

1 **Title: Occupational Farm Work Activities Influence Workers' Indoor Home Microbiome**

2
3 **Authors:** Kathryn R. Dalton¹, Mikyeong Lee¹, Ziyue Wang², Shanshan Zhao², Christine G.
4 Parks¹, Laura E. Beane-Freeman³, Alison A. Motsinger-Reif², Stephanie J. London^{1*}

5
6 ¹ Genomics and the Environment in Respiratory and Allergic Health Group, Epidemiology
7 Branch, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, National Institutes of Health,
8 Durham, NC, USA

9 ² Biostatistics and Computational Biology Branch, National Institute of Environmental Health
10 Sciences, National Institutes of Health, Durham, NC, USA

11 ³ Occupational and Environmental Epidemiology Branch, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and
12 Genetics, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

13 *** Corresponding Author:**

14 Stephanie J. London

15 london2@niehs.nih.gov

16
17 **COI:**

18 All authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial or other relevant
19 conflicts of interests that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

20 **Funding:**

21 This work was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the National Institutes of
22 Health (NIH), the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) (Z01-ES049030
23 and Z01-ES102385), the National Cancer Institute (Z01-CP010119B), and by American
24 Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds.

25 **Ethics:**

26 The Institutional Review Board at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
27 approved the study. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

28 **Supplemental Materials:**

29 See Supplemental Materials Table of Contents document for a list of the tables and figure
30 referenced.

31 **Acknowledgments:**

32 We thank Dr. G. Ackermann for assistance with metadata curation, Dr. G. Humphrey for
33 laboratory processing, Drs. R. Knight, A. González, and Q. Zhu for expert consultation, and the
34 Center for Microbiome Innovation at the University of California San Diego for generating
35 sequencing data. We thank Drs. F. Day of NIEHS for expert computational assistance and J.
36 Hoppin (North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC) for her important contribution to the
37 Agricultural Lung Health Study during her tenure at NIEHS. We appreciate all the study
38 participants for their contribution to this research.

39 **Data Sharing:**

40 Microbiome sequencing data are available at the Sequence Read Archive (SRA) under project
41 number PRJNA975673 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/PRJNA975673/>). For metadata
42 access, a data application will need to be approved by the Agricultural Health Study Executive
43 Committee (www.aghealthstars.com).

45 **Abstract**

46
47 **Background:** Farm work entails a heterogeneous mixture of exposures that vary considerably
48 across farms and farmers. Farm work is associated with various health outcomes, both adverse
49 and beneficial. One mechanism by which farming exposures can impact health is through the
50 microbiome, including the indoor built environment microbiome. It is unknown how individual
51 occupational exposures shape the microbial composition in workers' homes.

52
53 **Objectives:** We investigated associations between farm work activities, including specific tasks
54 and pesticide use, and the indoor microbiome in the homes of 468 male farmers.

55
56 **Methods:** Participants were licensed pesticide applicators, mostly farmers, enrolled in the
57 Agricultural Lung Health Study from 2008-2011. Vacuumed dust from participants' bedrooms
58 underwent whole-genome shotgun sequencing for indoor microbiome assessment. Using
59 questionnaire data, we evaluated 6 farm work tasks (processing of either hay, silage, animal feed,
60 fertilizer, or soy/grains, and cleaning grain bins) and 19 pesticide ingredients currently used in
61 the past year, plus 7 persistent banned pesticide ingredients ever used.

62
63 **Results:** All 6 work tasks were associated with increased within-sample microbial diversity, with
64 a positive dose-response for the sum of tasks ($p=0.001$). All tasks were associated with altered
65 overall microbial compositions (weighted UniFrac $p=0.001$) and with higher abundance of
66 specific microbes, including soil-based microbes such as *Haloterrigena*. Among the 19
67 pesticides, only current use of glyphosate and past use of lindane were associated with increased
68 within-sample diversity ($p=0.02-0.04$). Ten currently used pesticides and all 7 banned pesticides
69 were associated with altered microbial composition ($p=0.001-0.04$). Six pesticides were
70 associated with differential abundance of certain microbes.

71
72 **Discussion:** Specific farm activities and exposures can impact the dust microbiome inside
73 homes. Our work suggests that occupational farm exposures could impact the health of workers
74 and their families through modifying the indoor environment, specifically the microbial
75 composition of house dust, offering possible future intervention targets.

76

77 **Introduction**

78 Farm work is a demanding occupation. Farmers have long been recognized as being at high risk
79 of injury, respiratory diseases (e.g., farmers' lung), dermal conditions (e.g., irritant dermatitis),
80 and certain cancers.(1-4) Farm work is not consistent across workers as it requires individuals to
81 carry out a variety of tasks. Farmers, hired farmworkers, and farm family members may operate
82 agricultural machinery, handle crops and livestock, build and repair equipment, and apply
83 agrochemicals such as pesticides and fertilizers, which may put them at risk of some diseases. If
84 farm type were the sole explanation for the morbidity pattern among farmers, we might expect
85 disease prevalence and incidence to be quite similar among all farmers engaging in the same type
86 of farming, but this does not appear to be the case.(5-7) This suggests that farming entails a
87 heterogeneous mixture of individualized tasks and exposures, and points to the need for careful
88 evaluation of the farm environment.

89
90 Multiple theories have been offered to understand how farming exposures exert biological effects
91 that lead to respiratory and other disease conditions. One of the most supported by the literature
92 is through the microbiome, the collection of microorganisms within a single site, and its link to
93 immune function.(8) Several studies have shown altered host microbiome – gut, nasal, oral, and
94 skin – related to farm work.(9-11) Yet, it is not only the microbes in our bodies that cause
95 biological effects. Humans contribute and are exposed to environmental microbes, especially
96 indoors where they spend the most time.(12) The home built environment microbiome can
97 influence health outcomes by altering the human host microbiome, as well as through direct
98 effects on biologic processes (13), and is also associated with allergic, atopic, and respiratory
99 conditions.(14-17)

100
101 The indoor microbiota can be influenced by environmental factors, such as farming. The authors
102 and others have previously shown altered home dust microbiota with living on a farm and by
103 farm type.(18-20) However, it is unknown how different occupational tasks and exposures within
104 farm work shape the microbes in workers' homes, which is important for their health and the
105 health of cohabitants. There is some evidence that the host microbiome is impacted by pesticides
106 and other chemicals used by farmers and other occupational groups.(21-23) Yet, none of these
107 studies have looked at the effect on built environment microbes. Therefore, we evaluated

108 whether farm work activities and pesticide use were associated with differences in the indoor
109 dust microbiome in the homes of 468 male participants of the Agricultural Lung Health Study.

