

1 **Teleworking and health in an epidemic context:**
2 **contrasting the infectious and non-communicable**
3 **diseases perspectives**

4
5 Léo Moutet*¹, Quentin J. Leclerc*^{1,2,3,4}, Maylis Layan^{1,2,3,4}, Karim Aït Bouziad¹, William Dab¹,
6 Paul Henriot^{1,2}, Elise Hodbert^{1,5}, Narimène Louati¹, Aurélie Maurin^{1,2}, Frédérique Thonon¹,
7 Sylvie Znaty¹, Mohamed Ben Halima¹, Kévin Jean^{1,2,6}, Laura Temime^{1,2}

8
9 *These authors contributed equally

10
11 ¹ Laboratoire Modélisation, Épidémiologie et Surveillance des Risques Sanitaires
12 (MESuRS), Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, 75003 Paris, France

13 ² Institut Pasteur, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, Unité PACRI, 75015 Paris,
14 France

15 ³ Institut Pasteur, Université Paris Cité, Epidemiology and Modelling of Bacterial Escape to
16 Antimicrobials (EMEA), 75015 Paris, France

17 ⁴ INSERM, Université Paris-Saclay, Université de Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines, Team
18 Échappement aux Anti-infectieux et Pharmacopépidémiologie U1018, CESP, 78000
19 Versailles, France

20 ⁵ Cibles et médicaments des infections et de l'immunité, IICiMed, UR 1155, Nantes
21 Université, Nantes, France)

22 ⁶ Eco-Evolutionary Mathematics team, IBENS, École Normale Supérieure, CNRS, INSERM,
23 Université Paris Science & Lettres, Paris, France

24 **Abstract**

25 The global response to the COVID-19 pandemic has brought a significant shift towards
26 teleworking. While this escalating practice can reduce the risk of infection for workers, its
27 societal and health impact also encompasses non-communicable diseases (NCDs).
28 However, the link between teleworking frequency and NCD risk is unclear. In this study, we
29 aimed to unravel the intricate interplay between teleworking, infectious disease (ID)
30 transmission, and NCD risk, to quantify how these factors could affect a potential optimal
31 teleworking frequency with regards to health outcomes.

32
33 First, we conducted a rapid review to identify possible exposure-response relationships
34 between teleworking and the risk of NCDs such as musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) or
35 mental health. Then, we designed a mathematical model of the transmission of ID and the
36 acquisition of NCD in a medium-sized company to illustrate how varying levels of teleworking
37 can impact workers health. We simulated infection dynamics over a three-month epidemic
38 wave, considering that employees could be infected by the virus either within the workplace
39 or outside it. On weekdays, employees were either physically present at the workplace, with
40 potential exposure to infectious colleagues, or engaged in telework, facing a reduced
41 community-based risk. We compared the results obtained by our model when using different
42 teleworking frequencies and exposure-response functions, to contrast both ID and NCD risks
43 in relation to the extent of telework engagement.

44
45 From the literature, we found diverging evidence for the shape of the exposure-response
46 relationship indicating that, depending on the NCD considered, the risk incurred by
47 teleworking may peak at either low, intermediate or high teleworking frequency. Depending
48 on the chosen shape of this relationship and frequency of teleworking, we observed an
49 individual and collective benefit-risk balance between a reduction in ID transmission and a
50 potentially increased burden of NCD.

51
52 By acknowledging the dual facets of both infectious and non-communicable health
53 outcomes, our study emphasises the need for a holistic approach when formulating
54 strategies for ID prevention, ensuring that the societal and health impacts of such
55 interventions are comprehensively assessed.

56
57 **Keywords:** teleworking, infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases, exposure-
58 response relationship, mathematical model, rapid review

59 **Background**

60

61 Teleworking describes work that is fully or partially carried out at a location other than the
62 default place of work, typically at home (1). In the European Union, the proportion of workers
63 who sometimes or usually telework rose from 9% in 2019 before the COVID-19 pandemic, to
64 12.2% in 2022 (15.8% to 21.3% in France) (2). Recently, several large organisations have
65 switched to a full-remote work organisation, where workers whose job can be performed
66 remotely no longer have an office (3,4). During the same period, the willingness of
67 employees to telework has increased (5,6). Overall, the increasing prevalence of teleworking
68 implies the necessity to understand the impact of this activity on worker health (7).

69

70 From the perspective of infectious diseases (IDs), there is a consensus that teleworking in
71 the context of an epidemic reduces the risk of infection (8,9). An important proportion of
72 contacts occur at work, hence reducing these can have a substantial impact on ID incidence
73 (10–14). The value of teleworking against ID transmission was particularly highlighted during
74 the COVID-19 pandemic, during which public health and social measures led to a global
75 transition towards telework across numerous sectors (15). Through these elements, we can
76 establish an exposure-response relationship between teleworking and IDs, whereby an
77 increased teleworking frequency mechanistically leads to a reduction of ID risk.

78

79 On the other hand, the shape of this potential exposure-response relationship between
80 teleworking and non-communicable diseases (NCDs) risk remain unclear. This is notably
81 due to conflicting evidence for the impact of teleworking on NCD risk, within which we can
82 distinguish between physical and mental health. In a well-organised manner, teleworking can
83 enhance the equilibrium between work-related commitments and personal life, diminish road
84 congestion and commuting time, and decrease atmospheric pollutants, all of which indirectly
85 contribute to the improvement of physical and mental well-being (16,17). However,
86 suboptimal physical settings and workplace design can cause musculoskeletal disorders
87 (MSDs), ocular strain (18), and an associated psychological burden (19). Other major health
88 determinants can be affected by teleworking such as obesity, alcohol abuse, physical
89 inactivity, and tobacco use (20). Combined, these elements suggest that the relationship
90 between teleworking and NCD risk is not as clear as for IDs.

91

92 In this study, we aimed to explore the health impacts associated with telework in an
93 epidemic context, including both ID and NCD. We first clarified the situation for NCDs by
94 conducting a rapid review to identify exposure-response relationships that have been
95 quantified between teleworking frequency and physical or mental health. We then illustrated
96 how different exposure-response functions may lead to contrasting impacts of teleworking on
97 health, using a mathematical model simulating the incidence of an ID amongst employees of
98 a non-specific company. This model accounts for the impact of teleworking frequency on
99 both the ID transmission and the incidence of NCD.

