

Serveur Académique Lausannois SERVAL [serval.unil.ch](http://serval.unil.ch)

## Author Manuscript

Faculty of Biology and Medicine Publication

This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Published in final edited form as:

**Title:** Association of Endotoxin and Allergens with Respiratory and Skin Symptoms: A Descriptive Study in Laboratory Animal Workers.

**Authors:** Oppliger A, Barresi F, Maggi M, Schmid-Grendelmeier P, Huaux F, Hotz P, Dressel H

**Journal:** Annals of Work Exposures and Health

**Year:** 2017 Aug 1

**Issue:** 61

**Volume:** 7

**Pages:** 822-835

**DOI:** 10.1093/annweh/wxx048

In the absence of a copyright statement, users should assume that standard copyright protection applies, unless the article contains an explicit statement to the contrary. In case of doubt, contact the journal publisher to verify the copyright status of an article.

1  
2  
3 Association of endotoxin and allergens with respiratory and skin symptoms: a descriptive study in  
4 laboratory animal workers  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 A. Oppliger <sup>1</sup>, F. Barresi <sup>2</sup>, M. Maggi <sup>2</sup>, P. Schmid-Grendelmeier <sup>3</sup>, F. Huaux <sup>4</sup>, P. Hotz <sup>2</sup>, H. Dressel <sup>2</sup>  
13  
14

15  
16 <sup>1</sup> Institute for Work and Health, University of Lausanne, CH-1011 Lausanne, Switzerland  
17  
18

19  
20 <sup>2</sup> Division of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, EBPI, University of Zurich and University  
21 Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland  
22  
23

24  
25 <sup>3</sup> Department of Dermatology, Allergy Unit, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland  
26  
27

28  
29 <sup>4</sup> Louvain Centre for Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology, Institut de Recherche Expérimentale et  
30 Clinique (IREC), Université Catholique de Louvain, Brussels, Belgium  
31  
32

33  
34 Corresponding author: Prof. H. Dressel; Abteilung für Arbeits- und Umweltmedizin, EBPI, Universität  
35 Zürich und Universitätsspital Zürich, Zürich. Tel +41 44 634 63 12 Fax +41 044 634 47 09 E-Mail:  
36  
37 holger.dressel@usz.ch  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Abstract

4  
5 Background

6 In laboratory animal work, allergens are classically considered to play a prominent role in generation of  
7 respiratory and skin symptoms. However, recent development may have changed working conditions  
8 and require an updating of preventive measures.

9  
10  
11 Objective

12 In workers exposed to a range of animals besides laboratory mice and rats the relative role of  
13 endotoxin, irritants, and allergens in symptom generation was assessed for updating preventative  
14 measures and health surveillance.

15  
16  
17 Methods

18 Eligible workers were recruited from university units in which exposure to rats and/or mice, occurrence  
19 of respiratory and/or skin symptoms, and/or a history of animal bites had been reported. Exposure to  
20 endotoxin and rat and mouse allergen was assessed (71 half-day personal samples). "Symptomatic"  
21 was defined by work-related ocular, nasal, respiratory, or skin symptoms. A concentration of specific  
22 IgE against rat or mouse (e87 and e88)  $\geq 0.35$  kU/l defined sensitization. Sensitivity analyses  
23 examined the effect of alternative exposure indicators and definitions of "sensitized" and  
24 "symptomatic".

25  
26  
27 Results

28 From 302 eligible workers, 177 participated. There were 121 and 41 workers in the asymptomatic and  
29 non-sensitized and symptomatic but non-sensitized group, respectively. Eight subjects were  
30 symptomatic and sensitized. Six sensitized subjects were asymptomatic. One participant could not be  
31 assigned to a subgroup. Airborne endotoxin and allergen concentrations were mostly below 20 EU/m<sup>3</sup>  
32 or the detection limit, respectively. Clinical history showed that irritants and sensitizers other than  
33 mouse/rat allergen or endotoxin were a major cause of symptoms. Results were sensitive to the  
34 selected exposure indicator and the definition of "symptomatic".

35  
36  
37 Conclusions

38 Health surveillance programs need to be adapted to include a larger range of allergens and pay more  
39 attention to irritants.

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Keywords

1  
2  
3 Irritants; sensitizers; rhinitis; asthma; laboratory animal.  
4  
5

6 Abbreviations  
7

8 95%CI: 95% confidence interval  
9

10 EU: units of endotoxin  
11

12 FEV1: forced expiratory volume in the 1<sup>st</sup> second  
13

14 FVC: forced vital capacity  
15

16 IVC: individually ventilated cages  
17

18 LA: laboratory animal  
19

20 LOD: limit of detection  
21

22 OR: odds ratio  
23

24 PAMP: pathogen-associated molecular pattern  
25

26 Se: sensitized  
27

28 Sy: symptomatic  
29

30 WR: work-related  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INTRODUCTION

Laboratory animal (LA) allergy is a well-recognized occupational disease. Classically, the disease develops within 1-4 years after starting work and is more likely with high exposure to animal allergens, atopy, and sensitization or allergy to pet cats or dogs. It has also been suggested that variability of exposure levels, IgG or IgG4 concentrations, and genetic variants may be risk factors (Feary and Cullinan, 2016; Jones, 2015; Jones et al., 2014; Nicholson et al., 2010; Pacheco et al., 2008; Pacheco et al., 2010; Peng et al., 2011; Phipatanakul et al., 2012). Risk assessment is currently difficult because of uncertainties surrounding the cause of disease and the level of exposure.

With respect to cause of disease, a large proportion of symptomatic workers are not sensitized (Lieutier-Colas et al., 2002; Pacheco et al., 2003; Samadi et al., 2012; Schmid et al., 2009). Indeed, the incidence of occupational asthma defined by work-related chest symptoms was about 2-4 cases x 100 person-years, whereas the incidence of allergic asthma defined by symptoms and positive prick tests was much lower (0.4-1.6 cases x 100 person-years) (Folletti et al., 2008). Similar findings were reported for occupational rhinitis (7-11 vs. 2-5 x 100 person-years) (Folletti et al., 2008). The large difference between the prevalence of symptomatic workers and of symptomatic workers with specific sensitization to rat or mouse suggests a role for irritants (Kacergis et al., 1996; Kogevinas et al., 2007) or allergens not looked for in the study, e.g., sensitization to storage or house dust mites (Hollander et al., 1996; Ruoppi et al., 2005), other animal allergens (Botham et al., 1987), powdered latex gloves, drugs or anesthetics.

Besides the aforementioned agents, the role of pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) has been suggested. Although endotoxin remains an important agent assumed to cause activation of the innate immune system and neutrophilic asthma (Doreswamy and Peden, 2011; Haldar and Pavord, 2007; Poole and Romberger, 2012) its clinical relevance in LA workers is currently conflicting (Freitas et al., 2016; Lieutier-Colas et al., 2002; Pacheco et al., 2003). The role of peptidoglycans, gram-positive bacteria cell wall components, (1→3)-β-D-glucans, and fungi have hardly been studied in LA workers.