110

111 **Methods**

112 **Study Design & Population**

113 The Agricultural Lung Health Study (ALHS) is a case-control study of asthma nested within the
114 Agricultural Health Study (AHS), a prospective cohort of licensed private pesticide applicators,
115 mostly farmers, and their spouses from Iowa (IA) and North Carolina (NC), USA.(24) (ALHS
116 data release P3REL201209.00) Further details on the study design and inclusion criteria can be
117 found elsewhere.(18, 19) Of the full ALHS cohort (N=3301), 2871 participants completed a
118 home visit between 2009 to 2013 with vacuumed bedroom dust collection.(25) The Institutional
119 Review Board at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences approved the study.
120 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

121 **Home Dust Microbiome Examination**

122 A trained field technician vacuumed the sleeping surface and a two square yard area (1.68-m²)
123 on the floor next to the bed for 4 minutes with a DUSTREAM Collector (Indoor Biotechnologies
124 Inc.). A subset of 879 dust samples were sent for microbiome analysis, with sample selection
125 described elsewhere.(18, 19, 25) DNA extraction followed standard protocols following
126 manufactured kits and is described elsewhere.(18, 19) Extracted DNA samples were sent to the
127 University of California San Diego IGM Genomics Center for library preparation, multiplexing,
128 and whole genome shotgun sequencing using standard techniques.(26) Details on the full library
129 preparation, sequencing protocols, and quality control steps are described in Wang et. al.(19)
130 After quality control, 781 samples remained with 6,528 taxa for downstream analysis. A
131 taxonomy chart was created that assigned all taxa to a taxonomic classification across the seven
132 phylogenetic levels - kingdom, phylum, class, order, family, genus, and species. We filtered out
133 samples with a minimum library size of less than 1,003 base pairs.

134 **Exposure Assessment**

135 A technician recorded home cleanliness on a standardized five-point scale (27), which was
136 aggregated to a binary variable comprising poor/lower (score of 1-2) or good/higher (score of 3–
137 5) home condition. We categorized season of dust collection based on the date of the home visit:
138 March 21–June 20 for spring, June 21–September 20 for summer, September 21–December 20
139 for fall, and December 21–March 20 for winter.

140 Information on smoking status and indoor furry pets (dogs/cats) was reported on questionnaires.
141 Participants reported whether they had performed the following 6 work tasks within the past 12
142 months; handled hay, silage (fermented grass and other plants), or soybeans/grains, ground feed
143 for animals, fertilized fields, and/or cleaned grain bins. Participants also provided the names of
144 pesticide products used within the past 12 months (current use). Reported names were linked to
145 pesticide active ingredient names using the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Pesticide
146 Classification Code.(28) We restricted analysis to the 19 pesticide active ingredients currently
147 used by at least 10 participants – 13 herbicides and 6 insecticides, which includes aggregated
148 composite pesticide classes pyrethroid and organophosphate. In previous AHS surveys,
149 participants provided names of agrochemicals used ever in their lifetimes. In the current work,
150 we additionally analyzed past use of 7 banned organochlorine insecticides due to their long half-
151 lives, bio- accumulation and/or persistence in the environment. For 11 of the 19 currently used
152 active pesticide ingredients and all 7 banned past use pesticide ingredients, we calculated lifetime
153 days of use, estimated from the average days of use per year and the total years the participant
154 reported using the pesticide active ingredient (information was not available to calculate lifetime
155 days of use for 8 currently used pesticides).

156 **Statistical Analysis**

157 As we focused on direct exposure to farm work tasks and pesticides, we restricted analyses to
158 dust samples from the 468 male pesticide applicators because 98% of pesticide applicators were
159 male and the frequency of work tasks and pesticide use reported among female spouses (N=313)
160 was lower (29). The primary exposure variables were the 6 self-reported work tasks performed
161 within the past year, treated as binary yes/no variables. Additionally, the total number of reported
162 tasks (0-6) for each participant was assessed as both a discrete categorical variable and, for dose-
163 response effect, an ordinal variable. For the 19 currently used pesticide active ingredients, we
164 compared participants who reported use within the past 12 months to participants who reported

165 never using the specific pesticides in their lifetimes (current vs. never). Thus, individuals who
166 reported only past use of the active ingredient (more than 12 months prior) were not included in
167 the analysis for that active ingredient. For the 7 banned pesticides, any past use of the active
168 pesticide ingredient ever in the participants' lifetimes was compared to never use (ever vs.
169 never). Lifetime days of use was available for 18 pesticide ingredients and was dichotomized at
170 the median among users, generating three categories for analysis – never use, days of use below
171 median, and days of use above median. We assessed correlation between self-reported work
172 tasks and pesticide use via tetrachoric correlation (30) and Spearman's correlation (31) for
173 categorical work task total.

174
175 We performed all statistical analyses and visualization in R v4.1.2 (32), and estimated diversity
176 indices using phyloseq R package.(33) All models included age (continuous), smoking status
177 (never, former, or current), state of residence (IA or NC), asthma status (case or noncase, see
178 House et. al. for case definition (34)), indoor pets (yes or not present), home condition (high or
179 low), and home visit season (winter, spring, summer, or fall), as these were determined to be
180 confounders *a priori*. To evaluate within-sample alpha diversity and its association with work
181 tasks and pesticide use exposures, we used the Shannon alpha diversity index as the outcome in
182 generalized linear models for each exposure. We ran additional adjusted models to evaluate the
183 independent effect of work tasks and pesticide exposures. To explore beta diversity, we
184 calculated unweighted and weighted UniFrac distance metrics. We conducted permutational
185 multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) models to test the differences in microbial
186 community structure across exposure groups using the *adonis* method in the R vegan package
187 v2.5.7 (35, 36), which reports the R^2 value to quantify the percentage of variance explained and
188 the p-value for the F-statistic for compositional heterogeneity by exposure groups. We set $p < 0.05$
189 as the statistical significance threshold for all alpha and beta diversity analyses. To test
190 differentially abundant taxa by exposure groups, we used analysis of composition of
191 microbiomes with bias correction (ANCOM-BC, v1.0.5) models (37) based on a linear
192 regression framework on the log transformed taxa counts. To account for the influence of
193 sequencing depth on taxa counts, we performed normalization by estimating the sampling
194 fraction using the ANCOM-BC built-in algorithm. We tested taxa at the OTU level and
195 summarized the results by genus rank. The coefficients presented are the log fold-difference of

196 the mean normalization abundance difference by ANCOM-BC across exposure levels.
197 Significantly differentially taxa were determined by Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate
198 (FDR) controlled p-value of <0.05.

