



**Occupation and the risk of bothersome tinnitus: results
from a prospective cohort study (HUNT)**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000512
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Oct-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Engdahl, Bo; Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Division of Mental Health Krog, Norun Kvestad, Ellen Hoffman, Howard Tambs, Kristian
Primary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Occupational & environmental medicine, Otolaryngology
Keywords:	Audiology < OTOLARYNGOLOGY, EPIDEMIOLOGY, OCCUPATIONAL & INDUSTRIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Occupation and the risk of bothersome tinnitus: results from a prospective cohort study (HUNT)

by

Bo Engdahl¹, Norun Hjertager Krog¹, Ellen Kvestad¹, Howard J. Hoffman², Kristian Tambs^{1,3}

Full work was performed at:

Norwegian Institute of Public Health
Division of Mental Health
Box 4404 Nydalen
N-0403 Oslo, Norway

¹ Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Division of Mental Health, Oslo, Norway

² Epidemiology and Statistics Program, National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD), National Institutes of Health (NIH), Bethesda, Maryland, USA

³ Departments of Psychiatry and Human Genetics, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

Corresponding author:

Bo Engdahl
Norwegian Institute of Public Health
Division of Mental Health
Box 4404 Nydalen
N-0403 Oslo, Norway.

E-mail: bo.engdahl@fhi.no

Tel: +47 21 07 82 27

Fax: +47 23 40 81 01

Article summary:

‘Article focus’

- We studied the effect of occupation on prevalence of bothersome tinnitus and estimated the attributable fraction due to occupation
- We also studied if the effect remained after adjustment for noise exposure, education and income, other risk factors and hearing threshold.

‘Key messages’

- There are very few epidemiologic studies quantifying work-related tinnitus risk, and our large and representative sample gives precise estimates of occupational risk.
- This study shows moderate effects of occupation on bothersome tinnitus and presents prevalence estimates of 122 different occupations in 49 948 subjects
- Noisy occupations were associated with an increased risk of bothersome tinnitus in men, but in women, occupations with the highest risk for tinnitus were not typically noisy ones, and the attributable fraction was determined mainly by the group of occupationally inactive

‘Strengths and limitations of this study’

- The major advantages of the present study are the prospective design and that the study population is representative of the general working population.
- The occupations are not classified by risk factors for tinnitus, but according to the tasks and duties undertaken in the job. Heterogeneity regarding exposure within occupational categories implies that occupation, as an explanatory variable, does not capture all effects of occupational exposures on tinnitus.

Running title:

Occupation and the risk of tinnitus

Conflict of interest statements:

We are not aware of any conflicts of interest (financial, competitive or otherwise) that may have influenced the interpretation of data and results either by us authors or our respective institutions.

Contributions:

The following authors have contributed to the paper:

Bo Engdahl – Design, analysis and interpretation of data, writing. Final approval of the version to be published.

Norun Hjertager Krog- Preparing data, drafting the manuscript, critical revision of manuscript. Final approval of the version to be published.

Ellen Kvestad – Preparing data, drafting the manuscript, critical revision of manuscript. Final approval of the version to be published.

Howard J. Hoffman – Obtaining funding, data acquisition, drafting the manuscript, critical revision of manuscript. Final approval of the version to be published.

Kristian Tambs – Conception and design, obtaining funding, data acquisition, drafting the manuscript, critical revision of manuscript. Final approval of the version to be published.

Data sharing: There is no additional data available.

Funding: This work was supported by the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD), National Institutes of Health (NIH) via research contract No. N01-DC-6-2104.

Acknowledgement:

The Nord-Trøndelag Health Study (The HUNT Study) is a collaboration between the HUNT Research Centre (Faculty of Medicine, the Norwegian University of Science and Technology NTNU), the Nord-Trøndelag County Council, and The Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

Abstract

Abstract

Objectives: Estimates of occupation-specific tinnitus prevalence may help identify high-risk occupations where interventions are warranted. We studied the effect of occupation on prevalence of bothersome tinnitus and estimated the attributable fraction due to occupation. We also studied how much of the effect remained after adjusting for noise exposure, education income, hearing thresholds and other risk factors.

Design: A prospective cohort study

Setting: A health survey of the Nord-Trøndelag county of Norway

Participants: A sample of the general adult population (n = 49,948)

Primary outcome measure: Bothersome tinnitus

Results: Occupation had a marked effect on tinnitus prevalence. The effect of occupation on tinnitus was reduced in men by controlling for self-reported occupational noise exposure and in women by controlling for education and income. Adding hearing loss as a predictor increased the effect of occupation somewhat. In men, age-adjusted prevalence ratios of tinnitus ranged from 1.5 (workshop mechanics) to 2.1 (crane and hoist operators) in the 10 occupations with highest tinnitus prevalence. In women, the most important contribution to the tinnitus prevalence was from the large group of occupationally inactive persons, with a prevalence ratio of 1.5.

Conclusion: This study found a moderate association between occupation and bothersome tinnitus.

MeSh key words: Epidemiology, Occupational Exposure, Tinnitus

INTRODUCTION

Tinnitus, or the perception of sound without an external acoustic stimulus, is a common health complaint in the adult population. In addition to general irritation and annoyance with the sound, tinnitus can cause difficulties with sleep and concentration, reduced speech intelligibility, and various psychosomatic, emotional, and interpersonal problems.[1] The prevalence of chronic tinnitus in the adult population is estimated at 8-15%, depending on the definition.[2;3] It is higher in men and increases with age up to a certain point, after which it declines.[3-5]

Tinnitus frequently occurs together with permanent hearing loss[6;7] suggesting that tinnitus may be associated with cochlear damage. Tinnitus shares many of the same risk factors as hearing loss including occupational noise, work-related diseases, exposure to toxins, non-occupational noise exposure, drugs or medications, otologic diseases, dizziness, head injury, and socioeconomic and general health status.[4;7-11]

However, tinnitus is not always secondary to hearing loss, and may occur in individuals with normal hearing. Some have suggested that tinnitus is an early sign of hearing loss, in particular noise-induced hearing loss,[12] although there are studies opposing this hypothesis.[13] Central nervous system mechanisms are believed to play an important role in the pathology of tinnitus.[14] Therefore, risk factors related to neural plasticity and sensitization may be of importance. Stress seems to play a role: patients often report worsening of tinnitus with stress. Workers perceiving high job stress have an increased risk of tinnitus[9;15] and tinnitus may be induced by stressful life events and trauma.[16] Work related stress such as low degree of control, conflicting work demands, conflict between work and family life, and lack of support from superiors may therefore be risk factors for tinnitus. Tinnitus has been associated with mental health and well being,[17] factors that might themselves be work related, thus mediating the

