

1 **Association between telecommuting environment and low back pain**
2 **among Japanese telecommuting workers: A cross-sectional study**

3

4

5 Ryutaro Matsugaki¹, Ph.D., Keiji Muramatsu¹, M.D., Ph.D, Seiichiro Tateishi², M.D.,
6 Ph.D., Tomohisa Nagata³, M.D., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji⁴, M.D., Ph.D., Ayako Hino⁵,
7 M.D., Ph.D., Kazunori Ikegami⁶, M.D., Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino⁷, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.,
8 and Shinya Matsuda¹, M.D., Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork Project

9

10 ¹ Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine,
11 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

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

14 ³ Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
15 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

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

18 ⁵ Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
19 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

20 ⁶ Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
21 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

22 ⁷ Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological
23 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

24

25 **Corresponding author:**

26 **Yoshihisa Fujino, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.**

27 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
28 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

29 1-1, Iseigaoka, Yahatanishiku, Kitakyushu, 807-8555, Japan

30 Tel: +81-93-691-7401

31 Email: zenq@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

32 **Abstract**

33 **Objectives:** We evaluated the relationship between telecommuting environment and
34 low back pain (LBP) among desk-based workers in Japan.

35 **Methods:** This cross-sectional study included 3,663 desk-based, telecommuting
36 workers. LBP was assessed using a 0–10 numerical rating scale. The telecommuting
37 environment was evaluated using subjective questions. Mixed-effects logistic regression
38 analysis was used.

39 **Results:** Mixed-effects logistic model results revealed that not having a place or room
40 to concentrate on work, desk not well-lit enough for work, not having enough space on
41 the desk to work, not having enough legroom, and not having comfortable temperature
42 and humidity conditions in the workspace were significantly associated with higher
43 odds of LBP.

44 **Conclusions:** Our findings suggest that telecommuting environment is associated with
45 the prevalence of LBP.

46

47 **Keywords:** Low Back Pain, Telecommuting, Workplace, COVID-19, Japan

48 **Introduction**

49 The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic led to rapid expansion of
50 telecommuting in Japan. The Japanese government recommended telecommuting to
51 prevent the spread of COVID-19 infection^{1,2}. Although the telecommuting rate of a
52 Japanese worker was 14.8% as of October 2019, it increased to 23.0% by November
53 2020³. In actuality, 85.0% of workers who were teleworking as of November 2020 did
54 so to prevent the spread of COVID-19 infection³. Telecommuting is a way to continue
55 business even in times of emergency, and it may become an even more common way of
56 working.

57 With the rapid expansion of telecommuting due to the COVID-19 pandemic,
58 management of the work environment during telecommuting is an emerging
59 occupational health problem. As with the office environment, the recommended
60 working environment for a telecommute worker is a private, quiet, and safe dedicated
61 space, with adequate lighting, comfortable temperature and humidity, ergonomic
62 chairs/desk⁴⁻⁶. However, it is difficult to manage the telecommute work environment
63 because, in contrast to the office, the workstation at home is difficult to supervise by
64 managers, and managers do not have the authority to direct the private environment of
65 an individual. In addition, neither companies nor workers were sufficiently prepared to
66 optimize telecommuting environment due to the unexpected occurrence of COVID-19⁴.
67 It has been reported that more than 50% of telecommuting workers in Japan do not have
68 a desk/ chair and more than 70% do not have a private room or space for work³.

69 Low back pain (LBP) is an important health problem associated with office
70 work. The prevalence of LBP is 34-56% among office workers⁷⁻¹⁰. In office workers,
71 gender, body mass index, sleep disturbance, and previous symptoms of LBP are known
72 to be risk factors for LBP^{8,10-13}. In terms of work-related factors, it is known that sitting

73 time and sitting posture at work are known to be risk factors for LBP in an office
74 worker^{8,14,15}. At home, the work environment is less developed than in the office
75 environment; therefore, the work environment of home workers is assumed to be an
76 important risk factor for low back pain.

77 Previous studies conducted in the COVID-19 pandemic have suggested an
78 association between telecommuting and musculoskeletal pain¹⁶. However, the
79 relationship between work environment and LBP in telecommuting workers is unclear.
80 Thus, the purpose of this study was to clarify the relationship between the work
81 environment and LBP of telecommuting workers.

