Turning the taps on: Is water fluoridation closer to becoming a reality?

Introduction
There are some things in life so simple and obvious you have to wonder why they're not ingrained pillars of society. Basic common courtesy, equality, vaccinations, cheese and jam sandwiches. OK, maybe not the last thing there, but you get the picture.

A decade ago as a fresh-faced PR and Press Officer and my foray into dentistry, one of those simple and obvious things to me was water fluoridation. You didn't have to be a genius to see its benefits, namely a cost-effective public health intervention that would improve the oral health of the population and save the NHS millions of pounds spent on tooth extractions under anaesthetic.

A long time coming
Alas, the Southampton experience left a feeling that you did need to be a genius to see it, and for a number of years that was that – fluoridation was off the table. Cut to 2019, and 'Advancing our health: prevention in the 2020s' put it right back on the agenda. But why did it take so long for it to come back to the table?

Dr Nigel Carter OBE, Chief Executive of the Oral Health Foundation, points to the 2012 Health and Social Care Act as a large reason.

‘Much of the challenge after the change from Strategic Health Authorities to local authorities was the system for approving any local health measures,’ he said. ‘You moved from an organisation making sure that national priorities were integrated into local plans to local councillors who didn’t have the same grasp of wider public health measures and were more susceptible to maverick scientific opinion on fluoridation that was vocal, loud and organised.

‘We know from surveys that anywhere between 60-75% of the population is in
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favour of water fluoridation, and that number will be higher if you asked the profession. It was incredibly disappointing, but by the time the decision was handed down in 2014 it perhaps wasn’t surprising.’

British Society of Paediatric Dentistry spokesperson, Dr Claire Stevens CBE, thought part of the issue may be a little closer to home.

‘We as a profession perhaps need some introspection – have all the key stakeholders been as co-ordinated, serious and organised as the anti-fluoride lobbyists? Have we all been working together, united in one voice? I would suspect the answer to that is no, and so the anti voice has filled the void, leaving councillors little choice but to shelve any talk of fluoridating water supplies.

‘The dental community may be firmly in support of it, but if you’re being given misinformation about the effects of fluoride it doesn’t matter whether they’re fantasy or non-fiction’

‘I can sympathise with their reaction, although it flies in the face of scientific evidence. As a graduate I was once warned never to stick my head above the parapet when it came to supporting water fluoridation. I remember some years later heading into a Westminster Forum to do a presentation, only to leave and find a barrage of abuse in my direction on social media. It was incredible. Reports of emotional, physical and verbal bullying are all too common, particularly now social media is a tool for them to exploit.

‘It’s clearly not a lack of evidence – the benefits are black and white. What has had an impact is the way the anti-fluoride voices have mobilised, united and been vocal – in all honesty more vocal than the profession in its support of water fluoridation. Emotive reasoning – regardless of whether it’s rational or not – cuts through to those who don’t know how effective water fluoridation is, and why would the general public know?’

Dr Rebecca Linney, an associate dentist based in Liverpool who recently produced a paper looking at the relationship between water fluoridation and social media, echoed Claire’s thoughts on the negativity surrounding the move.
'I think a lot of it surrounds the sheer weight of negativity voiced by a fairly vociferous minority,' she said. 'The dental community may be firmly in support of it, but if you're being given misinformation about the effects of fluoride it doesn't matter whether they're fantasy or non-fiction, they will have an impact. Over time these stories will stay with those on local councils, all the while we seen anti-fluoride lobbyists becoming a powerful force on social media and reaching a completely different audience. It's almost reached a point where it's too difficult to discuss.'

Dr Barry Cockroft CBE, a long term advocate for targeted water fluoridation and Chair of the British Fluoridation Society, agreed.

'The anti-fluoride protestors in Southampton were a very small but very organised bunch, as has been previously mentioned. I was Chief Dental Officer for England at the time, and we saw how effective their methods were, and they proved to be difficult to overcome, especially when you tie rogue science to emotion. It was really galling, having won the consultation and Judicial Review to see the scheme not progress because of system reorganisation.

'What was particularly surprising was in a telephone survey of residents carried out during the consultation, 69% already thought their water supplies were already fluoridated. Winning the Judicial Review and then being denied years later was a real missed opportunity.'

Amanda Allard from the National Children's Bureau suggests the hiatus from the agenda may simply be a reflection of the general public’s basic understanding of oral health.