1  
2  
3 With respect to exposure levels of LA workers to allergens and PAMPs, the situation may be rapidly  
4 changing because genetically modified mice have largely supplanted rats, individually ventilated cages  
5 (IVC) have been introduced in place of traditional open cages, and more attention is paid to personal  
6 protective equipment (Feary and Cullinan, 2016; Jones, 2015). However, some tasks still cause high  
7 exposures (e.g., animal handling or cage dumping) (Curtin-Brosnan et al., 2010; Glueck et al., 2012).  
8 Hence, it is uncertain whether an exposure decline requiring an updating of preventive measures is  
9 necessary.  
10

11  
12 The purpose of the study was to inform an updated health surveillance scheme for LA workers and  
13 adapt preventative measures to the current work conditions. In this respect, major issues were the  
14 ascertainment of the current prevalence of LA allergy and the relative role of endotoxin, irritants, and  
15 allergens in respiratory and/or skin symptom generation. To this end, a previously described  
16 categorization scheme (Pacheco et al., 2003) for discriminating between endotoxin and allergen  
17 exposure was used, care was taken to assess objectively allergens and endotoxin exposure, and a  
18 wide range of causes of symptoms was considered. The study was descriptive and the population was  
19 working in a university setting.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was carried out in the frame of an analysis of occupational risks of workers exposed to animals in different units of the faculties of medicine, veterinary medicine, and sciences. It was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the ethics commission (canton of Zurich; KEK-ZH-Nr. 2012-0142). The study purpose was explained at information meetings, workers received written information, and all subjects gave written informed consent.

The study was made of three consecutive parts (figure 1).

As the study was planned, no data about work-related animal allergy was available for the studied population. Therefore, a preliminary interview study was conducted (2011-2012) at the unit level to gather information on animals, personnel, working conditions, and occurrence of work-related symptoms in anyone working in this unit. This information was reported by the interviewed unit representative.

Regarding the main study (November 2012-January 2014), work with exposure to animals other than rodents was assumed to occur in too few subjects for allowing valid conclusions and/or to entail a lower sensitization risk. Therefore, exposure had to include rats and/or mouse for a unit to be selected. However, simultaneous exposure to other animals was not an exclusion criterion. (Figure). As a lung-skin connection in occupational allergy has been suggested (Heederik et al., 2012; Redlich and Herrick, 2008) animal bites were also considered in the selection procedure.

### Clinical examination

Clinical examination, spirometry and IgE (rat- and mouse-specific and total) determinations have been described in details elsewhere (Lemaire et al., submitted). Briefly, clinical and occupational history were recorded through semi-structured interviews by trained physicians using a checklist and written instructions. When symptoms were reported, the worker was asked about their characteristics, concomitant symptoms or signs, and circumstances of occurrence. Cases who were both work-related (WR) and non-WR were considered as WR. Measurements of serum IgE were carried out blinded in batches of coded samples. Total and specific IgE against mouse (e88, Mouse epithelium, serum

1  
2  
3 proteins and urine proteins) and rat (e87, Rat epithelium, serum proteins and urine proteins) were  
4 measured by ImmunoCAP (Phadia AB, Uppsala, Sweden). Categories of total IgE were used to define  
5 atopy with cut-offs of <26 kU/l (probability of being non-atopic: 84%) and >100 kU/l (probability of  
6 atopy 78 %). Concentrations of total IgE <2 kU/l were attributed a value of 1 kU/l.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Workers were categorized in four subgroups according to work-related symptoms and specific  
13 sensitization [non-symptomatic and non-sensitized (Sy-/Se-), symptomatic and sensitized (Sy+/Se+),  
14 symptomatic and non-sensitized (Sy+/Se-), non-symptomatic and sensitized (Sy-/Se+)] because this  
15 classification scheme had been previously considered suitable for discriminating allergen- and  
16 endotoxin-induced work-related respiratory and skin symptoms in LA workers (Pacheco et al., 2003).  
17 According to this classification system, symptomatic (Sy+) individuals were defined as those having  
18 ever had work-related symptoms. The pre-defined symptoms systematically assessed in the clinical  
19 examination were irritation of conjunctiva, nose or throat, rhinitis symptoms (itchy, runny or stuffy nose,  
20 sneezing, common cold), cough, wheeze; asthma attack, skin rash, itchy skin, and other skin  
21 symptoms. Work-relatedness was defined as caused by a specific work task and without non-  
22 occupational cause. Regarding irritant effects, the occurrence of similar symptoms in co-workers was  
23 also considered. The association between work and symptoms had to be probable or certain as  
24 assessed by clinical history. Sensitized (Se+) workers had a specific IgE concentration to rat and/or  
25 mouse  $\geq 0.35$  kU/l.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **Exposure assessment**

41 Lifelong history of exposure to animals was reconstructed on the basis of a semi-structured interview.  
42 First, all successive jobs were recorded in chronological order. Then, the interviewer systematically  
43 asked for additional information relating to jobs involving exposure to animals (beginning and end of  
44 each employment, job category, cages with high efficiency particulate air filter, and animal bites). If  
45 there had been important changes (job, workplace) when working for the same employer, two different  
46 forms were filled in to take these changes into account. Source of occupational exposure to animals  
47 was classified into five categories: Animal handlers (caring for animals, changing and cleaning cages,  
48 changing litter, feeding, and breeding); technicians (collecting blood/urine, surgery, biopsy,  
49 administering active ingredients, euthanasia); researchers (including trainees, students, and any  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 person conducting experimental work); various other tasks with exposure to animals (e.g.,  
4 veterinarians); no occupational exposure to animals.  
5  
6  
7

8 Personal sampling (March to July 2014) was used to collect samples in parallel onto two separate filter  
9 devices, by means of pocket pumps (SKC pocket pump Air Chek 2000 Model 210-2002, SKC Inc.,  
10 USA), set at a flow rate of 2.0 l/min (endotoxin) or 3 l/min (allergens). Airflow was calibrated before  
11 and after field sampling with a piston calibrator (DryCal DC-Lite, Bios International, Pompton Plains,  
12 USA). As a rule, sampling was carried out separately in the morning and afternoon. Pumps were not  
13 worn during breaks. As duration of exposure varies task-dependently and may be less than a whole 4-  
14 hour-half-day, a minimum duration of 1 hour was required. Whether shorter time periods should be  
15 sampled had to be decided later according to study results. The mean of the morning and afternoon  
16 measurement of each worker and the highest of the individual morning and afternoon measures was  
17 defined as the daily and the maximum exposure, respectively. Daily exposure was not computed when  
18 only one half-day of sampling had been possible. If only one sampling half-day had been possible this  
19 measurement was considered as maximum exposure.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Total airborne dust for endotoxin assessment was collected onto polycarbonate filters (37 mm  
33 diameter, 0.4 micrometer pore size), placed into a ready to use polystyrene closed-faced cassette  
34 (endofree-cassette, Aerotech Laboratories, Inc., Phoenix, USA). Total airborne dust for allergen  
35 assessment was collected onto gelatin filters (25 mm diameter, 3.0 micrometers pore size, SKC Inc.  
36 Eighty Four, PA 15330, USA) placed into a closed-faced polystyrene cassette. After sampling,  
37 cassettes were kept in a cold box, transported to the laboratory within the same day and stored at -  
38 20°C for 1-3 months to await measurement. Endotoxins were extracted by shaking the filters at room  
39 temperature for one hour in 10 ml of pyrogen-free water in a 50-ml conical polypropylene tube.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Endotoxins were analyzed using a quantitative kinetic chromogenic Limulus Ameobocyte Lysate assay  
48 (Lonza Group, Visp, Switzerland) with an automated microtiter plate reader. *Escherichia coli* O55:B5  
49 endotoxin (Lonza Group) was used as a calibration standard to calculate endotoxin concentration in  
50 the experimental samples. Results were expressed in units of endotoxin (EU)/m<sup>3</sup> air. Rat and mouse  
51 allergens were analyzed using ELISA kits (Rat n 1 ELISA kit (EL-RN1); Mus m 1 ELISA kit (EL-MM1),  
52 Indoor biotechnologies, Warminster, UK). Allergens were extracted by dissolving the gelatin filter at  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 37°C during 3 minutes in 1 ml of sterile water in an Eppendorf tube. Then, the protocol proposed by  
4 the manufacturer was used. Each sample was measured in duplicate and the mean was used as a  
5 result. Results were expressed in ng allergen/m<sup>3</sup> air. Limits of detection (LOD) were 0.05 EU/filter,  
6 0.097 and 0.024 ng/filter for endotoxin, rat allergen, and mouse allergen, respectively. A concentration  
7 equal to half the LOD was attributed to samples below this limit, while two samples with very high  
8 concentrations (>25 ng/filter) were attributed a value of 25 ng/filter for statistical analysis.  
9  
10 Measurements of airborne contaminants were carried out blinded in batches of coded samples.  
11  
12 Results can be compared with those measured by the same laboratory using the same assay in  
13 previous studies on respiratory conditions in the same region (Tabrizi et al., 2010; Tschopp et al.,  
14 2011).