82

83

84 **Methods**

85 **Study Design and Subjects**

86 This cross-sectional internet-based monitoring survey was conducted from
87 December 22 through to December 26, 2020, when the third wave of COVID-19
88 infections began in Japan. The details of the survey protocol have been previously
89 reported.¹⁷ The data was collected from the workers with employment contracts at the
90 time of the survey. Of the 33,302 workers participating in the survey, 27,036 were
91 surveyed, excluding those who gave fraudulent answers. Of these, 3,663 (2,093 males
92 and 1,570 females) who responded that they mainly performed desk work (e.g., office
93 work, computer work) and telecommuted at least once a week were included in the
94 present analysis.

95 This study conformed to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. In addition,
96 the study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational and

97 Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079). Informed consent was obtained
98 online from the participants through the website.

99

100 **The assessment of LBP**

101 We assessed the presence of LBP in the participants based on two questions. First,
102 we asked all subjects "Have you experienced stiff shoulders or LBP in the past two
103 weeks?" and asked them to answer, "yes" or "no." If the subject answered "yes" to that
104 question, the following questions were asked to assess the severity of LBP such as, "what
105 was your average level of LBP in the past 2 weeks? (Please rate your pain from 0 to 10,
106 where 0=no pain at all and 10=the most intense pain you have experienced)." The
107 numerical rating scale (NRS) was used for evaluating the pain severity. In this study, a
108 score of 3 or higher on the NRS was defined as LBP.

109

110 **The assessment of the telecommuting environment**

111 The telecommuting environment was assessed among the telecommuting workers
112 with the following questions: 1) "Do you have a place or room where you can concentrate
113 on your work?" ; 2) "Is your desk well-lit enough for you to work?" ; 3) "Do you have
114 enough space on your desk to work?"; 4) "Is there enough space to stretch the legs?"; 5)
115 "Are the degrees of temperature and humidity in the room where you work appropriate
116 for working comfortably?"; 6) "Do you use an office desk or chair? (Including children's
117 study desks)." The respondents answered either "yes" or "no."

118

119 **The assessment of participants' characteristics and other covariates**

120 The following items were examined for socioeconomic factors: age, sex, body
121 mass index (calculated by dividing the weight by height squared), educational

122 background (junior high school; high school; vocational school; junior college or
123 technical college; university; or graduate school) and equivalent income (household
124 income divided by the square root of the household size).

125 The following items were examined for lifestyle factors: smoking (currently
126 smoking), drinking (alcohol consumption on two or more days per week), physical
127 activity (perform equivalent physical activities for at least 1 h a day in daily life for more
128 than 2 days a week), and exercise habit (exercise for 30 minutes or more for more than
129 two days a week).

130 For mental health status was assessed using the following question: “During the
131 past 30 days, how many days did you experience poor mental health, including stress,
132 depression, emotional problems, etc.?”

133 The following items were examined for work-related factors: we examined the
134 following items: industry type, working time (hours per week), frequency of
135 telecommuting (one day per week; more than two days per week; and more than four days
136 per week), company size (total number of employees at the company where the
137 respondent is working), and working hours per week.

138

139 **Statistical analysis**

140 The number of days that the participant experienced poor mental health during the
141 past 30 days are expressed as continuous variables using mean and standard deviation.
142 Other variables are presented as categorical variables using numbers and percentages.

143 Mixed-effects logistic regression analysis was conducted with the presence of
144 LBP as the dependent variable, subjective evaluation of the telecommuting environment
145 as the independent variable, with the city of residence as the random effects. We used age,
146 sex, body mass index, lifestyle habits, the number of days of poor mental health,

147 equivalent income, educational background, working hours, company size, and industry
148 type as covariates to adjust for potential confounders.

149 All statistical analysis were performed with Stata software (Stata Statistical
150 Software: Release 16; StataCorp LLC, TX, USA). A p-value of < 0.05 was considered
151 statistically significant.

152

153

154 **Results**

155 Table 1 presents the characteristics of the participants. The prevalence rate of
156 LBP in the study participants was 49.9%. Compared to the participants without LBP, the
157 participants who experienced LBP were younger; middle-aged workers (20–49 years:
158 43.1% vs. 52.2%) and more likely to be females (37.6% vs. 48.2%).

