

Discrepancies Over Fluoridation

British Medical Association says:

“The findings of the University of York’s NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (Published in the BMJ of 6 October 2000) confirm that water fluoridation is safe and effective.”

“..fluoride is highly protective to the teeth, and is very safe.”

There is no evidence of any adverse risk to human health...”

“Evidence through scientific experiments shows that fluoride in water, at or around one part per million, does not have any effect on the health of the body other than reducing decay in teeth.”

“There is evidence...that...fluoridation is the most effective way to reduce dental health inequalities..”

“..fluoridation is the most cost-effectiveness (sic) approach.”

“The review by York University has confirmed the health benefits.”

“These findings are in line with a plethora of other reviews...”

York Review says:

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

“The degree to which caries is reduced...is not clear... The..difference in the proportion (%) of caries-free children (has) a median of 14.6%..” (IS, Objective 1)

“...it is surprising to find that little high quality research has been undertaken..” (Executive Summary, Conclusions) “Assessment of the long-term benefits of water fluoridation is needed.” (12.9.1)

“High quality research (into adverse effects) is needed.” (12.9.2)

It is possible that this long-term exposure (showing potential adverse effect) has not been captured by these studies.” (12.4)

“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.” (ES, Conclusions)

“A search of the NHS Economic Evaluation Database did not identify any recent studies meeting the criteria for a full..(cost-effectiveness) evaluation... This review is presenting new information...which previous economic analyses would not have had.” (12.7.1)

“The benefit and harm data need to be considered in conjunction when making decisions about water fluoridation.” (12.8) “The prevalence of fluorosis at...1.0 ppm was estimated to be 48%. (ES Objective4) (“We accept that dental fluorosis is a manifestation of systemic toxicity.” Government reply, House of Lords Hansard WA 158, 20 April 1999.)