ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

OCCPATIONAL DISEAS PREVENTION STRATEGIES IN SMES CHALLENGES AND INNOVATIONS IN THE UK AND USA

AUTHOR - AMITHA T, FRIST YEAR LL.M, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR & ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AT TAMIL NADU DR AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

BEST CITATION - AMITHA T, OCCPATIONAL DISEAS PREVENTION STRATEGIES IN SMES CHALLENGES AND INNOVATIONS IN THE UK AND USA, ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL, 4 (2) OF 2025, PG. 267-280, APIS – 3920-0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230

ABSTRACT:

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) play a critical role in the economies of both the United Kingdom and the United States, yet they face unique challenges in managing occupational health risks. Unlike larger corporations, SMEs often operate with limited financial and human resources, which can hinder the implementation of comprehensive occupational disease prevention strategies. This study explores the key barriers that SMEs encounter, including limited access to occupational health services, insufficient awareness of regulatory requirements, and gaps in employee training. Through a comparative lens, the research examines how SMEs in the UK and USA approach the prevention of common occupational illnesses such as respiratory conditions, musculoskeletal disorders, and work-related stress. It also highlights recent innovations and best practices, including digital risk assessment tools, low-cost ergonomic interventions, and sector-specific training programs. By analysing policy frameworks and case studies, the article identifies actionable strategies that can enhance occupational health outcomes in SMEs. The findings underline the importance of tailored support, accessible guidance, and cross-sector collaboration to strengthen disease prevention efforts in this often-overlooked business segment.

KEYWORDS:

United Kingdom, United State, Occupational disease ,Health service, Health risk, Occupational illness, Respiratory condition, Musculoskeletal disorder, Innovations, Occupational Health.

INTRODUCTION:

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) form the backbone of the economies in both the United Kingdom and the United States, contributing significantly to employment and economic output. Despite their importance, SMEs often face distinct challenges when it comes to ensuring workplace health and safety, particularly in the prevention of occupational diseases. Limited resources, lack of specialized personnel, and evolving regulatory demands can hinder their ability to implement effective preventive strategies. Occupational diseases, ranging from respiratory conditions and musculoskeletal disorders to mental health issues, pose long-term health risks for workers and economic burdens for employers. In recent years, both the UK and the USA have witnessed growing efforts to address these issues through targeted regulations, awareness campaigns, and technological innovations. However, the degree of implementation and effectiveness of these strategies varies greatly across sectors and business sizes.This article explores the current landscape of occupational disease prevention within SMEs in the UK and USA. It examines the key challenges these enterprises face, evaluates innovative practices being adopted, and considers how cross-national lessons can be leveraged to strengthen health and safety frameworks. By shedding light on these dynamics, the article aims to support a

deeper understanding of how occupational health in SMEs can be protected and promoted more effectively.

MEANING AND CONCEPT OF THE OCCUPATIONAL DISEAS:

Occupational disease refers to any chronic or acute health condition that arises primarily as a result of exposure to risk factors or harmful conditions in the workplace. Unlike accidental injuries that occur suddenly, occupational diseases usually develop over time due to prolonged exposure to certain hazards such as chemicals, noise, dust, repetitive movements, or even psychological stress.These diseases are directly linked to the nature of a person's job or the working environment. For example, long-term inhalation of asbestos fibers may lead to asbestosis , particularly in construction or shipbuilding industries. Similarly, workers in manufacturing or assembly lines may suffer from repetitive strain injuries or musculoskeletal disorders due to repetitive tasks and poor ergonomics.The concept of occupational disease highlights the relationship between work and health. It emphasizes that certain jobs inherently carry specific risks that, if not properly managed, can lead to serious health problems. As such, the recognition of occupational diseases is crucial not only for diagnosing and treating affected individuals but also for developing preventive measures, improving workplace conditions, and shaping public health and labor policies.Understanding occupational diseases is essential for employers, workers, and policymakers alike. It encourages a proactive approach to workplace safety by identifying risks early, promoting health surveillance, and ensuring that appropriate control measures are in place to protect workers long term well being.

OCCUPATIONL DISEASE RELATED LAWS IN THE UK:

The United Kingdom has developed a comprehensive legal framework to manage and prevent occupational diseases, aiming to protect workers from long-term health risks associated with various industries. These laws impose responsibilities on employers to identify, assess, and control workplace hazards.

HEALTH AND SAFETY AT WORK ACT 1974:

The **Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974** (HSWA) is the principal piece of legislation governing workplace health and safety in the United Kingdom. Its purpose is to secure the health, safety, and welfare of individuals at work, as well as to protect others who may be affected by work activities. The Act lays down a broad framework for regulating workplace risks, supported by more specific regulations and codes of practice.

