

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

1 Associations between work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis: a cross-sectional

2 study of 285,947 UK Biobank participants

3 Hashmi A BSc¹, Scott S BSc¹, Jung M PhD^{1,2}, Meng Q-J MD PhD³, Tobias JH MD PhD^{1,2},

4 Beynon RA PhD^{1,2*}, Faber BG MBBS PhD^{1,2*}

5 * Joint Senior authors

6

7 1) Musculoskeletal Research Unit, University of Bristol, UK

8 2) Medical Research Council Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, UK

9 3) Wellcome Centre for Cell-Matrix Research, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health,
10 University of Manchester, UK

11

12 Corresponding Author

13 Dr Benjamin Faber

14 Musculoskeletal Research Unit

15 Learning and Research Building

16 Southmead Hospital, Bristol BS10 5NB

17 ben.faber@bristol.ac.uk

18

19 Running Title: Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

20 Key words: epidemiology, knee osteoarthritis, hip osteoarthritis, occupational risk, shift

21 work, physical work

22

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

23 Abstract

24 Objectives

25 Shift work-induced circadian rhythm disruption has been identified as a risk factor for specific
26 diseases. Additionally, physically demanding work has been linked to osteoarthritis. This study
27 investigated the independent associations of shift work and physical work with risk of large
28 joint osteoarthritis.

29 Design

30 UK Biobank participants completed questionnaires detailing their employment status,
31 including shift work, night shifts, heavy manual work and prolonged non-sedentary work.
32 Responses were categorised into binary and categorical variables. Knee and hip osteoarthritis
33 diagnoses were extracted from hospital records and osteoarthritis (any site) was self-reported.
34 Logistic regression models, adjusted for age, sex, BMI, Townsend Deprivation Index and other
35 work factors, were used to investigate the relationships between work characteristics and
36 osteoarthritis outcomes.

37 Results

38 This study included 285,947 participants (mean age 52.7 years; males 48.0%). Shift work and
39 night shifts were associated with knee osteoarthritis (fully adjusted OR: 1.12 [95% CI:1.07-
40 1.17] and 1.12 [1.04-1.20], respectively), and self-reported osteoarthritis but there was little
41 evidence of an association with hip osteoarthritis (1.01 [0.95-1.08] and 1.03 [0.93-1.14]).
42 Heavy manual work and prolonged non-sedentary work were associated with increased risk of
43 all osteoarthritis outcomes.

44 Conclusions

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

45 Shift work showed independent associations with knee osteoarthritis and self-reported
46 osteoarthritis but not hip osteoarthritis, suggesting circadian rhythm dysfunction may play a
47 role in knee osteoarthritis pathogenesis. Heavy manual work and prolonged non-sedentary
48 work were associated with all outcomes, with stronger associations in knee osteoarthritis,
49 possibly reflecting the knee's higher susceptibility to biomechanical stress. Further research is
50 needed to explore workplace interventions for reducing these risks.

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

51 Introduction

52 Osteoarthritis ranks as the 7th leading cause of years lived with disability worldwide,
53 particularly in those aged over 70, with the knee and hip being the most affected joints (1, 2).
54 The global disease burden is increasing due to an upsurge in prevalence, driven by an aging
55 demographic and a growing incidence of obesity (3). The identification of risk factors has the
56 potential to alleviate this burden by helping prevent disease onset and progression. Given that
57 individuals in the UK spend an average of 1532 hours at work annually (4), the workplace
58 environment emerges as an important area for uncovering such risk factors. Notably, shift
59 work-induced circadian disruption has received growing interest, with over 20% of European
60 workers engaged in shift work in 2015 (5).

61

62 Circadian (24-hourly) rhythm has been shown to play a role in maintaining joint tissue
63 homeostasis (6). Circadian rhythm is generated by a network of clock genes and proteins that
64 rhythmically regulate their own expression and that of other tissue-specific target genes. This
65 regulation occurs through a transcription-translation feedback loop (7). Notably, genes
66 involved in extracellular matrix turnover and chondrocyte differentiation demonstrate circadian
67 rhythmicity, with clock genes implicated in this regulation (8). In human osteoarthritis models,
68 disruptions in clock gene function have been linked to increased expression of cartilage
69 catabolic genes (9, 10), while environmental disturbances to circadian rhythms have been
70 shown to induce osteoarthritis-like pathological alterations in the mouse knee joint (11).

71

72 Shift work is a known disruptor of circadian rhythms, by causing a misalignment in the sleep-
73 wake cycle, raising the possibility it might influence osteoarthritis risk (12). Retrospective
74 cohort studies of retired Chinese workers have revealed a positive association between shift

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

75 work and risk of osteoarthritis, compared with daytime workers (13, 14). However, the
76 generalisability of these findings to other populations may be limited. Of note, in the UK, both
77 men and women engaging in night shift work are more likely to perform physically demanding
78 tasks (15), which are a known risk factor for large joint osteoarthritis (16-18). Therefore, when
79 exploring the association between shift work and osteoarthritis, it is important to consider the
80 influence of work physicality as a possible confounding factor.

81

82 This study aimed to investigate the relationships between work characteristics and the
83 prevalence of osteoarthritis within the UK Biobank (UKB) study. Specifically, our objectives
84 were to explore the independent associations between shift work and the prevalence of hospital-
85 diagnosed knee and hip osteoarthritis, as well as self-reported osteoarthritis, whilst considering
86 the influence of work physicality. In addition, we sought to identify any sex differences in these
87 relationships. By addressing these questions, our study aimed to offer insights into the
88 associations between these work characteristics and joint health, with the goal of informing the
89 development of future interventions and policies concerning the design of employment
90 patterns, to alleviate the burden of osteoarthritis

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

91 **Materials and Methods**

92 **Population**

93 UKB is a longitudinal, population-based cohort study, that commenced in 2006, recruiting over
94 500,000 individuals aged 40-69 from across the UK. Participants underwent extensive physical
95 and lifestyle assessment, including questionnaires on socio-demographic and environmental
96 factors. Consent was given for linkage to electronic healthcare records, which enabled
97 participant follow-up (19). UKB obtained ethical approval from the National Information
98 Governance Board for Health and Social Care and Northwest Multi-centre Research Ethics
99 Committee (11/NW/0382). All participants provided informed consent for the collection and
100 use of their data.

101

102 **Self-reported Outcomes**

103 Self-reported diagnoses of non-site-specific osteoarthritis were obtained through a
104 questionnaire administered at baseline and during three follow-up periods. Participants were
105 asked: *“Have you ever been told by a doctor that you have had osteoarthritis affecting one or
106 more joints (e.g. hip, knee, shoulder)?”*. Participants could respond with “Yes”, “No”, “Do not
107 know,” or “Prefer not to answer”. A binary variable was created by coding participants as “1”
108 if they answered yes at any timepoint and as “0” if they did not answer yes at any point. Those
109 who did not know or preferred not to answer were excluded from analyses.

