1. **What is fluoride?**

**Answer.**
Fluoride is a naturally occurring mineral that can help prevent tooth decay.

**Fact.**
The element fluorine is abundant in the earth’s crust as a naturally occurring fluoride compound found in rocks and soil. As ground water moves through the earth, it passes over rock formations and dissolves the fluoride minerals that are present, releasing fluoride ions that are naturally occurring fluoride in the rocks. This increases the fluoride content of the water. The concentration of fluoride in ground water (e.g., wells, springs) varies according to such factors as the depth at which the water is found and the quantity of fluoride-bearing minerals in the area.

Fluoride is present at varied concentrations in all water sources including rainwater and the oceans. For example, the oceans’ fluoride levels range from 1.2 to 1.4 mg/L. In the United States, the natural level of fluoride in ground water varies from very low levels to over 4 mg/L. In comparison, the fluoride concentrations in surface water sources such as lakes and rivers is very low. For example, the water analysis completed by the city of Chicago for the year 2016 lists the range for Lake Michigan’s natural fluoride level as 0.11 to 0.13 mg/L.

2. **How does fluoride help prevent tooth decay?**

**Answer.**
Tooth decay begins when the outer layer of a tooth loses some of its minerals due to acid produced by bacteria in dental plaque breaking down the sugars that we eat. Fluoride protects teeth by helping to prevent the loss of these minerals and by restoring them with a fluoride-containing mineral that is more resistant to acid attacks. In other words, fluoride protects teeth by reducing demineralization and enhancing remineralization. Fluoride also works to hinder bacterial activity necessary for the formation of tooth decay.

**Fact.**
One of fluoride’s main mechanism of action is its ability to prevent or delay the loss of minerals from teeth. Cavities start to form when minerals are lost due to acid attacks from bacteria in dental plaque (a soft, sticky film that is constantly forming on teeth). Bacteria grow rapidly by feeding on the sugars and refined carbohydrates that we consume. This process of losing minerals is called demineralization.

Fluoride’s second mechanism of action is called remineralization, which is the reversal of this demineralization process. Teeth gain back the minerals lost during acid attacks through remineralization but with an important difference. Some of the hydroxyapatite crystal lost is replaced with fluorapatite. This fluoride-rich replacement mineral is even more resistant to acid attacks than the original tooth surface.
Studies indicate fluoride has a third mechanism of action that hinders the ability of bacteria to metabolize carbohydrates and produce acids. It can also hinder the ability of the bacteria to stick to the tooth surface.

Fluoride and minerals, including calcium and phosphate, are present in saliva and are stored in dental plaque. To halt the formation of tooth decay or rebuild tooth surfaces, fluoride must be constantly present in low concentrations in saliva and plaque. Frequent exposure to small amounts of fluoride, such as that which occurs when drinking fluoridated water, helps to maintain the reservoir of available fluoride in saliva and plaque to resist demineralization and enhance remineralization. In other words, drinking fluoridated water provides the right amount of fluoride at the right place at the right time. Fluoride in water and water-based beverages is consumed many times during the day, providing frequent contact with tooth structures and making fluoride available to fluoride reservoirs in the mouth. This helps explain why fluoride at the low levels found in fluoridated water helps to prevent tooth decay.

Additionally, studies have concluded that fluoride ingested during tooth formation becomes incorporated into the tooth structure making the teeth more resistant to acid attacks and demineralization. In particular, this pre-eruptive exposure to fluoride, before the teeth come into the mouth during childhood, can play a significant role in preventing tooth decay in the pits and fissures of the chewing surfaces, particularly of molars. Sources of fluorides in the United States that provide this pre-eruptive effect include fluoridated water and dietary fluoride supplements as well as fluoride present in foods and beverages. Additionally, young children often swallow substantial percentages of the fluoride toothpaste and other fluoride-containing dental products which adds to their intake of fluoride. Originally, it was believed that fluoride’s action was exclusively pre-eruptive, meaning the benefit occurred only during tooth formation, but by the mid-1950s there was growing evidence of the importance of fluoride’s important roles in demineralization and remineralization.

Pre-eruptive effects are sometimes called systemic, while post-eruptive effects are called topical. These terms refer to different things. Pre- and post-eruptive refer to the timing of fluoride benefits while systemic and topical refer to the mode of administration or source of fluoride. Defining the effects of fluoride from a specific source as solely systemic or topical is not entirely accurate. For example, water fluoridation provides both a systemic (during tooth development) and topical effect (at the time of ingestion strengthening the outside of the tooth).

Today it is understood that the maximum reduction in tooth decay occurs when both effects are combined, that is when fluoride has been incorporated into the tooth during formation and when it is available at the tooth surface during demineralization and remineralization. Water fluoridation works in both ways to prevent tooth decay.

3. What is water fluoridation?

**Answer.**

Water fluoridation is the controlled adjustment of the natural fluoride concentration in community water supplies to the concentration recommended for optimal dental health. Fluoridation helps prevent tooth decay in children and adults.

**Fact.**

In 2015, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), using the best available science, established the recommended concentration for fluoride in the water in the United States at 0.7 mg/L. This level effectively reduces tooth decay while minimizing dental fluorosis.

The level of fluoride in water is measured in milligrams per liter (mg/L) or parts per million (ppm). When referring to water, a concentration in milligrams per liter is identical to parts per million and the notations can be used interchangeably. Thus, 0.7 mg/L of fluoride in water is identical to 0.7 ppm. The preferred notation is milligrams per liter.
At 0.7 mg/L, there are seven-tenths of one part of fluoride mixed with 999,999.3 parts of water. While not exact, the following comparisons can be of assistance in comprehending 0.7 mg/L:

- 1 inch in approximately 23 miles
- 1 minute in approximately 1000 days
- 1 cent in approximately $14,000.00
- 1 seat in more than 34 Wrigley Field baseball parks (seating capacity 41,268)

The following terms and definitions are used in this publication:

- **Community water fluoridation** is the controlled adjustment of the natural fluoride concentration in water up to 0.7 mg/L, the level recommended for optimal dental health. Other terms used interchangeably are water fluoridation, fluoridation and optimally fluoridated water. Optimal levels of fluoride can be present in the water naturally or by adjusted means.

- **Sub-optimally fluoridated water** is water that naturally contains less than the optimal level (below 0.7 mg/L) of fluoride. Other terms used are nonfluoridated water and fluoride-deficient water.

Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 6.

4. How much fluoride is in your water?

**Answer.**

If your water comes from a public/community water supply, the options to learn the fluoride level of the water include contacting the local water supplier or the local/county/state health department, reviewing the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) issued by your local water supplier, and using the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s internet based “My Water’s Fluoride.” If your water source is a private well, it will need to be tested and the results obtained from a certified laboratory.

**Fact.**

The fluoride content of the local public or community water system can be obtained by contacting the local water supplier or the local/county/state health department. The name of your water system might not be the same as the name of your community.

