Qualitative	Total
Age					
20-59 years	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	6,756 (65.7%)
Over 60 years	858	858	858	858	3,432 (34.3%)
Gender					
Male	1,236	1,236	1,236	1,236	4,944 (49.4%)
Female	1,266	1,266	1,266	1,266	5,064 (50.6%)
Education Level					
Non-College Graduate	1,278	1,256	1,287	1,333	5,154 (51.5%)
College Graduate	1,224	1,246	1,215	1,169	4,854 (48.5%)
Marital Status					
Unmarried	1,025	1,064	1,069	1,040	4,198 (42.0%)
Married	1,477	1,438	1,433	1,462	5,810 (58.1%)
Vaccination					
Unvaccinated	319	356	371	323	1,369 (13.7%)
Vaccinated	2,183	2,146	2,131	2,179	8,639 (86.3%)
Chronic Diseases					
Yes	385	441	433	434	1,693 (16.9%)
No	2,117	2,061	2,069	2,068	8,315 (83.1%)
Infected with COVID-19					
Yes	502	511	527	526	2,066 (20.6%)
No	2,000	1,991	1,975	1,976	7,942 (79.4%)
Acq. Died from COVID-19					
Yes	178	165	157	164	664 (6.6%)
No	2,324	2,337	2,345	2,338	9,344 (93.4%)
N					10,008

Notes: This table reports summary statistics for respondents' individual attributes. Numbers denote counts, and percentages are in parentheses.

In the survey, we asked our respondents about their perceptions of COVID-19 infection or fatality risks and their individual characteristics. For infection or fatality risks, we asked our respondents about their subjective perceptions of those risks over the next month. Specifically, we asked the probability of being infected with COVID-19 over the next month and the probability of dying if infected with COVID-19. For both infection and fatality rates, we presented the following response options to choose from: (1) less than 0.001%, (2) 0.001%-0.01%, (3) 0.01%-0.1%, (4) 0.1%-1%, (5) 1%-5%, (6) 5%-10%, (7) 10%-20%, (8) 20%-50%, (9) 50% or higher.[5]

For individual characteristics, we collected respondents' information to examine the association with the subjective risks. From the survey company, we obtained respondents' registered data, such as age, gender, prefecture of residence, and marital status. We also asked about the following:

- Education level: elementary/junior high school, high school, associate's degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, or Ph.D.

- Medical history of chronic diseases: malignant neoplasms, cerebrovascular disease, respiratory system diseases, cardiovascular disease, gastrointestinal diseases, endocrine system diseases, kidney diseases, hematological diseases, or none

- Primary media source: television, newspaper, the Internet, SNS, radio, or others

- COVID-19-related experiences: vaccination status, number of past infections, and acquaintance death

When we provided information about COVID-19, we divided respondents into four groups (each consisting of 2,502 respondents). We did not provide one group with any information, which we call "a control group." We provided one group with information about recent dynamics of new infections in level ("level" information). We provided one group with information about the recent dynamics of new infections as a percentage of the total population in Japan ("percentage" information). We provided one group with qualitative information about a possible future path of new infection ("qualitative" information). The exact wording for these three types of information are as follows:

"Level" information

---

[5]We adopted the same response options in our previous work (Chiba et al., 2024) that examined COVID-19 risk perceptions without conducting information provision experiments.

"From mid-March 2023 to mid-April 2023 in Japan, the total number of newly confirmed cases is 226,007. From April 2022 to March 2023 in Japan, the total number of deaths is 45,727."

"Percentage" information

"From mid-March 2023 to mid-April 2023 in Japan, the actual infection rate is 0.18%. From April 2022 to March 2023 in Japan, the actual case fatality rate is 0.17%."

"Qualitative" information

"The number of new cases has been gradually increasing, and there is concern about the spread of infection after the holidays in May. On April 19, the expert group mentioned the possibility of a 9th wave, which would be larger than the 8th wave. Compared to the 6th and 7th waves (January-April 2022 and July-September 2022), the 8th wave (November 2022-February 2023) showed an increase in the case fatality rate."

We obtained the specific numbers in the level and percentage information from (i) the population in Japan published from the Statistics Bureau of Japan (MIAC (2023)) and (ii) daily data on the newly confirmed cases and deaths published from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW (2023b)).

In Table 2, we examine whether randomization in our samples successfully balances respondents' characteristics across groups using a balance test. The first four columns report the mean values of individual characteristics for each group, while the next three columns show the p-values from t-tests comparing each treatment group with the control group. In most cases, the p-values are above 0.1, suggesting that our sample is well balanced across groups.

