

1 **A cross-sectional study of infection control measures against COVID-19 and**
2 **psychological distress among Japanese workers**

3

4 Yoshino Yasuda¹, Tomohiro Ishimaru¹, Masako Nagata², Seiichiro Tateishi³, Hisashi Eguchi⁴,
5 Mayumi Tsuji⁵, Akira Ogami⁶, Shinya Matsuda⁷, and Yoshihisa Fujino¹ for the
6 CORoNaWork project

7

8 **Author contributions:** Y.F. was the chairperson of the study group. Y.Y. and Y.F.
9 conceived the research questions. Y.F. conducted the statistical analysis. Y.Y., T.I. and Y.F.
10 drafted the manuscript. All the authors designed the research protocol and developed the
11 questionnaire. All the authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

12

13 **Authors' affiliations:**

14 ¹ Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
15 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

16 ² Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial
17 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan,
18 Kitakyushu, Japan

19 ³ Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
20 Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan Department of Psychiatry, University of
21 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

22 ⁴ Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
23 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

24 ⁵ Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
25 Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

26 ⁶ Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
27 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan, Kitakyushu, Japan

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

30

31 **Corresponding author:** Yoshihisa Fujino¹, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.

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

34 1-1, Iseigaoka, Yahatanishiku, Kitakyushu, 807-8555, Japan

35 Tel: +81-93-691-7401

36 E-mail: zenq@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

37

38 **Abstract**

39 **Objectives:** This study examined the relationship between the status of infection control
40 efforts against COVID-19 in the workplace and workers' mental health using a large-scale
41 **Internet-based** study.

42 **Methods:** This cross-sectional study was based on an Internet monitoring survey conducted
43 during the third wave of the COVID-19 epidemic in Japan. Of the 33,302 people who
44 participated in the survey, 27,036 were included in the analyses. Participants answered
45 whether or not each of 10 different infection control measures were in place at their
46 workplace (e.g. wearing masks at all times during working hours). A Kessler 6 (K6) score of
47 ≥ 13 was defined as mild psychological distress. The odds ratios (ORs) of psychological
48 distress associated with infection control measures at the workplace were estimated using a
49 multilevel logistic model nested in the prefectures of residence.

50 **Results:** The OR of subjects working at facilities with 4 or 5 infection control measures **for**
51 **psychological distress** was **1.19** (95% confidence interval [CI]: **1.05-1.34**, **p=0.010**), that in
52 facilities with 2 or 3 infection control measures was **1.43** (95% CI: **1.25-1.64**, **p<0.001**), and
53 that in facilities with 1 or no infection control measures was **1.87** (95% CI: **1.63-2.14**,
54 **p<0.001**) compared to subjects whose workplaces had ≥ 6 infection control measures.

55 **Conclusion:** Our findings suggest that proactive COVID-19 infection control measures can
56 influence the mental health of workers.

57 **Keywords:** COVID-19, Japan, Occupational Health, Psychological Distress, Prevention and
58 Control

59 **Introduction**

60 A new type of coronavirus infection (COVID-19) was confirmed in China in December 2019
61 and spread rapidly around the world. On April 7, 2020, a state of emergency was declared in
62 Tokyo and six other prefectures, followed by a nationwide declaration on April 16. Although
63 the number of infected people temporarily decreased in Japan, a second wave arrived in
64 August of the same year, and a third wave was noted in December to January 2021.

65 The spread of COVID-19 has transformed people's lifestyles. To stop the spread of
66 the infection, events and gatherings, including the 2020 Tokyo Olympics, were postponed or
67 cancelled, and restrictions on going out, as well as online schooling and telecommuting were
68 encouraged. The government recommends that residents avoid the "three Cs" of "closed,
69 crowded, and close" in their daily lives by maintaining as much distance between people as
70 possible, going outdoors rather than staying indoors when interacting, and avoiding talking
71 directly to one another whenever possible.^{1,2}

72 In addition to the above measures, various measures are also being taken to prevent
73 infection in the workplace, including maintaining physical distance, wearing masks, basic
74 hygiene (e.g. hand washing), daily health checks, and telework. Further, infection control
75 measures are being implemented not only in public facilities but also in the private sector.
76 Measures to ensure social distance in the workplace, such as spacing out seats, are
77 increasingly common. Even in the hospitality industry, where wearing a mask has historically
78 been frowned upon, the donning of a face mask for health purposes is now routine. Many
79 companies have also introduced programs to allow employees to telecommute, some on a
80 permanent basis. According to a survey,³ the number of companies in Tokyo practicing
81 telework has increased markedly, from 24% in March 2020 to 57% in January 2021.

