



Risk assessment of fluoride exposure in drinking water of Tunisia



Wiem Guissouma^{a, b}, Othman Hakami^c, Abdul Jabbar Al-Rajab^{d, *}, Jamila Tarhouni^a

^a Rural Engineering Department, National School of Agronomy of Tunis, University of Carthage, Tunis, Tunisia

^b National Agency of the Sanitary and Environmental Control of Products (ANCSEP), Tunis, Tunisia

^c Chemistry Department, Faculty of Sciences, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia

^d Center for Environmental Research & Studies, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia

HIGHLIGHTS

- Fluoride concentrations were $\leq 2.4 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ in 100 water consumption points in Tunisia.
- Risk assessment of Fluoride exposure was assessed depending on the age of consumers.
- Approximately 75% of the Tunisian population is at risk for dental decay.
- 25% of Tunisians have a potential dental fluorosis risk.
- 20% of Tunisians might have a skeletal fluorosis risk.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 January 2017

Received in revised form

2 March 2017

Accepted 3 March 2017

Available online 3 March 2017

Handling Editor: A. Gies

Keywords:

Fluoride

Tap water

Daily exposure

Risk assessment

Fluorosis

ABSTRACT

The presence of fluoride in drinking water is known to reduce dental cavities among consumers, but an excessive intake of this anion might lead to dental and skeletal fluorosis. This study reports a complete survey of the fluoridated tap water taken from 100 water consumption points in Tunisia. The fluoride concentrations in tap water were between 0 and 2.4 mg L^{-1} . Risk assessment of Fluoride exposure was assessed depending on the age of consumers using a four-step method: hazard identification, toxicity reference values selection (TRVs), daily exposure assessment, and risk characterization. Our findings suggest that approximately 75% of the Tunisian population is at risk for dental decay, 25% have a potential dental fluorosis risk, and 20% might have a skeletal fluorosis risk according to the limits of fluoride in drinking water recommended by WHO. More investigations are recommended to assess the exposure risk of fluoride in other sources of drinking water such as bottled water.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Water fluoridation is practiced by many developed countries as a routine measure of public health in order to help reduce dental cavities among the population (Jones et al., 2005; Petersen and Lennon, 2004; Podgorny and McLaren, 2015). However, more than 400 million citizens around the world receive artificially fluoridated water. Fluoride can prevent tooth decay by up to 40%; it has therefore been an official policy of the U.S. Public Health Service since 1951 to add fluoride to the public water supply, and it costs just about \$1 per person/year. The Centers for Disease Control and

Prevention (CDCP) reported that adding fluoride to tap water is among the most important achievements for public health in the 20th century (Horowitz, 1996). Yet many activists and political parties across the world campaign against water fluoridation. They claim that it simply isn't safe and point to possible side effects like the outbreaks of fluoride poisoning that occurred three times in the 1990s in Tunisia. Since its introduction in 1950, nine countries have outlawed water fluoridation. Is fluoride a potential health risk? The only proven side effect of water fluoridation is dental fluorosis, which is a discoloration or staining of the enamel in the teeth. This usually forms in children up to the age of four, and a study by the CDC shows rates of fluorosis increased by 9% between 1987 and 2002. Fluorosis may be harmless, but it is virtually impossible for children to avoid in countries where the entire water supply is fluoridated. Meanwhile, scientific studies arguing in favor of

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: alrajab@hotmail.com (A.J. Al-Rajab).

fluoridation have been criticized as insubstantially researched and dismissive of the long-term effects of excessive consumption of fluoride, which could potentially include weakened bones. This practice has raised the ethical debate about water fluoridation (Park and Kwon, 2016.).

In order to investigate the pros and cons of water fluoridation on human health, this study reports a complete survey of the fluoridated tap water in Tunisia and provides the scientific community with a health-risk assessment approach which was developed on a four-step method: hazard identification, toxicity reference values selection (TRVs), daily exposure assessment, and risk characterization (Wassie et al., 2012).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Sample collection and analysis

Excessive fluoride concentrations in public water supplies have been largely reported in many Tunisian areas (Ketata et al., 2011a, 2011b; Perennes, 1993). In the present study, 100 water samples were collected from tap water points located in the 24 Tunisian regions. The sampling distribution was done empirically, based on the population density served by public water networks. At each collection point, tap water ran for 5 min before collecting a water sample in a 1 L polyethylene container washed twice with distilled water. Samples were labeled and transferred in a field cooler to the lab for analyses. Samples were analyzed within 24 h after collection at the Centre International des Technologies de l'Environnement de Tunis, Tunisia CITET, using an iCE™ 3300 AAS Atomic Absorption Spectrometer (ThermoFisher Scientific, Tunis, Tunisia). The probing rate, the number of samples per region, and the number of samples per delegation were taken into account in the sampling plan.

