Published in final edited form as:

Am J Ind Med. 2015 November ; 58(11): 1217–1228. doi:10.1002/ajim.22447.

Wheezing in Tobacco Farm Workers in Southern Brazil

Nadia Spada Fiori, MD, MSc^{1,2,*}, Anaclaudia Gastal Fassa, MD, PhD¹, Neice Muller Xavier Faria, MD, PhD³, Rodrigo Dalke Meucci, MSc¹, Vanessa Iribarrem Miranda, MSc¹, and David C. Christiani, MD, MPH, MS⁴

¹Social Medicine Department, Postgraduate Program in Epidemiology, Federal University of Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil

²Takemi Program in International Health, Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts

³Municipal Health Department of Bento Gonçalves, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil

⁴Department of Environmental Health, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts

Abstract

Background—Tobacco workers are exposed to several respiratory occupational sensitizers.

Methods—A representative cross-sectional study was carried out on 2469 tobacco family farming growers. Gender-stratified multivariate analyses evaluated the association between wheezing and socio-demographic, behavioral and occupational variables.

Results—Wheezing prevalence was 11.0% with no difference between genders. Among men, age, smoking, strenuous work, pesticide use, contact with vegetable dust and dried tobacco dust, lifting sticks with tobacco leaves to the curing barns and green tobacco sickness (GTS) were risk factors for wheezing. Among women, family history of asthma, tying hands of tobacco, strenuous work, contact with chemical disinfectants and GTS were positively associated with wheezing. Harvesting lower tobacco leaves was a protective factor for the outcome in both genders.

Conclusions—Pesticides, dusts exposure and GTS were risk factors for wheezing. The synergic effect of these factors needs to be better evaluated to improve prevention.

MeSH terms

wheezing; asthma; tobacco; occupational diseases; rural health; prevalence

*Correspondence to: Nadia Spada Fiori, MD, Social Medicine Department, Federal University of Pelotas, Avenida Duque de Caxias, 250-38andar Pelotas, RS CEP: 96030-000, Brazil. nsfiori@yahoo.com.br/nsfiori@gmail.com.

CONTRIBUTORS

All authors of this research paper participated directly in the planning, execution, or analysis of the study, and they all have read and approved the final version submitted.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors report no conflicts of interests.

ETHICS APPROVAL

Federal University of Pelotas Research Ethics Committee.

INTRODUCTION

Tobacco production is estimated to involve more than 30 million farm workers in more than 100 countries worldwide. China, Brazil, India, the United States, Malawi and Indonesia account for 2/3 of global production [Schmitt et al., 2007].

Work-Related Asthma has become one of the most common types of adult-onset asthma in industrialized countries, accounting for 25% or more of cases [Dykewicz, 2009]. It is classified into two types, sensitizer-induced asthma (whether measured or not by Immunoglobulin E) and irritant-induced asthma [de Nijs et al., 2013]. Irritant agents can also exacerbate pre-existing asthma (work-exacerbated asthma). Occupational sensitizers are estimated to cause one in every ten cases of asthma in adults of working age and more than 300 substances have already been associated with work-related asthma [GINA, 1993].

There are few studies evaluating the occurrence of respiratory diseases and symptoms among tobacco workers. Most studies are case-control conducted with workers in tobacco processing factories. Large studies of agricultural workers or studies of family farming in tobacco plantations have not been conducted. The literature shows a high concentration of dust and the presence of bacteria and fungus in tobacco processing environments [Chloros et al., 2004; Mustajbegovic et al., 2003; Reiman et al., 2000; Zhang et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2009] as well as lung function deterioration as cumulative exposure to dust increases [Zhang et al., 2009], chronic bronchitis (20.6%), occupational asthma (6.2%) and respiratory symptoms (chronic cough 32.9% males and 28.3% females; chest tightness 20.0% males and 16.7% females) have been significantly reported by tobacco processing factory workers [Chloros et al., 2004; Mustajbegovic et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2005].

The tobacco leaf processing working environment can be very humid owing to the use of curing barns. Together with the high concentration of tobacco dust arising from storing the leaves in closed barns, this is conducive to the development of microbes, gram-negative bacteria and diverse kinds of fungi (mesophilic, thermotolerant, thermophilic actinomycetic, among others) [Reiman et al., 2000; Zhang et al., 2005].

Apart from the respiratory risk arising from contact with dust, microorganisms and pesticides, tobacco production gives rise to exposures that are peculiar to it, such as high nicotine absorption through the skin. The relationship between dermal absorption of nicotine and respiratory problems has not yet been described.

Brazil is currently the world's second largest tobacco producer. This activity is concentrated in the south of the country and is undertaken by more than 220,000 families. Despite the economic importance of tobacco growing and the involvement of a large number of family farmers, studies evaluating the occurrence of respiratory symptoms in this population were not found. The objective of this study is therefore to describe the prevalence of wheezing and to analyze associated factors among tobacco farmers in the municipality of São Lourenço do Sul, in the state of Rio Grande do Sul. This state accounts for more than 50% of Brazilian tobacco leaf production.

METHODS

A cross-sectional study was performed on a random sample of tobacco growers in the municipality of São Lourenço do Sul, state of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, during the 2011 harvest period (January to March).

A total of 1100 invoices issued by tobacco producers in 2009 were randomly selected. The issuing of invoices for tobacco sales is mandatory and this ensured that the sample of tobacco producers was representative. All individuals aged 18 or over working with tobacco for at least 15 hours a week and who had cultivated tobacco in 2010 were eligible to take part in the study. Invoices issued by individuals residing in other municipalities or in the urban area of São Lourenço do Sul, or who no longer cultivated tobacco were replaced by the next nearest tobacco producing property.

The sample size was calculated to allow wheezing prevalence of 11% to be estimated, with a margin of error of 1.5 percentage points. Estimated wheezing prevalence was 11%. The sample size was also calculated to estimate associations with risk ratios over 1.5 considering a 95% confidence level, 80% statistical power, 10% wheezing prevalence in the unexposed and an unexposed-exposed ratio of 1:4.

Two questionnaires were used in the study. The first questionnaire was administered to the person in charge of the farm property and collected information about the property, such as economic indicators, tobacco production, agricultural production, mechanization, vehicles and pesticides used on the property. The second questionnaire was administered to all the workers and sought to obtain information about sociodemographic factors (gender, age and schooling), family history of asthma, smoking, occupational exposures and comorbidities. A family history of asthma was determined by the occurrence of asthma in one or both parents, reported by the respondent. Smoking was categorized as non-smoker, smoker (one cigarette or more per day) and former smoker (stopped smoking a month or more ago).

