


Journal Pre-proof

Occupational Contact Dermatitis: Retrospective Analysis of North American Contact Dermatitis Group Data, 2001 to 2016

Joel G. DeKoven, MD, MHSc, Benjamin M. DeKoven, Bsc, Erin M. Warshaw, MD, MS, Mathias CGT, James S. Taylor, MD, Denis Sasseville, MD, Donald V. Belsito, MD, Joseph F. Fowler, Jr., MD, Melanie D. Pratt, MD, Kathryn A. Zug, MD, Howard I. Maibach, MD, Vincent A. DeLeo, MD, Jonathan I. Silverberg, MD, PhD, MPH1, Amber R. Atwater, MD, Margo J. Reeder, MD, D. Linn Holness, MD, MHSc



PII: S0190-9622(21)00591-0

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2021.03.042>

Reference: YMJD 15810

To appear in: *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*

Received Date: 2 January 2021

Revised Date: 2 March 2021

Accepted Date: 6 March 2021

Please cite this article as: DeKoven JG, DeKoven BM, Warshaw EM, CGT M, Taylor JS, Sasseville D, Belsito DV, Fowler Jr JF, Pratt MD, Zug KA, Maibach HI, DeLeo VA, Silverberg JI, Atwater AR, Reeder MJ, Holness DL, Occupational Contact Dermatitis: Retrospective Analysis of North American Contact Dermatitis Group Data, 2001 to 2016, *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology* (2021), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2021.03.042>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2021 Published by Elsevier on behalf of the American Academy of Dermatology, Inc.

Occupational Contact Dermatitis: Retrospective Analysis of North American Contact Dermatitis Group Data, 2001 to 2016

Joel G. DeKoven, MD, MHSc¹, Benjamin M. DeKoven, BSc¹, Erin M. Warshaw MD, MS², Mathias CGT³, James S. Taylor, MD⁴, Denis Sasseville, MD⁵, Donald V. Belsito, MD⁶, Joseph F. Fowler, Jr, MD⁷, Melanie D. Pratt, MD⁸, Kathryn A. Zug MD⁹, Howard I. Maibach, MD¹⁰, Vincent A. DeLeo, MD¹¹, Jonathan I. Silverberg, MD, PhD, MPH¹², Amber R. Atwater MD¹³, Margo J. Reeder, MD¹⁴, D. Linn Holness, MD, MHSc¹

1. Division of Occupational Medicine, Department of Medicine, St Michael's Hospital, Unity Health, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada
2. Department of Dermatology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
3. Cincinnati, OH
4. Department of Dermatology, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH
5. Division of Dermatology, Montreal General Hospital, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
6. Department of Dermatology, Columbia University Irving Medical School, New York, NY
7. Division of Dermatology, University of Louisville, KY
8. Division of Dermatology, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
9. Department of Dermatology, Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH
10. Department of Dermatology, University of California San Francisco
11. Department of Dermatology, Keck School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA
12. Department of Dermatology, The George Washington University School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Washington, DC
13. Department of Dermatology, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC

14. Department of Dermatology, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public
Health, Madison, WI

Corresponding author:

Joel DeKoven MD
Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre
M1-730 2075 Bayview Avenue
Toronto ON Canada M4N 3M5
joel.dekoven@sunnybrook.ca

Funding sources: None

Conflict of Interest: None

IRB approval status: Reviewed and approved by Unity Health Toronto Research Ethics Board

Disclosures:

Dr. Warshaw has received an investigator-initiated grant from Wen by Chaz Dean and served as
a consultant for Wen by Chaz Dean and Noven Pharmaceuticals.

Dr. Atwater received a Pfizer Independent Grant for Learning & Change and has consulted for
Henkel.

Dr. Sasseville receives royalties from UpToDate (Wolters Kluwer Health)

Dr. Taylor owns non-controlling shares of stock in Astra Zeneca, Cigna, Merck, Johnson &
Johnson, and Opko Health. He has consulted for Kao Brands and Monsanto (Bayer), is a member
of the Cosmetic Ingredient Review Steering Committee, and has a non-dependent child
employed by Pfizer.

Manuscript word count: 2495 words (excluding capsule summary, abstract, tables, figures, references)

Abstract word count: 158

Capsule summary word count: 50

References: 58

Figures: 1

Tables: 4

Supplementary tables: 4

Keywords: allergic contact dermatitis; contact allergy; patch tests, occupational skin disease, occupational, occupational allergic contact dermatitis, occupational irritant contact dermatitis, surveillance

Acknowledgements: The authors thank Rick Wang for his statistical contributions to the manuscript.

Supplemental material available at <https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/yvvgg24th6g/1>

Abstract

Background: Patch-testing is an important diagnostic tool for suspected allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) in occupational settings.

Objective: Provide an overview of occupational skin disease (OSD) and analysis of occupational ACD in North American patients undergoing patch-testing 2001-2016.

Methods: Patients with OSD were analyzed for frequency of allergic reactions to a screening series of allergens, occupational relevance, location of skin disease, and exposure sources. Demographic and occupation/industry information was recorded.

Results: Of 38,614 patients evaluated, 4471 (11.6%) had OSD, of whom 3150 (70.5%) had ACD. The most common occupationally related allergens included rubber accelerators, preservatives and bisphenol A epoxy resin. Hands (75.8%), arms (30.0%) and face (15.9%) were common sites of dermatitis.. The most affected occupations were service workers and machine operators.

Limitations: Our cohort may not reflect the general working population.

Conclusion: This study identified common occupational allergens, exposure sources, and occupations/industries at risk. This information may help the clinician evaluate and manage patients with occupational contact dermatitis.

