## Major Health Problems of Expressway Workers in Thailand: An 8-Year Cohort Study

Chotima Charusabha BSc\*,

Ketsaraporn Thongpakdee BA\*, Natefa Rakmanee MSc\*, Pratap Singhasivanon MD, DrPH\*, Saranath Lawpoolsri MD, PhD\*

\* Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

**Background and Objective:** Workers in the transportation sector may be expose to environmental hazards resulting in adverse health outcomes. The present study aimed to assess environmental-hazard-related morbidity among transportation workers over an eight-year period.

*Material and Method:* Data were extracted from the registry database of a cohort of workers in the Expressway Authority of Thailand between 2004 and 2011. Annual trends and changes in health status were described. Factors associated with major health problems were also evaluated.

**Results:** The cohort consisted of 2,000 to 2,700 workers. The trend of abnormal lung function, abnormal hearing, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and asthma significantly increased over the period. Very few workers had high serum lead levels.

**Conclusion:** The present study revealed several major occupation-related health problems among transportation workers. In addition to an annual health assessment, other control measures should be instituted to protect workers from occupation-related exposures.

Keywords: Expressway workers, Transportation, Health impact, Occupation-related, Prospective cohort

#### J Med Assoc Thai 2014; 97 (2): 241-9 Full text. e-Journal: http://www.jmatonline.com

Occupations in the transportation sector are reportedly linked to a multitude of adverse health outcomes, including clinical, psychophysiological, and other morbidities<sup>(1)</sup>. Several studies have examined diseases, sickness, impairment, and even mortality, among professionals working on the highways, as road constructors, highway patrol, traffic control, or those with driving careers<sup>(1-8)</sup>. Exposure to gasoline/diesel fumes, small particles, and dust were reported as potentially associated with headache, nausea, respiratory tract problems, stroke, and cardiovascular disease. Postural fatigue in the working environment, as well as exposure to noise or vibration, could lead to musculoskeletal disorders, injuries, fatigue, insomnia, and headaches. The types of work that dictate a sedentary lifestyle and unhealthy diet have shown significant associations with being overweight and a tendency to obesity, high cholesterol, hypertension, stroke, and diabetes.

assessment of public transportation have mostly been based on secondary data and cross-sectional or short-term follow-up. However, results based on cross-sectional or short-term follow-up may not reflect the health impact of occupational exposures, which usually requires long-term exposure. A longitudinal cohort study of workers would provide strong evidence of occupational-related health problems and diseases. Monitoring health conditions of a cohort of workers in particular organizations would help assess occupation-related health problems, which is important for planning prevention and control in an organization. The Expressway Authority of Thailand

Epidemiological studies on the health-impact

(EXAT) cohort of workers who underwent annual health examinations was established, in collaboration with the Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, in 1994. EXAT is responsible for the construction, maintenance, and management of expressways and public land transportation infrastructure, and other expressway-related activities. With the development of new expressways and highways across the country, the numbers of motor vehicles, as well as the transport energy consumption, have been increasing rapidly. That means that air,

Correspondence to:

Singhasivanon P, Department of Tropical Hygiene, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, 420/6 Ratchawithi Road, Ratchathewi, Bangkok 10400, Thailand. Phone: 0-2354-9100 ext. 1695, Fax: 0-2644-4436

*E-mail: pratap.sin@mahidol.ac.th* 

noise, and other environmental pollutions are also increasing continually.

The main aim of the present study was to assess health problems among workers in the transportation sector over an eight-year period (2004-2011). In addition, the health problems of different at-risk groups were investigated with timevarying exposure variables.

# Material and Method *Participants*

The cohort, established in 1994, consisted of EXAT workers who had been working in five operational units, which included maintenance, toll collection, traffic control, special construction, and strategic planning. Due to the inconsistency of data collected before 2004, only those workers who attended and registered at the hospital for the annual checkup program between 2004 and 2011 were involved in this study. New workers could be enrolled during the course of the eight-year follow-up period, while a few retired or died.

#### Health assessment

The main purpose of the worker cohort was to monitor their health status, for help plan health promotion activities and prevent occupation-related illness/disability. The on-going annual health checkup program includes a general physical examination, vision examination, color-blindness examination, hearing test (audiogram), pulmonary function test, and chest X-ray. Basic laboratory tests, including hematological examinations, urinalysis, and stool examinations, were performed for all workers. In particular, serum lead levels are routinely monitored. Workers aged >35 years also receive health-status checks for diabetes, lipid profiles, renal and liver function, and serum uric acid.

Morbidities and health status were assessed by physicians at the hospital. In the present study, the morbidities directly examined by the physicians during the annual checkup visit included impaired lung function, hearing impairment, and lead level. In addition, from the interview at annual checkup, certain morbidities diagnosed by any physician(s) during the previous year were self-reported by the registered workers. Some of these morbidities were not confirmed at the current annual checkup visit.

#### Statistical analysis

Data in the annual registry database for the period between 2004 and 2011 were extracted. The

annual trends and changes in health status as well as diseases/sickness were assessed descriptively using the existing reported data. Factors associated with main morbidities, including health problems and selected diseases, were evaluated using a generalized estimation equation model with time-varying covariates. Due to the nature of the registry, where health check-up procedures are voluntary, some data were missing and incomplete across variables. Thus, analysis was only based on complete and clean data for each variable.

#### Ethical consideration

Data analysis was based on extracted secondary data with unlinked identification. The use of the data was authorized by the Program Director and the EXAT Director, with ethical review and approval by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University.

#### Results

#### **Demographics and exposures**

Besides the physical, clinical, and laboratory examinations, general health and exposure status were assessed by the health personnel at the hospital. As shown in Table 1, the number of workers who attended the checkup program varied over the eight years, ranging from 2,000 to 2,700. About two-thirds of the workers were male, and half of them aged between 31 and 40 years. About 50% were of normal weight, while 40% were overweight. Interestingly, about one-third never consumed alcohol, while there was a shift of 40 to 50% from "frequently drink alcohol" to "occasionally" since 2009. In terms of smoking, the statistics were consistent; about 60% were non-smokers and 20% were current smokers. The workers were classified by the location where most of their work time was spent. Over the eight-year follow-up period, about 40% had been working in offices or traffic-control centers, 35 to 40% worked in toll booths, 20% on expressways, and 4% did field work (including equipment repair and landscaping).

