

**Title:** Artificial water fluoridation for dental health improvement: a review and meta-analysis of the evidence and implications of a possible association between water fluoride and IQ.

**Authors:**

Vickie S. Braithwaite<sup>1\*</sup>, Ruth A. Valentine<sup>2</sup>, Nicholas J. Wareham<sup>1</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup>MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Institute of Metabolic Science, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, CB2 0QQ, United Kingdom.

<sup>2</sup>School of Dental Sciences, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE2 4BW, United Kingdom.

**\*Corresponding author:** Vickie S. Braithwaite, MRC Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Institute of Metabolic Science, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, CB2 0QQ, United Kingdom; [v.braithwaite1@nhs.net](mailto:v.braithwaite1@nhs.net)

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

Globally, dental caries affects 60-90% of schoolchildren. Although artificial water fluoridation improves dental health and reduces dental health inequalities, there is concern that excessive fluoride exposure may lower cognition.

We systematically reviewed and meta-analysed the association between water fluoride and intelligence quotient (IQ).

### **Methods**

A literature search of Medline and Web of Science and random-effects meta-analysis comparing mean IQ of children living in low/normal or higher water fluoride areas was investigated. Followed by exploration of possible dose effects among sub-groups, living in moderate (<1.5 ppm) high (1.5-3.0 ppm) or extremely high (>3ppm) water fluoride areas.

### **Results**

Twenty-three observational studies (n=9539 children) were included. Overall, the higher water fluoride group had a lower mean IQ compared with the low water fluoride group (standardised mean difference (95% confidence interval): -0.43 (-0.63 to -0.24)  $p < 0.0001$ ,  $I^2 = 94.2\%$   $p < 0.0001$ ). Sub-group analysis showed no association between water fluoride and mean IQ in studies of moderate fluoride concentrations (moderate: 0.04 (-0.08 to 0.15)  $p = 0.53$ ,  $I^2 = 0.0\%$   $p = 0.68$ ). Mean IQ was lower in the higher water fluoride groups (high: -0.52 (-0.92 to -0.12)  $p = 0.01$ ,  $I^2 = 96.2\%$   $p < 0.00001$ , extremely high: -0.60 (-0.87 to -0.33),  $p < 0.0001$ ,  $I^2 = 84.6\%$   $p < 0.0001$ ).

## **Conclusions**

At moderate levels (<1.5 ppm) there was no statistical or clinically meaningful association between water fluoride and IQ. This suggests that populations living in these areas could benefit from artificial water fluoridation without experiencing neurotoxicity. An association between lower mean IQ and high water fluoride observed suggests a need to prioritise removal of excess fluoride from drinking water in these regions.

## **Keywords (3-10)**

Fluoride; water fluoridation; intelligence quotient (IQ); cognition; public health; dental public health; primary prevention; meta-analysis; systematic review.

## **Key Message (3-5 bullet points in complete sentence)**

At low concentrations of water fluoride (<1.5 ppm) there was no detectable association between water fluoride and intelligence quotient (IQ);

At high levels of water fluoride concentrations (>1.5 ppm) there was an inverse association between increasing fluoride concentration and decreasing mean IQ;

In countries in which fluoridation of water is considered but kept within safe concentrations, the available evidence suggests that fluoridation has demonstrable benefits on public dental health without any clinically significant effect on IQ.

In countries with excessive groundwater fluoride concentrations there is an imperative to promote water de-fluoridation schemes to protect the public from skeletal and dental fluorosis and from possible neurotoxicity.

**Funding:** VSB was funded through a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)

Academic Clinical Fellowship.

**Conflict of interest statement:** None declared

## **Background:**

Poor dental health in children is of major public health concern. Globally, dental caries are estimated to affect 60-90% of schoolchildren and the vast majority of adults (1) and is the most common non-communicable disease (2). As well as the direct medical costs, ~US\$300 billion spent on dental caries globally per year (2), there are substantial indirect medical and societal costs associated with poor dental health in children include taking time off school, dental pain, decreased attainment in school and loss of parental earnings (3).

Tooth decay is caused by the production of acid from the breakdown of fermentable carbohydrates by bacteria in biofilm on tooth surfaces. This process is exacerbated by dietary factors such as consumption of sugar, acid and carbonated beverages (4) and is strongly associated with deprivation. For example, tooth decay in children living in the most deprived counties in England is almost twice as high compared with children living in the least deprived counties (30% and 16%, respectively)(**Figure 1**).

Fluoride exposure can protect against tooth decay (5). Calcium-hydroxyapatite is the major inorganic component of enamel as well as other hard tissues such as dentine and bone (4). When exposed to acid, calcium-hydroxyapatite dissolves resulting in tooth-softening and decay (4). Fluoride can reduce demineralisation and enhance remineralisation of enamel by displacing calcium and forming fluorine-hydroxyapatite; a compound that is less soluble than calcium-hydroxyapatite (4, 6).

The main methods of ensuring topical exposure of fluoride in many high income countries is through tooth-brushing with fluoride-containing toothpaste and through applying fluoride-varnishes to teeth by dental professionals. Despite these interventions, tooth decay remains a major problem. Many health organisations including Public Health England (PHE), the Centre for Disease and Control and Prevention and the WHO promote artificial water

fluoridation as a solution to the problem of poor dental health in regions with low levels of naturally occurring fluoride (1, 7).