159 [Insert Table 1. here]

160 The associations of LBP and telecommuting environments are shown in Table 2.
161 There was a significant association of LBP with the question "Do you have a place or
162 room where you can concentrate on your work? (No)" (odds ratio [OR]: 1.37, 95% CI:
163 1.16–1.63, $p < 0.001$), "Is your desk well-lit enough for you to work? (No)" (OR: 1.47,
164 95%CI: 1.22–1.79, $p < 0.001$), "Do you have enough space on your desk to work? (No)"
165 (OR: 1.22, 95%CI: 1.04–1.43, $p = 0.012$), "Is there enough space to stretch the legs? (No)"
166 (OR: 1.32, 95%CI: 1.11–1.57, $p = 0.002$), and "Are the degrees of temperature and
167 humidity in the room where you work appropriate for working comfortably? (No)" (OR:
168 1.37, 95%CI: 1.16–1.61, $p < 0.001$). There was no significant association of LBP with the
169 question "Do you use an office desk or chair? (NO)" (OR: 1.04, 95%CI: 0.90–1.19,
170 $p = 0.633$). Similar results were obtained for Model 1, which was adjusted only for sex and
171 age, and Model 2, which was adjusted for other potential confounders.

172 [Insert Table 1. here]

173

174

175 **Discussion**

176 This study showed that telecommuting environment was associated with LBP
177 in telecommuting workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, it was
178 suggested that insufficient desk and foot space, inadequate desk lighting, uncomfortable
179 room temperature and humidity, and lack of room/space for concentrating on work were
180 associated with the prevalence of LBP.

181 In this study, inadequate desk and foot space, and insufficient lighting were
182 associated with LBP. It is suggested that an awkward posture and sitting for long
183 durations are risk factors for LBP ^{8,18-20}. Having enough space on the desk and at the
184 feet is effective in maintaining good posture when working as well as changing the
185 posture and stretching as needed. Also, inadequate lighting at the desk may contribute to
186 awkward posture of workers when looking at documents or computer screens on their
187 desk. It is necessary to manage the work environment to avoid awkward postures and
188 prolonged maintenance of the same posture during work.

189 The present study also revealed that uncomfortable temperature and humidity
190 in the telecommuting space was associated with LBP. Since this study was conducted
191 during the winter season, it can be speculated that the results imply that cold
192 temperature and low humidity is associated with LBP. The relationship between cold
193 temperature and LBP has been shown in previous studies ^{15,21-23}; this is also the same
194 for telecommuting workers. Although the most suitable room temperature for the
195 prevention of LBP is not clear, we consider that room temperatures that are subjectively

196 cold should be avoided as they may increase the risk of musculoskeletal symptoms and
197 injuries.

198 In this study, using an office chair/desk was not associated with LBP. This
199 finding is supported by the findings of previous studies reporting no significant
200 association between LBP and use of chair/desk in office workers^{11,24}. Alternately,
201 previous studies have reported that LBP is related to the characteristics of the chair,
202 such as with or without lumbar support and adjustable back support^{8,18}. This may
203 suggest that it is not simply a matter of whether an office chair is used, but what
204 function and shape of the chair is used for prevention of LBP.

205 The lack of room or space to concentrate on work was associated with LBP. It
206 is suggested that the teleworker's workstation should be in a dedicated space that is
207 private, quiet, and secure, preferably away from the flow of activity in the home⁴. The
208 results of this study support that argument. Previous studies have reported that
209 psychological stress is associated with LBP in workers²⁵⁻²⁷. The lack of room or space
210 to concentrate on work may cause psychological stress to telecommuting workers. The
211 results of this study suggest that it is important for telecommuting workers to have a
212 space where they can devote themselves to their work as much as possible, even if they
213 work from home.

214 Based on these findings, we suggest that the work environment of
215 telecommuting workers may be associated with LBP. Therefore, employers need
216 educate telecommuting workers of the importance of an appropriate home working
217 environment. If it is difficult to prepare an appropriate telecommuting environment due
218 to household situations and family structure, it is necessary to consider the use of
219 co-working spaces, satellite offices, and spaces near the employee's residence for
220 telecommuting.

221 Moreover, this study has three limitations. Firstly, the specific details such as
222 previous history, duration of the symptoms, and diagnosis of LBP are unknown as only
223 the NRS was used for its evaluation. It is uncertain how these factors affect the
224 relationship between the telecommuting environment and low back pain. Secondly, the
225 home environment was also evaluated using subjective questions; hence, the validity of
226 the responses is unclear. However, an objective method to evaluate the work
227 environment at home has not been established at this time. Thirdly, there may be a
228 selection bias in this study. If it is possible to choose telecommuting, people with LBP
229 may be more likely to choose telecommuting. The effect of this bias on the results of
230 this study is uncertain.