#### Major health problems

An increase in self-reported cases with at least one health problems was observed, from 35% in 2004 to 53% in 2011. The trend of workers with two or more reported health problems also increased during the eight-year period. As shown in Fig. 1, the most frequently reported health problems were high cholesterol, asthma, and high blood pressure. Other diseases with the proportion <5% were also reported.

	2004 (%)	2005 (%)	2006 (%)	2007 (%)	2008 (%)	2009 (%)	2010 (%)	2011 (%)
Sex								
N*	2,075	2,370	2,375	2,393	2,499	2,750	2,702	2,731
Male	68.1	68.2	68.2	68.1	69.0	65.1	63.8	65.7
Female	32.0	31.8	31.8	31.9	31.1	34.9	36.2	34.4
Age								
N*	2,075	2,370	2,375	2,393	2,499	2,750	2,702	2,731
<30	30.4	24.1	18.8	13.1	10.4	20.6	24.0	23.4
31-40	48.7	53.6	55.9	59.7	60.1	50.6	46.5	44.6
41-50	18.8	20.0	22.4	23.5	25.2	23.7	23.6	25.3
>50	2.0	2.3	2.9	3.7	4.3	5.1	6.0	6.8
BMI								
N*	2,073	2,368	2,375	2,392	2,499	2,750	2,699	2,731
Normal	51.6	50.6	49.3	49.0	46.5	48.5	47.0	45.3
Underweight	15.6	12.0	10.2	9.7	8.8	12.2	10.0	9.6
Overweight	32.8	37.5	40.5	41.3	44.7	39.4	43.1	45.1
Alcohol consumption								
N*	2,069	2,360	2,349	2,392	2,470	2,720	2,665	2,713
Never	35.7	34.9	35.8	37.0	35.0	32.2	30.4	30.4
Used to, but quit	18.9	19.1	20.6	20.1	20.9	11.5	11.6	10.5
Frequently	45.4	46.0	43.7	42.9	44.1	7.1	6.6	6.8
Occasionally	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	49.2	51.3	52.3
Smoking								
N*	2,069	2,360	2,352	2,392	2,470	2,718	2,662	2,712
Never	59.6	57.9	58.3	59.7	59.1	61.9	62.2	60.8
Quit	15.3	17.5	18.3	17.6	18.6	16.9	18.0	17.4
Current smoker	25.1	24.6	23.3	22.7	22.3	21.3	19.8	21.8

Table 1. Characteristics of the registered annual check-up personnel during 2004 to 2011

\* N varies with the available data in the annual registry

BMI = body mass index

Based on lung function examinations, there were fluctuating levels of abnormal lung capacity through the years, ranging from 1% to 28% (Table 2). In self-reported asthma diagnosis, however, there was a consistent level of about 20% over the eight-year period. In addition, increasing problems with hearing



Fig. 1 Trends of physician-diagnosed morbidities reported by registered personnel.

were observed during examinations at the annual visits; the proportion of workers who had problems with one ear increased from 12% to 18%, and with two ears from 22% to 29% in 2004 and 2011, respectively. The majority of hearing problems were classified by the checkup physician as being noise-induced hearing loss. Levels of high blood pressure in 2004 to 2011 were similar between self-reported cases and the results of blood pressure examinations during the checkup visit. Levels of self-reported hypertension increased from 5% to 16%, while high blood pressure measured during the annual checkup increased from 8% to 19%. Self-reported cases of high cholesterol also revealed an increasing trend over the eight-year follow-up period, from 11% to 30%.

When classifying major health problems by risk group (Fig. 2), abnormal lung function tended to be higher in later years across all groups; from 2004 to 2011, 8% to 25% among office staff, 12% to 27% for tollbooth staff, 4% to 32% for field workers, and

