

1 **TITLE**

2 Self-reported work activities, mucus membrane symptoms, and respiratory health outcomes  
3 among an industrial hog operation worker cohort, North Carolina, USA

4

5 **AUTHORS**

6 Vanessa R. Coffman, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>

7 Devon J. Hall<sup>2</sup>

8 Nora Pisanic, Ph.D.<sup>3</sup>

9 David C. Love, Ph.D.<sup>3,4</sup>

10 Maya Nadimpalli, Ph.D.<sup>5,6</sup>

11 Meredith McCormack, MD<sup>3,7,8</sup>

12 Marie Diener-West, Ph.D.<sup>8-13</sup>

13 Meghan F. Davis, Ph.D.<sup>3,4,7</sup>

14 Christopher D. Heaney, Ph.D.<sup>3,4,8,10,14-16</sup>

15

16 <sup>1</sup>Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois,  
17 USA

18 <sup>2</sup>Rural Empowerment Association for Community Help (REACH), Warsaw, North Carolina,  
19 USA

20 <sup>3</sup>Department of Environmental Health and Engineering, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of  
21 Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

22 <sup>4</sup>Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,  
23 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

24 <sup>5</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tufts University, Medford,  
25 Massachusetts, USA

26 <sup>6</sup>Center for Integrated Management of Antimicrobial Resistance (CIMAR), Tufts University,  
27 Boston, MA, USA

28 <sup>7</sup>School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

29 <sup>8</sup>Johns Hopkins Center for Global Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

30 <sup>9</sup>Department of Biostatistics, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins  
31 University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

32 <sup>10</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns  
33 Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

34 <sup>11</sup>Johns Hopkins School of Nursing, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

35 <sup>12</sup>Johns Hopkins Center for Clinical Trials and Evidence Synthesis, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg  
36 School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

37 <sup>13</sup>Johns Hopkins Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, Johns Hopkins University,  
38 Baltimore, Maryland, USA

39 <sup>14</sup>Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns  
40 Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

41 <sup>15</sup>Johns Hopkins Education and Research Center for Occupational Safety and Health, Johns  
42 Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland,  
43 USA

44 <sup>16</sup>The Johns Hopkins University Water Institute, Department of Environmental Health and  
45 Engineering, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and Whiting School of  
46 Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

47

48 **Corresponding author:** Vanessa Coffman; University of Illinois at Chicago School of Public  
49 Health, 1603 W. Taylor Street, Room 978b, Chicago, IL 60612; Phone: +1.971.409.4968; Email:  
50 [vcoffm2@uic.edu](mailto:vcoffm2@uic.edu)

51

## 52 **COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS**

53 The authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.

54

## 55 **FUNDING**

56 Funding for this study was provided by National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health  
57 (NIOSH) grant K01OH010193; Johns Hopkins NIOSH Education and Research Center grant  
58 T42OH008428; a directed research award from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future;  
59 the Johns Hopkins NIOSH Education and Research Center Pilot Award; award 018HEA2013  
60 from the Sherrilyn and Ken Fisher Center for Environmental Infectious Diseases Discovery  
61 Program at the Johns Hopkins University, School of Medicine, Department of Medicine,  
62 Division of Infectious Diseases; and National Science Foundation (NSF) grant 1316318 as part  
63 of the joint NSF–National Institutes of Health (NIH)-U.S. Department of Agriculture Ecology  
64 and Evolution of Infectious Diseases program. V.R.C was supported by the Johns Hopkins  
65 Center for a Livable Future-Lerner Fellowship. N.P. was supported by NIH/National Institute of  
66 Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) grant 5T32ES007141-30. D.L was supported by funds  
67 from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future. M.N. was supported by a Royster Society  
68 fellowship and a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Science to Achieve Results fellowship.  
69 C.D.H. was supported by NIOSH grant K01OH010193, E.W. “Al” Thrasher Award 10287,

70 NIEHS grant R01ES026973, and NSF grant 1316318. The funders had no role in study design,  
71 data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

72

73 **KEY WORDS**

74 industrial hog operation, concentrated animal feeding operation, CAFO, pig, swine, occupational  
75 health, worker, symptoms, respiratory, mask, PPE

76 **ABSTRACT**

77 **Background:** Respiratory disease among industrial hog operation (IHO) workers is well  
78 documented; however, it remains unclear whether specific work activities are more harmful and  
79 if personal protective equipment (PPE), as used by workers, can reduce adverse health outcomes.

80 **Objectives:** To assess the relationship between self-reported IHO work activities and PPE use  
81 with mucus membrane and respiratory health symptoms in an occupational cohort.

82 **Methods:** IHO workers ( $n=103$ ) completed baseline and up to eight bi-weekly (*i.e.*, every two  
83 weeks) study visits. Workers reported typical (baseline) and transient (bi-weekly) work  
84 activities, PPE use, and physical health symptoms. Baseline and longitudinal associations  
85 between work activities and health outcomes were assessed using generalized logistic and fixed-  
86 effects logistic regression models, respectively.

87 **Results:** At baseline, reports of ever versus never drawing pig blood, applying pesticides, and  
88 increasing years worked at any IHO were positively associated with reports of eye, nose, and/or  
89 throat irritation. Over time, transient exposures, including those associated with dustiness in  
90 barns, cleaning of barns, and pig contact were associated with increased odds of symptoms  
91 including sneezing, headache, and eye or nose irritation, particularly in the highest categories of  
92 exposure. When PPE was used, workers had decreased odds of symptoms interfering with sleep  
93 (odds ratio (OR): 0.1; 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.01, 0.8), sneezing (OR: 0.1; 95% CI: 0.01,  
94 1.0), and eye or nose irritation (OR: 0.1; 95% CI: 0.02, 0.9). Similarly, when they washed their  
95 hands  $\geq 8$  times per shift (the median) versus less frequently, workers had decreased odds of any  
96 respiratory symptom (OR: 0.3; 95% CI: 0.1, 0.8).

97 **Discussion:** In this healthy volunteer IHO worker population, increasingly unfavorable work  
98 activities were associated with self-reported mucus membrane and respiratory health outcomes.

99 Strong protective associations were seen between PPE use and handwashing and the odds of  
100 symptoms, warranting further investigation in intervention studies.

101 **INTRODUCTION**

102 Industrial hog operations (IHOs) pose a respiratory health risk to workers (Casey et al.  
103 2015; Cole et al. 2000; Heederik et al. 2007; Kirkhorn et al. 2002; Nordgren et al. 2016; Poole et  
104 al. 2008). Particulates become airborne from the movement of workers and animals to, from, and  
105 within animal housing facilities (Basinas et al. 2013; Gustafsson 1999), contributing to human  
106 exposures to bacteria, endotoxin, fungi (Douglas et al. 2018) viruses, dander, gases, and feed  
107 constituents (Duchaine et al. 2000). These airborne contaminants lead to a number of negative  
108 respiratory health outcomes including lung inflammation, airway hyper-responsiveness, and  
109 irritation of mucosal membranes (Charavaryamath et al. 2005; Cole et al. 2000; Senthilselvan et  
110 al. 2007). Even though researchers have been cataloging these harmful exposures for decades  
111 (*e.g.*, Brouwer et al. 1986; Donham et al. 1977), they have not fully identified the riskiest  
112 contemporary work activities and the effectiveness of personal protective equipment (PPE) in  
113 this industry.

114 These knowledge gaps seriously limit the ability to propose suitable guidance for health  
115 protections among the estimated 31,000 IHO workers in the U.S. (BLS 2020). For example, in  
116 2010, an expert panel concluded that researchers do not entirely understand which IHO workers  
117 could benefit most from the use of PPE (Von Essen et al. 2010). While we know that respirators  
118 can reduce the health effects from IHO contaminants (Dosman et al. 2000; Sundblad et al. 2006;  
119 Zejda et al. 1993), the panel was unable to determine whether PPE use for specific tasks is  
120 sufficient or whether PPE should be donned as soon as a worker enters an IHO; a potentially  
121 onerous and expensive recommendation that may not be feasible given harsh IHO work  
122 conditions.

