Association between telecommuting environment and low back pain among Japanese telecommuting workers: A cross-sectional study

Ryutaro Matsugaki[1], Ph.D., Keiji Muramatsu[1], M.D., Ph.D, Seiichiro Tateishi[2], M.D., Ph.D., Tomohisa Nagata[3], M.D., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji[4], M.D., Ph.D., Ayako Hino[5], M.D., Ph.D., Kazunori Ikegami[6], M.D., Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino[7], M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., and Shinya Matsuda[1], M.D., Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Corresponding author:

Yoshihisa Fujino, 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

Abstract

Objectives: We evaluated the relationship between telecommuting environment and low back pain (LBP) among desk-based workers in Japan.

Methods: This cross-sectional study included 3,663 desk-based, telecommuting workers. LBP was assessed using a 0–10 numerical rating scale. The telecommuting environment was evaluated using subjective questions. Mixed-effects logistic regression analysis was used.

Results: Mixed-effects logistic model results revealed that not having a place or room to concentrate on work, desk not well-lit enough for work, not having enough space on the desk to work, not having enough legroom, and not having comfortable temperature and humidity conditions in the workspace were significantly associated with higher odds of LBP.

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that telecommuting environment is associated with the prevalence of LBP.

Keywords: Low Back Pain, Telecommuting, Workplace, COVID-19, Japan

Introduction

The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic led to rapid expansion of telecommuting in Japan. The Japanese government recommended telecommuting to prevent the spread of COVID-19 infection[1,2]. Although the telecommuting rate of a Japanese worker was 14.8% as of October 2019, it increased to 23.0% by November 2020[3]. In actuality, 85.0% of workers who were teleworking as of November 2020 did so to prevent the spread of COVID-19 infection[3]. Telecommuting is a way to continue business even in times of emergency, and it may become an even more common way of working.

With the rapid expansion of telecommuting due to the COVID-19 pandemic, management of the work environment during telecommuting is an emerging occupational health problem. As with the office environment, the recommended working environment for a telecommute worker is a private, quiet, and safe dedicated space, with adequate lighting, comfortable temperature and humidity, ergonomic chairs/desk[4–6]. However, it is difficult to manage the telecommute work environment because, in contrast to the office, the workstation at home is difficult to supervise by managers, and managers do not have the authority to direct the private environment of an individual. In addition, neither companies nor workers were sufficiently prepared to optimize telecommuting environment due to the unexpected occurrence of COVID-19 [4]. It has been reported that more than 50% of telecommuting workers in Japan do not have a desk/ chair and more than 70% do not have a private room or space for work[3].

Low back pain (LBP) is an important health problem associated with office work. The prevalence of LBP is 34-56% among office workers [7–10]. In office workers, gender, body mass index, sleep disturbance, and previous symptoms of LBP are known to be risk factors for LBP [8,10–13]. In terms of work-related factors, it is known that sitting

time and sitting posture at work are known to be risk factors for LBP in an office worker[8,14,15]. At home, the work environment is less developed than in the office environment; therefore, the work environment of home workers is assumed to be an important risk factor for low back pain.

Previous studies conducted in the COVID-19 pandemic have suggested an association between telecommuting and musculoskeletal pain[16]. However, the relationship between work environment and LBP in telecommuting workers is unclear. Thus, the purpose of this study was to clarify the relationship between the work environment and LBP of telecommuting workers.

Methods

Study Design and Subjects

This cross-sectional internet-based monitoring survey was conducted from December 22 through to December 26, 2020, when the third wave of COVID-19 infections began in Japan. The details of the survey protocol have been previously reported.[17] The data was collected from the workers with employment contracts at the time of the survey. Of the 33,302 workers participating in the survey, 27,036 were surveyed, excluding those who gave fraudulent answers. Of these, 3,663 (2,093 males and 1,570 females) who responded that they mainly performed desk work (e.g., office work, computer work) and telecommuted at least once a week were included in the present analysis.

