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1. Abstract

It was proposed by SCENIHR in a Preliminary Report to the EU-Commission (29.11.2007) that “...no risks of adverse systemic effects exist and the current use of dental amalgam does not pose a risk of systemic disease...”. This statement is based on (i) unsystematically selected studies, (ii) the comparison with occupationally mercury exposed workers which is not allowed, (iii) the mercury levels in blood or urine, which do not exceed “safety limits” in humans with dental amalgams.

But, a simple Medline search results in thousands scientific literature which confirms that mercury is extremely toxic even in very low levels and the WHO have repeatedly stated that amalgam is the major contributor to human body burden.

Furthermore, SCENIHR disregard the basic toxicology of mercury and, unfortunately, did not include many important scientific amalgam studies in their review. The scientific data provided here shows, in contrast to the study selection done by SCENIHR that:

(a) dental amalgam is by far the main source of human total mercury body burden. This is proofed by many autopsy studies which found 2-12 times more mercury in the body tissues of individuals with dental amalgam. Autopsy studies are the most valuable and most important studies for examining the amalgam caused mercury body burden. It is hard to explain, why exactly SCENIHR did not cite any autopsy study. This same methodology is normally used mostly in studies and reviews, performed by dentists and their advocates, for underplaying the importance of dental amalgam for the human mercury body burden.

(b) there exists no correlation between mercury levels in blood or urine, and the levels in body tissues or severity of clinical symptoms. SCENIHR only use levels in urine or blood. As expected, they found only levels below safety levels in amalgam bearers and concluded that this as the proof of the safety of amalgam.

(c) There exists no “safety level”, below adverse effects are excluded (WHO 2005). But SCENIHR again insist on the unscientific assumption that no adverse effects occur below established “safety limits”, which, furthermore, was never adopted for amalgam derived mercury vapour exposure.

(d) autopsy studies have shown consistently that, despite of mercury levels below “safety limits” in urine or blood, a significant proportion of individuals have very high mercury levels in their brains, kidneys or glands, derived from dental amalgam. These mercury levels are far above toxic levels, which easily cause damage in human- and animal cells in scientific experiments. SCENIHR neglect this data completely.
(e) the half-life of mercury in the brain could last from several years to decades, thus mercury accumulates over time of amalgam exposure in body tissues to toxic levels. But SCENIHR state that the half live of mercury in the body is only “20-90 days”.

(f) mercury, in particular mercury vapor is known to be the most toxic non-radioactive elelement, about ten times more toxic than lead on human neurons and with synergistic toxicity to other metals. most studies cited by SCENIHR, which concludes that amalgam fillings are safe for humans have profound methodogical flaws which makes them invaluable for assessing the safety of amalgam. Some of them were also granted by dental organisation. The SCENIHR report was neither performed by physicans nor by experts in environmental medicine, but mostly by dentists and their advocates which: (i) have conflict of interests regarding the use of dental amalgam, (ii) have no expertise in the diagnosis, treatment and pathogenesis of most human diseases (except some oral ones). Due to their education and their very limited clinical experience, they are not able to judge about possible adverse side effects from dental amalgam, like multiple sclerosis, autism, autoimmunity, Alzheimer’s disease, psychiatric diseases. Usage of dental amalgam is increasing worldwide (caries epidemic in undeveloped countries, where most of the world populations live). Dental associations wordwide posess patents for amalgam mixtures and are responsible for possible adverse health effects (fear of litigitation). Today, Dental organisations are the only trade group of health professionals to endorse the use of a product that is primarily mercury. Every amalgam patent that has been awarded for decades has been produced according to Dental organisations specifications.
2. Dental amalgam AS THE MAIN SOURCE OF mercury DEPOSITS in HUMAN BODY tissues

SCENIHR write on page 17 (Section 3.3.2.2.): “Exposure to mercury is difficult to measure. The indications for mercury exposure are therefore normally obtained by measuring mercury levels in urine and blood of individuals.”

It is not explainable, why SCENIHR did not cite any autopsy studies, which are the most reliable studies for assessing mercury levels in tissues. Levels in urine or blood are not important, important are the mercury levels in body tissues like brain or kidney. Furthermore SCENIHR did not mention that dental amalgam is the main source of human mercury load in body tissues, as studies in animals (Danscher et al., 1990; Galic et al., 1999, Galic et al., 2001, Hahn et al., 1989, 1990; Lorscheider et al., 1995; Lorscheider and Vimy, 1991; Vimy et al., 1990) and men show: An approx. 2-5-fold increase of mercury levels in blood und urine as well as a 2-12 fold increase of the mercury concentration in several body tissues was observed in people with dental amalgam compared to those without amalgam (Barregard et al., 1999; Becker et al., 2002, 2003; Drasch et al., 1992, 1994; 1997; Egglestone & Nylander, 1987; Gottwald et al., 2001, Guzzi et al., 2002, 2006, Levey et al., 2004; Lorscheider et al., 1995; Kingmann et al., 1998; Mortada et al., 2002, Nylander 1986, 1991, Nylander et al., 1987; Pizzichini et al., 2003, Weiner & Nylander, 1993, Zimmer et al., 2002).

Therefore mercury exposure through dental amalgam exceeds the exposure by fish consumption by far. Dental amalgam is, according to autopsy studies, responsible for at least 60-95% of mercury deposits in human tissues, a fact, which is not mentioned by SCENIHR.

2.1. Methyl-Mercury through dental amalgam?

SCENIHR state that “there is no evidence that biotransformation of amalgam derived mercury takes place intra-orally in association with bacterial activity.”

This statement is weakly founded: Mercury (Hg) from dental amalgam is also transformed into organic mercury compounds like Methyl-Mercury by microorganisms in the gastrointestinal tract (Leistevuo et al., 2001, Heintze et al., 1983, Yannai et al., 1991). Leistevuo et al. (2001) found three times increased methyl mercury concentrations in the saliva from individuals with dental amalgam compared to persons without amalgam, although frequency and kind of fish consumption were identical in both groups. Mercury levels in saliva exceed mercury limits for sewage in 20% of individuals with amalgam (Leistevuo et al. 2001). The form of Methyl-mercury derived from dental amalgam is much more toxic (about 20 times) than the form of methyl mercury found in fish (see section “toxicity of mercury”).
2.2. Toxic mercury levels in humans through dental amalgam?

SCENIHR only use studies which assess inorganic mercury levels in urine as a goldstandard for the estimation of mercury body burden or severity of clinical symptoms. Because they found only urine levels below the safety levels for mercury in amalgam bearers, they concluded this as one proof of the safety of dental amalgam.

This argument need to be explained in detail. In a recent study on cadavers, it was found that individuals with more than 12 amalgam fillings have more than 10-times higher mercury levels in several tissues including the brain, compared to individuals, which have only 0-3 amalgam fillings.


The average mercury level in the brain of people with more than 12 amalgam fillings was 300 ng Hg/g brain tissue (Guzzi et al. 2006), which is well above toxic mercury levels (see below). In another study, the levels of inorganic mercury (which correlates significantly with number of amalgam fillings) in the occipital cortex was in average 12 ng Hg/g ± 29 ng Hg/g (Bjorkmann et al. 2007). Mercury levels in thyroid- and pituitary gland were 55 ng Hg/g and 200ng Hg/g respectively and again, these levels correlate significantly with the numbers of dental amalgam and are above toxic levels (Bjorkmann et al. 2007).

People with more than 8 amalgam fillings have on average 320 ng Hg/g in their kidney tissues compared to 70 ng Hg/g in the kidneys of individuals without amalgam (Drasch et al 1997). Individuals with more than 10 amalgams have 504ng Hg/g in their kidneys (0-2 amalgams: 54 ng Hg/g); 83,3 ng Hg/g in the liver (0-2 amalgams: 17,68 ng Hg/g) (Drasch et al. 1992).

