Effort-reward imbalance at work, glycated hemoglobin and prediabetes prevalence in a prospective cohort

C Riopel[1,2], X Trudel[1,2], A Milot[1,2], D Laurin[2,3,4], M Gilbert-Ouimet[2,5,6], C Brisson[1,2,3]

[1]Département de médecine sociale et préventive, Faculté de médecine, Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada
[2]Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec-Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada
[3] Centre d'excellence sur le vieillissement de Québec, Centre de recherche VITAM en santé durable, CIUSSS-Capitale Nationale, Québec, Québec, Canada
[4]Faculty of Pharmacy, Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada
[5]Health Sciences Department, Université du Québec à Rimouski Campus de Lévis, Lévis, Québec, Canada
[6]Canada Research Chair in Sex and Gender in Occupational Health, Université du Québec à Rimouski Campus de Lévis, Lévis, Québec, Canada

Abstract

Context– Prospective studies and meta-analyses suggest that psychosocial stressors at work from the effort-reward imbalance model are associated with an increased risk of type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). Prediabetes is an intermediate disorder on the glucose metabolism continuum. It increases the risk of developing T2DM, while also being separately associated with increased mortality. Evidence about the effect of effort-reward imbalance at work on prediabetes is scarce.

Objective– The objective was to evaluate, in women and men, the association between effort-reward imbalance at work, glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) concentration and the prevalence of prediabetes in a prospective cohort study.

Methods– Data were collected from 1,463 white-collar workers followed for an average of 16 years. Effort-reward imbalance at work (ERI) was measured in 1999-2001 using a validated instrument. HbA1c was assessed at follow-up (2015-18) using the immunochemical method. Several covariates were considered including sociodemographics, anthropometric, and lifestyle risk factors. Differences in mean HbA1c concentration were estimated with linear models. Prediabetes prevalence ratios (PRs) were computed using generalized linear models.

Results– In women, those exposed to effort-reward imbalance at work had a higher prevalence of prediabetes (adjusted PR=1.5, 95% confidence interval: 1.0-2.3). There was no difference in HbA1c concentration among those exposed and those unexposed to an effort-reward imbalance at work.

Conclusion– Among women, effort-reward imbalance at work was associated with the prevalence of prediabetes. Preventive workplace interventions targeting these psychosocial stressors at work may be effective strategies to reduce the prevalence of prediabetes among women.

Introduction

Type II diabetes mellitus (T2DM) affects over 400 million individuals across the globe and is on the rise (1). T2DM increases the risk of renal, cardiovascular and neurocognitive pathologies, making it a leading cause of mortality worldwide (1). Prediabetes refers to high blood glucose that is not within diabetes range. Prediabetes is associated with a significant increase in morbidity and mortality whether individuals develop T2DM or not (2-5). There is also a linear relationship between glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c), an indicator of glucose metabolism, and health complications including cardiovascular diseases and all-cause mortality, even if individuals do not develop T2DM (6). Therefore, primary prevention strategies tackling upstream risk factors such as lifestyle habits are recommended to prevent or delay the onset of prediabetes itself, and to mitigate its adverse effect on health(7)

Previous evidence suggests an association between psychosocial stressors at work and the risk of T2DM (8, 9). Two well defined and empirically supported models have been used to assess the adverse effect of psychosocial stressors at work. The demand-control (i.e. job strain) model states that stress-related ill health risks increase from the combined effects of high psychological demand and low job control (10, 11). The effort-reward imbalance model (ERI) posits that failed reciprocity between efforts invested at work and rewards obtained in return (monetary, social and organizational) induces a high-stress situation (12). Little is known about the effect of these adverse psychosocial stressors at work on prediabetes. To our knowledge, only one prospective study, conducted among 7,503 workers in Brazil has examined this effect (13) showing sex-specific associations. Indeed, this previous study has reported that, among women, job strain is associated with a 32% increase in prediabetes incidence. However, exposure to an

ERI at work showed no independent association with prediabetes. This result could be explained by a low participation at baseline (30%) (14) which can lead to selection bias and effect underestimation (15, 16). Moreover, the 4-year follow-up might have been too short to fully capture the adverse effect of ERI exposure. Additional studies are therefore needed to determine whether ERI at work is associated with the prevalence of prediabetes. The objective of the present study was to examine the association between effort-reward imbalance at work, glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) concentration and the prevalence of prediabetes in a prospective cohort study of women and men followed for 16 years.

Methods

Study Design and Population

The study sample was derived from the PROspective Quebec (PROQ) cohort, which has been previously described (17). Briefly, PROQ is a prospective white-collar workers cohort initiated in 1991–1993 (T1). The 9,188 workers (48.5% women) were recruited from 19 public organizations in Quebec City, Canada (Figure 1). They were followed up 8 and 24 years later (T2 and T3), with good participation rates: 75% at baseline, 90% at the 8-year follow-up and 81% at the 24-year follow-up (Figure 1). This study was approved by the CHU de Quebec's Research Center ethical review board. All participants, or their respondents in case of inability, provided their informed consent.

