

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

# **BMJ Open**

# Which work-related characteristics are most strongly associated with common mental disorders?: A crosssectional study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020770
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Nov-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Riviere, Mathieu; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136); Centre Hospitalier Régional, Department of Infectious Diseases Leroyer, Ariane; Centre Hospitalier Regional Universitaire de Lille, Occupational Health Ferreira Carreira, Lionel; Centre Hospitalier Regional Universitaire de Lille, Occupational Health Blanchon, Thierry; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Plancke, Laurent; Fédération régionale de recherche en psychiatrie et santé mentale Hauts-de-France Melchior, Maria; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Plancke, Naria; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Younès, Nadia; EA 40-47 University of Versailles Saint-Quentin; Academic Unit of psychiatry for adults, Versailles Hospital
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Occupational and environmental medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health, General practice / Family practice
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PSYCHIATRY, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

#### **BMJ** Open

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
,	
ð	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
17	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
20	
27	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
50	
20	
39	

60

Which work-related characteristics are most strongly associated with common mental disorders? : A cross-sectional study

Mathieu Rivière<sup>a,b</sup>, Ariane Leroyer<sup>c</sup>, Lionel Ferreira Carreira<sup>c</sup>, Thierry Blanchon<sup>a</sup>, Laurent Plancke<sup>d</sup>,

Maria Melchior<sup>a</sup>, Nadia Younès<sup>e,f</sup>

a Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique

(IPLESP UMRS 1136), F75013, Paris, France

b Department of Infectious Diseases, Centre Hospitalier Régional, Orléans, France

c Université Lille Nord de France, Lille, France

d Fédération régionale de recherche en santé mentale (F2RSM) Nord - Pas-de-Calais, Lille, France

e EA 40-47 University of Versailles Saint-Quentin, Versailles, France

f Academic Unit of psychiatry for adults, Versailles Hospital, Versailles, France

Word count: 3,109

Corresponding author: Mathieu Rivière Réseau Sentinelles, Centre hospitalier régional d'Orléans 1 rue porte Madeleine, 45000 Orléans, France Phone : 00 33 (2) 38 74 40 05. Fax : 00 33 (2) 76 34 16 38 E-mail : mathieu.riviere@iplesp.upmc.fr

#### ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: Studies exploring work-related risk factors of common mental disorders (CMD) such as major depressive disorder (MDD), generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) or alcohol abuse have generally focused on a limit set of work characteristics. We study, for the first time in a primary care setting, simultaneously multiple workplace risk factors of CMD.

METHOD: We use data from a representative study of working individuals recruited among 2,027 patients of 121 representative general practitioners (GP) in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in France (April-August 2014). CMD were assessed using the MINI (Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview). Six emergent worked-related factors were explored (work intensity, emotional demands, autonomy, social relationships at work, conflict of values, and insecurity of work). Several covariates were considered (patient's, GP's and contextual characteristics). To study the association between workplace risk factors and CMD (MDD; GAD; alcohol abuse) multilevel logistic or Poisson regression models adjusted for covariates were performed.

RESULTS: Among study participants, 389 (19.1%) had current MDD, 522 (25.8%) current GAD and 196 (9.7%) current alcohol abuse. In multivariable analyses adjusted for covariates, MDD/GAD was significantly associated with work intensity (RR=1.16 [1.06 - 1.27]), emotional demands (RR=1.24 [1.13 - 1.35]) and social relations at work (RR=0.78 [0.70 - 0.87]); alcohol abuse was associated with social relations at work (OR=1.31 [1.04 - 1.65]) and autonomy (OR=0.79 [0.64 - 0.98]).

CONCLUSIONS: Several workplace factors are associated with CMD among working individuals seen by a GP. These findings confirm the role of organizational characteristics of work as a correlate of psychological difficulties above and beyond other sources of risk.

Key terms: mental health; primary care; workplace factors

# STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- Cross-sectional study design
- Study of occupational factors related to common mental disorders among working adults in primary care with a standardized diagnostic tool in a large sample
- The study was conducted in the Nord Pas-de-Calais region in France, one of the poorest in France thus, this could lead to a high level of psychological disorders
- Selective participation of general practitioners (GP) that may have caused a larger selection of patient of patient with psychological disorders. However GPs were selected to be representative of the region GPs and a random procedure to define patients included in the study limits this bias

#### INTRODUCTION

Individuals who are part of the labour force are generally in better health,<sup>1</sup> however work can also have negative effects on somatic and psychosocial health. Work-related diseases have been described and among them, common mental disorders (CMD) such as anxiety, depression and alcohol abuse are the most frequent after musculoskeletal disorders.<sup>2</sup> Work-related CMD are responsible for most of sickness absence and long-term work incapacity.<sup>3</sup> The association between work and CMD is bidirectional: work is a risk factor of poor mental health<sup>4</sup> but the presence of CMD can also influence job performance and well-being.<sup>5 6</sup> Several others risk factors of CMD are already known, even if associations vary from the different disorders. Sociodemographic risk factors include being divorced or widowed, having a low educational level, older age, sex.<sup>7.9</sup> Genetic factors<sup>10</sup> and personal or family history of chronic disease or psychiatric disease are also well-known.<sup>11</sup> Environmental factors (social and material deprivation...) were described and show that individuals with low socio economic status had higher risk of depression.<sup>7 8</sup>

Three main theoretical models have been proposed to explain relations between work characteristics and health. First, Karasek<sup>12</sup> proposed that keys to health are psychological demands, decision latitude and social support. Second, Siegrist<sup>13</sup> proposed that the subjectively ascertained effort-reward balance is what matters most. These two models are the gold standard to study psychosocial risk at work and have a good predictive value but they lack some dimensions to well describe the psychosocial environment at work at the individual level. A third model addressing the role of organizational justice developed by Elovainio allowed interpersonal comparison.<sup>14</sup> Several studies evaluate the impact of work using these theoretical models.<sup>4</sup> <sup>15</sup> <sup>16</sup> In synthesis, the risk of mental disorders is greater when there is high job demands, low job control, high effort-reward imbalance or low organizational justice. As work organization is evolving, others psychosocial factors described as "emergent factors" appear in the recent studies<sup>17-20</sup>. Workers experiencing high job insecurity or role conflict seem also to have a higher levels of CMD.<sup>17</sup> <sup>18</sup> Few studies uses validated diagnostic interviews and many studies investigated separately the diagnosis of MDD (most explored), of GAD and alcohol abuse (less explored).<sup>4</sup> <sup>21</sup> <sup>22</sup> We aimed to assess the

#### **BMJ** Open

3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
27
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
<u>10</u>
77 50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58

59

60

association between GAD, MDD and alcohol abuse in a primary care setting, using validated diagnostic interviews and combining classical and emergent psychosocial work factors simultaneously that have not often been studied in literature even less in a population of individuals consulting their general practitioner (GP).

We conducted our research in a primary care setting. Indeed, persons with CMD are frequently treated by GP either initially or throughout treatment.<sup>23 24</sup> In primary care, the prevalence levels of CMD are therefore high, ranging from 3%<sup>18</sup> to 25% for anxiety disorders,<sup>9 23-26</sup> 6%<sup>9</sup> to 25% for depression<sup>7 23-26</sup> and 2%<sup>24</sup> to 11% for alcohol abuse.<sup>23 24</sup> This makes it important to elucidate work .es in related factors of mental health difficulties in this particular population, considering also several covariates, at the patient's level, at the GP's level and contextual characteristics.

#### 2 METHODS

#### 2.1 Design and Study population

Heracles is a cross-sectional study conducted between April and August 2014 among working individuals consulting a primary care physician in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in the North of France. The number of subjects needed and the set-up of the study have previously been described<sup>27</sup>. Briefly, we aimed to include 2 000 patients via their GP. Participating GP's were asked to include randomly a maximum of 24 patients who were actively employed and aged 18 to 65 years regardless of the reason of their appointment.

This study was conducted by the Sentinelles network,<sup>28</sup> part of the INSERM-Paris Sorbonne University research unit UMR-S 1136. This research group has a standing authorization from the French independent administrative authority protecting privacy and personal data (CNIL), n°471 393 to conduct research among GPs and their patients.

#### 2.2 Data collection

After their regular appointment, GPs interviewed their patients for the purposes of the study. Study questionnaires included information on:

erie

#### 2.2.1 Measurement of common mental disorders

CMDs were measured using a standardised diagnostic interview: the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI). The MINI is a structured clinical interview that enables the diagnosis of psychiatric disorders based on the Diagnosis and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fourth edition (DSM-IV).<sup>29</sup>

In this study, three different diagnoses were ascertained: Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) (during the preceding 2 weeks), Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD) (during the preceding 6 months), and alcohol abuse (during the preceding 12 months).

#### **BMJ** Open

## 

## 2.2.2 Work's factors

We used a national French questionnaire proposed by experts in the field based on the international scientific literature and after auditioning Robert Karasek and Johannes Siegrist.<sup>19</sup> It combines questions measuring demand - control - social support developed in Karasek's model<sup>12</sup> (2 questions about decision latitude, 4 questions about psychological demands and 2 questions about social support); questions measuring effort/reward balance in Siegrist's model<sup>13</sup> (3 questions about reword and one question about overinvestment), and questions about organizational justice from Moorman's guestionnaire.<sup>30</sup> guestions from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire<sup>31</sup> and from the General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work<sup>32</sup> or from WOrking Conditions and Control Questionnaire (WOCCQ)<sup>33</sup>. Overall, twenty items explore six different areas (Appendix 1): 1) five for the first area related to work intensity and duration (contradictory orders, excessive amounts of work, too much to think about at work, difficulties in balancing work and family life, time needed for work), 2) six items for the second area concerning emotional demands (contacts with customers/beneficiaries, contact with people in distress, conflicts with customers/beneficiaries, the need to hide emotions, fear, exposure to aggressions), 3) two items for the third area concerning autonomy (limited possibility of decision, full and well employment of skills), 4) three items for the fourth area relating quality of social work relations (full-recognition of the work, support from colleagues, support from superior), 5) two items for the fifth area concerning ethical conflicts (possibility to make a work of quality, doing disapproved things) 6) and two items in the last area about insecurity of work (ability to work until retirement, fear of losing job). For four of these items (public contact at work, contact with people in distress, contradictory order, ability to work until retirement) the response was "yes" or "no" and for the other factors the response were "always"/"often"/"sometimes"/"never".

## 2.2.3 Covariates

### Patient's characteristics

We considered already know risk-factors of CMD<sup>7</sup>.

Past somatic or psychiatric problems;

- Sociodemographic (age, gender, family status, family income, level of education);
- Occupational grade<sup>34</sup>, they were classified in three groups: blue (farmer/manual worker), pink (technician/associate professional/clerk/service worker) and white collars (manager/professional);<sup>35</sup>
- Company size;

• Job instability: a recombined variable of type of contract

## Primary care characteristics<sup>36</sup>

- Reason of medical appointment (somatic, psychological, chronic disease management);
- Sociodemographic (age, gender);
- Practice characteristics (size of practice; easiness with psychological distress issues; opportunity to collaborate with mental health specialists).

## Contextual characteristics (by proximity area)

Contextual characteristics have been shown to be associated with CMD in primary care<sup>78</sup>

- Psychiatrists, psychologist and GPs density;
- Social deprivation (loneliness, single parenthood, widowhood/divorce) and material deprivation (unemployment, income, level of not graduated)<sup>37 38</sup>.

## 2.3 Statistical Analyses

Socio demographic characteristics of all patients were described and associations between these covariates with GAD, MDD and alcohol abuse were studied using the Chi-square test. Covariates associated with the outcomes with p<0.2 were included in the multivariate analysis.

A value was attributed to each answer of the twenty questions regarding occupational factors. Those factors were regrouped according to the 6 dimensions defined in the Gollac report and in order to be able to compare each dimension a Z-score was calculated for each dimension.<sup>19</sup> In bivariate analysis the dimensions were classified high if the score was above the third quartile and low if not, in multivariable models they were used as continuous variable. To study the association between

#### **BMJ** Open

occupational factors and alcohol we performed multilevel logistic regression models with patient as level one and geographical area as level two. For GAD/MDD we used multilevel Poisson regression models because, given the high prevalence of these problems, logistic regression overestimates relative risks. GAD/MDD or alcohol abuse were the dependent variables and the six occupational factors were the exposition variables. The models were adjusted for each exposition variable and for other covariates that were associated with GAD/MDD or alcohol abuse in a multivariable logistic/Poisson regression model excluding occupational factors. Age, sex and occupational grade were included directly in the adjustment variable.

ore termony

All analyses were performed using GNU R software version 3.1.1. (Ime4 package).

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

**BMJ** Open

#### 3 RESULTS

#### 3.1 Participation and description of the population

Of the 1 000 GPs contacted by mail, 185 accepted to participate (response rate= 18.5%) and 121 completed the study (Figure 1). Participating GPs were more likely to be male (sex ratio=1.82), and to be 50 years or older; they were disseminated throughout the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region (Table 1). Participating GPs were representative of the other GPs in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in term of geographical localisation, age and practice and years.

Participating GPs recruited 2 027 patients among which 389 (19.1%) had MDD, 522 (25.8%) GAD and 196 (9.7%) alcohol abuse. Patients were mostly female (53.6%) aged 42.3 years (sd 10.6) on average, mainly living with a partner (76.2%). Patients were pink collar in 60.1% of cases (clerk/service workers and technician/associate professional), 61.3% had graduated from high school and 30.2% had been unemployed in the past. Among participants, 21.0% came to see their GP for psychological reasons (Table 1). Characteristics of patient with MDD, GAD or alcohol abuse are presented in table 2.

The study response rate was 80%: 41 GPs filled a non-respondent form for 495 patients who refused to participate. Non-respondents did not differ from participants in term of age (p= 0.47) and sex (p=0.23). Comparing with the data of the National Health Insurance for working age patient consulting a GP, participants were older (p<0.01) and were similar for sex distribution (p=0.08).

Table 1: Description of the study population, Hérac	lès study, France, 2014	
	N	%
Work intensity		
High	437	21 6
Low	1588	78.3
Emotional demands		
High	476	23.5
Low	1549	76.4
Autonomy		
High	598	29.5
Low	1427	70.4
Conflict of values	225	
High	685	33.8
LOW Social relationships at work	1340	00.1
High	688	33.0
	1337	66.0
	1007	00.0
High	565	27.9
Low	1460	72.0
Covariates		
Patient Characteristics		
Age group		
[18-35]	597	29.5
[36-50]	872	43.1
[51-65]	552	27.3
Occupational grade	070	10.0
Biue collar Diale collar	273	13.9
PINK COllar White collar	1185	60.1 26.0
Educational level	513	20.0
< High school degree	780	38.7
≥ High school degree	1238	61.3
Family status		
Lives alone	481	23.8
Lives with a partner or parents	1543	76.2
Household income (in €)		
[0-3.000]	491	30.6
3.000 +	1112	69.4
Number of worker in the company		
1 to 5	361	18.4
6 to 25	490	25.0
26 to 250	420	21.5
200 +	687	35.1
	180	0.0
No	109	9.0
Past somatic problems	1755	30.2
Yes	550	28 0
100	555	20.8

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1
ר
2
3
4
5
6
7
2 2
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
10
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
20
27
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
26
20
3/
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
16
40
47
4ð
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
50
20
59
60

	Ν	%
Purpose of consultation with GP		
Somatic		
Yes	1331	65.7
No	696	34.3
Psychological		0 110
Yes	425	21.0
No	1602	79.0
Chronic disease management	1002	10.0
Yes	313	15.4
No	1714	84.6
Past unemployment	17.14	04.0
Vee	613	30.2
No	1/1/	50.2 60.8
Ich instability	1414	09.0
	522	33.0
No	1061	67.0
	1001	07.0
GPs characteristics		
GP s gender	400.4	07.0
Male	1364	67.3
⊢emale	663	32.7
GP's age		
[18-39]	194	9.6
[40-49]	626	30.9
[50-59]	832	41.0
60 +	375	18.5
Size of practice population		
0-500	211	11.2
5000 - 1000	993	52.5
1000- 1500	433	22.9
1500+	253	13.4
Easiness with Mental health problems		
High	1600	82.6
Low	338	17.4
High opportunity to work with mental health specialists		
High	1036	52.4
Low	941	47.6
Contextual characteristics		
Social deprivation		
High	552	27.2
low	1475	72.8
Material deprivation		
High	850	41.9
	1177	58.1
Density of insychiatrist	11//	50.1
High	1560	77 /
	1509	11.4 22 G
Luw Density of nevelopist	400	22.0
	1664	76 7
	1554	/0./
LOW	4/3	23.3
	4-0-	
High	1525	75.2
L OW	502	24.8

#### BMJ Open

## 

## 3.2 MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse and related work factors

# Bivariate analysis

In bivariate analyses, sex was significantly associated with the two outcomes with higher disorders within women for GAD and MDD, for alcohol abuse where men were more affected. Family status, the number of workers in the company, past psychiatric problems, consultation for psychiatric, somatic or chronic diseases and job insecurity were also significantly associated with the two outcomes. Occupational grade, education level and past unemployment were significantly associated (p<0.01) with only alcohol abuse with higher rate for blue collars, patients who experienced unemployment in the past and individuals with an education level lower than a high school degree. Age and household income were only associated with MDD/GAD.

Regarding GP characteristics, GPs gender and opportunity to work with mental health specialist was associated with the two outcomes. Size of practice population was associated only with MDD/GAD.

Most of the contextual variables studied were not associated with our study outcomes, except for material deprivation, density of psychiatrists and psychologists which were significantly associated with MDD/GAD. To the contrary, work characteristics were almost all significantly associated with the two outcomes except insecurity and autonomy which were not associated with alcohol abuse (Table 2).

 Table 2: Association between common mental disorders (major depressive disorders (MDD), generalised anxiety disorders (GAD) and Alcohol abuse) and covariates, Héraclès study, France, 2014 (Chi-square test)

	MDD/GAD (	n=648)	Alcohol (n	=196)
	N (%)	p	N (%)	p
Work Characteristics				-
Work intensity		<0.01		0.01
High	232 (52.8)		58 (13.3)	
Low	416 (26.2)		138 (8.7)	
Emotional demands		<0.01		<0.01
High	262 (54.9)		73 (15.3)	
Low	386 (24.9)		123 (7.9)	
Autonomy		<0.01		0.48
High	158 (26.4)		53 (8.9)	
Low	490 (34.3)		143 (10.0)	
Conflict of values		<0.01		<0.01
High	335 (48.8)		90 (13.1)	
Low	313 (23.3)		106 (7.9)	
Social relationships at work		<0.01		0.03
High	103 (15.0)		52 (7.6)	
Low	545 (40.7)		144 (10.8)	
Insecurity		<0.01		0.14
High	242 (42.8)		64 (11.3)	
Low	406 (27.8)		132 (9.0)	
Covariates				
Patient Characteristics				
Age group	(70,00,0)	0.03		0.24
[18-35]	172 (28.8)		48 (8.0)	
[36-50]	306 (35.1)		87 (10.0)	
[01-00]	169 (30.6)	<0.01	60 (10.9)	<0.01
	266 (20 2)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	140 (14 0)	<b>NO.01</b>
	200 (20.3)		140 (14.9) 56 (5.2)	
Cocupational grade	302 (35.2)	0.32	56 (5.2)	<0.01
Blue collar	70 (28 0)	0.52	53 (10 4)	<b>NO.01</b>
Dide collar Dink collar	79 (20.9)		00 (19.4) 96 (7.2)	
White collar	152 (20.6)		50 (7.3)	
Educational level	152 (23.0)	0.13	50 (5.7)	<0.01
< High school degree	266 (34 1)	0.10	98 (12.6)	-0.01
> High school degree	381 (30.8)		97 (7.8)	
Family status	001 (00.0)	0.01	57 (1.0)	<0.01
l ives alone	471 (30.5)	0.01	63 (13 1)	
Lives with a partner or parents	177 (36.8)		133 (8.6)	
Household income (in €)	(00.0)	0.03		0.30
[0-3.000]	184 (37.5)		53 (10.8)	
3.000 +	353 (31.7)		100 (9.0)	
Number of worker in the company	,	0.03		<0.01
1 to 5	108 (29.9)		51 (14.1)	
6 to 25	183 (37.3)		53 (10.8)	
26 to 250	138 (32.9)		43 (10.2)	
250 +	203 (29.5)		45 (6.6)	
Past psychiatric problems	· · · ·	<0.01	. ,	<0.01
Yes	108 (57.1)		30 (15.9)	
No	516 (29.8)		150 (8.6)	
Past somatic problems		0.82		0.84
Yes	185 (33.1)		53 (9.5)	
No	445 (32.4)		136 (9.9)	

p: Chi-square test

2	Table 2: (continued)				
3		MDD and GAI	D (n=648)	Alcohol (n	=196)
4		N (%)	р	N (%)	р
5	Purpose of consultation with GP				
6	Somatic		<0.01		0.04
7	Yes	335 (25.2)		115 (8.6)	
8	No	313 (45.0)		81 (11.6)	
9	Psychological		<0.01		<0.01
10	Yes	312 (73.4)		61 (14.4)	
10	NO Chronic diagona managament	336 (21.0)	-0.04	135 (8.4)	<0.04
11		75 (24.0)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	46 (44 7)	<b>NO.01</b>
12	i es	73 (24.0) 572 (22.4)		40 (14.7)	
13	Past unemployment	575 (33.4)	0.57	150 (0.0)	<0.01
14	Ves	202 (33 0)	0.57	80 (13 1)	<b>NO.01</b>
15	No	202 (33.0)		116 (8 2)	
16	loh instability	01.0)	<0.01	110 (0.2)	<0.01
17	Yes	229 (43.9)		70 (13.4)	
18	No	400 (27.5)		118 (11 1)	
19	GPs Characteristics	100 (21.0)		110 (11.1)	
20	GP's gender		< 0.01		<0.01
21	Male	375 (27.5)		152 (11.1)	
22	Female	273 (41.2)		44 (6.6)	
22	GP's age	,	0.13	(0.0)	0.14
23	[18-39]	72 (37.1)		18 (9.3)	
24	[40-49]	190 (30.4)		49 (7.8)	
25	[50-59]	254 (30.5)		95 (11.4)	
26	60 +	132 (35.2)		34 (9.1)	
27	Size of practice population		<0.01		0.06
28	0-500	79 (37.4)		18 (8.5)	
29	5000 - 1000	295 (29.7)		82 (8.3)	
30	1000- 1500	136 (31.4)		47 (10.9)	
31	1500+	104 (41.1)		34 (13.4)	
32	Easiness with Mental health problems		0.21		0.48
33	High	500 (31.3)		155 (9.7)	
3/	Low	118 (34.9)		28 (8.3)	
25	High opportunity to work with mental		<0.01		0.05
20		245 (26 7)		102 (0.0)	0.05
30	Low	343 (30.7) 296 (27.6)		103 (9.9)	
3/	Contextual obstactoristics	200 (27.0)		60 (9.1)	
38	Social deprivation		0.32		0.97
39	High	167 (30.2)	0.52	52 (0 1)	0.07
40	Low	/81 (32.6)		1// (9.8)	
41	Material deprivation	401 (02.0)	<0.01	144 (3.0)	0 74
42	High	306 (36.0)		85 (10.0)	0.14
43	low	342 (29.1)		111 (9.4)	
44	Density of psychiatrist	0.2 (20.1)	0.02		0.97
45	Hiah	522 (33.3)		45 (9.8)	
46	Low	126 (27.5)		151 (9.6)	
40	Density of psychologist	( )	0.05	( )	0.10
77 10	High	515 (33.1)		36 (7.6)	
40	Low	133 (28.1)		160 (10.3)	
49	Density of GP	. ,	0.06		0.88
50	High	505 (33.1)		50 (10.0)	
51	Low	143 (28.4)		146 (9.6)	
52	p: Chi-square test				

Multivariable analysis

All occupational factors were associated with our two study outcomes in unadjusted analysis. In adjusted analyses, patients reporting high levels of work intensity (RR=1.16 [1.06 - 1.27]; p<0.01) and emotional demands (RR=1.24 [1.13 - 1.35]; p<0.01) had a higher risk of MDD/GAD whereas patient with high social relations at work had lower risk to have MDD/GAD (RR=0.78 [0.70 - 0.87]; p<0.01).

social relations. Regarding alcohol abuse, social relations at work were associated with higher risk (OR=1.31 [1.04 -1.65]; p=0.02) and higher autonomy was protective (OR=0.79 [0.64 - 0.98]; p=0.04) (Table 3).