The potential benefits of artificial water fluoridation have been long known. Grand Rapids, a city in Michigan, USA was the first city in the world to fluoridate their water supply in the 1940s and to show a dramatic reduction in dental caries following this intervention (8). With artificial water fluoridation, the community water supply is supplemented with a silicofluoride compound. 1.0 ppm (parts per million) of fluoride in water is considered optimal for dental health (9) and 1.5 ppm is considered the maximum upper-limit for overall health (10).

Water fluoridation is an effective primary prevention measure and has been shown to reduce tooth decay in deciduous and permanent teeth by ~25-35% and to reduce tooth decay-related paediatric hospital admissions by 55% (11-13). Importantly, water fluoridation is a low-agency intervention and as such would be expected to improve overall dental health and can reduce dental health inequalities (14). It has been estimated that ~370 million people worldwide, in 27 countries are supplied with artificially fluoridated water (15), however, in the UK only 10% of the population has access to naturally (>0.5 ppm) or artificially fluoridated water (16) and this pattern is mirrored in many other European countries

Despite the effectiveness of artificial water fluoridation in improving dental health, there are concerns about the safety of fluoride exposure on health and the ethics of the intervention (17, 18). Fluoride occurs naturally in groundwater but the concentration varies depending on underlying geology (19). Naturally occurring concentrations of groundwater fluoride is typically low across Europe (<0.5 ppm) whereas concentrations >25 ppm have been reported in India, China and Africa (19) where cases of dental and skeletal fluorosis are also seen.

Dental and skeletal fluorosis are defined by the incorporation of excessive amounts of

fluoride into calcified tissues. Mild dental fluorosis results in cosmetic discolouration of teeth with no other side effects (20), whereas severe dental fluorosis results in dark-brown mottling of teeth, porosity of enamel and increased risk of tooth decay (21). Skeletal fluorosis can lead to an increased fracture risk (22).

However, beyond the skeletal adverse effects of high fluoride exposure, there is growing concern that fluoride exposure in early childhood may act as a neurotoxin and impair cognitive ability as measured by intelligence quotient (IQ) (17).

The aims of this study were to review and meta-analyse the published literature investigating a possible association between water fluoride concentration and IQ and to discuss these findings in the broader context of artificial water fluoridation.

## **Methods:**

### *Search Strategy of the Literature*

A literature search was performed of Medline and Web of Science on the 08-January-2020 and inclusion and exclusion criteria were developed together with the study aims prior to performing the literature search (**Table 1 and 2**). The search, literature review, assessment of study quality and data abstraction was performed by a single reviewer.

### *Assessment of Study Quality*

All studies identified in the literature search were observational studies. Study quality was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for cohort studies (23) and adapted for cross-sectional studies (24). Studies were scored in three domains: selection, comparability and outcome and were scored out of a maximum of 10 points. Studies with scores >7 were classed as high quality, 5-7 as good and 0-4 as poor.

### *Statistical Analysis*

A random effects meta-analysis model was selected *a priori* based on the anticipated heterogeneity of studies. The meta-analysis was performed using sample size, mean IQ and standard deviation (or standard error, subsequently converted to standard deviation) (25, 26) of studies assessing the standardised mean difference (SMD) in IQ in children exposed to low/normal concentrations of water fluoride compared with children exposed to higher concentrations of water fluoride. For studies that presented total IQ and a breakdown of IQ (e.g. verbal and performance), total IQ score was used (27, 28). Where studies presented more than two comparator groups i.e. low, moderate and high water fluoride concentrations the moderate groups was selected to compare with the low fluoride group and the high group was excluded; the low to moderate comparison was deemed to be more informative than low to high comparison. (29-33).

The meta-analysis was performed using the STATA programme “metan” and was presented as SMD and 95% confidence interval (CI) and  $I^2$  to indicate the extent of study heterogeneity (34). Studies were weighted using study standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) and between study standard deviation ( $\tau$ ; as a measure of study heterogeneity) using the following formula:

weight =  $\frac{1}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2}$ . Publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot and Egger’s test using the programmes “metafunnel” and “metabias” respectively (35).

Subgroup analysis was performed based on mean fluoride concentration. Studies were categorised as moderate: <1.5 ppm, high: 1.5-3.0 ppm, extremely high: >3.0 ppm or unknown.

Sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the effect of outliers on the meta-analysis.



## **Results:**

### *Study Characteristics*

Twenty-three studies from five different countries were identified; three were prospective cohort studies from New Zealand (36) and Canada (27, 37) and 20 were cross-sectional studies from China, India and Iran (**Table 3**)(25, 26, 28-33, 38-49). Data from 9539 children were used and participants were aged 3-14 years. Nineteen of 20 cross-sectional studies compared the IQ of children living in regions with naturally high or low concentrations of groundwater fluoride. The three prospective cohort studies compared the IQ of children living in regions with naturally low concentrations of groundwater fluoride with or without artificial water fluoridation programmes. The mean fluoride concentration in the reference group was  $\leq 1.5$  ppm in all studies (range 0.1-1.5 ppm) with the exception of one study with a mean of 2.0 ppm (26). Two studies did not specify fluoride concentration (**Table 3**)(41, 45). The three prospective cohort studies and one cross-sectional study compared their reference group with a moderate fluoride group ( $< 1.5$  ppm) and the remaining 17 cross-sectional studies compared their reference groups with high (1.5-3.0 ppm, n=11 studies) or extremely high ( $> 3.0$  ppm, n=6 studies) fluoride groups. Study quality ranged from poor to high quality (2-9) with a median score of 5 (interquartile range: 5-6) (**Table 3**).

