

Endotoxin concentration in poultry houses for laying hens kept in cages or in alternative housing systems

Adeline Huneau-Salaün, Sophie Le Bouquin, Valérie Bex-Capelle, Didier Huonnic, Loïc Balaine, Marie-Thérèse Guillam, Fabrice Squizani, Claire Ségala, Virginie Michel

▶ To cite this version:

Adeline Huneau-Salaün, Sophie Le Bouquin, Valérie Bex-Capelle, Didier Huonnic, Loïc Balaine, et al.. Endotoxin concentration in poultry houses for laying hens kept in cages or in alternative housing systems. British Poultry Science, 2011, 52 (05), pp.523-530. 10.1080/00071668.2011.617728 hal-00745615

HAL Id: hal-00745615 https://hal.science/hal-00745615

Submitted on 26 Oct 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Endotoxin concentration in poultry houses for laying hens kept in cages or in alternative housing systems

Journal:	British Poultry Science
Manuscript ID:	CBPS-2010-306.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Dec-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Huneau-Salaün, Adeline; Anses, EBEAC LE BOUQUIN, Sophie; Anses, UEBEAC Bex-Capelle, Valérie; LHVP Huonnic, Didier; Anses, UEBEAC Balaine, Loïc; Anses, UEBEAC Guillam, Marie-Thérèse; SEPIA-Santé Squizani, Fabrice; LHVP Ségala, Claire; SEPIA-Santé Michel, Virginie; Anses, UEBEAC
Keywords:	Laying hens, dust, endotoxin

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

1 2		NOTE; Please
3 4 5	1	grid lines from Figure 1 and 2: CBPS-2010-306 CBPS-2010-306 Edited Hocking 13 August 2011
6 7 8	2	axis title needs to Edited Randall July 2011 Edited Randall July 2011
9 10	3	mayrequireIt authors input.in poultry houses for laying hens kept in cages or in
11 12 13	4	alternative housing systems
14 15	5	
16 17 18	6	A. HUNEAU-SALAÜN, S. LE BOUQUIN, V. BEX-CAPELLE ¹ , D. HUONNIC, L.
19 20	7	BALAINE, M T. GUILLAM ² , F. SQUIZANI ¹ , C. SEGALA ² , AND V. MICHEL
21 22 23	8	
24 25	9 10	Anses-French Agency for food, environmental and occupational health safety, BP 53 Poute de Requeemaine, 22440 Ploufragen France: ¹ LHVP, Laboratory of Hygiene of
20 27 28	11	Paris 11 rue Georges Eastman F-75013 Paris France: and ² SEPIA-Santé 31 rue de
29 30 31	12	Pontivy, F-56150 Baud, France
32 33	13	
34 35 36	14	Running title: Endotoxin concentrations in henhouses
37 38	15	Acconted for publication:
39 40 41	16	15th Jan 2011
42 43	17	Correspondence to: Adeline Huneau-Salaün, Anses, BP 53, F-22440 Ploufragan, France. Tel: + 33 296 01
44 45	18	62 22, Fax: + 33 296 01 62 23, E-mail: <u>Adeline.HUNEAU@anses.fr</u>
46 47	19	
48 49 50	20	
51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	21	

Abstract 1. Endotoxins as components of organic dust may have adverse effects on the
respiratory health of workers in poultry buildings. The move towards more welfarefriendly housing systems for layers may increase worker exposure to air contaminants
due to the use of litter.

26 2. The endotoxin concentrations in the inhalable fraction of airborne dust (below 100
27 µm) from cage and alternative system houses (on-floor, free range and aviaries) were
28 compared under both experimental and commercial conditions.

3. The endotoxin concentration was higher in experimental aviaries (median: 565
EU/m³, range: 362-1491 EU/m³) than in cage housing (98 EU/m³ (51-470)).

4. In field conditions, the endotoxin concentration in the air of 13 alternative houses was higher (35 to 3156 EU/m³) than in cage system buildings (n=8, 78-576 EU/m³). It was correlated to the respirable dust concentration (fraction below 5 μ m) and to the temperature inside the henhouse but no seasonal variation was observed.

35 5. The present study emphasises that considerable worker exposure to endotoxins may36 occur in laying houses, especially in alternative systems.