Workers performed more than one activity during tobacco growing, as follows:

- Harvesting the leaves next to the ground (lower tobacco leaves).
- Lifting sticks with tobacco leaves to the curing barns was executed concomitantly with the organization of the sticks inside these barns. While some of the workers raise the sticks from the ground, others climb the scaffolding to take hold of the sticks and position them from the highest part of the curing barns.
- During tobacco classification, the leaves were separated in accordance with their size, color and texture that determine their commercial value.
- After classification, workers tied hands of tobacco leaves into small bundles. This is a repetitive activity that does not require physical effort and takes place inside sheds.

To characterize dust exposure, the respondents reported if they had contact, in the year prior to the survey, with:

- Dried tobacco leave dust
- Other vegetables dust, except tobacco dust (e.g: flowers pollen, corn straw, grain dust as cotton, soy and bean)
- Chemical dust, except pesticides (e.g: fertilizers dust, urea)
- Animal feed dust
- Mineral dust (e.g: ground/land dust, stone or rock powder, limestone, ashes)
- Animal dust (e.g: pens, animal hair, dry manure)
- Domestic dust (e.g: old things, moldy)

Cumulative exposure to pesticides was determined by the number of years of pesticide exposure in life and the monthly frequency of contact with these products.

Workers also reported whether they worked in smoky conditions, performed strenuous work (jobs that require great physical effort) and the number of months of intensive work during the year. Green tobacco sickness (GTS) was assessed as comorbidity and characterized by the number of episodes of sickness in the previous year (headache or dizziness together with nausea or vomiting, following contact with green tobacco leaves).

The outcome was wheezing in the year prior to the survey. This variable is a good predictor of active asthma and has been widely used by other studies [Douwes et al., 2007; GINA, 1993; Gomez et al., 2004; Hoppin et al., 2006; Smit et al., 2008]. The questions about respiratory symptoms were designed based on the questionnaire used in the Platino study [PLATINO, 2002].

The group of interviewers was trained and was comprised of people who lived in the region. The majority were community health agents and interviewers for the Brazilian Census, undertaken by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics. The interviews took place at the farm properties, using Personal Digital Assistants (PDA). An abridged version of the questionnaire was administered to 10% of the respondents for the purposes of quality control.

The data were analyzed by describing the variables using the Wald test for heterogeneity and linear trend with regard to the categorical variables, with stratification by gender. The crude and adjusted analyses were performed using Poisson regression with robust estimation of variance and backward selection. The multivariate analysis followed an hierarchical model which included sociodemographic, economic and family history of asthma variables on the first level; smoking on the second level; occupational variables (tasks performed in the last year) on the third level; workloads on the fourth level; and GTS on the fifth level. Variables having a p value of 0.2 were maintained in the model and those with a p value of <0.05 were considered to be associated.

This study was reviewed and approved by the Federal University of Pelotas Research Ethics Committee. The participants voluntarily signed a consent form and cases with health problems were referred for medical assessment free of charge.

RESULTS

Total sample size was 2626 tobacco growers from 912 farm properties. 5.9% of those selected were not located or refused to take part in the study, thus the final sample comprised 2469 workers.

Family members comprised the workforce predominantly, fewer than 5% of the sample were tenants or employees and 59.3% were male. The average number of workers per property was 2.7.

44.0% of the workers lived on properties producing between 5 and 10 tons of tobacco in the previous year, more than a third had been working with tobacco for at least 20 years and about 90.0% of males and 80.0% of females worked more than eight hours a day during the harvest season (Table I).

The majority of the tobacco workers, around 50% from both genders, were aged between 25 and 44. Males and females had a similar level of schooling of between 5 and 8 years (50.0% and 47.1%, respectively). Family history of asthma was reported by 7.6% of males and 8.8% of females. More than 30% of males were smokers, compared to 3.1% of females (Table I).

Tobacco leaf harvesting was undertaken by more than 90.0% of the workers of both genders. The majority of males (75.5%) undertook tasks requiring strenuous work, whilst the majority of females tied hands of tobacco leaves, classified the tobacco and lifted the sticks with tobacco leaves to be hung in the curing barns (86.6%, 86.3% and 73.1% respectively) (Table I).

Activities involving contact with pesticides were significantly different between the genders ($p<0.001$), with greater male exposure. Some 85.0% of males reported contact with pesticides in the previous year and 12.6% of them had had contact more than ten days a month in the period when pesticides are used intensively. 43.1% of males and 20.5% of females reported having been exposed to pesticides for more than 20 years (Table I).

There were significant differences between the genders ($p<0.001$) with regard to several types of dust. Females were more exposed to dry tobacco dust (57.8%) and mold dust (6.8%), whereas males were mostly exposed to vegetable dust (19.1%), chemical dust (36.3%), mineral dust (19.7%) and pesticides (17.7%). A higher number of females reported not working in smoky environments (81.4%). Reports of more than five episodes of GTS in the previous year were significantly more prevalent in females (5.5%) than in males (2.5 %).

There was no significant difference between the genders in the prevalence of wheezing in the previous year; it was reported by 11.0% of the population studied (Table II). However, the crude and adjusted analyses stratified by gender showed important differences with regard to factors associated with wheezing in the last year. Schooling and income (the amount of tobacco produced in the previous year) were not associated with the outcome in either gender. Adjusted analysis in males showed that age was associated with wheezing in the last year and males aged 55 or above had the greatest risk (1.71 RR, p -trend=0.022). Smokers showed greater risk of wheezing (1.53 RR, 95%CI 1.10–2.13). Among activities

involving tobacco, harvesting lower leaves was found to be inversely associated with wheezing (0.35 RR, p -trend=0.000), whilst lifting sticks with tobacco leaves to be hung in the curing barns was directly associated (1.48 RR, p -trend=0.024). Pesticide use was found to be associated with the occurrence of wheezing between males and those using pesticides for more than ten days a month were at the higher risk (2.71 RR, 95%CI 1.56–4.71). After adjustment, chemical dust and the number of days per year of intensive work lost statistical significance, whilst association remained in relation to vegetable dust (1.54 RR, p -trend 0.053), dried tobacco dust (1.59 RR, p -trend 0.039) and strenuous work (1.72 RR, 95%CI 1.14–2.61). The number of GTS episodes showed a direct association with wheezing and high relative risk for those who had had more than five episodes in the last year (3.12 RR, p -trend=0.000) (Table III).