### *Meta-analysis*

The meta-analysis estimated a pooled effect of a lower IQ in the high fluoride groups compared with the low fluoride groups; standardised mean difference (95% CI) of -0.43 (-0.63 to -0.24)  $p < 0.0001$  with significant study heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 94.2\%$   $p < 0.0001$ ) (**Figure 2**).

Subgroup analysis of studies grouped by the fluoride concentration showed no association between water fluoride concentration and IQ in the moderate fluoride group compared with

the reference (<1.5 ppm: 0.04 (-0.08 to 0.15)  $p=0.53$ ) and no study heterogeneity was detected ( $I^2=0.0\%$   $p=0.68$ ). IQ was significantly lower in studies with high or extremely high water fluoride concentrations compared with the reference (1.5-3.0 ppm: -0.52 (-0.92 to -0.12)  $p=0.01$  and >3.0 ppm: -0.60 (-0.87 to -0.33)  $p<0.0001$ ) (**Figure 2**) and study heterogeneity was significant ( $I^2=96.2\%$  and  $84.6\%$   $p<0.0001$  respectively).

### ***Bias***

Assymmetry of the funnel plot showed evidence of publication bias (Egger's test  $p=0.055$ )(**Figure 3**). In particular, there was an absence of small studies showing a null or a positive association between water fluoride concentrations and IQ. The funnel plot indicated a clear study outlier (33). When this study was excluded the pooled effect size decreased to -0.31 (-0.46, -0.14)  $p<0.0001$  and  $I^2$  decreased to 91%  $p<0.0001$  (data not shown).

### **Discussion**

The random-effects meta-analysis indicated that, overall, there was a negative statistical association between water fluoride and mean IQ (SMD (95% CI): -0.43 (-0.63 to -0.24),  $p<0.0001$ ). This finding was based on 23 studies consisting of 9,539 children.

However, at moderate concentrations of water fluoride that were below the considered safe-upper limit (<1.5 ppm), there was no association between water fluoride and mean IQ (0.04 (-0.08, 0.15),  $p=0.53$ ). This finding was based on four studies ( $n=1858$  children), three of which were cohort studies that compared IQ in regions with or without artificial water fluoridation programmes in countries with low concentrations of naturally occurring groundwater fluoride (New Zealand and Canada).

In the studies with high (1.5-3.0 ppm) or extremely high (>3.0 ppm) concentrations of water fluoride, there was a significant, negative association between water fluoride and IQ (high: -0.52 (-0.92, -0.12),  $p=0.01$  and extremely high: -0.60 (-0.87, -0.33),  $p<0.0001$ ). These finding

were based on 17 cross-sectional studies (n=6396 children) that compared IQ in regions with high or low concentrations of naturally occurring groundwater fluoride (China, India and Iran).

While there was evidence to suggest an association between high or extremely high concentrations of naturally occurring water fluoride ( $\geq 1.5$  ppm) and a lower IQ, there was no statistical evidence of an association between artificial water fluoridation ( $< 1.5$  ppm) and IQ in regions with naturally low concentrations of groundwater fluoride.

This is the first meta-analysis investigating the association between water fluoride and IQ to include the three cohort studies comparing IQ in regions with or without artificial water fluoridation programmes (27, 36, 37). Previous meta-analyses only included studies from regions with naturally high concentrations of groundwater fluoride (50). In addition, this meta-analysis attempted to investigate whether the association between water fluoride and IQ depended on fluoride concentration (i.e. moderate, high and extremely high). Crucially, this is the first meta-analysis to suggest that there is no association between moderate concentrations of water fluoride and IQ. Our results are consistent with other meta-analyses suggesting an inverse association between fluoride and IQ when concentrations are high (27, 36, 37).

The studies included in this meta-analysis ranged in quality. The three cohort studies were assessed as being of high quality and the remaining cross-sectional studies were assessed as being of poor or good quality. There was substantial variation in study design, most of the studies were susceptible to bias and confounding and causality was not established. In addition, most of the studies were semi-ecological by design and did not assess individual fluoride exposure through total daily fluoride intake measurements or through biological markers of individual fluoride exposure (e.g. fluoride in urine, blood, hair).

A further weakness was that the subgroup of studies with moderate fluoride concentration (<1.5 ppm) comprised of 1858 participants only. This sample size may have been underpowered to detect a small difference in mean IQ where group differences in fluoride concentrations was also small.

### ***Conclusion***

This meta-analysis suggests that water fluoridation at moderate concentrations (<1.5 ppm) was not associated with lower IQ in regions with low concentrations of naturally occurring groundwater fluoride. This suggests that artificial fluoridation in these regions may offer substantial public dental health benefit without any neurotoxic effects although this finding was not based on individual level fluoride exposure. However, there was evidence of an association between water fluoride concentrations and lower IQ in regions with high concentrations of naturally occurring groundwater fluoride ( $\geq 1.5$  ppm). In such countries, there is an imperative to promote water de-fluoridation schemes to protect the public from skeletal and dental fluorosis and from possible neurotoxicity.