123           A majority of data regarding health risks to U.S. agricultural workers comes from the  
124 Agricultural Health Study, a prospective cohort of over 50,000 North Carolinian and Iowan  
125 licensed pesticide applicators. While well-designed to study incident cancer outcomes related to  
126 pesticide exposures (Alavanja et al. 1996), and a follow-up interview was conducted to capture  
127 respiratory symptoms (Rinsky et al. 2019), it was not designed to focus specifically on IHO  
128 workers and therefore does not capture all farming activities. Further, this cohort consists largely  
129 of male managers (Alavanja et al. 1996), rather than those who work day-to-day inside  
130 concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) barns. Inclusion of both male and female  
131 workers in these studies is essential as there are known sex differences in respiratory outcomes  
132 among operation workers (Dosman et al. 2009, Senthilselvan et al. 2007).

133           One factor which restricts data collection on operations and limits to our understanding of  
134 IHO work conditions, exposures, and worker health outcomes is the blocking of access for  
135 researchers to CAFOs due to owner's legal concerns. In addition, workers, who are often from  
136 marginalized communities including minorities, those with low-incomes, and lacking health  
137 insurance, may face job termination for participating in research efforts. This makes on-site air  
138 monitoring and the collection of health data exceedingly rare. Further, operations are often  
139 heterogenous in their age, design, animal density, animal life stages, and waste management  
140 systems. Therefore, comparing workers to one another from different operations without air  
141 sampling presents statistical problems and may lead to residual confounding due to differences in  
142 exposures (Radon et al. 2000), feed type (Kimbell & Dunn et al. 2001), barn construction (Kim et  
143 al. 2007), and activities between operations.

144           Fixed-effects regression analyses, which compare workers to themselves over time, can  
145 be used to examine exposure-outcome relationships and mitigate some of the threats to inference



146 from heterogeneity in IHO sites. This technique has been successfully employed by Schinasi *et*  
147 *al.* who found strong associations between increasing CAFO odors and decrements in  
148 community health (Schinasi et al. 2011). To the best of our knowledge, no prior U.S. study has  
149 related self-reported work activities and PPE use to self-reported health outcomes among IHO  
150 workers who perform the day-to-day operations on industrial facilities. Further, no study of IHO  
151 worker activities and health outcomes has been analyzed using fixed-effects regression  
152 techniques. The purpose of this investigation was to identify factors that are associated with the  
153 respiratory and mucous membrane (eye, nose, and throat) health of the IHO workers we  
154 surveyed and to provide insight into factors for future research and interventions using an  
155 underemployed biostatistical method.

156

## 157 **METHODS**

### 158 **Study population**

159 In total, 103 IHO workers in North Carolina were recruited. Detailed methods on  
160 enrollment have been previously described (Nadimpalli et al. 2016). In brief, participants were  
161 recruited on a rolling basis from October 2013 to February 2014, with the last surveys completed  
162 in June 2014. Participants were eligible for inclusion in the sample population if they were: (1)  
163 current IHO workers (full- or part-time) and (2) agreed to participate in the study. Eligibility for  
164 inclusion in the baseline analysis population required that they provide survey data for the  
165 baseline enrollment visit. IHO workers were eligible for inclusion in the longitudinal analysis  
166 population if they were: (1) enrolled in the study and (2) completed at least one follow-up visit.  
167 Signed informed consent was obtained from each participant prior to participation. The study

168 protocol was approved by the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health Institutional  
169 Review Board.

170

## 171 **Study location**

172 North Carolina contains 10% of all pigs and hog operations in the U.S. and roughly 3,300  
173 North Carolinian workers are employed in pig farming (NAICS code 1122) (BLS 2019). Located  
174 in southeast N.C., Duplin County is the second-greatest pork producing county in the U.S. (Food  
175 and Water Watch 2015). It is also home to the Rural Empowerment Association for Community  
176 Help (REACH; <https://www.ncruralempowerment.org>), who performed the recruitment,  
177 enrollment, and much of the data collection for this analysis.

178

## 179 **Questionnaires**

### 180 *Baseline*

181 At enrollment, a baseline questionnaire was employed. It was designed to capture  
182 established work routines and health symptoms. Participants responded to survey questions  
183 consisting of how health, job tasks, and their work environment were “typically” or “usually” at  
184 their current IHO of employment. For example, participants were asked, “As part of your work,  
185 do you ever give antibiotics to pigs?” and “Do you usually have a cough?” Information about,  
186 and proxies for, the frequency, magnitude, and duration of contact with livestock, livestock  
187 manure, PPE use at work, animal species and life stage, typical job activities, and barn  
188 conditions were collected (see Supplemental Material, Questionnaires).

189

### 190 *Follow-up*

191           The follow-up questionnaire was adapted from the Agricultural Health Study  
192 (<https://www.aghealth.nih.gov/collaboration/questionnaires.html>), the American Thoracic  
193 Society (ATS-DLD-78-A), and Kimbell-Dunn *et al.* (Kimbell □Dunn et al. 1999). It was  
194 employed at two-week intervals for up to eight visits. Differing from the baseline questionnaire,  
195 it was designed to capture transient exposures and symptoms (see Supplemental Material,  
196 Questionnaires). Information about the frequency, magnitude, and duration of contact with pigs,  
197 job activities, personal behaviors (*e.g.*, cigarette use), and PPE use at work was collected. Each  
198 question asked participants about the week prior to the study visit. For example, “In the past  
199 week have you...” In both questionnaires, with an attempt to capture a dose-response  
200 relationship, some questions asked participants to rate exposures using a Likert-like scale, while  
201 others asked for binary (ever/never or yes/no) responses.

202

## 203 **Statistical analyses**

### 204 *Baseline*

205           At baseline, generalized logistic models clustered for household were used to assess the  
206 relationship between cross-sectional self-reported exposures and outcomes. Persons reporting at  
207 least one eye, nose, or throat symptom were grouped as mucous membrane cases. Due to  
208 collinearity, those who reported ever giving pigs shots and/or antibiotics were likewise grouped  
209 together. Biologically implausible values were dropped. Due to the small number of reported  
210 outcomes in some categories, analyses on exposures and outcomes with fewer than 5% of  
211 respondents indicating case status were not run.

212           *A priori* covariates explored in baseline analyses included age at enrollment (a continuous  
213 variable in years), sex (binary male/female), race/ethnicity (binary non-black Hispanic/other),

214 asthma medication use if person reported being an asthmatic (binary controlled/uncontrolled),  
215 current smoking status (binary smoker/non-smoker), and season (summer, fall, winter, spring)  
216 (O'Shaughnessy et al. 2009), as well as days since last work shift (continuous). Based on prior  
217 knowledge and model fit, age and sex were included as baseline confounders in sensitivity  
218 analyses.

219

#### 220 *Follow-up*

221 Longitudinal data were also checked for accuracy and variability. Exposures or outcomes  
222 with limited variability ( $\leq 1\%$  of respondents) were *a priori* dropped from analyses to reduce any  
223 bias associated with small numbers (**Tables S4 and S5**).

224 Scores were created for exposure activities that were similar in nature and displayed  
225 multi-collinearity (assessed via  $\chi^2$  tests, with an  $\alpha$  cutoff of 0.05). For example, poor  
226 *environmental barn conditions* consisted of reports of the following: vent fans turned off or non-  
227 existent at the facility (binary yes/no), extreme malodor (3 or 4 on a 4-point Likert-like scale),  
228 extreme temperature (3 or 4 on a 4-point Likert-like scale), a new herd entering the barns (binary  
229 yes/no), or extreme dust (3 or 4 on a 4-point Likert-like scale) in the past week. In main binary  
230 analyses, persons experiencing poor *environmental barn conditions* during that specific week  
231 were coded as a 1, whereas persons who reported none of the aforementioned activities were  
232 coded as referent 0. For sensitivity dose-response analyses, binary forms of each of the five input  
233 variable were summed; 1 being reported and 0 not being reported for that week, with a score of  
234 up to 5 for *environmental barn conditions*.