1 association between occupation and tinnitus. The direction of influence between tinnitus and
2
3 many of these factors is however unclear and there may even be bidirectional relationships.[18]
4

5 Although tinnitus has been associated with a few occupational risk factors such as noise
6 exposure,[4;5;8;9;11] there are very few studies quantifying occupational-specific tinnitus
7 risk.[4], Epidemiologic studies of work-related tinnitus are needed in order to identify high-risk
8 occupations with specific types of harmful exposure so that protective measures can be
9 implemented.
10
11

12 Previous analyses of data from the Nord-Trøndelag Hearing Loss Study showed effects of
13 self-reported occupational and impulse noise exposure on tinnitus.[4] Analyses also revealed
14 effects of education, income, general health status, recurrent ear infections, head injury, and
15 cigarette smoking. Frequent exposure to loud music and having played in a band were, in
16 contrast, more frequent among subjects without tinnitus. Detailed information on occupation type
17 was not included in the previous analyses. However, information from the nationwide occupation
18 register has recently been used to study the effect of occupation specific hearing loss.[19]
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The primary aim of the present study was to determine the effect of occupation on
35 bothersome tinnitus. Secondly, we estimated the fraction of tinnitus that can be attributed to
36 occupation-associated risks. We also wanted to examine the extent to which differences in
37 tinnitus between the various occupations remained after adjustment for self-reported occupational
38 noise exposure, non-occupational noise exposure, other risk factors, education, income, and
39 hearing loss.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study population

The Nord-Trøndelag Hearing Loss Study (NTHLS) is part of the Nord-Trøndelag Health Study (HUNT-2). The entire adult population of Nord-Trøndelag County in Norway was invited to participate in HUNT-2, which was conducted from January 1996 to February 1998. Screening included several types of examinations and two questionnaires (HUNT-2 Q1 and Q2). Seventeen of the 24 municipalities were offered and accepted hearing examination, consisting of pure-tone audiometry and the completion of two questionnaires (Hearing Q1 and Q2), as part of the screening program.

The subjects ranged in age from 20 to 101 years (median 48.0 years; mean (SD) 50.2 (17.0) years). The participation rate for all municipalities except one (Levanger) was 69%, 65% among males and 73% among females. The corresponding rates for Levanger (where the HUNT-2 participants had to be re-invited to have their hearing examined) were 42%, 39%, and 45% overall and for males and females, respectively. The participation rates varied with age, from about 40% for subjects younger than 30 years or older than 80 years, to 82% for subjects from 60 to 69 years. The low participation rate among young people is likely due in part to the absence of students and young adults serving their (compulsory) military service who, while formally keeping their childhood home address, had moved to other parts of the country.

A total of 51,574 persons arrived for their hearing examination and provided written informed consent. Participants completed a questionnaire (Hearing Q1) on hearing-related information at the examination site. Audiometric data were missing for 774 persons (1.5%). Questionnaire data were missing or incomplete for 815 persons (1.6%). The sample is described in greater detail elsewhere.[20]

1 Information on occupation, education, and income was obtained for all but 37 subjects
2
3 from the population register information from Statistics Norway. In total, the sample consisted of
4
5 49,948 subjects with complete data.
6
7
8
9

10 Measures

11
12 The Hearing Q1 included questions about bothersome tinnitus. Tinnitus was here defined by a
13
14 “yes” response to the single general question: “Are you bothered by ringing in the ears?” Missing
15
16 values and a “no” response were considered equivalent to “not bothered”. The Hearing Q2
17
18 included a slightly differently phrased question about the degree to which the respondent is
19
20 bothered by tinnitus (response categories: not bothered, a little bothered and strongly bothered).
21
22 In the present study the question and data from Q1 was used. Previous analysis has shown a test –
23
24 retest polychoric correlation for 27,792 persons tested twice on both Q1 and Q2, with the
25
26 majority of time lags ranging from 3 to 6 months, of 0.65 (95% CI 0.63-0.66) indicating
27
28 relatively high reliability for our tinnitus measure.[21]
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Data on occupation were obtained using census records from 1970, 1980, and 1990. The
37
38 most recent occupation information was used. For example, if a subject was not working in 1990,
39
40 his or her occupation status from 1980 was used. About 22% of the population (14% of males
41
42 and 30% of females) had no registered occupation (i.e., were occupationally inactive) during all
43
44 of the census registration years. Occupation was coded according to the Nordic Classification of
45
46 Occupations[22] using a three-digit code. The digits represent the major class (“felt”), the sector
47
48 (“område”), and the occupation group. The codes consist of 13, 86, and 412 groups,
49
50 respectively[23]. For supplementary analyses the group of occupationally inactive was further
51
52 distinguished into subclasses based on questions on working situation in the HUNT-2 Q1. The
53
54 subgroups were: i) full-time household workers, ii) military service or student, iii) unemployed,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 and iv) receiving social security or disability pension. These latter groups were not mutually
2
3 exclusive, so that individuals could belong to more than one of these groups.
4

5 Education data were available for 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, and 1998. We used the most
6
7 recent education information. Education was classified into nine levels, from elementary school
8
9 to tertiary studies leading to advanced professional degrees.
10
11

12 Income data from 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, and 1998 was calculated as the mean income
13
14 over the years available, corrected for an increase in the general population income during the
15
16 period 1980-1998.
17
18

19 Self-reported noise exposure and other risk factors for hearing loss were obtained from
20
21 the Hearing Q1. Occupational noise exposure was measured by questionnaire items on the
22
23 duration of exposure to loud noise at work in general (scored 0-3) and from specific noise
24
25 sources: staple gun/hammering, metal hammering/riveting, circular saw/machine planing, chain
26
27 saw operation, tractor/construction machines, sledgehammer operation, blasting, machine room
28
29 noise, and other factory noise (scored as “yes” or “no”). Non-occupational risk factors were
30
31 measured by questionnaire items about impulse noise (i.e. explosions, shootings, etc.); playing in
32
33 a band or going to discotheques, rock concerts, or similar loud events; recurrent ear infections (in
34
35 childhood or later); hospitalization (ever) for a head injury (scored as “no”, “perhaps or I don’t
36
37 know”, and “yes”), and smoking cigarettes daily (scored as “no”, “yes, for 0 to <5 years”, “yes,
38
39 for ≥ 5 to <15 years”, “yes, for ≥ 15 years”). The items on the questionnaire are described in detail
40
41 elsewhere.[4;24]
42
43
44
45
46