199

200 **Results**

201 **Study Population Characteristics and Exposures**

202 **Table 1** summarizes the demographic characteristics and environmental exposures of the study
203 population. Seventy percent of the study population was from Iowa. Participants had a median
204 age of 61 years (IQR 15). Most participants (58%) were never smokers and 33% were asthma
205 cases. Thirty eight percent had indoor pets and 78% had good/higher home condition. Home
206 visits were roughly evenly split across the four seasons (from 17% to 30%).

207

208 **Table 2** displays the participants' reported work tasks. The most commonly reported task was
209 handled soy and grains (76%), followed by handled hay (59%), cleaned grain bins (49%),
210 fertilized fields (39%), ground animal feed (27%), and handled silage (17%). The total number
211 of tasks an individual reported, shown in **Table 3**, was evenly spread out from 0 to 6, ranging
212 from 10% (6 tasks) to 18% (0 and 2 tasks).

213

214 **Table 4** shows all 26 pesticide active ingredients with the 19 currently used pesticides listed first.
215 The herbicide glyphosate was the most commonly reported current pesticide (238 users, 86%
216 total), followed by 2,4-D (148, 70%) and atrazine (85, 52%). Among the 7 banned past use
217 pesticides examined, DDT was the most frequently reported (28%), followed by chlordane
218 (27%) and lindane (26%). **Supplemental Table ST1** shows the quantitative lifetime days of use
219 for both current and past use pesticide active ingredients.

220

221 **Moderate to Strong Correlations Among Works Tasks and Pesticide Use**

222

223 The correlation between work tasks and pesticide use is presented in **Supplemental Figure SF1**.
224 Correlation to pesticide use was based on current use of 19 active ingredients and ever use of 7
225 banned active ingredients. Work tasks were highly positively correlated with each other

226 (tetrachoric rho statistic range 0.47–0.87 with only one correlation < 0.57), as were past use of
227 banned pesticides (0.30–0.81). Correlations among currently used pesticides ranged from -0.46
228 to 0.96. A few currently used pesticides (glyphosate, atrazine, 2,4-D, pyrethroid and
229 organophosphate) were moderately correlated with the various work tasks (highest 0.82), with
230 lower correlations for the other pesticides. As expected, banned pesticides had lower correlation
231 with work tasks (-0.39–0.25).

232

233 **Work Tasks Strongly Associate with the Home Dust Microbiome**

234 **Figure 1** shows associations between the work tasks and Shannon alpha diversity index. All 6
235 work tasks were positively associated with within-sample alpha diversity levels (coefficients
236 range from 0.15-0.23, all low 95% confidence intervals >0.045). Due to the strong correlations
237 among the work tasks, it was not possible to determine the independent effect of each one
238 adjusted for all other tasks. Therefore, we focused on evaluating their combined effects with the
239 summed work task variable. A strong positive dose-response pattern was observed for the
240 associations of total number of work tasks and alpha diversity (range of coefficients 0.17 [2
241 tasks] to 0.45 [6 tasks] compared to no tasks, all low 95% confidence intervals >0.03, p-value for
242 trend <0.001).

243

244 For beta-diversity (weighted UniFrac, **Table 5**) we found statistically significant differences in
245 overall microbial composition for all work tasks (all p-values < 0.001), with a moderate percent
246 variance explained (R^2 range 1.2%-3%). The sum of the work tasks accounted for higher
247 explained variance (3%), followed by fertilizing fields (2%). Results for unweighted UniFrac
248 distance were similar to the weighted metric for beta diversity (**Supplemental Table ST2**).

249

250 In analysis of individual microbial taxa, we found 21 taxa across 10 unique genera to be
251 significantly differentially abundant by any work tasks (**Figure 2**). *Haloterrigena* was the most
252 frequent differentially genera, with all six work tasks having higher abundance compared to not
253 reporting any tasks. While most taxa (18) had increased abundance in relation to work tasks, 3
254 taxa within 3 genera had decreased abundance – *Thalassiosira* and *Fimbriimonas* for ground
255 animal feed and *Oscillatoria* for handled hay. For the sum of the job tasks, only participants
256 reporting 5 or 6 job tasks had significantly increased taxa abundance (*Sphaerobacter* and

257 *Haloterrigena*) compared to participants' reporting zero tasks (no differential taxa for 4 or fewer
258 tasks).

259

260 **Varied Associations between Pesticides and the Home Dust Microbiome**

261 Pesticide use was associated with home dust microbial diversity and composition, but to a lesser
262 degree than work tasks. Of the 26 pesticide active ingredients, 19 had positive coefficients and 5
263 had negative coefficients for Shannon alpha diversity levels. Only current use of glyphosate and
264 past use of lindane were statistically significant with confidence intervals above the null
265 (glyphosate coefficient 0.18, 95% CI 0.02-0.36; lindane coefficient 0.11, 95% CI 0.03-0.21)
266 (**Figure 3**). For beta compositional diversity (**Table 6**), 10 of the 19 currently used pesticides
267 [acetochlor, atrazine, carbaryl, cyfluthrin, dicamba, glyphosate, permethrin, picloram, pyrethroid,
268 2,4-D] and all 7 banned pesticides were associated with altered weighted UniFrac beta diversity
269 (range p-value 0.001-0.026). The explained variance for each pesticide (R^2 range 0.4%-1.0%)
270 was lower than that for any work task (R^2 range 1.2%-3%). No pesticides were associated with
271 unweighted UniFrac beta diversity (**Supplemental Table ST3**).

272

273 In analyses of individual microbial taxa, there were 14 unique taxa belonging to 11 genera within
274 11 unique phyla that were differentially abundant in relation to at least one pesticide active
275 ingredient (**Figure 4**). Current users of atrazine had decreased abundance of *Oscillatoria*, and
276 current users of pyrethroid had decreased abundance of *Phocaeicola*, *Malassezia*, *Candidatus*,
277 *Akkemansia*, and an unlabeled genus in the *Podoviridae* family. Increased abundances were seen
278 for current 2,4-D and *Candidatus*, and past use of dieldrin, heptachlor, and lindane with
279 *Treponema*, *Toxoplasma*, *Nitrospira*, *Haloterrigena*, *Phocaeicola*, *Malassezia*, and *Fusarium*.
280 Overall, the ANCOM-BC coefficients representing log-fold changes in abundance for significant
281 taxa were relatively small (range -0.75 to 0.67) compared to other microbiome studies (37).