The adjusted analysis in females maintained the majority of the results obtained in the crude analysis. Family history of asthma (2.02 RR, 95%CI 1.3–3.15) and sporadically tying hands of tobacco (3.89 RR, 95%CI 1.17–12.94) were positively associated with wheezing, whilst harvesting lower tobacco leaves was a protection factor (0.46 RR, p -trend=0.018). The longer the exposure time to pesticides, the greater the risk of wheezing, and those females with more than 30 years of exposure were at greater risk (RR2.32, p -trend=0.002). With regard to workloads, strenuous work (1.76 RR, 95%CI 1.22–2.54), working in smoky environments (1.86 RR, p -trend=0.061) and having contact with chemical disinfectants (1.54 RR, 95%CI 1.00–2.35) remained associated after adjustment. The number of GTS episodes in the last year was directly associated with wheezing and females with more than 5 episodes in the previous year had twice the risk of those who had not had any episodes. (2.29 RR, p -trend=0.005) (Table IV).

DISCUSSION

The prevalence of wheezing in the last year was similar between males and females (11%). Among males, age was directly associated with wheezing in the last year. Being a smoker, lifting sticks with tobacco leaves to be hung in the curing barns, monthly frequency of pesticide use and contact with dry tobacco leaf dust were risk factors for wheezing in the last year. Among females, family history of asthma, tying hands of tobacco, length of exposure to pesticides, working in smoky environments and having had contact with disinfectants in the last month were found to be positively associated with wheezing in the last year. In both genders the number of GTS episodes in the last year was directly associated with wheezing and strenuous work showed positive association, whilst harvesting lower tobacco leaves showed inverse association.

Although wheezing may be related to colds and other obstructive pulmonary diseases, authors mention that wheezing has a high diagnostic value, good sensitivity and specificity, excellent positive predictive value and Youden Index for identifying asthma, whereas bronchial hyper-responsiveness (BHR) has low sensitivity in population-based studies [Jenkins et al., 1996; Pekkanen et al., 1999; Sistek et al., 2001]. Several studies have used wheezing as an outcome in rural areas and this expands the analysis of the consistency of findings [Douwes et al., 2007; GINA, 1993; Gomez et al., 2004; Hoppin et al., 2006; Smit et al., 2008].

Adult-onset asthma was more prevalent among females. Authors suggest that female hormones could be involved in the pathogenesis of this disease, with greater incidence during puberty and lesser incidence during the menopause [de Nijs et al., 2013]. In this study, the prevalence of wheezing was similar in both genders and this may be related to the very low prevalence of smoking among women and their lower exposure to pesticides and dust than males.

The direct association between age and wheezing in male tobacco growers is in agreement with the literature [Rask-Andersen, 2011] and is reinforced by cumulative exposure to cigarette smoke [James et al., 2013]. Among females, no association was found, possibly owing to the low prevalence of smoking and less contact with pesticides.

Family history of asthma is a recognized risk factor for the development of atopic asthma in childhood, but is unclear in relation to adult-onset asthma [de Nijs et al., 2013]. Increased risk of wheezing in females with a family history of asthma may be related to the greater importance of atopic asthma in females while among males wheezing could be more related to the work environment and smoking.

The low prevalence of smoking among females resulted in low statistical power for evaluating this variable. Current smoking among males was associated with wheezing. Inhaling cigarette smoke for at least 15 years has been shown to be capable of inducing acute bronchoconstriction in both animals and humans [Chiba et al., 2005; Hong et al., 1995; Hong et al., 1996; Matsumoto et al., 1996]. Moreover, it has been suggested that simultaneous and persistent exposure to airborne allergens and to smoking may have an additional or synergetic effect on the occurrence of adult-onset asthma [de Nijs et al., 2013].

Strenuous work was associated with the occurrence of wheezing in both genders. Tobacco workers perform activities requiring physical effort in closed environments with high concentrations of dust, such as inside curing barns and sheds. People with and without asthma have presented prevalence of more than 20% of exercise-induced bronchoconstriction (EIB) syndrome [Parsons et al., 2013b]. Chronic exposure to airborne pollutants while exercising increases airway hyperreactivity and reduces lung function [Parsons et al., 2013a; Parsons et al., 2013b], and simultaneous exposure to smoking and organic dusts could contribute to EIB development and severity [Minov et al., 2006].

Lifting sticks with tobacco leaves to be hung in the curing barns was predominantly performed by females, however it was positively associated with wheezing only among males. Less healthy or less strong workers raise the sticks from the ground, while others, the healthier and stronger ones, climb the scaffolding to take hold of the sticks and position them in the curing barns, thus indicating a healthy workers effect. The lack of association among females might indicate that they are not selected for this activity according to their health status but rather because of their physical strength.

Another association biased by the healthy workers effect is harvesting the lower tobacco leaves, which showed inverse association with wheezing. Considering that this activity requires considerable physical effort, takes place in a hot and humid environment, demands leaf handling implying contact with pesticide residues and dermal absorption of nicotine,

sick workers are unable to deal with these work conditions. This activity can both give rise to a wheezing attack and also prevent workers with active asthma from doing it.

Although both genders referred tying hands of dry tobacco leaves, females are usually responsible for monotonous and repetitive tasks and might spend more time doing this activity than males, thus being more exposed to the humid and closed environment of the sheds with high concentrations of dried tobacco dust and micro-organisms (fungi and bacteria) [Bee, 2000; Brito et al., 1991]. This might explain the positive association of tying hands of dry tobacco leaves and wheezing only among females. Studies of tobacco processing factory workers showed that the increase in cumulative doses of dust could reduce lung function [Mustajbegovic et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2009].

The association between applying pesticides more than 10 days a month in males and contact with pesticides for more than 10 years in females with wheezing is in agreement with the literature. A Brazilian study found an increased risk of asthma symptoms among farm workers as the number of days per month of pesticide application increased [Faria et al., 2005], while in the Agricultural Health Study, farmers and commercial pesticide applicators showed a positive dose-response effect between days of application per annum and wheezing in relation to chlorimuron-ethyl, chlorpyrifos and phorate (only in commercial applicators) [Hoppin et al., 2006].

