# BMJ Open Occupational skin diseases among bricklayers and brick masons in a resource poor setting, Southwest Nigeria: prevalence and correlates - a case-control study

Michael Gbenga Israel , <sup>1,2</sup> Oluwaseyi Kikelomo Israel , <sup>3,4</sup> Adeolu Oladayo Akinboro, Peter Kehinde Uduagbamen, <sup>6,7</sup> Sebastien S Oiwoh, 8 Olanrewaju Olayemi,<sup>9</sup> Fatai O Olanrewaju,<sup>10</sup> Mufutau M Oripelaye,<sup>10</sup> Stephen Olawale Aiyedun, 11 Olumayowa Oninla, 10 Olayinka Olasode, 10 Olanivi Onavemi<sup>10</sup>

To cite: Israel MG, Israel OK, Akinboro AO, et al. Occupational skin diseases among bricklayers and brick masons in a resource poor setting, Southwest Nigeria: prevalence and correlates - a case-control study. BMJ Open 2025;15:e086321. doi:10.1136/ bmjopen-2024-086321

Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (https://doi.org/10.1136/ bmjopen-2024-086321).

Received 12 March 2024 Accepted 10 January 2025



@ Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2025. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ Group.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

#### **Correspondence to**

Dr Oluwaseyi Kikelomo Israel; okisrael@lautech.edu.ng

#### ABSTRACT

**Objectives** Cement and most other materials used by bricklayers and brick masons for construction purposes could heighten the risk for occupational skin diseases (OSDs) which mostly include occupational contact dermatitis (OCD) and others. The activities of the bricklayers or brick masons are essentially manual as they work as artisans involving mixing sands and gravels with cement and water for building and block moulding, respectively. This can lead to a significant decline in the quality of life and psychosocial function. We determined the prevalence of OSDs and their correlates among bricklayers and brick masons.

**Design** This was a comparative case—control study which involved 200 bricklavers/brick masons and 200 healthy non-bricklayers/non-brick masons.

Settings This study was carried out in two local governments (LGAs) in Ogbomoso community.

Methods Respondents were selected using a multistage random sampling technique. Interviewer-administer semi-structured questionnaire was used to collect data. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, the prevalence of OCD and other OSD were determined,  $\chi^2$ test and logistic regression were obtained. A p<0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

Results The mean age of the bricklayers/brick masons was 39.74±17.03 years, while that of the control group was 40.04±17.24 years. The prevalence of OCD was significantly higher in the bricklayers/brick masons (43.0%) than controls (5.5%), p<0.001. Other dermatological conditions were more common among the cases (8.5%) than the controls (5.0%), p=0.04. Bricklayers/brick masons not using personal protective equipment (PPE, hand gloves) were three times more likely to develop OCD compared with those who used them (OR=3.38, 95% CI 0.12 to 0.72, p=0.007). A family history of allergy is also a predictor of OCD (OR=2.69, 95% CI 1.30 to 5.60, p=0.008).

Conclusion OSD are common in bricklayers/brick masons, especially among those without the use of PPE.

## STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- ⇒ Control inclusion makes this study a robust one compared with similar study in the past.
- ⇒ Patch testing usage makes the study more scientific and evidence based.
- ⇒ Multistage sampling method adopted makes this study minimal bias prone.
- ⇒ Population size limitation beyond the sample size minimised this study.
- ⇒ Financial constraints due to self-sponsorship limited number of patch tested subjects.

Regular educational programmes emphasizing the need to reduce direct contact with cement including the proper and regular use of PPE among this population group are advised.

# INTRODUCTION

Occupational contact dermatitis (OCD), defined as a pathological skin condition resulting from occupational exposure to some substances or chemicals has been documented to be the most common occupational skin disease in many countries. The OCDs are seen in up to 6.7–10.0% of work-related diseases and can lead to a significant decline **Q**. in quality of life (QoL) and psychosocial stability.<sup>2</sup> The worldwide incidence of OCD ranged from 0.6 to 6.7 per 10000 personyears, and 90% of all occupational skin disorders are reported to be OCD.<sup>3 4</sup> About 28.7% of the OCDs reported in Brazil were found in construction workers.<sup>5</sup> In Nigeria, cementassociated dermatoses were common in bricklayers, and prevalence was positively related to the duration of exposure. 6 Dermatitis was



reported to be the most common (31%) cause of skin disorders in Pakistan.<sup>7</sup> An epidemiological survey found that up to 500000 working hours and over 20 million pounds are lost annually, to illness, absence from work and cost of retraining in the UK as a result of OCD.8

Bricklayers/brick masons' contact with cement involves mixing, pouring, spreading, plastering cement concrete, asphalt, gravel and other materials, and this can increase the risk of developing irritant and/or allergic contact dermatitis.<sup>1-3</sup> Despite the current increases in mechanisation involving precast concrete sections, a greater proportion of these artisans are still frequently exposed to cement, particularly in low-income settings (LIS) like Nigeria. The fact that these artisans are involved in hard physical labour, mostly under stressful conditions (hot, cold, wet and sunny weather), further heightens the risk of occupational skin diseases (OSDs) and hazards in them. 9 10

A significant proportion of occupational diseases have dermatological diseases, mostly, contact dermatitis. 1 4 Others include contact urticaria, infections, pigmentary and hair follicle disorders, neoplasms, and connective tissue-associated diseases like scleroderma, telangiectasia and Raynaud's phenomenon.<sup>11</sup>

The clinical features of occupational contact dermatitis could be acute or chronic. Acute features include erythema, papular and bullous eruption while the chronic includes scale formation. However other symptoms include pruritus and scratch marks which could be present in acute or chronic contact dermatitis.