47 Air conduction hearing thresholds were obtained by pure-tone audiometry as described in an
48
49 earlier publication[20]. The hearing scores were computed as pure-tone average on the worse ear
50
51 for three independent mean values: 1) low frequency hearing level (250 and 500 Hz) 2) medium
52
53 frequency hearing level (1000 and 2000 Hz), and 3) high frequency hearing level (3000, 4000,
54
55 6000, and 8000 Hz).
56
57
58
59
60

Statistical methods

The effects of occupation on the prevalence of tinnitus were estimated using a log-binomial model with occupation group and age in five-year groups as fixed factors. The analyses were stratified by sex and age groups (20-44 years, 45-64 years, and ≥ 65 years). The model, a generalized linear model in which the link function is the logarithm of the proportion under study and the distribution of the error is binomial, was estimated by maximum likelihood. The occupation groups 060-069 were aggregated into one occupation group 06 “pedagogical work” and used as a reference with a sufficient number of subjects for estimating prevalence ratios. Occupations with fewer than 40 subjects were collapsed into one group. Direct estimates of prevalence ratios by log-binomial regression have some advantages over odds ratios estimated with logistic regression analysis[25] and the high prevalence of tinnitus in our sample makes prevalence ratios easier to interpret.

Overall model fit was determined by the residual deviance, the lack of fit that remains after modelling with m predictors, as well as the McFadden pseudo R^2 defined as:

$$R_l^2 = 1 - \frac{\ln(L_m)}{\ln(L_0)} \quad (1)$$

where L_m is the likelihood function of the model containing m predictors and L_0 is the likelihood function of the model containing only the intercept. As R_l^2 does not reach 1, a rule of thumb is that the model has an excellent fit with R_l^2 being between 0.2 and 0.4.[26]

The overall effect of occupation in the model was estimated by the partial R_l^2 (the difference in R_l^2 values between a model with and without occupation). Changes in the overall effect of occupation by controlling for hearing loss, self-reported noise exposure, other risk factors, education, and income were measured by changes in partial R_l^2 after subsequently entering additional control variables in the model.

1 In order to estimate the portion of tinnitus cases in the population that can be attributed to
2 an occupation, the occupation-specific adjusted attributable fraction (AF) was calculated by the
3 following formula:[27]
4
5
6

$$pd_i \frac{PR_i - 1}{PR_i} \quad (2)$$

7
8
9
10
11 where PR_i is the adjusted prevalence ratio for the i th occupation relative to occupation group 063
12 and pd_i represents the proportion of cases in the i th occupation to the total population. The sum of
13 the occupation-specific adjusted AF is thus:
14
15
16
17

$$1 - \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{pd_i}{PR_i} \quad (3)$$

18
19 where k is the total number of occupations.
20
21
22
23

24
25 The 95% confidence intervals of the occupation-specific AF were estimated by nonlinear
26 bootstrapping with the percentile method and 1000 replications. All statistical analyses were
27 performed using the computer program R, version 2.11.1.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

The tinnitus prevalence is higher in men and increases by age (Table 1).

Table 1. Tinnitus prevalence

Age Group	Men		Women	
	Sample Size	Tinnitus Prevalence (%)	Sample Size	Tinnitus Prevalence (%)
All	23374	16.4	26574	12.1
20-44 years	9359	10.6	10920	8.4
45-64 years	8618	18.5	9246	12.0
>64 years	5397	23.0	6408	18.7

The goodness of fit (viz., pseudo R^2) for models of tinnitus prevalence by age, occupation, self-reported noise exposure, other risk factors, education, income, and hearing loss, entered step- and block-wise, are shown in Tables 2 and 3 for men and women, respectively. Occupation contributed significantly to the prediction of tinnitus after adjusting for age in all age groups and for both sexes. Differences in pseudo R^2 values, ΔR^2 , for each model showing specifically the additional effect of occupation compared with the same model without occupation, ranged from 0.9% to 2.5%. The effects of occupation as observed by ΔR^2 were higher in men than in women, and highest in men above 64 years. In all strata, the best model fit was obtained with the complete set of predictors with a significant increase in pseudo R^2 value for each step.

Controlling for self-reported occupational noise exposure reduced the effect of occupation only in men age 45 years or older. The effect of occupation was still statistically significant. Additional control for leisure-related noise, recurrent ear infections, head injuries, and smoking had little influence on the effect of occupation at all; this was also true when controlling for education and income. Controlling for hearing loss, however, increased the effect of occupation somewhat.

In women, the effect of occupation was not reduced by controlling for self-reported occupational noise exposure or by controlling for leisure-related noise, recurrent ear infections, head injuries, and smoking. However, controlling for education and income considerably reduced the estimated effect of occupation, so that the effect was no longer statistically significant.

Table 2. Log-Binomial regression models. Pseudo R^2 and differences in pseudo R^2 between models with and without occupation among men.

Model variables:											
	Age and occupation			Age, occupation and occupational noise exposure		Age, occupation, all risk factors†		Age, occupation, all risk factors†, income, education		Age, occupation, all risk factors†, income, education and hearing loss	
Age Group:	R^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
All	2.4	3.4	1.06**	5.0	0.82**	6.7	0.76**	6.8	0.78**	8.3	1.16**
20-44 years	0.1	1.9	1.83*	3.9	1.82	6.3	1.74	6.6	1.73	10.1	1.80
45-64 years	0.5	2.5	2.04**	4.4	1.73**	6.8	1.76**	7.0	1.74**	11.7	1.97**
>64 years	0.1	2.5	2.49**	11.8	2.20**	12.6	2.21**	12.9	2.26**	14.6	2.48**

R^2_L - Pseudo R^2 (McFadden, 1979); ΔR^2_L - Partial pseudo R^2 is the difference in R^2_L values between a model with and without occupation.

* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$, likelihood ratio test on 89 DF.

† - Self-reported occupational noise, leisure noise, recurrent ear infections, head injuries, and smoking.

Table 3. Log-Binomial regression models. Pseudo R^2 and differences in pseudo R^2 between models with and without occupation among women.

Model variables:											
	Age and occupation			Age, occupation and occupational noise exposure		Age, occupation, all risk factors†		Age, occupation, all risk factors†, income, education		Age, occupation, all risk factors†, income, education and hearing loss	
Age Group:	R^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L	R^2_L	ΔR^2_L
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
All	2.3	2.8	0.59**	3.4	0.62**	5.1	0.59**	5.4	0.38	7.8	0.45**
20-44 years	0.0	1.3	1.31*	2.7	1.38**	4.6	1.20	5.4	1.01	7.4	0.97
45-64 years	0.3	1.4	1.15*	1.8	1.17*	3.9	1.19*	4.1	1.02	7.3	1.08**
>64 years	0.5	1.4	0.91*	2.2	0.99	3.7	1.04	4.1	0.77	7.0	0.85**

R^2_L - Pseudo R^2 (McFadden, 1979); ΔR^2_L - Partial pseudo R^2 is the difference in R^2_L values between a model with and without occupation.

* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$, likelihood ratio test on 54 DF.

† - Self-reported occupational noise, leisure noise, recurrent ear infections, head injuries, and smoking.

Tables 4 and 5 report the predicted age-adjusted prevalence estimates for tinnitus according to various occupational groups. The tables also show the attributable fractions - the fraction of tinnitus cases in the population attributed to an occupation. The aggregated occupational group “pedagogical work” was specified as a reference group. For men, the occupations with the highest prevalence ratios were crane and hoist operators and miners, with prevalence ratios of 2.1 and 1.9, respectively. For women, laboratory assistants had the highest prevalence ratio, 1.9. The large group of subjects with no reported occupation had the highest attributable fractions both in men and women, although their prevalence ratio was moderate, 1.2 and 1.5, respectively. The sum of all occupation-specific, age-adjusted attributable fractions was estimated to be 13.3% (95% CI 9.1 to 17.0) and 21.4% (95% CI 13.9 to 24.9) in men and women, respectively. In women, the overall attributable fraction was to a great extent determined by the contribution from the group not reporting an occupation.

Table 4. Predicted age-adjusted prevalence ratio (PR) and attributable fractions (AF) of tinnitus among men†.

Nordic Classification of Occupational Codes	PR	(95% CI)	AF(%)§	(95% CI)	Sample Size (23,374)
872 Crane and hoist operators etc.	2.1	1.4 to 3.1	0.23	0.05 to 0.42	53
501 Miners - in underground mines, quarrymen, shot firers	1.9	1.5 to 2.5	0.69	0.36 to 1.03	171
754 Sheet-metal workers	1.8	1.2 to 2.8	0.19	0.01 to 0.38	68
871 Stationary engine operators	1.8	1.1 to 2.8	0.15	-0.01 to 0.33	40
827 Dairy workers	1.7	1.2 to 2.3	0.35	0.11 to 0.61	125
A30 Military - Senior officers	1.7	1.1 to 2.5	0.19	0.01 to 0.39	58
881 Longshoremen and vehicle loaders	1.7	1.1 to 2.6	0.17	-0.01 to 0.37	64
912 Cooks	1.7	1.0 to 2.9	0.12	-0.02 to 0.28	55
909 Others in 90 public safety and protection work	1.6	1.0 to 2.7	0.11	-0.02 to 0.26	44
751 Workshop mechanics	1.5	1.1 to 2.0	0.33	0.04 to 0.64	183
757 Metal plate and steel structural workers	1.5	1.1 to 2.0	0.32	0.04 to 0.62	174
77 Wood work	1.5	1.0 to 2.5	0.12	-0.04 to 0.29	46
821 Millers	1.5	0.9 to 2.5	0.12	-0.04 to 0.30	51
331 Salesmen operating from an office	1.4	1.0 to 1.9	0.30	-0.02 to 0.58	182
836 Papermakers	1.4	1.0 to 2.0	0.21	-0.01 to 0.44	124
875 Material-handling equipment operators	1.4	0.9 to 2.1	0.15	-0.04 to 0.36	96
0X6 Personnel specialists	1.4	0.8 to 2.3	0.08	-0.06 to 0.24	50
876 Oilers and greasers etc	1.4	0.8 to 2.5	0.06	-0.07 to 0.22	57
753 Machine- and motor repairmen	1.3	1.0 to 1.5	0.71	0.08 to 1.31	695
761 Electricians and electrical fitters	1.3	1.0 to 1.6	0.39	-0.08 to 0.83	410
772 Sawmill and planing mill workers	1.3	1.0 to 1.6	0.36	-0.06 to 0.72	282
756 Welders and flame cutters	1.3	1.0 to 1.7	0.27	-0.07 to 0.63	256