Capsule Summary

- This article provides an update on occupational contact dermatitis in North America from 2001-2016 including relevant allergens, exposure sources and associated occupations/ industries.
- Knowledge of common allergens, their exposure sources, and occupations/industries at risk can help guide diagnostic evaluation and facilitate prevention on an individual level and in the workplace.

Introduction

Occupational skin disease (OSD) accounts for almost 30% of all occupational illnesses.¹ It is the second most common occupational illness in the United States, after musculoskeletal injuries.² Occupational contact dermatitis (OCD) makes up 90% of all OSD, and includes allergic contact dermatitis (ACD) and irritant contact dermatitis (ICD).³ Negative impacts of OCD include reduced function, quality of life, work disruption, and economic effects.⁴ Information about OCD comes from a variety of sources including government, workers compensation and insurance agencies, registries of OSD, patch test databases, workplace studies and case reports.⁴ Recent retrospective studies which analyzed sizeable populations include an examination of the Finnish Register of Occupational Diseases (2005-2016) and the North Eastern Italian patch test database (1996 - 2016).^{5,6} The European Surveillance System on Contact Allergy (ESSCA) network examined their 2002-2010 data, but an occupational analysis of a large North American patch test population has not been conducted within the past 20 years.^{7,8}

The North American Contact Dermatitis Group (NACDG) is a group of dermatologists based in Canada and the U.S who evaluate patients with suspected contact dermatitis by patch testing. The NACDG uses a screening series that is re-evaluated and adjusted every two years.⁹⁻¹⁶ The purpose of this retrospective study is to describe the characteristics and patch test results of workers diagnosed with OSD in the NACDG database from 2001-2016. Areas of inquiry include

the frequency of occupational ACD, demographics of affected individuals, major occupations/industries, causative allergens, and their sources.

Methods

The NACDG began recording consecutive patch test cycle data in 1992.⁹⁻¹⁹ Since 2001, detailed exposure source codes have been included. Between 2001 - 2016 the NACDG completed eight patch test cycles with a screening series of allergens. Institutional Review Board approval for data collection is obtained by each member, specific to their organization. Patch testing was performed in accordance with NACDG standards that have been previously described.^{15,19} A final determination of “allergic/positive” or “not allergic” was determined by each investigator based on the temporal pattern, patch test appearance, and known characteristics of that allergen. The clinical relevance of positive patch test reactions was determined using the patient's history and clinical skin examination. Relevance was coded as current (“definite”, “probable”, or “possible”), past or unknown.¹⁹ Patients were tested to supplemental allergens as determined by each individual physician, depending on the patient's clinical presentation and occupation. Up to 3 sites of dermatitis and 3 diagnoses could be coded for each patient. The physician interpreted whether positive reactions were related to the patient's occupation. A primary exposure source for each occupationally-relevant screening allergen was identified. An exposure source was also classified for patients positive to supplemental allergens; the names of these allergens were not specifically recorded.

Occupation and industry were coded for each patient by an occupational expert using the US 2000 Census Bureau Codes based on answers to a series of 5 standardized questions.^{20,21}

All data were manually entered into a computerized database at a centralized location using Access software (Access 2010; Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA) and comparative statistical analyses were performed using R version 4.0.2 (2020; R Core Team, Vienna, Austria). Demographics, occupational relevance, exposure sources and affected occupations/industries were presented using descriptive analyses including frequencies, counts, and proportions. For each of the top allergens, logistic regression was used to analyze the trend in the proportion of patients having an occupationally-relevant patch test in each year. Year was modeled as a linear covariate and the odds ratio for a one-year increase was reported. *P*-values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. There were no statistical adjustments for multiple comparisons.

Results

Patient Characteristics

Of 38,614 patients tested, 4471 (11.6%) had OSD. Demographics and disease characteristics of these OSD patients are described using MOAHLFAP (male, occupational, atopic, hand, leg, face, age >40 years, proportion of positivity) guidelines (Table S1).²² More patients were male (51.4%) and most patients were Caucasian (87.1%) and > 40 years of age (55.3% - median 43 years). Atopic characteristics included hay fever (26.8%), eczema (19.3%) or asthma (14.5%). The most common sites of dermatitis were hands (75.8%), arms (30.0%), face (15.9%), and scattered generalized (12.4%) (Table S2). Most patients were diagnosed with occupational ACD (70.5%), and/or ICD (45.7%) and 10% had atopic dermatitis. All other diagnoses occurred in < 5% (Table S3).

Allergens

Within the cohort of individuals with occupational ACD, 81.7% had positive reactions to only NACDG screening series allergens, 13.1% also reacted ≥ 1 supplemental allergen(s) and 5.2% only had positive reactions to ≥ 1 supplemental allergen(s).

The allergens with the greatest proportions and frequency of occupationally related reactions are shown in Table 1. The 10 most common occupational patch test substances were carba mix (9.7%), thiuram mix (9.6%), methylisothiazolinone [MI] (9.3%) bisphenol A epoxy resin (5.6%), diphenylguanidine (5.4%), formaldehyde (1% aq) (3.9%), nickel sulfate hexahydrate (3.8%), potassium dichromate (3.6%), 2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate [HEMA] (3.4%) and cobalt chloride hexahydrate (3.2%). Bisphenol A epoxy resin had the highest percentage of occupationally-relevant reactions (90.6%) followed by glyceryl thioglycolate [GTG] (87.7%), thiuram mix (87.6%), carba mix (87.0%) and mercapto mix (84.9%), (Table 1).