Differential diagnoses of occupational contact dermatitis include atopic dermatitis, irritant contact dermatitis, drug-induced photosensitivity, nummular eczema, seborrhoeic dermatitis, tinea corporis and scabies.

The high alkalinity of wet cement and its tiny content of water-soluble chromate have been documented as the offending trigger for OSDs, and this is due to the corrosive and sensitising effects of lime and chromium, respectively. 9-11 The construction industry in Nigeria is at present, the second largest, a clinical and epidemiological audit of bricklayers found cement dermatitis (CD), wear and tear dermatosis and hypersensitivity to chrome as common OSDs. 12

Research work is still ongoing globally, regarding OSDs but literature on cement-related OSDs is still scanty hence effective preventive strategies are unavailable.<sup>13</sup> This comparative case-control study therefore assessed the prevalence of OSDs and their correlates among bricklayers and brick masons in Nigeria.

# **Objectives**

- 1. To determine the prevalence of occupational and other skin disorders among bricklayers and brick masons in Ogbomoso, Oyo state, Nigeria.
- 2. To determine the predictors of occupational skin disorders and its correlates among bricklayers and brick masons in Ogbomoso, Oyo state, Nigeria.

#### **Hypotheses**

#### Null hypothesis

There is no difference in the occurrence of dermatitis and other skin disorders, among bricklayers and brick masons in Ogbomoso and its environs of Oyo state, Nigeria.

#### Alternate hypothesis

There is a difference in the occurrence of dermatitis and other skin disorders, among bricklayers and brick masons in Ogbomoso and its environs of Oyo state, Nigeria.

# **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

#### Study design

This community-based comparative case-control study was conducted at Ogbomoso, Southwest Nigeria.

#### **Settings**

This study was conducted in an urban setting. 10 zones were selected from 15 zones in the Ogbomoso North and South Local government area by random sampling. 20 consenting bricklayers were chosen by balloting from 40 d bricklayers that make up each zone until a total of 200 g bricklayers were chosen. The samples were collected within 3 weeks. Patch testing, laboratory study which & includes skin scraping and nail clips for fungal study were performed using 10% and 20% Potassium hydroxide (KOH), respectively. Data entry and analysis with discussion took place within 9 weeks.

#### **Participants**

400 (200 practicing and apprentice bricklayers and masons and 200 age and sex-matched healthy nonbricklayers/brick masons) adult participants from within the same locality took part in the study. The participants (bricklayers/brick masons/apprentices) were enrolled at the work sites where interviewing and physical examination took place in a room prepared for this purpose while the control (non bricklayers/brick masons) were mobilised within the same communities where local security meetings of the environment usually takes place weekly.

# Patient and public involvement

Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

Sample size determination

The minimum sample size was calculated using Leslie given

Fischer's formula and a prevalence from a similar study conducted in Nigeria.

• Qualitative outcome variable  $n=Z_{\alpha}^{2} pq/d^{2}$ where n is the minimum sample size

 $Z_{\alpha}$  is the standard normal deviate corresponding to a level of significance of 5%

p is the proportion of outcome of interest from the previous study 16.1% of the respondents had contact dermatitis<sup>14</sup>

q=1p

d is the desired level of precision (usually at 5% for single proportions); d varies for single means

 $\sigma$ =SD deviation of the quantitative outcome of interest obtained from a previous study

$$n=1.96^2\times0.161^{64}\times0.839/0.5^2$$

=208

When the population is less than 10 000, the formulae that shall be used are:

$$nf = \frac{n}{1+n-1/N}$$

where nf is the desired sample size when population is less than 10000

n is the The desired sample size when population is greater than 10000 which equals 208

N is the the estimate of population size which is=1000 (Anecdotal evidence from the bricklayer association)

So, 
$$nf = \frac{208}{1+208-1/1000}$$
  
= 172.32

Non-response of the above population will be 10% of 172.32=17.23

172.32+17.23=189.55

This was approximated to 200 for a good representation of the population size.

This gave a sample size of 200 after correcting for non-response.

#### **Inclusion criteria for cases**

This included consented bricklayers, brick masons and apprentices of at least 18 years of age, who practice primarily in Ogbomoso, Oyo state, Nigeria.

## **Exclusion criteria for cases**

Bricklayers, brick masons and bricklayer apprentices with known chronic illnesses and individuals with chronic allergies were also excluded.

# **Inclusion criteria for control**

This included consented non-bricklayers/brick masons of at least 18 years of age, who resides primarily in Ogbomoso, Oyo state, Nigeria.

#### **Exclusion criteria for control**

Non-bricklayers/brick masons and bricklayer with known chronic illness and individual with chronic allergy were also excluded.