1	A10	Military - Corporals and privates	1.3	0.9 to 1.9	0.21	-0.07 to 0.51	247
2	755	Plumbers and pipe fitters	1.3	0.9 to 1.8	0.20	-0.10 to 0.47	177
3	75	Iron and metal ware work	1.3	0.9 to 1.9	0.14	-0.07 to 0.36	106
4	7	Manufacturing and construction work	1.3	0.9 to 2.0	0.13	-0.06 to 0.33	86
5	769	Others in 76 electrical work	1.3	0.9 to 2.1	0.11	-0.08 to 0.30	82
6	765	Linemen and cable jointers	1.3	0.8 to 1.9	0.10	-0.10 to 0.31	87
7	759	Others in 75 iron and metal ware work	1.3	0.7 to 2.2	0.06	-0.08 to 0.22	56
8	X	Occupation not reported	1.2	1.0 to 1.5	1.88	0.16 to 3.33	3216
9	111	Directors, managers and working proprietors	1.2	1.0 to 1.5	0.46	-0.10 to 0.98	469
10	003	Other engineers, eng technicians, industrial designers	1.2	1.0 to 1.6	0.43	-0.07 to 0.91	459
11	874	Operators of earth-moving and construction machinery	1.2	1.0 to 1.6	0.36	-0.09 to 0.76	383
12	826	Butchers, sausage makers, etc.	1.2	0.9 to 1.8	0.15	-0.10 to 0.42	157
13	299	Others in 29 other clerical work	1.2	0.9 to 1.7	0.14	-0.11 to 0.36	149
14	853	Plastic product makers	1.2	0.8 to 1.7	0.13	-0.13 to 0.40	163
15	002	Chief engineers	1.2	0.8 to 1.7	0.11	-0.16 to 0.35	153
16	781	Building and furniture painters	1.2	0.8 to 1.7	0.10	-0.14 to 0.37	146
17	105	Senior administrators and exec officials, municipal adm.	1.2	0.8 to 1.7	0.08	-0.12 to 0.30	99
18	113	Administration secretaries	1.2	0.8 to 2.0	0.07	-0.08 to 0.23	57
19	834	Mechanical pulp workers	1.2	0.7 to 2.0	0.06	-0.09 to 0.23	57
20	106	Other administrators and exec officials, municipal adm.	1.2	0.7 to 2.1	0.05	-0.09 to 0.22	54
21	Y	Occupations with <40 subjects	1.1	1.0 to 1.3	1.48	-0.31 to 3.04	2519
22	774	Construction carpenters and workers	1.1	0.9 to 1.4	0.53	-0.28 to 1.28	911
23	882	Warehouse workers	1.1	0.9 to 1.5	0.16	-0.22 to 0.53	290
24	441	Forestry workers and loggers	1.1	0.8 to 1.5	0.12	-0.24 to 0.49	276
25	641	Bus drivers	1.1	0.8 to 1.7	0.08	-0.15 to 0.32	133
26	302	Working proprietors, retail trade	1.1	0.8 to 1.6	0.06	-0.19 to 0.32	131
27	0X2	Social workers	1.1	0.7 to 1.8	0.05	-0.13 to 0.25	92
28	822	Bakers and pastry cooks	1.1	0.7 to 1.9	0.05	-0.12 to 0.22	78
29	612	Able and ordinary seamen	1.1	0.6 to 2.1	0.03	-0.11 to 0.17	49
30	119	Others in 11 administration of private enterprises and org.	1.1	0.6 to 1.9	0.02	-0.13 to 0.18	61
31	404	Managers and supervisors - farms	1.1	0.6 to 1.8	0.02	-0.14 to 0.20	84
32	031	Other physicians	1.1	0.6 to 2.0	0.01	-0.12 to 0.15	49
33	793	Cement finishers, excavators etc.	1.0	0.8 to 1.3	0.04	-0.48 to 0.58	509
34	104	Other adm governmental servants - local state adm.	1.0	0.6 to 1.7	0.01	-0.15 to 0.20	80
35	0X1	Auditors	1.0	0.6 to 1.8	0.01	-0.14 to 0.17	64
36	06	Pedagogical work	1.0	ref	0.00	ref	1095
37	764	Installers, fitters, repairmen - radio, TV, phone, telegraph	1.0	0.6 to 1.6	0.00	-0.20 to 0.21	123
38	0X9	Others in technical, physical science, humanistic, artistic work	1.0	0.5 to 2.1	-0.01	-0.12 to 0.14	48
39	311	Salesmen of insurance	1.0	0.5 to 1.9	-0.01	-0.13 to 0.12	45
40	911	Housekeepers etc. - not private or public service	1.0	0.5 to 1.8	-0.01	-0.14 to 0.13	51
41	931	Janitors, vergers etc	1.0	0.7 to 1.2	-0.07	-0.49 to 0.32	333
42	644	Lorry and van drivers	1.0	0.8 to 1.2	-0.10	-0.75 to 0.55	782
43	024	Silviculturists and forestry consultants	0.9	0.5 to 1.7	-0.02	-0.16 to 0.12	61
44	681	Postmen	0.9	0.5 to 1.6	-0.03	-0.18 to 0.14	74
45	76	Electrical work	0.9	0.4 to 1.8	-0.03	-0.14 to 0.10	48
46	671	Local postmasters, postal assistance	0.9	0.6 to 1.5	-0.03	-0.22 to 0.17	117
47	A20	Non-commissioned officers and subalterns	0.9	0.6 to 1.4	-0.04	-0.30 to 0.22	164
48	643	Taxi drivers	0.9	0.5 to 1.5	-0.04	-0.19 to 0.11	70
49	791	Masons, bricklayers, and plasterers	0.9	0.5 to 1.4	-0.05	-0.24 to 0.14	101
50	333	Shop assistants	0.9	0.6 to 1.2	-0.17	-0.53 to 0.22	373
51	663	Railway supervisors	0.8	0.4 to 1.6	-0.04	-0.17 to 0.09	43
52	851	Concrete product makers, etc	0.8	0.5 to 1.5	-0.05	-0.20 to 0.11	80
53	201	Accountants and book keepers	0.8	0.5 to 1.3	-0.08	-0.28 to 0.11	119
54	903	Policemen and detectives	0.8	0.5 to 1.3	-0.10	-0.29 to 0.10	126

1	777	Wood working machine setters and operators	0.8	0.5 to 1.2	-0.13	-0.36 to 0.09	159
2	332	Shop managers	0.8	0.6 to 1.1	-0.20	-0.49 to 0.09	236
3	412	Livestock workers – general	0.8	0.6 to 1.1	-0.23	-0.59 to 0.13	436
4	411	Farm helpers – general	0.8	0.6 to 1.0	-0.35	-0.76 to 0.06	429
5	401	General farmers, livestock farmers-working on own behalf	0.8	0.7 to 1.0	-2.20	-4.33 to -	2763
6						0.42	
7	095	Editors and journalists, etc.	0.7	0.3 to 1.6	-0.06	-0.17 to 0.06	44
8	297	Real estate managers, store-room keepers, etc.	0.7	0.4 to 1.4	-0.07	-0.21 to 0.08	64
9	103	Leading administrators and exec officials - local state adm	0.7	0.3 to 1.4	-0.09	-0.22 to 0.04	57
10	403	Gardeners, horticultural farmers, and fruit growers	0.6	0.2 to 1.5	-0.08	-0.17 to 0.02	43
11	021	Veterinarians	0.5	0.2 to 1.5	-0.08	-0.17 to 0.02	40
12	432	Fish hatchers	0.5	0.2 to 1.4	-0.09	-0.19 to 0.02	61
13	023	Agronomists and horticulturists, agricultural consultants	0.5	0.2 to 1.1	-0.15	-0.28 to 0.00	69
14	292	Clerks - bank	0.4	0.2 to 1.2	-0.13	-0.23 to 0.00	67
15	699	Others in 69 other transport and communication work	0.3	0.1 to 1.0	-0.15	-0.22 to 0.00	40

† In relation to the reference occupation group 06 “pedagogical work”.

‡ Occupations with <40 are collapsed into one group.

\$ Attributable fraction estimated by bootstrap with 1,000 replications.

Occupational groups are sorted by prevalence ratio.

Table 5. Predicted age-adjusted prevalence ratio (PR) and attributable fractions (AF) of tinnitus among women†.