'I don't think we've done enough to ensure that people understand the impact poor oral health can have on their overall health and the possible consequences,' she told me. 'I have something of an inside track as my sister is a dentist and she tells me about the number of children hospitalised with tooth decay who require multiple extractions – the numbers are appalling, and they're backed up with various survey data of children.

'We have definitely not done enough to get good accessible information out to disadvantaged families; least likely to be registered with a dentist, most likely to be subsisting on a poor diet.'
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'A very social problem
It is very telling that gazes are being cast toward keyboard warriors. On next to no budget and a lack of action from the platforms they distribute their 'opinions' on, they can be a real force. Is it one dentistry was in a position to – or even willing to tackle? According to Nigel, there's a decision to be made on how the profession and the wider healthcare community decides to counter it – one he's faced many times.

'In my capacity as Chief Executive of the Oral Health Foundation, I have encountered so many anti-fluoride lobbyists and had the opportunity to comment on their position, but it almost fans the flames and they will come back with something else to counter your point, and before you know it you've spent your day arguing with the incomprehensible. This creates a problem – do you continue to challenge and refute their 'evidence' or – particularly in print medium – do you let it burn out? We as a profession need to be as coherent as the anti-fluoride lobbyists when it comes to an approach on countering their misinformation, and we're not there yet.'

'I agree Nigel,' Rebecca added. 'My biggest takeaway from the research was that anything you say on fluoridation has to be evidence-based. If anti-fluoride lobbyists respond, don't engage – you will only find yourself going around in circles. The more we put the evidence out there, the better traction we will get with those on social media. No matter how coherent or logically sound your argument, if you become embroiled in a discussion there will always be a retort, which is unhelpful.'

Amanda believes a more targeted approach may be necessary to bring about the change needed.

'The Community Water Fluoridation (CWF) Network counters online misinformation very well. Part of the approach is understanding that you won't win over everyone – there are different approaches that can yield the same results. Some require engagement, some – as Nigel suggests – require you to take a step back and let the thing burn out because it's so toxic.

'As the only non-dental organisation in the campaign, we saw the figures and the simplicity in water fluoridation. It's not something that can or indeed should be done in isolation, but at a time where recourse to public funds is more difficult than ever, it's a cost-effective win for public health.'

'That reliance on a coherent approach is something Claire feels is necessary.

'We need to trust in education to counter their approach, but it cannot just be the dental team. We need politicians, paediatricians, dental public health – to name a few – to be a co-ordinated, unified
voice countering misinformation which,
given the current environment, we should
be able to do.
‘There also needs to be recognition of
how much groundwork it takes to bring
water fluoridation to the consultation stage
and engage public support. Anti-fluoride
voices are starting to be diluted in favour
of taxpayers wanting sound investments
locally. This gives us a foot in the door, so to
speak. The evidence is clear-cut, and if we
can increase levels of public support then we
will be in a very strong position to see water
fluoridation become a reality.’

The purse strings
Maybe it’s just me, but it seems odd for a
profession of 115,000 – according the latest
GDC registration report – to be fearful and
drowned out by a small band of keyboard
warriors. The collective experience, nous
and support should be enough to convince
policymakers of how effective – for oral
health and the Treasury’s purse strings –
water fluoridation is. So why has it not been
implemented, and what difference could the
wait have made to children’s oral health?

Amanda said: ‘My understanding is
topical application of fluoride is the most
effective form for preventing decay. We can
improve oral health via this route – some
local authorities where there are large areas
of deprivation have very good oral health
figures, in large due to the topical application.
So behaviour change is possible, but it is
difficult and there is an effective, alternative
direct intervention.

‘There is also the question of the role
dentists play. Dentistry is clearly well-
aware of the benefits water fluoridation
can bring, but is the dental team trained
to a high enough standard to have difficult
conversations with parents and start the
wheels of behaviour change turning? Parents
get very defensive when there’s even a slight
suggestion they’ve put their child in harm’s
way – it’s a natural response. I have had
communications with parents of children who
say there’s nothing more they could have
done to stop their child from having an
extraction, but when you dig a little under the
surface there’s usually a reason. I would argue
that parent needs more help to understand
the drinks container
milkshakes, fruit drinks and bars aren’t good
for oral health and that the drinks container
surface there’s usually a reason. I would argue
extraction, but when you dig a little under the

for oral health and that needs to

be the foundation – such areas would need a
range of measures to tackle high dental need
in their community’

‘Where you do see the difference is when
you move to a different area of the country. In
fluoridated Newcastle I saw lots of children
with decayed teeth, yet most were restorable.
Working in the community in non-
fluoridated Middlesbrough it was a different
story – almost nothing was restorable.

