

**Relationship between support for workers with illness and work functioning
impairment in Japan during the COVID-19 pandemic**

Yu Igarashi¹, M.D., Ph.D., Seiichiro Tateishi², M.D., Ph.D., Arisa Harada¹, M.D.,
Ayako Hino³, M.D., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji⁴, M.D., Ph.D., Akira Ogami⁵, M.D., Ph.D.,
Koji Mori⁶, M.D., Ph.D., Ryutaro Matsugaki⁷, Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino⁸, M.D., M.P.H.,
Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork project

¹ Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of
Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

² Disaster Occupational Health Center, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

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

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

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

⁶ Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

⁷ Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine,
University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

⁸ Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological
Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

Correspondence to Seiichiro Tateishi, M.D., Ph.D.

Disaster Occupational Health Center, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,

University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

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

Tel: +81-93-691-7323

Email: tateishi@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

Sources of Funding

This study was supported and partly funded by the research grant from the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (no grant number); Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (H30-josei-ippan-002, H30-roudou-ippan-007, 19JA1004, 20JA1006, 210301-1, and 20HB1004); Anshin Zaidan (no grant number), the Collabo-Health Study Group (no grant number), and Hitachi Systems, Ltd. (no grant number) and scholarship donations from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. (no grant number). The funder was not involved in the study design, collection, analysis, interpretation of data, the writing of this article or the decision to submit it for publication. All authors declare no other competing interests.

Acknowledgements

The current members of the CORoNaWork Project, in alphabetical order, are as follows: Dr. Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the study group), Dr. Akira Ogami, Dr. Arisa Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr. Kazunori Ikegami, Dr. Kei Tokutsu, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kosuke Mafune, Dr. Kyoko Kitagawa, Dr. Masako Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Ms. Ning Liu, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr. Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr. Seiichiro Tateishi, Dr. Shinya Matsuda, Dr.

Tomohiro Ishimaru, and Dr. Tomohisa Nagata. All members are affiliated with the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan.

Conflict of interest

None declared.

Ethics approval: This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No.R2-079 and R3-006).

Running Title: Relationship between support for sick workers and WFun in the CORoNaWork Project

1 **Abstract**

2 **Objective:** This study examined the relationship between **job accommodations** for
3 workers with **poor health** and work functioning impairment during the COVID-19
4 pandemic.

5 **Methods:** An internet survey was conducted in December 2020. We included **24,429**
6 subjects for analysis. One question was used to determine whether subjects needed **job**
7 **accommodations** from their company to continue working in their current health
8 condition. The odds ratios (ORs) of **the necessity of job accommodations** for sick
9 workers associated with work functioning impairment were estimated using multilevel
10 logistic regression analysis.

11 **Results:** The OR of work functioning impairment among sick workers not receiving
12 **job accommodations** was **5.75** (95% confidence interval (CI) **5.34-6.20**, $p < 0.001$) and
13 those receiving **job accommodations** was **1.88** (95% CI **1.69-2.08**, $p < 0.001$) compared
14 to healthy workers.

15 **Conclusions:** This study suggests that providing **job accommodations** to workers with
16 **poor health** may improve their work functioning impairment.

17

18 **Keywords:** Work functioning impairment, Presenteeism, **Job accommodations,**

19 COVID-19, Occupational health

20

21 Introduction

22 An estimated 80% of workers continue to work despite having an illness or
23 health problem¹. **The development of new drugs and therapeutic devices, improved**
24 **diagnostic procedures, and improved surgical techniques have led to better treatment**
25 **outcomes for diseases such as cancer², stroke³, heart disease⁴, and musculoskeletal**
26 **disorders⁵, making it possible for workers who may have previously had to give up**
27 **their job to instead continue working even after becoming ill⁶. In addition, extension of**
28 **the retirement age has increased the number of elderly people in the workforce, who**
29 **typically have a higher incidence of health problems due to their advanced age⁷.**

30 The phenomenon of working while **in poor health** is known as presenteeism.
31 **The term presenteeism describes two broad concepts: a state of reduced productivity**
32 **associated with poor health, and a state in which a person continues to work despite**
33 **being in poor health⁸. Poor health includes having either an acute or chronic illness,**
34 **and is independent of whether or not the person has been to a hospital, whether or not**
35 **they have been diagnosed, and whether or not they need treatment. Workers who**

