

1 Original Article

2 Effect of commuting on the risk of COVID-19 and COVID-19-induced anxiety

3

4 Hajime Ando^{1*}, M.D., M.O.H., Ph.D., Kazunori Ikegami¹, M.D., Ph.D., Tomohisa Nagata², M.D., Ph.D., Seiichiro

5 Tateishi³, M.D., Ph.D., Hisashi Eguchi⁴, M.D., M.B.A., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji⁵, M.D., Ph.D., Shinya Matsuda⁶,

6 M.D., Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino⁷, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., Akira Ogami¹, M.D., Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork Project

7

8 ¹Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational

9 and Environmental Health, Japan

10 ²Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,

11 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

12 ³Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and Environmental

13 Health, Japan.

14 ⁴Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and

15 Environmental Health, Japan.

16 ⁵Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and Environmental Health,

17 Japan.

18 ⁶Department of Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

19 ⁷Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of

20 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

21

22

23 *Corresponding Author: Hajime Ando, M.D., M.O.H., Ph.D.

24 1-1, Iseigaoka, Yahatanishi-ku, Kitakyushu, Fukuoka 807-8555, Japan;

25 Phone Number: +81-93-603-1611; Fax Number: +81-93-601-2667

26 E-mail: h-ando@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

27

28 Abstract

29 *Background:* To prevent the spread of coronavirus disease (COVID-19), it is important to avoid 3Cs (closed spaces,
30 crowded places, and close-contact settings). However, the risk of contact with an unspecified number of people is
31 inevitable while commuting to and from work. In this study, we investigated the relationship between commuting,
32 and the risk of COVID-19 and COVID-19-induced anxiety.

33 *Methods:* An internet-based questionnaire survey was conducted to obtain a dataset from 27036 respondents.
34 One-way commuting time was evaluated using a five-case method. The commuting distance was estimated using
35 zip codes of the home and workplace. Logistic regression analysis was performed with the following outcomes:
36 COVID-19 risk, close contact, infection anxiety, and infection anxiety due to commuting. Commuting distance
37 and commuting time were analyzed separately in the model. We excluded participants with incalculable
38 commuting distance, commuting distance exceeding 300 km, commuting distance of 0 km, or who telecommuted
39 at least once a week.

40 *Results:* The total number of participants included in the analysis was 14038. The adjusted odds ratios (aORs) of
41 using public transportation for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection were 4.17 (95%
42 confidence interval [CI]: 2.51-6.93) (commuting time) and 5.18 (95% CI: 3.06-8.78) (commuting distance). The
43 aOR of COVID-19 diagnosis decreased significantly with increasing commuting distance. The aORs of using
44 public transportation to infection anxiety were 1.44 (95% CI: 1.31-1.59) (commuting time) and 1.45 (95% CI:
45 1.32-1.60) (commuting distance). The longer the commuting time, the more the aOR increased..

46 *Conclusions:* COVID-19 risk, close contact, and infection anxiety were all associated with the use of public
47 transportation during commuting. Both commuting distance and time were associated with infection anxiety due to
48 commuting, and the strength of the association increased with increase in commuting time distance. Since
49 transportation by commuting is associated with COVID-19 risk and anxiety, we recommend the use of
50 telecommuting and other means of work.

51

52

53 **Keywords:** COVID-19. Commute, public transportation, commuting distance, commuting time

54 Background

55 Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), caused by the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2
56 (SARS-CoV-2), was first discovered in Wuhan, China in December 2019 [1]. In Japan, COVID-19 has had a
57 considerable social impact, starting from the infection transmission in the Diamond Princess ship; moreover, in
58 April 2020, the Japanese government declared a state of emergency in some prefectures, which later became
59 nationwide. The state of emergency required a 70% reduction in the amount of human contact, which accelerated
60 the adoption of telework initiatives by companies. According to a survey by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government,
61 the telework adoption rate rose from 24% in March 2020 to 62.7% in April 2020 [2]. Notwithstanding,
62 approximately 40% of companies continued to work at the office. Although there are regional differences in the
63 means of commuting, in urban areas such as the Tokyo metropolitan area, people mainly use public transportation
64 such as trains. To prevent COVID-19, it is important to avoid 3Cs (closed spaces, crowded places, and
65 close-contact settings). However, the 3Cs are not easy to avoid in public transportation. A report examining the risk
66 of SARS-CoV-2 infection in high-speed trains conducted on patients with COVID-19 and their close contacts in
67 China found that the closer the seats and longer the contact time, the greater the risk of COVID-19 transmission
68 [3]. Although there are no reports on the relationship between commuting and SARS-CoV-2 infection, commuter
69 trains are generally shorter than high-speed trains, with a considerable number of passengers, which can
70 potentially predispose to COVID-19 transmission. In particular, trains are often extremely crowded during
71 commuting hours in Japan, with the number of passengers sometimes reaching twice the train capacity [4].
72 Although no clusters have been reportedly caused by commuting using public transportation, it is difficult to