110

111 **Diagnosed Outcomes**

112 Hospital diagnosed knee osteoarthritis and hip osteoarthritis cases were identified through
113 linkage to hospital episode statistics (HES), which use the International Classification of

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

114 Diseases (ICD) 9th and 10th revision codes. Specifically, cases were identified using codes
115 adopted from Zengini et al. (20) (Supplementary Table 1). The linkage of all UKB participants
116 was conducted both prospectively and retrospectively at baseline. Records were available from
117 1st April 1997, and the data was downloaded from the UKB Showcase in August 2023,
118 encompassing information until the end of October 2022.

119

120 Exposures

121 Participants were asked about their work patterns at baseline and three follow-up periods,
122 through a self-reported touchscreen questionnaire. This included “*Does your work involve shift*
123 *work?*”, defined as a work schedule outside the routine daytime working hours of 09:00 to
124 17:00. Participants responded according to a four-point Likert scale: “Never/Rarely”,
125 “Sometimes”, “Usually” or “Always”. Those who answered sometimes, usually or always were
126 subsequently asked “*Does your work involve night shifts?*”, defined as a work schedule that
127 involves working during the regular sleeping hours, for example from 00:00 to 06:00.
128 Participants could answer according to the same four responses. For work physicality,
129 participants were asked, “*Does your work involve heavy manual or physical work?*” and “*Does*
130 *your work involve walking or standing for most of the time?*”. Heavy manual work was defined
131 as employment involving the use of heavy objects and tools. Prolonged non-sedentary work
132 was defined as work that requires prolonged periods of walking or standing. Again, responses
133 followed the same four-category scale.

134

135 Categorical variables for the work exposures were created and coded: (1) never/rarely, (2)
136 sometimes, (3) usually or (4) always. From this, a binary exposure variable was generated: (0)
137 never/rarely and sometimes or (1) usually and always. Questionnaire data spanning the four

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

138 timepoints was examined but considering most respondents only answered once, this
139 information was collapsed into one set of variables. If a participant answered more than once,
140 their highest response was selected. Those who did not know or preferred not to answer were
141 excluded from analyses.

142

143 [Statistical Analysis](#)

144 Descriptive statistics summarised the baseline population characteristics, presented as means,
145 standard deviations (SDs) and ranges for continuous variables and as frequencies for
146 categorical and binary variables. Logistic regression models examined the associations
147 between each work exposure (shift work, night shifts, heavy manual work and prolonged non-
148 sedentary work) and each osteoarthritis outcome (knee, hip and self-reported). Results are
149 shown as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Directed acyclic graphs guided
150 the a priori selection of covariates for adjustment, specifically age, sex, body mass index (BMI)
151 and Townsend Deprivation Index (TDI). The TDI is a postcode-based measure of
152 socioeconomic deprivation, with a higher measure indicating increased socioeconomic
153 deprivation (21). Models of shift work exposures were adjusted accordingly: model (1)
154 unadjusted, (2) age and sex, (3) age, sex, BMI and TDI, (4) age, sex, BMI, TDI and both work
155 physicality variables. Models using work physicality exposures were similarly adjusted except
156 for model 4, which was adjusted for age, sex, BMI, TDI, shift work and the other work
157 physicality variable. Age, BMI and TDI were incorporated into the models as continuous
158 variables. Shift work and night shifts were not mutually adjusted due to direct classification
159 overlap. The effect of exposure frequency on risk of osteoarthritis was explored using
160 categorical work exposure variables, which used the “never” group as the comparator.
161 Combined sex analyses were supplemented by sex-stratified analyses. Sex interactions terms

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

162 were also examined. All statistical analyses were conducted using STATA version 18
163 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

164 Results

165 Baseline characteristics

166 In total, 285,947 participants (mean age 52.7, SD: 7.1 years, range: 38-71 years), were included
167 in the analysis (Table 1). There were 137,154 (48.0%) males and 148,793 (52.0%) females.
168 Knee osteoarthritis and hip osteoarthritis were diagnosed in 18,578 (6.5%) and 10,698 (3.7%)
169 individuals, respectively. Non-site-specific osteoarthritis was self-reported in 16,407 (5.7%) of
170 individuals. Knee osteoarthritis was more common among males with a prevalence of 9,623
171 (7.0%) compared to females (8,955 [6.0%]). Hip osteoarthritis and self-reported osteoarthritis
172 were more common among females with a prevalence of 5,895 (4.0%) and 10,018 (6.7%). In
173 males, 4,803 (3.5%) had hip osteoarthritis and 6,389 (4.7%) had self-reported osteoarthritis.
174 Shift work, nights shifts and heavy manual work were more commonly reported among males,
175 whereas prolonged non-sedentary work had a similar prevalence among males and females
176 (Table1).

177

178 Knee Osteoarthritis

179 Combined sex analyses, unadjusted for work physicality, demonstrated consistent associations
180 between binary shift work and knee osteoarthritis (model 1: odds ratio (OR) 1.31 [95% CI:
181 1.25-1.37], model 2: 1.42 [1.36-1.49], model 3: 1.29 [1.23-1.35]). A similar trend was seen for
182 night shifts (Table 2, Supplementary Figure 1). In sex stratified analyses, the effect estimates
183 were comparable between males and females and the inclusion of a sex interaction term in the
184 models did not provide strong evidence of an interaction ($p < 0.1$), except in the unadjusted shift
185 work model (Table 2, Supplementary Figure 1). Work physicality exposures exhibited stronger
186 associations than the shift work exposures, with the point estimates for heavy manual work
187 (model 1: OR 1.55 [95% CI: 1.49-1.61], model 2: 1.59 [1.53-1.65], model 3: 1.58 [1.52-1.64])

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

188 slightly higher than prolonged non-sedentary work (model 1: 1.48 [1.44-1.53], model 2: 1.46
189 [1.41-1.50], model 3: 1.48 [1.43-1.52]). For both work physicality exposures, sex interactions
190 were seen in all models and sex stratification indicated that heavy manual work and prolonged
191 non-sedentary work were more strongly associated with knee osteoarthritis in males compared
192 to females (Table 2, Supplementary Figure 1).