235 Using the same methodology, a *cleaning activity* score was created, consisting of on-IHO  
236 use of chemicals (binary yes/no), pressure washing the inside of barns (binary yes/no),

237 application of pesticides (binary yes/no), and using a torch to clean the barns (binary yes/no) in  
238 the past week. In binary analyses, a person could have conducted a *cleaning activity* (coded as  
239 1), or not (coded as 0), and in sensitivity trend analyses they could have a score of up to 4  
240 reported activities.

241 In both the main binary *environmental barn conditions* and main binary *cleaning activity*  
242 analyses, summations of scores  $\geq 2$  were aggregated due to small numbers (1 of 711 for barn  
243 conditions and 12 of 738 for cleaning activities).

244 Intense *pig contact* activities (giving pigs medicine or shots) were also grouped using the  
245 same process, with main binary scores of 0 or 1 for each activity and sensitivity trend scores of 0  
246 to 2.

247 Individual unweighted exposures and activities were also summed (1 as have been  
248 reported, and 0 if not reported in the past week) to assess the health implication for persons  
249 performing none to all 10 of the assessed activities. Up to six activities were reported in a single  
250 week by an individual, so scores of  $\geq 4$  were aggregated due to small numbers.

251 The use of PPE, including facemasks, eyewear, and full body suit/coveralls, was also  
252 grouped due to multi-collinearity. Participants were coded as a 1 in each category if they  
253 reported use of the specific PPE at least 80% of the time while at work in the past week and 0 if  
254 they reported using it less often. These scores were then summed, giving possible values from 0  
255 to 3. Mask, eye protection, and coveralls were chosen for this analysis because we believed them  
256 to: (1) be *a priori* related to the outcomes of interest and (2) have variability in their use at  
257 baseline and over time and thus would not be dropped from fixed-effects regression models. For  
258 example, 726 of 737 (98.5%) of reported wearing boots 100% of the time at work in the past  
259 week; boot use was therefore not examined in models.

260 Reports of the number of times a person washed his/her hands was assessed in tertiles  
261 due to non-linearity. A report of handwashing 100 times per shift was dropped.

262 Groupings were also created for adverse health outcomes *a priori* based on biological  
263 understanding and number of case reports. These included reports of at least one respiratory  
264 symptom (*i.e.*, excessive coughing, runny nose, difficulty breathing, or sore throat), at least one  
265 symptom that interfered with sleep (*i.e.*, any symptoms reported, waking from sleep due to  
266 coughing, waking from sleep due to wheezing, or waking from sleep due to phlegm), sneezing,  
267 headache, and any reported mucous membrane symptom (*i.e.*, eye or nose irritation).

268 Fixed-effects logistic regression was used to assess the relationship between self-reported  
269 exposures and outcomes in the past week and to control for time-invariant confounding variables  
270 (Allison 2009). These differences may include physical production facilities (*i.e.*, number and  
271 life stage of pigs or waste management systems) and the operational structures (*i.e.*, how often  
272 pits under slatted floors are drained). Confounders of interest from the literature and relevant to  
273 the longitudinal fixed-effects analysis included only month of follow-up visit (Basinas et al.  
274 2013).

275 All data were analyzed using Stata (StataCorp. 2017. *Stata* Statistical Software: Release  
276 15. College Station, TX: *StataCorp* LP).

277

## 278 **RESULTS**

279 In this study of IHO workers, elevated odds of self-reported symptoms by those who ever  
280 performed activities and those who performed increasingly hazardous transient activities on the  
281 IHO were found. Due to small case numbers, confidence intervals are often wide, but effect

282 estimates are large and demonstrate a consistency in magnitude and direction across main and  
283 sensitivity analyses.

284 At baseline, 103 current workers entered the cohort through rolling admissions. As  
285 reported in previous studies, these workers (with 1-27 years of IHO experience) were primarily  
286 non-black Hispanic (88%), male (55%), and aged 16-62 years (Nadimpalli et al. 2016). Most did  
287 not live on the same property as an IHO (92%) (**Table 1**). An average of 8 years working on any  
288 IHO was reported, as was an average of 6.4 days worked per week and a majority of work time  
289 spent in direct contact with pigs (82%) (**Table 2**). The most prevalent work activities employees  
290 reported *ever* performing included handling dead pigs (79%), giving pigs shots or injections  
291 (69%), having direct contact with pig manure (67%), administering antibiotics (62%), applying  
292 pesticides in or around barns (49%), and drawing blood from pigs (9%). Participants were also  
293 asked to classify typical mask usage at work, and 38% responded that they always wore a mask  
294 (**Table 2**).

295 Participants were asked whether they ever experienced a variety of symptoms, outside of  
296 having a cold or the flu. Respondents most frequently reported having eye irritation (18%), nose  
297 irritation (16%), throat irritation (15%), any allergies (13%), and doctor-diagnosed asthma (9%;  
298 **Table 3**).

299 Those who reported *ever* drawing pig blood had an increased likelihood of reporting eye,  
300 nose, and throat symptoms (PR: 3.7; 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.9, 7.0) and any allergies  
301 (PR: 4.4; 95% CI: 1.7, 12) (**Table 4**). Increased prevalence of eye, nose, or throat symptoms  
302 were also reported in those who ever applied pesticides in or around pig barns (PR: 2.2; 95% CI:  
303 1.0, 4.8) and those who washed work clothes with household laundry (PR: 2.3; 95% CI: 1.0, 5.3).  
304 Across tertiles of years worked on any IHO, increasing eye, nose, and throat symptoms were

305 reported ( $p$ -for trend: 0.01), and in the uppermost tertile of exposure (PR: 4.3; 95% CI: 1.5, 12).  
306 This trend was also seen in the association between eye, nose, and throat symptoms and tertiles  
307 of percent of life worked on any IHO ( $p$ -for trend: 0.04; highest tertile PR: 3.4; 95% CI: 0.99,  
308 11) (**Table 4**).

309 In the un hypothesized direction, reports of always wearing all three PPE (full body  
310 suit/coveralls, mask, and eye protection) on the job were associated with higher prevalence of  
311 reports of any allergies (PR: 3.8; 95% CI: 1.4, 9.9), while working all seven days per week  
312 compared to those working less often was associated with lower prevalence of allergies (PR: 0.1;  
313 95% CI: 0.01, 0.6) (**Table 4**). In models that converged, these associations were consistent in  
314 direction and magnitude after adjustment for age and sex (**Table S1**).

315 Of the 101 persons eligible for longitudinal data analyses, 95% of their study visits were  
316 completed and 90 of the 101 participants completed all eight follow-up visits (**Figure 1**).  
317 Multiple imputation was not conducted as, overall, very few data points were missing (~5-10%  
318 per analysis) and the missingness was determined to not be at random.

319 During the previous week, persons reported working an average of  $6 \pm 1$  days per week,  
320  $42 \pm 12$  hours per week, with  $38 \pm 14$  hours in direct contact with pigs. High-frequency work  
321 activities included administering shots (49%) and using cleaning chemical(s) (56%) (**Table 5**).

322 Outcomes of high prevalence and variability reported in the same bi-weekly surveys  
323 included any respiratory health symptom (6%), consisting of excessive coughing (3%), runny  
324 nose (3%), difficulty breathing (2%), sore throat (1%), shortness of breath (1%), wheezing or  
325 whistling in chest (1%), and/or chest tightness (0%, 2 cases). Symptoms interfering with sleep  
326 were reported in 3% of surveys and sneezing and headache in 2% of surveys. Mucous membrane



327 symptoms, consisting of burning, tearing, or irritated eyes (1%) and/or burning or irritated nose  
328 (1%), were also reported in 2% of bi-weekly surveys (**Table 6**).

329         Due to concerns about false reporting of symptoms or work conditions, researchers  
330 included ten “dummy” symptoms (*i.e.*, without any known prior association with exposure to  
331 hog production facilities, such as difficulty urinating) on the questionnaires. None of the dummy  
332 symptoms were reported more than six times within the 752 person-records.

