1 **Original Article**

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

4

5 Makoto Okawara¹, M.D., Tomohiro Ishimaru¹, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., Seiichiro Tateishi², M.D., Ph.D.,

6 Ayako Hino³, M.D., Ph.D., Mayumi Tsuji⁴, M.D., Ph.D., Akira Ogami⁵, M.D., Ph.D., Tomohisa

7 Nagata⁶, M.D., Ph.D., Shinya Matsuda⁷, M.D., Ph.D., Yoshihisa Fujino¹, M.D., M.P.H., Ph.D., for

8 the CORoNaWork project

9

10 **Author contributions:** Y.F. planned the overall survey; all authors designed the research protocol
11 and questionnaire; M.O. handled the data and conducted statistical analysis with Y.F.; M.O. drafted
12 the initial manuscript; all authors revised and approved the final manuscript.

13

14 **Authors' affiliations:**

15 1 Department of Environmental Epidemiology, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences,
16 University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

17 2 Department of Occupational Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
18 Environmental Health, Japan

19 3 Department of Mental Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
20 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

21 4 Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Occupational and
22 Environmental Health, Japan

23 5 Department of Work Systems and Health, Institute of Industrial Ecological Sciences, University of
24 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

25 6 Department of Occupational Health Practice and Management, Institute of Industrial Ecological
26 Sciences, University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

27 7 Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, School of Medicine, University of
28 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan

29

30 **Corresponding author:**

31 Makoto Okawara, M.D.

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

34 1-1, Iseigaoka, Yahatanishiku, Kitakyushu, 807-8555, Japan

35 Tel: +81-93-691-7401

36 E-mail: makotouoeh@med.uoeh-u.ac.jp

37 **Abstract**

38 **Objectives:** This study examined the relationship between interruption to routine medical care
39 during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic and sickness presenteeism among workers in Japan.

40 **Methods:** A cross-sectional study using data obtained from an internet monitor questionnaire was
41 conducted. Interruption to medical care was defined based on the response “I have not been able to
42 go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled.” The fraction of sickness presenteeism days in
43 the past 30 days was employed as the primary outcome. A fractional logit model was used for
44 analysis to treat bounded data.

45 **Results:** Of the 27,036 participants, 17,526 (65%) were workers who did not require routine medical
46 care, 8,451 (31%) were using medical care as scheduled, and 1,059 (4%) experienced interrupted
47 medical care. The adjusted odds ratio (aOR) of sickness presenteeism was significantly higher
48 among workers who experienced interrupted medical care (3.44; 95% confidence interval [CI]:
49 3.04–3.89) than those who did not require routine medical care. In terms of symptoms, the highest
50 aOR was observed among workers with mental health symptoms (aOR: 5.59, 95% CI: 5.04–6.20).

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

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

54

55 **Introduction**

56 Sickness presenteeism is an increasingly important issue in occupational health. Aronsson
57 defined sickness presenteeism as “people, despite complaints and ill health that should prompt rest
58 and absence from work, still turning up at their jobs”¹. Sickness presenteeism is the result of a choice
59 made by a worker with ill-health, disease, or capacity loss between sickness presenteeism and
60 sickness absence². This decision is influenced by the individual's personality, values, economic
61 status, workplace “demands for presence” and support for adaptation, and national culture and
62 employment customs². Evidence suggests that sickness presenteeism can lead to sickness absence
63 and future worsening of physical and mental health conditions³⁻⁹. In addition, the impact of working
64 while ill on productivity is also gaining attention, especially in North America^{10,11}. A variety of
65 diseases and health conditions have been found to be associated with sickness presenteeism,
66 suggesting the importance of managing disease and maintaining good condition^{4,12}.

67 Under the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, there is concern that both
68 organizational and individual factors will increase sickness presenteeism above that observed under
69 normal conditions¹³⁻¹⁵. Increased workload on workers can lead to a negative work culture around
70 taking sick leave, such as where workers who choose to work while ill are valued for their loyalty to
71 the company and motivation to work, thus promoting sickness presenteeism¹⁶. Examples of

72 individual factors that may increase sickness presenteeism include worsening economic situations
73 and job insecurity; increased telecommuting, which can make it easier for workers to work even
74 while sick; the impact of the pandemic on anxiety and mental health; worsening of health conditions
75 and diseases due to lifestyle changes; and worsening of chronic diseases due to the inability to access
76 medical resources. All of these factors are expected to lead to an increase in sickness presenteeism.

