

in the shop and right-to-know training, emergency planning, ergonomics, personal protective equipment, respiratory protection, paint booth and mixing room, electrical and machine safety). Facilities that were working or had worked with a safety consultant had significantly fewer missing items at baseline ($p < 0.03$), but not at follow-up. On average, shop owners chose to correct 59% of the missing items ($SD = 17\%$) and after one year reported a completion rate of 70% ($SD = 28\%$). One-year assessments indicate that, on average 56% of the items selected for improvement were actually completed ($SD = 27\%$).

Conclusions Results indicate that most business owners were able to improve health and safety in the shop if they were provided specific information about hazards and solutions, received regular reminders and utilised tailored technical assistance.

259 DOES FEEDBACK ON MEASURED CONCENTRATIONS REDUCE THE LEVEL OF EXPOSURE TO DUST AMONG FARMERS?

¹I. Basinas, ¹Sigsgaard, ²Kromhout, ¹Bønløkke, ¹Schlünssen. ¹Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark; ²Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences (IRAS), Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

10.1136/oemed-2013-101717.259

Objective To assess whether exposure can be reduced by providing feedback to the farmers concerning the levels of dust that they are daily exposed to in their farm.

Methods The personal dust levels of farmers in 53 pig and 25 dairy cattle farms were evaluated in 2 measurement series performed approximately 6 months apart. Detailed information on technical parameters and farm characteristics were also registered. Participating farms were *a priori* randomly divided into a control ($n = 39$) and an intervention group ($n = 39$). Shortly after the first visit, farm owners in the intervention group received a letter with information on the measured dust concentrations on their farm together with some general advises on exposure reduction strategies (e.g. use of respirators during certain tasks). Relationships between measured dust concentrations and intervention status were quantified by means of linear mixed effect analysis, with farm id as a random effect. Season, type of farming, visit, intervention status and their two-way interactions were tested as fixed effects.

Results After adjustment for season and farm type we found no effect by intervention status. There was no interaction by type of farm, but measured dust levels on the second visit were significantly lower than during the first visit. Similar results were observed in models stratified by type of farming, where the effects of visit were most clearly observed among pig farms.

Conclusion These preliminary findings suggest no interventional effects on the levels of exposure; though, the presence of the investigation itself seems to reduce the levels of exposure. By June 2013, the authors intend to present the above results along with those from further analysis addressing potential changes in working patterns and hygienic parameters during the second exposure evaluation.

260 INTERVENTIONS TO PREVENT OCCUPATIONAL NOISE-INDUCED HEARING LOSS - A COCHRANE REVIEW

¹V. J. Verbeek, ²Kateman, ³Morata, ⁴Dreschler, ⁵Mischke. ¹Kuopio, Finland; ²Center of Expertise in Hearing and Noise Problems, Doetinchem, Nederland; ³National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), Cincinnati, United States of America;

⁴Academic Medical Centre, Amsterdam, Nederland; ⁵Cochrane Occupational Safety and Health Review Group, FIOH, Kuopio, Finland

10.1136/oemed-2013-101717.260

Objectives Millions of workers worldwide are exposed to noise levels that increase their risk of hearing impairment. Little is known about the effectiveness of hearing loss prevention interventions. Therefore we assessed the effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions for preventing occupational noise exposure or occupational hearing loss compared to no intervention or alternative interventions.

Methods We followed the methods prescribed by the Cochrane Collaboration. We searched 8 different electronic databases to 25 January 2012. We included randomised controlled trials, controlled before-after studies and interrupted time-series of non-clinical hearing loss prevention interventions among workers. Two authors independently assessed study eligibility and risk of bias and extracted data. We combined similar studies in a meta-analysis using RevMan5 and assessed statistical heterogeneity with the I^2 statistic.

Results We included 25 studies. We found no controlled studies on engineering controls for noise exposure but one interrupted time-series on legislation to reduce noise exposure. Eight studies evaluated effects of personal hearing protection devices. Sixteen studies evaluated hearing loss prevention programs (HLPPs). The implementation of stricter legislation was shown to reduce noise levels in workplaces. Case studies showed that substantial reductions in noise levels can be achieved, but there are no controlled studies of the effectiveness of such measures. Better use of hearing protection devices as part of HLPPs reduces the risk of hearing loss, whereas for other program components of HLPPs we did not find such an effect. The overall quality of studies was low to very low.

Conclusions There is still a considerable risk of hearing loss in workers that are considered to be protected by hearing loss prevention programs. The effectiveness of hearing protection devices depends on training and their proper use. Better implementation and reinforcement of hearing loss prevention programs is needed. Better evaluations of technical interventions and long-term effects are needed.

261 WHEN DOES RESEARCH SERVE PREVENTION?

Dr Wergeland. Labour Inspection Authority, Oslo, Norway

10.1136/oemed-2013-101717.261

Objectives It is commonly considered that prevention should be based on scientific evidence. But the relationship between research and prevention is not a simple one. What constitutes evidence, and how should results be interpreted? Research may sometimes delay prevention. The aim of this study is to identify factors that have influenced the impact of research on prevention in Norway over the last century.

Methods We examined available documents about two large industries, the production of silicon carbide, established in 1913, and the production of primary aluminium, established in 1908. Research papers on occupational exposure and workers health in these industries have been examined, together with recommendations issued by members of the scientific community. "State of the art" scientific knowledge has been compared with concurrent initiatives taken by various stakeholders, including the Norwegian Labour Inspection.