medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Title:

Treatment interruption is a risk factor for sickness presenteeism: a large-scale cross-sectional study during the COVID-19 pandemic

Authors:

Makoto Okawara[1], M.D., Tomohiro Ishimaru[1], M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., Seiichiro Tateishi[2], M.D., Ph.D., Ayako Hino[3], M.D., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji[4], M.D., Ph.D., Akira Ogami[5], M.D., Ph.D., Tomohisa Nagata[6], M.D., Ph.D., Shinya Matsuda[7], M.D., Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino[1], M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., for the CORoNaWork project

Affiliations:

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

4 Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Environmental Health, Japan

5 Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

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

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

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

E-mail: zenq@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

Abstract

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Objective: This study examined the relationship between interruption to routine medical care during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic and sickness presenteeism in Japan.

Methods: An internet monitor questionnaire was conducted. Data from 27,036 people were analyzed. Interruption to medical care was defined based on the response "I have not been able to go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled." The number of sickness presenteeism days in the past 30 days was employed as the primary outcome. A zero-inflated negative binomial model was used for analysis.

Results: The incidence rate ratio was significantly higher among workers who experienced interrupted medical care (2.26; 95% confidence interval: 2.03–2.52) than those who did not require routine medical care.

Conclusions: This study suggests the importance of continuing necessary treatment during a pandemic to prevent presenteeism.

Keywords: occupational health; patient dropouts; presenteeism; COVID-19; regression analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Sickness presenteeism is an increasingly important issue in occupational health. Aronsson defined sickness presenteeism as "people, despite complaints and ill health that should prompt rest and absence from work, still turning up at their jobs"[1]. Sickness presenteeism is the result of a choice made by a worker with ill-health, disease, or capacity loss between sickness presenteeism and sickness absence[2]. This decision is influenced by the individual's personality, values, economic status, workplace "demands for presence" and support for adaptation, and national culture and employment customs[2]. Evidence suggests that sickness presenteeism can lead to sickness absence and future worsening of physical and mental health conditions[3–9]. In addition, the impact of working while ill on productivity is also gaining attention, especially in the US[10,11]. A variety of diseases and health conditions have been found to be associated with sickness presenteeism, suggesting the importance of managing disease and maintaining good condition[4,12].

Under the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, there is concern that both organizational and individual factors will increase sickness presenteeism above that observed under normal conditions[13–15]. Organizational factors that may lead to more sickness presenteeism include increased workload and working hours per person, increased work pressure due to a manpower shortage in the organization and changes in work demands on short notice during the pandemic. This

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

increased workload on workers can lead to a negative work culture around taking sick leave, such as where workers who choose to work while ill are valued for their loyalty to the company and motivation to work, thus promoting sickness presenteeism[16]. Examples of individual factors that may increase sickness presenteeism include worsening economic situations and job insecurity; increased telecommuting, which can make it easier for workers to work even while sick; the impact of the pandemic on anxiety and mental health; worsening of health conditions and diseases due to lifestyle changes; and worsening of chronic diseases due to the inability to access medical resources. All of these factors are expected to lead to an increase in sickness presenteeism.

Interruption to medical care is an important problem in the COVID-19 pandemic. Access to necessary routine medical care and medical resources is reportedly being affected in many countries around the world[17–19]. In Japan, there is data showing that the number of prescriptions issued has decreased[20]. There are multiple reasons for such interruptions to medical care, including fear of being infected with COVID-19 when leaving the house to visit a hospital, worsening personal economic situations, and shortages in medical personnel, all of which affect the treatment schedule for chronic diseases[21]. Interruption to medical care can adversely affect management of chronic diseases and delay the detection and treatment of new diseases[22]. In fact, excess deaths unrelated to COVID-19 have been reported[23]. Thus, interruption to medical care during the COVID-19 pandemic may lead to worsening of non-COVID-19 diseases and health conditions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of people working while ill may increase as a result of worsening health conditions arising from treatment interruptions and delays. This may result in an increase in sickness presenteeism. However, few studies have examined the effect of medical care interruption on sickness presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic. We hypothesized that sickness presenteeism has increased among workers who experienced interruptions to their medical care during the COVID-19 pandemic. The purpose of this study was to examine the association between medical care interruption and sickness presenteeism in Japanese workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Materials and Methods

We performed a cross-sectional study based on baseline survey data obtained in the Collaborative Online Research on the Novel- Coronavirus and Work (CORoNaWork) project, a prospective cohort study that performed a questionnaire-based survey of Internet monitors to determine the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on workers' health. Before completing the online survey, participants read a description of the survey's aims and details about the handling of their information. Only participants who agreed with the contents of the description were allowed to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

participate. Participation was anonymized. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (Approval No. R2-079 and R3-006).

