

1 **Association between the physical work environment and work functioning impairment while**
2 **working from home under the COVID-19 pandemic in Japanese workers**

3

4 Makoto Okawara¹, M.D., Tomohiro Ishimaru¹, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., Seiichiro Tateishi², M.D., Ph.D.,

5 Ayako Hino³, M.D., M.B.A., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji⁴, M.D., Ph.D., Kazunori Ikegami⁵, M.D., Ph.D.,

6 Masako Nagata⁶, M.D., Ph.D., Shinya Matsuda⁷, M.D., Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino^{1*}, M.D., M.P.H.,

7 Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork project

8

9 1 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University
10 of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

11 2 Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
12 Environmental Health, Japan

13 3 Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational
14 and Environmental Health, Japan

15 4 Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
16 Environmental Health, Japan

17 5 Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
18 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

19 6 Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial Ecological

20 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

21 7 Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine, University of

22 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

23

24 *Corresponding author

25 Yoshihisa Fujino, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.

26 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of

27 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

28 1-1, Iseigaoka, Yahatanishiku, Kitakyushu, 807-8555, Japan

29 Tel: +81-93-691-7401

30 E-mail: zenq@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

31

32 **Abstract**

33 **Objective:** This study examined the relationship between the physical work environment and work
34 functioning impairment while working from home in the context of rapid changes associated with the
35 COVID-19 pandemic.

36 **Methods:** This cross-sectional study of internet monitors was conducted between December 22 and
37 26, 2020. Of a total of 33,302 participants, 5,760 who worked from home at least 1 day a month,
38 excluding those who met the exclusion criteria, were included in the analysis. A binary subjective
39 assessment of the physical work environment while working from home was used as an exposure
40 factor. We examined 9 items related to the physical work environment, including level of illuminance
41 and use of suitable desks and chairs, traditionally recommended for health and safety management
42 when working at a desk. The number of non-conformities to 7 items was also used as an exposure
43 factor. The presence of severe work functioning impairment was measured using the Work Functioning
44 impairment Scale (WFun), a self-reported outcome measure of the degree of work functioning
45 impairment. Odds ratios of severe work functioning impairment were estimated using mixed-effects
46 logistic regression analysis with the prefecture of residence as a random effect.

47 **Results:** Multivariate analysis showed that the odds ratio of severe work functioning impairment was
48 significantly higher among those who indicated “No” to all recommended items except for “I work at
49 a desk/chair for office use.” The highest odds ratio of work functioning impairment was associated

50 with a “No” response to “There is enough light to do my work” (aOR: 2.02, 95%CI: 1.73–2.35,
51 $p<0.01$). Our results also suggest the presence of a dose-response relationship between the number of
52 non-conformities to recommendations for work environments while working from home and work
53 functioning impairment.

54 **Conclusions:** Our findings suggest that it is important for both companies and individual workers to
55 create a work environment that prevents negative health outcomes and improves productivity while
56 working from home.

57 **Keywords: Environment and Public Health, workplace, Posture, presenteeism, Work**
58 **Performance, COVID-19**

59

60 **Introduction**

61 The expansion of telecommuting brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic is one of the
62 most marked changes to the way people work around the world in decades. In February 2020, the
63 Japanese government issued a basic policy describing countermeasures against COVID-19, in which
64 it included a recommendation for companies to implement telework to prevent the spread of infection
65 (1). Furthermore, as the disease continued to spread throughout Japan, the government declared a state
66 of emergency in April 2020, requesting people to refrain from going out, and further promoting
67 telework (2). As a result, the number of companies adopting telecommuting and the percentage of
68 workers working from home have increased rapidly (3). Further, even after the state of emergency
69 ended, more and more companies continued to employ coronavirus countermeasures, mixing going to
70 work and working from home, based on the situation in each region (4).