2.2. Fluoride risk assessment in tap drinking water of Tunisia

Laboratory analyses were done in order to assess the health risk of fluoride in tap water. Risk assessment involved 1) identifying the hazard element, 2) establishing the values of toxicological reference, 3) estimating the fluoride exposure, and 4) characterizing the risk.

3. Results and discussion

Table 1 presents the measured fluoride concentrations in drinking water for the 24 Tunisian regions. The number of samples was chosen with respect to population size and distribution along the different Tunisian regions. A significant difference is observed in the maximum and minimum values in the Gabes region. This difference can be explained by the heterogeneity of fluoride levels within the same governorate. The minimum (0.29 mg L⁻¹) and maximum (1.94 mg L⁻¹) concentration levels was found in El-Hamma city and in Mareth city respectively. A mixture of these two types of water could be a solution to obtain moderately fluoridated water (~1 mg L⁻¹). In the other hand, three sites (Gafsa, Tataouine and Mednine) present an exceedance over the Tunisian regulation for fluoride concentrations in drinking water; i.e. 1.5 mg L⁻¹ (standard NT09-13 and standard NT09-14). This fluoride contamination is essentially due to nature of hard rock aquifers (Alaya et al., 2014; Ketata et al., 2011a, 2011b).

3.1. Fluoride risk assessment in tap drinking water of Tunisia

Following the basic four steps of the risk assessment process, different referential toxicity values were used to assess the exposure and to characterize the risk of consumed fluoride via drinking

tap water in Tunisia.

3.1.1. Hazard identification

High exposure or deficiency of fluoride might lead to serious health issues for human teeth (Fluoride in Drinking Water (2006); Freeze and Lehr, 2009). Deficient fluoride levels may lead to tooth decay (Hong et al., 2006; Warren et al., 2009), and high fluoride exposure may cause dental fluorosis. With long-term exposure to high-fluoride levels, skeletal fluorosis may occur (Barbier et al., 2010; Dhar and Bhatnagar, 2009).

3.1.2. The toxicity reference value (TRV)

The TRV values shown in Table 2 were used to assess the health risk of fluoride to the human body due to oral ingestion and with respect to the duration of exposure (chronic, sub-chronic, or acute).

Fluoride levels of 0.5 mg L⁻¹ or higher are recommended for prevention of dental cavities. (Petersen, 2004, 2003), and a daily intake of 122 mg kg⁻¹ bw d⁻¹ of fluoride might cause fluorosis (US EPA, 2005; Gupta, 2011), while more than 200 mg kg⁻¹ bw d⁻¹ of fluoride might lead to skeletal fluorosis issues. There are no harmful effect from daily fluoride intake lower than or equal to the fluoride safety limit of 0.5 mg L⁻¹ (Anses - French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety, 2015).

3.1.3. Assessment of fluoride exposure

Exposure to fluoride from tap drinking water (ED) was calculated using Equation (1):

$$E_D = \frac{C_F \times C_d}{B_w} \quad (1)$$

where C_F is the concentration of fluoride in the water samples (mg L⁻¹), C_d represents the average daily consumption of water (L d⁻¹) and B_w represents the average body weight (kg).

The daily consumed amount of drinking water estimated by WHO depends on age group and body weight, as shown in Table 3.

Significant difference between levels of daily fluoride exposure (E_D) was observed for the three age groups (Fig. 1). Moreover, the fluoride exposure level was higher in the young group (infants and children) than in adults. Consequently, this group of young people is considered to be a hyper-sensitive population.

3.1.4. Risk characterization

The risk characterization involves a comparative analysis between the TRVs and the daily exposure to fluoride (Ramirez-Martinez et al., 2014).