77 Interruption to medical care is an important problem in the COVID-19 pandemic. Access to
78 necessary routine medical care and medical resources is reportedly being affected in many countries
79 around the world¹⁷⁻¹⁹. In Japan, there is data showing that the number of prescriptions issued has
80 decreased²⁰. Interruption to medical care can adversely affect management of chronic diseases and
81 delay the detection and treatment of new diseases²². In fact, excess deaths unrelated to COVID-19
82 have been reported²³. Thus, interruption to medical care during the COVID-19 pandemic may lead to
83 worsening of non-COVID-19 diseases and health conditions.

84 During the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of people working while ill may increase as a
85 result of worsening health conditions arising from treatment interruptions and delays. This may
86 result in an increase in sickness presenteeism. However, few studies have examined the effect of
87 medical care interruption on sickness presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic. We
88 hypothesized that sickness presenteeism has increased among workers who experienced

89 interruptions to their medical care during the COVID-19 pandemic. The purpose of this study was to
 90 examine the association between medical care interruption and sickness presenteeism in Japanese
 91 workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.

92

93 **Materials and Methods**

94 We performed a cross-sectional study based on baseline survey data obtained in the
 95 Collaborative Online Research on the Novel- Coronavirus and Work (CORoNaWork) project, a
 96 prospective cohort study that performed a questionnaire-based survey of Internet monitors to
 97 determine the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on workers' health. Details of the study protocol are
 98 published elsewhere²³. The practical aspects of the survey, namely recruitment, data sampling, initial
 99 data clean-up, and management of respondents' **user identifications (IDs)** for tracking cohort data,
 100 were conducted by Cross Marketing Inc. (Tokyo, Japan), which has 4.7 million registered monitors.
 101 Before completing the online survey, participants read a description of the survey's aims and details
 102 about the handling of their information. Only participants who agreed with the contents of the
 103 description were allowed to participate. Participants' **user IDs** were stored by the survey company.
 104 To participate in surveys offered by the survey company, users had to register in advance. Once
 105 registered, participants were given a **user ID** to use when completing online surveys. Thus, all

106 surveys were conducted anonymously. The survey company assigned each respondent a unique
 107 number that would be used only within this study to merge the data from the first and subsequent
 108 surveys, based on the user ID within the survey company. The user ID is not provided to the
 109 researcher, but the unique number enabled the researcher to merge the data and create the cohort
 110 data. Participants' personal data were anonymized prior to receipt by the researchers, and were
 111 protected based on the survey company's privacy policy. This study was approved by the Ethics
 112 Committee of the University of Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (Approval No.
 113 R2-079 and R3-006).

114 The baseline survey was conducted from December 22 to 26, 2020. A total of 605,381
 115 registered monitors were emailed invitations to participate. Sampling was designed such that sex and
 116 occupation (office and non-office workers) were approximately equal among the five regions of
 117 residence. Specifically, we predetermined a total of 20 units comprising five regions of residence,
 118 two sexes, and two occupations. Sampling was continued until each unit reached 1500 responses
 119 plus a margin of 10%, after which the unit was closed to participation. We devised the five regions
 120 of residence according to infection and geographic status: first, Japan's 47 prefectures were divided
 121 into four categories based on the cumulative COVID-19 infection rate; second, the category with the
 122 highest infection rate was further divided into Kanto and non-Kanto regions. A total of 55,045
 123 participants answered the initial screening questions, of whom 33,302 matched the survey's criteria

124 (worker status, region of residence, sex, and age). Participants answered one questionnaire item per
 125 page, with the overall questionnaire containing 55 pages. Participants could review and change their
 126 responses using the back button. Participants who provided fraudulent responses (n=6,266)
 127 according to the survey company or a predefined definition of a fraudulent response were excluded.
 128 Fraudulent responses included an unusually short response time (below 6 minutes), unusually short
 129 height (below 140 cm), unusually low weight (below 30 kg), varying answers to similar questions in
 130 the survey (e.g., varying answers to questions about marital status or area of residence), and
 131 incorrect answers to tiered questions used to identify inappropriate responses (e.g., choose the third
 132 highest number from the following five numbers). After exclusion, responses from 27,036
 133 participants aged from 20 and 65 years who indicated they were working when completing the
 134 survey were ultimately included in the analysis.