The British Society of Paediatric Dentistry
supports community water fluoridation for
areas of high need. It doesn’t make sound
economic sense to fluoridate Oxford’s waters,
for example, where they have excellent
children’s oral health. There is a clear link
with areas of deprivation, and that needs to
be the foundation – such areas would need a
range of measures to tackle high dental need
in their community’

Barry pointed to the options on the menu
open to the profession to bring about change
in other ways.

‘You have to consider the effectiveness of
topical application and the increase in the
amount of fluoride added to toothpaste for
very young children,’ he said. ‘Those are two
very effective methods with instant effects
not in the hands of politicians. Children’s
oral health has overall been trending in the
right direction for a number of years. It will
be interesting to see whether that trajectory
remains post-pandemic, where reports of
increased snacking, long waiting lists and
access problems created a perfect storm.

‘We’ve all got experience of treating
children in fluoridated and non-fluoridated
areas, and I would have expected to see
greater progress had the decision in
Southampton not been reversed in the
intervening years.

‘With any public health intervention, you
will always have detractors and people will
always find holes. When seatbelts were made
mandatory, people said they’d kill more than
they’d save because people would be trapped.
This may have happened in a small number of
cases, but there is ample evidence that

clearly shows that argument has no substance

‘We will consult on rolling out a school
toothbrushing scheme in more pre-school
settings and primary schools in England.

‘Evidence suggests that these programmes
have the ability to reduce tooth decay,
mitigate inequalities and establish lifelong
behaviour to improve oral health. Half of all
local authorities already have a version of
the scheme in place, but they are not always
focused on the children that would benefit the
most. Next year, we’ll consult on proposals that
will allow us to reach the most deprived 3 to 5
year olds in all areas of the country. The aim
would be to reach 30% by 2022.

‘We will explore ways of removing the
funding barriers to fluoridating water to
encourage more local areas that are interested
to come forward with proposals. NHS England
will actively seek partnerships between local
authorities and the NHS, with councils
rewarded for their fluoridation efforts by
receiving a share of the savings from fewer
child tooth fillings and extractions. This
also includes examining the role that water
companies can play in supporting fluoridation
efforts.’

The paper went on to add that in 2018,
Public Health England (PHE) concluded that
‘water fluoridation is an effective and
safe public health measure to reduce the
frequency and severity of dental decay, and
narrow differences in dental health between
more and less deprived children and young
people.’

While the pandemic provides some
mitigation for the lack of progress on the
former of these points, Claire suggested

water fluoridation is one of many elements
dentistry needs to implement to bring about
change.

‘It would be wise to say that water
fluoridation is not a silver bullet and the
solution to all of our problems’, she added.

‘It’s one of the items on the Local Health
and Care Planning: Menu of preventative
interventions but cannot be done in isolation.
In this instance we would have seen some
improvement, but it would have taken up
to five years for them to trickle through the
system.
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to it – seatbelts save far more lives and significantly reduce injuries.

'It is the same with water fluoridation. People will always find 'new research' that hasn't been published and bears no resemblance to a solid evidence base. Quite often you find these papers haven't been published, but that doesn't stop people from using them. In England, we fluoridate one part per million – in distance speak, which isn't directly comparable but gives you a visual idea, that's one inch per 23 miles. In money speak, it's £1 a year per person to do, and the potential savings are considerably higher.

'It isn't as simple as getting one local authority to agree to water fluoridation and that's it, job done. The way water is distributed means you have to sign up a minimum of two or three local authorities, all in agreement after public meetings and consultations, and we know that is difficult. I recall some of the public objections were so off-the-wall that it beggared belief their views were being taken seriously, and with many anti-fluoride lobbyists forming a powerful and coherent strategy of online/social media manipulation, you can start to see why it was such an issue.

'The Southampton debacle highlighted how much of a contentious issue it was, and many simply saw it as too difficult to press ahead with.'