This study conformed to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. In addition, the study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational and

Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079). Informed consent was obtained online from the participants through the website.

The assessment of LBP

We assessed the presence of LBP in the participants based on two questions. First, we asked all subjects "Have you experienced stiff shoulders or LBP in the past two weeks?" and asked them to answer, “yes” or “no.” If the subject answered “yes” to that question, the following questions were asked to assess the severity of LBP such as, “what was your average level of LBP in the past 2 weeks? (Please rate your pain from 0 to 10, where 0=no pain at all and 10=the most intense pain you have experienced).” The numerical rating scale (NRS) was used for evaluating the pain severity. In this study, a score of 3 or higher on the NRS was defined as LBP.

The assessment of the telecommuting environment

The telecommuting environment was assessed among the telecommuting workers with the following questions: 1) “Do you have a place or room where you can concentrate on your work?” ; 2) “Is your desk well-lit enough for you to work?” ; 3) “Do you have enough space on your desk to work?”; 4) “Is there enough space to stretch the legs?”; 5) “Are the degrees of temperature and humidity in the room where you work appropriate for working comfortably?”; 6) “Do you use an office desk or chair? (Including children's study desks).” The respondents answered either “yes” or “no.”

The assessment of participants’ characteristics and other covariates

The following items were examined for socioeconomic factors: age, sex, body mass index (calculated by dividing the weight by height squared), educational

background (junior high school; high school; vocational school; junior college or technical college; university; or graduate school) and equivalent income (household income divided by the square root of the household size).

The following items were examined for lifestyle factors: smoking (currently smoking), drinking (alcohol consumption on two or more days per week), physical activity (perform equivalent physical activities for at least 1 h a day in daily life for more than 2 days a week), and exercise habit (exercise for 30 minutes or more for more than two days a week).

For mental health status was assessed using the following question: “During the past 30 days, how many days did you experience poor mental health, including stress, depression, emotional problems, etc.?”

The following items were examined for work-related factors: we examined the following items: industry type, working time (hours per week), frequency of telecommuting (one day per week; more than two days per week; and more than four days per week), company size (total number of employees at the company where the respondent is working), and working hours per week.

Statistical analysis

The number of days that the participant experienced poor mental health during the past 30 days are expressed as continuous variables using mean and standard deviation. Other variables are presented as categorical variables using numbers and percentages.

Mixed-effects logistic regression analysis was conducted with the presence of LBP as the dependent variable, subjective evaluation of the telecommuting environment as the independent variable, with the city of residence as the random effects. We used age, sex, body mass index, lifestyle habits, the number of days of poor mental health,

equivalent income, educational background, working hours, company size, and industry type as covariates to adjust for potential confounders.

All statistical analysis were performed with Stata software (Stata Statistical Software: Release 16; StataCorp LLC, TX, USA). A p-value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the participants. The prevalence rate of LBP in the study participants was 49.9%. Compared to the participants without LBP, the participants who experienced LBP were younger; middle-aged workers (20–49 years: 43.1% vs. 52.2%) and more likely to be females (37.6% vs. 48.2%).

[Insert Table 1. here]

The associations of LBP and telecommuting environments are shown in Table 2. There was a significant association of LBP with the question "Do you have a place or room where you can concentrate on your work? (No)" (odds ratio [OR]: 1.37, 95% CI: 1.16–1.63, p<0.001), “Is your desk well-lit enough for you to work? (No)" (OR: 1.47, 95%CI: 1.22–1.79, p<0.001), "Do you have enough space on your desk to work? (No)" (OR: 1.22, 95%CI: 1.04–1.43, p=0.012), "Is there enough space to stretch the legs? (No)" (OR: 1.32, 95%CI: 1.11–1.57, p=0.002), and "Are the degrees of temperature and humidity in the room where you work appropriate for working comfortably? (No)" (OR: 1.37, 95%CI: 1.16–1.61, p<0.001). There was no significant association of LBP with the question "Do you use an office desk or chair? (NO)” (OR: 1.04, 95%CI: 0.90–1.19, p=0.633). Similar results were obtained for Model 1, which was adjusted only for sex and age, and Model 2, which was adjusted for other potential confounders.