Allergen Trends

Over the 16-year study period, there were statistically significant increases in the odds ratios of patients having an occupationally-relevant reaction to carba mix [OR 1.034, CI 1.014-1.054; $p < 0.001$], and MCI/MI [OR 1.193, CI 1.147-1.244; $p < 0.001$] (Figure 1). 2-mercaptobenzothiazole showed a significant downward trend (Table S4).

Occupations and Industries

Major occupational groups included service workers (20.3%), machine operators/assemblers/inspectors (17.0%), precision production workers (11.0%), mechanics/repairers (8.3%), and

health professionals (7.4%) (Table 2). The most common industries were hospitals (13.5%), transportation equipment (9.2%), personal services (8.6%), construction (5.4%), and health practitioners offices (5.0%) (Table 2). The most commonly affected occupations/industries associated with the most frequently identified occupational allergens are noted in Table 3.

Sources of Occupationally-Related Allergens

Gloves were the most common source of occupational ACD among screening allergens, followed by hair dyes, cement/concrete/mortar, adhesives/glues/bonding agents and coatings. The most common sources for each of the top 10 patch test substances and the proportion of OCD attributed to each source are shown in Table 4.

For patients tested to supplemental allergens, top sources were adhesives/glues/ bonding agents, hair dyes, gloves, coatings, moisturizers/lotions/creams, and metalworking fluids.

Discussion

In this analysis of 38,614 patch-tested patients, 11.6% had OSD, and 8.2% had allergic OCD. These represent proportions of OSD and ACD in NACDG patch-tested patients and not in the North American general population. Several groups have examined patch test results over at least an eight-year interval. The ESSCA analyzed data from patients diagnosed with OCD across 11 countries (2002 - 2010) and reported a higher prevalence of OCD (24.0%).⁷ In contrast, analysis of 18,859 Italian patients (1996 - 2016) found 10.4% with OCD.⁶ The German Contact Dermatitis Group) (2010-2012) diagnosed 16.2% of patch-tested patients with occupationally-

related disease.²³ The NACDG examined its results from 1998-2000 and found 19% to be occupationally-related.⁸ One of the challenges in making comparisons is the variation in the outcome of interest: some report all OSD while others report OCD or specifically occupational ACD. Others restrict the age range, exclude the unemployed, or vary in the inclusion of clinics specializing in OCD.

It is frequently reported that ICD is a more common occupational skin disease than ACD.^{3,24} Here, the proportion of ACD among patients with OCD was 70.5% vs 45.7% for ICD. This may be due to selection bias; patients suspected to have ACD (vs. ICD) would be more frequently referred for patch testing.

Industries

Hospitals had the greatest number of cases of OSD. ACD and ICD are common diagnoses within the healthcare sector.²⁵⁻²⁷ Sources of occupational ACD include nickel, components of disinfectants, and rubber accelerators in latex/nitrile gloves.^{25,26}

Occupations

The most common occupation was service occupations, including personal service workers (hairdressers/cosmetologists), cleaning/building service occupations (janitors/cleaners), and food service workers (cooks/kitchen workers/waiters). The ESSCA found the greatest risk of OCD in personal service workers (hairdressers, healthcare professionals, and metal workers).⁷ The Italian data identified hairdressers/barbers/beauticians as the most affected followed by cooks, metal workers, chemical industry and construction workers.⁶ The Finnish Register on

Occupational ACD highlighted farmers, hairdressers, healthcare workers, cooks, cleaners, and metal workers.⁵ The 1998-2000 NACDG analysis found high rates of OCD in assemblers/machinists, hairdressers, and nurses.⁸ These results are largely consistent with our data which are derived from patch tested workers with OCD, not the general population as a whole.

ACD in hairdressers/cosmetologists is well-documented; common allergens include p-phenylenediamine, GTG, HEMA, quaternium-15, nickel and thiurams found in hair dyes, other cosmetic products, instruments and personal protective equipment.^{28,29} Cleaners and janitors often work with disinfectants and rubber containing allergens such as formaldehyde, MI, and thiurams, contributing to their high prevalence of OCD.³⁰ ICD among restaurant workers is commonly reported, due to extensive wet work, and contact with oils, detergents, and foods.³¹

Machine operators/assemblers/inspectors were the second most common group. Machinists are at elevated risk due to exposure to metalworking fluids.³²⁻³⁴ Contact allergy to MCI/MI, other biocides, and corrosion inhibitors is often diagnosed in machinists..³⁵ A Swedish study diagnosed 22/163 (13.5%) metalworkers with OCD to neat oils, cutting fluids, or biocides, with ACD in 10 and ICD in 12.³⁶ A large-scale study from Germany found formaldehyde and formaldehyde releasers to be common occupational allergens in metal workers.³⁷

Allergens and their Sources

The most common occupational allergens/mixes identified in this study were carba mix (CM) (includes the rubber accelerators zinc dibutyldithiocarbamate, zinc diethyldithiocarbamate and

the chemically unrelated diphenylguanidine (DPG)), thiuram mix (TM), MI, bisphenol A epoxy resin, formaldehyde and nickel. The 1998-2000 NACDG study produced similar findings.⁸ The ESSCA also reported their most prevalent occupational allergens included thiurams, epoxy resin, and formaldehyde in addition to MCI/MI and methyldibromoglutaronitrile.⁷ CM showed the sharpest increase in prevalence across our study period (OR 1.034 CI 1.014-1.054; $p < 0.001$), a trend confirmed by other groups. A study from the U.K. (1996-2012) on rubber contact allergy showed a significant rise in the frequency of occupational cases attributable to CM, with a 10.1% average annual increase.³⁸ The same trend was reported in a multicentre European study where occupational ACD to CM was found in 5.5% of 1854 patients tested.³⁹

In order to decrease exposure to natural rubber latex in gloves, the proportions of accelerators used in synthetic rubber gloves have changed. Today, dithiocarbamates are the main accelerators accounting for their increasing contribution to occupational ACD in groups such as healthcare workers and food processors.⁴⁰⁻⁴³ In our study, gloves were by far the most common source of occupational ACD.

