Introduction

Fluoridation Facts has been published by the American Dental Association (ADA) since 1956. Revised periodically, Fluoridation Facts answers frequently asked questions about community water fluoridation. In this 2018 edition, the ADA Council on Advocacy for Access and Prevention provides updated information for individuals and groups interested in the facts about fluoridation. The United States now has more than 70 years of extensive experience with community water fluoridation. Its remarkable longevity and success is testimony to fluoridation’s significance as a public health measure. In recognition of the impact that water fluoridation has had on the oral and general health of the public, in 1999, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) named fluoridation of drinking water as one of ten great public health achievements of the 20th century.1,2

Support for Water Fluoridation

Since 1950, the American Dental Association (ADA) has continuously and unreservedly endorsed the optimal fluoridation of community water supplies as a safe and effective public health measure for the prevention of tooth decay. The ADA’s policy is based on the best available scientific evidence on the safety and effectiveness of fluoridation. Since the ADA first adopted policy recommending community water fluoridation in 1950, the ADA has continued to reaffirm its position of support for water fluoridation and has strongly urged that its benefits be extended to communities served by public water systems.3

Over the years, additional support has come from numerous U.S. Surgeons General who are the leading spokespersons on matters of public health in the federal government. In 2016, Surgeon General Dr. Vivek H. Murthy in his “Statement on Community Water Fluoridation,”4 noted:

Water fluoridation is the best method for delivering fluoride to all members of the community, regardless of age, education, income level or access to routine dental care. Fluoride's effectiveness in preventing tooth decay extends throughout one's life, resulting in fewer — and less severe — cavities. In fact, each generation born over the past 70 years has enjoyed better dental health than the one before it. That's the very essence of the American promise.4

In addition to the American Dental Association, the American Medical Association,5 the American Academy of Pediatrics6 and the World Health Organization7 also support community water fluoridation.

Many organizations in the United States and around the world recognize the benefits of community water fluoridation. The ADA has developed a list of “National and International Organizations that Recognize the Public Health Benefits of Community Water Fluoridation for Preventing Dental Decay.” Please see the ADA website at www.ADA.org/fluoride for the most current listing as well as information on reproduction and distribution of the list.
It has been observed that the major features of human fluoride metabolism are not affected by the three fluoride additives used in community water fluoridation nor are they affected by whether the fluoride is present naturally or added to drinking water. In more simple terms, there is no difference chemically between natural and adjusted fluoridation.

When fluoride is added under controlled conditions to fluoride-deficient water, the dental benefits are the same as those obtained from naturally fluoridated water. Fluoridation is merely an increase of the level of the naturally occurring fluoride present in all drinking water sources to the level recommended for optimal dental health.

Fluoridation is merely an increase of the level of the naturally occurring fluoride present in all drinking water sources to the level recommended for optimal dental health.

For example, a fluoridation study conducted in the Ontario, Canada, communities of Brantford (optimally fluoridated by adjustment), Stratford (optimally fluoridated naturally) and Sarnia (fluoride-deficient), revealed much lower decay rates in both Brantford and Stratford as compared to nonfluoridated Sarnia. There was no observable difference in the decay-reducing effect between the naturally occurring fluoride and adjusted fluoride concentration water supplies, proving that dental benefits were similar regardless of the source of fluoride.

Some individuals use the term “artificial fluoridation” to imply that the process of water fluoridation is unnatural and that it delivers a foreign substance into a water supply when, in fact, all water sources contain some fluoride. The fluoride ion released in water is the same regardless of the source and is metabolized (processed) by the body in the same way no matter what the source. Community water fluoridation is a natural way to improve oral health.

7. Is water fluoridation effective in helping to prevent tooth decay?

**Answer.**

Yes. According to the best available scientific evidence, community water fluoridation is an effective public health measure for preventing, and in some cases, reversing tooth decay, in children, adolescents and adults. With hundreds of studies published in peer-reviewed, scientific journals, fluoridation is one of the most studied public health measures in history and it continues to be studied today.