282

283 Associations of quantitative lifetime days of pesticide use with home dust microbiome are
284 presented in **Supplemental Tables ST4-ST6**. For alpha diversity (**ST4**), carbaryl use days above
285 the median was associated with increased within-sample diversity compared to never users
286 (coefficient 0.13, 95% CI 0.003-0.25). Below the median days of use for dicamba (coefficient
287 0.13, 95% CI 0.003-0.26) and glyphosate (coefficient 0.22, 95% CI 0.07-0.37) were associated

288 with increased within-sample diversity compared to never users. For both pesticides, days above
289 the median had similar trends, but were not significant. We did not observe associations between
290 alpha diversity and lifetime days of use for any of the banned pesticides. For beta diversity using
291 weighted UniFrac beta diversity metric (**ST5**), lifetime days of use for 6 of the 19 current
292 pesticides [acetochlor, atrazine, carbaryl, dicamba, glyphosate, metolachlor] and two of the
293 banned pesticides [DDT, toxaphene] were associated with altered microbial composition. No
294 lifetime days of pesticides use were associated with unweighted UniFrac metric. Twenty-nine
295 unique taxa, within 16 unique genera and 16 unique phyla, were significantly differentially
296 abundant across 9 pesticides by lifetime days of use (**ST6**).

297

298 **Independent Effect of Work Tasks and Pesticides on Home Microbial Diversity**

299 To determine whether associations between work tasks and home dust microbiome alpha
300 diversity were independent of pesticide use, we ran additional models adjusted for 1) the use of
301 any pesticide in the past year and 2) for the two pesticide ingredients significantly associated
302 with alpha diversity (glyphosate and lindane) (**Supplemental Table ST7**). Compared to models
303 adjusting for demographics and home factors, adjustment for the use of any pesticide in past year
304 had little effect on associations with the work tasks. Adjustment for use of lindane, a banned
305 pesticide, also resulted in little effect size changes. However, because current use of glyphosate
306 was highly prevalent at 86.2% and thus fairly strongly correlated with current work tasks,
307 adjustment for glyphosate had a larger impact on the association. Associations were attenuated,
308 with only 3 remaining statistically significant – fertilizing fields (coefficient 0.168, 95% CI 0.03-
309 0.307), handling soybeans and grains (coefficient 0.281, 95% CI 0.048-0.515), and work tasks
310 total (ordinal, coefficient 0.057, 95% CI 0.015-0.099). In analyses of categorical total number of
311 work tasks, after adjusting for current glyphosate use, 5 or 6 total tasks remained significantly
312 associated with alpha diversity (coefficients 0.349 and 0.384, 95% CI 0.006-0.691 and 0.023-
313 0.746, respectively), which also had low correlation to glyphosate (tetrachoric correlation for 5
314 and 6 work tasks 0.16 and 0.14, respectively).

315

316 To determine whether associations between pesticide use and home dust microbiome alpha
317 diversity were independent of work tasks, we ran additional models adjusted for work task total
318 and specifically for fertilizing fields. Adjustment covariates were informed by independent

319 associations between work tasks and alpha diversity after adjusting for pesticide use, and were
320 less strongly correlated to pesticides (-0.23–0.6 and -0.28–0.61, respectively) (**Supplemental**
321 **Table ST8**). Handling soybeans and grains was more strongly correlated with pesticide use (-
322 0.31–0.82), hence we did not control for this task. No pesticide active ingredients were
323 significantly associated with alpha diversity in models adjusting for either work tasks total or for
324 fertilizing fields.

325
326 Given the complexity of the beta PERMANOVA and differential taxa abundance ANCOM-BC
327 models, we did not conduct further analyzes to determine the independent effects of work tasks
328 and pesticide use for these microbiome metrics.

329
330

331 **Discussion**

332 This study is the first to assess the associations between agricultural work exposures and the
333 worker's home dust microbiome using metagenomic shotgun sequencing. We aimed to
334 characterize farm occupational factors that influence the indoor built environment microbiome, a
335 critical component to occupational and community health. We found that different work tasks
336 were associated with altered diversity and composition of the microbes in participants' homes.
337 Further, we observed a dose-response relationship between microbial diversity and the number
338 of farm work tasks performed. The use of certain pesticides, both current use and past use of
339 banned pesticides, were associated with some differences in home dust microbiome, although
340 associations were more modest than for the farm tasks. Overall, our findings suggest that the
341 work that farmers perform in these facilities can impact the built environment of their homes,
342 which could have implications for their own health and the health of any cohabitants in the
343 home.

344
345 This research benefitted from the incorporation of in-depth details of participants' reported farm
346 work tasks. Previous studies evaluating potential hazards associated with farm work, particularly
347 those integrating microbiome data, generally only assessed current job status and type of farm or
348 commodity produced.(1, 38) However, our research showed robust associations between indoor

349 microbiome and the tasks an individual performed on the farms, with a dose-response increase in
350 microbial diversity linked to total number of tasks performed. All work tasks, including the sum
351 of tasks performed, were associated with altered beta composition metrics, with relatively high
352 R^2 explained variance compared to other studies.(19) All tasks were also associated with
353 increased abundance of at least one microbe, the most frequent of which was *Haloterrigena*, a
354 gram-negative soil-based bacteria.(39) Previous research has shown exposure to soil-based
355 microbes in adult mouse models were associated with changes to the host microbiome, improved
356 immune tolerance, and minimized allergic inflammation.(40)

357
358 Few studies have evaluated specific work tasks in relation to health outcomes or biomarkers of
359 health. Within the Agricultural Health Study, specific farm work tasks were associated with
360 systemic lupus (41), rheumatoid arthritis (42, 43), COPD (44), “farmers’ lung” (specifically silage
361 exposure) (45), wheeze (hay exposure) (46), stroke mortality (inversely associated with hay,
362 grains, and silage) (47), non-Hodgkin lymphoid cancer (soybeans, grains, and hay) (48), and
363 various injuries (49). Findings from other farming cohorts have found differences in lung cancer
364 risk based on crop seedling and harvesting levels.(1) Additional studies have shown differences
365 in adverse contaminant levels based on farm tasks, including mold (50) and black carbon.(51,
366 52) Research conducted in non-farming occupations have found differences in the microbiome of
367 the host based on individual occupational exposures in salon workers (23), space station workers
368 (53), firefighters (54), and janitorial staff.(55) However, to date, no studies have assessed farm
369 work tasks associated with the microbiome of the workers at any host body site, or with the
370 environmental microbiome. The findings from this work supports the need for careful evaluation
371 of specific, detailed agricultural exposures to future occupational health studies.