193 Mutual adjustment (model 4) attenuated the associations between binary work characteristics
194 and knee osteoarthritis. In combined sex analyses shift work and night shifts continued to be
195 associated with knee osteoarthritis (shift work: OR 1.12 [95% CI: 1.07-1.17], night shifts: 1.12
196 [1.04-1.20]). Unlike models 1-3, sex interactions were noted in the fully adjusted models for
197 shift work and night shifts (Table 2). After sex stratification, night shifts remained associated
198 with knee osteoarthritis in males (1.15 [1.05-1.26]) but weakly in females (1.09 [0.97-1.23])
199 Similarly, in combined sex analyses, work physicality remained strongly associated with knee
200 osteoarthritis in the mutually adjusted model (heavy manual work: 1.30 [1.24-1.36], prolonged
201 non-sedentary work: 1.32 [1.28-1.37]). Sex interactions persisted, with once again stronger
202 associations seen between work physicality and knee osteoarthritis in males than in females
203 (Table 2, Supplementary Figure 1).

204 When assessing work type as a categorical variable (1-4) in fully adjusted models, there was
205 no indication of a progressive positive association between both more frequent shift work and
206 nights shifts and knee osteoarthritis, with similar results seen in the sex stratified analyses
207 (Figure 1, Supplementary Table 2). A distinct progressive association emerged between
208 frequency of heavy manual work and knee osteoarthritis (sometimes: 1.17 [1.12-1.22], usually:
209 1.34 [1.26-1.42], always: 1.45 [1.36-1.55]), which was also the case for prolonged non-
210 sedentary work (sometimes: 1.17 [1.13-1.22], usually: 1.33 [1.26-1.40], always: 1.38 [1.31-
211 1.46]). The progressive trend was reflected in results for males and females, but effect sizes
212 were larger in males (Figure 1, Supplementary Table 2).

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

213 Hip Osteoarthritis

214 Combined sex analyses, unadjusted for work physicality, demonstrated little evidence of
215 associations between binary shift work and hip osteoarthritis (model 1: OR 0.99 [95% CI: 0.93-
216 1.05], model 2: 1.12 [1.05-1.20], model 3: 1.08 [1.01-1.15]). A similar lack of association was
217 seen in analyses of night shifts. No sex interactions were seen for either exposure across models
218 1-3 and sex-stratified analyses indicated little differences between males and females (Table 3,
219 Supplementary Figure 2). More robust associations were seen between work physicality and
220 hip osteoarthritis, although weaker than those for knee osteoarthritis (Table 3, Supplementary
221 Figure 2). Sex interactions were only evident for prolonged non-sedentary work. Sex-stratified
222 analyses saw stronger associations between prolonged non-sedentary work and hip
223 osteoarthritis in males (model 1: 1.26 [1.19-1.34], model 2: 1.24 [1.17-1.31], model 3: 1.26
224 [1.18-1.33]) than females (model 1: 1.14 [1.08-1.20], model 2: 1.10 [1.04-1.16] model 3: 1.10
225 [1.04-1.16]) (Table 3, Supplementary Figure 2).

226 Mutual adjustment (model 4) further attenuated the associations between binary work
227 characteristics and hip osteoarthritis towards the null (shift work: OR 1.01 [95% CI: 0.95-1.08],
228 night shifts: 1.03 [0.93-1.14]). In sex-stratified analysis, a similar lack of association between
229 hip osteoarthritis and shift work was seen in males and females (Table 3, Supplementary Figure
230 2). In mutually adjusted combined sex analyses, associations between work physicality and hip
231 osteoarthritis remained (heavy manual work: 1.13 [1.06-1.20], prolonged non-sedentary work:
232 1.12 [1.07-1.17]). Heavy manual work was similarly associated with hip osteoarthritis in
233 females (1.14 [1.04-1.25]) and males (1.10 [1.01-1.20]). Sex interactions persisted for
234 prolonged non-sedentary work, with stronger associations in males (1.21 [1.13-1.29])
235 compared to females (1.06 [1.00-1.13]) (Table 3, Supplementary Figure 2).

236 When assessing work type as a categorical variable (1-4) in fully adjusted models, as with knee
237 osteoarthritis, there was no indication of a progressive positive association between both more

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

238 frequent shift work and nights shifts and hip osteoarthritis. Similar results were seen in sex
239 stratified analysis (Figure 2, Supplementary Table 3). A more progressive association was
240 notable between heavy manual work frequency and hip osteoarthritis (sometimes: 1.03 [0.98-
241 1.09], usually: 1.15 [1.06-1.25], always: 1.15 [1.05-1.26]) and prolonged non-sedentary work
242 frequency and hip osteoarthritis (sometimes: 1.14 [1.09-1.20], usually: 1.19 [1.11-1.27],
243 always: 1.18 [1.10-1.27]). Stronger associations between both heavy manual work and
244 prolonged non-sedentary work and hip osteoarthritis were evident in males. Interestingly, the
245 progressive positive association between work physical frequency and risk of hip osteoarthritis
246 was absent in females (Figure 2, Supplementary Table 3).

247

248 Self-reported Osteoarthritis

249 In combined sex analyses, unadjusted for work physicality, associations between binary shift
250 work and self-reported osteoarthritis were present across all models (model 1: OR 1.15 [95%
251 CI: 1.09-1.21], model 2: 1.32 [1.25-1.39], model 3: 1.23 [1.17-1.30]). Similar patterns emerged
252 in night shift analyses. For both, stronger associations were seen in males and sex interactions
253 were present in model 3, which incorporated adjustments for BMI and TDI alongside age and
254 sex (Table 4, Supplementary Figure 3). In combined sex analyses, unadjusted for shift work,
255 heavy manual work showed strong associations with self-reported osteoarthritis (model 1: OR
256 1.21 [95% CI: 1.16-1.26], model 2: 1.36 [1.30-1.42], model 3: 1.34 [1.28-1.40]). Results for
257 prolonged non-sedentary work were similar. Like knee osteoarthritis, sex interactions were
258 observed in all models for heavy manual work and prolonged non-sedentary work and in sex
259 stratified analyses males exhibited higher odds of self-reported osteoarthritis (Table 4,
260 Supplementary Figure 3).

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

261 Like the other osteoarthritis outcomes, mutual adjustment for the other work factors (model 4)
262 weakened the associations between binary work type and self-reported osteoarthritis. In
263 combined sex analyses, shift work and night shifts retained associations with self-reported
264 osteoarthritis (shift work: OR 1.13 [95% CI: 1.07-1.19], night shifts: 1.15 [1.06-1.24]). Sex
265 interactions persisted for both (Table 4). Shift work and night shifts remained more strongly
266 associated with self-reported osteoarthritis in males (shift work: 1.20 [1.11-1.30], night shifts:
267 1.19 [1.07-1.33]) than in females (shift work: 1.08 [1.00-1.16], night shifts: 1.09 [0.97-1.23]).
268 Work physicality maintained its associations with self-reported osteoarthritis (heavy manual
269 work: 1.20 [1.14- 1.27], prolonged non-sedentary work: 1.15 [1.10-1.19]). Sex interactions
270 remained, and again stronger associations were seen between work physicality and self-
271 reported osteoarthritis in males than females (Table 4, Supplementary Figure 3).