36 engage in presenteeism experience a variety of difficulties in their work. Specifically,
37 they have a higher risk of absenteeism and unemployment⁹⁻¹¹, and lower work
38 productivity¹¹⁻¹³. Moreover, presenteeism reduces workers' quality of life¹⁴. In addition,
39 prioritizing work may cause workers to miss opportunities for treatment, which may
40 lead to severe disease¹⁵. To prevent the potentially detrimental effects of presenteeism
41 on employment and the course of workers' disease, it is important for companies to
42 **accommodate** workers who desire to continue working while in **poor health**.

43 There is a growing global movement **for companies** to provide **job**
44 **accommodations** to workers in **poor health who want to continue to work while**
45 **receiving treatment, regardless of whether they have a chronic or acute condition, such**
46 **as mental illness or chronic inflammatory disease, and whether they taking anti-cancer**
47 **drugs or have undergone surgery. Work accommodations** include providing workers
48 with flexible working hours so that those with **poor health** can work while receiving
49 medical treatment; and employment **accommodations** such as job adjustments,
50 workplace support, and physical changes in the work environment to improve their
51 ability to work. Around the world, this concept is known as "work accommodations,"
52 "reasonable accommodations," or "fit note"¹⁶⁻²⁰. In Japan, it is called "Ryoritsu Shien,"
53 which means **accommodating** workers who desire to continue working **despite being in**

54 **poor health**, with the Japanese government promoting "Ryoritsu Shien" to create a
55 society where people with **poor health** can also work. Accordingly, government
56 campaigns, guidelines, and a revision of medical fees have been implemented. Further,
57 some medical institutions have established new departments to promote the
58 **accommodation** of working people **with poor health**²¹⁻²⁴. **Accommodating** the
59 employment of workers with **poor health** has a number of benefits, including reducing
60 loss of work productivity²⁵, sickness absence²⁶, the risk of **job termination**^{16,17,27} and
61 **job stress**¹⁶.

62 It is particularly important to provide **job accommodations** to workers with
63 **poor health** in the current COVID-19 pandemic, a period during which many have
64 experienced interruption to treatments, **particularly those for chronic, non-emergency**
65 **diseases such as diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and hypertension**²⁸⁻²⁹.
66 In addition, workers with **poor health** suffer from psychological anxiety **related to**
67 **being more susceptible to COVID-19** infection and **having a high risk for** disease
68 **aggravation**³⁰, which is thought to lead to reduced work performance among those with
69 **poor health**. Thus, **job accommodations that** make it **more conducive for workers to**
70 **receive treatment and provide health guidance to** workers with **poor health** during the

71 COVID-19 pandemic are important for maintaining and improving workers' health

72 condition and work performance.

73 We hypothesized that **job accommodations** for workers with **poor health**
74 during the COVID-19 pandemic would **improve or maintain work** performance. Thus,
75 we examined the relationship between **job accommodations provided by companies** for
76 workers with **poor health** and a decline in work performance due to presenteeism
77 during the COVID-19 pandemic. We **also stratified our analysis** by job type, because
78 the relationship between workers with **poor health** and decreased work performance **is**
79 **hypothesized to differ by the type of job being performed. Different job types can have**
80 **different characteristics, such as physical demands, loads from the physical**
81 **environment, and mental strains from overwork and interpersonal communication.**

82

83 **Methods**

84 **Study design and subjects**

85 **The CORONaWork (Collaborative Online Research on Novel-coronavirus**
86 **and Work) project was a cross-sectional internet monitoring survey conducted from**
87 **December 22 to 26, 2020, with the aim of examining the relationship between the**
88 **working environment and the health status of workers during the COVID-19**

89 pandemic³¹. Data were collected through Cross Marketing Inc (Tokyo, Japan). From
90 55,045 registered monitors, 33,302 full-time workers were selected based on prefecture,
91 occupation and sex, because we expected that random sampling without such criteria
92 would lead to bias of participant attributes toward big cities, men, and desk workers
93 due to the nature of internet monitoring. In addition, we sought to reduce any regional
94 bias caused by the large regional variation in COVID-19 infection rates across Japan.