333         Time-varying acute health outcomes and work activities were assessed using fixed-  
334 effects regression to control for time-invariant confounders. Consistency was seen between an  
335 increased risk of reported symptoms during weeks when workers engaged in activities that  
336 produced or retained dust within barns, conducted cleaning activities, and engaged in activities  
337 that involved close contact with pigs (13 of 14). Administering pigs medicine or shots was the  
338 riskiest activity category for all symptoms examined. Higher odds of headache, respiratory  
339 symptoms, and symptoms interfering with sleep were observed during weeks when workers  
340 conducted two or more categories of activities compared to zero or one. Also, as hypothesized, a  
341 protective effect was estimated for any PPE use (compared to when none was used) in all five  
342 outcomes. Handwashing was also protective in 4 of 5 outcomes during weeks when done at least  
343 eight times per shift (the median) versus fewer times (**Tables 7 and 8**).

344         In a sensitivity analysis, exposures were modeled via scores in an effort to assess a dose-  
345 response (**Tables S2 and S3**). Higher odds of reporting health impacts were observed with  
346 increasing exposures and worsening work conditions. The most profound effects were seen in the  
347 upper ends of exposure categories, with a *p*-for-trend <0.05 for 11 of 25 associations. The use of  
348 PPE showed a protective effect in 14 of 15 outcome groups with a no-threshold effect (**Table**  
349 **S2**). Sensitivity analyses that included the addition of a calendar month dummy variable were

350 also performed. In those models which converged, estimates of similar magnitude and direction  
351 were observed (data not shown).

352

## 353 **DISCUSSION**

354 In this study of self-reported IHO work activities and health outcomes, we found that  
355 during the weeks when workers performed the most unfavorable job tasks they also experienced  
356 increased odds of respiratory and mucous membrane irritation symptoms. In addition, they  
357 reported reduced odds of symptoms when they wore PPE or washed their hands more frequently.  
358 To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to apply fixed-effects regression as a tool to  
359 measure associations between self-reported workplace exposures and health outcomes in an IHO  
360 worker cohort. In addition, our study is more generalizable to day-to-day workers than prior  
361 work, where most cohort participants have been white male farm supervisors not in direct  
362 contact with swine (Alavanja et al. 1996). For example, in Iowa, the nation's largest producer of  
363 swine, Donham *et al.* enrolled 2,059 hog operation owners with five years of follow-up and three  
364 annual visits (Donham et al. 1990). From this cohort, 40 operations were determined to be  
365 CAFOs with 207 IHO workers enrolled. Of the 207 IHO workers, 100% were white, 88% were  
366 male, and 20% were smokers, limiting generalizability to a workforce who, in practice, is often  
367 made of non-white immigrants and, in our study, 46% female.

368 As in our study, Donham *et al.* did find that participants who worked in IHOs (compared  
369 to those working at non-confinement operations) had more chronic and acute respiratory health  
370 symptoms (Donham et al. 1990). Unlike our study, in which we did not attempt to gain access  
371 on-IHO, Donham *et al.* benefitted from on-operation collection of ambient air samples while

372 workers worked and samples from inside their masks; however, they failed to collect data  
373 regarding specific work activities.

374 In congruence with the Agricultural Health Study (Alavanja et al. 1996), our cohort  
375 consisted primarily of non-smokers; however, our participants had a higher prevalence of self-  
376 reported asthma (8.7%) than those in the Agricultural Health Study (5.1%) (Henneberger et al.  
377 2014). The prevalence of asthma in our predominantly non-black Hispanic adult population was  
378 also higher than national average for non-black Hispanic adults (6.4%) (Moorman et al. 2011).  
379 While capturing the incident development of asthma in our study was not possible, we did  
380 observe an association in increased reported cases of doctor-diagnosed asthma with increasing  
381 tertiles of years worked on any IHO (PR: 2.6; 95% CI: 1.03, 6.3), which is consistent with prior  
382 reports of increasing trends in development of asthma among farmers (Holness et al. 1995).

383 As hypothesized, reports of ever drawing pig blood, applying pesticides, and increasing  
384 years worked at any IHO were consistently associated with increased reports of eye, nose, or  
385 throat symptoms. Acute exposures, including those associated with dustiness and cleaning of  
386 barns and close contact with pigs were associated with increased odds of a variety of symptoms,  
387 particularly in the highest categories of exposure. Completing more of these tasks showed an  
388 increase in symptom reporting as well, evidence for a need to rotate job tasks among employees  
389 and to create work environments that are inherently less dusty.

390 Unexpectedly, working an average of seven days per week was associated with decreased  
391 reports of symptoms. This association is a potential indication of healthy worker effect bias  
392 where only the healthiest and most tolerant of symptoms report for work every day. It may also  
393 be due to the fact that when workers are away from work exposures their respiratory system  
394 rebounds, leading to inflammatory reactions (Bønløkke et al. 2012). Another unexpected finding

395 was that at baseline, workers who reported “always” wearing all three types of PPE at work  
396 reported increased odds of allergies. This is potentially a case of reverse causation or reporting  
397 errors, as this finding was not corroborated in our longitudinal analyses.

398 In weeks when wearing PPE and washing hands at or above the median frequency,  
399 workers had decreased odds of symptoms compared to weeks when they did not wear PPE or  
400 when they washed their hands less frequently. It has been shown that exposure to pesticides and  
401 other respiratory irritants can be modified by the use of PPE (Salvatore et al. 2008). In particular,  
402 N95 masks have been shown to block harmful pathogens found on IHOs (Ferguson et al. 2014).

403 While IHO workers in our study were not queried directly on which masks were used,  
404 subsequent assessment of a small number of different workers in a follow-up study ( $n=18$ )  
405 suggested that most adult IHO workers wear an employer-provided N95 respirator (15/17) and,  
406 less commonly, a surgical mask (2/17) (Coffman 2018). Of the 17 whose employer provided  
407 them a mask, 16 did so in the past two weeks, and all 17 reported using the mask provided  
408 (Coffman 2018). Employer training in face mask usage was also high (15/19) (Coffman 2018),  
409 which may partly explain the rate of use in this pilot study. Ferguson *et al.* have also documented  
410 that IHO workers are willing to become educated in personal protection and documented that  
411 they found value in learning about methods to protect themselves from exposures (Ferguson et  
412 al. 1989). Intervention studies that examine employer-provided handwashing stations and  
413 increased access to PPE are areas of future interest.

414

#### 415 *Limitations*

416 Several limitations potentially temper the current analysis. Because recruitment was non-  
417 random, participants represent a self-selected group, which may lead to potential selection bias;

418 including those who may be more concerned about work practices, are sicker than those who did  
419 not participate, and those who are willing to be involved in a study (which may have resulted in  
420 termination from their job had their employer discovered their participation). That said, the  
421 recruited population reflects the occupational demographics of the area of southeastern North  
422 Carolina. Second, in order to maintain worker confidentiality, operations could not be accessed  
423 directly, and therefore air sampling and personal monitoring could not be conducted on-site to  
424 corroborate survey responses. Third, baseline analyses lack needed temporality to make  
425 conclusions regarding causality and the small sample size ( $n=103$ ) of our baseline analyses make  
426 the results highly sensitive to outliers. Also, because of small numbers of varying reports of  
427 exposures or outcomes between weeks, the confidence interval for main and trend analyses are  
428 wide. However, the number, magnitude, and direction of estimates of association demonstrate  
429 strong consistency, which indicates that work on IHOs is detrimental to physical health. Finally,  
430 these data are from IHO workers, who may represent a healthy-worker population, but this bias  
431 would most likely drive associations toward to the null.

432

### 433 *Strengths*

434 Fixed-effects regression was used to eliminate data collection on the vast array of  
435 unmeasurable confounders that arise from a lack of access to IHOs and from differences due to  
436 between-person perception of magnitude of symptoms or work conditions. The use of fixed  
437 effects modeling also controls for characteristics on IHOs that do not change temporally during  
438 our study, such as feed type or barn construction (*e.g.*, floor slatting). Additionally, this modeling  
439 technique partially ameliorated challenges with model convergence, given a number of low-  
440 prevalence confounders. Another strength of our study was the ability to recruit day-to-day IHO

441 workers who are typically nervous about participating in research due to potential employer  
442 backlash. By working in tandem with a local organization who has strong ties to the community  
443 we were able to establish trust in our data security and provide laborers with information which  
444 may help them protect their health in the future.

