

From: Christine Massey [mailto:massey@hawaii.edu]

Date: January 3, 2019 at 9:11:29 AM EST

To: wahmed@wechu.org

Cc: 'w

ca,

[REDACTED]

Subject: fake fluoride input from medical officer in Windsor influenced decision

Dear Dr. Ahmed,

When you were questioned during the recent [water fluoridation meeting](#) in Windsor by Councillor Kusmierczyk regarding the [2017 IQ study](#) and the [2018 ADHD study](#) (both by Bashash et al.), you held up a document, stating:

*"...As I mentioned, **this document is recently prepared by Public Health Ontario, our scientific body, and it touches on, specifically on those studies**, and I would just say that those studies, and I'm quoting verbatim...."*

You went on to read the following quote from the *Neurobehavioral effects* section on page 9 (page 15 of the pdf) of PHO's [Evidence Review for Adverse Health Effects of Drinking Optimally Fluoridated Water \(2010-2017\)](#), which was published in the Windsor agenda, [page 237](#)):

"...This study was critiqued by other researchers for methodological limitations including measurement error and no consideration for other potential explanatory variables (such as pre-term birth or exposure to tobacco, alcohol, arsenic or lead) apart from SES. The results are advised to be interpreted with great caution due to high risk of ecological fallacy (water fluoridation measured at state level) and confounding bias."

The problem here is that the study referred to in the above quote is listed in PHO's reference section as:

18.

Bogstrand ST, Normann PT, Rossow I, Larsen M, Morland J, Ekeberg O. Prevalence of alcohol and other substances of abuse among injured patients in a Norwegian emergency department. Drug & Alcohol Dependence. 2011;117:132 - 8.

This is not either of the Bashash et al. studies about which you were questioned and claimed to be reading.

The other study referenced under the *Neurobehavioral effects* of the PHO evidence review is listed as:

29. Abavare L, Abavare C. Wound botulism resulting from heroin abuse: can you recognize it? *Journal of emergency nursing: JEN : official publication of the Emergency Department Nurses Association*. 2012;38:301 - 3.

This too is not either of the Bashash et al. studies about which you were questioned.

Nor could it be, since **the PHO evidence review you read from only covered literature published as of May 10, 2017 (see pages 7 and 10), and both of the Bashash et al studies were published after that date.** In fact, none of the 46 references in the PHO evidence review contain the word "fluoride" or "fluoridation" in their title.

PHO has noted [elsewhere](#), that "*The [IQ] study by Bashash et al. is a considerable improvement over previous research...*" (attached).

I can find no indication that PHO has reviewed the Bashash et al. ADHD study (see the attached search results from the PHO website).

[Unable to provide](#) a single chronic toxicity study of the fluoridation agent HFSA, or experimental proof that it dissociates 100% in tap water, or a single randomized controlled study of fluoridated water, or a single observational study that controls for all known potential confounders, you and your public health colleagues in the few areas of the world reckless enough to fluoridate public water (which the vast majority of Europe does not) rely on studies of lesser quality than the Bashash et al. studies, and you encourage decision makers to conflate the absence of perfect studies demonstrating harm with "proven safe with decades of research".

In short, you encourage decision makers to experiment with developing brains.

And you resort to further trickery to sway opinion and cover up the extent of dental fluorosis in your community: <http://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/windsor-essex-county-health-units-unscientific-2018-oral-health-report/>

Yours for Safe Water,
Christine Massey, M.Sc.
[Fluoride Free Peel](#)