These levels are only average levels. Therfore, a significant portion of individuals with dental amalgam have more than twice of this mercury levels in their body tissues. Additionaly, it must be considered that mercury levels found in subcellular fractions like mikrosomes, mitochondrai and other cell-compartiments exceed the average mercury levels of the whole brain tissues by far (Opitz et al. 1996, Wenstrup et al. 1990)


2.1.1. Comparison to toxic mercury levels in vitro and in vivo

Inorganic mercury concentrations of 0,02 ng Hg/g (2µl 0,1 µMolar Hg in 2 ml substrate) led to the total destruction of intracellular microtubuli and to the degeneration of axons (Leong et al., 2001). In other experiments inorganic mercury concentrations of 36 ng Hg/g (0,18 µMol Hg) led to an increase of oxidative stress as a prerequesite for further cell damage (Olivieri et al, 2000, 2002). Mercury vapour inhalation in doses, which also occur in humans with many amalgam fillings and chewing, lead to pathological changes in the brains of animals (Pendergrass et al. 1995, 1997).
2.2. Toxic mercury levels in Alzheimer´s diseased brains
The average mercury load in the brain of individuals with Alzheimer´s disease was **20 to 178 ng Hg/g**, in some cases the load exceeds up to **(236- 698 ng Hg/g)**. In **15% of the human brain samples** the mercury load was above **100 ng Hg/g** (Ehmann et al. 1986, Thompson et al. 1988, Saxe et al., 1999). The average mercury load in the pituitary gland was in mean **400 ng Hg/g** (Cornett et al., 1998). These levels are well above established toxic levels.

2.3. Mercury typical pathological changes in the brains of individuals in Germany
About 20% of people in the age group of 20 years, 50% of individuals in the age group of 50 years, and 90% of people in the age group of 85 years living in Germany have these, for mercury typical, pathological changes in their brains (Braak et al. 1997). This coverage of pathological brain chances, which is caused by very low levels of mercury in experiments and not by low levels of other metals like lead, iron, aluminum, copper, mangan, chrom. cadmium) (Leong et al. 2001, Pendergrass & Haley 1997) in “normal” people living in Germany resembles the frequency of dental amalgam fillings implanted in human mouth: About 80-90% of people living in Germany had have dental amalgam implanted for decades in their mouth. It must be noted that about 30-50% of german people over the age of 85 years have Alzheimer´s disease (AD) and there are many hints that mercury plays a major pathogenetic role in AD (Mutter et al. 2004).

2.4. Maternal amalgam as the main source of mercury in infant tissues
Maternal amalgam fillings leads to a significant increase of mercury levels in fetal and infant body tissues including the brain (Drasch et al., 1994). Placental, fetal and infant mercury body burden correlates with the numbers of dental amalgam fillings of the mothers. (Ask et al., 2002, Drasch et al., 1994, Holmes et al., 2003, Morgan et al., 2002; Takahashi et al., 2001, 2003; Vather et al., 2000; Yoshida et al., 2002, 2004).

Mercury levels in amniotic fluid (Luglie et al., 2003) and breast milk (Drasch et al., 1998, Oskarsson et al., 1996, Vimy et al., 1997) are also significantly correlated with the number of maternal amalgam fillings.
2.4.1. Mercury in infant tissues increase the risk of neurodevelopmental disorders

Drasch et al. (1994) found mercury levels of up to 20ng Hg/g in infant brain tissues from Germany, which were mainly caused by dental amalgam fillings of their mothers. As described above, mercury levels of 0.02 ng Hg/g led to degeneration of axons (Leong et al., 2001) and 36ng Hg/g led to an increase of oxidative stress as a prerequisite for cell damage (Olivieri et al, 2000, 2002). Furthermore, the mercury levels found in the infant brains of mothers with dental amalgam are sufficient enough to inhibit also the function of the important enzyme methionin synthetase (Waly et al., 2004, Deth, 2004). Methionin synthetase is crucial for methylation, a central step for most important metabolic reactions in the body, including the development of the brain, the maturation of nerve cells, the synthesis of neurotransmitters and for production of the antioxidants glutathione. Especially fetal and infant neurons have have an increased susceptibility to mercury.

Maternal amalgam fillings increases significantly the mercury levels in the cord blood (Palkovicova et al. 2007, Unuvar et al., 2007) and in fetal or infant tissues (Drasch et al., 1994). The risk for delayed neurodevelopment of children was 3.58- times increased, when cord blood was higher then 0.8ng Hg/ml (Jedrychowski et al, 2005). In Germany, mercury levels of 0.2- 5ng Hg/ ml cord blood are considered as "normal" (Stoz et al., 1995), thus leaving many infants to mercury levels, which may cause neurodevelopmental deficits.


3. No correlation between urinary mercury levels and mercury levels in tissues

SCENIHR rely their report on studies, which have measured mercury levels in biomarkers, like urine, for the assessment of clinical symptoms or mercury body burden. But reports confirm that the ratio of fecal to urine excretion is 12 to 1 (Lorscheider et al. 1995). This proves that the vast majority of excreted mercury leaves through the biliary transport system of the liver via the fecal route. Urine mercury therefore represents a minor excretory route of less than 8% of mercury being excreted. Also, urine mercury is a measure of mercury being excreted by the kidney---not total mercury exposure.

Even the WHO states (1991)

"Mercury typifies a “retention” toxicity and much of the mercury taken into the body is absorbed by the solid tissues. The amount in urine represents mercury being excreted. However, the main question is how much is being retained in the different body tissues”.

There is clear evidence, that amalgam derived mercury levels in blood or urine do not adequately represent mercury levels in critical body tissues. But it is not clear, why this is neglected by SCENIHR:
It has been shown in experiments with animals and men that in spite of normal or low mercury levels in blood, hair and urine, high mercury levels are found in critical tissues like brain and kidney (Danscher et al., 1990; Drasch, 1997; Hahn et al. 1989, 1990, Hargeaves et al., 1988; Holmes et al., 2003; Lorscheider et al., 1995; Opitz et al., 1996; Vimy et al., 1990; Weiner & Nylander, 1993). A recent study on deceased individuals found that there exists no correlation between inorganic mercury levels in urine or blood and mercury concentrations in brain tissues (Björkman et al. 2007).

Drasch et al. (2001, 2002, 2004) showed, that 64% of individuals, who were occupationally exposed to mercury vapor and having typical clinical signs of mercury intoxication had urine-levels of mercury below 5µg/l, which represent the No Observed Adverse Effekt Level (NOAEL). The same results were found for mercury levels in blood and hair (Drasch et al., 2001, 2002, 2004).

3.1. Paradoxical association between mercury levels in urine and clinical symptoms

Even a paradoxical correlation between mercury levels in urine, blood or hair and clinical symptoms exists:

Sudies on cadavers are known to be the gold standard for detecting mercury body burden. Deceased subjects, who showed only 0,3 ng mercury per ml urine had up to 350 ng mercury per g kidney tissue (wet weight) in kidney specimens. On the other hand, subjects with high urine levels of mercury (above 2ng/ml) had only 150 ng mercury per g in their kidney tissues. (Drasch et al, 1997).


Especially subjects with highest urine levels of mercury showed best recovery rates from neuropsychological complaints after removing their amalgam fillings (Stenman& Grans, 1997). Also children with highest mercury levels in hair showed better performance in developmental tests (Grandjean et al., 1995)

Another study indicates that autistic children had up to 15-times lower mercury levels in their infant hair than healthy controls, despite significantly higher exposure to mercury in the womb. Furthermore, the lower the mercury levels in infant hair, the higher was the severity of autism. (Holmes et al., 2003).

Despite higher mercury body burden, amalgam hyersensitives showed slightly lower levels of mercury in their saliva, blood and urine [Köhler et al. 2007]. Even after provocation with the mercury chelator DMPS, the amalgam hypersensitive group excrete in mean only 7,77 µg Hg via urine in 24 h whereas healthy amalgam bearers excrete 12,69 µg Hg/ 24h [Köhler et al. 2007].


The same tendency was found by Zimmer et al. (2002): Individuals with dental amalgam, who reported amalgam-derived-complaints showed partly lower mercury levels than individuals with
dental amalgam, but without complaints. If this study were adequately powered, these differences would have reached statistical significance (Walach et al., 2003).


Given the same exposure to mercury, individuals with high levels of mercury in urine, blood or hair may have a better excretion capacity for mercury. Presumably, this leads to a lower mercury body burden or to fewer mercury derived complaints compared to individuals with low levels of mercury in urine or hair.