Males and females were exposed in different ways and intensities to the types of dust analyzed. Dry tobacco and vegetable dust were risk factors for wheezing only in men. Organic dust is known as a common risk factor as well as an aggravating factor for asthma [Cummings et al., 2010; Sigsgaard et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2005]. Preliminary evidence has indicated that smoking could increase the sensitization to common occupational agents, increasing the risk of occupational asthma and allergies [Mustajbegovic et al., 2003; Vandenplas, 2011]. However, in this study there was no interaction between smoking and tobacco or other vegetable dust. These differences in the effect of dry tobacco and vegetable dust among genders needs further investigation.

The handling of chemical disinfectants was mostly done by females and was associated with wheezing only in them. Domestic and occupational exposure to cleaning agents is a risk factor both for occupational and non-occupational asthma [Jeebhay et al., 2014]. Recent studies have shown high risk of asthma attacks and new-onset asthma arising from exposure to bleaches, ammonia, degreasing sprays and accidental inhalation of vapours and gases from cleaning products [Vandenplas, 2011].

The number of GTS episodes reported in the last year was linearly associated with wheezing in both genders. The action of nicotine inhaled through cigarette smoking on bronchoconstriction and increased mucous production have been widely described in the literature, either as direct action on the lungs or on the central nervous system [Hong et al., 1995; Hong et al., 1996; Maouche et al., 2013; Matsumoto et al., 1996]. However, respiratory risks when harvesting tobacco have not been investigated yet.

According to Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic Modeling (PBPK model) [Smith et al., 2010], nicotine absorbed by skin reaches the lungs without the first-pass metabolism

reducing its bioavailability. Nicotine high solubility and low molecular weight (162.2 g/mol) [Zorin et al., 1999], added to the vasodilation, increase in heart rate and local blood flow, caused by heat and physical exercise, optimize its absorption through the skin [Lenz et al., 2011; Petersen et al., 2011]. The absorption of substances by the skin is lower than by inhaling [Smith et al., 2010], however skin exposure to nicotine when harvesting tobacco is believed to be high, enabling significant absorption by this route [Arcury et al., 2003; Gehlbach et al., 1975].

This was the only identified study evaluating wheezing in a large sample of tobacco farm workers on family owned and operated farms. The strategy used to select the sample, as well as, the few losses and refusals guaranteed the representativeness of the studied population. The large number of studied variables increased the probability of associations by chance. Moreover, the lack of objective measures, such as biological markers of exposure to pesticides, nicotine and dust is a limitation of this kind of study.

The findings highlight the importance of broadening perspectives about nicotine exposure considering its multiple source of absorption and variable intensity of exposure. GTS is an indicator of heavy exposure to nicotine [Fassa et al., 2014], however intense exposure might also course asymptomatic due to tolerance mechanisms.

These results provide an important support to draw actions to accomplish Article 18 of the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control regarding protection of the people and the environment. Mechanization of the harvesting and baling process could reduce tobacco farmers' exposure to nicotine. Often, farmers do not use personal protective equipment (PPE) or use PPE that has lost its effectiveness or is not certified to reduce nicotine exposure. Both developing efficient PPE and also ensuring its use in hot weather conditions in the harvesting season continue to be challenges. Article 17 of the same Convention addresses the need of governments to promote economically viable alternatives to tobacco plantation. However, promoting crop diversification is not enough to protect farmers' health, a sustainable agricultural production model with decreased pesticide use is also necessary.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Dr. Michael R. Reich, Dr. Marcia Castro and Dr. Thomas Smith, Harvard School of Public Health, for their sincere assistance and comments. The authors thank all workers who participated in this study.

FUNDING

The study was financially supported by the following Brazilian agencies: National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) and Research Support Foundation of the Rio Grande do Sul State (FAPERGS) and supported in part by NIH ES00002. The first author received a scholarship from CAPES, Ministry of Education – Brazil, during the writing of this paper, at Harvard School of Public Health, under process number: 7098-13-8.

REFERENCES

1. Arcury TA, Quandt SA, Preisser JS, Bernert JT, Norton D, Wang J. High levels of transdermal nicotine exposure produce green tobacco sickness in Latino farmworkers. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*. 2003; 5:315–321. [PubMed: 12791526]
2. Bee A. Globalization, grapes and gender: Women's work in traditional and agro-export production in northern Chile. *Geographical Journal*. 2000; 166(3):255–265.