IMPORTANTE PROVISIONS IN THIS ACT:

U/S 2 OF THIS ACT DEALS WITH GENERAL DUTIES OF EMPLOYER

Employers have a legal obligation to ensure, as far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety, and welfare of all their employees. This includes Maintaining safe systems of work and safe handling, storage, and transport of materials. Providing information, instruction, training, and supervision necessary for safety.Ensuring the maintenance of a safe working environment, including access, egress, and adequate welfare facilities.

U/S 3 OF THIS ACT DEALS WITH DUTIES TOWARD NON EMPLOYEES:

Employers and self-employed individuals must also protect the health and safety of people not in their employment—such as visitors, contractors, or members of the public—who may be affected by their operations.

U/S 7&8 OF THIS ACT DEALS WITH DUTIES OF EMPLOYEES:

Employees are required to take reasonable care of their own health and safety and that of others who may be affected by their actions or omissions. They must also cooperate with their employers in complying with legal requirements and must not intentionally interfere with or

misuse anything provided in the interest of health, safety, or welfare.

U/S 20 TO 25 DEALS WITH ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES:

The Act gives inspectors extensive powers to enter workplaces, carry out examinations and investigations, take samples, and require the production of documents. If legal requirements are breached, inspectors may service. Improvement notices, requiring specific issues to be rectified within a set period.Prohibition notices, which can stop work immediately if there is a serious risk to health or safety.Failure to comply can result in criminal prosecution, with penalties including unlimited fines and, in serious cases, imprisonment.

CONTROL OF SUBSTANCES HAZARDOUS TO HEALTH REGULATION 2002:

The **Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations 2002 (COSHH)** is a key legal framework in the United Kingdom designed to protect workers and others from health risks associated with hazardous substances in the workplace. These regulations place a duty on employers to prevent or adequately control exposure to substances that could cause harm, including chemicals, fumes, dusts, vaours, biological agents, and nanomaterials.

SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY:

COSHH applies to all workplaces where hazardous substances are used, produced, or encountered. It covers a wide range of industries—from manufacturing, agriculture, and construction to healthcare and cleaning services. The regulations apply not only to employers but also to self-employed individuals who may expose others to hazardous substances.

EMPLOYER RESPONSIBILITIES:

Under COSHH, employers are legally required to take the following steps.**Assessment of Risk (Regulation 6)** Employers must conduct a thorough risk assessment to identify hazardous substances present in the workplace and evaluate how they might affect workers' health.**Prevention or Control of Exposure (Regulation 7)** Once risks are identified, employers must eliminate or reduce exposure by implementing control measures. This could involve substituting harmful substances with safer alternatives, using closed systems, improving ventilation, or introducing protective equipment.**Use of Control Measures (Regulation 8)** All control measures must be properly used, maintained, and tested. Employers must ensure that staff follow safe working procedures and use any protective equipment provided.

Maintenance, Examination, and Testing (Regulation 9) Engineering controls (e.g., extraction systems) and personal protective equipment (PPE) must be routinely inspected and maintained to ensure effectiveness.**Monitoring of Exposure (Regulation 10)** In some workplaces, it is necessary to regularly monitor the level of exposure to specific substances to ensure they remain below legal limits. **Health Surveillance (Regulation 11)** If there is a risk of serious health effects (e.g., asthma, dermatitis), employers must arrange for appropriate health checks and medical surveillance by competent professionals.**Information, Instruction, and Training (Regulation 12)** Workers must be given clear information and training on the risks of hazardous substances, safe handling procedures, and the use of protective controls.

EMLOYEE DUTIES

Employees also have responsibilities under COSHH. They are required to cooperate with employers by following safety instructions, using control measures properly, wearing protective equipment as directed, and reporting any defects or concerns related to hazardous substances.

RECORD KEEPING AND REVIEW:

Employers must keep records of risk assessments, health surveillance, and maintenance of control measures. These

documents must be reviewed regularly, especially when work processes change or when new information about health risks becomes available.

ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES:

The **Health and Safety Executive (HSE)** is responsible for enforcing COSHH. Failure to comply can result in enforcement actions, including improvement or prohibition notices, fines, or prosecution. Penalties can be severe, particularly in cases where negligence leads to serious health outcomes.