## References

1. Petersen PE, Lennon MA. Effective use of fluorides for the prevention of dental caries in the 21st century: the WHO approach. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 2004;32(5):319-21.
2. WHO. Sugars and dental caries 2017 [Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sugars-and-dental-caries>].
3. Ruff RR, Senthil S, Susser SR, Tsutsui A. Oral health, academic performance, and school absenteeism in children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the American Dental Association (1939).* 2019;150(2):111-21.e4.
4. Abou Neel EA, Aljabo A, Strange A, Ibrahim S, Coathup M, Young AM, et al. Demineralization-remineralization dynamics in teeth and bone. *Int J Nanomedicine.* 2016;11:4743-63.
5. Wong MC, Clarkson J, Glenny AM, Lo EC, Marinho VC, Tsang BW, et al. Cochrane reviews on the benefits/risks of fluoride toothpastes. *J Dent Res.* 2011;90(5):573-9.
6. Loskill P, Zeitz C, Grandthyll S, Thewes N, Müller F, Bischoff M, et al. Reduced Adhesion of Oral Bacteria on Hydroxyapatite by Fluoride Treatment. *Langmuir.* 2013;29(18):5528-33.
7. PHE. Improving oral health: a community water fluoridation toolkit for local authorities [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk): PHE; 2016 [Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/774128/Fluoridation\\_Toolkit\\_-\\_Publications\\_gateway\\_version\\_20160304.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/774128/Fluoridation_Toolkit_-_Publications_gateway_version_20160304.pdf)].
8. Research" NIDaC. The Story of Fluoride 2008 [Available from: <https://www.nidcr.nih.gov/health-info/fluoride/the-story-of-fluoridation>].
9. Dean HT, Arnold FA, Jr., Jay P, Knutson JW. Studies on mass control of dental caries through fluoridation of the public water supply. *Public health reports (Washington, DC : 1896).* 1950;65(43):1403-8.
10. Directive EUDW. The quality of water intended for human consumption 1998 [Available from: [eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:330:0032:0054:EN:PDF](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1998:330:0032:0054:EN:PDF)].
11. McDonagh MS, Whiting PF, Wilson PM, Sutton AJ, Chestnutt I, Cooper J, et al. Systematic review of water fluoridation. *BMJ.* 2000;321(7265):855-9.
12. Iheozor-Ejiofor Z, Worthington HV, Walsh T, O'Malley L, Clarkson JE, Macey R, et al. Water fluoridation for the prevention of dental caries. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015(6):276.
13. Rugg-Gunn AJ, Do L. Effectiveness of water fluoridation in caries prevention. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol.* 2012;40 Suppl 2:55-64.
14. McGrady MG, Ellwood RP, Maguire A, Goodwin M, Boothman N, Pretty IA. The association between social deprivation and the prevalence and severity of dental caries and fluorosis in populations with and without water fluoridation. *BMC public health.* 2012;12:1122.
15. Whelton HP, Spencer AJ, Do LG, Rugg-Gunn AJ. Fluoride Revolution and Dental Caries: Evolution of Policies for Global Use. *J Dent Res.* 2019;98(8):837-46.
16. PHE. Water Fluoride [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk): PHE; 2018 [Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/692754/Water\\_Fluoridation\\_Health\\_monitoring\\_report\\_for\\_England\\_2018\\_final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/692754/Water_Fluoridation_Health_monitoring_report_for_England_2018_final.pdf)].
17. Connett P. 50 Reasons to Oppose Fluoridation 2012 [Available from: <http://fluoridealert.org/articles/50-reasons/>].
18. Griffin M, Shickle D, Moran N. European citizens' opinions on water fluoridation. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology.* 2008;36(2):95-102.
19. Kimambo V, Bhattacharya P, Mtalo F, Mtamba J, Ahmad A. Fluoride occurrence in groundwater systems at global scale and status of defluoridation – State of the art. *Groundwater for Sustainable Development.* 2019;9:100223.
20. Pretty IA, Boothman N, Morris J, MacKay L, Liu Z, McGrady M, et al. Prevalence and severity of dental fluorosis in four English cities. *Community Dent Health.* 2016;33(4):292-6.