Therefore, the preliminary report of SCENIHR, which rely only on the mercury-levels in urine or blood as the gold standard for the assessment of clinical symptoms or the estimation of mercury-levels in critical tissues lead to completely distorted conclusions.

3.2. No safety level for mercury

Taken together the data present above (and this was also confirmed by the WHO 2005): It is not possible to determine any safety levels for mercury, below adverse effects are excluded (WHO 2005).

SCENIHR also use safety limits for mercury which were deduced from studies with workers exposed to mercury. But this cannot be applied to individuals with amalgam fillings and must be critically evaluated:

1. Frequently, mercury exposure of workers in the chlorine-alkali industry are compared although the simultaneous exposure to chlorine considerably diminishes the absorption of Hg into the organs of animals (50-100%) [Viola & Cassano 1968].

2. Workers exposed to mercury usually represent a group, whose Hg-exposure begins as adults only (during the limited duration of working hours), while amalgam bearers can be exposed to mercury from amalgam fillings from childhood (also as fetuses via the maternal amalgam) until death at a rate of 24 hours per day.

3. Workers are a selected healthy group, while pregnant women, infants, children and individuals with illness (like multiple sclerosis, autoimmunity, cancer, psychiatric diseases) do not start working at all either due to industrial safety regulations or to early health problems.

4. Despite mercury exposure below “safety limits”, significant adverse health effects were found in most studies in occupationally mercury exposed workers, even several years after exposure has ceased.
• Smith PJ, Langolf GD, Goldberg J (1983) Effects of occupational exposure to elemental mercury on short term memory. BR. J. IND. MED.; 40:(4)413-419
• Williamson AM, Teo RK, Sanderson J (1982) Occupational mercury exposure and its consequences for behaviour. International Archives of Occupational & Environmental Health 50:(3)273-86

4. **Body half-time period of mercury**

SCENIHR state that the body half-time (of mercury) is “20-90 days”. Particularly in the brain, mercury have a much longer half-live. There is, for example, the case of a healthy worker who was shortly accidently exposed to mercury vapor. Four weeks afterwards, mercury levels in urine decreased to normal levels due to chelation. After the accident, he suffered for 16 years from severe fatigue, irritability, burning stomach and diabetes. But these complaints were diagnosed as an “organic psycho syndrome” not caused by mercury because mercury levels in urine were found to be normal. He was never able to work again. 16 years after mercury exposure he died of lung cancer. Autopsy revealed very high mercury levels in his cerebellum (2190 ng Hg/g), occipital lobe (1090 ng Hg/g), thalamus (1010 ng Hg/g), kidneys (1650 ng Hg/g), lungs (600 ng Hg/g) and in thyroid glands (250 ng Hg/g) (Opitz et al, 1996). Interestingly most of the mercury was found to be intracellularly near to cell nuclei. Mercury was also accumulated in motoneurons and the basal ganglia.
During 16 years after initial mercury exposure, these extraordinary high mercury levels in his body tissues were not excreted, neither naturally nor through frequently applied chelation therapy. According to SCENIHR even 99% of the mercury body load should be excreted after two years of mercury exposure. 16 years after exposure, no mercury should be detectable in the tissues. Other authors also report about the extremely long half time or long lasting effect of mercury in body tissues (Hargreaves 1988; Takahata N 1970; Sugita M 1978, Kishi R, 1994, He FS 1984, Kobal et al., 2004, Letz et al., 2000).

5. Toxicity of Mercury

SCENIHR did not mention the specific toxicity of mercury vapour coming of dental amalgam fillings. This should be completed:

Mercury (Hg) has been shown to be 10- times more toxic than lead (Pb) in vitro (Thier et al., 2003, Stoiber et al, 2004a, 2004b). Mercury, especially mercury vapour coming off dental amalgam and amalgam derived organic mercury compounds, is the most toxic non-radioactive element. Mercury vapor is one of the most toxic forms of mercury along with some of the organic mercury compounds. This is probably due to the efficient partitioning of vaporous mercury into certain body organs (e.g. Central Nervous system (CNS), kidney) and into specific cellular organelles (e.g. the mitochondria) based on mercury vapor’s ability to easily penetrate cell membranes and the blood brain barrier. This extraordinary toxicity is determined by the following properties:

1. It is the only metal representing a volatile gas at room temperature, which is is readily absorbed (80%) by the respiratory system.
2. Mercury vapors, which escape amalgam continuously, penetrate biological tissues with great ease, because of his monopolar atomic configuration.
3. Once inside the cells, mercury vapor is oxidized to Hg$^{2+}$, the toxic form of mercury which binds covalently to thiol groups of proteins inhibiting their biological activity.
4. Hg$^{2+}$ is more toxic than Pb$^{2+}$, Cadmium (Cd$^{2+}$) and other metals because it has an extremely high affinity due to “covalent bond” formation with thiol groups (cysteines in proteins) causing irreversible inhibition (binding-constant $10^{30-40}$). Other metals form reversible bonds with proteins and are therefore less toxic. This might explain the exceptionally long half-life of mercury in not renewing tissue (e.g. brain) from several years to decades (Hargreaves et al., 1988; Opitz et al., 1996; Sugita 1978).
5. Hg$^{2+}$ does not bind tightly enough to the carboxylate groups of natural organic acids (natural chelators like citrate) to prevent its toxicity.
6. Chelating agents, like EDTA, which normally inhibit the toxic effect of heavy metals like lead, have no inhibitory effect on the toxicity of mercury or may even increase it (Duhr et al., 1993; Pendergrass & Haley, 1996). Other chelating agents (DMPS and DMSA) inhibit the toxic effect of Cd$^{2+}$ and Pb$^{2+}$ but not of Hg$^{2+}$ (Soares et al., 2003). DMPS, DMSA or natural chelators like vitamin C, glutathione or alpha-lipoic acid are not able to remove mercury.
from nervous tissues. (Aposhian et al., 2003). DMPS or DMSA may even increase the inhibitory activity of Hg$^{2+}$ and Cd$^{2+}$ on enzymes but not by Pb$^{2+}$ (Nogueira et al., 2003). Furthermore, DMPS in animals led to an increase of Hg concentrations in spinal cord (Ewan & Pamphlett, 1996).

The toxicity of methyl mercury (Me-Hg), which is bound to cysteine in fish, seems to be far lower (only approx. 1/20) than Me-Hg-compounds usually used in experiments [Harris et al. 2003]. Furthermore, marine fish represents a significant source of selenium and essential omega-3-fatty acids, which protect effectively against mercury toxicity. Nevertheless, Me-Hg-Cl, which proved to be more toxic than Me-Hg in fish, showed less neurotoxicity for the growing nervous system in vivo than did mercury vapor [Frederikson et al. 1996].

Investigations by Drasch et al. [2001] shows similar correlations: A population of a goldmining-area, which, was exposed to mercury vapor, showed significantly more neurological symptoms of mercury intoxication than a control group, which mainly was exposed to methyl-Hg from fish consumption, despite their Hg levels in hair and plasma were higher compared to the individuals exposed to mercury vapor [Drasch et al. 2001, 2002]. Another study also points to smaller neurotoxicity of Me-Hg from fish compared to iatrogenic Hg-sources (Amalgam, Thiomersal) [Holmes et al. 2003]. Here, in contrast to the numbers of dental amalgam in the mothers, no correlation between maternal fish consumption during pregnancy and the risk of autism for their children was found.

Taken together, mercury vapour coming off dental amalgam or methyl mercury derived from amalgam in the gastrointestinal tract has not reacted with anything yet and has its full toxic potential. Mercury vapour is easily absorbed by body tissues (like brain) and then did react to cellular structures, which are in turn damaged. On the other side, methylmercury in fish has already reacted with fish proteins and other protective molecules or atoms in fish tissues, like Glutathione or Selenium, which are enriched in fish and make the methylmercury less toxic.
5.1. Synergistic toxicity of mercury to lead (Pb)

Some scientists try to argue that results gained by animal or cell testing are overestimated and not comparable to the situation of the human body. However, in contrast to test animals, humans are exposed to many other xenobiotica simultaneously, thus the effects add up or are even synergistic. (Schubert et al. 1978, Haley, 2002). For example, it has been proven that the combination of one tens of the Letal Dosis 1% of mercury \( \text{LD}_{1	ext{Hg}} \) together with the LD1 of lead \( \text{LD}_{1	ext{Pb}} \) results in the death of all animals, so the following toxicological equation can be assumed:

\[
\frac{1}{10} \text{LD}_{1	ext{Hg}} + \text{LD}_{1	ext{Pb}} = \text{LD}_{100}
\] (Schubert et al. 1978).