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Year							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Morbidity								
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	N*	2,074	2,369	2,374	2,393	2,499	2,746	2,692	2,727
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1 disease	25.3	28.0	28.9	29.0	29.9	27.4	28.4	29.8
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2 diseases	7.5	8.8	10.2	13.0	13.6	13.9	15.7	15.3
Lung function test $N^*$ 1,951 2,258 2,286 2,296 2,389 2,588 2,550 2,541 Obstructive 7.2 0.9 0.9 1.4 0.8 0.71 1.2 0.8 Restrictive 2.4 0.0 8.4 4.0 15.7 13.6 7.0 26.7 Mixed 0.4 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 Diagnosed asthma (self-reported) $N^*$ 2,075 2,370 2,375 2,393 2,499 2,750 2,702 2,731 Yes 17.3 19.9 20.1 18.4 18.5 18.3 19.8 20.7 Yes 17.3 19.9 20.1 18.4 18.5 18.3 19.8 20.7 Yes 2.751 2,125 2,273 2,330 2,361 2,383 2,655 2,609 2,635 1 car 11.6 12.5 13.3 16.8 17.4 18.6 16.8 17.8 2 cars 11.6 12.5 13.3 16.8 17.4 18.6 16.8 17.8 2 cars 21.8 21.6 24.8 22.8 24.6 20.9 19.8 29.3 Right ear hearing: $N^*$ 20.0 0.0 0.0 2.2 2.4 3.2 2.7 6.7 Noise-induced 13.6 15.2 16.4 16.8 20.9 21.2 20.7 20.9 High pitched 13.8 10.1 12.2 9.1 8.4 7.3 7.0 7.3 Left ear hearing: $N^*$ 20.75 2,370 2,375 2,393 2,499 2,750 2,702 2,731 Left ear hearing: $N^*$ 20.75 2,370 2,375 2,393 2,499 2,750 2,702 2,731 Left ear hearing: $N^*$ 20.75 2,370 2,375 2,393 2,499 2,750 2,702 2,731 Yes 2,53 7,7 9,7 15.7 24.7 High pitched 13.8 10.4 13.3 11.2 9.5 7.0 5.7 8.4 Diagnosed hypertension (self-reported) $N^*$ 2,075 2,370 2,375 2,393 2,499 2,750 2,702 2,731 Yes 2,53 2,479 2,750 2,702 2,731 Yes 3,9 4 11.6 12.5 13.3 11.2 9.5 7.0 5.7 8.4 Diagnosed hypertension (self-reported) $N^*$ 2,075 2,370 2,375 2,393 2,499 2,750 2,702 2,731 Yes 10.9 14.0 16.7 2.2 2.0 2.0 0.6 1.1 0.1 1.5 1.5 3.1 2.4 8.2 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5	3 diseases	1.9	3.2	3.9	4.4	6.1	6.0	7.2	8.2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Lung function test								
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	N*	1,951	2,258	2,286	2,296	2,389	2,588	2,550	2,541
Restrictive2.40.08.44.015.713.67.026.7Mixed0.40.00.10.20.30.20.20.2Diagnosed ashma (self-reported)N*2.0752.3702.3752.3932.4992.7502.7022.731Yes17.319.920.118.418.518.319.820.7Hearing problemN*2.0252.2732.3302.3612.3832.6552.6092.6351 car11.612.513.316.817.418.616.817.82 cars21.821.624.822.824.620.919.829.3Right car hearing:Hearing impaired1.42.21.62.62.30.50.90.2Sensorineural0.00.00.02.22.43.22.76.7Nise-induced13.315.717.616.419.617.715.724.7Noise-induced13.315.917.616.419.617.715.724.7Nise-induced13.315.917.616.419.617.715.724.7Nise-induced13.810.413.311.29.57.02.7002.7022.7	Obstructive	7.2	0.9	0.9	1.4	0.8	0.7	1.2	0.8
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Restrictive	2.4	0.0	8.4	4.0	15.7	13.6	7.0	26.7
$\begin{array}{l lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Mixed	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Diagnosed asthma								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(self-reported)								
Yes17.319.920.118.418.518.319.820.7Hearing problem $\mathbb{N}^*$ 2,0252,2732,3302,3612,3832,6552,6092,6351 ear11.612.513.316.817.418.616.817.82 ears21.821.624.822.824.620.919.829.3Right ear hearing:Hearing impaired1.42.21.62.62.30.50.90.2Sensorineural0.00.00.02.22.43.22.76.7Noise-induced13.615.216.416.820.921.220.720.9High pitched11.810.112.29.18.47.37.07.3Left ear hearing:Hearing impaired1.31.71.72.22.00.61.10.1Sensorineural0.00.00.01.71.53.12.48.2Noise-induced13.810.413.311.29.57.05.78.4Diagnosed hypertension(self-reported)N*2.0752.3702.3752.3932.4992.7502.7022.731Yes5.37.29.011.914.814.115.115.815.8Diagnosed hypertension(self-reported)N*2.0752.3702.3752.3932.4992.7502.7022.731Yes0.9<	N*	2,075	2,370	2,375	2,393	2,499	2,750	2,702	2,731
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Yes	17.3	19.9	20.1	18.4	18.5	18.3	19.8	20.7
N*       2,025       2,273       2,330       2,361       2,383       2,655       2,609       2,635         1 ear       11.6       12.5       13.3       16.8       17.4       18.6       16.8       17.8         2 ears       21.8       21.6       24.8       22.8       24.6       20.9       19.8       29.3         Right ear hearing:       Hearing impaired       1.4       2.2       1.6       2.6       2.3       0.5       0.9       0.2         Sensorineural       0.0       0.0       0.0       2.2       2.4       3.2       2.7       6.7         Noise-induced       13.6       15.2       16.4       16.8       20.9       21.2       20.7       20.9         High pitched       11.8       10.1       12.2       9.1       8.4       7.3       7.0       7.3         Left ear hearing:       Hearing impaired       1.3       1.7       1.7       2.2       2.0       0.6       1.1       0.1         Sensorineural       0.0       0.0       0.0       1.7       1.5       3.1       2.4       8.2         Noise-induced       13.3       15.9       17.6       16.4       19.6	Hearing problem								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	N*	2.025	2,273	2 330	2 361	2 383	2,655	2,609	2.635
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1 ear	11.6	12.5	13.3	16.8	17.4	18.6	16.8	17.8
Right ear hearing: Hearing impaired1.42.21.62.62.30.50.90.2Sensorineural0.00.00.02.22.43.22.76.7Noise-induced13.615.216.416.820.921.220.720.9High pitched11.810.112.29.18.47.37.07.3Left ear hearing: Hearing impaired1.31.71.72.22.00.61.10.1Sensorineural0.00.00.01.71.53.12.48.2Noise-induced13.810.413.311.29.57.05.78.4Diagnosed hypertension (self-reported) $N^*$ 2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes5.37.29.011.914.814.115.115.8Diagnosed hypertension (examination) $N^*$ 2,0752,3682,3742,3922,4992,7502,7022,731Yes8.39.411.615.414.517.016.219.2Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported) $N^*$ 2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes10.914.016.722.626.224.628.329.5Cholesterol level (agel >3516.721.621.623.322.5Cholesterol level (agel >3516.61.42	2 ears	21.8	21.6	24.8	22.8	24.6	20.9	19.8	29.3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Right ear hearing:								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Hearing impaired	1.4	2.2	1.6	2.6	2.3	0.5	0.9	0.2
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Sensorineural	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.4	3.2	2.7	6.7
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Noise-induced	13.6	15.2	16.4	16.8	20.9	21.2	20.7	20.9
Left ear hearing: Hearing impaired1.31.71.72.22.00.61.10.1Sensorineural0.00.00.01.71.53.12.48.2Noise-induced13.315.917.616.419.617.715.724.7High pitched13.810.413.311.29.57.05.78.4Diagnosed hypertension (self-reported) $x^*$ 2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes5.37.29.011.914.814.115.115.8Diagnosed hypertension (examination) $x^*$ 2,0752,3682,3742,3922,4992,7502,7002,727Yes8.39.411.615.414.517.016.219.2Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported) $x^*$ 2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes10.914.016.722.626.224.628.329.5Cholesterol level (agel >35 or as per request only) $x^*$ 8921,0831,2461,4241,6181,6971,6931,826Mean (SD)219 (40)216 (40)211 (39)215 (40)207 (38)220 (42)216 (39)217 (40)(min-max)(91-458)(106-383)(97-378)(98-529)(80-432)(110-543)(104-436)	High pitched	11.8	10.1	12.2	9.1	8.4	7.3	7.0	7.3