Table 2: Balance test

	Mean values				P-values (t-test)		
	No Info.	Level	Percentage	Qualitative	Level	Percentage	Qualitative
Age	50.898	50.828	50.997	50.881	0.877	0.827	0.970
Female	0.506	0.506	0.506	0.506	1.000	1.000	1.000
College Graduate	0.489	0.498	0.486	0.467	0.534	0.799	0.120
Married	0.590	0.575	0.573	0.584	0.264	0.207	0.667
Chronic Diseases	0.154	0.176	0.173	0.173	0.033	0.067	0.061
Infected with COVID-19	0.201	0.204	0.211	0.210	0.752	0.382	0.401
Acq. Died from COVID-19	0.071	0.066	0.063	0.066	0.467	0.235	0.433
Vaccinated	0.873	0.858	0.852	0.871	0.126	0.033	0.866

Notes: This table presents the results of covariate balance tests. The first four columns report mean values of each covariate for the control group and the three treatment groups. The last three columns report p-values from two-sided t-tests comparing each treatment group to the control group. "Acq." denotes acquaintance.

3 Results

We first compare the mean, median, and the proportion of overestimation and underestimation in perceived risks between the control group and the three treatment groups. To compute the means, we converted respondents' Likert scale responses for infection and fatality risks into numerical values using the midpoint of each category. For example, respondents choosing "(1) less than 0.001%" were assigned a subjective risk of 0.0005%. While we use midpoints to compute means, we instead assume uniformity within bins to compute the medians, treating subjective probabilities as uniformly distributed within each response category. We define respondents with subjective risk higher than 5% as overestimation and lower than 0.01% as underestimation.

Figure 2 shows the results for infection risks. Panels (a) and (b) show, respectively, the median and mean values of infection risks, represented by the black dots. The vertical bar shows confidence intervals. The dashed red horizontal line represents the actual infection risk. Across all four groups, respondents tend to overestimate the actual infection risk: the median perceived infection risks are 4.42, 4.31, 1.25, and 6.44% for these four groups versus the actual infection risk of 0.35%.[6] A similar pattern is observed when comparing the mean values with the actual risk.[7]

Turning to the effect of information provision, "level" information does not alter the risk perception by much, while "percentage" and "qualitative" information decrease and increase the risk perception, respectively. The median and mean perceived infection risks are 1.25% and 8.24% with "percentage" information, much lower than 4.42% and 11.27% with no information provision. In contrast, the median and mean perceived infection risks are 6.44% and 14.25% with "qualitative" information, much higher than those with no information provision.

Panels (c) and (d) present the proportions of respondents who overestimated (i.e., perceived it as 5% or higher) and underestimated (i.e., perceived it as less than 0.01%) the COVID-19 infection risks. There are no significant differences in the proportions of overestimation or underestimation between the "no information" and "level" groups, with 46.8% and 46.4% (17.4% and 16.5%) of respondents overestimating (underestimating) the infection risk, respectively. The proportion of respondents who overestimated the infection risk is lowest in the "percentage" group (32.6%) and highest in the "qualitative"

---

[6]We estimate that the actual infection risk (April 25 – May 24, 2023) was 0.35%, and the actual CFR during the eighth wave of the COVID-19 pandemic (November 1, 2022 – February 28, 2023) was 0.24%.

[7]The values for the no-information group in Figures 2 and 3 are consistent with those in Chiba et al., 2024 which examined the COVID-19 related risk perceptions without conducting information provision experiments.

Figure 2: Perceived Infection Risks in the Control Group and Treatment Groups

(a) Median

(b) Mean

(c) Overestimation (Risk Over 5%)

(d) Underestimation (Risk Under 0.01%)

Notes: This figure presents the mean and median values of perceived infection risks (panels (a) and (b)), as well as the proportions of infection risk overestimation and underestimation (panels (c) and (d)) for the control and three treatment groups. In panels (a) and (b), the black dots represent the median and mean values of infection risks, respectively. The dashed red horizontal line represents the actual infection risk. In panels (c) and (d), the black dots represent the proportions of respondents who overestimated (i.e., perceived the risk as 5% or higher) and underestimated (i.e., perceived the risk as less than 0.01%) the COVID-19 infection risks. The vertical bar shows confidence intervals.

10

group (54.9%). In contrast, the proportion of respondents who underestimated the infection risk is highest in the "percentage" group (21.6%) and lowest in the "qualitative" group (14.1%). These results—a similar trend in overestimation (as observed in the mean and median comparisons) and the opposite trend in underestimation—support the earlier findings that "level" information has minimal impact on risk perception, whereas "percentage" information mitigates overestimation of infection risks and "qualitative" information exacerbates it.

Figure 3 presents the mean and median values of fatality risks (panels (a) and (b)), as well as the proportions of fatality risk overestimation and underestimation (panels (c) and (d)) for the control and three treatment groups. Panels (a) and (b) indicate that respondents in all four groups tend to overestimate the actual CFR of 0.24%. Providing "level" information has little effect on the perception of fatality risks, whereas "percentage" information reduces such risk perception, and "qualitative" information increases it. Specifically, the median (mean) perceived fatality risks are 0.68% (7.51%) with "no information", 0.50% (6.88%) with "level" information, 0.13% (5.62%) with "percentage" information, and 0.97% (8.69%) with "qualitative" information.