100 **Methods**

101 **Rapid review**

102 We conducted a rapid review of research articles investigating quantifiable aspects of
103 telework (e.g. frequency measured in days per month or hours per week) in association with
104 the risk of NCDs, such as mental health disorders and MSDs. A rapid review assesses the
105 evidence regarding a specific issue (scale, scope and limitations), although the processes of
106 study selection, data extraction and quality assessment may be simplified (21).
107

108 Search strategy and study selection

109 Previous reviews on the impact of telework on health have found that the most notable
110 outcomes are related to behavioural risks, mental health or MSDs (22–24). Therefore, we
111 restricted our review to the impact of telework on these outcomes.
112

113 We searched three databases (Pubmed, Scopus and Google Scholar) to identify original
114 studies assessing the quantitative association between telework and health. We then
115 synthesised the evidence regarding the shape and magnitude of the relationship between
116 telework exposure and the various health outcomes studied.
117

118 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

119 We used the following inclusion and exclusion criteria to select studies:

- 120 ● Publication type: we included original research articles only.
- 121 ● Population: we included articles studying workers exposed to some level of telework,
122 whether they were part of a specific sub-population (such as specific professions) or
123 not.
- 124 ● Exposure: we included studies that compared at least two levels of exposure to
125 telework, in addition to no telework.
- 126 ● Outcomes: we included studies that reported MSDs, mental health conditions or
127 behavioural risks as outcomes, and excluded studies reporting only other outcomes.
128 We did not restrict ourselves to a single specific MSD, mental health condition or
129 behavioural risk.

130 We placed no restriction on the date of publication or the language.
131

132 Data collection

133 From the selected studies, we extracted the following information: study years, country,
134 working population (sector), study design, quantification of telework exposure, the health-
135 related outcomes examined, and the shape of the observed relationship. Importantly, we
136 extracted relationships regarding health-related outcomes for any telework level different
137 from 0 to portray plausible exposure-response functions. To inform the model, we only
138 considered exposure-response relationships based on significant ($p < 0.05$) values.
139

140 Mathematical modelling details

141 To simultaneously capture the relationship between teleworking and both ID and NCD risk,
142 we designed a compartmental deterministic model to represent the population of employees
143 from a non-specific company during an epidemic wave of a SARS-CoV-2-like virus (Figure
144 1a). This model is summarised in the following set of ordinary differential equations driving
145 the dynamics of numbers of individuals in each model compartment:

146
147

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS}{dt} &= -\lambda \cdot S \\ \frac{dE}{dt} &= \lambda \cdot S - \sigma \cdot E \\ \frac{dI_A}{dt} &= p_A \cdot \sigma \cdot E - \gamma_A \cdot I_A \\ \frac{dP}{dt} &= (1 - p_a) \cdot \sigma \cdot E - \rho \cdot P \\ \frac{dI_S}{dt} &= \rho \cdot P - \gamma_S \cdot I_S \\ \frac{dR}{dt} &= \gamma_A \cdot I_A + \gamma_S \cdot I_S\end{aligned}$$

148

149 We considered that all employees of the company are initially susceptible (S) to the ID and
150 can become exposed (E), *i.e.* infected but not yet infectious, following a transmission event
151 at rate λ . Exposed individuals progress through a latent period at rate σ before either
152 becoming infectious asymptomatic (I_A , with probability p_A), or infectious presymptomatic (P).
153 Presymptomatic individuals eventually become infectious symptomatic (I_S) at a rate ρ . All
154 infectious individuals eventually become recovered (R) at a rate which varies depending on
155 whether they are asymptomatic (γ_A) or symptomatic (γ_S). The total number of employees
156 $N=S+E+I_A+P+I_S+R$ is assumed constant over the time period of interest.

157

158 Rate of infection

159 Employees can become infected either via contacts with 1) other infectious employees
160 during working days when they are present in the workplace, 2) contacts with individuals
161 outside the company during working days when they are teleworking, or 3) contacts with
162 individuals outside the company during non-working days (Figure 1b). We assumed that five
163 days per week are working days, and calculated the overall force of infection as a weighted
164 average (assumed constant) of forces of infection in the workplace (λ_W), during telework (λ_T),
165 and on non-working days (λ_C), as follows:

166

167

$$\lambda = \frac{5}{7} \cdot (1 - \alpha) \cdot \lambda_W + \frac{5}{7} \cdot \alpha \cdot \lambda_T + \frac{2}{7} \cdot \lambda_C$$

168 with

$$\lambda_W = \beta \frac{\nu \cdot I_A + P}{N - I_S}$$

169

170 Here, α indicates the average proportion of time spent in telework rather than in the office. If
171 employees are working from the office, they can be infected at a rate β either by infected
172 asymptomatic (I_A) or presymptomatic (P) employees also present. We assumed that infected
173 symptomatic (I_S) individuals are systematically on sick leave, and hence cannot infect other
174 employees since they are absent from the workplace. We further assumed that
175 asymptomatic individuals are less infectious than presymptomatic, hence v is the coefficient
176 of relative infectiousness for asymptomatic individuals compared to symptomatic (25). We
177 modelled workplace-transmission as a frequency-dependent process, and divided the
178 transmission rate by the number of employees present in the workplace (all employees N
179 minus I_S who are on sick leave).

180

181 The term λ_C corresponds to the force of infection which an employee is subjected to outside
182 the workplace, on a non-working day. We considered that this represents the wider epidemic
183 in the community, which is independent of the workplace epidemic since it is much larger.
184 We calibrated λ_C to available data from the second wave of SARS-CoV-2 in France
185 (01/09/2020 - 01/12/2020) (Figure 1c), assuming an initial low-level transmission of the ID in
186 the community. Briefly, we calculated the per-day individual probability of being infected,
187 defined as the daily incidence divided by the prevalence of susceptible individuals, among all
188 individuals aged between 20 and 64 years old. We then converted this daily probability to the
189 daily individual rate of infection (i.e. λ_C), using the formula: $rate = -\ln(1-probability)$. On
190 teleworking days, we assumed that employees would also have contacts with other
191 individuals in the community, although at a lower rate than on non-working days, hence we
192 defined the force of infection on teleworking days λ_T as a fraction ε of λ_C .


193

194 We calculated the within-company basic reproduction number R_0 using the next generation
195 matrix method (26) (Supplementary Text 1) from which we derived the per-employee
196 transmission rate β for presymptomatic individuals in the workplace as

197

$$\beta = \frac{R_0 \cdot \rho \cdot \gamma_A}{(1 - p_A)\gamma_A + \rho \cdot v \cdot p_A}$$

198



199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207

Figure 1: Model structure. a) Model diagram. With regards to the infectious disease, individuals can either be Susceptible (S), Exposed (E), Infected Asymptomatic (I_A), Presymptomatic (P), Infected Symptomatic (I_S) or Recovered (R). Compartments with the superscript “C” indicate individuals who will eventually develop a NCD due to teleworking. **b) Components of the total force of infection λ .** **c) Community epidemic curve (bars, left axis) and corresponding force of infection λ_C (line, right axis).**

208 Rate of non-communicable disease incidence

209 To represent the incidence of the selected NCD due to telework in this model, we duplicated
210 the compartments listed above to further stratify individuals according to whether they will
211 develop a NCD due to teleworking. We considered that individuals in the infected
212 symptomatic state cannot move to the corresponding compartment, since they do not
213 telework but are on sick leave. For all other states, the transition towards the NCD status
214 occurs at an average daily rate defined by the exposure-response function $f(\alpha)$ which
215 depends on the proportion of telework α . Possible shapes for this function were informed by
216 the studies identified in our rapid review (20,27,28). To ensure comparability between the
217 different forms of $f(\alpha)$, we systematically set the baseline value $f(0)$ equal to 8.9×10^{-5}
218 per day. This corresponds to an annual probability of approximately 3.2% ($= 1 - \exp(-8.9 \times 10^{-5} \times 365)$)
219 to develop a NCD in absence of teleworking, similar to the Global Burden of Disease
220 2021 estimates for the cumulative incidence of MSDs and mental disorders (29). Parameter
221 values for the model are summarised in Table 1.
222