There are a few caveats to the inclusion of CM as a screening patch test preparation. A study from Sweden of patients with known ACD to rubber accelerators, found that patch-test positivity to individual dithiocarbamates was closely associated with positivity to the equivalent thiuram compound.⁴⁴ A Finnish investigation reported that in 34 dithiocarbamate positive patients, there were no independent reactions to thiurams, obviating the need for screening with carba mix.⁴⁵ Separate NACDG analyses have discussed the limitations of CM including its potential for causing irritant (false positive) patch test reactions.^{46,47} However, in 947 patients with strong positive reactions (++, +++) to CM and/or TM. 31.4% (297/947) with strong

reactions to CM would have been missed by testing TM alone.⁴⁶ Similar results have been reported from Denmark.⁴⁸ Supplemental testing to individual rubber accelerators may be required in some cases.

Here, MI was one of the most common allergens, although it has only been on the screening series since 2013. This is reflected in the significant increase in occupational ACD to MCI/MI 2001-2016 (OR 1.034 CI 1.014-1.054; $p < 0.001$). The results of other pooled databases have shown similar trends. Personal care products are the primary source of MI, but substantial occupational risk exists for hair/beauty industry workers, cleaners, healthcare workers, and machinists due to its presence in shampoos and cleaning products, and workplace hand cleansers/lotions.⁴⁹⁻⁵¹ In our study, 52.5% of positive reactions to MI were considered occupationally-relevant. Liquid lotions/bar soaps/cleansers, waterless hand soaps and shampoos/conditioners were the top three sources of exposure. Occupational ACD to MI increased significantly in the U.K. (2008-2012) as its use in industrial and personal care products increased; healthcare workers, painters, hairdressing and manufacturing professions were highlighted.⁴⁹ The Finnish Institute of Occupational Health found 36/1745 patients with positive reactions to MCI/MI and/or MI attributed to occupational exposure, especially liquid soaps and industrial hand cleansers.⁵² An Australian case series reported similar sources as well as paints and industrial biocides.⁵³

Our data showed bisphenol A epoxy resin was another important occupational allergen affecting 5.6% (250/4471) of patients with OSD. It ranked number one for test positives attributed to an occupational source 83.9% (250/298), consistent with the 1998-2000 NACDG analysis.⁸ This is not surprising given that epoxy resins are one of the major causes of occupational ACD.⁵⁴

Common sources in the current study include adhesives/glues/bonding agents and coatings like paint and lacquer. Similarly, the ESSCA reported epoxy resin allergy in 3.1% of 9969 tested patients with OCD; most common exposures occurred in workers who used epoxy glues and paints.⁷ Reports of contact allergy to epoxy resins may underestimate its full extent - a screening series of allergens is not enough to detect some cases of occupational ACD to epoxy.

Comprehensive evaluation requires testing to supplemental allergens and worksite epoxy-related compounds, appropriately diluted.⁵⁵

Nickel is the most frequent cause of contact allergy worldwide; consumer sources including jewellery and metal in clothing are more commonly reported.⁵⁶ In our population, 3.8% had occupationally-related nickel reactions. Only 21% of positive reactions were deemed occupationally-relevant. Common sources included tools, equipment and instruments.

Previously, the NACDG described occupationally-relevant patch test reactions to nickel (1998-2016). Primary sources were instruments/equipment, vehicles/machinery, tools, and jewelry.

Occupations at greatest risk were hairdressers/cosmetologists, machine operators, and healthcare workers.⁵⁷ Other reports include tools, keys, electrical components, coins, sewing needles, dental tools/alloys, and crochet hooks.⁵⁸

Our study, spanning a 16-year period, is the largest reported analysis from North America to examine OSD. Among patients with occupationally-relevant patch test reactions, 18.3% had a positive test to a non-screening allergen, and 5.2% only had ≥ 1 positive patch test to supplemental allergen(s) and/or workplace materials. If only the screening series had been used,

the source would have remained unknown, with implications for diagnosis, management and prognosis.

Limitations

Our cohort represents a referral population. Not all patients who may have contact dermatitis are tested, so the data may not reflect the actual percentage of OCD in the general population. There can be significant barriers to testing, such as lack of health insurance, inability to take time off work, and concerns for job loss if allergic. The NACDG does not collect data on supplemental allergens other than presence and source.

Conclusions

OSD was found in 11.6% of patients patch tested by the NACDG from 2001-2016. Most (70.5%) had occupational ACD. 20% of patients with occupationally-relevant ACD would have been inadequately assessed if only tested with the screening series. Important occupational allergens included rubber accelerators, bisphenol A epoxy resin, MI, formaldehyde and nickel. Knowledge of common occupational allergens, sources of exposure and occupations/industries at risk is important to facilitate prevention and treatment.