In this context, it must be considered that modern humans have more mercury\(^{-}\) and between 10-1000 fold more lead in their body tissues than ancient humans.


Lead levels well below the safety limits cause increased mortality through stroke and myocardial incarction (Menke et al. 2006)

- Menke A et al.: Blood lead below 0.48 \( \mu \text{mol/L} \) (10 \( \mu \text{g/dL} \)) and mortality among US adults. Circulation 2006; 114: 1388-94.

“Noormal” lead levels in the bones correlates with brain and bone diseases and cancer.


Thus neither for lead nor for mercury exists any safety limits.

In other experiments the addition of aluminium, antibiotics, thimerosal and testosterone increased the toxicity of mercury additionally or synergistically [Haley 2005, 2006].

- Haley B & Small T. Biomarkers supporting mercury toxicity as the major exacerbator of neurological illness, recent evidence via the urine prophyrin tests. Medical Veritas 2006; 3: 1-14.

6. No adverse health effects through dental amalgam?

SCENIHR states “It is generally concluded that no increased risk on adverse systemic effects exists and we do not consider that the current use of dental amalgam poses a risk of systemic
“disease” and “….some local adverse effects are occasionally seen with dental amalgam fillings, but the incidence is low and normally readily managed”

SCENIHR seem to neglect most important and well performed scientific studies which finds significant adverse health effects from dental amalgam:

**6.1. Cytotoxicity from amalgam in comparison to composites**

In most in vitro studies, even inorganic mercury, which is less toxic as mercury vapour coming of amalgam fillings, were proofed to be much more toxic than any dental composites. Mercury was proofed to be 100-800 fold more toxic than composite components for several cells (Kehe et al. 2001, Walther et al. 2002, Reichl et al. 2001, 2006a, 2006b)


**6.2. Genotoxicity, oxidative Stress, Cancer**

Aberrations of chromosomes can be provoked through amalgam in cell cultures (Akiyama et al., 2001). Amalgam bearers show significantly increased oxidative stress in saliva (Pizzichini et al., 2000, 2002) and blood (Pizzichini et al., 2001, 2003), which correlates with the numbers of amalgam fillings. Very low mercury concentrations, which are frequently seen in tissues of many people with dental amalgam fillings, lead to increased oxidative stress and reduction of the glutathione concentrations, which lead to subcellular damage (Olivieri et al., 2000, 2002). In humans, DNA damage in blood was caused by their dental amalgam fillings (Di Pietro et al. 2008).

Very low levels of inorganic mercury, which is less toxic than mercury vapor coming off dental amalgams, lead to significant DNA damage in human tissue cells and lymphocytes (Schmid K et al. 2007). This effect was seen below mercury levels which normally caused cytotoxicity and cell death. Significantly elevated mercury levels were observed in breast cancer tissues (Ionescu et al. 2006).

Mercury deposited in the tissue is mostly bound to selenium, which means, that this selenium is not longer available for the body. Mercury from amalgam may aggravate a latent deficiency of selenium, particularly in countries with suboptimal selenium supply (e.g. in Central Europe) (Drasch et al., 2000).

6.3. Antibiotic Resistance
It has been shown, that mercury from dental amalgam can select for mercury resistant bacteria.[Liebert et al. 1997; Lorscheider et al. 1995b, Summers et al. 1993]. This lead to a general antibiotica resistance in oral bacteria and in other body sites [Summers et al. 1993]. This is particularly true when the antibiotic resistance genes are contained within the same mobile element as the mercury resistance operon [Davis et al. 2005]. Mercury resistance is common in oral bacteria [Edlund et al, 1996, Leistevuo et al. 2000, Pike et al. 2002]. Monkeys with dental amalgam also showed an increase in antibiotic resistant bacteria in their stools [Summers et al. 1993; Wiremann et al. 1997].


6.4. Skin Allergies, Lichen

There is a correlation between atopic eczema and IgE-levels and the body burden of mercury (Weidinger et al., 2004). Amalgam fillings can induce lichenoid reactions (Berlin, 2003; Dunsche et al., 2003a, 2003b; Martin et al., 2003; Wong & Freeman, 2003). In more than 90% of the cases, these lesions have been found to recover by removal of amalgam, no matter whether an allergy patch test was positive or not. Granulomatosis improved likewise (Guttman-Yassky et al., 2003). Also, other forms of dermatitis seem to be related with dental amalgams (Guarneri & Marini 2008, Pigatteo et al. 2008).


6.5. Autoimmune Disorders and Sensitivity

Constant low-dose mercury exposure, as is common in amalgam bearers, has been considered as a possible cause for certain autoimmune diseases, e.g. multiple sclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis or systemic lupus erythematosis (SLE) (Bartova et al., 2003, Berlin, 2003, Hultmann et al., 1994, 1998; Pollard et al., 2001; Prochazkova et al., 2004, Stejskal & Stejskal, 1999; Stejskal et al., 1999, Sterzl et al., 1999, Via et al., 2003, Sterzl et al., 2006). These effects may occur with exposure below mercury safety limits (Kazantzis, 2002).

According to a Swedish risk analysis the frequency of particularly sensitive persons is considered to be 1 %. (Berlin, 2003). The Commission of Human-Biomonitoring of the German Federal Environmental Agency (Umweltbundesamt) estimates, that approx. 1-4% of the population may have reactions due to being particularly sensitive to amalgam (Kommission Human-Biomonitoring des Umweltbundesamtes, 1999). This rate of 1-4% was confirmed by studies, which rated immunological disorders caused by amalgam at 1-3% of the population (Marcusson, 1999). This represents a significant medical and economical problem when considering the frequency of amalgam fillings in a large percentage of the population. A commissioner, who had been appointed
to provide data on amalgam from the Canadian Federal Health Board, had even estimated that up to 25% of individuals with amalgam have amalgam-derived-complaints (Richardson, 1995). Recent research has shown that mercury and ethylmercury have the ability to inhibit the first step (phagocytosis) in the innate and acquired immune response of humans at very low levels (Rampersad et al. 2005). This clearly shows that mercury exposures quite below the average exposure through amalgam exposure can cause disruption of the immune system at all ages.


6.4.1. Only “rare cases of proven allergic reactions”? SCENIHR only accept the old “proof” of allergic reactions to amalgam, which is a positive cutaneous patch test. But it has been shown that in more than 90% of the cases, these lesions have been found to recover by removal of amalgam, no matter whether an allergy patch test was positive or not.


Therefore the relevance of the epicutaneous test in detecting sensitivity or allergy to mercury which are implanted in the oral cavity without any epicutaneous contact was severely questioned.


The results with another, validated test system, reveal that there exists more than only “rare cases” who suffers from immunological or systemic complaints through dental amalgam.

- Valentine-Thon et al. LTT-MELISA(R) is clinically relevant for detecting and monitoring metal sensitivity. Neuro Endocrinol Lett. 2006; 27: in print

As described in the above mentioned studies and confirmed by our clinical observations, reactivity to mercury disappear some week after amalgam removal in this test-system.
There may also be a correlation between atopic eczema, IgE-levels and the body burden of mercury, which is also not detected with patch tests.


Because mercury from maternal dental amalgam is one of the main source of mercury body burden in fetal and and infant tissues, postnatal atopic eczema disappear after mercury detoxification of the infants

[Wortberg 1997]


### 6.6 Heart diseases

Mercury may cause hypertension and myocardial infarction

- [Houston MC. The role of mercury and cadmium heavy metals in vascular disease, hypertension, coronary heart disease, and myocardial infarction. Altern Ther Health Med 2007; 13: S128-S133], and heart insufficiency


### 6.7 Urinary system

SCENIHR only cite a review, performed by a dentist (Dodes 2001) and a 5 year study on healthy children for their argument that “there is no evidence that dental amalgam fillings affect kidney function in human”. But there are many studies which suggest the opposite:

In animal experiments an impairment of renal functions due to amalgam fillings has been reported (Boyd et al., 1991, Galic et al., 2001; Pollard et al., 2001). Humans with amalgam fillings show more signs of tubular and glomerular damage when compared to individuals without dental amalgams (Mortada et al., 2002). Even the children amalgam trails study found even after 5 year of amalgam exposure first signs of kidney damage (Microalbuminurial) (Trachtenberg & Barregard 2007).　