73 strictly perform contact tracing on public transportation, which is used daily by an unspecified number of people.

74 In addition to the direct risk of COVID-19 transmission, commuting may cause anxiety among users due to the
75 lack of adequate infection control measures. Many studies have reported mental health problems caused by
76 COVID-19 [5-8]. In a survey conducted in Japan, Sasaki et al. found that the fear of infection and anxiety tended to
77 increase with stronger corporate infection prevention measures, whereas psychological distress and work
78 performance tended to decrease with stronger corporate infection prevention measures [9]. Commuting is an
79 essential part of working; however, companies face severe limitations in implementing infection prevention
80 measures during commuting. Although it is possible to grant special permission for workers to commute using
81 private cars, which is not normally permitted, or to shift commuting times, the risk of infection during the
82 commuting process is expected to remain somewhat high.

83 We aimed to clarify the relationship between commuting and the risk of COVID-19 and anxiety about infection,
84 using a large-scale internet-based cross-sectional survey.

85

86 Methods

87 *Participants*

88 The survey was conducted among workers aged between 20 and 65 years. Participants were recruited through
89 an online survey, and we included 33087 individuals who met the sampling criteria for age, sex, region, and
90 occupation. We excluded 6051 participants with errors in their data, and a dataset of 27036 participants was used.
91 Details of the survey protocol are reported separately [10]. Of the 27036 participants, we excluded 5145

92 participants who telecommuted for more than 1 day per week. We also excluded participants whose commuting
93 distance could not be calculated, which will be discussed later.

94

95 *Questionnaire*

96 The questionnaire items used in this study are described in detail by Fujino et al. [10]. We used questionnaire
97 data on sex, age, educational background, job type, telecommuting frequency, the use of public transportation for
98 commuting, one-way commuting time, home zip code, and workplace zip code.

99

100 *Calculation of commuting distance*

101 We used HeartRails Geo API (HeartRails Inc. Sagamihara, Kanagawa, Japan) [11] to obtain the longitude and
102 latitude of the representative points corresponding to the postal code in the questionnaire. Regarding home
103 addresses, there were three participants for whom API(Application Programming Interface) could not be used to
104 obtain the longitude and latitude of the area where a new postal code was added in 2020; consequently, the
105 longitude and latitude were obtained using the postal code that existed prior to the designation of a new postal code.
106 Addresses that were not regular postal codes, such as postal codes for offices alone, or those that were entered with
107 fictitious numbers, which caused errors in the API, were excluded. The longitude and latitude of the workplace
108 could not be obtained for 3705 participants. The commuting distance was calculated by determining the
109 straight-line distance using the longitude and latitude of the home and workplace. The commuting distance was
110 calculated for 23331 (86.3%) of the 27036 participants.

111 In addition, 61 participants whose commuting distances were greater than 300 km were excluded because they
112 were unreliable. We also excluded 7069 participants with a commuting distance of 0 km.

113

114 *Variables*

115 Outcome variable

116 The outcome was the response to four questions in the questionnaire from "Q38. The following questions are
117 related to novel coronavirus infections: to " Q38.1 Have you had COVID-19? (Y/N)," " Q38.2 Have you come in
118 close contact with a person infected with COVID-19? (Y/N)," " Q38.5 Do you feel anxious about being infected
119 with COVID-19? (Y/N)," and " Q38.7 Do you feel anxious about getting infected when you commute to work?
120 (Y/N)."

121

122 Predictor variable

123 Based on approximate quartiles, the commuting distances were divided into four groups: 3 km or less, 6 km or
124 less, 15 km or less, and longer.