The baseline survey was conducted from December 22 to 26, 2020. A total of 33,302 participants aged from 20 and 65 years who indicated they were working when completing the survey were included. Participants were selected such that sex and occupation (office and non-office workers) were approximately equal among the regions of residence. Regions of residence were categorized according to the cumulative COVID-19 infection rate. Participants who provided fraudulent responses (n=6,266) according to the survey company or a predefined definition of a fraudulent response were excluded. Fraudulent responses included an unusually short response time (below 6 minutes), unusually short height (below 140 cm), unusually low weight (below 30 kg), varying answers to similar questions in the survey (e.g., varying answers to questions about marital status or area of residence), and incorrect answers to tiered questions used to identify inappropriate responses (e.g., choose the third highest number from the following five numbers). After exclusion, responses from 27,036 participants were included in the analysis.

Assessment of treatment status

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We assessed the presence of disease and participants' need for medical care using the following question: "Do you have a disease that requires regular visits to the hospital or treatment?" Responses were "I do not have any such disease"; "I am able to go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled"; "I have not been able to go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled."

Those who answered "I do not have any such disease" were defined as workers who did not require routine medical care, and thus did not have any disease that requires hospital visits or treatment. Those who answered "I am able to go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled" were defined as workers who used medical care. Those who answered "I have not been able to go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled" were defined as workers who experienced interrupted medical care.

Assessment of sickness presenteeism and other covariates

Respondents' number of sickness presenteeism days was ascertained based on the following question and used as the primary outcome: "In the last 30 days, how many days have you worked (including work from home) despite feeling that you really should have taken sick leave due to your state of health?"

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Socioeconomic and work-related factors included sex, age, job type (mainly desk work, mainly interpersonal communication, mainly physical work), marital status (married, divorced/deceased, never married), annual household income, education (junior high school, high school, vocational school/junior college/college of technology, university/graduate school), company size (total number of employees in the respondent's main place of work [1 for self-employed]), and the number of days worked per week.

The cumulative infection rate of COVID-19 in the province of residence was employed as a community-level variable.

To control for potential confounders, we also asked participants to indicate their main symptoms using the following question: "Which of the following conditions or body parts give you the most trouble during your work?" The options were "No problem"; "pain"; "movement"; "tightness, loss of energy, appetite, fever, dizziness, or feeling poor"; "toileting or elimination"; "mental health"; "skin, hair, or beauty"; "sleep"; "eyes"; "nose"; "ears"; and "other."

Statistical analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Age and the number of sickness presenteeism days were expressed as continuous variables, with median and interquartile range (IQR). Other covariates were expressed as categorical variables using percentages.

We compared the results of linear regression, Poisson regression, Zero-inflated Poisson regression (ZIP), negative binomial regression, and Zero-inflated Negative Binomial regression (ZINB) as statistical models, as they treat the number of sickness presenteeism days as continuous count data. Negative binomial regression can handle over-dispersed data, where the variance is much higher than the mean, which cannot be assumed in Poisson distribution. Further, to handle data with excess zeros, which indicates a population at low risk of sickness presenteeism, we used a zero-inflated model. In addition to dealing with the excess zeros that often occur in count data, a zero-inflated model has also been proposed as a way to handle the difficulty of defining sickness presenteeism cutoffs[24,25]. As a measure of model fitness, we compared the Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), and ultimately adopted the ZINB model.

ZINB regression analysis was conducted with the number of continuous sickness presenteeism days as the dependent variable, the respondents' category of treatment status as an independent variable, and the number of days worked per week as an offset variable.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We adjusted for the following potential confounders: sex, age, job type, marital status, household income, education, company size, cumulative infection rate by prefecture, and main symptoms.