71 Due to the unexpected emergence of COVID-19, neither companies nor workers were able
72 to sufficiently prepare their home environments for conducting work. While work-from-home systems
73 had been discussed as a way to counter overwork and promote work-life balance in Japan, few
74 effective efforts had been made (5). However, with the COVID-19 pandemic, companies were forced
75 to rapidly adopt telework at the request of the national and local governments. As a result, many
76 workers have had to work from home in environments that are not fully equipped with the necessary
77 systems or facilities, and that are suboptimal for work execution. In 2019, about 20% of companies in

78 Japan had adopted telework. In contrast, in March 2020, 24% of companies in Tokyo had adopted
79 telework, jumping to about 57% in January 2021 (4,6).

80 Working from home is expected to have an impact on workers' health and work productivity.
81 Working in environments that are not properly designed and working with poor posture can affect the
82 musculoskeletal system (7,8,9). In addition, there are concerns that individuals are working longer due
83 to insufficient management of working hours. Further, reduced opportunities for direct communication
84 can make it difficult for individuals to receive support from superiors and colleagues, and for managers
85 to manage the situation. These factors have been linked to feelings of loneliness, isolation, and
86 depressed mood (10,11,12).

87 Workers' physical work environment while working from home is important for their health
88 and work productivity. There are several basic recommendations for the working-from-home
89 environment: have enough space to work; control the illumination of text, keyboard surfaces, and
90 displays; prevent glare from displays; provide windows and other ventilation equipment; maintain a
91 constant temperature and humidity in the room; reduce noise; and prepare necessary equipment,
92 including desks and chairs, to enable a good work posture and provide an effective workspace
93 (13,14,15).

94 However, because working from home has rapidly become the new way of working in Japan during
95 the COVID-19 pandemic, it is not known how the physical work environment while working from

96 home affects worker's health and productivity. In fact, many companies have no control over workers'
97 work environment while they are working from home. A previous survey reported that, of the 1,256
98 companies in Japan that had introduced telework, 75.8% indicated that they did not check any
99 components of workers' physical work environment, such as air conditioning, lighting, and desk and
100 chair condition, while they were working from home (16). Working from home in an environment that
101 is not properly maintained can cause work functioning impairment through worker's health problems.

102 The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the physical work
103 environment while working from home and work functioning impairment in the context of rapid
104 changes associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

105

106 **Methods**

107 This cross-sectional study was conducted using data from the baseline survey of the
108 Collaborative Online Research on the Novel-coronavirus and Work (CORoNaWork) Project, a
109 prospective cohort study that used a questionnaire survey of Internet monitors to investigate the health
110 of workers during the COVID-19 pandemic (17). This study was conducted with the approval of the
111 Ethics Committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (Approval No.
112 R2-079).

113 The survey was conducted between December 22 and 26, 2020. A total of 33,302 workers
114 between the ages of 20 and 65 years at the time of the survey were included, and sampling was
115 designed such that participants' sex and occupation (office workers and non-office workers) were
116 balanced by region of residence, based on the cumulative infection rate of COVID-19. Excluding those
117 who were deemed to have provided inappropriate responses, the total number of participants in this
118 study was 27,036. Details of the exclusion criteria are described in the protocol (17). Briefly, we
119 excluded those who had extremely short response times, were shorter than 140 cm tall, weighed less
120 than 30 kg, or provided inconsistent responses to multiple identical questions. In this study, workers
121 who were working from home at least 1 day a month were included in the analysis.

122

123 Assessment of physical work environment while working from home

124 A binary subjective assessment of the physical work environment while working from home
125 was used as an exposure factor. The following nine items were examined: “There is a place/room
126 where I can concentrate,” “There is enough light to do my work,” “There is enough space on my desk
127 to work,” “There is enough space at my feet,” “The temperature and humidity in the room are
128 comfortable,” “The environment is quiet,” “I work at a desk/chair for office use,” “I work at a
129 desk/chair not for office use,” “I work at a coffee table or kotatsu.” We included the final item “I work
130 at a coffee table or kotatsu” because sitting on the floor at a low table such as a coffee table or kotatsu
131 (a low table equipped with a heater) to eat or do light work is a common way of life in Japan.