At the 24-year follow-up, a convenience sample of 2,318 participants were targeted for blood tests including HbA1c concentration (Figure 1). Of these, 17 died before the follow-up, 86 were lost to follow up, 344 refused to participate, 367 participated by mail only, and 41 did not

get adequate blood samples. Finally, 60 individuals did not participate at T2 (45 refusals and 15 lost to follow-up) and were therefore excluded from the analysis due to missing data. A total of 1403 participants were included in this analysis (979 active workers and 424 recently retired individuals). Since ERI was measured at T2 but not T1, the baseline for this study was T2.

Effort-reward imbalance at work

Effort-reward imbalance was measured at T2 (1999-2001) using validated scales. Reward at work was measured by nine original questions from the French version (18-20) of the effort-reward imbalance scale (three of five questions from the esteem subscale, the four-item subscale of promotion prospects and salary, and the two-item subscale of job security). The questions were answered in two steps (20). The respondents were first asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed that the question content described an experience typical of their work situation. If they agreed, they were then asked to indicate to what extent they felt distressed by the experience with 1 = very distressed, 2 = distressed, 3 =somewhat distressed, 4 = not at all distressed (scores were inverted for positive items). The 5-point answer mode were recoded in 3 points with a range from 9 to 27, lower values indicating lower reward. Effort was measured by nine items from the validated French version of the psychological demand scale of the Job Content Questionnaire (21, 22). The 4-point answer mode were recoded in 3 points with a range from 9 to 27, with higher values indicating higher effort. The psychometric qualities of this version have been demonstrated (23). In line with previous literature, the ERI score was calculated by dividing the effort score by the reward score and ERI was categorized in the following way: participants were considered exposed to an ERI if their effort-reward ratio was ≥ 1 and unexposed if their ratio was <1.

HbA1c and prediabetes

Non fasting blood samples were taken at T3 (2015-2018) by a trained nurse following a standardized protocol. EDTA whole-blood samples were analyzed at Biron Groupe Santé inc, a certified laboratory. HbA1c was measured using the immunochemical method on an Integra platform from Roche diagnostics (coefficient of variation of 1.6%). The *American Diabetes Association* guidelines were followed, which define prediabetes as an HbA1c between 5.7% and 6.49% (24). Workers with a HbA1c concentration under these thresholds were considered to have normal glucose metabolism. Participants with a HbA1c ≥6.5% were considered prevalent T2DM cases.

Covariates

The following risk factors for prediabetes were assessed at T2 (1999-2001) and retained as covariates. Age was divided into tertiles: <40 years old, 40–49 years old and 50 years old or above. Education was defined as the highest degree obtained: less than college, college, or university. Smoking status was categorized following the WHO guidelines: nonsmokers, ex-smokers and current smokers (25). Physical activity was categorized as follows, based on participants' answers to a validated question on the duration and frequency of their physical activity: sedentary (active once or less per week), insufficiently active (active 2–3 times per week), and active (>3 physical activity sessions per week) (26). Alcohol consumption was dichotomized based on a validated question on alcohol consumption (27): 1) nondrinkers: less than 1 alcoholic beverage per week and 2) drinkers: ≥1 alcoholic beverage per week. Long working hours were dichotomized based on a standard full-time employment schedule in

Canada: 1) <41hrs/week and 2) ≥ 41hrs/week. Clinical characteristics (blood pressure [BP], weight, height) were measured by trained employees using validated protocols (27). BP was measured following the American Heart Association protocol (28). After 5 minutes of rest, two blood pressure measurements were taken 1–2 minutes apart and the average of the two measures was used in the analyses. BP was dichotomized according to the presence or absence of hypertension (systolic BP ≥140 mmHg or diastolic BP ≥90 mmHg). Body mass index (BMI) was obtained by dividing the weight in kilograms by the height in metres squared and was treated as a continuous variable. Hypercholesterolemia was self-reported.

Statistical Analysis

First, descriptive analyses with Student's t-tests for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables were done. Results of the descriptive analyses were adjusted for age.

Crude and adjusted HbA1c mean differences according to ERI exposure as well as its individual components (efforts and rewards) were computed using linear regression analyses. Prevalence and prevalence ratio (PR) of prediabetes with 95% confidence intervals were computed using generalized linear models with a log link and a Poisson working model (29). A robust variance was used to account for the larger variance of the Poisson distribution compared to the binomial distribution. Crude and adjusted PRs were estimated. Missing data on each variable was less than 1% except for family history of T2DM (7.6%). A dummy indicator was used to prevent the exclusion of participants with missing data on this variable. According to prior literature, the impact of psychosocial stressors at work on T2DM may be partially mediated

by adoption of unhealthy lifestyle habits (30-33). Therefore, sequential adjustments were used. Adjusted models without and with lifestyle risk factors yielded similar results, therefore only the later are presented.