In further analysis, we estimated the margins of sickness presenteeism days for each treatment status and symptom. First, we used the same statistical model as that in the main analysis. Second, we calculated the predictive margins of sickness presenteeism days, substituting measured values for other covariates, dividing the data into 36 groups (3 treatment statuses and 12 symptoms)[26]. Preliminarily, we confirmed the simple main effects for each treatment status compared to workers who did not require routine medical care by adding the interaction term between treatment status and symptoms to the model used for the main analysis. For all analyses, the Bonferroni method was used to adjust for multiple comparisons.

All comparisons were performed in Stata (Stata Statistical Software: Release 16; StataCorp LLC, TX, USA), with $p<0.05$ indicating statistical significance.

Results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Of the 33,302 responses, 6,266 were excluded (215 were deemed fraudulent according to the survey company and 6,051 satisfied the exclusion criteria during data cleaning), leaving a total of 27,036 responses for analysis. Because all responses were mandatory, there were no missing data in this study.

The demographic and sociological characteristics of the analyzed population are shown in Table 1. A total of 13,814 (51%) were men, with a median age of 48 years (IQR: 39–55). Of the total population, 17,526 (65%) were workers who did not require routine medical care, 8,451 (31%) were using medical care as scheduled, and 1,059 (4%) experienced interrupted medical care. The overall median number of sickness presenteeism days was 0.0 (IQR: 0–2). The distribution of sickness presenteeism is shown for the three treatment statuses in a histogram in Figure 1.

The association between the number of sickness presenteeism days and treatment status is shown in Table 2. There was a significant association between the number of sickness presenteeism days and treatment status based on the count model part of ZINB. After adjusting for other covariates in the multivariate model, the incidence rate ratio (IRR) of sickness presenteeism days was significantly higher among workers who used medical care (IRR: 1.15, 95%CI: 1.08–1.22, $p<0.001$) and workers who experienced interrupted medical care (IRR: 2.26, 95%CI: 2.03–2.52, $p<0.001$) compared to workers who did not require routine medical care.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The association between the number of sickness presenteeism days and participants' main symptoms is shown in Table 3. There were significant associations between the number of sickness presenteeism days and some symptoms using the model presented in Table 2. The highest IRR of sickness presenteeism days was observed for mental health symptoms (adjusted IRR: 1.67, 95%CI: 1.52–1.83, $p<0.001$).

The predictive margins of sickness presenteeism days for each treatment status and symptom are shown in Table 4 and Figure 2. When the analysis was performed based on the three treatment statuses, irrespective of symptom, the predictive margin of sickness presenteeism days among workers who experienced interrupted medical care was 7.06 days (standard error [SE]=0.34), while that among workers who did not require routine medical care was 1.43 days (SE=0.03). When the analysis was performed based on the 36 treatment-symptom groups (3 treatment statuses and 12 symptoms), the largest predictive margin of sickness presenteeism days was observed for mental health symptoms AND interrupted medical care (PM: 10.05 days, SE=0.57). The simple effect comparisons test, which included the interaction term between treatment status and symptoms, showed that there were significant differences between workers with the same symptoms who did and did not require routine medical care, and between workers with the same symptoms who experienced interruption to medical care and who did not require routine medical care. For example, the number of sickness presenteeism days significantly differed between those with mental health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

symptoms who used medical care and those with mental health symptoms who did not require routine medical care ($p<0.001$).

Discussion

This study demonstrated an association between treatment interruption and sickness presenteeism among Japanese workers in the COVID-19 pandemic. Compared to workers who did not require routine medical care, workers who had diseases that required routine medical care reported more days of sickness presenteeism, and those who experienced interrupted medical care reported even more such days. Furthermore, our findings reveal differences in the occurrence of sickness presenteeism depending on workers' symptoms.

We found that workers who experienced interrupted medical care had increased sickness presenteeism. This is because appropriate treatment can improve work function and productivity by improving workers' health and subjective symptoms[10,27]. This is supported by the fact that workers who used medical care reported fewer sickness presenteeism days than those who experienced interrupted medical care, although workers who used medical care had a higher incidence of sickness presenteeism than workers who did not require routine medical care. Employees who experience interrupted treatment for chronic diseases may be forced to return to work due to fear of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

being laid off, depending on the financial situation of their workplace during the pandemic. It is thus important to continue regular treatment during the COVID-19 pandemic to manage disease and maintain good condition[28].

