Title: Worries about COVID-19 infection and psychological distress at work and while commuting

Masamichi Uehara[1], M.D., Tomohiro Ishimaru[1], M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., Hajime Ando[2], M.D., M.O.H., Ph.D., Seiichiro Tateishi[3], M.D., Ph.D., Hisashi Eguchi[4], M.D., M.B.A., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji[5], M.D., Ph.D., Koji Mori[6], M.D., Ph.D., Shinya Matsuda[7], M.D., Ph.D., and Yoshihisa Fujino[1], M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork Project

[1] Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

[2] Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

[3] Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

[4] Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

[5] Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

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

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

Author contribution:

MU; Writing the manuscript, TI; creating the questionnaire, review of manuscripts, and advice on interpretation, HA; review of manuscripts and advice on interpretation, ST, HE, MT, KM and SM; Review of manuscripts, advice on interpretation, and funding for research, YF; Overall survey planning, creating the questionnaire, analysis, and drafting the manuscript

Correspondence to Yoshihisa Fujino[1], M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.

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

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

Tel: +81-93-691-7401

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

Funding Sources

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

Conflict of Interest:

Dr. Fujino received personal fees from Sompo Health Support Inc., outside the submitted work.

Acknowledgements

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

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

Running title: worries about COVID-19 infection and psychological distress

Abstract

Objective: This study examined the relationship between worry about COVID-19 infection in the workplace and while commuting to work and psychological distress in Japan.

Methods: An internet monitor study was conducted. Out of a total of 33,302 participants, 26,841 people were included. The subjects were asked single-item questions about whether they were worried about COVID-19 infection in general, at work and while commuting to work. Kessler 6 (K6) was used to assess psychological distress.

Results: The OR was significantly higher in association with worry about infection in the workplace at 1.71 (95%CI 1.53–1.92) and worry about infection while commuting at 1.49 (95%CI 1.32–1.67).

Conclusions: This study suggests the need for psychological intervention to reduce worry about infection in response to public mental health challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords: Anxiety, COVID-19, Japan**,** Occupational Health, Psychological Distress

Introduction

Mental health problems associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are an emerging public health issue[1]. Outbreaks increase generalized fear, community anxiety, and panic symptoms[2,3]. Previous studies have reported a higher prevalence of psychological symptoms such as depression and anxiety among individuals who experienced lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic [1,4–7]

Containment measures against pandemics like COVID-19 have a strong impact on individuals' daily lives and psychological well-being[8]. "A new normal" of avoiding the "three Cs" (crowded places, close-contact settings, and confined and enclosed spaces) has been recommended as an effective countermeasure against infection[8]. However, such measures also distance people from each other, which can lead to decreased communication and socializing. In addition, COVID-19 has also brought about economic recession and job insecurity. Together, these effects are thought to have contributed to an increase in loneliness, worry, fear, anxiety, and stress among individuals.

In situations like the current pandemic, worry of infection is a common feeling among the majority of the population, given that various aspects of daily life pose potential risk of infection. An increase in infections can trigger psychological symptoms

37 such as generalized fear and widespread community anxiety[2,3]. Psychological symptoms
38 such as persistent worrying, feeling overwhelmed by emotions, restlessness and
39 irritability emerge within the population in the form of anxiety, panic attacks,
40 depression and suicide[9,10]. Worry of infection is an early sign of psychological distress.

41 For workers, the workplace and commuting[11–14] are considered particularly risky
42 opportunities for infection. For this reason, most workplaces are taking various infection
43 control measures, including limiting the number of visitors, restricting business trips,
44 encouraging telecommuting, ensuring sufficient office ventilation, and installing
45 partitions in customer-facing spaces.[15,16] However, some workplaces are not taking
46 sufficient recommended measures for business reasons or due to cost.[17,18] Naturally,
47 infection control efforts in the workplace influence workers' worry of infection. When
48 infection control does not meet expectations, workers' anxiety and depression are
49 high.[19] In contrast, intensive workplace measures against COVID-19 are associated with
50 lower psychological distress among employees.[15,19] In addition, anxiety and depression
51 are higher among workers who do not telecommute and those with interpersonal tasks.[19]

52 Therefore, we hypothesized that worry of infection in the workplace and while
53 commuting affect the psychological distress of workers. In this study, we examined the
54 relationship between workers' worry about infection and psychological distress in the

55 midst of a rapid outbreak of COVID-19 in Japan.

