Title: A cross-sectional study of socioeconomic status and sickness presenteeism in Japanese workers during the COVID-19 pandemic

Masashi Masuda, M.D.[1], Tomohiro Ishimaru, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.[1], Ayako Hino, M.D., Ph.D. [2], Hajime Ando, M.D., M.O.H., Ph.D. [3], Seiichiro Tateishi, M.D., Ph.D.[4], Tomohisa Nagata, M.D., Ph.D.[5], Mayumi Tsuji, M.D., Ph.D.[6], Shinya Matsuda, M.D., Ph.D.[7], and Yoshihisa Fujino, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D.[1], for the CORoNaWork Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Author contribution:

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

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

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

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

Tel: +81-93-691-7401

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

Funding Sources

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

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest associated with this manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The current members of the CORoNaWork Project, in alphabetical order, are as follows: Dr. Yoshihisa Fujino (present chairperson of the study group), Dr. Akira Ogami,

Dr. Arisa Harada, Dr. Ayako Hino, Dr. Hajime Ando, Dr. Hisashi Eguchi, Dr. Kazunori Ikegami, Dr. Kei Tokutsu, Dr. Keiji Muramatsu, Dr. Koji Mori, Dr. Kosuke Mafune, Dr. Kyoko Kitagawa, Dr. Masako Nagata, Dr. Mayumi Tsuji, Ms. Ning Liu, Dr. Rie Tanaka, Dr. Ryutaro Matsugaki, Dr. Seiichiro Tateishi, Dr. Shinya Matsuda, Dr. Tomohiro Ishimaru, and Dr. Tomohisa Nagata. All members are affiliated with the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan.

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

Running title: Socioeconomic status and sickness presenteeism in Japanese workers

A cross-sectional study of socioeconomic status and sickness presenteeism in Japanese workers during the COVID-19 pandemic

Abstract:

Background: We examined the relationship between socioeconomic and health status, and lifestyle habits and sickness presenteeism among Japanese workers during the COVID-19 epidemic.

Methods: A cross-sectional study using Internet monitors was conducted in December, 2020 in Japan. Of 33,302 survey participants, we analysed 27,036 (13,814 males and 13,222 females) who reported experience with sickness presenteeism.

Results: The OR of sickness presenteeism associated with unmarried versus married status was 1.15. Respective figures for other variables were 1.11 for manual laboring work compared to desk work; 1.79 and 2.29 for loss of employment at the time the pandemic began and continuation of unemployment compared to maintaining employment during the pandemic; and 3.34 for a feeling of financial instability compared to stability.

Conclusion: The issue of sickness presenteeism has been highlighted by COVID-19.

Keywords: COVID-19; Japan; Socioeconomic Factors; Sickness Presenteeism

Introduction

Shortly after the initial confirmation of COVID-19 in China, the infection spread globally, and its presence in Japan was confirmed in January 2020. Japan then experienced two peaks of infection, one each in May and August 2020, which were relatively short-lived, and the number of people infected and deaths were considered low on comparison with other countries. The number of infections then increased again in November 2020, which was the so-called third wave, and was considered the peak of the infection.

Sickness presenteeism has rapidly attracted attention in occupational health. It has been defined as "the phenomenon of people, despite complaints and ill health that should prompt rest and absence from work, still turning up at their jobs"[1]. High case numbers have been reported in a number of countries[2-6]. It is known that workers with sickness presenteeism are more likely to be aware of suboptimal general health and at increased risk of developing coronary artery disease and depression.[7-9]. Known workplace impacts of sickness presenteeism include increased long-term leave, reduced work capacity, and the spread of infectious diseases[10-12].

Vulnerable socioeconomic conditions, insecure employment status, as well as individual health views, work attitudes, company leave systems and culture influence workers' experience of sickness presenteeism[13]. Workers who are worried about their job security are reluctant to take time off work for treatment. Workers with insecure employment are more likely to engage in sickness presenteeism because they fear that complaining about their health condition will be detrimental to the status of their employment contract. The shortage of employees and inadequate leave system also lead to an increase in sickness presenteeism[14,15]. Sick leave rates are low in areas where

unemployment rate is high[16], and it is thought that the fear of losing employment and poverty have led to situations in which people feel they have no choice but to work even if they are in poor physical condition[17]. In addition, worker behaviors, such as a positive job attitude, feelings of strong obligation, and considering absence a less legitimate option, are also known to result in sickness presenteeism [18].