135

136 Assessment of treatment status

137 We assessed the presence of disease and use of medical care using the following question:
 138 “Do you have a disease that requires regular visits to the hospital or treatment?” Responses were “I
 139 do not have any such disease”; “I am able to go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled”; “I
 140 have not been able to go to the hospital or receive treatment as scheduled.”

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

147

148 Assessment of sickness presenteeism and other covariates

149 Respondents’ number of sickness presenteeism days was ascertained based on the following
150 question and used as the primary outcome: “In the last 30 days, how many days have you worked
151 (including work from home) despite feeling that you really should have taken sick leave due to your
152 state of health?”² According to a previous study, the target period for sickness presenteeism can
153 range from four weeks to 12 months.²⁴ We chose a target period of 30 days to reduce the effects of
154 recall bias and changes in the COVID-19 pandemic situation in Japan.

155 Socioeconomic and work-related factors included sex, age, job type (mainly desk work,
156 mainly interpersonal communication, mainly physical work), marital status (married,
157 divorced/deceased, never married), equivalent income (household income divided by the square root

158 of the number of people in the household), education (junior high school, high school, vocational
159 school/junior college/college of technology, university/graduate school), frequency of working from
160 home (at least one day a month, at least one day a week, at least two days a week, at least four days a
161 week), company size (total number of employees in the respondent's main place of work [1 for
162 self-employed]), presence of a policy by the employer requesting that employees refrain from
163 attending work while ill (yes or no), and the number of days worked per week.

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

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

171

172 Statistical analysis

173 Age was treated as a continuous variable and reported as mean and standard deviation (SD).

174 The number of sickness presenteeism days was treated as a discrete variable and converted to a

175 fractional response variable by dividing by the maximum value of 30 days. Categorical variables

176 were reported as number and percentage. Equivalent income was categorized into quartiles.

177 We compared the results of Poisson regression, Zero-inflated Poisson regression (ZIP),

178 negative binomial regression, Zero-inflated Negative Binomial regression (ZINB), and fractional

179 logistic regression as statistical models. To handle data with excess zeros, which indicates a

180 population at low risk of sickness presenteeism, we considered a zero-inflated model²⁴. Fractional

181 logistic regression²⁶ was also considered because the maximum possible number of days of sickness

182 presenteeism was 30, allowing the data to be treated as bounded data. As a measure of model fitness,

183 we compared the Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), and ultimately adopted the fractional logit

184 model.

185 Fractional logistic regression analysis was conducted with the fraction of sickness

186 presenteeism days in last 30 days (0 indicates 0 days of sickness presenteeism; 1 indicates 30 days of

187 sickness presenteeism) as the dependent variable and the respondents' category of treatment status as

188 an independent variable.

189 We adjusted for the following potential confounders: sex, age, job type, marital status,
190 equivalent income, education, frequency of working from home, company size, cumulative infection
191 rate by prefecture, main symptoms, presence of a policy by the employer requesting that employees
192 refrain from attending work while ill, and the number of days worked per week.

193 In further analysis, we estimated the margins of sickness presenteeism days for each
194 treatment status and symptom. First, we used the same statistical model as that in the main analysis.
195 Second, we calculated the predictive margins of sickness presenteeism days, substituting measured
196 values for other covariates, dividing the data into 36 groups (3 treatment statuses and 12
197 symptoms)²⁷. In the fractional logit model, because predictive margins were calculated as fractions,
198 we multiplied margins and standard errors by 30 to obtain predictive margins for sickness
199 presenteeism days in the last 30 days. Preliminarily, we confirmed the simple main effects for each
200 treatment status compared to workers who did not require routine medical care by adding the
201 interaction term between treatment status and symptoms to the model used for the main analysis. For
202 all analyses, the Bonferroni method was used to adjust for multiple comparisons.

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

205

206 **Results**

207 The demographic and sociological characteristics of the analyzed population are shown in
 208 Table 1. A total of 13,814 (51%) were men, and the mean age was 47.0 years (SD: 10.5). Of the total
 209 population, 17,526 (65%) were workers who did not require routine medical care, 8,451 (31%) were
 210 using medical care as scheduled, and 1,059 (4%) experienced interrupted medical care. The
 211 distribution of sickness presenteeism is shown for the three treatment statuses in a histogram in
 212 Figure 1. While the majority of respondents reported zero days of sickness presenteeism, a large
 213 number also selected the maximum of 30 days. There were also small clusters at 5, 10, and 20 days,
 214 which may be due to digit preference.