132 Additionally, we examined the number of non-conformities to seven of the nine
133 recommended items for work environments; we excluded “I work at a desk/chair for office use” and
134 combined responses to the items “I work at a desk/chair not for office use” and “I work at a
135 table/kotatsu.” Thus, non-conformity was indicated by “No” responses to the following items: “There
136 is a place/room where I can concentrate,” “There is enough light to do my work,” “There is enough
137 space on my desk to work,” “There is enough space at my feet,” “The temperature and humidity in the
138 room are comfortable,” “The environment is quiet,” and “I work at a desk/chair not for office use” or
139 “I work at a coffee table or kotatsu.” The number of non-conformities was stratified into five categories
140 (0 items, 1-2 items, 3-4 items, 5-6 items, and 7 items) and used as an exposure factor.

141 Assessment of work functioning impairment and other covariates

142 The presence or absence of severe work functioning impairment was measured using the
143 Work Functioning impairment Scale (WFun) and used as the primary outcome. WFun is a self-reported
144 outcome measure of the degree of work functioning impairment developed based on the Rasch model
145 and validated according to Consensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement
146 Instruments (COSMIN) (18). Subjects provide responses to a total of seven items, including “I haven’t
147 been able to behave socially” and “I have felt that my work isn’t going well,” on a five-point scale,
148 and the total score indicates the degree of work functioning impairment. The total score ranges from
149 7 to 35, and a score of 21 or higher is defined as severe work functioning impairment based on the
150 results of interviews with occupational health nurses in a previous study (19). While the original WFun
151 contains seven items, we used a six-item version, from which the scores can be equivalently converted
152 to those of the original version based on the Rasch model.

153 For socioeconomic factors, we examined the following items: sex, age, education (junior
154 high school; high school; vocational school, junior college, or technical college; university or graduate
155 school), marital status (married; divorced/bereaved; never married), job type (mainly desk work; Jobs
156 mainly involving interpersonal communication; mainly physical work), equivalent income (household
157 income divided by the square root of household size), company size (total number of employees in the
158 company where the respondent mainly works [self-employed answered one]).

159 For work-related factors, we examined the following items: frequency of working from

160 home (at least 4 days a week; at least 2 days a week; at least 1 day a week; at least 1 day a month;
161 hardly ever), change in working hours compared to pre-2019 (increased; no change; decreased), one-
162 way commute time.

163 As the community-level factor, we used the cumulative incidence of COVID-19 infection
164 in the prefecture of residence one month before the survey. Data were collected from the websites of
165 public institutions.

166

167 Statistical analysis

168 Age and WFun scores are presented as continuous variables using median and interquartile
169 range (IQR). Other variables are presented as categorical variables using percentages. We conducted
170 mixed-effects logistic regression analysis using the presence or absence of severe work functioning
171 impairment as the dependent variable and subjective evaluation of the physical work environment or
172 the number of non-conformities to the recommendations for work environments while working at
173 home as independent variables, with the prefecture of residence as the random effect. To adjust for
174 potential confounders, we used sex, age, education, job type, equivalent income, company size,
175 frequency of working from home, change in working hours compared with pre-2019, one-way
176 commute time, and cumulative infection rate by prefecture as covariates.

177 All statistical analyses were conducted using Stata (Stata Statistical Software: Release 14.2;

178 StataCorp LLC, TX, USA). A p -value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

179

180 **Results**

181 Of a total of 33,302 responses, 6,266 cases were excluded: 215 cases were judged to have
182 provided fraudulent responses by the company in charge of conducting the survey, and 6,051 cases
183 met the exclusion criteria after tabulation. Of the remaining 27,036 cases, respondents who met the
184 inclusion criteria (those worked from home at least 1 day a month) were selected, providing 5,760
185 cases for analysis. A flowchart showing the inclusion and exclusion of participants is shown in Figure
186 1.