References

1. US Department of Labor-Bureau of Labor Statistics. Injuries, Illnesses, and Fatalities. 2018. Available at: <https://www.bls.gov/iif/oshsum.htm>. Accessed July 15, 2020.
2. NIOSH. Skin Exposures & Effects; 2010. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/skin/>. Accessed July 15, 2020.
3. Sasseville D. Occupational contact dermatitis. *Allergy Asthma Clin Immunol*. Jun 2008;4(2):59-65. doi:10.1186/1710-1492-4-2-59
4. Holness DL. Occupational Dermatoses. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep*. 07 2019;19(9):42. doi:10.1007/s11882-019-0870-6
5. Aalto-Korte K, Koskela K, Pesonen M. 12-year data on dermatologic cases in the Finnish Register of Occupational Diseases I: Distribution of different diagnoses and main causes of allergic contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis*. Jun 2020;82(6):337-342. doi:10.1111/cod.13488
6. Santarossa M, Mauro M, Belloni Fortina A, Corradin MT, Larese Filon F. Occupational contact dermatitis in Triveneto: Analysis of patch test data of the North Eastern Italian Database from 1996 to 2016. *Contact Dermatitis*. Jun 2020;82(6):370-379. doi:10.1111/cod.13512
7. Pesonen M, Jolanki R, Larese Filon F, et al. Patch test results of the European baseline series among patients with occupational contact dermatitis across Europe - analyses of the European Surveillance System on Contact Allergy network, 2002-2010. *Contact Dermatitis*. Mar 2015;72(3):154-63. doi:10.1111/cod.12333
8. Rietschel RL, Mathias CG, Fowler JF, et al. Relationship of occupation to contact dermatitis: evaluation in patients tested from 1998 to 2000. *Am J Contact Dermat*. Dec 2002;13(4):170-6. doi:10.1053/ajcd.2002.36635

9. Pratt MD, Belsito DV, DeLeo VA, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group patch-test results, 2001-2002 study period. *Dermatitis*. Dec 2004;15(4):176-83.
10. Warshaw EM, Belsito DV, DeLeo VA, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group patch-test results, 2003-2004 study period. *Dermatitis*. 2008 May-Jun 2008;19(3):129-36.
11. Zug KA, Warshaw EM, Fowler JF, et al. Patch-test results of the North American Contact Dermatitis Group 2005-2006. *Dermatitis*. 2009 May-Jun 2009;20(3):149-60.
12. Fransway AF, Zug KA, Belsito DV, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group patch test results for 2007-2008. *Dermatitis*. 2013 Jan-Feb 2013;24(1):10-21.
doi:10.1097/DER.0b013e318277ca50
13. Warshaw EM, Belsito DV, Taylor JS, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group patch test results: 2009 to 2010. *Dermatitis*. 2013 Mar-Apr 2013;24(2):50-9.
doi:10.1097/DER.0b013e3182819c51
14. Warshaw EM, Maibach HI, Taylor JS, et al. North American contact dermatitis group patch test results: 2011-2012. *Dermatitis*. 2015 Jan-Feb 2015;26(1):49-59.
doi:10.1097/DER.0000000000000097
15. DeKoven JG, Warshaw EM, Belsito DV, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group Patch Test Results 2013-2014. *Dermatitis*. 2017 Jan/Feb 2017;28(1):33-46.
doi:10.1097/DER.0000000000000225
16. DeKoven JG, Warshaw EM, Zug KA, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group Patch Test Results: 2015-2016. *Dermatitis*. 2018 Nov/Dec 2018;29(6):297-309.
doi:10.1097/DER.0000000000000417

17. Marks JG, Belsito DV, DeLeo VA, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group patch test results for the detection of delayed-type hypersensitivity to topical allergens. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Jun 1998;38(6 Pt 1):911-8. doi:10.1016/s0190-9622(98)70587-0
18. Marks JG, Belsito DV, DeLeo VA, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group patch-test results, 1996-1998. *Arch Dermatol*. Feb 2000;136(2):272-3. doi:10.1001/archderm.136.2.272
19. Marks JG, Belsito DV, DeLeo VA, et al. North American Contact Dermatitis Group patch-test results, 1998 to 2000. *Am J Contact Dermat*. Jun 2003;14(2):59-62.
20. 1990 Census Alphabetical Index of Industries and Occupation, US. Washington, DC: Department of Commerce, Government Printing Office; 1993.
21. Bureau USC. Industry and occupation code lists and crosswalks. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/topics/employment/industry-occupation/guidance/code-lists.html> Accessed July 16, 2020.
22. Uter W, Schwitulla J, Thyssen JP, Frosch PJ, Statham B, Schnuch A. The 'overall yield' with the baseline series - a useful addition to the array of MOAHLFA factors describing departmental characteristics of patch tested patients. *Contact Dermatitis*. Dec 2011;65(6):322-8. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.2011.01964.x
23. Mahler V, Geier J, Schnuch A. Current trends in patch testing - new data from the German Contact Dermatitis Research Group (DKG) and the Information Network of Departments of Dermatology (IVDK). *J Dtsch Dermatol Ges*. Jul 2014;12(7):583-92. doi:10.1111/ddg.12371