272 Overall, in fully adjusted categorical analyses of shift work and night shift frequency, there
273 were no progressive association with self-reported osteoarthritis (Figure 3, Supplementary
274 Table 3). Regarding heavy manual work frequency, progressive stronger associations with self-
275 reported osteoarthritis were observed in fully adjusted models (sometimes: 1.16 [1.11-1.22],
276 usually: 1.26 [1.18-1.35], always: 1.33 [1.24- 1.44]). Prolonged non-sedentary work displayed
277 a similar progressive trend. Unlike knee and hip osteoarthritis, increasing heavy manual work
278 frequency, saw progressive associations with self-reported osteoarthritis in females. In contrast,
279 for prolonged non-sedentary work, progressive associations were seen in males but not females
280 (Figure 3, Supplementary Table 3).

281

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

282 Discussion

283 As far as we are aware, this is the largest cross-sectional study to date exploring the
284 relationships between work characteristics (i.e. shift work, night-shifts, heavy manual work
285 and prolonged non-sedentary work) and osteoarthritis (knee, hip and self-reported). Overall,
286 both shift work and night shifts were associated with an increased risk of knee osteoarthritis
287 and self-reported osteoarthritis, while no such associations were observed for hip osteoarthritis.
288 Importantly, these associations remained after adjustment for possible confounding factors
289 including age, sex, BMI and deprivation, as well as for the physical nature of work. Greater
290 associations were seen between work physicality and osteoarthritis compared to shift work and
291 night shifts, which were stronger in the knee than the hip. Broadly, work characteristics showed
292 larger association with osteoarthritis in males as compared with females. The increasing
293 frequency of heavy manual work and prolonged non-sedentary work showed clear progressive
294 trends with an increasing risk of osteoarthritis. Shift work and night shifts did not display a
295 similar trend.

296

297 Previous epidemiological research has linked shift work to an increased risk of osteoarthritis,
298 in smaller Chinese cohorts. One study saw a hazard ratio of 1.19 for knee osteoarthritis in shift
299 workers compared to non-shift workers, after adjusting for work posture but also working years
300 (13). Another study saw a comparable OR of 1.22 for lower-limb osteoarthritis in shift workers
301 compared to day workers, after adjusting for work posture (14). In comparison, this study saw
302 an OR of 1.12 for both shift work and night shifts with knee osteoarthritis, after adjusting for
303 work physicality. The lack of a progressive association between increasing frequency of shift
304 work or night shifts with risk of osteoarthritis could be attributed to the limited number of
305 responses in the “usually” group, which underpowered these analyses. Nevertheless,

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

306 progressive positive associations were present in physicality analyses, suggesting these
307 associations are weaker for shift work. Another explanation is circadian adaptation among
308 more permanent shift workers. However, research indicates that less than 3% show complete
309 adjustment with only 25% experiencing a beneficial degree of adjustment. Therefore, it is
310 unlikely that most workers undergo sufficient synchronisation to benefit their health (22).

311

312 Although causal associations cannot be inferred from this cross-sectional study, the findings
313 are supported by animal studies, where circadian rhythm disruption, whether through
314 environmental disturbance or genetic deletion of clock genes, contributed to osteoarthritis-like
315 changes (11, 23). While underlying mechanisms remain unclear, shift work is an established
316 cause of circadian misalignment, due to frequent alterations in sleep-wake and light-dark cycles
317 and has been shown to desynchronise clock gene expression (24). Therefore, shift work may
318 be viewed as a proxy for circadian rhythm disruption and these findings provide evidence that
319 circadian rhythm dysfunction is an important risk factor for osteoarthritis. Interestingly, genetic
320 knockout animal studies only saw degenerative cartilage changes in the knee joint and not at
321 the hip, as was seen in this study (23). Since work physicality was adjusted for, this suggests
322 that the knee may be more vulnerable to the effects of circadian rhythm disruption, independent
323 of more extreme physical stressors. Indeed existing research has indicated disparities in the
324 cellular and molecular pathophysiology of knee and hip osteoarthritis, including differences in
325 inflammatory processes (25), but further research is required to elucidate any differences within
326 the context of shift work and circadian rhythm disruption.

327

328 Both heavy manual work and prolonged non-sedentary work exposures demonstrated
329 associations with all osteoarthritis outcomes. Occupational physical stressors and risk of

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

330 osteoarthritis have been more extensively explored. For instance, a longitudinal cohort study
331 found heavy manual work was associated with an increased risk of knee osteoarthritis, double
332 that of sedentary work (26). In another cross-sectional study, workers conducting highly
333 physical work exhibited a nearly two-fold higher prevalence of symptomatic osteoarthritis,
334 compared to those with less physical work (27). Multiple reviews have also concluded that
335 occupations characterised by heavy physical workloads, repetitive actions and prolonged
336 walking and standing are associated with increased risk of knee and hip osteoarthritis (28-30).

337

338 Although heavy manual work and prolonged non-sedentary work showed associations with
339 both knee and hip osteoarthritis, these were stronger at the knee. A different study also saw a
340 greater association between job-related physical activity and knee osteoarthritis, with a hazard
341 ratio of 1.39 compared with 1.22 for hip osteoarthritis (31). This may be explained by the
342 increased susceptibility of the knee to biomechanical stress. During everyday movements the
343 knee experiences higher peak compressive forces compared to the hip (32). Moreover, as the
344 knee has more restricted movement and less stability, it is more inclined to injury, which can
345 accelerate degenerative changes (25, 33).

346

347 Despite associations being present for both males and females, work physicality mostly
348 displayed stronger associations with osteoarthritis in males. Similarly, a meta-analysis of 71
349 studies found greater odds of knee osteoarthritis in workers with physically demanding
350 occupations, that were male (OR 1.61), compared to female (1.35) (28). Across all occupations,
351 men demonstrate a stronger correlation between physical stressors, repetitive tasks, work
352 demands and risk of injury (34). Moreover, in hip osteoarthritis analyses, the progressive
353 associations between work frequency and risk of osteoarthritis were not observed in females

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

354 and similar findings have been reported in other studies where positive associations were solely
355 found in males (35). These differences could be attributed to the greater engagement in manual
356 labour among the male demographic, reflected by the larger number of male-only studies (35),
357 but more work is justified to fully understand the reasons behind this.