215 The association between treatment status and the fraction of sickness presenteeism days is
 216 shown in Table 2. There was a significant association between the fraction of sickness presenteeism
 217 days and treatment status. After adjusting for other covariates in the multivariate model, the odds
 218 ratio (aOR) of sickness presenteeism days was significantly higher among workers who used
 219 medical care (aOR: 1.36, 95%CI: 1.26–1.46, $p<0.001$) and workers who experienced interrupted
 220 medical care (aOR: 3.28, 95%CI: 2.93–3.67, $p<0.001$) compared to workers who did not require
 221 routine medical care.

222 The association between participants' main symptoms and the fraction of sickness
223 presenteeism days is shown in Table 3. There were significant associations between the fraction of
224 sickness presenteeism days and some symptoms using the model presented in Table 2. The highest
225 OR of sickness presenteeism days was observed for mental health symptoms (aOR: 5.35, 95% CI:
226 4.85–5.91, $p<0.001$).

227 The predictive margins of sickness presenteeism days for each treatment status and
228 symptom are shown in Table 4 and Figure 2. When the analysis was performed based on the three
229 treatment statuses, irrespective of symptom, the predictive margin of sickness presenteeism days
230 among workers who experienced interrupted medical care was 6.6 days (standard error [SE]=0.25),
231 while that among workers who did not require routine medical care was 1.4 days (SE=0.03). When
232 the analysis was performed based on the 36 treatment-symptom groups (3 treatment statuses and 12
233 symptoms), the largest predictive margin of sickness presenteeism days was observed for mental
234 health symptoms AND interrupted medical care (predictive margin: 9.9 days, SE=0.38). The simple
235 effect comparisons test, which included the interaction term between treatment status and symptoms,
236 showed that there were significant differences between workers with the same symptoms who did
237 and did not require routine medical care, and between workers with the same symptoms who
238 experienced interruption to medical care and who did not require routine medical care. For example,
239 the fraction of sickness presenteeism days significantly differed between those with mental health

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

242

243 **Discussion**

244 This study demonstrated an association between treatment interruption and sickness
245 presenteeism among Japanese workers during the country's third wave of the COVID-19 pandemic.
246 Compared to workers who did not require routine medical care, workers who had diseases that
247 required routine medical care reported more days of sickness presenteeism, and those who
248 experienced interrupted medical care reported even more such days. Furthermore, our findings
249 revealed that there may be some symptoms that are more likely to lead to sickness presenteeism.

250 We found that workers who experienced interrupted medical care had increased sickness
251 presenteeism. This is because appropriate treatment can improve work function and productivity by
252 improving workers' health and subjective symptoms^{10,28}. Employees who experience interrupted
253 treatment for chronic diseases may be forced to return to work due to fear of being laid off,
254 depending on the financial situation of their workplace during the pandemic. It is important to
255 continue regular treatments to manage disease and maintain health²⁹ to prevent inappropriate
256 presence at work while ill.

257 We found that the proportion of sickness presenteeism days varies by the type of symptoms
 258 experienced by workers. While ORs among workers with symptoms related to mental health
 259 problems, loss of energy/fever, body movement, and sleep were high, those among workers with
 260 nose and skin, hair, beauty symptoms were moderate. Sickness presenteeism is the result of a
 261 worker's choice to attend work despite being unwell rather than being absent from work. Many
 262 previous studies conducted mainly in Europe have evaluated "sickness presenteeism" as a health
 263 behavior based on whether or not workers "worked one or more days in a certain period of time with
 264 a health condition for which they think they really should be absent"^{2,30}. This is in contrast to studies
 265 of "presenteeism" in North America, where the concept is evaluated as productivity loss due to
 266 illness or a health condition using the Work Limitations Questionnaire or other tools^{10,31}. One reason
 267 as to why sickness presenteeism is more likely to be reported by workers experiencing mental health
 268 problems may be that these symptoms are severe enough to cause "health conditions for which they
 269 think they really should be absent." In contrast, physical symptoms such as those of allergic rhinitis
 270 may not be considered "health conditions for which they think they really should be absent"
 271 regardless of severity. If workers themselves do not consider their symptoms to be "health conditions
 272 for which they think they really should be absent," they may not report experiencing sickness
 273 presenteeism. However, there may be cases in which workers do not deem it necessary to be absent
 274 from work, despite having a symptom that reduces productivity. Allergies with nose-related

275 symptoms are one example that causes loss of productivity due to presenteeism^{11,32}. Workers may
 276 not link these symptoms to sickness presenteeism due to differences in interpretation of “health
 277 conditions that require absence from work.” This is an important point when evaluating “sickness
 278 presenteeism” as a health behavior.