Prior studies found important sex differences in the association between psychosocial stressors at work and glucose metabolism imbalances (13, 34). Therefore, separate analyses were performed for men and women. Statistical analyses were conducted using the statistical software package SAS, version 9.4. Two tailed statistical tests with a significance level of 0.05 were used.

Participants who reported a previous T2DM diagnosis were 1) excluded from the HbA1c analyses and 2) categorized as prevalent T2DM cases for the prediabetes prevalence analyses. These participants with a history of T2DM are likely to have a different HbA1c value than at time of diagnosis because of their treatment, which could diminish the strength of the association between ERI at work and HbA1c.

Results

Table 1 presents baseline characteristics of our study sample, by sex. Compared to men, women were younger (38.9 years old, SD=4.5 vs 40.0 years old, SD=5.2). Women were less educated; 43.2% of them held a university diploma compared to 65.2% of men. More men lived with a spouse (83.6%) than women (77.3%). Women were healthier (lower prevalence of overweight individuals, hypertension and high cholesterol) and only 61.7% of them were alcohol drinkers, compared to 76.3% of men. However, more women were current smokers (17.3%) than men (12.2%). Only 2.8% of women reported long working hours compared to 9.0% of men. Lastly, there was no difference in ERI prevalence between men and women, but more men reported high efforts at work (44.1%) than women (37.4%).

Table 2 presents mean HbA1c concentration and mean differences according to ERI, effort and reward exposures, by sex. There was no association between ERI exposure and the mean HbA1c concentration in either men or women. Also, no association was observed when efforts and reward were considered separately.

Table 3 presents the prevalence and prevalence ratio (PR) of prediabetes according to ERI, efforts and reward exposures, by sex. In women, the prevalence of prediabetes was higher among those exposed to ERI compared to unexposed women, after adjusting for potential confounders (PR=1.52, 95% CI: 1.01-2.29). In men, the results did not suggest an association between ERI exposure and prediabetes prevalence. The results did not suggest and association between efforts and prediabetes prevalence in either men or women. Lastly, in women, low rewards were associated with an increased prediabetes prevalence (PR=1.67, 95% CI: 1.02-2.72), although statistical significance was not reached in the adjusted model (PR=1.57, 95% CI: 0.94-2.60).

Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample at baseline (1999-2001)

	MEN (N=697)	**WOMEN (N=689)**	**TOTAL (N=1,386)**
Age (years), mean (SD)	40.0 (5.2)*	38.9 (4.5)*	39.4 (4.9)
Education, n (%)			
Less than college	44 (6.3)*	141 (20.5)*	185 (13.4)
College	198 (28.5)*	249 (36.2)*	447 (32.3)
University	454 (65.2)*	297 (43.2)*	751 (54.3)
Family history of T2DM, n (%) [b]	129 (20.2)	153 (23.9)	282 (22.1)
Living with a spouse, n (%)	581 (83.6)*	530 (77.3)*	1111 (80.5)
Overweight (BMI ≥ 25.0 kg/m^2), n (%)	405 (59)*	215 (31.7)*	620 (45.4)
Hypertension, n (%) [a]	106 (15.6)*	18 (2.7)*	124 (9.3)
High cholesterol, n (%)	189 (27.2)*	96 (13.9)*	285 (20.6)
Smoking status, n (%)			
Nonsmoker	437 (62.8)*	352 (51.2)*	789 (57.0)
Ex-smoker	174 (25.0)*	217 (31.5)*	391 (28.3)
Current smoker	85 (12.2)*	119 (17.3)*	204 (14.7)
Alcohol drinker, n (%) [c]	530 (76.3)*	424 (61.7)*	954 (69.0)
Physical activity, n (%) [d]			
Active	181 (26.0)	145 (21.1)	326 (23.6)
Insufficiently active	284 (40.9)	288 (41.9)	572 (41.4)
Sedentary	230 (33.1)	254 (37.0)	484 (35.0)
Long working hour (≥ 41h/wk), n (%)	62 (9.0)*	19 (2.8)*	81 (5.9)
Effort-reward ratio ≥1, n (%)	183 (26.8)	167 (24.8)	350 (25.9)
Efforts, n (%)			
Low	152 (22.3)*	214 (31.9)*	366 (27.0)
Medium	229 (33.6)*	207 (30.8)*	436 (32.2)
High	301 (44.1)*	251 (37.4)*	552 (40.8)
Rewards, n (%)			
High	211 (39.0)	203 (30.2)	414 (30.6)
Medium	253 (37.1)	231 (34.4)	484 (35.8)
Low	218 (32.0)	238 (35.4)	456 (33.7)