[Insert Table 1. here]

Discussion

This study showed that telecommuting environment was associated with LBP in telecommuting workers during the COVID-19pandemic. Specifically, it was suggested that insufficient desk and foot space, inadequate desk lighting, uncomfortable room temperature and humidity, and lack of room/space for concentrating on work were associated with the prevalence of LBP.

In this study, inadequate desk and foot space, and insufficient lighting were associated with LBP. It is suggested that an awkward posture and sitting for long durations are risk factors for LBP [8,18–20]. Having enough space on the desk and at the feet is effective in maintaining good posture when working as well as changing the posture and stretching as needed. Also, inadequate lighting at the desk may contribute to awkward posture of workers when looking at documents or computer screens on their desk. It is necessary to manage the work environment to avoid awkward postures and prolonged maintenance of the same posture during work.

The present study also revealed that uncomfortable temperature and humidity in the telecommuting space was associated with LBP. Since this study was conducted during the winter season, it can be speculated that the results imply that cold temperature and low humidity is associated with LBP. The relationship between cold temperature and LBP has been shown in previous studies [15,21–23]; this is also the same for telecommuting workers. Although the most suitable room temperature for the prevention of LBP is not clear, we consider that room temperatures that are subjectively

cold should be avoided as they may increase the risk of musculoskeletal symptoms and injuries.

In this study, using an office chair/desk was not associated with LBP. This finding is supported by the findings of previous studies reporting no significant association between LBP and use of chair/desk in office workers [11,24]. Alternately, previous studies have reported that LBP is related to the characteristics of the chair, such as with or without lumbar support and adjustable back support[8,18]. This may suggest that it is not simply a matter of whether an office chair is used, but what function and shape of the chair is used for prevention of LBP.

The lack of room or space to concentrate on work was associated with LBP. It is suggested that the teleworker's workstation should be in a dedicated space that is private, quiet, and secure, preferably away from the flow of activity in the home [4]. The results of this study support that argument. Previous studies have reported that psychological stress is associated with LBP in workers [25–27]. The lack of room or space to concentrate on work may cause psychological stress to telecommuting workers. The results of this study suggest that it is important for telecommuting workers to have a space where they can devote themselves to their work as much as possible, even if they work from home.

Based on these findings, we suggest that the work environment of telecommuting workers may be associated with LBP. Therefore, employers need educate telecommuting workers of the importance of an appropriate home working environment. If it is difficult to prepare an appropriate telecommuting environment due to household situations and family structure, it is necessary to consider the use of co-working spaces, satellite offices, and spaces near the employee's residence for telecommuting.

Moreover, this study has three limitations. Firstly, the specific details such as previous history, duration of the symptoms, and diagnosis of LBP are unknown as only the NRS was used for its evaluation. It is uncertain how these factors affect the relationship between the telecommuting environment and low back pain. Secondly, the home environment was also evaluated using subjective questions; hence, the validity of the responses is unclear. However, an objective method to evaluate the work environment at home has not been established at this time. Thirdly, there may be a selection bias in this study. If it is possible to choose telecommuting, people with LBP may be more likely to choose telecommuting. The effect of this bias on the results of this study is uncertain.

Conclusion

The present study suggests that telecommuting environment is associated with the prevalence of LBP among telecommuting workers in Japan and suggests that employers may need to consider providing telecommuting workers with a working space where they can concentrate on their work with appropriate room temperature and humidity control to prevent LBP.