223 **Table 1: Model parameters.**

Name	Symbol	Value	Range explored	Source
Reproduction number	R_0	2.66	2 - 4	(30)
Coefficient of relative infectiousness of asymptomatics	ν	0.35	0.1 – 1.27	(25)
Coefficient of relative community force of infection on teleworking days	ϵ	0.21	0.17 – 0.25 (assumed +/- 20%)	(15)
Progression rate from exposed to infectious (= 1/incubation period)	σ	$1/6.57 \text{ days}^{-1}$	$1/18.87 - 1/1.80 \text{ days}^{-1}$	(31)
Probability of asymptomatic infection	ρ_A	0.2	0.17 – 0.25	(25)
Recovery rate from infection for asymptomatics	γ_A	$1/5 \text{ days}^{-1}$	N/A	(32)
Progression rate from presymptomatic to symptomatic	ρ	$1/1.5 \text{ days}^{-1}$	N/A	(32)
Recovery rate for symptomatics	γ_S	$1/5 \text{ days}^{-1}$	N/A	(32)
Baseline incidence rate of non-communicable disease in absence of telework	$f(0)$	$8.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{ days}^{-1}$	N/A	(29)
Maximum change in relative risk of non-communicable disease due to telework*	ω	+/- 0.7	+/- 0.05-0.7	This study

224 *This parameter is only used in the sensitivity analysis

225

226

227 Model simulations over a 3-month time period were performed using R version 4.2.2. The

228 code for the model and all the analysis presented in this article is included in a GitHub

229 repository (https://github.com/MESuRS-Lab/telework_health).

230

231 Results

232 Literature review

233 Studies on the exposure-response relationship between teleworking and non-communicable 234 disease risk

235 We identified three studies that met our selection criteria and presented exposure-response
236 relationships between teleworking and NCD risk (Table 2). Of those studies, one focused on
237 work-related outcomes (27), one on physical health (28), and one on health determinants
238 (including behavioural changes) impacting both mental and physical health (20). Importantly,
239 two of the identified studies were entirely conducted before the COVID-19 pandemic (20,27).

240

241 The study that focused on work-related outcomes notably examined depressive symptoms
242 and self-rated health (27). The results of this longitudinal study conducted on United States
243 employees highlighted exposure-response relationships for several outcomes. A U-shaped
244 (US) relationship was found between the number of teleworking days per week and
245 depressive symptoms, with a higher risk among non-teleworkers (0 days per week) and
246 those with a higher frequency of telework (5 days per week). The association between
247 number of teleworking days per week and self-rated health also displayed a US relationship.

248

249 For physical health, the study we identified only focused on lower back pain as a MSD-
250 related outcome (28). The findings from this cross-sectional study conducted in Japan
251 revealed an inverted U-shaped (IU) exposure-response relationship between teleworking
252 frequency and lower back pain, with the highest risk in case of intermediate teleworking
253 frequencies (2-3 days/week).

254

255 Finally, the last study described exposures related to both mental and physical health such
256 as alcohol abuse or physical inactivity (20). This longitudinal study was conducted in the
257 United States on insurance company employees. Retrieved results (significant values at $p <$
258 0.05) suggested a broadly decreasing relationship between teleworking intensity and risks of
259 alcohol abuse and tobacco use. For the Edington risk score (a summary score accounting
260 for several risk factors), we observed an L-shaped (LS) relationship with increased telework
261 intensity, with an initial rapid decrease in risk at low telework frequencies followed by a more
262 stable relationship at higher frequencies.

263 **Table 2: Summary of identified studies on the exposure-response relationship**
 264 **between teleworking frequency and non-communicable disease (NCD) risk.** Here, we
 265 classified (or retrieved) the shape exposure-response relationships into five types: U-shaped
 266 (US), inverted U-shaped (IU), L-shaped (LS), broadly decreasing (D) and broadly increasing
 267 (I). Relationships in *italic* are tested in our mathematical model in the next section. “Baseline
 268 level” values are values from the studies for groups not exposed to telework (0 days per
 269 week).

Article	Study period & country	Exposure to telework	Health outcome	Health outcome measurement & shape of relationship	Baseline level
Chen et al., 2023 (27)	2018-2019, USA	Days per week (3 groups): • 1-4 • 5	Self-reported (range: 0-10)		
			<i>Depressive symptoms</i>	US: 1.71* ; 2.08*	2.33
			Self-rated health	US: 6.01* ; 5.96*	5.69
Matsugaki et al., 2021 (28)	2020, Japan	Days per week (3 groups): • 1 • 2-3 • 4+	Self-reported symptom (% of Yes)		
			<i>Lower back pain</i>	IU: 52.8%* ; 53.2%* ; 47.5%*	49.9%
Henke et al., 2016 (20)	2010-2011, USA	Hours per month (4 groups) : • 8- • 9-32 • 33-72 • 73+	Regression coefficient and percentage at baseline		
			Alcohol abuse (at least 2 or 3 drinks per day)	D: -0.061 ; -0.503 ; -0.024 ; -1.423*	4.9%
			Physical inactivity (<3 days of exercise per week)	US: -0.189 ; -0.249* ; -0.140 ; -0.015	40.4%
			Tobacco use (yes/no)	D: -0.100 ; -0.175 ; -0.426* ; -0.263	12.3%
			<i>Edington risk (>5 health risk factors)</i>	LS: -0.571* ; -0.997* ; -0.321 ; -1.233*	5.7%
			Obesity risk	US: -0.150 ; -0.146 ; -0.202 ; -0.113	33.1%
			Depression	D: -0.083 ; -0.056 ; -0.202 ; -0.151	16.4%
			Stress	I: 0.033 ; -0.037 ; 0.040 ; 0.137	29.5%
			Poor nutrition	US: -0.017 ; -0.110 ; 0.009 ;	86.2%

			0.194	
--	--	--	-------	--

270 *Reported p value <0.05 in the referenced study

271 Main gaps in identified literature

272 Through our rapid review, we identified several important knowledge gaps based on the
273 selected studies.

274

275 First, there is a lack of uniformity across the measurements of health outcomes (clinical
276 diagnoses and declarative statements) explored in relation with teleworking, ranging from
277 physical to mental health (depression, anxiety, burnout).

278

279 Second, exposures are poorly characterised. Exposure to teleworking is not coded in a
280 standardised manner; depending on the study, it may be expressed in terms of number of
281 days per week, or number of hours per day, with different categories.

282

283 Third, study contexts are heterogenous. Studies encompassing short- and long-term
284 perspectives, within both pandemic and non-pandemic settings, yield outcomes potentially
285 contingent on the phase of the COVID-19 pandemic (33). Confounding factors (such as the
286 region, pre-existing comorbidities or professional status) are not well described or controlled
287 for, and differ across studies.