INTRODUCTION

The high frequency of respiratory health problems among workers in poultry confinement buildings has often been reported (Radon *et al.*, 2002b; Kirychuck *et al.*, 2003; Rylander and Carvalheiro, 2006). The air in poultry houses is known to be contaminated by various potentially hazardous materials including gases (e.g. NH₃), chemicals such as disinfectants, and organic and inorganic dust. Organic dust in poultry houses consists of a complex combination of feed, litter, animal material such as

feathers and skin, and faecal particles (Ellen et al., 2000). It also contains high

concentrations of airborne microorganisms such as fungi, viruses, bacteria, and their constituents (Jones et al., 1984; Seedorf et al., 1998; Radon et al., 2002a; Lee et al., 2006). Endotoxins, derived from the outer membrane of Gram negative bacteria, constitute a major component of organic dust (Rylander, 2002). Endotoxins exhibit proinflammatory properties and are therefore implicated in the aetiology of occupational lung diseases including asthma-like syndrome, organic dust toxic syndrome (ODTS) and chronic airway obstruction (Schenker et al., 1998; Rylander, 2002; Douwes et al., 2003). High levels of endotoxins in poultry confinement buildings have been reported (Clark et al., 1983; Jones et al., 1984; Seedorf et al., 1998; Schriel et al., 2007). A relationship between poultry worker exposure to endotoxins and the occurrence of respiratory symptoms has been established in some studies (Thelin et al., 1984; Donham et al., 2000; Kirychuck et al., 2006). In laying hen and turkey buildings an exposure concentration higher than 614 EU/m^3 endotoxins was associated with pulmonary function decrements in workers (Donham et al., 2000). Interestingly, aerial concentrations of endotoxins and their consequences on human health appear to vary according to the bird housing system. Kirychuk et al. (2006) reported that endotoxin concentrations in cage-housed poultry farms tended to be greater than in on-floor broiler farms, and that workers in cage systems more frequently reported current and chronic phlegm. In experimental layer houses, Larsson et al. (1999) observed that exposure to airborne dust from on-floor houses induced a more acute inflammatory reaction in the upper airways of naïve subjects than exposure to dust from cage system houses. This was related to higher concentrations of inhalable dust and ammonia, but not of endotoxins, in the air of the non-cage buildings. However, these studies have not

completely taken into account recent developments in hen housing systems, especially in Europe. Indeed, to improve animal welfare, the European Directive 1999/74/EC requires the abolition of conventional cages for housing laying hens from 2012 onwards. Alternatives such as furnished cages with litter or loose systems have been proposed. In France, 80% of laying hens are still kept in cages but conventional cages are gradually being replaced by furnished cages which include a nest box, a pecking and scratching area with litter, and 15 cm of perch per bird. The most common alternative system in France is the on-floor henhouse in which the building is divided into a slatted area with perches and nest boxes, and a litter area. The development of housing systems where hens can move freely and are provided with litter seems to lead to an increase in airborne dust concentration, but few comparisons of cage and alternative hen housing systems have been carried out since the adoption of the European Directive for the protection of laying hens (Protais et al., 2003; de Reu et al., 2009; Nimmermark et al., 2009). There is therefore a lack of data to assess the impact of housing system modifications on the working environment. Thus a French epidemiological study, called AIRPOUL project, was carried out to characterise more precisely the air quality and worker exposure to aerial dust in cage and alternative systems for laying hens. This project was based on an experimental assay, followed by an observational field survey. The experimental assay was focused on measuring the personal exposure of workers to air pollutants, while the field study assessed air quality in poultry buildings under commercial conditions. The first objective of the present study, within the framework of the AIRPOUL project, was to determine the personal exposure to endotoxins of stockmen working in a cage system and an aviary system under experimental conditions. Secondly, the ambient endotoxin concentrations were determined and

5

2 3	
4 5	94
6 7 8	95
9 10	96
11 12	97
13 14 15	98
16 17	99
18 19 20	100
20 21 22	101
23 24	102
25 26 27	103
28 29	104
30 31	105
32 33 34	106
35 36	107
37 38	108
39 40 41	109
42 43	110
44 45 46	111
40 47 48	112
49 50	113
51 52 53	114
54 55	115
56 57	116
วช 59 60	117

compared with cage and on-floor buildings for laying hens under commercial 94 95 conditions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

99 *Experimental facilities*

Experimental trial

00 The study was performed in 2006 in two laying houses on an experimental farm located 01 in Brittany (France). In the first building, hens were kept in two identical aviaries 02 separated by a wire netting fence. Each aviary consisted of platforms on three levels and 03 housed 2,680 hens at a density of 9 hens per m² (409 cm² of litter per hen). The second 04 poultry-house was equipped with three batteries of cages on three levels. The cages 05 were conventional with 5 birds per cage (580 cm² per hen). There were 5760 hens. A 06 high-extraction forced ventilation system operated in both buildings. Hens and 07 husbandry management (feeding, watering and lighting programs) were the same in 80 both the cage and aviary houses.

