ALLERGY, VIDEO

PORQUE NO TE CALLAS?

25.10.2008

Here is the abstract of another pro D3 article by <u>Gilchrest</u> in the AJCN with a few comments by me (not<u>Juan Carlos</u>)

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 rheorical 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 tanning 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...

CC-BY-NC Science Surf 25.10.2008, access 18.10.2025 ☐