# Sampling technique

A multistage sampling technique was used to select the respondents. Two Local Government Areas (LGAs) were selected from the five LGAs in Ogbomoso town using simple random sampling by balloting. 10 out of the 15 zones of the bricklayers and brick masons in the two selected LGAs were randomly selected through balloting, and 20 consenting bricklayers and masons were selected from each zone.

#### **Data collection method**

Data were collected using an interviewer-administered questionnaire (online supplemental table 1 online supplemental file 2, 1).

Participants' weight and height were measured using a weighing scale and stadiometer, respectively, and the body mass index (BMI) was calculated using the equation, BMI=weight (kg)/height (m<sup>2</sup>).

The examination was performed by the principal investigator (dermatologist) along with a senior registrar in dermatology who were able to distinguish between OCD and papulosquamous disorders like psoriasis, lichen planus and superficial fungal infections like tinea corporis. The patch test was conducted for participants with clinical evidence of OCD by the principal investigator supported by the research assistants according to standard protocol. The patch test was performed in a dedicated procedure room attached to the medical ward of the institution of the principal investigator.

# Statistical analysis

Data generated from the study were entered into the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) V.25.0. Continuous variables were presented as means with SD and compared using the paired Student's t-test. Categorical variables were presented as proportions and percentages and compared using  $\chi^2$ . Univariate analysis was used to determine the association between the variables and OCD while the multivariate model was used to determine the independent associates of occupational contact dermatitis after adjusting for confounders. Statistical significance was considered at p<0.05.

#### **Ethical consideration**

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the association of bricklayer and brick masons. Written informed consent was obtained from the eligible respondents after they had been well educated on the purpose of the study. Confidentiality was also assured.

#### **Definition of terms**

In Nigeria, most of the bricklayers and brick masons are informally trained, with no formal established guidelines for training and certification. For this study, the following were defined as shown below.

were defined as shown below.

Supervisors

Qualified bricklayers and brick masons who are the heads of each team and recruited other qualified bricklayers & and brick masons and apprentices.

#### **Qualified bricklayers and brick masons**

Those deemed fit by their trainers to practice with little or no supervision after a variable training period and hired by the supervisors.

# **Apprentices**

Those undergoing the informal training process.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2024-086321 on 30 January 2025. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

Table 1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents (N=400)

Variables	Study group n=200	Controls n=200	Total N (%)	X <sup>2</sup>	df	P value
18–20	9 (4.5)	9 (4.5)	18 (4.5)	0.09	4	0.999
21–29	65 (32.5)	65 (32.5)	130 (32.5)			
30–39	37 (18.5)	35 (17.5)	72 (18.0)			
40–49	28 (14.0)	28 (14.0)	56 (14.0)			
≥50	61 (30.5)	63 (31.5)	124 (31.0)			
Mean age (in years)	39.74±17.03	40.04±17.24	39.89±17.12			
Marital status						
Married	138 (69.0)	141 (70.5)	279 (69.8)	2.69	3	0.441
Single	58 (29.0)	52 (26.0)	110 (27.5)			
Divorced	2 (1.0)	6 (3.0)	8 (2.0)			
Widower	2 (1.0)	1 (0.5)	3 (0.8)			
Religion						
Christian	135 (67.5)	165 (82.5)	300 (75.0)	12.18	2	0.002*
Islam	64 (32.0)	34 (17.0)	98 (24.5)			
Traditional	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.5)			
Tribe						
Yoruba	193 (96.5)	189 (94.5)	382 (95.5)	0.93	1	0.335
Others	7 (3.5)	11 (5.5)	18 (4.5)			
Educational status						
No formal	13 (6.5)	11 (5.5)	24 (6.0)	0.42	3	0.937
Primary	71 (35.5)	71 (1.5)	142 (35.5)			
Secondary	109 (54.5)	109 (54.5)	218 (54.5)			
Tertiary	7 (3.5)	9 (4.5)	16 (4.0)			

# **RESULTS**

All 400 (200 cases and 200 controls) participants were males. The mean age of the bricklayers/brick masons and the controls were  $39.7\pm17.0$  years and  $40.0\pm17.1$  years, respectively, (p=0.999). About 69.0% of the cases and 70.5% of the control were married (p=0.44). 109 (54.5%) cases and 109 (54.5%) controls had secondary education (table 1).

161~(80.5%) of the cases were bricklayers and brick masons, 17~(8.5%) were apprentice and 22~(11.0%) were supervisors. A greater proportion (80%) of the cases were qualified bricklayers and masons (online supplemental figure 1).

Nature of work by greater proportions of the respondents (61.5%) were a combination of various duties of construction work. Above half of cases (51.5%) mould 51–100 blocks daily and most of the respondents had been involved in this job for 20 years and above (37.5%) (table 2).

A greater proportion of the cases compared with the controls had contact dermatitis (cases 43%; controls 5.5%, (p<0.001) and traumatic skin injury (cases 72%; controls 26.5% (p<0.001) (table 3). Occupational contact dermatitis was commoner in the upper limbs (39.0%), (p<0.001) compared with the lower limb (4.0%), (p<0.004). Fungal

infections were more common in the cases (13.0%) than the controls (8.0%) (table 3).

