

Poster Presentation

Respiratory

0457 CONSEQUENCES OF ASTHMA ON OCCUPATIONAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN THE SIP STUDY

¹Dorothee Provost*, ³Jean-Francois Chastang, ¹Marie-Christine Delmas, ²Chantal Raheison, ¹Yuriko Iwatsubo. ¹Santé publique France, Saint Maurice, France; ²INSERM U219, Bordeaux, France; ³INSERM UMRS 1136, Paris, France

10.1136/oemed-2017-104636.378

Objective To study the employment and financial characteristics among asthmatics.

Methods This study was based on the data from the prospective French national representative SIP (Santé et Itinéraire Professionnel) survey. In 2006, 13 648 individuals aged between 20 to 74 years living in metropolitan France were interviewed. In 2010, 11 221 of those who had participated in 2006 accepted to be re-interviewed. The 2006 questionnaire collected occupational and medical histories. Asthma cases were identified by the statement of the subjects at different moments of their medical and occupational histories. The 2010 questionnaire collected the duration of unemployment and that of sickness absences between 2006 and 2010 and the annual income in 2010. The analyses considered the individuals who had completed occupational history. Asthmatic subjects identified in 2006 were compared to the subjects without asthma for employment and financial outcomes between 2006 and 2010.

Results A total of 426 asthmatic subjects were identified in 2006. Due to lost to follow-up, analyses were conducted with 362 asthmatics (138 men and 224 women) and 10 858 non asthmatics. Between 2006 and 2010, the female asthmatics experienced more frequently a period of unemployment and that of sickness absences compared to non asthmatics. They presented lower annual income in 2010. Among males, no significant association was observed.

Conclusions These results suggest that asthmatic women experience rather negative work life events and lower income than non asthmatics. In contrast, no such results were observed in men. These results must be confirmed in future prospective cohort studies.

Poster Presentation

Methodology

0458 SHOULD OCCUPATIONAL EPIDEMIOLOGISTS CONSIDER A NEW PARADIGM? THE OCCUPATIONAL CANCER CASE

^{1,2}Charles-Olivier Betansedi*. ¹Paris-Saclay/Paris-Sud University, Kremlin Bicetre, France; ²INSERM CESP U1018, Kremlin Bicetre, France

10.1136/oemed-2017-104636.379

The past decades have been the theatre of intellectual movements in epidemiology. The early 1990s in particular were marked by lively debates about the nature of the discipline and the role it should play in society. In addition to the importance of theory, two major points of controversy concerned on one hand the role denied, assumed or criticised of politics or more generally of ideology in research, on the other hand the nature

of the causal determinism for a disease. Did these controversies have any impact in the occupational health domain?

We review these debates in the light of the current state of research in occupational cancer epidemiology. We aim to illustrate, the questioning, the practices of occupational epidemiologists when inscribed in different in views of the discipline.

We found that research conducted tend to primarily use "reductionist" paradigms and prioritise a deontological ethic (as opposed consequentialist). Occupational health is an issue of power: social, economic and political, crossed by many social dimensions such as social class or gender. Therefore, can occupational epidemiologists afford to neglect work as a social construction? Would it be beneficial for occupational epidemiologists, as suggested in other domains, to move towards a new paradigm or a new ethic?

Oral Presentation

Methodology

0459 PRODUCTIVITY ESTIMATION IN ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY INTERVENTIONS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

¹Jonas Steel*, ²Lode Godderis, ^{1,3}Jeroen Luyten. ¹Leuven Institute for Healthcare Policy, KULeuven, Leuven, Belgium; ²Environment and Health, KULeuven, Leuven, Belgium; ³Department of Social Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, Leuven, Belgium

10.1136/oemed-2017-104636.380

Background OHS interventions increasingly have to demonstrate that they offer good value-for-money. The intervention's effect on productivity gains is thereby essential. However, productivity is not easily measured nor valued, possibly causing employers to underestimate the benefits of OHS programs.

Objectives A systematic review of the measurement and valuation of productivity in economic evaluations of occupational health and safety was conducted, to assess the methodological quality of productivity estimation and the consistency of perspectives used.

Methods Searches were conducted in EMBASE, PUBMED and Cochrane's CENTRAL, between 2007 and December 2016. Two researchers independently reviewed the studies for inclusion. Articles had to be economic evaluations or cost analyses, OHS interventions, aimed at an employed (or return-to-work) population >16 years old and written in English, French, or Dutch. From the included studies, information regarding the general characteristics, inclusion of productivity costs and effects, and methodology of productivity estimation was extracted and analysed.

Results Ninety-two studies were retained. Ninety percent of the studies contrasted intervention costs with absenteeism effects, a third included presenteeism. About half of the studies valued these effects using the human capital approach, twenty-five percent used the friction cost approach. The methodological characteristics were of poor quality in many studies, resulting in a considerable risk of bias. The diversity of studies was also apparent, with studies differing in ten different characteristics concerning the measurement and valuation of productivity. Finally, a new method came into view - direct productivity estimation - that holds a promising alternative to the current standard methods.