95 Out of a total of 33,302 participants in the survey, 27,036 were included in the
96 study after removing those who provided fraudulent responses. Fraudulent responses
97 were defined as follows: extremely short response time (≤ 6 minutes), extremely low
98 body weight (< 30 kg), extremely short height (< 140 cm), inconsistent answers to
99 similar questions throughout the survey (e.g., inconsistency to questions about marital
100 status and living area), and wrong answers to a staged question used to identify
101 fraudulent responses (choose the third largest number from the following five
102 numbers). Because job accommodations such as job adjustments, workplace support,
103 and improvements to the work environment are provided to workers by companies or
104 supervisors, we only included employed workers. A total of 2,607 subjects who
105 indicated that their occupation was self-employed or SOHO (Small Office, Home
106 Office) were excluded because self-employed workers cannot receive job

107 accommodations from the company. A total of 24,429 individuals (12,184 males and
108 12,245 females) were included in this analysis. This study was approved by the ethics
109 committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan
110 (reference No. R2-079). Informed consent was obtained using a form on the survey
111 website.

112

113 **Assessment of job accommodations for workers with poor health**

114 A single-item question was used to determine workers' need for job
115 accommodations: "Do you need any job accommodations from your company to
116 continue working in your current health condition?" The participants responded by
117 choosing from "Not necessary", "Yes, but I am not receiving any accommodations",
118 and "Yes, I am receiving accommodations". We classified subjects who answered
119 "Not necessary" as healthy workers, "Yes, but I am not receiving any accommodations"
120 as sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their company, and "Yes, I am
121 receiving accommodations" as sick workers receiving job accommodations from their
122 company.

123

124 Assessment of work functioning impairment

125 We assessed the decline in workers' performance due to presenteeism using
126 the work functioning impairment scale (WFun). WFun is a self-reported questionnaire
127 developed using the Rasch model³². It consists of seven questions and the total score
128 ranges from 7 to 35. A higher score indicates higher severity of work functioning
129 impairment. A score of 21 or higher is defined as mild to severe work functioning
130 impairment due to health problems. WFun has been confirmed for hypothesis testing,
131 responsiveness, and criterion-relevant validity according to the consensus-based
132 standards for the selection of health status measurement instruments. A previous study
133 that examined the association between the interview results of occupational health
134 nurses and WFun confirmed the validity of the criterion association³³. In this study, we
135 used a six-item version whose items can be equivalently converted to those of the
136 original tool based on the Rasch model.

137

138 Other covariates

139 The following survey items were considered confounding factors: age, sex,
140 household income, educational status, number of employees at the workplace and
141 marriage status. Evidence from previous studies indicate that these factors are
142 associated with presenteeism³⁴⁻³⁷. Although the association between these factors and

143 job accommodations is unclear, we think that the provision of job accommodations by
144 companies is related to socioeconomic status; this is another reason for the inclusion of
145 the above factors as confounders in this study.

146

147 Statistical analysis

148 The odds ratios (ORs) of mild to severe work functioning impairment as
149 assessed by WFun associated with job accommodations for workers with poor health
150 were estimated using a multilevel logistic regression model. The model was adjusted
151 for age, sex, household income, educational status, the number of employees at the
152 workplace, and marriage status. We further estimated the multivariate ORs of work
153 functioning impairment associated with job accommodations for workers with poor
154 health stratified by job type (mainly desk work, mainly interpersonal communication,
155 and mainly manual labor).

156 A p value less than .05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses
157 were conducted using R ver.1.4.1103 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna,
158 Austria)³⁸.

159

160 Results

161 Table 1 shows the characteristics of the subjects in this study. Of the total
162 subjects, 74.0% (n=18,120) were healthy workers, 16.0% (n=3,999) were sick workers
163 receiving job accommodations from their company, and 9.5% (n=2,310) were sick
164 workers not receiving job accommodations from their company. The mean age and
165 proportion of current smokers were lower among sick workers receiving job
166 accommodations than sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their
167 company. In contrast, household income, educational background, and the number of
168 employees at the workplace tended to be higher among sick workers receiving job
169 accommodations than sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their
170 company. The proportion of married employees was higher among healthy workers
171 than others.