279 We also found that the impact of continuing treatment on the prevention of sickness
 280 presenteeism varied by symptom. Sickness presenteeism was more frequent in workers with
 281 treatment interruption and symptoms related to pain, tightness and loss of energy, toileting and
 282 elimination, mental health, sleep, and eyes than those who did not require routine medical care.
 283 Among those who reported toileting and elimination, sleep, and eye symptoms, there was no
 284 difference in sickness presenteeism between workers who used medical care and those who did not
 285 require routine medical care. This suggests the importance of continuing necessary routine medical
 286 care for preventing sickness presenteeism due to these symptoms. For those with pain, tightness and
 287 loss of energy, and mental health symptoms, sickness presenteeism remained high even with
 288 continued treatment, indicating the need to identify appropriate treatment and manage one’s daily
 289 health condition in addition to continuing treatment. Meanwhile, the prevalence of sickness
 290 presenteeism was comparable among treatment statuses for participants with movement and mobility,
 291 nose, and ear symptoms. This may be because individuals may not consider these symptoms
 292 sufficiently adverse to engage in sickness presenteeism, or may experience chronic symptoms for

293 which support and adaptive behaviors have already been put into place such as movement symptoms.

294 The impact of continuing treatment on sickness presenteeism may be related to whether an

295 individual considers their symptoms to be sufficiently adverse to require an absence from work, or

296 whether or not the symptoms can be improved with treatment.

297 There are several limitations to this study. First, since this study is a survey of Internet

298 monitors, limitations regarding selection bias and generalizability are unavoidable. To reduce

299 potential bias, sampling and recruitment were conducted according to occupation and sex in each

300 region and the COVID-19 infection rate. To understand the characteristics of the target population of

301 this survey, we compared the results with those of national surveys and occupational surveys using

302 various batteries²³. Second, we did not obtain detailed information related to treatment interruptions,

303 including the type of disease, duration, and reasons for interruption. We were thus unable to

304 determine whether the reason for interruption to treatment was due to patient-related reasons (e.g.,

305 economic situation and anxiety) or hospital-related reasons (e.g., schedule adjustment). Additionally,

306 the questions we used to identify exposure factors were related to the presence or absence of diseases

307 that require hospital visits and use of medical care. However, sickness presenteeism is not just

308 related to disease and medical status, but also a wide range of health conditions or concerns. Third,

309 interruptions to treatment may be the result of better disease control and improved health. It is

310 unclear how these factors would affect the occurrence of sickness presenteeism. Fourth, because this

311 study examined sickness presenteeism among workers during the third wave of the COVID-19
 312 pandemic in Japan, caution is needed when interpreting the results. Further, causality is unclear. For
 313 example, because most workers were told to remain home if they were experiencing COVID-like
 314 symptoms during the pandemic, sickness presenteeism may have been reduced during this period.
 315 However, it is unclear how such instructions affected overall sickness presenteeism, including that
 316 associated with symptoms unrelated to COVID-19. Finally, we did not consider all possible
 317 confounders affecting sickness presenteeism because we did not obtain information on some
 318 confounders, such as job insecurity, annual leave rights, and the culture around employment and sick
 319 leave in each company.

320

321 **Conclusion**

322 Interruption to medical care was associated with the occurrence of sickness presenteeism
 323 during Japan's third wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. While the occurrence of sickness
 324 presenteeism largely differed according to symptoms, it may be possible that there were important
 325 cases of sickness presenteeism that were undetectable using the questionnaire. This study
 326 demonstrates the importance of maintaining one's health condition and continuing necessary
 327 treatment even during an infectious disease pandemic.

328

329 **Acknowledgements:**

330 This study was supported and partly funded by research grants from the University of
 331 Occupational and Environmental Health, Japan (no grant number); the Japanese Ministry of Health,
 332 Labour and Welfare (grant numbers H30-josei-ippan-002, H30-roudou-ippan-007, 19JA1004,
 333 20JA1006, 210301-1, and 20HB1004); Anshin Zaidan (no grant number); the Collabo-Health Study
 334 Group (no grant number); and Hitachi Systems, Ltd. (no grant number); and scholarship donations
 335 from Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd. (no grant number).