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

#### **BMJ** Open

Table 3: major depressive disorders (MDD), generalized anxiety disorders (GAD) and alcohol abuse work-related factors, Héraclès study, France, 2014. Multilevel regression models

	MDD/GAD (n=1782)			Alcohol (n=1776)									
		Unadjusted			Adjusted			Unadjusted			Adjusted		
	RR	CI 95%	Р	RR <sup>1</sup>	CI 95%	Ρ	OR	CI 95%	P	$OR^2$	CI 95%	P	
Work intensity	1.46	[1.35 - 1.57]	<0.01	1.16	[1.06 - 1.27]	<0.01	1.35	[1.17 - 1.57]	<0.01	1.20	[0.98 - 1.46]	0.08	
Emotional demands	1.53	[1.43 - 1.64]	<0.01	1.24	[1.13 - 1.35]	<0.01	1.46	[1.27 - 1.68]	<0.01	1.21	[0.98 - 1.48]	0.06	
Autonomy	0.68	[0.63 - 0.73]	<0.01	0.94	[0.85 - 1.04]	0.26	0.70	[0.60 - 0.80]	<0.01	0.79	[0.64 - 0.98]	0.04	
Conflict of values	1.45	[1.35 - 1.56]	<0.01	1.06	[0.96 - 1.17]	0.26	1.35	[1.17 - 1.55]	<0.01	1.21	[0.97 - 1.50]	0.09	
Social relationships at work	0.61	[0.56 - 0.66]	<0.01	0.78	[0.70 - 0.87]	<0.01	0.81	[0.70 - 0.95]	0.01	1.31	[1.04 - 1.65]	0.02	
Insecurity	1.13	[1.05 - 1.22]	<0.01	1.03	[0.95 - 1.11]	0.49	1.14	[1.00 - 1.30]	0.05	0.94	[0.80 - 1.12]	0.50	

RR : relative risk

OR: odd ratio

<sup>1</sup>Adjusted on : each occupational factors, age, sex, occupational grade, past psychiatric problems, alcohol abuse, material deprivation and GP's gender <sup>2</sup>Adjusted on : each occupational factors, age, sex, occupational grade, family status, number of person in the company, past psychiatric problems, job instability, education level, past unemployment, GAD and MDD

#### **DISCUSSION**

#### 4.1 Main results

In our study conducted among a large sample of persons consulting a GP, we found that several work characteristics are associated with mental health. Unfavourable social relations at work are associated with a higher risk of MDD/GAD, but a lower risk of alcohol abuse. High work intensity and high emotional demands at work are associated with a higher risk of MDD/GAD. Finally, low autonomy at work is significantly associated with a higher risk of alcohol abuse.

#### 4.2 Comparison with literature

We confirm, for the first time in primary care, the association between common mental disorders and work social support. This is consistent with data from a cross sectional study conducted in Japan (using the K10 questionnaire to assess depression): higher risk of depressive symptoms for workers with low social support at work (OR=3.8)<sup>39</sup>. It is also coherent with data from a meta-analysis of 17 other studies investigating depressive disorders.<sup>40</sup> Low social support at work is also associated with anxiety disorders as already observed in the population based study of Wang: employees with high stress in social support from superior or co-workers had higher risk of having anxiety disorders for both gender.<sup>41</sup> However, the causal direction of this association cannot be determined due to the cross sectional design of our study. It is possible that low social support increases the risk of having depression or anxiety as it has been shown in different longitudinal studies.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, it is well known that social relations and support (outside or inside work) affect psychological health,<sup>43</sup> but it is also possible that individual with no depression or anxiety disorders have better social support.<sup>43</sup> Finally, the association between GAD/MDD and social support could also be related to negative views of social support when depressed or anxious.<sup>44</sup> For alcohol abuse an inverse association is observed: higher risk associated with high social relationship at work and this result is consistent with results of

#### **BMJ** Open

a cross sectional study conducted among Canadian workers.<sup>21</sup> It raises question about festive alcohol consumption with colleagues in or outside the company.<sup>45</sup>

Work intensity, or high psychological demand in terms of high working time and intensity was associated with depressive symptoms in the meta-analysis of Theorell (10 studies).<sup>40</sup> The meta-analysis of longitudinal studies of Netterstrom highlights the adverse effect of high psychological demand on the occurrence of depressive disorders.<sup>42</sup> However, this association could also ensue that persons with depressive disorders have distorted views of psychological demands.<sup>44</sup>

High emotional demands at work have already been observed for depressive disorders among women in a population-based nested case-control study of 14,166 psychiatric patients in Denmark (IRR=1.39)<sup>22</sup> or for GAD in the French prospective study SIP (using the same diagnostic tool MINI) (RR=1.66 among workers with high emotional demand<sup>18</sup>). The designs of those two studies argue for the negative effect of high emotional demand on depression and anxiety, but in our cross sectional study the causal attribution is not possible thus it is also possible that people with depression and/or anxiety have a different view towards those demands.<sup>44</sup>

Autonomy appears related to alcohol abuse, as reported in an English prospective study: low decision latitude, which is a part of the autonomy axis in our study, is associated to higher risk of alcohol dependence within women.<sup>46</sup>

We do not confirm the association found earlier between CMD and high job insecurity or conflict of value.<sup>17 18 20</sup>

## 4.3 Strengths and limitations of the study

Several limitations of our study should be acknowledged.

First, our study was conducted in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region, i.e. one of the poorest in France with a total 4,000,000 inhabitants. This highly industrialized region during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, suffered since 1950 from industrial decline, mines, textile and steel industries gradually closing. Despite the growth of services and some specialized industries (car, rail and glass), levels of education, unemployment (15%), and poverty and health indicators (e.g. life expectancy) are unfavourable. The Nord - Pas-de-Calais region have a low density of GPs (11% less than in France)

#### **BMJ** Open

and other medical specialities (24% less).<sup>47</sup> Moreover, the study was conducted after the 2008 recession, which has been associated with an increase in the prevalence of common mental health disorders worldwide.<sup>48 49</sup> This could lead to a high level of psychiatric disorders. The prevalence of MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse within patient consulting a GP is respectively 19.1%, 25.8% and 9.7%. This is consistent in the superior limits with studies in primary care ranging prevalence from 6% to 25% for depression, 3% to 25% for anxiety and 2% to 11% for alcohol abuse.<sup>7 9 23-26</sup> Results should be replicated in others areas.

Second, a possible weakness is the selective participation of GPs. GPs who have participated in the study could be especially interested in common mental disorders. This interest may be related to interest of GP itself, but it could also be related to the GPs patient rate of common mental disorders. Therefore, it may cause a larger selection of patient with psychological disorders. However, participation rate were similar to previous studies<sup>24 50</sup> and GP were selected to be representative of the Nord - Pas-de-Calais GPs in term of geographical localisation and therefore limiting this possible bias. Participating GP had similar age, practice and years of practice than all GP in the region. Patient selection should also be considered. However, a random procedure to define patients included in the study limits this bias. Indeed, GPs were asked to include patient following an inclusion schedule that was provided at the start of the study. This allowed us to include patient in different time slots of the week. Moreover a non-respondent form had to be filled by the GPs but we suppose that the filling rate was low because only 41 GPs filled this form and declare that 495 patient were not included. Characteristics of patients included and those not included did not differ in term of age and sex.

If we were able to take into account many co-variables (individuals, GPs and contextual), we missed for some important individual variables (as social support outside of work, life events...) we would like to control to study CMD and work-related factors.

Despite these limitations, the results of this study are of interest because they study occupational factors related to CMD (MDD/GAD and alcohol abuse) among working adults in primary care with a standardized diagnostic tool (MINI) in a large sample (n=2 027).<sup>29</sup> However we have to be cautious about these results and further studies in other areas have to be done in order to confirm our findings.

#### **BMJ** Open

#### 4.4 Conclusion

Our study is one of the first studying simultaneously well-known factors related to the job strain and effort-reward imbalance models and new occupational factors described in recent literature and the first conducted among working individuals in primary care. Results point out the importance of social support at work and different occupational factors that are associated with MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse. These results could be a starting point to apprehend these factors with the patient and to communicate with occupational physician.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank all the participating GPs of the Nord – Pas-de-Calais region and their patients who participate to Héraclès study. We thanks the department of General practice of Lille's university and the regional union of health professional of GP's (URPS-ML) of the Nord – Pas-de-Calais region for their involvement in the GP recruitment phase. We also want to thank all the members' scientific committee of the Héraclès study who contribute to the brainstorming and the set-up of this survey

#### CONTRIBUTORS

Study concept and design: MR, NY, MM, AL, TB, LP. Data analysis and collection: MR, LFC, MM, LP. Drafting of the manuscript: MR. Critical revision of the manuscript: NY, MM, AL. All authors have approved the final manuscript.

#### **COMPETING INTERESTS**

All authors declare that they do not have any competing interests and declare independence from the funders.

#### FUNDING

This work was supported by the Nord – Pas-de-Calais regional health agency (ARS) and the Ile-de-France region – DIM Gestes (Mathieu Rivière's PhD thesis).

# DATA SHARING STATEMENT

No additional data are available

tor peer teriew only

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

51

52

53

59

60

# 5 **REFERENCES**

- Wagenaar AF, Kompier MA, Houtman IL, et al. Employment contracts and health selection: unhealthy employees out and healthy employees in? *J Occup Environ Med* 2012;54(10):1192-200. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e3182717633 [published Online First: 2012/09/22]
- Hussey L, Turner S, Thorley K, et al. Work-related ill health in general practice, as reported to a UK-wide surveillance scheme. *Br J Gen Pract* 2008;58(554):637-40. doi: 10.3399/bjgp08X330753 [published Online First: 2008/09/20]
- Whiteford HA, Degenhardt L, Rehm J, et al. Global burden of disease attributable to mental and substance use disorders: findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *Lancet* (*London, England*) 2013;382(9904):1575-86. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)61611-6 [published Online First: 2013/09/03]
- 4. Harvey SB, Modini M, Joyce S, et al. Can work make you mentally ill? A systematic meta-review of work-related risk factors for common mental health problems. *Occup Environ Med* 2017;74(4):301-10. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2016-104015 [published Online First: 2017/01/22]
- Reme SE, Grasdal AL, Lovvik C, et al. Work-focused cognitive-behavioural therapy and individual job support to increase work participation in common mental disorders: a randomised controlled multicentre trial. *Occup Environ Med* 2015;72(10):745-52. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2014-102700 [published Online First: 2015/08/08]
- Stewart WF, Ricci JA, Chee E, et al. Cost of lost productive work time among US workers with depression. *JAMA* 2003;289(23):3135-44. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.23.3135 [published Online First: 2003/06/19]
- Milanovic SM, Erjavec K, Poljicanin T, et al. Prevalence of depression symptoms and associated socio-demographic factors in primary health care patients. *Psychiatr Danub* 2015;27(1):31-7. [published Online First: 2015/03/10]
- Freeman A, Tyrovolas S, Koyanagi A, et al. The role of socio-economic status in depression: results from the COURAGE (aging survey in Europe). *BMC Public Health* 2016;16(1):1098. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3638-0 [published Online First: 2016/10/21]
- 9. Ibanez G, Son S, Chastang J, et al. Mental Health Disorders in General Practice in France: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *Transl Biomed* 2016:7:4. doi: 10.2167/2172-0479.100096
- Lacerda-Pinheiro SF, Pinheiro Junior RF, Pereira de Lima MA, et al. Are there depression and anxiety genetic markers and mutations? A systematic review. J Affect Disord 2014;168:387-98. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2014.07.016 [published Online First: 2014/08/12]
- 11. Abbas RA, Hammam RA, El-Gohary SS, et al. Screening for common mental disorders and substance abuse among temporary hired cleaners in Egyptian Governmental Hospitals, Zagazig City, Sharqia Governorate. *The international journal of occupational and environmental medicine* 2013;4(1):13-26. [published Online First: 2013/01/03]
- 12. Karasek R. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain : implication for job redesign. *Adm Sci Q* 1979 24 285-309.
- 13. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *J Occup Health Psychol* 1996;1(1):27-41. [published Online First: 1996/01/01]
- 14. Elovainio M, Kivimaki M, Vahtera J. Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. *Am J Public Health* 2002;92(1):105-8. [published Online First: 2002/01/05]
- 15. Rugulies R, Aust B, Madsen IE. Effort-reward imbalance at work and risk of depressive disorders. A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2017;43(4):294-306. doi: 10.5271/sjweh.3632 [published Online First: 2017/03/18]
- 16. Stansfeld S, Candy B. Psychosocial work environment and mental health--a meta-analytic review. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2006;32(6):443-62. [published Online First: 2006/12/19]

- 17. Murcia M, Chastang JF, Niedhammer I. Psychosocial work factors, major depressive and generalised anxiety disorders: results from the French national SIP study. *J Affect Disord* 2013;146(3):319-27. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2012.09.014 [published Online First: 2012/10/13]
- Niedhammer I, Malard L, Chastang JF. Occupational factors and subsequent major depressive and generalized anxiety disorders in the prospective French national SIP study. *BMC Public Health* 2015;15:200. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1559-y [published Online First: 2015/04/18]
- Gollac M. Mesurer les facteurs psychosociaux de risque au travail pour les maîtriser. 2010 [Available from: <u>http://travail-</u> emploi.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport SRPST definitif rectifie 11 05 10.pdf.
- 20. Schutte S, Chastang JF, Parent-Thirion A, et al. Psychosocial work exposures among European employees: explanations for occupational inequalities in mental health. *Journal of public health (Oxford, England)* 2015;37(3):373-88. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdv044 [published Online First: 2015/04/26]
- 21. Marchand A, Parent-Lamarche A, Blanc ME. Work and high-risk alcohol consumption in the Canadian workforce. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2011;8(7):2692-705. doi: 10.3390/ijerph8072692 [published Online First: 2011/08/17]
- Wieclaw J, Agerbo E, Mortensen PB, et al. Psychosocial working conditions and the risk of depression and anxiety disorders in the Danish workforce. *BMC Public Health* 2008;8:280. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-8-280 [published Online First: 2008/08/09]
- 23. Ansseau M, Dierick M, Buntinkx F, et al. High prevalence of mental disorders in primary care. J Affect Disord 2004;78(1):49-55. doi: S0165032702002197 [pii] [published Online First: 2003/12/16]
- 24. Toft T, Fink P, Oernboel E, et al. Mental disorders in primary care: prevalence and co-morbidity among disorders. results from the functional illness in primary care (FIP) study. *Psychol Med* 2005;35(8):1175-84. [published Online First: 2005/08/25]
- 25. Alkhadhari S, Alsabbrri AO, Mohammad IH, et al. Prevalence of psychiatric morbidity in the primary health clinic attendees in Kuwait. *J Affect Disord* 2016;195:15-20. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2016.01.037 [published Online First: 2016/02/08]
- 26. Norton J, de Roquefeuil G, David M, et al. [Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in French general practice using the patient health questionnaire: comparison with GP case-recognition and psychotropic medication prescription]. *Encephale* 2009;35(6):560-9. doi: 10.1016/j.encep.2008.06.018
- S0013-7006(08)00267-4 [pii] [published Online First: 2009/12/17]
- 27. Riviere M, Plancke L, Leroyer A, et al. Prevalence of work-related common psychiatric disorders in primary care: The French Heracles study. *Psychiatry Res* 2017 doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2017.09.008 [published Online First: 2017/09/19]
- 28. Flahault A, Blanchon T, Dorleans Y, et al. Virtual surveillance of communicable diseases: a 20year experience in France. *Statistical methods in medical research* 2006;15(5):413-21. [published Online First: 2006/11/09]
- Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J Clin Psychiatry* 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33;quiz 34-57. [published Online First: 1999/01/09]
- 30. Moorman R. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perception influence employee citizenship? *J Appl Psychol* 1991;76:845–55.
- 31. Kristensen TS, Hannerz H, Hogh A, et al. The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire--a tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2005;31(6):438-49. [published Online First: 2006/01/24]

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
20	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
77	
40	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
52	
55	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

- 32. Dallner M, Elo A-L, Gamberale F, et al. Validation of the general Nordic questionnaire (QPSNordic) for psychological and social factors at work (No. Nord 2000:12). In: Ministers NCo, ed. Copenhagen, 2000.
- Hansez I. The Working Conditions and Control Questionnaire (WOCCQ): Towards a structural model of psychological stress. *European Review of Applied Psychology* 2008;58(253 – 262)
- INSEE. Nomenclature des Professions et Catégories Socioprofessionnelles PCS 2003 [Available from: https://www.insee.fr/fr/information/2400059.
- 35. Min KB, Park SG, Hwang SH, et al. Precarious employment and the risk of suicidal ideation and suicide attempts. *Preventive medicine* 2015;71:72-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.12.017 [published Online First: 2014/12/24]
- 36. Fleury MJ, Bamvita JM, Farand L, et al. Variables associated with general practitioners taking on patients with common mental disorders. *Mental health in family medicine* 2008;5(3):149-60. [published Online First: 2008/09/01]
- 37. Pampalon R, Hamel D, Gamache P, et al. Validation of a deprivation index for public health: a complex exercise illustrated by the Quebec index. *Chronic diseases and injuries in Canada* 2014;34(1):12-22. [published Online First: 2014/03/13]
- 38. Moreno-Betancur M, Latouche A, Menvielle G, et al. Relative index of inequality and slope index of inequality: a structured regression framework for estimation. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass)* 2015;26(4):518-27. doi: 10.1097/ede.00000000000011 [published Online First: 2015/05/23]
- 39. Honda A, Date Y, Abe Y, et al. Work-related Stress, Caregiver Role, and Depressive Symptoms among Japanese Workers. Saf Health Work 2014;5(1):7-12. doi: 10.1016/j.shaw.2013.11.002 [published Online First: 2014/06/17]
- 40. Theorell T, Hammarström A, Aronsson G, et al. A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and depressive symptoms. *BMC Public Health* 2015;15 doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1954-4
- 41. Wang JL, Lesage A, Schmitz N, et al. The relationship between work stress and mental disorders in men and women: findings from a population-based study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2008;62(1):42-7. doi: 10.1136/jech.2006.050591 [published Online First: 2007/12/15]
- 42. Netterstrom B, Conrad N, Bech P, et al. The relation between work-related psychosocial factors and the development of depression. *Epidemiologic reviews* 2008;30:118-32. doi: 10.1093/epirev/mxn004 [published Online First: 2008/07/01]
- 43. Melchior M, Berkman LF, Niedhammer I, et al. Social relations and self-reported health: a prospective analysis of the French Gazel cohort. *Social science & medicine (1982)* 2003;56(8):1817-30. [published Online First: 2003/03/18]
- 44. Beck AT, Brown GK, Steer RA, et al. Psychometric properties of the Beck Self-Esteem Scales. *Behaviour research and therapy* 2001;39(1):115-24. [published Online First: 2000/12/28]
- 45. Nordaune K, Skarpaas LS, Sagvaag H, et al. Who initiates and organises situations for workrelated alcohol use? The WIRUS culture study. *Scandinavian journal of public health* 2017:1403494817704109. doi: 10.1177/1403494817704109 [published Online First: 2017/07/02]
- 46. Head J, Stansfeld SA, Siegrist J. The psychosocial work environment and alcohol dependence: a prospective study. *Occup Environ Med* 2004;61(3):219-24. [published Online First: 2004/02/27]
- 47. Plancke L, Bavdek R. Les disparités régionales en santé mentale et en psychiatrie. La situation du Nord Pas-de-Calais en France métropolitaine, Lille, F2RSM. 2013. <u>http://www.santementale5962.com/ressources-et-outils/les-editions-de-la-f2rsm/article/disparites-regionales-en-sante</u>.
- 48. Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL, Popham F. Trends in population mental health before and after the 2008 recession: a repeat cross-sectional analysis of the 1991-2010 Health Surveys of

England. *BMJ Open* 2012;2(5) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001790 [published Online First: 2012/10/19]

- 49. Lee S, Guo WJ, Tsang A, et al. Evidence for the 2008 economic crisis exacerbating depression in Hong Kong. *J Affect Disord* 2010;126(1-2):125-33. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2010.03.007 [published Online First: 2010/04/13]
- 50. Goldenberg MG, Skeldon SC, Nayan M, et al. Prostate-specific antigen testing for prostate cancer screening: A national survey of Canadian primary care physicians' opinions and practices. *Canadian Urological Association journal = Journal de l'Association des urologues du Canada* 2017 doi: 10.5489/cuaj.4486 [published Online First: 2017/11/07]

# Legends:

Figure 1: Flow chart of participation in the Héraclès study, France, 2014



# 1) Work intensity

- I receive contradictory orders or indication ("Yes"/"No")
- I am asked excessive amounts of work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have too much to think about at work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have difficulties in balancing work and family life ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have the time needed to do my work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 2) Emotional demands

- I work in contact with customers/beneficiaries ("Yes"/"No")
- I am in contact with people in distress ("Yes"/"No")
- I have conflicts with customers/beneficiaries ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have to hide my emotions and pretend to be in a good mood ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I sometimes experience fear during my work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- During my work, I am exposed to physical, verbal, psychological aggressions ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 3) Autonomy

- I have very little freedom to decide how I do my job ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I can fully employ my skills ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 4) Conflict of values