### 21 22 23 **Exposure indicators**

24  
25 As Pacheco et al. (2003) critically discussed the limitations of their exposure estimates and suggested  
26 that “verification of these exposure estimates awaits further study”, we attempted to reproduce their  
27 “cumulative exposure”. Briefly, Pacheco et al. (2003) measured endotoxin concentrations in 11  
28 combinations of specific work tasks and work sites (altogether 43 stationary samples). Then,  
29 combination-specific arithmetic means were calculated, extrapolated to all subjects carrying out the  
30 same task-site combination, and finally multiplied by the number of hours the subject reported  
31 performing the task. All performed tasks were summed and the resulting daily exposure was multiplied  
32 by the total number of months in the current job reported by each subject. We used the calculation and  
33 extrapolation rules reported by Pacheco et al. (2003) but replaced their calculated estimates of daily  
34 exposure by the mean daily exposure actually measured in each of the five job categories. The  
35 measured mean daily exposure was extrapolated to all workers belonging to the same job category  
36 and multiplied by the total number of years in the current job (EU/m<sup>3</sup> x years).

### 47 48 49 **Statistics and sensitivity analyses**

50  
51 Data on prevalence and incidence of LA allergy show considerable discrepancies (Bakerly et al., 2008;  
52 Folletti et al., 2008; Gautrin et al., 2008; Vandenplas et al., 2011) making accurate power calculations  
53 impossible. Consequently, we used the most recent study having examined the four possible  
54 combinations of symptoms and sensitization simultaneously (Pacheco et al., 2003) to assess crudely  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 how large the population had to be for enabling us to make four subgroups of 10-15 workers according  
4 to the four combinations of symptoms and specific sensitization. In the aforementioned study, the  
5 percentages were 66, 10, 12-13, and 11-12% in Sy-/Se-, Sy+/Se+, Sy+/Se-, and Sy-/Se+ subjects,  
6  
7 respectively. Therefore, if these results were generalizable, even the smallest subgroup was expected  
8  
9 to include 10-15 workers if a population of at least 100 subjects was examined.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14 The study was descriptive. Statistical analysis was performed using SAS 9.4 statistical software (SAS  
15 Institute, Cary, North Carolina, USA). Variable distributions were examined for normality, and non-  
16 parametric tests or logarithmic transformation used when appropriate ( $\chi^2$ , Fisher's exact, Wilcoxon  
17 two-sample, or Kruskal-Wallis test, analysis of variance). Subjects with a missing value for one  
18 variable were excluded from the analyses using this variable. Results <LOD were included in the  
19 calculations and were not considered as missing.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 The computation of the aforementioned exposure indicators rely on at least two strong assumptions,  
28 the use of means and the definition of the time period. Pacheco et al. (2003) used the arithmetic mean  
29 assuming that "the arithmetic mean better reflects excursions in exposure that may be important for  
30 intermittent symptom generation". However, owing to the non-normal distribution of exposure  
31 measurements medians may be preferred and were used in our sensitivity analyses. Secondly, with  
32 respect to the time period Sy+ individuals were defined as having ever had work-related symptoms,  
33 which does not fit in well with a "cumulative exposure" based on current airborne concentrations and  
34 reported number of months in the current job. Therefore, sensitivity analyses were conducted after  
35 defining Sy+ as having had symptoms in the last year. For computing the latter exposure indicator the  
36 exposure duration was reduced to a maximum of one year (less if the worker had worked <1 year).  
37 Further sensitivity analyses were conducted using the cut-off of >0.7 kU/l for defining sensitization,  
38 which increases test specificity (Heederik et al., 1999; Hollander et al., 1996),  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## RESULTS

### Part 1: preliminary survey

As expected, the preliminary study showed that mice and rats were by far the most frequent species (58 and 27 units, respectively) but >20 other animal groups occurred as well (mostly sheep in 13 units). Other species occurred less often (for example, cat, horse, rabbit, hamster, dog, or guinea pig in 10, 9, 9, 7, 6, and 5 units, respectively). Thus, exposure was mostly to more than one animal species and a clear-cut separation between mouse and/or rats and other animals was hardly possible. Indeed, a single exposure to mice or rat was found only in 29 and four units, respectively. Eye/nose, skin, and respiratory symptoms in the unit were reported in 17, 7, and 10 interviews, respectively.

### Part 2: main survey

#### *Whole population*

From 302 eligible workers, 177 participated (58.6%) (Figure). One case was partly missing (no attribution to a subgroup was possible). Median age differed between participants and non-participants (31 vs 37 years;  $p=0.006$ ), whereas gender did not differ statistically significantly ( $p=0.15$ ). More than 15 different nationalities were represented but only four of them including >10 subjects (Switzerland, Germany, Italy, other) were considered for comparing participants with non-participants ( $p=0.8$ ). Overall, 41 cases of asthma (occupational and/or non-occupational) were recorded (Table 1). Diagnoses had been confirmed by a doctor in 36/41 (87.8%) workers, while diagnoses were self-reported by five participants. No worker was diagnosed with an organic dust toxic syndrome or hypersensitivity pneumonitis. Fifty-four, 58, 32, 19, 8, 4, 1 workers had worked at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 different workplaces. Eight participants had changed workplace for health reasons, four of whom because of allergic disease (1 rhinitis, 3 asthma). Two of them currently had symptoms due to bystander exposure. 52.8% of the 159 workers currently working with animals able to bite reported animal bites. Therefore, bites in workers currently working with animals were much more frequent than sensitization to rat and/or mice, thereby not supporting the hypothesis of a tight association between bite and sensitization to rat and/or mice. At the time of the investigation, only nine of 164 workers with usable answer wore a respirator protecting from organic dust more than 50% of the time. Hence, even in recent years an efficient respiratory protection was seldom worn.

1  
2  
3 Lifelong occupational exposure to animals was associated both with symptoms and sensitization  
4 (Table 1) and with job category (median in researchers and technicians of 5 and 17 years,  
5 respectively, with values in between in animal handlers and those with various other tasks with  
6 exposure to animals;  $p < 0.0001$ ). Atopy (total IgE  $> 100$  kU/l) was associated with the risk of having  
7 positive specific IgE against mouse and/or rat (odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (95%CI):  
8 7.31 (2.05-27.27) ( $p = 0.0007$ ). Having had a cat and/or dog during childhood ( $n = 130$ ) was associated  
9 with an OR (95%CI) of 0.44 (0.13-1.53) ( $p = 0.2$ ) of positive specific IgE against rat and/or mouse, while  
10 having had a rat and/or mouse ( $n = 30$ ) was associated with an OR of 2.09 (0.51-8.06) ( $p = 0.3$ ) of  
11 positive specific IgE against rat and/or mouse. These ORs must be interpreted with great caution as  
12 only 14 workers did not report any pet exposure in childhood and 118 subjects reported more than one  
13 pet category. The prevalence of Sy-/Se- workers was nearly identical to that expected (68 vs. 66%),  
14 whereas the two subgroups of Se+ workers included  $< 5\%$  of the population each and were smaller  
15 than expected (10-13%). Main population characteristics are presented in table 1.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