56

Method

Study design and subjects

This cross-sectional, internet monitor study was conducted on December 22–26, 2020, when Japan experienced its third wave of COVID-19 infection. Details of the protocol of this survey are reported elsewhere[20]. Briefly, data were collected from workers who had employment contracts at the time of the survey and were selected based on prefecture, job type, and sex.

Out of a total of 33,302 people who participated in the survey, 27,036 people were included in the study after removing those found to have provided fraudulent responses. Participants were excluded if they had exceptionally short response times (≤6 minutes), exceptionally low body weight (<30 kg), exceptionally short height (<140 cm), provided inconsistent responses to comparable questions (e.g., inconsistent responses to questions on marital status and area of residence), and gave incorrect responses to a question included to identify fraudulent responses (select the third largest number from among the following five numbers). After further excluding 195 individuals who indicated in the survey that they had already been infected with COVID-19, a total of 26,841 individuals (13,713 males and 13,128 females) were included in the current analysis. This study was approved by the ethics committee of the

University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079). Informed consent was obtained in the form of the website.

Assessment of worry about COVID-19 infection

Three single-item questions were used to determine whether or not the subjects were worried about infection. One question inquired about general worry of COVID-19 infection, while the other two were situation dependent, inquiring about worry of infection at work and while commuting to work. The questions were, “Are you worried about being infected with COVID-19?” “Are you worried about being infected while working at your workplace?” and “Are you worried about being infected while commuting to work?” The participants responded “yes” or “no” to the questions.

Assessment of psychological distress

Kessler 6 (K6) was used to assess psychological distress[21]. The validity of the Japanese version of the K6 has been confirmed[22]. In the present study, a K6 score of 5 or higher was used as the cutoff for mild psychological distress, and a score of 13 or higher as the cutoff for severe psychological distress.

93 Other covariates

94 We selected potential confounding factors which are possibly related to anxiety
95 and psychological distress. The following survey items were considered confounding
96 factors: age, sex, marital status (married, unmarried, bereaved/divorced), occupation
97 (mainly desk work, jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication, and mainly
98 labor), number of employees, educational background, equivalent income (household
99 income divided by the square root of household size), smoking status, alcohol
100 consumption, frequency of telecommuting, and use of public transportation when
101 commuting. The questionnaire also asked the following questions: “Have you been a
102 close contact of someone infected with COVID-19?” and “Do you know of anyone
103 close to you (friends or family) who has been infected with COVID-19?”

104 The questionnaire also asked the participants to rate their company's infection
105 control measures using the question “Do you think your company has taken adequate
106 infection control measures for its employees?” Participants responded on a four-point
107 scale: “yes,” “somewhat,” “not really,” “no.”

108 In addition, the cumulative incidence rate of COVID-19 infection one month
109 prior to conduct of the survey in the prefectures of residence was used as a
110 community-level variable. Information was collected from the websites of public

institutions.

Statistical analysis.

The odds ratios (ORs) of psychological distress associated with worry about infection were estimated using a multilevel logistic model nested in the prefectures of residence. Psychological distress was defined as a K6 score of 5 or higher and 13 or higher.

The multivariate model was adjusted for sex, age, education, equivalent household income, occupation, number of business establishments, smoking status, alcohol consumption, frequency of telecommuting, use of public transportation when commuting, perceived assessment of workplace infection control efforts, presence of infection among acquaintances, and experience of being a close contact. The incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture was also used as a prefecture-level variable.

We further estimated the multivariate ORs of psychological distress associated with use of public transportation, with adjustment for all factors except worry about infection during commuting, because adjusting for worry about infection would be an over-adjustment.

A p value less than .05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses

129 were conducted using Stata (Stata Statistical Software: Release 16; StataCorp LLC, TX,

130 USA).

131

Results

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the subjects according to their worries about infection. A total of 75% of the participants were worried about infection. While 50% of participants were worried about being infected in the workplace, 32% were worried about being infected while commuting to work. Women were more worried about infection than men. There were no substantial differences in income, educational background, or lifestyle by worry about COVID-19 infection in general, while at work, or while commuting. Participants who indicated that they worried about infection in the workplace and while commuting shared similar characteristics.

