Working in swine-confinement buildings causes an accelerated decline in FEV1: a 7-yr follow-up of Danish farmers
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ABSTRACT: Work in swine confinement units causes exposure to high levels of organic dust and is associated with a high prevalence of work-related respiratory symptoms and probably with accelerated decline in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1).

A 7-yr follow-up on FEV1, forced vital capacity (FVC), bronchial reactivity, and respiratory symptoms was performed on 181 Danish farmers. The participation rate was 76.3% and nonparticipants had more symptoms, were more likely to be current-smokers and had lower lung function in the first survey than participants in both surveys.

Farmers who worked exclusively with pigs in the follow-up had an accelerated decline in FEV1 but not in FVC compared with dairy farmers, where the observed decline in FEV1 was close to the expected. For a nonsmoking pig farmer compared to a nonsmoking dairy farmer the mean additional decline in FEV1 was 17 mL·yr⁻¹ (53.0 mL·yr⁻¹ versus 36.1 mL·yr⁻¹).

The authors conclude that working in swine confinement units causes an accelerated decline in forced expiratory volume in one second but not in forced vital capacity. The mean decline is ~0.5 L during a working life and some farmers will develop clinically significant airway obstruction due to work in swine confinement units.

survey. After two or more practice blows FEV1 and FVC was determined as the highest value from the results of measurements.

Histamine challenge

Bronchial reactivity to histamine was performed in accordance with a method described by Cockcroft et al. [18]. The aerosol was generated by a Wright nebulizer, calibrated to give a constant output of 0.13–0.15 mL min⁻¹. The aerosol was inhaled during 2 min of tidal breathing through a mouthpiece. A nose clip was used. FEV1 was measured before start of the procedure and 90 s after each inhalation (Vitalograph, Model S; Vitalograph Ltd.). FEV1 after isotonic saline inhalation was used as baseline. Histamine dihydrochloride was inhaled in doubling concentrations from 0.03–32 mg mL⁻¹. The results were expressed as the provocative concentration of histamine causing a 20% fall in FEV1 (PC20) histamine obtained from the log dose-response curve by linear interpolation of the two last points or the slope calculated as the maximal fall in percent of FEV1 divided by the cumulative doses of histamine in mg. Bronchial hyperreactivity in this study means a PC20 histamine of ≤32 mg mL⁻¹.

Statistics

Parametric statistics were used with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) [19]. Analysis of variance with covariate analysis was used to compare means and multiple linear regression analysis to study explanatory variables for decline in FEV1 and FVC. Test for normal distribution of variables was performed with the Lilliefors test. A significance level of 0.05 was used for unpaired comparisons. Wilcoxon matched pairs test for comparison from 0.03–32 mg mL⁻¹. The results were expressed as the provocative concentration of histamine causing a 20% fall in FEV1 (PC20) histamine obtained from the log dose-response curve by linear interpolation of the two last points or the slope calculated as the maximal fall in per cent of FEV1 divided by the cumulative doses of histamine in mg. Bronchial hyperreactivity in this study means a PC20 histamine of ≤32 mg mL⁻¹.

Results

Participants versus nonparticipants

Of the 181 farmers, four died in the follow-up period. Death certificates were obtained from the national death certificate register. None of the deaths were caused by respiratory disease and the four deceased farmers had lung function values in the normal range at the survey in 1989. Of 177 farmers, 135 (76.3%) participated in the survey. Participants and nonparticipants were of the same age and height and had the same number of working hours in confinement buildings (table 1) but nonparticipants had significantly lower FEV1 (96.0% versus 105.3%), FVC, FEV1/FVC ratio and more respiratory symptoms during work (39.1% versus 24.4%) and more were smokers 20.7% versus 34.8%) than participants (table 1). The daily number of working hours in the confinement buildings were nearly the same in participants and nonparticipants (5.0 and 5.3 h). Three farmers had changed their farming practices so that they could not be classified as exclusively pig or dairy farmers in the follow-up period, therefore 132 farmers were included in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Nonparticipants</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean height m</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV1 % pred</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV1/FVC %</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV1/FVC &lt;70%</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related respiratory symptoms %</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoking %</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive skin prick test %</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily working hours in building</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEV1: forced expiratory volume in one second; FVC: forced vital capacity; % pred: percentage of the predicted value.

The decline of FEV1 (fig. 1), and FVC (fig. 2), showed a continuous distribution not significantly different from a normal distribution (p>0.20). This also applied to the subgroups of dairy farmers/swine farmers and smokers/nonsmokers with a normal distribution (Lilliefors test, p>0.05).

Because the first cross-sectional survey had demonstrated an interaction between smoking and pig farming, the decline in FEV1 and FVC were analysed separately in farmers who were nonsmokers in the study period and in the whole group of farmers.