24. Pacheco KA. Occupational dermatitis: How to identify the exposures, make the diagnosis, and treat the disease. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 06 2018;120(6):583-591. doi:10.1016/j.anai.2018.04.013
25. Nettis E, Colanardi MC, Soccio AL, Ferrannini A, Tursi A. Occupational irritant and allergic contact dermatitis among healthcare workers. *Contact Dermatitis.* Feb 2002;46(2):101-7. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0536.2002.460208.x
26. Liu QL, He XZ, Liang K, et al. Prevalence and risk factors for latex glove allergy among female clinical nurses: a multicenter questionnaire study in China. *Int J Occup Environ Health.* 2013 Jan-Mar 2013;19(1):29-34. doi:10.1179/2049396712Y.0000000012
27. Molin S, Bauer A, Schnuch A, Geier J. Occupational contact allergy in nurses: results from the Information Network of Departments of Dermatology 2003-2012. *Contact Dermatitis.* Mar 2015;72(3):164-71. doi:10.1111/cod.12330
28. Schwensen JF, Johansen JD, Veien NK, et al. Occupational contact dermatitis in hairdressers: an analysis of patch test data from the Danish contact dermatitis group, 2002-2011. *Contact Dermatitis.* Apr 2014;70(4):233-7. doi:10.1111/cod.12176
29. Warshaw EM, Wang MZ, Mathias CG, et al. Occupational contact dermatitis in hairdressers/cosmetologists: retrospective analysis of north american contact dermatitis group data, 1994 to 2010. *Dermatitis.* 2012 Nov-Dec 2012;23(6):258-68. doi:10.1097/DER.0b013e318273a3b8
30. Bauer A. Contact dermatitis in the cleaning industry. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol.* Oct 2013;13(5):521-4. doi:10.1097/ACI.0b013e328364ec21

31. Teo S, Teik-Jin Goon A, Siang LH, Lin GS, Koh D. Occupational dermatoses in restaurant, catering and fast-food outlets in Singapore. *Occup Med (Lond)*. Oct 2009;59(7):466-71. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqp034
32. de Boer EM, van Ketel WG, Bruynzeel DP. Dermatoses in metal workers. (I). Irritant contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis*. Mar 1989;20(3):212-8. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.1989.tb04658.x
33. de Boer EM, van Ketel WG, Bruynzeel DP. Dermatoses in metal workers. (II). Allergic contact dermatitis. *Contact Dermatitis*. Apr 1989;20(4):280-6. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.1989.tb03146.x
34. Coenraads PJ, Nater JP, van der Lende R. Prevalence of eczema and other dermatoses of the hands and arms in the Netherlands. Association with age and occupation. *Clin Exp Dermatol*. Sep 1983;8(5):495-503. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2230.1983.tb01816.x
35. Madden SD, Thiboutot DM, Marks JG. Occupationally induced allergic contact dermatitis to methylchloroisothiazolinone/methylisothiazolinone among machinists. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. Feb 1994;30(2 Pt 1):272-4. doi:10.1016/s0190-9622(08)81927-5
36. Gruvberger B, Isaksson M, Frick M, Pontén A, Bruze M, Pontén AN. Occupational dermatoses in a metalworking plant. *Contact Dermatitis*. Feb 2003;48(2):80-6. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0536.2003.480205.x
37. Schubert S, Brans R, Reich A, et al. Contact sensitization in metalworkers: data from the information network of departments of dermatology (IVDK), 2010-2018. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2020;83:487-496. doi: 10.1111/cod.13686
38. Warburton KL, Urwin R, Carder M, Turner S, Agius R, Wilkinson SM. UK rates of occupational skin disease attributed to rubber accelerators, 1996-2012. *Contact Dermatitis*. May 2015;72(5):305-11. doi:10.1111/cod.12356

39. Warburton KL, Bauer A, Chowdhury MM, et al. ESSCA results with the baseline series, 2009-2012: rubber allergens. *Contact Dermatitis*. Nov 2015;73(5):305-12. doi:10.1111/cod.12454
40. Crepy MN. Rubber: new allergens and preventive measures. *Eur J Dermatol*. Dec 2016;26(6):523-530. doi:10.1684/ejd.2016.2839
41. Pontén A, Hamnerius N, Bruze M, et al. Occupational allergic contact dermatitis caused by sterile non-latex protective gloves: clinical investigation and chemical analyses. *Contact Dermatitis*. Feb 2013;68(2):103-10. doi:10.1111/cod.12010
42. Uter W, Hegewald J, Pfahlberg A, Lessmann H, Schnuch A, Gefeller O. Contact allergy to thiurams: multifactorial analysis of clinical surveillance data collected by the IVDK network. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. Aug 2010;83(6):675-81. doi:10.1007/s00420-009-0503-9
43. Goodier MC, Ronkainen SD, Hylwa SA. Rubber accelerators in medical examination and surgical gloves. *Dermatitis*. Mar/Apr 2018;29(2):66–76. doi: 10.1097/DER.0000000000000342
44. Hansson C, Ponten A, Svedman C, Bergendorff O. Reaction profile in patch testing with allergens formed during vulcanization of rubber. *Contact Dermatitis*. May 2014;70:300–308. doi: 10.1111/cod.12168
45. Aalto-Korte K, Pesonen M. Patterns of simultaneous patch test reactions to thiurams and dithiocarbamates in 164 patients. Dec 2016;75(6):353-357. doi: 10.1111/cod.12687
46. Warshaw EM, Gupta R, Silverberg JI, Maibach HI, DeKoven JG, Taylor JS, Atwater AR, Reeder MJ, Zug KA, Sasseville D, Fowler JF, Pratt MD, Fransway AF, Belsito DV, DeLeo VA. Positive patch test reactions to carba mix and thiuram mix: the North American contact dermatitis group experience, 1994-2016. *Dermatitis*. Dec 2020. doi: 10.1097/DER.0000000000000648. Online ahead of print.

