

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

3

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

8

9 <sup>1</sup> Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological  
10 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

11 <sup>2</sup> Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,  
12 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

13 <sup>3</sup> Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of  
14 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

15 <sup>4</sup> Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of  
16 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

17 <sup>5</sup> Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational  
18 and Environmental Health, Japan

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

19 <sup>6</sup> Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial  
20 Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

21 <sup>7</sup> Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine,  
22 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

23

24 **Author contribution:**

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

30

31 **Correspondence to** Yoshihisa Fujino<sup>1</sup>, 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 Email: zenq@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

37 **Funding Sources**

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

46

47 **Conflict of Interest:**

48 Dr. Fujino received personal fees from Sampo Health Support Inc., outside the  
49 submitted work.

50

51 **Acknowledgements**

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

60

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

63

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

1 **Abstract**

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

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

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

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

16

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

18

## 19 **Introduction**

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

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

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

37 such as generalized fear and widespread community anxiety<sup>2,3</sup>. 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<sup>9,10</sup>. Worry of infection is an early sign of psychological distress.

41 For workers, the workplace and commuting<sup>11-14</sup> 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.<sup>15,16</sup> However, some workplaces are not taking  
46 sufficient recommended measures for business reasons or due to cost.<sup>17,18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> In contrast, intensive workplace measures against COVID-19 are associated with  
50 lower psychological distress among employees.<sup>15,19</sup> In addition, anxiety and depression  
51 are higher among workers who do not telecommute and those with interpersonal tasks.<sup>19</sup>

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

57 **Method**

58 Study design and subjects

59 This cross-sectional, internet monitor study was conducted on December 22–26,  
60 2020, when Japan experienced its third wave of COVID-19 infection. Details of the  
61 protocol of this survey are reported elsewhere<sup>20</sup>. Briefly, data were collected from  
62 workers who had employment contracts at the time of the survey and were selected  
63 based on prefecture, job type, and sex.

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

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

76 Informed consent was obtained in the form of the website.

77

78 Assessment of worry about COVID-19 infection

79 Three single-item questions were used to determine whether or not the subjects

80 were worried about infection. One question inquired about general worry of COVID-19

81 infection, while the other two were situation dependent, inquiring about worry of

82 infection at work and while commuting to work. The questions were, “Are you worried

83 about being infected with COVID-19?” “Are you worried about being infected while

84 working at your workplace?” and “Are you worried about being infected while

85 commuting to work?” The participants responded “yes” or “no” to the questions.

86

87 Assessment of psychological distress

88 Kessler 6 (K6) was used to assess psychological distress<sup>21</sup>. The validity of the

89 Japanese version of the K6 has been confirmed<sup>22</sup>. In the present study, a K6 score of 5

90 or higher was used as the cutoff for mild psychological distress, and a score of 13 or

91 higher as the cutoff for severe psychological distress.

92

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

111 institutions.

112

113 Statistical analysis.

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

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

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

128         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

## 132 **Results**

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

141 Table 2 shows the ORs of psychological distress. In the age-adjusted model for  
142 moderate psychological distress defined by a K6 score of 5 or higher, general worry  
143 about COVID-19 infection (OR=1.29, 95%CI 1.22–1.37), worry about infection at work  
144 (OR=1.79, 95%CI 1.70–1.88), and worry about infection while commuting (OR=1.64,  
145 95%CI 1.55–1.73) all showed significant associations with psychological distress.  
146 Multivariate analysis showed that the OR of moderate psychological distress associated  
147 with general worry about COVID-19 infection was 0.97 (95% CI 0.91–1.04). The ORs  
148 were significantly higher in association with worry about infection in the workplace at  
149 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<sup>23-25</sup>. 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.<sup>19</sup>

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.<sup>18</sup>

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.<sup>18,19</sup> Commuting to work is  
191 considered one way in which risk of infection can increase<sup>26</sup>, 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<sup>27</sup>.

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.<sup>18</sup>  
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.<sup>15,18,19</sup> 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.<sup>18,19</sup> 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.<sup>28-30</sup> Cognitive-behavioral therapy is also considered an  
226 effective method for such a purpose<sup>31</sup>.

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<sup>10</sup>. 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<sup>32</sup>. 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-public>  
291 lic

- 292 9. Greenberg N, Brooks SK, Wessely S, Tracy DK. How might the NHS protect the  
293 mental health of health-care workers after the COVID-19 crisis? *Lancet*  
294 *Psychiatry*. 2020;7(9):733-734.
- 295 10. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsi E, Katsaounou P.  
296 Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during  
297 the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav*  
298 *Immun*. 2020;88:901-907.
- 299 11. Tan L, Ma C. Choice behavior of commuters' rail transit mode during the  
300 COVID-19 pandemic based on logistic model. *Journal of Traffic and*  
301 *Transportation Engineering (English Edition)*. 2021;8(2):186-195.
- 302 12. Hu M, Lin H, Wang J, et al. Risk of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Transmission in  
303 Train Passengers: an Epidemiological and Modeling Study. *Clin Infect Dis*.  
304 2021;72(4):604-610.
- 305 13. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario).  
306 *Public Transport and COVID-19 – What We Know so Far*. Queen's Printer for  
307 Ontario; 2020.
- 308 14. World Health Organization. Supporting healthy urban transport and mobility in the  
309 context of COVID-19. Published November 2, 2020. Accessed June 3, 2021.  
310 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240012554>
- 311 15. Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Workplace responses to COVID-19  
312 associated with mental health and work performance of employees in Japan. *J*  
313 *Occup Health*. 2020;62(1):e12134.
- 314 16. Ministry of Health Labour and Welfare, Japan. Checklist for the prevention of 257  
315 COVID-19 spreading at workplaces. Accessed June 3, 2021.  
316 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/000694987.pdf>
- 317 17. Ishimaru T, Nagata M, Hino A, et al. Workplace measures against COVID-19  
318 during the winter third wave in Japan: Company size-based differences. *J Occup*  
319 *Health*. 2021;63(1):e12224.
- 320 18. Nabe-Nielsen K, Nilsson CJ, Juul-Madsen M, Bredal C, Hansen LOP, Hansen  
321 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.

- 351 28. Sasaki N, Kuroda R, Tsuno K, Kawakami N. Exposure to media and fear and  
352 worry about COVID-19. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2020;74(9):501-502.  
353 doi:10.1111/pcn.13095
- 354 29. Torales J, O'Higgins M, Castaldelli-Maia JM, Ventriglio A. The outbreak of  
355 COVID-19 coronavirus and its impact on global mental health. *Int J Soc*  
356 *Psychiatry*. 2020;66(4):317-320.
- 357 30. Mowbray H. In Beijing, coronavirus 2019-nCoV has created a siege mentality.  
358 *BMJ*. 2020;368:m516.
- 359 31. Yue J-L, Yan W, Sun Y-K, et al. Mental health services for infectious disease  
360 outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. *Psychol Med*.  
361 2020;50(15):2498-2513.
- 362 32. Yamamoto T, Uchiumi C, Suzuki N, Yoshimoto J, Murillo-Rodriguez E. The  
363 Psychological Impact of "Mild Lockdown" in Japan during the COVID-19  
364 Pandemic: A Nationwide Survey under a Declared State of Emergency. *Int J*  
365 *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 (K&#x2D;5)	2447 (35.1%)	8240 (41.5%)	4264 (32.0%)	6423 (47.5%)	6516 (36.0%)	4171 (47.7%)
Severe psychological distress (K&#x2D;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.