In 1999, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) began requiring water suppliers to make annual drinking water quality reports accessible to their customers. Available prior to July 1 each year for the preceding calendar year, these Consumer Confidence Reports (CCRs), or Water Quality Reports, can be mailed to customers, placed in the local newspaper or made available through the internet. To obtain a copy of the report, contact the local water supplier. If the name of the community water system is unknown, contact the local health department.

There are two sites on the internet that supply information on water quality of community water systems. The online source for Water Quality Reports or CCRs is the EPA website at: [https://ofmpub.epa.gov/axepx/safewater/?p=136.102](https://ofmpub.epa.gov/axepx/safewater/?p=136.102). Additionally, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) fluoridation website, “My Water’s Fluoride,” is available at: [https://ncdc.cdc.gov/DOH_NWF/Default/Default.aspx](https://ncdc.cdc.gov/DOH_NWF/Default/Default.aspx). The website allows consumers in currently participating states to learn the fluoridation status of their water system. It also provides information on the number of people served by the water system, the water source, and if the water system is naturally fluoridated or adjusts the fluoride level in the water supply.

The EPA does not have the authority to regulate private drinking water wells. However, the EPA recommends that private well water be tested once a year. For
the most accurate results, a state certified laboratory that conducts drinking water tests should be used for fluoride testing. For a list of state certified laboratories, contact the local, county or state water/health department.

The EPA does not specifically recommend testing private wells for the level of fluoride. However, if a household with a private well has children under 16 years of age, their health professionals will need to know the fluoride level of the well water prior to consideration of prescription of dietary fluoride supplements or to counsel patients about alternative water sources to reduce the risk of fluorosis if the natural fluoride levels are above 2 mg/L.

Dietary fluoride supplements (tablets, drops or lozenges) are available only by prescription and are intended for use by children ages six months to 16 years living in nonfluoridated areas and at high risk of developing tooth decay. Your dentist or physician can prescribe the correct dosage.

Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 12 and in the Safety Section, Questions 21, 27, 28 and 29.

5. What additives are used to fluoridate water supplies in the United States?

Answer.
Sodium fluoride, sodium fluorosilicate and fluorosilicic acid are the three additives approved for use in community water fluoridation in the United States. Sodium fluorosilicate and fluorosilicic acid are sometimes referred to as silicofluoride additives.

Fact.
The three basic additives used to fluoridate water in the United States are: 1) sodium fluoride which is a white, odorless material available either as a powder or crystals, 2) sodium fluorosilicate which is a white or yellow-white, odorless crystalline material and 3) fluorosilicic acid which is a white to straw-colored liquid.

Water fluoridation began in the U.S. in 1945 with the use of sodium fluoride; the use of silicofluorides began in 1946 and by 1951, they were the most commonly used additives. First used in the late 1940s, fluorosilicic acid is currently the most commonly used additive to fluoridate communities in the United States. To ensure the public's safety, regardless of where the additives are manufactured, they should meet safety standards for water treatment in the U.S. Specifically, additives used in water fluoridation should meet standards of the American Water Works Association (AWWA). With respect to NSF/ANSI certification, fluoride additives are considered no different than other water additives. Fluoride additives, like any other water additive should also meet NSF/ANSI Standards. In the United States, the authority to regulate products for use in drinking water, including additives used to fluoridate community water systems, rests with individual states. In 2013, AWWA reported that 47 states had adopted the NSF/ANSI Standard 60 which specifies the product quality with validation supplied by independent certification entities.

Additional information on the topic of fluoride additives can be found in the Fluoridation Practice section of this publication and at the CDC's fluoridation website, "Water Operators and Engineers" at https://www.cdc.gov/fluoridation/engineering/index.htm.

6. Is there a difference in the effectiveness between naturally occurring fluoridated water (at optimal fluoride levels) and water that has fluoride added to reach the optimal level?

Answer.
No. The dental benefits of optimally fluoridated water occur regardless of the fluoride's source.

Fact.
Fluoride is present in water as "ions" or electrically-charged atoms. These ions are the same whether acquired by water as it seeps through rocks and sand or added to the water supply under carefully controlled conditions.
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.

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 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.*

**Figure 2. Dean’s Graph**

Relationships of tooth decay experience (solid line), dental fluorosis index (dashed line) and the fluoride concentration of drinking water.
Since that time, hundreds of studies have been done, including a number of systematic reviews which continue to show fluoride’s effectiveness in helping to prevent tooth decay. A systematic review is an analysis of studies that identifies and evaluates all of the evidence with which to answer a specific, narrowly focused question. It entails a systematic and unbiased review process that locates, assesses and combines high quality evidence from a collection of scientific studies to obtain a comprehensive, valid and reliable review on a specific topic. Systematic reviews provide the highest level of scientific evidence about a specific research question. Below is a discussion of major reviews of community water fluoridation, beginning with two systematic reviews published in 2017 and 2013, respectively, demonstrating that water fluoridation is effective in reducing tooth decay.

On November 9, 2017, the Australian Government's National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) released the NHMRC Public Statement 2017 — Water Fluoridation and Human Health in Australia recommending community water fluoridation as a safe, effective and ethical way to help reduce tooth decay. Based on a comprehensive review of the evidence, published in 2016, and the translation of that evidence into the NHMRC Information Paper — Water Fluoridation: Dental and Other Human Health Outcomes, published in 2017, the Public Statement notes that the NHMRC found that water fluoridation reduces tooth decay by 26% to 44% in children and adolescents, and by 27% in adults. Additionally, it notes that recent Australian research found that access to fluoridated water from an early age is associated with less tooth decay in adults. The Statement notes that NHMRC supports Australian states and territories fluoridating their drinking water supplies within the range of 0.6 to 1.1 mg/L.

Established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in 1996, the Community Preventive Services Task Force develops and disseminates guidance on which community-based health promotion and disease prevention intervention approaches work, and which do not work, based on available scientific evidence. The Task Force issues findings based on systematic reviews of effectiveness and economic evidence. The Guide to Community Preventive Services ("The Community Guide") is a collection of evidence-based findings of the Community Preventive Services Task Force and is designed to assist decision makers in selecting interventions to improve health and prevent disease.

The Community Guide reviews are designed to answer three questions:

1. What has worked for others and how well?
2. What might this intervention approach cost, and what am I likely to achieve through my investment?
3. What are the evidence gaps?

In a 2013 update of the evidence, the Community Preventive Services Task Force continued to recommend community water fluoridation to reduce tooth decay, noting that cavities decreased when fluoridation was implemented and that cavities increased when fluoridation was stopped, as compared to communities that continued fluoridation.

A summary of systematic reviews by the Oral Health Services Research Centre at the University Dental School in Cork, Ireland, published in 2009, reviewed results from three systematic reviews, all of which were published between 2000 and 2007. The summary of results concluded that the best available scientific evidence demonstrated that water fluoridation was an effective community-based method to prevent tooth decay, especially for the disadvantaged who bear the greatest burden of disease.