We found that the occurrence of sickness presenteeism depends on the type of symptoms experienced by workers. Workers with symptoms related to mental health problems, loss of energy/fever, and body movements reported more sickness presenteeism than those who reported having “no problem.” In contrast, workers with symptoms related to sleep, pain, and elimination reported comparable or fewer days of sickness presenteeism to those who reported having “no problem.” Sickness presenteeism is the result of a worker's choice to be absent from work or to attend work despite being unwell. Many previous studies have evaluated sickness presenteeism based on whether or not workers “worked one or more days in a certain period of time with a health condition for which they think they really should be absent”[2,29]. However, workers experiencing symptoms not typically associated with sickness presenteeism may not consider their symptoms suitable for an absence from work, and thus may not have indicated that they experienced sickness presenteeism. For example, symptoms related to beauty are not directly related to an individual’s ability to work; sleep may be considered something that the individual simply needs to get more of on holidays; and chronic pain may be considered an instruction to move rather than rest. However, some symptoms that can pose a health risk are also unlikely to be recognized as contributing to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

sickness presenteeism. These include symptoms that can lead to delayed detection or worsening of a disease if left untreated when rest or treatment is in fact required. For individuals with insomnia or elimination symptoms, for example, resting or visiting a hospital when feeling unwell can lead to prevention or early diagnosis and treatment of mental health problems or inflammatory bowel disease, respectively. While forcing oneself to work with such symptoms can pose a health risk, workers may not consider this sickness presenteeism due to differences in interpretation of "health conditions that require absence from work." This is an important point when evaluating sickness presenteeism.

We also found that the impact of continuing treatment on the prevention of sickness presenteeism varied by symptom. Sickness presenteeism was more frequent in workers who experienced interrupted medical care with symptoms related to tightness and loss of energy, toileting and elimination, sleep, and eyes than those who did not require routine medical care. In contrast, no difference in sickness presenteeism was observed between workers who used medical care and those who did not require routine medical care, suggesting the importance of continuing necessary routine medical care for preventing sickness presenteeism due to these symptoms. Workers who experienced interrupted medical care with these symptoms may be able to reduce the incidence of sickness presenteeism by continuing appropriate treatment to maintain and improve their health condition. Symptoms that led to more sickness presenteeism in both workers who used medical care and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

workers who experienced interrupted medical care compared to workers who did not require routine medical care were pain and mental health-related symptoms. For these symptoms, sickness presenteeism remained high even with continued treatment, indicating the need to identify appropriate treatment and manage one's daily health condition in addition to continuing treatment. In contrast, symptoms that led to comparable sickness presenteeism in workers who used medical care and workers who experienced interrupted medical care compared to workers who did not require routine medical care were related to movement and mobility; skin, hair, or beauty; nose; ears; and other symptoms, for which treatment is ineffective to prevent sickness presenteeism. The lack of a difference in sickness presenteeism for these symptoms may be due to the fact that individuals do not consider these symptoms sufficiently adverse to require an absence from work. Alternatively, some individuals, such as those with physical movement symptoms, may experience chronic symptoms for which support and adaptive behaviors have already been put into place; thus, whether or not these individuals experience sickness presenteeism may be unrelated to their treatment status. Thus, the impact of continuing treatment on sickness presenteeism may be related to whether an individual considers their symptoms to be sufficiently adverse to require an absence from work, or whether or not the symptoms can be improved with treatment.

There are several limitations to this study. First, we did not obtain detailed information related to treatment interruptions, including the type of disease, duration, and reasons for interruption.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We were thus unable to determine whether the reason for interruption to treatment was due to patient-related reasons (e.g., economic situation and anxiety) or hospital-related reasons (e.g., schedule adjustment). Second, interruptions to treatment may be the result of better disease control and improved health. It is unclear how these factors would affect the occurrence of sickness presenteeism. Finally, we did not consider all possible confounders affecting sickness presenteeism because we did not obtain information on some confounders, such as job insecurity, annual leave rights, and the culture around employment and sick leave in each company.

Conclusion

Interruption to medical care during the COVID-19 pandemic was associated with the occurrence of sickness presenteeism. This study demonstrates the importance of maintaining one's health condition and continuing necessary treatment even during an infectious disease pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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. 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.