- I have the possibility to make a work of quality ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- In my work, I have to do disapproved things ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 5) Social relationships at work

- My work is fully recognized ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have support from colleagues ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have support from superior ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 6) Insecurity of work

- I feel able to do my current job until retirement ("Yes"/"No")
- I work with fear of losing my job ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstrac
The and abstract	1	(a) indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title of the absuace
		(b) Drovide in the electron informative and belanced summary of what was done
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done
		and what was found - page 1 and 2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported page 4 and 5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses - page 4 and 5
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper - page 6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment,
		exposure, follow-up, and data collection - page 6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of
		participants - page 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effec
		modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable – page 6 to 8
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of
measurement		assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there
		more than one group - page 6 to 8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias – page 6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at – page 6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable,
		describe which groupings were chosen and why – page 8 and 9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
		page 8 and 9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially
1		eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study,
		completing follow-up, and analysed – page 10 and figure 1
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage – <b>figure 1</b>
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram – figure 1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and
2 osonpui o auto		information on exposures and potential confounders – <b>page 10 to 12</b>
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures – nage 13
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and if applicable confounder-adjusted estimates and
	10	their precision (eg. 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were
		adjusted for and why they were included - nage 13 to 17
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous veriables were estagorized
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized

For peer review only - http://bmjopen!bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

		meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and
		sensitivity analyses
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives - page 18
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias - page 19
		and 20
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,
		multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence -
		page 18 and 19
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results - page 20 and 21
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if
		applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based – page 21

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen?bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

# **BMJ Open**

# Which work-related characteristics are most strongly associated with common mental disorders?: A crosssectional study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020770.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Mar-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Riviere, Mathieu; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136); Centre Hospitalier Régional, Department of Infectious Diseases Leroyer, Ariane; Centre Hospitalier Regional Universitaire de Lille, Occupational Health Ferreira Carreira, Lionel; Centre Hospitalier Regional Universitaire de Lille, Occupational Health Blanchon, Thierry; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Plancke, Laurent; Fédération régionale de recherche en psychiatrie et santé mentale Hauts-de-France Melchior, Maria; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Plancke, Naria; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Younès, Nadia; EA 40-47 University of Versailles Saint-Quentin; Academic Unit of psychiatry for adults, Versailles Hospital
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Occupational and environmental medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health, General practice / Family practice
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PSYCHIATRY, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

2	1	
3	2	Which work-related characteristics are most strongly associated with common mental
4	3	disorders? : A cross-sectional study
5	4	
6 7 8	5	Mathieu Rivière <sup>a,b</sup> , Ariane Leroyer <sup>c</sup> , Lionel Ferreira Carreira <sup>c</sup> , Thierry Blanchon <sup>a</sup> , Laurent Plancke <sup>d</sup> ,
9 10	6	Maria Melchior <sup>a</sup> , Nadia Younès <sup>e,f</sup>
11	7	
12	8	a Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique
13 14	9	(IPLESP UMRS 1136), F75013, Paris, France
15 16	10	b Department of Infectious Diseases, Centre Hospitalier Régional, Orléans, France
17 19	11	c Université Lille Nord de France, Lille, France
18 19	12	d Fédération régionale de recherche en santé mentale (F2RSM) Nord - Pas-de-Calais, Lille, France
20 21	13	e EA 40-47 University of Versailles Saint-Quentin, Versailles, France
22	14	f Academic Unit of psychiatry for adults, Versailles Hospital, Versailles, France
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Word count: 4,497 <u>Corresponding author:</u> Mathieu Rivière Réseau Sentinelles, Centre hospitalier régional d'Orléans 1 rue porte Madeleine, 45000 Orléans, France Phone : 00 33 (2) 38 74 40 05. Fax : 00 33 (2) 76 34 16 38 E-mail : mathieu.riviere@iplesp.upmc.fr
36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45		
46 47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54 55		
56		
57		
58		4
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

**BMJ** Open

#### ABSTRACT

OBJECTIVES: Studies exploring work-related risk factors of common mental disorders (CMD) such as major depressive disorder (MDD), generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) or alcohol abuse have generally focused on a limited set of work characteristics. We study, for the first time in a primary care setting, simultaneously multiple work-related risk factors of CMD. 

METHOD: We use data from a representative study of working individuals recruited among 2,027 patients of 121 representative general practitioners (GP) in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in France (April-August 2014). CMD were assessed using the MINI (Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview). Six emergent worked-related factors were explored (work intensity, emotional demands, autonomy, social relationships at work, conflict of values, and insecurity of work). Several covariates were considered (patient's, GP's and contextual characteristics). To study the association between workplace risk factors and CMD (MDD; GAD; alcohol abuse) multilevel Poisson regression models adjusted for covariates were performed.

RESULTS: Among study participants, 389 (19.1%) had current MDD, 522 (25.8%) current GAD and 196 (9.7%) current alcohol abuse. In multivariable analyses adjusted for covariates, MDD/GAD was significantly associated with work intensity (RR=1.16 [1.06 - 1.27]) (absolute risk = 52.8%), emotional demands (RR=1.24 [1.13 - 1.35]) (absolute risk = 54.9%) and social relations at work (RR=0.78 [0.70 – 0.87]) (absolute risk = 15.0%); alcohol abuse was associated with social relations at work (RR=1.25 [1.01 - 1.53]) (absolute risk = 7.6%) and autonomy (OR=0.82 [0.67 - 0.99]) (absolute risk = 8.9%). 

CONCLUSIONS: Several workplace factors are associated with CMD among working individuals seen by a GP. These findings confirm the role of organizational characteristics of work as a correlate of psychological difficulties above and beyond other sources of risk.

- Key terms: mental health; primary care; workplace factors

BMJ Open

2 3	1	STRE	NGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
4 5	2	►	Cross-sectional study design
6 7	3	$\triangleright$	Study of occupational factors related to common mental disorders among working adults in
8 9	4		primary care with a standardized diagnostic tool in a large sample
10 11	5	$\succ$	The study was conducted in the Nord – Pas-de-Calais region in France, one of the poorest in
12 13	6		France thus, this could lead to a high level of psychological disorders
14 15	7	$\triangleright$	Selective participation of general practitioners (GP) may have led to an overrepresentation of
16 17	8		patients with psychological disorders. However GPs were selected to be representative of
18 19	9		the region's GPs and the use of a random procedure to define patients included in the study
20 21	10		limits this bias
22 23	11		
24 25	12		
26 27	13		
28 29			
30 31			
32 33			
34 35			
36 37			
38 39			
40 41			
42			
43 44			
45 46			
47 48			
49 50			
51 52			
53 54			
55 56			
57 58			
59 60			3 For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
00			
#### 1 INTRODUCTION

 Individuals who are part of the labour force are generally in better health than the unemployed.<sup>1</sup> however work can also have negative effects on somatic and psychosocial health.<sup>2</sup> A study with trained general practitioners (GP) in occupational medicine found that mental health issues are the most frequent disorders attributed to work, after musculoskeletal disorders.<sup>3</sup> They are responsible for most of sickness absence and long-term work incapacity.<sup>4</sup> In France, data from the national health insurance shows that 20% of sickness absence are caused by mental disorders with an increased proportion for long term sickness absence.<sup>5</sup> Mental disorders encountered among employed are mainly "Common Mental Disorders" (CMD), as defined based on epidemiological data by a systematic review and meta-analysis of this literature, as a combination of disorders across the mood, anxiety and substance use disorder (alcohol) spectrum.<sup>6</sup> The association between work and CMD is bidirectional: work has been shown as a risk factor of poor mental health<sup>7</sup> but the presence of CMD can also influence job performance and well-being.<sup>89</sup> Several others risk factors of CMD are already known, even if associations vary for the different disorders. Sociodemographic risk factors include being divorced or widowed, having a low educational level, older age, sex.<sup>10-12</sup> Genetic factors<sup>13</sup> and personal or family history of somatic chronic disease or psychiatric disease are also well described in literature.<sup>14</sup> Environmental factors (e.g. social and material deprivation, etc.) were described and show that low socio-economic status was associated with higher rates of depression.10 11 

Psychosocial factors related to the work environment are of particular interest because they may be more easily prevented than those which results from life events, which are often unavoidable. Three main theoretical models have been proposed to explain relations between work characteristics and mental health. First, Karasek<sup>15</sup> argued that keys to health are psychological demands, decision latitude and social support. Second, Siegrist<sup>16</sup> proposed that the subjectively ascertained effort-reward balance is what matters most. These two models are the gold standard to study psychosocial risk at work and have a good predictive value but they lack some dimensions to well describe the psychosocial environment at work at the individual level and more precisely dimension Page 5 of 36

#### **BMJ** Open

about procedural justice in the company. A third model addressing the role of organizational justice developed by Elovainio included interpersonal comparison, that is to say comparison of the response of the company in the same situation for different employees.<sup>17</sup> Several studies evaluate the impact of work on mental health using these theoretical models.<sup>7 18 19</sup> Overall, the risk of mental disorders is higher when there is high job demands, low job control, high effort-reward imbalance or low organizational justice. As work organization is evolving, other psychosocial factors described as "emergent factors" (e.g. insecurity at work, conflict of values, etc.) appear in the recent studies<sup>20-23</sup>: Workers experiencing high job insecurity or role conflict also seem to have a higher levels of CMD.<sup>20</sup> <sup>21</sup>An important systematic meta-review identified three overlapping categories of work-placed risk factors that may contribute to the development of common mental health problems (considering depression and/or anxiety), combining emergent and classical factors and identified with reasonable levels of evidence: imbalanced job design (high job demands, low job control, low social support in work-place, effort-reward imbalance), occupational uncertainty (low job control, low procedural justice, job insecurity, temporary employment status, low social support in work-place) and lack of value and respect in workplace (effort-reward imbalance, procedural justice, temporary employment status, low social support in work-place).<sup>7</sup> This review did not describe precisely CMD (MDD was most explored, GAD less explored<sup>7 24 25</sup> and alcohol abuse should also be explored among CMD) and as reported by the authors, it was based too frequently upon self-reported questionnaires and not validated diagnostic interviews. Moreover, those factors changes over time with modification of the labour market (increased globalization, competition, new forms of work organization, etc). A French study assessed changes in psychosocial work factors between 2006 and 2011 and showed that some psychosocial work factors deteriorated (decision latitude, social support, reward, role conflict and work life imbalance) between 2006 and 2011. It also found that these changes varied according to age, occupation, sector activity and type of contract.<sup>26</sup> The objective of this study is to assess the association between GAD, MDD and alcohol abuse in a primary care setting, using validated diagnostic interviews and combining most psychosocial work-related risk factors in a population of individuals consulting their general practitioner (GP). Combining emergent and classical factors is important in order to identify which are most strongly related to workers' mental

health, this was outlined in the meta-review by Harvey et al.<sup>7</sup> We considered that this population is important to explore as people with CMD are frequently treated by GP either initially or throughout treatment.<sup>27 28</sup> In primary care, the prevalence levels of CMD are high, ranging from 3%<sup>21</sup> to 25% for anxiety disorders,<sup>12 27-30</sup> 6%<sup>12</sup> to 25% for depression<sup>10 27-30</sup> and 2%<sup>28</sup> to 11% for alcohol abuse.<sup>27 28</sup> Two studies conducted in the United Kingdom show that a third of patients seeing a GP for workrelated reasons had a mental health issue.<sup>3 31</sup> It constitutes a major clinical issue: GPs often have difficulties managing work-related mental health problems, as they often lack negotiation strategies regarding sick leave, communication skills and cooperation with occupational physicians.<sup>32</sup> GPs encounter every type of workers and not only big industrial settings with occupational services. A better understanding of work related factors of mental health is important in order to help GPs to consider specific actions.

BMJ Open

#### 2 METHODS

#### 2.1 Design and Study population

Heracles is a cross-sectional study conducted between April and August 2014 among working individuals consulting a primary care physician in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in the North of France. The number of subjects needed and the set-up of the study have previously been described<sup>33</sup>. Briefly, with an estimated prevalence of 20% and to have a precision of 10%, we aimed to include 2,000 patients via their GP. Participating GPs who gave an oral consent to participate, were asked to include randomly a maximum of 24 patients who met the following criteria: being actively employed and aged 18 to 65 years, regardless of the reason of their medical appointment. GPs were selected to be representative of the distribution of GPs in 15 areas of the Nord-Pas-de-Calais region that we studied. GPs had to include the two first patients who met the inclusion criteria in each previously defined time slot. Approximately ¼ of the GPs of the region were contacted to participate, they were selected in a way that was proportional to the distribution of GPs in 15 areas of Nord - Pas-de-Calais region that were studied. GP's had to include the two first patient who met the inclusion criteria in each time slot defined previously with GPs according to their working schedule. Before the appointment the GP gave written information to their patients to inform them about the study and asked them to sign an informed consent.

18 This study was conducted by the Sentinelles network,<sup>34</sup> part of the INSERM-Paris Sorbonne 19 University research unit UMR-S 1136. This research group has a standing authorization from the 20 French independent administrative authority protecting privacy and personal data (CNIL), n°471 393 21 to conduct research among GPs and their patients.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

#### 2.2 Data collection

Participating GPs received a 15 minute phone training on the use of the questionnaire before the
beginning of the study. After their regular appointment, GPs interviewed their patients for the
purposes of the study. Study questionnaires included information on:

#### 2.2.1 Measurement of common mental disorders

6 CMDs were measured using a standardised diagnostic interview: the Mini International 7 Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) that was used as a screening tool. The MINI is a structured clinical 8 interview that enables the diagnosis of mental disorders based on the Diagnosis and Statistical 9 Manual of Mental Disorders, fourth edition (DSM-IV).<sup>35</sup>

In this study, three different diagnoses were ascertained: Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) (during
 the preceding 2 weeks), Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD) (during the preceding 6 months), and
 alcohol abuse (during the preceding 12 months).

Depending on the mental disorders studied, the sensibility of the MINI varied between 83 to 94%
(MDD: 94%; GAD: 88%; Alcohol: 83%), the specificity between 72 to 97% (MDD: 79%; GAD: 72%;
Alcohol: 97%) and the Kappa concordance coefficient between 0.36 to 0.82 (MDD: 0.73; GAD: 0.36;
Alcohol: 0.82). The inter-rater and test-retest reliability measured by Kappa coefficient were good,
respectively 0.88 to 1 and 0.76 to 0.93.<sup>36</sup>

#### 2.2.2 Work characteristics

Work characteristics were self-reported by the patient to their GP. We used a national French questionnaire proposed by experts in the field based on the international scientific literature and after auditioning Robert Karasek and Johannes Siegrist.<sup>22</sup> It combines guestions measuring demand - control – social support developed in Karasek's model<sup>15</sup> (two questions about decision latitude, four questions about psychological demands and two questions about social support); questions measuring effort/reward balance in Siegrist's model<sup>16</sup> (three questions about reward and one question about overinvestment), and questions about organizational justice from Moorman's guestionnaire.<sup>37</sup> guestions from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire<sup>38</sup> and from the 

Page 9 of 36

#### **BMJ** Open

General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work<sup>39</sup> or from WOrking Conditions and Control Questionnaire (WOCCQ)<sup>40</sup>. Overall, twenty items explore six different areas (Appendix 1): 1) five for the first area related to work intensity and duration (contradictory orders, excessive amounts of work, too much to think about at work, difficulties in balancing work and family life, time needed for work), 2) six items for the second area concerning emotional demands (contacts with customers/beneficiaries, contact with people in distress, conflicts with customers/beneficiaries, the need to hide emotions, fear, exposure to aggressions), 3) two items for the third area concerning autonomy (limited possibility of decision, full and well employment of skills), 4) three items for the fourth area relating quality of social work relations (full-recognition of the work, support from colleagues, support from superior), 5) two items for the fifth area concerning ethical conflicts (possibility to make a work of quality, doing disapproved things) 6) and two items in the last area about insecurity of work (ability to work until retirement, fear of losing job). For four of these items (public contact at work, contact with people in distress, contradictory order, ability to work until retirement) the response was either "yes" or "no" and for the other factors the responses were "always"/"often"/"sometimes"/"never" numbered from 1 to 4. Reliability of the questionnaire was assessed by computing an alpha Cronbach coefficient. This coefficient varied between 0.34 to 0.68. The reliability was lower for ethical conflicts ( $\alpha$ =0.34), emotional demands ( $\alpha$ =0.44) and higher for work intensity ( $\alpha$ =0.48), insecurity of work ( $\alpha$ =0.48), autonomy ( $\alpha$ =0.65) and social work relations (α=0.68).

2.2.3 Covariates

Patient's characteristics

- We considered already know risk-factors of CMD.<sup>10</sup>
  - Past somatic or psychiatric problems;

Sociodemographic (age, gender, family status, family income, level of education); •

Occupational grade<sup>41</sup>, they were classified in three groups; blue (farmer/manual worker). • pink (technician/associate professional/clerk/service worker) and white collar workers (manager/professional);42 

2	1	Company size;
5 4 5	2	Job instability: a recombined variable of type of contract
6 7 8	3	Primary care characteristics <sup>43</sup>
9 10	4	• Reason for medical appointment (somatic, psychological, chronic disease management);
11 12	5	Sociodemographic (GP's age, GP's gender);
13 14	6	• Practice characteristics (size of practice; comfort with psychological distress issues;
15 16 17	7	opportunity to collaborate with mental health specialists).
18 19	8	Contextual characteristics (by proximity area)
20 21 22	9	Contextual characteristics have been shown to be associated with CMD in primary care <sup>10 11</sup>
23 24	10	<ul> <li>Psychiatrists, psychologist and GPs density;</li> </ul>
25	11	• Social deprivation (loneliness, single parenthood, widowhood/divorce) and material
20 27 29	12	deprivation (unemployment, income, level of not graduated); <sup>44 45</sup>
20 29	13	• Geographical area: 15 proximity areas defined by the regional health agency of the Nord
30 31 32	14	– Pas-de-Calais region.
33 34 35 36	15	2.3 Statistical Analyses
37 38	16	Some of the covariates were recoded to use fewer categories. For family status, participants living
39 40	17	alone or living with parents were grouped into one category. For family income, participants were
41 42	18	grouped in two categories: [0-3,000 euros (which corresponds to approximately two times the
43 44	19	minimum wage in France) and >=3,000 euros. For educational level, we created two categories:
45 46	20	less than a high school degree (no degree, degree below high school) or a degree higher or equal to
47 48	21	a high school degree. For age, our continuous variable was studied in three categories based on the
49 50	22	distribution 18-35; 36-50; 51-65.
51 52	23	Sociodemographic characteristics of all patients were described and associations between these
53 54	24	covariates with GAD, MDD and alcohol abuse were studied using the Chi-square test. Covariates
55 56	25	associated with the outcomes with p<0.2 were included in the multivariate analysis.
57 58		40
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 11 of 36

#### BMJ Open

A value was attributed to each answer of the twenty questions regarding occupational factors. Those factors were regrouped according to the 6 dimensions defined in the Gollac report and in order to be able to compare each dimension, a Z-score was calculated for each dimension.<sup>22</sup> A correlation matrix of the different work characteristics was computed and presented in a supplementary file (appendix 2). In bivariate analysis the dimensions were classified as high if the score was above the third guartile and as low if not, in multivariable models they were used as continuous variables. To study the association between occupational factors and alcohol we performed multilevel logistic regression models with patient as level one and geographical area as level two. GAD and MDD were merged into the same variable because of intercorrelation. To study the association between occupational factors and GAD/MDD and alcohol we used multilevel Poisson regression models using a robust error variance procedure (sandwich estimation)<sup>46</sup> with patient as level one and geographical area as level two. Given the high prevalence of these problems, Poisson regression was preferred to logistic regression to avoid overestimating the risk ratios.<sup>47</sup> GAD/MDD or alcohol abuse were the dependent variables and the six occupational factors were the exposition variables. The models were adjusted for each exposition variable and for other covariates that were associated with GAD/MDD or alcohol abuse (p<0.05) in a multivariable Poisson regression model excluding occupational factors. Age, sex and occupational grade were included directly in the adjustment variable. Absolute risk within exposed population was computed for each occupational factors. All analyses were performed using GNU R software version 3.1.1. (Ime4 package).4849 

#### 3 RESULTS

### 3.1 Participation and description of the population

Of the 1,000 GPs contacted by mail, 185 accepted to participate (response rate= 18.5%) and 121 completed the study (Figure 1). Participating GPs were more likely to be male (sex ratio=1.82), and to be 50 years or older; they were disseminated throughout the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region (Table 1). Participating GPs were representative of the other GPs in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in term of geographical localisation, age, type and years of practice.

Participating GPs recruited 2,027 patients among which 389 (19.1%) had MDD, 522 (25.8%)
GAD and 196 (9.7%) alcohol abuse. Patients were mostly female (53.6%) aged 42.3 years (sd 10.6)
on average, mainly living with a partner (76.2%). Patients were pink collar workers in 60.1% of
cases (clerk/service workers and technician/associate professional), 61.3% had graduated from high
school and 30.2% had been unemployed in the past. Among participants, 21.0% came to see their
GP for psychological reasons (Table 1). Characteristics of patient with MDD, GAD or alcohol abuse
are presented in table 2.

The study response rate was 80%: 41 GPs filled a non-respondent form for 495 patients who refused to participate. Non-respondents did not differ from participants in term of age (p=0.47) and sex (p=0.23). Comparing with the data of the National Health Insurance for working age patient consulting a GP, participants were older (p<0.01) and were similar for sex distribution (p=0.08).

