haematopoietic malignancies and other cancers following occupational styrene exposure.

**Method** The cohort consists of 74,902 workers (84% men) in the Danish reinforced plastics industry, originating from 481 companies ever producing reinforced plastics in Denmark 1964–2009. We identified all workers in the National Supplementary Pension Fund Registry for which all employees are compulsory members. Cancer diagnoses were found in the National Cancer Registry. Standardised Incidence Rate Ratios (SIRs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were used for relative risk estimation.

**Results** Among the 74,902 workers, we identified 10,374 cases of cancer accumulating 1.5 million person years. The overall SIR was 1.00 (95% CI 0.98–1.02). SIR for lymphatic and haematopoietic cancers was 0.99 (0.91–1.07). Among male workers we observed increased risk of buccal cavity and pharyngeal cancers (SIR 1.24; 1.12–1.37), cancers of the respiratory system (SIR 1.33; 1.26–1.39), and bladder cancer (SIR 1.08; 1.0–1.17), and among female workers cancers of the respiratory system (SIR 1.41; 1.22–1.62).

**Conclusions** The cohort experiences the same overall cancer risk as the general population and no increased overall risk of malignant haematopoietic diseases was apparent. However, we observed increased risks for cancers that may be due to confounding from smoking and alcohol. Internal risk assessment that includes historical styrene exposure data will supplement the current findings.

**0179  INDEPENDENT MEDICAL EVALUATIONS - IMPORTANT, NEGLECTED, IN NEED OF REFORM: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW**

1. Jason Busse, 1Sharil Ibrahim, 1John Riva, 2Sheena Bance, 1Gordon Guyatt, 1Michael Bagby, 1Regina Kurz. 1McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada; 2University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; 3Basel Academy of Swiss Insurance Medicine, Basel, Switzerland

**Objective** Independent medical evaluations (IMEs) are a common and influential form of assessment, often influencing whether patients receive compensation for an injury or illness. To inform the evidence-base underlying IMEs, we conducted a systematic review of all primary literature conducted in North America.

**Method** We searched CINAHL, EMBASE, MEDLINE and PsycINFO and other sources for studies published through to Sept. 20, 2011. We included all primary literature on the topic of IMEs from a North American perspective. Assessment for study inclusion, data extraction and risk-of-bias analyses were performed in duplicate.

**Results** We included 52 studies, all of which were observational in design and most of which focussed on determining the rate of malingering among examinees. Estimates of non-credible symptom over-reporting among patients presenting for IMEs ranged from 16% to 55%, with studies at lower risk of bias finding higher estimates. Other studies found that inter-rater reliability among IME assessors for assigning degree of impairment to the same IME report was poor, and that patients presenting for an IME with external incentive (e.g. litigation, disability benefits) perform systematically worse across a range of psychometric tests versus patients presenting with similar illness/injury but without external incentive.

**Conclusions** Symptom exaggeration is common among patients presenting for IMEs, and particularly among those patients with external incentive. IME assessors reviewing the same case demonstrate little agreement regarding the degree of impairment that should be assigned. Standards for IME assessment and reporting are urgently needed to ensure greater reliability and validity of this common form of assessment.

**0180  DOES LONG-TERM STRESS CAUSE DEPRESSION? OCCUPATIONAL NOISE EXPOSURE AND THE USE OF ANTIDEPRESSANTS**

1NM Raaschou, 2A Stokholm, 1MV Villit, 1O Mors, 1JM Vestergaard, 1IW Frederiksen, 1HA Kolstad. 1Danish Ramazzini Centre, Department of Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark; 2Danish Ramazzini Centre, Department of Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark; 3Danish Ramazzini Centre, Department of Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark; 4Danish Ramazzini Centre, Department of Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark; 5Danish Ramazzini Centre, Department of Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark; 6Danish Ramazzini Centre, Department of Occupational Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark

**Objective** The purpose of this study was to determine if occupational noise exposure causes depression, and if antidepressants are used to treat occupational depression.

**Method** The study was a cross-sectional analysis of data from the Health Interview Survey in the United States. The study included 10,000 individuals who were employed in the past year and who had ever been diagnosed with depression by a health professional. The study compared the prevalence of occupational noise exposure and the use of antidepressants among individuals with and without depression.

**Results** The results showed that individuals with occupational noise exposure were more likely to have depression (odds ratio = 1.5; 95% CI = 1.2–1.9) and were more likely to use antidepressants (odds ratio = 1.7; 95% CI = 1.4–2.1) compared to individuals without occupational noise exposure.

**Conclusion** Occupational noise exposure is a significant risk factor for depression and the use of antidepressants. Further research is needed to determine the mechanism by which occupational noise exposure causes depression and the effectiveness of antidepressants in treating occupational depression.