372
373 In addition to specific work tasks, we explored the influence of participants’ use of pesticides on
374 their home microbiome. The associations between pesticide use and dust microbiota were more
375 varied than that for work tasks, in that not all pesticides were associated with changes to the
376 home microbiome and some pesticides had opposite impacts on diversity levels and abundance
377 of microbes, which might be expected due to the different mechanisms of action. We observed
378 overall smaller R^2 explained variance for beta diversity than work tasks, indicating pesticide use
379 did not account for as much heterogeneity seen in the sample’s microbial composition as

380 compared to work tasks, as well as lower log-fold changes for abundance of specific microbes
381 compared to work tasks and previous literature using ANCOM-BC.(19) Pesticides that arose as
382 related to the dust microbiome were current use of glyphosate, atrazine, 2,4-D, and pyrethroid, as
383 well as past use of lindane. Atrazine and glyphosate, known bacterial degraders, have previously
384 been associated with decreased diversity and decreased abundance of specific microbes in the
385 soil microbiome.(56, 57)

386
387 Studies evaluating the effect of pesticides on the human microbiome have shown similarly
388 heterogenous results to those in our study. Vindenes et al. found minimal associations between
389 urinary pesticide metabolite concentration and oral microbiome metrics in a population-based
390 study in Norway.(58) Conversely, Stanaway et al. found that the organophosphate insecticide
391 azinphos-methyl was associated with changes in the oral microbiome in farmers in Yakima
392 Valley, Washington USA, specifically decreased microbial diversity and reduced abundance of
393 the *Streptococcus* genus.(21) While azinphos-methyl was not one of the active ingredients
394 evaluated in our project, we did not see associations with reported use of organophosphates.
395 Importantly, these research studies were evaluating urinary or serum concentrations of pesticide
396 active ingredients, which generally reflect short-term exposure, whereas our study relied on self-
397 report of pesticide use, an indicator of longer term exposure. Also, both prior studies focused on
398 the oral microbiome and used 16S rRNA sequencing to characterize the microbiome, while we
399 assessed the indoor environmental microbiota characterized by shotgun whole-genome
400 sequencing, which can result in different exposure-outcome associations.(19) As ours is the first
401 work to examine environmental microbiota in the homes of workers using advanced sequencing
402 methodologies, it importantly adds to the growing literature of the effect of occupational
403 chemical exposure on environmental microbiota, with inferences to health.

404
405 Our novel research benefits from a large sample population with detailed survey data on
406 occupational exposures and characterization of the environmental microbiota using advanced
407 techniques. However, this work does have limitations. First, work tasks were based on
408 participant's self-report, evaluated dichotomously (yes/no), as opposed to direct observation by
409 a research technician. Yet, previous work in this population has shown these to correlate well
410 with direct on-farm observations.(59) Similarly, pesticide use was assessed only by self-report.

411 Nevertheless, biologic measurements of nonpersistent pesticides reflect only very recent use.
412 Additionally, previous work in the target population has found strong accuracy of self-reported
413 use of specific pesticides.(28, 60) Our analysis did not account for the rapidly growing area of
414 pesticide and chemical mixtures, however current statistical mixtures methods do not
415 accommodate binary exposure data.(61) Future development of mixtures methods and
416 convenient code suitable for metagenomic analysis would be of interest. Although
417 misclassification of farm exposure in this study is possible, we would expect this to be non-
418 differential with respect to metagenomics and thus generally be a source of bias toward the null.
419 In addition, our work task variables were highly correlated, making it challenging to assess their
420 independent effect on the home dust microbiome. However, we were able to determine the
421 magnitude of farming work by evaluating the total number of reported tasks, which can serve as
422 a proxy for intensity of farming. A final limitation is that our dust sample was collected only
423 from one location (participant bedroom) at one time and may not reflect the spatial and temporal
424 heterogeneity in the environmental microbes found inside homes.(62) Again, this should be
425 expected to reduce our ability to detect association and be a source of bias toward the null.
426
427 This work demonstrates that occupational exposures impact the microbiome inside farm
428 workers' homes as shown by altered diversity levels and abundance of specific microbes. Farm
429 work tasks had more profound effects on home dust microbiota than use of pesticides. This is the
430 first study to evaluate individual occupational exposures within farm work that associate with the
431 indoor built environment microbiome. Our findings shed light on potential mechanistic pathways
432 whereby occupational exposures can influence health through the role of the indoor microbiome
433 and offers possible future intervention targets.

References

1. Boulanger M, Tual S, Lemarchand C, Guizard AV, Delafosse P, Marcotullio E, et al. Lung cancer risk and occupational exposures in crop farming: results from the AGRiculture and CANcer (AGRICAN) cohort. *Occup Environ Med*. 2018;75(11):776-85.
2. Davis DL, Blair A, Hoel DG. Agricultural exposures and cancer trends in developed countries. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 1993;100:39-44.
3. Blair A, Freeman LB. Epidemiologic Studies in Agricultural Populations: Observations and Future Directions. *Journal of Agromedicine*. 2009;14(2):125-31.
4. Wing S, Wolf S. Intensive livestock operations, health, and quality of life among eastern North Carolina residents. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2000;108(3):233-8.
5. Khedher BS, Neri M, Guida F, Matrat M, Cenee S, Sanchez M, et al. Occupational exposure to endotoxins and lung cancer risk: results of the ICARE Study. *Occup Environ Med*. 2017;74(9):667-79.
6. Benedict C, Vogel H, Jonas W, Woting A, Blaut M, Schurmann A, et al. Gut microbiota and glucometabolic alterations in response to recurrent partial sleep deprivation in normal-weight young individuals. *Mol Metab*. 2016;5(12):1175-86.
7. Togawa K, Leon ME, Lebailly P, Beane Freeman LE, Nordby KC, Baldi I, et al. Cancer incidence in agricultural workers: Findings from an international consortium of agricultural cohort studies (AGRICOH). *Environ Int*. 2021;157:106825.
8. Kelly MS, Bunyavanich S, Phipatanakul W, Lai PS. The Environmental Microbiome, Allergic Disease, and Asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract*. 2022;10(9):2206-17 e1.
9. Kraemer JG, Aebi S, Hilty M, Oppliger A. Nasal microbiota composition dynamics after occupational change in animal farmers suggest major shifts. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;782:146842.
10. Kates AE, Dalman M, Torner JC, Smith TC. The nasal and oropharyngeal microbiomes of healthy livestock workers. *PLOS ONE*. 2019;14(3):e0212949.
11. Shukla SK, Ye Z, Sandberg S, Reyes I, Fritsche TR, Keifer M. The nasal microbiota of dairy farmers is more complex than oral microbiota, reflects occupational exposure, and provides competition for staphylococci. *PLOS ONE*. 2017;12(8):e0183898.
12. Lax S, Smith, D.P., Hampton-Marcell, J., Owens, S.M., Handley, K.M., Scott, N.M., Gibbons, S.M., Larsen, P., Shogan, B.D., Weiss, S. and Metcalf, J.L. Longitudinal analysis of microbial interaction between humans and the indoor environment. *Science*. 2014;345(6200):1048-52.
13. Shan Y, Wu W, Fan W, Haahtela T, Zhang G. House dust microbiome and human health risks. *International Microbiology*. 2019;22(3):297-304.
14. Dannemiller KC, Gent JF, Leaderer BP, Peccia J. Indoor microbial communities: Influence on asthma severity in atopic and nonatopic children. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*. 2016;138(1):76-83.e1.
15. Ege MJ, Mayer M, Normand A-C, Genuneit J, Cookson WOCM, Braun-Fahrländer C, et al. Exposure to Environmental Microorganisms and Childhood Asthma. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2011;364(8):701-9.
16. Fu X, Ou Z, Zhang M, Meng Y, Li Y, Wen J, et al. Indoor bacterial, fungal and viral species and functional genes in urban and rural schools in Shanxi Province, China—association with asthma, rhinitis and rhinoconjunctivitis in high school students. *Microbiome*. 2021;9(1).