[a]Defined as a systolic blood pressure ≥140 mmHg or a diastolic blood pressure ≥90 mmHg
[b]Measured at T3
[c]Drinker: ≥1 drink/week
[d]One session is defined as being physically active for at least 20 minutes. Active: ≥3 sessions/week, insufficiently active: 1–2 sessions/week, sedentary: <1 session/week
*Statistically significant difference between men and women ($p < 0.05$)

Table 2. Mean HbA1c and mean difference (MD) according to ERI, effort and reward exposures, by sex

			Crude (N=1,384)		**Adjusted** [(a)] (N=1,346)	
ERI	N	Mean (SD)	Mean difference	95% CI	Mean difference	95% CI
Women (n=656)						
ERI ratio <1	480	5.34 (0.33)	0.00	Ref.	0.00	Ref.
ERI ratio ≥1	160	5.37 (0.36)	0.02	(-0.04-0.08)	0.02	(-0.04-0.09)
Men (n=649)						
ERI ratio <1	471	5.41 (0.43)	0.00	Ref.	0.00	Ref.
ERI ratio ≥1	164	5.42 (0.32)	0.01	(-0.06-0.09)	-0.01	(-0.08-0.07)
Efforts	N	Mean (SD)	Mean difference	95% CI	Mean difference	95% CI
Women (n=656)						
Low	205	5.36 (0.40)	0.00	-	0.00	-
Medium	198	5.33 (0.31)	-0.03	(-0.09-0.04)	-0.02	(-0.09-0.05)
High	237	5.36 (0.31)	-0.00	(-0.07-0.06)	0.01	(-0.06-0.07)
Men (n=649)						
Low	144	5.42 (0.59)	0.00	-	0.00	-
Medium	218	5.41 (0.36)	-0.01	(-0.09- 0.08)	-0.02	(-0.10-0.07)
High	273	5.40 (0.31)	-0.02	(-0.10-0.06)	-0.05	(-0.13-0.04)
Rewards	N	Mean (SD)	Mean difference	95% CI	Mean difference	95% CI
Women (n=656)						
Low	196	5.33 (0.27)	0.00	-	0.00	-
Medium	218	5.34 (0.38)	0.01	(-0.05-0.08)	0.02	(-0.05-0.08)
High	226	5.37 (0.38)	0.04	(-0.02-0.11)	0.03	(-0.04-0.09)
Men (n=649)						
Low	198	5.42 (0.35)	0.00	-	0.00	-
Medium	239	5.39 (0.33)	-0.03	(-0.11- 0.05)	-0.03	(-0.11-0.05)
High	198	5.43 (0.52)	0.01	(-0.07-0.09)	0.01	(-0.07-0.09)

[(a)] Adjusted for age, living with a spouse, education, hypertension, working hours, family history of T2DM, total cholesterol, body mass index, smoking, alcohol intake and physical inactivity

Table 3. Prevalence of prediabetes and prevalence ratio (PR) according to ERI, effort and reward exposures, by sex.

			Crude (N=1,384)		**Adjusted** [(a)] (N=1,346)	
ERI ratio	N	Prediabetes N (%)	Prevalence ratio	95 % CI	Prevalence ratio	95 % CI
Women (N=672)						
ERI ratio <1	505	60 (11.9 %)	1.00	-	1.00	-
ERI ratio ≥1	167	30 (18.0 %)	**1.51***	(1.01-2.26)	**1.52***	(1.01-2.29)
Men (N=682)						
ERI ratio <1	499	98 (19.6 %)	1.00	-	1.00	-
ERI ratio ≥1	183	33 (18.0 %)	0.92	(0.64-1.31)	0.91	(0.63-1.32)
Efforts	N	Prediabetes N (%)	Prevalence ratio	95 % CI	Prevalence ratio	95 % CI
Women (N=672)						
Low	214	32 (15.0%)	1.00	-	1.00	-
Medium	207	25 (12.1%)	0.81	(0.50-1.31)	0.80	(0.47-1.34)
High	251	33 (13.2%)	0.88	(0.56-1.38)	0.88	(0.55-1.40)
Men (N=682)						
Low	152	28 (18.4%)	1.00	-	1.00	-
Medium	229	56 (24.5%)	1.33	(0.89-1.99)	1.29	(0.87-1.92)
High	301	47 (15.6%)	0.84	(0.55-1.30)	0.76	(0.49-1.19)
Rewards	N	Prediabetes N (%)	Prevalence ratio	95% CI	Prevalence ratio	95% CI
Women (N=672)						
Low	203	21 (10.3%)	1.00	-	1.00	-
Medium	231	28 (12.1%)	1.17	(0.69-2.00)	1.15	(0.66-2.01)
High	238	41 (17.2%)	**1.67**	**(1.02-2.72)**	1.57	(0.94-2.60)
Men (N=682)						
Low	211	46 (21.8%)	1.00	-	1.00	-
Medium	253	48 (19.0%)	0.87	(0.61-1.25)	0.86	(0.59-1.23)
High	218	37 (17.0%)	0.78	(0.53-1.15)	0.81	(0.55-1.20)

[(a)] Adjusted for age, living with a spouse, education, hypertension, working hours, family history of T2DM, total cholesterol and BMI plus the following lifestyle habits: smoking, alcohol intake and physical inactivity.
*Statistically significant PR ($p < 0.05$).