Table 1: Description	of the study population,	Héraclès study,	France,	2014
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		,	

Work Characteristics	Ν	%
Work intensity		
High	437	21.6
Low	1,588	78.3
Emotional demands	476	<b></b>
High	476 1 549	23.0 76.4
Autonomy	1,010	70.
High	598	29.5
Low	1,427	70.4
Conflict of values	605	22.0
Hign	085 1 340	53.0 66 1
Social relationships at work	1,040	00.
High	688	33.9
Low	1,337	66.0
Insecurity		<b>0-</b>
High	565	27.9
Covariates	1,400	12.0
Patient Characteristics		
Age group		
[18-35]	597	29.5
[36-50]	872	43.1
Occupational grade	552	21.3
Blue collar	273	13.9
Pink collar	1,185	60.1
White collar	513	26.0
Educational level	700	20.7
< High school degree	1 238	38. <i>1</i> 61.3
Family status	1,200	01.0
Lives alone	481	23.8
Lives with a partner or parents	1,543	76.2
Household income (in €)	101	
[0-3.000]	491	30.6
Number of worker in the company	1,112	09
1 to 10	361	18.4
11 to 50	490	25.0
51 to 250	420	21.5
250 +	687	35.
Yes	189	9.8
No	1,735	90.2
Past somatic problems		
Yes	559	28.9
No	1,373	71.1

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Table 1: (continued)		
	Ν	%
Purpose of consultation with GP		
Somatic		
Yes	1,331	65.7
No	696	34.3
Psychological		
Yes	425	21.0
No	1,602	79.0
Chronic disease management		
Yes	313	15.4
No	1,714	84.6
Past unemployment		
Yes	613	30.2
No	1,414	69.8
Job instability		
Yes	522	33.0
No	1,061	67.0
GPs characteristics		
GP's gender		
Male	1,364	67.3
Female	663	32.7
GP's age		
[18-39]	194	9.6
[40-49]	626	30.9
[50-59]	832	41.0
60 +	375	18.5
Size of practice population		
0-500	211	11.2
5000 - 1000	993	52.5
1000- 1500	433	22.9
1500+	253	13.4
Comfort with Mental health problems		
High	1,600	82.6
Low	338	17.4
High opportunity to work with mental health specialists	s	
High	1,036	52.4
Low	941	47.6
Contextual characteristics		
Social deprivation		
High	552	27.2
low	1.475	72.8
Material deprivation	, -	
High	850	41.9
low	1,177	58.1
Density of psychiatrist	.,	
High	1,569	77.4
Low	458	22.6
Density of psychologist		0
High	1.554	76.7
Low	473	23.3
Density of GP		_0.0
High	1 525	75.2
low	502	24.8
Geographical area	502	24.0
Métronole Flandre intérieure	1 035	51 1
	1,000	16.4
Hainault - Cambrésis	555	10.4
Hainault - Cambrésis Artois - Douaisis	227	16 6
Hainault - Cambrésis Artois - Douaisis Littoral	337	16.6

## BMJ Open

1 2 3 4	1	
5 6 7	2	3.2 MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse and related work factors
7 8 9	3	Bivariate analysis (Table 2)
10 11	4	In bivariate analyses, sex was significantly associated with the two outcomes: high levels of GAD
12 13	5	and MDD in women and high levels of alcohol abuse in men. Family status, the number of workers
13 14 15	6	in the company, past psychiatric problems, consultation for psychiatric, somatic or chronic diseases
15 16 17	7	and job insecurity were also significantly associated with the two outcomes. Occupational grade,
18 19	8	education level and past unemployment were significantly associated (p<0.01) with only alcohol
20 21	9	abuse with higher rates for blue collar workers, patients who experienced unemployment in the past
21 22 23 24 25 26 27	10	and individuals with an education level lower than a high school degree. Age and household income
	11	were only associated with MDD/GAD.
	12	Regarding GP characteristics, GP gender and opportunity to work with mental health specialist was
27	13	associated with the two outcomes. Size of practice population was associated only with MDD/GAD.
29 30 31	14	Most of the contextual variables studied were not associated with our study outcomes, except for
32	15	material deprivation and density of psychiatrists and psychologists which were significantly
33 34 25	16	associated with MDD/GAD. To the contrary, work characteristics were almost all significantly
35 36 27	17	associated with the two outcomes except insecurity and autonomy which were not associated with
37 38 30	18	alcohol abuse (Table 2).
40	19	
41 42		
43		
44 45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		

**Table 2**: Association between common mental disorders (major depressive disorders (MDD), generalised anxiety disorders (GAD) and Alcohol abuse) and covariates, Héraclès study, France, 2014 (Chi-square test)

	MDD and G	AD (n=648)	Alcohol	(n=196)
	N (%)	p (v2.df)	N (%)	p
Work Characteristics		( <u></u> χ∠-ui)		( <u></u> %2-ui)
Work intensity		<0.01		0.01
High Low	232 (52.8) 416 (26.2)	(111.1 - 1)	58 (13.3) 138 (8.7)	(7.5 - 1)
Emotional demands High Low	262 (54.9) 386 (24.9)	0.01<) (149.8 - 1)	73 (15.3) 123 (7.9)	0.01> (21.8 - 1)
Autonomy High	158 (26.4)	<0.01 (11.6 - 1)	53 (8.9)	0.48 (0.6 - 1)
Conflict of values High Low	335 (48.8) 313 (23.3)	<0.01 (134.4 - 1)	90 (13.1) 106 (7.9)	0.01
Social relationships at work High Low	103 (15.0) 545 (40.7)	<0,01 (137.2 - 1)	52 (7.6) 144 (10.8)	0,03 (4.9 - 1)
nsecurity High Low	242 (42.8) 406 (27.8)	<0,01 (41.8 - 1)	64 (11.3) 132 (9.0)	0,14 (2.2 - 1)
<u>Covariates</u>				
Patient Characteristics				
Age group [18-35] [36-50] [51-65]	172 (28.8) 306 (35.1) 169 (30.6)	0,03 (7.1 - 2)	48 (8.0) 87 (10.0) 60 (10.9)	0,24 (2.8 - 2)
Sex H F	266 (28.3) 382 (35.2)	<0,01 (10.5 - 1)	140 (14.9) 56 (5.2)	<0,01 (53.7 - 1)
Dccupational grade Blue collar Pink collar White collar	79 (28.9) 386 (32.6) 152 (29.6)	0.32 (2.3 - 2)	53 (19.4) 86 (7.3) 50 (9.7)	<0.01 (37.8 - 2)
Educational level < High school degree ≥ High school degree	266 (34.1) 381 (30.8)	0.13 (2.3 - 1)	98 (12.6) 97 (7.8)	0.01> (11.7 - 1)
Family status Lives alone Lives with a partner or parents	471 (30.5) 177 (36.8)	0.01 (6.3 - 1)	63 (13.1) 133 (8.6)	0.01> (7.9 - 1)
Household income (in €) [0-3.000] 3.000 +	184 (37.5) 353 (31.7)	0.03 (4.8 - 1)	53 (10.8) 100 (9.0)	0.30 (1.1- 1)
Number of worker in the company 1 to 5 6 to 25 26 to 250 250 +	108 (29.9) 183 (37.3) 138 (32.9) 203 (29.5)	0.03 (9.1 - 3)	51 (14.1) 53 (10.8) 43 (10.2) 45 (6.6)	<0.01 (16.5 - 3)
Past psychiatric problems Yes No	108 (57.1) 516 (29.8)	<0.01 (57.1 - 1)	30 (15.9) 150 (8.6)	0.01<0.01
Past somatic problems Yes No	185 (33.1) 445 (32.4)	0.82 (0.05 - 1)	53 (9.5) 136 (9.9)	0.84 (0.04- 1)

3 p: Chi-square test df: degree of freedo

*df: degree of freedom* 

**Table 2:** (continued)

	MDD and G	AD (n=648)	Alcohol (	(n=196)
	N (%)	p (χ2-df)	N (%)	р (χ2-df)
Purpose of consultation with GP				
Somatic		<0.01		0.04
Yes	335 (25.2)	(81.5 - 1)	115 (8.6)	(4.4 - 1)
No	313 (45.0)		81 (11.6)	
Psychological		<0.01		<0.01
Yes	312 (73.4)	(422.3 - 1)	61 (14.4)	(12.8 - 1)
No	336 (21.0)		135 (8.4)	
Chronic disease management	(2.1)	<0.01		<0.01
Yes	75 (24)	(10.5 - 1)	46 (14.7)	(10.0 - 1)
NO	573 (33.4)	0.57	150 (8.8)	10.01
Past unemployment	000 (00 0)	0.57	00 (40 4)	10.0>
res	202 (33.0)	(0.33 - 1)	80 (13.1)	(11.0 - 1)
INO Joh inconurity	446 (31.5)	<0.01	116 (8.2)	<0.01
Job Insecurity	220 (42 0)	<0.01	70 (12 4)	(12.0.1)
No	229 (43.9) 400 (27.5)	(47.0 - 1)	70 (13.4) 118 (11.1)	(12.0 - 1)
GPs Characteristics	400 (27.3)		110 (11.1)	
GP's gender		<0.01		<0.01
Male	375 (27 5)	(37.8 - 1)	152 (11 1)	(9.9 - 1)
Female	273 (41.2)	(01.0 1)	44 (6.6)	(0.0 1)
GP's age	)	0.13	(0.0)	0.14
[18-39]	72 (37.1)	(5.7 - 3)	18 (9.3)	(5.5 - 3)
[40-49]	190 (30.4)	(0.1. 0)	49 (7.8)	(0.0 0)
[50-59]	254 (30.5)		95 (11.4)	
60 +	132 (35.2)		34 (9.1)	
Size of practice population		<0.01		0.06
0-500	79 (37.4)	(14.7 - 3)	18 (8.5)	(7.4 - 3)
5000 - 1000	295 (29.7)		82 (8.3)	
1000- 1500	136 (31.4)		47 (10.9)	
1500+	104 (41.1)		34 (13.4)	
Comfort with mental health problems		0.21		0.48
High	500 (31.3)	(1.6 - 1)	155 (9.7)	(0.5 - 1)
Low	118 (34.9)		28 (8.3)	
High opportunity to work with mental		<0.01		0.05
	245 (26 7)	(10.0 1)	102 (0.0)	(2,7,1)
High	345 (36.7)	(18.2 - 1)	103 (9.9)	(3.7 - 1)
Contextual obstractoristics	200 (27.0)		00 (9.1)	
Social deprivation		0.32		0.87
High	167 (30.2)	(1.0 - 1)	52 (9 1)	(0.07 - 1)
Low	481 (32.6)	(1.0 - 1)	144 (9.8)	(0.00 - 1)
Material deprivation	401 (02.0)	< 0.01	144 (0.0)	0 74
High	306 (36.0)	(10.4 - 1)	85 (10)	(0.1 - 1)
Low	342 (29.1)	(10.1 1)	111 (9.4)	(0.1 1)
Density of psychiatrist		0.02		0.97
High	522 (33.3)	(5.1 - 1)	45 (9.8)	(0.01 - 1)
Low	126 (27.5)	, ,	151 (9.6)	. /
Density of psychologist	. ,	0.05	. ,	0.10
High	515 (33.1)	(4.0 - 1)	36 (7.6)	(2.7 - 1)
Low	133 (28.1)		160 (10.3)	
Density of GP		0.06		0.88
High	505 (33.1)	(3.6 - 1)	50 (10.0)	(0.02 - 1)
Low	143 (28.4)		146 (9.6)	

p: Chi-square test

df: degree of freedom

1 Multivariable analysis (Table 3)

All occupational factors were associated with our two study outcomes in unadjusted analysis. In adjusted analyses, patients reporting high levels of work intensity (RR=1.16 [1.06 - 1.27]; p<0.01) (absolute risk = 52.8%) and emotional demands (RR=1.24 [1.13 - 1.35]; p<0.01) (absolute risk = 54.9%) had a higher risk of MDD/GAD whereas patients with high social relations at work had lower risk to have MDD/GAD (RR=0.78 [0.70 – 0.87]; p<0.01) (absolute risk = 15.0%).

- 7 Regarding alcohol abuse, social relations at work were associated with higher risk (RR=1.25 [1.0 -
- 8 1.53]; p=0.03) (absolute risk = 7.6%) and higher autonomy was protective (RR=0.82 [0.67 0.99];
- 9 p=0.05) (absolute risk = 8.9%) (Table 3).
- 10 Result for the adjustment variables are presented as a supplementary file (appendix 3).

#### **BMJ** Open

Table 3: major depressive disorders (MDD), generalized anxiety disorders (GAD) and alcohol abuse work-related factors, Héraclès study, France, 2014. Multilevel Poisson regression models

		MDD/GAD (n=1782)				Alcohol (n=1776)						
		Unadjusted			Adjusted		Unadjusted			Adjusted		
	$RR^1$	CI 95%	Ρ	RR <sup>2</sup>	CI 95%	Ρ	$RR^1$	CI 95%	P	$RR^3$	CI 95%	Ρ
Work intensity	1.46	[1.35 - 1.57]	<0.01	1.16	[1.06 - 1.27]	<0.01	1.31	[1.14 - 1.50]	<0.01	1.16	[0.97 - 1.38]	0.10
Emotional demands	1.53	[1.43 - 1.64]	<0.01	1.24	[1.13 - 1.35]	<0.01	1.40	[1.23 - 1.59]	<0.01	1.16	[0.97 - 1.38]	0.10
Autonomy	0.68	[0.63 - 0.73]	<0.01	0.94	[0.85 - 1.04]	0.26	0.72	[0.63 - 0.83]	<0.01	0.82	[0.67 - 0.99]	0.05
Conflict of values	1.45	[1.35 - 1.56]	<0.01	1.06	[0.96 - 1.17]	0.26	1.30	[1.14 - 1.49]	<0.01	1.16	[0.96 - 1.40]	0.13
Social relationships at work	0.61	[0.56 - 0.66]	<0.01	0.78	[0.70 - 0.87]	<0.01	0.83	[0.72 - 0.96]	0.01	1.25	[1.01 - 1.53]	0.03
Insecurity	1.13	[1.05 - 1.22]	<0.01	1.03	[0.95 - 1.11]	0.49	1.14	[1.00 - 1.30]	0.05	0.95	[0.82 - 1.11]	0.52

RR : relative risk

<sup>1</sup>No adjustment: each occupational factor are studied one at the time

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted on : each occupational factors, age, sex, occupational grade, past psychiatric problems, alcohol abuse, material deprivation and GP's gender

<sup>3</sup>Adjusted on : each occupational factors, age, sex, occupational grade, family status, number of person in the company, past psychiatric problems, job instability, education level, past unemployment. GAD and MDD erien ont

For MDD/GAD model explained variance was 0.21 and 0.11 for Alcohol model

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
<i>'</i>	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
15	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
32 22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
30	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
15	
7J A6	
40	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
57	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
59	
60	

#### 4 DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 Main results

In our study conducted among a large sample of persons consulting a GP, we found that several work characteristics are associated with mental health. Unfavourable social relations at work are associated with a higher risk of MDD/GAD, but a lower risk of alcohol abuse. High work intensity and high emotional demands at work are associated with a higher risk of MDD/GAD. Finally, low autonomy at work is significantly associated with a higher risk of alcohol abuse.

9

1

1

2

3

### 4.2 Comparison with literature

10 We confirm, for the first time in primary care, the association between common mental disorders and 11 work social support. This is consistent with data from a cross sectional study conducted in Japan 12 (using the K10 guestionnaire to assess depression): higher risk of depressive symptoms for workers with low social support at work (OR=3.8)<sup>50</sup>. It is also coherent with data from a meta-analysis of 17 13 other studies investigating depressive disorders.<sup>51</sup> Low social support at work is also associated with 14 15 anxiety disorders as already observed in the population based study by Wang et al: employees with 16 poor social support from superior or co-workers had higher risk of having anxiety disorders for both gender.<sup>52</sup> However, the causal direction of this association cannot be determined due to the cross 17 18 sectional design of our study. It is possible that low social support increases the risk of having depression or anxiety as it has been shown in different longitudinal studies.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, it is well 19 known that social relations and support (outside or inside work) affect psychological health.<sup>54</sup> but it is 20 21 also possible that individual with no depression or anxiety disorders have better social support.<sup>54</sup> 22 Finally, the association between GAD/MDD and social support could also be related to negative views of social support when depressed or anxious.<sup>55</sup> For alcohol abuse an inverse association is observed: 23 higher risk associated with high social relationship at work and this result is consistent with results of 24 a cross sectional study conducted among Canadian workers.<sup>24</sup> It raises guestion about festive alcohol 25

Page 21 of 36

1 2

#### **BMJ** Open

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
3U 21	
ו כ ככ	
32 22	
27	
25	
36	
37	
38	
30	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

1 consumption with colleagues in or outside the company.<sup>56</sup> We perform a subgroup analysis by 2 occupational group to explore this result and we found that white collar were the most exposed group 3 to alcohol abuse with high social relationship at work (RR=1.89 [1.21 – 2.9]). Others studies have 4 approached this subject by pointing out afterwork with colleagues.<sup>57</sup>

5 Work intensity, or high psychological demand in terms of high working time and intensity is associated 6 with depressive symptoms in the meta-analysis by Theorell *et al* (10 studies).<sup>51</sup> The meta-analysis of 7 longitudinal studies by Netterstrom *et al* highlights the adverse effect of high psychological demand on 8 the occurrence of depressive disorders.<sup>53</sup> However, this association could also ensue that persons 9 with depressive disorders have distorted views of psychological demands.<sup>55</sup>

High emotional demands at work have already been observed for depressive disorders among women in a population-based nested case-control study of 14,166 psychiatric patients in Denmark (IRR=1.39)<sup>25</sup> or for GAD in the French prospective study SIP (using the same diagnostic tool MINI) (RR=1.66 among workers with high emotional demand<sup>21</sup>). The designs of those two studies argue for the negative effect of high emotional demand on depression and anxiety, but in our cross sectional study the causal attribution is not possible thus it is also possible that people with depression and/or anxiety have a different view towards those demands.<sup>55</sup>

Autonomy appears related to alcohol abuse, as reported in an English prospective study: low decision latitude, which is a part of the autonomy axis in our study, is associated to higher risk of alcohol dependence within women.<sup>58</sup>

20 We do not confirm the association found earlier between CMD and high job insecurity or conflict of 21 value.<sup>20 21 23</sup>

Based on stress models, our study shows that work intensity and emotional demand are stress factors for GAD/MDD and that social relations at work have a positive effect. For alcohol, autonomy is a stress factor and social relations at work seems to be induced by another mechanism described above.

60

26

#### 4.3 Strengths and limitations of the study

27 Several limitations of our study should be acknowledged.

First, our study was conducted in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region, i.e. one of the poorest in France with a total of four millions inhabitants. This region during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was highly industrialized and has suffered since the 1950s from industrial decline and mines, textile and steel industries gradually closing. Despite the growth of services and some specialized industries (car, rail and glass), levels of education, unemployment (15%), poverty and health indicators (e.g. life expectancy) are unfavourable. The Nord - Pas-de-Calais region has a low density of GPs (11% fewer than in France) and other medical specialities (24% fewer).<sup>59</sup> Moreover, the study was conducted after the 2008 recession, which has been associated with an increase in the prevalence of common mental health disorders worldwide.<sup>60 61</sup> This could lead to a high level of mental disorders. The prevalence of MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse within patient consulting a GP is respectively 19.1%, 25.8% and 9.7%. This is consistent in the superior limits with studies in primary care ranging prevalence from 6% to 25% for depression, 3% to 25% for anxiety and 2% to 11% for alcohol abuse.<sup>10 12 27-30</sup> Results should be replicated in others areas. 

Second, a possible weakness is the selective participation of GPs. GPs who have participated in the study could be especially interested in common mental disorders. This interest may be related to the personal interest of the GP, but it could also be related to the GP patient rate of common mental disorders. Therefore, it may cause a larger selection of patient with psychological disorders. However, response rate are similar to previous studies<sup>28 62</sup> and GPs were selected to be representative of the Nord - Pas-de-Calais GPs in term of geographical localization, thereby limiting possible bias. In general practice, GPs' response rate is known to be low<sup>63</sup>, and in order to favour an optimal response rate, we tested the guestionnaire to make it parsimonious, GPs were paid for their participation, and GPs who were asked to participate were individually called. Participating GP had similar age, practice and years of practice than all GPs in the region. Patient selection should also be considered. However, a random procedure to define patients included in the study limits this bias. Indeed, GPs were asked to include patient following an inclusion schedule that was provided at the start of the study. This allowed us to include patient in different time slots of the week. Moreover a non-respondent form had to be filled by the GPs but we suppose that the filling rate was low because only 41 GPs filled this form and declare that 495 patient were not included. Characteristics of patients

#### **BMJ** Open

included and those not included did not differ in term of age and sex. However it is important to note
that compared to studies in work environment settings, it is possible that patients included in this
primary care setting have a different level of health than other employees who do not consult their
GPs.

5 The measurement of psychosocial work factors was based on an unpublished work of experts in this 6 field who based their work on international literature, measurement of reliability in our sample was 7 rather low for some axis ( $\alpha$ =0.34 for ethical conflict). The use of a validated questionnaire could have 8 allowed for a better comparison with the existing literature and better psychometric quality.

9 We were able to take into account many covariates (characterizing individuals, GPs and patients' 10 context), but nevertheless we missed some other important variables. Indeed, it would have been 11 informative to control for individual characteristics such as prior history of mental health problems, 12 social support outside of work or life events that are known to be associated with CMD, thus they 13 could have an effect on the relationship between CMD and work related factors.

Despite these limitations, the results of this work are of interest because they study occupational factors related to CMD (MDD/GAD and alcohol abuse) among working adults in primary care with a standardized diagnostic tool (MINI) in a large sample (n=2,027).<sup>35</sup> The primary care sample used allows the inclusion of a representative panel of workers in the labour force including independent workers, workers in small companies or workers who don't have an occupational physician which is not the case in most of studies in occupational setting. Indeed, an international study including 49 countries shows that the average occupational health services coverage of workers was 24.8% with a larger gap among workers in small-scale enterprises, the self-employed, agriculture, and the informal sector.<sup>64</sup> Moreover the exploratory character of our study confirm the increased risk of anxiety/depression for work intensity, social support and emotional demands and the link between autonomy and alcohol abuse in a primary care setting. This study also shows a negative effect of social support at work for alcohol abuse.<sup>7 21 25 58</sup> However we have to be cautious about these results and further studies in other areas have to be done in order to confirm our findings.

#### 4.4 Conclusion

Our study is one of the first to investigate simultaneously well-known factors related to job strain and effort-reward imbalance models and new occupational factors described in recent literature. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first conducted among working individuals in primary care. Results emphasise the importance of social support at work and different occupational factors that are associated with MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse. These results could be a starting point for the GPs to apprehend these factors with the patient and to communicate with the occupational physician in order to prevent the onset of CMD.

#### 10 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank all the participating GPs of the Nord – Pas-de-Calais region and their patients who participated to the Héraclès study. We thank the department of General practice of Lille's university and the regional union of health professional of GP's (URPS-ML) of the Nord – Pas-de-Calais region for their involvement in the GP recruitment phase. We also want to thank the Héraclès study scientific committee members who contributed to the brainstorming and the set-up of this survey

#### 17 CONTRIBUTORS

Study concept and design: MR, NY, MM, AL, TB, LP. Data analysis and collection: MR, LFC, MM, LP.
Drafting of the manuscript: MR. Critical revision of the manuscript: NY, MM, AL. All authors have
approved the final manuscript.

#### 22 COMPETING INTERESTS

All authors declare that they do not have any competing interests and declare independence from thefunders.