288

289 Fourth, very few studies met our inclusion criteria, and we found no longitudinal study that
290 focused on MSDs, leading to a lack of quality in evidence especially regarding the temporal
291 relationship between exposure and MSDs. Our findings are in agreement with two recent
292 systematic reviews that also outlined the low quality of evidence regarding health impacts of
293 teleworking (34,35).

294

295 Overall, the identified studies led to divergent results on the shape of the exposure-response
296 function, depending on the considered health outcome (U-shaped, inverted U-shaped, L-
297 shaped, broadly decreasing, and broadly increasing curves). In addition, even for the same
298 health outcome, reported impacts of teleworking could be heterogeneous. For example,
299 Henke and colleagues found a broadly decreasing relationship between hours/month of
300 telecommuting and depression, while Chen and colleagues found a U-shaped relationship.
301 This conflicting evidence may be due to modifying effects as demonstrated by one study
302 according to which organisational factors within a company could alter the shape/direction of
303 the relationship, depending on the COVID-19 wave (33).

304

305 **Illustrative model**


306 The aforementioned limitations show that the exposure-response relationship between
307 teleworking and NCD risk may vary depending on the mental or physical health focus, as
308 well as on other factors. This is bound to impact the level at which teleworking best prevents
309 both ID and NCD. In this next section, we used a mathematical model to illustrate how
310 different typologies and strengths of relationships could affect the optimal frequency of
311 teleworking over an epidemic wave, considering the impact on both the short-term ID risk
312 and the longer-term risk of developing a NCD. Based on our literature review and the

313 statistically significant relationships we identified, we explored three relationships between
314 telework frequency and the risk of NCD: L-shaped (LS, for Edington risk), U-shaped (US, for
315 depressive symptoms), and inverted U-shaped (IU, for lower back pain). In the model, the
316 corresponding exposure-response functions $f(\alpha)$ giving the daily rate at which individuals will
317 develop a NCD for a given frequency of teleworking α were parameterized using data from
318 the three studies analysed in the rapid review (20,27,28) (values in italic in Table 2, see
319 Supplementary Text 2 for details). Importantly, since we used values from the literature to
320 parameterize these functions, the strengths of the association and therefore their upper and
321 lower bounds are different.

322

323 Implementing telework throughout the epidemic wave substantially reduced the cumulative
324 incidence of ID amongst employees (yellow curve), with greater reductions at higher
325 teleworking frequencies and no substantial differences between frequencies greater than
326 0.8, i.e. 4/5 days per week (Figure 2a). However, the cumulative incidence of NCD at
327 different teleworking frequencies varied depending on the exposure-response relationship
328 function, with the predicted peak incidence of NCD occurring either at low (LS, US) or
329 intermediate (IU) teleworking frequencies (Figure 2b).

330



331
 332 **Figure 2: Epidemic dynamics and cumulative incidence of non-communicable disease**
 333 **(NCD) at varying telework frequencies.** Model simulations over 3 months using a telework
 334 frequency $\alpha = 0$ (no telework), 0.2 (1 day in 5), 0.4 (2 days), 0.6 (3 days), 0.8 (4 days) and 1
 335 (full telework), for **a)** changes in the number of susceptible (S), exposed (E),
 336 asymptotically infected (Ia), presymptomatic (P), symptomatically infected (Is) and
 337 recovered (R) employees, and **b)** the relative risk for employees to eventually develop a
 338 NCD, in case of a L-shaped (LS, circles), U-shaped (US, triangles) or inverted U-shaped (IU,
 339 squares) exposure-response relationship between telework and NCD risk.

340


341

342 The impact of teleworking on cumulative disease incidence further varied depending on the
 343 timing of its implementation from the start of the epidemic wave (Figure 3). Since we
 344 performed simulations in the context of an epidemic wave, implementing teleworking too late
 345 prevented any significant reduction of the ID cumulative incidence (orange lines). If we set
 346 an arbitrary objective to reduce this incidence below 50% of the baseline value obtained
 347 without teleworking, a teleworking frequency of 0.2 (i.e. 1 day per week) was not sufficient to
 348 reach this target, even if implemented from the start of the simulation. At least two days of

349 teleworking are necessary to reach this target, with teleworking implemented within the first
350 40 days of the epidemic (solid orange lines). Regarding the change in NCD risk caused by
351 teleworking, as expected, early implementation of teleworking systematically led to a higher
352 change in cumulative incidence (blue lines). However, the nature of this change depended
353 on the assumed exposure-response function shape, upper and lower bounds, and on the
354 teleworking frequency.

355
356 For example, in the case of the L-shaped relationship for Edington risk parameterised
357 according to our review (first row), the incidence of NCD was lowest when teleworking was
358 implemented at a frequency of 1 on the first day (last column), while for the U-shaped
359 relationship for depressive symptoms (second row) the lowest incidence was achieved at a
360 frequency of 0.6 (fourth column). On the other hand, teleworking led to an increase in NCD
361 incidence (relative incidence > 100%) when considering the inverted U-shaped relationship
362 with lower back pain (last row), particularly at intermediate teleworking frequencies (0.4-0.6,
363 third and fourth columns). In that case, slightly delaying the implementation of teleworking to
364 avoid increasing the risk of NCD while still having an impact on ID could be better, and/or
365 implementing 100% teleworking, which would not increase the risk of NCD while keeping the
366 ID risk at a minimum. For the US relationship, timing is also important because early
367 teleworking implementation for intermediate frequencies reduces both health risks below
368 their respective targets, which is not the case for lower or higher frequencies. Additionally,
369 since there is no major difference for ID relative risk between frequencies of 0.8 and 1, a
370 teleworking frequency of 0.8 would be preferable to achieve strong reductions in both NCD
371 and ID risks.

372
373 The contrasting relationship between teleworking and ID versus NCD risks implies that
374 reducing both incidences simultaneously may not always be feasible. In our illustrative
375 example here, where we aimed to reduce ID incidence by at least 50% and NCD incidence
376 by at least 10%, we observed only limited conditions where teleworking could simultaneously
377 reduce both diseases incidences below these targets (Figure 3, grey shaded areas). The
378 definition of an “optimal” teleworking frequency to improve health will therefore vary
379 depending on (i) the observed exposure-response relationship between teleworking and
380 health outcomes, and (ii) the relative importance granted to both ID and NCD risks when
381 defining target thresholds.



382
 383 **Figure 3: Impact of teleworking timing and frequency on the relative cumulative**
 384 **incidences of infectious (ID) and non-communicable diseases (NCD) using observed**
 385 **exposure-response functions.** Cumulative incidence corresponds to the number of
 386 employees infected over the three months of the simulated epidemic. Here, we represent the
 387 cumulative incidences of ID and NCD relative to the cumulative incidences predicted by
 388 each model without teleworking (first column). For example, the lowest incidence of NCD
 389 (blue line) for the L-shaped function (first row) is when teleworking is implemented with a
 390 frequency of 1 (5 days a week) on day 0 (last column), while for the U-shaped exposure-
 391 response function (second row) this occurs at a frequency of 0.6 (fourth column). The grey
 392 dashed line indicates 100%, i.e. the baseline incidences. Lines are solid when the relative
 393 incidences of ID and NCD are respectively lower than 50% and 90% (chosen arbitrarily as
 394 examples), and faded otherwise. The shaded grey areas indicate conditions where both
 395 relative cumulative incidences are below the defined targets of 50% and 90% (for ID and
 396 NCD incidence, respectively).