### 6.8 Alzheimer’s Desease (AD)

SCENIHR question the hypothesis that mercury may contribute to the development AD. But they cite only a study, performed mainly by dentists (Saxe et al. 1999), published in the trade journal (JADA) of the world leading Dental association (ADA see also Section 9)), which have severe limits. But there are many hints, which was published recently and accuse mercury as on of the causes of AD (Mutter et al. 2004, Mutter et al 2007)
a. no other metal than mercury in very low levels is capable to produce every single change in the nervous system of animals and in cell tests which is typical for AD including the increase of β-Amyloid and the formation of neurofibrillar tangles (NFT).

b. If aluminium, lead or other metals are present in the body together with mercury, it is highly likely that synergistic toxic effects occur. The combination of the LD1 of lead and one tens of the LD1 of mercury results in the death of all test animals (LD100)(Schubert et al. 1978).

c. Several studies found elevated mercury levels in brain tissues or body fluids of individuals with AD.

d. The development of AD takes up to 30-50 years (Braak et al., 1997).

e. Since about 95% of all AD cases are triggered by exogenic factors and the disease is now pandemic in developed countries, the main exogenic factor should be present since about 50 years in many people, both in rural and in urban sites. This matches with the raised use of dental amalgam after the world war II 50 years ago.

f. The risk of AD increases with the incidence of dental decay.

- It is known that the presence of the apolipoprotein E subtype (Apo-E-4 allele) is a major risk factor for developing AD (Farrer et al., 1997; Ritchie and Dupuy, 1999). Exactly why Apo-E4 is a major risk factor for AD is yet not known. A possible link could be the fact that Apo-E4 has reduced the detoxifying abilities compared with the other two subtypes (Apo-E2, Apo-E3). Apo-E4 has no thiol-groups compared to the other forms, which may have the ability to bind and detoxify heavy metals like mercury (Godfrey et al., 2003; Pendergrass & Haley, 1996) and lead (Stewart et al., 2002).

According to our view these arguments show that mercury plays a major factor in the development of AD and is even more important than aluminum.

In Alzheimer’s disease (AD) the aberrant biochemical events and the pathological hallmarks are well described. So is the research that shows that mercury, and only mercury, will produce the aberrant biochemistry and produce most of the pathological hallmarks in appropriate test systems.

Also, a recent study has indicated that the increase in brain amyloid protein is due to an aberrant brain heme level and the heme synthetic pathway is one known to be extremely sensitive to mercury (Atamna & Frey 2004).


In spite of all this molecular level data the Alzheimer’s Association of America supports the ADA in its plan to continue exposing Americans, some of whom are destined to become demented with AD, to a 40 to 60 year exposure to mercury from dental amalgams. It seems logical to me that this exposure, even if you don’t want to think it causal for AD, would certainly exacerbate the rate of biochemical breakdown of the human brain of those who later suffer from AD type dementia.

It is also well known that the genetic inheritance of the APO-E4 form of apolipoprotein-E greatly increases the risk of early onset AD whereas inheritance of the APO-E2 form appears to be protective against AD. Both of these forms appear to do their biological functions adequately, and one of these functions is to remove oxidized cholesterol from the brain, into the cerebrospinal fluid, across the blood brain barrier and into the blood for removal by the liver. The second highest concentration of APO-E protein is in the cerebrospinal fluid. The one definite difference between APO-E4 and APO-E2 is the presence of two cysteines in the APO-E2 that are capable of mercury binding and therefore mercury removal from the central nervous system. APO-E4 differs from APO-E2 in that these two cysteines have been genetically replaced by arginines that have no mercury binding capacity. Therefore, as previously reported, one of the most logical explanations of the different protective effects of the widely accepted, differential risk for AD based on APO-E genotype can be explained by the loss of mercury binding capacity in the cerebrospinal fluid and brain of the proteins expressed by these genes.

6.9. Adverse health effects in dental staff and dentists

SCENIHR state that “the incidence of reported adverse effects is very low”. A simple literature research reveal the opposite picture: Dentists working with amalgam have an increased Hg exposure (Harakeh et al., 2003; Tezel et al., 2001, Nylander & Weiner, 1991). In most studies available, mercury exposure in dental clinics, which is considered to be below “safety limits”, resulted in significant adverse health effects dental workers (Aydin et al., 2003, Bittner et al., 1998; Echeverria et al., 1995; 1998; Heyer et al., 2004, Echeverria et al., 2005, 2006, Gonzalez-Ramirez et al. 1995, Langworth et al. 1997, Ngim et al. 1992, Ritchie et al. 1995, 2002, Uzzell et al 1986).

In some studies, the clinical symptoms were not correlated with mercury levels in urine or blood, and some authors falsely concluded that mercury was not the cause of the adverse effects (see also section 3.). Low level exposure to mercury vapor has been shown to lead to behavioral
changes in adult mice (Yoshida et al., 2004) and to the impairment of color discrimination in humans (Urban et al., 2003).

Visual evoked potentials in Hg exposed staff (among them dentists) show significant changes when compared to controls (Urban et al., 1999) or pathological muscle biopsies (Nadorfy-Lopez et al., 2000). A meta-analysis showed neuropsychological impairment in 686 persons exposed occupationally to mercury vapor compared to 579 controls (Meyer-Baron et al., 2002). Mercury levels in urine of these samples may be easily reached by exposure to amalgams (Lorscheider et al., 1995).

Rowland et al. (1994) found an increased incidence of infertility in female dental staff. Lindbohm et al. 2007 found a two-fold increased risk for miscarriage through occupational exposure to mercury (OR 2.0; 95% CI 1.0-4.1). The effect from mercury exposure was stronger as to exposure to acrylate compounds, disinfectants or organic solvents.

Even after 30 years after mercury exposure have stopped, dental nurses showed significant adverse health effects (Jones et al. 2007). In spite of the fact that 85% of the dentists and dental technicians tested showed mercury related toxicities in both behavior and physiological parameters, and 15% showed an increased mercury induced neurological deficits with polymorphism of the CPOX4 gene (Echeverria et al., 2005, 2006; Heyer et al., 2006), SCENIHR still maintain that amalgams do not cause any significant medical problems in dental workers, because the urine and blood levels are below “safety limits”. Again, SCENIHR miss the point that it is the mercury body burden, not the blood or urine levels that defines toxicity, and it has to take into account genetic susceptibility parameters.


6.10. Infertility
SCENIHR states “There is no evidence of any association between amalgam restorations and either male or female fertility or obstetric parameters” As a proof of this statement SCENIHR cite only one study, which only examine semen parameters in men. But others points to an opposite direction:

Women with a higher number of amalgam fillings or an increased excretion of mercury in the urine (after DMPS) suffered more frequently from infertility than controls (Gerhard et al., 1998a, 1998b; Gerhard & Runnebaum, 1992). Female dental assistants, who were exposed to amalgam, had a higher rate of infertility (Rowland et al., 1994). Heavy metal detoxification led to spontaneous pregnancies in a considerable part of the infertile patients (Gerhard et al., 1998b). Exposure to mercury may also lead to decreased male fertility (Sheiner et al., 2003), although low level mercury exposure does not necessarily cause infertility, but appears to have a negative impact on it. (Podzimek et al., 2003, 2005). The Norwegian study which is often cited as a proof for mercury exposure in dental clinics not causing infertility suffers from methodological flaws insofar, as only women were included who had already born at least one child. Women without children were excluded. Such a study certainly cannot answer the question if working with amalgam leads to infertility or not. Moreover, the exposure time to amalgam was not calculated and thus not included as a covariate into the study.