47. Warshaw EM, Gupta R, DeKoven JG, Fowler JF, Silverberg JI, Atwater AR, Taylor JS, Reeder MJ, Maibach HI, Sasseville D, Belsito DV, DeLeo VA, Pratt MD, Marks JG, Zug KA, Zirwas MJ. Patch testing to diphenylguanidine by the North American contact dermatitis group (2013-2016). *Dermatitis*. Nov/Dec 2020;31(6):350-358. doi: 10.1097/DER.0000000000000629
48. Mortz C, Jensen E, Madsen JT, Andersen KE. Should carba mix be reintroduced into the European baseline series? *Contact Dermatitis*. Jul 2016;75(1):48–50. doi: 10.1111/cod.12543
49. Urwin R, Warburton K, Carder M, Turner S, Agius R, Wilkinson SM. Methylchloroisothiazolinone and methylisothiazolinone contact allergy: an occupational perspective. *Contact Dermatitis*. Jun 2015;72(6):381-6. doi:10.1111/cod.12379
50. Zirwas MJ, Hamann D, Warshaw EM, et al. Epidemic of Isothiazolinone Allergy in North America: Prevalence Data From the North American Contact Dermatitis Group, 2013-2014. *Dermatitis*. 2017 May/Jun 2017;28(3):204-209. doi:10.1097/DER.0000000000000288
51. Madsen JT, Andersen KE. Further evidence of the methylisothiazolinone epidemic. *Contact Dermatitis*. Apr 2014;70(4):246-7. doi:10.1111/cod.12217
52. Vauhkala AR, Pesonen M, Suomela S, Kuuliala O, Suuronen K, Aalto-Korte K. Occupational contact allergy to methylchloroisothiazolinone/methylisothiazolinone and methylisothiazolinone. *Contact Dermatitis*. Sep 2015;73(3):150-6. doi:10.1111/cod.12413
53. Flury U, Palmer A, Nixon R. The methylisothiazolinone contact allergy epidemic in Australia. *Contact Dermatitis*. Sep 2018;79(3):189-191. doi:10.1111/cod.13025
54. Rømyhr O, Nyfors A, Leira HL, Smedbold HT. Allergic contact dermatitis caused by epoxy resin systems in industrial painters. *Contact Dermatitis*. Sep 2006;55(3):167-72. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.2006.00894.x

- 528 55. Houle MC, Holness DL, Dekoven J, Skotnicki S. Additive value of patch testing custom
529 epoxy materials from the workplace at the occupational disease specialty clinic in Toronto.
530 *Dermatitis*. 2012 Sep-Oct 2012;23(5):214-9. doi:10.1097/DER.0b013e31826f5b70
- 531 56. Ahlström MG, Thyssen JP, Wennervaldt M, Menné T, Johansen JD. Nickel allergy and
532 allergic contact dermatitis: A clinical review of immunology, epidemiology, exposure, and
533 treatment. *Contact Dermatitis*. Oct 2019;81(4):227-241. doi:10.1111/cod.13327
- 534 57. Warshaw EM, Schlarbaum JP, DeKoven JG, et al. Occupationally Related Nickel Reactions:
535 A Retrospective Analysis of the North American Contact Dermatitis Group Data 1998-2016.
536 *Dermatitis*. 2019 Sep/Oct 2019;30(5):306-313. doi:10.1097/DER.0000000000000516
- 537 58. Jensen P, Thyssen JP, Johansen JD, Skare L, Menné T, Lidén C. Occupational hand eczema
538 caused by nickel and evaluated by quantitative exposure assessment. *Contact Dermatitis*. Jan
539 2011;64(1):32-6. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.2010.01819.x

Figure Legend:

Figure 1: Occupational Allergic Contact Dermatitis: Relevant Reaction Trends

Table Legend:

Table 1: Most Common Occupational Allergens

Table 2: Occupations and Industries

Table 3: Occupational Allergens: Top Sources

Table 4: Top Industries/Occupations and Common allergens

Table S1: MOAHLFAP Characteristics

Table S2: Sites of Dermatitis

Table S3: Final diagnoses

Table S4: Occupational Allergen Trends 2001-20

Table 1. Most Common Occupational Allergens

Allergens/Allergen mixes	No. of pts with OSD Tested	Total Positive Reactions	Occupationally Relevant Positive Reactions				
			Number of patients	Occupational Positives/ Patients Tested (%)	Rank order	Occupational Positives/ Total Positives (%)	Rank order
Carba mix (3% pet)	4454	549	434	9.7%	1	79.1%	3
Thiuram mix (1% pet)	4460	536	429	9.6%	2	80.0%	2
Methylisothiazolinone (0.2% aq)*	1025	200	95	9.3%	3	47.5%	22
Bisphenol A Epoxy Resin (1% pet)	4471	298	250	5.6%	4	83.9%	1
Diphenylguanidine (1% pet)*	1025	80	55	5.4%	5	68.8%	11
Formaldehyde (2% aq)**	1023	116	40	3.9%	6	34.5%	34
Formaldehyde (1% aq)	4470	433	174	3.9%	7	40.2%	24
Nickel sulfate hexahydrate (2.5% pet)	4438	809	170	3.8%	8	21.0%	44
Potassium dichromate (0.25% pet)	4458	260	161	3.6%	9	61.9%	13
2-hydroxyethyl methacrylate (2% pet)*	2461	113	83	3.4%	10	73.5%	5
Cobalt (ii) chloride hexahydrate (1% pet)	4442	449	144	3.2%	11	32.1%	36
4-phenylenediamine (1% pet)	4452	280	140	3.1%	12	50.0%	20
Methylchloroisothiazolinone/ methylisothiazolinone (0.1% aq)	4455	281	133	3.0%	13	47.3%	23
Glutaraldehyde (1% pet)†	3899	131	92	2.4%	14	70.2%	9
Quaternium-15 (2% pet)	4455	427	105	2.4%	15	24.6%	40
Glyceryl thioglycolate (1% pet)††	3026	92	64	2.1%	16	69.6%	10
2-mercaptobenzothiazole (1% pet)	4466	110	78	1.7%	17	70.9%	8
Fragrance mix I (8% pet)	4431	376	70	1.6%	18	18.6%	46
Ammonium persulfate (2.5% pet)	572	25	9	1.6%	19	36.0%	33
Bipshenol F epoxy resin (1% pet)†††	1826	37	28	1.5%	20	75.7%	4

* Only included in 2013-16 screening series

** Only included in 2015-16 screening series

† Removed after 2013-14; †† Removed after 2009-10; ††† Removed after 2007-08.