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to evaluate the association between ERI at work, HbA1c concentration and prediabetes prevalence in a prospective cohort study. Results showed that the prevalence of prediabetes was higher in women exposed to ERI at work, compared to unexposed women. This association was robust to adjustment for sociodemographics, anthropometrics and lifestyle risk factors. Furthermore, women exposed to low rewards at work also had an increased prevalence of prediabetes.

The evidence on the adverse effect of psychosocial stressors at work on prediabetes is scarce. Previous cross-sectional studies on ERI and prediabetes reported conflicting results, which are likely due to the small sample sizes (35, 36). The only previous prospective study on ERI and prediabetes, by De Souza et al., found no association (13). The relatively low participation rate reported in this cohort could have led to a healthy worker selection effect and might have contributed to this null finding. Furthermore, the 4-year follow-up might not have been the optimal windows at risk to capture the adverse effect of ERI on prediabetes. Inadequate period at risk could also lead to a potential underestimation of the effect. Indeed, previous studies suggest that an induction period of several years is likely for psychosocial stressors at work to have an effect of cardiometabolic outcomes. The present study is consistent with this hypothesis suggesting an association between ERI at work and the subsequent prevalence of prediabetes assessed 16 years later, among women.

Results of the present study are in line with previous literature, which reported a stronger and more consistent association between psychosocial stressors at work and T2DM among

women (8, 13). A recent systematic review and meta-analysis evaluated the effect of ERI on T2DM incidence. In this review, T2DM incidence was higher in workers exposed to a high ERI (RR=1.24, 95 % CI : 1.08-1.42). Given the small number of individual studies on ERI and T2DM (n=4), the results of this meta-analysis were not stratified by sex. However, this previous systematic review also examined the effect of job strain, another work stressor, and reported a stronger and more consistent effect among women. Several hypotheses are put forward to explain the possibility for a sex-specific effect of psychosocial stressors at work on glucose metabolism imbalances. Previous evidence observed that both work-family conflict and total workload (i.e. paid and unpaid work) are higher among women than their male counterparts (37). Moreover, evidence suggests that combining psychosocial stressors at work and high family responsibilities leads to an increase in blood pressure (38). Biological responses to chronic stressors might also differ across sexes. Previous studies showed that women exposed to such stressful situations had steeper psychoneuroendocrine activation (39), including higher cortisol hormone secretion(40) than men. However, further examinations of sex (biological) and gender (socio-cultural) differences are required.

In the present study, no association was observed between ERI and mean HbA1c concentration. To our knowledge, there was no previous prospective study that has examined the effect of ERI at work on mean HbA1c concentration levels. However, previous cross-sectional studies found significant associations between ERI and both prediabetes prevalence and HbA1c concentration (34, 36, 41). These conflicting results highlight the need for further quality prospective research on the association between ERI exposure and this important biomarker of glucose metabolism.

Limitations should be acknowledged. First, the present study relied on a convenience sample comprising of workers who were still active who recently retired at the last follow-up. Thus, the possibility of a selection bias cannot be ruled out. In occupational studies, the healthy worker selection effect is well documented and leads to an underestimation of the true effect. This bias arises when less healthy workers are more likely to quit or change their job than healthier workers (42). However, high participation at each time reduced the possibility for such bias. If any, our comparison analysis suggests that the presence of a selection bias would have led to an underestimation of the effect. Second, HbA1c and prediabetes were assessed at the last follow-up only. Therefore, causal inferences cannot be made. However, previous studies have reported the adverse effect of ERI on T2DM incidence and do not suggest a strong possibility for reverse causation to explain the observed associations. Moreover, the outcome of interest was measured 16 years after assessing ERI exposure, which makes reverse causality unlikely. In the present study, diet was assessed only at the last follow-up, using the alternative healthy eating index (aHEI) among participants who agreed to answer this questionnaire (71,4%). In a sensitivity analysis, we have restricted the study sample to those with available information on diet. Estimates with and without adjustment for diet were identical, minimizing the possibility for residual confounding (not shown). However, this result should be interpreted with caution given that the temporal precedence of diet on prediabetes assessment was not respected. Lastly, the cohort involves white-collar workers, which limits generalization of the findings to workers with similar conditions. However, the participants in the present study held a diversity of white-collar occupations such as office workers, technicians, professionals and managers. Moreover, a majority of workers in OECD countries hold white-collar occupations, supporting generalization to a considerable section of the workforce (43).

