

From: [Zokaie, Tooka](#)
To: billmaas@verizon.net
Cc: [Christopher H. Fox](#); [Chris Wood](#); [Frances Kim \(AAPHD\)](#); [Angeles Martinez Mier](#); [Farrell, Chris \(DHHS\)](#); [Josefine Ortiz Wolfe](#); [Makyba Charles-Ayinde](#); [Judy Feinstein \(personal\)](#)
Subject: Re: Insisting NIEHS update their website to indicate NASEM has reviewed the NTP monograph on fluoride
Date: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 11:31:34 AM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Hello all,

Thank you for this clear and important ask. Our DC team members are looking at connecting with our contacts at NASEM to address this very concern. We do not see an issue with signing on a letter in theory, we would just need to go through our proper channels of approval before we can officially sign.

I hope to have more updates from Bob Burns after speaking with NASEM directly about the current misuse of the draft Monograph and misleading representations of its status on the website.

Regards,

Tooka Zokaie, MPH, CPH | zokaie@ada.org

Manager, Fluoridation and Preventive Health Activities

Council on Advocacy for Access and Prevention

[312.440.2862](tel:312.440.2862)

Pronouns: she/her

American Dental Association [211 E. Chicago Ave. Chicago, IL 60611](#) www.ada.org

Named a 2019 [Top Workplace](#) by the Chicago Tribune.

On Feb 23, 2021, at 10:02 AM, "billmaas@verizon.net" <billmaas@verizon.net> wrote:

Thank you, Chris. I agree that it would be good to include the broader community. The issue is timing. We'd like to bring this to the NIEHS's attention. They didn't do anything after the first rejection by the NASEM, perhaps justified by NASEM's "this doesn't mean the assertion (of harm) isn't true, only that it has not been justified by this analysis". But after a second rejection, keeping the monograph available without explanation is similar to "we still believe there is harm and we are still looking for evidence that might support our conclusion". That is not a defensible position for a science-based organization to take. However, I'm willing to give NIEHS leadership the benefit of the doubt that they simply aren't aware of the implications of misperceptions that would

be perpetuated by not modifying their previous post-NASEM-review actions.

We recognize that it will take much more time to get a “sign on” from the larger organizations, whose leadership isn’t even yet aware of this issue and NIEHS’s reluctance to change the public explanation of their position. We’ll get that process started too, just in case NIEHS is resistant to the request of what may be perceived as narrower interests.

Bill

From: Christopher H. Fox <cfox@iadr.org>
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 10:52 PM
To: Chris Wood <cwood@astdd.org>; billmaas@verizon.net; 'Frances Kim (AAPHD)' <fkim@aaphd.org>; 'Angeles Martinez Mier' <esmartin@iupui.edu>; Christine M. Farrell (MichDoH) <farrellc@michigan.gov>; Josefine Ortiz Wolfe <jwolfe@texashealthinstitute.org>; Tooka Zokaie (ADA) <zokalet@ada.org>; Makyba Charles-Ayinde <mcayinde@iadr.org>
Cc: Judy Feinstein (personal) <jafme52@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Insisting NIEHS update their website to indicate NASEM has reviewed the NTP monograph on fluoride

Dear Bill and others:

AADR would also take a serious look at such a sign-on letter, once drafted. It would be good to engage the broader medical and public health community too. i.e. APHA (not just oral health section), ASTHO, AAP (Pediatrics), etc.

Chris

Christopher H. Fox, DMD, DMSc, Chief Executive Officer
International Association for Dental Research | www.iadr.org
American Association for Dental Research | www.aadr.org
1619 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3406, USA
T: +1.703.299.8082 | F: +1.703.548.1883 | E: cfox@iadr.org
Publishers of [*Journal of Dental Research*](#) and [*JDR Clinical & Translational Research*](#)

From: Chris Wood <cwood@astdd.org>
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 7:07 PM
To: billmaas@verizon.net; 'Frances Kim (AAPHD)' <fkim@aaphd.org>; Angeles Martinez Mier' <esmartin@iupui.edu>; Christine M. Farrell (MichDoH) <farrellc@michigan.gov>; Josefine Ortiz Wolfe <jwolfe@texashealthinstitute.org>; Tooka Zokaie (ADA) <zokalet@ada.org>; Christopher H. Fox <cfox@iadr.org>; Makyba Charles-Ayinde <mcayinde@iadr.org>
Cc: Judy Feinstein (personal) <jafme52@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Insisting NIEHS update their website to indicate NASEM has reviewed the

NTP monograph on fluoride

EXTERNAL EMAIL

I am sure ASTDD's Board would support signing onto a letter and I can probably get their approval within a few days once I have a draft of it.

From: billmaas@verizon.net <billmaas@verizon.net>

Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 3:58 PM

To: 'Frances Kim (AAPHD)' <fkim@aaphd.org>; 'Angeles Martinez Mier' <esmartin@iupui.edu>; Chris Wood <cwood@astdd.org>; Christine M. Farrell (MichDoH) <farrellc@michigan.gov>; Josefina Ortiz Wolfe <jwolfe@texashealthinstitute.org>; Tooka Zokaie (ADA) <zokaie@ada.org>; Christopher Fox <cfox@iadr.org>; Makyba Charles-Ayinde (IADR/AADR) <mcayinde@iadr.org>

Subject: Insisting NIEHS update their website to indicate NASEM has reviewed the NTP monograph on fluoride

I'm sure you are all aware at some level that the National Academies special committee has completed their review of the NTP systematic review of fluoride and cognitive effects and concluded that the report does not support NTP's assertion that fluoride is a presumed neurotoxicant. Three weeks later, NTP still has put nothing up on its website to indicate that the assertions it made by its report have not passed independent peer review.

[Fluoride: Potential Developmental Neurotoxicity \(nih.gov\)](https://www.nih.gov/fluoride-potential-developmental-neurotoxicity)

It is as if a journal posted a pre-review report, was told by peer reviewers that the report did not support its conclusions, and then simply left the flawed report up to mislead the public. I realize that some of you are in organizations with more complex bureaucracies than others, but I'm informally seeking your interest in signing off on a letter to NIEHS (home institution of NTP) to ask that the long-awaited review by NASEM be acknowledged and the monograph (systematic review) be modified or labeled in some way so that anyone who accesses will clearly be advised that peer review concluded that the assertion was not supported by the report.

After NASEM review of version 1, NTP only posted a RESPONSE to the NASEM reviewing promising to do better in next version. Version 2 still didn't pass muster. Others are going to write to insist NTP hire new contractors to do third version if it insists on a 3rd version. NTP claims to have an obligation to tell the public the state of the science. If that is the case, they may need to do a 3rd version just to come to the conclusion that there is not consistent evidence of neurotoxic effects. That isn't our concern at this time, only that the lack of confidence in the CURRENT version of the report be clear as long as NTP insists on posting it as the best science on the topic.

What is your interest in signing a letter asking for the status of the monograph to be updated and clear? I think we can talk openly among ourselves, but if you want to

respond privately, that is fine too. If you are interested I'll send you the current draft of the request we are working on. If you are interested by think it would take more than a week to get sign off from your organization, we can deal with that too, sending one request now and then following up with others if the issue still hasn't been resolved by the time this request gets filtered up your chain of command.

Thanks for your consideration,

Bill Maas

Dental Public Health Consultant

p: 301-231-7814 | m: 301-254-7814 | e: billmaas@verizon.net