3. Skagen K, Collins AM. The consequences of sickness presenteeism on health and wellbeing over time: A systematic review. Soc Sci Med. 2016;161: 169–177.

4. Johns G. Presenteeism in the workplace: A review and research agenda. J Organ Behav. 2010;31: 519–542.

5. Kivimäki M, Head J, Ferrie JE, Hemingway H, Shipley MJ, Vahtera J, 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.

6. Janssens H, Clays E, De Clercq B, De Bacquer D, Braeckman L. The relation between presenteeism and different types of future sickness absence. J Occup Health. 2013;55: 132–141.

7. Bergström G, Bodin L, Hagberg J, Aronsson G, Josephson M. Sickness presenteeism today, sickness absenteeism tomorrow? A prospective study on sickness presenteeism and future sickness absenteeism. J Occup Environ Med. 2009;51: 629–638.

8. Gustafsson K, Marklund S. Associations between health and combinations of sickness presence and absence. Occup Med . 2014;64: 49–55.

9. Gustafsson K, Marklund S. Consequences of sickness presence and sickness absence on health and work ability: a Swedish prospective cohort study. Int J Occup Med Environ Health. 2011;24: 153–165.

10. Schultz AB, Chen C-Y, Edington DW. The cost and impact of health conditions on presenteeism to employers: a review of the literature. Pharmacoeconomics. 2009;27: 365–378.

11. Nagata T, Mori K, Ohtani M, Nagata M, Kajiki S, Fujino Y, et al. Total Health-Related Costs Due to Absenteeism, Presenteeism, and Medical and Pharmaceutical Expenses in Japanese Employers. J Occup Environ Med. 2018;60: e273–e280.

12. Burton WN, Pransky G, Conti DJ, Chen C-Y, Edington DW. The association of medical conditions and presenteeism. J Occup Environ Med. 2004;46: S38-45.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

13. Reuter M, Dragano N, Wahrendorf M. Working while sick in context of regional unemployment: a Europe-wide cross-sectional study. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2021;75: 574–580.

14. Tilchin C, Dayton L, Latkin CA. Socioeconomic Factors Associated With an Intention to Work While Sick From COVID-19. J Occup Environ Med. 2021;63: 363–368.

15. Kinman G, Grant C. Presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic: risks and solutions. Occup Med . 2020. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqaa193

16. Kinman G. Sickness presenteeism at work: prevalence, costs and management. Br Med Bull. 2019;129: 69–78.

17. Das AK, Mishra DK, Gopalan SS. Reduced access to care among older American adults during CoVID-19 pandemic: results from a prospective cohort study. bioRxiv. medRxiv; 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.11.29.20240317

18. Czeisler MÉ, Mpp KM, Clarke KEN, Salah Z, Shakya I, Thierry JAM, et al. Delay or avoidance of medical care because of COVID-19–related concerns — . doi:10.1101/2020.04.22.20076141v1

19. van Ballegooijen H, Goossens L, Bruin RH, Michels R, Krol M. Concerns, quality of life, access to care and productivity of the general population during the first 8 weeks of the coronavirus lockdown in Belgium and the Netherlands. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;21: 227.

20. Lopresti M Seo T Sato. Pandemics and access to care: use of real-world DATA to examine the IMPACT of COVID-19 on pharmacy visits in Japan. Value Health. [cited 28 May 2021]. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2020.08.1707

21. Bong C-L, Brasher C, Chikumba E, McDougall R, Mellin-Olsen J, Enright A. The COVID-19 Pandemic: Effects on Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Anesth Analg. 2020;131: 86–92.

22. Erol MK, Kayıkçıoğlu M, Kılıçkap M, Güler A, Yıldırım A, Kahraman F, et al. Treatment delays and in-hospital outcomes in acute myocardial infarction during the COVID-19 pandemic: A nationwide study. Anatol J Cardiol. 2020;24: 334–342.

23. Woolf SH, Chapman DA, Sabo RT, Weinberger DM, Hill L. Excess Deaths From COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and Other Causes, March-April 2020. JAMA. 2020;324: 510–513.