187 [Insert Figure 1. here]

188 The demographic and sociological characteristics of the analyzed population are shown in
189 Table 1. A total 3,361 (58%) were male and the median age was 50 years (IQR: 42–57). Of the total
190 population, 4,052 (70%) were desk workers and 2,790 (48%) telecommuted four or more days per
191 week. The overall median WFun score was 12 (IQR: 7–20) and severe work functioning impairment
192 ($WFun \geq 21$) was observed in 1,309 workers (23%). There were no missing data because the survey
193 was designed such that all responses were mandatory.

194 [Insert Table 1. here]

195 The associations of severe work functioning impairment with workers' physical work
196 environment while working from home are shown in Table 2. There was no significant association of
197 severe work functioning impairment with the item "I work at a desk/chair for office use" (adjusted

198 odds ratio [OR]: 0.93, 95% CI: 0.82–1.06, $p=0.27$). For all other items, the OR of severe work
199 functioning impairment was significantly higher among those who worked from home in an
200 unfavorable work environment. The highest OR of work functioning impairment was for a “No”
201 response to “There is enough light to do my work” (aOR: 2.02, 95%CI: 1.73–2.35, $p<0.01$). The results
202 of Model 1, which was adjusted only for sex and age, and Model 2, which was adjusted for other
203 potential confounders, were in a similar direction.

204 [Insert Table 2. here]

205 Table 3 shows the relationship between severe work functioning impairment and the number
206 of non-conformities (out of seven) to recommendations for work environments. From the nine items
207 in Table 2, we excluded “I work at a desk/chair for office use” and combined responses to the items “I
208 work at a desk/chair not for office use” and “I work at a table/kotatsu.” When we used those who
209 indicated no non-conformities to recommendations for work environments as the reference group, the
210 OR of severe work functioning impairment was significantly higher for any non-conformity to the
211 seven items examined. Moreover, an increase in the number of non-conformities was correlated with
212 an increase in the OR of severe work functioning impairment, with non-conformities to all seven items
213 associated with the highest risk (aOR: 4.51, 95% CI: 2.86–7.11, $p<0.01$). The results of Model 1,
214 which was adjusted only for sex and age, and Model 2, which was adjusted for other potential
215 confounders, were in a similar direction.

216 [Insert Table 3. here]

217

218 **Discussion**

219 To our knowledge, this is the first study to identify an association between the physical work
220 environment while working from home and work functioning impairment. We found that non-
221 conformity to any of the recommendations for work environments examined in this study, except for
222 “I work at a desk/chair for office use,” was associated with work functioning impairment. Additionally,
223 there was a dose-response relationship between the number of non-conformities to recommendations
224 for work environments and risk of work functioning impairment.

225 We found that non-conformity to any of the recommendations for work environments while
226 working from home examined in this study, except for “I work at a desk/chair for office use,” was
227 associated with work functioning impairment. The work environment items examined in this study are
228 traditionally recommended for health and safety management when working at a desk (13,14,15).
229 These included items related to the quality of the surrounds, such as temperature, humidity, and
230 quietness of the workplace; those linked to back pain, stiff shoulders, and musculoskeletal strain; and
231 those for concentration and performance. Comfortable temperature and humidity are expected to
232 improve workers’ concentration and performance. In addition, items related to work posture, such as
233 the choice of a desk and chair suitable for work and space on the desk and at the feet, are thought to
234 reduce musculoskeletal strain during work. In addition, managing proper work posture, temperature,
235 humidity, and illumination will help prevent visual display terminals syndrome. Setting up these

236 environments is expected to help prevent or reduce health problems and reduce work functioning
237 impairment while working from home.

