

Human & Experimental Toxicology

DOI: 10.1177/0960327109363973

Hum Exp Toxicol 2010; 29; 249

Edward J Calabrese

<http://het.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/249>

.....These studies have documented that the threshold dose response very poorly predicts responses below the estimated threshold, a performance that was broadly generalizable.

.....These findings point to a critical and ongoing failure of the scientific and regulatory communities to properly validate models, especially ones that are directly used to affect public health and medical practices....one must ask how it was possible for U.S. federal agencies such as the EPA, FDA, ATSDR, NIEHS, NIOSH, OSHA and others to never conduct or fund studies that would have addressed this question.

....This centrality of the threshold dose-response model within the biomedical sciences and public health regulatory agencies has led to the assumption that this dose-response model has been studied in detail, scientifically vetted and validated, and can be reliably assumed to provide accurate estimates of biological responses especially in the low dose zone (i.e. below toxicological and pharmacological thresholds).

....While there was the general belief that it must have been, given the importance of this question and the universal acceptance of this model within the scientific and regulatory communities, our comprehensive attempts to find research that had addressed this issue uniformly failed. Yet, this failure was very unsettling, for how could the biomedical community have built an entire toxicological and drug testing and regulatory framework upon a dose-response model that had not been validated?

.....This seemed to be implausible and therefore could not possibly be true. It most likely meant that our comprehensive attempts were not really 'comprehensive' and that we must have been missing the obvious. Yet, renewed attempts with differing search strategies to ferret out the scientific vetting of the threshold dose-response model continued to fail to yield any relevant publications.

.....Eventually a disturbing conclusion was reached, that is, the principal dose-response model upon which chemical and drug toxicity testing has been based had never been validated, but simply accepted as true, being passed down with authoritative conclusionary statements from textbook to textbook, from professor to student, from regulatory agencies to citizens, across generations of scientists, **creating an illusion of knowledge and informed guidance.**

A SCIENTIFIC VIEW OF THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF MOLD – US Chamber of Commerce (2003)

Nevertheless, except for persons with severely impaired immune systems, indoor mold is not a source of fungal infections, and **current scientific evidence** does not support the idea that human health has been adversely affected by inhaled mold toxins in home, school, or office environments. Thus, the notion that "toxic mold" is an insidious, secret "killer," as so many media reports and trial lawyers would claim, is **"junk science" unsupported by actual scientific study.**