A meta-analysis (a type of systematic review that seeks to determine a statistical estimate of an overall benefit based on the results of the collection of studies included in the review), which was published in 2007 in the Journal of Dental Research, demonstrated the effectiveness of water fluoridation for preventing tooth decay in adults. Twenty studies representing over 13,500 participants were included in the analysis. Of the 20 studies, nine examined the effectiveness of water fluoridation. The review of these studies found that fluoridation prevents approximately 27% of tooth decay in adults.

Besides systematic reviews, significant additional studies conducted since the initiation of water fluoridation in 1945, also have demonstrated the effectiveness of water fluoridation in reducing the occurrence of tooth decay.
In Grand Rapids, Michigan, the first city in the world to fluoridate its water supply, a 15-year landmark study showed that children who consumed fluoridated water from birth had 50–63% less tooth decay than children who had been examined during the original baseline survey completed in nonfluoridated Muskegon, Michigan.  

In 1985, the National Preventive Dentistry Demonstration Program analyzed various types and combinations of school-based preventive dental services to determine the cost and effectiveness of these types of prevention programs. Ten sites from across the nation were selected. Five of the sites had fluoridated water and five did not. Over 20,000 second and fifth graders participated in the study over a period of four years. Students were examined and assigned by site to one or a combination of the following groups:

- Biweekly in class brushing and flossing plus a home supply of fluoride toothpaste and dental health lessons (ten per year);
- In-class daily fluoride tablets (in nonfluoridated areas);
- In-school weekly fluoride mouthrinsing;
- In-school professionally applied topical fluoride;
- In-school professionally applied dental sealants; and
- A control.  

After four years, approximately 50% of the original students were examined again. The study affirmed the value and effectiveness of community water fluoridation. At the sites where the community water was fluoridated, students had substantially fewer cavities, as compared to those sites without fluoridated water where the same preventive measures were implemented. In addition, while sealants were determined to be an effective prevention method, the cost of a sealant program was substantially more than the cost of fluoridating the community water, confirming fluoridation as the most cost-effective preventive option.

In another review of studies conducted from 1976 through 1987 and published in 1989, data for different age groups were separated into categories by the types of teeth present in the mouth. The results demonstrated a 30–60% reduction in tooth decay in primary teeth, a 20–40% reduction in the mixed dentition (having both baby and adult teeth) and a 15%–35% reduction in the permanent dentition (adults and seniors) for those living in fluoridated communities.

In the United States, an epidemiological survey of nearly 40,000 schoolchildren was completed in 1987. Nearly 50% of the children aged 5 to 17 years who participated in the study were decay free in their permanent teeth, which was a major change from a similar survey conducted in 1980 in which approximately 37% were decay free. This dramatic decline in decay rates was attributed primarily to the widespread use of fluoride in community water supplies, toothpastes, dietary fluoride supplements and mouthrinses. Although decay rates had declined overall, data also revealed that the decay rate was 25% lower in children with continuous residence in fluoridated communities when the data were adjusted to control for exposure to dietary fluoride supplements and topical fluoride treatments.

In 1993, the results of 113 studies in 23 countries (over half of the studies were from the U.S.) were compiled and analyzed. This review provided effectiveness data for 66 studies of primary teeth and 86 studies of permanent teeth. The analysis of the studies demonstrated a 40–49% decay reduction for primary (baby) teeth and a 50–59% decay reduction for permanent (adult) teeth for those living in fluoridated communities.

A comprehensive analysis of the first 50 years of community water fluoridation in the United States concluded that “Community water fluoridation is one of the most successful public health disease prevention programs ever initiated.” While noting that the difference in tooth decay between optimally fluoridated communities and fluoride–deficient communities was smaller than in the early days of fluoridation, largely due to additional sources of fluoride, the difference was still significant and the benefits for adults should be emphasized. The report ended by noting that water fluoridation is a near-ideal public health measure whose benefits can transcend racial, ethnic, socioeconomic and regional differences.

The systematic reviews and studies noted above provide science-based evidence that, for more than 70 years, fluoridation has been effective in helping to prevent tooth decay.
8. With other sources of fluoride now available, is water fluoridation still an effective method for preventing tooth decay?

**Answer.**
Yes. Even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25% of tooth decay in children and adults throughout the life span.

**Fact.**
During the 1940s, studies demonstrated that children in communities with optimally fluoridated drinking water had reductions in tooth decay rates of approximately 40% to 60% as compared to those living in nonfluoridated communities. At that time, drinking water was the only source of fluoride other than fluoride that occurred naturally in foods.

**Increase in the Number of Sources of Fluoride**
Fluoride is available today from a number of sources including water, beverages, food, dental products (toothpaste, rinses, professionally applied fluoride foams, gels and varnish and dietary supplements.) As a result of the widespread availability of these various sources of fluoride, the difference between decay rates in fluoridated areas and nonfluoridated areas is somewhat less than several decades ago, yet it is still significant. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25% of tooth decay in children and adults throughout the life span. The benefits of fluoridation are extended to everyone in a community where they live, work, attend school or play — and it does not require a change of behavior or access to dental care.

**The Diffusion or Halo Effect**
The diffusion or “halo” effect occurs because foods and beverages processed in optimally fluoridated cities generally contain higher levels of fluoride than those processed in nonfluoridated communities. This exposure to fluoride in nonfluoridated areas through the diffusion effect lessens the differences in the amount of tooth decay between communities. The best available national data demonstrate that the failure to account for the diffusion effect results in an underestimation of the total benefit of water fluoridation especially in areas where large quantities of fluoridated beverage and food products are brought into nonfluoridated communities.

**Exposure to Fluoridation over the Life Span**
Another factor in the difference between decay rates in fluoridated areas and nonfluoridated areas is the high geographic mobility of our society. On a day-to-day basis, many individuals may reside in a nonfluoridated community but spend a significant part of their day in a fluoridated community at work, school or daycare. Additionally, over their lifetime, people tend to move and reside in a number of communities, some with optimally fluoridated water and some without. This mobility makes it increasingly difficult to study large numbers of people who have spent their entire lives in one (fluoridated or nonfluoridated) community. It also means that many individuals receive the benefit of fluoridation for at least some part of their lives. For children who have resided in fluoridated communities their entire lives, studies demonstrated they had less tooth decay than children who never lived in fluoridated communities.

Despite fluoride from a number of other sources, the “halo effect” and the mobility of today’s society, studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25% of tooth decay in children and adults throughout the life span.
9. What happens if water fluoridation is discontinued?

**Answer.**  
Tooth decay can be expected to increase if water fluoridation in a community is discontinued even if topical products such as fluoride toothpaste and fluoride mouthrinses are widely used.