238 Furthermore, our findings suggest that there is a dose-response relationship between the
239 number of non-conformities to recommendations for work environments while working from home
240 and work functioning impairment. In other words, no one specific item among the seven items
241 examined in this study had a positive impact on productivity; rather, adapting as much of the work
242 environment as possible to recommendations for work environments while working from home had
243 an increasingly positive impact on productivity. Interestingly, only 20% of workers indicated that they
244 conformed to all seven items examined in this study, suggesting the difficulty of creating an optimal
245 work environment while working from home. For example, purchasing and installing new desks and
246 chairs suitable for working from home can be a financial burden and a housing space problem. Further,
247 adequate management of room temperature and humidity is linked to issues such as insulation of the
248 dwelling and the purchase and electricity costs of air conditioning. Based on the results of a previous
249 survey and our present findings, we can infer that the methods and systems for checking and improving
250 the working environment while work from home are still lacking and that they are not being managed
251 within companies (16). To increase productivity when working from home, both companies and
252 workers need to account for each of these individual items when creating a work environment to ensure
253 that as many items conform to the recommendations as possible.

254 There is currently no consistent evidence on the impact of working from home on the health
255 and productivity of workers, as it varies depending on the worker's situation (20). While working from
256 home has its advantages, including improved work-life balance and reduced burden of commuting, it
257 also has disadvantages, including the psychological burden of a lack of separation between living and
258 working spaces and time, and the lack of communication with colleagues. Furthermore, as shown in
259 this study, the impact of various aspects of the physical work environment while working from home
260 can be significant. In fact, the number of conformities to recommendations for work environments
261 examined in this study varied among workers. Therefore, to understand the impact of working from
262 home on the health and productivity of workers, it is necessary to continue to study differences in the
263 physical work environment among individuals conducting work from home.

264 Working from home has been suggested to be associated with sickness presenteeism, a
265 condition in which individuals work while experiencing health problems. For example, the use of
266 properly designed desks and chairs can affect the health of workers with musculoskeletal disorders
267 and chronic pain, important problems that cause sickness presenteeism (21,22). Further, a study has
268 suggested that removing barriers to work, such as commuting and going to the office, is also associated
269 with the occurrence of sickness presenteeism (23). Improving workers' work environment while
270 working from home is important for reducing the negative health outcomes associated with working
271 from home, improving presenteeism, and increasing productivity. Many companies and workers who

272 have never had experience working from home are now suddenly being forced to do so, without
273 appropriate preparation. As the need to telework continues, the associated risks to health and
274 presenteeism may become more apparent, indicating the need for urgent measures to improve the work
275 environment for those working from home.

276 This study has several limitations. First, selection bias was unavoidable because the study
277 was a survey of Internet monitors. To reduce potential bias, recruitment was conducted by sampling
278 by occupation and gender in each region according to the infection rate. To understand the
279 characteristics of the participants in this study, we compared our findings with those from national and
280 occupational surveys that use various batteries (17). A previous study that used WFun to examine
281 33,985 workers from a general company showed that 20% had severe work functioning impairment
282 (24). Given that our study protocol found that 21% of the entire study population has severe work
283 functioning impairment (17), we concluded that our present study population was relatively unbiased.

284 Second, we relied on respondents' self-assessment of their physical environment while
285 working from home, but did not examine the actual physical environments. Therefore, there may be
286 discrepancies with objective evaluation. However, because we inquired about the physical
287 environment, the possibility of erroneous answers is low.

288 Third, since this study was a cross-sectional study, it is impossible to determine the causal
289 relationship between the exposure factors and outcome. However, we think it is unlikely that

290 individuals with severe work functioning impairment would choose to create a poor working
291 environment. For example, a person with back pain is unlikely to actively choose a small space or an
292 ill-fitting desk environment. Therefore, there is little possibility of reverse causality.

293 Finally, in addition to the exposure factors examined in this study, there may be other
294 environmental factors that can affect health and productivity while working from home. Some
295 examples are living with a family member who needs care, inadequate telecommunication speed, and
296 reduced physical activity.