125 The commuting time was classified into five categories: more than 2 h, more than 1 h, more than 30 min, less
126 than 30 min, and almost never. As for the use of public transportation for commuting, we used the answer to the
127 question "Q38.8 Do you use public transportation to go to work? (Y/N)."

128

129 *Potential confounders*

130 The following items, surveyed using a questionnaire, were used as confounding factors. Sex, age (20-29, 30-39,
131 40-49, 50-59, and ≥ 60 years), and education level (junior or senior high school, junior college or vocational school,
132 and university or graduate school) were considered as personal factors. Occupation (regular employees, managers,
133 executives, public service workers, temporary workers, freelancers, or professionals) were considered as
134 work-related factors.

135

136 *Statistical analyses*

137 Logistic regression analysis was used for statistical analysis. For each of the above objective variables, we
138 calculated the odds ratios for commuting time and public transportation use; moreover, commuting distance and
139 public transportation use were considered as explanatory variables, with and without correction for confounding
140 factors. In addition, the p-values of logistic regression analysis were calculated by considering each category scale
141 of commuting distance and commuting time as continuous variables (p for trend). The analysis was conducted
142 using STATA/SE version 15 (StataCorp LLC). The significance level was set at $p < 0.05$.

143

144 **Results**

145 Participant baseline characteristics are shown in Table 1. The total number of participants in the final analysis
146 was 14038. In this study, 64 (0.5%) participants had COVID-19, 136 (1.0%) were close contacts, 10627 (75.7%)
147 were anxious about infection, and 4302 (30.6%) were anxious about infection during commuting. Public

148 transportation was used for commuting by 3676 participants (26.2%).

149

150 Insert Table 1 here

151

152 Results of the logistic regression analysis of the relationship between COVID-19 risk, close contact as an

153 outcome, and commuting time are shown in Table 2. Multiple regression analysis showed that the adjusted odds

154 ratio (aOR) of using public transportation was 4.17 (95% confidence interval [CI]: 2.51-6.93) in the analysis with

155 COVID-19 risk as the outcome, and the trend in commuting time was not significant ($p=0.131$). In the analysis

156 with close contact as the outcome, the aOR of using public transportation was 1.99 (95% CI: 1.40-2.82) and the

157 trend in commuting time was significant ($p=0.048$, aOR=1.13, 95% CI: 1.00-1.28).

158

159 Insert Table 2 here

160

161 The results of the logistic regression analysis of the relationship between COVID-19 risk, close contact as the

162 outcome, and commuting distance are shown in Table 3. In the analysis with COVID-19 risk as the outcome, the

163 aOR of using public transportation was 5.18 (95% CI: 3.06-8.78), and the trend was significant ($p=0.003$,

164 aOR=0.70, 95% CI: 0.55-0.88). In the analysis with close contact as the outcome, the aOR for using public

165 transportation use was 2.15 (95% CI: 1.49-3.10), and the trend for commuting time was not significant ($p=0.109$).

166

167 Insert Table 3 here

168

169 Results of the logistic regression analysis of the relationship between infection anxiety about COVID-19 and
170 commuting time, with infection anxiety about commuting as the outcome are shown in Table 4. In the analysis of
171 infection anxiety as the outcome, the aOR of using public transportation was 1.44 (95% CI: 1.31-1.59), and the
172 trend in commuting time was significant ($p=0.004$, aOR=1.04, 95% CI: 1.01-1.07). In the analysis of infection
173 anxiety related to commuting as an outcome, the aOR of using public transportation was 15.80 (95% CI:
174 14.39-17.35) and the trend in commuting time was significant ($p=0.003$, aOR=1.05, 95% CI: 1.02-1.09).

175

176 Insert Table 4 here

177

178 Results of the logistic regression analysis of the relationship between infection anxiety about COVID-19 and
179 commuting distance, with infection anxiety about commuting as the outcome are shown in Table 5. In the analysis
180 with infection anxiety as the outcome, the aOR of using public transportation was 1.45 (95% CI: 1.32-1.60), and
181 the trend in commuting distance was not significant ($p=0.744$). In the analysis of infection anxiety related to
182 commuting as an outcome, the aOR for using public transportation was 15.17 (95% CI: 13.78-16.70) and the trend
183 in commuting distance was significant ($p=0.004$, aOR=1.06, 95% CI: 1.020-1.11).

