

Exponering för sensibiliserande och irriterande ämnen i arbetsmiljön och koppling till allergisk astma / Exposure to sensitizing and irritating substances in the work environment and its association with allergic asthma, rapport [10] (2024)

### Bilaga 1 Risk för bias bedömning av översikter från uppdaterad sökning

#### Appendix 1 Risk of bias assessment of reviews from updated search

AMSTAR 2																	
Reference	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	RoB
<b>Romero Starke et al 2021</b> [1]	Y	Y	Y	PY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Low
<b>Archangelidi 2020</b> [2]	Y	Y	Y	PY	Y	N	PY	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Moderate
<b>Baatjies et al 2023</b> [3]	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NM	NM	N	N	N	Y	High
<b>Antoniou and Zeegers 2022</b> [4]	Y	N	N	PY	N	N	PY	N	PY	N	NM	NM	N	Y	N	Y	High
<b>Macan et al 2022</b> [5]	Y	Y	Y	PY	Y	Y	Y	PY	N	N	NM	NM	N	Y	N	Y	High
<b>Coureau et al 2021</b> [6]	Y	N	N	PY	N	N	N	Y	N	N	NM	NM	N	N	N	Y	High
<b>Arcangeli et al 2020</b> [7]	Y	N	N	PY	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	NM	NM	N	N	N	Y	High
<b>Mohammadian and Nasirzade 2021</b> [8]	Y	N	N	PY	N	N	PY	N	N	N	NM	NM	N	N	N	Y	High

For critical appraisal of systematic reviews AMSTAR 2 was used [9]. Y=yes, N=no, PY=partly yes, NM=no meta analysis

1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?
3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?
4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?
6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?
7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?
8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?
9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?  
RCTs
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?
11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?  
RCTs
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

## References

1. Romero Starke K, Friedrich S, Schubert M, Kämpf D, Girbig M, Pretzsch A, et al. Are Healthcare Workers at an Increased Risk for Obstructive Respiratory Diseases Due to Cleaning and Disinfection Agents? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(10). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18105159>.
2. Archangelidi O, Sathiyajit S, Consonni D, Jarvis D, De Matteis S. Cleaning products and respiratory health outcomes in occupational cleaners: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Occup Environ Med*. 2021;78(8):541-7. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2020-106776>.
3. Baatjies R, Chamba P, Jeebhay MF. Wood dust and asthma. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2023;23(2):76-84. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1097/aci.0000000000000882>.
4. Antoniou EE, Zeegers MP. The relationship between toluene diisocyanate exposure and respiratory health problems: A meta-analysis of epidemiological studies. *Toxicol Ind Health*. 2022;38(9):595-605. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/07482337221095386>.
5. Macan J, Babić Ž, Hallmann S, Havmose MS, Johansen JD, John SM, et al. Respiratory toxicity of persulphate salts and their adverse effects on airways in hairdressers: a systematic review. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2022;95(8):1679-702. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-022-01852-w>.
6. Coureau E, Fontana L, Lamouroux C, Pélissier C, Charbotel B. Is Isocyanate Exposure and Occupational Asthma Still a Major Occupational Health Concern? Systematic Literature Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(24). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182413181>.
7. Arcangeli G, Traversini V, Tomasini E, Baldassarre A, Lecca LI, Galea RP, Mucci N. Allergic anaphylactic risk in farming activities: A systematic review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(14):1-20. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17144921>.
8. Mohammadian Y, Nasirzadeh N. Toxicity risks of occupational exposure in 3D printing and bioprinting industries: A systematic review. *Toxicol Ind Health*. 2021;37(9):573-84. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/07482337211031691>.
9. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *Bmj*. 2017;358:j4008. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008>.