Strengths should also be mentioned. First, the association between ERI at work, HbA1c concentration and prediabetes prevalence was examined in a long-term prospective study composed of women and men. Second, a large number of potential confounders were considered, and selected according to a direct acyclic graph (Annex A), in line with recent epidemiological recommendations (44). Third, a sequential adjustment was used to account for the possible role of lifestyle habits as a mediating factor. The estimates did not change after adjusting for lifestyle habits, suggesting that their role as mediators is minor. Lastly, ERI at work, HbA1c and other clinical measurements were performed using validated questionnaires and protocols.

The results of the present study suggest that, among women, ERI at work is associated with a higher prevalence of prediabetes. Prediabetes is on the continuum between normal glucose metabolism and T2DM. Since it is a reversible condition (45), early interventions have the potential to delay and prevent T2DM (46). Heightened understanding of the impact of adverse psychosocial stressors at work, including ERI at work, is paramount to improve primary prevention. Screening for psychosocial stressors at work may also be relevant to identify patients at risk of developing prediabetes. In recent years, non-pharmacological treatment options are considered as the standard of care in prediabetes as well as mild T2DM cases(7) Psychosocial stressors at work are promising targets to intensify non-pharmacological, population-based preventive interventions. As such, results from the present study suggest that workplace interventions tackling ERI at work may reduce the prevalence of prediabetes among women. Previous studies showed that PSW can be reduced through organizational interventions(47) and can provide benefits on workers' cardiovascular health (48). Therefore, reducing the prevalence of ERI exposure should be recognized as an encouraging avenue among prevention efforts aimed at attenuating the burden of glucose metabolism disorders. These results therefore highlight the

need for physicians and occupational health specialists to identify adverse psychosocial stressors at work and to cooperate with employers to implement targeted interventions aiming at decreasing these adverse exposures at work.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effect of exposure to effort-reward imbalance on HbA1c concentration and on the prevalence of prediabetes in a prospective cohort. In women, those exposed to ERI at work had an increased prevalence of prediabetes, when compared to unexposed women. Addressing these widespread and modifiable occupational factors could improve the health of workers. Moreover, establishing workplace interventions aiming at decreasing psychosocial stressors at work may be considered as a promising avenue to reduce the prevalence of prediabetes, among women.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by a grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (grant 57,750). CB was a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Investigator at the time this cohort was initiated, and CR was supported by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research training award when this work was conducted. CR was also supported by training awards from the Fond de Recherche du Quebec en Santé (FRQS) and by VITAM, a research center in sustainable health affiliated with the Centre Intégré Universitaire de Santé et Services Sociaux Capitale-Nationale.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that they have no conflict of interest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Organization WH. Global report on diabetes: World Health Organization; 2016.
2. Cai X, Zhang Y, Li M, Wu JH, Mai L, Li J, et al. Association between prediabetes and risk of all cause mortality and cardiovascular disease: updated meta-analysis. Bmj. 2020;370:m2297.
3. Raghavan S, Vassy JL, Ho YL, Song RJ, Gagnon DR, Cho K, et al. Diabetes Mellitus–Related All‐Cause and Cardiovascular Mortality in a National Cohort of Adults. Journal of the American Heart Association. 2019;8(4):e011295.
4. Echouffo-Tcheugui JB, Narayan KM, Weisman D, Golden SH, Jaar BG. Association between prediabetes and risk of chronic kidney disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Diabet Med. 2016;33(12):1615-24.
5. Huang Y, Cai X, Qiu M, Chen P, Tang H, Hu Y, et al. Prediabetes and the risk of cancer: a meta-analysis. Diabetologia. 2014;57(11):2261-9.
6. Selvin E, Steffes MW, Zhu H, Matsushita K, Wagenknecht L, Pankow J, et al. Glycated Hemoglobin, Diabetes, and Cardiovascular Risk in Nondiabetic Adults. New England Journal of Medicine. 2010;362(9):800-11.
7. Galaviz KI, Weber MB, Suvada KB, Gujral UP, Wei J, Merchant R, et al. Interventions for Reversing Prediabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Am J Prev Med. 2022;62(4):614-25.
8. Pena-Gralle APB, Talbot D, Duchaine CS, Lavigne-Robichaud M, Trudel X, Aubé K, et al. Job strain and effort-reward imbalance as risk factors for type 2 diabetes mellitus: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health. 2022;48(1):5-20.
9. Nyberg ST, Fransson EI, Heikkila K, Ahola K, Alfredsson L, Bjorner JB, et al. Job strain as a risk factor for type 2 diabetes: a pooled analysis of 124,808 men and women. Diabetes Care. 2014;37(8):2268-75.
10. Karasek RA, Theorell T. Healthy work: stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life. New-York: Basic Books; 1990.
11. Karasek R. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign. Adm Sci Quaterly. 1979;24:285-308.
12. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. J Occup Health Psychol. 1996;1(1):27-41.
13. de Souza Santos R, Härter Griep R, Mendes da Fonseca MJ, Chor D, Santos IS, Melo ECP. Combined Use of Job Stress Models and the Incidence of Glycemic Alterations (Prediabetes and Diabetes): Results from ELSA-Brasil Study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(5).
14. Schmidt MI, Duncan BB, Mill JG, Lotufo PA, Chor D, Barreto SM, et al. Cohort Profile: Longitudinal Study of Adult Health (ELSA-Brasil). International journal of epidemiology. 2015;44(1):68-75.
15. Choi B, Schnall P, Landsbergis P, Dobson M, Ko S, Gómez-Ortiz V, et al. Recommendations for individual participant data meta-analyses on work stressors and health outcomes: comments on IPD-Work Consortium papers. Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health. 2015;41(3):299-311.