- - 26 FUNDING

1		
2 3	1	This work was supported by the Nord – Pas-de-Calais regional health agency (ARS) and the Ile-de-
4 5	2	France region – DIM Gestes (Mathieu Rivière's PhD thesis).
6 7	3	
8 9	4	DATA SHARING STATEMENT
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	3 4 5	<section-header></section-header>
55 56		
57 58		
59 60		25 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

#### REFERENCES

1. Wagenaar AF, Kompier MA, Houtman IL, et al. Employment contracts and health selection: unhealthy employees out and healthy employees in? J Occup Environ Med 2012;54(10):1192-200. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e3182717633 [published Online First: 2012/09/22] 2. McLellan RK. Work, Health, And Worker Well-Being: Roles And Opportunities For Employers. Health Aff (Millwood) 2017;36(2):206-13. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1150 [published Online First: 2017/02/09] 3. Hussey L, Turner S, Thorley K, et al. Work-related ill health in general practice, as reported to a UK-wide surveillance scheme. Br J Gen Pract 2008;58(554):637-40. doi: 10.3399/bjgp08X330753 [published Online First: 2008/09/20] 4. Whiteford HA, Degenhardt L, Rehm J, et al. Global burden of disease attributable to mental and substance use disorders: findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. Lancet (London, England) 2013;382(9904):1575-86. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)61611-6 [published] Online First: 2013/09/03] 5. NHI. Description des populations du regime general en arret de travail de 2 a 4 mois 2004 [Available from: http://fulltext.bdsp.ehesp.fr/Cnamts/Etudes/2004/DESCRIPTION ARRETS TRAVAIL 2 4 MOIS 2004.pdf. 6. Steel Z, Marnane C, Iranpour C, et al. The global prevalence of common mental disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis 1980-2013. Int J Epidemiol 2014;43(2):476-93. doi: 10.1093/ije/dvu038 [published Online First: 2014/03/22] 7. Harvey SB, Modini M, Joyce S, et al. Can work make you mentally ill? A systematic meta-review of work-related risk factors for common mental health problems. Occup Environ Med 2017;74(4):301-10. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2016-104015 [published Online First: 2017/01/22] 8. Reme SE, Grasdal AL, Lovvik C, et al. Work-focused cognitive-behavioural therapy and individual job support to increase work participation in common mental disorders: a randomised controlled multicentre trial. Occup Environ Med 2015;72(10):745-52. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2014-102700 [published Online First: 2015/08/08] 9. Stewart WF, Ricci JA, Chee E, et al. Cost of lost productive work time among US workers with depression. JAMA 2003;289(23):3135-44. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.23.3135 [published Online First: 2003/06/19] 10. Milanovic SM, Erjavec K, Poljicanin T, et al. Prevalence of depression symptoms and associated socio-demographic factors in primary health care patients. Psychiatr Danub 2015;27(1):31-7. [published Online First: 2015/03/10] 11. Freeman A, Tyrovolas S, Koyanagi A, et al. The role of socio-economic status in depression: results from the COURAGE (aging survey in Europe). BMC Public Health 2016;16(1):1098. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3638-0 [published Online First: 2016/10/21] 12. Ibanez G, Son S, Chastang J, et al. Mental Health Disorders in General Practice in France: A Cross-Sectional Survey. Transl Biomed 2016:7:4. doi: 10.2167/2172-0479.100096 13. Lacerda-Pinheiro SF, Pinheiro Junior RF, Pereira de Lima MA, et al. Are there depression and anxiety genetic markers and mutations? A systematic review. J Affect Disord 2014:168:387-98. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2014.07.016 [published Online First: 2014/08/12] 14. Abbas RA, Hammam RA, El-Gohary SS, et al. Screening for common mental disorders and substance abuse among temporary hired cleaners in Egyptian Governmental Hospitals, Zagazig City, Sharqia Governorate. The international journal of occupational and environmental *medicine* 2013;4(1):13-26. [published Online First: 2013/01/03] 15. Karasek R. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain : implication for job redesign. Adm Sci Q 1979 24 285-309.

1		
2	1	1 Circuit I Advance health affects afficial affect/lane around any distance I Correct Health Davahal
3	1	16. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. J Occup Health Psychol 100(11(1))27.41 [mathicked Online First, 100(01/01]]
4	2	1996;1(1):27-41. [published Online First: 1996/01/01]
5	3	17. Elovalnio M, Kivimaki M, vantera J. Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial
6 7	4	predictor of health. Am J Public Health 2002;92(1):105-8. [published Online First: 2002/01/05]
/	5	18. Rugulies R, Aust B, Madsen IE. Effort-reward imbalance at work and risk of depressive disorders.
0	6	A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. Scand J Work Environ
10	7	<i>Health</i> 2017;43(4):294-306. doi: 10.5271/sjweh.3632 [published Online First: 2017/03/18]
11	8	19. Stansfeld S, Candy B. Psychosocial work environment and mental healtha meta-analytic review.
12	9	Scand J Work Environ Health 2006;32(6):443-62. [published Online First: 2006/12/19]
13	10	20. Murcia M, Chastang JF, Niedhammer I. Psychosocial work factors, major depressive and
14	11	generalised anxiety disorders: results from the French national SIP study. J Affect Disord
15	12	2013;146(3):319-27. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2012.09.014 [published Online First: 2012/10/13]
16	13	21. Niedhammer I, Malard L, Chastang JF. Occupational factors and subsequent major depressive and
17	14	generalized anxiety disorders in the prospective French national SIP study. BMC Public Health
18	15	2015;15:200. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1559-y [published Online First: 2015/04/18]
19	16	22. Gollac M. Mesurer les facteurs psychosociaux de risque au travail pour les maîtriser. 2010
20	17	[Available from: <u>http://travail-</u>
21	18	emploi.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport_SRPST_definitif_rectifie_11_05_10.pdf.
22	19	23. Schutte S, Chastang JF, Parent-Thirion A, et al. Psychosocial work exposures among European
23	20	employees: explanations for occupational inequalities in mental health. Journal of public health
24	21	(Oxford, England) 2015;37(3):373-88. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdv044 [published Online First:
25	22	2015/04/26]
20 27	23	24. Marchand A, Parent-Lamarche A, Blanc ME. Work and high-risk alcohol consumption in the
27	24	Canadian workforce. International journal of environmental research and public health
20 20	25	2011;8(7):2692-705. doi: 10.3390/ijerph8072692 [published Online First: 2011/08/17]
30	26	25. Wieclaw J, Agerbo E, Mortensen PB, et al. Psychosocial working conditions and the risk of
31	27	depression and anxiety disorders in the Danish workforce. BMC Public Health 2008;8:280. doi:
32	28	10.1186/1471-2458-8-280 [published Online First: 2008/08/09]
33	29	26. Malard L. Chastang JF. Niedhammer I. Changes in psychosocial work factors in the French
34	30	working population between 2006 and 2010. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 2015:88(2):235-
35	31	46. doi: 10.1007/s00420-014-0953-6 [published Online First: 2014/06/26]
36	32	27. Ansseau M. Dierick M. Buntinkx F. et al. High prevalence of mental disorders in primary care. J
37	33	Affect Disord 2004:78(1):49-55 doi: S0165032702002197 [pii] [published Online First:
38	34	2003/12/16]
39	35	28 Toft T Fink P Oemboel E et al Mental disorders in primary care: prevalence and co-morbidity
40	36	among disorders results from the functional illness in primary care (FIP) study. <i>Psychol Med</i>
41	37	2005:35(8):1175-84 [nublished Online First: 2005/08/25]
42	38	29 Alkhadhari S Alsabhrri AO Mohammad IH et al Prevalence of psychiatric morbidity in the
45 11	39	primary health clinic attendees in Kuwait <i>L Affect Disord</i> 2016:195:15-20 doi:
44 45	40	10 1016/i jad 2016 01 037 [nublished Online First: 2016/02/08]
46	41	30 Norton I de Roquefeuil G. David M. et al. [Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in French general
47	42	nractice using the patient health questionnaire: comparison with GP case-recognition and
48	12	practice using the patient nearly questionnane. comparison with OF case-recognition and psychotropic medication prescription] <i>Enceptiala</i> 2009:35(6):560-9. doi:
49	43	10 1016/j encen 2008 06 018
50	-++ //5	S0013-7006(08)00267-4 [nji] [nublished Online First: 2000/12/17]
51	43	21. Dealder A. Less D. Collington S. et al. Work related health advise in primary care. <i>Occurrational</i>
52	40 17	madicina 2011.61(7):408 502 doi: 10.1002/coord/kar110
53	4/	<i>medicine</i> 2011,01(7).498-502. doi: 10.1095/0ccined/kq1119
54	40	kyi i i 7 [phi] [puolisheu Ohime Filst. 2011/06/20]
55		
56		
57		
58		27
27 60		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/auidelines.xhtml
00		

2		
3	1	32. de Kock CA, Lucassen PL, Spinnewijn L, et al. How do Dutch GPs address work-related
4	2	problems? A focus group study. Eur J Gen Pract 2016:1-8. doi:
5	3	10.1080/13814788.2016.1177507 [published Online First: 2016/06/02]
6	4	33. Riviere M. Plancke L. Lerover A. et al. Prevalence of work-related common psychiatric disorders
7	5	in primary care: The French Heracles study <i>Psychiatry Res</i> 2017 doi:
8	6	10 1016/i psychres 2017 00 008 [published Online First: 2017/00/10]
9	07	24. Elebeult A. Dianahan T. Darleans V. et al. Virtual surveillance of communicable discosses: a 20
10	/	54. Fianault A, Diancholi I, Dolleans I, et al. villuar suivernance of communicable diseases. a 20-
11	8	year experience in France. Stat Methods Med Res 2006;15(5):413-21. [published Online First:
12	9	2006/11/09]
13	10	35. Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview
14	11	(M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for
15	12	DSM-IV and ICD-10. J Clin Psychiatry 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33;quiz 34-57. [published Online
16	13	First: 1999/01/09]
10	14	36 Lecrubier Y Sheehan DV Weiller E et al. The Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview
12	15	(MINI) A short diagnostic structured interview: reliability and validity according to the CIDI
10	16	<i>European Deschiates</i> 1007:12(5):224-21
20	10	27 Maamman B. Dalationalia hataraan ananimationaliantian and amanimational aitimuchin habarairen
20	1/	37. Moorman R. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational cluzenship behaviors.
21	18	do fairness perception influence employee citizenship? J Appl Psychol 1991; 76:845–55.
22	19	38. Kristensen TS, Hannerz H, Hogh A, et al. The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnairea tool for
25	20	the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. Scand J Work Environ
24	21	Health 2005;31(6):438-49. [published Online First: 2006/01/24]
25	22	39. Dallner M, Elo A-L, Gamberale F, et al. Validation of the general Nordic questionnaire
26	23	(OPSNordic) for psychological and social factors at work (No. Nord 2000:12). In: Ministers
27	24	NCo ed Copenhagen 2000
28	25	40 Hansez I. The Working Conditions and Control Questionnaire (WOCCO): Towards a structural
29	25	model of psychological stress. European Paview of Applied Psychology 2008:58(253 - 262)
30	20	11 DISEE Newsystem des Derfereiers et Octópenier Seriersfereiers lles DCS 2003, 56(255 – 202)
31	27	41. INSEE. Nomenciature des Professions et Categories Socioprofessionnelles - PCS 2003 [Available
32	28	from: https:// <u>www.insee.fr/fr/information/2400059</u> .
33	29	42. Min KB, Park SG, Hwang SH, et al. Precarious employment and the risk of suicidal ideation and
34	30	suicide attempts. Preventive medicine 2015;71:72-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.12.017
35	31	[published Online First: 2014/12/24]
36	32	43. Fleury MJ, Bamvita JM, Farand L, et al. Variables associated with general practitioners taking on
37	33	patients with common mental disorders. <i>Mental health in family medicine</i> 2008:5(3):149-60.
38	34	[nublished Online First: 2008/09/01]
39	35	44 Pampalon R Hamel D Gamache P et al Validation of a deprivation index for public health: a
40	36	complex exercise illustrated by the Quebec index. Chronic discass and injuries in Canada
41	27	2014:24(1):12 22 [mublished Online Eigst: 2014/02/12]
42	20	2014,54(1).12-22. [published Olimie Filst. 2014/05/15]
43	38	45. Moreno-Betancur M, Latouche A, Menviene G, et al. Relative index of inequality and slope index
44	39	of inequality: a structured regression framework for estimation. <i>Epidemiology (Cambridge,</i>
45	40	<i>Mass)</i> 2015;26(4):518-27. doi: 10.1097/ede.0000000000000311 [published Online First:
46	41	2015/05/23]
47	42	46. Zou G. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. Am J
48	43	<i>Epidemiol</i> 2004;159(7):702-6. [published Online First: 2004/03/23]
49	44	47. Knol MJ. Le Cessie S. Algra A. et al. Overestimation of risk ratios by odds ratios in trials and
50	45	cohort studies: alternatives to logistic regression CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association
51	46	iournal = iournal de l'Association medicale canadienne 2012:184(8):895-9 doi:
52	40	10 1502/amai 101715 [nubliched Online First: 2011/12/14]
53	4/	10.1505/cmaj.101/15 [published Omnie First. 2011/12/14]
54	48	48. Team RDC. R. A language and environment for statistical computing vienna, Austria: R
55	49	Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2008 [Available from: <u>http://www.R-project.org</u> .
56		
57		
58		28
59		20
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

## BMJ Open

1		
2 3	1	49. Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, et al. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using Ime4. Journal of
4	2	Statistical Software 2015;67(1):148. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01
5	3	50. Honda A, Date Y, Abe Y, et al. Work-related Stress, Caregiver Role, and Depressive Symptoms
6	4	among Japanese Workers. Saf Health Work 2014;5(1):7-12. doi: 10.1016/j.shaw.2013.11.002
7	5	[published Online First: 2014/06/17]
8	6	51. Theorell T, Hammarström A, Aronsson G, et al. A systematic review including meta-analysis of
9	7	work environment and depressive symptoms. BMC Public Health 2015;15 doi:
10	8	10.1186/s12889-015-1954-4
11	9	52. Wang JL, Lesage A, Schmitz N, et al. The relationship between work stress and mental disorders
12	10	in men and women: findings from a population-based study. J Epidemiol Community Health
13	11	2008;62(1):42-7. doi: 10.1136/jech.2006.050591 [published Online First: 2007/12/15]
14 15	12	53. Netterstrom B. Conrad N. Bech P. et al. The relation between work-related psychosocial factors
15	13	and the development of depression <i>Epidemiologic reviews</i> 2008:30:118-32 doi:
10	14	10 1093/enirev/mxn004 [published Online First: 2008/07/01]
18	15	54 Melchior M Berkman LF Niedhammer L et al. Social relations and self-reported health: a
19	16	prospective analysis of the French Gazel cohort Social science & medicine (1982)
20	17	2003:56(8):1817-30 [published Online First: 2003/03/18]
21	18	55 Beck AT Brown GK Steer RA et al Psychometric properties of the Beck Self-Esteem Scales
22	10	<i>Rehaviour research and therany</i> 2001:39(1):115-24 [nublished Online First: 2000/12/28]
23	20	56 Nordaune K Skarpaas I S Sagyaag H et al Who initiates and organises situations for work-
24	20	related alcohol use? The WIRUS culture study. Scandingvian journal of public health
25	21	2017:1403404817704100 doi: 10.1177/1403404817704100 [published Online First:
26	22	2017.1403494817704109. doi: $10.117771403494817704109$ [published Online First.
27	23	57 Hagihara A. Tarumi K. Nahutama K. Wark atrassoral drinking with colleagues after work and job
28	24	57. Haginard A, Tarunni K, Nobutonio K. Work subssors, drinking with conceques after work, and job
29	25	Satisfaction among white-conar workers in Japan. Substance use & misuse 2000,55(5).757-56.
30	20	[published Online First. 2000/05/12]
31	27	58. Head J, Stansfeld SA, Siegrist J. The psychosocial work environment and alconol dependence: a
32	28	prospective study. Occup Environ Med 2004;61(3):219-24. [published Online First:
33 24	29	$\frac{2004/02/27}{1}$
25	30	59. Plancke L, Bavdek K. Les disparites regionales en sante mentale et en psychiatrie. La situation du
36	31	Nord Pas-de-Calais en France metropolitaine, Lille, F2RSM. 2013.
37	32	http://www.santementale5962.com/ressources-et-outils/les-editions-de-la-
38	33	<u>f2rsm/article/disparites-regionales-en-sante</u> .
39	34	60. Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL, Popham F. Trends in population mental health before and after
40	35	the 2008 recession: a repeat cross-sectional analysis of the 1991-2010 Health Surveys of
41	36	England. <i>BMJ Open</i> 2012;2(5) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001790 [published Online First:
42	37	2012/10/19]
43	38	61. Lee S, Guo WJ, Tsang A, et al. Evidence for the 2008 economic crisis exacerbating depression in
44	39	Hong Kong. J Affect Disord 2010;126(1-2):125-33. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2010.03.007 [published
45	40	Online First: 2010/04/13]
46	41	62. Goldenberg MG, Skeldon SC, Nayan M, et al. Prostate-specific antigen testing for prostate cancer
47	42	screening: A national survey of Canadian primary care physicians' opinions and practices.
48	43	Canadian Urological Association journal = Journal de l'Association des urologues du Canada
49	44	2017 doi: 10.5489/cuaj.4486 [published Online First: 2017/11/07]
50	45	63. Cottrell E, Roddy E, Rathod T, et al. Maximising response from GPs to questionnaire surveys: do
51 52	46	length or incentives make a difference? BMC medical research methodology 2015;15:3. doi:
52 52	47	10.1186/1471-2288-15-3 [published Online First: 2015/01/08]
55 54	48	64. Rantanen J, Lehtinen S, Valenti A, et al. A global survey on occupational health services in
55	49	selected international commission on occupational health (ICOH) member countries. BMC
56	50	Public Health 2017;17(787) doi: doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4800-z.
57		
58		
59		29
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4	Legends: Figure 1: Flow chart of participation in the Héraclès study, France, 2014
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 9 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57		
58 59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



Appendix 1: Work's factor questionnaire

## 1) Work intensity

- I receive contradictory orders or indication ("Yes"/"No")
- I am asked excessive amounts of work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have too much to think about at work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have difficulties in balancing work and family life ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have the time needed to do my work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

## 2) Emotional demands

- I work in contact with customers/beneficiaries ("Yes"/"No")
- I am in contact with people in distress ("Yes"/"No")
- I have conflicts with customers/beneficiaries ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have to hide my emotions and pretend to be in a good mood ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I sometimes experience fear during my work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- During my work, I am exposed to physical, verbal, psychological aggressions ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

## 3) Autonomy

- I have very little freedom to decide how I do my job ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I can fully employ my skills ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

## 4) Conflict of values

- I have the possibility to make a work of quality ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- In my work, I have to do disapproved things ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

## 5) Social relationships at work

- My work is fully recognized ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have support from colleagues ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have support from superior ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

## 6) Insecurity of work

- I feel able to do my current job until retirement ("Yes"/"No")
- I work with fear of losing my job ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

	Work intensity	Emotional demands	Autonomy	Conflict of values	Social relationships at work	Insecurity
Work intensity		0.70	-0.72	0.70	-0.81	0.08
Emotional demands	0.70		-0.86	0.78	-0.84	0.23
Autonomy	-0.72	-0.86		-0.91	0.87	-0.42
Conflict of values	0.70	0.78	-0.91		-0.91	0.17
Social relationships at work	-0.81	-0.84	0.87	-0.91		-0.33
Insecurity	0.08	0.23	-0.42	0.17	-0.33	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

**Appendix 3:** major depressive disorders (MDD), generalized anxiety disorders (GAD) and alcohol abuse related factors adjusted on work related factors, Héraclès study, France, 2014. Multilevel regression models

	MC	DD GAD <u>(n=178</u>	2)	A	lcohol <u>(n=177</u>	(6)
	RR <sup>1</sup>	CI 95%	Р	$RR^1$	CI 95%	Р
Age group			0.38			0.34
[18 - 35]	1 -			1	-	
[36 - 50]	1.13	[0.93 - 1.39]		1.29	[0.86 - 1.92]	
[51 - 65]	1.03	[0.82 - 1.29]	0.24	1.37	[0.87 - 2.16]	<0.01
Malo	1 -		0.54	1	_	<0.01
Female	1.09	[0.91 - 1.31]		0.37	[0.25 - 0.53]	
Past unemployment		[0.01 1.01]			[0.10 0.00]	0.13
No				1	-	
Yes				1.30	[0.93 - 1.83]	
Occupational grade			0.71			0.09
Blue collar	1 -			1	-	
Pink collar	1.12	[0.86 - 1.46]		0.61	[0.39 - 0.98]	
White collar	1.11	[0.82 - 1.5]		0.80	[0.46 - 1.4]	
Family status						0.11
Lives alone				1	-	
Lives with partner or parents				1.34	[0.94 - 1.9]	
Educational level						0.51
< High school degree				1	-	
≥ High school degree				1.14	[0.77 - 1.7]	
Job instability						0.21
No				1	-	
Yes				1.31	[0.86 - 1.98]	
Number of workers in the company						0.02
1 to 10				1	-	
11 to 49				0.70	[0.45 - 1.09]	
50 to 250				0.83	[0.52 - 1.3]	
250 +				0.49	[0.31 - 0.78]	
Past psychiaric problems			<0.01			0.02
No	1 -			1	-	
Yes	1.58	[1.27 - 1.96]		1.65	[1.07 - 2.55]	
Major depressive disorders						0.01
No				1		
Yes				1.66	[1.12 - 2.44]	
Generalized anxiety disorders						0.25
No				1	-	
Yes				1.24	[0.86 - 1.8]	
Alcohol			0.01			
No	1 -					
Yes	1.38	[1.09 - 1.75]				
Material deprivation			0.04			
No	1 -					
Yes	1.19	[1.01 - 1.4]				
GPs Gender			0.02			
Male	1 -					
Female	1.22	[1.03 - 1.44]				

RR : relative risk

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted on: Work intensity, Emotional demands, Autonomy, Conflict of values, Social relationships at work, Insecurity

	No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstrac
The and abstract	1	(a) indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title of the absurde
		(b) Provide in the obstract on informative and balanced summary of what was done
		and what was found - name 1 and 2
		and what was found - page 1 and 2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported page 4 and 5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses - page 4 and 5
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper - page 6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment.
-		exposure, follow-up, and data collection - page 6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of
1		participants - page 6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect
		modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable – page 6 to 8
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of
measurement		assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there
		more than one group - page 6 to 8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias – page 6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at – page 6
Ouantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable,
		describe which groupings were chosen and why – page 8 and 9
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
		page 8 and 9
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results	12*	(-) Dement much and a fin dividual at each start of state for much and a starticilly
Participants	13**	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially
		completing follow up, and analyzed _ page 10 and figure 1
		(b) Cive reasons for non- participation at each stage figure 1
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage – ligure 1
Description 1.4	144	(c) Consider use of a now diagram – <b>ingure 1</b>
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and
		$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$
0	1 ~	(b) indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures – page 13
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and
		their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were
		adjusted for and why they were included – page 13 to 17
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a

For peer review only - http://bmjopen!bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

		meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and
		sensitivity analyses
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives - page 18
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias - page 19
		and 20
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,
		multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence -
		page 18 and 19
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results - page 20 and 21
Other information	~	
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if
		applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based – page 21

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen?bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# **BMJ Open**

## Which work-related characteristics are most strongly associated with common mental disorders?: A crosssectional study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-020770.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	18-May-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Riviere, Mathieu; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136); Centre Hospitalier Régional, Department of Infectious Diseases Leroyer, Ariane; Centre Hospitalier Regional Universitaire de Lille, Occupational Health Ferreira Carreira, Lionel; Centre Hospitalier Regional Universitaire de Lille, Occupational Health Blanchon, Thierry; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Plancke, Laurent; Fédération régionale de recherche en psychiatrie et santé mentale Hauts-de-France Melchior, Maria; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Plancke, Naria; Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique (IPLESP UMRS 1136) Younès, Nadia; EA 40-47 University of Versailles Saint-Quentin; Academic Unit of psychiatry for adults, Versailles Hospital
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Occupational and environmental medicine
Secondary Subject Heading:	Mental health, General practice / Family practice
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PSYCHIATRY, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

1		
2	1	
3	2	Which work-related characteristics are most strongly associated with common mental
4	3	disorders? : A cross-sectional study
5	4	
0 7 8	5	Mathieu Rivière <sup>a,b</sup> , Ariane Leroyer <sup>c</sup> , Lionel Ferreira Carreira <sup>c</sup> , Thierry Blanchon <sup>a</sup> , Laurent Plancke <sup>d</sup> ,
9 10	6	Maria Melchior <sup>a</sup> , Nadia Younès <sup>e,f</sup>
11	7	
12 13	8	a Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, INSERM, Institut Pierre Louis d'épidémiologie et de Santé Publique
14	9	(IPLESP UMRS 1136), F75013, Paris, France
15 16	10	b Department of Infectious Diseases, Centre Hospitalier Régional, Orléans, France
17	11	c Université Lille Nord de France, Lille, France
18 19	12	d Fédération régionale de recherche en santé mentale (F2RSM) Nord - Pas-de-Calais, Lille, France
20	13	e EA 40-47 University of Versailles Saint-Quentin, Versailles, France
21	14	f Academic Unit of psychiatry for adults, Versailles Hospital, Versailles, France
23 24	15	
25	16 17	
26	18	Word count: 4,185
27	19	
28	20	Corresponding author:
29	22	Mathieu Rivière
30 21	23	Phone : 00 33 (2) 38 74 40 05. Fax : 00 33 (2) 76 34 16 38
31 32	25	E-mail : mathieu.riviere@iplesp.upmc.fr
32	26	
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39 40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45 46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51 52		
52 53		
54		
55		
56		
57 50		
50 59		1
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

#### ABSTRACT

2 OBJECTIVES: Studies exploring work-related risk factors of common mental disorders (CMD) such 3 as major depressive disorder (MDD), generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) or alcohol abuse, have 4 generally focused on a limited set of work characteristics. For the first time in a primary care setting, 5 we examine simultaneously multiple work-related risk factors in relation to CMDs.