#### 29 *Sy/Se subgroups*

30 In the Sy+/Se+ subgroup ( $n = 8$ ), six out of eight workers had a history of rat- and/or mouse-related  
31 occupational asthma, required treatment, and had total IgE  $> 100$  kU/l (table 2) . Most of them had  
32 other occupational and/or non-occupational allergic manifestations. One case may have been  
33 misclassified (irritative dry cough and slightly increased IgE of questionable clinical relevance (e87:  
34 0.35, e88: 2.43 kUA/l)). Using the cut-off of  $> 0.7$  kU/l for defining sensitization, which increases test  
35 specificity (Heederik et al., 1999; Hollander et al., 1996), had no effect on the Sy+/Se+ subgroup.  
36 Unexpectedly, lifelong occupational exposure to animals was  $\leq 3$ , 4-5, and  $> 15$  years in 2, 1, and 5  
37 workers, respectively, suggesting that recent sensitization was a rare event, which fully agrees with  
38 information from clinical history (Table 2). No comparison between those having been exclusively  
39 exposed to mice and/or rats and those exposed to mice and/or rats and other animals could be done  
40 (limited sample size, few workers with a lifelong exposure to rat and/or mice only, confounding by non-  
41 occupational exposure to pets).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 In the Sy-/Se+ subgroup ( $n = 6$ ), no common characteristic of the six workers could be identified. Using  
55 the stricter cut-off of  $> 0.7$  kU/l would have moved two of the six workers to the Sy-/Se- subgroup.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The Sy+/Se- subgroup (n=41) was largely similar to the Sy-/Se- group. Indeed, apart from the number  
5 of symptomatic workers and subjects with allergic rhinitis, asthma, and any allergic disease, the  
6 variables listed in table 1 did not differ statistically significantly between subgroup Sy-/Se- and Sy+/Se-  
7 (0.15<p<0.9). Moreover, a comparison of symptoms unlikely to be associated with occupation  
8 (depressed without any reason, became irritated without any reason, appetite problems apart from  
9 loss of appetite, or irregular bowel movements) between the Sy-/Se- and the Sy+/Se- groups did not  
10 suggest systematic symptom over-reporting in the subgroup Sy+/Se- (0.2<p<1.0). Total duration of  
11 exposure to animals was always >3 years.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Contrary to expectations, endotoxin did not prove to be a major cause of symptoms in this Sy+/Se-  
22 subgroup, and on the basis of occupational and clinical history various other reasons for being  
23 “symptomatic” were identified. Indeed, in only three workers work conditions and clinical history were  
24 clearly compatible with an endotoxin-induced irritant effect resulting from a task with exposure to  
25 organic dust, whereas nine workers had an obvious irritant reaction due to cleaning  
26 agents/disinfectants (e.g. hydrogen peroxide vapor), formaldehyde (e.g. pathology, disinfection), or  
27 glove-induced irritation. Nineteen workers had a clinical history of allergic diseases often suggesting  
28 other allergens than those from rat and/or mouse (e.g. cow, horse, cat, dog, rabbit, latex, plant  
29 allergens) or had taken measures to reduce or prevent exposure to rat and/or mouse allergen. Indeed,  
30 12 workers had been occupationally asymptomatic in the last year. A few cases were likely to be  
31 symptomatic because of a type IV allergy (gloves). In six cases clinical history was compatible with  
32 both an allergic and an irritant reaction and four cases clearly reported work-related complaints related  
33 neither to irritant nor to allergen. Overall, in this Sy+/Se- group occupational and clinical history did not  
34 point to endotoxin as a major factor for symptoms without sensitization but disclosed numerous  
35 different causes of symptoms.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **Part 3: exposure assessment**

#### 51 *Airborne allergens and endotoxin*

52  
53 Regarding measurements of airborne allergens and endotoxin, Sy+/Se- workers were  
54 overrepresented (n=20; 48.8%) as aimed at by the selection procedure. Measurements were  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 performed on 31 different days over five months (March to July 2014). The two half-day sampling  
4 periods were from the same day (n=30) or from two different days (n=8; 1-7 days between the 2  
5 sampling periods). Three workers had measurements during half a day only. Median (range) morning  
6 sampling time was 200 min (106-305) and 200 min (108-292) for allergen and endotoxin, respectively.  
7  
8 Median (range) afternoon sampling time was 176 (84-253) and 173 (62-254) min for allergen and  
9 endotoxin, respectively. Sampling times were quite comparable in the four subgroups ( $0.5 < p < 1.0$ ).  
10  
11 Median temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ , range) was 23.3 (19.3-26.5) and 23.6 (21.1-27.1) in the morning and  
12 afternoon, respectively. Median humidity (% , range) was 37.9 (27-59.4) and 36.7 (23.8-64.7) in the  
13 morning and afternoon, respectively.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Rat allergen was  $\geq$ LOD in four and six morning and afternoon samples, respectively (Table 3), but six  
22 samples were exactly equal to the LOD making statistical calculations impossible. Mouse allergen was  
23  $\geq$ LOD in 51.9% of the samples. Regarding endotoxin, 41 and 38 morning and afternoon samples were  
24 collected with only one sample  $<$ LOD. Mouse allergen and endotoxin concentrations varied widely  
25 (Table 3).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 No statistically significant difference in mouse allergen and endotoxin concentrations was found  
33 between morning and afternoon samples (signed rank test;  $p > 0.60$  for mouse allergen;  $p > 0.10$  for  
34 endotoxin) allowing for computation of daily concentrations. Daily and "maximum" concentrations are  
35 indicated in table 3. With respect to endotoxin, all morning concentrations (n=41), apart from four,  
36 were  $< 20 \text{ EU/m}^3$  (77.3, 110, 390 and 1659  $\text{EU/m}^3$ ), while three of 38 afternoon concentrations  
37 exceeded this value (20.2, 62.9, and 251.3). Thus, 72/79 half-day concentrations were  $< 20 \text{ EU/m}^3$ .  
38 Use of straw, cleaning and feeding tasks, and contact with large animals (pig, sheep) were associated  
39 with the two highest endotoxin concentrations (390 and 1659  $\text{EU/m}^3$ ) (see online supplementary  
40 material). Differences between subgroup endotoxin concentrations were of borderline significance  
41 (Table 3).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

#### *Cumulated exposure*

53 The calculated cumulative endotoxin "exposure" did not differ between the Sy-/Se- and Sy+/Se-  
54 subgroups [median (range): 59.48 (0-3621) vs 29.74 (0-2769)  $\text{EU/m}^3 \times \text{years}$ , respectively;  $p = 0.99$ ].  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Owing to the prevalence of results <LOD, cumulative exposures were not computed for rat and mouse  
4 allergen.  
5  
6  
7

### 8 **Sensitivity analyses**

9  
10 With respect to the time period of symptom occurrence, substituting “past year” for “ever” moved 14  
11 (7.9%) workers into another category of symptoms and sensitization (133, 6, 29, and 8 Sy-/Se-,  
12 Sy+/Se+, Sy+/Se-, Sy-/Se+ workers). As a consequence, the significance level of the difference in  
13 endotoxin daily and maximum concentrations between subgroups Sy-/Se- and Sy+/Se- lessened  
14 considerably (Table 4).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Sensitivity analyses pertaining to the selection of the median instead of the mean showed that the  
22 cumulative exposure computed for a worker heavily depended on the choice of the parameter  
23 estimate (median or mean). Indeed, the median daily endotoxin concentration was 0.83 and 2.97  
24 EU/m<sup>3</sup> in the group “researchers” (n=16) and “various other tasks with exposure to animals” (n=13),  
25 respectively. Thus, the cumulative exposure for a hypothetical worker with a 10-year duration of  
26 exposure was 8.3 and 29.7 EU/m<sup>3</sup> x year, respectively. Arithmetic means were 29.74 and 4.30 EU/m<sup>3</sup>  
27 in the group “researchers” and “various other tasks with exposure to animals”, respectively, resulting in  
28 cumulative exposures of 297.4 and 43.0 EU/m<sup>3</sup> x year for the two same groups of workers. Thus, a  
29 difference of one order of magnitude arose and the ranks of the two workers were inverted. Similar  
30 results were found when calculating cumulative exposures based on maximum exposure  
31 measurements (details not shown).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Discussion

The study assessed the current exposure to airborne allergens and endotoxin in a population working in a university setting and exposed to a range of animals besides laboratory mice to serve as a basis for updated surveillance and prevention measures. Results showed low airborne concentrations of allergens and endotoxin. Moreover, while 49 subjects were symptomatic (Sy+), only eight of them were both symptomatic and sensitized.