6.11. Multiple Sclerosis (MS)
The prevalence of MS has been shown to be correlated with the prevalence of caries (Craelius 1978; McGrotheret al., 1999) and the prevalence of amalgam (Baasch 1968; Ingalls 1983). Several MS-epidemics occurred after acute exposure to mercury vapor or lead (Ingalls 1986). In animal models inorganic mercury caused a loss of Schwann cells which build the myelin sheaths and stabilize the axons of neurons (Issa et al., 2003). Autoimmune pathogenesis, including antibodies against myelin basic protein (MBP), can be provoked by mercury and by other heavy metals (Stejskal & Stejskal, 1999). Also, a 7, 5-fold increased concentration of mercury could be found in the cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) of MS-patients (Ahlrot-Westerlund 1989). It would be difficult to
speculate that the presence of this increase in the CSF would not at least exacerbate the problems associated with MS or any neurological disease.

MS-patients, who had their amalgam fillings removed, showed fewer depressions, and less hostile aggressions and psychotic and compulsory behaviors when compared to a group of MS-patients with amalgam fillings (Siblerud, 1992). They also had significantly lower blood mercury values (Siblerud & Kienholz, 1994). After the removal of the amalgam fillings in MS patients the oligoclonal bands in the CSF disappeared (Huggins et al., 1998). Removal of dental amalgam led to the recovery in a significant proportion of MS patients (Prochazkowa et al., 2004). A retrospective study on 20,000 military individuals revealed a slightly but significantly higher risk for MS in individuals with more amalgam-fillings (Bates et al., 2004). This risk may even be underestimated, because the study cohort consisted primary of healthy persons at the time of entrance to military, which was selected by the process of military scrutiny (Bates et al., 2004). Another problem in some studies regarding this topic is, that the dental status before or at the time of the onset of multiple sclerosis was not documented. Despite of this limitations Bates (2006) found an 3,9 fold increased risk for multiple sclerosis in individuals with amalgam compared with no amalgams. A recent systematic review also found also an increased risk for MS through dental amalgam in spite of the fact that most studies did not used proper amalgam free controls (Aminzadeh & Etminan 2007).


6.12. Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS)

SCENIHR state that “there is no evidence for a relationship between Amyotrophic Lateralsclerosis (ALS) and mercury”

It is not clear, why SCENIHR come to this conclusion, because there are many studies, which in fact suggest that mercury may play a pathogentic role in ALS:

Mercury vapor is absorbed by motor neurons (Pamphlett R & Coote P, 1998) where it leads to increased oxidative stress. Mercury vapor is also suggested to promote motor neuron diseases like ALS (Pamphlett et al., 1998, Pamphlett & Waley, 1996, Stankovic, 2006).

It is proposed that mercury enhances glutamate toxicity in neurons, which is one factor in ALS (Albrecht and Matyja, 1996). Case reports show a correlation between accidental mercury exposure and ALS (Adams et al. 1983; Schwarz et al., 1996). There is a reported case of a Swedish woman with more than 34 amalgam fillings who suffered from ALS. After removal of these fillings and treatment with selenium and vitamin E she completely recovered (Rehde & Pleva, 1994). A retrospective study reported a statistically significant association between increased amalgam fillings and the risk of motoneurone diseases (Bates et al, 2004).
6.13. Frequently reported symptoms and markers of sensitivity

Among the most frequently reported symptoms due to amalgam fillings in amalgam-sensitive subjects are: Chronic fatigue, headache, migraine, increased susceptibility to infections, muscle pain, lack of concentration, digestion disorders, sleeping disorders, low memory capacity, joint pain, depression, heart sensations, vegetative dysregulation, mood disorders and many more (Engel, 1998; Godfrey et al., 2003; Lindh et al., 2002; Siblerud 1989, 1992; Siblerud et al., 1993, 1994, Wojcik et al., 2006).

Until recently it was not possible to differentiate between „amalgam-sensitive“ respective to „amalgam-resistant“ persons by their biomarkers or an epicutaneous test (patch test) (Gottwald et al., 2001, Zimmer et al., 2002). Surprisingly, it could be shown that subjects could react to a mercury patch test with psychosomatic symptoms although there was no allergic reaction of the skin (Marcusson, 1996).

In addition, neutrophil granulocytes in amalgam-sensitive subjects react differently compared to those in amalgam-resistant subjects (Marcusson & Jarstrand, 1998) and different activities of the superoxide dismutase could be found (Marcusson et al., 2000).

6.13.1. High susceptibility to amalgam

SCENIHR did not mention any susceptibility parameters which make a significant proportion of the population more susceptible to mercury from dental amalgam:

1. Abnormal porphyrine profiles due to mercury exposure

For example, it is known that low level mercury exposure lead to aberrant urine porphyrine profiles in dentists (Woods et al. 1993) and autistic children and that this aberrancy was reversed by treating these children with a mercury chelator (Nataf et al. 2006, Geier & Geier 2006).


A genetic polymorphism of Coproporphyrinoxidase (CPOX4) (Woods et al. 2005, Heyer et al. 2006) lead to increased susceptibility to mercury and thus to a higher risk for neurobehavioral complaints [Echeverria et al. 2006].

The critical question is the effect of mercury vapor exposure on brain porphyrins profiles since an aberrancy has been reported in brain heme that has been associated with the inability to remove beta-amyloid protein from brain cells, which may lead to Alzheimer’s disease.


It should be noted that porphyrins lead to heme and heme is critical for several biochemical mechanisms:

1. First, heme is the oxygen carrying cofactor for haemoglobin
2. heme is a critical cofactor for the P450 class of enzymes that are responsible for detoxifying organic type of toxins from the body
3. heme is a necessary cofactor for one of the complexes in the electron transport system of mitochondria and therefore ATP-synthesis.

Therefore, mercury inhibition of heme production could have a multitude of secondary effects that cause human complaints and illnesses.

In spite of the fact that 85% of the dentists and dental technicians tested showed mercury related toxicities in both behavior and physiological parameters, and 15% showed an increased mercury induced neurological deficits with polymorphism of the CPOX4 gene, organized dentistry and SCENIHR still maintain that amalgams do not cause any significant medical problems because the urine and blood levels are below safety limits (see section 3).

2. Brain derived neurotropic factor
Another genetic polymorphism of the Brain derived neurotropic factor (BDNF) increases also the susceptibility to low level mercury exposure [Echeverria et al. 2005, Heyer et al. 2004].


3. Apolipoprotein E diversity
It could also be shown that amalgam sensitive persons are significantly more likely to be carriers of the apolipoprotein E4-allel (APO-E4) than symptom free controls and are less likely to carry the APO-E2 (Godfrey et al., 2003, Wojcik et al., 2006). APO-E4 is known to be the major genetic risk factor for Alzheimer’s disease, whereas APO-E2 decreases the risk. It has been postulated that this is caused through the difference in capacity to remove heavy metals from the Cerebrospinal fluid [Wojcik et al., 2006, Godfrey et al., 2003; Haley, 2002; Mutter et al., 2004, Pendergrass & Haley,
1996; Stewart et al., 2002). APO-E2 possesses two Cysteine with metal binding Sulfhydryl-groups whereas APO-E4 did not have any Cysteine.

4. Glutathion metabolism

Glutathione (GSH) is the main natural chelator for heavy metals in the body due to his Sulfhydryl-containing Cysteine. Mainly mercury, which is bound to glutathione is capable to leaving the body via urine or biliary excretion. Thus, high levels of glutathione is crucial for mercury metabolism. It has been described that polymorphisms in genes leading to impaired GSH production lead to higher retention of inorganic and organic mercury in the body


Other factors, which may increase susceptibility to low dose mercury exposure, e.g. low levels of Selenium, abnormal reaction of neutrophil granulocytes, activity of super oxide dismutase, D4-receptor positive methionine synthetase and impaired methionine transulfuration and methylation pathways (about 15% of the population), which lead to decreased mercury protecting agents, like S-Adenyl-methionine, Cysteine, Glutathione and metallothionein [For overview see Mutter et al. 2004, 2005].


