

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<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Siti Rizny Fitriana Saldi<sup>3¶</sup>, Marsen Isbayuputra<sup>2¶</sup>, Muchtaruddin Mansyur<sup>2&</sup>,  
Virginia Wiseman<sup>4&</sup>, Augustine Asante<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Population Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Community Medicine, University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

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

<sup>4</sup>Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

\*Corresponding author:

Email: [l.khoe@unsw.edu.au](mailto:l.khoe@unsw.edu.au) / [levina.chandra01@ui.ac.id](mailto: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>				
<b>Cherry, 2000</b>	1996-1999	UK	10,941	42
<b>Chen, 2005(a)</b>	2002-2003	Scotland	2,022	86
<b>Chen, 2005(b)</b>	2002-2003	UK, except Scotland	21,120	84
<b>Hussey, 2008</b>	2006-2007	UK	1,436	NA
<b>Hussey, 2010(a)</b>	2006-2007	UK	1,436	NA
<b>Hussey, 2010(b)</b>	2006-2007	UK	1,680	NA
<b>van der Molen, 2012</b>	2009-2013	Netherlands	1,782	346 (330-362)
<b>Hussey, 2013(a)</b>	2006-2009	UK	1,171	1,387
<b>Hussey, 2013(b)</b>	2006-2009	UK	7,759	131

<b>Carder, 2014</b>	2005-2007	GB	8,349	301
	2008-2010	GB	5,566	336
<b>Money, 2015</b>	2007-2012	GB	4,901	NA
		NI	557	NA
		ROI	161	NA
<b><i>Data type: National Registry</i></b>				
<b>Shih, 2003</b>	2008-2021	Taiwan	2,038 (1,233- 2,791)	NA
<b>Szeszenia-Dąbrowska, 2006</b>	2005	Poland	3,249	35
<b>Vainauskas, 2010</b>	1999-2008	Lithuania	928 (570-1,447)	64 (41-97)
<b>Szeszenia-Dąbrowska, 2013</b>	1998-2011	Poland	5,035 (2,562- 12,017)	50 (25-117)
<b>Oksa, 2019</b>	1975, 2005, 2013	Finland	NA	253 (200-310)*
<b><i>Data type: workers' compensation claims</i></b>				
<b>Kraut, 1994</b>	1989	Canada	37,927	28.2
<b>Shih, 2003</b>	2008-2021	Taiwan	752 (426-1,149)	NA
<b>Kourouklis, 2009</b>	2003-2007	Greece	34	1.7
<b><i>All type of occupational diseases in a specific sector</i></b>				
<b><i>Agriculture sector</i></b>				
<b>Stocks, 2010</b>	2002-2008	UK	33 (19-46)	NA
<b>Karttunen, 2013</b>	1982-2008	Finland	352	NA
<b>Szeszenia-Dąbrowska, 2016</b>	2000-2014	Poland	229 (141-340)	12.8 (5-14.6)
<b>van der Molen, 2020</b>	2004-2017	Italy	6431	1295
<b>Samant, 2020</b>	2007-2016	Norway	47 (26-66)	114 (68-169)
<b><i>Health sector</i></b>				
<b>Walsh, 2005</b>	2002-2003	UK	5508	NA
<b>Zhou, 2017</b>	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)
<b>Europe</b>	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)
<b>Asia</b>	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
<b>Northern America</b>	Skin diseases	1	1	4,289
	Poisonings	1	11	4,932
<b>Latin America</b>	Skin diseases	1	6	505
<b>Africa</b>	Asthma	1	2	113
	Respiratory diseases	1	2	1,530
	Tuberculosis	1	9	10
<b>Australia</b>	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**

<b>Industrial sector</b>	<b>Type of occupational disease</b>	<b>n of studies</b>	<b>n of years covered</b>	<b>Average n of annual cases (min-max)</b>
<b>Health</b>	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
<b>Agriculture</b>	Skin disease	1	8	13
	Cancer	1	6	34
<b>Construction</b>	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)
<b>Mining and quarrying</b>	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**

<b>Author, year</b>	<b>Reported period (year)</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Type of disease</b>	<b>n cases reported</b>	<b>n of cases not reported</b>	<b>Underreporting rate (%)</b>
<b>Skov, 1990</b>	1983-1987	Denmark	Cancer	78	178	50
<b>Moreno-Torres, 2018</b>	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
<b>Arnaud, 2010</b>	France	All	Telephone study	Physicians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulties in diagnosing ODs</li> <li>• Lack of knowledge of the reporting system</li> <li>• Perceived difficulties in the process of making a claim</li> <li>• Concerns about employee job security</li> </ul>
<b>Parhar, 2011</b>	Canada	Asthma	Postal survey	Pulmonologists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of knowledge of the reporting system</li> <li>• Concerns about employee job security</li> </ul>
<b>Lysdal, 2011</b>	Denmark	Hand eczema	Postal survey	Hairdressers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unaware of workplace risks and disease causation</li> <li>• Perceived difficulties in the claiming process</li> <li>• Lack of knowledge of the reporting system</li> </ul>
<b>Moldova, 2017</b>	16 Eastern	All	Online survey	Official national representatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employer’s perceived as loss of revenue</li> </ul>

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

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 18<sup>th</sup> 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, Yılmaz 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**