Table 4 shows that the occurrence of OCD among respondents was associated with the frequent use of hand gloves and boots usage (p<0.001)

Table 5 shows the predictors of occupational contact dermatitis among the study group. The risk of developing contact dermatitis among study group not using gloves were 3 times more than those using hand gloves (p=0.007). Family history of allergy increased risk of developing occupational contact dermatitis by 3 times among the study group than those with no family history of allergy, (p=0.008). Personal history of allergy to belt buckle and necklace increased risk to occupational contact dermatitis by 3 and 1 times, respectively, than those with no personal history of allergy. Though these differences were not statistically significant (p=0.228 and 0.817, respectively) at 95% CI.

Variables         Study group         Freq. (%)           Job descriptions         Bricklayers/brick masons         161         80.5           Bricklayers/brick masons apprentice         17         8.5           Bricklayers/brick masons supervisor         22         11.0           Total         200         100           Nature of work         8.5         8.5           Brick moulding         17         8.5           Sand/cement mixing         11         5.5           Bricklaying         19         9.5           Plastering         18         9.0           Washing of instrument         12         6           All of the above         123         61.5           Total         200         100           Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)         9         4.5           51–100         103         51.5           151–200         27         13.5           201–600         6         3.0           Total         200         100           Duration of works (years)         1–5         43         21.5           5.1–10         42         21.0           10.1–15         28         14.0	Table 2 Occupational profile o	f study group (I	N=200)
Bricklayers/brick masons         161         80.5           Bricklayers/brick masons apprentice         17         8.5           Bricklayers/brick masons supervisor         22         11.0           Total         200         100           Nature of work         200         100           Brick moulding         17         8.5           Sand/cement mixing         11         5.5           Bricklaying         19         9.5           Plastering         18         9.0           Washing of instrument         12         6           All of the above         123         61.5           Total         200         100           Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)         0-50         9         4.5           51-100         103         51.5         1.5           101-150         55         27.5         151-200         27         13.5           201-600         6         3.0         100           Duration of works (years)         1-5         43         21.5           5.1-10         42         21.0           10.1-15         28         14.0           15.1-20         12         6.0	Variables	Study group	Freq. (%)
Bricklayers/brick masons apprentice       17       8.5         Bricklayers/brick masons supervisor       22       11.0         Total       200       100         Nature of work       17       8.5         Brick moulding       17       8.5         Sand/cement mixing       11       5.5         Bricklaying       19       9.5         Plastering       18       9.0         Washing of instrument       12       6         All of the above       123       61.5         Total       200       100         Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)       9       4.5         51-100       103       51.5         101-150       55       27.5         151-200       27       13.5         201-600       6       3.0         Total       200       100         Duration of works (years)       1-5       43       21.5         5.1-10       42       21.0         10.1-15       28       14.0         15.1-20       12       6.0         >20       75       37.5	Job descriptions		
apprentice Bricklayers/brick masons supervisor  Total 200 100  Nature of work  Brick moulding 17 8.5  Sand/cement mixing 11 5.5  Bricklaying 19 9.5  Plastering 18 9.0  Washing of instrument 12 6  All of the above 123 61.5  Total 200 100  Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)  0–50 9 4.5  51–100 103 51.5  101–150 55 27.5  151–200 27 13.5  201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	Bricklayers/brick masons	161	80.5
supervisor         Total         200         100           Nature of work         Brick moulding         17         8.5           Sand/cement mixing         11         5.5           Bricklaying         19         9.5           Plastering         18         9.0           Washing of instrument         12         6           All of the above         123         61.5           Total         200         100           Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)         0-50         9         4.5           51-100         103         51.5         15.5           101-150         55         27.5         15.5           151-200         27         13.5         201-600         6         3.0           Total         200         100         100         100         100           Duration of works (years)         1-5         43         21.5         5.1-10         42         21.0           10.1-15         28         14.0         15.1-20         26.0         >20         75         37.5		17	8.5
Nature of work         Brick moulding       17       8.5         Sand/cement mixing       11       5.5         Bricklaying       19       9.5         Plastering       18       9.0         Washing of instrument       12       6         All of the above       123       61.5         Total       200       100         Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)       9       4.5         51–100       103       51.5         101–150       55       27.5         151–200       27       13.5         201–600       6       3.0         Total       200       100         Duration of works (years)       1–5       43       21.5         5.1–10       42       21.0         10.1–15       28       14.0         15.1–20       12       6.0         >20       75       37.5	•	22	11.0
Brick moulding 17 8.5  Sand/cement mixing 11 5.5  Bricklaying 19 9.5  Plastering 18 9.0  Washing of instrument 12 6  All of the above 123 61.5  Total 200 100  Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)  0–50 9 4.5  51–100 103 51.5  101–150 55 27.5  151–200 27 13.5  201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	Total	200	100
Sand/cement mixing       11       5.5         Bricklaying       19       9.5         Plastering       18       9.0         Washing of instrument       12       6         All of the above       123       61.5         Total       200       100         Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)       0-50       9       4.5         51-100       103       51.5         101-150       55       27.5         151-200       27       13.5         201-600       6       3.0         Total       200       100         Duration of works (years)       1-5       43       21.5         5.1-10       42       21.0         10.1-15       28       14.0         15.1-20       12       6.0         >20       75       37.5	Nature of work		
Bricklaying 19 9.5  Plastering 18 9.0  Washing of instrument 12 6  All of the above 123 61.5  Total 200 100  Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)  0–50 9 4.5  51–100 103 51.5  101–150 55 27.5  151–200 27 13.5  201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	Brick moulding	17	8.5
Plastering 18 9.0  Washing of instrument 12 6  All of the above 123 61.5  Total 200 100  Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)  0–50 9 4.5  51–100 103 51.5  101–150 55 27.5  151–200 27 13.5  201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	Sand/cement mixing	11	5.5
Washing of instrument       12       6         All of the above       123       61.5         Total       200       100         Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)       9       4.5         0-50       9       4.5         51-100       103       51.5         101-150       55       27.5         151-200       27       13.5         201-600       6       3.0         Total       200       100         Duration of works (years)       1-5       43       21.5         5.1-10       42       21.0         10.1-15       28       14.0         15.1-20       12       6.0         >20       75       37.5	Bricklaying	19	9.5
All of the above 123 61.5  Total 200 100  Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)  0–50 9 4.5  51–100 103 51.5  101–150 55 27.5  151–200 27 13.5  201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	Plastering	18	9.0
Total       200       100         Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)       9       4.5         0-50       9       4.5         51-100       103       51.5         101-150       55       27.5         151-200       27       13.5         201-600       6       3.0         Total       200       100         Duration of works (years)       1-5       43       21.5         5.1-10       42       21.0         10.1-15       28       14.0         15.1-20       12       6.0         >20       75       37.5	Washing of instrument	12	6
Numbers of blocks moulded or build with per day (blocks)  0–50 9 4.5  51–100 103 51.5  101–150 55 27.5  151–200 27 13.5  201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	All of the above	123	61.5
build with per day (blocks)  0-50 9 4.5  51-100 103 51.5  101-150 55 27.5  151-200 27 13.5  201-600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1-5 43 21.5  5.1-10 42 21.0  10.1-15 28 14.0  15.1-20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	Total	200	100
51–100       103       51.5         101–150       55       27.5         151–200       27       13.5         201–600       6       3.0         Total       200       100         Duration of works (years)       1–5       43       21.5         5.1–10       42       21.0         10.1–15       28       14.0         15.1–20       12       6.0         >20       75       37.5			
101–150 55 27.5 151–200 27 13.5 201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years) 1–5 43 21.5 5.1–10 42 21.0 10.1–15 28 14.0 15.1–20 12 6.0 >20 75 37.5	0–50	9	4.5
151–200 27 13.5 201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5 5.1–10 42 21.0 10.1–15 28 14.0 15.1–20 12 6.0 >20 75 37.5	51–100	103	51.5
201–600 6 3.0  Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	101–150	55	27.5
Total 200 100  Duration of works (years)  1–5 43 21.5  5.1–10 42 21.0  10.1–15 28 14.0  15.1–20 12 6.0  >20 75 37.5	151–200	27	13.5
Duration of works (years)  1–5	201–600	6	3.0
1-5     43     21.5       5.1-10     42     21.0       10.1-15     28     14.0       15.1-20     12     6.0       >20     75     37.5	Total	200	100
5.1-10     42     21.0       10.1-15     28     14.0       15.1-20     12     6.0       >20     75     37.5	Duration of works (years)		
10.1–15 28 14.0 15.1–20 12 6.0 >20 75 37.5	1–5	43	21.5
15.1–20 12 6.0 >20 75 37.5	5.1–10	42	21.0
>20 75 37.5	10.1–15	28	14.0
	15.1–20	12	6.0
Total 200 100	>20	75	37.5
	Total	200	100

