Indian J Physiol Pharmacol 2000; 44 (3): 371-372

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

# PEFR IN CEMENT PIPE FACTORY WORKERS IN **RELATION TO SMOKING**

Sir.

## (Received on November 25, 1999) Q0 6 . 17 76

We have analyzed the effect of cement exposure and smoking on PEFR. The study was conducted in the cement piper factory located at Ibrahimpatanam, Hyderabad. The total number of 73 males workers in the age group of 19-25 yrs were studied. Healthy workers with no previous history of respiratory or significant illness were selected. Age of the subjects and anthropometric measurements like Height

Wt wise : Group A2 between 50-60kgs Group b2 between 40-50kgs Each group was subdivided into smokers & nonsmokers. Mean Height, Weight & PEFR was calculated & the "r" & "p" was determined in each group. The findings are presented in the Table I & II, separately for Ht & Wt respectively.

(cms) & Weight(kgs) were recorded. PEFR 1. The PEFR of all groups is less than was measured using Pocket Peak Flow normal values reported in literature(I). This Meter. may be due to the exposure to cement.

Grouping of the subject was done as follows:

2. As expected PEFR is less in smokers when compared to nonsmokers.

Ht wise : Group AI between 160-170cms Group BI between 150-160cms

3. But unexpected finding is that there is no correlation between PEFR & Ht or

21-uno TABLE I Ht.  $(Cms) \pm SD$ . PEFR  $(L/min) \pm SD$ . n r Pvalue A1 Non-Somkers  $164.56 \pm 2.71$  $483 \pm 77.1$ 30 0.320.0005 Somkers 163.71 + 2.610.002  $392.85 \pm 67.61$ 21 **B1** Non-Somkers  $155.63 \pm 2.69$  $392.85 \pm 67.61$ 0.06 11 0.004 Somkers  $155.45 \pm 2.76$  $400 \pm 51.7$ 11 0.16

#### 372 Letter to the Editor

### Indian J Physiol Pharmacol 2000; 44(3)

			TABLE II	TOR	O THE EDI	LETTER T
		Wt. $(kgs) \pm SD$ .	$PEFR (L/min) \pm SD.$		a mamar	P value
A2 Non-Somkers	e A	54.88±2.90	473.07±86.29	26 <sup>0</sup> //U	0.22	2017,191
Somkers		$56.42 \pm 2.33$	410.95±53.09	21	0.46	0.004
B2 Non-Somkers		47±2.6	477.27±64.66	15	0.01	0.001
Somkers	581 <sup>15</sup>	46±2.81	392.6±37.76	11	0.37	0.001

PEFR & Wt in any group as indicated by their "r" values. This contradicts the results obtained by Alkija et al (2) who reported that PEFR in cement Factory correlated well with Height.
4. Abu Dhasise et al (3) have studied pulmonary function in cement Workers in

Jordan and concluded that inhalation of Cement dust irritates respiratory tree without markedly affecting the lung function and that smoking aggravates this effect. But our study reflects that ventilatory functions were affected significantly both by exposure to cement (4) and smoking.

asurements like Height

SIKANDAR HUSSIAN\*, M. SHAKEEL–UL–REHMAN, MD. ASHFAQ AHMED AND MOHAMMED SAJED ASAD RAFIQ

> Department of Physiology, Decan College Medical Sciences, Hyderabad – 500 029

 As expected PEFR is less in smokers when compared to non-moluers.

#### REFERENCES

1. Natrjan S, Radha K.Peak Expiratory 4. Hussian et al PEFR in cement pipe factory workers. flow rate in normal south Indians. Ind J Chest Indian J Physiol Pharmacol 1999; 43(3): 405-406. Diseases and Allied Sciences 1978;20:178-182. 5. Lai-JS Chen-WY. Chu-TS, Tsai IJ 2. Alakija et al. West Afr J med 1990; 9(3): Evaluation of cardio-vascular autonomic 187-192. function tests in normal subjects. Taiwan-I-Hsuch-Hui-Tsa-Chin 1989; Apr: 88(4): 3. Abu Dhaise et al. Int JOccup Med Environ Health

 3. Abu Dhaise et al. Int JOccup Med Environ Health
 1-115uch

 1997; 10(4): 417-28.
 404-406.

				1.112008	14.22.00.4.01	a to Autor a co- train
*Corresponding	Author		12 * 21	392.85 \$ 67.61	18.5 ; 15.201	somkers
					69 2489 961	it Ion-Samkers
		•		400×51,7		