3. Brito, JCD; D'Acri, V. Referencial de análise para a estudo da relação trabalho, mulher e saúde. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*. 1991; 7:201–214. [PubMed: 15830042]
4. Chiba Y, Murata M, Ushikubo H, Yoshikawa Y, Saitoh A, Sakai H, Kamei J, Misawa M. Effect of cigarette smoke exposure in vivo on bronchial smooth muscle contractility in vitro in rats. *American journal of respiratory cell and molecular biology*. 2005; 33(6):574–581. [PubMed: 16166743]
5. Chloros D, Sichletidis L, Kyriazis G, Vlachogianni E, Kottakis I, Kakoura M. Respiratory effects in workers processing dried tobacco leaves. *Allergol Immunopathol (Madr)*. 2004; 32(6):344–351. [PubMed: 15617662]
6. Cummings KJ, Gaughan DM, Kullman GJ, Beezhold DH, Green BJ, Blachere FM, Bledsoe T, Kreiss K, Cox-Ganser J. Adverse respiratory outcomes associated with occupational exposures at a soy processing plant. *Eur Respir J*. 2010; 36(5):1007–1015. [PubMed: 20413546]
7. de Nijs SB, Venekamp LN, Bel EH. Adult-onset asthma: is it really different? *European respiratory review : an official journal of the European Respiratory Society*. 2013; 22(127):44–52. [PubMed: 23457164]
8. Douwes J, Travier N, Huang K, Cheng S, McKenzie J, Le Gros G, von Mutius E, Pearce N. Lifelong farm exposure may strongly reduce the risk of asthma in adults. *Allergy*. 2007; 62(10): 1158–1165. [PubMed: 17845585]
9. Dykewicz MS. Occupational asthma: current concepts in pathogenesis, diagnosis, and management. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2009; 123(3):519–528. [PubMed: 19281900]
10. Faria NMX, Facchini LA, Fassa AG, Tomasi E. Pesticides and respiratory symptoms among farmers. *Rev saúde pública*. 2005; 39(6):973–981. [PubMed: 16341409]
11. Fassa AG, Faria NMX, Meucci RD, Fiori NS, Miranda VI, Facchini LA. Green tobacco sickness among tobacco farmers in southern Brazil. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*. 2014; 57(6): 726–735. [PubMed: 24526387]
12. Gehlbach SH, Williams WA, Perry LD, Freeman JI, Langone JJ, Peta LV, Van Vunakis H. Nicotine absorption by workers harvesting green tobacco. *The Lancet March*. 1975; 1:478–480.
13. Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA). Global Strategy for Asthma Management and Prevention. 1993 Available from: <http://www.ginasthma.org/>.
14. Gomez MI, Hwang SA, Lin S, Stark AD, May JJ, Hallman EM. Prevalence and predictors of respiratory symptoms among New York farmers and farm residents. *Am J Ind Med*. 2004; 46(1): 42–54. [PubMed: 15202124]
15. Hong JL, Rodger IW, Lee LY. Cigarette smoke-induced bronchoconstriction: cholinergic mechanisms, tachykinins, and cyclooxygenase products. *Journal of applied physiology*. 1995; 78(6):2260–2266. [PubMed: 7665427]
16. Hong JL, Lee LY. Cigarette smoke-induced bronchoconstriction: causative agents and role of thromboxane receptors. *Journal of applied physiology*. 1996; 81(5):2053–2059. [PubMed: 8941529]
17. Hoppin JA, Umbach DM, London SJ, Lynch CF, Alavanja MC, Sandler DP. Pesticides and adult respiratory outcomes in the agricultural health study. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2006; 1076:343–354. [PubMed: 17119214]
18. James AL, Knuiman MW, Divitini ML, Hui J, Hunter ML, Mulrennan SA, Musk AW. Risk factors for respiratory symptoms in adults: the Busselton Health Study. *Respirology*. 2013; 18(8):1256–1260. [PubMed: 23796074]
19. Jeebhay MF, Ngajilo D, le Moual N. Risk factors for nonwork-related adult-onset asthma and occupational asthma: a comparative review. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2014; 14(2):84–94. [PubMed: 24535141]
20. Jenkins MA, Clarke JR, Carlin JB, Robertson CF, Hopper JL, Dalton MF, Holst DP, Choi K, Giles GG. Validation of questionnaire and bronchial hyperresponsiveness against respiratory physician assessment in the diagnosis of asthma. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1996; 25(3):609–616. [PubMed: 8671563]
21. Lenz TL, Gillespie N. Transdermal patch drug delivery interactions with exercise. *Sport Med*. 2011; 41(3):177–183.
22. Maouche K, Medjber K, Zahm JM, Delavoie F, Terryn C, Coraux C, Pons S, Cloez-Tayarani I, Maskos U, Birembaut P, et al. Contribution of alpha7 nicotinic receptor to airway epithelium

- dysfunction under nicotine exposure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2013; 110(10):4099–4104. [PubMed: 23431157]
23. Matsumoto K, Aizawa H, Inoue H, Takata S, Shigyo M, Hara N. Role of thromboxane-A2 and cholinergic mechanisms in bronchoconstriction induced by cigarette smoke in guinea-pigs. *Eur Respir J*. 1996; 9(12):2468–2473. [PubMed: 8980955]
 24. Minov J, Karadzinska-Bislimovska J, Vasilevska K, Risteska-Kuc S, Stoleski S. Exercise-induced bronchoconstriction in textile and agricultural workers and in bakers. *Arhiv za Higijenu Rada I Toksikologiju/Archives of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*. 2006; 57(4):379–386. [PubMed: 17265676]
 25. Mustajbegovic J, Zuskin E, Schachter EN, Kern J, Luburic-Milas M, Pucar J. Respiratory findings in tobacco workers. *Chest*. 2003; 123(5):1740–1748. [PubMed: 12740295]
 26. Parsons JP, Hallstrand TS, Mastrorade JG, Kaminsky DA, Rundell KW, Hull JH, Storms WW, Weiler JM, Cheek FM, Wilson KC, et al. An official American Thoracic Society clinical practice guideline: Exercise-induced bronchoconstriction. Online Supplement. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013a; 187(9):1016–1027. [PubMed: 23634861]
 27. Parsons JP, Hallstrand TS, Mastrorade JG, Kaminsky DA, Rundell KW, Hull JH, Storms WW, Weiler JM, Cheek FM, Wilson KC, et al. An official American Thoracic Society clinical practice guideline: exercise-induced bronchoconstriction. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013b; 187(9):1016–1027. [PubMed: 23634861]
 28. Pekkanen J, Pearce N. Defining asthma in epidemiological studies. *Eur Respir J*. 1999; 14(4):951–957. [PubMed: 10573248]
 29. Petersen KK, Rousing ML, Jensen C, Arendt-Nielsen L, Gazerani P. Effect of local controlled heat on transdermal delivery of nicotine. *Int J Physiol Pathophysiol Pharmacol*. 2011; 3(3):236–242. [PubMed: 21941614]
 30. Projeto Latino-Americano de Investigação em Obstrução Pulmonar (PLATINO). Questionário. 2002 Available from: <http://www.platino-alat.org>.
 31. Rask-Andersen A. Asthma increase among farmers: a 12-year follow-up. *Ups J Med Sci*. 2011; 116(1):60–71. [PubMed: 20812893]
 32. Reiman M, Uitti J. Exposure to microbes, endotoxins and total dust in cigarette and cigar manufacturing: an evaluation of health hazards. *Ann Occup Hyg*. 2000; 44(6):467–473. [PubMed: 10963711]
 33. Schmitt NM, Schmitt J, Kouimintzis DJ, Kirch W. Health risks in tobacco farm workers—a review of the literature. *Journal of public health*. 2007; 15(4):255–264.
 34. Sigsgaard T, Schlunssen V. Occupational asthma diagnosis in workers exposed to organic dust. *Ann Agric Environ Med*. 2004; 11(1):1–7. [PubMed: 15236491]
 35. Sistek D, Tschopp JM, Schindler C, Brutsche M, Ackermann-Liebrich U, Perruchoud AP, Leuenberger P. Clinical diagnosis of current asthma: predictive value of respiratory symptoms in the SAPALDIA study. *Swiss Study on Air Pollution and Lung Diseases in Adults*. *Eur Respir J*. 2001; 17(2):214–219. [PubMed: 11334122]
 36. Smit LA, Heederik D, Doekes G, Blom C, van Zweden I, Wouters IM. Exposure-response analysis of allergy and respiratory symptoms in endotoxin-exposed adults. *Eur Respir J*. 2008; 31(6):1241–1248. [PubMed: 18256063]
 37. Smith, TJ.; Kriebel, D. *A Biologic Approach to Environmental Assessment and Epidemiology*. Vol. 2010. New York: Oxford University Press; 2010. p. 448
 38. Vandenplas O. Occupational asthma: etiologies and risk factors. *Allergy, asthma & immunology research*. 2011; 3(3):157–167.
 39. Wang XR, Zhang HX, Sun BX, Dai HL, Hang JQ, Eisen EA, Wegman DH, Olenchock SA, Christiani DC. A 20-year follow-up study on chronic respiratory effects of exposure to cotton dust. *Eur Respir J*. 2005; 26(5):881–886. [PubMed: 16264050]
 40. Zhang Y, Chen J, Chen Y, Dong J, Wei Q, Lou J. Environmental mycological study and allergic respiratory disease among tobacco processing workers. *J Occup Health*. 2005; 47(2):181–187. [PubMed: 15824484]

