

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

3

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

5

6 Masamichi Uehara¹, M.D., Tomohiro Ishimaru¹, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., Hajime Ando²,
7 M.D., M.O.H., Ph.D., Seiichiro Tateishi³, M.D., Ph.D., Hisashi Eguchi⁴, M.D., M.B.A.,
8 Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji⁵, M.D., Ph.D., Koji Mori⁶, M.D., Ph.D., Shinya Matsuda⁷, M.D.,
9 Ph.D., and Yoshihisa Fujino¹, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork Project

10 ¹ Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological
11 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

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

14 ³ Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of
15 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

16 ⁴ Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
17 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

18 ⁵ Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

19 and Environmental Health, Japan

20 ⁶ Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial

21 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

22 ⁷ Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine,

23 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

24

25 **Author contribution:**

26 MU; Writing the manuscript, TI; creating the questionnaire, review of manuscripts, and

27 advice on interpretation, HA; review of manuscripts and advice on interpretation, ST,

28 HE, MT, KM and SM; Review of manuscripts, advice on interpretation, and funding for

29 research, YF; Overall survey planning, creating the questionnaire, analysis, and drafting

30 the manuscript

31

32 **Correspondence to** Yoshihisa Fujino¹, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.

33 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,

34 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

35 1-1, Iseigaoka, Yahatanishiku, Kitakyushu, 807-8555, Japan

36 Tel: +81-93-691-7401

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

38

39

40

41 Abstract

42 **Objective:** This study examined the relationship between worry about COVID-19
43 infection in general, in the workplace and while commuting to work and psychological
44 distress in the midst of a rapid outbreak of COVID-19 in Japan.

45 **Methods:** This cross-sectional, internet monitor study was conducted on December 22–
46 26, 2020. Subjects were collected from throughout Japan. Out of a total of 33,302
47 participants, 26,841 people were included in the study after removing those providing
48 fraudulent responses. The subjects were asked single-item questions about whether they
49 were worried about COVID-19 infection in general, at work and while commuting to
50 work. Kessler 6 (K6) was used to assess psychological distress. The odds ratios (ORs)
51 of psychological distress associated with worry about infection were estimated using a
52 multilevel logistic model nested in the prefecture of residence, with adjustment for sex,
53 age, education, equivalent household income, occupation, number of business
54 establishments, smoking status, alcohol consumption, frequency of telecommuting, use
55 of public transportation, perceived assessment of workplace infection control efforts,
56 presence of infection among acquaintances, and experience of being a close contact.
57 Psychological distress was defined as a K6 score of 5 or higher and 13 or higher.

58 **Results:** Multivariate analysis showed that the OR of severe psychological distress

59 associated with general worry about COVID-19 infection was 1.10 (95% CI 1.00–1.22).

60 The OR was significantly higher in association with worry about infection in the
61 workplace at 1.71 (95%CI 1.53–1.92) and worry about infection while commuting at
62 1.49 (95%CI 1.32–1.67).

63 **Conclusions:** The present study suggests the need for psychological intervention to
64 reduce worry about infection in response to public mental health challenges associated
65 with the COVID-19 pandemic.

66

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

68

69 **Introduction**

70 Mental health problems associated with the COVID-19 pandemic are an
71 emerging public health issue¹. Outbreaks increase generalized fear, community anxiety,
72 and panic symptoms^{2,3}. Previous studies have reported a higher prevalence of
73 psychological symptoms such as depression and anxiety among individuals who
74 experienced lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic^{1,4-7}

75 Containment measures against pandemics like COVID-19 have a strong impact
76 on individuals' daily lives and psychological well-being⁸. "A new normal" of avoiding
77 the "three Cs" (crowded places, close-contact settings, and confined and enclosed
78 spaces) has been recommended as an effective countermeasure against infection⁸.
79 However, such measures also distance people from each other, which can lead to
80 decreased communication and socializing. In addition, COVID-19 has also brought
81 about economic recession and job insecurity. Together, these effects are thought to have
82 contributed to an increase in loneliness, worry, fear, anxiety, and stress among
83 individuals.