231

232 **Conclusion**

233 The present study suggests that telecommuting environment is associated with
234 the prevalence of LBP among telecommuting workers in Japan and suggests that
235 employers may need to consider providing telecommuting workers with a working
236 space where they can concentrate on their work with appropriate room temperature and
237 humidity control to prevent LBP.

238 **References**

- 239 1. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic
240 Policies for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Ministry of Health, Labour and
241 Welfare. Published 2020. Accessed June 9, 2021.
242 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10200000/000603610.pdf>
- 243 2. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic
244 Policies for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control (Revised on April 7, 2020).
245 Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Published 2020. Accessed June 9, 2021.
246 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10900000/000620733.pdf>
- 247 3. Vital statistics of telework (in Japanese). Ministry of Land, Infrastructure,
248 Transport and Tourism. Published 2021. Accessed June 8, 2021.
249 <https://www.mlit.go.jp/toshi/daisei/content/001392107.pdf>
- 250 4. Robertson MM, Mosier K. Work from home: Human factors/ergonomics
251 considerations for teleworking. International Labour Organization. Published
252 2020. Accessed May 31, 2021.
253 [http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/safety-and-health-at-work/events-training/events
254 -meetings/world-day-safety-health-at-work/WCMS_742061/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/safety-and-health-at-work/events-training/events-254-meetings/world-day-safety-health-at-work/WCMS_742061/lang--en/index.htm)
- 255 5. Work environment maintenance for teleworking at home (in Japanese). Ministry
256 of Health, Labour and Welfare. Published 2020. Accessed June 9, 2021.
257 https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage_01603.html
- 258 6. Guidelines for the Promotion of Appropriate Introduction and Implementation of
259 Telework (in Japanese). Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Published 2021.
260 Accessed June 9, 2021.
261 [https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/koyou_roudou/roudoukijun/shi
262 goto/guideline.html](https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/koyou_roudou/roudoukijun/shi262-goto/guideline.html)

- 263 7. Janwantanakul P, Pensri P, Jiamjarasrangsri V, Sinsongsook T. Prevalence of
264 self-reported musculoskeletal symptoms among office workers. *Occup Med*
265 *(Chic Ill)*. 2008;58(6):436-438. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqn072
- 266 8. Spyropoulos P, Papathanasiou G, Georgoudis G, Chronopoulos E, Koutis H,
267 Koumoutsou F. Prevalence of low back pain in greek public office workers. *Pain*
268 *Physician*. 2007;10(5):651-659. Accessed May 12, 2021.
269 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17876361/>
- 270 9. Fanta M, Alagaw A, Kejela G, Tunje A. Low back pain and associated factors
271 among civil service sectors office workers in Southern Ethiopia. *Int J Occup Saf*
272 *Heal*. 2020;10(1):53-63. doi:10.3126/ijosh.v10i1.29883
- 273 10. Kaliniene G, Ustinaviciene R, Skemiene L, Vaiciulis V, Vasilavicius P.
274 Associations between musculoskeletal pain and work-related factors among
275 public service sector computer workers in Kaunas County, Lithuania. *BMC*
276 *Musculoskelet Disord*. 2016;17(1):1-12. doi:10.1186/s12891-016-1281-7
- 277 11. Juul-Kristensen B, Søgaard K, Strøyer J, Jensen C. Computer users' risk factors
278 for developing shoulder, elbow and back symptoms. *Scand J Work Environ Heal*.
279 2004;30(5):390-398. doi:10.5271/sjweh.827
- 280 12. Janwantanakul P, Sitthipornvorakul E, Paksaichol A. Risk factors for the onset of
281 nonspecific low back pain in office workers: A systematic review of prospective
282 cohort studies. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2012;35(7):568-577.
283 doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2012.07.008
- 284 13. Shariat A, Cardoso JR, Cleland JA, et al. Prevalence rate of neck, shoulder and
285 lower back pain in association with age, body mass index and gender among
286 Malaysian office workers. *Work*. 2018;60(2):1-9. doi:10.3233/wor-2738