445

#### 446 *Conclusions*

447 In this analysis of self-reported work activities and health among 103 IHO employees, we  
448 observed positive associations between exposures and proxies for exposures to possible  
449 respiratory irritants and reported respiratory health and mucous membrane outcomes, using each  
450 participant as their own control. Fixed-effect regression analysis of repeated measures differs  
451 from prior research using traditional between-person estimates. Our study also differed as we  
452 recruited of day-to-day workers and women leading to a more representative sample of the in-  
453 barn workforce. Our data show that when exposed to unfavorable tasks the risk of mucous  
454 membrane and respiratory symptoms increased, while when handwashing increased or PPE was  
455 employed, the risk of reporting negative health outcomes was reduced. Further research should  
456 focus on what types of PPE are most appropriate and functional in this workplace environment  
457 and employers may wish to focus on activities that increase job rotation, decrease dust exposure,  
458 and provide adequate access to handwashing stations and PPE.

459 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

460           This study would not have been possible without a strong partnership between  
461 researchers and North Carolinian community-based organization members who have fostered the  
462 trust of too often marginalized and at-risk community members. The authors deeply thank the  
463 workers who participated in this study.

464           This manuscript is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Steve Wing, who helped conceive the  
465 design and analytical framework for this cohort study.

466 **REFERENCES**

467 Alavanja, Michael C., Dale P. Sandler, Suzanne B. McMaster, Shelia Hoar Zahm, Cheryl J.

468 McDonnell, Charles F. Lynch, Margaret Pennybacker et al. "The Agricultural Health

469 Study." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 104, no. 4 (1996): 362-369. PMID: [8732939](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8732939/),

470 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.96104362>

471

472 Allison, Paul D. *Fixed effects regression models*. Vol. 160. SAGE publications, 2009.

473

474 ATS-DLD-78-A. [https://www.pdfFiller.com/jsfiller-](https://www.pdfFiller.com/jsfiller-desk12/?et=12f&projectId=486642759#b5df0fc35a4daa6f470c790c8070afc3)

475 [desk12/?et=12f&projectId=486642759#b5df0fc35a4daa6f470c790c8070afc3](https://www.pdfFiller.com/jsfiller-desk12/?et=12f&projectId=486642759#b5df0fc35a4daa6f470c790c8070afc3). Accessed: July 1,

476 2020.

477

478 Basinas, Ioannis, Vivi Schlünssen, Hisamitsu Takai, Dick Heederik, Øyvind Omland, Inge M.

479 Wouters, Torben Sigsgaard, and Hans Kromhout. "Exposure to inhalable dust and endotoxin

480 among Danish pig farmers affected by work tasks and stable characteristics." *Annals of*

481 *Occupational Hygiene* 57, no. 8 (2013): 1005-1019. PMID: [23792973](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23792973/),

482 <https://doi.org/10.1093/annhyg/met029>

483

484 Bønløkke, Jakob Hjort, Marc Veillette, Anne Mériaux, Caroline Duchaine, and Yvon Cormier.

485 "Work-related health effects in swine building workers after respiratory protection use." *Journal*

486 *of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 54, no. 9 (2012): 1126-1132. PMID: [22918380](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22918380/),

487 <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e31825461f4>

488



489 Brouwer, Rudi, Klaas Biersteker, Paulien Bongers, Bregt Remijn, and Danny Houthuijs.  
490 "Respiratory symptoms, lung function, and IgG4 levels against pig antigens in a sample of Dutch  
491 pig farmers." *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 10, no. 3 (1986): 283-285. PMID:  
492 [3766555](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3766555/), <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700100314>  
493  
494 Casey, Joan A., Brent F. Kim, Jesper Larsen, Lance B. Price, and Keeve E. Nachman. "Industrial  
495 food animal production and community health." *Current Environmental Health Reports* 2, no. 3  
496 (2015): 259-271. PMID: [26231503](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26231503/), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-015-0061-0>  
497  
498 Charavaryamath, Chandrashekhar, Kyathanahalli S. Janardhan, Hugh G. Townsend, Philip  
499 Willson, and Baljit Singh. "Multiple exposures to swine barn air induce lung inflammation and  
500 airway hyper-responsiveness." *Respiratory Research* 6, no. 1 (2005): 1-13. PMID: [15932644](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15932644/),  
501 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1465-9921-6-50>  
502  
503 Coffman, Vanessa Renee. "Work activities and respiratory and physical health outcomes among  
504 industrial hog operation workers: community-driven data collection to inform appropriate  
505 protective actions." PhD diss., Johns Hopkins University, 2018.  
506 <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/handle/1774.2/61424>  
507  
508 Cole, Dana, Lori Todd, and Steve Wing. "Concentrated swine feeding operations and public  
509 health: a review of occupational and community health effects." *Environmental Health*  
510 *Perspectives* 108, no. 8 (2000): 685-699. PMID: [10964788](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10964788/),  
511 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.00108685>

512

513 Donham, Kelley J., James A. Merchant, Deborah Lassise, William J. Popen Dorf, and Leon F.

514 Burmeister. "Preventing respiratory disease in swine confinement workers: intervention through

515 applied epidemiology, education, and consultation." *American Journal of Industrial*

516 *Medicine* 18, no. 3 (1990): 241-261. PMID: [2220828](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2220828/), <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700180303>

517

518 Donham, Kelley J., Michael Rubino, Terry D. Thedell, and John Kammermeyer. "Potential

519 health hazards to agricultural workers in swine confinement buildings." *Journal of Occupational*

520 *and Environmental Medicine* 19, no. 6 (1977): 383-387.

521

522 Dosman, James A., Ambikaipakan Senthilselvan, Shelley P. Kirychuk, Stephane Lemay, Ernest

523 M. Barber, Philip Willson, Yvon Cormier, and Tom S. Hurst. "Positive human health effects of

524 wearing a respirator in a swine barn." *Chest* 118, no. 3 (2000): 852-860. PMID: [10988215](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10988215/),

525 <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.118.3.852>

526

527 Dosman, James A., Liliane Chenard, Donna C. Rennie, and Ambikaipakan Senthilselvan.

528 "Reciprocal association between atopy and respiratory symptoms in fully employed female, but

529 not male, workers in swine operations." *Journal of Agromedicine* 14, no. 2 (2009): 270-276.

530 PMID: [19437288](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19437288/), <https://doi.org/10.1080/10599240902772738>

531

532 Douglas, Philippa, Sarah Robertson, Rebecca Gay, Anna L. Hansell, and Timothy W. Gant. "A

533 systematic review of the public health risks of bioaerosols from intensive farming." *International*

534 *Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* 221, no. 2 (2018): 134-173. PMID: [29133137](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29133137/),  
535 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2017.10.019>

536

537 Duchaine, Caroline, Yan Grimard, and Yvon Cormier. "Influence of building maintenance,  
538 environmental factors, and seasons on airborne contaminants of swine confinement  
539 buildings." *AIHAJ-American Industrial Hygiene Association* 61, no. 1 (2000): 56-63. PMID:  
540 [10772615](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10772615/)

541

542 Ferguson, Dwight D., Tara C. Smith, Kelley J. Donham, and Patrick O'Shaughnessy.  
543 "Evaluation of the filtration efficiency of the N95 filtering facepiece respirator for airborne  
544 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*." *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health* 20, no. 4  
545 (2014): 255-265. <https://doi.org/10.13031/jash.20.10450>

546

547 Ferguson, Kristi J., Craig L. Gjerde, Cornelia Mutel, Kelley J. Donham, Carolyn Hradek, Kay  
548 Johansen, and James Merchant. "An educational intervention program for prevention of  
549 occupational illness in agricultural workers." *The Journal of Rural Health* 5, no. 1 (1989): 33-47.  
550 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-0361.1989.tb01068.x>

551

552 Food and Water Watch. "Factory farm nation: 2015 edition."

553 <https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/sites/default/files/factory-farm-nation-report-may-2015.pdf>.