We hypothesized that the COVID-19 epidemic would affect worker experience of sickness presenteeism via an effect on their socioeconomic status and employment instability, as well as on their health behaviors. During a COVID-19 epidemic, workers may be more hesitant to report their health condition to the company when they are not feeling well. Reports worldwide have also noted the interruption of treatment for previously controlled diseases during the COVID-19 outbreak[19,20], which also acts to increase sickness presenteeism. Furthermore, the management of sickness presenteeism is important in terms of preventing the spread of infection. Among various measures taken to halt the spread of COVID-19 in the workplace, self-reporting of physical condition and restriction of attendance by employees who have fever or other health problems are particularly important - the fact that some employees still come to work despite feeling ill is now an issue.

Some studies have considered the assumption that the COVID-19 epidemic affects the experience of workers' sickness presenteeism[21,22]. However, there are few reports on the characteristics of workers experiencing sickness presenteeism during the COVID-19 epidemic. We examined the relationship between socioeconomic and health status, and lifestyle habits and sickness presenteeism among Japanese workers during the COVID-19 epidemic.

Methods

Study Design and Subjects

A cross-sectional study was conducted from December 22 to 26, 2020 at the time of the third wave of COVID-19 infection in Japan. The study was conducted as an Internet-monitor survey. Details of the study protocol have been described elsewhere[23]. Briefly, the data were obtained from workers currently under an employment contract at the time of the survey, and categorized by prefecture, type of job, and sex. Of 33,302 survey participants, 27,036 people were included in the study following exclusion of those who provided a fraudulent response. The present analysis included all participants who responded that they had attended work despite needing to recuperate at home.

This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan. Informed consent was obtained via a form on the survey website.

Assessment of sickness presenteeism

Treatment status was determined using the following single-item question: “How many days have you worked (including at home) in the last 30 days under conditions in which you would really like to take a day off?” Respondents were asked to respond with the number of days. Those who answered 3 days or more were regarded as a group with sickness presenteeism.

Survey of subject socioeconomic conditions, health status, and lifestyle factors

The questionaire was conducted via the Internet and enquired about the subject’s socioeconomic conditions. Specifically, the survey enquired about age, sex, marital status

92 (married, unmarried, widowed/divorced), occupation (job mainly involves desk work,
93 interpersonal communication, or labor), educational background, equivalent income
94 (household income divided by the square root of household size), job change or
95 unemployment after April 2020 (no resignation or job change; transfer to another
96 company; resignation and immediate start at a new job; unemployment for a period, but
97 presently employed; retired and started a business), and perception of financial situation
98 (very difficult; somewhat difficult; slightly difficult; comfortable).

99 With regard to health status and psychological factors, we asked about self-rated
100 health, psychological distress, sense of loneliness, presence of supportive friends, and
101 having a health condition that requires company consideration to allow work.
102 Psychological distress was addressed using the Kessler 6 (K6) test [24], whose validity in
103 Japanese has been confirmed[25]. Subjects with a K6 score of 5 or higher were considered
104 to have mild psychological distress. Loneliness was examined with the question: "Have
105 you ever felt alone?", with response options of: "never," "a little," "sometimes," "usually,"
106 and "always." The presence of a health condition that required the employer's
107 consideration to permit work was surveyed using the question: "Do you require
108 consideration or support from your company to continue working in your current health
109 condition?", with the three response options of: "no;" "yes, but I have not received
110 support;" and "yes, and I have received support."