82 However, with the spread of COVID-19, mental health problems have become an
83 emerging public health issue. Previous studies have reported increased anxiety and mental

84 **distress** among residents of areas that experienced lockdowns.⁴ Increased rates of mental
85 health problems, such as depression, worsening of existing mental illnesses, suicide, and
86 alcohol dependence, have also been reported.⁵⁻⁷ In addition, encouraging avoidance of the
87 three Cs is also suspected to have had a negative impact on the mental health of the public, as
88 such measures necessarily interfere with public interaction, communication, and socialization.
89 Further, anxiety is likely to be heightened by the spread of unconfirmed or even outright false
90 information and the continuous state of fear and worry.⁸ However, while authorities have
91 recommended a variety of measures, the extent of infection prevention measures actually
92 implemented varies among companies. Depending on the industry, some measures may be
93 difficult to implement.

94 In general, anxiety about infectious diseases such as influenza, HIV, and Middle East
95 Respiratory Syndrome is known to affect mental health,⁹⁻¹¹ and the same holds true for
96 COVID-19.¹² A recent review reported that occupational factors and workplace environment
97 were associated with workers' mental health.¹³ To our knowledge, however, no report has yet
98 examined how the status of infection control efforts against COVID-19 in the workplace
99 influences workers' mental health.

100 We hypothesized that the implementation of good infection control efforts in the
101 workplace would have a positive impact on workers' mental health. Here, we examined the
102 relationship between the status of infection control efforts against COVID-19 in the
103 workplace and workers' mental health using a large-scale Internet-based study.

104 **Material and Methods**

105 *Study design and subjects*

106 This cross-sectional study was based on an Internet monitoring survey conducted on
107 December 22nd to 26th, 2020, when the third wave of the COVID-19 epidemic began in
108 Japan. Details of the protocol have already been reported.¹⁴ In brief, data were collected from
109 workers who had employment contracts at the time of the survey, allocated by prefecture,
110 occupation, and sex. Of the 33,302 people who participated in the survey, 27,036 were
111 included in the study, excluding fraudulent responses. **The exclusion criteria were as follows:**
112 **extremely short response time (≤ 6 minutes), extremely low body weight (< 30 kg), extremely**
113 **short height (< 140 cm), inconsistent answers to similar questions throughout the survey (e.g.,**
114 **inconsistency to questions about marital status and living area), and wrong answers to a**
115 **staged question used to identify fraudulent responses (choose the third largest number from**
116 **the following five numbers).**

117 This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational
118 and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079). Informed consent was obtained via
119 the website.

120

121 *Evaluation of infection control measures in the workplace*

122 Participants were asked to answer yes or no concerning whether the following measures had
123 been implemented in their workplace: refraining from and restrictions on business trips;
124 refraining from and restrictions on visitors; refraining from or requesting a limit on the
125 number of people at social gatherings and dinners; refraining from or limiting face-to-face
126 internal meetings; wearing masks at all times during working hours; installing partitions and
127 revising the workplace layout; recommending workers perform daily temperature checks at

128 their homes; encouraging telecommuting; prohibiting workers from eating at their own desk;
129 and requesting employees not come to work when they were not feeling well.

130

131 *Assessment of psychological distress*

132 The Kessler 6 (K6) was used to assess psychological distress.¹⁵ The validity of the Japanese
133 version of the K6 has been confirmed.^{16,17} The K6 was developed to screen for mental
134 disorders, such as depression and anxiety, and is also used as an indicator of the degree of
135 such mental problems, including psychological stress. The K6 is a series of six questions,
136 with scores ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (always), depending on how often the topics of the
137 questions were experienced in the past 30 days. The higher the total score, the greater the
138 possibility of depression or anxiety disorder, with a score of ≥ 5 indicating the possibility of
139 some kind of depression or anxiety problem and a score of ≥ 13 indicating a suspected
140 depression or anxiety disorder. In the present study, a K6 score of ≥ 13 was used as the cut-off
141 value for psychological distress.

