### Assessment of hand-arm vibration (HAV) exposure in an alumina refinery workshop.

A pilot study using new dosimetry technology

**Presenter: Mingguo Li** 

Authors: Mingguo Li, A. Michael Donoghue, Kathryn Hookham, Suzanne Bannerman Alcoa Medical Centre, Pinjarra Alumina Refinery

Western Australia

RACP Congress 2019

Auckland, New Zealand

## Introduction

- HAV: A known occupational hazard in many industries
- Prolonged exposure leads to adverse health effects
  - Vascular
  - Neurological
  - Musculoskeletal
- 400 workers compensation claims per year in Australia between 2000 and 2008 (Safe Work Australia, 2010)
- Critical to accurately assess the level of exposure







# HAV exposure dose

- Dose is dependent on vibration magnitude and duration
- Vibration magnitude is affected by
  - Tool and task features
  - Individual operator characteristics
- Duration varies
  - For different tasks and from day to day
- Daily exposure dose-referred to as A(8)
  - quantity of HAV during a working day
  - duration normalised to 8h

One tool A<sub>1</sub>(8) = 
$$ahv \sqrt{\frac{T}{T0}}$$
 Multiple tools A(8) =  $\sqrt{A_1(8)^2 + A_2(8)^2 + \cdots}$ 

Where  $a_{hv}$  is the vibration magnitude (m/s<sup>2</sup>) of the tool;  $T_0$  is exposure duration at  $a_{hv}$ ; T is the reference duration of 8 hours



## **Workplace vibration dose assessments**

- It is difficult to conduct vibration dose assessments in the workplace because:
  - A range of tools with different vibration magnitudes is typically used
  - Constant observation is required to record exposure duration with each tool

#### Traditional techniques

- Measurement of the vibration magnitude of each tool
- Using stop watch / video surveillance for duration
- Measuring simulated job tasks in a laboratory
- Measuring only selected work tasks
- Making inferences from databases
- Prone to errors



# New technology

### Q2 Dosimetry (Curotec, Hungerford, UK)







- Receptacle "holsters"
- Glued onto each tool
- Each holster uniquely identifies its tool
- Accelerometer
- Clicked onto the holster of each tool used
- Activated by vibration
- Accelerometer data downloaded to a "beacon"
- Beacon uploads data via a wireless device

## **Objectives**

- Pilot study to test the Q2 system
- Determine daily HAV exposure in a workshop
- Characterize risks by comparing results to EU standards
- Consider appropriate next step actions



### Methods

- Cross-sectional study
- The work undertaken in the WAO workshop
  - Removal of deposits, cleaning and painting of valves and parts
  - 4 working bays: physical descaling is undertaken in 2 bays
  - A tool survey identified and coded 18 vibration tools

#### • The workers

- 12 workers, 8 hours/day, 9 days/fortnight
- Rotating from one bay to the next daily
- 7 of 12 workers available all consented
- Each issued with a Q2 accelerometer



### Methods

#### Data collection

- Accelerometers were left in lockers at end of shift
- Data was downloaded to beacon and uploaded to iCloud sever
- Data was retrieved and analyzed from off-site computers
- Study period
  - 21 consecutive days (Dec 2018 Jan 2019)



### **Outcome measurement**

- Daily vibration points
  Calculated by the device
  - Data output shown in table

| Times  | Total H/A  | Total W/B  | Total Time | Asset No.            |
|--------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Used   | HSE Points | HSE Points | on tool    |                      |
| 4      | 210        |            | 00:16:45   | WA Workshop BB       |
| 5      | 63         |            | 06:24:44   | Tool 3 Needle Scaler |
| 1      | 21         |            | 00:04:49   | Tool 19 Spare        |
| 1      | 0          |            | 00:00:52   | Tool 4 Air Chisel    |
| Totals | 294        | 0          | 06:47:10   |                      |

### **Results compared to the EU Directive Standards**

- The Exposure Action Value (EAV) is 100 points = A(8) of 2.5m/s<sup>2</sup>. If the EAV is reached further controls are required.
- The Exposure Limit Value (ELV) is 400 points = A(8) of 5m/s<sup>2</sup>. If the ELV is reached there should be no more exposure during that shift.