111 The questionaire also contained a variety of questions on lifestyle and work-related
112 factors, including smoking (never; quit more than one year ago; quit within the past year;
113 started to smoke < 1 year ago; have smoked for > 1 year), alcohol consumption (6–7
114 days/week; 4–5 days/week; 2–3 days/week; < 1 day/week; almost never), exercise habit,
115 breakfast routine, time spent in one-way commuting and number of overtime hours

worked/day. With regard to exercise, participants indicated the number of days each week on which they exercised for 30 minutes or more. Regarding breakfast, they indicated the number of days each week on which they had breakfast.

Statistical analysis

Age- and sex-adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and multivariate adjusted ORs were analyzed using a multilevel logistic model with nesting by residential prefecture. All analyses included the incidence rate of COVID-19 since declared pandemic status was an area-level variable. In the analyses of socioeconomic conditions, the model included sex, age, marital status, equivalent household income, job type, employment status, educational background, and level of comfort with financial condition. The model for analysis of health-related factors included age, sex, psychological distress, self-rated health, feeling of lonliness, having a friend who can provide support, and having a health condition which requires the employer's support to allow work to occur. The model used to analyse lifestyle and work-related factors incorporated age, sex, alcohol intake, smoking habit, exercise, breakfast routine, overtime hours worked/day and time required for one-way commuting.

A *P* value of less than .05 was considered to indicate statistical significance. Stata Statistical Software version 16 (StataCorp LLC, TX, USA) was used for all analyses.

Results

Basic participant characteristics are shown in Table 1. Among all 27036 subjects, approximately 19 percent of subjects had experienced sickness presenteeism. On comparison, subjects who had experienced sickness presenteeism were more likely than those who had not to have lower level of subjective health, greater psychological distress, greater loneliness, and greater need for employment consideration from their employer.

ORs of socioeconomic status associated with sickness presenteeism are shown in Table 2. On multivariate analysis, the OR of sickness presenteeism associated with not being married versus being married was 1.15. respective values were 1.11 for manual labor versus desk work; 1.79 and 2.29 for lost employment when the COVID-19 pandemic started and continued unemployment compared with employment across the entire pandemic period; and 3.34 for a feeling of financial instability versus stability.

The ORs of health status, psychological disteress associated with sickness presenteeism is shown in Table 3. On multivariate analysis, the OR of sickness presenteeism associated with poor self-rated health was 11.21; experience of psychological distress was 6.11; feeling always alone was 8.30; and the need for company consideration to allow work but not receiving it was 9.57.

The ORs of lifestyle and occupational factors associated with sickness presenteeism is shown in Table 4. Smoking, breakfast routine, commute time, and hours worked overtime were associated with sickness presenteeism. In contrast, we saw no association between alcohol consumption (except less than 1 day a week) and sickness presenteeism. On multivariate analysis, current smokers were at higher likelihood of experiencing sickness presenteeism (OR=1.20, 95%CI: 1.12-1.29, $p<0.001$), as were those who rarely ate breakfast (OR=1.49, 95%CI: 95%CI: 1.38-1.62, $p<0.001$), spent

162 longer than 2 hours in one-way commuting (OR=1.45, 1.18-1.77, $p<0.001$), or worked

163 more than 2 hours overtime (OR=2.53, 95%CI: 2.53-2.80, $p<0.001$).

164

Discussion

This study found that 19% of workers in Japan had experienced sickness presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic. Risk of experiencing sickness presenteeism was higher in workers with a lower socioeconomic status and those in poor health. Further, risk was also higher in workers with an unfavorable lifestyle and working conditions.

Socioeconomic status is known to be an important factor in a worker's experience of sickness presenteeism[14,26]. Further, emergencies such as disasters impair access to health care for people with a disadvantaged socioeconomic status[27,28]. As a result, opportunities for workers to experience sickness presenteeism can be expected to increase. The present study reveals that socioeconomically disadvantaged workers were more likely to experience sickness presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, risk of sickness presenteeism was increased in subjects with low income, unemployment experience, and economic insecurity, a finding consistent with previous studies of the impact of COVID-19 on sickness presenteeism.[21,22] Economic deprivation is a direct reason for sickness presenteeism. Workers with unstable employment or a low income have little choice but to work hard for their livelihoods, even if they are not feeling well.[14] Conversely, workers with sickness presenteeism are more likely to exacerbate their illness[10]. As a result, sickness presenteeism will work in the direction of lower income and employment instability. Workers with unstable employment may not be entitled to sick leave or may be reluctant to take it[29,30], rendering them prone to sickness presenteeism. Moreover, experience of sickness presenteeism has also been shown to exacerbate health status, resulting in turn in employment instability as well as economic disadvantage.