References

1. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic Policies for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Published 2020. Accessed June 9, 2021. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10200000/000603610.pdf
2. Decisions by the Headquarters for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control. Basic Policies for Novel Coronavirus Disease Control (Revised on April 7, 2020). Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Published 2020. Accessed June 9, 2021. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10900000/000620733.pdf
3. Vital statistics of telework (in Japanese). Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism. Published 2021. Accessed June 8, 2021. https://www.mlit.go.jp/toshi/daisei/content/001392107.pdf
4. Robertson MM, Mosier K. Work from home: Human factors/ergonomics considerations for teleworking. International Labour Organization. Published 2020. Accessed May 31, 2021. http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/safety-and-health-at-work/events-training/events-meetings/world-day-safety-health-at-work/WCMS_742061/lang--en/index.htm
5. Work environment maintenance for teleworking at home (in Japanese). Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Published 2020. Accessed June 9, 2021. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage_01603.html
6. Guidelines for the Promotion of Appropriate Introduction and Implementation of Telework (in Japanese). Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. Published 2021. Accessed June 9, 2021. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/koyou_roudou/roudoukijun/shigoto/guideline.html

7. Janwantanakul P, Pensri P, Jiamjarasrangsri V, Sinsongsook T. Prevalence of self-reported musculoskeletal symptoms among office workers. *Occup Med (Chic Ill)*. 2008;58(6):436-438. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqn072

8. Spyropoulos P, Papathanasiou G, Georgoudis G, Chronopoulos E, Koutis H, Koumoutsou F. Prevalence of low back pain in greek public office workers. *Pain Physician*. 2007;10(5):651-659. Accessed May 12, 2021. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17876361/

9. Fanta M, Alagaw A, Kejela G, Tunje A. Low back pain and associated factors among civil service sectors office workers in Southern Ethiopia. *Int J Occup Saf Heal*. 2020;10(1):53-63. doi:10.3126/ijosh.v10i1.29883

10. Kaliniene G, Ustinaviciene R, Skemiene L, Vaiciulis V, Vasilavicius P. Associations between musculoskeletal pain and work-related factors among public service sector computer workers in Kaunas County, Lithuania. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2016;17(1):1-12. doi:10.1186/s12891-016-1281-7

11. Juul-Kristensen B, Søgaard K, Strøyer J, Jensen C. Computer users' risk factors for developing shoulder, elbow and back symptoms. *Scand J Work Environ Heal*. 2004;30(5):390-398. doi:10.5271/sjweh.827

12. Janwantanakul P, Sitthipornvorakul E, Paksaichol A. Risk factors for the onset of nonspecific low back pain in office workers: A systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2012;35(7):568-577. doi:10.1016/j.jmpt.2012.07.008

13. Shariat A, Cardoso JR, Cleland JA, et al. Prevalence rate of neck, shoulder and lower back pain in association with age, body mass index and gender among Malaysian office workers. *Work*. 2018;60(2):1-9. doi:10.3233/wor-2738

287 14. Janwantanakul P, Pensri P, Moolkay P, Jiamjarasrangsi W. Development of a
288 risk score for low back pain in office workers -a cross-sectional study. *BMC*
289 *Musculoskelet Disord*. 2011;12(1):23. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-12-23
290 15. Ye S, Jing Q, Wei C, Lu J. Risk factors of non-specific neck pain and low back
291 pain in computer-using office workers in China: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ*
292 *Open*. 2017;7(4). doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014914
293 16. Yoshimoto T, Fujii T, Oka H, Kasahara S, Kawamata K, Matsudaira K. Pain
294 Status and Its Association with Physical Activity, Psychological Stress, and
295 Telework among Japanese Workers with Pain during the COVID-19 Pandemic.
296 *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(11):5595. doi:10.3390/ijerph18115595
297 17. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based
298 health survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *medRxiv*.
299 Published online 2021. doi:https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.02.21249309
300 18. Janwantanakul P, Pensri P, Moolkay P, Jiamjarasrangsi W. *Development of a*
301 *Risk Score for Low Back Pain in Office Workers - a Cross-Sectional Study*. Vol
302 12.; 2011. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-12-23
303 19. Liira JP, Shannon HS, Chambers LW, Haines TA. Long-term back problems and
304 physical work exposures in the 1990 Ontario health survey. *Am J Public Health*.
305 1996;86(3):382-387. doi:10.2105/AJPH.86.3.382
306 20. Lis AM, Black KM, Korn H, Nordin M. Association between sitting and
307 occupational LBP. *Eur Spine J*. 2007;16(2):283-298.
308 doi:10.1007/s00586-006-0143-7
309 21. Jin K, Sorock GS, Courtney T, et al. Risk factors for work-related low back pain
310 in the People's Republic of China. *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2000;6(1):26-33.
311 doi:10.1179/oeh.2000.6.1.26