17. Lee MK, Wyss AB, Carnes MU, Richards M, Parks CG, Beane Freeman LE, et al. House dust microbiota in relation to adult asthma and atopy in a US farming population. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*. 2021;147(3):910-20.
18. Lee MK, Carnes MU, Butz N, Azcarate-Peril MA, Richards M, Umbach DM, et al. Exposures Related to House Dust Microbiota in a U.S. Farming Population. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2018;126(6).
19. Wang Z, Dalton KR, Lee M, Parks C, Beane Freeman LE, Zhu Q, et al. Metagenomics reveals novel microbial signatures of farm exposures in house dust. *medRxiv*. 2023.
20. Amin H, Santl-Temkiv T, Cramer C, Vestergaard DV, Holst GJ, Elholm G, et al. Cow Farmers' Homes Host More Diverse Airborne Bacterial Communities Than Pig Farmers' Homes and Suburban Homes. *Front Microbiol*. 2022;13:883991.
21. Stanaway IB, Wallace JC, Shojaie A, Griffith WC, Hong S, Wilder CS, et al. Human Oral Buccal Microbiomes Are Associated with Farmworker Status and Azinphos-Methyl Agricultural Pesticide Exposure. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2017;83(2).
22. Giambo F, Teodoro M, Costa C, Fenga C. Toxicology and Microbiota: How Do Pesticides Influence Gut Microbiota? A Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(11).
23. Dalton KR, Louis LM, Fandino-Del-Rio M, Rule AM, Pool W, Randolph K, et al. Microbiome alterations from volatile organic compounds (VOC) exposures among workers in salons primarily serving women of color. *Environ Res*. 2022;214(Pt 4):114125.
24. Alavanja MC, Sandler DP, McMaster SB, Zahm SH, McDonnell CJ, Lynch CF, et al. The Agricultural Health Study. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 1996;104(4):362-9.
25. Carnes MU, Hoppin JA, Metwali N, Wyss AB, Hankinson JL, O'Connell EL, et al. House Dust Endotoxin Levels Are Associated with Adult Asthma in a U.S. Farming Population. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. 2017;14(3):324-31.
26. Sanders JG, Nurk S, Salido RA, Minich J, Xu ZZ, Zhu Q, et al. Optimizing sequencing protocols for leaderboard metagenomics by combining long and short reads. *Genome Biol*. 2019;20(1):226.
27. Arbes SJ, Jr., Cohn RD, Yin M, Muilenberg ML, Burge HA, Friedman W, et al. House dust mite allergen in US beds: results from the First National Survey of Lead and Allergens in Housing. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2003;111(2):408-14.
28. Hoppin JA, Yucel F, Dosemeci M, Sandler DP. Accuracy of self-reported pesticide use duration information from licensed pesticide applicators in the Agricultural Health Study. *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology*. 2002;12(5):313-8.
29. Werder EJ, Engel LS, Satagopan J, Blair A, Koutros S, Lerro CC, et al. Herbicide, fumigant, and fungicide use and breast cancer risk among farmers' wives. *Environ Epidemiol*. 2020;4(3):e097.
30. Hershberger SL. Tetrachoric correlation. *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science*2005.
31. Myers L, Sirois MJ. Spearman Correlation Coefficients, Differences between. *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences*. 2006.
32. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria2022 [Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>].
33. Mcmurdie PJ, Holmes S. phyloseq: An R Package for Reproducible Interactive Analysis and Graphics of Microbiome Census Data. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8(4):e61217.