Our present results revealed that those with a poor health condition had a greater likelihood of experiencing sickness presenteeism: those whose self-rated health was poor, or with psychological distress, a sense of loneliness, and workplace support were at greater risk of experiencing sickness presenteeism. It is clear from the definition that sickness presenteeism is more likely in poor health[1]. Conversely, workers with sickness presenteeism are known to be more likely to exacerbate their illness[10]. In our present study, we found an association between greater psychological distress and a higher likelihood of sickness presenteeism. A number of studies have noted that the fear of infection when visiting a hospital is a major reason for treatment interruption [31-33]. Anxiety concerning infection may affect treatment discontinuation, resulting in continued working in poor physical condition. In addition, participants without company support were more likely to have sickness presenteeism. This result is consistent with reports that there is less sickness presenteeism with the support of workplace bosses[34]. For those who tend to feel lonely, it is thought that work efficiency is likely to decline due to the infectious disease countermeasures (eg Stay Home and Remote Work) that have become widespread during the COVID-19 epidemic, and the resulting decline in workplace communication.

Our present results also revealed the relationship of non-preferable lifestyle and work-related factors with sickness presenteeism. Previous studies have shown a relationship between lifestyle and sickness presenteeism[35-37]. It is thought that stress has likely to have increased due to environmental changes caused by infectious disease countermeasures (eg, Stay Home and Remote Work) that have become widespread during the COVID-19 epidemic. Sickness presenteeism will increase due to a deterioration in lifestyle habits, such as the stress caused by countermeasures against COVID-19 and

work at home, where the lack of restrictions on smoking leads to an increase in the number of cigarettes smoked[38]. The spread of remote work has had the positive effect of improving the quality of life, such as shortening commuting time, but has also had the negative effect of reducing physical activity[39,40]. It becomes difficult to distinguish between work and private life, and workers tend to work long hours. Workers who do not benefit from remote work, such as those engaged in essential services, may experience the stress of commuting with an increased risk of COVID-19 infection, as well as a feeling of being treated unfairly compared with head office/headquarters staff of the same company[41].

Sickness presenteeism is an major occupational health issue and public health challenge. The COVID-19 pandemic has brought a particular focus to it. Our present study emphasizes that sickness presenteeism is associated with socioeconomic status. Regardless of causation, individuals with a lower socioeconomic or health status were at greater risk of sickness presenteeism. It is therefore critical to recognize not only the clinical importance of COVID-19, but in addition the deterioration in labor productivity and the impact on the lives and health of workers through the socioeconomic environment. It is important to foster the social consensus that workers should take the day off from work when they are feeling unwell. It is known that companies with a leave system that is easy to use when workers are not feeling well have a low incidence of infectious diseases[15]. An easy-to-use leave system is effective not only in reducing sickness presenteeism but also with regard to COVID-19 countermeasures.

There are several limitations in this study. First, it was not knonw the reasons accounting for sickness presenteeism. Many possible explanations may explain why workers experience sickness presenteeism, including financial hardship preventing medical visits, unstable employment, or unavailability of sick leave entitlement. Second, we did not investigate the types of illnesses and health problems experienced by people with sickness presenteeism. Third, we did not determined the chronological relationship between sickness presenteeism and socioeconomic status and lifestyle.

In this study, we found that around 19% of Japanese workers experienced sickness presenteeism during the period of rapidly spreading COVID-19 infection. Those who were socioeconomically disadvantaged, in poor health, or with unfavorable lifestyle habits were more likely to report sickness presenteeism. Accordingly, the issue of sickness presenteeism has been highlighted by COVID-19. The increase in sickness presenteeism may not only worsen the health status of individuals, but also have long-term effects on society, such as reduced productivity and increased social security burden due to employment instability. These findings indicate the need for efforts to decrease sickness presenteeism in workers who need to recuperate at home.