METHOD: We use data from a study of working individuals recruited among 2,027 patients of 121 general practitioners (GPs) representative of the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in the North of France (April-August 2014). CMDs (MDD; GAD; alcohol abuse) were assessed using the MINI (Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview). Six worked-related factors were examined (work intensity, emotional demands, autonomy, social relations at work, conflict in values, and job insecurity). Several covariates were considered (patient, GP and contextual characteristics). To study the association between workplace risk factors and CMDs, we used multilevel Poisson regression models adjusted for covariates.

RESULTS: Among study participants, 389 (19.1%) met criteria for MDD, 522 (25.8%) for GAD and 16 (9.7%) for alcohol abuse. In multivariable analyses adjusted for covariates, MDD/GAD was significantly associated with work intensity (RR=1.16 [1.06 - 1.27]) (absolute risk = 52.8%), emotional demands (RR=1.24 [1.13 - 1.35]) (absolute risk = 54.9%) and social relations at work (RR=0.78 [0.70 – 0.87]) (absolute risk = 15.0%); alcohol abuse was associated with social relations at work (RR=1.25 [1.01 - 1.53]) (absolute risk = 7.6%) and autonomy (OR=0.82 [0.67 – 0.99]) (absolute risk = 8.9%).

CONCLUSIONS: Several workplace factors are associated with CMDs among working individuals
 seen by a GP. These findings confirm the role of organizational characteristics of work as a correlate
 of psychological difficulties above and beyond other sources of risk.

- 27 Key terms: mental health; primary care; workplace factors
| 1<br>2<br>3  | 1       | STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY  |
|--|---------|---|
| 4<br>5<br>6  | 2       | Cross-sectional study design  |
| 7  | 3       | Study of occupational factors in relation to common mental disorders among working adults       |
| 0<br>9<br>10   | 4       | in primary care evaluated with a standardized diagnostic tool in a large sample                 |
| 10<br>11<br>12   | 5       | > The inclusion of participants living in the Nord Pas de Calais region – one of the poorest in |
| 12<br>13<br>14   | 6       | France – and the selective participation of general practitioners (GPs) who took part in the    |
| 15<br>16   | 7       | study, may have led to an overrepresentation of patients with psychological disorders.          |
| <ol> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> <li>28</li> <li>29</li> <li>30</li> <li>31</li> <li>32</li> <li>33</li> <li>34</li> <li>35</li> <li>36</li> <li>37</li> <li>38</li> </ol> | 9<br>10 |   |
| 39<br>40<br>41   |         |   |
| 42<br>43   |         |   |
| 44<br>45   |         |   |
| 46<br>47   |         |   |
| 48<br>49   |         |   |
| 50<br>51   |         |   |
| 52<br>53   |         |   |
| 54<br>55   |         |   |
| 56<br>57   |         |   |
| 58<br>59   |         | 3   |
| 60   |         | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml                       |

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Individuals who are part of the labour force are generally in better health than the unemployed.<sup>1</sup> however work can also have negative effects on somatic and psychosocial health.<sup>2</sup> A study conducted among general practitioners (GP) trained in occupational medicine found that mental health issues are frequently attributed to work.<sup>3</sup> They are responsible for most of sickness absence and long-term work incapacity.<sup>4</sup> In France, data from the national health insurance shows that 20% of sickness absences are caused by mental disorders, and this proportion is even higher for long term sickness absences (on average 111 days).<sup>5</sup> The most frequent mental health difficulties among working individuals include mood, anxiety and substance use disorders (particularly alcohol-related problems), which can be grouped as "Common Mental Disorders" (CMDs).<sup>6</sup> A systematic review of the literature in European countries shows that there is great diversity in the ascertainment of mental disorders and thus the prevalence estimates vary between countries. The authors suggest that the study of a larger range of diagnoses and the standardization of methods can help the comparability across countries.7 

15 The association between work and CMDs is bidirectional: work has been shown to be a risk 16 factor of poor mental health<sup>8</sup>, but the presence of a CMD can also influence job performance and 17 well-being.<sup>9 10</sup> Other risk factors of CMDs include individuals' sociodemographic characteristics 18 including being divorced or widowed, having a low educational level, older age, female gender,<sup>11-13</sup>, 19 certain genetic factors<sup>14</sup> and a history of chronic somatic or psychiatric disorders.<sup>15</sup> Environmental 12 factors (e.g. social and material deprivation, etc.) were described and show that low socio-economic 13 status was associated with higher rates of depression.<sup>11 12</sup>

Psychosocial factors related to the work environment are of particular interest because they may be more easily prevented than those which result from life events and are often unavoidable. Three main theoretical models have been proposed to explain relations between work characteristics and mental health. First, Karasek and Theorell<sup>16</sup> argued that psychological demands, decision latitude and social support are especially important. Second, Siegrist<sup>17</sup> proposed that what matters most is the subjectively ascertained effort-reward balance. A third model, developed by

1 Elovainio, put an emphasis on the role of organizational justice including interpersonal comparison,

that is to say comparison of the response of the company in the same situation for different
 employees.<sup>18</sup>

Several studies evaluate the impact of work on mental health using these theoretical models.<sup>8 19</sup> <sup>20</sup> Overall, the risk of mental disorders is higher when individuals experience high job demands, low job control, high effort-reward imbalance or low organizational justice. As work organization is evolving, other psychosocial factors described as "emergent" have appeared in recent studies (e.g. job insecurity, conflicts in values)<sup>21-24</sup>: Workers experiencing high job insecurity or role conflicts also seem to have a higher levels of CMDs.<sup>21 22</sup> A recent systematic meta-review identified three overlapping categories of work-related risk factors that may contribute to the development of common mental health problems: imbalanced job design, occupational uncertainty and a lack of values and respect in the workplace.<sup>8</sup> This review did not precisely describe different CMDs (MDD was the most frequent outcome, GAD and alcohol abuse being less explored<sup>8 25 26</sup>). Additionally, most studies were based on self-reported questionnaires and not validated diagnostic interviews.

Work-related risk factors are also influenced by changes in society and work environments (globalization, demographic change, job specialization, communication load, new forms of work organization, industry 4.0<sup>27</sup>, etc). A French study assessed changes in psychosocial work factors between 2006 and 2011 and reported that some worsened (decision latitude, social support, reward, role conflict and work life imbalance) over that period. These changes have been shown to vary with age, occupation, sector activity and type of contract.<sup>28</sup>

The objective of this study is to assess the association between GAD, MDD and alcohol abuse in a primary care setting, testing different psychosocial work-related risk factors. Combining emergent and classical factors is important in order to identify which are most strongly related to workers' mental health, as outlined in the meta-review conducted by Harvey et al.8 Since GPs usually are the first contact point for employees in the health care process, the evaluation of primary care patients is of paramount importance.<sup>29 30</sup> In primary care, the prevalence of CMDs is high, ranging from  $3\%^{22}$  to 25% for anxiety disorders.<sup>13 29-32</sup>  $6\%^{13}$  to 25% for depression<sup>11 29-32</sup> and 2%<sup>30</sup> to 11% for alcohol abuse.<sup>29 30</sup> Two studies conducted in the United Kingdom show that a third of 

patients seeing a GP for work-related reasons have a mental health issue.<sup>3 33</sup> Yet GPs often have difficulties managing their patients' work-related mental health problems, as they often lack <text><text> negotiation strategies regarding sick leave, communication skills and cooperation with occupational physicians.<sup>34</sup> GPs encounter a variety of workers with systematic, unsystematic or non-existing occupational health services at their workplace. A better understanding of work-related factors associated with individuals' mental health is important to help GPs consider specific actions.

## 2 METHODS

2.1 Design and Study population

Heracles is a cross-sectional exploratory study conducted between April and August 2014 among
working individuals consulting a primary care physician in the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region in the
North of France.

#### 2.1.1 Patient and Public Involvement

The number of subjects needed and the set-up of the study have previously been described<sup>35</sup>. Briefly, with an estimated prevalence of 20%, to have a precision of 10%, we aimed to include 2,000 patients via their GP. Participating GPs gave an oral consent to participate and were asked to randomly include a maximum of 24 patients who met the following criteria: being a) actively employed and b) aged 18 to 65 years, regardless of the reason of their medical appointment. GPs were asked to include the first two patients who met study inclusion criteria in each randomly selected time slot which had previously been defined with the GP. Approximately 1/4 of the GPs in the region, selected to be representative of those practicing in 15 areas of Nord - Pas-de-Calais region, were contacted to participate in the study. Participating GPs gave written information to their patients regarding the study and asked them to sign an informed consent.

17 This study was conducted by the Sentinelles network,<sup>36</sup> part of the INSERM-Paris Sorbonne 18 University research unit UMR-S 1136. This research group has a standing authorization from the 19 French independent administrative authority protecting privacy and personal data to conduct 20 research among GPs and their patients (CNIL n°471 393).

22 2.2 Data collection

Participating GPs received a 15 minute phone training regarding the study protocol and
 questionnaire. After their regular appointment, GPs interviewed participating patients for the
 purposes of the study. Study questionnaires included information on:

1 2.2.

### 2.2.1 Measurement of common mental disorders

2 CMDs were measured using a standardised diagnostic interview: the Mini International 3 Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) that was used as a screening tool. The MINI is, a structured 4 clinical interview that enables the diagnosis of mental disorders based on the Diagnosis and 5 Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, fourth edition (DSM-IV).<sup>37</sup> Specifically, three different 6 diagnoses were ascertained: Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) (in the preceding 2 weeks), 7 Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD) (in the preceding 6 months), and alcohol abuse (in the 8 preceding 12 months).

9 The sensibility of the MINI varied between 83 to 94% (MDD: 94%; GAD: 88%; Alcohol: 83%), the 10 specificity between 72 to 97% (MDD: 79%; GAD: 72%; Alcohol: 97%) and the Kappa concordance 11 coefficient between 0.36 to 0.82 (MDD: 0.73; GAD: 0.36; Alcohol: 0.82). The inter-rater and test-12 retest reliability measured by Kappa coefficient were good, respectively 0.88 to 1 and 0.76 to 0.93.<sup>38</sup>

#### 13 2.2.2 Work characteristics

Work characteristics were self-reported by the patient to their GP. We used a national French questionnaire proposed by experts in the field based on the international scientific literature and after auditioning Robert Karasek and Johannes Siegrist.<sup>23</sup> It combines a) questions measuring psychological demands – work control – social support developed in Karasek's model<sup>16</sup> (two questions about decision latitude, four questions about psychological demands and two questions about social support); b) questions measuring effort/reward balance based on Siegrist's model<sup>17</sup> (three questions about rewards and one question about overinvestment); c) questions about organizational justice from Moorman's questionnaire:<sup>39</sup> d) questions from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire<sup>40</sup> and from the General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work<sup>41</sup> or from WOrking Conditions and Control Questionnaire (WOCCQ)<sup>42</sup>. Overall, the questionnaire included twenty work-related items exploring six different areas (Appendix 1): 1) five related to work intensity and duration (contradictory orders, excessive amount of work, too much to think about at work, difficulties in balancing work and family life, time needed for work), 2) six concerning emotional demands (contacts with customers/beneficiaries, contact with people in

# BMJ Open

ว	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
25	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
24	
54	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
10	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
15	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
- ЛО Г 1	
21	
52	
53	
54	
55	
55	
20	
57	
58	
59	
60	

1	distress, conflicts with customers/beneficiaries, the need to hide emotions, fear, exposure to
2	aggressions), 3) two regarding autonomy (limited decision making possibility, full use of skills), 4)
3	three on the quality of social work relations (full-recognition of the work performed, support from
4	colleagues, support from superiors), 5) two concerning conflicts in values (possibility to perform
5	quality work, doing disapproved things), 6) two about job insecurity (ability to work until retirement,
6	fear of job loss). For four of these items (contacts with the public at work, contacts with people in
7	distress, contradictory orders, ability to work until retirement) the response was either "yes" or "no",
8	and for other factors the responses were "always"/"often"/"sometimes"/"never" numbered from 1 to
9	4. The reliability of questions pertaining to work characteristics was assessed by computing an
10	omega coefficient <sup>43</sup> . This coefficient varied between 0.35 to 0.79. The reliability was higher for social
11	relations at work ( $\omega$ =0.72), emotional demands ( $\omega$ =0.75) and work intensity ( $\omega$ =0.79) than for
12	autonomy ( $\omega$ =0.66), job insecurity ( $\omega$ =0.50), or conflicts in values ( $\omega$ =0.35).
13	2.2.3 Covariates
14	Patient's characteristics
15	We considered already previously risk-factors of CMD. <sup>11</sup>
16	Past somatic problems;
17	Previous mental health problems/disorders;
18	Sociodemographic (age, gender, family status, family income, level of education);
19	<ul> <li>Occupational grade<sup>44</sup>: blue collar (farmer/manual worker), pink collar</li> </ul>
20	(technician/associate professional/clerk/service worker) or white collar
21	(manager/professional);45
22	Company size;
23	Job instability assessed based on the type of contract (temporary vs. permanent)
24	
25	Health care characteristics <sup>46</sup>
26	Reason for medical appointment (somatic, psychological, chronic disease management);

2 3	1	GP's sociodemographic characteristics (age, gender);						
4 5	2	• Practice characteristics (size; comfort with psychological distress issues; opportunity to						
6 7	3	collaborate with mental health specialists).						
8 9 10	4	Contextual characteristics (by the 15 proximity area of the region)						
11 12	5	Contextual characteristics shown to be associated with CMDs in primary care <sup>11 12</sup> :						
12 13 14	6	<ul> <li>Density of psychiatrists, psychologists and GPs;</li> </ul>						
15 16	7	Social deprivation (loneliness, single parenthood, widowhood/divorce) and material						
17 18	8	deprivation (unemployment, income, level of not graduated); <sup>47 48</sup>						
19 20	9	Geographical area: 15 proximity areas defined by the regional health agency of the Nord						
21 22	10	– Pas-de-Calais region.						
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 21	11	2.3 Statistical Analyses						
	12	Some of the covariates were recoded to use fewer categories. For family status, participants living						
	13	alone or living with parents were grouped into one category. For family income, participants were						
31 32	14	grouped in two categories: [0-3,000] euros (which corresponds to approximately two times the						
33 34	15	minimum wage in France) and >3,000 euros. For educational level, we created two categories: less						
35 36 27	16	than a high school degree (no degree, degree below high school) or a degree higher or equivalent to						
37 38 39	17	a high school degree. For age, our continuous variable was studied in three categories based on the						
39 40	18	distribution 18-35; 36-50; 51-65.						
41 42 42	19	Associations between sociodemographic characteristics and GAD, MDD and alcohol abuse were						
43 44 45 46 47 48 40	20	studied using the Chi-square test. Covariates associated with the outcomes with p<0.2 were						
	21	included in the multivariate analysis.						
	22	Work-related factors were regrouped according to 6 previously suggested dimensions transformed						
49 50 51	23	each into a Z-score to be comparable to each other. <sup>23</sup> A correlation matrix of different work						
51 52	24	characteristics was computed and presented in a supplementary file (Appendix 2). Each dimension						
55 54	25	was dichotomized based on the third quartile or studied as continuous variable in the multivariable						
55 56 57	26	models. At first, statistical analyses were conducted separately for each outcome, but factors						
58 59 60		10 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml						

#### BMJ Open

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
27	
2∠ 22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
57	
52 52	
J 5 ∕	
54 57	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

60

1 associated with MDD and GAD were very similar, therefore to gain statistical power we merged 2 these two disorders into one outcome. To study the association between occupational factors and 3 GAD/MDD and alcohol we used multilevel Poisson regression models using a robust error variance procedure (sandwich estimation)<sup>49</sup> with patient as level one and geographical area as level two. 4 5 Given the high prevalence of these problems, Poisson regression was preferred to logistic regression to avoid the overestimation of risk ratios.<sup>50</sup> GAD/MDD or alcohol abuse were the 6 7 dependent variables and the six dimensions of work-related factors were the exposure variables. 8 Statistical models were adjusted for each exposure variable and for other covariates that were 9 associated with GAD/MDD (previous mental health problems/disorders, alcohol abuse, material 10 deprivation and GP's gender) or alcohol abuse (family status, company size, previous mental health 11 problems/disorders, job instability, education level, past unemployment, GAD and MDD) (p<0.05) in 12 a multivariable Poisson regression model excluding occupational factors. Age, gender and 13 occupational grade were included directly in the adjustment variable. Absolute risks among persons 14 who were exposed were computed for each of the studied work dimensions.

15 All analyses were performed using GNU R software version 3.1.1. (Ime4 package).<sup>51 52</sup>

#### 3 RESULTS

3.1 Participation and description of the population

Of the 1,000 GPs contacted by mail, 185 accepted to participate (response rate= 18.5%) and 121 completed the study (Figure 1). Participating GPs were more likely to be male (sex ratio=1.82), and to be 50 years or older; they were disseminated throughout the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region (Table 1). Participating GPs were representative of those practicing in the region in terms of geography, age, type and years of practice.

8 Participating GPs recruited 2,027 patients among which 389 (19.1%) had MDD, 522 (25.8%) 9 GAD and 196 (9.7%) alcohol abuse. Participating patients were mostly female (53.6%), aged 42.3 10 years (sd 10.6) on average, mainly living with a partner (76.2%), working in pink collar occupations 11 (60.1%). 61.3% had graduated from high school and 30.2% had been unemployed in the past. 12 Among study participants, 21.0% came to see their GP for psychological reasons (Table 1). 13 Characteristics of participants with MDD, GAD or alcohol abuse are presented in Table 2.

The study response rate was 80%: 41 GPs filled a non-respondent form for 495 patients who refused to participate. Non-respondents did not differ from participants in term of age (p=0.47) and gender (p=0.23). Compared with working age patients consulting a GP in the study region, study participants were older (p<0.01) but had a similar gender distribution (p=0.08).

Table 1: Description of the study population, I	Héraclès study, France, 2014
---	------------------------------

Work Characteristics		
Work intensity		
VIOR Intensity	407	01
	407	70
Low	1,000	10
Emotional demands	470	
High	476	23
Low	1,549	76
Autonomy		
High	598	29
Low	1,427	70
Conflict in values		
High	685	33
Low	1,340	66
Social relations at work		
High	688	33
Low	1.337	66
Job Insecurity	,	
High	565	27
	1 460	72
Covariates	1,400	12
Detient Characteristics		
Gender		
Male	939	46
Female	1,086	53
Age group		
[18-35]	597	29
[36-50]	872	43
[51-65]	552	27
Occupational grade		
Blue collar	273	13
Pink collar	1,185	60
White collar	513	26
Educational level		
< High school degree	780	38
> High school degree	1 238	61
Family status	1,200	01
	101	- 22
Lives with a partner or perents	40   1 E 1 0	23
Lives with a partitler or parents	1,543	76
	404	00
[U-3.000]	491	30
3.000 +	1,112	69
Company size		
1 to 10	361	18
11 to 50	490	25
51 to 250	420	21
250 +	687	35
Previous mental health problems/disorders		
Yes	189	9
No	1,735	90
Past somatic problems	1,100	00
Vee	550	20
	009	∠0

2	1	Table 1: (continued)		
3			Ν	%
4		Purpose of consultation with GP		
5		Somatic		
6		Yes	1,331	65.7
7		NO De abalaciad	696	34.3
8		Psychological	105	21.0
9		Yes	425	21.0
10		Chronic disease management	1,002	79.0
11		Yes	313	15.4
12		No	1,714	84.6
12		Past unemployment	.,	01.0
17		Yes	613	30.2
14		No	1,414	69.8
15		Job instability		
10		Yes	522	33.0
17		No	1,061	67.0
18		GPs characteristics		
19		GP's gender		
20		Male	1,364	67.3
21		Female	663	32.7
22		GP's age		
23		[18-39]	194	9.6
24		[40-49]	626	30.9
25		[50-59]	832	41.0
26		60 +	375	18.5
27			211	11 0
28		5000 - 1000	211	52.5
20		1000- 1500	433	22.0
20		1500+	253	13.4
21		Comfort with Mental health problems	200	10.1
22		High	1.600	82.6
32		Low	338	17.4
33		High opportunity to work with mental health specialists		
34		High	1,036	52.4
35		Low	941	47.6
36		Contextual characteristics		
37		Social deprivation		
38		High	552	27.2
39		Low	1,475	72.8
40		Material deprivation		
41		High	850	41.9
42		Low	1,177	58.1
43		Density of psychiatrist	4 500	
44		High	1,569	//.4
45		LOW Density of neurobalasist	458	22.6
45			1 554	76 7
40			1,004	10.1 23.3
47		Low Density of CP	475	23.3
48		High	1 525	75.2
49		low	502	24.8
50		Geographical area	002	21.0
51		Métropole Flandre intérieure	1,035	51.1
52		Hainault - Cambrésis	333	16.4
53		Artois - Douaisis	337	16.6
54		Littoral	322	15.9
55	2			
56				

#### **BMJ** Open

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
∠3 ⊃4	
24 25	
25 26	
20 27	
27	
28	
29	
20 21	
27	
22 22	
37	
35	
36	
30	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

17

### 3.2 MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse and related work factors

2 Bivariate analysis (Table 2)

In bivariate analyses, female gender was significantly associated with GAD/MDD and male gender with alcohol abuse. Family status, company size, previous mental health problems/disorders, consultation for psychiatric, somatic or chronic diseases and job insecurity were also significantly associated with the two outcomes. Occupational grade, education level and past unemployment were significantly associated (p<0.01) only with alcohol abuse, with elevated rates in blue collar workers, patients who experienced unemployment and individuals with an education level lower than a high school degree. Age and household income were only associated with MDD/GAD.