184

185 Insert Table 5 here

186

187 Discussion

188 This study examined the impact of commuting on COVID-19 risk and infection anxiety using an online survey.
189 We analyzed the relationship between the number of persons with COVID-19 and the use of public transportation
190 in commuting, commuting time, and commuting distance. The use of public transportation in commuting has been
191 reported to be associated with COVID-19 risk. Trains and buses are the most common forms of public
192 transportation used for commuting. According to the 2010 census, 24.8% of commuters use the train, and 7.4% use
193 the bus to get to work or school [12]. Furuya et al. reported a mathematical model simulation of influenza virus
194 infection in trains [13]. They showed that the median of the estimated probability distribution of reproduction
195 number (RA) increased linearly with increasing exposure time in the train; when the number of people in the train
196 car was 150, the RA was less than 1 at an exposure time of less than 30 min. The capacity of a typical rail car in
197 Japan is approximately 150 people; however, according to the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and
198 Tourism (MLIT), the average congestion rate during commuting hours in the Tokyo metropolitan area is 163%,
199 and 11 of the 31 major sections have congestion rates exceeding 180% [4, 14]. The number of passengers was high
200 compared to that in the previous simulation.. In Tokyo, approximately 2.9 million people typically commute by
201 train from surrounding cities [15].

202 Regarding infection in bus vehicles, which is another major form of public transportation, mathematical
203 simulations for influenza viruses were reported by Zhu et al.[16]. They found that the infection rate was higher
204 when there were infected people on the air supply and exhaust routes, and that the infection rate was higher in areas

205 with mixed ventilation. According to a report by the MLIT, the ventilation capacity of major buses in Japan is
206 approximately 5 min with the windows closed for sightseeing buses, and approximately 3 min for route buses [17].
207 While several cluster infections have been reported in sightseeing buses, there are no reports of clusters in route
208 buses. This may be due to factors such as the difficulty in tracing the use of route buses and limited duration of the
209 ride.

210 We analyzed the relationship between COVID-19 risk, commuting time, and commuting distance. The
211 commuting time did not show a significant trend in COVID-19 risk. There was a significant association between
212 commuting distance and fewer COVID-19 risk with increasing distance. This suggests that the use of public
213 transportation has a greater effect on COVID-19 risk than commuting time. Although the generation of droplets is
214 limited because most passengers wear masks and there is little conversation on the train during commuting, it is
215 assumed that there is a risk of infection. Moreover, it is assumed that the longer the commuting distance, the more
216 contact opportunities there are, and the higher the likelihood of SARS-CoV-2 infection; nonetheless, the opposite
217 was true. One reason for this might be that the method of transportation changes as the commuting distance
218 increases, even if it is by the same train. Trains used could be regular, limited express, or bullet trains. In general,
219 the type of train used depends on the distance. During commuting hours, limited express and bullet trains are less
220 likely to be full, unlike regular trains; hence, it is thought that the latter has more opportunities for human contact.

221 There was a significant trend in commuting time and the use of public transportation for close contacts.
222 However, there was no significant trend in commuting distance. In Japan, the criterion for close contact is 15 min
223 or more of contact within 1 m without wearing a mask. Since contact time is an important factor in the above

224 criterion, we thought that the relationship of close contact with commuting time may have been stronger than that
225 with commuting distance.

226 Two types of infection anxiety were analyzed: general infection anxiety and commuting-related infection
227 anxiety. In terms of general infection anxiety, the use of public transportation was significantly associated with
228 increased anxiety with regards to both commuting time and commuting distance. There was no significant trend
229 for commuting distance, although there was a significant trend for commuting time, and the relationship between
230 commuting time and general infection anxiety became stronger as commuting time increased. Several studies have
231 reported that anxiety causes people to apply infection prevention measures [18, 19]. The use of public
232 transportation, commuting time, and commuting distance are all associated with anxiety about infection due to
233 commuting; the longer the commuting time and distance, the more likely are people to voluntarily intensify
234 infection prevention measures. This may be related to the finding of an inverse relationship between commuting
235 distance and COVID-19 risk. As a result of the increased anxiety caused by long-distance commuting, people may
236 voluntarily strengthen their infection control measures during commuting, and the risk of COVID-19 may reduce.
237 A larger number of users share the same space while using public transportation. It is very difficult to avoid the 3Cs
238 (closed spaces, crowded places, and close-contact settings) [20], which are considered to be high risk infection
239 transmission situations. This survey was conducted during the third wave of COVID-19 in Japan, and after the
240 survey was completed, a second state of emergency declaration was issued for the Tokyo metropolitan area on
241 January 8, 2021, after which a state of emergency was declared in other metropolitan areas on January 14, 2021.
242 This survey was conducted at a time when the infection was spreading, which may have affected the anxiety about

243 infection; hence, further research is required to clarify our study findings.