REPORTING OF INJURIES, DISEASE AND DANGEROUS OCCURRENCES REGULATIONS 2013 :

The Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 2013 (RIDDOR) is a key component of the UK's health and safety legal framework. It sets out specific requirements for employers, self-employed individuals, and those in control of work premises to formally report certain workplace incidents to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) or relevant local authority.

The primary goal of RIDDOR is to ensure that serious workplace incidents—whether involving injuries, occupational diseases, or dangerous occurrences—are officially recorded and monitored. This information supports the identification of risks, prevention of future incidents, and enforcement of safety standards across industries**.**

SCOPE AND APPLICATION OF THIS REGULATION:

RIDDOR applies to a wide range of workplaces and industries. It places legal responsibilities on Employers, Self-employed individuals, People in control of work premises such as building managers or site supervisors These parties are required to report specific incidents that result in serious harm or pose significant risk, regardless of the size or nature of the business.

REPORTABLE INCIDENTS UNDER RIDDOR:

RIDDOR outlines several categories of reportable events:

Work-Related Deaths and Major Injuries Employers must report any death that occurs as a result of a work-related incident, as well as certain serious injuries. These include Fractures (excluding fingers, thumbs, and toes)**,** Amputations**,** Serious burns**,** Loss of consciousness due to head injury or asphyxia**,** Injuries resulting from working in enclosed spaces

OVER SEEN DAYS INJURIES:

If an employee or self-employed person is unable to perform their normal work duties for more than seven consecutive days due to a work-related injury, this must be reported within 15 days of the incident.

OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES:

Employers must report certain diagnosed occupational diseases when they are likely linked to the employee's work. Examples include Carpal tunnel syndrome,Occupational dermatitis, Occupational asthma, Tendonitis or tenosynovitis of the hand or forearm, Hand-arm vibration syndrome (HAVS) A registered medical practitioner must confirm the diagnosis before it is reported.

DANGEROUS OCCURENCES:

These are specific, serious incidents that could have caused injury or death but did not. Examples include The collapse of lifting equipment, Explosions or fires in the workplace, Electrical short circuits leading to fire or explosionStructural failure, es or plant collapses Even if no one is harmed, these events must be reported as they signal significant risk.

INJURES TO NON WORKERS:

Incidents where a member of the public is injured on work premises and taken directly to hospital for treatment must also be reported.

METHOD AND TIMING OF REPORTING

All reportable incidents must be submitted to the HSE promptly, usually via the HSE's online reporting system. In cases of fatality or major injury, the report must be made without delay.

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Records of all reportable incidents must be kept for a minimum of **three years**, though longer retention may be advisable for legal or insurance purposes.

ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES:

Failure to comply with RIDDOR can lead to legal consequences, including fines and prosecution. The HSE has the authority to investigate breaches and may issue enforcement notices or pursue criminal charges where there is evidence of negligence.

HEALTH AND SAFTY EXECUTIVE IN THE UK:

The **Health and Safety Executive (HSE)** is the national regulatory body responsible for promoting and enforcing workplace health, safety, and welfare in the United Kingdom. Established under the **Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974**, the HSE operates as an independent public body, working to reduce work-related death, injury, and ill health across all sectors of the economy.

ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE:

The primary function of the HSE is to ensure that employers, employees, and other duty holders comply with health and safety legislation. This is achieved through a combination of regulatory activities, public guidance, policy development, and enforcement.**Inspection and Investigation** HSE inspectors carry out routine and targeted inspections of workplaces to assess compliance. They also investigate serious incidents, complaints, and breaches of legislation ,**Enforcement** The HSE has legal powers to take enforcement actions when safety standards are not met. This includes issuing improvement notices, prohibition notices, and prosecuting serious breaches, **Regulation Development** The HSE helps draft, update, and implement health and safety regulations. It also consults with stakeholders and industry groups to ensure that laws remain relevant and practical, **Education and Guidance** The HSE provides extensive resources, publications, and training materials to support employers and employees in understanding their duties and managing workplace risks effectively, **Research and Data Collection** By conducting and supporting research, the HSE collects data on occupational injuries, diseases, and dangerous occurrences. This evidence informs future policies and prevention strategies.

AREA OF FOCUS:

The HSE covers a broad range of industries including construction, manufacturing, agriculture, healthcare, and energy. It also oversees specific hazards such as:

- Exposure to hazardous substances (e.g., chemicals, asbestos)
- Machinery and equipment safety
- Manual handling and repetitive strain injuries
- Stress and mental health at work
- Slips, trips, and falls
- Occupational diseases like asthma, dermatitis, and noise-induced hearing loss

STRUCTRE AND GOVERNANCE:

The HSE is sponsored by the **Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)** and operates through a network of regional offices across Great Britain. It works in partnership with local authorities, which often share responsibility for inspecting lower-risk workplaces such as shops, offices, and hospitality venues.