## **Results**

#### HAV daily exposure points

- 33 measurements (among 7 operators)
- Range: 9 to 650 points
- Arithmetic mean 181 points
- Geometric mean 100 points
- 19/33 (58%) > EAV (in yellow)
- 4/33 (12%) > ELV (in red)

|          | OP1 | OP2 | OP3 | OP4 | OP5 | OP6 | OP7 |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Exposure | 17  | 105 | 130 | 101 | 194 | 135 | 650 |
| point    | 9   | 314 | 400 | 195 | 644 | 228 | 242 |
| -        | 50  |     | 43  | 35  | 466 | 635 | 267 |
|          | 17  |     |     | 291 |     |     | 109 |
|          | 69  |     |     |     |     |     | 9   |
|          | 145 |     |     |     |     |     | 205 |
|          | 41  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|          | 73  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|          | 61  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|          | 86  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|          | 42  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|          | 11  |     |     |     |     |     |     |

### **Similar Exposure Group**

- A logprobability plot of the data demonstrated a lognormal distribution, confirmed by the Shapiro-Wilk Wtest (p < 0.05)</li>
- This indicates it is appropriate to classify the data from the 7 operators as one Similar Exposure Group (SEG)



### **Lognormal parametric statistics**

- Estimated arithmetic mean = 205 points
- Estimated percent above ELV (400 points) = 13%
- 95% CI of estimated percent above ELV: 7-23%



## **Tools with high vibration**

| Vibration tools   | Maximum daily vibration<br>exposure points generated |
|-------------------|--|
| #14 needle scaler | 589  |
| #3 needle scaler  | 469  |

Another 7/18 tools recorded maximum daily vibration dose above the EAV

### Discussion

- Over half (58%) of the daily HAV doses were above the EAV
- 12% of the daily HAV doses were above the ELV
- This indicates the level of HAV exposure in this SEG is unacceptable
- Continued exposure increases the risk of HAVS
- Further control measures are required

### Discussion

- This is the first report of a field trial of the Q2 dosimeter
- We found the Q2 dosimeter
  - Was able to measure vibration doses across a range of tools and job tasks
  - Removed the need for separate magnitude & duration assessments
  - Was able to measure HAV in real-time working conditions
  - Was practical with minimal interference to work activities



### **Study limitation**

- Possible underestimation of daily vibration doses
  - 2 holsters were knocked off tools on the last day, affecting 3 readings
  - If workers forgot to attach the accelerometer every time they switched tools (minimised by staff engagement)

### **Summary**

- The Q2 dosimeter is a practical tool for HAV dose measurements in a real working environmentparticularly suitable for multiple tools and job tasks
- An unacceptable level of HAV exposure was identified in the selected workshop
- Further controls are regarded as necessary
  - Targeting tools identified generating high HAV
  - Optimal job rotation
  - Improved training and education
  - Revised periodic medical evaluations to include HS for HAVS

#### References

- Safe Work Australia. National hazard exposure worker surveillance: vibration exposure and the provision of vibration control measures in Australian workplaces [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2018 December 10]. Available from
- https://www.safeworkaustralia.gov.au/system/files/documents/1702/nhews\_vibration\_exposure\_provision\_vibration\_controls\_australian\_workplaces\_july\_201 0.pdf
- Nilsson T, Wahlstro"m J, Burstro"m L. Hand-arm vibration and the risk of vascular and neurological diseases—A systematic review and meta-analysis <u>PLoS</u> <u>One.</u> 2017; 12(7):e0180795.
- Takeuchi T, Futatsuka M, Imanishi H, Yamada S. Pathological changes observed in the finger biopsy of patients with vibration-induced white finger. Scand J Work Environ Health. 1986;12:280–283.
- Littleford RC, Khan F, Hindley MO, Ho M, Belch JJ. Microvascular abnormalities in patients with vibration white finger. QJM. 1997;90:525-529.
- Stromberg T, Dahlin LB, Brun A, Lundborg G. Structural nerve changes at wrist level in workers exposed to vibration. Occup Environ Med. 1997; 54(5): 307–311.
- Palmer KT, Harris EC, Coggon D. Carpal tunnel syndrome and its relation to occupation: a systematic literature review. Occupational Medicine. 2007;57:57– 66.
- Dahlin LB, Sandén H, Dahlin E, Zimmerman M, Thomsen N, Björkman A. Low myelinated nerve-fibre density may lead to symptoms associated with nerve entrapment in vibration-induced neuropathy. J Occup Med Toxicol. 2014;9:7.
- Poole CJ, Cleveland TJ. Vascular hand-arm vibration syndrome--magnetic resonance angiography. Occup Med (Lond). 2016;66(1):75-8.
- Virokannas H, Virokannas A. Temperature and vibration perception thresholds in workers exposed to hand-arm vibration. Cent Eur J Public Health. 1995;3(Suppl):66–69.
- Lindsell CJ, Griffin MJ. Thermal thresholds, vibrotactile thresholds and finger systolic blood pressures in dockyard workers exposed to hand-transmitted vibration. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 1999;72(6):377–386.
- Lundstrom R, Noor Baloch A, Hagberg M, Nilsson T, Gerhardsson L. Long-term effect of hand-arm vibration on thermotactile perception thresholds. J Occup Med Toxicol. 2018;22(13):19.
- Nilsson T, Burstrom L, Hagberg M, Lundstrom R. Thermal perception thresholds among young adults exposed to hand-transmitted vibration. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2008;81(5):519–533.
- Palmer KT, D'Angelo S, Syddall H, Griffin MJ, Cooper C, Coggon D. Dupuytren's contracture and occupational exposure to hand-transmitted vibration. Occup Environ Med. 2014;71:241–245.
- Van der Molen HG, Foresti C, Daams JG, Frings-Dresen MHW, Kuijer PPFM. Work-related risk factors for specific shoulder disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Occup Environ Med. 2017;74(10):745-755.
- Wahl U, Kaden I, Kohler A, Hirsch T. Vascular trauma of the hand a systematic review. Vasa. 2018;16:1-11.