172 Table 2 shows the ORs and adjusted ORs derived from multivariate models of
173 mild to severe work functioning impairment. The odds of mild to severe work
174 functioning impairment in age- and sex-adjusted subjects were 5.75 times higher
175 among sick workers not receiving job accommodations and 1.88 times higher among
176 sick workers receiving job accommodations from their company than healthy workers.
177 After adjusting for household income, educational status, the number of employees at
178 the workplace, and marriage status, the odds of mild to severe work functioning

179 impairment were **5.59 times higher among** sick workers not receiving **job**
180 **accommodations** and **1.85 times higher among** sick workers receiving **job**
181 **accommodations from their company** than healthy workers.

182 We also examined the relationship after stratifying by job type: mainly desk
183 work, mainly interpersonal communication, mainly manual labor. Among subjects
184 engaged mainly in desk work, **the odds** of mild to severe work functioning impairment
185 were **6.83 times higher among** sick workers not receiving **job accommodations** and
186 **1.95 times higher among** sick workers receiving **job accommodations** from their
187 company than healthy workers. Likewise, among subjects engaged mainly in
188 interpersonal communication, **the odds** of mild to severe work functioning impairment
189 were **4.81 times higher among** sick workers not receiving **job accommodations** and
190 **1.93 times higher among** sick workers receiving **job accommodations** from their
191 company than healthy workers. Similarly, among subjects engaged mainly in manual
192 labor, the odds of mild to severe work functioning impairment were **5.18 times higher**
193 **among** sick workers not receiving **job accommodations** and **1.68 times higher among**
194 sick workers receiving **job accommodations** from their company than healthy workers.
195 Multivariate analysis showed similar **trends** in the adjusted **odds** of mild to severe work
196 functioning impairment to those observed in the unadjusted models.

197

198 Discussion

199 This study examined the relationship between **job accommodations provided**
200 by companies for workers with **poor health** and work functioning impairment in a large
201 population living in Japan. **The odds of mild to severe work functioning impairment**
202 **among workers who were not receiving job accommodations were 5.8 times** higher
203 than those of workers who did not need **job accommodations**. Meanwhile, **the odds of**
204 **mild to severe work functioning impairment among workers who were not receiving**
205 **job accommodations were 1.9 times** higher than those of workers who did not need **job**
206 **accommodations**. The reduced risk of work functioning impairment for workers
207 receiving **job accommodations** suggests that providing **job accommodations** to workers
208 with **poor health** may improve worker performance. To our knowledge, this is the first
209 study to show a relationship between **job accommodations** for workers with **poor**
210 **health** and work functioning impairment in Japan.

211 We showed that workers with **poor health** have higher work functioning
212 impairment than those who are healthy. Individuals who work with health problems
213 have been reported to experience work disability and lower work productivity¹¹⁻¹³.
214 There are a variety of reasons why workers with **poor health** have reduced work ability.

215 First, the nature of their symptoms or illness can reduce workers' ability to perform
216 their job or certain tasks. For example, pain or musculoskeletal diseases, which are
217 typical causes of presenteeism, lead to decreased physical tolerance and hinder
218 performance in tasks such as handling heavy objects. In addition, sleep disorders and
219 mental health problems, which are a major cause of presenteeism, impair concentration
220 and cognitive function³⁹. Some **conditions** require workers to restrict certain tasks,
221 such as shift work, business trips, and work at heights, to ensure safety and to avoid
222 worsening their **condition**. Second, hospitalization and hospital visits for treatment may
223 reduce working hours and interrupt work schedules. Individuals who work while
224 experiencing work-related disability due to presenteeism have an increased risk of
225 future days off work, job loss, and exclusion from the labor market⁹⁻¹¹. Providing
226 appropriate **job accommodations** to workers, such as changing the contents of their
227 work and adjusting their working hours, is expected to decrease the loss in work
228 performance due to presenteeism and to reduce the risk of lost work days and
229 unemployment.