## DISCUSSION

This study determined the prevalence of OSDs among bricklayers and brick masons in Ogbomoso, Oyo state, Southwest Nigeria. The study also determined the prevalence of the common occupational dermatoses and assessed the relationship between the disease pattern and the participants' work specification.

The findings from this study show that all bricklayers and masons were males and a greater proportion of them were young and married, and majority of them had completed secondary school education. There was a predominance of bricklayers and masons relative to the supervisors and apprentices. There was a predominance of OCD among the OSDs seen among the study group. The use of personal protective equipment (PPE) had a protective effect as it reduced the incidence of the OSDs. A greater proportion of the bricklayers and masons were block moulders and had practiced the vocation for more than 20 years, and majority of them moulded between 51 and 100 blocks daily.

The all-male population pattern and the greater proportion of them being young in the vocation mirrors findings by Sarma<sup>13</sup> who found a mean age of 24.8 years for the bricklayers and brick masons who were all males. This study findings however are in disagreement with findings by Hansen et al<sup>14</sup> in Denmark that showed that less than 30% of construction workers were less than 50 years. Another study in the USA found a mean age of 43 years for construction workers. 15 The higher life expectancy in Denmark, USA and other developed nations compared with developing nations like India and Nigeria, could also be contributing to the younger participants in this study coupled with the relatively lower economic and educational status could have led more younger persons in lowincome societies to choose the construction industry as a last resort.

Since very little or no money is paid at the commencement of apprenticeship, and the fact that remunerations, though unattractive, are mostly given on a daily basis, allow these artisans to take care of urgent and immediate family financial commitments, further encouraging the young into the vocation. 16 The mean age of the current study participants was similar to the 34.49 years found by Kashif  $et\ al^{17}$  in Pakistan, but higher than the 24.8 years reported from Kolkata, India.<sup>17</sup>

The age group of 25–30 and 31–36 was found in a study done by Esmail and Sakwari<sup>18</sup> in OSDs in construction workers in Tanzania which was partially similar to the age group in the index study.