24. Navarro A, Salas-Nicás S, Llorens C, Moncada S, Molinero-Ruíz E, Moriña D. Sickness presenteeism: Are we sure about what we are studying? A research based on a literature review and an empirical illustration. Am J Ind Med. 2019;62: 580–589.

25. Tashiro Y, Nakamura K, Seino K, Ochi S, Ishii H, Hasegawa M, et al. The impact of a school-based tooth-brushing program on dental caries: a cross-sectional study. Environ Health Prev Med. 2019;24: 83.

26. Williams R. Using the Margins Command to Estimate and Interpret Adjusted Predictions and Marginal Effects. Stata J. 2012;12: 308–331.

27. Burton WN, Morrison A, Wertheimer AI. Pharmaceuticals and worker productivity loss: a critical review of the literature. J Occup Environ Med. 2003;45: 610–621.

28. Chudasama YV, Gillies CL, Zaccardi F, Coles B, Davies MJ, Seidu S, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on routine care for chronic diseases: A global survey of views from healthcare professionals. Diabetes Metab Syndr. 2020;14: 965–967.

29. Hansen CD, Andersen JH. Going ill to work--what personal circumstances, attitudes and work-related factors are associated with sickness presenteeism? Soc Sci Med. 2008;67: 956–964.

Table 1. Basic characteristics of the study subjects

	Total (n=27,036)	Workers who did not require routine medical care (n= 17,526)	Workers who used medical care (n=8,451)	Workers who experienced interrupted medical care (n=1,059)
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Age, median (IQR)	48 (39-55)	46 (38-53)	52 (45-58)	47 (39-54)
Sex, men	13814 (51.1%)	8422 (48.1%)	4885 (57.8%)	507 (47.9%)
Marital status, married	15029 (55.6%)	9627 (54.9%)	4894 (57.9%)	508 (48.0%)
Job type				
Mainly desk work	13468 (49.8%)	8545 (48.8%)	4440 (52.5%)	483 (45.6%)
Mainly interpersonal communication	6927 (25.6%)	4621 (26.4%)	2032 (24.0%)	274 (25.9%)
Mainly physical work	6641 (24.6%)	4360 (24.9%)	1979 (23.4%)	302 (28.5%)
Equivalent income (Japanese Yen)				
550000-2500000	5710 (21.1%)	3636 (20.7%)	1800 (21.3%)	274 (25.9%)
2500000-4250000	7550 (27.9%)	5036 (28.7%)	2227 (26.4%)	287 (27.1%)
4250000-5500000	6625 (24.5%)	4353 (24.8%)	2039 (24.1%)	233 (22.0%)
>5500000	7151 (26.4%)	4501 (25.7%)	2385 (28.2%)	265 (25.0%)
Education				
Junior high school	368 (1.4%)	244 (1.4%)	107 (1.3%)	17 (1.6%)
High school	6953 (25.7%)	4381 (25.0%)	2284 (27.0%)	288 (27.2%)
Vocational school, junior college, or technical college	6544 (24.2%)	4378 (25.0%)	1913 (22.6%)	253 (23.9%)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

University or graduate school	13171 (48.7%)	8523 (48.6%)	4147 (49.1%)	501 (47.3%)
Number of employees				
1	2556 (9.5%)	1625 (9.3%)	848 (10.0%)	83 (7.8%)
2-49	7999 (29.6%)	5378 (30.7%)	2320 (27.5%)	301 (28.4%)
50-999	9703 (35.9%)	6262 (35.7%)	3036 (35.9%)	405 (38.2%)
1000-9999	4719 (17.5%)	2986 (17.0%)	1552 (18.4%)	181 (17.1%)
≥10000	2059 (7.6%)	1275 (7.3%)	695 (8.2%)	89 (8.4%)
Sickness presenteeism days, median (IQR)	0.0 (0-2)	0.0 (0-1)	0.0 (0-2)	4.0 (1-10)

IQR: interquartile range

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 1. Sickness presenteeism days under each treatment status



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Association between treatment status and sickness presenteeism

	Univariate				Multivariate*			
Treatment status	IRR	95% CI		*p*	IRR	95% CI		*p*
Workers who did not require routine medical care	Reference				Reference			
Workers who used medical care	1.13	1.06	1.21	<0.001	1.15	1.08	1.22	<0.001
Workers who experienced interrupted medical care	2.30	2.06	2.57	<0.001	2.26	2.03	2.52	<0.001

