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:	<i>British Poultry Science</i>
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

NOTE; Please
remove box and
grid lines from
Figure 1 and 2;
axis title needs to
be changed. This
may require
authors input.

CBPS-2010-306
Edited Randall July 2011

CBPS-2010-306 Edited
Hocking 13 August 2011

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

A. HUNEAU-SALAÜN, S. LE BOUQUIN, V. BEX-CAPELLE¹, D. HUONNIC, L.
BALAINE, M.- T. GUILLAM², F. SQUIZANI¹, C. SEGALA², AND V. MICHEL

*Anses-French Agency for food, environmental and occupational health safety, BP 53
Route de Beaucemaine, 22440 Ploufragan France; ¹LHVP- Laboratory of Hygiene of
Paris, 11 rue Georges Eastman, F-75013 Paris, France; and ²SEPIA-Santé, 31 rue de
Pontivy, F-56150 Baud, France*

Running title:
Endotoxin concentrations in henhouses

Accepted for publication:
15th Jan 2011

Correspondence to: Adeline Huneau-Salaün, Anses, BP 53, F-22440 Ploufragan, France. Tel: + 33 296 01
62 22, Fax: + 33 296 01 62 23, E-mail: Adeline.HUNEAU@anses.fr

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 welfare-friendly housing systems for layers may increase worker exposure to air contaminants due to the use of litter.

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

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

4. In field conditions, the endotoxin concentration in the air of 13 alternative houses was higher (35 to 3156 EU/m^3) than in cage system buildings ($n=8$, 78-576 EU/m^3). It was correlated to the respirable dust concentration (fraction below 5 μm) and to the temperature inside the henhouse but no seasonal variation was observed.

5. The present study emphasises that considerable worker exposure to endotoxins may 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. NH_3), 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

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

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/m³ 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

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

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

96
97 MATERIALS AND METHODS

98 **Experimental trial**

99 *Experimental facilities*

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

109
110 *Endotoxin and dust sampling.*

111 The endotoxin concentrations in the inhalable dust fraction (diameter < 100 µm) were
112 measured 7 times in the ambient air when the hens were between 59 and 66 weeks of
113 age. The air sampler for endotoxin sampling (CAP 10, ARELCO, Auxerre, France) was
114 placed 1.5 m above the ground in the middle corridor of the cage building, and near the
115 separating fence at the height of the second platform in the aviary house. The air flow
116 was 1 l/min as specified by the manufacturer and was checked before and after sampling
117 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 μm (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 ($< 5\mu\text{m}$) 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/m^3 .

Field trial

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

142 *Farm sample*

143 The field study was carried out in 2008 on a sample of 21 laying houses stratified
144 according to housing system: 8 poultry houses where hens were kept in cages, and 13
145 buildings where they were housed in an alternative system. Ten of the 13 alternative
146 farms were specialised in free-range production, and in the remaining three houses the
147 hens were housed in aviaries. Farms were selected according to the willingness of the
148 owners to participate in the study. The main characteristics of these farms are shown in
149 Table 1. Cage buildings were characterised by their large size and forced ventilation
150 system, whereas the smaller poultry houses in free-range systems were equipped with a
151 natural ventilation system. The cages on two farms were furnished with a nest box and
152 perches. The aviary systems differed from the other alternative systems in that they had
153 a higher rearing density: median density of 13.6 hens/available m² (min: 13.1 - max:
154 18.5) versus 7.9 (5.7-10.7) in the free-range systems; a forced ventilation system; a
155 manure disposal system with belts; and no access to an open-air range.