554 Accessed: July 1, 2020.

555

556 Gustafsson, G. "Factors affecting the release and concentration of dust in pig houses." *Journal of*  
557 *Agricultural Engineering Research* 74, no. 4 (1999): 379-390.  
558 <https://doi.org/10.1006/jaer.1999.0476>  
559  
560 Heederik, Dick, Torben Sigsgaard, Peter S. Thorne, Joel N. Kline, Rachel Avery, Jakob H.  
561 Bønløkke, Elizabeth A. Chrischilles et al. "Health effects of airborne exposures from  
562 concentrated animal feeding operations." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 115, no. 2 (2007):  
563 298-302. PMID: [17384782](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17384782/), <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.8835>  
564  
565 Henneberger, Paul K., Xiaoming Liang, Stephanie J. London, David M. Umbach, Dale P.  
566 Sandler, and Jane A. Hoppin. "Exacerbation of symptoms in agricultural pesticide applicators  
567 with asthma." *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 87, no. 4  
568 (2014): 423-432. PMID: [23670403](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23670403/), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-013-0881-x>  
569  
570 Holness, D. Linn, James R. Nethercott, H. H. McDuffie, J. A. Dosman, K. M. Semchuk, SA  
571 Olenhock, and A. Senthilselvan. "What actually happens to the farmers? Clinical results of a  
572 follow-up study of hog confinement farmers." *Agricultural Health and Safety: workplace,*  
573 *environment, sustainability* (1995): 49-52. ISBN-13: 978-0873716178  
574  
575 Kim, Ki Y., Han J. Ko, Hyeon T. Kim, Yoon S. Kim, Young M. Roh, Cheol M. Lee, and Chi N.  
576 Kim. "Monitoring of aerial pollutants emitted from swine houses in Korea." *Environmental*  
577 *monitoring and assessment* 133, no. 1-3 (2007): 255-266. PMID: [17268924](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17268924/),  
578 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-006-9578-x>

579

580 Kimbell□Dunn, M., L. Bradshaw, T. Slater, R. Erkinjuntti□Pekkanen, D. Fishwick, and N.  
581 Pearce. "Asthma and allergy in New Zealand farmers." *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*  
582 35, no. 1 (1999): 51-57. PMID: [9884745](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9884745/), [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1097-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1097-0274(199901)35:1<51::aid-ajim7>3.0.co;2-f)  
583 [0274\(199901\)35:1<51::aid-ajim7>3.0.co;2-f](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1097-0274(199901)35:1<51::aid-ajim7>3.0.co;2-f)

584

585 Kimbell□Dunn, M. R., R. D. Fishwick, L. Bradshaw, R. Erkinjuntti□Pekkanen, and N. Pearce.  
586 "Work□related respiratory symptoms in New Zealand farmers." *American Journal of Industrial*  
587 *Medicine* 39, no. 3 (2001): 292-300. PMID: [11241562](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11241562/), [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0274(200103)39:3<292::aid-ajim1017>3.0.co;2-f)  
588 [0274\(200103\)39:3<292::aid-ajim1017>3.0.co;2-f](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0274(200103)39:3<292::aid-ajim1017>3.0.co;2-f)

589

590 Kirkhorn, Steven R., and Marc B. Schenker. "Current health effects of agricultural work:  
591 respiratory disease, cancer, reproductive effects, musculoskeletal injuries, and pesticide-related  
592 illnesses." *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health* 8, no. 2 (2002): 199. PMID: [12046806](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12046806/),  
593 <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.8432>

594

595 Moorman, Jeanne E., Hatice Zahran, Benedict I. Truman, Michael T. Molla, and Centers for  
596 Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). "Current asthma prevalence-United States, 2006-  
597 2008." *MMWR Surveill Summ* 60, no. Suppl (2011): 84-86.

598

599 Nadimpalli, Maya, Jill R. Stewart, Elizabeth Pierce, Nora Pisanic, David C. Love, Devon Hall,  
600 Jesper Larsen et al. "Livestock-associated, antibiotic-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal  
601 carriage and recent skin and soft tissue infection among industrial hog operation workers." *PloS*

602 *one* 11, no. 11 (2016): e0165713. PMID: [27851746](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27851746/),

603 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0165713>

604

605 Nordgren, Tara M., and Kristina L. Bailey. "Pulmonary health effects of agriculture." *Current*

606 *Opinion in Pulmonary Medicine* 22, no. 2 (2016): 144. PMID: [26761627](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26761627/),

607 <https://doi.org/10.1097/MCP.0000000000000247>

608

609 O'Shaughnessy, Patrick T., Kelley J. Donham, Thomas M. Peters, Craig Taylor, Ralph Altmaier,

610 and Kevin M. Kelly. "A task-specific assessment of swine worker exposure to airborne

611 dust." *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene* 7, no. 1 (2009): 7-13. PMID:

612 [19904655](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19904655/), <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459620903327970>

613

614 Poole, Jill A., Neil E. Alexis, Conrad Parks, Amy K. MacInnes, Martha J. Gentry-Nielsen, Paul

615 D. Fey, Lennart Larsson, Diane Allen-Gipson, Susanna G. Von Essen, and Debra J. Romberger.

616 "Repetitive organic dust exposure in vitro impairs macrophage differentiation and

617 function." *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 122, no. 2 (2008): 375-382.

618 PMID: [18585769](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18585769/), <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2008.05.023>

619

620 Radon, Katja, Susanne Garz, Anna Schottky, Frauke Koops, Jörg Hartung, Dieter Szadkowski,

621 and Dennis Nowak. "Lung function and work-related exposure in pig farmers with respiratory

622 symptoms." *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 42, no. 8 (2000): 814-820.

623 PMID: [10953819](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10953819/), <https://doi.org/10.1097/00043764-200008000-00010>

624

625 Rinsky, Jessica L., David B. Richardson, Kathleen Kreiss, Leena Nylander-French, Laura E.  
626 Beane Freeman, Stephanie J. London, Paul K. Henneberger, and Jane A. Hoppin. "Animal  
627 production, insecticide use and self-reported symptoms and diagnoses of COPD, including  
628 chronic bronchitis, in the Agricultural Health Study." *Environment International* 127 (2019):  
629 764-772. PMID: [31029031](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31029031/), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.02.049>

630  
631 Salvatore, Alicia L., Asa Bradman, Rosemary Castorina, José Camacho, Jesús López, Dana B.  
632 Barr, John Snyder, Nicholas P. Jewell, and Brenda Eskenazi. "Occupational behaviors and  
633 farmworkers' pesticide exposure: findings from a study in Monterey County,  
634 California." *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 51, no. 10 (2008): 782-794.  
635 PMID: [18702096](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18702096/), <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20622>

636  
637 Schinasi, Leah, Rachel Avery Horton, Virginia T. Guidry, Steve Wing, Stephen W. Marshall,  
638 and Kimberly B. Morland. "Air pollution, lung function, and physical symptoms in communities  
639 near concentrated swine feeding operations." *Epidemiology* 22, no. 2 (2011): 208.  
640 PMID: [21228696](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21228696/), <https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.0b013e3182093c8b>

641  
642 Senthilselvan, Ambikaipakan, Liliane Chénard, Kendra Ulmer, Natasha Gibson-Burlingette,  
643 Cheryl Leuschen, and James A. Dosman. "Excess respiratory symptoms in full-time male and  
644 female workers in large-scale swine operations." *Chest* 131, no. 4 (2007): 1197-1204. PMID:  
645 [17426228](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17426228/), <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.06-2323>