**Fact.**  
In 2013, using an updated systematic review, the Community Preventive Services Task Force, established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, continued to recommend community water fluoridation to reduce tooth decay, noting that cavities decreased when fluoridation was implemented and that cavities increased when fluoridation was stopped, as compared to communities that continued fluoridation. This confirmed the Task Force’s earlier systematic review published in 2002 which also noted an increase in tooth decay when fluoridation was halted (a median 17.9% increase in tooth decay during 6 to 10 years of follow-up).

**Historical Studies Noting an Increase in Tooth Decay after Discontinuation of Fluoridation**  
Antigo, Wisconsin, began water fluoridation in June 1949 and ceased adding fluoride to its water in November 1960. After five and one-half years without optimal levels of fluoride, second grade children had a 200% increase in tooth decay experience, fourth graders a 70% increase and sixth graders a 91% increase in decay experience compared with the levels of those of the same ages in 1960. Residents of Antigo re-instituted water fluoridation in October 1965 on the basis of the severe deterioration of their children’s oral health.

A study that reported the relationship between fluoridated water and tooth decay prevalence focused on the city of Galesburg, Illinois, a community whose public water supply contained naturally occurring fluoride at 2.2 mg/L. In 1959, Galesburg switched its community water source to the Mississippi River. This alternative water source provided the citizens of Galesburg a sub-optimal level of fluoride at approximately 0.1 mg/L. In the period of time between a baseline survey conducted in 1958 and a new survey conducted in 1961, data revealed a 10% decrease in the percentage of decay free 14-year-olds (oldest group observed), and a 38% increase in mean tooth decay experience. Two years later, in 1961, the water was fluoridated at the recommended level of 1.0 mg/L.

Because of a government decision in 1979, fluoridation in the northern Scotland town of Wick was discontinued after eight years. The water was returned to its sub-optimal, naturally occurring fluoride level of 0.02 mg/L. Data collected to monitor the oral health of Wick children clearly demonstrated a negative health effect from the discontinuation of water fluoridation. Five years after the cessation of water fluoridation, decay in primary (baby teeth) had increased 27%. This increase in decay occurred during a period when there had been a reported overall reduction in decay nationally and when fluoride toothpaste had been widely adopted. These data suggest that decay levels in children can be expected to rise where water fluoridation is interrupted or terminated, even when topical fluoride products are widely used.

In a similar evaluation, the prevalence of tooth decay in 5- and 10-year-old children in Stranraer, Scotland, increased after the discontinuation of water fluoridation. This increase in tooth decay was estimated to result in a 115% increase in the mean cost of restorative dental treatment for decay. These data support the important role water fluoridation plays in the reduction of tooth decay.

**Historical Studies and Factors Noting No Increase In Tooth Decay after Discontinuation of Fluoridation**  
There have been several studies from outside the United States that have not reported an increase in tooth decay following the discontinuation of fluoridation. In all of these, the discontinuation of fluoridation coincided with the implementation of other measures to prevent tooth decay.

In La Salud, Cuba, a study on tooth decay in children indicated that the rate of tooth decay did not increase after fluoridation was stopped in 1990. However, at the time fluoridation was discontinued a new preventive fluoride program was initiated where all children received fluoride mouthrinses on a regular basis and children two to five years of age received fluoride varnish once or twice a year.

In Finland, a longitudinal study in Kuopio (fluoridated from 1959 to 1992) and Jyväskylä (with low levels of natural fluoride) showed little difference in...
decay rates between the two communities that are extremely similar in terms of ethnic background and social structure. This was attributed to a number of factors. The dental programs exposed the Finnish children to intense topical fluoride regimes and dental sealant programs. Virtually all children and adolescents used the government-sponsored, comprehensive, free dental care. As a result, the effect of water fluoridation appeared minimal. Because of this unique set of factors, it was concluded that these results could not be replicated in countries with less intensive preventive dental care programs.52

No significant decrease in tooth decay was seen after fluoridation was discontinued in 1990 in Chemniz and Plauen, located in what was formerly East Germany.53 The intervening factors in these communities include improvements in attitudes toward oral health behaviors, and broader availability and increased use of other preventive measures including fluoridated salt, fluoride toothpaste and dental sealants.53

A similar situation was reported from the Netherlands. A study was conducted of 15-year-old children in Tiel (fluoridated 1953 to 1973) and Culemborg (nonfluoridated) comparing tooth decay rates from a baseline in 1968 through 1988. The lower tooth decay rate in Tiel after the cessation of fluoridation was attributed in part to the initiation of a dental health education program, free dietary fluoride supplements and a greater use of professionally applied topical fluorides.54

In the preceding examples, communities that discontinued fluoridation either found higher tooth decay rates in their children or a lack of an increase that could be attributed to the availability and use of free dental services for all children or the implementation of wide-spread decay prevention programs that require significant professional and administrative support and are less cost-effective than fluoridation.

10. Is tooth decay still a serious problem in the United States?

Answer.
Yes. Tooth decay is an infectious disease that continues to be a significant oral health problem.

Fact.
Good oral health is often taken for granted by many people in the U.S. Yet, while largely preventable, tooth decay, cavities or dental caries (a term used by health professionals) remains a common, debilitating, chronic condition for many children and adults.

Tooth decay begins with a weakening and/or breakdown (loss of minerals) of the enamel (the hard outer layer of teeth) caused by acids produced by bacteria that live in plaque. Dental plaque is a soft, sticky film that is constantly forming on teeth. Eating foods or drinking beverages that contain sugars or other refined carbohydrates allow the bacteria in the plaque to produce acids that attack the enamel. The plaque helps to keep these acids in contact with the tooth surface and demineralization (loss of mineral) occurs. After repeated acid attacks, the enamel can breakdown creating a cavity. Left unchecked, bacteria and acid can penetrate the dentin (the next, inner layer of teeth) and then finally the pulp, which contains nerves and blood vessels.

Once the bacteria enter the pulp, the tooth becomes infected (abscessed) and, without treatment, the infection can progress and travel into the surrounding tissues. The infection can enter the bloodstream and potentially spread the infection to other parts of the body which, in rare cases, becomes life-threatening.

Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 2.

Tooth decay can negatively affect an individual’s quality of life and ability to succeed. Tooth decay can cause pain — pain that can affect how we eat, speak, smile, learn at school or succeed at work. Children with cavities often miss more school and receive lower grades than children who are cavity-free.53 More than $6 billion of productivity is lost each year in the U.S. because people miss work to get dental care.56
While cavities are often thought of as a problem for children, adults in the U.S. are keeping their teeth longer (partially due to exposure to fluoridation) and this increased retention of teeth means more adults are at risk for cavities — especially decay of exposed root surfaces. Tooth root surfaces are covered with cementum (a softer surface than the enamel) and so are susceptible to decay. As Baby Boomers age, root decay experience is expected to increase in future years possibly to the point where older adults experience similar or higher levels of new cavities than do school children.

**Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 11.**

Additionally, once an individual has a cavity repaired with a filling (restoration), that filling can break down over time especially around the edges. These rough edges (or margins) can harbor bacteria that start the cavity process over again or leak which allows the bacteria to enter the tooth below the existing filling. These fillings often need to be replaced — sometimes multiple times over decades — each time growing larger to the point where the best restoration for the tooth is a crown that covers the entire tooth surface. Preventing cavities and remineralizing teeth at the earliest stages of decay is very important not only in saving tooth structure but also in reducing the cost for dental care. Community water fluoridation is an effective public health measure that is a cost-saving and cost-effective approach to preventing tooth decay.

**Additional information on this topic can be found in the Cost Section, Question 68.**

Oral health disparities exist in the United States and have been documented through extensive studies and reviews. Despite the fact that millions of people in the U.S. enjoy good dental health, disparities exist for many racial and ethnic groups, as well as by socioeconomic status, sex, age and geographic location. Water fluoridation helps to reduce the disparities in oral health at the community level as it benefits all residents served by community water supplies. In his 2001 Statement on Community Water Fluoridation, former Surgeon General Dr. David Satcher noted:

...community water fluoridation continues to be the most cost-effective, practical and safe means for reducing and controlling the occurrence of dental decay in a community...water fluoridation is a powerful strategy in efforts to eliminate health disparities among populations.

**Additional information on this topic can be found in the Public Policy Section, Question 59.**

Today, the major focus for achieving and maintaining oral health is on prevention. Established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Healthy People 2020 provides a science-based, comprehensive set of ambitious, yet achievable, ten-year national objectives for improving the health of the public. Included under oral health is an objective to expand the fluoridation of public water supplies. Objective 13 states that at least 79.6% of the U.S. population served by community water systems should be receiving the benefits of optimally fluoridated water by the year 2020. Data from the CDC indicate that, in 2014, 74.4% of the U.S. population on public water systems, or a total of 211.4 million people, had access to fluoridated water. Conversely, approximately 25% or more than 72.7 million people on public water systems do not receive the decay preventing benefits of fluoridation.
11. Do adults benefit from fluoridation?

**Answer.**

Yes. Fluoridation plays a protective role against tooth decay throughout life, benefiting both children and adults.

**Fact.**

While the early fluoridation trials were not designed to study the possible benefits fluoride might have for adults, by the mid-1950s, it became evident from the results of the first fluoridation trial in Grand Rapids, Michigan, that the beneficial effects of fluoridation were not confined to children drinking the fluoridated water from birth. The fact that a reduction in tooth decay was observed for teeth which had already been calcified or were erupted when fluoridation was started indicated that a beneficial effect could be gained by older age groups. Today it is understood that the maximum reduction in tooth decay occurs when fluoride has been incorporated into the tooth during formation and when it also is available at the tooth surface during demineralization and remineralization. Fluoridation works in both ways to prevent tooth decay.

Fluoride and minerals, including calcium and phosphate, are present in saliva and are stored in dental plaque (a soft, sticky film that is constantly forming on teeth). To halt the formation of tooth decay or rebuild tooth surfaces, fluoride must be constantly present in low concentrations in saliva and plaque. Frequent exposure to small amounts of fluoride, such as occurs when drinking fluoridated water, helps to maintain the reservoir of available fluoride in saliva and plaque to resist demineralization and enhance remineralization. In other words, drinking fluoridated water provides the right amount of fluoride at the right place at the right time. Fluoride in water and water-based beverages is consumed many times during the day, providing frequent contact with tooth surfaces and making fluoride available to fluoride reservoirs in the mouth. This helps explain why fluoride at the low levels found in fluoridated water helps to prevent tooth decay in teeth after they have erupted.

Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 2.

While teeth already present in the mouth when exposure to water fluoridation begins receive the benefit of decay protection, studies have indicated that adults who have consumed fluoridated water continuously from birth receive the maximum protection against tooth decay.

An Australian study published in 2008 investigating decay experience among Australian Defense Force personnel showed that a longer period of exposure to water fluoridation was associated with lower decay rates in adults between the ages of 17 and 44. Adults who lived at least 90% of their lifetime in communities with fluoridated water had 24% less decay than adults who lived in fluoridated areas for less than 10% of their lifetimes.

A meta-analysis published in 2007 examining the effectiveness of fluoridation for adults found that fluoridation prevents approximately 27% of tooth decay in adults. It included only studies that were published after 1979. The studies were limited to participants who were lifelong residents of communities with fluoridated water and a control group of lifelong residents of communities without fluoridated water.

A study published in 2002 examined the differences in tooth decay patterns between two cohorts of young adults: the first grew up before fluoridation was widely available and the second after fluoridation became more widespread. Comparing data from two different U.S. National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES), NHANES I (1971–1974) and NHANES III (1988–84), results indicated that total tooth decay declined among people aged 45 years and younger. No decline was observed in people aged 46 to 65, a cohort that grew up during the late 40s and early 50s before fluoridation was widely available. This was identified as the major reason this older cohort did not show a decline in tooth decay.

In 1989, a study conducted in the state of Washington found that adults (20–34 years of age) who had a continuous lifetime exposure to fluoridation water had 31% less tooth decay experience compared to similar aged adults with no exposure to fluoridated water. It also concluded that exposure to fluoridation only during childhood has lifetime benefits since adults exposed to fluoridated water only during childhood had decay experience similar to those adults exposed to fluoridated water only after age 14.

An important issue for adults is the prevention of root decay. People in the United States are living longer and retaining more of their natural teeth than ever.
before — in part due to water fluoridation. Adults with gum recession are at risk for root decay because the root surface, a much softer tooth surface than enamel, becomes exposed to decay-causing bacteria in the mouth as gums recede. Data from the ongoing NHANES survey indicate that root decay experience has declined in recent years among older adults with teeth (ages 65-years and older), decreasing from 46% (NHANES 1988–1994) to 36% (NHANES 1999–2004). However, the prevalence of root decay increases markedly as adults age and escalates more rapidly after age 65. Specifically, the 75-years and older group had 23% greater prevalence of root surface decay than did the 65- to 74-years-old age group. While most studies related to the prevention of root decay focus on professional fluoride treatments such as fluoride varnish, there is evidence that demonstrates fluoridation may have an impact on root decay. For example, in Ontario, Canada, lifelong residents of the nonfluoridated community of Woodstock had a 21% higher root surface decay experience than those living in the naturally fluoridated (1.6 ppm) matched community of Stratford. Similarly, Iowa residents more than 40 years of age living long-term in fluoridated communities had significantly less root decay than lifelong residents of nonfluoridated communities (0.56 versus 1.11 surfaces).

Adults in the U.S. are keeping their natural teeth longer — partially due to exposure to water fluoridation. But as adults age with their teeth, it means more teeth will be at risk for tooth decay. It has been suggested in the literature that decay experience for adults could increase to the point where older adults experience similar or higher levels of new cavities than do school children. It continues to be important to document and acknowledge the effectiveness of fluoridation in preventing tooth decay in adults because virtually all primary preventive dental programs target children and adolescents — with one exception — community water fluoridation. Fluoridation is unique in that it remains the one dental public health measure that reaches all members of a community including young, middle-aged and older adults.