**Fact.**

The effectiveness of fluoride in drinking water to prevent tooth decay has been documented in the scientific literature for over 70 years. Before the first community fluoridation program began in 1945, epidemiologic data from the 1930s and 1940s were collected and analyzed. What began as research to learn what caused “Colorado Brown Stain” (dental fluorosis) led to the discovery of strikingly low tooth decay rates associated with fluoride in drinking water at approximately 1 ppm (mg/L). Figure 2 shows the results of early research by Dr. H. Trendley Dean noting the relationship between children’s experience with tooth decay (solid line), dental fluorosis (dotted line) and the fluoride concentration in drinking water.

Additional information on this topic can be found in the Introduction Section.
difficult due to the fact that some patients have multiple sources of drinking water during a typical day. For example, while a patient may have access to drinking water in the home, they often also spend a large part of their day accessing drinking water at day care or school, which could be a different water system. It might be necessary to contact the local, county or state health departments for information on the fluoride content of public water sources or to be referred to a certified laboratory that can provide a fluoride test for private wells.

Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 4.

The ADA offers information on caries risk assessment on the web at http://www.ADA.org/en/member-center/oral-health-topics/caries-risk-assessment-and-management. It should be noted that dietary fluoride supplements are recommended only for children at high risk for tooth decay. Caries risk assessments should be completed for patients on a regular basis to determine their risk for tooth decay which can change over time.

Dietary fluoride supplements can be effective in helping to prevent tooth decay. To receive the optimal benefit from fluoride supplements, the use of supplements should begin at six months of age and continue daily until the child is 16 years old. However, individual patterns of compliance can vary greatly.

For that reason, the report suggests that providers carefully monitor the adherence to the schedule to maximize the therapeutic benefit of supplements in caries prevention. If the health care provider has concerns regarding a lack of compliance to the schedule, it might be best to consider other sources of fluoride exposure for the patient, such as bottled water with fluoride.

While dietary fluoride supplements can be effective in reducing tooth decay, there are a number of factors that can impede their use and resulting therapeutic value:

- Patients/parents/caregivers must have access to a professional health care provider who can provide the necessary assessments and provide prescriptions for the supplements — often repeatedly over time.
- The supplements must be obtained through a pharmacy/pharmaceutical service and refilled as necessary.
- The cost of supplements can be a financial hardship for some individuals.
- The compliance required (a child should take the supplement every day until 16 years of age) to obtain the optimal therapeutic affect often is difficult to achieve.

| Table 1. Dietary Fluoride Supplement Schedule for Children at High Caries Risk* |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Age              | Fluoride ion level in drinking water (ppm)* |
|                  | <0.3 ppm | 0.3-0.6 ppm | >0.6 ppm  |
| Birth - 6 months | None     | None         | None      |
| 6 months - 3 years | 0.25 mg/day** | None | None |
| 3-6 years        | 0.50 mg/day | 0.25 mg/day | None |
| 6-16 years       | 1.0 mg/day | 0.50 mg/day | None |

* 1.0 part per million (ppm) = 1 milligram/liter (mg/L) ** 2.2 mg sodium fluoride contains 1 mg fluoride ion.
For example, it has been reported in a number of studies that young children inadvertently swallow an average of 0.30 mg of fluoride from fluoride toothpaste at each brushing.\textsuperscript{44-48} If a child brushes twice a day, 0.60 mg of fluoride could be ingested inappropriately. This could slightly exceed the Adequate Intake (AI) values from Table 2. The 0.60 mg consumption is 0.10 mg higher than the AI value for children 6 to 12 months and is 0.10 mg lower than the AI for children from 1-3 years of age.\textsuperscript{40} Although toothpaste is not meant to be swallowed, children could consume the daily recommended Adequate Intake amount of fluoride from toothpaste alone. In order to decrease the risk of dental fluorosis, the American Dental Association (ADA) recommends:\textsuperscript{49}

- For children younger than 3 years, caregivers should begin brushing children’s teeth as soon as they begin to come into the mouth by using fluoride toothpaste in an amount no more than a smear or the size of a grain of rice (Figure 4). Brush teeth thoroughly twice per day (morning and night) or as directed by a dentist or physician. Supervise children’s brushing to ensure that they use the appropriate amount of toothpaste.