IMPACT AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT:

Over the years, the HSE has played a crucial role in improving workplace safety standards in the UK. Its proactive campaigns, such as "Go Home Healthy" and sector-specific safety drives, raise awareness about preventable risks. The HSE also engages with employers through consultation processes, ensuring that regulations are practical and enforcement.

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE RELATED LAWS IN USA

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1970:

UK Provisions Equivalent to the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970

Although the **Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970** is a U.S. law designed to protect workers from job-related hazards, the **United Kingdom enforces similar protections** through its own legislation. The most prominent equivalent is the **Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 (HSWA)**, supported by a range of specific regulations and enforced by the **Health and Safety Executive (HSE)**.

HEALTH AND SAFTY AT WORK ACT 1974:

The HSWA is the **primary legislation** governing occupational health and safety in the UK. It outlines the general responsibilities of employers, employees, and others involved in workplace activities.

U/S 2 DEALS WITH EMPLOYERS DUTY OF CARE:

Employers must, as far as reasonably practicable, ensure the health, safety, and welfare of employees. This includes providing safe systems of work, proper training, and a risk-free working environment.

U/S 3 DUTIES TO OTHERS**:**

Employers must also protect people who are not their employees but may be affected by work activities, such as visitors or contractors.

U/S 4 EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES:

Employees are required to take reasonable care of their own health and safety and that of others, and to cooperate with their employer in maintaining safe working conditions.

THE ROLE OF THE HEALTH AND SAFTY EXECUTIVE:

The **HSE** functions similarly to the **U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)**. It is responsible for

- Enforcing health and safety laws
- Conducting workplace inspections
- Investigating accidents and complaints
- Providing guidance and training materials
- Issuing improvement and prohibition notices when necessary

SUPPORTING REGULATION UNDER THE HSWA:

Several regulations made under the HSWA provide more detailed rules, resembling the standards created under the OSH Act in the U.S

MANAGEMENT OF HEALTH AND SAFTY AT WORK REGULATIONS 1999:

These regulations require employers to Carry out risk assessments, Appoint competent persons for health and safety, Establish emergency procedures,Provide adequate information and training.

CONTROL OF SUBSTTANCES HAZARDOUS TO HEALTH REGULATIONS 2002:

These govern exposure to harmful chemicals and biological agents, much like OSHA's hazardous substance standards.

PROVISION AND USE OF WORK EQUIPMENT REGULATIONS 1998:

These require that work equipment is suitable, maintained, and used safely—similar to OSHA standards on machine and tool safety.

REPORTING OF INJURIES , DISESSE AND DANGEROUS OCCURANCES REGULATIONS 2013:

RIDDOR mandates the formal reporting of certain workplace incidents, occupational diseases, and near-miss events, comparable to OSHA's recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

LEGAL ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES:

Improvement Notices: Require corrective action within a specified timeframe.**Prohibition Notices:** Can halt work immediately where there is a serious risk. **Prosecutions:** Employers and individuals can face criminal charges, fines, or imprisonment for serious or repeated breaches.

TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT:

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

The **Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA)** is a major environmental law in the United States that governs the production, importation, use, and disposal of specific chemical substances. Originally enacted in **1976**, TSCA is administered by the **Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)** and plays a vital role in protecting both public health and the environment from potentially harmful chemicals used in industry and consumer products.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE:

The primary aim of TSCA is to ensure that chemical substances are properly evaluated for their potential risks before they are widely distributed in commerce. Unlike laws that target chemicals already known to be hazardous (such as pesticides or food additives), TSCA focuses on a **preventive approach**, requiring oversight **before chemicals reach the public**.

TSCA applies to **industrial chemicals**, including those used in manufacturing, cleaning agents, plastics, coatings, electronics, and many other sectors. It does not cover food, drugs, cosmetics, or pesticides, which are regulated under separate federal laws.

CHEMICAL INVENTORY:

TSCA established a national inventory of all existing chemical substances in commerce at the time of the law's passage. Any new chemical that companies wish to manufacture or import must be **pre-approved** and added to this list through a formal process.

PRE MANUFACTURE NOTIFICATION

Before producing a **new chemical** or significantly using an existing one in a new way, manufacturers must submit a **Pre-Manufacture Notification** to the EPA. The agency then assesses potential environmental and health risks before granting approval.