12. Are dietary fluoride supplements effective in helping to prevent tooth decay?

Answer.

Yes. Dietary fluoride supplements can be effective in preventing tooth decay.

Fact.

Dietary fluoride supplements are available only by prescription in the United States and are intended for use by children who are at high risk for developing tooth decay and living in areas where the primary source of water is deficient in fluoride.


Additional information on this topic can be found in this section, Question 13.

As noted in Table 3 of the report, “Clinical recommendations for the use of dietary fluoride supplements:”

The expert panel convened by the American Dental Association Council on Scientific Affairs developed the following recommendations. They are intended as a resource for dentists and other health care providers. The recommendations must be balanced with the practitioner’s professional judgment and the individual patient’s needs and preferences.

Children are exposed to multiple sources of fluoride. The expert panel encourages health care providers to evaluate all potential fluoride sources and to conduct a caries risk assessment before prescribing fluoride supplements.

As noted in the recommendations, prior to prescribing dietary fluoride supplements, accurate assessment of the fluoride content of the patient’s primary drinking water source(s) should be conducted. The identification of the “primary” sources is sometimes
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Fluoride ion level in drinking water (ppm)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.3 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth - 6 months</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months - 3 years</td>
<td>0.25 mg/day**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 6 years</td>
<td>0.50 mg/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 16 years</td>
<td>1.0 mg/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 10 part per million (ppm) = 1 milligram/liter (mg/L) ** 2.2 mg sodium fluoride contains 1 mg fluoride ion

American Dental Association
Noting the potential obstacles listed above, where feasible, community water fluoridation offers proven decay prevention benefits without the need for access to a health care professional or a change in behavior on the part of the individual. Simply by drinking water at home, school, work or play everyone in the community benefits regardless of socioeconomic status, educational attainment or other social variables. While dietary fluoride supplements can reduce a child's risk of tooth decay, fluoridation extends that benefit to adults in the community. Additionally, the cost of dietary fluoride supplements over an extended period of time can be an economic concern to a family. In looking at overall costs, consideration should be given to the cost per person and the number of people who can benefit from a dietary fluoride supplement or community fluoridation program.

13. The ADA Dietary Fluoride Supplements Schedule 2010 contains the word “none” in specific boxes. Does this mean the ADA does not recommend fluoride for children?

**Answer.**

No, that would be a misinterpretation of the purpose of the schedule. The schedule reflects the recommended dosage of fluoride supplements based on age and the fluoride level of the child's primary source of drinking water, in addition to what would be consumed from other sources.

**Fact.**

The dietary fluoride supplement schedule (Table 1) is just that — a supplement schedule. Children residing in areas where the drinking water is not fluoridated will receive some fluoride from other sources such as foods and beverages. Dietary fluoride supplements are designed for children over six months of age who do not receive a sufficient amount of fluoride from those sources. The dosage amounts in the table reflect the additional amount of supplemental fluoride intake necessary to achieve an optimal anti-cavity effect. To reduce the risk of dental fluorosis, children under six months of age should not take dietary fluoride supplements.

Additional information on this topic can be found in the Safety Section, Question 23.

The dietary fluoride supplement schedule should not be viewed as a recommendation of the absolute upper limits of the amount of fluoride that should be ingested each day. In 2011, the Food and Nutrition Board of the Institute of Medicine developed Dietary Reference Intakes, a comprehensive set of reference values for dietary nutrient values. The values present nutrient requirements to optimize health and, for the first time, set maximum-level guidelines to reduce the risk of adverse effects from excessive consumption of a nutrient. In the case of fluoride, levels were established to reduce tooth decay without causing moderate dental fluorosis.

For example, the dietary fluoride supplement schedule recommends that a two-year-old child at high risk for tooth decay living in a nonfluoridated area (where the primary water source contains less than 0.3 ppm fluoride) should receive 0.25 mg of supplemental fluoride per day. This does not mean that this child should ingest exactly 0.25 mg of fluoride per day total. Instead, a two-year-old child could receive important anti-cavity benefits by taking 0.25 mg of supplemental fluoride a day without causing any adverse effects on health. This child would most probably be receiving fluoride from other sources (foods and beverages) even in a nonfluoridated area and the recommendation of 0.25 mg of fluoride per day takes this into account. In the unlikely event the child did not receive any additional fluoride from food and beverages, the 0.25 mg per day could be inadequate fluoride supplementation to achieve an optimal anti-cavity effect.

Additional information on this topic can be found in the Safety Section, Question 23.

The following statement is correct: “Fluoride supplement dosage levels have been lowered in the past as exposure to fluoride from other sources has increased.” Rather than being a problem, as those opposed to the use of fluoride might imply, this is evidence that ADA policy is based on the best available science. The ADA periodically reviews the dosage schedule and issues updated recommendations based on the best available science.

In 1994, a Dietary Fluoride Supplement Workshop, co-sponsored by the ADA, the American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry and the American Academy of Pediatrics, was held in Chicago. Based on a review of scientific evidence, a consensus was reached on a
new dosage schedule developed acknowledging that numerous sources of topical and systemic fluoride are available today that were not available many years ago.\textsuperscript{81}

The supplement schedule was reviewed and reissued in December 2010. At that time, the American Dental Association Council on Scientific Affairs (CSA) published evidence-based clinical recommendations for the schedule of dietary fluoride supplements.\textsuperscript{8} The evidence-based review recommended that the age stratification established in the ADA’s 1994 supplement schedule remain unchanged. The review also recommended that prior to prescribing fluoride supplements, the prescribing provider should assess the patient’s risk for cavities and only those at high risk should receive supplements.\textsuperscript{8} If at high risk, then the fluoride level of the patient’s primary drinking water source should be assessed.\textsuperscript{8} It should be noted that an accurate assessment of the patient’s primary drinking water source can be difficult due to the various sources of fluoridated water. For example, the patient might not have access to fluoridated water in the home, but may drink fluoridated water while at day care or school. The current dietary fluoride supplement schedule appears as Table 1.\textsuperscript{8}

\textbf{Additional information on this topic can be found in this Section, Question 12.}

14. What are salt and milk fluoridation and where are they used?

\textbf{Answer.}
Salt and milk fluoridation are fluoridation methods used to provide community-based fluoridation in countries outside of the United States where various political, geographical, financial, or technical reasons prevent the use of water fluoridation.