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

343

344 **Disclosure:**

345 Ethics Approval: This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Occupational

346 and Environmental Health, Japan (reference No. R2-079 and R3-006).

347 Informed Consent: Informed consent was obtained using a form on the survey website.

348 Registry and the Registration No. of the study/Trial: N/A

349 Animal Studies: N/A

350 Conflict of Interest: None declared.

351

352 References

- 353 1. Aronsson G, Gustafsson K, Dallner M. Sick but yet at work. An empirical study of sickness
354 presenteeism. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2000;54(7):502-509.
- 355 2. Aronsson G, Gustafsson K. Sickness presenteeism: prevalence, attendance-pressure factors, and
356 an outline of a model for research. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2005;47(9):958-966.
- 357 3. Skagen K, Collins AM. The consequences of sickness presenteeism on health and wellbeing
358 over time: A systematic review. *Soc Sci Med*. 2016;161:169-177.
- 359 4. Johns G. Presenteeism in the workplace: A review and research agenda. *J Organ Behav*.
360 2010;31(4):519-542.
- 361 5. Kivimäki M, Head J, Ferrie JE, et al. Working while ill as a risk factor for serious coronary
362 events: the Whitehall II study. *Am J Public Health*. 2005;95(1):98-102.
- 363 6. Janssens H, Clays E, De Clercq B, De Bacquer D, Braeckman L. The relation between
364 presenteeism and different types of future sickness absence. *J Occup Health*.
365 2013;55(3):132-141.
- 366 7. Bergström G, Bodin L, Hagberg J, Aronsson G, Josephson M. Sickness presenteeism today,
367 sickness absenteeism tomorrow? A prospective study on sickness presenteeism and future
368 sickness absenteeism. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2009;51(6):629-638.
- 369 8. Gustafsson K, Marklund S. Associations between health and combinations of sickness presence
370 and absence. *Occup Med* . 2014;64(1):49-55.
- 371 9. Gustafsson K, Marklund S. Consequences of sickness presence and sickness absence on health
372 and work ability: a Swedish prospective cohort study. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health*.
373 2011;24(2):153-165.
- 374 10. Schultz AB, Chen C-Y, Edington DW. The cost and impact of health conditions on
375 presenteeism to employers: a review of the literature. *Pharmacoeconomics*.
376 2009;27(5):365-378.
- 377 11. Nagata T, Mori K, Ohtani M, et al. Total Health-Related Costs Due to Absenteeism,
378 Presenteeism, and Medical and Pharmaceutical Expenses in Japanese Employers. *J Occup*
379 *Environ Med*. 2018;60(5):e273-e280.
- 380 12. Burton WN, Pransky G, Conti DJ, Chen C-Y, Edington DW. The association of medical

- 381 conditions and presenteeism. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2004;46(6 Suppl):S38-45.
- 382 13. Reuter M, Dragano N, Wahrendorf M. Working while sick in context of regional
383 unemployment: a Europe-wide cross-sectional study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.
384 2021;75(6):574-580.
- 385 14. Tilchin C, Dayton L, Latkin CA. Socioeconomic Factors Associated With an Intention to Work
386 While Sick From COVID-19. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2021;63(5):363-368.
- 387 15. Kinman G, Grant C. Presenteeism during the COVID-19 pandemic: risks and solutions. *Occup*
388 *Med* . Published online November 18, 2020. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqaa193
- 389 16. Kinman G. Sickness presenteeism at work: prevalence, costs and management. *Br Med Bull*.
390 2019;129(1):69-78.
- 391 17. Das AK, Mishra DK, Gopalan SS. Reduced access to care among older American adults during
392 CoVID-19 pandemic: results from a prospective cohort study. *bioRxiv*. Published online
393 November 30, 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.11.29.20240317
- 394 18. Czeisler MÉ, Mpp KM, Clarke KEN, et al. Delay or avoidance of medical care because of
395 COVID-19-related concerns —. doi:10.1101/2020.04.22.20076141v1
- 396 19. van Ballegooijen H, Goossens L, Bruin RH, Michels R, Krol M. Concerns, quality of life,
397 access to care and productivity of the general population during the first 8 weeks of the
398 coronavirus lockdown in Belgium and the Netherlands. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):227.
- 399 20. Lopresti M Seo T Sato. Pandemics and access to care: use of real-world DATA to examine the
400 IMPACT of COVID - 19 on pharmacy visits in Japan. *Value Health*.
401 doi:10.1016/j.jval.2020.08.1707
- 402 21. Erol MK, Kayıkçıoğlu M, Kılıçkap M, et al. Treatment delays and in-hospital outcomes in acute
403 myocardial infarction during the COVID-19 pandemic: A nationwide study. *Anatol J Cardiol*.
404 2020;24(5):334-342.
- 405 22. Woolf SH, Chapman DA, Sabo RT, Weinberger DM, Hill L. Excess Deaths From COVID-19
406 and Other Causes, March-April 2020. *JAMA*. 2020;324(5):510-513.
- 407 23. Fujino Y, Ishimaru T, Eguchi H, et al. Protocol for a nationwide Internet-based health survey in
408 workers during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. *bioRxiv*. Published online February 5, 2021.