230 **Job accommodations** can reduce work functioning impairment among
231 workers with **poor health**. In this study, we found that the odds of mild to severe work
232 functioning impairment was approximately three times higher among workers who

233 were not receiving **job accommodations** than those who were receiving **job**
234 **accommodations**. Workers with **poor health** experience a variety of difficulties
235 performing their duties and continuing to work. Providing **job accommodations** for
236 workers with **poor health** in the **form** of adjustments to work hours and shifts, job
237 descriptions to match their work ability, and changes to the physical work environment
238 can help them adjust to work. **Accommodations provided by** supervisors and
239 coworkers are also thought to enhance the effectiveness of these actions. Additionally,
240 a good health climate, or the perception by employees that the team to which they
241 belong cares about health issues, and their handling and communication of related
242 matters, are also thought to contribute. A previous study reported that greater
243 **accommodations** from supervisors and colleagues are associated with lower work
244 productivity loss due to presenteeism⁴⁰⁻⁴¹. In addition, a good health climate is
245 associated with lower presenteeism⁴²⁻⁴⁴. Thus, **job accommodations provided by**
246 companies to regulate workers' health and work environment is expected to lead to
247 improvements in workers' presenteeism and performance.

248 We observed a similar relationship between **job accommodations** for workers
249 with **poor health** and work functioning impairment across the job types examined. We
250 divided occupations into three groups, namely primarily desk jobs, primarily

251 interpersonal communication, and primarily physical labor. Different job types have
252 different degrees of psychological and physical demands. Workers with back pain who
253 engage in physical work naturally require different accommodations to those
254 undergoing anti-cancer drug treatment who work at a desk. While we did not identify
255 the details of the accommodations provided, our results nevertheless suggest that
256 providing accommodations for workers based on their job type and health condition
257 that are in line with their needs is useful for slowing or halting the decline in work
258 functioning impairment across all job types. While job accommodations are
259 increasingly being recommended for workers with poor health, there remains no
260 unified view on the best types of accommodations to offer workers with certain
261 illnesses and performing certain jobs. Job accommodations are currently being chosen
262 through collaboration among workers, employers, attending physicians, and industrial
263 physicians. In the future, studies may identify concrete recommendations of the most
264 effective type of accommodations to provide workers according to job type.

265 This study had some limitations. First, because we conducted a survey of
266 Internet monitors, a degree of selection bias was unavoidable. To minimize this, we
267 selected subjects based on their region, occupation, and prefecture according to the
268 cumulative infection rate from January to December 2020. Second, given the

269 cross-sectional design, we could not determine the causal relationship between **job**
270 **accommodations provided** by companies for workers with **poor health** and work
271 functioning impairment. Workers with mild work functioning impairment who are able
272 to work may receive **job accommodations** more readily. Third, we did not identify
273 workers' symptoms or disease in our study. The effect of **job accommodations** on the
274 improvement in work functioning impairment may depend on the type and degree of
275 **poor health** or symptoms exhibited by workers, combined with their job and tasks.
276 **Fourth, we used only one question to assess whether or not workers were receiving job**
277 **accommodations from their company, which may not be sufficiently valid.**

278 In conclusion, this study showed that there is a relationship between **job**
279 **accommodations provided** by companies for workers with **poor health** and work
280 functioning impairment in a large population of workers across Japan. Workers with
281 **poor health** who were receiving **job accommodations** were less likely to have work
282 functioning impairment than those who reported not receiving **job accommodations**.
283 These results suggest that providing **accommodations** to workers with **poor health** may
284 improve their work functioning impairment.

285

286

287 **References**

- 288 1. McKeivitt C, Morgan M, Dundas R, Holland WW. Sickness absence and
289 “working through” illness: a comparison of two professional groups. *J Public*
290 *Health Med.* 1997;19(3):295-300.
- 291 2. Silver JK, Baima J, Newman R, Galantino ML, Shockney LD. Cancer
292 rehabilitation may improve function in survivors and decrease the economic
293 burden of cancer to individuals and society. *Work.* 2013;46:455–72.
- 294 3. Westerlind E, Persson HC, Eriksson M, Norrving B, Sunnerhagen KS. Return
295 to work after stroke: A Swedish nationwide registry-based study. *Acta Neurol*
296 *Scand.* 2020;141(1):56-64.
- 297 4. Hegewald J, Wegewitz UE, Euler U, et al. Interventions to support return to
298 work for people with coronary heart disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.*
299 2019;2019(3):CD010748.
- 300 5. Palmer KT, Harris C, Linaker C, et al. Effectiveness of community- and
301 workplace-based interventions to manage musculoskeletal-related sickness
302 absence and job loss – a systematic review. *Rheumatology (Oxford).*
303 2012;51(2):230-242.