244 The use of public transportation was significantly related to both COVID-19 spread and infection anxiety. To
245 avoid contact with unspecified people, it is important to reduce the frequency of commuting, use non-public
246 transportation for commuting, and resort to telecommuting. In a simulation by Karako et al. [15], it was reported
247 that teleworking by 55% of the workforce may be effective in controlling COVID-19 spread in urban areas. In
248 addition, there are many cases where teleworking is impossible in some industries, such as manufacturing
249 industries. In addition to infection prevention measures, such as ventilation and wearing masks, it is important to
250 track contacts to prevent the spread of COVID-19 through commuting. Contact-tracing applications using the
251 Bluetooth function of smartphones have been developed worldwide [21]. In Japan, a software called COCOA is
252 being used, and it is thought to be useful for this purpose.

253 This study has some limitations. First, this was a cross-sectional study; thus, causality could not be addressed.
254 Due to the constantly changing social situation surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, longitudinal follow-up is
255 required. Second, this study was an internet-based questionnaire survey, which may not necessarily contain
256 accurate information. Third, the commuting distances used in this study were estimated from zip codes, which
257 limits the accuracy of the data. Moreover, because we used a straight line distance between home and work, the
258 overall commuting distance is likely to be underestimated. Commuting is not necessarily limited to a straight line
259 distance between home and work, but may include a variety of activities such as traveling to and from the station
260 and picking up children. This may be one of the reasons for the discrepancy between the results for commuting
261 distance and commuting time; thus, a more detailed survey is required.

262

263 Conclusions

264 COVID-19 risk, close contact, and infection anxiety were all associated with the use of public transportation
265 during commuting. The longer the commute, the greater the chances of having close contacts. Overall infection
266 anxiety was associated with commuting time, but not with commuting distance. Both commuting distance and
267 commuting time were associated with infection anxiety due to commuting; the strength of this association
268 increased with increasing commuting time and distance. To avoid infection anxiety, it is necessary to promote
269 measures such as telecommuting and commuting without the use of public transportation.

270

271 List of Abbreviations

272 aOR, adjusted odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; MLIT, Ministry of Land,
273 Infrastructure, Transport, and Tourism; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

274

275 Declarations

276 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

277 This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health,
278 Japan (reference No. R2-079) . The survey was conducted after an online confirmation of the participants' consent.

279 *Consent for publication*

280 All authors have read and agreed to the publication of the final version of the manuscript.

281 *Availability of data and materials*

282 Data are not available due to ethical restrictions

283 *Competing interests*

284 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare regarding this study.

285 *Funding*

286 This study was supported and partly funded by the University of Occupational and Environmental Health,
287 Japan; General Incorporated Foundation (Anshin Zaidan); The Development of Educational Materials on Mental
288 Health Measures for Managers at Small-sized Enterprises; Health, Labour and Welfare Sciences Research Grants;
289 Comprehensive Research for Women's Healthcare (H30-josei-ippan-002); Research for the Establishment of an
290 Occupational Health System in Times of Disaster (H30-roudou-ippan-007), scholarship donations from Chugai
291 Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., the Collabo-Health Study Group, and Hitachi Systems, Ltd.

292 *Author contributions*

293 HA, manuscript writing and data analysis; KI, data analysis, manuscript review, and advice on interpretation; ST,
294 TN, HE, MT, SM, and AO, manuscript review, advice on interpretation, and funding for research; YF, overall
295 survey planning, questionnaire creation, data analysis, and manuscript drafting.

296 *Acknowledgments*

297 We appreciate all the participants and all members of the CORoNaWork Study Group. The current members of
298 the CORoNaWork Project, in alphabetical order, are as follows: Dr. Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the
299 study group), Dr. Akira Ogami, Dr. Arisa Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr.