10 Endotoxin and dust sampling.

11 The endotoxin concentrations in the inhalable dust fraction (diameter $< 100 \mu m$) were 12 measured 7 times in the ambient air when the hens were between 59 and 66 weeks of 13 age. The air sampler for endotoxin sampling (CAP 10, ARELCO, Auxerre, France) was 14 placed 1.5 m above the ground in the middle corridor of the cage building, and near the 15 separating fence at the height of the second platform in the aviary house. The air flow 16 was 1 l/min as specified by the manufacturer and was checked before and after sampling 17 with a soap bubble flowmeter (BUCK Calibrator M5, ARELCOA 5% change of flow

rate between the two measurements was considered acceptable. Sampling took place from 0800 h to 1600 h during the same working day in both the cage building and aviary house. Personal exposure to endotoxin of the workers taking care of the birds was assessed three times during the same period. The workers wore the air sampler in the breathing zone during a 6-hour work shift. During this period, their main activities were collecting and sorting eggs, and making bird and mortality checks. Endotoxin samples were collected on 37 mm diameter glass fibre filters with a pore size of $0.5 \,\mu m$ (Millipore AP4003705, St Quentin, France), aseptically placed in three-part polystyrene filter holders (Millipore M000037AO) in a constant airflow pump (SKC 224-PCTX8, ARELCO) operating at a rate of 1 l/min (air flow checked before and after measuring). The two workers involved in the study were non-smokers; one worked in the cage building and the other in the aviary system. Neither suffered from chronic respiratory diseases.

Ambient dust was measured fortnightly when hens were 19 to 63 weeks old. Samples for the respirable dust fraction ($< 5\mu m$) were collected using a stationary sampler (CAP 10, ARELCO), equipped with a pre-weighed filter with a pore size of 4 µm. The samplers were located in the same places as the stationary air samplers for endotoxin sampling. They ran for about 8 h during the day of measurement. The suction pump was operated at a rate of 10 l/min and was checked before and after sampling. All exposed filters were subsequently reweighed (AG 104, Mettler Toledo, Viroflay, France) after desiccation for 12 h at 37°C. The results were calculated according to air volume and expressed as mg/m³.

141 Field trial

142 Farm sample

The field study was carried out in 2008 on a sample of 21 laying houses stratified according to housing system: 8 poultry houses where hens were kept in cages, and 13 buildings where they were housed in an alternative system. Ten of the 13 alternative farms were specialised in free-range production, and in the remaining three houses the hens were housed in aviaries. Farms were selected according to the willingness of the owners to participate in the study. The main characteristics of these farms are shown in Table 1. Cage buildings were characterised by their large size and forced ventilation system, whereas the smaller poultry houses in free-range systems were equipped with a natural ventilation system. The cages on two farms were furnished with a nest box and perches. The aviary systems differed from the other alternative systems in that they had a higher rearing density: median density of 13.6 hens/available m² (min: 13.1 - max: 18.5) versus 7.9 (5.7-10.7) in the free-range systems; a forced ventilation system; a manure disposal system with belts; and no access to an open-air range.

Table 1 near here

Dust and endotoxin sampling.

One stationary sample of the respirable dust fraction and one stationary sample of the inhalable endotoxins were collected twice from each poultry house: once during the autumn/winter period (from October to March) and once during the spring/summer period (from April to September). Thus, two dust samples and two endotoxin samples were taken on each farm with the exception of two free-range farms and the three aviaries, which were only visited once during the autumn/winter period. This was due to veterinary problems in the two free-range farms in the spring/summer period; and to the fact that the three aviaries were recruited for the study later than the other farms. The

166 endotoxin and dust samples were collected using the same methods as those used for 167 ambient air in the experimental assay. No personal exposure measures for endotoxins 168 were performed in the field study because the equipment required for this was too 169 cumbersome to be worn by the farmers during a working day under field conditions.

171 Endotoxin analysis

At the end of sampling, the filters were sent in their holders to the Laboratoire d'Hygiène de la Ville de Paris and stored at 4°C. Within 48 h of sampling, the endotoxins were extracted with 5 ml of pyrogen-free water in borosilicate vials by shaking them horizontally (1500 rpm) at room temperature for 60 min. The extracts were centrifuged at 1000g for 15 min in borosilicate tubes, and the supernatants were then analysed. Endotoxin analysis was performed using a microtitre plate (Falcon, 96 flat bottomed, sterile wells) with a quantitative kinetic chromogenic Limulus Amoebocyte Lysate (LAL) test (Endosafe, Charles River, L'Arbresle, France). 100 µl of LAL reagent was added to each 100 µl sample. The plate was then incubated at 37 +/-1°C in a spectrophotometer (Sunrise, Tecan, Männedorf, Switzerland) and the optical density was read kinetically at 405 nm every minute. Each sample value was compared to a standard curve. Escherichia coli strain O55:B5 endotoxin (CSE Lot: EX51722; LAL Reagent Lot: V2702E; potency 17 endotoxin units (EU) per ng) was used to construct the standard curve. Data were analysed using Endoscan software. Inhibition and enhancement phenomena were checked by adding a defined amount of standard endotoxin to each sample. These interferences were reduced by serial dilution of the sample (e.g. full-strength, 1:10 and 1:100). The endotoxin analysis followed the European Standard EN 14031 (2003). Results were expressed in EU per cubic metre of