397


398

399 Sensitivity analysis

400

401 While the exposure-response functions used in the previous section were directly informed
 402 by values we identified in the literature, their upper and lower bounds varied, which
 403 introduces a bias when comparing the incidence of different NCDs since the differences are
 404 not only attributable to the shape of the functions. For example, the greatest change in
 405 relative risk of NCD for the IU function (lower back pain) was approximately +6%, while for

406 the LS function (Edington risk) this reached -70%. As a sensitivity analysis, we reproduced
 407 our analysis using five theoretical functions with shapes corresponding to those we identified
 408 in our review (see Supplementary Text 2 for details, and Supplementary Figures 2 and 3 for
 409 the shapes of the functions), but each with the same greatest absolute change in relative risk
 410 of NCD (+/- 70%). The results obtained underline how the shape of these functions alone
 411 affects the optimal telework frequency and implementation date, independently of
 412 upper/lower bounds (Figure 4). This analysis also highlights scenarios where the relative
 413 increase in NCD incidence can be equivalent to the relative decrease in ID incidence, as can
 414 be seen for the theoretical IU function at a telework frequency of 0.6, and the theoretical
 415 linear increasing function at a frequency of 1 (Figure 4, rows 3 and 4).
 416
 417



418
 419

Figure 4: Impact of teleworking timing and frequency on the relative cumulative

420 **incidences of infectious (ID) and non-communicable diseases (NCD) using theoretical**
421 **exposure-response functions.** Cumulative incidence corresponds to the number of
422 employees infected over the three months of the simulated epidemic. Here, we represent the
423 cumulative incidences of ID and NCD relative to the cumulative incidences predicted by
424 each model without teleworking (first column). The grey dashed line indicates 100%, i.e. the
425 baseline incidences. Lines are solid when the relative incidences of ID and NCD are
426 respectively lower than 50% and 90% (chosen arbitrarily as examples), and faded otherwise.
427 The shaded grey areas indicate conditions where both relative cumulative incidences are
428 below the defined targets of 50% and 90% (for ID and NCD incidence, respectively).

429
430

431 We also calculated partial correlation coefficients to examine the impact of model parameter
432 values on cumulative incidence of ID and NCD over the period, assuming a telework
433 frequency of 0.5 (Supplementary Figure 3). The only differences in correlation coefficients
434 that we observed between scenarios of exposure-response relationships affected one
435 parameter, the maximum change in relative risk of NCD due to telework (ω); as expected,
436 this parameter was strongly positively correlated (coefficient ≈ 1) with NCD incidence for IU
437 and LI curves, and strongly negatively correlated (coefficient ≈ -1) with NCD incidence for
438 LD, LS and US curves.

439

440 Regardless of which exposure-response function was used, the relative infectiousness of
441 asymptomatic individuals (ν) was only slightly negatively correlated with ID cumulative
442 incidences (coefficient ≈ 0.2). The coefficient of relative community force of infection on
443 teleworking days (ϵ) was only slightly positively correlated with ID incidence (coefficient \approx
444 0.2). The reproduction number (R_0) and the progression rate from exposed to infectious (σ)
445 were strongly positively correlated with ID incidence (coefficient > 0.7). These two
446 parameters were negatively correlated with NCD incidence (coefficient ≤ -0.5), which is
447 expected since we assume that infected individuals cannot develop a NCD during the period
448 when they are infected and symptomatic. Inversely, the proportion of asymptomatic
449 infections (p_A) was slightly positively correlated with NCD incidence (coefficient ≈ 0.2), since
450 it leaves a greater proportion of infected individuals at risk of developing a NCD in parallel
451 due to reduced sick leaves.

452 Discussion

453

454 Recent years have seen an unprecedented increase in teleworking frequency in many
455 countries worldwide. In this study, we first reviewed the evidence on the consequences this
456 may have in terms of NCDs for teleworking employees, notably underlining potential impacts
457 on mental health and MSDs. Our rapid review uncovered a wide variety of possible
458 exposure-response relationships between teleworking intensity and NCD risk. By
459 incorporating this data in a mathematical model accounting for both ID transmission and
460 NCD incidence in employees of a non-specific company, we showed that optimal frequency
461 and timing of implementation of teleworking during an epidemic wave could vary widely. For
462 instance, for health impacts associated with teleworking through a L-shaped function with a
463 strength of association such as the one we identified for Edington risk (20), rapid and wide
464 implementation of teleworking during the first few days of an epidemic can reduce both ID
465 and NCD incidences. On the other hand, for a U-shaped relationship with parameters such
466 as the one we identified for depression (27), intermediate (3-4 days per week) teleworking
467 frequencies may be more optimal to maximise health benefits, while for inverted U-shaped
468 relationships with parameters as observed for lower back pain (28), it may be necessary to
469 weigh the increased NCD risk attributable to teleworking against the decreased ID risk.
470 Importantly, both the shape and the upper/lower bound of these exposure-response
471 functions must be taken into consideration when contrasting ID and NCD risk.

472

473 Implications

474

475 Overall, our rapid review confirmed that telework may impact both mental and physical
476 health. The intensity of telecommuting is associated with various health outcomes such as
477 depressive symptoms, MSDs or behavioural risks that can directly or indirectly affect health.
478 Pre-pandemic evidence indicates that telework can also influence working performance,
479 highlighting the importance of synergies between employers and employees regarding
480 organisational support. Addressing these multifaceted issues requires companies and
481 teleworkers to consider both the physical and psychological implications of telework.
482 Evidence remains scarce as to the main mechanisms that drive the impacts of telework on
483 health.

484

485 Our mathematical model suggests that the shape and range of variation of the exposure-
486 response relationship function between teleworking and NCD risk may influence the optimal
487 teleworking frequency. For a given target of incidence reduction, the choice of teleworking
488 frequency and the timing of its implementation as an intervention during an epidemic wave
489 varies. Naturally, in practice, this will depend on the relative importance given to both types
490 of diseases. For example, if the extra risk of NCD incurred through telework is considered
491 negligible in comparison with the epidemic risk, then the best choice will always be to
492 implement the highest frequency of teleworking as early as possible. The decision on
493 respective weights given to the ID and NCD incidence is further complicated by the different
494 timelines at which these diseases occur: typically short-term for IDs and mid- to long-term for
495 NCDs. The implications in terms of performances and costs are also different as we expect
496 sick-leaves due to IDs to be numerous but short while sick-leaves due to NCDs would be

497 fewer but longer. Furthermore, MSDs and psychological disorders are both heterogeneous
498 in severity, which makes quantitative assessments difficult. Finally, implications may largely
499 depend on the professional sector, for example, workers in healthcare settings or densely-
500 populated workplaces are expected to be more exposed to IDs, while desk-based workers
501 will be more exposed to NCDs.