- For children 3 to 6 years of age, caregivers should dispense no more than a pea-sized amount (Figure 4) of fluoride toothpaste. Brush teeth thoroughly twice per day (morning and night) or as directed by a dentist or physician. Supervise children’s brushing to minimize swallowing of toothpaste.\textsuperscript{49}

It should be noted that the amounts of fluoride discussed here are intake, or ingested, amounts. When fluoride is ingested, a portion is retained in the body and a portion is excreted.

\textbf{Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 25.}

24. Is there a need for prenatal dietary fluoride supplementation?

**Answer.**

There is no scientific basis to suggest any need to increase a woman’s daily fluoride intake during pregnancy or breastfeeding to protect her health. At this time, scientific evidence is insufficient to support the recommendation for prenatal fluoride supplementation for decay prevention for infants.

**Fact.**

The Institute of Medicine determined that, “No data from human studies document the metabolism of fluoride during lactation. Because fluoride concentrations in human milk are very low (0.007 to 0.011 ppm) and relatively insensitive to differences in the fluoride concentrations of the mother’s drinking water, fluoride supplementation during lactation would not be expected to significantly affect fluoride intake by the nursing infant or the fluoride requirement of the mother.”\textsuperscript{40}

A 2005 a randomized, double blind study\textsuperscript{50} compared the amount of fluoride incorporated into primary teeth exposed to prenatal and postnatal fluoride supplements to primary teeth that were exposed to only postnatal fluoride. The study concluded that teeth exposed to prenatal and postnatal fluoride supplements had no additional measurable fluoride other than that attributable to postnatal fluoride alone.\textsuperscript{50} This study confirmed the findings of a 1997 randomized, double blind study that evaluated the effectiveness of prenatal dietary supplementation which concluded that the data did not support the hypothesis that prenatal fluoride had a strong decay preventive effect on primary teeth.\textsuperscript{51}
Fluoridation Practice

47. Who regulates drinking water additives in United States?

**Answer.**
The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulates drinking water additives.

**Fact.**
In 1974, Congress passed the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) which protects the public’s health by regulating the nation’s public drinking water supply. The SDWA, as amended in 1986 and 1996, requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to ensure the public is provided with safe drinking water.† On June 22, 1979, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the EPA entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to clarify their roles and responsibilities in water quality assurance.† The stated purpose of the MOU is to “avoid the possibility of overlapping jurisdiction between the USEPA and FDA with respect to control of drinking water additives.” The two agencies agreed that the Safe Drinking Water Act’s passage in 1974 implicitly repealed FDA’s jurisdiction over drinking water as a ‘food’ under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA). Under the MOU, EPA enjoys exclusive regulatory authority over drinking water provided by public water systems, including any additives in such water. FDA retains jurisdiction over bottled drinking water under Section 410 of the FFDCA and “over water (and substances in water) used in food or food processing once it enters the food processing establishment.”†

While drinking water from the tap is regulated by the EPA, bottled water is regulated by the FDA which has established standards for its quality. The FDA has noted that fluoride can occur naturally in source waters used for bottled water or may be added by a bottled water manufacturer. Recognizing the benefit of fluoride in water, the FDA has stated that bottled water that meets specific standards of identity and quality set forth by FDA, and the provisions of the authorized health claim related to fluoride, may be labeled with the following health claim: “Drinking fluoridated water may reduce the risk of [dental caries or tooth decay].”‡

