

1 **TITLE**

2 The use of personal protective equipment during common industrial hog operation work
3 activities and acute lung function changes in a prospective worker cohort, North Carolina,
4 USA

5

6 **AUTHORS**

7 Vanessa R. Coffman, Ph.D.¹

8 Devon J. Hall²

9 Nora Pisanic, Ph.D.³

10 Maya Nadimpalli, Ph.D.^{4,5}

11 Meredith McCormack, M.D.^{3,6,7}

12 Marie Diener-West, Ph.D.⁷⁻¹²

13 Meghan F. Davis, Ph.D.^{3,6,13}

14 Christopher D. Heaney, Ph.D.^{3,6,8,13-16}

15

16 ¹Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago,
17 Illinois, USA

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

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

22 ⁴Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tufts University, Medford,
23 Massachusetts, USA

24 ⁵Center for Integrated Management of Antimicrobial Resistance (CIMAR), Tufts University,
25 Boston, MA, USA

26 ⁶School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

27 ⁷Johns Hopkins Center for Global Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland,
28 USA

29 ⁸Department of Biostatistics, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns
30 Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

31 ⁹Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns
32 Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

33 ¹⁰Johns Hopkins School of Nursing, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

34 ¹¹Johns Hopkins Center for Clinical Trials and Evidence Synthesis, Johns Hopkins
35 Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

36 ¹²Johns Hopkins Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, Johns Hopkins University,
37 Baltimore, Maryland, USA

38 ¹³Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public
39 Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

40 ¹⁴Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,
41 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

42 ¹⁵Johns Hopkins Education and Research Center for Occupational Safety and Health, Johns
43 Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
44 Maryland, USA

45 ¹⁶The Johns Hopkins University Water Institute, Department of Environmental Health and
46 Engineering, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and Whiting School of
47 Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

48

49 **Corresponding author:** Vanessa Coffman; University of Illinois at Chicago School of
50 Public Health, 1603 W. Taylor Street, Chicago, IL 60612; Phone: +1.971.409.4968; Email:
51 vcoffm2@uic.edu

52

53 **COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS**

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

55

56 **FUNDING**

57 Funding for this study was provided by National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
58 (NIOSH) grant K01OH010193; Johns Hopkins NIOSH Education and Research Center grant
59 T42OH008428; a directed research award from the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable
60 Future; the Johns Hopkins NIOSH Education and Research Center Pilot Award; award
61 018HEA2013 from the Sherrilyn and Ken Fisher Center for Environmental Infectious
62 Diseases Discovery Program at the Johns Hopkins University, School of Medicine,
63 Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases; and National Science Foundation
64 (NSF) grant 1316318 as part of the joint NSF–National Institutes of Health (NIH)-U.S.
65 Department of Agriculture Ecology and Evolution of Infectious Diseases program. V.R.C
66 was supported by the Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future-Lerner Fellowship and the
67 Johns Hopkins NIOSH Education and Research Center grant T42OH008428. N.P. was
68 supported by NIH/National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) grant
69 T32ES007141-30. M.F.D was supported by NIH/Office of the Director (K01OD019918) and
70 a pilot award from the Northeast Center for Occupational Safety and Health. C.D.H. was
71 supported by NIOSH grant K01OH010193, E.W. “AI” Thrasher Award 10287, NIEHS grant
72 R01ES026973, and NSF grant 1316318. The funders had no role in study design, data
73 collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

74

75 **KEY WORDS**

76 PPE, animal workers, indoor air, respiratory, occupational health practice

77

78 **WORD COUNT**

79 3,593

80

81 **ABSTRACT WORD COUNT**

82 249

83 **KEY MESSAGES**

84 **What is already known about this subject?**

85 Working on industrial hog operations may be deleterious to long- and short-term respiratory
86 health due to airborne bacteria, endotoxin, hazardous gases, dust, and dander in barns. In
87 efficacy studies PPE has been shown to be protective, but studies have shown that PPE
88 utilization among hog workers has historically been sub-optimal.

89 **What are the new findings?**

90 As barn conditions worsened and contact with pigs increased, workers in this cohort reported
91 wearing coveralls and face masks less often; however, they reported increased PPE use as
92 they conducted more cleaning activities at work. During weeks when workers wore PPE their
93 lung function declined, a possible cause being the improper use of the equipment leading to a
94 false sense of protection or re-exposure to hazardous contaminants.

95 **How might this impact on policy or clinical practice in the foreseeable future?**

96 Given COVID-19, the H1N1 “swine flu” pandemic, our knowledge of antimicrobial resistant
97 pathogens, and increasing awareness about how food systems are linked to the spread of
98 emerging infectious diseases, occupational health intervention research and workplace
99 policies may focus on creating barn environments that are more conducive to PPE use which
100 could help protect workers and consequently the community.

101 **ABSTRACT**

102 **Introduction:** As occupational activities related to acute industrial hog operation (IHO)

103 worker lung function are not well defined, we aimed to identify IHO work activities

104 associated with diminished respiratory function and the effectiveness, if any, of personal

105 protective equipment (PPE) on IHOs.

106 **Methods:** From 2014-2015, 103 IHO workers were enrolled and followed for 16 weeks. At

107 each bi-weekly visit, lung function measurements were collected via spirometry and work

108 activities and PPE use were self-reported via questionnaire. Generalized linear and linear

109 fixed-effects models were fitted to cross-sectional and longitudinal data.

110 **Results:** At baseline, increasing years worked on an IHO were associated with diminished

111 lung function, but other activities were less consistent in direction and magnitude. In

112 longitudinal models, only reports of working in feeding/finisher barns, showed a consistent

113 association. However, a -0.3 L (95% confidence interval: -0.6, -0.04) difference in FEV₁ was

114 estimated when workers wore PPE consistently versus those weeks they did not. In *post-hoc*

115 analyses, we found that coveralls and facemasks were worn less consistently when workers

116 experienced worse barn conditions and had more contact with pigs, but coveralls were worn

117 more consistently as cleaning activities increased.

118 **Conclusions:** Similar to past studies, baseline estimates were likely obscured by healthy

119 worker bias. Also making it challenging to disentangle the effect of work activities on lung

120 function was the discovery that IHO workers used PPE differently according to work task.

121 These data suggest that interventions may be targeted toward improving barn conditions so

122 that workers can consistently utilize IHO-provided PPE.

123 INTRODUCTION

124 Swine agricultural workers[1] and veterinarians[2] are at higher risk for adverse
125 respiratory health outcomes than the general public.[3-5] Air sampling studies of swine
126 facilities have reported that exposures include ammonia (NH₃),[6, 7] hydrogen sulfide (H₂S)
127 and hundreds of VOCs,[8] dust,[7, 9, 10] endotoxin,[7, 9-11] dander, feed, and microbes,[12,
128 13] with an alarming proportion of collected bacteria resistant to two or more antibiotics.[14]

129 Industrial hog operation (IHO) studies that have employed spirometry to measure
130 worker lung function are largely decades old, and most recent investigations rely on self-
131 reported health outcomes. Among the latest U.S. research that employs objective measures of
132 lung function (*i.e.*, spirometry) is a 1995 study by Schwartz *et al.* that found pig workers
133 were exposed to higher concentrations of dust and had greater work shift declines in forced
134 expiratory volume in the first second (FEV₁) and forced vital capacity (FVC) than a control
135 group of non-swine farmers.[15] Cross-shift changes in spirometry measurements were also
136 examined by the same research group finding that total dust concentrations ≥ 2.8 mg/m³ were
137 predictive of a $\geq 10\%$ decline in FEV₁ and that ammonia concentrations of ≥ 7.5 ppm were
138 predictive of a $\geq 3\%$ decline in FEV₁. [16]

139 Newer studies focus strongly on chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and
140 have not updated our understanding of other health outcomes, even as industrialized pig
141 farming practices evolve. Further, prospective cohort studies are lacking in this population. A
142 systematic review by Douglas *et al.* found that only 2 of 16 published studies of IHO workers
143 were from prospective cohorts.[3] This is not surprising, as previous publications have called
144 for additional research to identify workplace factors that account for the high prevalence of
145 respiratory symptoms in IHO worker populations.[17, 18]

146 Documenting the deleterious effects of IHOs on the respiratory health of workers in
147 the U.S. has historically been a challenge. Workers' hesitance to participate in scientific

148 studies for fear of termination, limited access to operations, and corporate influence[19] mean
149 studies are often short-term, lack the ability to determine changes to health on a granular
150 level, and are conducted outside the U.S. This lack of updated data hinders priority setting for
151 the occupational health of the ~33,000 IHO workers in the States,[19] many of whom are
152 from marginalized communities (e.g., low socioeconomic status, lacking health insurance,
153 minorities, and immigrants).

154 The work presented here is unique in that by employing fixed-effects regression
155 analyses,[20] workers are compared to themselves. This largely removes confounding from
156 fixed characteristics (e.g., participant age, sex, race/ethnicity, structural differences in barns,
157 perceived dustiness, and at-home characteristics), which may be present in models estimating
158 the difference in lung function between IHO workers and the general public or other
159 agricultural workers.[15, 21] To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time fixed-effects
160 regression has been used to assess the association between spirometry and IHO work
161 activities and PPE use. In addition, prior studies have examined cross-sectional,[9, 10, 17,
162 22-24] long-term (*i.e.*, chronic),[11, 15, 25-27] or cross-shift (*i.e.*, sub-acute)[16, 21, 26]
163 changes in lung function, but not acute effects.

164 The purpose of this investigation is to examine the effect a variety of modern IHO
165 work activities and personal protective equipment (PPE) have on lung function changes (*i.e.*,
166 spirometric measurements) on the acute scale.

167 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

168 **Study design**

169 At each of nine study visits, a work practices questionnaire (either baseline or bi-
170 weekly) adapted from the Agricultural Health
171 Study[<https://www.aghealth.nih.gov/collaboration/questionnaires.html>] and the American
172 Thoracic Society (ATS)[28] was administered by community investigators. Spirometry was
173 completed at each visit via a Piko-1 machine. At baseline, a reference instrument (Koko
174 spirometer) was also used (**Figure 1**). Each was used in accordance with recognized
175 guidelines[29, 30] and manufacturer's instructions.[
176 http://www.quickmedical.com/downloads/nspire-piko1_manual.pdf and
177 <http://respitechservice.com/Files-hold/KoKo%20User%20Manual.pdf>]

178

179 **Setting**

180 Participants from hog-producing counties in North Carolina were enrolled as
181 previously detailed.[31] In short, enrollment was conducted on a rolling basis from October
182 2013 through February 2014. Participants were followed for a maximum of 16 weeks, with a
183 visit from study staff every two weeks. Participants completed a questionnaire and performed
184 spirometry outside of work hours, either at home or in a public place. Data were collected
185 during a Porcine Epidemic Diarrhea Virus (PEDV) epidemic, meaning at times barns were
186 emptied of animals as they either died or were proactively slaughtered.

187

188 **Participants**

189 Participants were eligible for inclusion in the sample population if they were current
190 IHO workers (full- or part-time) and agreed to participate in the study. IHO workers were
191 eligible for inclusion in the baseline analysis population if they were enrolled in the study and

192 were eligible for inclusion in the longitudinal analysis population if they completed at least
193 two follow-up visits. Recruitment was performed by Rural Empowerment for Community
194 Help (REACH) personnel using word of mouth and personal connections and powered based
195 on longitudinal analyses. Signed informed consent was obtained from each participant prior
196 to participation. The study protocol was approved by the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School
197 of Public Health Institutional Review Board.

198

199 **Questionnaire**

200 Estimates of work practices and conditions

201 As described in earlier work,[31] all questionnaires were administered by research
202 staff. The enrollment survey instrument was designed to gather data regarding typical work
203 activities and underlying health characteristics. Specific questions were worded as what
204 participants “typically,” “usually,” or “ever” did on-operation and what environmental
205 conditions they were “typically,” “usually,” or “ever” exposed to at work.

206 At each follow-up visit, information about the frequency, magnitude, and duration of
207 participants' contact with pigs, job activities, personal behaviors (*e.g.*, cigarette use), and PPE
208 use was collected. Each question was asked about the week prior. For example, “In the past
209 week have you...”

210

211 Assessment of lung function

212 Lung function was assessed by spirometry. A portable Piko-1 pulmonary function
213 device, which records forced expiratory volume in the first second (FEV₁) and peak
214 expiratory flow rate (PEFr), was used during all study visits by a REACH community data
215 collector. This handheld, portable asthma-tracking tool can be operated without requiring an
216 individual who had completed formal training in National Institute for Occupational Safety

217 and Health (NIOSH)-spirometry to be on-site. Additionally, a Koko machine was employed
218 by a NIOSH-trained coach at baseline. The Koko had a wider range of measurements
219 including: FEV₁, PEFr, forced vital capacity (FVC), the ratio of forced expiratory volume in
220 the first second to forced vital capacity (FEV₁/FVC), forced expiratory volume in six seconds
221 (FEV₆), forced expiratory flow at 25-75% of the pulmonary volume (FEF_{25-75%}), and the
222 ratio of forced expiratory volume in the first second to forced expiratory volume in six
223 seconds (FEV₁/FEV₆). Ultimately, in analyses only the Piko-1 measurements and FEV₁,
224 PEFr, FVC, FEV₁/FVC Koko measurements were used. Three good trials, as defined by the
225 ATS[ATS] and the NIOSH standards,[30] were attempted for each testing session unless the
226 participant was physically unable to complete the three spirometric maneuvers. The best
227 maneuver per study visit for each person was used in data analysis.

228

229 **Data analysis**

230 Baseline data were analyzed via linear regression and linear fixed-effects models
231 were fitted to longitudinal data. Spirometry measurements were modeled as continuous
232 variables, with percent predicted (using reported age, race/ethnicity, and height as predictors
233 in the Hankinson 1999 reference values[32]) at baseline and raw measurements over time.

234 At baseline, years worked on any IHO and percentage of life working on an IHO were
235 transformed from continuous variables to tertiles due to non-linearity. Average days worked
236 per week and percentage of time at work spent in direct contact with pigs were transformed
237 into binary variables due to non-linearity and skewed distributions. Due to collinearity,
238 reports of workers who ever gave pigs shots and/or antibiotics were combined into a single
239 category.

240 Drawing on past work in longitudinal analyses,[18] the following unweighted
241 exposure categories and scores were created: (1) *barn conditions* consisting of reports of

242 binary extreme temperature, extreme malodor, extreme dust, vent fans turned off or non-
243 existent at the facility, and a new herd entering the barn(s); (2) *cleaning activities* composed
244 of cleaning chemical use, pesticide use, pressure washing, and torch use; (3) *pig contact*,
245 meaning gave pigs shots and/or gave pigs medicine; and (4) an unweighted sum of all the
246 aforementioned activities with 1 assigned to those reported being done or experienced and 0
247 to those not reported, for a possible total of 0 to 10. Consistency of PPE use was defined as a
248 worker reporting the gear was worn at least 80% of the time. All exposures were from reports
249 of experiences in the past week. Exposure variables with limited variability (fewer than 10
250 cases reported over the 752 longitudinal study visits) were *a priori* dropped from analyses to
251 reduce any bias associated with small numbers.

252 Confounders of interest from the literature and relevant to baseline generalized linear
253 models clustered at the household level included: cigarette smoking, hour of test, and
254 interviewer. Fixed-effects linear regression was used to control for measured and unmeasured
255 confounding in longitudinal analyses. Confounders of interest from the literature and relevant
256 to inclusion in fixed-effects models included: cigarette smoking, hour of test, month of test,
257 and interviewer. A dummy variable was used for hour of test (the time recorded by the Koko
258 machine, when available, or end-of-survey time if not), as this diurnal pattern is not
259 linear.[33]

260 Spirometry data were analyzed in two ways: (1) all data from the best try (*i.e.*, no
261 cough, inhale, or delay in start, and a good effort) was used; and (2) as a sensitivity analysis
262 for each model, only measurements with three good tries and two repeatable
263 measurements[29, 30] were used (see **Supplemental Material**). The decision to use all
264 spirometry measurements (regardless of ATS/NIOSH acceptability) as main analyses was
265 based on: (1) Piko-1 devices were not designed to conform to ATS criteria; (2) only the first
266 three maneuvers were recorded using the Piko-1 device (more maneuvers would have met

267 reproducibility had the Koko been used throughout the study); and (3) ATS/NIOSH criteria
268 state that to have a “valid” test both FEV₁ and FVC measures must have three good tries and
269 both must have two measurements within 0.15 L of each other. Since the Piko-1 device does
270 not assess FVC, this would have made even acceptable FEV₁ measurements technically
271 invalid.

272 Crude analyses are reported as main analyses, while fully adjusted models are shown
273 as sensitivity analyses because: (1) fixed-effects models do not suffer from the same
274 necessity for adjustment as other random effects models; and (2) baseline models are unable
275 to converge with many adjustments for confounders.

276 Data was analyzed using Stata (StataCorp. 2017. *Stata* Statistical Software: Release
277 15. College Station, TX: *StataCorp* LP).

278 **RESULTS**

279 At baseline, 103 workers entered the cohort, giving 98 FEV₁ measurements via Piko-
280 1 and 90 workers remained enrolled in the final week and provided 87 measurements (**Figure**
281 **1**). In examining key characteristics stratified by those who were able to complete spirometry
282 tests at baseline and those who were not, we saw little difference except that more non-
283 smokers than smokers were able to provide Koko maneuvers and overall more participants
284 were able to provide Piko-1 measurements (98 of 103) than Koko measurements (69 of 103)
285 (**Table 1**).

286 The concordance between best Piko-1 and Koko measurements differed by test (R^2 :
287 0.79 for FEV₁ measures and R^2 : 0.40 for PEFr measures) (**Table 2**). Using Bland-Altman
288 plots, Koko FEV₁ values were greater than Piko-1 for the same individuals; however, Piko-1
289 values for PEFr were greater than paired Koko values (data not shown). Due to the low
290 agreement for PEFr measures, we chose to only use FEV₁ measures in longitudinal analyses.

291 Measured lung function was similar to predicted values (**Table 2**) and very few
292 participants had obstructive or restrictive lung disease (**Table S1**), as classified either by the
293 Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease (GOLD) criteria[34] or by using the
294 lower limit of normal (LLN) as a cutoff for healthy versus non-healthy lung function.

295 Relationships between the most reported symptoms at enrollment and percent
296 predicted spirometry values were examined to assess the need to include symptoms as
297 confounders in subsequent models (**Table S2** and **S3**). Only report of doctor-diagnosed
298 asthma (a static characteristic) was significantly associated with lung function decline and so
299 symptoms were not included.

300 Ten binary self-reported measures of exposure and two variables transformed into
301 tertiles were examined in association with baseline measures of lung function (**Table 3**).

302 In this crude analysis, 8 of 56 associations were statistically significant (*i.e.*,
303 confidence interval did not include the null), with one relationship (FEV₁/FVC and pesticide
304 application) slightly significant but in the unhypothesized direction. Worse lung function was
305 seen in those who worked on any IHO longer than those in the first tertile, with significant
306 associations for trends in 3 of 8 models (**Table 3**). In sensitivity analyses, adjusting for the
307 hour of spirometric test, current cigarette smoking, and interviewer, the relationship between
308 pesticide application and FEV₁/FVC strengthened (**Table S4**), while the associations between
309 length of time working on any IHO weakened, although 14 of 16 remained in the negative
310 direction.

311 In longitudinal analyses, limited changes in respiratory function were observed
312 between weeks when an activity was versus was not performed (**Table 4**).

313 However, PPE use was statistically significant in the un-hypothesized adverse
314 direction in both crude and adjusted models and when exposure was either collapsed into
315 binary measures (**Table 4**) or expanded to detail the number of activities performed (**Table**
316 **S5**).

317 To further explore the relationship between PPE use and diminished lung function of
318 this un-hypothesized association, we *post-hoc* chose to examine the association between type
319 of PPE use and lung function using fixed-effects linear regression (**Table S6**). While
320 consistent face protection usage (defined as at least 80% mask and/or eye protection in the
321 past week) showed negligible effects on respiratory function, the consistent use of body
322 protection (defined as at least 80% coverall/full body suit utilization in the past week) was
323 associated with 0.2 to 0.3 L declines in FEV₁ in unadjusted and adjusted models respectively
324 (crude β : -0.2 L; 95% CI: -0.4, -0.03; adjusted β : -0.3 L; 95% CI: -0.6, -0.1) (**Table S6**).

325 *Post-hoc* we also explored which workers were more likely to wear certain PPE.

326 Pearson chi-squared tests for associations between on-IHO work activities and PPE use

327 (**Table 5**) and reported symptoms and PPE use were employed (**Table S7**).

328 While symptoms were not meaningfully associated with different levels of PPE

329 utilization, work activities were. Reports of consistent usage of body protection (irrespective

330 of face protection and with non-consistent face protection) as well as the use of both types of

331 PPE increased during weeks when the most cleaning activities were reported (**Table 5**).

332 Notably, body and face protection use (irrespective of the other type of PPE) declined as

333 reports of barn conditions worsened and as contact with pigs increased, as did the use of both

334 types of protection.

335 **DISCUSSION**

336 While our original analyses yielded little meaningful results regarding IHO workplace
337 activities and within-person changes in lung function, our *post hoc* analyses of PPE usage
338 provide a view of how IHO work conditions relate to PPE utilization. To the best of our
339 knowledge this is the first time an analysis of U.S. IHO work conditions and PPE use by day-
340 to-day workers has been presented; aiding our understanding of why PPE usage by IHO
341 workers may be sub-optimal.[35-37]

342

343 **Baseline analyses demonstrate the healthy worker effect**

344 At baseline, reports of time (years and percent of life) worked on any IHO were
345 associated with clinically relevant (~10%) diminished lung function compared to that
346 predicted by age, sex, and race, but other activities were less consistent in direction and
347 magnitude. This relationship has previously been documented, but with hours per day worked
348 as the explanatory variable.[5] Of note, the second tertile of years worked on an IHO shows
349 the greatest decrements in lung function. This may be due to the healthy worker effect, where
350 those who continue working in the industry the longest (third tertile) are the healthiest and
351 can withstand year-after-year exposures to dust and microbes. Others have previously
352 documented improved pulmonary function in IHO workers as they age,[16] and also
353 attributed their findings to healthy worker bias.[38] The healthy worker effect may also
354 explain the unexpected association between pesticide application and improved lung function
355 as measured by FEV₁/FVC.

356 While we did not capture data on those quitting IHOs, a prior study found that those
357 who those who left IHO work had lower FEV₁ measurements than those who remained
358 employed, and the odds of quitting pig operations increased for workers on farms with
359 greater than 400 head of swine.[39] In another population, Donham *et al.* found that baseline

360 FVC measurements were within 95% of predicted value,[21] an observation that was
361 corroborated in this cohort (**Table 2**), also pointing to healthy worker populations on IHOs.

362

363 **Longitudinal analyses were largely null**

364 Unexpectedly, longitudinal analyses did not produce many meaningful results. This is
365 perhaps because of the time scale chosen (once every two weeks), due to the limited
366 measurements of the devices used, or lung function impairment that is too early to detect, as
367 was seen in a study by Schwartz *et al.*[40] It is unlikely that there is no true association
368 between IHO exposures and worker lung function as this has been well documented in prior
369 studies.[41]

370 We did observe, however, a -0.3 L estimated difference in FEV₁ during weeks when
371 workers wore any PPE consistently versus those weeks when they did not, which may be
372 explained by (1) improper use leading to a sense of security and thus allowing higher
373 exposures, (2) re-exposure from previously worn, unclean equipment, and/or (3) confounding
374 by work activities associated with PPE usage. This finding led us to conduct a series of *post-*
375 *hoc* analyses.

376

377 **PPE *post-hoc* analyses**

378 Contrary to our hypothesis, in our *post-hoc* analyses we found that coveralls and
379 facemasks were worn less often when workers experienced worse barn conditions and had
380 more pig contact. This may be explained by workers wanting to remove or not don
381 constricting, cumbersome, sweaty, and hot PPE during tasks that may already be
382 uncomfortable. Workers did wear coveralls more consistently as cleaning activities increased,
383 which may be explained by training from an extension office or chemical supplier[36] on the
384 need to protect themselves from chemicals. However, wearing unwashed coveralls may lead

385 to re-exposure of these potentially dangerous substances. Further, at some IHOs, coveralls
386 are required to be worn to protect pigs from humans – especially during the time of data
387 collection which was amid a PEDV outbreak – whereas facemasks and eye protection are
388 not.

389 Since prior literature has shown face equipment to be protective,[42, 43] training and
390 educational interventions for workers performing increased numbers of dusty or dirty tasks
391 may be a priority for future research. In addition, IHO owners may consider ways to improve
392 workplace conditions (*e.g.*, better ventilation, dust control measures, fewer animals, hoop
393 barns) so that they are conducive to PPE usage. Given COVID-19, the H1N1 “swine flu”
394 pandemic, our knowledge of antimicrobial resistant pathogens, and increasing awareness
395 about how food systems are linked to the spread of emerging infectious diseases, PPE
396 adherence is particularly important to limit the transmission of diseases off operations[44-47]
397 to protect not only worker but community health.

398

399 **Design considerations**

400 This cohort of 103 IHO workers is a non-random, self-selected group, which may
401 lead to potential selection bias arising from differences in those who participated versus those
402 who did not (*e.g.*, health status, understanding of exposure issues, interest in protecting
403 themselves from work hazards). However, the population is believed to represent the
404 occupational population demographics from the area from which they were enrolled
405 including low-income, minorities, and those living with elder relatives. Further limitations in
406 generalizability include the possible differences between warmer climates (North Carolina)
407 and colder climates, where ventilation systems may differ. Our study was also limited by
408 healthy worker effect bias as detailed above.

409

410 **Strengths**

411 While we were unable to use the PEFr measurements, the use of the Piko-1
412 spirometer to capture FEV₁ readings was a strength. This easy-to-use handheld device
413 allowed more measurements from workers than had a gold standard Koko tabletop device
414 been used (**Tables 1** and **2**). The Piko-1 was also able to capture more smokers than the
415 Koko. Of the smokers, 12 of 13 had Piko-1 measurements at baseline, while only 5 of 13 had
416 Koko (**Table 1**). Considering that the Piko-1 is not a NIOSH gold standard instrument, it is
417 worth noting that when ATS/NIOSH acceptability criteria are applied to these measurements,
418 the resulting point estimates and confidence intervals were similar to those without these
419 criteria applied (data not shown).

420 Another strength of this work is the partnership with REACH. This study would not
421 have been possible without community-based participatory research and the community-
422 driven questions they provided. The organization was key to enrolling participants and
423 maintaining an ongoing relationship with IHO workers. The enrollment and high retention
424 rate of hard-to-reach non-white male and female workers performing the day-to-day
425 operations on-IHO is rare.

426

427 **Conclusions**

428 In this study we found that healthy IHO workers in North Carolina, the longer a
429 person worked on any IHO the worse their lung function became, as measured by spirometry.
430 It also showed that quality FEV₁ data can be collected through the use of a handheld, portable
431 asthma-tracking device that does not require a NIOSH-trained technician to be on-site to
432 operate. Further, PPE usage was associated with declines in the respiratory health of IHO
433 workers but is believed to be strongly associated with work activities, where people use face
434 protection less consistently as they perform tasks that involve increased contact with pigs and

435 worsening barn conditions, but wear coveralls more consistently when applying chemicals at
436 work. This may lead to re-exposure from chemicals on coveralls. More research is needed to
437 determine what kinds of masks and coveralls are being used, how they are cleaned, what
438 guidance is being provided to workers, and if interventions in barn conditions could increase
439 compliance and help protect lung function.

440 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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

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

447 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

448 Due to the exceedingly sensitive nature of this data, it will not be made publicly

449 available. For questions regarding access, please contact Dr. Christopher Heaney

450 cheaney1@jhu.edu.

451 **TABLES**

452 **Table 1.** Differences in population characteristics stratified by available baseline spirometry
 453 data from two instruments during enrollment into an industrial hog operation worker cohort.

Characteristic	Koko measurement		Piko-1 measurement	
	Has	Does not have	Has	Does not have
Workers in cohort, <i>n</i>	69	34	98	4
Age in years, <i>mean (SD)</i>	39 (11)	35 (9)	38 (11)	25 (-)
Sex, <i>n (%)</i>				
Male	34 (49)	21 (66)	54 (55)	1 (50)
Female	35 (51)	11 (34)	45 (45)	1 (50)
Race/ethnicity, <i>n (%)</i>				
Hispanic, non-black	68 (100)	20 (63)	88 (90)	0 (0)
Black	0 (0)	12 (34)	10 (10)	2 (100)
Education status, <i>n (%)</i>				
Less than high school education	34 (51)	13 (41)	49 (51)	0 (0)
High school degree/GED or college	33 (49)	19 (59)	47 (49)	3 (100)
Height (cm), <i>mean (SD)</i>	165 (9)	166 (14)	165 (11)	-
Weight (lbs), <i>mean (SD)</i>	172 (31)	174 (35)	172 (32)	-
Body mass index, <i>mean (SD)</i>	29 (5)	29 (6)	29 (5)	-
Used a gym or workout facility in the last three months, <i>n (%)</i>				
Yes	4 (6)	5 (16)	8 (8)	1 (50)
No	65 (94)	27 (84)	91 (92)	1 (50)
Current cigarette smoker, <i>n (%)</i>				
Yes	5 (7)	8 (73)	12 (16)	1 (100)
No	62 (93)	3 (37)	65 (84)	0 (0)
Had health insurance, <i>n (%)</i>				
Yes	34 (50)	14 (44)	46 (47)	2 (100)
No	34 (50)	18 (56)	52 (53)	0 (0)
Does not seek medical care under any circumstance, <i>n (%)</i>				
Yes	4 (6)	0 (0)	4 (4)	0 (0)
No	63 (94)	32 (100)	93 (96)	2 (100)
Auto repair or use of chemicals outside of work, <i>n (%)</i>				
Yes	3 (4)	3 (10)	6 (6)	0 (0)
No	64 (96)	28 (90)	91 (94)	1 (100)
Had any pet that goes inside the home, <i>n (%)</i>				
Yes	15 (39)	3 (33)	18 (38)	-
No	23 (61)	6 (64)	29 (62)	-
Lived on same property as an IHO, <i>n (%)</i>				
Yes	7 (11)	1 (3)	8 (8)	0 (0)
No	58 (89)	31 (97)	87 (92)	2 (100)
Interviewer, <i>n (%)</i>				
A	0 (0)	2 (8)	2 (2)	0 (0)
B	37 (55)	6 (25)	41 (47)	2 (67)
C	28 (42)	8 (33)	35 (40)	1 (33)
D	2 (3)	8 (33)	10 (11)	0 (0)

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

455 **Table 2.** Descriptive statistics of all spirometry measurements at baseline within an industrial
 456 hog operation worker cohort, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Characteristic	n	Mean (SD)	Predicted			R ² for Piko-1 and Koko based on mean measurements
			n	Mean (SD)	% (SD)	
Koko						
FEV ₁ (L)	69	3.2 (0.8)	67	3.4 (0.7)	95.4 (17.6)	-
PEFr (L/s)	68	6.6 (2.9)	66	4.8 (0.4)	138.2 (40.4)	-
FVC (L)	69	3.9 (0.9)	67	4.1 (0.8)	95.5 (17.6)	-
FEV ₁ /FVC	69	0.8 (0.1)	67	0.8 (0.0)	100.0 (7.2)	-
Piko-1						
FEV ₁ (L)	98	3.0 (0.8)	92	3.4 (0.7)	89.6 (22.5)	0.79
PEFr (L/s)	99	7.1 (2.1)	93	4.9 (0.5)	146.6 (39.9)	0.40

457 Note. Note. FEV₁ = forced expiratory volume in one second; PEFr = peak expiratory flow rate; FVC = forced vital capacity; SD = standard
 458 deviation.

459 **Table 3.** Crude baseline relationship between reported work exposures and measured lung function within an industrial hog operation worker
 460 cohort, North Carolina, 2013-2014 using GLM and clustered at the household level.

Characteristic	n	% Predicted FEV ₁ ^a		% Predicted FVC ^a		% Predicted FEV ₁ /FVC ^a		% Predicted FEV ₁ ^b		
		β (95% CI)	p-value	β (95% CI)	p-value	β (95% CI)	p-value	n	β (95% CI)	p-value
Have you ever										
Given pigs shots and/or antibiotics	65	-0.3 (-9.5, 8.9)		-3.0 (-11.5, 5.5)		3.4 (-0.2, 7.1)		90	5.7 (-4.3, 15.7)	
Drawn pig blood	65	5.0 (-19.8, 29.8)		1.1 (-18.4, 20.6)		2.1 (-2.8, 7.0)		90	6.3 (-16.3, 29.0)	
Handled pig manure	65	0.7 (-7.5, 9.0)		0.1 (-8.7, 8.9)		0.4 (-2.9, 3.7)		85	-1.9 (-11.5, 7.8)	
Applied pesticides in or around the barns	65	0.01 (-8.0, 8.1)		-4.3 (-12.7, 4.1)		4.3 (0.9, 7.7)		90	-1.0 (-10.3, 8.3)	
Washed work clothes with household laundry	64	0.8 (-10.7, 12.2)		-1.0 (12.3, 10.3)		1.4 (-2.5, 5.3)		88	3.1 (-13.0, 19.2)	
Do you typically										
Work exclusively in sow, nursery, and/or farrow barns	63	2.0 (-6.8, 10.8)		0.5 (-8.3, 9.4)		2.0 (-1.1, 5.0)		87	4.4 (-7.1, 16.0)	
Work exclusively in feeder and/or finisher barns	63	-3.9 (-12.7, 5.0)		-2.4 (-11.3, 6.5)		-1.8 (-5.9, 2.3)		80	-4.6 (-10.3, 1.2)	
Always wear a mask and bodysuit and eye protection	64	4.9 (-4.1, 13.9)		4.5 (-6.5, 15.5)		0.3 (-3.7, 4.3)		89	9.1 (-5.1, 23.4)	
Work 7 days per week	65	0.7 (-7.4, 8.9)		2.1 (-6.2, 10.3)		-1.7 (-4.7, 1.3)		89	0.6 (-8.4, 9.6)	
100% of time at work spent in direct contact with hogs	64	-6.7 (-15.5, 2.2)		-7.0 (-15.7, 1.8)		0.5 (-3.2, 4.2)		87	-9.4 (-19.5, 0.6)	
Years worked on any IHO	62							80		
Tertile 1 (1-5 years)		Ref (0.0)		Ref (0.0)		Ref (0.0)			Ref (0.0)	
Tertile 2 (6-10 years)		-10.3 (-19.9, -0.6)		-10.1 (-20.2, -0.002)		-0.7 (-5.8, 4.4)			-6.4 (-18.0, 5.2)	
Tertile 3 (11-27 years)		-9.8 (-19.3, -0.2)		-10.8 (-20.6, -1.0)		0.6 (-2.6, 3.7)			-8.9 (-20.1, 2.3)	
Trend			0.04		0.03		0.7			0.12
Percent of life working on any IHO	62							80		
Tertile 1 (2.4-11.6%)		Ref (0.0)		Ref (0.0)		Ref (0.0)			Ref (0.0)	
Tertile 2 (11.7-26.3%)		-12.4 (-22.8, -1.9)		-9.1 (-20.7, 2.5)		-4.3 (-8.5, -0.1)			-14.9 (-27.5, -2.2)	
Tertile 3 (26.4-51.9%)		-6.5 (-18.2, 5.3)		-5.8 (-17.6, 6.0)		-1.2 (-5.2, 2.7)			-12.2 (-24.3, -0.1)	
Trend			0.3		0.4		0.6			0.05

461 Note. FEV₁ = forced expiratory volume in one second; FVC = forced vital capacity; CI = Confidence interval. IHO = industrial hog operation.

462 a. Performed on a Koko spirometer.

463 b. Performed on a Piko-1 spirometer.

464 **Table 4.** Relationship between binary exposure activities and spirometry measurements over time within an industrial hog operation worker
 465 cohort, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Characteristic in the past week	Crude FEV ₁ (L)		Adjusted FEV ₁ ^a (L)	
	visits (workers) ^b	β (95% CI)	visits (workers) ^b	β (95% CI)
Experienced some form of dustiness or odor ^c	700 (99)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.1)	691 (99)	-0.02 (-0.2, 0.1)
Performed a cleaning activity ^d	720 (99)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)	711 (99)	0.01 (-0.1, 0.2)
Had pig contact ^e	718 (100)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.1)	708 (100)	-0.1 (-0.3, 0.1)
Performed two or three of the above ^f	687 (99)	0.02 (-0.1, 0.2)	679 (99)	0.03 (-0.1, 0.2)
Used any protection consistently ^g	712 (100)	-0.3 (-0.6, -0.1)	703 (100)	-0.3 (-0.6, -0.04)
Handwashing at least 8 times per shift ^h	717 (100)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)	707 (100)	0.1 (-0.1, 0.2)
Worked 7 days	738 (101)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.1)	726 (100)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.1)
Worked at least 45 hours	728 (101)	0.004 (-0.1, 0.1)	717 (100)	-0.1 (-0.2, 0.1)

466 Note. FEV₁ = forced expiratory volume in one second; CI = confidence interval. All estimates were made using fixed-effects regression.

467 *a.* Hour of test (dummy), month of test (dummy), smoked in the past 12 hours (binary), and interviewer (dummy)-adjusted relationship between reported symptoms and spirometry measurements over time within an
 468 industrial hog operation worker cohort, North Carolina, 2013-2014 using fixed-effects regression.

469 *b.* The number of observations equals the number of individual visits (1-8) for the number of persons (*i.e.*, groups) with both a response to the symptom question and a Piko-1 spirometry test result.

470 *c.* Reported at least one of the following: extreme temperature, extreme malodor, extreme dust, vents off, or a new herd entering the barns

471 *d.* Reported at least one of the following: used cleaning chemicals and/or pesticides, pressure washed or used a torch

472 *e.* Reported at least one of the following: gave hogs shots and/or medicine.

473 *f.* Binary (yes/no) to a, b, and/or c.

474 *g.* Consistently (≥80% of the time at work) wore at least one of the following: mask, glasses, or bodysuit/coveralls.

475 *h.* 8 is the median.

476 **Table 5.** Cross tabulations of personal protective equipment and reported work exposures within an industrial hog operation worker cohort,
 477 North Carolina, 2013-2014.

Reported in the past week	Body protection, irrespective of face protection		Face protection, irrespective of body protection		Both body and face protection		Body protection and no face protection	
	≥80%	<i>p</i> -value (Pearson X^2)	≥80%	<i>p</i> -value (Pearson X^2)	≥80%	<i>p</i> -value (Pearson X^2)	≥80%	<i>p</i> -value (Pearson X^2)
Barn conditions score ^a , <i>n</i> (%)								
0	298 (53)		226 (62)		193 (70)		105 (37)	
1	148 (27)		92 (25)		47 (17)		100 (35)	
2 or more	112 (20)	<0.001	45 (12)	<0.001	35 (13)	<0.001	77 (27)	0.002
Cleaning score ^b , <i>n</i> (%)								
0	172 (34)		114 (31)		81 (29)		90 (31)	
1	125 (25)		88 (24)		50 (18)		75 (26)	
2 or more	272 (53)	<0.001	163 (45)	0.70	147 (53)	<0.001	125 (43)	0.002
Pig contact score ^c , <i>n</i> (%)								
0	223 (39)		151 (42)		104 (38)		118 (41)	
1	203 (36)		134 (37)		118 (43)		85 (29)	
2	142 (25)	<0.001	77 (21)	0.01	54 (20)	<0.001	88 (30)	0.01
Score components ^d , <i>n</i> (%)								
0 or 1	121 (22)		92 (26)		63 (23)		57 (21)	
2 or 3	233 (43)		161 (45)		122 (45)		111 (41)	
4, 5, or 6	193 (35)	0.16	106 (30)	0.04	87 (32)	0.72	106 (39)	0.06
Number of times washed hands per shift, <i>n</i> (%)								
Tertile 1 (0-6)	239 (42)		140 (38)		97 (35)		142 (49)	
Tertile 2 (7-10)	267 (47)		193 (53)		156 (56)		109 (37)	
Tertile 3 (11-50)	68 (12)	0.53	33 (9)	0.001	26 (9)	<0.001	42 (14)	0.13

Note.

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


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

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

d. Sum of all above components, with a possible total of 0 to 11.

478
 479
 480
 481
 482

483 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**



484

485 **Figure 1.** Sampling scheme study visits, participant retention, and measurements obtained

486 within a cohort of industrial hog operation workers, North Carolina, 2013-2014.

487 **REFERENCES**

488 1 Hoppin JA, Umbach DM, London SJ, et al. Animal production and wheeze in the
489 Agricultural Health Study: interactions with atopy, asthma, and smoking. *Occup Environ*
490 *Med* 2003;60:e3-. PMID: [12883030](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12883030/), <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.60.8.e3>

491

492 2 Andersen CI, Von Essen SG, Smith LM, et al. Respiratory symptoms and airway
493 obstruction in swine veterinarians: A persistent problem. *Am J Ind Med* 2004;46:386-92.
494 PMID: [15376211](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15376211/), <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20080>

495

496 3 Douglas P, Robertson S, Gay R, et al. A systematic review of the public health risks of
497 bioaerosols from intensive farming. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 2018;221:134-73. PMID:
498 [29133137](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29133137/), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2017.10.019>

499

500 4 Von Essen S, Moore G, Gibbs S, et al. Respiratory issues in beef and pork production:
501 recommendations from an expert panel. *J Agromedicine* 2010;15:216-25. PMID: [20665307](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20665307/),
502 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2010.486283>

503

504 5 Zejda JE, Hurst TS, Rhodes CS, et al. Respiratory health of swine producers: focus on
505 young workers. *Chest* 1993;103:702-9. PMID: [8449055](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8449055/),
506 <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.103.3.702>

507

508 6 Borlée F, Yzermans CJ, Aalders B, et al. Air pollution from livestock farms is associated
509 with airway obstruction in neighboring residents. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*
510 2017;196:1152-61. PMID: [28489427](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28489427/), <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201701-0021OC>

511

512 7 Donham KJ, Reynolds SJ, Whitten P, et al. Respiratory dysfunction in swine production
513 facility workers: Dose-response relationships of environmental exposures and pulmonary
514 function. *Am J Ind Med* 1995;27:405-18. PMID: [7747746](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7747746/),
515 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700270309>

516

517 8 Schiffman SS, Bennett JL, Raymer JH. Quantification of odors and odorants from swine
518 operations in North Carolina. *Agric For Meteorol* 2001 Jun 25;108(3):213-40.
519 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923\(01\)00239-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(01)00239-8)

520

521 9 Preller L, Heederik D, Kromhout H, et al. Determinants of dust and endotoxin exposure of
522 pig farmers: development of a control strategy using empirical modelling. *Ann Occup Hyg*
523 1995;39:545-57. PMID: [8526390](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8526390/), [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4878\(95\)00024-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-4878(95)00024-9)

524

525 10 Zejda JE, Barber E, Dosman JA, et al. Respiratory health status in swine producers relates
526 to endotoxin exposure in the presence of low dust levels. *J Occup Med* 1994;36:49-56.
527 PMID: [8138848](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8138848/)

528

529 11 Vogelzang PF, van der Gulden JW, Folgering H, et al. Endotoxin exposure as a major
530 determinant of lung function decline in pig farmers. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*
531 1998;157:15-8. PMID: [9445272](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9445272/), <https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.157.1.9703087>

532

533 12 Friese A, Schulz J, Hoehle L, et al. Occurrence of MRSA in air and housing environment
534 of pig barns. *Vet Microbiol* 2012;158:129-35. PMID: [22386671](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22386671/),
535 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2012.01.019>

536

537 13 Nehme B, Létourneau V, Forster RJ, et al. Culture-independent approach of the bacterial
538 bioaerosol diversity in the standard swine confinement buildings, and assessment of the
539 seasonal effect. *Environ Microbiol* 2008;10:665-75. PMID: [18237302](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18237302/),

540 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2007.01489.x>

541

542 14 Chapin A, Rule A, Gibson K, et al. Airborne multidrug-resistant bacteria isolated from a
543 concentrated swine feeding operation. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005;113:137-42.

544 PMID: [15687049](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15687049/), <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.7473>

545

546 15 Schwartz DA, Donham KJ, Olenchock SA, et al. Determinants of longitudinal changes in
547 spirometric function among swine confinement operators and farmers. *Am J Respir Crit Care*

548 *Med* 1995;151:47-53. PMID: [7812571](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7812571/), <https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.151.1.7812571>

549

550 16 Donham KJ, Reynolds SJ, Whitten P, et al. Respiratory dysfunction in swine production

551 facility workers: Dose-response relationships of environmental exposures and pulmonary

552 function. *Am J Ind Med* 1995;27:405-18. PMID: [7747746](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7747746/),

553 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700270309>

554

555 17 Cushen B, Sulaiman I, Donoghue N, et al. High prevalence of obstructive lung disease in

556 non-smoking farmers: the Irish farmers lung health study. *Respir Med* 2016;115:13-9. PMID:

557 [27215498](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27215498/), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmed.2016.04.006>

558

559 18 Coffman VR, Hall DJ, Pisanic N, et al. Self-reported work activities, mucus membrane

560 symptoms, and respiratory health outcomes among an industrial hog operation worker cohort,

561 North Carolina, USA. *Preprint on medRxiv* 2020.

562 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203893>

563

564 19 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS]. Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages:

565 Private, NAICS 112210 Hog and pig farming, All Counties 2019 Fourth Quarter, All

566 establishment sizes

567 https://data.bls.gov/cew/apps/table_maker/v4/table_maker.htm#type=1&year=2019&qtr=4&

568 [own=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 2020.

569

570 20 Allison, PD. Fixed effects regression models. SAGE publications 2009.

571

572 21 Donham KJ, Haglind P, Peterson Y, et al. Environmental and health studies in swine

573 confinement buildings. *Am J Ind Med* 1986;10:289-93.