297 In conclusion, individuals who work in poor work environments while working from home
298 may exhibit work functioning impairment during a period of rapid change owing to the COVID-19
299 pandemic. As work environments become more diverse, it is important for both companies and
300 individual workers to create a work environment that prevents negative health outcomes and improves
301 productivity while working from home.

302

303

304 **References**


- 305 1. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic Policies for Novel
306 Coronavirus Disease Control. February 25, 2020. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from:
307 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10200000/000603610.pdf>
- 308 2. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic Policies for Novel
309 Coronavirus Disease Control (Revised on April 7,2020). April 7, 2020. [cited January 18, 2021].
310 Available from: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10900000/000620733.pdf>
- 311 3. Tokyo Metropolitan Government. [Results of an emergency survey on telework adoption rates].
312 May 11, 2020. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from:
313 <https://www.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/tosei/hodohappyo/press/2020/05/12/10.html>
- 314 4. Tokyo Metropolitan Government. [Results of a survey on telework adoption rates]. January 22,
315 2021. [cited February 23, 2021]. Available from:
316 <https://www.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/tosei/hodohappyo/press/2021/01/22/17.html>
- 317 5.Decisions by the Council for the Realization of Work Style Reform. Action Plan for the Realization
318 of Work Style Reform. March 28, 2017. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from:
319 <https://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/headline/pdf/20170328/07.pdf>
- 320 6. Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications. [FY2019 Survey Report on Telecommunications
321 Usage Trends (Corporate)]. August 17, 2020. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from:

- 322 https://www.soumu.go.jp/johotsusintokei/statistics/pdf/HR201900_002.pdf
- 323 7. Skov T, Borg V, Orhede E. Psychosocial and physical risk factors for musculoskeletal disorders of
324 the neck, shoulders, and lower back in salespeople. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 1996;
325 53:351-356.
- 326 8. Sang K, Gyi D, Haslam C. Musculoskeletal symptoms in pharmaceutical sales representatives.
327 *Occupational Medicine*. 2010; 60:108-114.
- 328 9. Celik S, Celik K, Dirimese E, Taşdemir N, Arik T, Büyükkara İ. Determination of pain in
329 musculoskeletal system reported by office workers and the pain risk factors. *Int J Occup Med Environ*
330 *Health*. 2018; 31:91-111.
- 331 10. Mann S, Holdsworth L. The psychological impact of teleworking: stress, emotions and health.
332 *New Technology, Work and Employment*. 2003; 18:196-211.
- 333 11. Montreuil S, Lippel K. Telework and occupational health: a Quebec empirical study and regulatory
334 implications. *Safety Science*. 2003; 41:339-358.
- 335 12. Cohen S, Janicki-Deverts D, Miller GE. Psychological stress and disease. *JAMA - Journal of the*
336 *American Medical Association*. 2007; 298:1685-1687.
- 337 13. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. [Guidelines for the Appropriate Introduction and
338 Implementation of Work Outside the Workplace Using Information and Communication Technology].
339 February 22, 2018. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from:

- 340 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000545678.pdf>
- 341 14. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. [The Occupational Health Guidelines on Information
342 Device Work at Office]. July 12, 2019. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from:
343 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000539604.pdf>
- 344 15. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. [Ordinance on Health Standards in the Office]. September
345 30, 1972. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from: [https://www.jniosh.johas.go.jp/icpro/jicosh-](https://www.jniosh.johas.go.jp/icpro/jicosh-old/japanese/country/japan/laws/03_rel/12_office_reg/index.html)
346 [old/japanese/country/japan/laws/03_rel/12_office_reg/index.html](https://www.jniosh.johas.go.jp/icpro/jicosh-old/japanese/country/japan/laws/03_rel/12_office_reg/index.html)
- 347 16. Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting Co., Ltd. [FY2020 Comprehensive Fact-Finding
348 Research Project on Labor Management for Teleworkers as a Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare
349 commissioned project: Fact-finding Survey on Labor Management of Teleworkers (Preliminary
350 version)]. December 16, 2020. [cited January 18, 2021]. Available from:
351 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/11911500/000694957.pdf>
- 352 17. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, Tsuji M, Seichiro T, Ogami A, et al. Protocol for a nationwide
353 Internet-based health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv*.
354 2021:2021.2002.2002.21249309.
- 355 18. Fujino Y, Uehara M, Izumi H, Nagata T, Muramatsu K, Kubo T, et al. Development and validity
356 of a work functioning impairment scale based on the Rasch model among Japanese workers. *J Occup*
357 *Health*. 2015; 57:521–31.