The low allergen and endotoxin levels and the low prevalence of sensitization, especially in workers with <4 years of lifelong occupational exposure to animals (Table 2), must be interpreted with caution owing to the lack of longitudinal data. However, the two findings may result from the increased use of genetically modified mice and the introduction of IVCs (Feary and Cullinan, 2016; Jones, 2015). This issue is of importance for prevention. Indeed, as exposure to rat and/or mouse allergen declines, the relative importance of other occupational allergens, irritants, PAMPs, and/or individual susceptibility could increase. Findings from the occupational history support this interpretation. Indeed, other allergens than those from rat and/or mouse (for example, other animal's allergens, latex or plant allergens), cleaning agents/disinfectants, and type IV reaction caused symptoms in much more workers than specific sensitization to rat and/or mice (41 vs. 8 workers).

A simple classification scheme would be extremely useful for efficiently identifying workers with endotoxin-induced symptoms. However, although every effort was made to reproduce the method used by Pacheco et al. (2003), we were unable to reproduce their finding of higher endotoxin exposure in the Sy+/Se- subgroup, although measured endotoxin concentrations were similar in both studies. Indeed, the highest concentration these authors measured amounted to 1 463 pg/m<sup>3</sup> (≈14.63 EU/m<sup>3</sup>), which compares well with those of the present study (72/79 half-day concentrations <20 EU/m<sup>3</sup>) and those reported by Lieutier-Colas et al. (2001) [all but two concentrations below 10 ng/m<sup>3</sup> (≈100 EU/m<sup>3</sup>), n=242]. The discrepancy between the results of these studies could result from the use of different methods for estimating the “daily” exposure. Indeed, in the study by Pacheco et al. (2003) arithmetic means representing 11 combinations of major task and work site (overall, 43 stationary measurements with 2-7 measurement for each combination) were used to compute the “daily” exposure of 269 workers, while we objectively assessed it with personal samples. Moreover, the

1  
2  
3 “cumulative exposure” resulted from multiplying the computed “daily exposure” by the number of  
4 reported months in the current job and could not be representative of individual and variable long-term  
5 exposures. In contrast, in rat-exposed workers with an extensive exposure assessment [128 stationary  
6 samples for estimating the daily exposure in 113 workers; endotoxin concentrations of personal and  
7 stationary endotoxin samples well correlated ( $r=0.88$ ;  $n=38$ )] endotoxin did not seem to be important in  
8 the generation of rat-related symptoms (Lieutier-Colas et al., 2001; Lieutier-Colas et al., 2002). Of  
9 note, an association between intensity of endotoxin exposure and symptoms is not quite consistent  
10 with the dose-response relationship. Indeed, all concentrations were well below the currently  
11 suggested occupational guidance values of 90 to 1000 EU/m<sup>3</sup> (Anonymous, 2016; Duquenne et al.,  
12 2013; Nordic Expert Group and Dutch Expert Committee, 2011; Samadi et al., 2013) (Further details in  
13 online supplementary material). As the computation of the exposure surrogates rely on at least two  
14 strong assumptions (means and time period) great attention should be given to control biases and  
15 confounders capable of affecting them.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Regarding the role of allergens, it should be stressed that the LOD of the assays we used were not  
29 higher than those of recent publications (Curtin-Brosnan et al., 2010; Glueck et al., 2012; Pacheco et  
30 al., 2006; Raulf et al., 2014).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Regarding association between exposure and outcome, time period of outcome occurrence (“ever”)  
37 and exposure measurements (one time point) are incongruent. Work conditions have improved over  
38 time and research may involve intense exposure for some months, followed by little to no exposure.  
39 Consequently, our sensitivity analyses using more congruent time periods should have improved  
40 specificity thereby strengthening the association between endotoxin and symptoms. However, the  
41 opposite was found suggesting a bias rather than a true association.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Last but not least, a major reason possibly explaining some discrepancies is the selection procedure.  
50 Pacheco et al. (2003) examined only symptoms and sensitization to mice, while Lieutier-Colas et al.  
51 (2002) exclusively included rat-exposed workers. We broadened eligibility criteria, which is more  
52 representative of exposure settings where many workers are exposed to several animal species.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This study has limitations. As no data was available, it was designed to give baseline information on  
4 the current situation. Therefore, the design was descriptive, airborne peptidoglycan and fungi were not  
5 considered, and immunological investigations were limited to two specific IgE determinations.  
6  
7

8 Secondly, the participation was 58.6% so that a selection bias may have arisen. Moreover, workers  
9 with symptoms and/or risk factors were overrepresented (figure). This was absolutely justifiable to set  
10 preventive priorities but limits generalization. Nevertheless, despite these limitations the high  
11 proportion of Sy+ workers with a clinical history of condition not due to rat or mouse allergen and the  
12 low proportion of sensitizations in those with short exposure duration bears on risk assessment and  
13 should be considered when updating surveillance and prevention programs.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 21 **Conclusion**

22  
23 The study suggests that prevention programs should not be restricted to one single specific allergen  
24 but consider both irritants and a broad range of sensitizers. Including in the surveillance program a  
25 classification scheme based on the combination of one single IgE determination and having ever had  
26 predefined work-related symptoms represents an attractive approach but may be an oversimplification  
27 and underestimate the prevalence of occupational allergy. As suggested by Feary and Cullinan (2016)  
28 and Jones (2015), the low levels of exposure to allergens and endotoxin may result from recent  
29 changes in the work environment of LA workers. However, this finding has to be confirmed in further  
30 studies.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the help of C. Fardo (literature management), D. Friedli (interviews), H. Anton, M. Egli, and A. Nydegger (clinical examinations), S. Marti and I. Cuhat (IgE measurements), and J. Frank (technical and organizational support).

Contributions made by each author: AO, FH, PH, and PSG devised the conceptual framework of the study. AO, FB, MM, PSG, PH, and HD contributed to the realization of the study. PH did the data analysis. All investigators contributed to the interpretation of the data and to the writing of the paper. Planning, conducting, and statistically analyzing the study was exclusively the work of the authors. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Funding: the study was entirely funded by the units performing the study.

Disclosure of potential conflicts of interests: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Research involving human participants: The study was conducted in the framework of an analysis of occupational risks of workers exposed to animals. It was conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the ethics commission (canton of Zurich; KEK-ZH-Nr. 2012-0142).

Informed consent: The study purpose was explained at information meetings, workers received written information, and all subjects gave written informed consent.