142

143 *Other covariates*

144 **Information on the subject's socioeconomic status and characteristics of the company, which**
145 **were considered potential confounding factors, were investigated.** Participants noted the
146 following about themselves in an online form: age, sex, prefecture of residence, marital status
147 (married, unmarried, bereaved/divorced), job type (mainly desk work, mainly involving
148 interpersonal communication, and mainly labor), number of employees in the workplace,
149 educational background, equivalent household income (household income divided by the
150 square root of the household size), smoking status, alcohol consumption (6–7 days a week, 4–
151 5 days a week, 2–3 days a week, less than 1 day a week, hardly ever), **telecommuting**

152 frequency and subjective evaluation of change in stress and working hours due to COVID-19
153 (increase, no change, decrease).

154

155 *Statistical analyses*

156 The age-sex adjusted and the multivariate adjusted odds ratios (ORs) of psychological
157 distress associated with each infection control measures at the workplace were estimated
158 using a multilevel logistic model nested in the prefecture of residence. The multivariate
159 model was adjusted for sex, age, education, equivalent household income, job type, number
160 of employees at the workplace, smoking status, alcohol consumption, telecommuting
161 frequency, and subjective evaluation of change in stress and working hours due to COVID-19.
162 The incidence rate of COVID-19 during a period between January and December of 2020 by
163 prefecture was also used as a prefecture-level variable. We further estimated the multivariate
164 ORs of psychological distress associated with the number of infection control measures at the
165 workplace.

166 A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were
167 conducted using Stata (Stata Statistical Software, Release 16; StataCorp LLC, College
168 Station, TX, USA).

169

170 **Results**

171 Table 1 shows the basic characteristics according to the number of infection control measures
172 implemented at the workplace. Of the 27036 participants, 14852 (55%) indicated that they
173 had ≥ 6 infection control measures implemented in their workplace. In contrast, 4177 (15%)
174 of the participants reported having ≤ 1 infection control measures implemented in their
175 workplace. **Compared to the subjects working in companies with fewer infection control**
176 **measures, the subjects working in companies with more infection control measures tended to**
177 **be more married, more desk workers, and had higher incomes and education.**

178 Table 2 shows the number of infection control efforts put in place and the details of
179 each effort. The most commonly implemented **infection control measures** were “wearing
180 masks at all times during working hours” (79%) and “refraining from or requesting a limit on
181 the number of people at social gatherings and dinners” (71%). In contrast, relatively few
182 companies had implemented “requesting employees not come to work when they are not
183 feeling well” (9%) and “prohibiting workers from eating at their own desk” (17%).

184 Table 3 shows the association of the number of infection control measures against
185 COVID-19 and severe psychological distress. As the number of measures increased, the OR
186 for psychological distress decreased. Compared to subjects whose workplaces had
187 implemented 6 or more infection control measures, the OR of subjects with 4 or 5 measures
188 was **1.19 (95% CI: 1.05-1.34 , p=0.010)**, **1.43 (95% CI: 1.25-1.64, p<0.001)** for 2 or 3
189 measures, and **1.87 (95% CI: 1.63-2.14, p<0.001)** for 1 or no measures.

190 Table 4 shows the association of each infection control measure and psychological
191 distress. Most of the measures were significantly associated with a reduction in psychological
192 distress, with ORs ranging from approximately **0.70 to 0.80**, with statistical significance. In
193 particular, “requesting employees not come to work when they are not feeling well” was
194 associated with a decreased OR for psychological distress (**OR=0.56, 95% CI: 0.50-0.62,**

195 $p < 0.001$), whereas “prohibiting workers from eating at their own desk” was **not** associated
196 with psychological distress (OR=1.09, 95% CI:0.97-1.22, $p=0.135$).