646

647 Sundblad, Britt-Marie, Karin Sahlander, Alexandra Ek, Maria Kumlin, Marianne Olsson, Kjell  
648 Larsson, and Lena Palmberg. "Effect of respirators equipped with particle or particle-and-gas  
649 filters during exposure in a pig confinement building." *Scandinavian Journal of Work,  
650 Environment & Health* (2006): 145-153. PMID: [16680385](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16680385/), <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.990>  
651  
652 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS]. "Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages: Private,  
653 NAICS 112210 Hog and pig farming, All Counties 2019 Fourth Quarter, All establishment  
654 sizes"  
655 [https://data.bls.gov/cew/apps/table\\_maker/v4/table\\_maker.htm#type=1&year=2019&qtr=4&own](https://data.bls.gov/cew/apps/table_maker/v4/table_maker.htm#type=1&year=2019&qtr=4&own=5&ind=112210&supp=0)  
656 [=5&ind=112210&supp=0](https://data.bls.gov/cew/apps/table_maker/v4/table_maker.htm#type=1&year=2019&qtr=4&own=5&ind=112210&supp=0) Accessed July 1, 2020.  
657  
658 Von Essen, Susanna, Gordon Moore, Shawn Gibbs, and Kerry Leedom Larson. "Respiratory  
659 issues in beef and pork production: recommendations from an expert panel." *Journal of  
660 Agromedicine* 15, no. 3 (2010): 216-225. PMID: [20665307](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20665307/),  
661 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2010.486283>  
662  
663 Zejda, Jan E., Thomas S. Hurst, Ernest M. Barber, Charles Rhodes, and James A. Dosman.  
664 "Respiratory health status in swine producers using respiratory protective devices." *American  
665 Journal of Industrial Medicine* 23, no. 5 (1993): 743-750. PMID: [8506852](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8506852/),  
666 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700230508>



667 **TABLES**

668

669 **Table 1.** Baseline demographic and household characteristics of the industrial hog operation  
 670 worker cohort, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

671

Characteristic	Reports
Workers in cohort, <i>n</i>	103
Age in years, <i>mean ± SD</i>	38 ± 11
Sex, <i>n (%)</i>	
Male	55 (54)
Female	46 (46)
Race/ethnicity, <i>n (%)</i>	
Hispanic, non-black	88 (88)
Black	12 (12)
Education status, <i>n (%)</i>	
Less than high school education	47 (47)
High school degree/GED or higher	52 (53)
Body mass index (BMI), <i>n (%)</i>	
<30.0	58 (56)
≥30.0	38 (37)
Used a gym or workout facility in the last three months, <i>n (%)</i>	
Yes	9 (9)
No	92 (91)
Current cigarette smoker, <i>n (%)</i>	
Yes	13 (17)
No	65 (83)
Health insurance, <i>n (%)</i>	
Yes	48 (48)
No	52 (52)
Place where IHO workers seek medical care, <sup>a</sup> <i>n (%)</i>	
Private doctor	49 (49)
Emergency department or urgent care center	29 (28)
Hospital	18 (17)
Free clinic	16 (16)
Other	3 (3)
Does not seek medical care under any circumstance	4 (4)
Had a cat or dog, <i>n (%)</i>	
Yes	44 (43)
No	50 (47)
Lived on same property as an IHO, <i>n (%)</i>	
Yes	8 (8)
No	89 (92)
Month of baseline visit, <i>n (%)</i>	
January	1 (1)
February	50 (49)
October	30 (29)
November	22 (21)

Note. IHO = industrial hog operation.  
 a. Categories are not mutually exclusive.

672  
 673

674 **Table 2.** Baseline self-reported occupational exposure activities among industrial hog operation  
675 workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014.  
676

Characteristic	Reports
Years worked on any IHO, <i>mean ± SD</i>	8 ± 6
Days worked per week, <i>mean ± SD</i>	6.4 ± 0.8
Percent of time at work spent in direct contact with pigs, <i>mean ± SD</i>	82 ± 27
Ever handled dead pigs, <i>n (%)</i>	77 (79)
Ever gave pigs shots or injections, <i>n (%)</i>	68 (69)
Ever came into direct contact with or touched pig manure, <i>n (%)</i>	61 (67)
Ever gave antibiotics to pigs, <i>n (%)</i>	60 (62)
Ever drew blood or collect other fluids from pigs, <i>n (%)</i> , <i>n (%)</i>	9 (9)
Only worked with	
Sows, nursery, and/or weaning pigs	46 (48)
Feeder and/or finisher pigs	24 (25)
Ever applied pesticides inside or around the barns, <i>n (%)</i>	48 (49)
Wore coveralls/full body suit, <i>n (%)</i>	
Always	68 (70)
Sometimes	14 (14)
Never	15 (16)
Wore a mask, <i>n (%)</i>	
Always	37 (38)
Sometimes	43 (44)
Never	18 (18)
Wore glasses/goggles, <i>n (%)</i>	
Always	22 (22)
Sometimes	34 (35)
Never	42 (43)
Work clothes ever washed with the laundry of household members, <i>n (%)</i>	16 (17)

677

678 **Table 3.** Baseline self-reported health conditions among industrial hog operation (IHO) workers,  
679 North Carolina, 2013-2014.  
680

Characteristic <sup>a</sup>	Prevalence, <i>n</i> (%)
Ever had eye irritation	19 (19)
Within the last month	12 (63)
Ever had nose irritation	16 (16)
Within the last month	10 (67)
Ever had throat irritation	15 (15)
Within the last month	13 (87)
Any allergies	13 (13)
Doctor-diagnosed asthma	9 (9)

681 Note.

682 *a.* Participants were asked to not report health outcomes that they attributed to having a cold.

**Table 4.** Crude baseline associations between binary (unless noted as tertiles) self-reported industrial hog operation (IHO) work activities and binary self-reported symptoms among IHO workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014, clustered at the household level.

Reported characteristic	Eye, nose, or throat symptoms			Any allergies			Doctor-diagnosed asthma		
	<i>n</i>	PR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value	<i>n</i>	PR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value	<i>n</i>	PR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value
Have you ever									
Given pigs shots and/or antibiotics	96	2.2 (0.8, 6.6)		97	0.6 (0.2, 1.5)		97	1.0 (0.2, 5.2)	
Drawn pig's blood	97	3.7 (1.9, 7.0)		98	4.4 (1.7, 12)		98	3.3 (0.9, 12)	
Handled pig manure	90	1.0 (0.4, 2.4)		91	1.3 (0.4, 4.6)		91	1.5 (0.3, 7.0)	
Applied pesticides in or around the barns	97	2.2 (1.0, 4.8)		98	2.3 (0.8, 6.9)		98	1.0 (0.2, 4.7)	
Washed work clothes with household laundry	95	2.3 (1.0, 5.3)		96	0.5 (0.1, 3.3)		96	0.7 (0.1, 5.7)	
Do you typically									
Work exclusively in sow, nursery, and/or farrow barns	93	0.8 (0.3, 1.7)		94	0.5 (0.2, 1.6)		94	2.1 (0.4, 11)	
Work exclusively in feeder and/or finisher barns	93	1.3 (0.5, 3.1)		94	1.0 (0.3, 3.4)		-	-	
Always wear coveralls/full body suit, mask, and eye protection	96	1.3 (0.5, 3.4)		97	3.8 (1.4, 9.9)		97	2.6 (0.6, 12)	
Work 7 days per week	96	0.4 (0.1, 1.1)		97	0.1 (0.01, 0.6)		97	0.3 (0.1, 1.7)	
Years worked on any IHO	85			85			87		
Tertile 1 (1-5 years)		Ref (1.0)			Ref (1.0)			Ref (1.0)	
Tertile 2 (6-10 years)		1.9 (0.5, 7.6)			0.6 (0.1, 2.6)			3.6 (0.4, 35)	
Tertile 3 (11-27 years)		4.3 (1.5, 12)			0.8 (0.2, 2.7)			3.0 (0.3, 30)	
Trend			0.01			0.6			0.3
Percent of life working on any IHO	82			83			55		
Tertile 1 (2.4-11.6%)		Ref (1.0)			Ref (1.0)			Ref (1.0)	
Tertile 2 (11.7-26.3%)		1.8 (0.4, 7.2)			1.04 (0.3, 3.8)			1.5 (0.3, 8.4)	
Tertile 3 (26.4-51.9%)		3.4 (0.99, 11)			0.84 (0.2, 3.5)			-	
Trend			0.04			0.8			0.1

Note. PR = prevalence ratio. CI = confidence interval. - = model did not converge. IHO = Industrial hog operation. Crude models are presented as main tables in this analysis due to convergence issues in adjusted models and the consistency between point estimates in crude and adjusted regressions. In alternative sensitivity analyses (not shown) prevalence odds ratios (PORs) were calculated and showed to overestimate the exposure-response association. Due to this, prevalence ratios (PRs) were presented for baseline analyses.