21. Moller IJ. Fluorides and dental fluorosis. *Int Dent J.* 1982;32(2):135-47.
22. Zohoori FV, Duckworth RM. Chapter 44 - Fluoride: Intake and Metabolism, Therapeutic and Toxicological Consequences. In: Collins JF, editor. *Molecular, Genetic, and Nutritional Aspects of Major and Trace Minerals.* Boston: Academic Press; 2017. p. 539-50.
23. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses [www.ohri.ca](http://www.ohri.ca)2019 [Available from: [http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\\_epidemiology/oxford.asp](http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp).
24. Herzog R, Álvarez-Pasquin MJ, Díaz C, Del Barrio JL, Estrada JM, Gil Á. Are healthcare workers' intentions to vaccinate related to their knowledge, beliefs and attitudes? a systematic review. *BMC public health.* 2013;13(1):154.
25. Trivedi MH, Sangai NP, Patel RS, Payak M, Vyas SJ. Assessment of groundwater quality with special reference to fluoride and its impact on IQ of schoolchildren in six villages of the Mudra Region, Kachchh, Gujarat, India. *Fluoride.* 2012;45(4):377-83.
26. Trivedi MH, Verma RJ, Chinoy NJ, Patel RS, Sathawara NG. Effect of high fluoride water on intelligence of school children in India. *Fluoride.* 2007;40(3):178-83.
27. Till C, Green R, Flora D, Hornung R, Martinez-Mier EA, Blazer M, et al. Fluoride exposure from infant formula and child IQ in a Canadian birth cohort. *Environment International.* 2020;134.
28. Wang GJ, Yang DL, Jia FG, Wang HQ. A study of the iq levels of four- to seven-year-old children in high fluoride areas. *Fluoride.* 2008;41(4):340-3.
29. Sebastian ST, Sunitha S. A cross-sectional study to assess the intelligence quotient (IQ) of school going children aged 10-12 years in villages of Mysore district, India with different fluoride levels. *Journal of the Indian Society of Pedodontics & Preventive Dentistry.* 2015;33(4):307-11.
30. Aravind A, Dhanya RS, Narayan A, Sam G, Adarsh VJ, Kiran M. Effect of fluoridated water on intelligence in 10-12-year-old school children. *Journal of International Society of Preventive and Community Dentistry.* 2016;6:S237-S42.
31. Hong FG, Cao YX, Yang D, Wang H. Research on the effects of fluoride on child intellectual development under different environmental conditions. *Fluoride.* 2008;41(2):156-60.
32. Wang SX, Wang ZH, Cheng XT, Li J, Sang ZP, Zhang XD, et al. Arsenic and fluoride exposure in drinking water: children's IQ and growth in Shanyin county, Shanxi province, China. *Environmental Health Perspectives.* 2007;115(4):643-7.
33. Razdan P, Patthi B, Kumar JK, Agnihotri N, Chaudhari P, Prasad M. Effect of fluoride concentration in drinking water on intelligence quotient of 12u14-year-old children in Mathura District: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of International Society of Preventive and Community Dentistry.* 2017;7(5):252-8.
34. Harris R, Bradburn M, Deeks J, Harbord R, Altman D, Sterne J. metan: fixed- and random-effects meta-analysis. *Stata Journal.* 2008;8(1):3-28.
35. Sterne JAC, Harbord RM. Funnel Plots in Meta-analysis. *The Stata Journal.* 2004;4(2):127-41.
36. Broadbent JM, Thomson WM, Ramrakha S, Moffitt TE, Zeng JX, Page LAF, et al. Community Water Fluoridation and Intelligence: Prospective Study in New Zealand. *American Journal of Public Health.* 2015;105(1):72-6.
37. Green R, Lanphear B, Hornung R, Flora D, Martinez-Mier EA, Neufeld R, et al. Association Between Maternal Fluoride Exposure During Pregnancy and IQ Scores in Offspring in Canada. *Jama Pediatrics.* 2019;173(10):940-8.
38. Chen YX, Han FL, Zhoua ZL, Zhang HQ, Jiao XS, Zhang SC, et al. Research on the intellectual development of children in high fluoride areas. *Fluoride.* 2008;41(2):120-4.
39. Eswar P, Nagesh L, Devaraj CG. Intelligence quotients of 12-14 year old school children in a high and a low fluoride village in india. *Fluoride.* 2011;44(3):168-72.


40. Karimzade S, Aghaei M, Mahvi AH. Investigation of intelligence quotient in 9-12-year-old children exposed to high- and low-drinking water fluoride in west azerbaijan province, iran. *Fluoride*. 2014;47(1):9-14.
41. Li YP, Jing XY, Chen D, Lin L, Wang ZJ. Effects of endemic fluoride poisoning on the intellectual development of children in Baotou. *Fluoride*. 2008;41(2):161-4.
42. Lu Y, Sun ZR, Wu LN, Wang X, Lu W, Liu SS. Effect of high-fluoride water on intelligence in children. *Fluoride*. 2000;33(2):74-8.
43. Mondal D, Dutta G, Gupta S. Inferring the fluoride hydrogeochemistry and effect of consuming fluoride-contaminated drinking water on human health in some endemic areas of Birbhum district, West Bengal. *Environmental Geochemistry and Health*. 2016;38(2):557-76.
44. Poureslami HR, Horri A, Garrusi B. A comparative study of the iq of children age 7-9 in a high and a low fluoride water city in iran. *Fluoride*. 2011;44(3):163-7.
45. Ren DL, Li KC, Liu DW. A study of the intellectual ability of 8-14 year-old children in high fluoride, low iodine areas. *Fluoride*. 2008;41(4):319-20.
46. Xiang Q, Liang Y, Chen L, Wang C, Chen B, Chen X, et al. Effect of fluoride in drinking water on children's intelligence. *Fluoride*. 2003;36(2):84-94.
47. Yu XC, Chen JW, Li YG, Liu HL, Hou CC, Zeng Q, et al. Threshold effects of moderately excessive fluoride exposure on children's health: A potential association between dental fluorosis and loss of excellent intelligence. *Environment International*. 2018;118:116-24.
48. Zhang S, Zhang XF, Liu HL, Qu WD, Guan ZZ, Zeng Q, et al. Modifying Effect of COMT Gene Polymorphism and a Predictive Role for Proteomics Analysis in Children's Intelligence in Endemic Fluorosis Area in Tianjin, China. *Toxicological Sciences*. 2015;144(2):238-45.
49. Zhao LB, Liang GH, Zhang DN, Wu XR. Effect of a high fluoride water supply on children's intelligence. *Fluoride*. 1996;29(4):190-2.
50. Duan Q, Jiao J, Chen X, Wang X. Association between water fluoride and the level of children's intelligence: a dose-response meta-analysis. *Public Health*. 2018;154:87-97.
51. Bashash M, Thomas D, Hu H, Martinez-Mier EA, Sanchez BN, Basu N, et al. Prenatal Fluoride Exposure and Cognitive Outcomes in Children at 4 and 6-12 Years of Age in Mexico. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2017;125(9):097017.
52. Cui YS, Zhang B, Ma J, Wang Y, Zhao L, Hou CC, et al. Dopamine receptor D2 gene polymorphism, urine fluoride, and intelligence impairment of children in China: A school-based cross-sectional study. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*. 2018;165:270-7.
53. Das K, Mondal NK. Dental fluorosis and urinary fluoride concentration as a reflection of fluoride exposure and its impact on IQ level and BMI of children of Laxmisagar, Simlupal Block of Bankura District, WB, India. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 2016;188(4).
54. Ding YG, Gao T, Sun H, Han H, Wang W, Ji X, et al. The relationships between low levels of urine fluoride on children's intelligence and dental fluorosis in endemic fluorosis areas in Hulunbuir, Inner Mongolia, China (vol 44, pg 50, 2011). *Fluoride*. 2011;44(3):182-.
55. Jimenez LV, Guzman ODL, Flores MC, Costilla-Salazar R, Hernandez JC, Contreras YA, et al. In utero exposure to fluoride and cognitive development delay in infants. *Neurotoxicology*. 2017;59:65-70.
56. Khan SA, Singh RK, Navit S, Chadha D, Johri N, Navit P, et al. Relationship Between Dental Fluorosis and Intelligence Quotient of School Going Children In and Around Lucknow District: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*. 2015;9(11):ZC10-ZC5.
57. Mustafa DE, Younis UM, Elhag SAA. The relationship between the fluoride levels in drinking water and the schooling performance of children in rural areas of khartoum state, sudan. *Fluoride*. 2018;51(2):102-13.