300 Kazunori Ikegami, Dr. Kei Tokutsu, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kosuke Mafune, Dr. Kyoko
301 Kitagawa, Dr. Masako Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Ms. Ning Liu, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr. Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr.
302 Seiichiro Tateishi, Dr. Shinya Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru, and Dr. Tomohisa Nagata. All members are
303 affiliated with the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan. We would also like to thank
304 Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312 References

313 1. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical characteristics of coronavirus
314 disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(18):1708–20.

315 2. Tokyo Metropolitan Government. Report on the results of our telework adoption rate survey! (Report
316 No. 1737). (Retrieved from: <https://www.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/tosei/hodohappyo/press/2021/03/06/14.html> Survey
317 results for the second half of February during the emergency measures period; 2021 (in Japanese).

318 3. Hu M, Lin H, Wang J, Xu C, Tatem AJ, Meng B, et al. Risk of coronavirus Disease 2019 transmission
319 in train passengers: an epidemiological and modeling study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;72(4):604–10.

320 4. Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism. Japan. Crowding rates for major sections in
321 the three major metropolitan areas 2018. (Retrieved from: <https://www.mlit.go.jp/common/001245347.pdf> (in
322 Japanese).

- 323 5. Qiu J, Shen B, Zhao M, Wang Z, Xie B, Xu Y. A nationwide survey of psychological distress among
324 Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: implications and policy recommendations. *Gen Psychiatr.*
325 2020;33(2):e100213.
- 326 6. Li S, Wang Y, Xue J, Zhao N, Zhu T. The impact of COVID-19 epidemic declaration on psychological
327 consequences: A study on active Weibo users. *IJERPH.* 2020;17(6):2032.
- 328 7. Varatharaj A, Thomas N, Ellul MA, Davies NWS, Pollak TA, Tenorio EL, et al. Neurological and
329 neuropsychiatric complications of COVID-19 in 153 patients: a UK-wide surveillance study. *Lancet Psychiatry.*
330 2020;7(10):875–82.
- 331 8. Serafini G, Parmigiani B, Amerio A, Aguglia A, Sher L, Amore M. The psychological impact of
332 COVID-19 on the mental health in the general population. *QJM An Int J Med.* 2020;113(8):531–7.
- 333 9. Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Workplace responses to COVID-19 associated with
334 mental health and work performance of employees in Japan. *J Occup Health.* 2020;62(1):e12134.
- 335 10. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, Tsuji M, Tateishi S, Ogami A, et al. Protocol for a nationwide
336 Internet-based health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *J UOEH.* 2021 (in press).
- 337 11. HeartRails Inc. HeartRails geo API. (Retrieved from: <https://geoapi.heartrails.com/>)
- 338 12. Statistics Bureau. Ministry of Internal affairs and communications. National Census/2010
339 Census/Aggregate data of population and industries by place of employment and place of commuting (Male and
340 female population, age, and industries of workers (major categories)); 2015. (Retrieved from:
341 <https://www.e-stat.go.jp/stat-search/files?page=1&layout=datalist&toukei=00200521&tstat=000001039448&cyc>)

- 342 [le=0&tclass1=000001049567&tclass2=000001051128&stat_infid=000013171990&tclass3val=0](#) (in Japanese)
- 343 13. Furuya H. Risk of transmission of airborne infection during train commute based on mathematical
344 model. *Environ Health Prev Med.* 2007;12(2):78–83.
- 345 14. Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism. Japan. Average traffic congestion rate,
346 transport capacity, and number of passengers on major routes in the three major metropolitan areas 2018.
347 (Retrieved from: <https://www.mlit.go.jp/common/001245346.pdf> (in Japanese))
- 348 15. Karako K, Song P, Chen Y, Tang W. Shifting workstyle to teleworking as a new normal in face of
349 COVID-19: analysis with the model introducing intercity movement and behavioral pattern. *Ann Transl Med.*
350 2020;8(17):1056
- 351 16. Zhu S, Srebric J, Spengler JD, Demokritou P. An advanced numerical model for the assessment of
352 airborne transmission of influenza in bus microenvironments. *Build Environ.* 2012;47:67–75.
- 353 17. Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism. Interior ventilation capacity of sightseeing
354 buses and route buses 2020. (Retrieved from:
355 https://www.mlit.go.jp/jidosha/anzen/top/data/covid19_info_shyanaikanki.pdf (in Japanese))
- 356 18. Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HHH, Yi YY, Tang A, Wei WI, et al. Community responses during early
357 phase of COVID-19 epidemic, Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(7):1575–9.
- 358 19. Magdy D, Metwally A, Magdy O. Assessment of Community Psycho-behavioral Responses during the
359 outbreak of novel coronavirus. 2019–nCoV): a cross-sectional study;2020. Available from
360 <https://dx.doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-40112/v1>

361 20. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan. Important notice for preventing COVID-19 outbreaks.