References

1. Aronsson G, Gustafsson K, Dallner M. Sick but yet at work. An empirical study of sickness presenteeism. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2000;54:502-509.
2. Eurofound. Health and well-being at work: a report based on the fifth european working conditions survey. Dublin: 2012.
3. Webster RK, Liu R, Karimullina K, Hall I, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ. A systematic review of infectious illness Presenteeism: prevalence, reasons and risk factors. BMC Public Health. 2019 Jun 21;19(1):799.
4. Shan G, Wang S, Wang W, Guo S, Li Y. Presenteeism in Nurses: Prevalence, Consequences, and Causes From the Perspectives of Nurses and Chief Nurses. Front Psychiatry. 2021 Jan 8;11:584040.
5. Park JW, Cho SS, Lee J, Hwang J, Kim JI, Kim BG, Hong YS. Association between employment status and sickness presenteeism among Korean employees: a cross-sectional study. Ann Occup Environ Med. 2020 Jun 12;32:e17.
6. Oshio T, Tsutsumi A, Inoue A, Suzuki T, Miyaki K. The reciprocal relationship between sickness presenteeism and psychological distress in response to job stressors: evidence from a three-wave cohort study. J Occup Health. 2017 Nov 25;59(6):552-561.
7. Taloyan M, Aronsson G, Leineweber C, et al. Sickness presenteeism predicts suboptimal self-rated health and sickness absence: A nationally representative study of the Swedish working population. PLoS One. 2012;7:e44721.
8. Kivimäki M, Head J, Ferrie JE, et al. Working while ill as a risk factor for serious coronary events: the Whitehall II study. Am J Public Health. 2005;95:98-102.
9. Conway PM, Hogh A, Rugulies R, et al. Is sickness presenteeism a risk factor for depression? A Danish 2-year follow-up study. J Occup Environ Med. 2014;56:595-603.

10. Hansen CD, Andersen JH. Sick at work－ a risk factor for long-term sickness absence at a later date? J Epidemiol Community Health. 2009; 63:397-402. （長期休業の相対危険度 1.74）

11. Dellve L, Hadzibajramovic E, Ahlborg G Jr. Work attendance among healthcare workers: prevalence, incentives, and long-term consequences for health and performance. J Adv Nurs. 2011;67:1918-1929.

12. Rosvold EO, Bjertness E. Physicians who do not take sick leave: hazardous heroes? Scand J Public Health. 2001;29:71-75.

13. Johns G. Presenteeism in the workplace: A review and research agenda. Journal of Organizational Behavior 2010;31:519-42.

14. Aronsson G, Gustafsson K. Sickness presenteeism: Prevalence, attendance-pressure factors, and an outline of a model for research. J Occup Environ Med. 2005;47:958-966.

15. Böckerman P, Laukkanen E. What makes you work while you are sick? Evidence from a survey of workers. Eur J Public Health. 2010;20:43-46.

16. Allebeck P, Mastekaasa A. Chapter 5. Risk factors for sick leave - general studies. Scand J Public Health 2004;32:49–108.

17. Sverke M, Hellgren J, Näswall K. No security: a meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. J Occup Health Psychol 2002;7:242–64.

18. Mariella Miraglia, Gary Johns. Going to work ill: A meta-analysis of the correlates of presenteeism and a dual-path model. J Occup Health Psychol. 2016 Jul;21(3):261-283.

19. Bong CL, Brasher C, Chikumba E, McDougall R, Mellin-Olsen J, Enright A. The COVID-19 Pandemic: Effects on Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Anesth Analg.