502

503 IDs represent a substantial socioeconomic burden (36), which can justify the implementation
504 of teleworking as an intervention to reduce disease spread. Part of this burden is related to
505 sick leave (37), which can lead companies to act in order to minimise disease incidence
506 among their employees. However, when designing a teleworking policy, deciders need to
507 account for feasibility, legal and ethical criteria. For instance, teleworkers need to have
508 access to telework equipment, which was not always straightforward during the COVID-19
509 pandemic context (38).

510 MSD

511 Sedentary behaviour is associated with MSDs, particularly among teleworkers (39). In 2013,
512 more than half of French workers reported MSDs as their most serious work-related health
513 problem (2). During the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, individuals who teleworked
514 and hybrid workers had an increased risk of developing musculoskeletal pain compared to
515 site-based workers (40). An Indian survey during the 2020 lockdown found a 6% increase in
516 MSD cases, with neck, shoulder and lower back being common sites of pain. Duration of
517 computer use was also correlated with neck and shoulder complaints. Prolonged sitting,
518 stress, and reduced physical activity were identified as factors contributing to low back pain,
519 and interventions to reduce sedentary time at work showed benefits in reducing lower back,
520 neck and shoulder pain. Creating an ergonomic workspace for computer users, including
521 proper seating, displays, keyboards, adjustable workstations, and training, can help reduce
522 MSDs and improve productivity. Ergonomic experts advise against low desks, floor chairs or
523 laptops, and recommend changing postures every 20 minutes. Telework implementation
524 should be prepared by companies before epidemic periods to ensure good teleworking
525 conditions, including workload, adequate support and appropriate work spaces to prevent
526 musculoskeletal problems (28,41).

527 Mental health

528 Telework has been shown to have both positive and negative effects on mental health. On
529 the positive side, it is associated with increased positive emotions, job satisfaction,
530 organisational commitment, and reduced feelings of emotional exhaustion (42). Conversely,
531 telework can promote factors associated with poor mental health (decreased physical
532 activity, unhealthy diet, poor sleep quality, social isolation...) (43–45). Additionally, it can
533 directly affect mental health such as increased anxiety, depression, stress, fatigue,
534 especially on women (23,46,47). Negative effects such as social isolation and stress may
535 start to appear from the second or third day of teleworking each week, but can be mitigated
536 by multifactorial measures such as technical support, sustained social communication,
537 personal health interventions, and flexible working hours (48). Mandatory telework may
538 reduce social support at work and increase work-life interference, potentially affecting well-
539 being (43). While full-time telework significantly changes working conditions and may affect

540 the health of teleworkers, part-time telework can positively influence psychosocial risk
541 factors and improve work-life balance and social relationships (49).
542

543 **Limitations**

544 As shown in our rapid review, the relationship between telework frequency and the risk of
545 developing common NCDs such as lower back pain or psychological distress in the long-
546 term depends on many unmeasured individual and environmental characteristics. Instead of
547 accounting for all these specificities, we illustrated with our model the impact of different
548 relationships considering one average risk for all individuals. The lack of significant
549 associations between telework and some NCDs is also a source of uncertainty in the
550 exposure-response relationships used in the model, as shown in Table 2. Alternative
551 modelling strategies could be used to integrate individual heterogeneity, but this would
552 require additional evidence regarding the distribution of exposures and risks based on
553 individual characteristics (age, gender, job...) that is not yet available in the literature.
554

555 The majority of evidence regarding telework arises from the COVID-19 pandemic. In this
556 context, telework was frequently unplanned and imposed on individuals, which does not
557 necessarily reflect conditions where teleworking would be planned and adapted at an
558 individual level (7). In addition, relatively few countries were represented in these studies,
559 while we would expect the impact of teleworking to vary across regions, between urban and
560 rural settings and living conditions. Finally, the impact of teleworking on health likely
561 depends on the socio-professional categories considered and its desirability.
562

563 In our illustrative example, we simulated the impact of telework policies in the context of the
564 second wave of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Thus, the results should be interpreted in the
565 context of an emerging ID for which no pharmaceutical intervention (e.g., vaccination) is
566 available, and for which no behavioural change among workers is observed apart from the
567 telecommuting policy decided by the employer. We expect different results in case these two
568 assumptions are not met.
569

570 Finally, we assumed homogeneous mixing within the company, whereby all employees
571 could be in contact, without considering more complex work organisations. Similarly, we
572 considered a simple telework policy according to which a fixed percentage of the total
573 workforce in the company is teleworking every day, but more refined policies have been
574 implemented during the pandemic, such as rotating telework (13). In these strategies,
575 employees are evenly distributed in groups that alternate on a daily or weekly basis. This is
576 expected to reduce the overall number of contacts per individual and potentially the risk of
577 transmission, whilst maintaining a reduced average frequency of telework.

578 **Conclusions**

579

580 In our rapid review, we identified three studies, two being longitudinal. This very low number
581 underlines the need for more data to monitor the health impacts of teleworking. In particular,
582 further studies should characterise the relationship between telework frequency and NCDs.
583 To this end, it is crucial to collect data outside the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, since
584 additional stressors during this period may have modulated the relationship between
585 telework and health. In addition, the mechanisms by which teleworking impacts mental and
586 physical health should be better characterised (e.g. unadapted workstation for MSDs).
587 Lastly, further efforts are needed to identify the individual factors affecting the exposure-
588 response relationships both during and outside of epidemic contexts.

589

590 Our innovative approach, which attempts to combine short- and longer-term consequences
591 of teleworking in a unique framework, could serve as a basis to develop tools for employers
592 and policymakers. Such tools could be used to quantify the impact of telework on employee
593 health and identify optimal telework strategies to limit health adverse events and improve
594 employee well-being.

595 **List of abbreviations**

596

597 ID: Infectious disease

598

599 IU: Inverted U-shaped

600

601 LD: Linear decrease

602

603 LI: Linear increase

604

605 LS: L-shaped

606

607 MSD: Musculoskeletal disorder

608

609 NCD: Non-communicable disease

610

611 US: U-shaped

612 **Declarations**

613 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

614 Not applicable.

615 **Consent for publication**

616 Not applicable.

617 **Availability of data and materials**

618 All code used in the analysis are available in the following GitHub repository:

619 https://github.com/MESuRS-Lab/telework_health

620 **Competing interests**

621 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

622 **Funding**

623 This project did not receive any specific funding.

624 **Authors' contributions**

625 All authors contributed to the design of this study. LM, EH, NL, KAB, and MBH performed
626 the study selection for the rapid review based on our inclusion and exclusion criteria. QJL,
627 ML, PH, AM and LT designed and implemented the mathematical model. All authors
628 contributed to the redaction of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final
629 manuscript.

630 **Acknowledgements**

631 The authors would like to thank Hanifa Bouziri for helpful discussions on musculoskeletal
632 disorders, and Pascal Crépey for access to the COVID-19 incidence data.

