Page 1 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> pages;

1-4	statistical observations on fluoridation trials
7	American Medical Association
1	no randomization to eliminate bias
2	no estimate of variability between or within examiners
2	random DMF variation unrecognized or ignored
2	bias in presentation of results
	Ontario Department of Health
2	relatively quick drop in DMF rates discounts systemic effect theory
2-3	percentage reductions exaggerate
3	divergent DMF results from different examiners
3-4	omission of Sarnia and Stratford
	DMF reductions
4	two disturbing features
5	basis for the fluoridation hypothesis
5-6	errors, omissions and mis-statements
5	gingival and periodontal sequelae
7	necessity for controls
	requirements of a control
	"uncontrolled causes which may influence the result are always strictly innumerable"
	socio-economic status "of less importance"
	"verification" of fluoridation requires control with a comparable water quality
7-8	effect on "fluoride potency" of other constituents of waters
8 .	"soft waters,,,cause the most severe mottled enamel"
	influence of rare elements
8	water composition unstated in the trials

Page 2 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued;

_	
8	effect of climate on water consumption
8	need for comparable baseline caries rates
8	need for random sampling
8-9	variation in DMF due to chance
9	examiner variability
9	examiner bias
10-15	the Grand Rapids study
10	Grand Rapids vs Muskegon
10	large differences in sample size
	a "group" of one child
	sampling by school class
	different methods of sampling
10-11	changes in examiners
77	examiner variability not assessed
11	late examination of control city
11	water of control (Muskegon) fluoridated
11-12	ignorance of commencement of fluoridation
	in Muskegon
12	variations in Muskegon rates
12-13	magnitude of decay reductions in Muskegon disguised by omission
13	"sampling error" applied only to the control city
13	variation in Muskegon
13	comparison with Aurora, Illinois
13	limitations of Aurora data
16-36	Evanston study
16	importance of X-ray examinations
16	the ideal control community (Dak Park)
16-17	different rates in student groups

Page 3 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued;

17	exclusion of data
17-18	an altered explanation
18-19	"correction" of data
19-20	altered methods in Evanston 1958 report
20-21	late examination in the control city
21	ten year delay in the publication of data
21	gross differences in initial caries rates
21-22	much unpublished data
23	disagreements between results
23-24	disagreements between tables
24	no data for deciduous teeth in Oak Park
24-25	variations in caries rates in control
25	inadequacy of the control and the authors' excuse for it
25-26	differences between school groups
26	"nearly comparable" or significantly different
26-28	decline in eruption of molars
28	odd method of assessing eruption
28-29	strange superiority of artificial fluoridation
29	"weighting" of results and example
29-30	significance tests and "weighting"
30	random variation ignored
30	original results altered
30	system of computation changed
30-31	the new method of computation
31	errors in amended rates
31	a confusing calculation
31-32	sampling

Page 4 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued;

32	were children "continuous residents"?
32	disturbing disagreements
32-33	gross discrepancies between sample sizes
33-34	disparities in Negro sample sizes
34	further unexplained differences
34-35	incompatible statements
35-36	remarkable changes in assessment of statistical significance
37-47	the Brantford studies
37	City Health Department study
37	no control
37	were results combined or averaged?
38-47	National Health and Welfare study
38	late commencement
38	DMF reduction within two years
38-39	the control cities
39	superior dental care in Brantford
39	no pre-fluoridation survey
39-40	doubtful comparability of data
40-41	the influence of treatment
41	tooth mortality
41	differences in oral hygiene
42	the concentration of fluorides
42-43	differing opinions on fluoride contents
43-44	three misleading statements
44	omission of decreases
44	different rates reported
45-46	significant fluctuations in controls
46	larger "percentage" changes in a control

Page 5 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued;

46-47	a smaller "percentage decrease" after long fluoridation
47	more misleading comments
47	unexplained significant changes in controls
48-62	the Newburgh study
48	differences between Newburgh and other fluoridation trials
48	the control city (Kingston)
48	late examination of control city
48-49	considerably different composition of waters
49-50	an unsatisfactory control
50	variations in methods used
50	the dental findings
50-51	different examiners used
51	non-comparability of data
51-52	examiner variability
52	different adjustment procedures
52-53	variations in age groups
53	grouping of data hinders comparisons
53	"weighting"
53-54	fewer erupted teeth than expected
54	delayed eruption or "weighting"?
54-55	"smoothing" of initial rates
55-56	fluctuations in the control city
56	fluctuations disguised
56	variability of caries rates
56-57	the meagre data supplied for deciduous teeth