Nordic Classification of Occupational Codes		PR	(95% CI)	AF(%)\$	(95% CI)	Sample Size (26,574)
013	Laboratory assistants	1.9	1.1 to 3.3	0.18	0.01 to 0.41	73
294	Clerks - public health insurance	1.6	0.9 to 3.0	0.12	-0.05 to 0.32	68
681	Postmen	1.6	0.8 to 3.4	0.07	-0.05 to 0.23	41
X	Occupation not reported	1.5	1.3 to 1.8	11.30	6.96 to 15.62	7946
915	Housekeepers - public service	1.5	1.2 to 1.8	1.42	0.59 to 2.30	842
049	Others in 04 nursing care	1.5	1.1 to 2.0	0.52	0.11 to 0.96	355
921	Headwaiters, waiters	1.5	1.1 to 2.1	0.43	0.05 to 0.83	295
914	Housekeepers, maids - private service	1.5	1.0 to 2.2	0.29	-0.01 to 0.63	212
911	Housekeepers etc. - not private or public service	1.5	1.0 to 2.2	0.20	-0.07 to 0.50	129
861	Packers, labelers and related workers	1.5	0.9 to 2.4	0.18	-0.06 to 0.44	111
853	Plastic product makers	1.4	0.8 to 2.4	0.11	-0.09 to 0.35	102
0X3	Librarians, archivists and scientific personnel in museums	1.4	0.7 to 2.8	0.06	-0.08 to 0.23	47
003	Oth engineers, eng techn, industrial designers, draughtsman	1.4	0.6 to 3.3	0.04	-0.07 to 0.18	48
932	Char workers and cleaners	1.3	1.1 to 1.6	2.03	0.64 to 3.43	1888
913	Kitchen assistants	1.3	0.9 to 1.7	0.32	-0.15 to 0.80	404
716	Sewers and embroiderers-textile products, leather garments	1.3	0.7 to 2.2	0.09	-0.11 to 0.29	94
825	Canning and other preservation workers	1.3	0.7 to 2.5	0.06	-0.09 to 0.25	80
104	Other adm governmental servants - local state adm.	1.3	0.7 to 2.6	0.06	-0.09 to 0.23	58
822	Bakers and pastry cooks	1.3	0.6 to 2.6	0.04	-0.10 to 0.18	45
Y	Occupations with <40 subjects	1.2	1.0 to 1.5	0.82	-0.15 to 1.87	1449
045	Other practical nurses	1.2	0.9 to 1.5	0.60	-0.15 to 1.35	1063
411	Farm helpers - general	1.2	0.9 to 1.5	0.53	-0.23 to 1.29	843
912	Cooks	1.2	0.9 to 1.8	0.20	-0.15 to 0.57	247
919	Others in 91 public safety and protection work	1.2	0.8 to 1.8	0.17	-0.17 to 0.53	310
671	Local postmasters, postal assistance	1.2	0.8 to 1.9	0.12	-0.17 to 0.40	203
941	Barbers, hairdressers and beauticians	1.2	0.8 to 1.9	0.10	-0.16 to 0.37	186
292	Clerks - bank	1.2	0.7 to 1.9	0.09	-0.15 to 0.37	202
413	Nursery workers and gardeners	1.2	0.7 to 2.1	0.08	-0.14 to 0.30	106
046	Dental assistance	1.2	0.7 to 2.2	0.07	-0.10 to 0.26	93
675	Telegraph dispatchers	1.2	0.6 to 2.4	0.05	-0.10 to 0.22	62
059	Others in 05 other professional health and medical work	1.2	0.5 to 2.7	0.02	-0.09 to 0.17	53
333	Shop assistants	1.1	0.9 to 1.4	0.59	-0.73 to 1.91	2042
401	General farmers, livestock farmers-working on own behalf	1.1	0.8 to 1.4	0.24	-0.47 to 1.05	905
04	Nursing care	1.1	0.7 to 1.8	0.04	-0.18 to 0.30	120
211	Secretaries and stenographers	1.1	0.6 to 1.8	0.02	-0.20 to 0.29	161
302	Working proprietors, retail trade	1.1	0.6 to 1.9	0.02	-0.16 to 0.23	94
043	Practical nurses in psychiatric institutions	1.1	0.5 to 2.4	0.02	-0.12 to 0.18	67
111	Directors, managers, and working proprietors	1.1	0.5 to 2.6	0.02	-0.10 to 0.14	42
412	Livestock workers - general	1.0	0.8 to 1.4	0.05	-0.51 to 0.60	439
299	Others in 29 other clerical work	1.0	0.8 to 1.3	0.03	-1.05 to 1.11	1636
673	Telephone switchboard operators - public service	1.0	0.5 to 2.2	0.01	-0.12 to 0.16	47
951	Laundry and dry-cleaning workers	1.0	0.5 to 1.9	0.00	-0.17 to 0.19	81
06	Pedagogical work	1.0	ref	0.00	ref	1299
0X2	Social workers	1.0	0.6 to 1.5	-0.01	-0.29 to 0.29	263
922	Other waiting personnel	1.0	0.6 to 1.7	-0.01	-0.22 to 0.21	136
201	Accountants and book-keepers	0.9	0.5 to 1.8	-0.02	-0.20 to 0.19	121

1	674 Telephone switchboard operators - private exchange	0.9	0.3 to 2.3	-0.02	-0.11 to 0.11	48
2	41 Farm work and livestock work	0.9	0.4 to 2.0	-0.02	-0.16 to 0.14	56
3	332 Shop managers	0.9	0.4 to 1.7	-0.04	-0.19 to 0.14	89
4	041 Professional nurses	0.9	0.7 to 1.3	-0.13	-0.69 to 0.46	745
5	052 Physio- and occupational therapists	0.8	0.4 to 1.5	-0.07	-0.26 to 0.15	134
6	203 Other cashiers	0.8	0.5 to 1.4	-0.09	-0.31 to 0.15	176
7	916 Concierge - hotels	0.7	0.2 to 2.0	-0.05	-0.13 to 0.07	51
8	047 Nursemaids in hospitals and other institutions	0.3	0.1 to 1.0	-0.20	-0.31 to 0.00	119
9	769 Others in 76 electrical work	0.2	0.0 to 1.6	-0.10	-0.14 to 0.00	48

^a In relation to the reference occupation group 06 "pedagogical work".

^b Occupations with <40 are collapsed into one group.

^c Attributable fraction estimated by bootstrap with 1,000 replications.

Occupational groups are sorted by prevalence ratio.

In order to further investigate the nature of tinnitus prevalence in the group of occupationally inactive women, we restricted our sample to subjects below 65 years of age (N=5,850). Significant effects after adjustment for age were estimated for receiving social security or disability pension (PR 2.0; 95% CI 1.6-2.5, N=567), for being unemployed (PR 1.6; 95% CI 1.2-2.0, N=503), and for being full-time household workers (PR 1.2; 95% CI 1.0-1.5, N=1,713). There was no effect of being in the military service or a student (PR 0.9; 95% CI 0.7-1.1, N=936). The effect of receiving social security or disability pension was slightly reduced by controlling for noise exposure and other risk factors (PR 1.7; 95% CI 1.4-2.1), and further reduced by controlling for education and income (PR 1.4; 95% CI 1.2-1.8). Controlling for hearing loss resulted in a negligible additional change (PR 1.3; 95% CI 1.1-1.6).

DISCUSSION

Our results showed that occupation has moderate but significant effects on the prevalence of bothersome tinnitus. The effect of occupation on tinnitus prevalence was smaller in women than in men, but the gender difference was not as marked as the previously reported effect of occupation on hearing loss in this sample.[19] Controlling for self-reported occupational noise exposure reduced the occupation effect in men but had no effect in women; this is likely a confirmation of previous reports that women are in general exposed to less occupational noise. However, additional control for education and income only affected the occupation effect in women.