10 Regarding GP characteristics, GP gender and opportunity to work with mental health specialist was 11 associated with the two outcomes. Size of practice population was associated only with MDD/GAD.

12 Most of the contextual variables studied were not associated with our study outcomes, except for 13 material deprivation and the density of psychiatrists and psychologists which were significantly 14 associated with MDD/GAD. To the contrary, work characteristics were almost all significantly 15 associated with the two study outcomes, except job insecurity and autonomy which were not 16 associated with alcohol abuse (Table 2).  $\frac{1}{2}$ Table 2: Association between common mental disorders (major depressive disorders (MDD), generalised anxiety disord

	MDD and G	AD (n=648)	Alcohol	(n=196)
	N (%)	p	N (%)	p
Nork Characteristics		(χ2-df)		(χ2-df)
Nork intensity		< 0.01		0.01
High	232 (52.8)	(111.1 - 1)	58 (13.3)	(7.5 - 1)
Low	416 (26.2)	(	138 (8.7)	(
Emotional demands		< 0.01		<0.01
High	262 (54.9)	(149.8 - 1)	73 (15.3)	(21.8 - 1)
Low	386 (24.9)	,	123 (7.9)	· · · ·
Nutonomy		<0.01		0.48
High	158 (26.4)	(11.6 - 1)	53 (8.9)	(0.6 - 1)
Low	490 (34.3)		143 (10.0)	()
Conflict in values		<0.01	- ( /	<0.01
High	335 (48.8)	(134.4 - 1)	90 (13.1)	(13.5 - 1)
Low	313 (23.3)	,	106 (7.9)	· · · ·
Social relations at work	. ,	<0,01	. ,	0,03
High	103 (15.0)	(137.2 - 1)	52 (7.6)	(4.9 - 1)
Low	545 (40.7)	, ,	144 (10.8)	· · ·
Mork Characteristics         Nork intensity         High         Low         Emotional demands         High         Low         Autonomy         High         Low         Conflict in values         High         Low         Social relations at work         High         Low         Job insecurity         High         Low         Job insecurity         High         Low         Job insecurity         High         Low         Job insecurity         High         Low         Octoariates         Patient Characteristics         Age group         [18-35]         [36-50]         [51-65]         Gender         Male         Female         Occupational grade         Blue collar         White collar         Educational level         < High school degree	· · · ·	<0,01	( )	0,14
High	242 (42.8)	(41.8 - 1)	64 (11.3)	(2.2 - 1)
Low	406 (27.8)	· · · ·	132 (9.0)	· · · ·
Covariates	· · · ·		× 4	
Patient Characteristics				
ge group		0,03		0,24
[18-35]	172 (28.8)	(7.1 - 2)	48 (8.0)	(2.8 - 2)
[36-50]	306 (35.1)		87 (10.0)	
[51-65]	169 (30.6)		60 (10.9)	
ender		<0,01		<0,01
Male	266 (28.3)	(10.5 - 1)	140 (14.9)	(53.7 - 1)
Female	382 (35.2)		56 (5.2)	
Occupational grade		0.32		<0.01
Blue collar	79 (28.9)	(2.3 - 2)	53 (19.4)	(37.8 - 2)
Pink collar	386 (32.6)		86 (7.3)	
White collar	152 (29.6)		50 (9.7)	
Educational level		0.13		<0.01
< High school degree	266 (34.1)	(2.3 - 1)	98 (12.6)	(11.7 - 1)
≥ High school degree	381 (30.8)		97 (7.8)	
amily status		0.01		<0.01
Lives alone	471 (30.5)	(6.3 - 1)	63 (13.1)	(7.9 - 1)
Lives with a partner or parents	177 (36.8)		133 (8.6)	
Household income (in €)		0.03		0.30
[0-3.000]	184 (37.5)	(4.8 - 1)	53 (10.8)	(1.1-1)
3.000 +	353 (31.7)		100 (9.0)	
Company size		0.03		<0.01
1 to 5	108 (29.9)	(9.1 - 3)	51 (14.1)	(16.5 - 3)
6 to 25	183 (37.3)		53 (10.8)	
26 to 250	138 (32.9)		43 (10.2)	
250 +	203 (29.5)		45 (6.6)	
Previous mental health		<0.01		<0.01
oropiems/alsorders		(67 4 4)	00 (45 0)	
Maa	108 (57 1)	(57.1-1)	30 (15.9)	(10.5 - 1)
Yes			450 (0.0)	
Yes No	516 (29.8)	0.00	150 (8.6)	0.04
Yes No Past somatic problems	516 (29.8)	0.82	150 (8.6)	0.84

4 p: Chi-square test

df: degree of freedom

**Table 2:** (continued)

,	MDD and G	AD (n=648)	Alcohol (n=196)		
	N (%)	p (χ2-df)	N (%)	p (χ2-df)	
Purpose of consultation with GP					
Somatic		<0,01		0,04	
Yes	335 (25,2)	(81.5 - 1)	115 (8,6)	(4.4 - 1	
No	313 (45)		81 (11,6)		
Psychological	- · - · · ·	<0,01		<0,01	
Yes	312 (73,4)	(422.3 - 1)	61 (14,4)	(12.8 - 1	
NO Observice discourse management	336 (21)	10.01	135 (8,4)	-0.0	
	75 (04)	<0,01		<0,0	
Tes No	70 (24) 572 (22 4)	(10.5 - 1)	40 (14,7)	(10.0 - 1	
NU Past unemployment	575 (33,4)	0.57	150 (0,0)	<0.0	
Voc	202 (22)	(0.22 1)	90 (12 1)	(11 0 1	
No	202 (33)	(0.55 - 1)	116 (9.2)	(11.0 - 1	
loh instahility	440 (31,5)	<0.01	110 (0,2)	<0.0	
Vee	220 (13 0)	(47.0 - 1)	70 (13 4)	(12.0 - 1	
No	400 (27 5)	(47.0 - 1)	118 (11 1)	(12.0 -	
GPs Characteristics	400 (27,0)		110 (11,1)		
GP's gender		< 0.01		<0.0	
Male	375 (27.5)	(37.8 - 1)	152 (11.1)	(9.9 - 1	
Female	273 (41.2)	(0110 1)	44 (6.6)	(0.0	
GP's age		0,13	(-)-)	0.1	
[18-39]	72 (37,1)	(5.7 - 3)	18 (9,3)	(5.5 - 3	
[40-49]	190 (30,4)	<b>`</b>	49 (7,8)	,	
[50-59]	254 (30,5)		95 (11,4)		
60 +	132 (35,2)		34 (9,1)		
Size of practice population		<0,01		0,0	
0-500	79 (37,4)	(14.7 - 3)	18 (8,5)	(7.4 - 3	
5000 - 1000	295 (29,7)		82 (8,3)		
1000- 1500	136 (31,4)		47 (10,9)		
1500+	104 (41,1)		34 (13,4)		
Comfort with mental health problems		0,21		0,4	
High	500 (31,3)	(1.6 - 1)	155 (9,7)	(0.5 - 7	
Low	118 (34,9)		28 (8,3)		
High opportunity to work with mental		<0,01		0.0	
High	345 (36 7)	(18.2 - 1)	103 (0 0)	(37-1	
low	286 (27 6)	(10.2 - 1)	86 (9,1)	(0.7 -	
Contextual characteristics	200 (21,0)				
Social deprivation		0.32		0.8	
High	167 (30.2)	(1.0 - 1)	52 (9,4)	(0.03 - 1	
Low	481 (32,6)		144 (9,8)	(	
Material deprivation		<0,01		0,7	
High	306 (36)	(10.4 - 1)	85 (10)	(0.1 - 1	
Low	342 (29,1)		111 (9,4)		
Density of psychiatrist		0,02		0,9	
High	522 (33,3)	(5.1 - 1)	45 (9,8)	(0.01 - 1	
Low	126 (27,5)		151 (9,6)		
Density of psychologist		0,05		0,1	
High	515 (33,1)	(4.0 - 1)	36 (7,6)	(2.7 - 1	
Low	133 (28,1)		160 (10,3)		
Density of GP		0,06		0,8	
High	505 (33,1)	(3.6 - 1)	50 (10)	(0.02 - 2	
LOW	143 (28,4)		146 (9,6)		

p: Chi-square test

df: degree of freedom

Multivariable analysis (Table 3) All occupational factors were associated with our two study outcomes in unadjusted analyses. In adjusted analyses, patients reporting high levels of work intensity (RR=1.16 [1.06 - 1.27]; p<0.01) (absolute risk = 52.8%) and emotional demands (RR=1.24 [1.13 - 1.35]; p<0.01) (absolute risk = 54.9%) had a higher risk of MDD/GAD, whereas patients with high social relations at work had a lower risk to have MDD/GAD (RR=0.78 [0.70 – 0.87]; p<0.01) (absolute risk = 15.0%). Regarding alcohol abuse, social relations at work were associated with a higher risk (RR=1.25 [1.0 -

1.53]; p=0.03) (absolute risk = 7.6%) and higher autonomy was protective (RR=0.82 [0.67 - 0.99]; p=0.05) (absolute risk = 8.9%) (Table 3). A sensitivity analyses by occupational group showed a higher risk of alcohol abuse for white collar workers in case of high social relations at work (RR=1.89 [1.21 – 2.9]).

Associations between covariates and the study outcomes are presented in supplementary material (Appendix 3).

#### **BMJ** Open

Table 3: Work-related factors and major depressive disorder (MDD), generalized anxiety disorders (GAD) and alcohol abuse, Héraclès study, France, 2014. Multilevel Poisson regression models

		MDD/GAD (n=1782)					Alcohol (n=1776)					
		Unadjusted			Adjusted			Unadjusted		Adjusted		
	$RR^1$	CI 95%	Ρ	RR <sup>2</sup>	CI 95%	Ρ	$RR^1$	CI 95%	P	$RR^3$	CI 95%	Ρ
Work intensity	1.46	[1.35 - 1.57]	<0.01	1.16	[1.06 - 1.27]	<0.01	1.31	[1.14 - 1.50]	<0.01	1.16	[0.97 - 1.38]	0.10
Emotional demands	1.53	[1.43 - 1.64]	<0.01	1.24	[1.13 - 1.35]	<0.01	1.40	[1.23 - 1.59]	<0.01	1.16	[0.97 - 1.38]	0.10
Autonomy	0.68	[0.63 - 0.73]	<0.01	0.94	[0.85 - 1.04]	0.26	0.72	[0.63 - 0.83]	<0.01	0.82	[0.67 - 0.99]	0.05
Conflict in values	1.45	[1.35 - 1.56]	<0.01	1.06	[0.96 - 1.17]	0.26	1.30	[1.14 - 1.49]	<0.01	1.16	[0.96 - 1.40]	0.13
Social relations at work	0.61	[0.56 - 0.66]	<0.01	0.78	[0.70 - 0.87]	<0.01	0.83	[0.72 - 0.96]	0.01	1.25	[1.01 - 1.53]	0.03
Job insecurity	1.13	[1.05 - 1.22]	<0.01	1.03	[0.95 - 1.11]	0.49	1.14	[1.00 - 1.30]	0.05	0.95	[0.82 - 1.11]	0.52

RR: relative risk

<sup>1</sup>No adjustment: each occupational factor are studied one at the time

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted on: each occupational factors, age, gender, occupational grade, previous mental health problems/disorders, alcohol abuse, material deprivation and GP's gender

<sup>3</sup>Adjusted on: each occupational factors, age, gender, occupational grade, family status, company size, previous mental health problems/disorders, job instability, education level, past erien ont unemployment, GAD and MDD

For MDD/GAD model explained variance was 0.21 and 0.11 for Alcohol model

## 4 DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Main results

In our study conducted among a large sample of persons consulting a GP, we found that several work characteristics are associated with mental health. Unfavourable social relations at work are associated with a higher risk of MDD/GAD, but a lower risk of alcohol abuse. High work intensity and high emotional demands at work are associated with a higher risk of MDD/GAD. Finally, low autonomy at work is associated with a higher risk of alcohol abuse.

#### 4.2 Comparison with literature

We confirm, for the first time in primary care, the association between common mental disorders and social relations at work which was reported in other studies. A cross sectional study conducted in Japan (using the K10 questionnaire to assess depression) reported a higher risk of depressive symptoms among workers who receive low social support at work (OR=3.8)<sup>53</sup>. A meta-analysis of 17 studies investigating depressive disorders<sup>54</sup> found that low social support at work is also associated with anxiety disorders, as had already been observed in a study conducted by Wang et al.<sup>55</sup> However, the causal direction of this association cannot be determined due to the cross-sectional design of our study. It is possible that low social relations at work increases the risk of depression or anxiety, as has been shown in different longitudinal studies.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, social relations and support (outside or at work) affect psychological health,<sup>57</sup> but it is also possible that individuals who are not depressed or experiencing anxiety disorders receive better social support.<sup>57</sup> Finally, the association between GAD/MDD and social relations at work could also be related to negative visions of social relations among persons who are depressed or anxious.<sup>58</sup> For alcohol abuse, an inverse association with social relations was observed: higher risk associated with high social relations at work, which is consistent with results of a cross sectional study conducted among Canadian workers.<sup>25</sup> It raises the possibility of festive alcohol consumption with colleagues in or outside work.<sup>59</sup> We performed

#### **BMJ** Open

sensitivity analyses by occupational group to explore this result and found that white collar workers
 were most likely to report alcohol abuse in case of high social relations at work (RR=1.89 [1.21 –
 2.9]). Other studies have approached this subject by pointing out afterwork with colleagues.<sup>60</sup>

Work intensity, or high work time and intensity, is associated with depressive symptoms in the metaanalysis conducted by Theorell *et al* (10 studies).<sup>54</sup> The meta-analysis of longitudinal studies by Netterstrom *et al* highlights the adverse effects of high psychological demands on the occurrence of depressive disorders.<sup>56</sup> However, this association could also be due to distorted views of psychological demands among persons with depressive disorders.<sup>58</sup>

9 High emotional demands at work have previously been shown to predict depressive disorders 10 among women in a population-based nested case-control study of 14,166 psychiatric patients 11 conducted in Denmark (IRR=1.39)<sup>26</sup> or for GAD in a French prospective study (using the same 12 diagnostic tool MINI) (RR=1.66 among workers with high emotional demand<sup>22</sup>). In our cross sectional 13 study, the causal attribution is not possible, thus it is also possible that people with depression and/or 14 anxiety have a different view towards those demands.<sup>58</sup>

Work autonomy appears related to alcohol abuse, as reported in an English prospective study:
 low decision latitude, which is a part of the autonomy axis in our study, is associated to higher risk of
 alcohol dependence within women.<sup>61</sup>

We did not confirm the association found earlier between CMD and high job insecurity or
 conflict in value.<sup>21 22 24</sup>

20 Overall, our study shows that work intensity and emotional demands are associated with GAD/MDD 21 and social relations at work have a positive effect. For alcohol abuse, autonomy and social relations 22 at work are negative risk factors.

### 4.3 Strengths and limitations of the study

Several limitations of our study should be acknowledged. First, our study was conducted in the Nord -Pas-de-Calais region, i.e. one of the poorest in France with a total of four millions inhabitants. During the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this region was highly industrialized and since the 1950s it has suffered from industrial decline as mines, as well as the textile and steel industries gradually closed.

Despite the growth of services and some specialized industries (car, rail and glass), levels of education, unemployment (15%), poverty and health indicators (e.g. life expectancy) are unfavourable. The Nord - Pas-de-Calais region has a low density of GPs (-11% than in France overall) and other medical specialities (-24%).<sup>62</sup> Moreover, the study was conducted after the 2008 recession, which has been associated with an increase in the prevalence of common mental health disorders worldwide.<sup>63 64</sup> This could lead to a high level of mental disorders. The prevalence of MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse among patients consulting a GP is respectively 19.1%, 25.8% and 9.7%. This is consistent with studies in primary care where the prevalence of CMDs ranges from 6% to 25% for depression, 3% to 25% for anxiety and 2% to 11% for alcohol abuse.<sup>11 13 29-32</sup> Results should be replicated in others areas. Second, a possible weakness is GPs' selective participation. GPs who participated in the study could be especially interested in common mental disorders. This interest may be related to the personal interest of the GP, but it could also be related to the GP's patients' rate of common mental disorders. Therefore, it may cause a larger selection of patients with psychological disorders. However, the study response rate is similar to previous studies among GPs<sup>30 65</sup> and physicians who participated were representative of the region, thereby limiting possible bias. In general practice, GPs' response rate is generally low<sup>66</sup>, and in order to favour an optimal response rate, we tested the guestionnaire to make it parsimonious, GPs were paid for their participation, and GPs who were asked to participate were individually called. A random procedure to select patients included in the study limited bias. Indeed, GPs were asked to include patients following an inclusion schedule that was provided at the start of the study. This allowed us to include patients in different time slots of the week. Moreover a non-respondent form had to be filled by participating GPs but we suppose that the filling rate was low because only 41 GPs filled this form and declare that 495 patient were not included. Characteristics of patients included and those not included did not differ in term of age and gender. However it is important to note that compared to studies in work environment settings, it is possible that patients included in this primary care setting have a different level of health than other employees who do not consult their GP. The measurement of psychosocial work factors in our study was based on an unpublished expert report based on the international literature, and measurement of reliability in our sample was rather low for some axis ( $\omega$ =0.35 for conflict in values,

Page 23 of 35

#### BMJ Open

0.50 for job insecurity and 0.66 for autonomy). These dimensions are only composed of 2 items, this
 can explain partly the rather low reliability. However, the use of a validated questionnaire could have
 allowed for a better comparison with the existing literature and better psychometric quality.

We were able to take into account many covariates (characterizing individuals, GPs and patients'
context), but some relevant variables were not included, such as participants' prior history of mental
health problems, social support outside of work, or life events.

Despite these limitations, the results of this study are of interest because it identifies occupational factors related to CMD (MDD/GAD and alcohol abuse) among working adults in primary care with a standardized diagnostic tool (MINI) in a large sample (n=2,027).<sup>37</sup> The primary care sample used allows the inclusion of a panel of workers in the labour force including independent workers, workers in small companies or workers who don't have an occupational physician which is not the case in most of studies in occupational setting. Indeed, an international study including 49 countries shows that the average occupational health services coverage of workers was 24.8% with a larger gap among workers in small-scale enterprises, the self-employed, agriculture, and the informal sector.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, the present study confirms the increased risk of anxiety and depression associated with work intensity, social relations at work and emotional demands as well as the association between reduced autonomy and alcohol abuse in a primary care setting. Furthermore, we could demonstrate a negative association between social relations at work and alcohol abuse.<sup>8 22 26 61</sup> 

4.4 Conclusion

Our study is one of the first to investigate simultaneously well-known occupational risk factors such as job strain and effort-reward imbalance and new occupational factors described in recent literature. Our results emphasise the importance of social relations at work and different occupational factors that are associated with MDD, GAD and alcohol abuse. These results could be a starting point for the GPs to apprehend these factors with their patients and to communicate with occupational physicians in order to prevent the onset of CMD.

### 

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank all the participating GPs of the Nord – Pas-de-Calais region and their patients who participated to the Héraclès study. We thank the department of General practice of Lille's university and the regional union of health professional of GP's (URPS-ML) of the Nord - Pas-de-Calais region for their involvement in the GP recruitment phase. We also want to thank the Héraclès study scientific committee members who contributed to the brainstorming and the set-up of this survey

# **CONTRIBUTORS**

Study concept and design: MR, NY, MM, AL, TB, LP. Data analysis and collection: MR, LFC, MM, LP. Drafting of the manuscript: MR. Critical revision of the manuscript: NY, MM, AL. All authors have approved the final manuscript.

#### **COMPETING INTERESTS**

All authors declare that they do not have any competing interests and declare independence from the L'C funders.

#### FUNDING

- This work was supported by the Nord – Pas-de-Calais regional health agency (ARS) and the Ile-de-
- France region – DIM Gestes (Mathieu Rivière's PhD thesis).