409 doi:10.1101/2021.02.02.21249309

410 24. Navarro A, Salas-Nicás S, Llorens C, Moncada S, Molinero-Ruíz E, Moriña D. Sickness
411 presenteeism: Are we sure about what we are studying? A research based on a literature review
412 and an empirical illustration. *Am J Ind Med*. 2019;62(7):580-589.

413 25. Papke LE, Wooldridge JM. Econometric methods for fractional response variables with an
414 application to 401(k) plan participation rates. *J Appl Econ*. 1996;11(6):619-632.

415 26. Williams R. Using the Margins Command to Estimate and Interpret Adjusted Predictions and
416 Marginal Effects. *Stata J*. 2012;12(2):308-331.

417 27. Burton WN, Morrison A, Wertheimer AI. Pharmaceuticals and worker productivity loss: a
418 critical review of the literature. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2003;45(6):610-621.

419 28. Chudasama YV, Gillies CL, Zaccardi F, et al. Impact of COVID-19 on routine care for chronic
420 diseases: A global survey of views from healthcare professionals. *Diabetes Metab Syndr*.
421 2020;14(5):965-967.

422 29. Hansen CD, Andersen JH. Going ill to work--what personal circumstances, attitudes and
423 work-related factors are associated with sickness presenteeism? *Soc Sci Med*.
424 2008;67(6):956-964.

425 30. Ishimaru T, Mine Y, Fujino Y. Two definitions of presenteeism: sickness presenteeism and
426 impaired work function. *Occup Med* . 2020;70(2):95-100.

427

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, mean (SD)	47.0 (10.5)	45.4 (10.5)	50.4 (9.8)	46.0 (10.2)
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)				
≤2500000	6859 (25.4%)	4,374 (25.0%)	2,147 (25.4%)	338 (31.9%)
2500001-3800000	7148 (26.4%)	4,777 (27.3%)	2,119 (25.1%)	252 (23.8%)
3800001-5250000	7002 (25.9%)	4,594 (26.2%)	2,167 (25.6%)	241 (22.8%)
>5250000	6027 (22.3%)	3,781 (21.6%)	2,018 (23.9%)	228 (21.5%)
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%)

University or graduate school	13171 (48.7%)	8523 (48.6%)	4147 (49.1%)	501 (47.3%)
Number of employees				
1	2,556 (9.5%)	1,625 (9.3%)	848 (10.0%)	83 (7.8%)
2-49	7,999 (29.6%)	5,378 (30.7%)	2,320 (27.5%)	301 (28.4%)
50-999	9,703 (35.9%)	6,262 (35.7%)	3,036 (35.9%)	405 (38.2%)
1000-9999	4,719 (17.5%)	2,986 (17.0%)	1,552 (18.4%)	181 (17.1%)
≥10000	2,059 (7.6%)	1,275 (7.3%)	695 (8.2%)	89 (8.4%)
Frequency of working from home				
Almost zero	21,276 (78.7%)	13,944 (79.6%)	6,484 (76.7%)	848 (80.1%)
At least 1 day a month	615 (2.3%)	370 (2.1%)	217 (2.6%)	28 (2.6%)
At least 1 day a week	878 (3.2%)	571 (3.3%)	277 (3.3%)	30 (2.8%)
At least 2 days a week	1,477 (5.5%)	915 (5.2%)	501 (5.9%)	61 (5.8%)
At least 4 days a week	2,790 (10.3%)	1,726 (9.8%)	972 (11.5%)	92 (8.7%)
Presence of a policy by the employer requesting that employees refrain from attending work while ill, Yes	20,230 (74.8%)	13,057 (74.5%)	6,484 (76.7%)	689 (65.1%)