Several occupations recognized to be associated with loud noise exposure were associated with an increased risk of tinnitus in men and contributed to the overall attributable fraction of tinnitus, i.e., the fraction of tinnitus cases due to occupation. This is in agreement with previous findings in regard to the effects of occupation on hearing loss based on this same study sample.[19]

In women, occupations with the highest risk for tinnitus were not typically noisy ones, and the attributable fraction was determined mainly by the group of occupationally inactive. This is different from the analysis of occupation effects on hearing loss[19] - there was no increased risk of hearing loss in occupationally inactive women.

Only a few previous studies have reported occupation-specific tinnitus prevalence. The odds for tinnitus according to different occupational groups were reported based on the 1994–95 U.S. National Health Interview Survey Disability Supplement dataset.[4] This study showed a marginal elevation in tinnitus prevalence in skilled and unskilled workers compared with professionals (OR 1.18; 95% CI 1.00 to 1.39). This study also found a reduced prevalence in the two occupational groups of managerial or administrative (OR 0.82; 95% CI 0.68 to 0.99) and technical or sales (OR 0.83; 95% CI 0.70 to 0.98).

1 Some studies evaluating the effect of self-reported occupational noise exposure found
2 results comparable to the present study. In a British general population sample of 12,907
3 subjects,[9] age-adjusted prevalence ratios for working in noisy environment for more than 10
4 years was estimated to be 2.6 (95% CI 2.0 to 3.4) in men and 1.9 (95% CI 1.0 to 3.7) in women
5 in comparison with those with no occupational exposure to noise. The overall tinnitus prevalence
6 of the sample was 6% in men and 3% in women. Previous British data also showed tinnitus to be
7 about twice as common in those with a history of occupational exposure to noise.[28]

8 In an earlier analysis of tinnitus in the NTHLS, being exposed to loud noise at work for
9 more than 15 hours per week resulted in an OR of 1.7 (95% CI 1.5 to 1.9) in men and 1.6 (95%
10 CI 1.4 to 1.9) in women, compared with those who had not been exposed to loud noise at
11 work.[4]

12 Among 2,015 older Australians, the relative risk of tinnitus was 1.4 (95% CI 1.1 to 1.7)
13 for participants exposed to “tolerable noise” and 1.5 (95% CI 1.11 to 2.1) for those exposed to
14 high levels of occupational noise (“unable to hear speech”) compared with unexposed
15 participants.[7] Among 3,753 older adults in Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, no association was found
16 between major occupation, history of occupational noise exposure, or hunting history, with the
17 likelihood of having tinnitus (prevalence) or developing tinnitus (incidence).[5]

18 We found adding hearing loss as a predictor did not decrease the effect of occupation;
19 when controlling for some other risk factors, a small increase in occupational effect was found.
20 Thus, hearing loss does not seem to mediate, but rather suppress, the effect of occupation on
21 tinnitus. This points to the importance of occupational risk factors not related to hearing loss,
22 such as work demands, level of control, social support, and other psychosocial factors.

23 The negative effect for women of being occupationally non-active is partly in agreement
24 with results from a study of self-reported hearing problems in a Swedish working and non-
25 working population.[11] A higher prevalence of frequent or constant tinnitus was found among
26

1 non-workers (15%) than workers (11%). While we found this effect mainly among women, the
2
3 previous study reported higher effects for men (25% and 15% for non-workers and workers,
4
5 respectively) than for women (10% and 8%). These numbers were not age-adjusted, however,
6
7 and the age distribution of workers was quite different from non-workers.
8
9

10 Receiving social security or disability pension was associated with the highest risk of
11
12 tinnitus in the group of occupationally non-active women. It may be that reduced functional
13
14 ability or poor general health decreases the ability to cope with tinnitus, although the causal
15
16 direction is not clear, as tinnitus may well be a part of the disability in the first place. Also, the
17
18 increased risk of tinnitus may be related to psychosocial factors, such as loss of social status and
19
20 self-esteem, social support, personal economy, and lifestyle factors such as physical inactivity.
21
22 Regardless of the underlying cause, the elevated occurrence of tinnitus among unemployed
23
24 women is hardly a real occupational effect, so the true fraction of tinnitus attributable to type of
25
26 occupation is much lower than the 21.4% estimated by including unemployed women.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Strengths and limitations

35
36 The major advantages of the present study are the prospective design and that the study
37
38 population is representative of the general working population. A substantial selection bias is
39
40 unlikely, since occupational data were complete for all participants, and the participation rate in
41
42 this population survey was relatively high (69% for the vast majority of the county).
43
44
45

46 A recent survey of sufferers from tinnitus showed they report excessive noise in the work
47
48 environment as the single most important factor for developing tinnitus.[29] Thus, there might be
49
50 a serious problem with recall bias that tends to exaggerate an association when both the exposure
51
52 and the outcome are self-reported. In the present study occupation data were obtained from
53
54 highly valid prospective registry data, thus, we consider recall bias on this factor not to be a
55
56 problem.
57
58
59
60

1 Test-retest of the question “are you bothered by tinnitus?” indicated a relatively high
2 reliability. Tinnitus is a personal, subjective experience that cannot be measured objectively and
3 is thus per definition described by self report. The clinical validity of the measure is unknown as
4 we have no data on the correlation between being bothered by tinnitus and seeking medical help.
5 Subjective need for treatment has been reported in as many as 2/3 of the subjects who found them
6 self suffering from tinnitus often or always [30]. The prevalence of suffering from tinnitus in that
7 study was reported to be 14%, which is very similar to the prevalence of bothered by tinnitus in
8 our study. But probably only a few % of the subjects with bothersome tinnitus have actually been
9 seeking help for this condition, a number that will depend on factors such as whether treatments
10 are determined to be effective and if they are known or available to the broader public.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 A weakness of the study is the lack of information about the duration of employment and
25 exposure. However, the estimated average tinnitus prevalence for each occupation group applies
26 to workers whose age is equal to the sample mean. Accordingly, we have essentially adjusted for
27 exposure duration.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 The Nordic Classification of Occupations does not classify occupations on the basis of
35 noise exposure levels or other risk factors for tinnitus, but according to the tasks and duties
36 undertaken in the job. Heterogeneity regarding noise and other exposure within occupational
37 categories implies that occupation, as an explanatory variable, does not capture all effects of
38 occupational exposures on tinnitus. Our results showed that adding information on self-reported
39 occupational noise exposure improved the prediction of tinnitus somewhat.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Selection for good hearing function in some occupations could in principle bias the
49 results, but we think it unlikely that this type of selection had a major effect on our results.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusions

This study found a moderate association between occupation and tinnitus. Estimates of occupation-specific tinnitus prevalence may help identify high-risk occupations in which interventions are needed.