#### DATA SHARING STATEMENT

No additional data are available

1		
2	1	
3	1	5 REFERENCES
4 5	2	1. Wagenaar AF, Kompier MA, Houtman IL, et al. Employment contracts and health selection:
6	3	unhealthy employees out and healthy employees in? J Occup Environ Med 2012;54(10):1192-
7	4	200. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e3182717633 [published Online First: 2012/09/22]
8	5	2. McLellan RK, Work, Health, And Worker Well-Being: Roles And Opportunities For Employers.
9	6	<i>Health Aff (Millwood)</i> 2017:36(2):206-13. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1150 [published Online
10	7	First: 2017/02/09]
11	8	3. Hussey L. Turner S. Thorley K. et al. Work-related ill health in general practice, as reported to a
12	9	UK-wide surveillance scheme. Br J Gen Pract 2008:58(554):637-40. doi:
13	10	10.3399/bjgp08X330753 [published Online First: 2008/09/20]
14	11	4. Whiteford HA. Degenhardt L. Rehm J. et al. Global burden of disease attributable to mental and
15	12	substance use disorders: findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. Lancet
16	13	(London, England) 2013:382(9904):1575-86 doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)61611-6 [published]
1/	14	Online First: 2013/09/03]
10 10	15	5. NHI, Description des populations du regime general en arret de travail de 2 a 4 mois 2004
20	16	[Available from:
21	17	http://fulltext.bdsp.ehesp.fr/Cnamts/Etudes/2004/DESCRIPTION ARRETS TRAVAIL 2 4
22	18	MOIS 2004.pdf.
23	19	6. Steel Z, Marnane C, Iranpour C, et al. The global prevalence of common mental disorders: a
24	20	systematic review and meta-analysis 1980-2013. Int J Epidemiol 2014;43(2):476-93. doi:
25	21	10.1093/ije/dvu038 [published Online First: 2014/03/22]
26	22	7. Wittchen HU, Jacobi F, Rehm J, et al. The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders
27	23	of the brain in Europe 2010. European neuropsychopharmacology : the journal of the
28	24	European College of Neuropsychopharmacology 2011;21(9):655-79. doi:
29	25	10.1016/j.euroneuro.2011.07.018 [published Online First: 2011/09/08]
20 21	26	8. Harvey SB, Modini M, Joyce S, et al. Can work make you mentally ill? A systematic meta-review
37	27	of work-related risk factors for common mental health problems. Occup Environ Med
33	28	2017;74(4):301-10. doi: 10.1136/oemed-2016-104015 [published Online First: 2017/01/22]
34	29	9. Reme SE, Grasdal AL, Lovvik C, et al. Work-focused cognitive-behavioural therapy and individual
35	30	job support to increase work participation in common mental disorders: a randomised
36	31	controlled multicentre trial. Occup Environ Med 2015;72(10):745-52. doi: 10.1136/oemed-
37	32	2014-102700 [published Online First: 2015/08/08]
38	33	10. Stewart WF, Ricci JA, Chee E, et al. Cost of lost productive work time among US workers with
39	34	depression. JAMA 2003;289(23):3135-44. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.23.3135 [published Online
40	35	First: 2003/06/19]
41 42	36	11. Milanovic SM, Erjavec K, Poljicanin T, et al. Prevalence of depression symptoms and associated
42	37	socio-demographic factors in primary health care patients. <i>Psychiatr Danub</i> 2015;27(1):31-7.
44	38	[published Online First: 2015/03/10]
45	39	12. Freeman A, Tyrovolas S, Koyanagi A, et al. The role of socio-economic status in depression:
46	40	results from the COURAGE (aging survey in Europe). BMC Public Health 2016;16(1):1098.
47	41	doi: 10.1186/s12889-016-3638-0 [published Online First: 2016/10/21]
48	42	13. Ibanez G, Son S, Chastang J, et al. Mental Health Disorders in General Practice in France: A
49	43	Cross-Sectional Survey. Transl Biomed 2016:7:4. doi: 10.2167/2172-0479.100096
50	44	14. Lacerda-Pinheiro SF, Pinheiro Junior RF, Pereira de Lima MA, et al. Are there depression and
51	45	anxiety genetic markers and mutations? A systematic review. J Affect Disord 2014;168:387-98.
52	46	doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2014.07.016 [published Online First: 2014/08/12]
53	47	15. Abbas RA, Hammam RA, El-Gohary SS, et al. Screening for common mental disorders and
54 55	48	substance abuse among temporary hired cleaners in Egyptian Governmental Hospitals, Zagazig
56		
57		
58		25
59		25
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

3	1	City, Sharqia Governorate. The international journal of occupational and environmental
4	2	medicine 2013;4(1):13-26. [published Online First: 2013/01/03]
5	3	16. Karasek R. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain : implication for job redesign.
6	4	Adm Sci Q 1979 24 285-309.
/	5	17. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. J Occup Health Psychol
8	6	1996;1(1):27-41. [published Online First: 1996/01/01]
9	7	18. Elovainio M, Kivimaki M, Vahtera J. Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial
10	8	predictor of health. <i>Am J Public Health</i> 2002;92(1):105-8. [published Online First: 2002/01/05]
17	9	19. Rugulies R, Aust B, Madsen IE. Effort-reward imbalance at work and risk of depressive disorders.
13	10	A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. Scand J Work Environ
14	11	Health 2017;43(4):294-306. doi: 10.5271/sjweh.3632 [published Online First: 2017/03/18]
15	12	20. Stansfeld S, Candy B. Psychosocial work environment and mental healtha meta-analytic review.
16	13	Scand J Work Environ Health 2006;32(6):443-62. [published Online First: 2006/12/19]
17	14	21. Murcia M, Chastang JF, Niedhammer I. Psychosocial work factors, major depressive and
18	15	generalised anxiety disorders: results from the French national SIP study. J Affect Disord
19	16	2013;146(3):319-27. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2012.09.014 [published Online First: 2012/10/13]
20	17	22. Niedhammer I, Malard L, Chastang JF. Occupational factors and subsequent major depressive and
21	18	generalized anxiety disorders in the prospective French national SIP study. BMC Public Health
22	19	2015;15:200. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1559-y [published Online First: 2015/04/18]
23	20	23. Gollac M. Mesurer les facteurs psychosociaux de risque au travail pour les maîtriser. 2010
24	21	[Available from: http://travail-
25	22	emploi gouy fr/IMG/pdf/rapport SRPST definitif rectifie 11 05 10 pdf
26	23	24 Schutte S Chastang JF Parent-Thiring A et al Psychosocial work exposures among European
27	24	employees: explanations for occupational inequalities in mental health <i>Journal of public health</i>
28	25	(Oxford England) 2015:37(3):373-88 doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdv044 [published Online First:
29	25	2015/04/261
30 21	20	25 Marchand A Parent Lamarche A Blanc MF Work and high risk alcohol consumption in the
22	27	23. Waterhand A, Tatent-Lamatene A, Blanc WL. Work and high-fisk alcohol consumption in the
32	20	2011.8(7):2602 705 doi: 10.3300/jjernh8072602 [nublished Online First: 2011/08/17]
34	29	26 Wieclaw I. A gerba F. Mortensen DB. et al. Psychosocial working conditions and the risk of
35	21	depression and anyioty disorders in the Danish workforce. <i>BMC Public Health</i> 2008;8:220. doi:
36	22	10 1186/1471 2458 8 280 [published Online First: 2008/08/00]
37	52 22	10.1100/14/1-2430-0-200 [published Online First. 2000/06/09]
38	22	27. Genther S. Industry 4.0. Reality, Future of Just Science Fiction? How to Convince Foday's
39	34 25	Management to Invest in Tomorrow's Future! Successful Strategies for Industry 4.0 and Manufacturing JT. Chimin 2016/20(0)/(28, 22, dai: 10.2522/abining 2016 (28 [amhlight d
40	35	Manufacturing 11. Chimia 2016; $70(9)$ :628-33. doi: 10.2533/chimia.2016.628 [published
41	36	Unline First: 2016/09/21]
42	37	28. Malard L, Chastang JF, Niedhammer I. Changes in psychosocial work factors in the French
43	38	working population between 2006 and 2010. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 2015;88(2):235-
44	39	46. doi: 10.100//s00420-014-0953-6 [published Online First: 2014/06/26]
45	40	29. Ansseau M, Dierick M, Buntinkx F, et al. High prevalence of mental disorders in primary care. J
46	41	Affect Disord 2004;78(1):49-55. doi: S0165032702002197 [p11] [published Online First:
4/	42	2003/12/16]
48	43	30. Toft T, Fink P, Oernboel E, et al. Mental disorders in primary care: prevalence and co-morbidity
49	44	among disorders. results from the functional illness in primary care (FIP) study. Psychol Med
50	45	2005;35(8):1175-84. [published Online First: 2005/08/25]
52	46	31. Alkhadhari S, Alsabbrri AO, Mohammad IH, et al. Prevalence of psychiatric morbidity in the
52	47	primary health clinic attendees in Kuwait. J Affect Disord 2016;195:15-20. doi:
55 54	48	10.1016/j.jad.2016.01.037 [published Online First: 2016/02/08]
55	49	32. Norton J, de Roquefeuil G, David M, et al. [Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in French general
56	50	practice using the patient health questionnaire: comparison with GP case-recognition and
57		
58		26
59		20
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2	1	psychotropic medication prescription] <i>Encephale</i> 2009:35(6):560-9 doi:
3 1	2	10 1016/i encen 2008 06 018
4 5	$\frac{2}{3}$	S0013-7006(08)00267-4 [pii] [published Online First: 2009/12/17]
6	4	33 Beckley A Lees B Collington S et al Work-related health advice in primary care <i>Occupational</i>
7	5	<i>medicine</i> 2011;61(7):498-502 doi: 10.1093/occmed/kar119
8	6	kar119 [pii] [published Online First: 2011/08/26]
9	7	34 de Kock CA Lucassen PL Spinnewijn L et al How do Dutch GPs address work-related
10	8	problems? A focus group study. Eur J Gen Pract 2016:1-8. doi:
11	9	10.1080/13814788.2016.1177507 [published Online First: 2016/06/02]
12	10	35 Riviere M Plancke L Lerover A et al Prevalence of work-related common psychiatric disorders
13	11	in primary care: The French Heracles study. <i>Psychiatry Res</i> 2017 doi:
14	12	10 1016/i psychres 2017 09 008 [published Online First: 2017/09/19]
15 16	13	36. Flahault A. Blanchon T. Dorleans Y. et al. Virtual surveillance of communicable diseases: a 20-
10	14	vear experience in France. <i>Stat Methods Med Res</i> 2006;15(5):413-21. [published Online First:
18	15	2006/11/09]
19	16	37. Sheehan DV. Lecrubier Y. Sheehan KH. et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview
20	17	(M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for
21	18	DSM-IV and ICD-10. J Clin Psychiatry 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33; guiz 34-57. [published Online
22	19	First: 1999/01/09]
23	20	38. Lecrubier Y, Sheehan DV, Weiller E, et al. The Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview
24	21	(MINI). A short diagnostic structured interview: reliability and validity according to the CIDI.
25	22	European Psychiatry 1997;12(5):224-31.
26	23	39. Moorman R. Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors:
27	24	do fairness perception influence employee citizenship? J Appl Psychol 1991;76:845–55.
20 29	25	40. Kristensen TS, Hannerz H, Hogh A, et al. The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnairea tool for
30	26	the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. Scand J Work Environ
31	27	Health 2005;31(6):438-49. [published Online First: 2006/01/24]
32	28	41. Dallner M, Elo A-L, Gamberale F, et al. Validation of the general Nordic questionnaire
33	29	(QPSNordic) for psychological and social factors at work (No. Nord 2000:12). In: Ministers
34	30	NCo, ed. Copenhagen, 2000.
35	31	42. Hansez I. The Working Conditions and Control Questionnaire (WOCCQ): Towards a structural
36	32	model of psychological stress. European Review of Applied Psychology 2008;58(253 – 262)
37	33	43. Dunn TJ, Baguley T, Brunsden V. From alpha to omega: a practical solution to the pervasive
38	34	problem of internal consistency estimation. British journal of psychology (London, England :
39 40	35	1953) 2014;105(3):399-412. doi: 10.1111/bjop.12046 [published Online First: 2014/05/23]
40 41	36	44. INSEE. Nomenclature des Professions et Catégories Socioprofessionnelles - PCS 2003 [Available
42	37	from: https://www.insee.fr/fr/information/2400059.
43	38	45. Min KB, Park SG, Hwang SH, et al. Precarious employment and the risk of suicidal ideation and
44	39	suicide attempts. Preventive medicine 2015;71:72-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.12.017
45	40	[published Online First: 2014/12/24]
46	41	46. Fleury MJ, Bamvita JM, Farand L, et al. Variables associated with general practitioners taking on
47	42	patients with common mental disorders. Mental health in family medicine 2008;5(3):149-60.
48	43	[published Online First: 2008/09/01]
49	44	47. Pampalon R, Hamel D, Gamache P, et al. Validation of a deprivation index for public health: a
50	45	complex exercise illustrated by the Quebec index. Chronic diseases and injuries in Canada
51 52	46	2014;34(1):12-22. [published Online First: 2014/03/13]
52 53	47	48. Moreno-Betancur M, Latouche A, Menvielle G, et al. Relative index of inequality and slope index
54	48	of inequality: a structured regression framework for estimation. Epidemiology (Cambridge,
55	49	Mass) 2015;26(4):518-27. doi: 10.1097/ede.0000000000000311 [published Online First:
56	50	2015/05/23]
57		
58		27
59		For poor rovious only http://bmionon.hmi.com/site/shout/swidelines.shtml
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xntml

3	1	49. Zou G. A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. Am J
4	2	<i>Epidemiol</i> 2004;159(7):702-6. [published Online First: 2004/03/23]
5	3	50. Knol MJ, Le Cessie S, Algra A, et al. Overestimation of risk ratios by odds ratios in trials and
6	4	cohort studies: alternatives to logistic regression. CMAJ: Canadian Medical Association
7	5	<i>journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne</i> 2012;184(8):895-9. doi:
8	6	10.1503/cmaj.101715 [published Online First: 2011/12/14]
9	7	51. Team RDC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing Vienna, Austria: R
10	8	Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2008 [Available from: http://www.R-project.org.
11	9	52. Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, et al. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using Ime4. Journal of
12	10	Statistical Software 2015;67(1):148. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01
13	11	53. Honda A. Date Y. Abe Y. et al. Work-related Stress. Caregiver Role, and Depressive Symptoms
14	12	among Japanese Workers. Saf Health Work 2014:5(1):7-12. doi: 10.1016/i.shaw.2013.11.002
15 16	13	[published Online First: 2014/06/17]
10	14	54 Theorell T Hammarström A Aronsson G et al A systematic review including meta-analysis of
12	15	work environment and depressive symptoms <i>BMC Public Health</i> 2015:15 doi:
19	16	10 1186/s12889-015-1954-4
20	17	55 Wang II Lesage A Schmitz N et al. The relationship between work stress and mental disorders
21	18	in men and women: findings from a nonulation-based study. <i>LEnidemiol Community Health</i>
22	10	2008:62(1):42.7. doi: 10.1136/jech.2006.050501 [published Online First: 2007/12/15]
23	20	56 Netterstrom B. Conrad N. Bech P. et al. The relation between work related nevchosocial factors
24	20	and the development of depression Enidemiologic regions 2008:20:118, 22, doi:
25	21	10 1002/oniroy/myn004 [nublished Online First: 2008/07/01]
26	22	57 Melebior M. Derkman J.E. Niedhemmer L et al. Social relations and self reported health: a
27	23	57. Melchiol M, Berkhian LF, Medhannier I, et al. Social relations and sen-reported health. a
28	24	2002.5((2):1917 20 [multiched Online Figure 2002/02/19]
29	25	2003;56(8):1817-30. [published Unline First: $2003/03/18$ ]
30	26	58. Beck A I, Brown GK, Steer RA, et al. Psychometric properties of the Beck Self-Esteem Scales.
31	27	Behaviour research and therapy 2001;39(1):115-24. [published Online First: 2000/12/28]
32	28	59. Nordaune K, Skarpaas LS, Sagvaag H, et al. Who initiates and organises situations for work-
33	29	related alcohol use? The WIRUS culture study. Scandinavian journal of public health
34 25	30	2017:1403494817/04109. doi: 10.117//1403494817/04109 [published Online First:
36	31	
30	32	60. Hagihara A, Tarumi K, Nobutomo K. Work stressors, drinking with colleagues after work, and job
38	33	satisfaction among white-collar workers in Japan. Substance use & misuse 2000;35(5):737-56.
39	34	[published Online First: 2000/05/12]
40	35	61. Head J, Stansfeld SA, Siegrist J. The psychosocial work environment and alcohol dependence: a
41	36	prospective study. Occup Environ Med 2004;61(3):219-24. [published Online First:
42	37	2004/02/27]
43	38	62. Plancke L, Bavdek R. Les disparités régionales en santé mentale et en psychiatrie. La situation du
44	39	Nord Pas-de-Calais en France métropolitaine, Lille, F2RSM. 2013.
45	40	http://www.santementale5962.com/ressources-et-outils/les-editions-de-la-
46	41	<u>f2rsm/article/disparites-regionales-en-sante</u> .
47	42	63. Katikireddi SV, Niedzwiedz CL, Popham F. Trends in population mental health before and after
48	43	the 2008 recession: a repeat cross-sectional analysis of the 1991-2010 Health Surveys of
49	44	England. BMJ Open 2012;2(5) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001790 [published Online First:
50	45	2012/10/19]
51	46	64. Lee S, Guo WJ, Tsang A, et al. Evidence for the 2008 economic crisis exacerbating depression in
52 52	47	Hong Kong. J Affect Disord 2010;126(1-2):125-33. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2010.03.007 [published
55 57	48	Online First: 2010/04/13]
5 <del>5</del>	49	65. Goldenberg MG, Skeldon SC, Nayan M, et al. Prostate-specific antigen testing for prostate cancer
56	50	screening: A national survey of Canadian primary care physicians' opinions and practices.
57		
58		00
59		28
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li><i>Canadian Urological Association journal = Journal de l'Association des urologues du Canada</i> 2017 doi: 10.5489/cuaj.4486 [published Online First: 2017/11/07]</li> <li>66. Cottrell E, Roddy E, Rathod T, et al. Maximising response from GPs to questionnaire surveys: do length or incentives make a difference? BMC medical research methodology 2015;15:3. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-15-3 [published Online First: 2015/01/08]</li> <li>67. Rantanen J, Lehtinen S, Valenti A, et al. A global survey on occupational health services in selected international commission on occupational health (ICOH) member countries. BMC Public Health 2017;17(787) doi: doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4800-z.</li> </ul>
11	9	
12	10	Legends:
14	11	Figure 1: Flow chart of participation in the Héraclès study, France, 2014
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 50 51 52 53 54 55	12	tor peer terien only
57		
58 50		29
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



59

60



Flow chart of participation in the Heracles study, France, 2014

154x104mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Appendix 1: Work's factor questionnaire

# 1) Work intensity

- I receive contradictory orders or indication ("Yes"/"No")
- I am asked excessive amounts of work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have too much to think about at work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have difficulties in balancing work and family life ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have the time needed to do my work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 2) Emotional demands

- I work in contact with customers/beneficiaries ("Yes"/"No")
- I am in contact with people in distress ("Yes"/"No")
- I have conflicts with customers/beneficiaries ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have to hide my emotions and pretend to be in a good mood ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I sometimes experience fear during my work ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- During my work, I am exposed to physical, verbal, psychological aggressions ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 3) Autonomy

- I have very little freedom to decide how I do my job ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I can fully employ my skills ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 4) Conflict in values

- I have the possibility to make a work of quality ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- In my work, I have to do disapproved things ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 5) Social relations at work

- My work is fully recognized ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have support from colleagues ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")
- I have support from superior ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

# 6) Insecurity of work

- I feel able to do my current job until retirement ("Yes"/"No")
- I work with fear of losing my job ("Always"/"Often"/"Sometimes"/"Never")

Appendix 2: Correlation matrix of work characteristics, Héraclès study, France. 2014, Pearson correlation coefficient

	Work intensity	Emotional demands	Autonomy	Conflict in values	Social relations at work	Insecurity
Work intensity		0.70	-0.72	0.70	-0.81	0.08
Emotional demands	0.70		-0.86	0.78	-0.84	0.23
Autonomy	-0.72	-0.86		-0.91	0.87	-0.42
Conflict in values	0.70	0.78	-0.91		-0.91	0.17
Social relations at work	-0.81	-0.84	0.87	-0.91		-0.33
Insecurity	0.08	0.23	-0.42	0.17	-0.33	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

**Appendix 3:** major depressive disorders (MDD), generalized anxiety disorders (GAD) and alcohol abuse related factors adjusted on work related factors, Héraclès study, France, 2014. Multilevel regression models

	MDI	D GAD (n=178	(2)	Α	Icohol (n=177	6)
	RR <sup>1</sup>	CI 95%	Р	$RR^1$	CI 95%	Р
Age group			0.38			0.34
[18 - 35]	1 -			1	-	
[36 - 50]	1.13	[0.93 - 1.39]		1.29	[0.86 - 1.92]	
[51 - 65] Gender	1.03	[0.82 - 1.29]	0.34	1.37	[0.87 - 2.16]	<0.01
Male	1 -		0.54	1	-	<b>\0.01</b>
Female	1.09	[0.91 - 1.31]		0.37	[0.25 - 0.53]	
Past unemployment						0.13
No				1	-	
Yes				1.30	[0.93 - 1.83]	
Occupational grade			0.71			0.09
Blue collar	1 -			1	-	
Pink collar	1.12	[0.86 - 1.46]		0.61	[0.39 - 0.98]	
White collar	1.11	[0.82 - 1.5]		0.80	[0.46 - 1.4]	
Family status						0.11
Lives alone				1	-	
Lives with partner or parents				1.34	[0.94 - 1.9]	
Educational level						0.51
< High school degree				1	-	
≥ High school degree				1.14	[0.77 - 1.7]	
Job instability						0.21
No				1	-	
Yes				1.31	[0.86 - 1.98]	
Company size						0.02
1 to 10				1	-	
11 to 49				0.70	[0.45 - 1.09]	
50 to 250				0.83	[0.52 - 1.3]	
250 +				0.49	[0.31 - 0.78]	
Past psychiaric problems			<0.01			0.02
No	1 -			1	-	
Yes	1.58	[1.27 - 1.96]	_	1.65	[1.07 - 2.55]	
Major depressive disorders						0.01
No				1	-	
Yes				1.66	[1.12 - 2.44]	
Generalized anxiety disorders						0.25
No				1	-	
Yes				1.24	[0.86 - 1.8]	
Alcohol			0.01			
No	1 -					
Yes	1.38	[1.09 - 1.75]				
Material deprivation			0.04			
No	1 -					
Yes	1.19	[1.01 - 1.4]				
GPs Gender		-	0.02			
Male	1 -					
Female	1.22	[1.03 - 1.44]				

RR : relative risk

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted on: Work intensity, Emotional demands, Autonomy, Conflict in values, Social relations at work, Insecurity

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
د د	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
/1	
12	
42	
45	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
57	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies* 

	ltem No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	( <i>a</i> ) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract
		page 1 and 2
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done
		and what was found - page 1 and 2
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Dueingi o uniu rueionure	-	page 4 - 6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses - page 4 - 6
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper - page 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment,
		exposure, follow-up, and data collection - page 7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of
		participants - page 7
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect
		modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable – page 8 to 10
Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of
measurement		assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is
		more than one group - page 8 to 10
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias – page 6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at – page 6
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable,
		describe which groupings were chosen and why - page 10 and 11
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding
		page 10 and 11
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy
		( <u>e</u> ) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially
		eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study,
		completing follow-up, and analysed - page 12 and figure 1
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage – figure 1
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram – figure 1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and
		information on exposures and potential confounders - page 12 to 14
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures - page 15
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and
		their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were
		adjusted for and why they were included – page 15 to 19
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a

For peer review only - http://bmjopen!bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

		meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and
		sensitivity analyses
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives - page 20
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or
		imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias - page 21 to
		23
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations,
		multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence -
		page 21 to 23
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results - page 20 and 21
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if
		applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based – page 24

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen?bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml