

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Global trends in occupational disease reporting: a systematic review

Levina Chandra Khoe^{1,2*}, Siti Rizny Fitriana Saldi^{3¶}, Marsen Isbayuputra^{2¶}, Muchtaruddin Mansyur^{2&},
Virginia Wiseman^{4&}, Augustine Asante¹

¹School of Population Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

²Department of Community Medicine, University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

³ Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Evidence-Based Medicine, Cipto Mangunkusumo Hospital,
Jakarta, Indonesia

⁴Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

*Corresponding author:

Email: l.khoe@unsw.edu.au / levina.chandra01@ui.ac.id

ORCID: 0000-0002-2050-392X

¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

&These authors contributed equally to this work.

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background**

25 Disease reporting is often unreliable and faces many challenges, making it difficult to estimate
26 the true burden of occupational diseases, defined as any disease that is caused by the work
27 activity or environment. This study aimed to assess the global reporting and underreporting
28 rate of occupational diseases, and to identify the factors affecting the underreporting of
29 occupational diseases.

30

31 **Methods**

32 Following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis
33 (PRISMA) guidelines, this study searched Medline (PubMed), CINAHL, EMBASE, Scopus,
34 Web of Science, WHO Institutional Repository for Information Sharing (IRIS) database,
35 Dimensions, and Google Scholar. We used search terms related to reporting and underreporting
36 of occupational diseases or illnesses. The selected records were screened, and data extracted
37 using the Covidence software tool. Screening and quality assessment were conducted by two
38 independent researchers and finalized by a third researcher. The quality of the evidence was
39 assessed with the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool. This study is registered on PROSPERO,
40 number CRD42023417814.

41 **Results**

42 A total of 121 studies from 29 countries were identified, all coming from high-income and
43 upper-middle-income countries. The incidence rate of occupational disease varied widely,

44 ranging between 1.71 to 1,387 per 100,000 employees yearly. The highest number of annual
45 cases was reported in the agricultural sector (ranging from 33 to 6,431), followed by the health
46 sector (146 to 5,508), and then the construction sector (264). Two studies evaluated rates of
47 underreporting, which varied from 50% to 95%. The main factor contributing to underreporting
48 was employee concerns about job security.

49 **Conclusions**

50 The results reveal a significant gap in the reporting of occupational diseases among high-
51 income and low-middle-income countries. This review also identifies variations in reporting
52 mechanisms across different countries. Our findings highlight the need to establish a national
53 system for reporting occupational diseases that engages employers, employees, and
54 healthcare providers.

55

56 **Introduction**

57 In 2016, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization
58 (ILO) produced the first joint estimates of the work-related burden of disease and injury. They
59 reported a total of 1.9 million deaths and a loss of 89.7 million disability-adjusted life years
60 (DALYs) attributable to 19 occupational risk factors (1). To prevent occupational diseases,
61 obtaining correct information on their prevalence is necessary. According to a global survey
62 conducted by the WHO, about 93.5% of countries globally collect data on occupational
63 diseases and 68.5% of these maintain a national registry of occupational diseases and accidents
64 (2). The same survey also shows that about 87.2% of high-income countries (HICs) have
65 national registries, and around 40.8% of low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) do not
66 have these registries. Even where national registries exist, the level of registration is reported

67 to be low, especially in LMICs (2). Concerns about incomplete registry data especially around
68 occupational risk factors has also been raised (3).

69

70 There are recognized challenges associated with the collection of occupational diseases data in
71 terms of population coverage, source of information, and coordination between multiple
72 authorities (3). Firstly, the population covered by reporting systems mainly includes employees
73 working in the formal sector, excluding the self-employed, part-time workers, casual workers,
74 seasonal workers, and those in micro to small enterprises (4). These gaps in population
75 coverage result in underreporting, especially in LMICs, where more than two-thirds of the
76 population works in the informal sector (5). Secondly, to diagnose occupational disease,
77 physicians require robust evidence on the possible occupational origins and their level of
78 exposure (6, 7), which must be sourced from employers (8). Insufficient training in
79 occupational medicine for physicians has also been identified as one of the factors contributing
80 to the under-diagnosis of occupational diseases (9-11). Apart from human factors, some
81 occupational diseases require a long latency period before the appearance of first symptoms.
82 For instance, the latency period from exposure to carcinogenic substances for bladder cancer
83 is about 14 years, which makes it difficult to establish the link between exposure and disease
84 (12). Lastly, the responsibility to collect data on occupational diseases may be divided among
85 different organizations. In many countries, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Labour
86 often require this information for disease surveillance purposes and for developing
87 occupational health programmes. Employers and insurance agencies need the information for
88 workers' compensation schemes(13). Each organization may use different reporting
89 mechanisms, which could increase the complexity and fragmentation of documenting
90 occupational diseases(2).

91

92 Occupational disease reporting systems are important sources of information for understanding
93 disease patterns among workers in a country and for developing effective prevention
94 programmes. However, statistics on occupational diseases are often unreliable and remain
95 scarce in many countries, particularly in LMICs, where many workers have a higher risk of
96 developing occupational diseases (14). While all cases of occupational disease must be
97 reported by employers, employees, and/or physicians, many employees are unaware that their
98 disease may be caused or worsened by the work environment (15, 16). Some may be aware but
99 choose not to report for fear of potential repercussions, including losing their jobs (17). Factors
100 that contribute to underreporting of occupational diseases might also originate from employers
101 who may not consider the employee's case as work-related. Additionally, there is a lack of
102 enforcement of occupational health and safety regulations in many countries. A lack of strictly
103 enforced sanctions on employers who fail to report confirmed or suspected occupational-
104 related diseases to authorities has been documented in many countries (17-20).

105 Occupational diseases are often described using the “icebergs phenomenon”(21). This means
106 that most cases may be invisible or mistakenly diagnosed as non-occupational diseases. Thus,
107 the number of cases reported in many countries may be just the tip of the iceberg. While studies
108 have documented the burden of occupational diseases, there has been limited effort to explore
109 the global disease pattern and identify its reporting mechanisms. To our knowledge, no
110 systematic review exists on the global reporting of occupational diseases. This systematic
111 review aims to fill that gap by bringing together evidence on the reporting of occupational
112 diseases in both high-income countries and LMICs. The review covers all types of occupational
113 diseases. Occupational injuries or accidents are not included because they are more easily
114 recognized and better reported compared with most diseases. Our goal is to systematically
115 review the reporting and underreporting pattern of occupational diseases based on countries'

116 income status, industrial development, and types of occupational diseases. We also aim to
117 identify the factors affecting the underreporting of occupational diseases.

118

119 **Methods**

120 The protocol for this review was prepared according to the Center for Reviews and
121 Dissemination (CRD) guidelines and registered on PROSPERO, under registration number
122 CRD42023417814. The selection of studies followed the Preferred Reporting Items for
123 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis-Protocols (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines. The quality of
124 the studies were assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (22). This study
125 is registered on PROSPERO, number CRD42023417814.

126

127

128 **Eligibility criteria**

129 Studies were eligible for inclusion if they examined the reporting or underreporting of
130 occupational diseases at the country level. Eligible studies included cohort studies, cross-
131 sectional studies or reports from national registries, national surveillance systems, workers'
132 compensation schemes, or national voluntary reporting schemes. As this review focused on the
133 reporting system at the national level, studies at the district or province level were excluded.
134 All types of occupational diseases were included; however, occupational injuries or accidents
135 were excluded. Review articles, editorials, guidelines, case reports, and case series were also
136 excluded, as our focus was on empirical studies. Qualitative and mixed-methods studies were
137 included to identify the factors underlying problems of underreporting. There were no
138 limitations on the date of publications and language. For non-English language articles, Google

139 Translate was used to screen titles and abstracts. These articles were kept in a separate folder
140 but not included in the analysis, to avoid language bias when appraising the articles.

141

142 **Outcome**

143 Outcome measures include the number of reported occupational disease cases, the rate of
144 reporting occupational diseases, the rate of underreporting or misreporting, the number of
145 occupational disease claims, the number of cases reported by physicians, employees or
146 employers. The underreporting rate is defined as the ratio between the number of non-reported
147 cases and the total number of cases (reported and not reported). The rate of misreporting refers
148 to the ratio between the number of falsely reported cases and the total number of cases.
149 Reported cases were classified according to the countries' income status, industrial
150 development, and types of occupational diseases.

151

152 **Data sources and search strategy**

153 Searches were conducted for the following electronic databases: Medline (PubMed), CINAHL,
154 EMBASE, Scopus, and Web of Science. Searches for eligible grey literature were carried out
155 in the WHO Institutional Repository for Information Sharing (IRIS) database, Dimensions, and
156 Google. Additionally, the reference lists of relevant articles were screened for titles and
157 abstracts that include key terms.

158

159 We explored different possible terms related to reporting and underreporting of occupational
160 diseases/illnesses including “report*”, “underreport*”, “misreport*”, “surveillance”, and
161 “capture-recapture”, and combined them with terms for occupational diseases (“occupational
162 disease*”, “occupational illness*”, “work-related disease”, “work-related illness”). The search
163 strategy included a combination of Medical Subject Heading (MESH) terms and free text

164 terms. These terms were combined with ‘OR’ and ‘AND’ Boolean operators. The full search
165 strategy is provided in S1 Appendix.

166

167 **Study selection**

168 Studies obtained from different data sources were combined and duplicate records were
169 removed using the Covidence systematic review software package. All records identified in
170 the search were initially screened based on titles and abstracts. Then, we assessed the full text
171 of selected studies according to the eligibility criteria. Study selection was performed by two
172 independent investigators (LK and SR or LK and MI). Any disagreements were resolved
173 through discussion with a third reviewer (SR or MI). The third reviewer was a person not
174 involved in the study selection process.

175

176 **Data extraction**

177 A standardized form was developed for data extraction based on the review questions.
178 Extracted information included basic study details such as study design, country of origin,
179 study setting, year or timeframe for data collection, participant employment characteristics
180 (industrial sector, job type), and the outcome data (e.g., number of cases reported, reporting
181 rate). Additionally, the countries where the studies were conducted were stratified by income
182 status and region according to the World Bank classification (23). One reviewer (LK) extracted
183 the data, while a second reviewer (SR or MI) checked the data for accuracy and completeness.
184 Any discrepancies between reviewers were resolved through consensus, or by involving a third
185 reviewer (SR or MI) to settle the disagreement in the data extraction process. Where essential
186 information was unclear or missing, the authors were contacted for clarification. Completed
187 data extraction forms were uploaded to the university’s (University of New South Wales) One
188 Drive account, which was accessible only to the reviewers.

189

190 **Quality assessment**

191 At least two reviewers (LK and SR or LK and MI) assessed and appraised the methodological
192 quality of the studies independently using Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (22). The
193 types of studies assessed using MMAT include qualitative studies, quantitative randomized
194 controlled trials, quantitative non-randomized studies, quantitative descriptive studies, and
195 mixed-method studies. Five criteria were used to assess the overall risk of bias for each study
196 type. Each criterion is given a rating of ‘yes’, ‘no’, or ‘can’t tell’. For every ‘yes’ answer, the
197 study was given a score of between 20 and 100, with 20 being the lowest and 100 the highest.
198 Any inconsistencies were resolved through discussion and included a third reviewer (SR or
199 MI), if necessary.

200

201 **Analysis and data synthesis**

202 The articles were categorized based on their content. Articles that included the number of
203 reported cases or incidence rate of occupational diseases were grouped into one folder and
204 analysed to address the primary objective, i.e., to estimate the global reporting and
205 underreporting rate of occupational diseases. Descriptive data from each reviewed study were
206 presented as narrative text or in tables. Due to the diversity in the characteristics of the studies,
207 conducting a meta-analysis was not possible. Thus, a narrative synthesis was performed for
208 this systematic review. A summary table showing the number of cases per year and incidence
209 of occupational diseases per 100,000 employees was presented. Where the incidence was
210 originally reported using a different denominator (e.g., per one million or one thousand
211 employees), the number was adjusted to a denominator of per 100,000 employees. The results
212 were also classified based on the type of occupational diseases in each region, and the type of
213 occupational diseases in each industrial sector. In every study, we calculated the number of

214 annual cases for each type of occupational disease by adding up the total cases and dividing by
215 the total number of years covered by the study to obtain the average number of cases per year.
216 The average number of cases per year in each study were summed up and then divided by the
217 total number of studies. For studies discussing the factors contributing to the underreporting of
218 occupational diseases, these articles were separated into a separate folder and analysed
219 thematically.

220

221 **Results**

222 **Characteristics of included studies**

223 From the searched databases, we identified 15,397 records. Of these, 6,885 duplicates were
224 removed. After title and abstract screening, the remaining 410 full-text articles were assessed
225 for eligibility. Of these 410 articles, 20 studies were in other languages; 3 German, 2 French,
226 4 Spanish, 2 Danish, 3 Polish, 2 Italian, 2 Norwegian, and 2 Chinese. A total of 289 studies
227 were excluded from the 410 because they did not meet the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
228 That left a total of 121 articles to be considered for final review, including 118 quantitative
229 studies and 3 qualitative studies. The study selection process is shown in Figure 1. These 121
230 studies covered 29 countries spread across all six geographical regions of the world (Africa,
231 Asia, Australia and Oceania, Europe, Northern America, and Latin America). The first study
232 was published in 1990 and the most recent in 2023. While only 15 studies were published in
233 the first 10 years between 1990 and 2000; the number of published articles remained stagnant
234 each year, at around 6 studies annually.

235

236 **Fig 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study selection**

237

238 The country with the highest number of publications on occupational diseases was the United
239 Kingdom (UK), which published 27 articles. Other top-producing countries included South
240 Korea and Finland, contributing 9 and 8 articles respectively. Denmark, Australia, and Canada
241 were the first countries to publish occupational disease studies between 1990 and 1996. All the
242 articles included in this review were published in high-income and upper-middle-income
243 countries. Across geographical regions, Europe contributed the highest number of publications
244 (95) while the regions of Latin America, Africa, and Australia had the least number of
245 publications; only two each. Of the 113 articles that assessed the rate of occupational disease
246 reporting, 47 studies used data sources from occupational health registries, 44 studies were
247 based on physician reports, 29 studies used data from workers' compensation claims, and the
248 rest gathered data from a variety of sources including cancer registries and labour surveys.

249
250 A total of 89 studies reported on specific occupational diseases, and the most commonly
251 studied conditions were skin diseases (22 studies), cancer (16 studies), respiratory diseases (16
252 studies), musculoskeletal disorders (11 studies), occupational asthma (9 studies), infectious
253 diseases (7 studies), asbestos-related diseases (5 studies), mental illnesses (4 studies), hearing
254 damage or loss (4 studies), and other chronic conditions (1 study). About 15 studies
255 investigated more than one type of occupational disease. In terms of industry, the health sector
256 had the highest number of studies (10), followed by construction and/or manufacturing (9),
257 agriculture (7), mining and quarrying (3), and other sectors (2). A descriptive summary of the
258 studies included in this review is presented in Appendix 2 in the Supplementary Data section.

259

260 **Quality of studies**

261 The majority of the 121 studies (n=116) used a quantitative descriptive research design,
262 followed by qualitative design (n=3), and quantitative non-randomized design (n=2). The

263 quality of the studies was appraised using MMAT with the highest score of 100. Studies that
264 obtained high scores in terms of quality were qualitative studies, with 66.7% (n = 2) scored
265 100 and 33.3% (n=1) scored 80. Among the quantitative descriptive studies, most (81.9%) had
266 an MMAT score of 80 or higher (n = 94). Only 7 studies (6.0%) scored 40 and 15 studies
267 (12.9%) scored 60. There were only two quantitative non-randomized studies, one scoring 60
268 and the other scoring 80.

269

270 The remaining results are presented according to the study objectives, type of occupational
271 disease, and type of industrial sector. We separated those articles to be analysed for the primary
272 objective, i.e., to estimate the global reporting and underreporting rate of occupational diseases,
273 and the secondary objective of identifying the factors contributing to the underreporting of
274 occupational diseases. Nine articles were assessed for the secondary objective, and the rest
275 were analysed for the primary objective. One article was assessed for both objectives. Of the
276 113 articles assessed for the primary objective, only two examined underreporting patterns in
277 occupational diseases. Ninety-seven (97) of the 113 studies examined only a specific
278 occupational disease without considering the type of industrial sector. Meanwhile, there were
279 15 articles which discussed all types of occupational diseases among the general working
280 population. Figure 2 below describes the number of studies in each category.

281

282 **Fig 2. Number of studies in each category based on study objectives, type of**
283 **occupational diseases and industrial sector**

284

285 **Reporting patterns for occupational disease**

286 Data from 15 studies indicate that the number of cases of occupational diseases among the
287 general working population globally ranged from 34 to 37,927 per year with an incidence rate

288 of between 1.71 to 1,387 per 100,000 employees per annum. Almost all the cases were reported
 289 in the European region, except for one case that was reported in Asia. The highest rate of
 290 occupational disease incidence, as reported by general practitioners between 2006 and 2009,
 291 was recorded in the UK. The lowest incidence was recorded in Greece, and it was based on
 292 data from workers' compensation claims. Three specific sectors: agriculture, healthcare, and
 293 construction, reported all types of occupational diseases from skin diseases to cancer. The
 294 reported annual cases of occupational diseases ranged between 33 to 6,431 in the agricultural
 295 sector; 146 to 5,508 in the healthcare sector, and 264 in the construction sector. Table 1
 296 summarises the number of reported cases and incidence rate of occupational diseases in general
 297 and specific working populations.

298

299 **Table 1. Number of cases and incidence rate of occupational diseases**

Author, year	Reported period (year)	Country	Annual average n of cases (min- max)	IR per 100,000 employees
<i>All type of occupational diseases in all sectors</i>				
<i>Data type: physician's report</i>				
Cherry, 2000	1996-1999	UK	10,941	42
Chen, 2005(a)	2002-2003	Scotland	2,022	86
Chen, 2005(b)	2002-2003	UK, except Scotland	21,120	84
Hussey, 2008	2006-2007	UK	1,436	NA
Hussey, 2010(a)	2006-2007	UK	1,436	NA
Hussey, 2010(b)	2006-2007	UK	1,680	NA
van der Molen, 2012	2009-2013	Netherlands	1,782	346 (330-362)
Hussey, 2013(a)	2006-2009	UK	1,171	1,387
Hussey, 2013(b)	2006-2009	UK	7,759	131

Carder, 2014	2005-2007	GB	8,349	301
	2008-2010	GB	5,566	336
Money, 2015	2007-2012	GB	4,901	NA
		NI	557	NA
		ROI	161	NA
<i>Data type: National Registry</i>				
Shih, 2003	2008-2021	Taiwan	2,038 (1,233- 2,791)	NA
Szeszenia-Dąbrowska, 2006	2005	Poland	3,249	35
Vainauskas, 2010	1999-2008	Lithuania	928 (570-1,447)	64 (41-97)
Szeszenia-Dąbrowska, 2013	1998-2011	Poland	5,035 (2,562- 12,017)	50 (25-117)
Oksa, 2019	1975, 2005, 2013	Finland	NA	253 (200-310)*
<i>Data type: workers' compensation claims</i>				
Kraut, 1994	1989	Canada	37,927	28.2
Shih, 2003	2008-2021	Taiwan	752 (426-1,149)	NA
Kourouklis, 2009	2003-2007	Greece	34	1.7
<i>All type of occupational diseases in a specific sector</i>				
<i>Agriculture sector</i>				
Stocks, 2010	2002-2008	UK	33 (19-46)	NA
Karttunen, 2013	1982-2008	Finland	352	NA
Szeszenia-Dąbrowska, 2016	2000-2014	Poland	229 (141-340)	12.8 (5-14.6)
van der Molen, 2020	2004-2017	Italy	6431	1295
Samant, 2020	2007-2016	Norway	47 (26-66)	114 (68-169)
<i>Health sector</i>				
Walsh, 2005	2002-2003	UK	5508	NA
Zhou, 2017	2001-2014	GB	146	515

Construction sector

Stocks, 2011	2002-2008	UK	264	NA
--------------	-----------	----	-----	----

300 Note: IR= incidence rate; *Incidence rate in the study was measured in average incidence rate per 10,000 employees, this number has been
301 adjusted to incidence per 100,000 employees. UK= United Kingdom, GB= Great Britain; NI = Northern Ireland; RoI = Republic of Ireland;
302 NA= not available. Hussey, 2010(a)= cases reported by occupational physicians; Hussey, 2010(b)= cases reported by general practitioners.
303 Hussey, 2013(a)= cases reported by general practitioners; Hussey, 2013(b)= cases reported by clinical specialists.
304

305 **Reporting by type of disease**

306 Occupational-related skin disease was the most reported condition in Europe (18 studies),
307 followed by respiratory diseases (13 studies), cancer (11 studies), musculoskeletal disorders (6
308 studies), asthma (6 studies), infectious diseases (4 studies), mental illnesses (4 studies), hearing
309 damage/loss (4 studies), and asbestoses (4 studies). Common occupational diseases reported
310 by countries in the European region (UK, Poland, and Finland) included allergic contact
311 dermatitis, irritant contact dermatitis, and contact urticaria as occupational diseases. However,
312 in other regions (Asia, Africa, and Australia), skin diseases were less likely to be studied
313 compared with other types of occupational diseases including musculoskeletal disorders,
314 infectious diseases, and cancer.

315
316 Occupational cancer was the second top disease commonly reported in Europe and Asia. The
317 following diagnoses were mostly reported in Europe: skin cancer (4 studies), mesothelioma (3
318 studies), sinonasal adenocarcinoma (2 studies), and laryngeal cancer (1 study). Many
319 occupational cancers reported in Asia were mesothelioma (South Korean studies), followed by
320 leukemia, and lung cancer (Chinese study).

321
322 The average number of reported cases of musculoskeletal disorders was highest in Europe and
323 Asia. Lower back pain was the most frequently reported diagnosis across all musculoskeletal
324 disorders in these two regions. Infectious diseases were also reported in Europe, Asia, and

325 Africa, and were commonly found among healthcare workers. The types of infectious diseases
 326 reported among the general working population were diarrheal, scabies, and tuberculosis, while
 327 hepatitis B and hepatitis C were frequently found in healthcare workers. Table 2 presents the
 328 most reported occupational diseases in the general working population classified by region.
 329 We included only studies that reported the number of cases of occupational disease in the
 330 general working population.

331

332 **Table 2. Most studied occupational diseases by region**

Region	Type of occupational disease	n of studies	n of years covered	Average n of annual cases (min-max)
Europe	Skin diseases	13	6.7 (1-14)	1,268 (290 – 2,095)
	Respiratory diseases	6	4.6 (1-19)	1,580 (598 – 3,217)
	Cancer	11	14.2 (3-36)	160 (4 - 754)
	Musculoskeletal disorders	5	5.6 (2-12)	1,653 (124 - 4,686)
	Asthma	5	6.6 (3-10)	335 (97 – 545)
	Infectious diseases	1	4	1,402
	Mental illnesses	3	6.2 (3-14)	2,788 (526 - 4,709)
	Hearing damage/loss	2	6 (3-9)	350 (244 – 540)
	Asbestoses	3	23 (20-30)	58 (6 – 103)
Asia	Musculoskeletal disorders	3	13.3 (1-25)	4,537 (534-9,925)
	Cancer	3	16 (10-23)	47 (28 - 75)
	Infectious diseases	1	20	145
	Asthma	2	9.7 (6-15)	30 (14-39)
	Poisonings	2	6.3 (1.6-11)	645 (60-1,194)

	Asbestoses	1	10	7,736
	Skin diseases	1	1.6	68
Northern America	Skin diseases	1	1	4,289
	Poisonings	1	11	4,932
Latin America	Skin diseases	1	6	505
Africa	Asthma	1	2	113
	Respiratory diseases	1	2	1,530
	Tuberculosis	1	9	10
Australia	Cancer	2	14 (7-20)	182 (81-284)

333 Note: n of studies defined as number of studies reported that particular occupational disease in the region; n of years covered defined as the
334 average number of years of data collection from all studies; average n of annual cases defined as the average number of cases reported per
335 year, calculated by averaging the total number of cases divided by the number of years of each study. One study might investigate more than
336 one occupational disease and appear more than once in this table. Studies that reported other outcomes, e.g., incident rate, change of incident
337 rate, are not included in the table.

338

339 **Reporting of occupational diseases by industrial sector**

340 In our findings, most reports were from health sector, agricultural, construction, mining and
341 quarrying. Studies in the health sector were dominated by infectious diseases (n=7),
342 particularly tuberculosis, hepatitis, and scabies. Three of the seven studies on infectious
343 diseases among healthcare workers were conducted in Germany, one in South Korea, one in
344 South Africa, one in the Czech Republic, and one in Great Britain. One study reported on work-
345 related mental illnesses among healthcare workers. Nurses had a higher number of cases of
346 work-related mental illness compared to doctors. The only study that reported skin disease in
347 healthcare workers was conducted in the Czech Republic. Allergic contact dermatitis, irritant
348 contact dermatitis, and contact urticaria were the most frequently reported cases in the
349 healthcare sector.

350

351 In the agricultural sector, we found only two studies: one analysed occupational dermatoses,
352 and the other discussed non-melanoma skin cancers and actinic keratoses. The construction
353 sector had only one study that reported on occupational cancer (i.e. malignant mesothelioma).
354 Musculoskeletal disorders and hearing damage were reported among workers in the mining
355 sector, while skin disease, asthma, and respiratory diseases were reported in the manufacturing
356 sector. Table 3 presents commonly reported occupational diseases across the different
357 industries.

358

359 **Table 3. Most reported occupational diseases by industrial sector**

Industrial sector	Type of occupational disease	n of studies	n of years covered	Average n of annual cases (min-max)
Health	Infectious disease	3	8.7 (5-14)	80 (8 – 187)
	Tuberculosis	4	9 (5-16)	99 (12-291)
	Mental illnesses	1	4	239 (136-375)*
	Skin disease	1	13	42
Agriculture	Skin disease	1	8	13
	Cancer	1	6	34
Construction	Skin disease	1	10	28
	Asthma	1	1	1,031
	Respiratory disease	2	4 (1-10)	245 (4-414)
	Cancer	2	20 (13-26)	571 (480-661)
Mining and quarrying	Musculoskeletal disorder	1	12	123
	Respiratory disease	1	10	6,183
	Poisoning	1	10	295

360 Note: In this table, we included studies which focused on a specific industrial sector and reported the number of occupational disease cases.
361 Some studies investigated more than one type of occupational disease. Average number of cases per year is estimated by the total number of
362 cases per year divided by total number of studies. *The cases were reported by general practitioners, psychiatrists, and occupational physicians.
363

364 **Underreporting of occupational diseases**

365 Only two studies investigated the underreporting of occupational diseases at the country level.
366 Both studies estimated a high underreporting rate of between 50% to 95%. One of the two
367 studies (Moreno-Torres 2018) reported the underreporting of all types of occupational diseases,
368 while Skov (1990) estimated the underreporting of occupational-related cancer among the
369 general working population (Table 4).

370

371 **Table 4. Underreporting of occupational diseases**

Author, year	Reported period (year)	Country	Type of disease	n cases reported	n of cases not reported	Underreporting rate (%)
Skov, 1990	1983-1987	Denmark	Cancer	78	178	50
Moreno-Torres, 2018	2000-2015	Mexico	All	NA	NA	89 (82-95)

372

373

374 **Factors affecting the underreporting of occupational diseases**

375 We reviewed seven studies that investigated the underreporting of occupational diseases.
376 Among these studies, one involved in-depth interviews with employees, another was an audit
377 study of employers, and the remaining five were structured surveys targeting of different
378 respondents including physicians, workers, and government representatives. A common theme
379 across all studies was a concern among workers about the possible negative consequences
380 related to job security when reporting occupational diseases. Alaguney et al (24) specifically

381 highlighted this concern among subcontracted workers and those employed without a legal
 382 contract. Additionally, limited knowledge of the causal relationship between workplace risks
 383 and diseases, as well as lack of awareness of the reporting systems, emerged as key factors
 384 influencing the underreporting of occupational diseases (Table 5).

385

386 **Table 5. Factors contributing to the underreporting of occupational diseases**

Author, year	Country	Type of OD	Method	Type of respondents	Contributing factors
Arnaud, 2010	France	All	Telephone study	Physicians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulties in diagnosing ODs • Lack of knowledge of the reporting system • Perceived difficulties in the process of making a claim • Concerns about employee job security
Parhar, 2011	Canada	Asthma	Postal survey	Pulmonologists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of knowledge of the reporting system • Concerns about employee job security
Lysdal, 2011	Denmark	Hand eczema	Postal survey	Hairdressers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaware of workplace risks and disease causation • Perceived difficulties in the claiming process • Lack of knowledge of the reporting system
Moldova, 2017	16 Eastern	All	Online survey	Official national representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employer's perceived as loss of revenue

	European countries				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about employee’s job security • Improper monitoring by the authorities
Fagan, 2017	US	All	Inspections	Employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of supervision and training of the onsite medical unit • No clear structure and policies governing the onsite medical unit
Alaguney, 2020	Turkey	All	Online survey	Physicians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employer’s perceived as loss of revenue • Concerns about employee’s job security, in particular, those working as subcontractor and those without a legal contract
Cheng, 2022	Taiwan	Asbestos-related diseases	In-depth interviews	Employees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unaware of workplace risks and disease causation • Perceived difficulties in the claiming process • Lack of knowledge of the reporting system • Concerns about employee’s job security

387

388

389 Discussion

390 This systematic review aimed to estimate the global reporting and underreporting of
 391 occupational diseases and to identify factors that influence underreporting. The review
 392 included 121 eligible studies, predominantly from high-income countries, with only two

393 articles from upper-middle-income countries, and none from lower-middle- and low-income
394 countries, illustrating the wide gap between high and low/middle-income countries in
395 occupational health research. Europe contributed the highest number of publications in
396 occupational health research; a trend that could be linked to the continent's high level of
397 industrialization. Historically, the first Industrial Revolution began in the United Kingdom in
398 the 18th century and later spread to other countries (25). This rapid industrialization not only
399 changed the way businesses operate but also raised issues related to occupational health and
400 safety, prompting more industrialized countries to establish laws and regulations to improve
401 working conditions (25).

402

403 Despite these advances in high- and upper-middle-income countries, occupational health and
404 safety have remained a lower-priority subject in LMICs compared to other health issues such
405 as infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases, and malnutrition. Our study found the UK
406 to be the most active in contributing to the global evidence on occupational diseases, whereas
407 none of the LMICs included in this review reported the number of occupational disease cases.
408 What was most striking was the limited number of publications from China; despite being the
409 world's top manufacturing hub (26), we found only two articles on the topic published in
410 Chinese language, with none in English. A previous study identified only six studies on
411 occupational health conducted in LMIC between 1928 and 2019 (27). A key challenge for
412 many LMIC, aside from the gradual rise in industrialization, concerns data quality,
413 completeness, utilization, and limited supporting health information infrastructure (28, 29).
414 Despite having information systems in place, data in many LMICs are frequently reported
415 without accompanying policies or regulations that facilitate data sharing and communication
416 between stakeholders (30). Without a proper system for data collection and interoperability,
417 understanding the extent of occupational disease problems in these countries is difficult.

418

419 The working population in LMICs is larger than that of high-income countries (HICs) (31).
420 The United Nations World Population Prospects predicts that by 2030, the largest increases in
421 population will be in LMICs, while populations in HICs will remain relatively stagnant (32).
422 Most of the population in LMICs will be in the productive age group, in contrast to the aging
423 population in HICs. This demographic trend coupled with the growing industrialization in
424 some LMICs, particularly China, necessitates the establishment of national surveillance
425 systems to prevent and monitor occupational diseases. These systems would require significant
426 investment in funding and human resources (33). They would also require strong political
427 support to make occupational health and safety one of the priority health concerns in LMICs
428 (34). To date, fewer LMICs compared to HICs, have ratified the 2002 Protocol to the
429 Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155), which was developed by the
430 International Labour Organization (ILO) (35).

431

432 Occupational disease data can be sourced from national registries, physician reports,
433 employers, employees, and workers' compensation claims. Our findings revealed that many
434 European studies were based on physician reports and/or national registries while in Asia the
435 studies relied more on data from worker compensation claims, and less on physician reports.
436 Reporting of occupational disease is often hindered by a lack of knowledge about workplace
437 risks and their causal relationship with diseases. Many employees have a low awareness of
438 occupational hazards and their health implications (15, 36). Utilizing information collected by
439 physicians could serve as an effective surveillance system, as physicians are better equipped to
440 recognize occupational diseases compared to employers or employees. As our results
441 demonstrate, the UK has an active surveillance system that utilizes reports from general
442 practitioners, occupational physicians, and other medical specialists (rheumatologists,

443 pneumologists, audiologists, and infectious disease specialists). However, not all physicians
444 can easily diagnose occupational diseases due to factors because they had limited training in
445 diagnosing occupational diseases, they might give low priority in recording occupational
446 diseases, or they did not have enough time to identify the occupational hazards in the workplace
447 (37, 38).

448

449 Workers face various hazardous risks at their workplace, including exposure to chemical
450 substances, physical hazards, infections, noise, ergonomic stressors, and work stress. In the
451 health sector, we found that biological and psychosocial hazards dominated. This result aligns
452 with the findings of other studies showing that infectious diseases and mental illnesses are the
453 most frequently reported occupational diseases in the health sector (39). Tuberculosis, hepatitis
454 B, and hepatitis C are the most common health concerns among healthcare workers, consistent
455 with previous studies (40-43). In the agricultural sector, workers are exposed to physical,
456 ergonomic, biological, and chemical hazards. They are at risk of developing musculoskeletal
457 disorders, cancer, and dermatitis, as evident from our findings. In terms of the type of diseases
458 according to the region, our study found that non-communicable diseases are the occupational
459 diseases commonly found in America and European countries while in the African region,
460 respiratory and infectious diseases are the most common. These findings align with the regional
461 epidemiology: in America and Europe, where more than 70% of the disease burden is non-
462 communicable, whereas in Africa only 30% is non-communicable (44).

463

464

465 **Strengths and limitations**

466 Data sources were varied and provided little information on the coverage of the working
467 population. There was significant heterogeneity in the methodologies used, particularly in

468 terms of the reporting systems, type of occupational diseases, and specific working population,
469 which restricted our ability to combine data. Consequently, a pooled prevalence of reporting
470 and underreporting of occupational diseases could not be generated using meta-analysis. We
471 included grey literatures, but non-English publications were not included in the analysis.
472 Excluding non-English publications might have little impact on the conclusions(45, 46).
473 Nevertheless, few studies have evaluated the reporting and underreporting trends of
474 occupational diseases using country-level data. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first
475 systematic review summarising the global evidence on the reporting of occupational diseases.
476

477 **Conclusions**

478 The evidence indicates a significant gap between high-income countries and LMICs in
479 occupational health research. Occupational diseases are primarily reported in highly developed
480 countries with established national reporting systems. Despite having a larger share of the
481 global working population, LMICs lack evidence on occupational diseases, making it difficult
482 to assess the magnitude of the occupational disease problem. Reporting mechanisms vary
483 substantially with different countries relying on different data sources including worker
484 compensation claims, disease registries, and physician reports. Our findings encourage
485 policymakers, particularly in LMICs, to establish health information infrastructures for
486 occupational disease reporting that enable data sharing and interoperability between
487 stakeholders, including employers, employees, and physicians. Additionally, raising awareness
488 about occupational hazards and improving knowledge about occupational disease reporting are
489 crucial. LMICs would benefit from providing training to employers, employees, and healthcare
490 workers as part of any national awareness campaign.

491

492 **Acknowledgements**

493 The authors would like to acknowledge University of New South Wales (UNSW) library for
494 providing methodological guidance and access to scientific journals.

495

496

497

498

499 References

500

- 501 1. WHO/ILO. WHO/ILO joint estimates of the work-related burden of disease and injury,
502 2000-2016: global monitoring report. Geneva: World Health Organization and International
503 Labour Organization; 2021.
- 504 2. WHO. WHO Global Plan of Action on Workers' Health (2008-2017): Baseline for
505 Implementation. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2013.
- 506 3. Difficulties of recording and notification of accidents and diseases in developing
507 countries [press release]. 2019.
- 508 4. Organization IL. Challenges for the collection of reliable OSH data 2017 [cited 2022
509 21 November]. Available from: [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---
510 protrav/---safework/documents/publication/wcms_546702.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---safework/documents/publication/wcms_546702.pdf).
- 511 5. Bonnet FV, Joann; Chen, Martha. Women and men in the informal economy: a
512 statistical brief. Manchester; 2019.
- 513 6. Boschman JS, Brand T, Frings-Dresen MHW, van der Molen HF. Improving the
514 assessment of occupational diseases by occupational physicians. *Occupational Medicine*.
515 2016;67(1):13-9.
- 516 7. Verbeek J. When Work is Related to Disease, What Establishes Evidence for a Causal
517 Relation? *Saf Health Work*. 2012;3(2):110-6.
- 518 8. Rushton L. The Global Burden of Occupational Disease. *Curr Environ Health Rep*.
519 2017;4(3):340-8.
- 520 9. Parhar A, Lemiere C, Beach JR. Barriers to the recognition and reporting of
521 occupational asthma by Canadian pulmonologists. *Can Respir J*. 2011;18(2):90-6.
- 522 10. Spreeuwers D, de Boer AGEM, Verbeek JHAM, van Beurden MM, van Dijk FJH.
523 Diagnosing and reporting of occupational diseases: a quality improvement study. *Occupational
524 Medicine*. 2008;58(2):115-21.
- 525 11. Cegolon L, Lange JH, Mastrangelo G. The Primary Care Practitioner and the diagnosis
526 of occupational diseases. *BMC Public Health*. 2010;10(1):405.
- 527 12. Yamaguchi N, Tazaki H, Okubo T, Toyama T. Periodic urine cytology surveillance of
528 bladder tumor incidence in dyestuff workers. *Am J Ind Med*. 1982;3(2):139-48.
- 529 13. Khoe LC, Mansyur M, Wiseman V, Asante A. What explains the provision of health
530 insurance by Indonesian employers? A trend analysis of the National Labour Force Survey
531 2018-2022. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2024;39(7):741-52.
- 532 14. Wu Y, Schwebel DC, Hu G. Disparities in Unintentional Occupational Injury Mortality
533 between High-Income Countries and Low- and Middle-Income Countries: 1990-2016. *Int J
534 Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(10).
- 535 15. Pilusa ML, Mogotlane MS. Worker knowledge of occupational legislation and related
536 health and safety benefits. *Curationis*. 2018;41(1):e1-e6.
- 537 16. Rappin CL, Wuellner SE, Bonauto DK. Employer reasons for failing to report eligible
538 workers' compensation claims in the BLS survey of occupational injuries and illnesses.
539 *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*. 2016;59(5):343-56.
- 540 17. Green DR, Gerberich SG, Kim H, Ryan AD, McGovern PM, Church TR, et al.
541 Knowledge of work-related injury reporting and perceived barriers among janitors. *Journal of
542 Safety Research*. 2019;69:1-10.
- 543 18. Boadu EF WC, Sunindijo RY. Challenges for occupational health and safety
544 enforcement in the construction industry in Ghana. *Construction Economics and Building*.
545 2021;21(1):1-21.