- 287 14. Janwantanakul P, Pensri P, Moolkay P, Jiamjarasrangsi W. Development of a
288 risk score for low back pain in office workers -a cross-sectional study. *BMC*
289 *Musculoskelet Disord.* 2011;12(1):23. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-12-23
- 290 15. Ye S, Jing Q, Wei C, Lu J. Risk factors of non-specific neck pain and low back
291 pain in computer-using office workers in China: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ*
292 *Open.* 2017;7(4). doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014914
- 293 16. Yoshimoto T, Fujii T, Oka H, Kasahara S, Kawamata K, Matsudaira K. Pain
294 Status and Its Association with Physical Activity, Psychological Stress, and
295 Telework among Japanese Workers with Pain during the COVID-19 Pandemic.
296 *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18(11):5595. doi:10.3390/ijerph18115595
- 297 17. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based
298 health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv.*
299 Published online 2021. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.02.21249309>
- 300 18. Janwantanakul P, Pensri P, Moolkay P, Jiamjarasrangsi W. *Development of a*
301 *Risk Score for Low Back Pain in Office Workers - a Cross-Sectional Study.* Vol
302 12.; 2011. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-12-23
- 303 19. Liira JP, Shannon HS, Chambers LW, Haines TA. Long-term back problems and
304 physical work exposures in the 1990 Ontario health survey. *Am J Public Health.*
305 1996;86(3):382-387. doi:10.2105/AJPH.86.3.382
- 306 20. Lis AM, Black KM, Korn H, Nordin M. Association between sitting and
307 occupational LBP. *Eur Spine J.* 2007;16(2):283-298.
308 doi:10.1007/s00586-006-0143-7
- 309 21. Jin K, Sorock GS, Courtney T, et al. Risk factors for work-related low back pain
310 in the People's Republic of China. *Int J Occup Environ Health.* 2000;6(1):26-33.
311 doi:10.1179/oeht.2000.6.1.26

- 312 22. Dovrat E, Katz-Leurer M. Cold exposure and low back pain in store workers in
313 Israel. *Am J Ind Med.* 2007;50(8):626-631. doi:10.1002/ajim.20488
- 314 23. Skandfer M, Talykova L, Brenn T, Nilsson T, Vakt skjold A. Low back pain
315 among mineworkers in relation to driving, cold environment and ergonomics.
316 *Ergonomics.* 2014;57(10):1541-1548. doi:10.1080/00140139.2014.904005
- 317 24. Celik S, Celik K, Dirimese E, Tasdemir N, Arik T, Büyükkara İb. Determination
318 of pain in musculoskeletal system reported by office workers and the pain risk
319 factors. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health.* 2018;31(1):91-111.
320 doi:10.13075/ijomeh.1896.00901
- 321 25. Vinstrup J, Jakobsen MD, Andersen LL. Perceived Stress and Low-Back Pain
322 Among Healthcare Workers: A Multi-Center Prospective Cohort Study. *Front*
323 *Public Heal.* 2020;8. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.00297
- 324 26. Tsuboi Y, Ueda Y, Naruse F, Ono R. The Association between Perceived Stress
325 and Low Back Pain among Eldercare Workers in Japan. *J Occup Environ Med.*
326 2017;59(8):765-767. doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000001062
- 327 27. Yoshimoto T, Oka H, Katsuhira J, et al. Prognostic psychosocial factors for
328 disabling low back pain in Japanese hospital workers. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(5).
329 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0177908
- 330

Table 1. Characteristics of participants

		Low back pain	
		-	+
		n (%)	n (%)
		1,834	1,829
Age (y)	20-29	88 (4.8%)	82 (4.5%)
	30-39	241 (13.1%)	319 (17.4%)
	40-49	462 (25.2%)	554 (30.3%)
	50-59	716 (39.0%)	629 (34.4%)
	60-69	327 (17.8%)	245 (13.4%)
Sex	Men	1145 (62.4%)	948 (51.8%)
	Women	689 (37.6%)	881 (48.2%)
Body mass index	< 18.5	199 (10.9%)	240 (13.1%)
	18.5-25.0	1265 (69.0%)	1200 (65.6%)
	25.0-30.0	317 (17.3%)	312 (17.1%)
	> 30.0	53 (2.9%)	77 (4.2%)
Educational background	Junior high school	15 (0.8%)	14 (0.8%)
	High school	268 (14.6%)	262 (14.3%)
	Vocational school	160 (8.7%)	173 (9.5%)
	junior college/technical college	157 (8.6%)	189 (10.3%)
	University	1030 (56.2%)	1014 (55.4%)
	Graduate school	204 (11.1%)	177 (9.7%)
Equivalent income (10,000yen)	<260	517 (28.2%)	485 (26.5%)
	261-450	458 (25.0%)	507 (27.7%)
	451-600	374 (20.4%)	393 (21.5%)
	> 601	485 (26.4%)	444 (24.3%)
Lifestyle habit	Smoking (yes)	447 (24.4%)	460 (25.2%)
	Drinking (≥ 2 d/w)	823 (44.9%)	855 (46.7%)
	Physical activity (≥ 2 d/w)	697 (38.0%)	685 (37.5%)
	Exercise habit (≥ 2 d/w)	531 (29.0%)	523 (28.6%)
Days experienced poor mental health		2.3 (5.9)	5.1 (8.4)

during the past 30 days, mean (SD)