156 Table 1 near here

157 *Dust and endotoxin sampling.*

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

1
2
3
4
5 166 endotoxin and dust samples were collected using the same methods as those used for
6
7 167 ambient air in the experimental assay. No personal exposure measures for endotoxins
8
9 168 were performed in the field study because the equipment required for this was too
10
11 169 cumbersome to be worn by the farmers during a working day under field conditions.
12
13
14 170

16 171 **Endotoxin analysis**

17
18 172 At the end of sampling, the filters were sent in their holders to the Laboratoire
19
20 173 d'Hygiène de la Ville de Paris and stored at 4°C. Within 48 h of sampling, the
21
22 174 endotoxins were extracted with 5 ml of pyrogen-free water in borosilicate vials by
23
24 175 shaking them horizontally (1500 rpm) at room temperature for 60 min. The extracts
25
26 176 were centrifuged at 1000g for 15 min in borosilicate tubes, and the supernatants were
27
28 177 then analysed. Endotoxin analysis was performed using a microtitre plate (Falcon, 96
29
30 178 flat bottomed, sterile wells) with a quantitative kinetic chromogenic Limulus
31
32 179 Amoebocyte Lysate (LAL) test (Endosafe, Charles River, L'Arbresle, France). 100 µl
33
34 180 of LAL reagent was added to each 100 µl sample. The plate was then incubated at 37
35
36 181 +/-1°C in a spectrophotometer (Sunrise, Tecan, Männedorf, Switzerland) and the optical
37
38 182 density was read kinetically at 405 nm every minute. Each sample value was compared
39
40 183 to a standard curve. *Escherichia coli* strain O55:B5 endotoxin (CSE Lot: EX51722;
41
42 184 LAL Reagent Lot: V2702E; potency 17 endotoxin units (EU) per ng) was used to
43
44 185 construct the standard curve. Data were analysed using Endoscan software. Inhibition
45
46 186 and enhancement phenomena were checked by adding a defined amount of standard
47
48 187 endotoxin to each sample. These interferences were reduced by serial dilution of the
49
50 188 sample (e.g. full-strength, 1:10 and 1:100). The endotoxin analysis followed the
51
52 189 European Standard EN 14031 (2003). Results were expressed in EU per cubic metre of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

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.

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.

RESULTS

214 **Experimental trial**

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

Table 2 & Fig 1 near here

224 **Field trial**

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

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

238 period ($P=0.03$). The inhalable endotoxin concentration was positively correlated to the
239 respirable dust concentration (Spearman coefficient $r=0.53$, $P<0.01$) and was negatively
240 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

245 This study shows that high dust and endotoxin concentrations can occur in the air of
246 experimental and commercial laying houses. The endotoxin concentrations in the
247 ambient air, and to which workers were exposed, appeared to be high in comparison
248 with the threshold of 50 EU/m³ over 8 h proposed by the Dutch Expert Committee on
249 Occupational Standards. The American International Commission on Occupational
250 Health (Schenker *et al.*, 1998) identified that short-term exposure to concentrations less
251 than 10 ng/m³ (100 EU/m³ assuming a conversion factor of 10 EU/m³ for 1 ng/m³) had
252 no impact on workers' health, while a concentration above 10 ng/m³ was associated
253 with inflammatory symptoms of the airways; a concentration above 100 ng/m³ (1000
254 EU/m³) with systemic effects on health; and a concentration higher than 200 ng/m³
255 (2000 EU/m³) with ODTs. The effect of exposure to endotoxins on the health of
256 stockmen, particularly in alternative housing systems, may thus give cause for concern
257 because the common concentration limits (not specific to poultry working
258 environments) are regularly exceeded in these buildings. However, the exposure-
259 response threshold of 614 EU/m³ for workers in a poultry environment, proposed by
260 Donham *et al.* (2000), only appeared to have been exceeded for one working day in the
261 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

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

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

1
2
3
4
5 310 ventilation rates dilute dust concentration inside the house, but reduce ambient
6
7 311 temperature leading to thermal discomfort for birds and to discharge of airborne
8
9 312 pollutants in the environment. Various methods of air treatment to reduce dust
10
11 313 concentrations (physical and electrical filtration) have been tested with success under
12
13 314 experimental conditions (Lyngtveit and Eduard, 1997; Mitchell *et al.*, 2000; Ellen *et al.*,
14
15 315 2010). However, their application in commercial conditions is difficult on account of
16
17 316 the large volumes of air to be treated. In contrast, spraying oil or fogging with water
18
19 317 droplets are inexpensive and effective methods which are relatively easy to use in
20
21 318 commercial poultry houses. A 50% reduction in airborne dust concentration in an aviary
22
23 319 was obtained using water fogging without deterioration in the conditions of the hens'
24
25 320 feathers (Gustafsson and Von Wachenfelt, 2006). Local manual application of oil on
26
27 321 litter of an experimental aviary gave a reduction of 20 to 30% of fine dust emissions,
28
29 322 but no effect was observed when oil was applied with an automatic system (Ellen *et al.*,
30
31 323 2010). This technique has thus to be improved before being used under commercial
32
33 324 conditions.