Table 2. Occupations and Industries of Patients with Occupational Skin Disease

Occupation (N=4140)	n (%)
Service occupations*	840 (20.3%)
Machine operators/assemblers/inspectors	702 (17.0%)
Other Precision production occupations†	455 (11.0%)
Mechanics/repairers	344 (8.3%)
Health assessment/ treating occupations	306 (7.4%)
Construction trades	194 (4.7%)
Handlers/equipment cleaners/helpers/laborers	185 (4.5%)
Health technologists/technicians	169 (4.1%)
Health diagnosing occupations	130 (3.1%)
Executive/administrative/managerial occupations	105 (2.5%)
Industry (N=4143)	n (%)
Hospitals	559 (13.5%)
Transportation equipment	382 (9.2%)
Personal services **	356 (8.6%)
Construction	224 (5.4%)
Offices of health practitioners	205 (5.0%)
Metal Industries	165 (4.0%)
Health services, N.E.C.	160 (3.9%)
Repair services	151 (3.6%)
Chemicals and allied products	149 (3.6%)
Eating and drinking places	138 (3.3%)

* Includes e.g. cleaners/janitorial, hairdressers, cooks, waiters

Excludes protective/household: police, firefighting/private household cleaners, housekeepers and childcare workers,

† Includes e.g. sheet metal workers, metal engravers, electronic equipment assemblers, cabinet makers

**Except private households/lodging

N.E.C.: Not elsewhere classified

629 **Table 3.** Occupational Allergens: Top Sources*

Allergen/Allergen mixes	Source	% of Occupationally Relevant Reactions to the Allergen
Carba mix (3% pet)	Gloves	85.5%
	Safety equipment, miscellaneous (e.g. masks, respirators)	2.7%
	Vehicles (air, rail, road, water)	2.3%
Thiuram mix (1% pet)	Gloves	88.1%
	Safety equipment, miscellaneous (e.g. masks, respirators)	3.0%
	Vehicles (air, rail, road, water)	1.4%
Bisphenol A epoxy resin (1% pet)	Adhesives, glues, bonding agents	24.8%
	Coatings (paint, lacquer, shellac, varnish, stains)	16.4%
	Epoxy resins (raw material)	8.4%
Formaldehyde (1% aq)	Metalworking fluid, cutting oils	3.4%
	Liquid, lotion and bar soaps, cleaners	2.9%
Nickel sulfate hexahydrate (2.5% pet)	Tools	15.9%
	Equipment, instruments, miscellaneous supplies	11.8%
	Jewelry	10.6%
Potassium dichromate (0.25% pet)	Cement, concrete, mortar	35.4%
	Gloves	15.5%
	Coatings (paint, lacquer, shellac, varnish, stains)	6.2%
Cobalt (ii) chloride hexahydrate (1% pet)	Cement, concrete, mortar	13.9%
	Metallic elements, dusts, powders, fumes	11.8%
	Tools	8.3%
4-phenylenediamine (1% pet)	Hair dyes	82.3%
	Shoes, boots, sandals, slippers	2.9%
Methylchlorisothiazolinone/ methylisothiazolinone (100 ppm aq)	Liquid, lotion and bar soaps, cleaners	19.5%
	Waterless hand soaps	18.8%
	Shampoos, conditioners	14.3%
Quaternium-15 (2% pet)	Moisturizers, lotions, creams	17.1%
	Cosmetics, beauty preparations, skin and healthcare products	12.4%
	Liquid, lotion and bar soaps, cleaners	11.4%


* Top allergens tested across the entire study period 2001-2016

Table 4. Top Industries/Occupations and Most Common Allergens.

Allergen	Top industries	# of cases	Top Occupations	# of cases
Carba mix (3% pet)	Hospitals	159	Service occupations, except protective and household	109
	Offices of health practitioners	66	Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	106
Thiuram mix (1% pet)	Hospitals	164	Service occupations, except protective and household	141
	Offices of health practitioners	73	Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	95
Bisphenol A epoxy resin (1% pet)	Transportation equipment	67	Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	113
	Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	58	Precision production occupations	93
Formaldehyde (1% aq)	Hospitals	72	Service occupations, except protective and household	123
	Personal services, except private households	53	Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	99
Nickel sulfate hexahydrate (2.5% pet)	Hospitals	159	Service occupations, except protective and household	276
	Personal services, except private households	118	Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	169


Journal Pre-proof

Figure 1. Occupational Allergic Contact Dermatitis: Relevant Reaction Trends 2001-2016[†]



[†]Statistically significant changes by year in the percentage of OSD patients with occupationally relevant reactions to selected patch test substances

- This article provides an update on occupational contact dermatitis in North America from 2001-2016 including relevant allergens, exposure sources and associated occupations/industries.
- Knowledge of common allergens, their exposure sources, and occupations/industries at risk can help guide diagnostic evaluation and facilitate prevention on an individual level and in the workplace.

Figure 1. Occupational Allergic Contact Dermatitis: Relevant Reaction Trends 2001-2016[†]

[†]Statistically significant changes by year in the percentage of OSD patients with occupationally relevant reactions to selected patch test substances