air (EU/m³). The detection limit was 0.005 EU/ml and the upper limit of the standard curve was 50 EU/ml. A value of half that of the detection limit (0.0025 EU/ml) was assigned to samples with concentrations below the detection limit. Given that sampling and analysis required the use of pyrogen-free material, the polystyrene filter holders were cleaned by sonication in 0.05 % triethylamine for 10 min, rinsed three times in pyrogen-free water and dried at 50°C in an oven. The glass fibre filter and glassware were heated at 250°C for 90 min. Each set of 20 filter holders and filters was tested in order to exclude sets with endotoxin levels higher than the detection limit. Blank field filters were used as controls for endotoxin contamination during transport and sampling at each sampling campaign.

201 Statistical analysis

The data collected in the field study were not normally distributed and therefore results are presented as median and range. Seasonal effect and correlation between respirable dust concentrations and endotoxin concentrations were assessed using rank-based tests (Spearman coefficient for correlation analysis, Kruskal-Wallis test for rank comparison). The 5 farms where measures were obtained only during the autumn/winter period were excluded from the seasonal-effect analysis (Wilcoxon test for rank comparison on paired data). One sample, taken from a cage house during the spring/summer period, was invalidated due to the high blank concentration and consequently, this farm was also excluded from the seasonal effect study. Statistical calculations were performed with SAS® 9.1 software.

7 212

RESULTS

214 Experimental trial

The endotoxin concentrations in the ambient dust samples obtained from the aviary house were higher than in samples from the cage building for all but one of the sampling days (Table 2). The median endotoxin concentration was thus higher (P < 0.05) in the air of the aviary house than in the cage house. Consequently the median exposure of workers to airborne endotoxins was at least three times lower in the cage system than in the aviary system for a 6 h work shift. Similarly, the ambient dust concentration was lower in the cage system than in the aviary system for all 23 days of measurements (Figure 1).

Table 2 & Fig 1 near here

224 Field trial

The median respirable dust concentrations and endotoxin concentrations in each housing system are given in Table 3. As expected, the respirable dust concentrations were higher (P < 0.01) in the alternative farms than in the cage farms, especially in the three aviaries. The measurements showed great variability in the alternative systems compared with the cage system. As shown in Figure 2, the endotoxin content of inhalable dusts was also higher and more variable in the alternative than in the cage houses: the median concentration was 684 EU/m³ (35-3156) in the alternative systems compared with 204 EU/m³ (78-576) in the cage systems (P < 0.01). No seasonal effect was observed on respirable dust concentrations or on endotoxin concentrations (Table 4), although the temperatures measured inside the buildings were actually lower during the autumn/winter period than during the spring/summer period: the median of the average temperature inside the buildings was 19.0°C (10.2-23.2) during the autumn/winter period compared with 21.7°C (16.8-23.7) during the spring/summer

British Poultry Science

period (P=0.03). The inhalable endotoxin concentration was positively correlated to the respirable dust concentration (Spearman coefficient r=0.53, P<0.01) and was negatively correlated to the average temperature inside the poultry house during the sampling

241 period (r=-0.40, *P*<0.01).

Tables 3, 4 & Fig 2 near here

DISCUSSION

This study shows that high dust and endotoxin concentrations can occur in the air of experimental and commercial laying houses. The endotoxin concentrations in the ambient air, and to which workers were exposed, appeared to be high in comparison with the threshold of 50 EU/m^3 over 8 h proposed by the Dutch Expert Committee on Occupational Standards. The American International Commission on Occupational Health (Schenker et al., 1998) identified that short-term exposure to concentrations less than 10 ng/m³ (100 EU/m3 assuming a conversion factor of 10 EU/m3 for 1 ng/m3) had no impact on workers' health, while a concentration above 10 ng/m³ was associated with inflammatory symptoms of the airways; a concentration above 100 ng/m^3 (1000) EU/m3) with systemic effects on health; and a concentration higher than 200 ng/m3 (2000 EU/m3) with ODTS. The effect of exposure to endotoxins on the health of stockmen, particularly in alternative housing systems, may thus give cause for concern because the common concentration limits (not specific to poultry working environments) are regularly exceeded in these buildings. However, the exposure-response threshold of 614 EU/m³ for workers in a poultry environment, proposed by Donham et al. (2000), only appeared to have been exceeded for one working day in the aviary system. Indeed, the exposures of workers to endotoxins in the experimental