SD: standard deviation

Table 2. Association between treatment status and sickness presenteeism

Treatment status	Univariate				Multivariate*			
	OR	95% CI		<i>p</i>	Adjusted OR	95% CI		<i>p</i>
Workers who did not require routine medical care	Reference				Reference			
Workers who used medical care	1.57	1.47	1.69	<0.001	1.36	1.26	1.46	<0.001
Workers who experienced interrupted medical care	5.75	5.16	6.40	<0.001	3.28	2.93	3.67	<0.001

*Adjusted for sex, age, marital status, equivalent income, education, company size, job type, frequency of working from home, number of days worked per week, presence of a policy by the employer requesting that employees refrain from attending work while ill, cumulative infection rate for COVID-19 in the region of residence, and main symptom.

OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval

Table 3. Association between main symptoms and sickness presenteeism

Main symptom	Adjusted* OR	95% CI		<i>p</i>
No problem	Reference			
Pain	2.76	2.46	3.10	<0.001
Movement	3.02	2.57	3.55	<0.001
Tightness, loss of energy, appetite, fever, dizziness, or feeling poor	4.53	4.05	5.06	<0.001
Toileting or elimination	2.62	2.14	3.21	<0.001
Mental health	5.35	4.85	5.91	<0.001
Skin, hair, or beauty	1.96	1.60	2.39	<0.001
Sleep	3.07	2.73	3.45	<0.001
Eyes	2.01	1.74	2.31	<0.001
Nose	1.54	1.09	2.17	0.014
Ears	2.35	1.74	3.18	<0.001
Other	2.58	2.22	3.00	<0.001

*Adjusted for sex, age, marital status, equivalent income, education, company size, job type, frequency of working from home, number of days worked per week, presence of a policy by the employer requesting that employees refrain from attending work while ill, cumulative infection rate for COVID-19 in the region of residence, and treatment status.

OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval

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	%	Predictive margins*	Standard error	n	%	Predictive margins*	Standard error	<i>p</i> †	n	%	Predictive margins*	Standard error	<i>p</i> †
Total	17526	100	1.4	0.03	8451	100	2.2	0.05	<0.001	1059	100	6.6	0.25	<0.001
Main symptom														
No problem	10938	62.4	0.8	0.03	3642	43.1	0.9	0.03	1.000	160	15.1	2.6	0.15	<0.001
Pain	849	4.8	2.0	0.10	842	10.0	2.5	0.12	<0.001	144	13.6	6.1	0.33	<0.001
Movement	481	2.7	2.3	0.16	344	4.1	2.8	0.20	1.000	54	5.1	6.5	0.44	0.42
Tightness, loss of energy, appetite, fever, dizziness, or feeling poor	715	4.1	3.4	0.15	583	6.9	4.1	0.17	0.027	133	12.6	8.9	0.39	<0.001
Toileting or elimination	263	1.5	2.0	0.18	201	2.4	2.5	0.23	1.000	40	3.8	5.5	0.50	<0.001
Mental health	1143	6.5	3.8	0.14	909	10.8	4.7	0.17	<0.001	219	20.7	9.9	0.38	<0.001
Skin, hair, or beauty	389	2.2	1.5	0.14	160	1.9	1.9	0.18	0.006	29	2.7	4.9	0.44	0.513
Sleep	997	5.7	2.3	0.11	637	7.5	2.8	0.14	0.127	116	11.0	6.5	0.35	<0.001
Eyes	795	4.5	1.5	0.09	512	6.1	1.8	0.11	0.319	65	6.1	4.3	0.30	<0.001
Nose	98	0.6	1.2	0.20	71	0.8	1.5	0.25	1.000	9	0.9	3.4	0.54	1.000

Ears	80	0.5	1.7	0.25	84	1.0	2.2	0.30	1.000	12	1.1	5.7	0.73	0.056
Other	778	4.4	2.0	0.13	466	5.5	2.5	0.17	0.031	78	7.4	6.3	0.41	<0.001

*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); calculated using the formula: mean predicted fraction $\times$ 30 (days)

[†] 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)

%: proportion of the total number of respondents for each treatment status

431

432

433 Figure 1. Number of days of sickness presenteeism among workers with each treatment status

434

435 (Figure 1)

436

437

438 Figure 2. Predictive margins with 95% confidence intervals for each treatment status and symptom

439

440 (Figure 2)

441

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

443 †Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals

444