\textbf{Fact.}
The practice of salt fluoridation began in the 1950s, approximately 10 years after water fluoridation was initiated in the United States.\textsuperscript{82} Based on the success several decades earlier of the use of iodized salt for the prevention of goiter, fluoridated salt was first introduced in Switzerland in 1956.\textsuperscript{83}

According to a review published in 2013, salt fluoridation is available in a number of countries in Europe but its coverage varies greatly.\textsuperscript{83} Germany and Switzerland have attained a coverage exceeding two-thirds of their populations (67% and 85% respectively). In other European countries including Austria, the Czech Republic, France, Slovakia and Spain, salt fluoridation is reportedly used on a very limited scale.\textsuperscript{83} Additional countries, such as Hungary, Romania, Slovenia, Croatia and Poland, have considered salt fluoridation but have failed to take action.\textsuperscript{84}

European regulations (current as of 2017) permit the addition of fluoride to salt and water.\textsuperscript{82} However, it appears that the majority of European countries favor the twice daily use of fluoride toothpaste as the most important measure for improving the public’s dental health.\textsuperscript{84} In Europe, toothpaste sold over the counter typically contains 1,500 ppm fluoride,\textsuperscript{85} while toothpaste in the United States typically contains 1,000 to 1,100 ppm fluoride.\textsuperscript{86}

On a historical note, prior to the political changes that occurred in the late 1980s and early 1990s in Europe, water fluoridation was widely available in the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Republic and to a lesser extent in Poland. With the end of the Communist regimes, efforts related to public health dentistry were largely discontinued. While fluoridation continued in several small towns until 1993, in general, it was abandoned.\textsuperscript{84}

In North and South America, salt fluoridation is available in Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. Like in Europe, the extent of salt fluoridation varies between countries. Columbia, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Mexico and Uruguay provide fluoridated salt to nearly their entire populations while there is less coverage in other countries.\textsuperscript{82}

In 2013, it was estimated that approximately 60 million people in Europe and 160 million in the Americas had access to fluoridated salt.\textsuperscript{82}

The Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), a regional division of the World Health Association (WHO) with responsibilities for health matters in North, South and Central America and the Caribbean, has been active in developing strategies to implement decay prevention programs in the regions of the Americas using water and salt fluoridation.\textsuperscript{87} In order to achieve the greatest reduction in tooth decay while minimizing the risk of dental fluorosis, it is advisable that a country implement only one of these two
public health measures — either community water fluoridation or salt fluoridation. The United States has implemented water fluoridation. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has not approved fluoridated salt for use in the U.S.

Early studies evaluating the effectiveness of salt fluoridation conducted in Columbia, Hungary and Switzerland indicated that fluoride delivered via salt might produce a reduction in tooth decay similar to that seen with optimally fluoridated water. When all salt destined for human consumption (both domestic salt and bulk salt that is used by commercial bakeries, restaurants, institutions, and industrial food production) is fluoridated, the decay-reducing effect could be comparable to that of water fluoridation over an extended period of time. When only domestic salt is fluoridated, the decay-reducing effect is diminished. Studies conducted in Costa Rica, Jamaica and Mexico in the 1980s and 1990s also showed significant reductions in tooth decay. However, it was noted that these studies did not include other variables that could have contributed to the reductions.

The fact that salt fluoridation does not require a centralized piped water system is of particular value in countries that do not have such water systems. Fluoridated salt is also a very cost-effective public health measure. For example, in Jamaica, where all salt destined for human consumption is fluoridated, the use of fluoridated salt was reported to reduce tooth decay by as much as 84% at a cost of 6 cents per person per year. In some cases, the cost to produce fluoridated salt is so low that for consumers, the cost of fluoridated salt is the same as for nonfluoridated salt.

The implementation of salt fluoridation has unique challenges not incurred with water fluoridation. Sources of salt, the willingness of local manufacturers to produce fluoridated salt or the need to import fluoridated salt would need to be studied. Because fluoridated salt should only be consumed by the public in areas with a naturally low level of fluoride, it would be necessary to completely map the naturally occurring levels of fluoride and devise a plan to keep fluoridated salt out of the areas with moderate to high naturally occurring fluoride (to aid in reducing the risk of dental fluorosis). Additionally, a plan would need to be developed to monitor the fluoride level in urine of those consuming fluoridated salt starting with a baseline before implementation and including follow-up testing on a regular basis. While salt fluoridation typically is not implemented through a public vote, it would be necessary to gain the cooperation of salt manufacturers and institutions of all kinds that would use salt in their food preparation. Additionally, educational efforts would need to be directed at health professionals and health authorities to avoid referendum approaches and identify enabling regulations.

In a number of European countries, consumers have a choice of purchasing either fluoridated or nonfluoridated salt for use in the home. While it has been argued that, unlike water fluoridation, this option to purchase fluoridated or nonfluoridated salt allows for personal choice, studies indicate that fluoridated salt is not as effective a public health measure when only a small portion of the population opts to purchase and use the product. For example, in France, fluoridated salt for home use became available to the consumer by decree in 1986, while nonfluoridated salt remained available for purchase. By 1991, with an aggressive public health campaign, the market share of fluoridated salt was 50% and it reached a high of 60% in 1993. Then the public health campaign ended. By 2003, the market share had decreased to 27%. It has been suggested that, in order to be a successful public health measure that effectively reaches those who are disadvantaged, approximately 70% of the population needs to use fluoridated salt. Conversely, usage rates less than 50% should be considered as having minimal effect on public health. While the situation described in Europe allows for personal choice, salt programs in the Americas where all salt destined for human consumption is fluoridated would seem at odds with the issue of personal choice, yet the program is apparently working well with fluoridated salt well accepted by the public.

A number of studies have shown an increase in the occurrence of dental fluorosis in areas where salt fluoridation programs have been implemented. For example, a 2006 cohort study examined the prevalence and severity of dental fluorosis in children before and after the implementation of salt fluoridation in Campeche, Mexico, in 1991. The study showed, that while 85% of the dental fluorosis identified was categorized as very mild, children born in 1990–1992 were more likely to have dental fluorosis than those born in the period 1986–1989. A study published in 2009 of children in Jamaica found...
showed similar results. Jamaica began a fluoridated salt program in 1987. In 1999, an area around St. Elizabeth was found to have a high prevalence of dental fluorosis. Examiners returned in 2006 to re-evaluate students in the area. While their results indicated a slightly reduced tooth decay experience for 6-year-olds in 2006 compared to 6-year-olds in 1999, they also found that 6-year-olds also had a higher prevalence of dental fluorosis in 2006 than the 6-year-olds examined in 1999. In addition to the implementation of salt fluoridation, other factors including the use of increased use of fluoridated toothpaste and mouth rinses could have played a role. However, both of these studies point out the need to carefully monitor fluorides from multiple sources especially when implementing fluoridated salt programs.

Fluoridated milk has been suggested as another alternative to community water fluoridation in countries outside the United States. Studies on the effectiveness of milk fluoridation have been carried out in numerous countries, including but not limited to, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Israel, Japan, Russia and the United Kingdom. Many of these studies have found milk fluoridation programs to be an efficient and cost-effective method to prevent cavities. For example, a 2001 study of Chilean preschoolers using fluoridated powdered milk and milk derivatives resulted in a 41% reduction in the number of primary decayed missing and filled tooth surfaces as compared to the control group that did not receive fluoridated milk. Additionally, in the same study, the proportion of decay free children increased from 22% to 48% in the study group after four years of implementing the program.