41. Zhang Y, Wang J, Lou J. The dose-response relationship between pulmonary function injury and cumulative dose of tobacco dust exposure among tobacco processing workers. *J Occup Health*. 2009; 51(2):164–168. [PubMed: 19179801]
42. Zorin S, Kuylenskierna F, Thulin H. In vitro test of nicotine's permeability through human skin. Risk evaluation and safety aspects. *Ann Occup Hyg*. 1999; 43(6):405–413. [PubMed: 10518466]

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Demographic, socioeconomic, behavioral and occupational description of tobacco farmers, stratified by gender. Brazil, 2011.

TABLE I

VARIABLES	MALE (N=1464)		FEMALE (N=1005)		P*
	N	% (95%CI)	N	% (95%CI)	
Age (years)					0.015
18 – 24	205	14.0(12.2 – 15.8)	151	15.0(12.8 – 17.2)	
25 – 34	383	26.2(23.9 – 28.4)	275	27.4(24.6 – 30.1)	
35 – 44	319	21.8(19.7 – 23.9)	216	21.5(18.9 – 24.0)	
45 – 54	317	21.6(19.5 – 23.8)	246	24.5(21.8 – 27.1)	
55	240	16.4(14.5 – 18.3)	117	11.6(9.6 – 13.6)	
Schooling (years)					0.020
0–4	644	44.0(41.4 – 46.5)	442	44.0(40.9 – 47.1)	
5–8	732	50.0(47.4 – 52.6)	473	47.1(44.0 – 50.2)	
9	88	6.0(4.8 – 7.2)	90	8.9(7.2 – 10.7)	
Family history of asthma					0.293
No	1353	92.4(91.1 – 93.8)	917	91.2(89.5 – 93.0)	
Yes	111	7.6(6.2 – 8.9)	88	8.8(7.0 – 10.5)	
Amount of tobacco produced (kg)					0.200
1 – 2500	91	6.3(5.0 – 7.5)	69	6.9(5.3 – 8.5)	
2501 – 5000	396	27.2(24.9 – 29.5)	290	29.1(26.2 – 31.9)	
5001 – 10000	368	43.8(41.3 – 46.4)	438	43.9(40.8 – 47.0)	
10001 – 36000	330	22.7(20.5 – 24.8)	201	20.1(17.7 – 22.6)	
Employment Status					0.339
Family owned	1385	94.8(93.6 – 95.9)	960	95.7(94.4 – 97.0)	
Tenants/employees	76	5.2(4.1 – 6.3)	43	4.3(3.0 – 5.5)	
Smoking					0.000
No	729	49.8(47.2 – 52.3)	930	92.5(90.0 – 94.2)	
Former	278	19.0(17.0 – 21.0)	44	4.4(3.1 – 5.6)	
Smoker	457	31.2(28.8 – 33.6)	31	3.1(2.0 – 4.1)	
Time working with tobacco (years)					0.136
<=9	457	31.2(28.8 – 33.6)	311	31.0(28.1 – 33.9)	

VARIABLES	MALE (N=1464)			FEMALE (N=1005)			P*
	N	% (95%CI)		N	% (95%CI)		
10–19	455	31.1(28.7 – 33.5)		347	34.6(31.6 – 37.5)		
>=20	551	37.7(35.5 – 40.1)		345	34.4(31.4 – 37.3)		
Days/month of pesticides use							0.000
No	242	16.5(14.6 – 18.4)		604	60.7(57.7 – 63.7)		
1 – 10	1038	70.9(68.6 – 73.2)		354	35.6(32.6 – 38.5)		
>=11	184	12.6(10.9 – 14.3)		37	3.7(2.5 – 4.9)		
Time of exposure to pesticides in life (years)							0.000
None	100	6.9(5.6 – 8.2)		377	38.0(35.0 – 41.1)		
1 – 10	362	24.8(22.6 – 27.1)		226	22.8(20.2 – 25.4)		
11 – 20	367	25.2(22.9 – 27.4)		185	18.7(16.2 – 21.1)		
21 – 30	355	24.4(22.2 – 26.6)		120	12.1(10.1 – 14.1)		
>= 31	273	18.7(16.7 – 21.0)		83	8.4(6.7 – 10.1)		
Working hours during agricultural season							0.000
8	124	8.5(7.1 – 9.9)		195	19.5(17.0 – 21.9)		
9–12	805	55.2(52.6 – 57.7)		556	55.4(52.3 – 58.5)		
13–18	530	36.3(33.9 – 38.8)		252	25.1(22.4 – 27.8)		
Lifting sticks with tobacco leaves to the barns							0.000
No	528	36.1(33.6 – 38.6)		179	17.8(15.4 – 20.2)		
Sometimes	415	28.4(26.0 – 30.7)		91	9.1(7.3 – 10.8)		
Always	520	35.5(33.1 – 38.0)		735	73.1(70.4 – 75.9)		
Tobacco classification							0.000
No	198	13.5(11.8 – 15.3)		87	8.6(6.9 – 10.4)		
Sometimes	94	6.4(5.2 – 7.7)		49	4.9(3.5 – 6.2)		
Always	1171	80.1(78.0 – 82.1)		869	86.5(84.3 – 88.6)		
Tying hands of tobacco							0.289
No	68	4.6(3.6 – 5.7)		54	5.3(4.0 – 6.8)		
Sometimes	142	9.7(8.2 – 11.2)		81	8.1(6.4 – 9.7)		
Always	1253	85.7(83.8 – 87.4)		870	86.6(84.4 – 88.7)		
Harvesting lower tobacco leaves							0.019
No	37	2.5(1.7 – 3.3)		42	4.2(2.9 – 5.4)		