633 References

- 634 1. International Labour Organization. COVID-19: Guidance for labour statistics data
635 collection: Defining and measuring remote work, telework, work at home and home-
636 based work [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Aug 24]. Available from:
637 [https://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/publications/WCMS_747075/lang--](https://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/publications/WCMS_747075/lang--en/index.htm)
638 [en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/publications/WCMS_747075/lang--en/index.htm)
- 639 2. Eurostat. Employed persons working from home as a percentage of the total
640 employment, by sex, age and professional status [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Aug 29].
641 Available from:
642 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/lfsa_ehomp/default/table?lang=en
- 643 3. Chocron V. Télétravail «total» chez Boursorama: les salariés commencent à quitter
644 Paris pour la province. Le Monde [Internet]. 2021 Sep 28; Available from:
645 [https://www.lemonde.fr/economie/article/2021/09/28/teletravail-total-chez-boursorama-](https://www.lemonde.fr/economie/article/2021/09/28/teletravail-total-chez-boursorama-les-salaries-commencent-a-quitter-paris-pour-la-province_6096226_3234.html)
646 [les-salaries-commencent-a-quitter-paris-pour-la-province_6096226_3234.html](https://www.lemonde.fr/economie/article/2021/09/28/teletravail-total-chez-boursorama-les-salaries-commencent-a-quitter-paris-pour-la-province_6096226_3234.html)
- 647 4. Hyder B. Return & Remote: How Salesforce Brings Employees Together for Modern
648 Work [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Aug 29]. Available from:
649 [https://www.salesforce.com/news/stories/return-remote-how-salesforce-brings-](https://www.salesforce.com/news/stories/return-remote-how-salesforce-brings-employees-together-for-modern-work/)
650 [employees-together-for-modern-work/](https://www.salesforce.com/news/stories/return-remote-how-salesforce-brings-employees-together-for-modern-work/)
- 651 5. OECD. Teleworking in the COVID-19 pandemic: Trends and prospects [Internet]. OECD;
652 2021 [cited 2023 Oct 31]. Available from: [https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/teleworking-in-the-covid-19-pandemic-trends-and-prospects-72a416b6/#biblio-d1e1079)
653 [responses/teleworking-in-the-covid-19-pandemic-trends-and-prospects-](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/teleworking-in-the-covid-19-pandemic-trends-and-prospects-72a416b6/#biblio-d1e1079)
654 [72a416b6/#biblio-d1e1079](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/teleworking-in-the-covid-19-pandemic-trends-and-prospects-72a416b6/#biblio-d1e1079)
- 655 6. Weber C, Golding SE, Yarker J, Lewis R, Ratcliffe E, Munir F, et al. Future Teleworking
656 Inclinations Post-COVID-19: Examining the Role of Teleworking Conditions and
657 Perceived Productivity. *Front Psychol* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Oct 31];13. Available
658 from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.863197>
- 659 7. Bouziri H, Smith DRM, Descatha A, Dab W, Jean K. Working from home in the time of
660 COVID-19: how to best preserve occupational health? *Occup Environ Med*. 2020
661 Jul;77(7):509–10.
- 662 8. Fisher KA. Telework Before Illness Onset Among Symptomatic Adults Aged ≥ 18 Years
663 With and Without COVID-19 in 11 Outpatient Health Care Facilities — United States,
664 July 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Nov 7];69.
665 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6944a4.htm>
- 666 9. Galmiche S, Charmet T, Schaeffer L, Paireau J, Grant R, Chény O, et al. Exposures
667 associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection in France: A nationwide online case-control
668 study. *Lancet Reg Health - Eur*. 2021 Jun 7;7:100148.
- 669 10. Ahmed F, Zviedrite N, Uzicanin A. Effectiveness of workplace social distancing
670 measures in reducing influenza transmission: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*.
671 2018 Apr 18;18:518.
- 672 11. Hill EM, Atkins BD, Keeling MJ, Dyson L, Tildesley MJ. A network modelling approach to
673 assess non-pharmaceutical disease controls in a worker population: An application to
674 SARS-CoV-2. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2021 Jun 16;17(6):e1009058.

- 675 12. Jarvis CI, Gimma A, van Zandvoort K, Wong KLM, Edmunds WJ. The impact of local
676 and national restrictions in response to COVID-19 on social contacts in England: a
677 longitudinal natural experiment. *BMC Med.* 2021 Feb 19;19:52.
- 678 13. Mauras S, Cohen-Addad V, Duboc G, Tour MD la, Frasca P, Mathieu C, et al. Mitigating
679 COVID-19 outbreaks in workplaces and schools by hybrid telecommuting. *PLOS*
680 *Comput Biol.* 2021 Aug 26;17(8):e1009264.
- 681 14. Mousa A, Winskill P, Watson OJ, Ratmann O, Monod M, Ajelli M, et al. Social contact
682 patterns and implications for infectious disease transmission – a systematic review and
683 meta-analysis of contact surveys. Rodriguez-Barraquer I, Serwadda DM, editors. *eLife.*
684 2021 Nov 25;10:e70294.
- 685 15. Bosetti P, Huynh BT, Abdou AY, Sanchez M, Eisenhauer C, Courtejoie N, et al.
686 Lockdown impact on age-specific contact patterns and behaviours, France, April 2020.
687 *Eurosurveillance.* 2021 Dec 2;26(48):2001636.
- 688 16. OECD. Assessing teleworking strategies for local development: a framework proposal
689 [Internet]. Paris; 2022 [cited 2023 Aug 31]. Available from:
690 [https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Assessing-teleworking-strategies-for-local-development-](https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Assessing-teleworking-strategies-for-local-development-PAT.pdf)
691 [PAT.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Assessing-teleworking-strategies-for-local-development-PAT.pdf)
- 692 17. World Health Organization and the International Labour Organization. Healthy and safe
693 telework: technical brief [Internet]. Geneva; 2021. Available from:
694 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240040977>
- 695 18. Tezuka M, Nagata T, Saeki K, Tsuboi Y, Fukutani N. Association Between Abrupt
696 Change to Teleworking and Physical Symptoms During the Coronavirus Disease 2019
697 (COVID-19) Emergency Declaration in Japan. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2022 Jan
698 1;64(1):1–5.
- 699 19. De Macêdo TAM, Cabral ELDS, Silva Castro WR, De Souza Junior CC, Da Costa Junior
700 JF, Pedrosa FM, et al. Ergonomics and telework: A systematic review. *Work.* 2020 Sep
701 17;66(4):777–88.
- 702 20. Henke RM, Benevent R, Schulte P, Rinehart C, Crighton KA, Corcoran M. The Effects of
703 Telecommuting Intensity on Employee Health. *Am J Health Promot.* 2016 Nov
704 1;30(8):604–12.
- 705 21. Grant MJ, Booth A. A typology of reviews: an analysis of 14 review types and associated
706 methodologies. *Health Inf Libr J.* 2009 Jun;26(2):91–108.
- 707 22. Beckel JLO, Fisher GG. Telework and Worker Health and Well-Being: A Review and
708 Recommendations for Research and Practice. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022
709 Mar 24;19(7):3879.
- 710 23. Furuya Y, Nakazawa S, Fukai K, Tatemichi M. Health impacts with telework on workers:
711 A scoping review before the COVID-19 pandemic. *Front Public Health.* 2022 Oct
712 31;10:981270.
- 713 24. Liu W, Xu Y, Ma D. Work-Related Mental Health Under COVID-19 Restrictions: A Mini
714 Literature Review. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9:788370.
- 715 25. Buitrago-Garcia D, Egli-Gany D, Counotte MJ, Hossmann S, Imeri H, Ipekci AM, et al.
716 Occurrence and transmission potential of asymptomatic and presymptomatic SARS-