299 2020 Jul; 131(1): 86-92.
300 20. Das AK, Mishra DK, Gopalan SS. Reduced access to care among older American
301 adults during CoVID-19 pandemic: results from a prospective cohort study. medRxiv.
302 2020: 2020.11.29.20240317.
303 21. Reuter M, Dragano N, Wahrendorf M. Working while sick in context of regional
304 unemployment: a Europe-wide cross-sectional study. J Epidemiol Community Health.
305 2020 Nov 13:jech-2020-214888.
306 22. van Ballegooijen H et al. Concerns, quality of life, access to care and productivity of
307 the general population during the first 8 weeks of the coronavirus lockdown in Belgium
308 and the Netherlands. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021 Mar 12;21(1):227. doi:
309 10.1186/s12913-021-06240-7.
310 23. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based health
311 survey in workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. medRxiv. Published online
312 February 5, 2021:2021.02.02.21249309.
313 24. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, et al. Short screening scales to monitor population
314 prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. Psychol Med.
315 2002;32(6):959-976.
316 25. Furukawa TA, Kawakami N, Saitoh M, et al. The performance of the Japanese version
317 of the K6 and K10 in the World Mental Health Survey Japan. Int J Methods Psychiatr
318 Res. 2008;17(3):152-158.
319 26. Kim JY, Lee J, Muntaner C, et al. Who is working while sick? Nonstandard
320 employment and its association with absenteeism and presenteeism in South Korea. Int
321 Arch Occcup Environ Health. 2016;89:1095-1101.
322 27. Feinstein JS. The Relationship between Socioeconomic Status and Health: A Review

323 of the Literature. Milbank Q. 1993;71(2):279-322.
324 28. Swain GR. How does economic and social disadvantage affect health. Focus.
325 2016;33(1):1-6.
326 29. Kinman G, Grant C. Presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic: risks and
327 solutions. Occup Med . Published online November 18, 2020.
328 doi:10.1093/occmed/kqaa193
329 30. Skagen K, Collins AM. The consequences of sickness presenteeism on health and
330 wellbeing over time: A systematic review. Soc Sci Med. 2016;161:169-177.
331 31. Czeisler MÉ, Marynak K, Clarke KEN, et al. Delay or Avoidance of Medical Care
332 Because of COVID-19-Related Concerns - United States, June 2020. MMWR Morb
333 Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69(36):1250-1257.
334 32. Chudasama YV, Gillies CL, Zaccardi F, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on routine care
335 for chronic diseases: A global survey of views from healthcare professionals. Diabetes
336 Metab Syndr. 2020;14(5):965-967.
337 33. Erol MK. Treatment Delays and In-Hospital Outcomes In Acute Myocardial
338 Infarction During The Covid-19 Pandemic: A Nationwide Study. The Anatolian Journal
339 of Cardiology. Published online 2020. doi:10.14744/anatoljcardiol.2020.98607
340 34. Caverley N, Cunningham JB, MacGregor JN. Sickness presenteeism, sickness
341 absenteeism, and health following restructuring in a public service organization. J
342 Manag Studies. 2007;44:304-319.
343 35. Robroek SJ, van den Berg TI, Plat JF, et al. The role of obesity and lifestyle behaviours
344 in a productive workforce. Occup Environ Med. 2011;68:134-139.
345 36. Kirkham HS, Clark BL, Bolas CA, et al. Which modifiable health risks are associated
346 with changes in productivity costs? Popul Health Manag. 2015;18:30-38.

37. Merchant JA, Kelly KM, Burmeister LF, et al. Employment status matters: a statewide survey of quality-of-life, prevention behaviors, and absenteeism and presenteeism. J Occup Environ Med. 2014; 56:686-698.

38. Siegel A, Korbman M, Erblich J. Direct and Indirect Effects of Psychological Distress on Stress-Induced Smoking. J Stud Alcohol Drugs. 2017 Nov;78(6):930-937.

39. Henke RM, Benevent R, Schulte P, Rinehart C, Crighton KA, Corcoran M. The Effects of Telecommuting Intensity on Employee Health. Am J Health Promot. 2016 Nov;30(8):604-612.

40. Mheidly N, Fares MY, Fares J. Coping With Stress and Burnout Associated With Telecommunication and Online Learning. Front Public Health. 2020 Nov 11;8:574969.