VARIABLES	MALE (N=1464)		FEMALE (N=1005)		P*
	N	%(95%CI)	N	%(95%CI)	
Sometimes	28	1.9(1.2 – 2.6)	29	2.9(1.8 – 3.9)	0.000
Always	1399	95.6(94.5 – 96.6)	934	92.9(91.3 – 94.5)	
Strenuous work					
No	359	24.5(22.3 – 26.7)	533	53.1(50.0 – 56.2)	0.000
Yes	1105	75.5(73.3 – 77.7)	471	46.9(43.8 – 50.0)	

95%CI: confidence interval;

* Fisher exact test of heterogeneity for the difference between genders.

TABLE II

Occupational description of tobacco farmers, stratified by gender. Brazil, 2011.

VARIABLES	MALE (N=1464)		FEMALE (N=1005)		P*
	N	%(95%CI)	N	%(95%CI)	
Contact with dried tobacco dust					0.000
No	90	6.1(4.9 – 7.4)	69	6.9(5.3 – 8.4)	
Little	635	43.4(40.8 – 45.9)	355	35.4(32.4 – 38.3)	
Too much	739	50.5(47.9 – 53.0)	580	57.8(54.7 – 60.8)	
Contact with vegetable dust					0.000
No	465	31.8(29.4 – 34.1)	402	40.0(37.0 – 43.1)	
Little	720	49.2(46.6 – 51.7)	482	48.0(45.0 – 51.1)	
Too much	279	19.1(17.0 – 21.1)	120	11.9(9.9 – 14.0)	
Contact with chemical dust					0.000
No	207	14.1(12.3 – 16.0)	249	24.8(22.1 – 27.5)	
Little	725	49.5(46.9 – 52.1)	408	40.6(37.6 – 43.7)	
Too much	532	36.3(33.9 – 38.8)	347	34.6(31.6 – 37.5)	
Contact with pesticides or other toxic gases					0.000
No	754	51.5(48.9 – 54.1)	757	75.4(72.7 – 78.1)	
Little	452	30.9(28.5 – 33.2)	181	18.0(15.6 – 20.4)	
Too much	258	17.7(15.7 – 19.6)	66	6.6(5.0 – 8.1)	
Contact with mold dust					0.000
No	1096	74.9(72.6 – 77.1)	546	54.4(51.3 – 57.5)	
Little	323	22.1(20.0 – 24.2)	390	38.8(35.8 – 41.9)	
Too much	45	3.1(2.2 – 3.9)	68	6.8(5.2 – 8.3)	
Contact with animal dust					0.041
No	573	39.1(36.6 – 41.6)	411	41.0(37.9 – 44.0)	
Little	789	53.9(51.3 – 56.4)	500	49.8(46.7 – 52.9)	
Too much	102	7.0(5.7 – 8.3)	93	9.3(7.5 – 11.0)	
Contact with animal feed dust					0.772
No	1057	72.2(69.9 – 74.5)	717	71.4(68.6 – 74.2)	
Little	336	22.9(20.8 – 25.1)	232	23.1(20.5 – 25.7)	

VARIABLES	MALE (N=1464)			FEMALE (N=1005)			P*
	N	% (95%CI)		N	% (95%CI)		
Too much	71	4.8(3.7 – 5.9)		55	5.5(4.1 – 6.9)		
Contact with mineral dust							0.000
No	385	26.3(24.0 – 28.5)		488	48.6(45.5 – 51.7)		
Little	791	54.0(51.5 – 56.6)		386	38.5(35.4 – 41.5)		
Too much	288	19.7(17.6 – 21.7)		130	12.9(10.9 – 15.0)		
Working in smoky conditions							0.002
No	1108	75.7(73.5 – 77.9)		817	81.4(79.0 – 83.8)		
Little	310	21.2(19.1 – 23.3)		157	15.6(13.4 – 17.9)		
Too much	46	3.1(2.2 – 4.0)		30	3.0(1.9 – 4.0)		
Contact with chemical disinfectant							0.000
No	1306	89.2(87.6 – 90.8)		314	31.3(28.4 – 34.1)		
Yes	158	10.8(9.2 – 12.4)		690	68.7(65.8 – 71.6)		
Month/year intensive work							0.445
None	181	12.4(10.7 – 14.1)		131	13.1(11.0 – 15.2)		
1 – 6	941	64.6(62.1 – 67.0)		662	66.1(63.1 – 69.0)		
7 – 12	335	23.0(20.8 – 25.1)		209	20.9(18.3 – 23.4)		
Number of GTS episodes in the previous year							
None	1324	91.2(89.9 – 92.6)		846	85.0(82.8 – 87.2)		0.000
1 – 5	92	6.3(5.1 – 7.6)		95	9.5(7.7 – 11.4)		
6	36	2.5(1.7 – 3.3)		54	5.5(4.0 – 6.8)		
Wheeze in the previous year							0.617
No	1302	89.0(87.8 – 90.6)		887	88.3(86.3 – 90.3)		
Yes	161	11.0(9.4 – 12.6)		117	11.7(9.6 – 13.6)		

95%CI: confidence interval;

* Fisher exact test of heterogeneity for the difference between genders.

TABLE III
Multivariate analysis: Asthma symptoms - prevalence and associated factors among men. Brazil, 2011.