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Left ear hearing:								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Hearing impaired	1.3	1.7	1.7	2.2	2.0	0.6	1.1	0.1
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Sensorineural	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.5	3.1	2.4	8.2
High pitched13.810.413.311.29.57.05.78.4Diagnosed hypertension (self-reported)N*2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes5.37.29.011.914.814.115.115.8Diagnosed hypertension (examination)N*2,0752,3682,3742,3922,4992,7502,7002,727Yes8.39.411.615.414.517.016.219.2Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported)N*2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes10.914.016.722.626.224.628.329.5Cholesterol level (aged >35 or as per request only)N*8921,0831,2461,4241,6181,6971,6931,826Mean (SD)219 (40)216 (40)211 (39)215 (40)207 (38)220 (42)216 (39)217 (40)(min-max)(91-458)(106-383)(97-378)(98-529)(80-432)(110-545)(94-367)(90-464)	Noise-induced	13.3	15.9	17.6	16.4	19.6	17.7	15.7	24.7
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	High pitched	13.8	10.4	13.3	11.2	9.5	7.0	5.7	8.4
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Diagnosed hypertension								
N*2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes5.37.29.011.914.814.115.115.8Diagnosed hypertension (examination) N*2,0752,3682,3742,3922,4992,7502,7002,727Yes8.39.411.615.414.517.016.219.2Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported) N*2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes10.914.016.722.626.224.628.329.5Cholesterol level (aged >35 or as per request only) N*8921,0831,2461,4241,6181,6971,6931,826Mean (SD)219 (40)216 (40)211 (39)215 (40)207 (38)220 (42)216 (39)217 (40)(min-max)(91-458)(106-383)(97-378)(98-529)(80-432)(110-545)(94-367)(90-464)	(self-reported)								
Yes $5.3$ $7.2$ $9.0$ $11.9$ $14.8$ $14.1$ $15.1$ $15.8$ Diagnosed hypertension (examination)N* $2,075$ $2,368$ $2,374$ $2,392$ $2,499$ $2,750$ $2,700$ $2,727$ Yes $8.3$ $9.4$ $11.6$ $15.4$ $14.5$ $17.0$ $16.2$ $19.2$ Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported) $N^*$ $2,075$ $2,370$ $2,375$ $2,393$ $2,499$ $2,750$ $2,702$ $2,731$ Yes $10.9$ $14.0$ $16.7$ $22.6$ $26.2$ $24.6$ $28.3$ $29.5$ Cholesterol level (aged >35 or as per request only) $N^*$ $892$ $1,083$ $1,246$ $1,424$ $1,618$ $1,697$ $1,693$ $1,826$ Mean (SD) $219$ (40) $216$ (40) $211$ (39) $215$ (40) $207$ (38) $220$ (42) $216$ (39) $217$ (40)(min-max)(91-458)(106-383)(97-378)(98-529) $(80-432)$ (110-545) $(94-367)$ $(90-464)$	N*	2,075	2,370	2,375	2,393	2,499	2,750	2,702	2,731
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Yes	5.3	7.2	9.0	11.9	14.8	14.1	15.1	15.8
$\begin{array}{c c} (examination) \\ N^{*} & 2,075 & 2,368 & 2,374 & 2,392 & 2,499 & 2,750 & 2,700 & 2,727 \\ \hline Yes & 8.3 & 9.4 & 11.6 & 15.4 & 14.5 & 17.0 & 16.2 & 19.2 \\ \hline Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported) \\ N^{*} & 2,075 & 2,370 & 2,375 & 2,393 & 2,499 & 2,750 & 2,702 & 2,731 \\ \hline Yes & 10.9 & 14.0 & 16.7 & 22.6 & 26.2 & 24.6 & 28.3 & 29.5 \\ \hline Cholesterol level (aged >35 \\ or as per request only) \\ N^{*} & 892 & 1,083 & 1,246 & 1,424 & 1,618 & 1,697 & 1,693 & 1,826 \\ \hline Mean (SD) & 219 (40) & 216 (40) & 211 (39) & 215 (40) & 207 (38) & 220 (42) & 216 (39) & 217 (40) \\ (min-max) & (91-458) & (106-383) & (97-378) & (98-529) & (80-432) & (110-545) & (94-367) & (90-464) \\ \end{array}$	Diagnosed hypertension								
N*2,0752,3682,3742,3922,4992,7502,7002,727Yes8.39.411.615.414.517.016.219.2Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported) N*2,0752,3702,3752,3932,4992,7502,7022,731Yes10.914.016.722.626.224.628.329.5Cholesterol level (aged >35 or as per request only) N*8921,0831,2461,4241,6181,6971,6931,826Mean (SD)219 (40)216 (40)211 (39)215 (40)207 (38)220 (42)216 (39)217 (40)(min-max)(91-458)(106-383)(97-378)(98-529)(80-432)(110-545)(94-367)(90-464)	(examination)								
Yes $8.3$ $9.4$ $11.6$ $15.4$ $14.5$ $17.0$ $16.2$ $19.2$ Diagnosed high cholesterol (self-reported) N* $2,075$ $2,370$ $2,375$ $2,393$ $2,499$ $2,750$ $2,702$ $2,731$ Yes $10.9$ $14.0$ $16.7$ $22.6$ $26.2$ $24.6$ $28.3$ $29.5$ Cholesterol level (aged >35 or as per request only) N* $892$ $1,083$ $1,246$ $1,424$ $1,618$ $1,697$ $1,693$ $1,826$ Mean (SD) $219$ (40) $216$ (40) $211$ (39) $215$ (40) $207$ (38) $220$ (42) $216$ (39) $217$ (40)(min-max) $(91-458)$ $(106-383)$ $(97-378)$ $(98-529)$ $(80-432)$ $(110-545)$ $(94-367)$ $(90-464)$	N*	2,075	2,368	2,374	2,392	2,499	2,750	2,700	2,727
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Yes	8.3	9.4	11.6	15.4	14.5	17.0	16.2	19.2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Diagnosed high cholesterol								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(self-reported)								
Yes10.914.016.722.626.224.628.329.5Cholesterol level (aged >35 or as per request only) $N^*$ 8921,0831,2461,4241,6181,6971,6931,826Mean (SD)219 (40)216 (40)211 (39)215 (40)207 (38)220 (42)216 (39)217 (40)(min-max)(91-458)(106-383)(97-378)(98-529)(80-432)(110-545)(94-367)(90-464)	N*	2.075	2.370	2.375	2.393	2.499	2,750	2.702	2.731
Cholesterol level (aged >35 or as per request only)         N*       892       1,083       1,246       1,424       1,618       1,697       1,693       1,826         Mean (SD)       219 (40)       216 (40)       211 (39)       215 (40)       207 (38)       220 (42)       216 (39)       217 (40)         (min-max)       (91-458)       (106-383)       (97-378)       (98-529)       (80-432)       (110-545)       (94-367)       (90-464)	Yes	10.9	14.0	16.7	22.6	26.2	24.6	28.3	29.5
or as per request only)       N*       892       1,083       1,246       1,424       1,618       1,697       1,693       1,826         Mean (SD)       219 (40)       216 (40)       211 (39)       215 (40)       207 (38)       220 (42)       216 (39)       217 (40)         (min-max)       (91-458)       (106-383)       (97-378)       (98-529)       (80-432)       (110-545)       (94-367)       (90-464)	Cholesterol level (aged >35								
N* $892$ $1,083$ $1,246$ $1,424$ $1,618$ $1,697$ $1,693$ $1,826$ Mean (SD) $219$ (40) $216$ (40) $211$ (39) $215$ (40) $207$ (38) $220$ (42) $216$ (39) $217$ (40)(min-max) $(91-458)$ $(106-383)$ $(97-378)$ $(98-529)$ $(80-432)$ $(110-545)$ $(94-367)$ $(90-464)$	or as per request only)								
Mean (SD) $219 (40)$ $216 (40)$ $211 (39)$ $215 (40)$ $207 (38)$ $220 (42)$ $216 (39)$ $217 (40)$ (min-max)(91-458)(106-383)(97-378)(98-529)(80-432)(110-545)(94-367)(90-464)	N*	892	1 083	1 246	1 424	1 618	1 697	1 693	1 826
$(min-max) \qquad (91-458)  (106-383)  (97-378)  (98-529)  (80-432)  (110-545)  (94-367)  (90-464)$	Mean (SD)	219 (40)	216 (40)	211 (39)	215 (40)	207 (38)	220 (42)	216 (39)	217 (40)
	(min-max)	(91-458)	(106-383)	(97-378)	(98-529)	(80-432)	(110-545)	(94-367)	(90-464)