Table 3 Prevalence of occupational skin disorder respondents

Variable	Study group (n=200)	Control (n=200)	Total (n=400)	X <sup>2</sup>	df	P value
Contact dermatitis	86 (43.0)	11 (5.5)	97 (24.3)	78.54	1	<0.001*
Traumatic skin injury	144 (72.0)	53 (26.5)	197 (49.3)	82.83	1	<0.001*
Fungal infections	26 (13.0)	16 (8.0)	42 (10.5)	2.66	1	0.141
Other skin disorders	17 (8.5)	10 (5.0)	27 (6.8)	1.96	1	0.231

Others—acne vulgaris, seborrhoeic eczema, idiopathic guttate hypomelanosis, onchodermatitis. \*Statistically significant.

\*Statistically significant.

Use of personal protective equipment (gloves and boots) among respondents Study group Control **Total**  $\mathbf{X}^2$ **Variable** (n=200)(n=200)(n=400)df P value 1 < 0.001\* Gloves 22 (11.0) 90 (45.0) 112 (28.0) 57.34 Frequency of use 4 (18.2) 0(0.0)4 (3.6) 25.58 2 < 0.001\* Always Sometimes 4 (18.2) 0(0.0)4 (3.6) Occasionally 14 (63.6) 89 (100.0) 103 (92.8) Types of gloves used Cellophane 2 (9.1) 0(0.0)61.48 2 < 0.001\* 2(1.8)Thick rubber 14 (63.6) 0(0.0)14 (12.6) Woollen 6 (27.3) 89 (100.0) 95 (85.6) **Boots** 92 (46.0) 39 (19.5) 131 (32.8) 31.89 1 < 0.001\* Frequency of use Always 39 (42.4) 0(0.0)39 (29.8) 53.04 2 < 0.001\* Sometimes 25 (27.2) 0(0.0)25 (19.1) Occasionally 28 (30.4) 39 (100.0) 67 (51.1) Types of boots used Thick rubber 92 (100.0) 39 (100.0) 131 (100.0)

The presence of skin diseases in this age group could therefore be associated with significant cosmetic and psychosocial instability. <sup>19</sup>

The all-male pattern observed in this study mirrors findings from another study in China that found an allmale (100%) vocation but is different from another study that found a male-to-female ratio of 1.5:1. The all-male pattern in this study can, however, be attributable to the fact that the study participants were recruited from their weekly meeting where only the males gather, as against what happens at the work-site, where females are involved in carrying of sands, gravel, concrete and drawing water for mixing work. A typical construction sites still remains a man's domain, justifying Procter's description of the construction site as 'the last bastion of sexist discrimination in the workplace'. 20 Similarly, a technical report on women's occupational health and safety in New Zealand also supported the fact that bricklaying or block laying and builders were dominated by males in 98% and 99% of the study conducted on the employment status of respondents.<sup>21</sup>

Majority of the bricklayers had secondary school education which was adequate to ensure effective communication. The bricklayers were involved in all aspects of the job description unlike the brick masons who were not job description unlike the brick masons who were not involved in bricklaying, plastering or concrete laying. This makes the bricklayers more likely to develop OSDs compared with the brick masons. 11 15 16 This study found that the majority of the participants worked every day of the week is similar to findings by Sparer et al<sup>22</sup> who reported that more than 65% of construction workers work daily for more than a month at a particular site, but in this study, participants mostly work in small nonmechanised settings, often works for days to a few weeks. A number of working days per week and the working years determine the risk for, and frequency of occupational disorder. 6 22 Over half of the artisans had been on the job continuously for more than 5 years, similar to findings that 43.7% of construction workers who worked for 8–10 hours had fewer symptoms while 75% of those that worked for more than 10 hours daily had more symptoms.<sup>23</sup>

Table 5 Predictors of occupational contact dermatitis			
Variable	В	OR (C.I 95%)	P value
Not using glove	-1.2	3.38 (0.12 to 0.72)	0.007*
Family history of allergy	1.0	2.69 (1.30 to 5.60)	0.008*
Belt allergy	1.0	2.77 (0.50 to 14.50)	0.228
Necklace allergy	-0.2	1.25 (0.12 to 5.30)	0.817
*Statistically significant.			

Injury from exposure to cement is also dependent on the daily number of blocks moulded or laid, and this is particularly significant in irritant contact dermatitis, the occurrence of which is concentration-based. The alkalinity and hygroscopic effect of cement, associated with zinc and selenium deficiency, particularly with large quantityexposure, induce the processes that leads to cement burns and dermatitis. This has led many researchers to recommend the listing of cement as a hazardous material and environmental pollutant.<sup>24</sup> The higher prevalence of OSDs in bricklayers and brick masons compared with the controls attest to the occupational hazard associated with cement, similar to findings from Finland in which 42.0% of construction workers had work-related contact dermatitis. 25 This prevalence is very close to the 43% found in our study which was higher than the 38.6% reported from the UK, and the 16.9% from Germany. 26 27 In an extensive review work on contact irritant dermatitis, Patel et at found to have a higher incidence of contact irritant dermatitis compared with contact allergic dermatitis.