- 717 CoV-2 infections: A living systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS Med.* 2020 Sep
718 22;17(9):e1003346.
- 719 26. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Metz JAJ. On the definition and the computation of the
720 basic reproduction ratio R_0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous
721 populations. *J Math Biol.* 1990 Jun 1;28(4):365–82.
- 722 27. Chen Y, Weziak-Bialowolska D, Lee MT, Bialowolski P, Cowden RG, McNeely E, et al.
723 Working from home and subsequent work outcomes: Pre-pandemic evidence. *PloS*
724 *One.* 2023;18(4):e0283788.
- 725 28. Matsugaki R, Muramatsu K, Tateishi S, Nagata T, Tsuji M, Hino A, et al. Association
726 Between Telecommuting Environment and Low Back Pain Among Japanese
727 Telecommuting Workers: A Cross-Sectional Study. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2021
728 Dec;63(12):e944–8.
- 729 29. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). Global Burden of Disease
730 Collaborative Network (GBD 2021) [Internet]. 2024. Available from:
731 <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-results/>
- 732 30. Dhungel B, Rahman MS, Rahman MM, Bhandari AKC, Le PM, Biva NA, et al. Reliability
733 of Early Estimates of the Basic Reproduction Number of COVID-19: A Systematic
734 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022 Jan;19(18):11613.
- 735 31. Wu Y, Kang L, Guo Z, Liu J, Liu M, Liang W. Incubation Period of COVID-19 Caused by
736 Unique SARS-CoV-2 Strains: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw*
737 *Open.* 2022 Aug 22;5(8):e2228008.
- 738 32. Kissler SM, Fauver JR, Mack C, Olesen SW, Tai C, Shiue KY, et al. Viral dynamics of
739 acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and applications to diagnostic and public health strategies.
740 Riley S, editor. *PLOS Biol.* 2021 Jul 12;19(7):e3001333.
- 741 33. Wels J, Wielgoszewska B, Moltrecht B, Booth C, Green MJ, Hamilton OK, et al. Home
742 working and social and mental wellbeing at different stages of the COVID-19 pandemic
743 in the UK: Evidence from 7 longitudinal population surveys. Thorley J, editor. *PLOS*
744 *Med.* 2023 Apr 27;20(4):e1004214.
- 745 34. Fadel M, Bodin J, Cros F, Descatha A, Roquelaure Y. Teleworking and Musculoskeletal
746 Disorders: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2023 Mar
747 11;20(6):4973.
- 748 35. Lunde LK, Fløvik L, Christensen JO, Johannessen HA, Finne LB, Jørgensen IL, et al.
749 The relationship between telework from home and employee health: a systematic
750 review. *BMC Public Health.* 2022 Jan 7;22(1):47.
- 751 36. Samsudin EZ, Yasin SM, Ruslan NH, Abdullah NN, Noor AFA, Hair AFA. Socioeconomic
752 impacts of airborne and droplet-borne infectious diseases on industries: a systematic
753 review. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2024 Jan 16;24(1):93.
- 754 37. Smith DRM, Jijón S, Oodally A, Shirreff G, Bouziad KA, Ante-Testard PA, et al. Sick
755 leave due to COVID-19 during the first pandemic wave in France, 2020. *Occup Environ*
756 *Med.* 2023 May 1;80(5):268–72.
- 757 38. Belzunegui-Eraso A, Erro-Garcés A. Teleworking in the Context of the Covid-19 Crisis.
758 *Sustainability.* 2020 Jan;12(9):3662.

- 759 39. Loef B, Van Oostrom SH, Bosma E, Lifelines Corona Research Initiative, Proper KI. The
760 mediating role of physical activity and sedentary behavior in the association between
761 working from home and musculoskeletal pain during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Front*
762 *Public Health*. 2022 Dec 2;10:1072030.
- 763 40. Bosma E, Loef B, van Oostrom SH, Proper KI, Lifelines Corona Research Initiative. The
764 longitudinal association between working from home and musculoskeletal pain during
765 the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2023 May 1;96(4):521–35.
- 766 41. El Kadri Filho F, Roberto De Lucca S. Telework during the COVID-19 pandemic:
767 Ergonomic and psychosocial risks among Brazilian labor justice workers. Davis K,
768 Kotowski S, editors. *Work*. 2022 Feb 18;71(2):395–405.
- 769 42. Charalampous M, Grant CA, Tramontano C, Michailidis E. Systematically reviewing
770 remote e-workers' well-being at work: a multidimensional approach. *Eur J Work Organ*
771 *Psychol*. 2019 Jan 2;28(1):51–73.
- 772 43. Kaltiainen J, Hakanen JJ. Why increase in telework may have affected employee well-
773 being during the COVID-19 pandemic? The role of work and non-work life domains. *Curr*
774 *Psychol* [Internet]. 2023 Jan 26 [cited 2023 Oct 24]; Available from:
775 <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12144-023-04250-8>
- 776 44. Lee L, Nam OH, Lee KE, Lee C. Relationship between insomnia and working from home
777 among Korean domestic workers: results from the 5th Korean working condition survey.
778 *BMC Public Health*. 2023 Jul 17;23(1):1367.
- 779 45. Lee L, Nam OH, Lee KE, Lee C. Relationship between insomnia and working from home
780 among Korean domestic workers: results from the 5th Korean working condition survey.
781 *BMC Public Health*. 2023 Jul 17;23(1):1367.
- 782 46. Chirico F, Zaffina S, Di Prinzio RR, Giorgi G, FERRARI G, Capitanelli I, et al. Working
783 from home in the context of COVID-19: A systematic review of physical and mental
784 health effects on teleworkers. *J Health Soc Sci*. 2021;319–32.
- 785 47. Xie Y. The impact of online office on social anxiety among primary and secondary school
786 teachers—Considering online social support and work intensity. *Front Psychol*. 2023
787 Mar 30;14:1154460.
- 788 48. Niu Q, Nagata T, Fukutani N, Tezuka M, Shimoura K, Nagai-Tanima M, et al. Health
789 effects of immediate telework introduction during the COVID-19 era in Japan: A cross-
790 sectional study. Wang J, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2021 Oct 8;16(10):e0256530.
- 791 49. Antunes ED, Bridi LRT, Santos M, Fischer FM. Part-time or full-time teleworking? A
792 systematic review of the psychosocial risk factors of telework from home. *Front Psychol*.
793 2023 Feb 22;14:1065593.

794