- 358 19. Nagata T, Fujino Y, Saito K, Uehara M, Oyama I, Izumi H, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of the Work
359 Functioning Impairment Scale (WFun): A Method to Detect Workers Who Have Health Problems
360 Affecting their Work and to Evaluate Fitness for Work. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2017; 59:557–562.
- 361 20. Oakman, J., Kinsman, N., Stuckey, R. et al. A rapid review of mental and physical health effects
362 of working at home: how do we optimise health?. *BMC Public Health.* 2020; 20:1825.
- 363 21. Loeppke R, Taitel M, Haufle V, Parry T, Kessler RC, Jinnett K. Health and Productivity as a
364 Business Strategy. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2009; 51:411–428.
- 365 22. Nagata T, Mori K, Ohtani M, Nagata M, Kajiki S, Fujino Y, et al. Total Health-Related Costs Due
366 to Absenteeism, Presenteeism, and Medical and Pharmaceutical Expenses in Japanese Employers. *J*
367 *Occup Environ Med.* 2018; 60:e273–e280.
- 368 23. Steidelmüller, Corinna PhD; Meyer, Sophie-Charlotte PhD; Müller, Grit PhD Home-Based
369 Telework and Presenteeism Across Europe. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine.*
370 2020; 62:998-1005.
- 371 24. Okawara M, Nagata T, Nagata M, Otani M, Mori K, et al. (2020) Association between the course
372 of hypnotics treatment for insomnia and work functioning impairment in Japanese workers. *PLOS*
373 *ONE.* 2020; 15: e0243635.

Figure 1. Flow chart of participants in the study



*Respondents who had extremely short response times, were shorter than 140 cm tall, weighed less than 30 kg, or provided inconsistent responses to multiple identical questions.

**Respondents who answered "hardly ever" to the question inquiring about the frequency of working from home

*** Respondents who work from home at least 1 day a month

Table 1. Participants' demographic and sociological characteristics

	Total	
	n	% or median(IQR)
Sex, male	3361	58%
Age, years, median (IQR)		50 (42-57)
20-29	270	5%
30-39	862	15%
40-49	1567	27%
50-59	2129	37%
≥60	932	16%
Education		
Junior high school	50	1%
High school	943	16%
Vocational school, junior college, or technical college	1132	20%
University or graduate school	3635	63%
Marital status		
Married	3280	57%
Divorced or bereaved	504	9%
Never married	1976	34%
Equivalent income (Japanese Yen)		
550000-2500000	1310	23%
2500000-4250000	1465	25%
4250000-5500000	1514	26%
>5500000	1471	26%
Job type		
Mainly desk work	4052	70%
Jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication	1219	21%
Mainly physical work	489	8%
Number of employees		
1	1518	26%
2-49	1200	21%
50-999	1304	23%
1000-9999	1076	19%
≥10000	662	11%
Frequency of working from home		
At least 1 day a month	615	11%
At least 1 day a week	878	15%
At least 2 days a week	1477	26%
At least 4 days a week	2790	48%
Time spent on one-way commute		
More than 2 hours	166	3%
1-2 hours	1041	18%
30 minutes to 1 hour	1392	24%
Less than 30 minutes	1109	19%
Very little	2052	36%
Change in working hours compared to pre-2019		
Increased	817	14%
No change	4049	70%
Decreased	894	16%
WFun total score, median (IQR)		12 (7-20)
WFun≥21	1309	23%