**Table 5.** Time-varying occupational exposure activities occurring during the week immediately preceding the biweekly study visit among industrial hog operation workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Activities in the past week	Affirmative responses
Number of days worked, <i>mean ± SD</i>	6 ± 1
Number of hours worked, <i>mean ± SD</i>	42 ± 12
Number of hours in direct contact, <i>mean ± SD</i>	38 ± 14
Number of sick pigs, <i>mean ± SD</i>	61 ± 166
Number of dead pigs, <i>mean ± SD</i>	42 ± 120
% of time coveralls/full body suit were worn, <i>mean ± SD</i>	81 ± 38
% of time a mask was used, <i>mean ± SD</i>	54 ± 46
% of time eye protection used, <i>mean ± SD</i>	28 ± 42
Number of times washed hands at the IHO, <i>mean ± SD</i>	8 ± 6
Barn condition score factors, <i>n (%)</i>	
Vent fans were off	178 (34)
Malodor	
None, moderate	564 (76)
Extreme	175 (24)
Temperature in the barns, <i>n (%)</i>	
Cold, comfortable	614 (85)
Hot	111 (15)
A new herd entered the barn(s), <i>n (%)</i>	47 (6)
Dustiness in barns, <i>n (%)</i>	
None, moderate	705 (96)
Extreme	32 (4)
Cleaning and pesticide score factors, <i>n (%)</i>	
Used cleaning chemical(s) at the IHO	414 (56)
Pressure washed	290 (39)
Applied pesticides	224 (30)
Used a torch	20 (3)
Pig contact score factors, <i>n (%)</i>	
Gave pigs medicine	241 (68)
Gave pigs shots	363 (49)
Received an influenza vaccine since the last study visit, <i>n (%)</i>	21 (3)

Note. SD = standard deviation. IHO = industrial hog operation.

**Table 6.** Time-varying acute health outcomes occurring during the week immediately preceding the biweekly study visit among industrial hog operation workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Reported in the past week	Affirmative responses, <i>n</i> (%)
≥1 respiratory symptom	43 (6)
Excessive coughing	22 (3)
Runny nose	20 (3)
Difficulty breathing	12 (2)
Sore throat	5 (1)
≥1 symptom interfered with sleep	26 (3)
Any symptoms reported	10 (1)
Waking from sleep due to coughing	15 (2)
Waking from sleep due to wheezing	11 (1)
Waking from sleep due to phlegm	9 (1)
Sneezing	19 (2)
Headache	15 (2)
Any mucus membrane	15 (2)
Eye irritation	11 (1)
Nose irritation	8 (1)

**Table 7.** Crude time-varying acute health outcomes and binary work activities the week immediately preceding the biweekly study visit among industrial hog operation workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Reported in the past week	At least one respiratory symptom <sup>a</sup>		At least one symptom interfered with sleep <sup>b</sup>	
	obs. (groups)	OR (95% CI)	obs. (groups)	OR (95% CI)
Any hot or dusty barn conditions <sup>c</sup>	225 (31)	4.0 (1.4, 12)	152 (21)	1.7 (0.5, 5.3)
Conducted any pesticide application or cleaning activity <sup>d</sup>	229 (31)	3.0 (1.2, 7.5)	147 (20)	4.5 (1.1, 18)
Administered pigs medicine or shots <sup>e</sup>	223 (30)	6.8 (1.8, 25)	-	-
Two or three of the above categories <sup>f</sup>	215 (30)	10 (2.2, 46)	144 (20)	19 (2.1, 171)
Used any PPE <sup>g</sup>	226 (31)	0.3 (0.1, 1.5)	154 (21)	0.1 (0.01, 0.8)
Washed hands at least 8 times per shift <sup>h</sup>	228 (31)	0.3 (0.1, 0.8)	147 (20)	0.6 (0.2, 1.8)

Note. OR = odds ratio. CI = confidence interval. - = model did not converge. PPE = personal protective equipment. OR (95% CI) estimates are derived from conditional logistic fixed-effects regression models, which estimate the average of all within-person differences between time-varying exposure and outcome.

a. Excessive coughing, runny nose, difficulty breathing, or sore throat.

b. Any sleep symptoms reported, waking from sleep due to coughing, waking from sleep due to wheezing, or waking from sleep due to phlegm.

c. Sum of vents off (yes=1, no=0), extreme malodor (yes=1, no=0), hot temperature (yes=1, no=0), a new herd entering the barn(s) (yes=1, no=0), and extreme dust (yes=1, no=0)

d. Sum of used cleaning chemicals (yes=1, no=0), pressure washed (yes=1, no=0), used pesticides (yes=1, no=0), and used a torch (yes=1, no=0)

e. Sum of gave pigs medicine (yes=1, no=0) and gave pigs shots (yes=1, no=0)

f. Number of individual activities/conditions (maximum 10)

g. Sum of consistently (≥80% of the time at work) wore the following: coveralls/full body suit (yes=1, no=0), mask (yes=1, no=0), and glasses (yes=1, no=0).

h. 8 is the median number of times workers reported washing their hands per IHO work shift.

**Table 8.** Crude time-varying acute health outcomes and binary work activities the week immediately preceding the biweekly study visit among industrial hog operation workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Reported in the past week	Sneezing		Headache		Eye or nose irritation	
	obs. (groups)	OR (95% CI)	obs. (groups)	OR (95% CI)	obs. (groups)	OR (95% CI)
Any hot or dusty barn conditions <sup>a</sup>	85 (12)	0.8 (0.2, 3.3)	92 (12)	2.6 (0.8, 9.0)	84 (11)	8.4 (1.0, 71)
Conducted any pesticide application or cleaning activity <sup>b</sup>	86 (12)	3.5 (0.97, 12)	93 (12)	1.9 (0.5, 7.1)	85 (11)	2.6 (0.6, 11)
Administered pigs medicine or shots <sup>c</sup>	87 (12)	12 (1.3, 105)	93 (12)	4.6 (0.8, 25)	70 (9)	15 (1.7, 133)
Two or three of the above categories <sup>d</sup>	85 (12)	4.1 (1.1, 16)	92 (12)	7.5 (1.4, 40)	67 (9)	6.1 (1.3, 28)
Used any PPE <sup>e</sup>	85 (12)	0.1 (0.01, 1.0)	90 (12)	0.9 (0.1, 6.2)	82 (11)	0.1 (0.02, 0.9)
Washed hands at least 8 times per shift <sup>f</sup>	87 (12)	0.9 (0.24, 3.2)	93 (12)	1.3 (0.3, 5.4)	85 (11)	0.6 (0.2, 2.2)

Note. OR = odds ratio. CI = confidence interval. PE = personal protective equipment. OR (95% CI) estimates are derived from conditional logistic fixed-effects regression models, which estimate the average of all within-person differences between time-varying exposure and outcome.

a. Sum of vents off (yes=1, no=0), extreme malodor (yes=1, no=0), hot temperature (yes=1, no=0), a new herd entering the barn(s) (yes=1, no=0), and extreme dust (yes=1, no=0)

b. Sum of used cleaning chemicals (yes=1, no=0), pressure washed (yes=1, no=0), used pesticides (yes=1, no=0), and used a torch (yes=1, no=0)

c. Sum of gave pigs medicine (yes=1, no=0) and gave pigs shots (yes=1, no=0)

d. Number of individual activities/conditions (maximum 10)


e. Sum of consistently (≥80% of the time at work) wore the following: coveralls/full body suit (yes=1, no=0), mask (yes=1, no=0), and glasses (yes=1, no=0)

f. 8 is the median number of times workers reported washing their hands per IHO work shift



**Figure 1.** Sampling scheme and loss-to-follow-up between the baseline and bi-weekly study visits within a cohort of industrial hog operation (IHO) workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Number of participants retained (i.e., not lost to follow up)



- E** Enrollment with baseline questionnaire
- F** Follow up with bi-weekly questionnaire