From time to time, states and communities have had to deal with legislation or ballot initiatives aimed at requiring the approval of the FDA before any agent can be added to community water systems. Often referred to as the Fluoride Product Quality Control Act, Water Product Quality Ordinance or Pure Water Ordinance, the legislation is specifically used by those opposed to water fluoridation as a tool to prevent water systems from providing community water fluoridation. Often this legislation does not specifically
mention fluoride or fluoridation. Those supporting this type of legislation may claim that they are not against water fluoridation but are proponents of pure water and do not want anything added to water that has not been approved by the FDA. On the surface, this may appear to be a “common sense” approach. However, its only real purpose is to defeat efforts to provide water fluoridation. That is because this proposed legislation would require the FDA — which does NOT regulate public water systems — to approve any water additive. By mistakenly (and perhaps craftily) naming the wrong federal agency, the probable outcome is to stop or prevent water fluoridation.

48. What standards have been established to ensure the safety of fluoride additives used in community water fluoridation in the United States?

**Answer.**
The three fluoride additives used in the U.S. to fluoridate community water systems (sodium fluoride, sodium fluorosilicate, and fluorosilicic acid) meet safety standards established by the American Water Works Association (AWWA) and NSF International (NSF).

The three fluoride additives used in the U.S. to fluoridate community water systems (sodium fluoride, sodium fluorosilicate, and fluorosilicic acid) meet safety standards established by the American Water Works Association (AWWA) and NSF International (NSF).

**Fact.**
Additives used in water treatment meet safety standards prepared in response to a request by the Environmental Protection Agency to establish minimum requirements to ensure the safety of products added to water for its treatment, thereby ensuring the public’s health. Specifically, fluoride additives used in water fluoridation meet standards established by the American Water Works Association (AWWA) and NSF International (NSF). Additionally, the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) endorses both AWWA and NSF standards for fluoridation additives and includes its name on these standards.

The American Water Works Association is an international nonprofit scientific and educational society dedicated to providing total water solutions to assure the effective management of water. Founded in 1881, the AWWA is the largest organization of water supply professionals in the world. The membership represents the full spectrum of the water community: public water and wastewater systems, environmental advocates, scientists, academicians, and others who hold a genuine interest in water. AWWA unites the diverse water community to advance public health, safety, the economy, and the environment.

NSF International, an independent, accredited organization, is dedicated to being the leading global provider of public health and safety-based risk management solutions. Manufacturers, regulators, and consumers look to NSF to develop public health standards and certifications that help protect food, water, consumer products, and the environment. Its professional staff includes microbiologists, toxicologists, chemists, engineers, and environmental and public health professionals. Founded in 1944 as the National Sanitation Foundation, NSF’s mission is to protect and improve global human health.

The American National Standards Institute (ANSI) is a private, non-profit organization that administers and coordinates the U.S. voluntary standardization and conformity assessment system. The Institute’s mission is to enhance both the global competitiveness of U.S. business and the U.S. quality of life by promoting and facilitating voluntary consensus standards and conformity assessment systems, and safeguarding their integrity.

The AWWA documents provide manufacturers, suppliers and purchasers with standards for the manufacturing, quality and verification for each of the three fluoride additives listed below. The AWWA standards set the physical, chemical and impurities standards including information on verification of the standard requirements and requirements for delivery.

- ANSI/AWWA B701 Sodium Fluoride
- ANSI/AWWA B702 Sodium Fluorosilicate
- ANSI/AWWA B703 Fluorosilicic Acid
57. What is public health?

Answer.
Public health promotes and protects the health of people and the communities where they live, learn, work and play. Public health measures improve the quality of life for members of the community.

Fact.
Public health has numerous definitions and dimensions. It can encompass issues of research, education, regulation, policy and more. It focuses on the health of entire populations that can vary in size from as small as a local neighborhood to a small-sized community and a large-sized city. It also can focus on populations with a state, national or even global perspective. But how does public health affect our everyday lives? Individuals are touched by public health measures every day without giving them a second thought. For example, garbage pick-up and disposal prevent the spread of disease. The stoplight at a busy intersection protects motorists and pedestrians from injury. Building sidewalks in communities provides the option for people to walk to help control their weight and improve their heart health. Smoke-free laws help prevent lung cancer. All of these are public health in action.

