## Open letter to CED, FDI, IADR and ADA.

Dear
Dr Wolfgang Doneus,
Dr Tin Chun Wong,
Dr. Christopher H. Fox
Dr. Charles H. Norman

In a relative short period of time several big dental organizations have denied the existence of (credible) scientific studies showing any significant ill effects from dental amalgam.

- In a recent policy paper the Council of European Dentists, CED, says:
- "Research over many decades has failed to show any significant health risk posed by dental amalgam either to patients, dental staff or the public."(1).
  - In a Press Release FDI World Dental Federation says:
- "We are all delighted that the Minamata Convention allows the dental profession continued access to a key restorative material. Dental amalgam is safe and effective: it has been in use for over 150 years and no studies have demonstrated any harm to human health" (2).
  - In an interview in Dental Tribune the Executive Director for International Association for Dental Research, IADR, Christopher Fox says:
- "Dental amalgam is a safe and effective restoration. The US National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research funded two large-scale randomised clinical trials on the safety of dental amalgam in children and failed to find any adverse health effects."(3).
  - In a Press Release the American Dental Association, ADA says.
- "The segment, entitled "Are Your Silver Fillings Making You Sick?" erroneously portrays dental amalgam, or silver-colored fillings, as a health risk, when in fact not one credible scientific study supports such a position." (4).

I am quite puzzled by these seemingly coordinated erroneous statements.

For example in a Dental Tribune interview Christopher Fox mentions two NIDCR funded trials. One of these, the Casa Pia trial initially did not find any ill health effects. This study has been extensively used by the dental community as proof of amalgam safety. However in the two last papers from this trial serious neurodevelopmental effects from dental amalgam in genetically susceptible boys (28%) have been found (5, 6). The cohort is the same as in the first study and the authors are partly the same.

These papers are published by the world leading group on genetic susceptibility to mercury headed by Research Prof. James Woods at the University of Washington. Woods and the group around him have published findings on health effects in patients and dental personnel for a number of years (7, 8, 9)

A number of other groups have also identified genetic susceptibility to mercury, both inorganic and organic (10, 11, 12, 13, 14)

Why are CED, FDI, IADR and ADA denying the existence of easily verifiable scientific studies?

Researchers following the field are aware that there is an obvious paradigm shift under way when it comes to mercury toxicity. Due to the fact that genetic susceptibility in substantial parts of the population has been discovered and verified by multiple research groups our understanding of mercury toxicity is rapidly changing (15). Mercury generates ill effects in concentrations much lower than previously thought.

## **Question:**

I would like to know why your organizations deny the existence high quality published scientific studies?

## References

- 1/ http://eudental.eu/library/104/files/CED-DOC-2013-076-FIN-E-20131127-1327.pdf
- 2/ <a href="http://www.fdiworldental.org/media/press-releases/latest-press-releases/09102013-fdi-welcomes-the-minamata-convention-on-mercury.aspx">http://www.fdiworldental.org/media/press-releases/latest-press-releases/09102013-fdi-welcomes-the-minamata-convention-on-mercury.aspx</a>
- 3/http://www.dentaltribune.com/articles/news/asiapacific/15706\_interview\_reach\_a\_point\_where \_restorative\_materials\_are\_rare\_for\_everybody.html
- 4/ http://www.ada.org/8448.aspx
- 5/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22765978
- 6/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23827881
- 7/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16343843
- 8/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16301096
- 9/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20526950
- 10/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23444121
- 11/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22233731
- 12/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21967774
- 13/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=mercury+genetic+Barecelos
- 14/ http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23603214
- 15/ http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BhhttQM8g E

## Kind regards

/Ulf Bengtsson

1st Research Engineer, University of Linköping

This document is in no way connected to my work at LiU. It is purely personal.