## References

- Anonymous. (2016) Grenzwerte am Arbeitsplatz 2016. 1 ed. Luzern: SUVA CNA INSAI.
- Bakerly ND, Moore VC, Vellore AD *et al.* (2008) Fifteen-year trends in occupational asthma: data from the Shield surveillance scheme. *Occup Med*; 58: 169-74.
- Botham PA, Davies GE, Teasdale EL. (1987) Allergy to laboratory animals: a prospective study of its incidence and of the influence of atopy on its development. *Br J Ind Med*; 44: 627-32.
- Curtin-Brosnan J, Paigen B, Hagberg KA *et al.* (2010) Occupational mouse allergen exposure among non-mouse handlers. *J Occup Environ Hyg*; 7: 726-34.
- Doreswamy V, Peden DB. (2011) Modulation of asthma by endotoxin. *Clin Exp Allergy*; 41: 9-19.
- Duquenne P, Marchand G, Duchaine C. (2013) Measurement of Endotoxins in Bioaerosols at Workplace: A Critical Review of Literature and a Standardization Issue. *Ann Occup Hyg*; 57: 137-72.
- Feary J, Cullinan P. (2016) Laboratory animal allergy: a new world. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol*; 16: 107-12.
- Folletti I, Forcina A, Marabini A *et al.* (2008) Have the prevalence and incidence of occupational asthma and rhinitis because of laboratory animals declined in the last 25 years? *Allergy*; 63: 834-41.
- Freitas AS, Simoneti CS, Ferraz E *et al.* (2016) Exposure to high endotoxin concentration increases wheezing prevalence among laboratory animal workers: a cross-sectional study. *BMC pulm med*; 16: 69.
- Gautrin D, Ghezze H, Infanterivard C *et al.* (2008) Long-term outcomes in a prospective cohort of apprentices exposed to high-molecular-weight agents. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*; 177: 871-9.
- Glueck JT, Huneke RB, Perez H *et al.* (2012) Exposure of laboratory animal care workers to airborne mouse and rat allergens. *J Am Assoc Lab Anim Sci*; 51: 554-60.
- Haldar P, Pavord ID. (2007) Noneosinophilic asthma: A distinct clinical and pathologic phenotype. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*; 119: 1043-52.
- Heederik D, Venables KM, Malmberg P *et al.* (1999) Exposure-response relationships for work-related sensitization in workers exposed to rat urinary allergens: Results from a pooled study. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*; 103: 678-84.
- Heederik D, Henneberger PK, Redlich CA *et al.* (2012) Primary prevention: exposure reduction, skin exposure and respiratory protection. *Eur Respir Rev*; 21: 112-24.

- 1  
2  
3 Hollander A, Doekes G, Heederik D. (1996) Cat and dog allergy and total IgE as risk factors of  
4 laboratory animal allergy. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*; 98: 545-54.  
5  
6 Jones M, Jeal H, Schofield S *et al.* (2014) Rat-specific IgG and IgG4 antibodies associated with  
7 inhibition of IgE-allergen complex binding in laboratory animal workers. *Occup Environ Med*; 71: 619-  
8 23.  
9  
10 Jones M. (2015) Laboratory Animal Allergy in the Modern Era. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep*; 15: 1-8.  
11  
12 Kacergis JB, Jones RB, Reeb CK *et al.* (1996) Air quality in an animal facility: particulates, ammonia,  
13 and volatile organic compounds. *Am Ind Hyg Assoc J*; 57: 634-40.  
14  
15 Kogevinas M, Zock JP, Jarvis D *et al.* (2007) Exposure to substances in the workplace and new-onset  
16 asthma: an international prospective population-based study (ECRHS-II). *Lancet*; 370: 336-41.  
17  
18 Lieutier-Colas F, Meyer P, Larsson P *et al.* (2001) Difference in exposure to airborne major rat  
19 allergen (Rat n 1) and to endotoxin in rat quarters according to tasks. *Clin Exp Allergy*; 31: 1449-56.  
20  
21 Lieutier-Colas F, Meyer P, Pons F *et al.* (2002) Prevalence of symptoms, sensitization to rats, and  
22 airborne exposure to major rat allergen (Rat n 1) and to endotoxin in rat-exposed workers: a cross-  
23 sectional study. *Clin Exp Allergy*; 32: 1424-9.  
24  
25 Nicholson PJ, Mayho GV, Roomes D *et al.* (2010) Health surveillance of workers exposed to  
26 laboratory animal allergens. *Occup Med*; 60: 591-7.  
27  
28 Nordic Expert Group for Criteria Documentation of Health Risks from Chemicals, Dutch Expert  
29 Committee on Occupational Standards. (2011) 144-Endotoxins. *Arbete och Hälsa*; 45: 1-53.  
30  
31 Pacheco K, Maier L, Silveira L *et al.* (2008) Association of Toll-like receptor 4 alleles with symptoms  
32 and sensitization to laboratory animals. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*; 122: 896-902.  
33  
34 Pacheco KA, Mccammon C, Liu AH *et al.* (2003) Airborne endotoxin predicts symptoms in non-mouse-  
35 sensitized technicians and research scientists exposed to laboratory mice. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*;  
36 167: 983-90.  
37  
38 Pacheco KA, Mccammon C, Thorne PS *et al.* (2006) Characterization of endotoxin and mouse  
39 allergen exposures in mouse facilities and research laboratories. *Ann Occup Hyg*; 50: 563-72.  
40  
41 Pacheco KA, Rose CS, Silveira LJ *et al.* (2010) Gene-environment interactions influence airways  
42 function in laboratory animal workers. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*; 126: 232-40.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Peng RD, Paigen B, Eggleston PA *et al.* (2011) Both the variability and level of mouse allergen  
4 exposure influence the phenotype of the immune response in workers at a mouse facility. *J Allergy*  
5 *Clin Immunol*; 128: 390-6.  
6  
7  
8 Phipatanakul W, Matsui E, Portnoy J *et al.* (2012) Environmental assessment and exposure reduction  
9 of rodents: a practice parameter. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*; 109: 375-87.  
10  
11 Poole JA, Romberger DJ. (2012) Immunological and inflammatory responses to organic dust in  
12 agriculture. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol*; 12: 126-32.  
13  
14 Raulf M, Buters J, Chapman M *et al.* (2014) Monitoring of occupational and environmental  
15 aeroallergens-- EAACI Position Paper. Concerted action of the EAACI IG Occupational Allergy and  
16 Aerobiology & Air Pollution. *Allergy*; 69: 1280-99.  
17  
18 Redlich CA, Herrick CA. (2008) Lung/skin connections in occupational lung disease. *Curr Opin Allergy*  
19 *Clin Immunol*; 8: 115-9.  
20  
21 Ruoppi P, Koistinen T, Pennanen S. (2005) Sensitisation to mites in laboratory animal workers with  
22 rhinitis. *Occup Environ Med*; 62: 612-5.  
23  
24 Samadi S, Spithoven J, Jamshidifard AR *et al.* (2012) Allergy among veterinary medicine students in  
25 The Netherlands. *Occup Environ Med*; 69: 48-55.  
26  
27 Samadi S, Wouters IM, Heederik DJJ. (2013) A review of bio-aerosol exposures and associated health  
28 effects in veterinary practice. *Ann Agric Environ Med*; 20: 206-21.  
29  
30 Schmid K, Jungert B, Hager M *et al.* (2009) Is there a need for special preventive medical check-ups  
31 in employees exposed to experimental animal dust? *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*; 82: 319-27.  
32  
33 Tabrizi RD, Bernard A, Thommen AM *et al.* (2010) Surfactant protein-D and exposure to bioaerosols in  
34 wastewater and garbage workers. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*; 83: 879-86.  
35  
36 Tschopp A, Bernard A, Thommen AM *et al.* (2011) Exposure to bioaerosols, respiratory health and  
37 lung-specific proteins: a prospective study in garbage and wastewater workers. *Occup Environ Med*;  
38 68: 856-9.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Vandenplas O, Lantin AC, D'Alpaos V *et al.* (2011) Time trends in occupational asthma in Belgium.  
*Respir Med*; 105: 1364-72.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Preliminary, main, and exposure assessment study