For peer review only

References

1. Erlandsson SI. Psychological Profiles of Tinnitus Patients. In: Tyler RS, editor. Tinnitus handbook. San Diego: Thomson Learning; 2000. 25-57.
2. Henry JA, Dennis KC, Schechter MA. General review of tinnitus: Prevalence, mechanisms, effects, and management. *J Speech Lang Hear Res* 2005;48(5):1204-1235.
3. Shargorodsky J, Curhan GC, Farwell WR. Prevalence and Characteristics of Tinnitus among US Adults. *Am J Med* 2010;123(8):711-718.
4. Hoffman HJ, Reed GW. Epidemiology of tinnitus. In: Snow Jr JB, editor. Tinnitus: Theory and management. Hamilton, Ontario: BC Decker Inc; 2004. 16-41.
5. Nondahl DM, Cruickshanks KJ, Wiley TL, et al. Prevalence and 5-year incidence of tinnitus among older adults: the epidemiology of hearing loss study. *J Am Acad Audiol* 2002;13(6):323-331.
6. Konig O, Schaette R, Kempter R, et al. Course of hearing loss and occurrence of tinnitus. *Hear Res* 2006;221(1-2):59-64.
7. Sindhusake D, Golding M, Newall P, et al. Risk factors for tinnitus in a population of older adults: The Blue Mountains Hearing Study. *Ear Hear* 2003;24(6):501-507.
8. Sulkowski W, Kowalska S, Lipowczan A, et al. Tinnitus and impulse noise-induced hearing loss in drop-forge operators. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health* 1999;12(2):177-182.
9. Palmer KT, Griffin MJ, Syddall HE, et al. Occupational exposure to noise and the attributable burden of hearing difficulties in Great Britain. *Occup Environ Med* 2002;59(9):634-639.
10. Gopinath B, McMahon CM, Rochtchina E, et al. Risk factors and impacts of incident tinnitus in older adults. *Ann Epidemiol* 2010;20(2):129-135.
11. Hasson D, Theorell T, Westerlund H, et al. Prevalence and characteristics of hearing problems in a working and non-working Swedish population. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2010;64(5):453-460.
12. Griest SE, Bishop PM. Tinnitus as an early indicator of permanent hearing loss. A 15 year longitudinal study of noise exposed workers. *AAOHN J* 1998;46(7):325-329.
13. Rubak T, Kock S, Koefoed-Nielsen B, et al. The risk of tinnitus following occupational noise exposure in workers with hearing loss or normal hearing. *Int J Audiol* 2008;47(3):109-114.
14. Saunders JC. The role of central nervous system plasticity in tinnitus. *J Commun Disord* 2007;40(4):313-334.

- 1 15. Lin YH, Chen CY, Lu SY. Physical discomfort and psychosocial job stress among male and
2 female operators at telecommunication call centers in Taiwan. *Appl Ergon* 2009;40(4):561-
3 568.
- 4
5 16. Hinton DE, Chhean D, Pich V, et al. Tinnitus among Cambodian refugees: Relationship to
6 PTSD severity. *J Trauma Stress* 2006;19(4):541-546.
- 7
8 17. Krog NH, Engdahl B, Tambs K. The association between tinnitus and mental health in a
9 general population sample: results from the HUNT Study. *J Psychosom Res*
10 2010;69(3):289-298.
- 11
12 18. Guitton MJ. Tinnitus and Anxiety: More than Meets the Ear. *Curr Psychiatry Rev*
13 2006;2(3):333-338.
- 14
15 19. Engdahl B, Tambs K. Occupation and the risk of hearing impairment--results from the
16 Nord-Trøndelag study on hearing loss. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2010;36(3):250-257.
- 17
18 20. Tambs K, Hoffman HJ, Borchgrevink HM, et al. Hearing loss induced by noise, ear
19 infections, and head injuries: results from the Nord-Trøndelag Hearing Loss Study. *Int J*
20 *Audiol* 2003;42(2):89-105.
- 21
22 21. Kvestad E, Czajkowski N, Engdahl B, et al. Low heritability of tinnitus: results from the
23 second Nord-Trøndelag health study. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 2010;136(2):178-
24 182.
- 25
26 22. Statistics Norway. *Nordic Classification of Occupations*. 1976. Oslo, Statistics Norway.
- 27
28 23. Vassenden K. *Censuses 1960, 1970 and 1980. Documentation of the comparable files*. 87/2.
29 1987. Statistics Norway, Oslo, Norway.
- 30
31 24. Engdahl B, Tambs K, Borchgrevink HM, et al. Screened and unscreened hearing threshold
32 levels for the adult population: Results from the Nord-Trøndelag Hearing Loss Study. *Int J*
33 *Audiol* 2005;44(4):213-230.
- 34
35 25. Barros AJ, Hirakata VN. Alternatives for logistic regression in cross-sectional studies: an
36 empirical comparison of models that directly estimate the prevalence ratio. *BMC Med Res*
37 *Methodol* 2003;3:21.
- 38
39 26. McFadden D. *Quantitative Methods for Analyzing Travel Behaviour of Individuals: Some*
40 *Recent Developments*. In: Hensher D, Stopher P, editors. *Behavioural travel modelling*.
41 London: Croom Helm London; 1978. 279-318.
- 42
43 27. Miettinen OS. Proportion of disease caused or prevented by a given exposure, trait or
44 intervention. *Am J Epidemiol* 1974;99(5):325-332.
- 45
46 28. Coles RR. Epidemiology of tinnitus: (1) prevalence. *J Laryngol Otol Suppl* 1984;9:7-15.
- 47
48 29. Sufferers blame occupational noise for their tinnitus. Deafness Research UK Web site [
49 2010 [cited 2011 July 1]; Available from:
50 URL:[http://www.deafnessresearch.org.uk/Sufferers%20blame%20occupational%20noise%
51 20for%20their%20tinnitus+4318.twl](http://www.deafnessresearch.org.uk/Sufferers%20blame%20occupational%20noise%20for%20their%20tinnitus+4318.twl)
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
30. Axelsson A, Ringdahl A. Tinnitus - a study of its prevalence and characteristics. Br J Audiol 1989;23(1):53-62.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	4
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5-6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	6
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	7
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	8-9, 11
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	8-9
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	11
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	11
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	7
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	7
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	7-8
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	14-17
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	19
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	21-22
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	22
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	3

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

For peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>