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

87 such as generalized fear and widespread community anxiety^{2,3}. Psychological symptoms
88 such as persistent worrying, feeling overwhelmed by emotions, restlessness and
89 irritability emerge within the population in the form of anxiety, panic attacks,
90 depression and suicide^{9,10}. Worry of infection is an early sign of psychological distress.

91 For workers, the workplace and commuting are considered particularly risky
92 opportunities for infection. For this reason, most workplaces are taking various infection
93 control measures, including limiting the number of visitors, restricting business trips,
94 encouraging telecommuting, ensuring sufficient office ventilation, and installing
95 partitions in customer-facing spaces. However, some workplaces are not taking
96 sufficient recommended measures for business reasons or due to cost. Naturally,
97 infection control efforts in the workplace influence workers' worry of infection. A
98 previous study reported that intensive workplace measures against COVID-19 are
99 associated with lower psychological distress among employees¹¹.

100 Therefore, we hypothesized that worry of infection in the workplace and while
101 commuting affect the psychological distress of workers. In this study, we examined the
102 relationship between workers' worry about infection and psychological distress in the
103 midst of a rapid outbreak of COVID-19 in Japan.

104 **Method**

105 Study design and subjects

106 This cross-sectional, internet monitor study was conducted on December 22–26,
107 2020, when Japan experienced its third wave of COVID-19 infection. Details of the
108 protocol of this survey are reported elsewhere¹². Briefly, data were collected from
109 workers who had employment contracts at the time of the survey and were selected
110 based on prefecture, job type, and sex. Out of a total of 33,302 participants in the
111 survey, 27,036 were included in the study after removing those who provided fraudulent
112 responses. After further excluding 195 individuals who indicated in the survey that they
113 had already been infected with COVID-19, a total of 26,841 individuals (13,713 males
114 and 13,128 females) were included in the current analysis. This study was approved by
115 the ethics committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health,
116 Japan (reference No. R2-079) . Informed consent was obtained in the form of the
117 website.

118

119 Assessment of worry about COVID-19 infection

120 Three single-item questions were used to determine whether or not the subjects
121 were worried about infection. One question inquired about general worry of COVID-19

122 infection, while the other two were situation dependent, inquiring about worry of
123 infection at work and while commuting to work. The questions were, “Are you worried
124 about being infected with COVID-19?” “Are you worried about being infected while
125 working at your workplace?” and “Are you worried about being infected while
126 commuting to work?” The participants responded “yes” or “no” to the questions.

127

128 Assessment of psychological distress

129 Kessler 6 (K6) was used to assess psychological distress¹³. The validity of the
130 Japanese version of the K6 has been confirmed¹⁴. In the present study, a K6 score of 5
131 or higher was used as the cutoff for mild psychological distress, and a score of 13 or
132 higher as the cutoff for severe psychological distress.

133

134 Other covariates

135 The following survey items were considered confounding factors: age, sex,
136 marital status (married, unmarried, bereaved/divorced), occupation (mainly desk work,
137 jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication, and mainly labor), number of
138 employees, educational background, equivalent income (household income divided by
139 the square root of household size), smoking status, alcohol consumption, frequency of

140 telecommuting, and use of public transportation when commuting. The questionnaire
141 also asked the following questions: “Have you been a close contact of someone infected
142 with COVID-19?” and “Do you know of anyone close to you (friends or family) who
143 has been infected with COVID-19?”

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

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

152

153 Statistical analysis

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

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

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

168 A *p* value less than .05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses
169 were conducted using Stata (Stata Statistical Software: Release 16; StataCorp LLC, TX,
170 USA).