This study found that non-use of hand gloves and family history of allergy are both predictors of the occurrence of OCDs in bricklayers and brick masons, this is slightly different from the observation in a previous study that stated that though cement can cause both allergic contact dermatitis and primary contact irritative dermatitis. The PPE may also favour the development of allergic contact dermatitis. This assertion was similar to a study conducted on Singaporean healthcare workers whose dermatitis were found to be related to use of latex gloves. Out of 13.7% of the Singaporean healthcare workers with adverse reactions after wearing gloves, 22.9% of those were sensitised to latex. Personal and family history of atopy was higher in sensitised workers compared with those who were not.<sup>28</sup>

However, it should also be borne in mind that despite the beneficial effects of PPE in reducing the frequencies of OSDs (as earlier reported and as was found in this study), the higher risk for fungal infections in hand gloves users by bricklayers/brick masons has been documented.<sup>29–34</sup>

#### **Limitations**

Encountered in this study included the fact that women did not get the opportunity of taking part, and this could limit a community-based study. The fact that the working schedule of most of these artisans is dependent on the availability of work, the reliability of the daily and yearly time expositions in assessing the 'duration' effect may be compromised. Similarly, not determining the association between OCD and some nutrients/mineral deficiency could have eroded the usefulness of knowing the possible confounding role of these nutrients/minerals.

# **CONCLUSION**

Occupational contact dermatitis remains the most common occupational skin disorder in construction workers and its risk of occurrence is related to the volume and duration of exposure. It is a male-dominated trade

that does not require formal training, and this, coupled with the mostly daily remunerations could be contributory to the large proportion of the young in the trade. The significance of contact with cement and its constituents in the pathogenesis of OCD is further exemplified by its higher frequency in the upper limbs than in the lower limbs.

#### **Author affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Medicine, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso,

<sup>2</sup>Department of Medicine, Faculty of Clinical Sciences, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup>Department of Community of Medicine, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria

<sup>4</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso, Nigeria

<sup>5</sup>Department of Medicine, Dermatology Unit, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria

<sup>6</sup>Division of Nephrology and Hypertension, Department of Internal Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Bowen University College of Health Sciences, Iwo, Nigeria <sup>7</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Bowen University, Iwo, Nigeria

<sup>8</sup>Department of Medicine, Dermatology Unit, Irrua Specialist Teaching Hospital, Irrua, Nigeria

<sup>9</sup>Department of Medicine, Dermatology Unit, Osun State University College of Health Sciences, Osogbo, Nigeria

<sup>10</sup>Dermatology and Venereology, Obafemi Awolowo University College of Health Sciences, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

<sup>11</sup>Department of Medicine, Dermatology Unit, University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, Ilorin, Nigeria

Acknowledgements Our appreciation to the entire members of the Ogbomosho bricklayer association for their support and understanding.

Contributors MGI conceived the study, participated in its design, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, also involved in drafting the manuscript. OKI, AOA and OOnin made substantial contributions to conception, design, analysis and interpretation of data, also involved in revising the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. PKU, SSO, OOlay, FOO, MMO, SOA, OOlas and 00nay participated in data interpretation and revising the manuscript critically for important intellectual content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript. The guarantor is MGI.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Ethics approval This study involves human participants and was approved by Ethical Review Committee of Ladoke Akintola University of Technology (LAUTECH) Teaching Hospital, Ogbomoso Nigeria. The ethical approval number/ID was LTH/ OGB/EC/2014/061. Participants gave informed consent to participate in the study before taking part.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data are available upon reasonable request. All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines. terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

**Open access** This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

#### **ORCID** iDs

Michael Gbenga Israel http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5582-0821 Oluwaseyi Kikelomo Israel http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8839-8217