CHEMICAL RISK EVALUATION AND PRIORITIZATION :

Under amendments made in 2016 (via the **Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act**), the EPA is required to **evaluate existing chemicals** for safety. This includes Identifying **high-priority substances** for risk evaluation, Determining whether these chemicals pose an **unreasonable risk**, Taking action to reduce or eliminate those risks

CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION:

TSCA allows companies to protect trade secrets by designating certain data as confidential. However, recent reforms have placed stricter limits on CBI claims to ensure greater **transparency** and **public access** to health and safety information.

RESTRICTIONS:

If a chemical is found to pose an unreasonable risk, TSCA grants the EPA authority to impose restrictions or even **ban its use entirely**. The agency can limit manufacturing, distribution, labeling, or disposal methods.

WORKPLACE AND PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:

While TSCA is not a workplace safety law in the traditional sense, it significantly contributes to **occupational health** by reducing exposure to hazardous substances before they become widespread in industrial settings. The data gathered under TSCA often supports rules set by the **Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)** and informs employers and workers about chemical hazards.In addition, TSCA plays an essential role in **environmental justice**, ensuring that communities—especially vulnerable or marginalized populations—are protected from toxic exposures linked to industrial activity.

ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE:

The EPA has the authority to Conduct inspections and request records, Order testing or risk evaluations, Issue fines and take legal action against violatorsCompanies must comply with reporting, recordkeeping, and notification requirements, and failure to do so can lead to significant penalties.

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

ISSUES RELATED OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE IN UK AND USA:

Occupational diseases remain a persistent concern in both the United States and the United Kingdom, despite decades of regulatory development, workplace reforms, and technological advancements. Unlike accidents, occupational diseases often develop slowly and silently, making them difficult to detect, diagnose, and manage. Both countries face unique and overlapping challenges in addressing the causes, reporting, prevention, and compensation of work-related illnesses.

UNDERREPORTING AND MISDIAGNOSIS:

One of the most common challenges in both the US and the UK is the **underreporting of occupational diseases**. Many cases go unnoticed or unlinked to the workplace due to the delayed onset of symptoms. Conditions such as occupational asthma, hearing loss, or repetitive strain injuries may not be reported until they become severe, if at all.

In the **UK**, although systems like **RIDDOR (Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations)** are in place, compliance varies across sectors. Many smaller businesses lack awareness or fail to report due to fear of liability or regulatory scrutiny.

In the **US**, a fragmented healthcare system and limited worker protections in certain sectors make early diagnosis and reporting inconsistent. Workers, particularly in low-wage or precarious jobs, may fear retaliation or job loss if they report illnesses related to their occupation.

CHANGING NATURE OF WORK AND EMERGING RISKS:

The evolution of work, including the growth of **remote work**, **gig economy jobs**, and **digital labor platforms**, presents new health challenges that are not yet fully addressed by existing laws. For example, ergonomic risks from poor home-office setups, stress-related disorders, and mental health conditions are increasingly recognized but are still **underregulated** in both countries.

The **USA** has been slower in adapting federal regulations to new forms of work, especially in sectors without union representation. In the **UK**, while the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) provides guidance, formal regulatory enforcement often lags behind emerging risks.

LIMITED RESOURCES IN SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES:

SMEs form the backbone of both economies but often struggle with **limited financial and technical resources** to implement effective occupational health programs. In both the UK and the USA, smaller firms may lack access to occupational health specialists, rely on outdated practices, or not prioritize preventive measures due to cost concerns. In the UK, SMEs may benefit from more accessible public guidance from the HSE, but enforcement and follow-up inspections are often limited. In the US, the absence of mandatory health and safety programs in many states leaves small businesses largely unmonitored unless a serious incident occurs.

AGING WORKFORCES AND LONGTERM HEALTH EFFECT:

Both nations are experiencing an aging workforce, leading to increased cases of chronic conditions such as musculoskeletal disorders, cumulative trauma, and noise-induced hearing loss. These conditions often result from years of workplace exposure and are more difficult to treat or reverse.

Occupational health systems in both countries must adapt to **longer working lives**, requiring better risk assessment and personalized interventions to protect older employees.

REGULATORY AND LEGAL COMPLEXITY:

The **regulatory landscape** in both the UK and the US presents its own challenges. In the US, a dual system involving **federal and state laws** often creates confusion and inconsistency. Some states have more protective laws, while

others offer minimal coverage for occupational illnesses.

In contrast, the UK operates under a **centralized legal framework**, but the post-Brexit period has introduced questions about the future of regulatory alignment with EU health and safety standards. Moreover, enforcement bodies like the HSE have faced **resource constraints**, reducing inspection frequency and limiting proactive oversight.

