

ALLERGY, VIDEO

PORQUE NO TE CALLAS?

25.10.2008

Here is the abstract of another pro D3 article by [Gilcrest](#) in the AJCN with a few comments by me (not [Juan Carlos](#))

Ultraviolet radiation is a carcinogen that also compromises skin appearance and function.

yea, yea

Because the ultraviolet action spectra for DNA damage, skin cancer, and vitamin D3 photosynthesis are identical and vitamin D is readily available from oral supplements, why has sun protection become controversial?

nay, nay – even as a rhetorical question this is already off key as *sola dosis facit venerum*. Clearly, an “artificial” supplement needs to be carefully checked against a “physiological” exposure.

First, the media and, apparently, some researchers are hungry for a new message.

not a genuine scientific argument

Second, the controversy is fueled by a powerful special interest group: the tanning industry. This industry does not target the frail elderly or inner-city ethnic minorities, groups for whom evidence of vitamin D3 insufficiency is strongest, but rather fair-skinned teenagers and young adults, who are at highest risk of ultraviolet photodamage.

I see this industry also with reluctance – but her argument would even imply that the tann-

ing industry should address now also the frail elderly. Or does she want to close all tanning studios?

Third, evolution does not keep pace with civilization.

Nice argument – follow Rosseau or the advice of a physician who has a lower life expectancy than the general population?

When nature gave humans the appealing capacity for cutaneous vitamin D3 photosynthesis, life expectancy was <40 y; long-term photodamage was not a concern; and vitamin D3 deficiency, with its resulting skeletal abnormalities (rickets), was likely to be fatal in early life.

Clearly wrong -we may an epidemiologist for an explanation of the meaning of average life expectancy in a cohort of high infant mortality.

In the 21st century, life expectancy approaches 80 y in developed countries, vitamin D3 is available at the corner store, and the lifetime risk of skin cancer is 1 in 3 among white Americans. Medical and regulatory groups should avoid poorly reasoned, sensationalistic recommendations regarding unprotected ultraviolet exposure.

So, skin cancer in white Americans at age 80 y is the result of “poorly reasoned, sensationalistic recommendations regarding unprotected ultraviolet exposure” in the last 10 years??

Instead, they should rigorously explore possible cause-and-effect relations between vitamin D3 status and specific diseases while advocating the safest possible means of ensuring vitamin D3 sufficiency.

A somewhat trivial end...