574 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700100317>

575

576 22 Donham KJ, Zavala DC, Merchant JA. Respiratory symptoms and lung function among

577 workers in swine confinement buildings: a cross-sectional epidemiological study. *Arch*

578 *Environ Occup Health* 1984;39:96-101. PMID: [6609685](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/6609685/),

579 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00039896.1984.10545842>

580

581 23 Brouwer R, Biersteker K, Bongers P, et al. Respiratory symptoms, lung function, and

582 IgG4 levels against pig antigens in a sample of Dutch pig farmers. *Am J Ind Med*

583 1986;10:283-5. PMID: [3766555](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3766555/), <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700100314>

584

585 24 Bongers P, Houthuijs D, Remijn B, et al. Lung function and respiratory symptoms in pig
586 farmers. *Occup Environ Med* 1987;44:819-23. PMID: [3689717](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3689717/),

587 <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.44.12.819>

588

589 25 Iversen M, Dahl R. Working in swine confinement buildings causes an accelerated
590 decline in FEV1: A 7 yr follow up of Danish farmers. *Eur Respir J* 2000;16:404-8. PMID:

591 [11028651](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11028651/), <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3003.2000.016003404.x>

592

593 26 Reynolds SJ, Donham KJ, Whitten P, et al. Longitudinal evaluation of dose response
594 relationships for environmental exposures and pulmonary function in swine production

595 workers. *Am J Ind Med* 1996;29:33-40. PMID: [8808040](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8808040/)

596

597 27 Senthilselvan A, Dosman JA, Kirychuk SP, et al. Accelerated lung function decline in
598 swine confinement workers. *Chest* 1997;111:1733-41. PMID: [9187201](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9187201/),

599 <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.111.6.1733>

600

601 28 ATS-DLD-78-A. [https://www.pdfFiller.com/jsfiller-](https://www.pdfFiller.com/jsfiller-desk12/?et=12f&projectId=486642759#b5df0fc35a4daa6f470c790c8070afc3)

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

603 2020.

604

605 29 Miller MR, Hankinson JA, Brusasco V, et al. Standardisation of spirometry. *Eur Respir J*

606 2005;26:319-38. PMID: [16055882](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16055882/), <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.05.00034805>

607

608 30 Beeckman-Wagner LA, Freeland D. Spirometry quality assurance; common errors and

609 their impact on test results. 2012. <https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/11759>

610

611 31 Nadimpalli M, Stewart JR, Pierce E, et al. Livestock-associated, antibiotic-resistant

612 *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal carriage and recent skin and soft tissue infection among

613 industrial hog operation workers. *PLoS one* 2016;11:e0165713. PMID: [27851746](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27851746/),

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

615

616 32 Hankinson JL, Odencrantz JR, Fedan KB. Spirometric reference values from a sample of

617 the general US population. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1999;159:179-87. PMID: [9872837](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9872837/),

618 <https://doi.org/10.1164/ajrccm.159.1.9712108>

619

620 33 Medarov BI, Pavlov VA, Rossoff L. Diurnal variations in human pulmonary function. *Int*

621 *J Clin Exp Med* 2008;1:267. PMID: [19079662](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19079662/)

622

623 34 Gómez FP, Rodriguez-Roisin R. Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease

624 (GOLD) guidelines for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Curr Opin Pulm Med*

625 2002;8:81-6. PMID: [11845001](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11845001/), <https://doi.org/10.1097/00063198-200203000-00001>

626

627 35 Odo NU, Raynor PC, Beaudoin A, Somrongthong R, Scheftel JM, Donahue JG, Bender

628 JB. Personal protective equipment use and handwashing among animal farmers: A multi-site

629 assessment. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2015;12:363-8. PMID: [25626124](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25626124/),

630 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2015.1006635>

631

632 36 Carpenter WS, Lee BC, Gunderson PD, Stueland DT. Assessment of personal protective

633 equipment use among Midwestern farmers. *Am J Ind Med* 2002;42:236-47. PMID:

634 [12210692](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12210692/), <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.10103>

635

636 37 Rabinowitz PM, Huang E, Paccha B, Vegso S, Gurzau A. Awareness and practices
637 regarding zoonotic influenza prevention in Romanian swine workers. *Influenza Other Respir*
638 *Viruses* 2013;7:27-31. PMID: [24224817](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24224817/), <https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.12191>

639

640 38 Cole D, Todd L, Wing S. Concentrated swine feeding operations and public health: a
641 review of occupational and community health effects. *Environ Health Perspect*
642 2000;108:685-99. PMID: [10964788](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10964788/), <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.00108685>

643

644 39 Chénard L, Senthilselvan A, Grover VK, et al. Lung function and farm size predict
645 healthy worker effect in swine farmers. *Chest* 2007;131:245-54. PMID: [17218583](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17218583/),
646 <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.05-2238>

647

648 40 Schwartz DA, Landas SK, Lassise DL, et al. Airway injury in swine confinement workers.
649 *Ann Intern Med* 1992;116:630-5. PMID: [1546862](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1546862/), [https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-116-8-](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-116-8-630)
650 [630](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-116-8-630)

651

652 41 Iversen M, Takai H. Lung function studies in farmers during work in swine confinement
653 units. *Zentralbl Arbeitsmed Arbeitsschutz Ergon* 1990;40:236-42.
654 <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/19902075940>

655

656 42 Dosman JA, Senthilselvan A, Kirychuk SP, et al. Positive human health effects of wearing
657 a respirator in a swine barn. *Chest* 2000;118:852-60. PMID: [10988215](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10988215/),
658 <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.118.3.852>

659

- 660 43 Palmberg L, Larsson BM, Sundblad BM, et al. Partial protection by respirators on airways
661 responses following exposure in a swine house. *Am J Ind Med* 2004;46:363-70. PMID:
662 [15376212](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15376212/), <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.20079>
663
- 664 44 Costa M, Teixeira PJ, Freitas PF. Respiratory manifestations and respiratory diseases:
665 prevalence and risk factors among pig farmers in Braço do Norte, Brazil. *J Bras Pneumol*
666 2007;33:380-8.
667
- 668 45 Beaudoin A, Johnson S, Davies P, Bender J, Gramer M. Characterization of influenza A
669 outbreaks in Minnesota swine herds and measures taken to reduce the risk of zoonotic
670 transmission. *Zoonoses Public Health* 2012;59:96-106. PMID: [21824375](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21824375/),
671 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2011.01423.x>
672
- 673 46 Hollenbeck JE. Interaction of the role of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs)
674 in emerging infectious diseases (EIDS). *Infection, Genetics and Evolution* 2016;38:44-6.
675 PMID: [26656834](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26656834/), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2015.12.002>
676
- 677 47 Garcés L. COVID-19 exposes animal agriculture's vulnerability. *Agriculture and Human*
678 *Values* 2020;14:1-2. PMID: [32412528](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32412528/), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-020-10099-5>