197 **Discussion**

198 This study demonstrated an association between psychological distress and the
199 implementation of 10 common COVID-19 infection prevention measures recommended in
200 the workplace. In addition, our study revealed that the more infection control measures
201 implemented in the workplace, the lower the workers' mental **distress**.

202 Each individual preventive measure was found to be associated with low
203 psychological distress. In particular, the policy of “requesting employees not come to work
204 when they are not feeling well” markedly reduced psychological distress. This measure, which
205 likely reduces the risk of infection of others when one employee is infected, was generally thought by
206 workers to be directly effective in minimizing damage in the event of infection around them, and was
207 linked to their mental stability. Sickness presenteeism is reportedly influenced by organizational
208 culture, employment instability, and socioeconomic status.¹⁸⁻²⁰ Such a clear statement of
209 company policy would discourage workers with a poor socioeconomic status against
210 concealing their fever and coming to work, thereby preventing infection.

211 In contrast, only the measure “prohibiting workers from eating at their own desk” was
212 not associated with decreased psychological distress, possibly reflecting the psychological
213 **distress** caused by reducing communication with peers during a time of refreshment. These
214 results suggest that communication is becoming an issue during the COVID-19 pandemic and
215 that efforts to consciously balance COVID-19 infection control and communication in the
216 workplace are needed.²¹ **It should be noted, however, that interpretation of these results needs
217 to be caution. These analyses compared people who took a certain measure with those who
218 did not, but the people who did not take such measure may also take other measures.
219 Therefore, it does not evaluate the effectiveness of a particular measure in isolation.**

220 The present study revealed marked variation in the COVID-19 infection control
221 measures among companies. These differences in among companies are attributed to various

222 factors, including the difficulty of adopting some measures in certain industries, the influence
223 of the sense of risk among companies and employers, and the costs associated with the
224 implementation of measures. This is supported by the results of this study. Those who
225 worked in companies that implemented more infection control measures had higher incomes,
226 more education, and larger company sizes. The feasibility of infection control measures also
227 differs depending on the work environment. For example, in workplaces that do not have
228 break rooms for taking meals, prohibiting workers from eating at their own desks may be
229 difficult. In workplaces where employees have fixed starting and working hours, crowding of
230 changing rooms at certain times may be unavoidable. The ability to implement such measures
231 varies depending on the budget available, the size of the company, and the presence of an
232 individual in charge of promoting safety and health.

233 Our study also found that the more infection control measures implemented in the
234 workplace, the less substantial workers' mental distress. We assumed that companies with
235 more infection control measures in place would have stronger company governance. Such
236 proactive corporate initiatives for infection control may contribute to the mental health of
237 workers by promoting a safety climate and psychosocial safety climate in the workplace.²²
238 The results suggest that the implementation of proactive infection control helps reduce
239 psychological distress. Infection anxiety concerning COVID-19 reportedly affects mental
240 health,^{5,7,8,12,23} which is consistent with findings for other infectious diseases, such as hepatitis
241 and HIV.^{24,25} These results suggest that infection control measures alleviate workers' anxiety
242 about infection. Proactive infection prevention measures in the workplace are expected to
243 reduce workers' anxiety about infection and thereby have a positive impact on workers'
244 mental health.²⁶

245 Several possible reasons may explain why active infection control in the workplace is
246 associated with psychological distress in workers. As mentioned above, infection prevention

247 measures have a direct effect on reducing infection anxiety. In addition, the implementation
248 of appropriate COVID-19 control measures based on correct information can itself serve as a
249 form of infection prevention education for workers.²⁷ When an organization faces a crisis,
250 whether or not the employer provides appropriate support affects the mental health of the
251 workers.²³ A clear COVID-19 infection prevention policy in the workplace can build a
252 relationship of trust between the employer and workers and consequently reduce workers'
253 psychological distress.¹³

254 Several limitations associated with the present study warrant mention. First, this study
255 was a cross-sectional study, so causality is unclear. More psychologically anxious people
256 may have been prone to underestimate the efficacy of the infection control measures in the
257 workplace. However, since this study inquired about the existence of visible and physical
258 measures, we believe that the likelihood of wrong answers was low. Second, we did not
259 confirm the time when the countermeasures were implemented. This study investigated the
260 situation as of December 2020, when the infection was at its peak in Japan. Therefore, the
261 degree of the subjects' anxiety and their reaction to their workplace's efforts may have
262 differed between the time when the infection rate was relatively low and the time of the
263 survey, when the rate was relatively high. **Third, a lack of information regarding possible**
264 **confounding factors, such as industry and employment stability might affect the results. For**
265 **example,** we did not ask about the subjects' workplaces or industries in detail, but some of
266 these factors likely affected the results, such as the size of the workplace space (small office
267 vs. a large space, such as a retail store) or how often the subjects were in contact with
268 unspecified numbers of people. Finally, establishments that have implemented many
269 measures are more likely to be companies that are enthusiastic about mental health measures
270 and consider their employees' well-being on a regular basis, so the mental **distress** may have
271 already been low at baseline; however, this aspect was not evaluated.

272 This study suggests that proactive COVID-19 infection control measures can lead to
273 improved mental health care for workers. Proactive infection prevention measures in the
274 workplace are expected to reduce workers' anxiety about infection and have a positive impact
275 on workers' mental health. The implementation of COVID-19 infection control measures in
276 the workplace is recommended not only as a way to prevent infection but also as a new
277 mental health measure.

278

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

287 The current members of the CORoNaWork Project, in alphabetical order, are as
288 follows: Dr. Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the study group), Dr. Akira Ogami, Dr.
289 Arisa Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr. Kazunori Ikegami,
290 Dr. Kei Tokutsu, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kosuke Mafune, Dr. Kyoko
291 Kitagawa, Dr. Masako Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Ms. Ning Liu, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr.
292 Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr. Seiichiro Tateishi, Dr. Shinya Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru, and
293 Dr. Tomohisa Nagata. All members are affiliated with the University of Occupational and
294 Environmental Health, Japan.

295

296 **Disclosure**

297 **Ethical approval:** This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of
298 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079).

299 **Informed Consent:** Informed consent was obtained through an online website.

300 **Registry and the Registration No. of the study/Trial:** N/A

301 **Animal Studies:** N/A

302 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest associated with this
303 manuscript.

304 References

- 305 1. Shimizu K, Wharton G, Sakamoto H, Mossialos E. Resurgence of covid-19 in Japan.
306 *BMJ*. 2020;370:m3221.
- 307 2. Sarwar A, Imran M. Prioritizing Infection Prevention and Control Activities for SARS-
308 CoV-2 (COVID-19): A Multi-Criteria Decision-Analysis Method. *J Healthc Leadersh*.
309 2021;13:77-84.
- 310 3. Tokyo Metroplolitan Government. [Results of an emergency survey on telework
311 adoption rates]. Published May 11, 2020. Accessed December 25, 2020.
312 <https://www.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/tosei/hodohappyo/press/2020/05/12/10.html>
- 313 4. Hyland P, Shevlin M, McBride O, et al. Anxiety and depression in the Republic of
314 Ireland during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2020;142(3):249-256.
- 315 5. Shi L, Lu Z-A, Que J-Y, et al. Prevalence of and Risk Factors Associated With Mental
316 Health Symptoms Among the General Population in China During the Coronavirus
317 Disease 2019 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(7):e2014053.
- 318 6. Yao H, Chen J-H, Xu Y-F. Patients with mental health disorders in the COVID-19
319 epidemic. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(4):e21.
- 320 7. Niedzwiedz CL, Green MJ, Benzeval M, et al. Mental health and health behaviours
321 before and during the initial phase of the COVID-19 lockdown: longitudinal analyses of
322 the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.
323 2021;75(3):224-231.
- 324 8. Gao J, Zheng P, Jia Y, et al. Mental health problems and social media exposure during
325 COVID-19 outbreak. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(4):e0231924.
- 326 9. Starks TJ, Rendina HJ, Breslow AS, Parsons JT, Golub SA. The psychological cost of
327 anticipating HIV stigma for HIV-negative gay and bisexual men. *AIDS Behav*.
328 2013;17(8):2732-2741.

- 329 10. Aiello A, Khayeri MY-E, Raja S, et al. Resilience training for hospital workers in
330 anticipation of an influenza pandemic. *J Contin Educ Health Prof.* 2011;31(1):15-20.
- 331 11. Kunzler AM, Stoffers-Winterling J, Stoll M, et al. Mental health and psychosocial
332 support strategies in highly contagious emerging disease outbreaks of substantial public
333 concern: A systematic scoping review. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(2):e0244748.
- 334 12. Torales J, O'Higgins M, Castaldelli-Maia JM, Ventriglio A. The outbreak of COVID-19
335 coronavirus and its impact on global mental health. *Int J Soc Psychiatry.*
336 2020;66(4):317-320.
- 337 13. Giorgi G, Lecca LI, Alessio F, et al. COVID-19-Related Mental Health Effects in the
338 Workplace: A Narrative Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;17(21).
339 doi:10.3390/ijerph17217857
- 340 14. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a Nationwide Internet-based Health
341 Survey of Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic in 2020. *J UOEH.* 2021;43(2):217-
342 225.
- 343 15. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, et al. Short screening scales to monitor population
344 prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol Med.*
345 2002;32(6):959-976.
- 346 16. Sakurai K, Nishi A, Kondo K, Yanagida K, Kawakami N. Screening performance of
347 K6/K10 and other screening instruments for mood and anxiety disorders in Japan.
348 *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 2011;65(5):434-441.
- 349 17. Furukawa TA, Kawakami N, Saitoh M, et al. The performance of the Japanese version
350 of the K6 and K10 in the World Mental Health Survey Japan. *Int J Methods Psychiatr*
351 *Res.* 2008;17(3):152-158.
- 352 18. Widera E, Chang A, Chen HL. Presenteeism: a public health hazard. *J Gen Intern Med.*
353 2010;25(11):1244-1247.

- 354 19. Leineweber C, Westerlund H, Hagberg J, Svedberg P, Alexanderson K. Sickness
355 presenteeism is more than an alternative to sickness absence: results from the
356 population-based SLOSH study. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2012;85(8):905-914.
- 357 20. Webster RK, Liu R, Karimullina K, Hall I, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ. A systematic review of
358 infectious illness Presenteeism: prevalence, reasons and risk factors. *BMC Public Health*.
359 2019;19(1):799.
- 360 21. Abrams EM, Greenhawt M. Risk Communication During COVID-19. *J Allergy Clin*
361 *Immunol Pract*. 2020;8(6):1791-1794.
- 362 22. Dollard MF, Tuckey MR, Dormann C. Psychosocial safety climate moderates the job
363 demand-resource interaction in predicting workgroup distress. *Accid Anal Prev*.
364 2012;45:694-704.
- 365 23. Hamouche S. COVID-19 and employees' mental health: stressors, moderators and
366 agenda for organizational actions. *Emerald Open Research*. 2020;2:15.
367 doi:10.35241/emeraldopenres.13550.1
- 368 24. Morrison MF, Petitto JM, Ten Have T, et al. Depressive and anxiety disorders in women
369 with HIV infection. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2002;159(5):789-796.
- 370 25. Wada K, Smith DR, Ishimaru T. Reluctance to care for patients with HIV or hepatitis B
371 / C in Japan. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2016;16:31.
- 372 26. Havaei F, Ma A, Staempfli S, MacPhee M. Nurses' Workplace Conditions Impacting
373 Their Mental Health during COVID-19: A Cross-Sectional Survey Study. *Healthcare*
374 *(Basel)*. 2021;9(1). doi:10.3390/healthcare9010084
- 375 27. Coelho CM, Suttiwan P, Arato N, Zsido AN. On the Nature of Fear and Anxiety
376 Triggered by COVID-19. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:581314.

Table 1. Characteristics of the subjects according to the number of workplace measures against COVID-19

Factor	Number of workplace measures against COVID-19 (n=27036)			
	0-1	2-3	4-5	≥6
Number of subjects	4177	3404	4603	14852
Age, mean (SD)	48.6 (9.9)	47.0 (10.3)	46.8 (10.6)	46.6 (10.7)
Sex, male	2489 (59.6%)	1726 (50.7%)	2222 (48.3%)	7377 (49.7%)
Marital status, married	2006 (48.0%)	1751 (51.4%)	2462 (53.5%)	8810 (59.3%)
Job type				
Mainly desk work	1954 (46.8%)	1475 (43.3%)	2119 (46.0%)	7920 (53.3%)
Jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication	870 (20.8%)	929 (27.3%)	1342 (29.2%)	3786 (25.5%)
Mainly labor	1353 (32.4%)	1000 (29.4%)	1142 (24.8%)	3146 (21.2%)
Equivalent income (million JPY)				
50-249	1453 (34.8%)	933 (27.4%)	990 (21.5%)	2334 (15.7%)
250-374	1197 (28.7%)	1101 (32.3%)	1368 (29.7%)	3884 (26.2%)
375-489	838 (20.1%)	727 (21.4%)	1116 (24.2%)	3944 (26.6%)
≥490	689 (16.5%)	643 (18.9%)	1129 (24.5%)	4690 (31.6%)
Education				
Junior high school	111 (2.7%)	83 (2.4%)	71 (1.5%)	103 (0.7%)
High school	1475 (35.3%)	1043 (30.6%)	1213 (26.4%)	3222 (21.7%)
Vocational school/college, university, graduate school	2591 (62.0%)	2278 (66.9%)	3319 (72.1%)	11527 (77.6%)
Current smoker	1289 (30.9%)	990 (29.1%)	1219 (26.5%)	3506 (23.6%)
Alcohol consumption, 6–7 days a week	1057 (25.3%)	755 (22.2%)	927 (20.1%)	2935 (19.8%)
Number of employees in the workplace				
1-29	2394 (57.3%)	1248 (36.7%)	977 (21.2%)	1546 (10.4%)
30-99	1046 (25.0%)	1203 (35.3%)	1572 (34.2%)	3119 (21.0%)
100-999	451 (10.8%)	594 (17.5%)	1152 (25.0%)	4956 (33.4%)
≤1000	286 (6.8%)	359 (10.5%)	902 (19.6%)	5231 (35.2%)
Telecommuting frequency				
More than 4 days per week	808 (19.3%)	262 (7.7%)	259 (5.6%)	1461 (9.8%)
More than 2 days per week	123 (2.9%)	108 (3.2%)	128 (2.8%)	1118 (7.5%)
More than 1 days per week	63 (1.5%)	58 (1.7%)	84 (1.8%)	673 (4.5%)
Less than 1 day per week	32 (0.8%)	41 (1.2%)	81 (1.8%)	461 (3.1%)
Hardly ever	3151 (75.4%)	2935 (86.2%)	4051 (88.0%)	11139 (75.0%)
Change in stress due to COVID-19 epidemic				
increase	779 (18.6%)	989 (29.1%)	1477 (32.1%)	4834 (32.5%)
no change	3308 (79.2%)	2332 (68.5%)	2986 (64.9%)	9339 (62.9%)
decrease	90 (2.2%)	83 (2.4%)	140 (3.0%)	679 (4.6%)
Change in working hours due to COVID-19 epidemic				
increase	193 (4.6%)	246 (7.2%)	372 (8.1%)	1444 (9.7%)
no change	3654 (87.5%)	2834 (83.3%)	3718 (80.8%)	11725 (78.9%)
decrease	330 (7.9%)	324 (9.5%)	513 (11.1%)	1683 (11.3%)
Severe psychological distress (K6≥13)	464 (11.1%)	355 (10.4%)	429 (9.3%)	1212 (8.2%)

