SCHER preliminary opinion on "The environmental risks and indirect health effects of mercuryfrom dental amalgam (update)"

YOUR IDENTITY	
Do you write as an individual or on behalf of an organization? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Individual
2. Your name or the name of your organization: -open reply-(optional)	Florian Schulze (CAT-Berlin)
3. Your email address: -open reply-(compulsory)	florianschulze@hotmail.com
•	caused by the use of dental amalgam a risk to the released from dental clinics as well as the fate of
mercury released to air, water and into account	soil from fillings placed in patients should be taken
4. YOUR COMMENTS: Do you agree with the observations made by the Scientific Committees? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Mostly disagree
Explain why: -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Relevant scientific and other information missing from the analysis
5. Please provide the evidence to improve the ov	rerall report (with complete references): -open reply-(compulsory)
methylation can take place by sulfate-reducing bacteria genera are also the predominant sulfate-reducing bacteria total mercury in stimulated saliva[3], which was studied populated areas, could be a significant source of mercurby prevalence or mutation, which could have effects or would claim for further analysis of this aspect and to take Meyer J, van der Hoeven JS. Isolation of Desulfomicro involved in human periodontal disease. Int J Syst Evol Kieboom, M. J. M. Schaeken Sulfate-reducing bacteria	In dental practice (Point 3.2.2.4.) into account, which is not further specified. Oral a like Desulfomicrobium or Desulfobacter in subgingival dental plaque.[1] These eria in the human large intestine.[2] In correlation with elevated concentration of a in individuals with multiple dental amalgam fillings, humans, especially in cury pollution. Even more, if there would be an increase of sulfate-reducing bacteria in the methylation rate. Since the only reference in the report dates from 2003, I ke this comment into consideration. [1]Langendijk PS, Kulik EM, Sandmeier H, bium orale sp. nov. and Desulfovibrio strain NY682, oral sulfate-reducing bacteria Microbiol. 2001 May;51(Pt 3):1035-44. [2]J. S. van der Hoeven, C. W. A. van den in the periodontal pocket 19 DEC 2007 DOI: 10.1111/j.1399 302X.1995 y L, Huovinen P, Tenovuo J. Mercury in saliva and the risk of exceeding limits for the Environ Health. 2002 Jul-Aug;57(4):366-70.
Question 2: Is it scientifically justified	ed to conclude that mercury in dental amalgam could
cause serious effects on human he	alth due to mercury releases into the environment?
6. YOUR COMMENTS: Do you agree with the observations made by the Scientific Committees? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Mostly disagree
Explain why: -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Disagreement with the interpretation of the existing scientific and other data

7. Please provide the evidence to improve the overall report (with complete references) -open reply-(compulsory)

The use of mercury must be considered not only against the background of it's elevated toxicity in the methylated form but also in interaction with other toxic elements like lead or cadmium. The inter-individual ability to eliminate methylmercury from the body, and the genetic predisposition to effects of mercury have another effect on the risk of mercury-induced disease, too. (WHO2010) Recent studies about low-level intoxications with mercury proof long-term developmental delays (loss of IQ) in unborn and young children. Other toxic effects include alteration of sensory functions, motor coordination, memory and attention. Mercury has been linked to diseases like myocardial infarction, heart rate variability, blood pressure, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, autism and Parkinson's disease.[1-9] These serious health effects should be taken into consideration regarding the ongoing increase of Hg and MeHg levels in the environment and fish. Mercury is a chemical of global concern owing to its long-range atmospheric transport, its persistence in the environment once anthropogenically introduced, its ability to bioaccumulate in ecosystems and its significant negative effects on human health.(Minamata Convention) It is never removed from the environment; it is just moved to other locations and eventually buried under soils and sediments. Due to anthropogenical impact the mercury level in surface water has tripled during the past century and the MeHg concentration in historical archives, such as marine bird feathers, increased of a factor of 4 for the North Atlantic during that time, supporting the assertion of a first order relationship between the pools of available inorganic Hg and MeHg formed in the upper ocean.[10,11] It has been predicted that the concentration of Hg in North Pacific intermediate waters will double by the year 2050, relative to 1995, assuming actual atmospheric Hg deposition rates[12] and according to a recent study, warmer sea surface temperatures could result in greater bioaccumulation of MeHg in fish, and consequently, increased human exposure. [13] The Report quotes a recent study about mercury concentration in hair from mother and children which are generally below the EFSA derived TWI but not below the limit derived by US EPA. Another study (Table 4) exclusively analyses the estimated transformation of the mercury-emission of dentists into the environment to MeHg in fish and shows that in a worst case scenario the limits by the US EPA and EU could be exceeded. This demonstrates that the contemporary exposure of MeHg is already elevated and that there is a close relation between the emission of Hg and the exposure to MeHg by the consumption of fish even if the dental emission is only a relatively small contribution to the total anthropogenic emission. From my point of view these alarming circumstances and their in fact existing health effects should not only lead to a more conservative threshold (WFD) but to protect the human health and the environment from anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury and mercury compounds by an unconditionally phase out of dental amalgam. PS: References are attached in a mail to SANCO-SCHER-PUBLIC-CONSULTATIONS@ec.europa.eu.

Question 3: Comparison of environmental risk from the use of mercury in dental amalgam and the use of alternatives without mercury

8. YOUR COMMENTS: Do you agree with the observations made by the Scientific Committees? -single choice reply-(compulsory)

Uncertain

9. Please provide the evidence with the overall report (with complete references) -open reply-(compulsory)

no comment