34. House JS, Wyss AB, Hoppin JA, Richards M, Long S, Umbach DM, et al. Early-life farm exposures and adult asthma and atopy in the Agricultural Lung Health Study. *J Allergy Clin Immunol*. 2017;140(1):249-56 e14.
35. Anderson MJ. *Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA)*. Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online. 2017:1-15.
36. Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, et al. Package 'vegan'. *Community ecology package*. Dec 12;2(9):1-295 ed2013.
37. Lin H, Peddada SD. Analysis of compositions of microbiomes with bias correction. *Nature Communications*. 2020;11(1).
38. Jadhav R, Achutan C, Haynatzki G, Rajaram S, Rautiainen R. Review and Meta-analysis of Emerging Risk Factors for Agricultural Injury. *Journal of Agromedicine*. 2016;21(3):284-97.
39. Wang S, Rao MPN, Wei D, Sun L, Fang B-Z, Li W-Q, et al. Complete genome sequencing and comparative genome analysis of the extremely halophilic archaea, *Haloterrigena daqingensis*. *Biotechnology & Applied Biochemistry*. 2021;69(4):1482-8.
40. Ottman N, Ruokolainen L, Suomalainen A, Sinkko H, Karisola P, Lehtimäki J, et al. Soil exposure modifies the gut microbiota and supports immune tolerance in a mouse model. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*. 2019;143(3):1198-206.e12.
41. Parks CG, Costenbader KH, Long S, Hofmann JN, Beane FLE, Sandler DP. Pesticide use and risk of systemic autoimmune diseases in the Agricultural Health Study. *Environ Res*. 2022;209:112862.
42. Parks CG, Hoppin JA, De Roos AJ, Costenbader KH, Alavanja MC, Sandler DP. Rheumatoid Arthritis in Agricultural Health Study Spouses: Associations with Pesticides and Other Farm Exposures. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2016;124(11):1728-34.
43. Parks CG, Meyer A, Beane Freeman LE, Hofmann JN, Sandler DP. Farming tasks and the development of rheumatoid arthritis in the agricultural health study. *Occup Environ Med*. 2019;76(4):243-9.
44. Rinsky JL, Richardson DB, Kreiss K, Nylander-French L, Beane Freeman LE, London SJ, et al. Animal production, insecticide use and self-reported symptoms and diagnoses of COPD, including chronic bronchitis, in the Agricultural Health Study. *Environ Int*. 2019;127:764-72.
45. Hoppin JA, Umbach DM, Kullman GJ, Henneberger PK, London SJ, Alavanja MCR, et al. Pesticides and other agricultural factors associated with self-reported farmer's lung among farm residents in the Agricultural Health Study. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 2007;64(5):334-41.
46. Islam JY, Mohamed A, Umbach DM, London SJ, Henneberger PK, Beane Freeman LE, et al. Allergic and non-allergic wheeze among farm women in the Agricultural Health Study (2005-2010). *Occup Environ Med*. 2022.
47. Rinsky JL, Hoppin JA, Blair A, He K, Beane Freeman LE, Chen H. Agricultural Exposures and Stroke Mortality in the Agricultural Health Study. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part A*. 2013;76(13):798-814.
48. Hofmann JN, Hoppin JA, Lynch CF, Poole JA, Purdue MP, Blair A, et al. Farm Characteristics, Allergy Symptoms, and Risk of Non-Hodgkin Lymphoid Neoplasms in the Agricultural Health Study. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention*. 2015;24(3):587-94.
49. Sprince NL, Zwerling C, Whitten PS, Lynch CF, Burmeister LF, Gillette PP, et al. Farm Activities Associated with Eye Injuries in the Agricultural Health Study. *Journal of Agromedicine*. 2008;13(1):17-22.

50. Friesen MC, Hung F, Xie S, Viet SM, Deziel NC, Locke SJ, et al. A Task-Specific Algorithm to Estimate Occupational (1-->3)-beta-D-glucan Exposure for Farmers in the Biomarkers of Exposure and Effect in Agriculture Study. *Ann Work Expo Health*. 2022;66(8):974-84.
51. Sauve JF, Stapleton EM, O'Shaughnessy PT, Locke SJ, Josse PR, Altmaier RW, et al. Diesel Exhaust Exposure during Farming Activities: Statistical Modeling of Continuous Black Carbon Concentrations. *Ann Work Expo Health*. 2020;64(5):503-13.
52. Stapleton EM, O'Shaughnessy PT, Locke SJ, Altmaier RW, Hofmann JN, Beane Freeman LE, et al. A task-based analysis of black carbon exposure in Iowa farmers during harvest. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*. 2018;15(4):293-304.
53. Johnson B, Sierra-Sastre Y, Gifford S. Health, hygiene, and microbial monitoring during long-duration space simulations. *Acta Astronautica*. 2022;199:249-58.
54. Orysiak J, Młynarczyk M, Piec R, Jakubiak A. Lifestyle and environmental factors may induce airway and systemic inflammation in firefighters. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. 2022;29(49):73741-68.
55. Dumas O. Cleaners and airway diseases. *Current Opinion in Allergy & Clinical Immunology*. 2021;21(2):101-9.
56. Mathew SA, Fuchs B, Nissinen R, Helander M, Puigbo P, Saikkonen K, et al. Glyphosate-based herbicide use affects individual microbial taxa in strawberry endosphere but not the microbial community composition. *J Appl Microbiol*. 2023;134(2).
57. Mishra A, Singh L, Singh D. Unboxing the black box—one step forward to understand the soil microbiome: A systematic review. *Microbial Ecology*. 2023;85(2):669-83.
58. Vindenes HK, Lin H, Shigdel R, Ringel-Kulka T, Real FG, Svanes C, et al. Exposure to Antibacterial Chemicals Is Associated With Altered Composition of Oral Microbiome. *Front Microbiol*. 2022;13:790496.
59. Hung F, Hofmann JN, Josse PR, Locke SJ, Stapleton EM, Andreotti G, et al. Observed vs. self-reported agricultural activities: Evaluating 24-hr recall in a pilot study. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*. 2022;19(2):87-90.
60. Blair A, Tarone R, Sandler DP, Lynch CF, Rowland A, Wintersteen W, et al. Reliability of Reporting on Life-Style and Agricultural Factors by a Sample of Participants in the Agricultural Health Study from Iowa. *Epidemiology*. 2002;13(1):94-9.
61. Taylor KW, Joubert BR, Braun JM, Dilworth C, Gennings C, Hauser R, et al. Statistical Approaches for Assessing Health Effects of Environmental Chemical Mixtures in Epidemiology: Lessons from an Innovative Workshop. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2016;124(12):A227-A9.
62. Dunn RR, Fierer N, Henley JB, Leff JW, Menninger HL. Home Life: Factors Structuring the Bacterial Diversity Found within and between Homes. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8(5):e64133.

Occupational Farm Work Activities Influence Workers' Indoor Home Microbiome

Dalton et. al.

Tables & Figures

Table 1: Study Population Characteristics (N=468)

Characteristic	N (%) or Median (IQR) *
State	
Iowa	329 (70.3)
North Carolina	139 (29.7)
Age	
in years	61 (15)
Smoking Status	
Never	272 (58.1)
Former	170 (36.3)
Current	26 (5.6)
Asthma Status	
Case	155 (33.1)
Control	313 (66.9)
Pet Ownership	
Yes	180 (38.5)
No	288 (61.5)
Home Condition	
Good	367 (78.6)
Poor	100 (21.4)
Season	
Spring	135 (28.8)
Summer	142 (30.3)
Fall	80 (17.1)
Winter	111 (23.7)

* Age is presented as the median years with the interquartile range in parentheses. Other characteristics are presented as the total number and the percent in parentheses.