Panels (c) and (d) show the proportions of respondents who overestimated or underestimated the fatality risk. The proportion of fatality risk overestimation was lowest in the "percentage" group (19.1%) and highest in the "qualitative" group (32.6%), while the proportion of underestimation follows the opposite pattern. Overall, these results reinforce our findings that percentage information helps correct the overestimation of COVID-19 risks, while qualitative information tends to amplify them.

To quantify the effects of information provision in an alternative way, we now estimate the following equation:

$$y_i = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \beta_j D_{ji} + \mathbf{x}_i' \gamma + \epsilon_i \tag{1}$$

where the dependent variable (y_i) is the subjective infection or fatality risks, defined as the midpoints of each response category. The independent variables (D_{1i}, D_{2i}, D_{3i}) are dummy variables for "level", "percentage", and "qualitative" information group, respectively. The set of control variables ($\mathbf{x}_i$) include dummy variables for age, gender, education, marital status, chronic diseases, infection history (0 or ≥ 1), acquaintance death, and vaccination status. We also control for prefecture fixed effects and for the primary type of media respondents used to obtain information about COVID-19, considering that respondents were under different measures and situations of COVID-19 across prefectures and under different accuracy and accessibility to information across media. However, in all

Figure 3: Perceived Fatality Risks in the Control Group and Treatment Groups

(a) Median

(b) Mean

(c) Overestimation (Risk Over 5%)

(d) Underestimation (Risk Under 0.01%)

Notes: This figure presents the mean and median values of perceived fatality risks (panels (a) and (b)), as well as the proportions of fatality risk overestimation and underestimation (panels (c) and (d)) for the control and three treatment groups. In panels (a) and (b), the black dots represent the median and mean values of infection risks, respectively. The dashed red horizontal line represents the actual CFR. In panels (c) and (d), the black dots represent the proportions of respondents who overestimated (i.e., perceived the risk as 5% or higher) and underestimated (i.e., perceived the risk as less than 0.01%) the COVID-19 fatality risks. The vertical bar shows confidence intervals.

tables presenting regression results, the coefficients on media types and prefectures are omitted for simplicity.

Table 3 shows the results of this regression analysis. Two-sided p-values <0.05 were considered to indicate statistical significance. For each group dummy variable included in the regression, if the estimated coefficient is positive (negative), respondents in that group perceive the risk to be higher (or lower) than those in the benchmark group. The coefficient on "level" information is negative for fatality risk, though only weakly statistically significant, and the magnitude of the effect is small. Meanwhile, the coefficients on "percentage" and "qualitative" information are large and statistically significant in both infection risk and fatality risk regressions.

Overall, this evidence is consistent with the unconditional analyses in Figures 2 and 3. That is, "level" information does not alter the risk perception by much, while "percentage" and "qualitative" information substantially decrease and increase the risk perception, respectively.

Table 3 reveals heterogeneity in risk perception across various individual characteristics. For infection risk, older people and college graduates tend to overestimate the risk by less, while females, people with chronic diseases, people with COVID-19 infection experience, people who knew their close friends or relatives who died from COVID-19, and vaccinated people tend to overestimate the risk by more. For fatality risk, older people, people with chronic diseases, and people who knew their close friends or relatives who died from COVID-19 tend to overestimate the risk by more, while college graduates, married people, people with COVID-19 infection experience, and vaccinated people tend to overestimate the risk by less. The results regarding education, gender, and chronic diseases are consistent with Akesson et al. (2022). The results on those who knew someone who died from COVID-19 are consistent with Abel et al. (2021).

As a robustness check, we employ multivariate logistic regressions in which the dependent variables are dummy variables for risk overestimation or underestimation (subjective risk higher than 5% or subjective risk lower than 0.01%). We use the same set of independent and control variables as in our multiple regression analyses. As shown in Table 4, the logistic regression results indicate that our findings are robust to alternative model specifications.

4   Heterogeneous Responses to Information Provision

In the last part of the previous section, we discussed heterogeneity in the risk perception across respondents' demographic/socio-economic characteristics and their COVID-19 ex-

Table 3: Perceived Risks in the Control Group and Treatment Groups:
Multiple Regression Analysis

	(1) Infection Risk	(2) Fatality Risk
Info.: Level	0.026	−0.747*
	(0.486)	(0.441)
Info.: Percentage	−2.995***	−2.027***
	(0.467)	(0.431)
Info.: Qualitative	2.877***	1.002**
	(0.510)	(0.456)
Age Over 60 years	−4.648***	1.070***
	(0.386)	(0.366)
Female	1.101***	0.276
	(0.363)	(0.327)
College Graduate	−1.302***	−2.171***
	(0.363)	(0.325)
Married	−0.576	−1.555***
	(0.381)	(0.344)
Chronic Diseases	2.381***	6.238***
	(0.501)	(0.545)
Infected with COVID-19	1.397***	−2.174***
	(0.445)	(0.341)
Acq. Died from COVID-19	3.738***	2.432***
	(0.797)	(0.717)
Vaccination	1.611***	−1.698***
	(0.563)	(0.552)
Constant	10.866***	8.729***
	(1.072)	(0.974)
Observations	10,008	10,008
R-squared	0.046	0.051

Notes: This table reports regression results examining the average treatment effects of information provision. The dependent variable is subjective infection risk (column (1)) or subjective fatality risk (column (2)). The independent variables are dummy variables for information groups. Control variables include dummies for age, gender, education, marital status, chronic diseases, infection history (0 or $\geq$1), acquaintance death, and vaccination status. All regressions also include prefecture fixed effects and dummy variables for primary media type; however, coefficients for these variables are omitted for brevity. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01.