 Table 2. Percentages of diagnosed morbidities and major health problems among EXAT personnel during 2004 to 2011

\* N varies with the available data in the annual registry EXAT = expressway authority of Thailand



Fig. 2 Trends of major health problems by risk group.

11% to 33% for expressway personnel. In contrast, levels of diagnosed asthma from previous years increased slightly and were relatively consistent across risk groups; from 2004 to 2011, 20% to 25% for office staff, 16% to 20% for tollbooth staff, 16% to 20% for field workers, and 15% to 16% among expressway workers. Similarly, levels of abnormal hearing increased over the eight-year follow-up period and were again relatively consistent across the groups; from 2004 to 2011, 33% to 48% for office staff, 20% to 38% for toll booth staff, 35% to 58% for field workers (levels were exceptionally high in 2004, at 69%), and 47% to 58% among expressway workers. As expected, blood

pressure and cholesterol levels tended to be higher in later years across the groups. From 2004 to 2008, high blood-pressure cases were recorded as follows: 6% to 17% among office staff, 3% to 12% for toll booth staff, 11% to 18% for field workers, and 7% to 19% among expressway workers. Over the eight-year period, high cholesterol was recorded at 17% to 40% among office staff, 4% to 19% for tollbooth staff, 12% to 23% for field workers, and 12% to 29% for expressway workers. Only three cases had serum lead levels above the standard cutoff of 40  $\mu$ g/d: one office worker and one expressway worker (2010), and one office staff member (2011); among these three workers, no clinically significant lead poisoning was found.

Multivariate analysis was adjusted for gender and other time-varying factors (age, risk behavior, personal protective equipment), and suggested significant changes over time and differences across each of the risk groups (Table 3). Abnormal lung function was higher among expressway personnel than office workers (OR = 1.31; 95% CI 1.12-1.53), and the increasing proportions were much higher in 2011 than the baseline proportion in 2004 (OR = 3.23; 95% CI 2.76-3.77). Asthma was not different among the risk groups, but levels increased significantly in later years compared with the baseline year (in 2011, OR = 1.26; 95% CI 1.14-1.40). Regarding abnormal hearing, tollbooth workers (OR = 1.13; 95% CI 1.03-1.24),