58. Nagarajappa R, Pujara P, Sharda AJ, Asawa K, Tak M, Aapaliya P, et al. Comparative Assessment of Intelligence Quotient among Children Living in High and Low Fluoride Areas of Kutch, India-a Pilot Study. *Iranian Journal of Public Health*. 2013;42(8):813-8.
59. Rocha-Amador D, Navarro ME, Carrizales L, Morales R, Calderon J. Decreased intelligence in children and exposure to fluoride and arsenic in drinking water. *Cadernos De Saude Publica*. 2007;23:S579-S87.
60. Sharma P, Singh M, Kumar D, Grover A, Bhardwaj AK. Effect of fluoride exposure through drinking water on the oral health status and intelligence profile of school children of district una, himachal pradesh: an interim analysis. *Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences-Jemds*. 2016;5(102):7484-7.
61. Soto-Barreras U, Escalante-Villalobos KY, Holguin-Loya B, Perez-Aguirre B, Nevarez-Rascon A, Martinez-Martinez RE, et al. Effect of fluoride in drinking water on dental caries and iq in children. *Fluoride*. 2019;52(3):474-82.
62. Wang MW, Liu L, Li HJ, Li YG, Liu HL, Hou CC, et al. Thyroid function, intelligence, and low-moderate fluoride exposure among Chinese school-age children. *Environment International*. 2020;134.
63. Xiang QY, Liang YX, Chen BH, Chen LS. Analysis of children's serum fluoride levels in relation to intelligence scores in a high and low fluoride water village in china. *Fluoride*. 2011;44(4):191-4.
64. Yang YK, Wang XH, Guo XW, Hu PY. The effects of high levels of fluoride and iodine on child intellectual ability and the metabolism of fluoride and iodine. *Fluoride*. 2008;41(4):336-9.
65. Zhao Q, Niu Q, Chen JW, Xia T, Zhou GY, Li P, et al. Roles of mitochondrial fission inhibition in developmental fluoride neurotoxicity: mechanisms of action in vitro and associations with cognition in rats and children. *Archives of Toxicology*. 2019;93(3):709-26.
66. Zhou GY, Tang S, Yan L, Ni Q, Che JW, Xi T, et al. Effects of long-term fluoride exposure on cognitive ability and the underlying mechanisms: Role of autophagy and its association with apoptosis. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*. 2019;378.
67. Karinnzade S, Aghaei M, Mahvi AH. Iq of 9-12-year-old children in high- and low-drinking water fluoride areas in west azerbaijan province, iran: further information on the two villages in the study and the confounding factors considered. *Fluoride*. 2014;47(3):266-71.
68. Li XS, Zhi JL, Gao RO. Effect of fluoride exposure on intelligence in children. *Fluoride*. 1995;28(4):189-92.
69. Liu SL, Lu Y, Sun ZR, Wu L, Lu WL, Wang XW, et al. Report on the intellectual ability of children living in high-fluoride water areas. *Fluoride*. 2008;41(2):144-7.




**Figure 1.** The association between index of multiple deprivation and percentage of children <5 years of age with tooth decay in England, UK.



There was a negative association between index of multiple deprivation (county and unitary authority level data) and % of <5 year olds with tooth decay in England ( $P < 0.0001$ ). 92% of the variation in tooth decay was explained by index of multiple of deprivation. 1 is the most deprived decile and 10 is the least deprived decile. 95% confidence intervals were included in the figure as the error bars. Data to produce this graph was obtained from Public Health England using 2017 data (1). **NB.** Y-axis starts at 10% for visual clarity.