Page 6 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued;

57	unexplained marked decreases in the control
57	the increase in caries-free teeth in the control
57-58	"analysis" of findings
58	changes in caries-free teeth in the control
58-59	changes in the sampling method
59	continuous residence only assumed
59-60	population changes in Newburgh
60	population movement in Kingston
60-61	considerable alterations in populations
61	data of migrants excluded only in Newburgh
61	alterations in sample size
61-62	sampling by selection
62	a decrease in the "per cent difference"
63-71	discussion
63	World Health Organisation
63	United Kingdom Mission
63-64	New Zealand Commission of Inquiry
64	United Kingdom Mission on controls
65	initial caries rates
66	delayed tooth eruption in Feltman study
66-67	emotional opposition and favourable interpretation
72	summary
73-128	criticisms and comments
74-83	Dr Donald Galagan
74-75	fluoridation trials not the sole basis for demonstrating success of fluoridation
75	examiner variability not overlooked

Page 7 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued:

75-76	delayed tooth eruption
76-83	commentary on the Galagan review
76-78	"demonstrations" or experimental trials?
79-80	examiner variability
80	caries occurrence in a population
80-81	Feltman study
81	delayed tooth eruption inadequately studied in Newburgh-Kingston study alone
81-82	Short report does not deal with eruption pattern or eruption delay
82-83	Dr Galagan's views on the "opposition" to fluoridation
84-94	Dr J R Blayney and Dr I N Hill
84-85	comparability of control and study areas
85	caries prevalence in Evanston vs Aurora
85-86	variations in number examined
86-94	commentary on the Blayney/Hill review
87	"median" vs "mean" rental/dwelling values
87	different initial caries rates
87-88	unexplained exclusion of data
88-89	data not published
89	hidden variables
89-90	effect of constant examination on interest in dental health
90	lack of yearly assessment of control
90	lack of assessment of random variation
90-91	discrepancy in numbers explained
91	more discrepancies
91-92	no attempt to limit examinations to continuous resident children
92-93	more discrepancies

Page 8 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued;

93	Commenter and Wilth
	Evanston report XVII
93-94	error not corrected
94	majority of errors, omissions and mis-statements remain unexplained
95-110	Dr R M Grainger
95	numbers of children examined
95	date of commencement of fluoridation
95	error in percentage reduction conceded
95	late commencement of caries study
96	selection of control cities
96	difference in level of dental care
96	comparability of caries rates
96	concentration of fluorides
96	re statement by Brown, et al
96-97	reason for omission of data
97	examiner variability
97	fluctuations in controls
97	larger percentage changes in controls
97	smaller percentage decrease after longer fluoridation due to random fluctuation
97-98	quote from Ontario Government Report
98	weighting effect alleged due to
	age distribution
98-110	commentary on review by Dr R M Grainger
98	the "unimpeachable study"
98-99	an impossible situation
99	eight errors and two omissions on one page
100	pre-fluoridation caries rate and selection of the control
	serection of the control
100	selection of the control cities

Page 9 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation: Errors and Omissions in Experimental Trials</u> <u>2nd edition</u> continued;

101	doubtful comparability of rates
101	"Brown's statement"
101-102	effect on findings of differences in oral hygiene
102	concentration of fluorides
102	guesses on fluoride content
102-103	an incorrect statement on concentrations
103	period of fluoridation or observation?
103	decrease in d,f, rates for 9-11 group in Sarnia
103-104	decrease in Brantford not "over the period 1948 to 1955
104	d,f, rates for Stratford
104-105	astonishing omission of reduction in control city
105	reduction in control city
105	examiner variability
105-106	significant fluctuations in controls
106	downward trend only in one age group
106-107	larger percentage changes in control
107-108	smaller percentage decrease after longer fluoridation
108-109	quotation "out of context"
109-110	possible weighting effect
111-128	Mr J Ferris Fuller
111-114	criticisms of first edition
114-128	commentary on the Fuller review
129	conclusion
130-142	references

Page 10 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>A Struggle With Titans</u> pages;

12	high caries in high-fluoride area of Arizona
13	contribution of other minerals unknown
20	concentration control
55	Paulev studies show delay in onset or recognition of decay
63	Boulder survey excludes 3rd molars
119	Armstrong and Brekhus claim less fluoride in decayed teeth
194	promotion in naturally fluoridated cities reveals lack of sounder teeth
287	scientism
305	Dr Armstrong can't make up his mind
	6 ppm did not prevent tooth decay in rats
	non-essentiality for dental health
319	sugar responsible for decay
332	Armstrong reverses decision
	mottling too high a price to pay in Israel
	substantial decay in high-fluoride area of India
333	Iowa infant
334	deplorable teeth in Baltimore