Corrected for age, height and pack-yrs in the study period the annual decline in FEV1 of pig farmers was significantly higher than dairy farmers (33.7 versus 39.1 mL, p=0.045), whereas there was no significant difference for FVC (33.7 versus 39.1 mL, p=0.608) (table 2). With the analysis restricted to farmers who were nonsmokers in the
study period, the difference was more pronounced for FEV1 (53.0 mL·yr⁻¹ for pig farmers and 36.1 mL·yr⁻¹ for dairy farmers (p = 0.018)) whereas FVC was essentially unchanged (38.2 mL·yr⁻¹ versus 36.8 mL·yr⁻¹, p = 0.920) (table 3).

Multiple linear regression analysis showed that the level of bronchial reactivity expressed by the histamine slope at the initial survey was not a significant predictor for decline in FEV1 in the total group (p = 0.536) (table 4), or in the group of nonsmokers (p = 0.340) (table 5).

**Bronchial reactivity**

In the first survey bronchial reactivity was not significantly different between pig and dairy farmers (p = 0.715) nor was it in the second survey (p = 0.969). With linear correction for FEV1 with respect to PC20 histamine a significant, although small, decrease in bronchial hyperreactivity was seen (p < 0.001 for pig and dairy farmers). The difference in both groups was caused by a number of persons going from light bronchial hyperresponsiveness to a non-respondent status (fig. 3).

**Work-related respiratory symptoms**

The number of persons with asthma-like respiratory symptoms like wheezing, shortness of breath or dry cough during work in the animal house was similar in the two surveys (n = 11) and they were all found among the pig farmers.

**Table 2.** – Values of decline in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1) and forced vital capacity (FVC) for pig and dairy farmers. Analysis of variance with correction for age, height, and pack-yrs in the follow-up period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pig farmers</th>
<th>Dairy farmers</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decline in FEV1</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline in FVC</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mL·yr⁻¹.

**Discussion**

This 7-yr follow-up study had a bias in the participation as nonparticipants had significantly more work-related respiratory symptoms, airways obstruction and number of current-smokers. However there was no bias with respect to pig/dairy farmer, age, height or number of working hours in confinement building. The bias is substantial and probably means that this study will underestimate the harmful effects of pig farming with respect to decline in FEV1.

Participation in the first survey and knowing the results of lung function measurements represents another possible bias. Pig farmers especially had increased awareness of the potential harmful effects of their occupation and the harmful effects of smoking and some took measures to reduce exposure. This bias, which would tend to diminish the effects of pig farming found in this study were not evaluated. Nonsmoking dairy farmers had an annual decline in FEV1 very close to the expected 30 mL·yr⁻¹ found nonsmoking Danish men in a non rural population [20]. The excess decline due to pig farming had a mean value of 17 mL·yr⁻¹ which would correspond to 0.51 L in 30 yrs of work. As the normal physiological loss of FEV1 from the age of 30 to the age of 60 is ~1 L an additional decline of 0.5 L represents a substantial loss. Farmers with FEV1 values low in the normal range or higher than average decline in FEV1 due to pig farming will probably develop clinically significant airways obstruction before the age of

**Table 3.** – Values of decline in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1) and forced vital capacity (FVC) for pig and dairy farmers who did not smoke in the follow-up period. Analysis of variance with correction for age and height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pig farmers</th>
<th>Dairy farmers</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decline in FEV1</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline in FVC</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data presented as mL·yr⁻¹.

Pig farmers with symptoms had more airways obstruction than nonsymptomatic pig farmers (FEV1:FVC ratio 0.76 versus 0.84, p = 0.316) larger annual decline in FEV1 (72.7 versus 51.7 mL, p = 0.066), larger annual decline in FVC (58.2 versus 30.34 mL) and there were more current smokers (36% versus 13%, p = 0.123) but none of the differences were significant.

**Table 4.** – Regression analysis of decline in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1), results from all 132 participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>B: regression coefficient</th>
<th>SE of B</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Histamine slope 1989</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig versus dairy farming</td>
<td>-11.010</td>
<td>6.328</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking in follow-up</td>
<td>2.421</td>
<td>6.535</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant 61.521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: regression coefficient; SE: standard error.
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### Table 5. Regression analysis of decline in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1), results from the 101 participants who were nonsmokers in the follow-up period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE of B</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Histamine slope 1989</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig versus dairy farming</td>
<td>-15.205</td>
<td>7.161</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEV1 in 1989 L</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>64.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: regression coefficient; SE: standard error.

## Figure 3

![Box-plot of decline in provocative concentration of histamine causing a 20% fall in forced expiratory volume in one second (PC20 histamine) in 1989 and 1996 in pig and dairy farmers. Fifty per cent of observations are within the closed boxes, median values are indicated by the solid lines. ●: outliers; ***: p=0.001; *: p=0.715; -: p=0.969.](image-url)

In conclusion, nonsmoking pig farmers experience sign-
ificant excess decline in forced expiratory volume in one second but not in forced vital capacity over a 7-yr period, whereas nonsmoking dairy farmers have declines in forced expiratory volume in one second and forced vital capacity comparable to the general population.
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