362 Avoid the “three Cs”!; 2020. (Retrieved from: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/3CS.pdf>)

363 21. Nakamoto I, Jiang M, Zhang J, Zhuang W, Guo Y, Jin MH, et al. Evaluation of the design and
364 implementation of a peer-to-peer COVID-19 contact tracing mobile app (COCOA) in Japan. JMIR mHealth
365 uHealth. 2020;8(12):e22098.

366

367

368

369

370 Tables

371 Table 1 Participant baseline characteristics

Items	COVID-19		Close contact		Anxiety of infection		Anxiety about infection due to commuting	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Using public transportation								
Y	37	3639	55	3621	2958	718	2719	957
N	27	10335	81	10281	7669	2693	1583	8779
Commuting Time								
Almost never	16	6256	46	6226	4693	1579	1854	4418
<30 min	13	2020	24	2009	1571	462	627	1406
<1 h	16	2272	27	2261	1776	512	730	1558
<2 h	12	2183	21	2174	1664	531	697	1498
≥ 2h	7	1243	18	1232	923	327	394	856
Commuting Distance								
≤3 km	25	4132	46	4111	3149	1008	971	3186
≤6 km	12	3035	26	3021	2296	751	818	2229
≤15 km	15	4097	37	4075	3133	979	1300	2812
>15 km	12	2710	27	2695	2049	673	1213	1509
Sex								
Male	36	6639	75	6600	4778	1897	1843	4832
Female	28	7335	61	7302	5849	1514	2459	4904
Age								
20-29 yr	11	1045	16	1040	802	254	380	676
30-39 yr	9	2729	31	2707	2117	621	945	1793
40-49 yr	17	4346	35	4328	3211	1152	1293	3070
50-59 yr	21	4395	37	4379	3360	1056	1256	3160
≥60 yr	6	1459	17	1448	1137	328	428	1037
Education								
Junior or Senior high school	16	4017	27	4006	3004	1029	1023	3010
Junior college or vocational school	14	3558	39	3533	2787	785	1132	2440
University or graduate school	34	6399	70	6363	4836	1597	2147	4286
Occupation								
Regular employees	32	7368	59	7341	5524	1876	2324	5076
Managers	10	1328	11	1327	1007	331	401	937
Executives	2	329	4	327	253	78	84	247
Public service worker	9	1670	19	1660	1279	400	409	1270
Temporary workers	1	1673	13	1661	1274	400	640	1034
Freelancers or professionals	8	1425	26	1407	1144	289	388	1045
Others	2	181	4	179	146	37	56	127

372 Table 2 Odds ratios for COVID-19 and close contact (commuting time)

	Unadjusted OR					Adjusted OR					
	OR	95% CI		p	p for trend	OR	95% CI		p	p for trend	
		Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper			
OVID-19											
Using public transportation Commuting Time	3.89	2.37	6.40	<.001	0.021	4.17	2.51	6.93	<.001	0.131	
Almost never	1					1					
<30 min	2.52	1.21	5.24	0.014		2.38	1.13	4.98	0.022		
<1 h	2.75	1.37	5.52	0.004		2.45	1.21	4.96	0.012		
<2 h	2.15	1.02	4.55	0.046		1.76	0.82	3.79	0.146		
≥2 h	2.21	0.90	5.36	0.082		1.72	0.69	4.29	0.247		
Close contact											
Using public transportation Commuting Time	1.93	1.37	2.72	<.001	0.024	1.988	1.399	2.824	<.001	0.048	
Almost never	1					1					
<30 min	1.62	0.98	2.66	0.058		1.56	0.94	2.57	0.083		
<1 h	1.62	1.00	2.61	0.049		1.51	0.93	2.46	0.093		
<2 h	1.31	0.78	2.20	0.311		1.25	0.74	2.13	0.402		
≥2 h	1.98	1.14	3.42	0.015		1.92	1.09	3.40	0.024		