Table 2. Association between workers' physical work environment while working from home and severe work functioning impairment

Variable	n=5760		WFun score		WFun \geq 21		Model 1			Model 2				
	n	%	Median	IQR	n	%	OR	95%CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95%CI	<i>p</i>		
There is a place/room where I can concentrate														
No	1367	24%	14	7-22	426	31%	1.71	1.49	1.96	<0.01	1.65	1.43	1.91	<0.01
Yes	4393	76%	11	7-18	883	20%	ref							
There is enough light to do my work														
No	1019	18%	15	7-22	358	35%	2.13	1.84	2.47	<0.01	2.02	1.73	2.35	<0.01
Yes	4741	82%	11	7-18	951	20%	ref							
There is enough space on my desk to work														
No	1661	29%	14	7-21	506	30%	1.79	1.57	2.04	<0.01	1.69	1.47	1.93	<0.01
Yes	4099	71%	11	7-18	803	20%	ref							
There is enough space at my feet														
No	1244	22%	15	7-22	425	34%	2.09	1.82	2.40	<0.01	1.98	1.71	2.28	<0.01
Yes	4516	78%	11	7-18	884	20%	ref							
The temperature and humidity in the room are comfortable														
No	1388	24%	15	7-22	467	34%	2.06	1.80	2.36	<0.01	1.90	1.65	2.18	<0.01
Yes	4372	76%	11	7-18	842	19%	ref							
The environment is quiet														
No	1246	22%	14	7-22	408	33%	1.87	1.62	2.15	<0.01	1.76	1.52	2.03	<0.01
Yes	4514	78%	11	7-18	901	20%	ref							
I work at a desk/chair for office use														
No	2906	50%	12	7-20	693	24%	ref							
Yes	2854	50%	11	7-19	616	22%	0.91	0.80	1.03	0.15	0.93	0.82	1.06	0.27
I work at a desk/chair not for office use														
No	3231	56%	12	7-19	689	21%	ref							
Yes	2529	44%	12	7-20	620	25%	1.15	1.01	1.30	0.03	1.16	1.02	1.32	0.02
I work at a coffee table or kotatsu														
No	4092	71%	11	7-19	837	20%	ref							
Yes	1668	29%	13	7-21	472	28%	1.45	1.27	1.66	<0.01	1.39	1.21	1.59	<0.01

Model 1: adjusted for sex, age

Model 2: adjusted for sex, age, education, marital status, job type, equivalent income, company size, frequency of working from home, change in working hours compared to pre-2019, commute time, and cumulative infection rate by prefecture

Table 3. Association between the number of nonconformities to recommendations for work environments while working from home and severe work functioning impairment

Variable	n=5760		WFun score		WFun ≥21		Model 1			Model 2			
	n	%	Median	IQR	n	%	OR	95%CI	<i>p</i>	OR	95%CI	<i>p</i>	
Number of nonconformities to recommendations for work environments													
0	1177	20%	8	7-14	159	14%	ref				ref		
1-2	2808	49%	11	7-18	562	20%	1.50	1.24 1.82	<0.01	1.44	1.18 1.75	<0.01	
3-4	1084	19%	14	7-21	312	29%	2.38	1.91 2.95	<0.01	2.18	1.75 2.72	<0.01	
5-6	598	10%	16	7-23	232	39%	3.79	2.98 4.80	<0.01	3.46	2.71 4.42	<0.01	
7	93	2%	20	11-27	44	47%	5.31	3.40 8.28	<0.01	4.51	2.86 7.11	<0.01	

Model 1: adjusted for sex, age

Model 2: adjusted for sex, age, education, marital status, job type, equivalent income, company size, frequency of working from home, change in working hours compared to pre-2019, commute time, and cumulative infection rate by prefecture