	Abnormal							
	Abnormal lung* OR (95% CI)	Asthma* OR (95% CI)	Abnormal hearing <sup>+</sup> OR (95% CI)	Hypertension <sup>#</sup> OR (95% CI)	High cholesterol <sup>#</sup> OR (95% CI)			
Workplace								
Office	1	1	1	1	1			
Toll booth	1.13 (0.98-1.30)	1.01 (0.93-1.11)	1.13 (1.03-1.24)	1.01 (0.88-1.17)	0.83 (0.73-0.93)			
Field work	0.99 (0.75-1.30)	0.95 (0.80-1.11)	1.25 (1.06-1.48)	1.23 (0.99-1.53)	0.77 (0.62-0.96)			
Expressway	1.31 (1.12-1.53)	0.96 (0.86-1.09)	1.33 (1.18-1.48)	1.06 (0.91-1.23)	0.95 (0.82-1.09)			
Year								
2004	1	1	1	1	1			
2005	0.08 (0.05-0.12)	1.21 (1.11-1.32)	0.96 (0.87-1.06)	1.31 (1.10-1.57)	1.24 (1.07-1.44)			
2006	0.89 (0.75-1.06)	1.18 (1.08-1.29)	1.10 (1.00-1.22)	1.60 (1.34-1.91)	1.38 (1.19-1.59)			
2007	0.50	1.04 (0.95-1.14)	1.12 (1.02-1.24)	1.93 (1.62-2.29)	1.86 (1.61-2.15)			
2008	1.68 (1.43-1.98)	1.08 (0.99-1.19)	1.19 (1.07-1.31)	2.44 (2.06-2.90)	2.17 (1.88-2.50)			
2009	1.46 (1.24-1.72)	1.08 (0.98-1.19)	1.17 (1.06-1.30)	2.43 (2.03-2.91)	2.14 (1.85-2.48)			
2010	0.80 (0.66-0.95)	1.23 (1.12-1.36)	1.04 (0.94-1.16)	2.76 (2.30-3.31)	2.72 (2.35-3.14)			
2011	3.23 (2.76-3.77)	1.26 (1.14-1.40)	1.55 (1.40-1.72)	2.77 (2.30-3.32)	2.60 (2.24-3.02)			

Table 3. Multivariate analysis of risk groups and trend over time of major health problems

Analysis was based on repeated-measures Generalized Estimation Equation model

\* Adjusted for sex and time-varying age, smoking, wearing respiratory protection

<sup>+</sup> Adjusted for sex and time-varying age, wearing ear plug

<sup>#</sup> Adjusted for sex and time-varying age, smoking, alcohol consumption

field workers (OR = 1.25; 95% CI 1.06-1.48), and expressway personnel (OR = 1.33; 95% CI 1.18-1.48) were all at higher risk of hearing loss than office workers, with significantly greater levels measured through each passing year (OR = 1.55; 95% CI 1.40-1.72). High blood pressure was not significantly different among the risk groups, but office workers were more likely to have high cholesterol levels than tollbooth or field workers. Increased levels were found for these two health problems with each passing year in relation to the baseline year (in 2011, high blood pressure, OR = 2.77; 95% CI 2.31-3.32 and high cholesterol, OR = 2.60; 95% CI 2.24-3.02).

#### Discussion

Workers exposed to traffic emissions over extended periods of time, due to working on or near expressways, suffered greater health impacts than those not occupationally exposed. As reported in earlier studies, expressway workers appeared to have higher rates of respiratory symptoms than the less exposed groups<sup>(2,4,7)</sup>. The present study found that expressway workers were more likely to have impaired lung function than office or tollbooth workers. This may be due to tollbooth workers tending to use personal protective equipment (PPE) more often than expressway workers. In the present study, the odds of abnormal lung function increased over the eight-year follow-up period; about three folds higher in the eighth year compared with the baseline year. This suggests that special attention is required from the authorities to investigate the cause of this increasing trend. Other studies among workers in the transportation sector, aside from those operating near highways or busy streets, also reported specific adverse respiratory tract outcomes, ranging from acute symptoms, such as coughing and wheezing, to more chronic conditions, such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)<sup>(2,5,9,10)</sup>. In the present study, the odds of developing asthma, after adjusting for risk and protective factors, for workers operating in different working environments, were not significantly different. However, levels of diagnosed asthma as reported by workers in all risk groups showed a slightly increasing trend over the duration of the study period.

Increases in transport volume cause air and noise pollution. Exposure to traffic noise may cause other acute and chronic effects, such as insomnia, lack of sleep quality, and hearing loss. Several studies have supported an association between road traffic noises at higher than average levels and morbidities<sup>(11-15)</sup>. Simultaneous exposure to multiple sources of noise was reported in one study to have a combined effect on hearing impairment<sup>(11)</sup>. The study was conducted in the electronics industry; physical examinations, including hearing tests, showed the prevalence of hearing loss among workers was as high as 68%. Another study reported that police officers were 1.4 times more likely to have selective hearing loss than civil servants, and this, particularly, was 5.3 times more likely among motorcycle police officers<sup>(15)</sup>. A study in Thailand identified four different categories of occupation in Bangkok's urban areas that were at risk of traffic noise-induced hearing loss: drivers, street vendors, traffic officers, and street dwellers, with the driver group at the highest risk<sup>(14)</sup>. Like the other studies, the hearing problems in the present study, identified by hearing test during annual checkup, were relatively high across all risk groups, ranging from 38% to 58%. The odds ratios showed significantly increasing trends, up to 1.6 times, in the eight-year follow-up period. Although the organizational authority implemented engineering and administrative controls, workers still had to be encouraged to wear personal protective equipment (PPE). Personnel in both tollbooth and expressway locations require conversations with customers, so that PPE are not commonly used by these workers.

Studies of noise exposure have linked noise exposure to non-auditory physical health effects, such as changes in blood pressure and heart rate, and levels of stress<sup>(16-20)</sup>. The results were inconsistent regarding links between road-traffic noise and hypertension<sup>(21-23)</sup>. The cause of hypertension is multi-factorial, includes age, gender, and personal behaviors. In the present study, the prevalence of hypertension increased across all risk groups, from 8% up to 19% during the 8-year annual examinations. Coincidently, cholesterol levels among workers in all risk groups increased as well, from 11% to 30% over the 8 years. Both hypertension and high cholesterol outcomes may not be due to traffic-related exposure alone, and could be partially due to culture, work environment, and lifestyle. Other factors have been reported to be related to such morbidities, e.g., cigarette smoking, dietary habits, lack of physical exercise, and workplace conditions<sup>(24-27)</sup>. In addition, alternating shift work can have an impact on serum total cholesterol levels<sup>(28)</sup>. High serum total cholesterol levels were more common among shift workers than day workers, after adjustment for age and food type<sup>(29)</sup>. Almost all workers in the present study were working shifts.