34
35
36
37
38
39
40 325 No differences in dust or endotoxin concentrations were observed in our field
41
42 326 study between the measures obtained during the autumn/winter period and during the
43
44 327 spring/summer period. This result is in line with the observations of Seedorf *et al.*
45
46 328 (1998). By contrast, Schriel *et al.* (2007) noted a higher concentration of endotoxins in
47
48 329 the dust samples taken in winter than in those taken in summer and spring. Although the
49
50 330 seasonal effect was not significant in our study, a negative correlation was observed
51
52 331 between the average temperature inside the house and the endotoxin concentration. The
53
54 332 temperature inside the building, and the ventilation control measures taken in response
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

333 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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

346
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

REFERENCES

- 353
- 354
- 355 CLARK S., RYLANDER R. & LARSSON L. (1983) Airborne bacteria, endotoxin and fungi in
- 356 dust in poultry and swine confinement buildings. *American Industrial Hygiene Association*
- 357 *Journal*, **44**: 537-541.
- 358 DE REU K., RODENBURG T.B., GRIJSPEERDT K., MESSENS W., HEYNDRIKX M.,
- 359 TUYTTENS F., SONCK B., ZOONS J. & HERMAN L. (2009) Bacteriological contamination,
- 360 dirt, and cracks of eggshells in furnished cages and noncage systems for laying hens: An
- 361 international on-farm comparison. *Poultry Science*, **88**: 2442-2448.
- 362 DONHAM K.J., CUMRO D., REYNOLDS S.J. & MERCHANT J.A. (2000) Dose-response
- 363 relationships between occupational aerosol exposures and cross-shift declines of lung function
- 364 in poultry workers : recommendations for exposure limits. *Journal of Occupational and*
- 365 *Environmental Medicine*, **42**: 260-269.
- 366 DOUWES J., THORNE P., PEARCE N. & HEEDERIK D. (2003) Bioaerosol health effects and
- 367 exposure assessment: progress and prospects. *Annals of occupational Hygiene*, **47**: 187-200.
- 368 ELLEN H.H., AARNINK A., MOSQUERA J., WINKEL A., CAMBRA-LOPEZ M., VAN
- 369 HARN J. & OGINK N. (2010) Dust Reduction Options for Poultry Houses. *World's Poultry*
- 370 *Science Journal*, **66**: S26.
- 371 ELLEN H.H., BOTTCHE R.W., VON WACHENFELT E. & TAKAI H. (2000) Dust levels
- 372 and control methods in poultry houses. *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health*, **6**: 275-282.
- 373 GUSTAFSSON G. & VON WACHENFELT E. (2006) Airborne Dust Control Measures for
- 374 Floor Housing System for Laying Hens. *VIII Agricultural Engineering International*
- 375 *Conference*, pp. 1-11.
- 376 JONES W., MORRING K., OLENCHOCK S.A., WILLIAMS T. & HICKEY J. (1984)
- 377 Environmental study of poultry confinement buildings. *American Industrial Hygiene*
- 378 *Association Journal*, **45**: 760-766.

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

379 KIRYCHUCK S., DOSMAN J.A., REYNOLDS S.J., WILLSON P., SENTHILSELVAN A.,
380 FEDDES J.J.R., CLASSEN H. & GUENTER W. (2006) Total dust and endotoxin in poultry
381 operations: comparison between cage and floor housing and respiratory effects in workers.
382 *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, **48**: 741-748.