assay, even in the aviaries (181-667 EU/m³), were lower than those reported in a previous experimental study (83-175 ng/m3 or 830-1750 EU/m3) (Larsson et al., 1999). For the field study, stationary rather than personal sampling was chosen to determine the exposure of both workers and animals. Indeed, deterioration of air quality may also have an impact on poultry health (Michel and Huonnic, 2003), although no critical concentrations of organic dust or endotoxins in the air have been established for livestock. However, the stationary sampling method might lead to an underestimation of human exposure to airborne endotoxins, because workers are close to endotoxin sources and can even handle them during cleaning operations (Renström, 2002). Therefore, the endotoxin measurements obtained by stationary sampling in our study cannot be compared with the personal exposure measurements performed in studies designed solely to assess human exposure. Furthermore, the endotoxin concentrations in the ambient air, observed in both parts of our study, were lower than the average concentrations measured with stationary samplers in 43 laying houses by Seedorf et al. (1998) (860 ng/m3 or 8604 EU/m3); or the concentrations reported by Schriel et al. (2007) in three on-floor houses (3,389 UE/m³ (100-21933)). These comparisons have to be considered with caution because endotoxin analysis methods may differ from one study to another, although Schriel et al. (2007) also used the European Guideline EN 14031.

A multicentric European survey under commercial conditions reported a deterioration of air quality in alternative systems compared to cage systems for dust concentrations (Takai *et al.*, 1998) and endotoxin concentrations (Seedorf *et al.*, 1998). However, these studies date from the early 1990s, before the implementation of Directive 1999/74/EC, which is likely to have led to substantial modifications to

housing systems in Europe and to have altered air quality in poultry houses. Our study thus confirms that air quality may deteriorate after the adoption of modern alternative housing systems which comply with the recent European regulation. Differences in dust and endotoxin concentrations between the cage and alternative systems may be due to the presence of litter and to the greater activity of the hens in the on-floor buildings. In addition, the natural ventilation systems in the alternative houses, in contrast to the forced ventilation systems in the cage buildings, could lead to a lower ventilation rate and thus a lower clearance rate of air-borne dust and endotoxins. For example, higher concentrations of bacteria and gases were found in the air of poultry houses with ventilation through porous inlets than in buildings equipped with automatic ventilation systems (Radon et al., 2001).

As described in previous studies of personal exposure of poultry workers to airborne dust and endotoxins (Thelin et al., 1984; Simpson et al., 1998a; Simpson et al., 1998b; Donham et al., 2000), a strong correlation between dust and endotoxin concentrations was observed in the field studies, although the endotoxins were measured in the inhalable fraction, and not in the respirable fraction as for dust. According to Simpson et al. (1998b), this correlation may be difficult to demonstrate in personal exposure studies as the endotoxin concentrations in dust could vary in the different rooms and sites where people were working during the sampling period. This problem does not occur in ambient exposure studies with stationary samplers. The correlation between dust and endotoxin concentrations in layer houses could be useful for implementing monitoring programs and corrective measures; assessment of exposure could be limited to measurements of dust concentration, and control measures taken to reduce dust concentration should also reduce the endotoxin concentration. High

ventilation rates dilute dust concentration inside the house, but reduce ambient temperature leading to thermal discomfort for birds and to discharge of airborne pollutants in the environment. Various methods of air treatment to reduce dust concentrations (physical and electrical filtration) have been tested with success under experimental conditions (Lyngtveit and Eduard, 1997; Mitchell et al., 2000; Ellen et al., 2010). However, their application in commercial conditions is difficult on account of the large volumes of air to be treated. In contrast, spraying oil or fogging with water droplets are inexpensive and effective methods which are relatively easy to use in commercial poultry houses. A 50% reduction in airborne dust concentration in an aviary was obtained using water fogging without deterioration in the conditions of the hens' feathers (Gustafsson and Von Wachenfelt, 2006). Local manual application of oil on litter of an experimental aviary gave a reduction of 20 to 30% of fine dust emissions, but no effect was observed when oil was applied with an automatic system (Ellen et al., 2010). This technique has thus to be improved before being used under commercial conditions.