Table 2. Implemented workplace measurements against COVID-19

	Number of workplace measures against COVID-19				Total N=27036
	0-1 n=4177	2-3 n=3404	4-5 n=4603	≥6 n=14852	
Refraining from and restriction of business trips	56 (1.3%)	400 (11.8%)	1479 (32.1%)	12725 (85.7%)	14660 (54.2%)
Refraining from or restriction on visitors	26 (0.6%)	189 (5.6%)	867 (18.8%)	11217 (75.5%)	12299 (45.5%)
Refraining from or requesting a limit on the number of people at social gatherings and dinners	149 (3.6%)	1200 (35.3%)	3340 (72.6%)	14525 (97.8%)	19214 (71.1%)
Refraining from or limiting face-to-face internal meetings	8 (0.2%)	250 (7.3%)	1418 (30.8%)	13001 (87.5%)	14677 (54.3%)
Wearing masks at all times during working hours	551 (13.2%)	2315 (68.0%)	3970 (86.2%)	14387 (96.9%)	21223 (78.5%)
Installation of partitions and consideration of workplace layout (e.g. altering desk layout or adjusting flow lines)	83 (2.0%)	748 (22.0%)	2316 (50.3%)	12587 (84.7%)	15734 (58.2%)
Recommending workers perform daily temperature checks at their homes	183 (4.4%)	1349 (39.6%)	2892 (62.8%)	12825 (86.4%)	17249 (63.8%)
Encouragement of telecommuting	114 (2.7%)	255 (7.5%)	539 (11.7%)	6886 (46.4%)	7794 (28.8%)
Prohibiting eating at a worker's own desk	12 (0.3%)	87 (2.6%)	292 (6.3%)	4206 (28.3%)	4597 (17.0%)
Requesting employees not to come to work when they are not feeling well	464 (11.1%)	355 (10.4%)	429 (9.3%)	1212 (8.2%)	2460 (9.1%)

Table 3. Association of the number of workplace measures against COVID-19 and severe psychological distress ($K6 \geq 13$)

number of workplace measures against COVID-19	Age-sex adjusted			Multivariate*		
	OR	95% CI	p	OR	95% CI	p
0-1	1.53	1.37 1.72	p<0.001	1.87	1.63 2.14	p<0.001
2-3	1.34	1.18 1.52	p<0.001	1.43	1.25 1.64	p<0.001
4-5	1.16	1.04 1.31	0.010	1.19	1.05 1.34	0.010
≥ 6	reference			reference		

* The multivariate model included sex, age, education, equivalent household income, occupation, number of business establishments, smoking status, alcohol consumption, **telecommuting frequency, change in stress and change in working hours due to COVID-19**. The incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture was also used as a prefecture-level variable.

Table 4. Association of workplace measures against COVID-19 and severe psychological distress (K6≥13)

	Age-sex adjusted			Multivariate*		
	OR	95% CI	p	OR	95% CI	p
Refraining from and restrictions on business trips	0.78	0.72 0.85	<0.001	0.75	0.68 0.83	<0.001
Refraining from and restrictions on visitors	0.85	0.78 0.92	<0.001	0.82	0.75 0.90	<0.001
Refraining from or requesting a limit on the number of people at social gatherings and dinners	0.75	0.68 0.81	<0.001	0.70	0.64 0.78	<0.001
Refraining from or limiting face-to-face internal meetings	0.77	0.70 0.83	<0.001	0.74	0.67 0.81	<0.001
Wearing masks at all times during working hours	0.82	0.74 0.91	<0.001	0.74	0.66 0.83	<0.001
Installation of partitions and consideration of workplace layout (e.g. altering desk layout or adjusting flow lines)	0.79	0.72 0.86	<0.001	0.75	0.68 0.82	<0.001
Recommending workers perform daily temperature checks at their homes	0.82	0.75 0.90	<0.001	0.77	0.70 0.85	<0.001
Encouragement of telecommuting	0.85	0.77 0.93	0.001	0.85	0.76 0.96	0.009
Prohibiting workers from eating at their own desk	1.08	0.97 1.20	0.172	1.09	0.97 1.22	0.135
Requesting employees not come to work when they are not feeling well	0.60	0.55 0.65	<0.001	0.56	0.50 0.62	<0.001

* The multivariate model included sex, age, education, equivalent household income, occupation, number of business establishments, smoking status, alcohol consumption, telecommuting frequency, change in stress and change in working hours due to COVID-19. The incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture was also used as a prefecture-level variable.