41. Uehara, M., Ishimaru, T., Ando, H., Tateishi, S., Eguchi, H., Tsuji, M., Mori, K., Matsuda, S., & Fujino, Y. (2021). Worries about COVID-19 infection and psychological distress at work and while commuting. J Occup Environ Med (in print)

Table 1. Characteristics of the study subjects

	Sickness presenteeism <3day (n=21997)	Sickness presenteeism >=3day (n=5039)
Sex, male	11417 (51.9%)	2397 (47.6%)
Marital status, married	12503 (56.8%)	2526 (50.1%)
Job type		
Mainly desk work	11126 (50.6%)	2342 (46.5%)
Jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication	5556 (25.3%)	1371 (27.2%)
Mainly labor	5315 (24.2%)	1326 (26.3%)
Annual equivalent household income (JPY)		
500000-2650000	7075 (32.2%)	1919 (38.1%)
2650000-4500000	7139 (32.5%)	1543 (30.6%)
>4500000	7783 (35.4%)	1577 (31.3%)
Self-rated health, very good/good	12305 (55.9%)	1151 (22.8%)
Psychological distress (K6≥5)	7054 (32.1%)	3763 (74.7%)
Have you ever felt alone? usually OR always	1535 (7.0%)	1215(24.1%)
Do you require consideration or support from your company to continue working in your current health condition?		
No	18122 (82.4%)	2139 (42.4%)
Yes, but I have not received support	2001 (9.1%)	2297 (45.6%)
Yes and I have received support	1874 (8.5%)	603 (12.0%)
Current smoker	5614 (25.5%)	1390 (27.6%)
Alcohol consumption, 6–7 days a week	4690 (21.3%)	984 (19.5%)
How often do you eat breakfast? less than 1 day a week	3697 (16.8%)	1095 (21.7%)
Time spent on one-way commuting (excluding time spent at home), more than 2 hours	434 (2.0%)	151 (3.0%)
Overtime work, more than 2 hours	1732 (7.9%)	721 (14.3%)

Table 2. Association between socioeconomic status and sickness presenteeism

	Age- and sex-adjusted				Multivariate*			
	OR	95%CI		p	OR	95%CI		p
Marital status								
Married	reference				reference			
Unmarried	1.25	1.13	1.39	<0.001	1.15	1.04	1.28	0.009
Divorced/widowed	1.19	1.11	1.28	<0.001	1.13	1.05	1.21	0.001
Job type								
Mainly desk work	reference				reference			
Jobs mainly involving interpersonal communication	1.13	1.05	1.22	<0.001	1.11	1.03	1.20	0.005
Mainly labor	1.16	1.08	1.26	<0.001	1.11	1.03	1.20	0.009
Annual equivalent household income(JPY)								
500000-2650000	1.29	1.19	1.38	<0.001	1.19	1.10	1.29	<0.001
2650000-4500000	1.03	0.95	1.11	0.474	1.01	0.94	1.10	0.721
>4500000	reference				reference			
Education								
Junior high school	1.32	1.03	1.69	0.027	1.17	0.91	1.50	0.212
High school	1.02	0.95	1.10	0.538	0.97	0.90	1.05	0.464
Vocational school/college, university, graduate school	reference				reference			
Have you resigned or changed jobs since April 2020?								
Did not resign or change jobs	reference				reference			
Transferred to another company	2.66	1.92	3.69	<0.001	2.69	1.94	3.73	<0.001
Resigned and entered into a new job immediately	1.40	1.18	1.65	<0.001	1.36	1.15	1.61	<0.001
Unemployed for a period, but currently working	1.90	1.56	2.32	<0.001	1.79	1.47	2.19	<0.001
Retired and started a business (e.g., running a company, personal business, or self-employment)	2.42	1.89	3.09	<0.001	2.29	1.79	2.92	<0.001
How do you feel about your current financial situation?								
Very difficult	3.41	3.01	3.88	<0.001	3.34	2.94	3.81	<0.001
Slightly difficult	1.95	1.73	2.19	<0.001	1.94	1.72	2.18	<0.001
Fairly difficult	1.13	1.01	1.27	0.035	1.13	1.01	1.27	0.033
Comfortable	reference				reference			

* The multivariate model was adjusted for sex, age, marital status, job type, equivalent household income, educational background, employment status, perception of financial situation and incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture.