358

359 This study has identified robust associations between work-related exposures and large-joint
360 osteoarthritis, which have important implications for occupational health policies. Further
361 research is needed to establish causal relationships through randomised trials of workplace
362 interventions. For example, therapies and interventions that tackle sleep hygiene, shift timing
363 and light exposures have demonstrated favourable results in improving sleep among shift
364 workers and may have a positive impact on joint health (36). Considering that certain
365 occupational exposures are likely unavoidable, it may be more feasible to examine dose-
366 response associations to identify thresholds of safe working and to introduce closer monitoring
367 or screening of musculoskeletal health in these workers. Another area of interest is the potential
368 chronotherapeutic administration of prospective disease-modifying therapies and it may be
369 useful to explore differences in medication timing between day and night shift workers (37).

370

371 A notable strength of this study is its large sample size, enhancing the statistical power of the
372 analyses. Mutual-adjustment allowed for the estimation of independent associations between
373 shift work and work physicality with risk of osteoarthritis, to be drawn, addressing a gap in
374 prior research. UKB contains extensive lifestyle data, enabling adjustments for age, sex, BMI
375 and deprivation, which have been associated with osteoarthritis and employment. Previously,
376 socioeconomic status has been largely unconsidered (13, 14), but was included in this study.

377

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

378 A main limitation of this study is its cross-sectional nature, preventing the inference of causal
379 associations in isolation. Having osteoarthritis could influence choices about employment, as
380 these individuals would be more likely to avoid physically demanding or prolonged non-
381 sedentary jobs, which could lower their odds. For shift work, the triangulation between this
382 study and animal studies does add to the causal hypothesis that circadian rhythm dysfunction
383 causes knee osteoarthritis. The population within UKB predominantly comprises Caucasian
384 participants and those who tend to be more healthy and less deprived, restricting
385 generalisability to other ethnicities. Additional research among more ethnically diverse cohorts
386 would be beneficial. Another limitation is that this study was unable to account for employment
387 duration (i.e. years worked) or regularity of shift patterns (e.g. fixed versus rotating shifts),
388 which are likely to be important components of risk.

389

390 In conclusion, this large cross-sectional study saw independent associations between shift work
391 and both knee and self-reported osteoarthritis, but not hip osteoarthritis. These findings support
392 the role of circadian rhythm dysfunction as a contributing factor in knee osteoarthritis
393 pathogenesis, which aligns with the results of previous animal studies. Although further
394 replication of these findings is warranted given the duration of work exposures were not known.
395 Work physicality demonstrated association with osteoarthritis at all sites, with the strongest
396 associations seen in the knee, possibly reflecting its higher susceptibility to biomechanical
397 stress. These findings highlight the importance of the workplace environment in risk factor
398 management and could inform strategies to promote joint health in the workforce. Further
399 research is warranted to explore the effects of workplace interventions in minimising the risk
400 of osteoarthritis and to investigate the anatomical discrepancies that were observed.

401

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

402 Acknowledgements:

403 This work has been conducted using the UK Biobank resource, access application 17295.

404

405 Author contributions:

406 Significant contributions were made by all authors towards the conception and design of this

407 study, the acquisition of data, its analysis and interpretation. Each author helped draft the article

408 before agreeing the final version of this manuscript. Asad Hashmi (tc20694@bristol.ac.uk)

409 takes full responsibility for the integrity of the work.

410

411 Role of the funding source:

412 AH and SS were self-funded undergraduate students. BGF is supported by an NIHR Academic

413 Clinical Lectureship. RB and MJ were supported by a Wellcome Trust collaborative award

414 (209233/Z/17/Z). QJM was supported by a Versus Arthritis Senior Fellowship Award 20875.

415

416 Competing interest statement:

417 None to declare.

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

418 References

- 419 1. Steinmetz JD, Culbreth GT, Haile LM, Rafferty Q, Lo J, Fukutaki KG, et al. Global,
420 regional, and national burden of osteoarthritis, 1990–2020 and projections to 2050: a
421 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet Rheumatology*.
422 2023;5(9):e508-e22.
- 423 2. Versus Arthritis. THE STATE OF MUSCULOSKELETAL HEALTH 2023: Arthritis
424 and other musculoskeletal conditions in numbers. 2023. p. 6.
- 425 3. Long H, Liu Q, Yin H, Wang K, Diao N, Zhang Y, et al. Prevalence Trends of Site-
426 Specific Osteoarthritis From 1990 to 2019: Findings From the Global Burden of Disease
427 Study 2019. *Arthritis & Rheumatology*. 2022;74(7):1172-83.
- 428 4. OECD. Hours worked (indicator). 2024 [10/03/24]. Available from:
429 <https://data.oecd.org/emp/hours-worked.htm>.
- 430 5. Eurofound, Wilczynska A, Cabrita J, Parent-Thirion A, Biletta I, Vargas O, et al. 6th
431 European working conditions survey – 2017 update: Publications Office; 2017.
- 432 6. Rogers N, Meng Q-J. Tick tock, the cartilage clock. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*.
433 2023;31(11):1425-36.
- 434 7. Takahashi JS. Transcriptional architecture of the mammalian circadian clock. *Nature*
435 *Reviews Genetics*. 2017;18(3):164-79.
- 436 8. Poulsen RC, Hearn JI, Dalbeth N. The circadian clock: a central mediator of cartilage
437 maintenance and osteoarthritis development? *Rheumatology*. 2021;60(7):3048-57.
- 438 9. Akagi R, Akatsu Y, Fisch KM, Alvarez-Garcia O, Teramura T, Muramatsu Y, et al.
439 Dysregulated circadian rhythm pathway in human osteoarthritis: NR1D1 and BMAL1
440 suppression alters TGF- β signaling in chondrocytes. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2017;25(6):943-
441 51.
- 442 10. Du Z, You X, Wu D, Huang S, Zhou Z. Rhythm disturbance in osteoarthritis. *Cell*
443 *Communication and Signaling*. 2022;20(1):70.
- 444 11. Kc R, Li X, Voigt RM, Ellman MB, Summa KC, Vitaterna MH, et al. Environmental
445 disruption of circadian rhythm predisposes mice to osteoarthritis-like changes in knee joint. *J*
446 *Cell Physiol*. 2015;230(9):2174-83.
- 447 12. Boivin DB, Boudreau P, Kosmadopoulos A. Disturbance of the Circadian System in
448 Shift Work and Its Health Impact. *Journal of Biological Rhythms*. 2022;37(1):3-28.
- 449 13. Zhou M, Yang S, Guo Y, Wang D, Qiu W, Wang B, et al. Shift work and the risk of
450 knee osteoarthritis among Chinese workers: a retrospective cohort study. *Scandinavian*
451 *Journal of Work, Environment & Health*. 2020(2):152-60.
- 452 14. Zhou H, Zhou M, Qiu WH, Wang MY, Chen JH, Wang DM, et al. [The association
453 between shift work and lower extremity osteoarthritis among retired workers]. *Zhonghua Yu*
454 *Fang Yi Xue Za Zhi*. 2021;55(6):759-66.
- 455 15. Bevilacqua G, D'Angelo S, Ntani G, Stevens M, Linaker CH, Walker-Bone K. Shift
456 work amongst older UK workers and job exit. *Occupational Medicine*. 2021;71(9):429-38.
- 457 16. Cooper C, McAlindon T, Coggon D, Egger P, Dieppe P. Occupational activity and
458 osteoarthritis of the knee. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 1994;53(2):90-3.
- 459 17. Felson DT, Hannan MT, Naimark A, Berkeley J, Gordon G, Wilson PW, et al.
460 Occupational physical demands, knee bending, and knee osteoarthritis: results from the
461 Framingham Study. *J Rheumatol*. 1991;18(10):1587-92.
- 462 18. Croft P, Coggon D, Cruddas M, Cooper C. Osteoarthritis of the hip: an occupational
463 disease in farmers. *Bmj*. 1992;304(6837):1269-72.
- 464 19. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK
465 Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature*. 2018;562(7726):203-9.