171

172 **Results**

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

181 Table 2 shows the ORs of psychological distress. In the age-adjusted model for
182 moderate psychological distress defined by a K6 score of 5 or higher, general worry
183 about COVID-19 infection (OR=1.29, 95%CI 1.22–1.37), worry about infection at work
184 (OR=1.79, 95%CI 1.70–1.88), and worry about infection while commuting (OR=1.64,
185 95%CI 1.55–1.73) all showed significant associations with psychological distress.
186 Multivariate analysis showed that the OR of moderate psychological distress associated
187 with general worry about COVID-19 infection was 0.97 (95% CI 0.91–1.04). The ORs
188 were significantly higher in association with worry about infection in the workplace at
189 1.57 (95%CI 1.57–1.48) and worry about infection while commuting at 1.49 (95%CI

190 1.38–1.60).

191 The sex- and age-adjusted OR of severe psychological distress, defined by a
192 K6 score of 13 or higher, associated with general worry about COVID-19 infection was
193 1.05 (95%CI 0.95–1.15). ORs were significantly higher in association with worry about
194 infection in the workplace (OR=1.76, 95%CI 1.61–1.92) and worry about infection
195 while commuting (OR=1.65, 95%CI 1.51–1.80). Multivariate analysis of severe
196 psychological distress showed similar results.

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

202

203

204 **Discussion**

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

208 The spread of COVID-19 infection is causing people to worry about infection in
209 a number of everyday situations. In the present study, 75% of participants were worried
210 about infection, suggesting that COVID-19 infection is a major source of public stress.
211 However, in this situation, worrying about infection is not unhealthy, but rather, a
212 natural reaction to current events. Such worry about infection may lead to preventive
213 behaviors¹⁵⁻¹⁷. In this situation, we found that having general worry about COVID-19
214 infection did not lead to psychological distress.

215 However, our study indicates that certain everyday situations, such as working
216 in the workplace and commuting to work, are particularly worrisome in relation to
217 infection. We found that worry about infection at work was associated with moderate
218 and severe psychological distress. There are many opportunities in the workplace for
219 direct contact with others, such as while communicating with colleagues and providing
220 services to customers, and for indirect contact with people through objects.
221 Additionally, in places like offices, workers share a relatively small space. Thus, the

222 fact that individuals have limited control over maintaining the recommended three Cs
223 strategy for infection prevention at work can be a major cause of stress.

224 The present study also showed that worry about infection during commuting was
225 associated with moderate and severe psychological distress. Commuting to work is
226 considered one way in which risk of infection can increase¹⁸, because individuals come
227 into contact with an unspecified number of people, are unable to maintain social
228 distancing, and are present in a space that feels relatively enclosed, such as a bus or
229 train. In fact, 47% of participants who were worried about infection while commuting
230 experienced moderate psychological distress, and 23% experienced severe
231 psychological distress. These results suggest that reducing worries about infection in the
232 workplace and during commuting is important for reducing public mental health issues
233 caused by COVID-19¹⁹.

234 However, our findings also suggest the difficulty of reducing psychological
235 distress due to worry about infection. We found that worries about infection in the
236 workplace and while commuting to work were associated with psychological distress
237 even after adjusting for assessment of adequate infection control measures in the
238 workplace and use of public transportation. This suggests that workers worry regardless
239 of whether or not they use public transportation to commute to work or have adequate

240 infection prevention measures installed in their workplace, and that these worries are
241 related to psychological distress. In fact, 38% of those who were worried about their
242 commute did not use public transportation. While we found that public transportation
243 use was associated with psychological distress, this association disappeared after
244 adjusting for general worry about COVID-19 infection. This finding supports the idea
245 that worry, rather than facts, is associated with psychological distress. Worry about
246 infection is not only based on rational judgment, but is also an intuitive feeling.
247 Therefore, to reduce excessive worry about infection and the resulting psychological
248 distress, it is necessary to both promote infection prevention measures and adjust
249 individuals' perception of their worries. Cognitive-behavioral therapy is considered an
250 effective method for such a purpose²⁰.