DELAYS IN COMPENSATION AND ACCESS TO BENEFITS :

Accessing compensation for occupational diseases remains a complicated and often frustrating process in both countries. In the **USA**, workers must often go through **complex workers' compensation systems**, which can vary widely by state and may require extensive evidence linking disease to workplace exposure.In the **UK**, while the **Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit (IIDB)** scheme provides support, not all conditions are recognized under the prescribed disease list, and claimants must meet strict criteria to qualify for financial support.

CASE LAWS RELATING TO THE OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE:

MAGUIRE VS HARLAND & WOLFF PLC(2005)

This case concerned the widow of a man who died from mesothelioma caused by asbestos exposure. The central issue was whether secondary exposure (from asbestos carried home on work clothes) could be attributed to employer negligence.

Significance: The Court of Appeal ruled against the claimant, noting that employers could not reasonably foresee secondary exposure in the 1960s. However, the case clarified the scope of **foreseeability and duty of care** in occupational disease claims and influenced later compensation cases involving indirect exposure.

FAIRCHILD VS GLENHAVEN FUNRAL SERVICES LTD(2002)

This landmark case involved workers who had developed mesothelioma after being exposed to asbestos by multiple employers.

Significance: The House of Lords held that a claimant who had been exposed to asbestos by multiple employers could sue any one of them, even if it could not be proven which exposure caused the disease. This decision introduced the **"material increase in risk"** doctrine and significantly improved access to justice for victims of occupational diseases.

PAGE VS SMITH (1995)

Although not strictly about a physical disease, this case involved a claimant who developed chronic fatigue syndrome after a minor car accident and sued for psychiatric injury.

Significance: The case extended the scope of **foreseeable injury**, ruling that as long as some form of personal injury was foreseeable, the defendant could be liable for the full extent of the damage—including mental or psychological illness triggered by the incident.

SILKWOOD VS KERR MCGEE CORP (1984)

Karen Silkwood was a laboratory worker at a nuclear facility who was exposed to plutonium and died under suspicious circumstances. Her estate sued Kerr-McGee for negligence in handling radioactive materials.

Significance: The U.S. Supreme Court upheld the jury's decision to award punitive damages, reinforcing that companies can be held financially accountable for **willful negligence involving occupational exposure**, even when federal regulatory standards exist.

METRO NORTH COMMUTER RAILROAD CO VS BUCKLEY(1997)

This case involved a railroad worker who had been exposed to asbestos but had not yet developed any physical illness. He sought compensation for emotional distress and medical monitoring.

ILE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL [IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 4 AND ISSUE 2 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 – 0007 | ISSN - 2583-7230
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Significance: The U.S. Supreme Court ruled against the plaintiff, stating that **asymptomatic exposure** alone does not justify compensation under federal labor laws unless accompanied by physical injury. The case clarified limits on liability in toxic exposure claims under the **Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA)**.

INTERNATINAL UNION, UAW VS JOHNSON CONTROLS,INC(1991)

This case challenged a company policy that barred women of childbearing age from certain jobs due to the potential risk of lead exposure affecting unborn children.

Significance: The Court held that such policies violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. It emphasized that occupational health protections cannot be used as a **pretext for discrimination**, and that workers have the right to make informed choices about job-related.

DRYDEN & OTHERS VS JOHNSON MATTHEY PLC(2018)

Facts: Employees of a company producing catalytic converters were exposed to platinum salts, leading to sensitization, which meant they could no longer work in their current roles.

Ruling: The Supreme Court ruled that sensitization—even in the absence of current physical symptoms—could constitute an injury because it materially changed the claimants' physical condition and future employability.

Significance: This case clarified that **loss of bodily function or physical capability**, even without visible illness, may count as personal injury, broadening the legal interpretation of occupational disease.

CARTLEDGE VS EJOPLIAN&SONSLTD(1963)

Facts: Workers contracted pneumoconiosis due to prolonged exposure to silica dust, but the disease did not become diagnosable until years after the exposure ceased.

Ruling: The House of Lords acknowledged the injury occurred during the period of exposure, despite late diagnosis. This led to further legal reforms on limitation periods for personal injury claims.

Significance: The case contributed to the **Law Reform (Limitation of Actions, etc.) Act 1954** and influenced the **Limitation Act 1980**, allowing claims to be brought after the discovery of latent diseases.

GIBSON VS EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE COUNCIL(2000)

Facts: A teacher developed chronic voice strain due to prolonged speaking in noisy classrooms and alleged lack of employer support and intervention.