6.15. No neurodevelopmental disorders through mercury?

SCENIHR states “There is no evidence of a causal relationship between dental amalgam and autism” and “…that no link has been yet established between vaccines, thimerosal and autism”

Others come to other findings:

“…mercury exposure altered cell number and cell division; these impacts have been postulated as modes of action for the observed adverse effects in neuronal development. The potential implications of such observations are evident when evaluated in context with research showing that altered cell proliferation and focal neuropathologic effects have been linked with specific neurobehavioral deficits (e.g., autism).” (Faustmann et al. 2000)

SCENIHR question that mercury through maternal amalgam fillings and mercury containing vaccines (thimerosal) play a role in the development of autism and other neurodevelopmental disorders. The following studies, which indicates to mercury as one main cause of neurodevelopmental disorders, was completely neglected by SCENIHR:

a. Cheuk and Wong (2006) in patients diagnosed with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and Desoto and Hitlan (2007) in patients diagnosed with autistic disorders founds significant elevations in blood mercury levels in comparison with controls. Adams et al. (2007) observed significant increases in the mercury levels of baby teeth in infants with autistic disorders in comparison with controls. Mercury in baby teeth mirrors mercury exposure in the womb. Recent brain pathology studies have revealed elevations in mercury levels and mercury-associated oxidative stress markers in
patients diagnosed with autistic disorders (Evans et al. 2008; Lopez-Hurtado & Prieto, 2008; Sajdel-Sulkowska et al. 2008).

b. The levels of mercury in urine of autistic children is increased by 3-5-fold after appropriate treatment with the mercury chelator DMSA compared to healthy children (Bradstreet et al, 2003). Autistic children also excrete higher concentrations of coproporphyrine which is exactly specific for mercury intoxication (Nataf et al. 2006; Geier & Geier 2006b; 2007a-b). This was also seen in mercury exposed dentists (Echeverria et al, 2005, 2006, Heyer et al, 2006). Detoxification of mercury with DMSA normalized the abnormal coproporphyrin levels in autistic children (Geier & Geier, 2006, Nataf et al., 2006). Therefore the increased level of coproporphyrin in autistic children could only be explained by mercury exposure.

c. Experimental as well as epidemiological studies indicate that mercury exposure could be responsible for autism or deterioration of the disease. Prenatal exposure through maternal amalgam (Holmes et al. 2003), maternal thimerosal (Holmes et al. 2003, Geier et al. 2008) and postnatal sources (mercury from vaccines of the child) (Geier & Geier 2003, 2004, 2005) together with a genetically sensitivity may trigger autism.

d. In animal experiments vaccination with thimerosal led to autistic symptoms (Hornig et al, 2004).

e. Epidemiological studies confirms that there was a significant association between low-dose mercury exposure and neurodevelopmental disorders (Amin-Zaki et al. 1981; Counter et al. 2002; Debes et al. 2006; Geier & Geier 2006a; Jedrychowski et al. 2006; Palmer et al. 2006; Rury, 2006; Windham et al. 2006).

f. Autistic children show decreased levels of the natural mercury chelator glutathione (James et al., 2004) and mercury is able to cause this phenomenon (James et al, 2005).

g. In some therapy studies chelation therapy led to the improvement of symptoms in up to 60-80% of the cases. The Autism Research Institute therefore lists chelation as the most effective therapeutic approach among 88 therapies including 53 medications. (Autism Research Institute, 2005).

h. Some studies, which found no associations between mercury exposure and autism have severe methodical flaws (Mutter et al. 2005).

Zahir et al. (2005) described that the access of mercury,

“…to man through multiple pathways air, water, food, cosmetic products and even vaccines increase the exposure. Fetuses and children are more susceptible towards mercury toxicity. Mothers consuming diet containing mercury pass the toxicant to fetus and to infants through breast milk. Decreased performance in the areas of motor function and memory has been reported among
children exposed to presumably safe mercury levels…Mercury has been found to be a causative agent of various sorts of disorders, including neurological, nephrological, immunological, cardiac, motor, reproductive and even genetic. Recently heavy metal mediated toxicity has been linked to diseases like Alzheimer’s, Parkinson’s, Autism, Lupus, Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, etc."

It was shown that administration of prenatal Thimerosal to animals at less than 1 part-per-million (ppm) can induce significant fetal lethality and teratogenicity (Digar et al. 1987; Gasset et al. 1975; Itoi et al. 1972). Heinonen et al. (1977) examined 2,277 children with birth defects among 50,282 mother-child pairs and determined that Thimerosal exposure during the first 4 months of pregnancy was associated with a significantly increased risk.

The concentrations of inorganic mercury remained the same (in the thalamus) or doubled (in the pituitary) six months after mercury dosing had ended (Vahter et al. 1994; 1995). Studies on the brains of monkeys indicated that the persistence of inorganic mercury in the brain was associated with a significant increase in the number of microglia in the brain, whereas the number of astrocytes declined (Charleston et al., 1994; 1995; 1996). These observations are important because “an active neuroinflammatory process” including a marked activation of microglia was shown in pathological examinations of the brains of some with neurodevelopmental disorders (Vargas et al. 2005).


7. Severe Methodical flaws in studies cited by SCENIHR as an proof of the safety of dental amalgam

For studying toxic effects it is necessary to compare at least two samples: one that was exposed to the substance in question and one that was not. One of the main problems in most of the amalgam studies is that the vast majority did not incorporate a true control group which was never exposed to dental amalgam. Even when comparing samples with and without dental fillings, the sample without the dental fillings probably was exposed to dental amalgam earlier in life.

The studies cited frequently as a proof of the putative harmlessness of amalgam, do not use "proper" non-amalgam control groups. We would like to describe a prominent example: The Swedish twin study (Björkmann et al., 1996) actually only compared 57 twin-pairs in a co-twin analysis, and not 587. As the average age of the sample was 66 years, 25% had no teeth at the time of investigation, many had missing teeth and an unknown number had crowns using other dental materials. Root fillings with amalgam and amalgam fillings under crowns were not calculated. As an allegedly "non-amalgam" group, they were compared with individuals who still had dental amalgam fillings. The authors found that individuals with more amalgam fillings (which means also more own teeth) had a better health status. It is fair to assume that individuals with few or no teeth or teeth that have been restored with dental materials other than amalgam had probably had dental amalgam previously. As Hg accumulates in organs, this “amalgam free group” might have been equally, or even have been more exposed to mercury than the “amalgam group” with currently existing amalgam fillings.

SCENIHR also cite Zimmer et al. (2002) as an proof of the safety of amalgam. But this study compared two groups exposed to amalgam (all female, one group of patients who claimed to be suffering from symptoms they related to their amalgam fillings and the other group, which did not report any association between complaints and their fillings) in terms of mercury levels in body fluids and psychometric tests. The mean number of amalgam fillings was identical in both groups. They found equal Hg levels in both amalgam groups.

Zimmer et al. (2002: p. 210) conclude: “Thus, mercury released from amalgam fillings was not a likely cause of complaints reported by the amalgam sensitive subjects”.

It is not clear why these authors come to such a conclusion.
Furthermore it is known from animal experiments and pharmacological studies that persons given equal amounts of a toxin might react differently. An example is that not every smoker develops lung cancer, although smoking is now accepted as the cause of the cancerous tumors.

7.1. “Childrens amalgam trails”

SCENIHR based their statement of the safety of dental amalgam mainly on two childrens amalgam trails. These studies was performed by dentists (see section 9) and show severe methodical flaws:

In two randomised trails on children (Children amalgam trails) it was evaluated whether mercury-containing dental amalgam had adverse neuropsychological or renal effects. [Bellinger et al. 2006, DeRouen et al. 2006]. Healthy children were randomised to either amalgam or composite surface restoration. Two children in the amalgam group die (one possible per suicide) and were excluded from the studie.

Power calculation [binomial - adverse event vs. no event] indicates that psychological illness, having prevalence of 6.7% in the composite-treated children, would have to have had a prevalence of at least 14.5% in the amalgam group to have an 80% chance of being proven statistically (observed was 9.0%). Similarly for neurological illness, observed prevalences in the composite group (0.4% composite, 1.5% amalgam) would have needed at least 4.5% prevalence in the amalgam group to be significant. From the authors it was concluded that “there is no reason to discontinue use of mercury amalgam” [Bellinger et al 2006] and "dental amalgam ---emits small amounts of mercury vapor" [DeRouen et al. 2006].

The conclusion is a classic type II (beta-) error: Due to its lack of power, the study provides false reassurance that mercury is ‘safe’. To effectively evaluate the effect sizes seen, the trial should have been much larger (1500-2500 / group).