Fluorine in Stomatology and Hygiene pages;

227-230 298-332 745-784

Page 11 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

Fluoridation and Truth Decay pages;

8	fluoride bad for teeth
10	Dr F J Stare of Harvard Dept of Nutrition reassures mothers
16	Dr C C Bass opposed to fluoridation and topical fluoride treatments
16	past president of The American Cancer Society opposes and denounces fluoridation
17	dentists waking up to the fluoridation con
18	no FDA research on alleged effectiveness of Crest
46	138% reduction in caries from multi-fluoride treatment?
50	Mayor sees no dental benefit in Concord, New Hampshire
67	decay rampant in Puerto Rico
67-8	dental decay in children who moved from Milwaukee
110	fluorosed teeth are to be called "rampant caries"
133-4	Dr W D Armstrong's error and water under the bridge
196-7	more caries, malocclusion and periodontal disease in Newburgh than in Kingston — but report "revised"
197	caries postponed, not prevented
197	Dr Leone's testimony in Eire
198	98% of Irish people suffering from decaying teeth or gum inflammation, eight years after fluoridation
216	Dean's study of mottling in 21 cities
216	Dean's call for USPHS investigation into dangers of cumulativity
216	US Public Health Service
216	dentist doubts fluoride hypothesis, requests study of decay resistance in Hereford and Deaf Smith County, Texas
216-7	Hereford study conclusions on caries and mottling
217	fluoride gets the credit for high local mineral content of soils and the food grown therein
219-2.	21 Newburgh-Kingston "studies"

Fage 12 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

Fluoridation and Truth Decay continued;

220-1 high caries rates in molars of Newburgh 16 year-olds after 10 years 221 greatest prophylaxis on teeth least attacked by caries 221 Muskegon fluoridated after caries reductions found 221-3 statistical method avoids showing delay in caries 222 DMFT in Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1944 and 1954 223 differing decay time trends in Grand Rapids, 1944/1954 227-8 "benefits" are statistical illusions 228 unerupted teeth counted as "sound" 228 decay delay in various studies 228 31% worse in Danvers, Massachussetts nine years after fluoridation 228-9 AMA finds no prevention of dental decay 229 Swedish and Austrian mathematicians analyse USPHS statistics, find conclusions unwarranted 229 Dr Dean admits under oath that his research is invalid according to his own standards 230 decay rate same in Philadelphia with 1 ppm as in Fresno with 0.1 ppm, despite extraordinary care 230 faster decay in Miami after fluoridation 230 Baltimore teeth "deplorable" 12 years after fluoridation 230 caries and mottling common in Puerto Rico after 14 years of fluoridation 230 fluorine makes it more difficult for patients to learn that they have cavities 231 U of Illinois study finds no variations in dental practice or evidence for "65% reduction in decay" 231 University of Illinois study not hailed in the press 231 US Navy study finds best teeth in unfluoridated areas 231 failure of fluoridation in Baltimore and Pittsburgh 232-3 analysis of 1969 DHSS report confirms decay delay theory proposed by Weaver in 1948

Page 13 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation and Truth Decay</u> continued;

233	
	diet and education the only answer
233	ADA replies to National Confectioners Association claim that sweets do not cause cavities
233-	4 "plaque control"
234	discoverer of "plaque control" believes fluoridation increases activity of existing periodontoclasia and is potentially harmful mass medication
237	FDA bans fluoride supplements for pregnant women on grounds of uselessness and danger of mental retardation
240	no drop in caries with fluoridation in Curico, Chile
275	topical treatment abandoned at Dental Infirmary for Children, Boston, Massachussetts
275	neither fluoridated toothpaste nor topical application with stannous fluoride found to be of benefit — McClure
275	Proctor and Gamble pay \$500,000 in grants to Dr Muhler at U of Indiana for research on Crest's efficacy
276	validity of Dr Muhler's research questioned
276	four year experiment involving 1000 English children abandoned when no significant differences found between fluoride and non-fluoride dentifrices
276	statistical work in some US toothpaste experiments was done by the toothpaste manufacturers or firms paid by them
276	NIDR report fluoride toothpastes ineffective
276	UK study of 719 children shows fluoride paste no better, more black-brown stains in experimental group
298	fluoridation — an American disaster
299	Dr H R Muhlmann of Zurich University Dental Institute speaks out

Page 14 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

The Fluoride Question pages;