- 304 6. Prins R. Sickness absence and disability: an international perspective. In: Loisel
305 P, Anema JR, eds. Handbook of Work Disability: Prevention and Management.
306 Springer; 2013:3-14.
- 307 7. EUROSTAT. hlth_dlm040—population by type of disability, sex, age and
308 labour status [Table]. EUROSTAT;
309 2011.<https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do>
310 Accessed August 25, 2021.
- 311 8. Brooks A, Hagen SE, Sathyanarayanan S, Schultz AB, Edington DW.
312 Presenteeism: critical issues. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2010;52(11):1055-1067.
- 313 9. Fujino Y, Shazuki S, Izumi H, et al. Prospective cohort study of work
314 functioning impairment and subsequent absenteeism among Japanese workers.
315 *J Occup Environ Med.* 2016;58(7):e264-267.
- 316 10. Hansen CD, Andersen JH. Sick at work--a risk factor for long-term sickness
317 absence at a later date? *J Epidemiol Community Health.* 2009;63(5):397-402.
- 318 11. Sadatsafavi M, Rousseau R, Chen W, Zhang W, Lynd L, FitzGerald JM. The
319 preventable burden of productivity loss due to suboptimal asthma control: a
320 population-based study. *Chest.* 2014;145(4):787-793.

- 321 12. Dellve L, Hadzibajramovic E, Ahlborg G. Work attendance among healthcare
322 workers: prevalence, incentives, and long-term consequences for health and
323 performance. *J Adv Nurs*. 2011;67(9):1918-1929.
- 324 13. Merchant JA, Kelly KM, Burmeister LF, et al. Employment status matters: a
325 statewide survey of quality-of-life, prevention behaviors, and absenteeism and
326 presenteeism. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2014;56(7):686-698.
- 327 14. Schmitt JM, Ford DE. Work limitations and productivity loss are associated
328 with health-related quality of life but not with clinical severity in patients with
329 psoriasis. *Dermatology*. 2006;213(2):102-110.
- 330 15. Kinman G. Sickness presenteeism at work: prevalence, costs and management.
331 *Br Med Bull*. 2019;129(1):69-78.
- 332 16. Zafar N, Rotenberg M, Rudnick A. A systematic review of work
333 accommodations for people with mental disorders. *Work*. 2019;64(3):461-475.
- 334 17. Chow CM, Cichocki B, Croft B. The impact of job accommodations on
335 employment outcomes among individuals with psychiatric disabilities.
336 *Psychiatr Serv*. 2014;65(9):1126-1132.
- 337 18. Thornhill S, Williams N. Completion of the statement of fitness for work:
338 concise guidance. *Clin Med (Lond)*. 2012;12(1):63-66.

- 339 19. Dorrington S, Roberts E, Mykletun A, Hatch S, Madan I, Hotopf M. Systematic
340 review of fit note use for workers in the UK. *Occup Environ Med*.
341 2018;75(7):530-539.
- 342 20. Paulides E, Geary RB, de Boer NKH, Mulder CJJ, Bernstein CN, McCombie
343 AM. Accommodations and adaptations to overcome workplace disability in
344 inflammatory bowel disease patients: a systematic review. *Inflamm Intest Dis*.
345 2019;3(3):138-144.
- 346 21. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Vital Statistics 2015. (In Japanese).
347 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/toukei/saikin/hw/jinkou/kakutei15/> Accessed
348 September 1, 2021.
- 349 22. The Japan Institute for Labour Policy and Training. Survey on Balancing Work
350 and Illness Treatment (Web-based Patient Survey)2018. (In Japanese).
351 <https://www.jil.go.jp/institute/research/2018/180.html> Accessed September 1,
352 2021.
- 353 23. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Guideline for Support of Balancing
354 Medical Treatment and Occupational Life in the Workplace (in Japanese).
355 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/0000115267.html> Accessed
356 September 1, 2021.