312 22. Dovrat E, Katz-Leurer M. Cold exposure and low back pain in store workers in
313 Israel. *Am J Ind Med*. 2007;50(8):626-631. doi:10.1002/ajim.20488
314 23. Skandfer M, Talykova L, Brenn T, Nilsson T, Vaktskjold A. Low back pain
315 among mineworkers in relation to driving, cold environment and ergonomics.
316 *Ergonomics*. 2014;57(10):1541-1548. doi:10.1080/00140139.2014.904005
317 24. Celik S, Celik K, Dirimese E, Tasdemir N, Arik T, Büyükkara İb. Determination
318 of pain in musculoskeletal system reported by office workers and the pain risk
319 factors. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health*. 2018;31(1):91-111.
320 doi:10.13075/ijomeh.1896.00901
321 25. Vinstrup J, Jakobsen MD, Andersen LL. Perceived Stress and Low-Back Pain
322 Among Healthcare Workers: A Multi-Center Prospective Cohort Study. *Front*
323 *Public Heal*. 2020;8. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.00297
324 26. Tsuboi Y, Ueda Y, Naruse F, Ono R. The Association between Perceived Stress
325 and Low Back Pain among Eldercare Workers in Japan. *J Occup Environ Med*.
326 2017;59(8):765-767. doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000001062
327 27. Yoshimoto T, Oka H, Katsuhira J, et al. Prognostic psychosocial factors for
328 disabling low back pain in Japanese hospital workers. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(5).
329 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0177908
330

Table 1. Characteristics of participants

		Low back pain	
		-	+
		n (%)	n (%)
		1,834	1,829
Age (y)	20-29	88 (4.8%)	82 (4.5%)
	30-39	241 (13.1%)	319 (17.4%)
	40-49	462 (25.2%)	554 (30.3%)
	50-59	716 (39.0%)	629 (34.4%)
	60-69	327 (17.8%)	245 (13.4%)
Sex	Men	1145 (62.4%)	948 (51.8%)
	Women	689 (37.6%)	881 (48.2%)
Body mass index	< 18.5	199 (10.9%)	240 (13.1%)
	18.5-25.0	1265 (69.0%)	1200 (65.6%)
	25.0-30.0	317 (17.3%)	312 (17.1%)
	> 30.0	53 (2.9%)	77 (4.2%)
Educational background	Junior high school	15 (0.8%)	14 (0.8%)
	High school	268 (14.6%)	262 (14.3%)
	Vocational school	160 (8.7%)	173 (9.5%)
	junior college/technical college	157 (8.6%)	189 (10.3%)
	University	1030 (56.2%)	1014 (55.4%)
	Graduate school	204 (11.1%)	177 (9.7%)
Equivalent income (10,000yen)	<260	517 (28.2%)	485 (26.5%)
	261-450	458 (25.0%)	507 (27.7%)
	451-600	374 (20.4%)	393 (21.5%)
	> 601	485 (26.4%)	444 (24.3%)
Lifestyle habit	Smoking (yes)	447 (24.4%)	460 (25.2%)
	Drinking (≥2d/w)	823 (44.9%)	855 (46.7%)
	Physical activity (≥2d/w)	697 (38.0%)	685 (37.5%)
	Exercise habit (≥2d/w)	531 (29.0%)	523 (28.6%)
Days experienced poor mental health		2.3 (5.9)	5.1 (8.4)

during the past 30 days, mean (SD)

