

# Notes to statistical tables

## 【 Notes to overall tables 】

1. Figures may not add up to totals because figures are rounded to ten thousand or “unclassifiable/not reported” is included in totals.
2. “0” indicates that the figure is less than half of the given unit. “-” indicates that the figure does not exist. “...” indicates that the figure is not surveyed, tabulated or calculated.
3. In the Detailed Tabulation, the inmates of reformatory institutions and the personnel resided in Self-Defense Forces areas are excluded from the tabulation. And the Detailed Tabulation sample universe covers only the second month of the second year sample in the Basic Tabulation. Figures in the Detailed Tabulation don’t necessarily correspond with those in the Basic Tabulation because of the difference in the coverage. Items related to “labour underutilization” were presented in the category “labour force status” in Detailed Tabulation in January 2018. Hence, the definition of “Not in Labour force” and some other items in Detailed Tabulation are different from the ones used in Basic Tabulation or used in Detailed Tabulation until 2017.

## 【 Notes to time series tables 】

1. Attention needs to be paid when comparing the change over the year of weekly hours of work, etc. because the number of weekdays in the survey week\* is not always the same.  
\* The last seven days of every month. As for December, 20th to 26th.
2. The benchmark population for calculating the results of the Labour Force Survey is revised every five years since 1982. The data from October 2015 through December 2021 (excluding rate) have been adjusted to comparable time-series data (the intercensal-level adjustment data or the retroactive adjustment data). And the data until 1977 is the compatible time-series data that are adjusted to the effects of the methodological reform in 1961 and 1967, and the benchmark revision in 1975. On this account, the data from October 2005 through December 2021 and the data until 1977 are different from the data of e-Stat and the annual report published in each year. The data that are not adjusted to comparable time-series data include difference due to the revision. For further information of difference, refer to “Reference Tab. 1 Difference in level of the benchmark revisions” of “Sampling Method, Estimation Method, and Sampling Errors of Estimates”.
3. Figures covering from March through August 2011 for whole Japan are supplementary-estimated figures due to the damage caused by the Great East Japan Earthquake.
4. On the release of January results, the seasonal adjustments are computed retroactively by adding new data for twelve months of the previous year. For further information, refer to “5. Seasonal adjustment methods” of “Sampling Method, Estimation Method, and Sampling Errors of Estimates”.

## 【 Notes to the Japan Standard Industrial Classification and the Japan Standard Occupational Classification 】

Along with the revision of the Japan Standard Industrial Classification (JSIC) and the Japan Standard Occupational Classification, the industrial classification and occupational classification of employed persons used in the tabulation of the Labour Force Survey are revised. Retrospective data are prepared to the extent possible for each revision. However, it should be noted that long-term, accurate retrospective connections cannot be made due to the impact of the changes in the classification contents due to the revision.

Period of revision of the Japan Standard Industrial Classification  
and the corresponding time series data range

| Period of revision of the Japan Standard Industrial Classification | The corresponding time series data range |
|--|--|
| 13th revision (2013)   | 2002～                                    |
| 12th revision (2007)   | 2002～                                    |
| 11th revision (2002)   | 1998～2009                                |
| 10th revision (1993)   | 1953～2002                                |

\* In the Labour Force Survey, the results classified by JSIC revision 12th and JSIC revision 13th are directly comparable.

Period of revision of the Japan Standard Occupational Classification  
and the corresponding time series data range

| Period of revision of the Japan Standard Occupational Classification | The corresponding time series data range |
|--|--|
| 5th revision (2009)  | 2009～                                    |
| 4th revision (1997)  | 1953～2010                                |

**【 Notes to regional tables and reference tables monthly results for Southern-Kanto and Kinki 】**

1. The regional classification used in the current Labour Force Survey consists of the prefectures in the following table.

| Region                 | Prefecture   |
|------------------------|--|
| Hokkaido               | Hokkaido   |
| Tohoku                 | Aomori, Iwate, Miyagi, Akita, Yamagata, Fukushima            |
| Southern-Kanto         | Saitama, Chiba, Tokyo, Kanagawa                              |
| Northern-Kanto, Koshin | Ibaraki, Tochigi, Gumma, Yamanashi, Nagano                   |
| Hokuriku               | Niigata, Toyama, Ishikawa, Fukui                             |
| Tokai                  | Gifu, Shizuoka, Aichi, Mie                                   |
| Kinki                  | Shiga, Kyoto, Osaka, Hyogo, Nara, Wakayama                   |
| Chugoku                | Tottori, Shimane, Okayama, Hiroshima, Yamaguchi              |
| Shikoku                | Tokushima, Kagawa, Ehime, Kochi                              |
| Kyushu                 | Fukuoka, Saga, Nagasaki, Kumamoto, Oita, Miyazaki, Kagoshima |
| Okinawa                | Okinawa  |

2. Rates for regional results are calculated with numerators and denominators which are rounded off to the nearest thousand.
3. The precision of “the monthly results for Southern-Kanto and Kinki” released as reference tables are insufficient compared to the results of whole Japan.

**【 Notes to reference tables prefectural results (model-based estimation) 】**

1. The precision of the prefectural results are lower compared to the results of whole Japan. The sampling design aims for wider region than prefectural, thus the sample size for each prefecture (excluding Hokkaido, Okinawa) is relatively small and might be insufficient.
2. The figures are estimated by the time series regression model (TSRM). However, Hokkaido, Tokyo, Kanagawa, Aichi, Osaka and Okinawa have sufficient sample size and are estimated by the ratio estimation. The gaps caused by the revision of the benchmark population to 2015 Census-based population estimates and 2020 Census-based population estimates are adjusted before the TSRM estimate.
3. The annual average of Kumamoto is estimated from the predicted values by TSRM, due to the lack of questionnaire data caused by 2016 Kumamoto Earthquake.
4. Figures of the latest five years are revised at the following release of the first quarter results.