Table 4: Misperceptions of Risks in the Control Group and Treatment Groups:
Multivariate Logistic Regression - Odds Ratios

(a) Infection Risk

	(1) Risk Under 0.01%	(2) Risk Over 5%
Info.: Level	0.915	0.987
	(0.071)	(0.057)
Info.: Percentage	1.272***	0.544***
	(0.094)	(0.033)
Info.: Qualitative	0.761***	1.396***
	(0.061)	(0.081)
Age Over 60 years	1.488***	0.590***
	(0.093)	(0.029)
Female	0.809***	1.330***
	(0.046)	(0.058)
College Graduate	0.808***	0.988
	(0.046)	(0.043)
Married	1.026	0.943
	(0.060)	(0.042)
Chronic Diseases	0.760***	1.263***
	(0.059)	(0.072)
Infected with COVID-19	0.599***	1.335***
	(0.047)	(0.069)
Acq. Died from COVID-19	0.544***	1.532***
	(0.072)	(0.127)
Vaccination	0.372***	1.738***
	(0.026)	(0.113)
Constant	0.471***	0.509***
	(0.075)	(0.062)
Observations	10,008	10,008

Notes: This table reports the odds ratios from multivariate logistic regressions examining the average treatment effects of information provision on perceived infection risk. The dependent variables are dummy variables for infection risk overestimation or underestimation (subjective infection risk higher than 5% or subjective infection risk lower than 0.01%). The independent variables are dummy variables for information groups. Control variables include dummies for age, gender, education, marital status, chronic diseases, infection history (0 or $\geq$1), acquaintance death, and vaccination status. All regressions also include prefecture fixed effects and dummy variables for primary media type; however, coefficients for these variables are omitted for brevity. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

(b) Fatality Risk

	(1) Risk Under 0.01%	(2) Risk Over 5%
Info.: Level	1.002	0.825***
	(0.061)	(0.054)
Info.: Percentage	1.194***	0.606***
	(0.072)	(0.042)
Info.: Qualitative	0.717***	1.271***
	(0.045)	(0.080)
Age Over 60 years	0.832***	1.183***
	(0.043)	(0.063)
Female	0.866***	1.123**
	(0.039)	(0.055)
College Graduate	1.022	0.758***
	(0.047)	(0.038)
Married	1.214***	0.795***
	(0.057)	(0.040)
Chronic Diseases	0.597***	2.005***
	(0.038)	(0.120)
Infected with COVID-19	1.214***	0.663***
	(0.065)	(0.042)
Acq. Died from COVID-19	0.773***	1.447***
	(0.071)	(0.130)
Vaccination	0.608***	0.999
	(0.038)	(0.071)
Constant	0.792*	0.366***
	(0.100)	(0.050)
Observations	10,008	10,008

Notes: This table reports the odds ratios from multivariate logistic regressions examining the average treatment effects of information provision on perceived fatality risk. The dependent variables are dummy variables for fatality risk overestimation or underestimation (subjective fatality risk higher than 5% or subjective fatality risk lower than 0.01%). The independent variables are dummy variables for information groups. Control variables include dummies for age, gender, education, marital status, chronic diseases, infection history (0 or $\geq$1), acquaintance death, and vaccination status. All regressions also include prefecture fixed effects and dummy variables for primary media type; however, coefficients for these variables are omitted for brevity. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

periences. In this section, we examine heterogeneity in the response of risk perception to information provision across these individual characteristics. For that purpose, we estimate the following equation:

$$y_i = \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \beta_j D_{ji} + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \eta_j D_{ji} \times H_i + \delta H_i + \mathbf{x}_i' \gamma + \epsilon_i \tag{2}$$

For this analysis, we added to our baseline regressions in (1) (presented in Table 3) the interaction terms between the information group dummy variables and each characteristic of interest (H_i)—age, gender, education, marital status, health condition, COVID-19-related experiences, and vaccination status. Panels (a) and (b) of Table 5 present the estimation results for infection risk and fatality risk, respectively. For brevity, the coefficients for the control variables are omitted from the panels.

Starting with panel (a), the coefficients on "level" information are statistically insignificant, whereas those on "percentage" ("qualitative") information are negative (positive) and statistically significant across almost all model specifications. These results reaffirm the average effects of information provision observed in Figure 2 and Table 3. That is, "level" information does not significantly affect the perceptions of infection risk, while "percentage" and "qualitative" information lead to lower and higher infection risk perceptions, respectively.

The next row reports the coefficients on "H," which capture the heterogeneity in risk perception across individual characteristics. Older people and college graduates are less likely to overestimate the infection risk, while females, people with chronic diseases, and people with acquaintances who died from COVID-19 are more likely to overestimate the risk. These results are consistent with the empirical evidence reported in Table 3.

Table 5: Heterogeneous Effects of Information Provision

(a) Infection Risk

	(1) Age H=Old	(2) Gender H=Female	(3) Education H=College Graduate	(4) Marital Status H=Married	(5) Health H=Chronic Diseases	(6) Infection H=Infected	(7) Acq. Death H= Acq. Died	(8) Vaccination H=Vaccinated
Info.: Level	0.464	1.069	−0.923	−0.09	−0.008	0.023	0.423	−0.265
	(0.635)	(0.681)	(0.71)	(0.785)	(0.523)	(0.549)	(0.495)	(1.551)
Info.: Percentage	−2.599***	−1.793***	−2.891***	−2.706***	−2.799***	−3.294***	−2.641***	−2.381
	(0.621)	(0.653)	(0.698)	(0.776)	(0.507)	(0.52)	(0.473)	(1.506)
Info.: Qualitative	3.614***	2.741***	3.226***	2.280***	2.790***	2.103***	3.133***	−0.994
	(0.661)	(0.699)	(0.756)	(0.825)	(0.553)	(0.565)	(0.519)	(1.49)
H	−3.497***	2.144***	−1.539**	−0.754	2.504**	0.055	7.286***	0.657
	(0.714)	(0.697)	(0.704)	(0.727)	(1.008)	(0.86)	(1.803)	(1.219)
H*Info: Level	−1.278	−2.059**	1.904**	0.199	0.174	0.045	−5.740**	0.324
	(0.960)	(0.970)	(0.971)	(0.999)	(1.377)	(1.163)	(2.269)	(1.630)
H*Info: Percentage	−1.155	−2.370**	−0.217	−0.511	−1.145	1.485	−5.161**	−0.745
	(0.901)	(0.928)	(0.929)	(0.962)	(1.299)	(1.175)	(2.279)	(1.579)
H*Info: Qualitative	−2.152**	0.272	−0.758	1.018	0.489	3.740***	−3.615	4.444***
	(1.020)	(1.020)	(1.015)	(1.049)	(1.445)	(1.303)	(2.433)	(1.583)
Constant	10.510***	10.337***	11.000***	10.954***	10.857***	11.129***	10.549***	11.672***
	(1.098)	(1.111)	(1.111)	(1.150)	(1.081)	(1.080)	(1.075)	(1.451)
Observations	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008
R-squared	0.046	0.047	0.046	0.046	0.047	0.047	0.047	0.046

Notes: This table reports regression results examining heterogeneous effects of information provision on infection risk. Each column separately examines heterogeneity with respect to an individual characteristic, **H**, which is a dummy variable equal to one for people with the characteristic listed at the top of each column and zero otherwise (e.g., **H** equals one for older people in column (1), females in column (2), and so on). In all specifications, the dependent variable is subjective infection risk. The independent variables are **H**, the treatment group dummy, and their interaction term. All specifications control for individual characteristics, prefecture fixed effects, and primary media type dummies. However, coefficients for these variables are omitted from the table for brevity. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

(b) Fatality Risk

	(1) Age H=Old	(2) Gender H=Female	(3) Education H=College Graduate	(4) Marital Status H=Married	(5) Health H=Chronic Diseases	(6) Infection H=Infected	(7) Acq. Death H= Acq. Died	(8) Vaccination H=Vaccinated
Info: Level	−0.839*	−0.143	−1.338**	−0.730	−0.667	−0.840	−0.472	−1.937
	(0.495)	(0.623)	(0.678)	(0.709)	(0.434)	(0.517)	(0.449)	(1.532)
Info: Percentage	−1.133**	−1.347**	−2.295***	−1.693**	−1.514***	−2.463***	−1.769***	−3.171**
	(0.511)	(0.604)	(0.665)	(0.715)	(0.431)	(0.499)	(0.438)	(1.501)
Info: Qualitative	1.520***	0.611	1.239*	0.667	0.924**	0.739	1.215***	−1.413
	(0.535)	(0.626)	(0.696)	(0.740)	(0.459)	(0.530)	(0.465)	(1.534)
H	2.036***	0.717	−2.476***	−1.546**	7.074***	−3.158***	5.058***	−3.066**
	(0.715)	(0.640)	(0.644)	(0.665)	(1.154)	(0.687)	(1.581)	(1.231)
H*Info: Level	0.266	−1.192	1.188	−0.028	−0.567	0.475	−3.971*	1.365
	(0.992)	(0.879)	(0.878)	(0.899)	(1.564)	(0.912)	(2.083)	(1.596)
H*Info: Percentage	−2.612***	−1.339	0.548	−0.584	−3.052**	2.114**	−3.746*	1.309
	(0.934)	(0.855)	(0.853)	(0.888)	(1.499)	(0.938)	(2.017)	(1.563)
H*Info: Qualitative	−1.509	0.776	−0.522	0.573	0.359	1.296	−3.029	2.772*
	(0.999)	(0.914)	(0.907)	(0.939)	(1.588)	(1.004)	(2.144)	(1.605)
Constant	8.415***	8.497***	8.887***	8.712***	8.631***	8.933***	8.495***	9.912***
	(0.980)	(1.012)	(1.031)	(1.020)	(0.970)	(0.992)	(0.972)	(1.368)
Observations	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008	10,008
R-squared	0.052	0.051	0.051	0.051	0.052	0.051	0.051	0.051

Notes: This table reports regression results examining heterogeneous effects of information provision on fatality risk. Each column separately examines heterogeneity with respect to an individual characteristic, **H**, which is a dummy variable equal to one for people with the characteristic listed at the top of each column and zero otherwise (e.g., **H** equals one for older people in column (1), females in column (2), and so on). In all specifications, the dependent variable is subjective fatality risk. The independent variables are **H**, the treatment group dummy, and their interaction term. All specifications control for individual characteristics, prefecture fixed effects, and primary media type dummies. However, coefficients for these variables are omitted from the table for brevity. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Looking at the interaction terms, the results suggest that individual characteristics play a role in shaping how people respond to information provision. "Percentage" information reduces the perception of infection risks more for females and people with acquaintances who died from COVID-19 than for their counterparts. "Qualitative" information increases risk perception more for people under 60, vaccinated people, and those who have contracted COVID-19. For "level" information, although it generally does not alter infection risk perception, females, college graduates, and people with acquaintances who died from COVID-19 tend to respond differently to this type of information compared to their counterparts.

Turning to panel (b) on fatality risk, we find results consistent with those in Figure 3 and Table 3. In particular, "percentage" information reduces perceived fatality risk, whereas "qualitative" information increases it. There is also heterogeneity in fatality risk perceptions across individual characteristics—older people, those with chronic diseases, and those with acquaintances who died from COVID-19 are more likely to overestimate the fatality risk, while college graduates, married people, people infected with COVID-19, and vaccinated people are less likely to overestimate it.

The interaction terms show that "percentage" information reduces fatality risk perception more for older people, those with chronic diseases, those who have not contracted COVID-19, and those with acquaintances who died from COVID-19 than for their counterparts. Meanwhile, "qualitative" information increases risk perception more for vaccinated people. Unlike infection risk, "percentage" information does not reduce fatality risk perception more for females, nor does "qualitative" information increase it more for younger people or previously infected people. Moreover, while "level" information affects fatality risk perception differently between those who with acquaintances who died from COVID-19 and their counterparts, it also affects infection risk perception differently between females, college graduates, and their counterparts.

Taken together, the empirical evidence suggests that individual characteristics play an important role in shaping how people respond to information provision. The results remain robust when we examine the heterogeneous effects through subsample comparisons of the median infection and fatality risks (not shown for the sake of brevity).

5 Discussion

In this study, we conducted an information provision experiment to examine how different types of information affect the perceptions of COVID-19 risks. We first compared perceived risks with actual risks and found that the majority of respondents overestimated

infection and fatality risks. We found that "percentage" information and "qualitative" information tend to reduce and increase perceived risks, respectively, while "level" information shows little effect. These results indicate that different types of information can affect risk perceptions in opposite directions, suggesting that the government should carefully consider how information is presented when communicating risks to the public.

More specifically, level information and pessimistic qualitative information were common ways of risk communication through the pandemic. Our results suggest that they are less effective than percentage information at correcting risk overestimation. Level information—such as the daily number of new infections, severe cases, or deaths—can appear large even when the actual risk is low, thus limiting its ability to correct misperceptions of risks. Qualitative information—such as pessimistic warnings of the government or experts about new waves of infection or serious situations—can increase pessimism and further raise the perceived risks. In contrast, percentage information makes it easier for people to evaluate the magnitude of the threat relative to the total population, helping align perceptions more closely with actual risks. Taken together, our results suggest that the government may want to adopt risk communication that relies more on % information than the other two types.

We found that there was heterogeneity in risk perceptions across individual characteristics. For example, our results suggest that unvaccinated people, older people, and people without chronic diseases tend to perceive lower subjective infection risks than their counterparts. Because vaccination status could be closely related to preventive behaviors, it seems natural that unvaccinated people are likely to underestimate COVID-19 infection risk. Meanwhile, age and health status may affect risk perceptions through normalcy bias—a cognitive tendency to underestimate the likelihood or potential impact of a threat. For instance, older people may perceive their infection risk as lower based on past experiences with infectious disease outbreaks in which they were not infected, while healthy individuals may believe they are less likely to be infected because of confidence in their own health.

There is also substantial heterogeneity in responses to information provision across individual characteristics. For example, "percentage" information reduces infection risk perceptions more for females and people with acquaintances who died from COVID-19, while "qualitative" information increases risk perceptions more for younger people, vaccinated people, and those who have contracted COVID-19. This result suggests that people with different backgrounds, experiences, and beliefs may interpret the same information differently. The government may consider adopting group-specific risk communication to correct risk misperceptions more effectively.

Let us conclude our discussion by pointing out the two possible limitations of our study. First, because we rely on an internet survey, our sample may not be representative. In particular, 6.6% of our respondents had acquaintances who died from COVID-19. By the time of our survey, the number of cumulative deaths was about 75,000, less than 0.1% of the total population in Japan. Thus, our sample is likely to overrepresent those who emotionally suffered from the COVID-19 pandemic. If these respondents respond more strongly to information provision than an average citizen—which the seventh column of panel (a) in Table 5 indicates is true—our average treatment effects may overstate effects for the general population.

Second, we did not conduct a follow-up survey to investigate how persistent the effects of information provision on risk perceptions are. In thinking about government communication policy, it is useful to know how persistently information provision affects the public's risk perceptions. We leave such an investigation to future research.

6   Conclusion

We conducted an experiment in April 2023 in Japan to investigate how different types of information affect people's subjective assessment of COVID-19 infection and fatality risks. We find that, regardless of whether respondents are provided with information or not, the majority of respondents overestimate both infection and fatality risks. We also find that "percentage" and "qualitative" information lowers and raises subjective risks, respectively, whereas "level" information does not significantly alter risk perceptions. Finally, we found that there was substantial heterogeneity in both risk perceptions and responses to information provision across individual characteristics, namely, age, gender, education, marital status, health status, COVID-19-related experiences, and vaccination status. We hope that our results are useful for policymakers in refining their risk communication strategies in future pandemics.

References

Abel, M., T. Byker, and J. Carpenter (2021). Socially optimal mistakes? Debiasing COVID-19 mortality risk perceptions and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 183*, 456–480.

Adachi, M., M. Murakami, D. Yoneoka, T. Kawashima, M. Hashizume, H. Sakamoto, A. Eguchi, C. Ghaznavi, S. Gilmour, S. Kaneko, H. Kunishima, K. Maruyama-Sakurai,

Y. Tanoue, Y. Yamamoto, H. Miyata, and S. Nomura (2022). Factors associated with the risk perception of COVID-19 infection and severe illness: A cross-sectional study in Japan. *SSM - Population Health 18*, 101105.

Akesson, J., S. Ashworth-Hayes, R. Hahn, R. Metcalfe, and I. Rasooly (2022). Fatalism, beliefs, and behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty 64*(2), 147–190.

Asahi (2022a). Death rate from COVID-19 drops among seniors, ministry says. https://www.asahi.com/ajw/articles/14799310.

Asahi (2022b). Pandemic death toll in Osaka Prefecture defies easy explanation. https://www.asahi.com/ajw/articles/14565341.

Bruine De Bruin, W. and D. Bennett (2020). Relationships between initial COVID-19 risk perceptions and protective health behaviors: A national survey. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine 59*(2), 157–167.

Bundorf, M. K., J. DeMatteis, G. Miller, M. Polyakova, J. L. Streeter, and J. Wivagg (2025). Risk perceptions and private protective behaviors: Evidence from COVID-19 pandemic. *Review of Economics and Statistics 107*(3), 728–740.

Chiba, A., T. Nakata, T. L. Nguyen, and R. Takaku (2024). COVID-19 risk perceptions in Japan: A cross-sectional study. *Scientific Reports 14*(1), 16862.

Cipolletta, S., G. Andreghetti, and G. Mioni (2022). Risk perception towards COVID-19: A systematic review and qualitative synthesis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 19*(8), 4649.

Dryhurst, S., C. R. Schneider, J. Kerr, A. L. J. Freeman, G. Recchia, A. M. Van Der Bles, D. Spiegelhalter, and S. Van Der Linden (2020). Risk perceptions of COVID-19 around the world. *Journal of Risk Research 23*(7-8), 994–1006.

Dyer, M. L., H. M. Sallis, J. N. Khouja, S. Dryhurst, and M. R. Munafò (2022). Associations between COVID-19 risk perceptions and mental health, wellbeing, and risk behaviours. *Journal of Risk Research 25*(11-12), 1372–1394.

Garfin, D. R., B. Fischhoff, E. A. Holman, and R. C. Silver (2021). Risk perceptions and health behaviors as COVID-19 emerged in the United States: Results from a probability-based nationally representative sample. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied 27*(4), 584–598.

Gollust, S. E., R. I. Vogel, A. Rothman, M. Yzer, E. F. Fowler, and R. H. Nagler (2020). Americans' perceptions of disparities in COVID-19 mortality: Results from a nationally-representative survey. *Preventive Medicine 141*, 106278.

Graso, M. (2022). The new normal: COVID-19 risk perceptions and support for continuing restrictions past vaccinations. *PLOS ONE 17*(4), e0266602.

Greenaway, T. and K. S. Fielding (2020). Positive affective framing of information reduces risk perceptions and increases acceptance of recycled water. *Environmental Communication 14*(3), 391–402.

Hall, J. D. and J. M. Madsen (2022). Can behavioral interventions be too salient? Evidence from traffic safety messages. *Science 376*(6591), eabm3427.

Huynh, T. (2020). The COVID-19 risk perception: A survey on socioeconomics and media attention. *Economics Bulletin 40*(1), 758–764.

JIHS (2023). Infectious diseases weekly report surveillance data table 2023. https://id-info.jihs.go.jp/en/surveillance/idwr/rapid/2023/index.html.

Kato, G., S. Annaka, and M. Endo (2022). Public reactions toward government-sponsored COVID-19 information in Japan. Working Paper Series E22002, Waseda Institute of Political Economy, Waseda University.

Komatsu, H., H. Kubota, N. Tanaka, M. Griffin, J. Link, G. Geher, and M. L. Fisher (2022). Cross-cultural comparison of nudging effects for environmental protection: A case-study of risk-averse attitudes toward disposable plastics. *PLOS ONE 17*(11), e0277183.

Linciano, N., C. Lucarelli, M. Gentile, and P. Soccorso (2018). How financial information disclosure affects risk perception. Evidence from Italian investors' behaviour. *The European Journal of Finance 24*(15), 1311–1332.

Mainichi (2022). Experts warn of 8th COVID wave as infections spread in Japan's chilly regions. https://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20221105/p2a/00m/0na/007000c.

MHLW (2023a). Regarding the outbreak of COVID-19. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/001126858.pdf.

MHLW (2023b). Visualizing the data: Information on COVID-19 infections. https://covid19.mhlw.go.jp/en/.

MIAC (2023). Population Estimates. https://www.stat.go.jp/data/jinsui/.

Murakami, M., M. Yamagata, and A. Miura (2026). The impact of COVID-19 infection experience on risk perception and preventive behaviour: A cohort study. *Epidemiology & Infection 154*, e4.

Oviedo-Trespalacios, O., V. Truelove, B. Watson, and J. A. Hinton (2019). The impact of road advertising signs on driver behaviour and implications for road safety: A critical systematic review. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 122*, 85–98.

Sasaki, R., A. Ota, H. Yatsuya, and T. Tabuchi (2022). Gender difference in fear and anxiety about and perceived susceptibility to COVID-19 in the third wave of pandemic among the Japanese general population: A nationwide web-based cross-sectional survey. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 19*(23), 16239.

Sato, M., S. Kinoshita, and T. Ida (2022). Subjective risk valuation and behavioral change: Evidence from COVID-19 in the U.K. and Japan. Technical Report e-22-011, Graduate School of Economics, Kyoto University.

Savadori, L. and M. Lauriola (2022). Risk perceptions and COVID-19 protective behaviors: A two-wave longitudinal study of epidemic and post-epidemic periods. *Social Science & Medicine 301*, 114949.

Shiina, A., T. Niitsu, O. Kobori, K. Idemoto, T. Hashimoto, T. Sasaki, Y. Igarashi, E. Shimizu, M. Nakazato, K. Hashimoto, M. Iyo, T. Yamamoto, and N. Ozaki (2020). Relationship between perception and anxiety about COVID-19 infection and risk behaviors for spreading infection: A national survey in Japan. *Brain, Behavior, & Immunity - Health 6*, 100101.

Shimamoto, K. and Y. Ibuka (2024). Socioeconomic disparities in risk perceptions and precautionary actions against COVID-19 among the working age population aged 18–59 in Japan: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ Public Health 2*(1), e000181.

Sinclair, A. H., S. Hakimi, M. L. Stanley, R. A. Adcock, and G. R. Samanez-Larkin (2021). Pairing facts with imagined consequences improves pandemic-related risk perception. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118*(32), e2100970118.

Takemura, S., Y. Sato, K. Kondo, and N. Kondo (2022). Characteristics associated with optimistic or pessimistic perception about the probability of contracting COVID-19: A cross-sectional study of Japanese older adults. *SSM - Population Health 19*, 101186.

Vai, B., S. Cazzetta, D. Ghiglino, L. Parenti, G. Saibene, M. Toti, C. Verga, A. Wykowska, and F. Benedetti (2020). Risk perception and media in shaping protective behaviors:

Insights from the early phase of COVID-19 Italian outbreak. *Frontiers in Psychology 11*, 563426.

Wang, C., A. Sen, M. T. Ruffin, D. E. Nease, R. Gramling, L. S. Acheson, S. M. O'Neill, and W. S. Rubinstein (2012). Family history assessment. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine 43*(4), 392–398.

Wise, T., T. D. Zbozinek, G. Michelini, C. C. Hagan, and D. Mobbs (2020). Changes in risk perception and self-reported protective behaviour during the first week of the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. *Royal Society Open Science 7*(9), 200742.

Yamagata, M., M. Murakami, and A. Miura (2025). Effects of political treatments during the COVID-19 pandemic on infection-prevention behavior and risk perception: A panel data analysis of Japan. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 117*, 105201.