VARIABLES	CRUDE			ADJUSTED		
	Wheeze %	PR	95%CI	P	PR	95%CI
1st level						
Age (years)				0.022**		0.022**
18 – 24	7.8	1.00	--		1.00	--
25 – 34	8.9	1.14	(0.65 – 1.98)		1.14	(0.65 – 1.98)
35 – 44	13.2	1.69	(0.98 – 2.91)		1.69	(0.98 – 2.91)
45 – 54	11.7	1.50	(0.86 – 2.61)		1.50	(0.86 – 2.61)
55	13.3	1.71	(0.97 – 3.02)		1.71	(0.97 – 3.02)
2nd level						
Smoking				0.007*		0.022*
No	8.9	1.00	--		1.00	--
Former	10.1	1.13	(0.75 – 1.70)		1.02	(0.67 – 1.57)
Smoker	14.9	1.67	(1.21 – 2.31)		1.53	(1.10 – 2.13)
3rd level						
Harvesting lower tobacco leaves				0.002**		0.001**
No	24.3	1.00	--		1.00	--
Sometimes	17.9	0.73	(0.28 – 1.94)		0.71	(0.28 – 1.80)
Always	10.5	0.43	(0.24 – 0.76)		0.35	(0.19 – 0.66)
Lifting sticks with tobacco leaves to the barns				0.035**		0.024**
No	9.3	1.00	--		1.00	--
Sometimes	10.1	1.09	(0.73 – 1.63)		1.09	(0.73 – 1.61)
Always	13.5	1.45	(1.02 – 2.06)		1.48	(1.05 – 2.10)
Days/month of pesticides use				0.012*		0.001**
None	9.5	1.00	--		1.00	--
1 – 10	10.2	1.07	(0.69 – 1.67)		1.49	(0.92 – 2.41)
11	17.4	1.82	(1.10 – 3.05)		2.71	(1.56 – 4.71)
4th level						

VARIABLES	Wheeze %	CRUDE			ADJUSTED		
		PR	95%CI	P	PR	95%CI	P
Strenuous work				0.005*			0.010*
No	6.9	1.00	--		1.00	--	
Yes	12.3	1.77	(1.19 – 2.65)		1.72	(1.14 – 2.61)	
Contact with dried tobacco dust				0.001*			0.039**
No	6.7	1.00	-		1.00	-	
Little	8.3	1.25	(0.56 – 2.78)		1.12	(0.48 – 2.57)	
Too much	13.8	2.07	(0.96 – 4.48)		1.59	(0.68 – 3.71)	
Contact with vegetable dust				0.002**			0.053**
No	8.0	1.00	--		1.00	--	
Little	11.1	1.40	(0.95 – 2.05)		1.31	(0.88 – 1.93)	
Too much	15.8	1.98	(1.29 – 3.04)		1.54	(0.99 – 2.39)	
Contact with chemical dust				0.001**			0.078**
No	5.8	1.00	--		1.00	--	
Little	10.3	1.78	(0.98 – 3.24)		1.56	(0.89 – 2.76)	
Too much	13.9	2.40	(1.33 – 4.34)		1.76	(1.00 – 3.08)	
Month/year of intensive work				0.059*			0.077*
None	12.1	1.00	--		1.00	--	
1 – 6	9.6	0.79	(0.51 – 1.22)		0.61	(0.39 – 0.96)	
7 – 12	14.3	1.18	(0.74 – 1.88)		0.78	(0.47 – 1.29)	
5th level							
Number of GTS episodes in the previous year				0.000**			0.001**
None	9.4	1.00	--		1.00	--	
1 – 5	23.9	2.53	(1.68 – 3.81)		2.41	(1.62 – 3.60)	
6	30.6	3.23	(1.94 – 5.39)		3.12	(1.98 – 4.94)	

PR, prevalence rate; 95%CI, confidence interval;

* Wald test of heterogeneity;

** Wald test of linear trend

TABLE IV
Multivariate analysis: Asthma symptoms - prevalence and associated factors among women. Brazil, 2011.

VARIABLES	Wheeze %	CRUDE			ADJUSTED		
		PR	95%CI	P	PR	95%CI	P
1 st level							
Family history of asthma							
No	10.7	1.00	--	0.002 *	1.00	--	0.002 *
Yes	21.6	2.02	(1.30 – 3.15)		2.02	(1.30 – 3.15)	
2 nd level							
Harvesting lower tobacco leaves							
No	19.1	1.00	--	0.063 **	1.00	--	0.018 **
Sometimes	17.2	0.90	(0.33 – 2.50)		0.57	(0.20 – 1.64)	
Always	11.1	0.58	(0.30 – 1.12)		0.46	(0.24 – 0.90)	
Tying hands of tobacco							
No	5.6	1.00	--	0.011 *	1.00	-	0.016 *
Sometimes	21.0	3.78	(1.16 – 12.34)		3.89	(1.17 – 12.94)	
Always	11.2	2.01	(0.65 – 6.18)		2.29	(0.74 – 7.10)	
Time of exposure to pesticides in life (years)							
None	9.8	1.00	--	0.003 **	1.00	--	0.002 **
10	8.4	0.86	(0.50 – 1.45)		0.88	(0.52 – 1.50)	
11 – 20	14.1	1.43	(0.90 – 2.30)		1.44	(0.90 – 2.31)	
21 – 30	12.5	1.27	(0.72 – 2.24)		1.39	(0.77 – 2.50)	
31	22.9	2.33	(1.41 – 3.87)		2.32	(1.41 – 3.82)	
3 rd level							
Strenuous work							
No	9.2	1.00	--	0.010 *	1.00	--	0.008 *
Yes	14.4	1.56	(1.11 – 2.19)		1.76	(1.22 – 2.54)	
Working in smoky conditions							
No	10.6	1.00		0.018 **	1.00	-	0.061 **
Little	15.3	1.43	(0.96 – 2.15)		1.28	(0.85– 1.92)	

VARIABLES	Wheeze %	CRUDE			ADJUSTED		
		PR	95%CI	P	PR	95%CI	P
Too much	20.0	1.88	(0.89 – 3.94)		1.86	(0.89 – 3.88)	
Contact with chemical disinfectants				0.055*			0.046*
No	8.6	1.00	--		1.00	--	
Yes	13.0	1.51	(0.99 – 2.30)		1.54	(1.00 – 2.35)	
Month/year of intensive work				0.118*			0.089**
None	16.8	1.00	--		1.00	--	
1 – 6	10.6	0.63	(0.40 – 0.98)		0.61	(0.36 – 1.03)	
7 – 12	11.0	0.65	(0.38 – 1.12)		0.56	(0.31 – 1.00)	
4th level							
Number of GTS episodes in the previous year				0.000**			0.005**
None	10.3	1.00	--		1.00	--	
1 – 5	12.6	1.23	(0.70 – 2.14)		1.13	(0.66 – 1.93)	
6	27.8	2.70	(1.68 – 4.34)		2.29	(1.37 – 3.82)	

PR, prevalence rate; 95% CI, confidence interval;

* Wald test of heterogeneity;

** Wald test of linear trend