Table 2 shows the ORs of psychological distress. In the age-adjusted model for moderate psychological distress defined by a K6 score of 5 or higher, general worry about COVID-19 infection (OR=1.29, 95%CI 1.22–1.37), worry about infection at work (OR=1.79, 95%CI 1.70–1.88), and worry about infection while commuting (OR=1.64, 95%CI 1.55–1.73) all showed significant associations with psychological distress. Multivariate analysis showed that the OR of moderate psychological distress associated with general worry about COVID-19 infection was 0.97 (95% CI 0.91–1.04). The ORs were significantly higher in association with worry about infection in the workplace at 1.57 (95%CI 1.57–1.48) and worry about infection while commuting at 1.49 (95%CI

150 1.38–1.60).

151 The sex- and age-adjusted OR of severe psychological distress, defined by a
152 K6 score of 13 or higher, associated with general worry about COVID-19 infection was
153 1.05 (95%CI 0.95–1.15). ORs were significantly higher in association with worry about
154 infection in the workplace (OR=1.76, 95%CI 1.61–1.92) and worry about infection
155 while commuting (OR=1.65, 95%CI 1.51–1.80). Multivariate analysis of severe
156 psychological distress showed similar results.

157 We also examined situations we predicted could enhance worry. Being in close
158 contact with an infected person increased the ORs of severe psychological distress;
159 however, having acquaintances who had been infected was not significantly associated
160 with severe psychological distress. The OR of severe psychological distress associated
161 with using public transportation for commuting to work was 1.25 (95%CI 1.25–1.39).

162

163

164 **Discussion**

165 This study showed that while general worry about COVID-19 infection was not
166 associated with psychological distress, worry about infection at work and while
167 commuting were associated with moderate and severe psychological distress.

168 The spread of COVID-19 infection is causing people to worry about infection in
169 a number of everyday situations. In the present study, 75% of participants were worried
170 about infection, suggesting that COVID-19 infection is a major source of public stress.
171 However, in this situation, worrying about infection is not unhealthy, but rather, a
172 natural reaction to current events. Such worry about infection may lead to preventive
173 behaviors[23–25]. In this situation, we found that having general worry about COVID-19
174 infection did not lead to psychological distress.

175 However, our study indicates that certain everyday situations, such as working
176 in the workplace and commuting to work, are particularly worrisome in relation to
177 infection. We found that worry about infection at work was associated with moderate
178 and severe psychological distress. There are many opportunities in the workplace for
179 direct contact with others, such as while communicating with colleagues and providing
180 services to customers, and for indirect contact with people through objects. Previous
181 studies have also reported an increase in anxiety and depression in interpersonal work.[19]

182 Additionally, in places like offices, workers share a relatively small space. Thus, the
183 fact that individuals have limited control over maintaining the recommended three Cs
184 strategy for infection prevention at work can be a major cause of stress. A sense of
185 security and trust that workplaces can be made safe in the event of a pandemic may
186 counteract any negative feelings.[18]

187 The present study also showed that worry about infection during commuting was
188 associated with moderate and severe psychological distress. This result is consistent
189 with previous studies that found a higher prevalence of anxiety and depressive
190 symptoms among workers who have to commute to work.[18,19] Commuting to work is
191 considered one way in which risk of infection can increase[26], because individuals come
192 into contact with an unspecified number of people, are unable to maintain social
193 distancing, and are present in a space that feels relatively enclosed, such as a bus or
194 train. In fact, 47% of participants who were worried about infection while commuting
195 experienced moderate psychological distress, and 23% experienced severe
196 psychological distress. These results suggest that reducing worries about infection in the
197 workplace and during commuting is important for reducing public mental health issues
198 caused by COVID-19[27].

199 However, our findings also suggest the difficulty of reducing psychological

200 distress due to worry about infection. We found that worries about infection in the
201 workplace and while commuting to work were associated with psychological distress
202 even after adjusting for assessment of adequate infection control measures in the
203 workplace and use of public transportation. This result is consistent with a previous
204 study that showed that workers' anxiety about infection differs in different workplaces,
205 and cannot be explained by workplace-related COVID-19 risk management strategies.[18]
206 These results suggest that workers worry regardless of whether or not they use public
207 transportation to commute to work or have adequate infection prevention measures
208 installed in their workplace, and that these worries are related to psychological distress.
209 In fact, 38% of those who were worried about their commute did not use public
210 transportation. While we found that public transportation use was associated with
211 psychological distress, this association disappeared after adjusting for general worry
212 about COVID-19 infection. This finding supports the idea that worry, rather than facts,
213 is associated with psychological distress. Worry about infection is not only based on
214 rational judgment, but is also an intuitive feeling. Therefore, to reduce excessive worry
215 about infection and the resulting psychological distress, it is necessary to both promote
216 infection prevention measures and adjust individuals' perception of their worries.
217 Recent studies have provided useful suggestions for reducing anxiety about

218 COVID-19 infection. Establishing infection control policies and implementing infection
219 control measures in the workplace can be beneficial for the mental health of workers,
220 and a sense of trust and security that infection control measures in the workplace are
221 adequate will alleviate anxiety.[15,18,19] Use of personal protective equipment when
222 conducting interpersonal tasks and access to testing in case of suspected infectious
223 contact can also ease anxiety.[18,19] Additionally, public awareness, such as through
224 access to correct information and avoiding excessive exposure to the media, may be
225 useful for reducing anxiety.[28–30] Cognitive-behavioral therapy is also considered an
226 effective method for such a purpose[31].

227 Limitations of this study warrant mention. First, the generalizability of the
228 results is uncertain because this study was conducted through internet monitors.
229 However, we attempted to reduce as much bias in the target population as possible by
230 sampling according to region, job type, and prefecture based on the infection incidence
231 rate. Second, the study asked simple questions about individuals' worries about
232 infection. Dichotomous yes/no responses can prevent a nuanced understanding of the
233 real sensations experienced by individuals. However, the questions were not intended to
234 diagnose psychiatric symptoms or psychiatric illnesses. Participants who indicated that
235 they were worried may also exhibit psychiatric symptoms, such as anxiety, depression,

236 and panic; however, distinguishing these symptoms was outside the scope of this study.
237 Third, worry about infection in the workplace is thought to be greatly influenced by the
238 type of job and the environment in which one works. Health care workers are a typical
239 example of a population that is at high risk of infection and are more likely to
240 experience psychological distress[10]. In this study, we only adjusted for simple variables
241 such as job type (desk work and physical work) and the number of employees in the
242 workplace. Fourth, because this was a cross-sectional study, the temporal relationship
243 between worry about infection and psychological distress is unclear. Excessive anxiety
244 and depression may be symptoms of psychological distress. Previous studies have
245 shown that people with a history of psychiatric disorders are more anxious and show
246 greater psychological distress during the COVID-19 pandemic[32]. However, because it is
247 easier to confirm feelings of worry than to make a psychiatric diagnosis, we believe that
248 it is useful to identify the presence of worry among workers for determining health
249 status.

250 In conclusion, while general worry about infection was not associated with
251 psychological distress, worry about infection in specific situations such as in the
252 workplace and while commuting was associated with moderate and severe
253 psychological distress. These worries and the associated psychological and emotional

254 responses may not be mediated by actual infection control measures taken in the
255 workplace or use of public transportation. Thus, despite the continued spread of
256 COVID-19 infection and an increase in anxiety in the population, situational fear, but
257 not generic fear, is correlated with poor mental health. Such knowledge will be useful
258 for designing future policies to manage mental health. The results of this study suggest
259 the need for psychological approaches to reduce worries about infection in response to
260 the mental health challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.
261

262 **References:**

263 1. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, et al. Immediate Psychological Responses and Associated
264 Factors during the Initial Stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19)
265 Epidemic among the General Population in China. *Int J Environ Res Public*
266 *Health*. 2020;17(5). doi:10.3390/ijerph17051729

267 2. Varatharaj A, Thomas N, Ellul MA, et al. Neurological and neuropsychiatric
268 complications of COVID-19 in 153 patients: a UK-wide surveillance study. *Lancet*
269 *Psychiatry*. 2020;7(10):875-882.

270 3. Serafini G, Parmigiani B, Amerio A, Aguglia A, Sher L, Amore M. The
271 psychological impact of COVID-19 on the mental health in the general population.
272 *QJM*. Published online June 22, 2020. doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcaa201

273 4. Tang W, Hu T, Hu B, et al. Prevalence and correlates of PTSD and depressive
274 symptoms one month after the outbreak of the COVID-19 epidemic in a sample of
275 home-quarantined Chinese university students. *J Affect Disord*. 2020;274:1-7.

276 5. Losada-Baltar A, Jiménez-Gonzalo L, Gallego-Alberto L, Pedroso-Chaparro MDS,
277 Fernandes-Pires J, Márquez-González M. "We're staying at home". Association of
278 self-perceptions of aging, personal and family resources and loneliness with
279 psychological distress during the lock-down period of COVID-19. *J Gerontol B*
280 *Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. Published online April 13, 2020. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbaa048

281 6. Mazza C, Ricci E, Biondi S, et al. A Nationwide Survey of Psychological Distress
282 among Italian People during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Immediate Psychological
283 Responses and Associated Factors. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(9).
284 doi:10.3390/ijerph17093165

285 7. Moccia L, Janiri D, Pepe M, et al. Affective temperament, attachment style, and
286 the psychological impact of the COVID-19 outbreak: an early report on the Italian
287 general population. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2020;87:75-79.

288 8. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the
289 public. Accessed January 27, 2021.
290 https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-pub
291 lic

9. Greenberg N, Brooks SK, Wessely S, Tracy DK. How might the NHS protect the mental health of health-care workers after the COVID-19 crisis? *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2020;7(9):733-734.

10. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsi E, Katsaounou P. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2020;88:901-907.

11. Tan L, Ma C. Choice behavior of commuters' rail transit mode during the COVID-19 pandemic based on logistic model. *Journal of Traffic and Transportation Engineering (English Edition)*. 2021;8(2):186-195.

12. Hu M, Lin H, Wang J, et al. Risk of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Transmission in Train Passengers: an Epidemiological and Modeling Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;72(4):604-610.

13. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). *Public Transport and COVID-19 – What We Know so Far*. Queen's Printer for Ontario; 2020.

14. World Health Organization. Supporting healthy urban transport and mobility in the context of COVID-19. Published November 2, 2020. Accessed June 3, 2021. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240012554

15. Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Workplace responses to COVID-19 associated with mental health and work performance of employees in Japan. *J Occup Health*. 2020;62(1):e12134.

16. Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare, Japan. Checklist for the prevention of 257 COVID-19 spreading at workplaces. Accessed June 3, 2021. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000694987.pdf

17. Ishimaru T, Nagata M, Hino A, et al. Workplace measures against COVID-19 during the winter third wave in Japan: Company size-based differences. *J Occup Health*. 2021;63(1):e12224.

18. Nabe-Nielsen K, Nilsson CJ, Juul-Madsen M, Bredal C, Hansen LOP, Hansen ÅM. COVID-19 risk management at the workplace, fear of infection and fear of

322 transmission of infection among frontline employees. *Occup Environ Med*.
323 2021;78(4):248-254.

324 19. Smith PM, Oudyk J, Potter G, Mustard C. Labour market attachment, workplace
325 infection control procedures and mental health: A cross-sectional survey of
326 Canadian non-healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Ann Work*
327 *Expo Health*. 2021;65(3):266-276.

328 20. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based
329 health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv*.
330 Published online January 1, 2021:2021.02.02.21249309.

331 21. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, et al. Short screening scales to monitor
332 population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol*
333 *Med*. 2002;32(6):959-976.

334 22. Furukawa TA, Kawakami N, Saitoh M, et al. The performance of the Japanese
335 version of the K6 and K10 in the World Mental Health Survey Japan. *Int J*
336 *Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2008;17(3):152-158.

337 23. Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HHH, et al. Community Responses during Early Phase of
338 COVID-19 Epidemic, Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(7):1575-1579.

339 24. Bowman L, Kwok KO, Redd R, et al. Public perceptions and preventive
340 behaviours during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic: a comparative
341 study between Hong Kong and the United Kingdom. *bioRxiv*. Published online
342 August 7, 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.08.06.20169409

343 25. Magdy DM, Metwally A, Magdy O. Assessment of Community Psycho-behavioral
344 Responses during the outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV): A cross
345 sectional study. *Research Square*. Published online April 29, 2020.
346 doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-25146/v1

347 26. Zhang J. Transport policymaking that accounts for COVID-19 and future public
348 health threats: A PASS approach. *Transp Policy*. 2020;99:405-418.

349 27. Dam P, Mandal S, Mondal R, Sadat A, Chowdhury SR, Mandal AK. COVID-19:
350 Impact on transport and mental health. *J Transp Health*. 2020;19:100969.

28. Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Exposure to media and fear and worry about COVID-19. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2020;74(9):501-502. doi:10.1111/pcn.13095

29. Torales J, O'Higgins M, Castaldelli-Maia JM, Ventriglio A. The outbreak of COVID-19 coronavirus and its impact on global mental health. *Int J Soc Psychiatry*. 2020;66(4):317-320.

30. Mowbray H. In Beijing, coronavirus 2019-nCoV has created a siege mentality. *BMJ*. 2020;368:m516.

31. Yue J-L, Yan W, Sun Y-K, et al. Mental health services for infectious disease outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. *Psychol Med*. 2020;50(15):2498-2513.

32. Yamamoto T, Uchiumi C, Suzuki N, Yoshimoto J, Murillo-Rodriguez E. The Psychological Impact of "Mild Lockdown" in Japan during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Nationwide Survey under a Declared State of Emergency. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(24). doi:10.3390/ijerph17249382

Table 1. The characteristics of the subjects according to their worries about infection.

	Worry about infection		Worry about infection at work		Worry about infection while commuting	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Number of subjects	6967	19874	13323	13518	18091	8750
Age, mean (SD)	47.0 (10.3)	47.0 (10.6)	48.3 (10.2)	45.8 (10.7)	47.4 (10.4)	46.2 (10.8)
Sex, male	4099 (58.8%)	9614 (48.4%)	7819 (58.7%)	5894 (43.6%)	9551 (52.8%)	4162 (47.6%)
Marriage status, married	3702 (53.1%)	11207 (56.4%)	7519 (56.4%)	7390 (54.7%)	10196 (56.4%)	4713 (53.9%)
Job type						
Mainly desk work	3402 (48.8%)	9970 (50.2%)	7257 (54.5%)	6115 (45.2%)	8594 (47.5%)	4778 (54.6%)
Jobs mainly involving interpersonal communi-cation	1707 (24.5%)	5163 (26.0%)	2856 (21.4%)	4014 (29.7%)	4570 (25.3%)	2300 (26.3%)
Mainly labor	1858 (26.7%)	4741 (23.9%)	3210 (24.1%)	3389 (25.1%)	4927 (27.2%)	1672 (19.1%)
Equivalent income (million JPY)						
50-249	1612 (23.1%)	4061 (20.4%)	2920 (21.9%)	2753 (20.4%)	4013 (22.2%)	1660 (19.0%)
250-374	1897 (27.2%)	5607 (28.2%)	3578 (26.9%)	3926 (29.0%)	5128 (28.3%)	2376 (27.2%)
375-489	1565 (22.5%)	5013 (25.2%)	3170 (23.8%)	3408 (25.2%)	4426 (24.5%)	2152 (24.6%)
≥490	1893 (27.2%)	5193 (26.1%)	3655 (27.4%)	3431 (25.4%)	4524 (25.0%)	2562 (29.3%)
Educational background						
Junior high	115 (1.7%)	252 (1.3%)	205 (1.5%)	162 (1.2%)	273 (1.5%)	94 (1.1%)
High school	1892 (27.2%)	5018 (25.2%)	3599 (27.0%)	3311 (24.5%)	5113 (28.3%)	1797 (20.5%)
University, graduate school, vocational school, junior college	4960 (71.2%)	14604 (73.5%)	9519 (71.4%)	10045 (74.3%)	12705 (70.2%)	6859 (78.4%)
Current smoker	1818 (26.1%)	5136 (25.8%)	3560 (26.7%)	3394 (25.1%)	4807 (26.6%)	2147 (24.5%)
Alcohol consumption						
6 to 7 days per week	1523 (21.9%)	4092 (20.6%)	3089 (23.2%)	2526 (18.7%)	3932 (21.7%)	1683 (19.2%)
4 to 5 days per week	530 (7.6%)	1513 (7.6%)	1012 (7.6%)	1031 (7.6%)	1309 (7.2%)	734 (8.4%)
2 to 3 days per week	826 (11.9%)	2420 (12.2%)	1635 (12.3%)	1611 (11.9%)	2127 (11.8%)	1119 (12.8%)
Less than 1 day per week	1106 (15.9%)	3417 (17.2%)	2117 (15.9%)	2406 (17.8%)	2960 (16.4%)	1563 (17.9%)
Almost none	2982 (42.8%)	8432 (42.4%)	5470 (41.1%)	5944 (44.0%)	7763 (42.9%)	3651 (41.7%)
Number of employees in the workplace						
1-29	1736 (24.9%)	4386 (22.1%)	3927 (29.5%)	2195 (16.2%)	4615 (25.5%)	1507 (17.2%)
30-99	1768 (25.4%)	5126 (25.8%)	3245 (24.4%)	3649 (27.0%)	4893 (27.0%)	2001 (22.9%)
100-999	1725 (24.8%)	5375 (27.0%)	3095 (23.2%)	4005 (29.6%)	4640 (25.6%)	2460 (28.1%)
≤1000	1738 (24.9%)	4987 (25.1%)	3056 (22.9%)	3669 (27.1%)	3943 (21.8%)	2782 (31.8%)
Experience of being a close contact	56 (0.8%)	148 (0.7%)	79 (0.6%)	125 (0.9%)	122 (0.7%)	82 (0.9%)
Presence of infection among acquaintances	364 (5.2%)	1778 (8.9%)	855 (6.4%)	1287 (9.5%)	1248 (6.9%)	894 (10.2%)
Use of public transportation for commuting	1358 (19.5%)	5884 (29.6%)	2730 (20.5%)	4512 (33.4%)	1761 (9.7%)	5481 (62.6%)
General worry about infection	0 (0.0%)	19874 (100.0%)	7221 (54.2%)	12653 (93.6%)	11895 (65.8%)	7979 (91.2%)
Worry about infection at work	865 (12.4%)	12653 (63.7%)	0 (0.0%)	13518 (100.0%)	6568 (36.3%)	6950 (79.4%)
Worry about infection while commuting	771 (11.1%)	7979 (40.1%)	1800 (13.5%)	6950 (51.4%)	0 (0.0%)	8750 (100.0%)
Moderate psychological distress (K6≥5)	2447 (35.1%)	8240 (41.5%)	4264 (32.0%)	6423 (47.5%)	6516 (36.0%)	4171 (47.7%)
Severe psychological distress (K6≥13)	605 (8.7%)	1814 (9.1%)	860 (6.5%)	1559 (11.5%)	2926 (16.2%)	2047 (23.4%)