- 357 24. Minohara R et al. Qualitative analysis of provided information and advice from
358 occupational physicians to attending clinical physicians in supporting an
359 employee's work-treatment balance. *Sangyo Eiseigaku Zasshi*.
360 2021;63(1):6-20. (In Japanese)
- 361 25. Okubo K, Gotoh M, Shimada K, Ritsu M, Okuda M, Crawford B.
362 Fexofenadine improves the quality of life and work productivity in Japanese
363 patients with seasonal allergic rhinitis during the peak cedar pollinosis season.
364 *Int Arch Allergy Immunol*. 2005;136(2):148-154.
- 365 26. dos Santos K, Kupek E, Cunha JCCB, Blank VLG. Sickness-absenteeism, job
366 demand-control model, and social support: a case-control study nested in a
367 cohort of hospital workers, Santa Catarina, Brazil. *Rev Bras Epidemiol*.
368 2011;14(4):609-619.
- 369 27. Spelten ER, Sprangers MAG, Verbeek JHAM. Factors reported to influence the
370 return to work of cancer survivors: a literature review. *Psychooncology*.
371 2002;11(2):124-131.
- 372 28. Czeisler MÉ, Marynak K, Clarke KEN, et al. Delay or Avoidance of Medical
373 Care Because of COVID-19-Related Concerns - United States, June 2020.
374 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(36):1250-1257.

- 375 **29. Chudasama YV, Gillies CL, Zaccardi F, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on routine**
376 **care for chronic diseases: A global survey of views from healthcare**
377 **professionals. *Diabetes Metab Syndr.* 2020;14(5):965-967.**
- 378 **30. Erol MK, Kayıkçıoğlu M, Kılıçkap M, et al. Treatment delays and in-hospital**
379 **outcomes in acute myocardial infarction during the COVID-19 pandemic: A**
380 **nationwide study. *Anatol J Cardiol.* 2020;24(5):334-342.**
- 381 **31. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide internet-based**
382 **health survey of workers during the covid-19 pandemic in 2020. *J UOEH.***
383 **2021;43(2):217-225.**
- 384 **32. Fujino Y, Uehara M, Izumi H, et al. Development and validity of a work**
385 **functioning impairment scale based on the Rasch model among Japanese**
386 **workers. *J Occup Health.* 2015;57(6):521-531.**
- 387 **33. Nagata T, Fujino Y, Saito K, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of the work functioning**
388 **impairment scale (Wfun): a method to detect workers who have health**
389 **problems affecting their work and to evaluate fitness for work. *J Occup***
390 ***Environ Med.* 2017;59(6):557-562.**
- 391 **34. Susser P, Ziebarth NR. Profiling the u. S. Sick leave landscape: presenteeism**
392 **among females. *Health Serv Res.* 2016;51(6):2305-2317.**

- 393 **35.** Wee LH, Yeap LLL, Chan CMH, et al. Antecedent factors predicting
394 absenteeism and presenteeism in urban area in Malaysia. *BMC Public Health*.
395 2019;19(Suppl 4):540.
- 396 **36.** Li W, Moriyama M, Cui Y, Kazawa K, Nakaya T, Susanto T. Presenteeism
397 among Chinese workers in Japan and its relationship with mental health and
398 health-promoting lifestyles. *Ind Health*. 2020;58(1):35-45.
- 399 **37.** Mekonnen TH, Tefera MA, Melsew YA. Sick at work: prevalence and
400 determinants among healthcare workers, western Ethiopia: an institution based
401 cross-sectional study. *Ann Occup Environ Med*. 2018;30:2.
- 402 **38.** R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
403 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL_
404 <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 405 **39.** Swanson LM, Arnedt JT, Rosekind MR, Belenky G, Balkin TJ, Drake C. Sleep
406 disorders and work performance: findings from the 2008 National Sleep
407 Foundation Sleep in America poll. *J Sleep Res*. 2011;20(3):487-494.
- 408 **40.** Saijo Y, Yoshioka E, Nakagi Y, Kawanishi Y, Hanley SJB, Yoshida T. Social
409 support and its interrelationships with demand-control model factors on