Safe Work Australia. Guide to measuring and assessing workplace exposure to hand-arm vibration. [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2018 December 15]. Available from https://www.safeworkaustralia.gov.au/system/files/documents/1703/guidetomeasuringassessinghandarmvibration.pdf

#### **References cont.**

ISO 5349-1:2013: Mechanical vibration-measurement and evaluation of human exposure to hand-transmitted vibration-Part 1: General requirement [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2018 December 10]. Available from

https://archive.org/details/gov.in.is.iso.5349.1.2001/page/n3

ISO 5349-2:2013: Mechanical vibration-measurement and evaluation of human exposure to hand-transmitted vibration-Part 2: Practical guidance for measurement at the workplace. [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2018 December 10]. Available from

https://archive.org/details/gov.in.is.iso.5349.2.2001/page/n3

- Mulhausen JR, Damiano J. A strategy for assessing and managing occupational exposures. American Industrial Hygiene Association. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Fairfax, VA:AIHA Press; 1998:241-250.
- McDowell TW, Welcome DE, Warren C, Xu XS, Dong RG. Assessment of hand-transmitted vibration exposure from motorized forks used for beach-cleaning operations. Ann Occup Hyg. 2013;57(1):43-53.
- Liljelind I, Wahlstrom J, Nilsson L, Toomingas A, Burstrom L, Liljelind I. Variability in hand-arm vibration during grinding operations. Ann Occup Hyg. 2011;55(3):296-304.
- Su TA, Maeda S, Fukumoto J, et al. Dose–response relationship between hand-transmitted vibration and hand-arm vibration syndrome in a tropical environment. Occup Environ Med. 2013;70:498–504.
- McDowell TW, Welcome DE, Warren C, Xu XS, Dong RG. The effect of a mechanical arm system on portable grinder vibration emissions. Ann. Occup Hyg. 2016; 60(3): 371–386.
- Sauni R, Paakkonen R, Virtema P, Toppila E, Uitti J. Dose response relationship between exposure to hand-arm vibration and health effects among metalworkers. Ann. Occup Hyg. 2009; 53(1):55–62.
- Mason HJ, Poole K, Young C. Exposure assessment in health assessments for hand-arm vibration syndrome. Occup Med (Lond). 2011;61(5):374-376.

Riedel S. Consideration of grip and push forces for the assessment of vibration exposure. Cent Eur J Public Health. 1995;3(Suppl):139-141.

- Lundström R. Neurological disorders: aspects of quantitative sensory testing methodology in relation to hand-arm vibration syndrome. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 2002;75:68–77.
- Gemne G, Lundström R. Evaluation of the white finger risk prediction model in ISO 5349 suggests need for prospective studies. Cent Eur J Public Health. 1996;4:137-139.
- Bovenzi M. Exposure-response relationship in the hand-arm vibration syndrome: an overview of current epidemiology research. Int Arch Occup Environ Health. 1998;71:509-519.
- Jang JY, Kim S, Park SK, Roh J, Lee TY, Youn JT. Quantitative exposure assessment for shipyard workers exposed to hand-transmitted vibration from a variety of vibration tools. AIHA J. 2002;63:305–310.
- Bylund SH. Hand-arm vibration and working women consequences and affecting factors. [Medical dissertation on the Internet]. Solfjadern,Umeå; 2004 [cited 2019 January 15]. Available from:

http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:143332/FULLTEXT01.pdf