Occupational exposures and fluorescent oxidation products in 723 adults of the EGEA study

To the Editor:

Occupational asthma can be induced by a variety of agents, including high and low molecular weight sensitisers, and respiratory irritants [1]. The role of exposure to cleaning products and disinfectants in work-related asthma is increasingly recognised, although the specific substances that increase asthma risk are not well identified [2]. Some of the numerous agents contained in these products are chemical sensitisers, but most are hypothesised to act as respiratory irritants [2]. While high molecular weight sensitisers are known to cause occupational asthma through a typical allergic response, the pathophysiological mechanisms involved in occupational asthma induced by low molecular weight (LMW) chemicals, and in irritant-induced asthma, remain poorly understood [1, 3, 4].

Oxidative stress is one of the potential mechanisms causing epithelial injury, which may be especially relevant in irritant-induced asthma [1, 4]. In this context, we sought to investigate the associations between occupational exposure to potentially asthmogenic chemicals and irritants, and the level of fluorescent oxidation products, a global marker of damage due to oxidative stress [5], in adults from the Epidemiological study on the Genetics and Environment of Asthma (EGEA).

The French EGEA combines a case–control and family-based study [6]. The baseline study (EGEA1; 1991–1995, n=2047) included cases with asthma, their first degree relatives, and population-based controls. The study protocol was approved by the relevant institutional review board committees (Cochin Port-Royal Hospital and Necker-Enfants Malades Hospital, Paris, France) and all participants gave written informed consent. The current analysis used data from the follow-up study (EGEA2; 2003–2007) and included only adults who had never had asthma (n=888), in order to distinguish occupational exposures from the oxidative stress generated by the disease. 723 participants (328 men and 395 women) had fluorescent oxidation products measurements available and complete data for smoking habits, an environmental exposure related to oxidative stress.

Levels of fluorescent oxidation products were measured in plasma as described previously [5]. Briefly, plasma was extracted with 3:1 by volume ethanol/ether and was measured using a spectrofluorometer (360nm excitation wavelength, 430nm emission wavelength). The fluorescence was determined as relative fluorescent intensity units per millilitre of plasma (RFU·mL$^{-1}$).

Occupational history was recorded by questionnaire, and an asthma-specific job-exposure matrix (JEM) was used to evaluate exposure to agents potentially at risk for asthma or respiratory health [7]. Hospital workers (including healthcare workers or cleaners in hospitals) were further asked to complete a job-specific questionnaire regarding exposure to cleaning/disinfecting tasks and products. An expert assessment was also conducted to evaluate exposure to 18 specific products in hospital workers [8]. We chose to study the following occupational exposures, in the current or last job held, in relation to levels of fluorescent oxidation products: 1) exposure to cleaning/disinfecting products evaluated both by the JEM (a highly specific assessment in which only jobs with high probability of exposure to industrial cleaning products were classified as exposed), and by the expert assessment with a focus on cleaning/disinfecting products which are more likely to be respiratory irritants; and 2) exposure to LMW agents evaluated by the JEM.

Associations between occupational exposures and levels of fluorescent oxidation products were evaluated separately in men and women. We used linear regression of log-transformed levels of fluorescent oxidation products, adjusted for age and smoking habits. The coefficients obtained from the log-transformed fluorescent oxidation products models were back-transformed to obtain geometric mean (GM) ratios.

The GM (first quartile–third quartile) of fluorescent oxidation products level in all adults was 94.4 (81.9–108.1) RFU·mL$^{-1}$. As expected [5], levels of fluorescent oxidation products increased with age (p<0.0001), were higher in women (age-adjusted GM (95% CI) 95.7 (93.7–97.7) RFU·mL$^{-1}$) than in men (92.9 (90.8–95.0) RFU·mL$^{-1}$; p=0.06), and increased with current smoking. Among women, levels of fluorescent oxidation products were increased in current smokers (age-adjusted GM (95% CI): 100.2
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**TABLE 1** Age- and smoking-adjusted associations between current occupational exposure and levels of fluorescent oxidation products in men and women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational exposure</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>GM ratio (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>GM ratio (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>p-value for interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non exposed</strong> (reference)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleaning products</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Industrial cleaning products (JEM)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.06 (0.93–1.21)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Irritant cleaning products (expert assessment)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.06 (0.99–1.13)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) or 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LMW agents</strong> (JEM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any LWM agent*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.01 (0.92–1.09)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.01 (0.92–1.09)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly reactive chemicals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.02 (0.93–1.11)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.05 (0.95–1.17)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jobs classified as exposed to irritant cleaning products (assessed among hospital workers only) included various healthcare-related occupations (e.g., nursing professionals, personal care workers (mainly women), medical doctors, physiotherapists and life science technicians). Jobs classified as exposed to highly reactive chemicals included chemists, biologists or pharmacologists, and jobs such as varnishers/painters, embalmers or hairdressers. GM: geometric mean; JEM: job-exposure matrix; LMW: low molecular weight. #: nonexposed to any agent potentially a risk for asthma or respiratory health (asthma-specific JEM); *: including bleach, ammonia, decalcifiers, solvents, formaldehyde, glutaraldehyde, alcohol, quaternary ammonium compounds, chloramine T, ethylene oxide, and disinfection or bio-cleaning tasks; †: including industrial cleaning products, highly reactive chemicals, metals and diisocyanates.
between occupational exposures and oxidative stress may be more difficult to detect in these women experiencing exposure to multiple cleaning and disinfecting products, especially when further considering domestic exposures [14, 15]. Gender differences may also be explained by the different ability to maintain redox status between men and women [16]. Larger studies are needed to further investigate the role of exposure to specific chemicals in women.

Irritant-induced asthma was first described in relation to a single exposure to high concentrations of irritants. There is increasing recognition that repeated workplace exposures to moderate levels of irritants also has an adverse effect in asthma, although whether such chronic exposure can cause new-onset asthma remains unclear [4]. Although the biological processes by which irritant cleaning products induce asthma onset or exacerbations are unknown, it has been proposed that irritants may induce injury of the bronchial epithelium, triggering release of inflammatory mediators and/or increasing epithelium permeability [1, 4]. Our results are consistent with the hypothesis that oxidative stress is one of the mechanisms through which respiratory irritants may cause epithelial damage.

In conclusion, the results suggest that occupational exposures to asthmogenic chemicals and irritants, in particular cleaning and disinfecting products, generate oxidative stress. Future research should investigate oxidative stress as one of the potential mechanisms of chemical- or irritant-induced occupational asthma.

Associations between occupational exposures to asthmogenic chemicals and irritants and oxidative stress were found http://ow.ly/K6RSt
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