383 KIRYCHUCK S., SENTHILSELVAN A., DOSMAN J.A., JUORIO J.A., FEDDES J.J.R.,
384 WILSON P., CLASSEN H., REYNOLDS S.J., GUENTER W. & HURST T.S. (2003)
385 Respiratory symptoms and lung function in poultry confinement workers in Western Canada.
386 *Canadian Respiratory Journal*, **10**: 375-380.

387 LARSSON B.-M., LARSSON K., MALMBERG P., MARTENSSON L. & PALMBERG L.
388 (1999) Airway responses in naive subjects to exposure in poultry houses : comparison between
389 cage rearing system and alternative rearing system for laying hens. *American Journal of*
390 *Industrial Medicine*, **35**: 142-149.

391 LEE S.-A., ADHIKARI A., GRINSHUPUN S.A., MCKAY R., SHUKLA R. & REPONEN T.
392 (2006) Personal exposure to airborne dust and microorganisms in agricultural environments.
393 *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, **3**: 118-130.

394 LYGTVET T. & EDUARD W. (1997) Reduction of dust exposure by negative air ionisation.
395 *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*, **4**: 229-232.

396 MICHEL V. & HUONNIC D. (2003) A comparison of welfare, health and production
397 performance of laying hens reared in cages or aviaries. *British poultry science*, **43**: 775-776.

398 MITCHELL B.W., HOLT P.S. & SEO K.H. (2000) Reducing dust in a cage layer room: an
399 electrostatic space charge system. *Journal of Applied Poultry Research*, **9**: 292-296.

400 NIMMERMARK S., LUND V., GUSTAFSSON G. & EDUARD W. (2009) Ammonia, dust
401 and bacteria in welfare-oriented systems for laying hens. *Annals of Agricultural and*
402 *Environmental Medicine*, **16**: 103-113.

403 PROTAIS J., QUEGUINER S., BOSCHER E., PIQUET J.C., NADARD B. & SALVAT G.
404 (2003) Effect of housing systems on the bacterial flora of the air. *British Poultry Science*, **43**:
405 788-789.

- 1
2
3
4
5 406 RADON K., DANUSER B., IVERSEN M., MONSO E., WEBER C., HARTUNG J.,
6
7 407 DONHAM K.J., PALMGREN U. & NOWAK D. (2002a) Air contaminants in different
8
9 408 European farming environments. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*, **9**: 41-48.
10
11 409 RADON K., MONSO E., WEBER C., DANUSER B., IVERSEN M., OPRAVIL U.,
12
13 410 DONHAM K.J., HARTUNG J., PEDERSEN S., GARZ S., BLAINEY D., RABE U. &
14
15 411 NOWAK D. (2002b) Prevalence and risk factors for airway diseases in farmers - summary of
16
17 412 results of the European Farmers' Project. *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*,
18
19 413 **9**: 207-213.
20
21
22 414 RADON K., WEBER C., IVERSEN M., PEDERSEN S. & NOWAK D. (2001) Exposure
23
24 415 assessment and lung function in pig and poultry farmers. *Occupational Environmental*
25
26 416 *Medicine*, **58**: 405-410.
27
28 417 RENSTRÖM A. (2002) Exposure to airborne allergens: a review of sampling methods. *Journal*
29
30 418 *of Environmental Monitoring*, **4**: 619-622.
31
32
33 419 RYLANDER R. (2002) Endotoxin in the environment - exposure and effects. *Journal of*
34
35 420 *Endotoxin Research*, **8**: 241-252.
36
37 421 RYLANDER R. & CARVALHEIRO M.F. (2006) Airways inflammation among workers in
38
39 422 poultry houses. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, **79**: 487-
40
41 423 490.
42
43 424 SCHENKER M.B., CHRISTIANI D., CORMIER Y., DIMICH-WARD H., DOEKES G.,
44
45 425 DOSMAN J., DOUWES J., DOWLING K., ENARSON D., GREEN F., HEEDERIK D.,
46
47 426 HUSMAN K., KULLMAN G., LACASSE Y., LAWSON B., MALMBERG P., MAY J.,
48
49 427 MCCURDY S., MERCHANT J., MYERS J., NIEUWENHUIJSEN M., OLENCHOCK S.,
50
51 428 SAIKI C., SCHWARTZ D., SEIBER J., THORNE P., WAGNER G., WHITE N., XU X. &
52
53 429 CHAN-YEUNG M. (1998) Respiratory health hazards in agriculture. *American Journal of*
54
55 430 *Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, **158**: S1-S76.
56
57
58
59
60

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

431 SCHRIEL R., HEISE A., SCHNEIDER F., EICHELSER R., NESER S. & NOWAK D. (2007)
432 Endotoxin concentration in modern animal houses in Southern Bavaria. *Annals of Agricultural*
433 *and Environmental Medicine*, **14**: 129-136.