Urine porphyrin profils and markers of oxidative stress [Chauhan & Chauhan 2006 in press], which are elevated in individuals with dental amalgam [Pizichini et al. 2002,2003] were not measured. Also, genetic polymorphism, which increase the susceptibility to
mercury, like BDNF-Polymorphism [Echeverria et al. 2005, Heyer et al. 2005] and Glutathion-S-Transferase gene polymorphism [Buyske et al. 2006] were not measured. Also the real exposure level of mercury (mercury vapor emitted in the oral cavity) was not determined, which question the ethics of such a study. Research done in the laboratory of Prof. Boyd Haley have demonstrated that the emission of mercury vapor were much higher than what has been “estimated” by dentists. Further, Chew et al. [1991] showed that that 43.5 microgram/cm²/day Hg was released from a “non-mercury releasing amalgam” and this remained constant over the study period of 2 years.

Mean mercury urine levels were significantly higher in the amalgam groups [Bellinger et al 2006, De Rouen et al 2006], despite on years 3 to 7 the level of mercury in the urine of the amalgam bearer continuously drop until they near the levels of the amalgam free children [DeRouen et al 2006]. But restorative treatment was used in years 6 and, 7 which should increase, or at least maintain the urine mercury levels. This needed explaining. In the Chew study above [Chew 1991], the amount of mercury released was steady for 2 years (the length of the study). Amalgams do not stop releasing mercury vapor within 7 years. So, what caused the drop after year 2? Urine mercury levels are a measure of the amount of mercury being excreted by this route. Therefore, after two years of mercury exposure the route of kidney excretion of mercury appears to be becoming less effective. This is consistent with the well known fact that increased mercury exposure inhibits it own excretion. It has been published and verified that over 90% of mercury excreted by humans leaves through the biliary transport system of the liver and is excreted in the feces, not the urine [Lorscheider et al. 1995].

The conclusion of Bellinger et al. (2006) that “there is no reason to discontinue use of mercury amalgam” is amazing, because possible adverse effects may need more than five years of mercury exposure to develop. If mercury is involved in the pathogenesis of
Alzheimer’s disease, the disease may need up to 50 years to be diagnosed clinically [Mutter et al. 2004 AD].

One of the inclusion criteria for the two studies was “no interfering health conditions” including neurodevelopmental disorders. The CDC reports that 1 in 6 American children have a neurodevelopmental disorder. However, these papers conclude that amalgams should remain a viable clinical option in dental restorative treatment [DeRouen et al 2006] and they did not exclude use on children with neurodevelopmental disorders, exactly the type of child they excluded from their studies. As mercury exposure during pregnancy may be the prime cause of neurodevelopmental disorders [Holmes et al. 2003, Mutter et al. 2005 autism, Jedrychowski et al. 2005], this conclusions from the children amalgam trials seem to be dangerous for the public.

Conclusion: These studies were poorly designed and tell us that - children with amalgams most likely slowly lose their ability to excrete mercury after about two years of amalgam exposure. This experiment should have been done on primates, not humans and presents a question of ethics in medicine.

- Chew et al. Clinical Preventive Dentistry 13(3) 5-7, 1991. In a study of long term dissolution of mercury from an non-mercury releasing amalgam it was determined that 43.5 microgram/cm2/day Hg was released and this remained constant for 2 years.

8. **Amalgam and mercury in the environment**

There was an alarmingly rising increase of mercury in our environment during the last decades. The UNEP (UNEP, 2002) reports on a 3-5 fold increase over the last 25 years. In the European Union (EU) the usage of amalgam amounts to 70 tons yearly. Dentist are the 2nd most user in the EU (Hylander & Godsie 2006, Hylander et al., 2006). Recent calculations done by Hylander (2005a, 2006) show that there are 40 tons of mercury in teeth with dental amlagam of swedish people, which results to the excretion of 100 kg of mercury per year in wastewater. 1300 to 2200 tons of mercury in dental amalgam is present in the teeth of the citizens of the EU (Hylander et al, 2005b), and for USA the respective figures are about 1000 tons. In the US, dental amalgam is the 3rd significant source of environmental mercury (Bender, 2005). In contrast to the EU, removed amalgam is not separated from the wastewater of dental
clinics in the US. But even in the EU, where such separators are in use, parts of the dental amalgam leaks into the environment (Hylander, 2005a).

As this mercury from dental amalgam (mercury emissions from dental clinics in wastewater, excreted mercury emissions from amalgam in living individuals, mercury emissions from elevated mercury deposits in tissues of deceased and cremated humans with dental amalgam) will enter into the environment. Hylander and Godsie (2006) showed that amalgam is the most costly material for dental fillings, if environmental costs are included into the economic calculation.

9. The role of dentistry in SCENIHR and in defending amalgam

SCENIHR consists of one engineer (chairman), four dentists, a toxicologist and two veterinarians. The chairman has strong contacts to the industry. No experts for medicine or environmental medicine were included. One must wonder why exactly dentists, which have some conflict of interests, was the strongest party in SCENIHR.

This may be indeed a critical point, because organized dentistry, which proclames the use of dental amalgam for decades, are responsible for the world-wide usage of thousands tons of mercury in dental amalgam and for their possible side effects and posseses patents for dental amalgam mixtures. They may fear litigation if dental amalgam would be acknowledged as toxic for humans. Therefore, the strategies of organized dentistry to influence science and politics in the last decades, seem to be analogues to other well known topics, were conflicts of interests exist and effective measures for influencing the science and politics was used.

- JACOBSON MF. Lifting the veil of secrecy from industry funding of nonprofit health organizations.

To understand why organized dentistry and its advocates fight to protect the marketing of amalgam that is 50% mercury, two fundamental points must be borne in mind. First, mercury-based amalgam has been the cornerstone of the world’s most powerful dental trade association since the
middle of the 19th century and in the future through caries epidemic in overpopulated undeveloped countries. Second, dentistry fear litigation from adverse health effects through dental amalgam.

In 1859, an enterprising group of dentists formed the up to date, the world most powerfull American Dental Association (ADA), which dictate until now dental organisations worldwide— not to advance the science of dentistry, but for the specific purpose of promoting the commercial use of “silver amalgam-mercury use in dentistry.”

Since then, the ADA has marched with mercury producers and amalgam manufacturers, marketing the fillings as “silver” to an unsuspecting public. For 150 years, the existence of organized dentistry has depended on suppressing any suggestion that implanting mercury in the mouth might create health problems. Despite mounting scientific evidence to the contrary, it has continued to insist that mercury fillings are safe, based on the length of use – the same argument that enabled the tobacco industry to keep Federal regulators at bay for decades.

Every amalgam patent that has been awarded for decades has been produced according to ADA specifications. The ADA has used this control to block the emergence of criticism by dentists trying to communicate concerns to patients and the public. In 1988, in a move that protected the power of its existing patents on amalgam, the ADA promulgated within its “Code of Ethics” the infamous gag rule, forbidding dentists from volunteering information to patients about the toxicity of mercury. Today, all Federal government-funded research on the health risks of amalgam is run by dentists or other representatives of organized dentistry. The Dental Devices Branch at US-FDA routinely collaborates with the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research at NIH.

Some Members of Congress have voiced strong criticism, pointing out that research and regulation of amalgam’s toxicity is controlled by dentists – professionals whose training does not qualify them to determine the impact of mercury on the body and who have an inherent conflict of interest due to the ADA’s endorsement of amalgam. The pro-amalgam dentists at NIH run the research, and the pro-amalgam dentists at FDA make the rules. It should come as no surprise that all government literature reviews on amalgam’s toxicity have been managed by groups composed mainly of
dentists. For example, a multimillion dollar grant to study amalgam was given to a dentist sitting on the ADA’s Council of Scientific Affairs; that person chose a defenseless group – institutionalized Portuguese orphans – on which to experiment with mercury, without disclosures of health risks. The Secretary’s Office of Human Research Protections, the watchdog charged with stopping unethical medical experimentation, found that this experiment denied the children and their guardians the basic disclosures of risks required in all research on human beings – making it both unethical and immoral.

10. Conclusion
Amalgam cannot be called a safe dental filling material as it was proposed by SCENIHR, neither with regard to medicine and occupational medicine, nor to ecology.
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