8	twice the number of dentists in the longest fluoridated towns of the US
	US dental decay crisis
10	a little but not very much
14	pros and antis
21	physiological effects
27	research of H T Dean
45	decay not due to absence of fluoride
147	the Acid Theory

Fluoridation \ The Great Dilemma pages;

55-6	effect of diet
55-8	historical background
56	causes
56	DMFs
56-7	economic impact
57	effect on general health
	prevention
58-60	mechanism
64	DMFs
65	prevention
67-71	fluoridation pilot studies
80-3	F ⁻ content of teeth
185-190	fluoridation pilot studies
	unreliability of data
186-191	DMFs
187-90	inconsistencies in DMF data
190-3	effect of minerals on

Page 15 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

Fluoridation \ The Great Dilemma continued;

192-3	effect of diet
303	F ⁻ content of teeth
357-8	inconsistencies in DMF data
	unreliability of data
377-9	effect of diet
377-80	prevention
379	effect of minerals on
	mechanism

<u>Fluoridation 1979:</u> <u>Scientific Criticisms and Fluoride Dangers</u> pages;

69-92	the efficacy of artificial fluoridation is questionable
69	determination of changes in caries prevalence
70	longditudinal trials of fluoridation
71	the need for controls in experimental trials
73	premature establishment of fluoridation trials
74	small number of fluoridation trials with experimental controls
74	fluoridation demonstrations
75	the terms "controlled study" and "controlled fluoridation"
77	results, reports of results, and opinions of fluoridation trials
78	the gross errors in the main American/Canadian fluoridation trials
79	additional errors in the Evanston trial data
81	the question of delayed eruption of teeth

Page 16 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

<u>Fluoridation 1979:</u> <u>Scientific Criticisms and Fluoride Dangers</u> continued;

82	reduction or retardation of dental caries
88	reports from statisticians
260	"mediocrity of the literature demonstrating its efficiency in the prevention of dental caries"
260	compromise between fluorosis and "some possible reduction in dental decay"
261	difficulty of multivariate analysis

Fluoride \ The Aging Factor pages;

48	fluoride content of teeth
87	relation to caries not evidence of essentiality
94	Cox's "discovery"
96-98	fluoride content of enamel
	no decay reduction in animal studies
99	no effect on tooth decay rates in humans
100 correl	ation between decay, fluoride and other minerals
100-103	no effect on tooth decay rates in humans
103-107	fluoridation trials in US and Britain
108	decay down in unfluoridated areas
109	"super bad" dental problems in fluoridated area
same in	crease in dental costs in areas with and without
110 costs i	n fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas compared
112	Cox and ALCOA
138	ADA warning

Page 17 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

Fluoride in Australia \ A Case to Answer pages;

8	dental improvement in non-fluoridated areas too
14	fluoridation of control city
27	benefits better broadcast than actually established
27-8	no agreement on mechanism of anti-caries action
28	"50% increase" in caries-free children in Bacchus Marsh turns out to mean three children instead of two
28-9	Tasmanian Dept of Health pamphlet's comparison of decay levels criticised by Dr J Polya
	Grand Rapids sampling design "conspicuous by its absence"
30	poor design of early studies
31-2	relevance of North American fluoridation trials to Australia
32	failure of fluoridation in Kilmarnock, UK and Hastings, NZ
	"a large number of poor studies does not equal one good study"
32	flaws in N American studies replicated in Australia
32-33	data omitted in Sydney and Bunbury-Bussleton study
	no controls in most Australian fluoride-caries studies
33	"no scientific evidence to link the reported drop in tooth decay with fluoridation"
33	speakers and scientists at Boston conference would not identify factors responsible for caries decline in both fluoridated and unfluoridated countries
34	headlines claiming various percentage reductions in decay
35	NSW Health Commission's northern Sydney survey
	fluoride dentifrices given the credit, but no evidence
37	promoters underplay the inadequacy of epidemiological studies
46	incorporation of fluoride into bones and teeth
50	propaganda insinuates fluoride is inert in the body apart from the dental benefits

Page 18 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

Fluoride in Australia \ A Case to Answer continued;