Community water fluoridation is another example of a public health measure.

- Optimally fluoridated water is accessible to the entire community regardless of socioeconomic status, educational attainment or other social variables.¹

- Individuals do not need to take special action or otherwise change their behavior to obtain the benefits of fluoridation.

- Frequent exposure to small amounts of fluoride over time makes fluoridation effective through the life span in helping to prevent tooth decay.²

- Community water fluoridation is more cost-effective and cost-saving than other forms of fluoride treatments or applications.³, ⁴

During the 20th century, the health and life expectancy of persons residing in the United States improved dramatically. Since 1900, the average life span of persons in the United States lengthened by greater than 30 years; 25 years of this gain are attributable to advances in public health. Many notable public health achievements occurred during the 1900s. In a series of reports during 1999, the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) profiled 10 public health achievements chosen to highlight the contributions of public health and to describe the impact of these contributions on the health and well being of persons in the United States.⁵

Ten Great Public Health Achievements — United States, 1900-1999⁵

- Vaccination
- Motor-vehicle safety
- Safer workplaces
- Control of infectious diseases
- Decline in deaths from coronary heart disease and stroke
- Safer and healthier foods
- Healthier mothers and babies
- Family planning
- Fluoridation of drinking water
- Recognition of tobacco use as a health hazard
In discussing the contribution of fluoridation, the October 22, 1999 MMWR noted fluoridation of community drinking water was a major factor responsible for the decline in tooth decay during the second half of the 20th century. Although other fluoride-containing products are available, water fluoridation remains the most equitable and cost-effective method of delivering fluoride to all members of communities, regardless of age, educational attainment, or income level.

58. Is water fluoridation a valuable public health measure?

Answer.
Yes. Community water fluoridation is a public health measure that benefits people of all ages and is a public health program that saves money for families and the health care system. Because fluoridation reaches large numbers of people where they live, learn, work and play, it is more effective than other forms of fluoride delivery. Water fluoridation reaches everyone in the community regardless of age, race, education, income level or access to routine dental care. Because of the important role it has played in the reduction of tooth decay, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of 10 great public health achievements of the 20th century.

Fact.
Throughout decades of research and more than 70 years of practical experience, fluoridation of public water supplies has been responsible for dramatically improving the public’s oral health status.

The oral health of Americans suffered greatly during the time of the Great Depression and into the era of World War II. There were no public health programs in place that addressed tooth decay and the loss of teeth was viewed as an eventuality. In fact, as World War II approached, those joining the U.S. Army were required to have six back teeth (three on the top and three on the bottom) that opposed each other to serve the function of chewing food and six front teeth (three on the top and three on the bottom) that opposed each other for the purpose of biting into food. The number of men disqualified for dental reasons far exceeded all expectations as “dental disease” became the most common reason for military deferment. One out of eleven registrants examined was disqualified for military service due to dental issues. After Pearl Harbor it was apparent that the manpower needed to fight a global war could be obtained only if dental standards for induction were drastically relaxed. By March 1942, the standards had been revised so that a man who was “well nourished, of good musculature, and free from gross dental infections” but who was completely edentulous (without any teeth) could be inducted if his condition was corrected or could be corrected with dentures.

Because fluoridation reaches large numbers of people where they live, learn, work and play, it is more effective than other forms of fluoride delivery.

In January 1945, a community water fluoridation trial began in Grand Rapids, Michigan followed within months by trials in Newburgh, NY (May 1945), Brantford, Ontario (June 1945) and Evanston, IL (February 1947). Reductions in tooth decay were dramatic leading to the rapid adoption of fluoridation in cities across the U.S. As a result, tooth decay declined sharply during the second half of the 20th century. Tooth loss was no longer considered inevitable.

