

Discrepancies Over Fluoridation

British Dental Association Says:

“The review...confirms that water fluoridation is safe and effective.”

“John Hunt, Chief Executive of the (BDA) says:
“The compelling evidence provided by the review...”

“The report confirms that there is clear evidence that fluoridation reduces (decay).”

“The report confirms that fluoridation reduces dental health inequalities..(and)..significantly narrows the dental health gap..”

“There is no evidence that water fluoridation is linked to cancer, bone disease, or any other adverse effect.”

“Dental fluorosis is recognized by the York review as a cosmetic issue, not a health problem.”

“..projections in the review estimate that fluoridation might.. increase..dental fluorosis of “aesthetic concern”..to around 10%.”

“Dental fluorosis is an undesirable cosmetic effect.”

“The review shows no differences in the effects of natural versus artificial fluoridation.”

“These findings are in line with at least 18 other reviews...”

“Clearly (National Pure Water Association’s) executive committee could never accept the findings of any scientific review..”

York Review says:

“The studies included for (effectiveness) were of moderate quality (level B (moderate risk of bias), and limited quantity.” (12.1)

“Any future research...(should use)...appropriate methodology to improve the quality of the existing evidence base.” (ES, Conclusions)
No level A studies were found

“To have clear confidence in the ability to answer the question (on caries reduction), the quality of the evidence would need to be higher.” (4.9)

“The research evidence is of insufficient quality to allow confident statements about other potential harms (than dental fluorosis) or whether there is an impact on social inequalities.” (Executive Summary, Conclusions)

“High quality research (into adverse effects) that takes confounding factors into account is needed.” (12.9.2)

This is nowhere to be found in the report. The lead researcher confirms “we..did not say it was a cosmetic issue.”

“The proportion who have teeth that are affected enough to cause aesthetic concern is approximately 12.5%.” (12.8)

“We accept that dental fluorosis is a manifestation of systemic toxicity.” (Government reply to Written Question, House of Lords Hanford: WA 158, 20 April 1999.)

“..the evidence is not adequate to make a conclusion regarding this objective.” (ES Objective 5.)

A systematic scientific review covers all the ground of earlier studies, only more and better. The York review thus supersedes, with differing conclusions, all previous reviews of an inferior standard.

Will the British Dental Association accept the findings of the York review as shown in these citations?