Table 3. Association between health status, psychological distress and sickness presenteeism

	Age- and sex-adjusted				Multivariate*			
	OR	95%CI		p	OR	95%CI		p
Self-rated health								
Very good/good	reference				reference			
Neither good nor bad	2.81	2.60	3.04	<0.001	2.81	2.60	3.04	<0.001
Bad	11.21	10.25	12.27	<0.001	11.21	10.24	12.28	<0.001
Psychological distress (K6≥5)	6.14	5.73	6.59	<0.001	6.11	5.70	6.56	<0.001
Have you ever felt alone?								
Never	reference				reference			
A little	2.51	2.30	2.73	<0.001	2.52	2.32	2.74	<0.001
Sometimes	4.30	3.93	4.69	<0.001	4.32	3.95	4.73	<0.001
Usually	6.13	5.45	6.90	<0.001	6.21	5.51	7.00	<0.001
Always	8.17	7.24	9.23	<0.001	8.30	7.34	9.39	<0.001
Do you require consideration or support from your company to continue working in your current health condition?								
No	reference				reference			
Yes, but I have not received support	9.67	8.97	10.42	<0.001	9.57	8.87	10.32	<0.001
Yes and I have received support	2.6363	2.3793	2.9211	<0.001	2.6377	2.3803	2.9229	<0.001

* The multivariate model was adjusted for sex, age, marital status, job type, equivalent household income, and incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture.

Table 4. Association between lifestyle, occupational factors and sickness presenteeism

	Age- and sex-adjusted				Multivariate*			
	OR	95%CI		p	OR	95%CI		p
Current smoker	1.22	1.13	1.31	<0.001	1.20	1.12	1.29	<0.001
Alcohol consumption								
6–7 days a week	0.96	0.88	1.05	0.337	0.98	0.90	1.07	0.674
4–5 days a week	0.91	0.80	1.03	0.142	0.94	0.83	1.06	0.301
2–3 days a week	0.96	0.87	1.06	0.385	0.98	0.89	1.08	0.677
Less than 1 day a week	0.88	0.80	0.96	0.004	0.89	0.81	0.97	0.008
Hardly ever	reference				reference			
How often do you eat breakfast?								
6–7 days a week	reference				reference			
4–5 days a week	1.43	1.29	1.59	<0.001	1.41	1.27	1.57	<0.001
2–3 days a week	1.71	1.52	1.93	<0.001	1.68	1.49	1.90	<0.001
Less than 1 day a week	1.72	1.50	1.97	<0.001	1.70	1.49	1.95	<0.001
Hardly ever	1.54	1.42	1.66	<0.001	1.49	1.38	1.62	<0.001
Time spent on one-way commuting (excluding time spent at home)								
More than 2 hours	1.35	1.11	1.66	0.003	1.45	1.18	1.77	<0.001
More than 1 hour	1.06	0.95	1.19	0.272	1.13	1.01	1.27	0.029
More than 30 minutes	0.92	0.83	1.01	0.086	0.96	0.87	1.06	0.386
Less than 30 minutes	0.79	0.73	0.87	<0.001	0.81	0.73	0.88	<0.001
Almost none	reference				reference			
Overtime work								
More than 2 hours	2.39	2.16	2.64	<0.001	2.53	2.28	2.80	<0.001
More than 1 hour	1.67	1.53	1.83	<0.001	1.75	1.60	1.91	<0.001
More than 30 minutes	1.45	1.32	1.58	<0.001	1.50	1.37	1.64	<0.001
Less than 30 minutes	1.15	1.05	1.28	0.005	1.19	1.07	1.31	0.001
Almost none	reference				reference			

* The multivariate model was adjusted for sex, age, marital status, job type, equivalent household income, and incidence rate of COVID-19 by prefecture.