*Adjusted for sex, age, marital status, household income, education, company size, job type, cumulative infection rate for COVID-19, and main symptoms

Offset variable: number of days worked per week

IRR: incidence rate ratio, CI: confidence interval

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3. Association between main symptoms and sickness presenteeism

Main symptom	IRR	95% CI		*p*
No problem	Reference			
Pain	1.03	0.92	1.15	0.587
Movement	1.28	1.11	1.48	0.001
Tightness, loss of energy, appetite, fever, dizziness, or feeling poor	1.35	1.21	1.50	<0.001
Toileting or elimination	0.97	0.81	1.17	0.780
Mental health	1.67	1.52	1.83	<0.001
Skin, hair, or beauty	0.90	0.75	1.09	0.284
Sleep	1.05	0.95	1.17	0.352
Eyes	0.86	0.75	0.98	0.024
Nose	0.68	0.49	0.95	0.023
Ears	0.85	0.63	1.15	0.299
Other	1.35	1.18	1.54	<0.001

Adjusted for sex, age, marital status, household income, education, company size, job type, cumulative infection rate for COVID-19, and treatment status

Offset variable: number of days worked per week

IRR: incidence rate ratio, CI: confidence interval

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 4. Predictive margins of sickness presenteeism days for each symptom and comparison between each treatment status

	Workers who did not require routine medical care (n=17,526)				Workers who used medical care (n=8,451)					Workers who experienced interrupted medical care (n=1,059)				
	n	%	PM	SE	n	%	PM	SE	*p*	n	%	PM	SE	*p*
Total	17526	100	1.43	0.03	8451	100	2.16	0.05	<0.001	1059	100	7.06	0.34	<0.001
Main symptom														
No problem	10938	62.4	0.76	0.02	3642	43.1	0.97	0.04	0.001	160	15.1	4.85	0.35	0.006
Pain	849	4.8	2.11	0.10	842	10.0	2.53	0.11	0.017	144	13.6	6.19	0.38	<0.001
Movement	481	2.7	2.61	0.17	344	4.1	3.09	0.20	1.000	54	5.1	7.11	0.57	1.000
Tightness, loss of energy, appetite, fever, dizziness, or feeling poor	715	4.1	3.67	0.16	583	6.9	3.96	0.17	0.056	133	12.6	8.32	0.53	<0.001
Toileting or elimination	263	1.5	1.91	0.16	201	2.4	2.35	0.20	1.000	40	3.8	5.87	0.56	<0.001
Mental health	1143	6.5	4.09	0.15	909	10.8	4.69	0.17	<0.001	219	20.7	10.05	0.57	<0.001
Skin, hair, or beauty	389	2.2	1.62	0.14	160	1.9	1.99	0.17	0.069	29	2.7	5.45	0.54	1.000
Sleep	997	5.7	2.34	0.10	637	7.5	2.74	0.12	1.000	116	11.0	6.20	0.39	<0.001
Eyes	795	4.5	1.46	0.08	512	6.1	1.76	0.10	1.000	65	6.1	4.57	0.33	<0.001
Nose	98	0.6	1.29	0.19	71	0.8	1.54	0.23	1.000	9	0.9	4.03	0.67	1.000
Ears	80	0.5	1.76	0.24	84	1.0	2.14	0.29	1.000	12	1.1	5.25	0.80	0.343
Other	778	4.4	1.96	0.12	466	5.5	2.51	0.16	1.000	78	7.4	7.86	0.60	0.351

PM: predictive margins; mean predicted number of sickness presenteeism days for each symptom and treatment status using the model in Table 2 and 3 with substitution of measured values for other covariates (adjusted using the Bonferroni method)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Offset variable: number of days worked per week

IRR: incidence rate ratio, SE: standard error, %: proportion of the total number of respondents for each treatment status

p: p-value for simple main effects for each treatment status compared to workers who did not require routine medical care using a model that included the interaction term for treatment status and main symptoms (adjusted using the Bonferroni method)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2. Predictive margins of each treatment status and symptom



*others include loss of energy, appetite, fever, dizziness, or feeling poor

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.14.21261996; this version posted August 25, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.