No differences in dust or endotoxin concentrations were observed in our field study between the measures obtained during the autumn/winter period and during the spring/summer period. This result is in line with the observations of Seedorf et al. (1998). By contrast, Schriel et al. (2007) noted a higher concentration of endotoxins in the dust samples taken in winter than in those taken in summer and spring. Although the seasonal effect was not significant in our study, a negative correlation was observed between the average temperature inside the house and the endotoxin concentration. The temperature inside the building, and the ventilation control measures taken in response

British Poultry Science

to this temperature, are likely to influence the endotoxin concentration more than the

334	season.
335	The present study highlights that considerable exposure to endotoxins may occur
336	in laying houses under both experimental and field conditions. The personal exposures
337	to endotoxins recorded in the experimental houses exceeded the limits proposed by the
338	Dutch Expert Committee on occupational standards on all measurement days, and thus
339	give grounds for concern about the health of poultry workers. Effective methods to
340	reduce worker exposure to air contaminants in laying houses still need to be developed.
341	Higher dust and endotoxin concentrations were measured in alternative housing systems
342	than in cage houses under commercial conditions. Therefore further research is required
343	to focus on working conditions in these alternative systems because of the ban on
344	conventional cages in European Union from 2012.
345	
346	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
347	
348	The authors are grateful to the Experimental Services for Poultry and Rabbit Husbandry
349	of Anses, and to the egg production companies and farmers who collaborated in this
350	study. Funding for the AIRPOUL project was provided by the Conseil Régional de
351	Bretagne.
352	

2 3		
4 5	353	REFERENCES
6 7	354	
8 9 10	355	CLARK S., RYLANDER R. & LARSSON L. (1983) Airborne bacteria, endotoxin and fungi in
10 11 12	356	dust in poultry and swine confinement buildings. American Industrial Hygiene Association
13 14	357	Journal, 44 : 537-541.
15 16	358	DE REU K., RODENBURG T.B., GRIJSPEERDT K., MESSENS W., HEYNDRICKX M.,
17 18	359	TUYTTENS F., SONCK B., ZOONS J. & HERMAN L. (2009) Bacteriological contamination,
19 20	360	dirt, and cracks of eggshells in furnished cages and noncage systems for laying hens: An
21 22 22	361	international on-farm comparison. <i>Poultry Science</i> , 88 : 2442-2448.
23 24 25	362	DONHAM K.J., CUMRO D., REYNOLDS S.J. & MERCHANT J.A. (2000) Dose-response
26 27	363	relationships between occupational aerosol exposures and cross-shift declines of lung function
28 29	364	in poultry workers : recommendations for exposure limits. Journal of Occupational and
30 31	365	Environmental Medicine, 42 : 260-269.
32 33	366	DOUWES J., THORNE P., PEARCE N. & HEEDERIK D. (2003) Bioaerosol health effects and
34 35 26	367	exposure assessment: progress and prospects. Annals of occupational Hygiene, 47: 187-200.
30 37 38	368	ELLEN H.H., AARNINK A., MOSQUERA J., WINKEL A., CAMBRA-LOPEZ M., VAN
39 40	369	HARN J. & OGINK N. (2010) Dust Reduction Options for Poultry Houses. World's Poultry
41 42	370	Science Journal, 66: S26.
43 44	371	ELLEN H.H., BOTTCHER R.W., VON WACHENFELT E. & TAKAI H. (2000) Dust levels
45 46	372	and control methods in poultry houses. Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health, 6: 275-282.
47 48 40	373	GUSTAFSSON G. & VON WACHENFELT E. (2006) Airborne Dust Control Measures for
49 50 51	374	Floor Housing System for Laying Hens. VIII Agricultural Engineering International
52 53	375	Conference, pp. 1-11.
54 55	376	JONES W., MORRING K., OLENCHOCK S.A., WILLIAMS T. & HICKEY J. (1984)
56 57	377	Environmental study of poultry confinement buildings. American Industrial Hygiene
58 59 60	378	Association Journal, 45: 760-766.

1 2 2		
3 4 5	379	KIRYCHUCK S., DOSMAN J.A., REYNOLDS S.J., WILLSON P., SENTHILSELVAN A.,
6 7	380	FEDDES J.J.R., CLASSEN H. & GUENTER W. (2006) Total dust and endotoxin in poultry
8 9	381	operations: comparison between cage and floor housing and respiratory effects in workers.
10 11 12	382	Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 48: 741-748.
13 14	383	KIRYCHUCK S., SENTHILSELVAN A., DOSMAN J.A., JUORIO J.A., FEDDES J.J.R.,
15 16	384	WILSON P., CLASSEN H., REYNOLDS S.J., GUENTER W. & HURST T.S. (2003)
17 18	385	Respiratory symptoms and lung function in poultry confinement workers in Western Canada.
19 20	386	Canadian Respiratory Journal, 10: 375-380.
21 22 22	387	LARSSON BM., LARSSON K., MALMBERG P., MARTENSSON L. & PALMBERG L.
23 24 25	388	(1999) Airway responses in naive subjects to exposure in poultry houses : comparison between
26 27	389	cage rearing system and alternative rearing system for laying hens. American Journal of
28 29 30 31	390	Industrial Medicine, 35 : 142-149.
	391	LEE SA., ADHIKARI A., GRINSHPUN S.A., MCKAY R., SHUKLA R. & REPONEN T.
32 33	392	(2006) Personal exposure to airbone dust and microorganisms in agricultural environments.
34 35 26	393	Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 3: 118-130.
30 37 38	394	LYNGTVEIT T. & EDUARD W. (1997) Reduction of dust exposure by negative air ionisation.
39 40	395	Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine, 4: 229-232.
41 42	396	MICHEL V. & HUONNIC D. (2003) A comparison of welfare, health and production
43 44	397	performance of laying hens reared in cages or aviaries. British poultry science, 43: 775-776.
45 46	398	MITCHELL B.W., HOLT P.S. & SEO K.H. (2000) Reducing dust in a cage layer room: an
47 48 40	399	electrostatic space charge system. Journal of Applied Poultry Research, 9: 292-296.
49 50 51	400	NIMMERMARK S., LUND V., GUSTAFSSON G. & EDUARD W. (2009) Ammonia, dust
52 53	401	and bacteria in welfare-oriented systems for laying hens. Annals of Agricultural and
54 55	402	Environmental Medicine, 16: 103-113.
56 57	403	PROTAIS J., QUEGUINER S., BOSCHER E., PIQUET J.C., NADARD B. & SALVAT G.
58 59 60	404	(2003) Effect of housing systems on the bacterial flora of the air. British Poultry Science, 43:

405 788-789.

406	RADON K., DANUSER B., IVERSEN M., MONSO E., WEBER C., HARTUNG J.,
407	DONHAM K.J., PALMGREN U. & NOWAK D. (2002a) Air contaminants in different
408	European farming environments. Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine, 9: 41-48.
409	RADON K., MONSO E., WEBER C., DANUSER B., IVERSEN M., OPRAVIL U.,
410	DONHAM K.J., HARTUNG J., PEDERSEN S., GARZ S., BLAINEY D., RABE U. &
411	NOWAK D. (2002b) Prevalence and risk factors for airway diseases in farmers - summary of
412	results of the European Farmers' Project. Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine,
413	9 : 207-213.
414	RADON K., WEBER C., IVERSEN M., PEDERSEN S. & NOWAK D. (2001) Exposure
415	assessment and lung function in pig and poultry farmers. Occupational Environmental
416	Medicine, 58 : 405-410.
417	RENSTRÖM A. (2002) Exposure to airborne allergens: a review of sampling methods. Journal
418	of Environmental Monitoring, 4 : 619-622.
419	RYLANDER R. (2002) Endotoxin in the environment - exposure and effects. Journal of
420	Endotoxin Research, 8: 241-252.
421	RYLANDER R. & CARVALHEIRO M.F. (2006) Airways inflammation among workers in
422	poultry houses. International Archives of Occupational and Environemental Health, 79: 487-
423	490.
424	SCHENKER M.B., CHRISTIANI D., CORMIER Y., DIMICH-WARD H., DOEKES G.,
425	DOSMAN J., DOUWES J., DOWLING K., ENARSON D., GREEN F., HEEDERIK D.,
426	HUSMAN K., KULLMAN G., LACASSE Y., LAWSON B., MALMBERG P., MAY J.,
427	MCCURDY S., MERCHANT J., MYERS J., NIEUWENHUIJSEN M., OLENCHOCK S.,
428	SAIKI C., SCHWARTZ D., SEIBER J., THORNE P., WAGNER G., WHITE N., XU X. &
429	CHAN-YEUNG M. (1998) Respiratory health hazards in agriculture. American Journal of
430	Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 158: S1-S76.

1 2 2		
3 4 5	431	SCHRIEL R., HEISE A., SCHNEIDER F., EICHELSER R., NESER S. & NOWAK D. (2007)
6 7	432	Endotoxin concentration in modern animal houses in Southern Bavaria. Annals of Agricultural
8 9	433	and Environmental Medicine, 14: 129-136.
10 11 12	434	SEEDORF J., HARTUNG J., SCHRÖDER M., LINKERT K.H., PHILLIPS V.R., HOLDEN
12 13 14	435	M.R., SNEATH R.W., SHORT J.L., WHITE R.P., PEDERSEN L.J., TAKAI H., JOHNSEN
15 16	436	J.O., METZ J.H.M., GROOT KOERKAMP P.W.G., UENK G.H. & WATHES C.M. (1998)
17 18	437	Concentrations and emissions of airbone endotoxins and microorganisms in livestock buildings
19 20	438	in Northern Europe. Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research, 70: 97-109.
21 22	439	SIMPSON J.C.G., NIVEN R.M., FLETCHER A.M., OLDHAM L.A. & FRANCIS H.M.
23 24 25	440	(1998a) Prevalence and predictors of work related respiratory symptoms in workers exposed to
26 27	441	organic dusts. Occupational Environmental Medicine, 55: 668-672.
28 29	442	SIMPSON J.C.G., NIVEN R.M., PICKERING C.A.C., OLDHAM L.A., FLETCHER A.M. &
30 31	443	FRANCIS H.M. (1998b) Comparative personal exposures to organic dusts and endotoxin.
32 33	444	Annals of occupational Hygiene, 43 : 107-115.
34 35 20	445	TAKAI H., PEDERSEN S., JOHNSEN J.O., METZ J.H.M., GROOT KOERKAMP P.W.G.,
30 37 38	446	UENK G.H., PHILLIPS V.R., HOLDEN M.R., SNEATH R.W., SHORT J.L., WHITE R.P.,
39 40	447	HARTUNG J., SEEDORF J., SCHRÖDER M., LINKERT K.H. & WATHES C.M. (1998)
41 42	448	Concentrations and emissions of airborne dust in livestock buildings in Northern Europe.
43 44	449	Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research, 70 : 59-77.
45 46	450	THELIN A., TEGLER O. & RYLANDER R. (1984) Lung reactions during poultry handling
47 48 40	451	related to dust and bacterial endotoxin levels. European Journal of Respiratory Diseases, 65:
49 50 51	452	266-271.
52 53		
54 55		
22		