Work characteristics and large joint osteoarthritis

- 466 20. Zengini E, Hatzikotoulas K, Tachmazidou I, Steinberg J, Hartwig FP, Southam L, et
467 al. Genome-wide analyses using UK Biobank data provide insights into the genetic
468 architecture of osteoarthritis. *Nat Genet.* 2018;50(4):549-58.
- 469 21. Townsend P, Phillimore P, Beattie A. *Health and deprivation: inequality and the*
470 *North*: Taylor & Francis; 1988.
- 471 22. Folkard S. Do permanent night workers show circadian adjustment? A review based
472 on the endogenous melatonin rhythm. *Chronobiol Int.* 2008;25(2):215-24.
- 473 23. Dudek M, Gossan N, Yang N, Im HJ, Ruckshanthi JP, Yoshitane H, et al. The
474 chondrocyte clock gene *Bmal1* controls cartilage homeostasis and integrity. *J Clin Invest.*
475 2016;126(1):365-76.
- 476 24. Cuesta M, Boudreau P, Cermakian N, Boivin DB. Rapid resetting of human peripheral
477 clocks by phototherapy during simulated night shift work. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7(1):16310.
- 478 25. Hall M, van der Esch M, Hinman RS, Peat G, de Zwart A, Quicke JG, et al. How does
479 hip osteoarthritis differ from knee osteoarthritis? *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage.* 2022;30(1):32-
480 41.
- 481 26. Perry TA, Wang X, Gates L, Parsons CM, Sanchez-Santos MT, Garriga C, et al.
482 Occupation and risk of knee osteoarthritis and knee replacement: A longitudinal, multiple-
483 cohort study. *Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism.* 2020;50(5):1006-14.
- 484 27. d'Errico A, Fontana D, Sebastiani G, Ardito C. Risk of symptomatic osteoarthritis
485 associated with exposure to ergonomic factors at work in a nationwide Italian survey. *Int*
486 *Arch Occup Environ Health.* 2023;96(1):143-54.
- 487 28. Wang X, Perry TA, Arden N, Chen L, Parsons CM, Cooper C, et al. Occupational
488 Risk in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Observational
489 Studies. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* 2020;72(9):1213-23.
- 490 29. Unverzagt S, Bolm-Audorff U, Frese T, Hechtel J, Liebers F, Moser K, et al. Influence
491 of physically demanding occupations on the development of osteoarthritis of the hip: a
492 systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology.* 2022;17(1):18.
- 493 30. Canetti EFD, Schram B, Orr RM, Knapik J, Pope R. Risk factors for development of
494 lower limb osteoarthritis in physically demanding occupations: A systematic review and
495 meta-analysis. *Applied Ergonomics.* 2020;86:103097.
- 496 31. Zhu J, Chen W, Hu Y, Qu Y, Yang H, Zeng Y, et al. Physical activity patterns, genetic
497 susceptibility, and risk of hip/knee osteoarthritis: a prospective cohort study based on the UK
498 Biobank. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage.* 2022;30(8):1079-90.
- 499 32. Luepingsak N, Amin S, Krebs DE, McGibbon CA, Felson D. The contribution of
500 type of daily activity to loading across the hip and knee joints in the elderly. *Osteoarthritis*
501 *Cartilage.* 2002;10(5):353-9.
- 502 33. Chhabra A, Elliott CC, Miller MD. *Normal Anatomy and Biomechanics of the Knee.*
503 *Sports Medicine and Arthroscopy Review.* 2001;9(3):166-77.
- 504 34. Biswas A, Harbin S, Irvin E, Johnston H, Begum M, Tiong M, et al. Differences
505 between men and women in their risk of work injury and disability: A systematic review. *Am*
506 *J Ind Med.* 2022;65(7):576-88.
- 507 35. Sun Y, Nold A, Glitsch U, Bochmann F. Hip Osteoarthritis and Physical Workload:
508 Influence of Study Quality on Risk Estimations-A Meta-Analysis of Epidemiological
509 Findings. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2019;16(3).
- 510 36. Robbins R, Underwood P, Jackson CL, Jean-Louis G, Madhavaram S, Kuriakose S, et
511 al. A Systematic Review of Workplace-Based Employee Health Interventions and Their
512 Impact on Sleep Duration Among Shift Workers. *Workplace Health & Safety.*
513 2021;69(11):525-39.
- 514 37. Dernie F, Adeyoju D. A matter of time: Circadian clocks in osteoarthritis and the
515 potential of chronotherapy. *Experimental Gerontology.* 2021;143:111163.




Figure 1 – Logistic regression results for the associations between categorical work characteristic frequency and knee osteoarthritis in fully-adjusted combined and sex-stratified analyses.

Odds ratios with the comparator group “never” are displayed with 95% confidence intervals. Different shapes represent the various employment intensities - circle: “sometimes”, square: “usually” and diamond: “always”.




Figure 2 – Logistic regression results for the associations between categorical work characteristic frequency and hip osteoarthritis in fully-adjusted combined and sex-stratified analyses.

Odds ratios with the comparator group “never” are displayed with 95% confidence intervals. Different shapes represent the various employment intensities - circle: “sometimes”, square: “usually” and diamond: “always”.




Figure 3 – Logistic regression results for the associations between categorical work characteristic frequency and self-reported osteoarthritis in fully-adjusted combined and sex-stratified analyses.