#### **REFERENCES**

- Warshaw EM, Hagen SL, DeKoven JG, et al. Occupational Contact Dermatitis in North American Production Workers Referred for Patch Testing: Retrospective Analysis of Cross-Sectional Data From the North American Contact Dermatitis Group 1998 to 2014. *Dermatitis* 2017;28:183–94.
- 2 Chu C, Marks JG, Flamm A. Occupational Contact Dermatitis: Common Occupational Allergens. *Dermatol Clin* 2020;38:339–49.
- 3 Larese Filon F, Pesce M, Paulo MS, et al. Incidence of occupational contact dermatitis in healthcare workers: a systematic review. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol 2021;35:1285–9.
- 4 Sasseville D. Occupational contact dermatitis. *Allergy Asthma Clin Immunol* 2008;4:59–65.
- 5 Plombom GY, Oliveira MS de, Tabushi FL, et al. Epidemiological analysis of occupational dermatitis notified in Brazil in the period 2007 to 2012. An Bras Dermatol 2016;91:732–6.
- 6 Soyinka F. Epidemiology of occupational disease among bricklayers in Nigeria. Effects of age and duration of contact. *Berufsdermatosen* 1977:25:195–202.
- 7 Aman S, Nadeem M, Mahmood K, et al. Pattern of skin diseases among patients attending a tertiary care hospital in Lahore, Pakistan. J Taibah Univ Med Sci 2017;12:392–6.
- 8 Cherry NM, Meyer JD, Holt DL, et al. Surveillance of Work-Related Diseases by Occupational Physicians in the UK: OPRA 1996 1999. Occup Med 2000;50:496–503.
- 9 Fathi F, Jafarpoor M. Matching evaluation between occupational contact dermatitis and various jobs in Yazd in during 2007-2012. Acta Med Iran 2013;51:793–8.
- Tamene A. Occupational Contact Dermatitis in Employees of Large-Scale Narcotic Crop Farms of Ethiopia: Prevalence and Risk Factors. A Self-Reported Study Using the Nordic Occupational Skin Questionnaire. *Environ Health Insights* 2021;15:11786302211048378.
- 11 Yamamoto O, Nishio D, Tokui N. Six cases of occupational skin diseases caused by cement: considerations from the aspect of occupational dermatology. J UOEH 2001;23:169–80.
- 12 Danimoh MA, Muhammad AS, Mohammed A, et al. OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY PRACTICES AMONG WORKERS IN BLOCK/CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES IN GOMBE METROPOLIS, GOMBE STATE, NORTHEAST, NIGERIA. West Afr J Med 2023;40:S17–8.
- 13 Sarma N. Occupational allergic contact dermatitis among construction workers in India. *Indian J Dermatol* 2009;54:137–41.
- 14 Hansen PW, Schlünssen V, Fonager K, et al. Association of perceived work pace and physical work demands with occupational accidents:

- a cross-sectional study of ageing male construction workers in Denmark. *BMC Public Health* 2022;22:18.
- Milam EC, Nassau S, Banta E, et al. Occupational Contact Dermatitis: An Update. J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract 2020;8:3283–93.
- 16 Donkor F. Reasons for non-completion among apprentices: the case of automotive trades of the informal sector in Ghana. J Vocat Educ Train 2012;64:25–40.
- 17 Kashif M, Albalwi A, Raqib A, et al. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders among Pakistani construction workers: Prevalence, characteristics, and associated risk factors. Work 2022;72:119–26.
- 18 Esmail R, Sakwari G. Data from: Occupational skin disorders among constructional workers in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Ann Glob Health* 2001:1–11
- 19 Yew YW, Kuan AHY, Ge L, et al. Psychosocial impact of skin diseases: A population-based study. PLoS One 2020;15:e0244765.
- 20 Shah KR, Tiwari RR. Occupational skin problems in construction workers. *Indian J Dermatol* 2010;55:348–51.
- 21 Procter K. Data from: can she fix it? Yes she can! as julie bindel discovers, female builders are in huge demand - but can they ever compete with the tea-swilling boys?, 00.06 BST. The Guardian; 2006.
- 22 Sparer EH, Okechukwu CA, Manjourides J, et al. Length of time spent working on a commercial construction site and the associations with worker characteristics. American J Industrial Med 2015;58:964–73.
- 23 Shah KR, Tiwari RR. Occupational skin problems in construction workers. *Indian J Dermatol* 2010;55:348.
- 24 Dietz JB, Menné T, Meyer HW, et al. Occupational contact dermatitis among young people in Denmark – A survey of causes and long-term consequences. Contact Derm 2022;86:404–16.
- 25 Kazi AG, Afridi HI, Arain MB, et al. Adverse impact of occupational exposure on Laborers of cement industry have scalp psoriasis and Pityriasis amiantacea with deficiency of zinc and selenium: impact of mineral supplement. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int 2021;28:68330–7.
- 26 Aalto-Korte K, Koskela K, Pesonen M. 12-year data on dermatologic cases in the Finnish Register of Occupational Diseases I: Distribution of different diagnoses and main causes of allergic contact dermatitis. Contact Derm 2020;82:337–42.
- 27 Perkins JB, Farrow A. Prevalence of occupational hand dermatitis in U.K. hairdressers. *Int J Occup Environ Health* 2005:11:289–93.
- 28 Patel K, Nixon R. Irritant Contact Dermatitis a Review. Curr Dermatol Rep 2022;11:41–51.
- 29 Mai WH, Liu XW, Su GX, et al. Prediction of occupational allergic contact dermatitis induced by formaldehyde by IL17/IL22 secretion cell rest combined with patch test. Zhonghua Lao Dong Wei Sheng Zhi Ye Bing Za Zhi 2017;35:727–31.
- 30 Sedeh FB, Michaelsdóttir TE, Jemec GBE, et al. Prevalence, risk factors, and prevention of occupational contact dermatitis among professional cleaners: a systematic review. Int Arch Occup Environ Health 2023;96:345–54.
- 31 Keng BMH, Gan WH, Tam YC, et al. Personal protective equipment-related occupational dermatoses during COVID-19 among health care workers: A worldwide systematic review. JAAD Int 2021;5:85–95.
- 32 Abdali S, Yu J. Occupational Dermatoses Related to Personal Protective Equipment Used During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Dermatol Clin 2021;39:555–68.
- 33 Tang MBY, Leow YH, Ng V, et al. Latex sensitisation in healthcare workers in Singapore. *Ann Acad Med Singap* 2005;34:376–82.
- 34 Wall LM, Gebauer KA. A follow-up study of occupational skin disease in Western Australia. Contact Derm 1991;24:241–3.