453 FIGURE LEGENDS

455 Figure 1. Respirable dust concentrations in the ambient air of cage and aviary systems
456 in the experimental trial.

Figure 2. Endotoxin concentrations in the inhalable fraction of dust in different 460 housing systems in the field study. Means are represented by a "plus" and the extreme 461 values depicted by a square are outside the interval defined as the 1^{st} or 3^{rd} quartile \pm

1.5 interquartile range.

464 Table 1. Characteristics of cage houses and alternative systems monitored in the field
465 study. The median (range) is given for continuous variables.

Variable	Caga	Alternative systems			
vanable	Cage	Free-range	Aviary		
Number of houses studied	8	10	3		
Area (m ²)	1,426	625	350		
	(1062-1650)	(412-864)	(350-784)		
Volume of the henhouse (m ³)	9,600	2,040	1,600		
	(4400-11700)	(1600-3500)	(1600-5800)		
Housing capacity (hens/house)	46,400	4,600	4,700		
	(32000-65000)	(2900-4900)	(4600-16100)		
Density (hens/m ²)	31.9	7.9	13.6		
	(26.1-54.2)	(5.7-10.7)	(13.1-18.5)		
Access to an open-air run (number					
of houses)					
- Yes	-	10	0		
- No	8	0	3		
Ventilation (number of houses)					
- Natural	0	10	0		
- Forced	8	0	3		
Manure disposal system (number					
of houses)					
- Manure belts	5	0	3		
- Dip pit	3	10	0		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Number of hens per cage	9 (5-60)	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			

2 3 4 5 6	1
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2
18 19 20 22 23 24 25 26 78 29 30 12 33 34 56 78 39 41 42 34 45 46 78 90 12 23 45 55 55 55 57 85 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55	3
59 60	

Table 2. Median (range) of endotoxin concentrations (EU/m³) of inhalable dust
fraction per housing system in the experimental trial.

Housing	Ambient air (8 h)		Ambient air (8 h) Personal exposure (6		onal exposure (6 h)
system	n	Concentration	n	Concentration	
Cage	7	98 (51-470)	3	90 (88-97)	
Aviaries	7	565 (362-1491)	3	450 (181-667	

1 Table 3. Respirable dust and endotoxin concentrations (median and range) in the

2 inhalable dust fraction in laying houses for each housing system in the field study

	1	Respirable dust concentration	Endotoxin concentration
Housing system	n	(mg/m^3)	(EU/m^3)
Cage	15	0.125 (0.000-0.264)	204 (78-576)
Alternative	21	0.438 (0.020-2.850)	684 (35-3156)
- Free-range	18	0.386 (0.020-1.010)	669 (35-3156)
- Aviary	3	1.200 (0.825-2.850)	771 (465-1543)
P^2		<0.01	<0.01

3 ¹Number of measures.

4 ² Probability for the Kruskal Wallis test for comparison of cage and alternative housing

5 systems.

Table 4. Respirable dust concentrations and endotoxin concentrations in the inhalable
 dust fraction in laying houses for each season in the field study (median and range)

Season	n^1	Respirable dust concentration	Endotoxin concentration
		(mg/m^3)	(EU/m ³)
Autumn/winter	15	0.189	320
		(0.000-0.599)	(135-1822)
Spring/summer	15	0.143	385
		(0.000-0.733)	(35-2329)
P^2		0.55	0.65
¹ Number of mea	asures		
² Probability	for	the Wilcoxon test for con	nparison between seaso

E-mail: br.poultsci@bbsrc.ac.uk URL: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/cbps