Former U.S. Surgeon General, Dr. Luther Terry, called fluoridation as vital a public health measure as immunization against disease, pasteurization of milk and purification of water.
Targeting Politicians and Community Leaders: Antifluoridation websites contain draft letters to be sent to newspaper publishers, water departments, and community public officials warning them of their “liability” should they support or endorse water fluoridation. Leaders are urged to remain “neutral” and allow fluoridation decisions to be put to a public vote, therefore, relieving the leaders of any and all responsibility in the matter. Antifluoridationists use the time gained to conduct a public referendum to bombard the public with misinformation designed to turn public opinion against fluoridation.

Unproven Claims: Antifluoridationists have repeatedly claimed fluoridation causes an entire laundry list of human illnesses, including AIDS, Alzheimer’s disease, cancer, Down Syndrome, genetic damage, heart disease, lower intelligence, kidney disease, osteoporosis and hip fractures. None of these claims has a basis in fact. These allegations are often repeated so frequently during campaigns that the public assumes they must be true. Their appearance in print, even if only in letters to the editor of the local newspaper, reinforces the allegation’s credibility. With just a small amount of doubt established, the opposition slogan, “If in doubt, vote it out,” often rings true with voters.

Innuendo: The statement, “Fifty years ago physicians and dentists posed for cigarette ads,” is an example of innuendo or, more specifically, guilt by association. Even though fluoridation is not mentioned, individuals are expected to make the connection that the medical community changed its position on smoking so it is possible health professionals are wrong about fluoridation, too.

Outdated Studies and Statements from “Experts”: Antifluoridation websites often offer a list of “respected medical professionals and scientists” who have spoken out against fluoridation. One of those often quoted is Dr. Charles Gordon Heyd who is noted to be a Past President of the American Medical Association (AMA). What is not disclosed is the source of the quote or that Dr. Heyd was President of the AMA in 1936 – almost ten years before water fluoridation trials began. His decades-old quote certainly does not represent the current AMA position of support for water fluoridation and is characteristic of antifluoridationists’ use of items that are out of date. Additionally, antifluoridationists have claimed that fourteen Nobel Prize winners have “opposed or expressed reservations about fluoridation.” It should be noted that the vast majority of these individuals were awarded their prizes from 1929 through 1958.

Statements Out of Context: One of the most repeated antifluoridation statements is, “Fluoride is a toxic chemical. Don’t let them put it in our water.” This statement ignores the scientific principle that toxicity is related to dosage and not just to exposure to a substance. Examples of other substances that can be harmful in the wrong amounts, but beneficial in the correct amounts, are salt, vitamins A and D, iron, iodine, aspirin and even water itself.

Conspiracy Theories: Hardly a fluoridation campaign goes by without those opposed to fluoridation bringing up any number of conspiracy theories about fluoridation. Whether it is the claim that scientists from the original atomic bomb program secretly shaped and guided the early Newburgh, NY, fluoridation trial or that chemtrails are a government plot to spread fluoride, these claims have no basis in fact. Even the belief that fluoridation was a communist plot to destroy America was famously parodied in the 1964 movie Dr. Strangelove. Over the decades, those opposed to fluoridation have used propaganda schemes and conspiracy theories that reflected the social and political environment of the times. Today, “follow the money” is a common theme as the opposition claims that the beverage industry, the companies supplying fluoride additives and others are financially backing researchers, as well as dental and medical groups, who are promoting fluoridation. None of these claims has a basis in fact.
Adoption of fluoridation is ultimately a decision of state or local decision makers, whether determined by elected officials, health officers or the voting public. Fluoridation can be enacted through state legislation, administrative regulation, ordinance or a public referendum. While fluoridation is not legislated at the federal level, it is legislated at the state and local level. As with any public health measure, a community has the right and obligation to protect the health and welfare of its citizens, even if it means overriding individual objections to implement fluoridation.

Those opposed to fluoridation sometimes comment that “the government is forcing fluoridation” on the community. But who is “the government?” The fact is that since fluoridation is implemented by state or local votes (by city councils or public vote), the people are “the government.” Voters elect officials at the...