**Figure 2.** Random effects meta-analysis of the association between water fluoride and intelligence quotient (IQ)




Random effects meta-analysis of the standardised mean difference (SMD) of intelligence quotient (IQ) in children from the reference group compared with the higher fluoride group. \*denotes studies conducted in countries with low concentrations of naturally occurring groundwater fluoride with and without artificial water fluoridation programmes. The remaining studies compared IQ in regions with moderate or high with low concentrations of naturally occurring groundwater fluoride. I-squared was a measure of study heterogeneity. Subgroup analysis was performed by categorising studies based on the mean fluoride concentration of their higher fluoride group: moderate (<1.5 ppm, n=4), high (1.5-3.0 ppm, n=11), extremely high (>3.0 ppm, n=6) and unknown (n=2). The concentration of water fluoride in the reference group was <1.5 ppm in all studies (range 0.1-1.5 ppm) with the exception of three studies; one study that had a mean concentration of 2 ppm (26) and two that did not specify water fluoride concentration (41, 45). Overall, mean IQ was significantly lower in the higher fluoride group compared to the reference (SMD (95% CI): -0.43 (-0.63 to -0.24), p<0.0001) and there was substantial study heterogeneity (I-squared: 94.2%,

$p < 0.0001$ ). Subgroup analysis indicated no significant difference in IQ in the moderate fluoride group compared with the reference (0.04 (-0.08 to 0.15),  $p = 0.53$ ) and no study heterogeneity was detected (I-squared: 0.0%,  $p = 0.68$ ). IQ was significantly lower in the high fluoride (-0.52 (-0.92 to -0.12),  $p = 0.01$ ) and extremely high fluoride groups (-0.60 (-0.87 to -0.33),  $p < 0.0001$ ) compared to the reference and there was substantial heterogeneity (I-squared: 96.2% and 86.6%,  $p < 0.0001$  respectively). There was no significant difference in mean IQ in the subgroup of studies with unknown fluoride concentrations (-0.52 (-1.34 to 0.30),  $p = 0.22$ ).


CI: confidence interval, IQ: intelligence quotient, ppm: parts per million, SMD: standardised mean difference.

**Figure 3.** Assessment of possible publication bias with a funnel plot and Egger's test.



Studies were grouped by the mean fluoride concentration of their fluoride group: moderate (blue, <1.5 ppm, n=4), high (red, 1.5-3.0 ppm, n=11), extremely high (green, >3.0 ppm, n=6) and unknown (orange, n=2). The Funnel plot indicated a clear outlier study conducted in a region of India with naturally high groundwater fluoride (33). The plot suggested possible publication bias as there was asymmetry in the graph; particularly a lack of studies with higher standard error (i.e. smaller studies) that show a null or a positive association between fluoride concentration and intelligence quotient. Egger's test for bias was  $p=0.055$ . CI: confidence interval, IQ: Intelligence quotient, Pooled: meta-analysis pooled-effect size, ppm: parts per million.

**Table 1.** PRISMA flow-diagram of search strategy, search results and studies included in the final meta-analysis.



IQ: intelligence quotient, SD: standard deviation, SE: standard error. Ti.ab: title and abstract, /: exploded medical subject headings term (MeSH)

**Table 2.** Inclusion and exclusion criteria

<b>Inclusion Criteria</b>	<b>Exclusion Criteria</b>
Article is in humans	Editorials, reviews, conference abstracts
Article looks at water fluoride exposure	Full text not available
Article presents mean and standard deviation/error of intelligence quotient in low/normal and higher concentrations of water fluoride concentration	Not available in English
	Not in children