Industry type	Energy, materials, industrial machinery	71 (3.9%)	85 (4.6%)
	Food	20 (1.1%)	14 (0.8%)
	Beverages/Tobacco products	8 (0.4%)	6 (0.3%)
	Pharmaceuticals/Medical supplies	38 (2.1%)	32 (1.7%)
	Cosmetics/Toiletries/Sanitary products	13 (0.7%)	12 (0.7%)
	Fashion and Accessories	20 (1.1%)	19 (1.0%)
	Precision Machinery and Office supplies	43 (2.3%)	45 (2.5%)
	Home appliances/AV equipment	61 (3.3%)	57 (3.1%)
	Automobiles and Transportation equipment	72 (3.9%)	67 (3.7%)
	Household goods	3 (0.2%)	4 (0.2%)
	Hobby/Sporting goods	8 (0.4%)	5 (0.3%)
	Real estate and Housing equipment	105 (5.7%)	96 (5.2%)
	Information and Communication	318 (17.3%)	288 (15.7%)
	Distribution and Retail	72 (3.9%)	91 (5.0%)
	Finance/Insurance	87 (4.7%)	98 (5.4%)
	Transportation and Leisure	20 (1.1%)	22 (1.2%)
	Restaurant and Other services	44 (2.4%)	49 (2.7%)
	Public offices and Organizations	50 (2.7%)	56 (3.1%)
	Education, medical services, religion	71 (3.9%)	97 (5.3%)
	Mass media	29 (1.6%)	30 (1.6%)
	Market research	7 (0.4%)	8 (0.4%)
	Other	674 (36.8%)	648 (35.4%)
Working time (h/w)	< 40	1346 (73.4%)	1293 (70.7%)
	40-48	237 (12.9%)	245 (13.4%)
	49-60	189 (10.3%)	232 (12.7%)
	> 60	62 (3.4%)	59 (3.2%)
Frequency of telecommute	1 d/w	266 (14.5%)	297 (16.2%)
	2-3 d/w	495 (27.0%)	563 (30.8%)
	≥ 4d/w	1073 (58.5%)	969 (53.0%)
Company size (person)	-9	732 (39.9%)	614 (33.6%)
	10-99	202 (11.0%)	228 (12.5%)
	100-999	304 (16.6%)	370 (20.2%)
	>1000	596 (32.5%)	617 (33.7%)

SD: standard deviation

Table 2. The association between low back pain and telecommuting environment

	Total		Low back pain		Model 1†				Model 2‡			
	n	%	n	%	OR	95% CI		P	OR	95% CI		P
Environment of telecommute												
Do you have a place or room where you can concentrate on your work? (No)	847	23.1	496	58.6	1.51	1.29	1.77	<0.001	1.37	1.16	1.63	<0.001
Is your desk well-lit for you to work? (No)	596	16.3	361	60.6	1.65	1.37	1.98	<0.001	1.47	1.22	1.79	<0.001
Do you have enough space on your desk to work? (No)	1054	28.8	582	55.2	1.33	1.15	1.54	<0.001	1.22	1.04	1.43	0.012
Is there enough space to stretch the legs? (No)	784	21.4	450	57.4	1.46	1.24	1.72	<0.001	1.32	1.11	1.57	0.002
Are the degrees of temperature and humidity in the room where you work appropriate for working comfortably? (No)	921	25.1	526	57.1	1.44	1.24	1.69	<0.001	1.37	1.16	1.61	<0.001
Do you use an office desk or chair? (Including children's study desks) (No)	1791	48.9	931	52.0	1.10	0.97	1.26	0.149	1.04	0.90	1.19	0.633

†Model 1: Adjusted for age, sex

‡Model 2: Adjusted for age, sex, body mass index, lifestyle habit (smoking, drinking, physical activity, and exercise habit), days experienced poor mental health during the past 30 days, equivalent income, educational background, industry type, working time, frequency of telecommute, company size

CI: confidence interval, OR: Odds ratio