- 410 presenteeism and absenteeism in Japanese civil servants. *Int Arch Occup*
411 *Environ Health*. 2017;90(6):539-553.
- 412 41. Schmid JA, Jarczok MN, Sonntag D, Herr RM, Fischer JE, Schmidt B.
413 Associations between supportive leadership behavior and the costs of
414 absenteeism and presenteeism: an epidemiological and economic approach. *J*
415 *Occup Environ Med*. 2017;59(2):141-147.
- 416 42. Zanon REB, Dalmolin G de L, Magnago TSB de S, Andolhe R, Carvalho
417 REFL de. Presenteeism and safety culture: evaluation of health workers in a
418 teaching hospital. *Rev Bras Enferm*. 2021;74(1):e20190463.
- 419 43. Schulz H, Zacher H, Lippke S. The importance of team health climate for
420 health-related outcomes of white-collar workers. *Front Psychol*. 2017;8:74.
- 421 44. Liu B, Lu Q, Zhao Y, Zhan J. Can the psychosocial safety climate reduce
422 ill-health presenteeism? Evidence from Chinese healthcare staff under a dual
423 information processing path lens. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
424 2020;17(8):E2969.
425

Table1. Characteristic of the subjects

Characteristic	Healthy workers (n=18,120)		Sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their company (n=3,999)		Sick workers receiving job accommodations from their company (n=2,310)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age, mean (SD)	46.8 (10.6)*		45.9 (10.2)*		44.9 (10.9)*	
Sex, men	9,117	50	1,985	50	1,082	47
Household income						
200-299million yen	2,256	12	770	19	340	15
300-499million yen	4,216	23	1,090	27	549	24
500-699million yen	3,994	22	851	21	484	21
700-899million yen	3,309	18	593	15	437	19
900million yen or more	4,345	24	695	17	500	22
Education status						
Junior high school	211	1	71	2	26	1
High school	4,647	26	1,061	27	545	24
Vocational school/college, Universtiy, Graduate school	13,262	73	2,867	72	1,739	75
Cuurent smoker	4,504	25	1,135	28	517	22
Number of employees at the workplace						
<10	2,801	15	546	14	312	14
<100	5,063	28	1,179	29	621	27
<1000	5,246	29	1,246	31	648	28
>1000	5,010	28	1,028	26	729	32
Marriage status, married	10,379	57	2,034	51	1,238	54

* Represents mean and SD.

Table 2. Odds ratios and adjusted odds ratios for multivariate model of mild to severe work function impairment

Mild to severe work function impairment (WFun \geq 21)	n	Model 1			Model 2		
		OR	95% CI	P value	OR	95% CI	P value
All subjects	24,429						
Healthy workers	18,120	1.00			1.00		
Sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their company	3,999	5.75	5.34 6.20	<0.001	5.59	5.19 6.03	<0.001
Sick workers receiving job accommodations from their company	2,310	1.88	1.69 2.08	<0.001	1.85	1.67 2.05	<0.001
Mainly desk work	12,486						
Healthy workers	9,496	1.00			1.00		
Sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their company	1,831	6.83	6.13 7.61	<0.001	6.60	5.92 7.36	<0.001
Sick workers receiving job accommodations from their company	1,159	1.95	1.69 2.25	<0.001	1.92	1.66 2.22	<0.001
Mainly interpersonal communication	5,884						
Healthy workers	4,327	1.00			1.00		
Sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their company	1,022	4.81	4.15 5.59	<0.001	4.70	4.05 5.46	<0.001
Sick workers receiving job accommodations from their company	535	1.93	1.56 2.38	<0.001	1.94	1.56 2.38	<0.001

Mainly manual labor	6,059									
Healthy workers	4,297	1.00					1.00			
Sick workers not receiving job accommodations from their company	1,146	5.18	4.48	5.99	<0.001	5.07	4.38	5.86	<0.001	
Sick workers receiving job accommodations from their company	616	1.68	1.37	2.06	<0.001	1.66	1.35	2.03	<0.001	

Model 1: Adjusted for age, sex

Model 2: Further adjusted for household income, educational status, number of employees at the workplace and marriage status