Odds ratios with the comparator group “never” are displayed with 95% confidence intervals. Different shapes represent the various employment intensities - circle: “sometimes”, square: “usually” and diamond: “always”.

Table 1 - Descriptive statistics of study population

	Combined	Male	Female
	Mean [SD, Range]	Mean [SD, Range]	Mean [SD, Range]
Age at baseline	52.7 [7.1, 38-71]	53.2 [7.4, 38-70]	52.3 [6.8, 40-71]
BMI	27.3 [4.7, 13.6-74.7]	27.8 [4.1, 14.9-63.3]	26.8 [5.1, 13.6-74.7]
TDI	-1.3 [3.0, -6.3-11.0]	-1.4 [3.0, -6.3-10.5]	-1.3 [3.0, -6.3-11.0]
Categorical Exposures	N [%]	N [%]	N [%]
Shift work			
Never/Rarely	235,136 [82.2]	109,362 [79.7]	125,774 [84.5]
Sometimes	21,855 [7.6]	12,043 [8.8]	9,812 [6.6]
Usually	6,271 [2.2]	3,217 [2.4]	3,054 [2.1]
Always	22,685 [7.9]	12,532 [9.1]	10,153 [6.8]
Night shifts			
Never/Rarely	260,177 [91.0]	121,194 [88.4]	138,983 [93.4]
Sometimes	14,432 [5.1]	8,929 [6.5]	5,503 [3.7]
Usually	3,968 [1.4]	2,512 [1.8]	1,456 [1.0]
Always	7,370 [2.6]	4,519 [3.3]	2,851 [1.9]
Heavy manual work			
Never/Rarely	183,796 [64.3]	81,022 [59.1]	102,774 [69.1]
Sometimes	62,355 [21.8]	31,693 [23.1]	30,662 [20.6]
Usually	20,010 [7.0]	12,257 [8.9]	7,753 [5.2]
Always	19,786 [6.9]	12,182 [8.9]	7,604 [5.1]
Non-sedentary work			
Never/Rarely	97,507 [34.1]	44,043 [32.1]	53,464 [35.9]
Sometimes	87,981 [30.8]	43,956 [32.1]	44,025 [29.6]
Usually	43,023 [15.1]	21,470 [15.7]	21,553 [14.5]
Always	57,436 [20.1]	27,685 [20.2]	29,751 [20.0]
Outcomes			
Knee osteoarthritis	18,578 [6.5]	9,623 [7.0]	8,955 [6.0]
Hip osteoarthritis	10,698 [3.7]	4,803 [3.5]	5,895 [4.0]
Self-reported osteoarthritis	16,407 [5.7]	6,389 [4.7]	10,018 [6.7]
Total number of observations	285,947 [100.0]	137,154 [48.0]	148,793 [52.0]

Abbreviations: BMI – body mass index, TDI – Townsend Deprivation Index

Table 2 - Logistic regression results showing the associations between binary work exposures and knee osteoarthritis in combined and sex-stratified analyses.

Knee Osteoarthritis	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P
Combined								
Shift work	1.31 [1.25-1.37]	8.87×10^{-32} *	1.42 [1.36-1.49]	6.30×10^{-52}	1.29 [1.23-1.35]	3.73×10^{-27}	1.12 [1.07-1.17]	3.87×10^{-6} *
Night shifts	1.32 [1.23-1.42]	1.26×10^{-15}	1.46 [1.36-1.57]	6.61×10^{-27}	1.30 [1.21-1.39]	3.39×10^{-13}	1.12 [1.04-1.20]	1.75×10^{-3} *
Heavy manual work	1.55 [1.49-1.61]	2.00×10^{-113} *	1.59 [1.53-1.65]	3.00×10^{-122} *	1.58 [1.52-1.64]	4.00×10^{-114} *	1.30 [1.24-1.36]	5.76×10^{-30} *
Non-sedentary work	1.48 [1.44-1.53]	2.00×10^{-146} *	1.46 [1.41-1.50]	7.00×10^{-131} *	1.48 [1.43-1.52]	3.00×10^{-135} *	1.32 [1.28-1.37]	5.30×10^{-54} *
Males								
Shift work	1.24 [1.16-1.31]	9.11×10^{-12}	1.39 [1.31-1.48]	6.79×10^{-26}	1.32 [1.24-1.40]	1.09×10^{-17}	1.14 [1.07-1.21]	8.34×10^{-5} *
Night shifts	1.24 [1.14-1.35]	1.14×10^{-6}	1.43 [1.31-1.56]	1.41×10^{-15}	1.34 [1.23-1.46]	1.14×10^{-10}	1.15 [1.05-1.26]	2.14×10^{-3} *
Heavy manual work	1.65 [1.57-1.73]	4.70×10^{-93}	1.73 [1.65-1.81]	2.00×10^{-108}	1.76 [1.68-1.85]	3.00×10^{-112}	1.38 [1.30-1.46]	6.18×10^{-28} *
Non-sedentary work	1.66 [1.59-1.73]	6.00×10^{-126}	1.64 [1.58-1.71]	3.00×10^{-119}	1.69 [1.62-1.76]	3.00×10^{-127}	1.45 [1.38-1.52]	1.10×10^{-4} *
Females								
Shift work	1.38 [1.29-1.47]	1.65×10^{-20}	1.45 [1.36-1.55]	7.40×10^{-27}	1.26 [1.18-1.36]	4.59×10^{-11}	1.14 [1.06-1.22]	6.78×10^{-4} *
Night shifts	1.39 [1.24-1.55]	9.06×10^{-9}	1.49 [1.33-1.67]	3.30×10^{-12}	1.23 [1.10-1.38]	4.09×10^{-4}	1.09 [0.97-1.23]	0.14
Heavy manual work	1.32 [1.24-1.41]	1.48×10^{-17}	1.38 [1.29-1.47]	3.82×10^{-22}	1.31 [1.23-1.40]	6.39×10^{-16}	1.12 [1.04-1.21]	1.97×10^{-3} *
Non-sedentary work	1.31 [1.25-1.37]	1.26×10^{-33}	1.28 [1.22-1.33]	1.32×10^{-27}	1.28 [1.23-1.34]	1.62×10^{-27}	1.22 [1.16-1.28]	1.76×10^{-14} *

Adjusted accordingly: Model 1 – unadjusted, Model 2 – age and sex, Model 3 – age, sex, BMI and TDI, Model 4 – age, sex, BMI, TDI and other employment factors.

* Denotes a sex interaction term with P-value <0.1.

Table 3 - Logistic regression results showing the associations between binary work exposures and hip osteoarthritis in combined and sex-stratified analyses.