251 Limitations of this study warrant mention. First, the generalizability of the
252 results is uncertain because this study was conducted through internet monitors.
253 However, we attempted to reduce as much bias in the target population as possible by
254 sampling according to region, job type, and prefecture based on the infection incidence
255 rate. Second, the study asked simple questions about individuals' worries about
256 infection, and was not intended to diagnose psychiatric symptoms or psychiatric
257 illnesses. Participants who indicated that they were worried may also exhibit psychiatric

258 symptoms, such as anxiety, depression, and panic; however, distinguishing these
259 symptoms was outside the scope of this study. Third, worry about infection in the
260 workplace is thought to be greatly influenced by the type of job and the environment in
261 which one works. Health care workers are a typical example of a population that is at
262 high risk of infection and are more likely to experience psychological distress¹⁰. In this
263 study, we only adjusted for simple variables such as job type (desk work and physical
264 work) and the number of employees in the workplace. Fourth, because this was a
265 cross-sectional study, the temporal relationship between worry about infection and
266 psychological distress is unclear. Excessive anxiety and depression may be symptoms
267 of psychological distress. Previous studies have shown that people with a history of
268 psychiatric disorders are more anxious and show greater psychological distress during
269 the COVID-19 pandemic²¹. However, because it is easier to confirm feelings of worry
270 than to make a psychiatric diagnosis, we believe that it is useful to identify the presence
271 of worry among workers for determining health status.

272 In conclusion, while general worry about infection was not associated with
273 psychological distress, worry about infection in specific situations such as in the
274 workplace and while commuting was associated with moderate and severe
275 psychological distress. These worries and the associated psychological and emotional

276 responses may not be mediated by actual infection control measures taken in the
277 workplace or use of public transportation. The results of this study suggest the need for
278 psychological approaches to reduce worries about infection in response to the mental
279 health challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

280

281 Acknowledgements

282 This study was funded by a research grant from the University of Occupational
283 and Environmental Health, Japan; a general incorporated foundation (Anshin Zaidan)
284 for the development of educational materials on mental health measures for managers at
285 small-sized enterprises; Health, Labour and Welfare Sciences Research Grants:
286 Comprehensive Research for Women's Healthcare (H30-josei-ippan-002) and Research
287 for the establishment of an occupational health system in times of disaster
288 (H30-roudou-ippan-007); and scholarship donations from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.,
289 Ltd.

290 Present members of the Collaborative Online Research on the
291 Novel-coronavirus and Work (CORoNaWork) Project are: Dr. Yoshihisa Fujino
292 (current chairperson), Dr. Akira Ogami, Dr. Arisa Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr.
293 Chimed-Ochir Odgerel , Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr. Kazunori Ikegami,
294 Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kyoko Kitagawa, Dr. Masako Nagata, Dr.
295 Mayumi Tsuji, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr. Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr. Seiishiro Tateishi, Dr.
296 Shinya Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru, Dr. Tomohisa Nagata, Dr. Yosuke Mafune,
297 and Ms. Ning Liu, in alphabetical order. All of the members are affiliated with the

298 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan.

299

300

301 **Disclosure**

302 **Ethical approval:** This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University

303 of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No.R2-079) .

304 **Informed consent:** Informed consent was obtained in the form of the website.

305

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

307 **Animal Studies:** N/A

308 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest associated with this

309 manuscript.