Ruling: The Court of Appeal accepted that the employer failed to take reasonable steps to protect the employee's health by ignoring early warnings and advice.

Significance: This case underlined the **duty of care for non-traditional occupational diseases**, including those involving vocal strain and stress, emphasizing preventative obligations.

NORFOLK & WESTERN RAILWAY CO VS AYERS(2003)

Facts: Six former employees who were exposed to asbestos sought damages for asbestosis and emotional distress over the risk of developing mesothelioma.

Ruling: The Supreme Court held that workers with a diagnosed occupational disease could recover damages for **fear of future disease**, as long as it was a reasonable fear stemming from current injury.

Significance: This ruling expanded recoverable damages in occupational disease cases under **Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA)** and acknowledged **mental anguish as a compensable harm**.

CSX TRANSPORTATION,INC VS HENLEY(2009)

Facts: The plaintiff developed asbestosis after years of working in rail yards and sued the employer under FELA.

Ruling: The U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal after a lower court found the railroad liable. The case confirmed employer liability when causation between exposure and illness was clear and safety practices were inadequate.

Significance: It underscored the **high standard of employer responsibility** under FELA, especially in industries with known exposure risks.

BARGER VS GENERAL ELECTRIC CO (1984)

Facts: A worker developed respiratory problems after prolonged exposure to harmful substances in the workplace and alleged that the company failed to warn of known dangers.

Ruling: The court found in favor of the plaintiff, emphasizing that **employers have a duty to inform and protect workers** from substances that pose health risks.

Significance: This case helped reinforce the principle that **failure to warn** is a breach of duty in occupational health law, particularly when the employer is aware of hazardous substances.

CONVENTIONS RELATED OCCUPATIONAL DISEASE:

1. ILO Convention No. 121 – Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 (Revised)
This convention covers both work-related injuries and occupational diseases. It requires member states to provide compensation for employees who suffer temporary or permanent disability or death resulting from employment-related health conditions. Includes a **list of occupational diseases** eligible for compensation. Requires states to establish **benefit systems** covering medical care, income support, and survivors' benefits. Encourages updates to the list as new diseases are recognized.**Importance** This was one of the earliest efforts to **standardize compensation globally**, and it laid the groundwork for many national systems.

2. ILO Convention No. 155 – Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981
Convention 155 establishes a **comprehensive framework** for occupational safety and health (OSH), including the **prevention of occupational diseases**. States must adopt a **national policy on OSH** and the working environment.Employers are responsible for ensuring the workplace is **free from hazards** likely to cause illness or injury.Workers have the right to **receive information and training** on occupational risks.**Importance** This convention emphasizes a **preventive approach** to occupational disease, aiming to reduce exposure to hazardous agents before harm occurs.

3. ILO Convention No. 161 – Occupational Health Services Convention, 1985
Convention 161 focuses on the establishment and development of **occupational health services** within workplaces. Requires the creation of internal or external **occupational health units**.These units must identify workplace risks, monitor employee health, and contribute to **disease prevention programs**.Emphasizes collaboration between employers, employees, and public health authorities **Importance** This convention supports **continuous monitoring and early detection** of occupational diseases, especially in high-risk industries.

4. ILO Convention No. 187 – Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health,2006
This convention builds upon previous agreements by promoting a **systematic and sustained national approach** to workplace health and safety.Encourages countries to create **national OSH programs**.Promotes the use of **data collection systems** to identify trends in occupational diseases and injuries.Focuses on long-term improvement through policy development and performance evaluation.**Importance**:Convention 187 recognizes that occupational disease prevention must be a **long-term national priority**, not just a regulatory requirement.

5. WHO and ILO Joint Efforts

Beyond ILO conventions, the **World Health Organization (WHO)** also works with the ILO to address occupational health. Together, they produce. **Global strategy documents** on occupational health for all, **Collaborative research programs** on emerging occupational illnesses (e.g., stress, musculoskeletal disorders),**Databases and guidance tools** for diagnosis, prevention, and reporting of occupational diseases.

The prevention of occupational diseases is increasingly benefiting from technological advancements and innovative approaches. As workplace hazards evolve, modern solutions are being developed to better detect, manage, and minimize exposure to harmful agents. These innovations not only improve worker health but also enhance productivity and compliance with safety standards.