- 546 19. Atusingwize E, Musinguzi G, Ndejjo R, Buregyeya E, Kayongo B, Mubeezi R, et al.
547 Occupational safety and health regulations and implementation challenges in Uganda. Arch
548 Environ Occup Health. 2019;74(1-2):58-65.
- 549 20. Joshi TK, Bhuvu UB, Katoch P. Asbestos ban in India: challenges ahead. Ann N Y
550 Acad Sci. 2006;1076:292-308.
- 551 21. Rosenstock L CM, Fingerhut M. Occupational Health. In: Jamison DT BJ, Measham
552 AR, et al, editor. Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries. New York: The World
553 Bank & Oxford University Press; 2006.
- 554 22. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, et al. The Mixed
555 Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers.
556 Education for Information. 2018;34:285-91.
- 557 23. Bank TW. World Bank Country and Lending Groups 2021 [Available from:
558 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
559 [lending-groups](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)].
- 560 24. Alaguney ME YA, Demir AU, Ergor OA. Physicians' opinions about the causes of
561 underreporting of occupational diseases. Archives of Environmental & Occupational Health.
562 2020;75(3):165-76.
- 563 25. Freeman C, Louçã F, Freeman C, Louçã F. 153The British Industrial Revolution: The
564 Age of Cotton, Iron, and Water Power. As Time Goes By: From the Industrial Revolutions to
565 the Information Revolution: Oxford University Press; 2002. p. 0.
- 566 26. R B. China is the world's sole manufacturing superpower: A line sketch of the rise 2024
567 [updated 17 Jan 2024. Available from: [https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/china-worlds-sole-](https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/china-worlds-sole-manufacturing-superpower-line-sketch-rise)
568 [manufacturing-superpower-line-sketch-rise](https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/china-worlds-sole-manufacturing-superpower-line-sketch-rise)].
- 569 27. Courtice MN OA, Cherrie JW. Less Economically Developed Countries Need Help to
570 Create Healthy Workplaces. Frontiers in Public Health. 2019;7.
- 571 28. Hoxha K, Hung YW, Irwin BR, Grépin KA. Understanding the challenges associated
572 with the use of data from routine health information systems in low- and middle-income
573 countries: A systematic review. Health Information Management Journal. 2022;51(3):135-48.
- 574 29. Abdul-Rahman T, Ghosh S, Lukman L, Bamigbade GB, Oladipo OV, Amarachi OR,
575 et al. Inaccessibility and low maintenance of medical data archive in low-middle income
576 countries: Mystery behind public health statistics and measures. Journal of Infection and Public
577 Health. 2023;16(10):1556-61.
- 578 30. O'Neil S, Taylor S, Sivasankaran A. Data Equity to Advance Health and Health Equity
579 in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review. DIGITAL HEALTH.
580 2021;7:20552076211061922.
- 581 31. King EM, Randolph HL, Floro MS, Suh J. Demographic, health, and economic
582 transitions and the future care burden. World Dev. 2021;140:105371.
- 583 32. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs PD. World Population
584 Prospects 2022: Summary of Results United Nations; 2022.
- 585 33. Witter S, Hamza MM, Alazemi N, Alluhidan M, Alghaith T, Herbst CH. Human
586 resources for health interventions in high- and middle-income countries: findings of an
587 evidence review. Human Resources for Health. 2020;18(1):43.
- 588 34. Mills A. Health Care Systems in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. New England
589 Journal of Medicine. 2014;370(6):552-7.
- 590 35. Protocol of 2002 to the Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981, (2002).
- 591 36. Geleta DH, Alemayehu M, Asrade G, Mekonnen TH. Low levels of knowledge and
592 practice of occupational hazards among flower farm workers in southwest Shewa zone,
593 Ethiopia: a cross-sectional analysis. BMC Public Health. 2021;21(1):232.
- 594 37. Gök AS, Yilmaz TE, Kasim İ, Şencan İ, Özkara A. Occupational Health and Disease
595 Knowledge and Practices of Family Physicians. J Occup Environ Med. 2020;62(11):e625-e9.

- 596 38. Holness DL, Kudla I, Brown J, Miller S. Awareness of occupational skin disease in the
597 service sector. *Occupational Medicine*. 2016;67(4):256-9.
- 598 39. Vecchio D, Sasco AJ, Cann CI. Occupational risk in health care and research. *Am J Ind*
599 *Med*. 2003;43(4):369-97.
- 600 40. Mohanty A, Kabi A, Mohanty AP. Health problems in healthcare workers: A review. *J*
601 *Family Med Prim Care*. 2019;8(8):2568-72.
- 602 41. O'Hara LM, Yassi A, Zungu M, Malotle M, Bryce EA, Barker SJ, et al. The neglected
603 burden of tuberculosis disease among health workers: a decade-long cohort study in South
604 Africa. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2017;17(1):547.
- 605 42. Kacem M, Dhouib W, Bennasrallah C, Zemni I, Abroug H, Ben Fredj M, et al.
606 Occupational exposure to hepatitis C virus infection and associated factors among healthcare
607 workers in Fattouma Bourguiba University Hospital, Tunisia. *PLoS One*.
608 2022;17(9):e0274609.
- 609 43. Westermann C, Peters C, Lisiak B, Lamberti M, Nienhaus A. The prevalence of
610 hepatitis C among healthcare workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Occupational*
611 *and Environmental Medicine*. 2015;72(12):880.
- 612 44. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi M, Abbasifard M, et al. Global burden
613 of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic
614 analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10258):1204-22.
- 615 45. Dobrescu AI, Nussbaumer-Streit B, Klerings I, Wagner G, Persad E, Sommer I, et al.
616 Restricting evidence syntheses of interventions to English-language publications is a viable
617 methodological shortcut for most medical topics: a systematic review. *Journal of Clinical*
618 *Epidemiology*. 2021;137:209-17.
- 619 46. Nussbaumer-Streit B, Klerings I, Dobrescu AI, Persad E, Stevens A, Garritty C, et al.
620 Excluding non-English publications from evidence-syntheses did not change conclusions: a
621 meta-epidemiological study. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2020;118:42-54.
- 622

623 **Supporting Information**

624 **S1 Appendix. Search strategies for electronic databases**

625 **S2 Appendix. Characteristics of included studies**

626 **S3 Appendix. Fig 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study selection**

627 **S4 Appendix. Fig 2. Number of studies in each category based on study objectives, type**
628 **of occupational diseases and industrial sector**

629 **S5 Appendix. Risk of bias assessment of quantitative descriptive studies using Mixed**
630 **Method Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018**

631 **S6 Appendix. Risk of bias assessment of quantitative non-randomized studies using**
632 **Mixed Method Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018**

- 633 **S7Appendix. Risk of bias assessment of qualitative studies using Mixed Method**
634 **Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018**
- 635 **S8 Appendix. Table 1. Number of cases and incidence rate of occupational diseases**
- 636 **S9 Appendix. Table 2. Most studied occupational diseases by region**
- 637 **S10 Appendix. Table 3. Most reported occupational diseases by industrial sector**
- 638 **S11 Appendix. Table 4. Underreporting of occupational diseases**
- 639 **S12 Appendix. Table 5. Factors contributing to the underreporting of occupational**
640 **diseases**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24314032>; this version posted September 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Fig 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study selection




Fig 2. Number of studies in each category based on study objectives, type of occupational diseases and industrial sector