310

311 **References:**

- 312 1. Wang C, Pan R, Wan X, et al. Immediate Psychological Responses and Associated
313 Factors during the Initial Stage of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19)
314 Epidemic among the General Population in China. *Int J Environ Res Public*
315 *Health*. 2020;17(5). doi:10.3390/ijerph17051729
- 316 2. Varatharaj A, Thomas N, Ellul MA, et al. Neurological and neuropsychiatric
317 complications of COVID-19 in 153 patients: a UK-wide surveillance study. *Lancet*
318 *Psychiatry*. 2020;7(10):875-882.
- 319 3. Serafini G, Parmigiani B, Amerio A, Aguglia A, Sher L, Amore M. The
320 psychological impact of COVID-19 on the mental health in the general population.
321 *QJM*. Published online June 22, 2020. doi:10.1093/qjmed/hcaa201
- 322 4. Tang W, Hu T, Hu B, et al. Prevalence and correlates of PTSD and depressive
323 symptoms one month after the outbreak of the COVID-19 epidemic in a sample of
324 home-quarantined Chinese university students. *J Affect Disord*. 2020;274:1-7.
- 325 5. Losada-Baltar A, Jiménez-Gonzalo L, Gallego-Alberto L, Pedroso-Chaparro MDS,
326 Fernandes-Pires J, Márquez-González M. “We’re staying at home”. Association of
327 self-perceptions of aging, personal and family resources and loneliness with
328 psychological distress during the lock-down period of COVID-19. *J Gerontol B*
329 *Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. Published online April 13, 2020. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbaa048
- 330 6. Mazza C, Ricci E, Biondi S, et al. A Nationwide Survey of Psychological Distress
331 among Italian People during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Immediate Psychological
332 Responses and Associated Factors. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(9).
333 doi:10.3390/ijerph17093165
- 334 7. Moccia L, Janiri D, Pepe M, et al. Affective temperament, attachment style, and
335 the psychological impact of the COVID-19 outbreak: an early report on the Italian
336 general population. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2020;87:75-79.
- 337 8. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) advice for the
338 public. Accessed January 27, 2021.
339 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/advice-for-public>
340 lic

- 341 9. Greenberg N, Brooks SK, Wessely S, Tracy DK. How might the NHS protect the
342 mental health of health-care workers after the COVID-19 crisis? *Lancet*
343 *Psychiatry*. 2020;7(9):733-734.
- 344 10. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsis E, Katsaounou P.
345 Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during
346 the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav*
347 *Immun*. 2020;88:901-907.
- 348 11. Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Workplace responses to COVID-19
349 associated with mental health and work performance of employees in Japan. *J*
350 *Occup Health*. 2020;62(1):e12134.
- 351 12. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based
352 health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv*.
353 Published online February 5, 2021:2021.02.02.21249309.
- 354 13. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, et al. Short screening scales to monitor
355 population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol*
356 *Med*. 2002;32(6):959-976.
- 357 14. Furukawa TA, Kawakami N, Saitoh M, et al. The performance of the Japanese
358 version of the K6 and K10 in the World Mental Health Survey Japan. *Int J*
359 *Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2008;17(3):152-158.
- 360 15. Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HHH, et al. Community Responses during Early Phase of
361 COVID-19 Epidemic, Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(7):1575-1579.
- 362 16. Bowman L, Kwok KO, Redd R, et al. Public perceptions and preventive
363 behaviours during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic: a comparative
364 study between Hong Kong and the United Kingdom. *bioRxiv*. Published online
365 August 7, 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.08.06.20169409
- 366 17. Magdy DM, Metwally A, Magdy O. Assessment of Community Psycho-behavioral
367 Responses during the outbreak of novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV): A cross
368 sectional study. *Research Square*. Published online April 29, 2020.
369 doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-25146/v1
- 370 18. Zhang J. Transport policymaking that accounts for COVID-19 and future public

- 371 health threats: A PASS approach. *Transp Policy*. 2020;99:405-418.
- 372 19. Dam P, Mandal S, Mondal R, Sadat A, Chowdhury SR, Mandal AK. COVID-19:
373 Impact on transport and mental health. *J Transp Health*. 2020;19:100969.
- 374 20. Yue J-L, Yan W, Sun Y-K, et al. Mental health services for infectious disease
375 outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. *Psychol Med*.
376 2020;50(15):2498-2513.
- 377 21. Yamamoto T, Uchiumi C, Suzuki N, Yoshimoto J, Murillo-Rodriguez E. The
378 Psychological Impact of “Mild Lockdown” in Japan during the COVID-19
379 Pandemic: A Nationwide Survey under a Declared State of Emergency. *Int J*
380 *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 communication	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.