One concern of traffic-related health problem is elevated blood-lead levels. However, people can be exposed to lead in their homes and the environment through inhalation, or ingestion of lead-containing dust or fumes. Even though lead in gasoline and other substances (e.g. paint, electronic fittings) declined several years ago, there is still sufficient concern to monitor lead levels among at-risk workers. In the present study, only three workers had serum lead levels above Thailand's standard cutoff (40  $\mu$ g/dL). However, with a cutoff >25  $\mu$ g/dL, like the level used in the Adult Blood Lead Epidemiology and Surveillance Program of the US National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)<sup>(30)</sup>, there were 10 cases: 1 office worker (in 2004), 1 toll booth and 1 office worker (in 2008), 2 toll booth, 2 expressway and 1 office worker (in 2010), and 1 expressway and 1 office worker (in 2011). However, in the present study, clinical lead poisoning was not observed. Considering such a small proportion of workers displayed high blood-lead levels, this is less likely to be occupation-related. However, further investigation is needed to determine the causes of high blood-lead levels among these workers.

It should be noted that some occupationrelated health effects have not yet been monitored in this cohort. Numerous reports have identified exposure to vehicle-related pollutants as associated with excess overall mortality, as well as with other diverse health effects, e.g., heart disease, stroke, and reproductive, psychosocial, and neurological effects<sup>(2,6,8,19)</sup>. Such morbidity risks suggest the need for further epidemiological research and interventions in the transport sector. In particular, there should be a plan for monitoring acute and long-term outcomes among workers in this cohort.

#### Conclusion

Based on this longitudinal cohort of workers in the transportation sector, the present study revealed several major occupation-related health problems. Expressway workers at risk of daily exposure to noise and air pollution over prolonged periods showed a tendency to have problems with lung function and hearing, when compared with office staff. Tollbooth staff and field workers were also found to have problems with hearing when compared with office staff. High serum lead levels were found in a few cases. The problems of high blood pressure and high cholesterol were found across all types of worker, and the prevalence of these major morbidities increased

over the 8-year period. As a means of reducing these risks for workers, health-promotion programs should be implemented; there is strong evidence that such initiatives have been successful over the past decade<sup>(31,32)</sup>. While conducting annual health examinations has been one measure for the screening and early detection of health problems, greater efforts are required to promote and enforce self-protection measures. Engineering and administrative controls are also important to reduce occupational-related hazards.

#### Acknowledgment

The authors wish to thank the Expressway Authority of Thailand (EXAT) for allowing us to use the de-identified data of the worker cohort. The authors are grateful to Dr. Jaranit Kaewkungwal of the Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University for his valuable advice in the present study. The authors wish to thank Mr. Paul Adams for reviewing the grammar of this manuscript. Finally, the authors are grateful to all staff at the Faculty of Tropical Medicine and at EXAT who contributed their valuable time and effort to this project.

#### Potential conflicts of interest None.

#### References

- Apostolopoulos Y, Sonmez S, Shattell MM, Belzer 1 M. Worksite-induced morbidities among truck drivers in the United States. AAOHN J 2010; 58: 285-96.
- 2. Campbell C, Bassil K, Morgan C, Lalani M, Macfarlane R, Bienefeld M. Air pollution burden of illness from traffic in toronto-problems and solutions [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2012 Sep 15]. Available from: http://www.toronto.ca/health/ hphe/pdf/air pollution burden.pdf
- de Paula SU, Braga AL, Giorgi DM, Pereira LA, 3. Grupi CJ, Lin CA, et al. Effects of air pollution on blood pressure and heart rate variability: a panel study of vehicular traffic controllers in the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil. Eur Heart J 2005; 26: 193-200.
- Dragonieri S, Musti M, Izzo C, Esposito LM, 4. Foschino Barbaro MP, Resta O, et al. Sputum induced cellularity in a group of traffic policemen. Sci Total Environ 2006; 367: 433-6.
- Eagan TM, Gulsvik A, Eide GE, Bakke PS. 5. Occupational airborne exposure and the incidence of respiratory symptoms and asthma. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002; 166: 933-8.

- Ozturk A, Tokmak B, Tokmak A. Nerve conduction velocities of toll collectors who are exposed to exhaust particles in highways. Internet J Neurol [Internet] 2007 [cited 2012 Sep 15]; 8: 1-8. Available from: http://ispub.com/IJN/8/2/8021
- Randem BG, Ulvestad B, Burstyn I, Kongerud J. Respiratory symptoms and airflow limitation in asphalt workers. Occup Environ Med 2004; 61: 367-9.
- Riediker M, Cascio WE, Griggs TR, Herbst MC, Bromberg PA, Neas L, et al. Particulate matter exposure in cars is associated with cardiovascular effects in healthy young men. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2004; 169: 934-40.
- Hazenkamp-von Arx ME, Schindler C, Ragettli MS, Kunzli N, Braun-Fahrlander C, Liu LJ. Impacts of highway traffic exhaust in alpine valleys on the respiratory health in adults: a crosssectional study. Environ Health 2011; 10: 13.
- 10. Sarnat JA, Holguin F. Asthma and air quality. Curr Opin Pulm Med 2007; 13: 63-6.
- Chang SJ, Chen CJ, Lien CH, Sung FC. Hearing loss in workers exposed to toluene and noise. Environ Health Perspect 2006; 114: 1283-6.
- 12. Heimann D, de Franceschi M, Emeis S, Lercher P, Seibert P. Air pollution, traffic noise and related health effects in the alpine space—A guide for authorities and consulters. Trento, Italy: Università degli Studi di Trento, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile e Ambientale, Trento; 2007.
- Kurmis AP, Apps SA. Occupationally-acquired noise-induced hearing loss: a senseless workplace hazard. Int J Occup Med Environ Health 2007; 20: 127-36.
- Leong ST, Laortanakul P. Monitoring and assessment of daily exposure of roadside workers to traffic noise levels in an Asian city: a case study of Bangkok streets. Environ Monit Assess 2003; 85: 69-85.
- Lesage FX, Jovenin N, Deschamps F, Vincent S. Noise-induced hearing loss in French police officers. Occup Med (Lond) 2009; 59: 483-6.
- Babisch W. Traffic Noise and Cardiovascular Disease: Epidemiological Review and Synthesis. Noise Health 2000; 2: 9-32.
- 17. Babisch W. Noise and health. Environ Health Perspect 2005; 113: A14-A15.
- Belojevic GA, Jakovljevic BD, Stojanov VJ, Slepcevic VZ, Paunovic KZ. Nighttime roadtraffic noise and arterial hypertension in an urban population. Hypertens Res 2008; 31: 775-81.

