

1 **TITLE**

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

4

5 **AUTHORS**

6 Vanessa R. Coffman, Ph.D.¹

7 Devon J. Hall²

8 Nora Pisanic, Ph.D.³

9 David C. Love, Ph.D.^{3,4}

10 Maya Nadimpalli, Ph.D.^{5,6}

11 Meredith McCormack, MD^{3,7,8}

12 Marie Diener-West, Ph.D.⁸⁻¹³

13 Meghan F. Davis, Ph.D.^{3,4,7}

14 Christopher D. Heaney, Ph.D.^{3,4,8,10,14-16}

15

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

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

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

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

24 ⁵Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tufts University, Medford,
25 Massachusetts, USA

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

28 ⁷School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

29 ⁸Johns Hopkins Center for Global Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

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

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

34 ¹¹Johns Hopkins School of Nursing, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

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

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

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

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

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

47

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

51

52 **COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS**

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

54

55 **FUNDING**

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

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

72

73 **KEY WORDS**

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

76 **ABSTRACT**

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

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

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

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

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

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

101 **INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

156

157 **METHODS**

158 **Study population**

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

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

170

171 **Study location**

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

178

179 **Questionnaires**

180 *Baseline*

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

189

190 *Follow-up*

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

202

203 **Statistical analyses**

204 *Baseline*

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

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

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

219

220 *Follow-up*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

277

278 **RESULTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

352

353 **DISCUSSION**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

414

415 *Limitations*

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

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

432

433 *Strengths*

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

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

445

446 *Conclusions*

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

459 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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

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

466 **REFERENCES**

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

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

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

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

471

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

473

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

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

476 2020.

477

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

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

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

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

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

483

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

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

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

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

488

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

512

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

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

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

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

517

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

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

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

521

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

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

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

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

526

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

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

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

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

531

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

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

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

536

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

541

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

546

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

551

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

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

554 Accessed: July 1, 2020.

555

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

579

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

584

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

589

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

594

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

598

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

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

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

604

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

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

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

608

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

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

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

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

613

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

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

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

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

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

619

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

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

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

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

624

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

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

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

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

646

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

667 **TABLES**

668

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

671

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

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

672
 673

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

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

677

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

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

681 Note.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

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



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