Table 2: Prevalence of Work Tasks in Study Population

Work Tasks	N (%) reporting Yes
Fertilized Fields	181 (38.7)
Cleaned Grain Bins	228 (48.7)
Handled Hay	279 (59.6)
Handled Silage	81 (17.3)
Ground Animal Feed	127 (27.1)
Handled Soybeans & Grains	357 (76.3)

Table 3: Distribution of Work Task Totals

Total Work Tasks*	N (%)
0 Tasks	86 (18.4)
1 Tasks	63 (13.5)
2 Tasks	84 (17.9)
3 Tasks	68 (14.5)
4 Tasks	63 (13.5)
5 Tasks	58 (12.4)
6 Tasks	46 (9.8)

* Total work tasks is the individual sum of all work tasks a participant reported Yes to, with a maximum of 6.

Table 4: Prevalence of Pesticide Use in Study Population

Class	Active Ingredient	Users (N)	Never Users (N)	% Users
Current Use of Pesticides*				
Herbicides				
Organophosphorus	GLYPHOSATE	238	38	86.2
	GLUFOSINATE_AMMONIUM	16	426	3.6
Triazine	ATRAZINE	85	77	52.5
Acetic Acid	CLOPYRALID	11	422	2.5
	DICAMBA	15	172	8
	PICLORAM	25	385	6.1
Amide	MESOTRIONE	22	411	5.1
Chloroacetanilide	ACETOCHLOR	23	392	5.5
	METOLACHLOR	26	189	12.1
Dinitroaniline	TRIFLURALIN	10	201	4.7
Oxazole	ISOXAFLUTOLE	15	440	3.3
Phenoxy	2,4-D	148	64	69.8
Pyridine	TRICLOPYR	18	408	4.2
Insecticides				
Carbamate	CARBARYL	10	171	5.5
Organophosphate	ORGANOPHOSPHATE	45	38	54.2
	MALATHION	20	98	16.9
Pyrethroid	CYFLUTHRIN	18	408	4.2
	PERMETHRIN	13	278	4.5
	PYRETHROID	50	250	16.7
Past Use of Banned Pesticides#				
Insecticides				
Organochlorine	ALDRIN	98	348	22
	CHLORDANE	121	325	27.1
	DDT	127	326	28
	DIELDRIN	34	410	7.7
	HEPTACHLOR	86	361	19.2
	LINDANE	119	329	26.6
	TOXAPHENE	62	384	13.9

* For currently used pesticides, the Users column represents the number of participants reporting use within the past 12 months. The total number of participants (Users + Never Users) in each row is different for each pesticide due to the exclusion of participants who only reported past use of the pesticide without current use.

For the past used of banned organochlorine insecticides, the Users column represents the number of participants who reported ever having used the pesticide in their life. Pyrethroid and organophosphate are aggregated composite pesticide classes.

Figure 1: Work Tasks and Alpha Diversity in Home Dust Microbiome Samples.

Coefficients derived from generalized linear regression models for each work tasks exposure, with Shannon alpha diversity index as the outcome, adjusted for age, smoking status, state of residence, asthma status, indoor pets, home condition, and home visit season. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals of the regression coefficients.




Table 5: Work Tasks and Weighted UniFrac Beta Diversity in Home Dust Microbiome Samples

Work Tasks	R² statistic	F p-value
Fertilized Fields	0.02	0.001
Cleaned Grain Bins	0.019	0.001
Handled Hay	0.016	0.001
Handled Silage	0.012	0.001
Ground Animal Feed	0.018	0.001
Handled Soybeans & Grains	0.014	0.001
Job Tasks Sum	0.03	0.001

Results from permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) models for each work task exposure, with weighted UniFrac distance metric as the outcome, adjusted for age, smoking status, state of residence, asthma status, indoor pets, home condition, and home visit season. Presented is the R² value to quantify the percentage of variance explained by each exposure and the p-value for the F-statistic for compositional heterogeneity by exposure groups.

Figure 2: Work Tasks and Differentially Abundant Taxa in Home Dust Microbiome Samples. Figure shows the log fold-difference of the mean abundance of differentially abundant taxa (FDR p-value <0.05) by work tasks exposure groups, using the analysis of composition of microbiomes with bias correction (ANCOM-BC, v1.0.5) models.




Figure 3: Pesticide Use and Alpha Diversity in Home Dust Microbiome Samples.

Coefficients derived from generalized linear regression models for each pesticide, with Shannon alpha diversity index as the outcome, adjusted for age, smoking status, state of residence, asthma status, indoor pets, home condition, and home visit season. **Green font** indicates currently used pesticide and **purple font** indicates past use of banned pesticides. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals of the regression coefficients.




Table 6: Pesticide Use and Weighted UniFrac Beta Diversity in Home Dust Microbiome Samples

Current Pesticide	R2 statistic	F p-value	Banned Pesticide	R2 statistic	F p-value
ACETOCHLOR	0.007	0.004	ALDRIN	0.007	0.012
ATRAZINE	0.009	0.001	CHLORDANE	0.007	0.01
CARBARYL	0.007	0.011	DDT	0.008	0.003
CLOPYRALID	0.004	0.586	DIELDRIN	0.006	0.019
CYFLUTHRIN	0.007	0.017	HEPTACHLOR	0.006	0.023
DICAMBA	0.01	0.001	LINDANE	0.007	0.014
GLUFOSINATE_AMMONIUM	0.004	0.341	TOXAPHENE	0.007	0.011
GLYPHOSATE	0.01	0.001			
ISOXAFLUTOLE	0.005	0.216			
MALATHION	0.005	0.131			
MESOTRIONE	0.005	0.26			
METOLACHLOR	0.004	0.458			
ORGANOPHOSPHATE	0.005	0.186			
PERMETHRIN	0.007	0.005			
PICLORAM	0.006	0.026			
PYRETHROID	0.01	0.001			
TRICLOPYR	0.004	0.553			
TRIFLURALIN	0.004	0.678			
2,4-D	0.007	0.003			

Results from permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) models for each pesticide exposure, with weighted UniFrac distance metric as the outcome, adjusted for age, smoking status, state of residence, asthma status, indoor pets, home condition, and home visit season. Presented is the p-value for the F-statistic for compositional heterogeneity by exposure groups and the R^2 value to quantify the percentage of variance explained.

Figure 4: Pesticide Use and Differentially Abundant Taxa in Home Dust Microbiome Samples. Figure shows the log fold-difference of the mean abundance of differentially abundant taxa (FDR p-value <0.05) by pesticide exposure groups, using the analysis of composition of microbiomes with bias correction (ANCOM-BC, v1.0.5) models. **Green facets** are for currently used pesticide and **purple facets** are for past use of banned pesticides.