348x217mm (96 x 96 DPI)



Table 1 Characteristics of the study population

	<b>GROUP</b>			
	<b>Sy-/Se-</b>	<b>Sy+/Se+</b>	<b>Sy+/Se-</b>	<b>Sy-/Se+</b>
	<b>(n=121)</b>	<b>(n=8)</b>	<b>(n=41)</b>	<b>(n=6)</b>
Age (years)	31.0 (16.0-63.0)	50.0 (27-64)	31.0 (22-58)	39.0 (28-53)
Sex (women)	83 (68.6)	4 (-)	26 (63.4)	3 (-)
Education level				
High	86 (71.1)	7 (-)	26 (63.4)	5 (-)
Middle	34 (28.1)	1 (-)	13 (31.7)	1 (-)
Low	1 (-)	0 (-)	2 (-)	0 (-)
Nationality				
Switzerland	57 (47.1)	4 (-)	20 (48.8)	1 (-)
Germany	24 (19.8)	1 (-)	11 (26.8)	2 (-)
Italy	10 (8.3)	0	1(-)	0
Other <sup>a</sup>	30 (24.8)	3 (-)	9 (-)	3 (-)
Smoking				
Never	82 (67.8)	5 (-)	31 (75.6)	3 (-)
Former	21 (17.3)	2 (-)	5 (-)	2 (-)
Current	18 (14.9)	1 (-)	5 (12.2)	1 (-)
Pack-years (cigarette smokers only) (n)	2.95 (0.05-21) (39)	4.05-35 (3)	3.60 (0.25-22.75) (10)	0.20-5.25 (n=3)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>b</sup>	22.49 (17.31-35.98)	25.2 (19.4-35.3)	23.2 (16.4-35.4)	23.2 (21.5-32.8)
FEV1 (percent predicted) <sup>c</sup>	103.3 (79.2-139.1)	98.5 (84.3-109.1)	102.8 (68.9-136.9)	94.1 (87.4-128.2)
FEV1/FVC (%) <sup>c</sup>	78.4 (53.7-94.9)	70.1 (59.2-80.6)	77.4 (58.2-90.1)	79.3 (71.5-80.5)
Health condition				
Symptomatic <sup>d</sup>				
No	35 (28.9)	0	0	0
Non-WR	86 (71.1)	0	0	6 (-)
WR	0	8 (-)	41 (100)	0
Allergic rhinitis				
No	80 (66.1)	1 (-)	20 (48.8)	5 (-)
NWR	41 (33.9)	0 (-)	10 (24.4)	1 (-)
WR	0 (0)	7 (-)	11 (26.8)	0 (0)
Any allergic disease <sup>e</sup>				

1					
2					
3	No	58 (47.9)	0 (0)	9 (-)	1 (-)
4	NWR	63 (52.1)	1 (-)	7 (-)	5 (-)
5	WR	0 (0)	7 (-)	25 (61.0)	0 (0)
6	<i>Asthma<sup>f</sup></i>				
7	No	99 (81.8)	1 (-)	32 (78.1)	3 (-)
8	NWR	22 (18.2)	1 (-)	5 (-)	3 (-)
9	WR	0 (0)	6 (-)	4 (-)	0 (0)
10					
11	Total IgE (kU/l)	28.1 (1.00-1451)	163.5 (22.5-1209)	30.9 (1.00-1127)	146.5 (18.9-306)
12	Total IgE				
13	≤100	100 (82.6)	2 (-)	30 (73.2)	3 (-)
14	>100	21 (17.4)	6 (-)	11 (26.8)	3 (-)
15					
16	Specific IgE (≥0.35 kUA/l)				
17	Rat	0	1	0	0
18	Mouse	0	1	0	4
19	Mouse + rat	0	6	0	2
20					
21	Lifelong occupational				
22	exposure to animals				
23	(year)	6.0 (0-43.0)	20.5 (3.0-39.0)	7.0 (0-37.0)	10.5 (4.0-32.0)
24					
25					

26 Values are median and range or number and percent. n: sample size. One case is missing (no attribution to a subgroup because of missing values). Percentages  
27 not indicated for n<10.

28 <sup>a</sup>Other nationality” includes >12 different nationalities

29 <sup>b</sup>BMI: body mass index

30 <sup>c</sup>Spirometric results includes only acceptable spirometric curves in Caucasians. Regarding FEV1 (FEV1/FVC), subgroup size is 98 (95), 7 (6), 37 (36), and 5 (5) in  
31 subgroups Sy-/Se-, Sy+/Se+, Sy+/Se-, and Sy-/Se+, respectively.

32 <sup>d</sup>“Symptomatic”, “non-work-related (NWR)” and “work-related” (WR): see methods. Note that according to the classification scheme subjects having any pre-defined  
33 symptom are considered asymptomatic when the symptom is not work-related. Cases who were both WR (work-related) and non-WR were considered as WR.

34 <sup>e</sup>Any allergic disease comprises allergic rhinitis, asthma, eczema or any other skin allergy, and allergy to animals

35 <sup>f</sup>Asthma (occupational and/or non-occupational) was defined by a positive response to the question “Have you ever had asthma”? Asthma had been confirmed by a  
36 doctor in 36/41 (87.8%) workers.

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Table 2 Main characteristics of the Sy+/Se+ subgroup

Current job category/ duration (year)	Previous job category with animal exposure /duration (year)	Lifelong exposure to animals (year)	Symptoms Treatment	Clinically rat- or mouse-related asthma	FEV1 (percent predicted) FEV1/FVC (%)	Total IgE (kU/l) e87 (kUA/l) e88 (kUA/l)	Endotoxin concentrations (morning/afternoon) (EU/m <sup>3</sup> ) Others
Researcher/4	None	4	N, R AH, BA, S B: 1990	Yes	95.06 NA	Total: 162.0 e87: 5.18 e88: 28.80	NA/NA Direct and bystander exposure causes symptoms
Researcher/4	Researcher/8 Researcher/6 Researcher/2 Researcher/1 Researcher/4	25	E, N, R AH B: 1991	Yes	98.46 71.93	Total: 165.0 e87: 1.00 e88: 11.50	8.3/10.3 RPE use Asthma was exclusively occupational
Research manager (exposure stop in 2005)	Researcher/16	16	E, N, R AH, BA, S B: 1988	Yes	84.26 68.16	Total: 79.60 e87: 0.05 e88: 2.34	1.1/2.7 Had to stop exposure because of allergy but still symptomatic in lift when animals are transported
Researcher/4	Researcher/3 Researcher/8 Researcher/16	31	E, N, R, U AH, BA, S B: 1998	Yes	89.08 59.22	Total: 1209.0 e87: 6.91 e88: 12.0	NA/NA
Researcher/3	None	3	E, N, R AH, BA B: 2010	Yes	107.18 75.31	Total: 426.0 e87: 14.70 e88: 2.34	3.6/15.3 RPE use
Animal handler/33	Miscellaneous exposure/1 Researcher/5	39	R (infrequently) No antiallergic treatment B: unknown	Very unlikely given the clinical picture	NA	Total: 419.0 e87: 0.35; e88: 2.43	11.0/9.9 Non-acceptable spirometry curves
Technician/34	None	34	No symptom in the last year T, BA, S B: 1990	Yes	107.79 59.62	Total: 22.50 e87: 2.41 e88: 0.08	NA/NA Asthma was exclusively occupational
Researcher/3	None	3	No symptom in the last year No antiallergic treatment B: 2013	No asthma but U and N	109.07 80.63	Total: 132.0 e87: 2.39 e88: 0.54	0.3/0.2 RPE use. Has to limit long or intense exposure

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Job category: see "methods" Job categories listed from the most recent to the oldest one. E: eye N: nose R: respiratory U: urticaria B: year of beginning of symptoms of occupational allergy recvorded in 2013 AH: antihistamine BA: beta agonist S: Steroid T: theophylline RPE: respiratory protection equipment e87 and e88: specific IgE against rat and mouse, respectively. NA: not available.