51	Japan's leading toothpaste manufacturer removes fluoride from all its formulas
51	corrective versus antidotal prevention
53	interest of makers of cariogenic foods in fluoridation
53	fluoride dentifrice manufacturers' interest in fluoridation
60	fluoridation promotion directs attention away from the real cause of dental disease
60	fluoridation propaganda implies that fluoride alone can maintain healthy teeth
61	fluoridation an alternative to dietary correction
65	diet last of six factors in preventing tooth decay, according to Dr Craig
69	NRC committee member B G Bibby recommended lead fluoride
70	no evidence that reducing sweets will reduce tooth decay — Stare
73	Mars Bars fund dental conference — sugar not to blame for tooth decay
82	enamel becomes so brittle dentists can concentrate on the more profitable work of fitting crowns — Prof J C Muhler
84	unwillingness of dental experts to oppose sale of cariogenic foods
84-3	5 Hobart dental convention; "You can eat as many biscuits and Mars Bars as you like — so long as you clean your teeth properly"
85	dental profession discourages dental hygiene
90-	dentists pessimistic about dietary changes
91	measures to reduce sugar intake in Norway
93	the only research necessary in Australia
93	Australian studies on dental decay unscientific
94	drop in decay in Brisbane without fluoridation
95	rejection of Diesendorf article by New Doctor

Page 19 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

Fluoride in Australia \ A Case to Answer continued;

104	decline in caries prevalence in communities with unfluoridated water (including New Zealand, USA and Great Britain)
116-7	fluoridation "benefits the poor as a group more than the well-to-do"
122	Tasmanian Health Department anticipates encouraging caries figures
124	report for premier of W Australia criticises early fluoridation trials
126	Glen Walker unable to obtain NHMRC report under Freedom of Information Act

Fluoride \ The Freedom Fight pages;

87	comparison of one child with no children shows 38% caries reduction
128-129	Tiel-Culembourg yoghourt discovery
149 same reduct	tion in tooth decay with or without fluoride
Tiel red	ductions hardly attributable to fluoridation
149-150 beta	ter teeth in unfluoridated areas (Colquhoun)
171	better teeth in unfluoridated areas (Cook)
172 (Gei	better teeth in unfluoridated areas man Association of Gas and Water Engineers)

National Fluoridation News issues;

IX 2 Apr-May 1963 IX 3 Jun-Jul 1963 IX 4 Aug-Sep 1963 IX 5 Oct-Nov 1963 IX 6 Dec 63-Jan 1964 (2)

Page 20 of 21 on; TEETH (CARIES)

National Fluoridation News continued;

X 1 Feb-Mar 1964 X 2 Apr-May 1964 X 3 Jun-Jul 1964 X 4 Aug-Oct 1964 X 5 Nov-Dec 1964 XI | Jan-Feb 1965 XI 2 Mar-Apr 1965 XI 3 May-Jun 1965 XII 4 Sep-Oct 1966 XIII I Jan-Feb 1967 XIII 2 Mar-Apr 1967 XIII 3 May-Jun 1967 XIII 4 Jul-Aug 1967 XIII 5 Sep-Oct 1967 XIV 1 Jan-Feb 1968 XIV 2 Mar-Apr 1968 XIV 3 May-Jun 1968 XIV 6 Nov-Dec 1968 XV 1 Jan-Feb 1969 XV 2 Mar-Apr 1969 XV 5 Sep-Oct 1969 XVI 5 Nov-Dec 1970 XVII 2 Mar-Apr 1971 XVII 5 Sep-Oct 1971 XIX 4 Oct-Dec 1973 XX 1 Jan-Mar 1974 XX 3 Jul-Sep 1974 XX 4 Oct-Dec 1974 XXI | Jan-Mar 1975 XXI 4 Oct-Dec 1975

(2) (2)

(2nd print)

Page 21 of 21 on: TEETH (CARIES)

National Fluoridation News continued:

XXII 2 Apr-Jun 1976 XXII 3 Jul-Sep 1976 XXII 4 Oct-Dec 1976 XXIII 2 Apr-Jun 1977 XXIII 4 Oct-Dec 1977 XXIV I Jan-Mar 1978 XXIV 2 Apr-Jun 1978 XXV 1 Jan-Mar 1979 XXV 2 Apr-Jul 1979 XXV 3 Aug-Oct 1979 XXVI 4 Oct-Dec 1980 XXVII 2 Apr-Jun 1981 XXVII 3 Jul-Oct 1981 XXVII 4 Nov-Dec 1981 (correction) XXVIII 2 Apr-Jun 1982 XXVIII 3 Jul-Sep 1982 XXVIII 4 Oct-Dec 1982 XXIX 1 Spring 83 XXIX 3 Fall 83 XXIX 4 Winter 1983-84 XXX 2 Summer 84 XXX 4 Winter 1984-85 XXXI 1 Summer 85 XXXI 4 Spring 1986 declining decay rates fluoride promoters meet the press XXXII 1/2 1986/1987 fluorides worry pediatricians XXXII 3 1987-88 (in Presley)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(4)