16. Taouk Y, Spittal MJ, LaMontagne AD, Milner AJ. Psychosocial work stressors and risk of all-cause and coronary heart disease mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health. 2020;46(1):19-31.
17. Trudel X, Gilbert-Ouimet M, Milot A, Duchaine CS, Vézina M, Laurin D, et al. Cohort Profile: The PROspective Québec (PROQ) Study on Work and Health. International journal of epidemiology. 2018;47(3):693-i.
18. Niedhammer I, Siegrist J, Landre M-F, Goldberg M, Leclerc A. Étude des qualités psychométriques de la version française du modèle du Déséquilibre Efforts/Récompenses. Revue d'épidémiologie et de santé publique. 2000;48(5):419-38.
19. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. Journal of occupational health psychology. 1996;1(1):27.
20. Siegrist J, Starke D, Chandola T, Godin I, Marmot M, Niedhammer I, et al. The measurement of effort-reward imbalance at work: European comparisons. Soc Sci Med. 2004;58(8):1483-99.
21. Karasek R. Job Content Questionnaire user's guide. Department of Work Environemnt. 1985.
22. Brisson C, Blanchette C, Guimont C, Dion G, Moisan J, Vézina M, et al. Reliability and validity of the French version of the 18-item Karasek Job Content Questionnaire. Work & Stress. 1998;12(4):322-36.
23. Aboa-Eboule C, Brisson C, Blanchette C, Maunsell E, Bourbonnais R, Abdous B, et al. Effort-reward imbalance at work and psychological distress: a validation study of post-myocardial infarction patients. Psychosom Med. 2011;73(6):448-55.
24. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes Care. 2010;33 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S62-9.
25. Weitkunat R, Coggins CRE, Sponsiello-Wang Z, Kallischnigg G, Dempsey R. Assessment of Cigarette Smoking in Epidemiologic Studies. Beiträge zur Tabakforschung International/Contributions to Tobacco Research. 2013;25(7):638-48.
26. Gionet NJ, Godin G. Self-reported exercise behavior of employees: a validity study. J Occup Med. 1989;31(12):969-73.
27. Santé Québec, Daveluy, C., Chenard, L., Levasseur, M. et Emond, A. (sous la direction de) Et votre cœur, ça va? Enquête québécoise sur la santé cardiovasculaire 1990, Montréal, ministère de la santé et des services sociaux, gouvernement du Québec, 1994.
28. Frohlich ED. Recommendations for human blood pressure determination by sphygmomanometers. Circulation. 1988;77(2):501A-14A.
29. Lumley T, Kronmal R, Ma S. Relative risk regression in medical research: models, contrasts, estimators, and algorithms. 2006.
30. Heikkilä K, Fransson EI, Nyberg ST, Zins M, Westerlund H, Westerholm P, et al. Job strain and health-related lifestyle: findings from an individual-participant meta-analysis of 118 000 working adults. 2013;103(11):2090-7.
31. Heikkilä K, Nyberg ST, Fransson EI, Alfredsson L, De Bacquer D, Bjorner JB, et al. Job strain and tobacco smoking: an individual-participant data meta-analysis of 166,130 adults in 15 European studies. PloS one. 2012;7(7):e35463.