373 OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval

374 Adjusted odds ratios are adjusted for sex, age, education, and occupation.

375 Table 3 Odds ratios for COVID-19 and close contact (commuting distance)

	Unadjusted OR					Adjusted OR					
	OR	95% CI		p	p for trend	OR	95% CI		p	p for trend	
		Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper			
COVID-19											
Using public transportation	3.89	2.37	6.40	<.001	0.229	5.18	3.06	8.78	<.001	0.003	
Commuting Distance	1					1					
≤3 km	0.65	0.33	1.30	0.277		0.55	0.27	1.10	0.090		
≤6 km	0.61	0.32	1.15	0.125		0.42	0.22	0.82	0.011		
>15 km	0.73	0.37	1.46	0.375		0.36	0.17	0.75	0.006		
Close contact											
Using public transportation	1.93	1.37	2.72	<.001	0.568	2.15	1.49	3.10	<.001	0.109	
Commuting Distance	1					1					
≤3 km	0.77	0.47	1.25	0.287		0.74	0.46	1.21	0.229		
≤6 km	0.81	0.53	1.25	0.347		0.72	0.46	1.13	0.151		
>15 km	0.890	0.56	1.44	0.650		0.68	0.41	1.12	0.131		

376 OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval

377 The mono-regression analysis of “Using public transportation” is a reiteration of Table 2.

378 Adjusted odds ratios are adjusted for sex, age, education, and occupation.

379 Table 4 Odds ratios for COVID-19 anxiety and for infection anxiety due to commuting (commuting time)

	Unadjusted OR					Adjusted OR					
	OR	95% CI		p	p for trend	OR	95% CI		p	p for trend	
		Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper			
Infection anxiety											
Using public transportation	1.45	1.32	1.59	<.001	0.633	1.44	1.31	1.59	<.001	0.004	
Commuting Time											
Almost never	1					1					
<30 min	1.14	1.02	1.29	0.026		1.18	1.05	1.33	0.007		
<1 h	1.17	1.04	1.31	0.008		1.24	1.11	1.40	<.001		
<2 h	1.05	0.94	1.18	0.359	1.17	1.04	1.31	0.009			
≥2 h	0.95	0.83	1.09	0.465	1.11	0.96	1.28	0.163			
Anxiety about infection due to commuting											
Using public transportation	15.76	14.39	17.26	<.001	0.019	15.802	14.394	17.346	<.001	0.003	
Commuting Time											
Almost never	1					1					
<30 min	1.06	0.95	1.19	0.273		1.11	0.97	1.27	0.127		
<1 h	1.12	1.01	1.24	0.036		1.17	1.03	1.33	0.015		
<2 h	1.11	1.00	1.23	0.054	1.12	0.98	1.27	0.101			
≥2 h	1.10	0.96	1.25	0.167	1.25	1.06	1.48	0.007			

380 OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval

381 Adjusted odds ratios are adjusted for sex, age, education, and occupation.

382 Table 5 Odds ratios for COVID-19 anxiety and for infection anxiety due to commuting (commuting distance)

	Unadjusted OR					Adjusted OR					
	OR	95% CI		P	p for trend	OR	95% CI		P	p for trend	
		Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper			
Infection anxiety											
Using public transportation	1.45	1.32	1.59	<.001	0.927	1.45	1.32	1.60	<.001	0.744	
Commuting Distance											
≤3 km	1					1					
≤6 km	0.98	0.88	1.09	0.697		0.98	0.88	1.10	0.734		
≤15 km	1.02	0.93	1.13	0.640		1.01	0.92	1.12	0.793		
>15 km	0.98	0.87	1.09	0.653	0.96	0.86	1.08	0.531			
Anxiety about infection due to commuting											
Using public transportation	15.76	14.39	17.26	<.001	<.001	15.17	13.78	16.70	<.001	0.004	
Commuting Distance											
≤3 km	1					1					
≤6 km	1.20	1.08	1.34	0.001		0.97	0.86	1.10	0.637		
≤15 km	1.52	1.38	1.67	<.001		0.99	0.88	1.11	0.826		
>15 km	2.64	2.38	2.93	<.001	1.26	1.10	1.43	0.001			

383 OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval

384 The mono-regression analysis of “Using public transportation” is a reiteration of Table 4.

385 Adjusted odds ratios are adjusted for sex, age, education, and occupation.

386