In 2004, the dental health of school children from the northwest of England, who were enrolled in the school milk fluoridation program, was compared to children with similar characteristics who were not consuming fluoridated milk. The average age of the children in the study was 11 years old. In order to participate in the study, participants chosen for the test group were required to have been receiving fluoridated milk for a minimum of 6 years. First permanent molars were examined for tooth decay experience. Results from the study indicated that children consuming fluoridated milk had less tooth decay experience (1.01 DMFT) than the children who did not receive fluoridated milk (1.46 DMFT).

A study of community milk programs in Bulgaria examined children at age 3 and again at age 8. The study indicated that tooth decay experience was substantially lower in the cohort of children who had received fluoridated milk in school for five years compared with the cohorts of children who had received milk in school without fluoride added. At the end of the five-year trial in 2009, tooth decay experience was lower in children who received fluoridated milk (5.61 dmfs and 0.48 DMFS) than in the control community children who received milk with no fluoride (9.41 dmfs and 1.24 DMFS).

In these two examples “dmfs” is the mean number of decayed, missing or filled tooth surfaces on primary (or baby) teeth while “DMFS” is the mean number of decayed missing or filled tooth surfaces on permanent teeth.

Studies completed on milk fluoridation to date largely target children. There has been only a very small number that have looked at the role fluoridated milk might play for adults. These studies have largely examined fluoridated milk and its possible effect on root decay. For example, a study published in 2011 and conducted in Sweden indicated that fluoridated milk could be of value in remineralizing early tooth decay in root surfaces.

It was estimated that as of 2013, more than one million children worldwide were receiving fluoridated milk. The majority of studies conducted have indicated that fluoridated milk is effective in preventing tooth decay under certain conditions. It is most effective if the consumption of fluoridated milk starts before 4 years of age and continues until the permanent teeth are present in the mouth. Most successful programs are conducted through schools where the natural fluoride levels in water are low and children are able to consume fluoridated milk for a minimum of 200 days a year. While these conditions prevent fluoridated milk from being recommended as a public health measure for an entire community, fluoridated milk might be the most appropriate and effective means of fluoride exposure for children in some circumstances.
15. Can the consistent use of bottled water result in individuals missing the benefits of optimally fluoridated water?

**Answer.**
Yes. The majority of bottled waters on the market do not contain optimal levels (0.7 mg/L) of fluoride.

**Fact.**
There is not a large body of research regarding the risk for tooth decay associated with the consumption of bottled water. However, a lack of exposure to fluoride could increase an individual’s risk for tooth decay. The vast majority of bottled waters do not contain significant amounts of fluoride. Individuals who drink bottled water as their primary source of water could be missing the decay preventive effects of optimally fluoridated water available from their community water supplies. These consumers should seek advice from their dentists about their risk for tooth decay and specific fluoride needs.

While drinking water from the tap is regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), bottled water is regulated by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The FDA has established maximum allowable levels for physical, chemical, microbiological, and radiological contaminants in bottled water.

Individuals who drink bottled water as their primary source of water could be missing the decay preventive effects of optimally fluoridated water available from their community water supplies.

Noting that fluoride can occur naturally in source waters used for bottled water or can be added by a bottled water manufacturer, the FDA has approved standards for the fluoride content of bottled water. However, the FDA regulations require the fluoride content of bottled water to be listed on the label only if fluoride is added during processing. If the fluoride level is not shown on the label of the bottled water, the company can be contacted, or the water can be tested to obtain this information. Most consumers are unaware that the vast majority of bottled waters, especially those treated by distillation or reverse osmosis, are largely fluoride-free. Unknowingly, individuals who drink bottled water as their primary source of water could be missing the decay preventive effects of optimally fluoridated water available from their community water supplies. The American Dental Association supports the labeling of bottled water with the fluoride content to aid consumers in making informed decisions about choices of drinking water.

Recognizing the benefit of fluoride in drinking water, in 2006 the FDA issued the “FDA Health Claim Notification for Fluoridated Water and Reduced Risk of Dental Caries” which states that bottled water meeting the specific standards of identity and quality set forth by FDA, and containing greater than 0.6 mg/L up to 1.0 mg/L total fluoride, can be labeled with the following health claim: “Drinking fluoridated water may reduce the risk of [dental caries or tooth decay].” This health claim is not intended for use on bottled water products specifically marketed for use by infants.

Additional information on this topic can be found in the Safety Section, Question 28.

According to a 2017 press release from the Beverage Marketing Corporation, bottled water surpassed carbonated soft drinks in 2016 to become the largest beverage category by volume in the United States. Per capita consumption of bottled water was approximately 39.3 gallons in 2016, while the average consumption of carbonated soft drinks was approximately 38.5 gallons per person per year. The majority (67.3%) of U.S. bottled water is sold in single-serving PET (polyethylene terephthalate or plastic resin) bottles. Bottled water is also sold via bulk deliveries to homes and offices (approximately 11%) and by retail sales in different sizes of gallon containers (approximately 9%).

Individuals choose to drink bottled water for various reasons. Some find it a calorie-free substitute for carbonated soft drinks or other sugary beverages. Others dislike the taste of their tap water or have concerns about the possible contaminants in their local water supply.

In a small study published in 2012, a convenience sample of caretakers and adolescents at an urban clinic found that 17% drank tap water exclusively, 38% drank bottled water exclusively and 42% drank both. Bottled water was ranked significantly higher
in taste, clarity, purity and safety than tap water. Only 24% of caretakers of children and adolescents knew whether or not fluoride was in their drinking water. The authors concluded that perception of the qualities of water were responsible for choices of drinking water. Similar findings have been echoed in earlier studies. Additionally, cultural influences can affect drinking water preferences. In some Latino communities, parents were less likely to give tap water to their children because they believed tap water would make them sick based in part on the fact that many have come to the U.S. from places with poor water quality where waterborne illness was common. Besides missing the decay preventive effects of fluoridated tap water, it has been determined that families spend hundreds of dollars more each year on purchasing water than if they were to consume tap water.

16. Can home water treatment systems such as water filters, reverse osmosis and water softeners remove fluoride from drinking water?

**Answer.**

Some types of home water treatment systems can reduce the fluoride levels in water supplies. Individuals who drink water processed by home water treatment systems as their primary source of water could be losing the decay preventive effects of optimally fluoridated water available from their community water supply.

**Fact.**

There are many kinds of home water treatment systems including reverse osmosis systems, distillation units, water softeners and water filters such as carafe filters, faucet filters, under the sink filters and whole house filters. There has not been a large body of research regarding the extent to which these treatment systems affect the fluoride content of optimally fluoridated water.

However, it has been consistently documented that reverse osmosis systems and distillation units remove significant amounts of fluoride from the water supply. Studies regarding water softeners show clearly that the water softening process does not significantly change fluoride levels.
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