Table 3 Exposure measurements

Subgroup	Sy-/Se-	Sy+/Se+	Sy+/Se-	Sy-/Se+	p value (Sy-/Se- vs. Sy+/Se-)
Rat allergen <LOD (ng/filter) (n)					
Morning (n=41)	10/11	4/5	18/20	5/5	1.0
Afternoon (n=38)	8/9	5/5	15/19	4/5	1.0
Mouse allergen <LOD (ng/filter) (n)					
Morning (n=41)	6/11	0/5	13/20	1/5	0.7
Afternoon (n=38)	5/9	1/5	11/19	1/5	1.0
Daily exposure (ng/m <sup>3</sup> ) (n=35)	0.02-12.69 (7)	0.03-50.94 (5)	0.03 (0.02-9.97) (18)	0.03-7.52 (5)	0.4
Maximum exposure (ng/m <sup>3</sup> ) (n=40)	0.64 (0.02-17.03) (10)	0.04-50.95 (5)	0.03 (0.02-18.10) (20)	0.03-14.75 (5)	0.4
Endotoxin (EU/m <sup>3</sup> )					
Morning (n=41)	0.54 (0.24-4.58) (11)	0.25-11.02 (5)	1.29 (0.17-390) (20)	0.32-1659 (5)	0.2
Afternoon (n=38)	0.15-4.31 (9)	0.21-15.34 (5)	1.83 (0.29-251) (19)	0.09-20.2 (5)	0.09
Daily exposure (n=38)	0.23-2.84 (9)	0.23-10.46 (5)	1.99 (0.30-320) (19)	0.20-839 (5)	0.06
Max. exposure (n=41)	1.44 (0.32-4.58) (11)	0.25-15.34 (5)	2.56 (0.17-390) (20)	0.32-1659 (5)	0.09

Results are number or median, range, and number (median not indicated when size <10). Subgroup size may slightly vary because of participant non-available for one half-day (n=3) or pump malfunction.

LOD: limit of detection (expressed in ng/filter; see "Methods"). Regarding mouse allergen, a concentration equal to half the LOD was attributed to samples <LOD, while two samples with very high concentrations (>25 ng/filter) were attributed a value of 25 ng/filter for statistical analyses. Only one endotoxin sample was <LOD.

p value (Kruskal-Wallis test) for comparison between subgroups Sy-/Se- and Sy+/Se- only (owing to the small subgroup size results from subgroups Sy+/Se+ and Sy-/Se+ are given only for the sake of completeness).

Table 4 Effect of the time period selected for outcome assessment on the endotoxin concentration (EU/m<sup>3</sup>)

Time period of symptom occurrence "ever"			
	Subgroup		
	Sy-/Se-	Sy+/Se-	p value
Daily exposure (n)	0.23-2.84 (9)	1.99 (0.30-320) (19)	0.06
Maximum exposure (n)	1.44 (0.32-4.58) (11)	2.56 (0.17-390) (20)	0.09
Time period of symptom occurrence "past year"			
	Subgroup		
	Sy-/Se-	Sy+/Se-	p value
Daily exposure (n)	1.25 (0.23-320) (17)	1.58 (0.30-86.4) (11)	0.6
Maximum exposure (n)	1.72 (0.32-390) (19)	1.89 (0.17-110) (12)	0.8

Time period for symptom occurrence is "ever" (top) and "past year" (bottom). Subgroup size may slightly vary because of participant non-available for one half-day (n=3) or pump malfunction.  
p-value according to Kruskal-Wallis test.

**Association of endotoxin and allergens with respiratory and skin symptoms: a descriptive study in laboratory animal workers**

A. Oppliger<sup>1</sup>, F. Barresi<sup>2</sup>, M. Maggi<sup>2</sup>, P. Schmid-Grendelmeier<sup>3</sup>, F. Huaux<sup>4</sup>, P. Hotz<sup>2</sup>, H. Dressel<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute for Work and Health, University of Lausanne, CH-1011 Lausanne, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup> Division of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, EBPI, University of Zurich and University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup> Department of Dermatology, Allergy Unit, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>4</sup> Louvain Centre for Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology, Institut de Recherche Expérimentale et Clinique (IREC), Université Catholique de Louvain, Brussels, Belgium

Corresponding author: Prof. H. Dressel; Abteilung für Arbeits- und Umweltmedizin, EBPI, Universität Zürich und Universitätsspital Zürich, Zürich. Tel +41 44 634 63 12 Fax +41 044 634 47 09 E-Mail: [holger.dressel@usz.ch](mailto:holger.dressel@usz.ch)

Part 1: Supplementary table S1 Current job category

Part 2: Job tasks associated with endotoxin concentrations clearly exceeding the currently suggested occupational guidance values (90 to 1000 EU/m<sup>3</sup>)

Part 3: Comment about the guidance values

**Supplementary table S1 Current job category**

Subgroup	Sy-/Se-	Sy+/Se+	Sy+/Se-	Sy-/Se+
Animal handlers	13	1	7	1
Technicians	5	1	4	0
Researchers	73	5	14	3
Various other tasks				
with exposure to animals	21	0	15	2
No occupational exposure to animals	9	1	1	0

The job category is the current job category. A worker may have no exposure in its job category but be exposed and symptomatic because of bystander exposure. Tasks defining each job category: see methods.

**Job tasks associated with endotoxin concentrations clearly exceeding the currently suggested occupational guidance values (90 to 1000 EU/m<sup>3</sup>)***Worker 1*

Morning (1659.5 UE/m<sup>3</sup>): work with rabbits and pigs (cage cleaning; feeding) and cleaning room (cleaning of cages for rat and mouse).

Afternoon (20.2 UE/m<sup>3</sup>): reception of rats and mice and putting straw and water in the mouse and/or rat cages

Case 1 belonged to the subgroup Sy-/Se+.

*Worker 2*

Morning (390.30 UE/m<sup>3</sup>)

Worker in various stables (pig, sheep, and rabbit). Several tasks were carried out: petting and feeding animals, and refilling hay; immunization (rabbits); drug administration (sheep); taking feces probes.

Afternoon (251.307 UE/m<sup>3</sup>): mainly office work (five dogs are usually in the office). A further task was feeding animals with straw.

Case 2 belonged to the subgroup Sy+/Se-.

**Comment about the guidance values**

The endotoxin concentrations of the present study can be compared with those measured by the same laboratory and with the same assay in previous studies on respiratory conditions in the same region (Tabrizi et al. 2010; Tschopp et al. 2011). At similar endotoxin levels, no endotoxin-related eye, nose, or respiratory effect could be evidenced, which agrees quite well with information from occupational history and supports the use of the currently suggested occupational guidance values of 90 to 100 EU/m<sup>3</sup>.

**References**

- Tabrizi RD, Bernard A, Thommen AM *et al.* (2010) Surfactant protein-D and exposure to bioaerosols in wastewater and garbage workers. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*; 83: 879-86.
- Tschopp A, Bernard A, Thommen AM *et al.* (2011) Exposure to bioaerosols, respiratory health and lung-specific proteins: a prospective study in garbage and wastewater workers. *Occup Environ Med*; 68: 856-9.