434 SEEDORF J., HARTUNG J., SCHRÖDER M., LINKERT K.H., PHILLIPS V.R., HOLDEN
435 M.R., SNEATH R.W., SHORT J.L., WHITE R.P., PEDERSEN L.J., TAKAI H., JOHNSEN
436 J.O., METZ J.H.M., GROOT KOERKAMP P.W.G., UENK G.H. & WATHES C.M. (1998)
437 Concentrations and emissions of airborne endotoxins and microorganisms in livestock buildings
438 in Northern Europe. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*, **70**: 97-109.

439 SIMPSON J.C.G., NIVEN R.M., FLETCHER A.M., OLDHAM L.A. & FRANCIS H.M.
440 (1998a) Prevalence and predictors of work related respiratory symptoms in workers exposed to
441 organic dusts. *Occupational Environmental Medicine*, **55**: 668-672.

442 SIMPSON J.C.G., NIVEN R.M., PICKERING C.A.C., OLDHAM L.A., FLETCHER A.M. &
443 FRANCIS H.M. (1998b) Comparative personal exposures to organic dusts and endotoxin.
444 *Annals of occupational Hygiene*, **43**: 107-115.

445 TAKAI H., PEDERSEN S., JOHNSEN J.O., METZ J.H.M., GROOT KOERKAMP P.W.G.,
446 UENK G.H., PHILLIPS V.R., HOLDEN M.R., SNEATH R.W., SHORT J.L., WHITE R.P.,
447 HARTUNG J., SEEDORF J., SCHRÖDER M., LINKERT K.H. & WATHES C.M. (1998)
448 Concentrations and emissions of airborne dust in livestock buildings in Northern Europe.
449 *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*, **70**: 59-77.

450 THELIN A., TEGLER O. & RYLANDER R. (1984) Lung reactions during poultry handling
451 related to dust and bacterial endotoxin levels. *European Journal of Respiratory Diseases*, **65**:
452 266-271.

453 FIGURE LEGENDS

454

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

457

458

459 **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 1st or 3rd quartile ±*
462 *1.5 interquartile range.*

463

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

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

Variable	Cage	Alternative systems	
		Free-range	Aviary
Number of houses studied	8	10	3
Area (m ²)	1,426 (1062-1650)	625 (412-864)	350 (350-784)
Volume of the henhouse (m ³)	9,600 (4400-11700)	2,040 (1600-3500)	1,600 (1600-5800)
Housing capacity (hens/house)	46,400 (32000-65000)	4,600 (2900-4900)	4,700 (4600-16100)
Density (hens/m ²)	31.9 (26.1-54.2)	7.9 (5.7-10.7)	13.6 (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

Number of hens per cage	9	-	-
	(5-60)		

466

For Peer Review Only

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

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

3

Table 3. *Respirable dust and endotoxin concentrations (median and range) in the inhalable dust fraction in laying houses for each housing system in the field study*

Housing system	n ¹	Respirable dust concentration (mg/m ³)	Endotoxin concentration (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)
<i>P</i> ²		<0.01	<0.01

¹ Number of measures.

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

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

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 (mg/m ³)	Endotoxin concentration (EU/m ³)
Autumn/winter	15	0.189 (0.000-0.599)	320 (135-1822)
Spring/summer	15	0.143 (0.000-0.733)	385 (35-2329)
<i>P</i> ²		0.55	0.65

¹ Number of measures

² Probability for the Wilcoxon test for comparison between seasons

1

For Peer Review Only

Figure 1

Figure 2