Hip Osteoarthritis	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P
Combined								
Shift work	0.99 [0.93-1.05]	0.74	1.12 [1.05-1.20]	5.60×10^{-4}	1.08 [1.01-1.15]	0.03	1.01 [0.95-1.08]	0.74
Night shifts	0.97 [0.88-1.07]	0.54	1.16 [1.04-1.28]	5.24×10^{-3}	1.10 [0.99-1.21]	0.08	1.03 [0.93-1.14]	0.59*
Heavy manual work	1.13 [1.07-1.19]	1.00×10^{-5}	1.22 [1.15-1.29]	1.55×10^{-12}	1.22 [1.15-1.28]	2.87×10^{-12}	1.13 [1.06-1.20]	1.32×10^{-6}
Non-sedentary work	1.19 [1.14-1.24]	5.10×10^{-18} *	1.16 [1.11-1.21]	3.53×10^{-13} *	1.17 [1.12-1.21]	5.17×10^{-14} *	1.12 [1.07-1.17]	1.39×10^{-6}
Males								
Shift work	0.96 [0.88-1.05]	0.39	1.12 [1.02-1.23]	0.01	1.09 [0.99-1.19]	0.08	1.02 [0.93-1.12]	0.67
Night shifts	0.99 [0.86-1.12]	0.83	1.19 [1.04-1.36]	9.45×10^{-3}	1.15 [1.01-1.31]	0.04	1.08 [0.94-1.23]	0.27
Heavy manual work	1.16 [1.08-1.25]	3.96×10^{-5}	1.23 [1.14-1.32]	3.40×10^{-8}	1.24 [1.15-1.33]	7.12×10^{-9}	1.10 [1.01-1.20]	0.03
Non-sedentary work	1.26 [1.19-1.34]	5.51×10^{-15}	1.24 [1.17-1.31]	1.34×10^{-12}	1.26 [1.18-1.33]	5.04×10^{-14}	1.21 [1.13-1.29]	1.18×10^{-6}
Females								
Shift work	1.04 [0.95-1.13]	0.43	1.11 [1.01-1.21]	0.03	1.06 [0.96-1.16]	0.25	1.00 [0.91-1.10]	0.95
Night shifts	0.99 [0.85-1.16]	0.90	1.08 [0.93-1.27]	0.31	1.01 [0.86-1.19]	0.88	0.95 [0.81-1.11]	0.53
Heavy manual work	1.14 [1.05-1.24]	1.53×10^{-3}	1.20 [1.11-1.30]	1.38×10^{-5}	1.19 [1.09-1.29]	5.53×10^{-5}	1.14 [1.04-1.25]	4.75×10^{-3}
Non-sedentary work	1.14 [1.08-1.20]	2.53×10^{-6}	1.10 [1.04-1.16]	8.64×10^{-4}	1.10 [1.04-1.16]	7.82×10^{-4}	1.06 [1.00-1.13]	0.06

Adjusted accordingly: Model 1 – unadjusted, Model 2 – age and sex, Model 3 – age, sex, BMI and TDI, Model 4 – age, sex, BMI, TDI and other employment factors.

* Denotes a sex interaction term with P-value <0.1.

Table 4 - Logistic regression results showing the associations between binary work exposures and self-reported osteoarthritis in combined and sex-stratified analyses.

Self-reported Osteoarthritis	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P	OR [95% CI]	P
Combined								
Shift work	1.15 [1.09-1.21]	6.83×10^{-8}	1.32 [1.25-1.39]	1.16×10^{-26}	1.23 [1.17-1.30]	1.51×10^{-15} *	1.13 [1.07-1.19]	5.54×10^{-6} *
Night shifts	1.11 [1.03-1.20]	6.20×10^{-3}	1.37 [1.27-1.48]	3.56×10^{-15}	1.26 [1.16-1.36]	1.22×10^{-8} *	1.15 [1.06-1.24]	7.00×10^{-4} *
Heavy manual work	1.21 [1.16-1.26]	1.21×10^{-17} *	1.36 [1.30-1.42]	7.30×10^{-43} *	1.34 [1.28-1.40]	2.95×10^{-38} *	1.20 [1.14-1.27]	5.54×10^{-13} *
Non-sedentary work	1.26 [1.22-1.30]	5.30×10^{-46} *	1.24 [1.20-1.28]	4.96×10^{-38} *	1.24 [1.20-1.28]	2.87×10^{-37} *	1.15 [1.10-1.19]	1.27×10^{-12} *
Males								
Shift work	1.19 [1.11-1.28]	3.64×10^{-6}	1.38 [1.28-1.49]	2.78×10^{-17}	1.31 [1.22-1.42]	2.82×10^{-12}	1.20 [1.11-1.30]	3.77×10^{-6}
Night shifts	1.16 [1.04-1.29]	5.85×10^{-3}	1.39 [1.25-1.55]	2.65×10^{-9}	1.31 [1.17-1.46]	1.35×10^{-6}	1.19 [1.07-1.33]	1.78×10^{-3}
Heavy manual work	1.35 [1.27-1.44]	8.48×10^{-23}	1.43 [1.34-1.52]	3.35×10^{-30}	1.42 [1.34-1.51]	4.80×10^{-29}	1.21 [1.12-1.30]	2.94×10^{-7}
Non-sedentary work	1.41 [1.34-1.49]	1.00×10^{-40}	1.39 [1.32-1.46]	1.57×10^{-36}	1.39 [1.32-1.46]	4.00×10^{-36}	1.26 [1.19-1.34]	7.61×10^{-14}
Females								
Shift work	1.17 [1.09-1.25]	4.84×10^{-6}	1.25 [1.17-1.34]	1.15×10^{-10}	1.16 [1.08-1.24]	3.00×10^{-5}	1.08 [1.00-1.16]	0.04
Night shifts	1.20 [1.07-1.34]	1.35×10^{-3}	1.32 [1.18-1.48]	1.64×10^{-6}	1.18 [1.06-1.33]	4.03×10^{-3}	1.09 [0.97-1.23]	0.15
Heavy manual work	1.22 [1.15-1.30]	3.33×10^{-10}	1.29 [1.21-1.37]	4.64×10^{-15}	1.26 [1.18-1.34]	3.19×10^{-12}	1.17 [1.09-1.26]	1.42×10^{-5}
Non-sedentary work	1.18 [1.14-1.23]	2.16×10^{-15}	1.15 [1.10-1.19]	3.68×10^{-10}	1.14 [1.10-1.19]	7.26×10^{-10}	1.08 [1.03-1.14]	1.07×10^{-3}

Adjusted accordingly: Model 1 – unadjusted, Model 2 – age and sex, Model 3 – age, sex, BMI and TDI, Model 4 – age, sex, BMI, TDI and other employment factors.

* Denotes a sex interaction term with P-value <0.1.