'The Southampton debacle highlighted how much of a contentious issue it was, and many simply saw it as too difficult to press ahead with.'
such common sense, they don’t need to be vocal about it? There doesn’t appear to be cohesion within the wider healthcare sphere and integration of messages and services. Is there too much linear and not enough lateral thinking? I would say there is.

‘There are lots of reasons a child living with a disability would have poor oral health not through a lack of knowledge, and I’m not sure the system is adequately set up to help those who this applies to.’

Claire suggested: ‘As much as it pains me to say, I think that’s a reasonable assumption. If a local authority has a choice between suspending a supervised toothbrushing programme or closing a local library for financial reasons, you know which one will fall by the wayside. A library closing would elicit a strong communal response and outrage, and we’re not putting oral health high enough up on the agenda to generate the same kind of feeling.

‘If we’re talking about a Cinderella service, then you need look no further than children’s mental health – we have been left behind.’

‘It’s not until recently with the work of Simon Hearms and the CWF that we have started to advocate stronger. Unless we put it on the agenda, it’s not going to magically appear there. If two or three local areas unite and come to a consensus that fluoridation is a positive thing, then we can start to change perceptions.’

Barry also agreed, but pointed to a lack of fundamentals fuelling a bigger issue.

‘Caries in essence only exists because people aren’t complying with basic oral health messages. Fluoridation needs no compliance – it’s in tea, the food we eat, the beer we drink – depending on your location. While I think dentistry doesn’t get the credit it deserves for advancing levels of children’s oral health, there is obviously still a way to go. Silent support is no longer enough – we need to stand up and be far more vocal about fluoridation and dentistry in general to raise its profile. The British Fluoridation Society has developed a suite of information to give to members to arm them with knowledge on how to approach water fluoridation.

You can find these on the BFS website, and membership of the BFS is now free. We do have a fixation with countering what negativity there is rather than promoting the 75 years of published evidence on the benefits of fluoridation.’

Remaining obstacles

As the White Paper itself states, removing the funding barriers is one of the many remaining obstacles in the way of water fluoridation becoming a reality. As with most political decisions these days, it appears to come down to money, none more so than throughout the pandemic. Aside from the obvious financial barrier, what are the remaining obstacles?

‘The government needs to see oral health as a priority – that’s a basic,’ Rebecca said. ‘The amount of money that can be saved fluoridating water compared to the spend on extracting teeth is enormous. It seems every time there’s an opportunity for change politicians think ‘it’s only oral health’ and something else takes priority. That absolutely has to change, and while it was welcome to see the government put forward water fluoridation in the paper, it has to go further – we need to see action.’

Claire suggests the same barriers could be flipped into opportunities, with the right timing.

‘The biggest challenge is keeping the momentum going through the transition period from announcement through to delivery. That is a tough ask – water fluoridation takes a long time. I don’t think there are any insurmountable barriers, but it will remain a delicate situation until we can finally say we’ve completed this objective.

‘I also wonder whether COVID-19 has reset the general public’s thoughts – and indeed the government’s – on preventive measures. We heard some pretty dreadful reports of DIY dentistry during the first lockdown, so perversely it could highlight how important it is to have good oral health. The pandemic really shone a light on the huge holes in the system.

‘In Greater Manchester we put forward a paper on child-friendly dental practices in 2017. It went nowhere, COVID-19 happened and all of a sudden MCN meetings were crying out for solutions to ease the backlog. As frustrating as that was for us, it shows the opportunities for healthcare recovery post-pandemic. Roughly 10% of the population have access to fluoridated water – this has to change. We’ve been able to get oral health higher up on the priority of non-dental minds. It’s vital to remember children’s oral health is everyone’s business, and the more we can engage stakeholders outside of dentistry on this, the better.’

Nigel cast a more cautious tone. ‘It’s going to be difficult. There needs to be a push to improve political support which will put pressure on local councils to do the right thing. Even if there is a step-change in the right direction, it won’t happen overnight. Some areas of the country are further along in their consultations, so there’s a disjointed element the profession needs to overcome.

‘In the meantime, it falls on dental professionals to continue to educate local residents about practices of good oral health. Fluoride varnish treatments in practices, schools and socially deprived areas are the best chance we have to implement preventive measures at a time when social distancing measures make this challenging.

‘We will continue to lobby for nation-wide fluoridation as we believe it is the biggest single action the Government can take to reduce and tackle tooth decay.’
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