NEW INNOVATION TO REDUCE THE OCCU[ATIONAL DISEASES:

1. Wearable Health Monitoring Devices

Wearable technology has revolutionized occupational health by enabling real-time monitoring of workers' exposure to hazardous conditions. Devices equipped with sensors can track environmental factors such as Air quality (detecting harmful gases or particulates), Noise levels, Temperature extremes, Physical strain or repetitive motion. These devices provide immediate alerts when exposure exceeds safe limits, allowing workers and supervisors to take timely protective measures. Additionally, wearables can monitor vital signs like heart rate and stress levels, helping to prevent chronic conditions linked to workplace stress and overexertion.

Advanced Air Filtration and Ventilation Systems

Improvements in ventilation technology and air purification are crucial for reducing airborne occupational diseases such as those caused by dust, asbestos, and chemical fumes. Innovations include. High-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filters tailored for industrial environments, Smart ventilation systems that adjust airflow based on real-time air quality data, Portable air purifiers for confined or hazardous workspaces. These systems reduce the concentration of toxic substances, significantly lowering the risk of respiratory diseases among workers.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) for Risk Assessment

AI and machine learning are being applied to analyze vast amounts of workplace data to predict and prevent occupational diseases. By examining patterns in Incident reports, Environmental monitoring data, Employee health records AI systems can identify emerging risks, recommend safety improvements, and customize protective strategies for specific job roles or environments. This proactive approach helps prevent disease before symptoms even appear.

Robotics and Automation

The use of robots to perform hazardous tasks reduces human exposure to dangerous substances and environments. Automation is particularly useful in industries like mining, chemical manufacturing, and construction where Workers may be exposed to toxic chemicals, There is a risk of repetitive strain injuries, Heavy machinery can cause accidents. Robotic systems take on these roles, improving safety and lowering the incidence of occupational diseases caused by physical or chemical hazards.

Virtual Reality (VR) for Training

Virtual reality offers immersive training experiences that simulate workplace hazards without putting workers at risk. VR can train employees on Proper use of personal protective equipment (PPE), Hazard recognition, Emergency response procedures. By enhancing learning retention and engagement, VR training improves workers' ability to avoid exposure and reduces accidents leading to occupational disease.

Genomic and Biomarker Research

Cutting-edge biomedical research is identifying genetic markers and biomarkers that indicate susceptibility to occupational diseases. This innovation allows for Personalized risk assessments,Early detection of disease before symptoms develop,Tailored interventions to prevent progression.Employers and healthcare providers can use this data to implement targeted health surveillance programs and improve worker outcomes.

CONCLUSION:

Occupational disease prevention in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) remains a complex challenge in both the UK and USA. Despite existing regulations and frameworks, SMEs often struggle due to limited resources, lack of expertise, and inconsistent enforcement. Underreporting, delayed diagnosis, and emerging risks such as stress and chemical exposure further complicate disease management. However, recent innovations—such as wearable safety technology, AI-based risk assessments, and advanced ventilation systems—offer practical solutions tailored for smaller operations. Government initiatives, public-private partnerships, and increased awareness are gradually bridging gaps in compliance and education. In both nations, aligning policy with innovation and supporting SMEs with accessible tools and guidance are crucial. A sustainable occupational health strategy must prioritize prevention, early intervention, and adaptability to new workplace risks. Ultimately, protecting worker health not only fulfills legal and ethical obligations but also enhances productivity and long-term business resilience in the SME sector.

Bibliography

Regulatory Frameworks

1. **Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 (UK)**
2. **Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (USA)**

Webliography

1. https://advanced.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/aisy.202100099
2. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HEPA
3. https://advanced.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/aisy.202100099
4. https://blogs.cdc.gov/niosh-science-blog/2019/11/18/wearables-construction/
5. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biomonitoring

LIST OF CASE LAWS:

NO:	CASE LAWS
1.	MAGUIRE VS HARLAND & WOLFF PLC(2005)
2.	FAIRCHILD VS GLENHAVEN FUNRAL SERVICES LTD(2002)
3.	PAGE VS SMITH (1995)
4.	SILKWOOD VS KERR MCGEE CORP (1984)
5.	METRO NORTH COMMUTER RAILROAD CO VS BUCKLEY(1997)
6.	INTERNATINAL UNION, UAW VS JOHNSON CONTROLS,INC(1991)
7.	**DRYDEN & OTHERS VS JOHNSON MATTHEY PLC(2018)**
8.	CARTLEDGE VS EJOPLIAN & SONSLTD(1963)
9.	GIBSON VS EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE COUNCIL(2000)

10.	NORFOLK & WESTERN RAILWAY CO VS AYERS(2003)
11.	CSX TRANSPORTATION,INC VS HENLEY(2009)
12.	BARGER VS GENERAL ELECTRIC CO (1984)