- Bodin T, Albin M, Ardo J, Stroh E, Ostergren PO, Bjork J. Road traffic noise and hypertension: results from a cross-sectional public health survey in southern Sweden. Environ Health 2009; 8: 38.
- de Kluizenaar Y, Gansevoort RT, Miedema HM, de Jong PE. Hypertension and road traffic noise exposure. J Occup Environ Med 2007; 49: 484-92.
- 21. Barregard L, Bonde E, Ohrstrom E. Risk of hypertension from exposure to road traffic noise in a population-based sample. Occup Environ Med 2009; 66: 410-5.
- 22. Leon BG, Berglind N, Nordling E, Rosenlund M. Road traffic noise and hypertension. Occup Environ Med 2007; 64: 122-6.
- 23. Wolf-Maier K, Cooper RS, Banegas JR, Giampaoli S, Hense HW, Joffres M, et al. Hypertension prevalence and blood pressure levels in 6 European countries, Canada, and the United States. JAMA 2003; 289: 2363-9.
- 24. Adachi H, Hirai Y, Sasaki S, Enomoto M, Fukami A, Kumagai E, et al. Trends in dietary intakes and serum cholesterol levels over 50 years in Tanushimaru in Japanese Men. Food Nutr Sci 2011; 2: 479-81.
- Atiku MK, Iliyasu A, Sen KK, Ubon GA. Cigarette smoking versus blood pressure, body mass index, serum total cholesterol and HDL-cholesterol levels in hypertensive subjects resident in Kano Metropolis, Nigeria. NISEB Journal 2001; 1: 249-53.
- 26. Lee IM, Sesso HD, Oguma Y, Paffenbarger RS Jr. Relative intensity of physical activity and risk of coronary heart disease. Circulation 2003; 107: 1110-6.
- Sealey RM, Sinclair WH, Pollock P, Wright A. A case study identifying disease risk factor prevalence in government office workers in Queensland, Australia. Int J Workplace Health Manag 2010; 3: 34-43.
- Dochi M, Suwazono Y, Sakata K, Okubo Y, Oishi M, Tanaka K, et al. Shift work is a risk factor for increased total cholesterol level: a 14-year prospective cohort study in 6886 male workers. Occup Environ Med 2009; 66: 592-7.
- 29. Ghiasvand M, Heshmat R, Golpira R, Haghpanah V, Soleimani A, Shoushtarizadeh P, et al. Shift working and risk of lipid disorders: a cross-sectional study. Lipids Health Dis 2006; 5: 9.
- Walters J. Adult blood lead reporting in Oregon, 2006-2010. Portland, OR: Public Health Division, Office of Environmental Public Health, 2011.

 Anderson RC, Kaczmarek BA. The importance of promoting health in the workplace. The Internet Journal of Academic Physician Assistants [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2012 Sep 15]; 4: 1-5. Available from: http://ispub.com/IJAPA/4/1/12093

 Snashall D. Occupational health in the construction industry. Scand J Work Environ Health 2005; 31 (Suppl 2): 5-10.

### ภาวะทางสุขภาพที่สำคัญของพนักงานการทางพิเศษแห่งประเทศไทย: การศึกษาติดตามใน 8 ปี

โชติมา จารุสภา, เกษราภรณ์ ทองภักดี, เนตรฟ้า รักมณี, ประตาป สิงหศิวานนท์, สารนาถ ล้อพูลศรี

<mark>ภูมิหลังและวัตถุประสงค์:</mark> พนักงานที่ปฏิบัติงานในหน่วยงานเกี่ยวกับการคมนาคม อาจมีความเสี่ยงต่อการสัมผัสกับมลพิษใน สิ่งแวดล้อมที่มีผลเสียต่อสุขภาพ วัตถุประสงค์ในการศึกษานี้เพื่อประเมินภาวะทางสุขภาพที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการสัมผัสกับมลพิษใน พนักงานของการทางพิเศษแห่งประเทศไทย ในช่วงระยะเวลา 8 ปี

<mark>วัสดุและวิธีการ:</mark> ข้อมูลจากฐานข้อมูลการตรวจสุขภาพประจำปีของพนักงานการทางพิเศษแห่งประเทศไทย ระหว่างปี พ.ศ. 2547 ถึง ปี พ.ศ. 2554 นำมาใช้ในการวิเคราะห์เพื่อสรุปรูปแบบภาวะสุขภาพที่มีการเปลี่ยนแปลงเป็นรายปี และเพื่อค้นหาปัจจัยที่สัมพันธ์ กับภาวะการเจ็บป่วยที่สำคัญของพนักงาน

**ผลการศึกษา:** ฐานข้อมูลประกอบด้วยข้อมูลพนักงานประมาณ 2,000-2,700 คน ภาวะทางสุขภาพ เช่น การทำงานของปอด การได้ยิน ความดันโลหิต ระดับไขมันในเลือด มีแนวโน้มผิดปกติมากขึ้นในช่วง 8 ปี ที่ศึกษา และการรายงานของโรคหอบหืดยังมี จำนวนเพิ่มขึ้นในช่วงที่ศึกษา มีพนักงานเพียง 3 ราย ที่มีระดับสารตะกั่วในเลือดสูงกว่าค่ามาตรฐาน

สรุป: การศึกษานี้แสดงให้เห็นถึงภาวะทางสุขภาพที่สำคัญที่เกี่ยวเนื่องกับการทำงานของพนักงานในหน่วยงานที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการ คมนาคม นอกเหนือจากการตรวจสุขภาพประจำปีแล้ว ควรมีการใช้อุปกรณ์เพื่อป้องกันความเสี่ยงที่เกี่ยวเนื่องกับการทำงานด้วย