32. Heikkilä K, Nyberg ST, Fransson EI, Alfredsson L, De Bacquer D, Bjorner JB, et al. Job strain and alcohol intake: a collaborative meta-analysis of individual-participant data from 140,000 men and women. PloS one. 2012;7(7):e40101.
33. Fransson EI, Heikkilä K, Nyberg ST, Zins M, Westerlund H, Westerholm P, et al. Job strain as a risk factor for leisure-time physical inactivity: an individual-participant meta-analysis of up to 170,000 men and women: the IPD-Work Consortium. American journal of epidemiology. 2012;176(12):1078-89.
34. Xu W, Hang J, Gao W, Zhao Y, Li W, Wang X, et al. Association between effort-reward imbalance and glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) among Chinese workers: results from SHISO study. International archives of occupational and environmental health. 2012;85(2):215-20.
35. Reynolds RY. Prevalence and characteristics of prediabetes in workers in industry. J Adv Nurs. 2020;76(3):803-13.
36. Li J, Jarczok MN, Loerbroks A, Schöllgen I, Siegrist J, Bosch JA, et al. Work stress is associated with diabetes and prediabetes: cross-sectional results from the MIPH Industrial Cohort Studies. Int J Behav Med. 2013;20(4):495-503.
37. Griep RH, Toivanen S, van Diepen C, Guimarães JMN, Camelo LV, Juvanhol LL, et al. Work-Family Conflict and Self-Rated Health: the Role of Gender and Educational Level. Baseline Data from the Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Adult Health (ELSA-Brasil). Int J Behav Med. 2016;23(3):372-82.
38. Fadel M, Li J, Sembajwe G, Gagliardi D, Pico F, Ozguler A, et al. Cumulative Exposure to Long Working Hours and Occurrence of Ischemic Heart Disease: Evidence From the CONSTANCES Cohort at Inception. J Am Heart Assoc. 2020:e015753.
39. Rohleder N, Kudielka BM, Hellhammer DH, Wolf JM, Kirschbaum C. Age and sex steroid-related changes in glucocorticoid sensitivity of pro-inflammatory cytokine production after psychosocial stress. Journal of neuroimmunology. 2002;126(1-2):69-77.
40. Maina G, Palmas A, Bovenzi M, Filon FL. Salivary cortisol and psychosocial hazards at work. American journal of industrial medicine. 2009;52(3):251-60.
41. Jarczok MN, Koenig J, Li J, Mauss D, Hoffmann K, Schmidt B, et al. The Association of Work Stress and Glycemic Status Is Partially Mediated by Autonomic Nervous System Function: Cross-Sectional Results from the Mannheim Industrial Cohort Study (MICS). PloS one. 2016;11(8):e0160743.
42. Kachi Y, Inoue A, Eguchi H, Kawakami N, Shimazu A, Tsutsumi A. Occupational stress and the risk of turnover: a large prospective cohort study of employees in Japan. BMC Public Health. 2020;20(1):174.
43. Chen W-H, Mehdi T. Assessing job quality in Canada: A multidimensional approach. Canadian Public Policy. 2019;45(2):173-91.
44. Rothman KJ, Lash TL, VanderWeele TJ, Haneuse S. Modern epidemiology. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer / Lippincott Williams & Wilkins ;; 2021. Available from: https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&NEWS=n&CSC=Y&PAGE=booktext&D=books&AN=02211188$&XPATH=/PG(0)&EPUB=Y https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=3241828.

45. Morris DH, Khunti K, Achana F, Srinivasan B, Gray LJ, Davies MJ, et al. Progression rates from HbA1c 6.0-6.4% and other prediabetes definitions to type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. Diabetologia. 2013;56(7):1489-93.
46. Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada, Donovan D, McDowell I, Hunter D. AFMC Primer on Population Health: A Virtual Textbook on Public Health Concepts for Clinicians. AFMC Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada; 2013.
47. Letellier MC, Duchaine CS, Aubé K, Talbot D, Mantha-Bélisle MM, Sultan-Taïeb H, et al. Evaluation of the Quebec Healthy Enterprise Standard: Effect on Adverse Psychosocial Work Factors and Psychological Distress. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2018;15(3).
48. Trudel X, Gilbert-Ouimet M, Vézina M, Talbot D, Mâsse B, Milot A, et al. Effectiveness of a workplace intervention reducing psychosocial stressors at work on blood pressure and hypertension. Occupational and environmental medicine. 2021;78(10):738-44.



[1] Participants missing the necessary information to be re-contacted at follow-up
[2] 8120/9071=89.52% of eligible at T2; 8120/9188=88.38% of baseline
[3] Employment status according to the self-report questionnaire at T2 (question 44): n = 6902 active (6258 permanent employment, 550 occasional, contractual or seasonal, 53 self-employed, 41 others); n = 1218 inactive (1154 retirees, 8 interns or students, 54 unemployed, 2 long-term illness or prolonged disability)
[4] 8120 + 13 + 194 + 744=9071
[5] 6744/8336=80.90% of eligible at T3; 6744/9188=73.40% of baseline
[6] 37 participants seen in-person could not answer the self-report questionnaire (eg: MoCa <18, blind, physical limitations)
[7] 1149 participants only answered a short form of the self-report questionnaire
[8] 788 participants answered the standard or short form of the self-report questionnaire by post and therefore did not have in-person measurements (eg: MoCa, blood pressure, body measurements)
[9] N=1463 had the blood sample taken for glycated among the 2318 workers and new retirees who had yet to be interviewed as of May 9, 2017
[10] Men=3389 (50.3%), Women=3355 (49.7%)

Figure 1. Flowchart of the prospective cohort and the sample for the present study

Annex A: Direct Acyclic Graph (DAG)