Table 2. Associations of worry about infection and psychological distress

	OR of moderate psychological distress (K6≥5)								OR of severe psychological distress (K6≥13)							
	Age-sex adjusted				Multivariate*				Age-sex adjusted				Multivariate*			
	OR	95% CI		p	OR	95% CI		p	OR	95% CI		p	OR	95% CI		p
General worry about infection	1.29	1.22	1.37	<0.001	0.97	0.91	1.04	0.412	1.05	0.95	1.15	0.365	1.10	1.00	1.22	0.060
Worry about infection at work	1.79	1.70	1.88	<0.001	1.57	1.48	1.68	<0.001	1.76	1.61	1.92	<0.001	1.71	1.53	1.92	<0.001
Worry about infection during commuting	1.64	1.55	1.73	<0.001	1.49	1.38	1.60	<0.001	1.65	1.51	1.80	<0.001	1.49	1.32	1.67	<0.001
Experience of being a close contact	1.42	1.08	1.89	0.014	1.47	1.10	1.97	0.010	1.45	0.96	2.19	0.074	1.57	1.02	2.41	0.039
Presence of infection among acquaintances	1.07	0.97	1.17	0.163	1.06	0.96	1.16	0.271	0.97	0.83	1.14	0.730	0.97	0.82	1.14	0.689
Use of public transportation for commuting	1.11	1.04	1.17	0.001	0.86	0.80	0.93	<0.001	1.18	1.07	1.31	0.001	0.94	0.83	1.06	0.336
					1.15**	1.08	1.23	<0.001					1.25**	1.12	1.39	<0.001
"Do you think your company has taken adequate infection control measures for its employees?"																
Yes	reference				reference				reference				reference			
Somewhat	1.23	1.14	1.31	<0.001	1.23	1.14	1.32	<0.001	0.90	0.79	1.01	0.080	0.86	0.76	0.98	0.022
Not really	1.99	1.83	2.16	<0.001	1.93	1.77	2.10	<0.001	1.48	1.29	1.71	<0.001	1.35	1.17	1.56	<0.001
No	2.70	2.44	2.98	<0.001	2.50	2.25	2.77	<0.001	3.21	2.78	3.70	<0.001	2.74	2.36	3.18	<0.001

* The multivariate model included sex, age, education, equivalent household income, occupation, number of business establishments, smoking status, alcohol consumption, frequency of telecommuting, and use of public transportation when commuting, perceived assessment of workplace infection control efforts, presence of infection among acquaintances, and experience of being a close contact. The incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture was also used as a prefecture-level variable

** ORs were derived from the multivariate model without worry about infection at work and while commuting.