Industry type	Energy, materials, industrial machinery	71 (3.9%)	85 (4.6%)
	Food	20 (1.1%)	14 (0.8%)
	Beverages/Tobacco products	8 (0.4%)	6 (0.3%)
	Pharmaceuticals/Medical supplies	38 (2.1%)	32 (1.7%)
	Cosmetics/Toiletries/Sanitary products	13 (0.7%)	12 (0.7%)
	Fashion and Accessories	20 (1.1%)	19 (1.0%)
	Precision Machinery and Office supplies	43 (2.3%)	45 (2.5%)
	Home appliances/AV equipment	61 (3.3%)	57 (3.1%)
	Automobiles and Transportation equipment	72 (3.9%)	67 (3.7%)
	Household goods	3 (0.2%)	4 (0.2%)
	Hobby/Sporting goods	8 (0.4%)	5 (0.3%)
	Real estate and Housing equipment	105 (5.7%)	96 (5.2%)
	Information and Communication	318 (17.3%)	288 (15.7%)
	Distribution and Retail	72 (3.9%)	91 (5.0%)
	Finance/Insurance	87 (4.7%)	98 (5.4%)
	Transportation and Leisure	20 (1.1%)	22 (1.2%)
	Restaurant and Other services	44 (2.4%)	49 (2.7%)
	Public offices and Organizations	50 (2.7%)	56 (3.1%)
	Education, medical services, religion	71 (3.9%)	97 (5.3%)
	Mass media	29 (1.6%)	30 (1.6%)
	Market research	7 (0.4%)	8 (0.4%)
Other	674 (36.8%)	648 (35.4%)	
Working time (h/w)	< 40	1346 (73.4%)	1293 (70.7%)
	40-48	237 (12.9%)	245 (13.4%)
	49-60	189 (10.3%)	232 (12.7%)
	> 60	62 (3.4%)	59 (3.2%)
Frequency of telecommute	1 d/w	266 (14.5%)	297 (16.2%)
	2-3 d/w	495 (27.0%)	563 (30.8%)
	≥ 4d/w	1073 (58.5%)	969 (53.0%)
Company size (person)	-9	732 (39.9%)	614 (33.6%)
	10-99	202 (11.0%)	228 (12.5%)
	100-999	304 (16.6%)	370 (20.2%)
	>1000	596 (32.5%)	617 (33.7%)

SD: standard deviation

Table 2. The association between low back pain and telecommuting environment

	Total		Low back pain		Model 1 [†]			Model 2 [‡]				
	n	%	n	%	OR	95% CI	P	OR	95% CI	P		
Environment of telecommute												
Do you have a place or room where you can concentrate on your work? (No)	847	23.1	496	58.6	1.51	1.29	1.77	<0.001	1.37	1.16	1.63	<0.001
Is your desk well-lit for you to work? (No)	596	16.3	361	60.6	1.65	1.37	1.98	<0.001	1.47	1.22	1.79	<0.001
Do you have enough space on your desk to work? (No)	1054	28.8	582	55.2	1.33	1.15	1.54	<0.001	1.22	1.04	1.43	0.012
Is there enough space to stretch the legs? (No)	784	21.4	450	57.4	1.46	1.24	1.72	<0.001	1.32	1.11	1.57	0.002
Are the degrees of temperature and humidity in the room where you work appropriate for working comfortably? (No)	921	25.1	526	57.1	1.44	1.24	1.69	<0.001	1.37	1.16	1.61	<0.001
Do you use an office desk or chair? (Including children's study desks) (No)	1791	48.9	931	52.0	1.10	0.97	1.26	0.149	1.04	0.90	1.19	0.633

[†]Model 1: Adjusted for age, sex

[‡]Model 2: Adjusted for age, sex, body mass index, lifestyle habit (smoking, drinking, physical activity, and exercise habit), days experienced poor mental health during the past 30 days, equivalent income, educational background, industry type, working time, frequency of telecommute, company size

CI: confidence interval, OR: Odds ratio