**Table 3.** Characteristics and quality of the studies found through the literature search.

Study	Study Type	Age range (years)	Mean fluoride by Group (ppm)	Mean IQ (SD), n		Exposure Measurement (water fluoride)	Outcome Measurement Test (IQ)	Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Domains			
				Reference Group	Fluoride Group			Selection	Comparability	Outcome	Total Score of 10
<b>Broadbent 2015, New Zealand (36)*</b>	prospective birth cohort	7-13	0.3 vs 1.0	99.8 (14.5) n=99	100.0 (15.1) n=891	National Reports	Wechsler adult intelligence scale-revised	3	2	4	9
<b>Sebastian 2015 India (29)</b>	cross-sectional	10-12	0.4 vs 1.2	86.4 (13.6) n=135	88.6 (14.0) n=135	National Reports	Raven's coloured progressive matrices	1	1	2	4
<b>Till 2019, Canada (27)*</b>	prospective cohort	3-4	0.1 vs 0.6	106.8 (13.5) n=130	106.1 (15.8) n=68	National Reports	Wechsler primary and preschool scale of intelligence-III	3	2	3	8
<b>Green 2019, Canada (37)*</b>	prospective birth cohort	3-4	0.1 vs 0.6	108.1 (13.3) n=238	108.2 (13.7) n=162	National Reports	Wechsler primary and preschool scale of intelligence-III	3	2	3	8
<b>Wang 1996, China (28)</b>	cross-sectional	4-7	≤1.0 vs >1.5	101.2 (15.8) n=83	95.6 (14.3) n=147	Measured in the study	Wechsler preschool and primary scale of intelligence	2	1	2	5
<b>Hong 2001, China (31)</b>	cross-sectional	8-14	0.8 vs 2.9	82.8 (8.9) n=32	80.6 (2.3) n=85	Unclear	Rural version of the Chinese standardized raven's test	2	1	2	5
<b>Xiang 2003, China (46)</b>	cross-sectional	8-13	0.4 vs 2.5	100.4 (13.2) n=290	92.0 (13.0) n=222	Measured in the study	Combined Raven's test for rural China	2	1	3	6
<b>Poureslami 2011, Iran (44)</b>	cross-sectional	7-9	0.4 vs 2.4	97.8 (15.9) n=60	91.4 (16.6) n=60	Obtained from the literature	Persian version of Raven's progressive matrices test	1	1	2	4
<b>Eswar 2011, India (39)</b>	cross-sectional	12-14	0.3 vs 2.5	88.0 (15.3) n=65	86.3 (12.8) n=68	Measured in the study	Raven's standard progressive matrices test	3	0	2	5
<b>Trivedi 2012, India (25)</b>	cross-sectional	12-13	0.8 vs 2.3	97.2 (17.9) n=50	92.5 (18.2) n=34	Measured in the study	Adapted Stanford-Binet intelligence scale	2	1	2	5
<b>Zhang 2015, China (48)</b>	cross-sectional	10-12	0.6 vs 1.5	109.4 (13.3) n=98	102.3 (13.5) n=84	Measured in the study	Combined Raven's test for rural China	3	1	2	6
<b>Mondal 2016, India (43)</b>	cross-sectional	10-14	<1.5 vs >1.5	26.4 (10.5) n=22	21.2 (6.8) n=18	Measured in the study	Raven standard theoretical intelligence test	1	1	2	4
<b>Aravind 2016, India (30)</b>	cross-sectional	10-12	<1.2 vs ≥1.5	41.0 (16.4) n=96	56.7 (14.5) n=96	Measured in the study	Raven's standard progressive matrices	3	0	2	5
<b>Razdan 2017,</b>	cross-	12-14	0.6 vs 1.7	38.6 (6.3)	18.9 (4.4)	Measured in	Rural version of the Chinese	2	0	2	4

<b>India (33)</b>	sectional			n=69	n=75	the study	standardized Raven test				
<b>Yu 2018, China (47)</b>	cross-sectional	7-13	0.5 vs 2.0	107.4 (130.0) n=1636	106.4 (12.3) n=1250	Measured in the study	Combined Raven's test for rural China	2	1	2	5
<b>Chen 1991, China (38)</b>	cross-sectional	7-14	0.9 vs 4.6	104.0 (14.9) n=320	100.2 (14.5) n=320	Unclear	Rural version of the Chinese standardized Raven test	2	1	2	5
<b>Zhao 1996, China (49)</b>	cross-sectional	7-14	0.9 vs 4.1	105.2 (14.9) n=160	97.7 (13.0) n=160	Unclear	Unclear	1	1	2	4
<b>Lu 2000, China (42)</b>	cross-sectional	10-12	0.4 vs 3.2	103.0 (13.9) n=58	92.3 (20.5) n=60	Measured in the study	Combined Raven's test for rural China	2	1	2	5
<b>Trivedi 2007, India (26)</b>	cross-sectional	12-13	2.0 vs 5.6	104.4 (12.4) n=101	91.7 (10.7) n=89	Measured in the study	Questionnaire prepared by a local Professor	1	1	2	4
<b>Wang 2007, China (32)</b>	cross-sectional	8-12	0.5 vs 8.3	104.8 (14.7) n=196	100.5 (15.8) n=253	Subset measured in the study	Combined Raven's test for rural China	3	2	2	7
<b>Karmizade 2014, Iran (40)</b>	cross-sectional	9-12	0.3 vs 3.9	104.3 (20.7) n=20	81.2 (16.2) n=19	Measured in the study	Raymond B Cattell test	2	1	2	5
<b>Ren 1989, China (45)</b>	cross-sectional	8-14	ND	85.0 (22.3) n=169	64.8 (20.4) n=160	Unclear	Wechsler intelligence test IQ scores	0	0	2	2
<b>Li 2003, China (41)</b>	cross-sectional	6-13	ND	93.8 (14.3) n=236	92.1 (17.1) n=720	Unclear	Chinese standardized Raven test for rural China	0	0	2	2

Studies denoted with\* were those performed in areas with low concentrations of naturally occurring groundwater fluoride where IQ was compared between children living in regions with (Fluoride group) and without (Reference group) artificial water fluoridation programmes. The remaining studies compared IQ in children living in regions with naturally high with children living in regions with naturally low groundwater fluoride concentrations. The “Study” column includes the first author of the publication, the year it was published, the country in which the study was performed and the reference. The “Mean fluoride by group (ppm)” column refers to the estimated mean concentration of fluoride in the water supply in the two comparative groups in each study (i.e. reference group vs. the higher fluoride group). The “Age range (years)” column refers to the age range of the participants in the study. Study quality was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scales for cohort studies and adapted for cross-sectional studies. Studies were scored out of a maximum of 10 points based on three domains (selection, comparability and outcome). Studies with scores >7 were classed as high quality, 5-7 as good quality and 0-4 as poor quality. IQ: Intelligence quotient, ND: not determined, ppm: parts per million, SD: standard deviation.