3.1.4.1. Fluoride acute toxicity in the tap water of Tunisia.

Calculated levels of exposure to fluoride with drinking water showed that the highest exposure level was observed in the area of Medenine for the three age groups with a maximum of 0.08, 0.24 and 0.36 mg kg⁻¹ bw d⁻¹ for adults, children and infant respectively. Assuming average body weights that were mentioned in Table 3, adults, children and infant, in the area of Medenine, are exposed to ingest 4.8 mg, 2.4 mg and 4.8 mg of fluoride respectively. According to Akiniwa, K. (Akiniwa, 1997), acute fluoride poisoning that causing first symptoms had occurred at an estimated dose of 0.3 mgF kg⁻¹ bw (Gessner et al., 1994). Hence, in our case, a slight exceedance of these minimum doses is shown in the case of infant in Medenine, Gafsa, Siliana and Tataouine areas. All subjects from the other areas are not exposed to the acute toxicity of fluoride.

3.1.4.2. Fluoride chronic toxicity in the tap water of Tunisia.

The origin of chronic toxicity of fluoride may be due to the long

Table 1
Measured Fluoride concentrations in tap drinking water for the 24 Tunisian regions expressed as means \pm standard deviation. 'n' denotes the number of samples.

Regions	n	Fluoride Concentration [mg L ⁻¹]	Min. [mg L ⁻¹]	Max. [mg L ⁻¹]
Ariana	5	0.40 \pm 0.01	0.39	0.41
Béja	2	0.22	0.05	0.39
Ben Arous	6	0.30 \pm 0.00	0.30	0.30
Bizerte	5	0.43 \pm 0.10	0.33	0.52
Gabes	2	1.12	0.29	1.94
Gafsa	3	1.75 \pm 0.48	1.27	2.22
Jendouba	4	0.12 \pm 0.07	0.05	0.19
Kairouan	4	0.98 \pm 0.32	0.66	1.29
Kasserine	4	0.59 \pm 0.21	0.38	0.79
Kébili	1	0.41	0.32	0.49
Kef	3	0.35 \pm 0.02	0.33	0.36
Mahdia	4	0.47 \pm 0.11	0.36	0.58
Manouba	6	0.31 \pm 0.01	0.3	0.31
Mednine	4	1.84 \pm 0.57	1.27	2.40
Monastir	4	0.47 \pm 0.12	0.35	0.59
Nabeul	7	0.50 \pm 0.19	0.31	0.68
Sfax	10	0.59 \pm 0.18	0.41	0.77
Sidi Bouzid	2	1.05	0.69	1.40
Siliana	2	0.41	0.36	0.46
Sousse	6	0.45 \pm 0.07	0.38	0.52
Tataouine	2	2.08	2.08	2.08
Tozeur	2	0.67	0.67	0.67
Tunis	10	0.41 \pm 0.02	0.39	0.43
Zaghouan	2	0.30	0.29	0.31

term intake of high levels of this anion via drinking water. Chronic toxicity can lead to tooth decay and dental or skeletal fluorosis.

3.1.4.2.1. Risk of tooth cavities. Our results showed that the population of 18 of 24 Tunisian regions (75%), especially the regions located in the north of the country, i.e. *jendouba and beja*, receive fluoride concentrations less than the limit recommended by WHO of 0.5 mg L⁻¹, which helps in tooth cavity prevention.

3.1.4.2.2. Dental fluorosis risk. Our results showed that the children of 6 of 24 regions in Tunisia (25%) have exposure levels of fluoride above the TRVs recommended by Health Canada 122 mg kg⁻¹ bw d⁻¹, which might cause dental fluorosis issues. As the tap drinking water is the major source of fluoride intake, the exposure can be higher than TRVs if water exposure is correlated with other fluoridated foods, drinks and gels, i.e. tea and toothpastes.

This risk characterization steps can leads to the estimation of some risk indicators as the hazard quotient HQ which is expressed as the ratio between the fluoride exposure level and the TRV. However, an adverse effect may occur if the HQ exceeds the unitary value (Doornaert and Pichard, 2006). Moreover, five studied areas showed HQ exceeding unity. Consequently, the consumers of tap water from these areas are more likely to be affected by dental fluorosis (Fig. 2). Furthermore, the children in Medenine have a risk

of exposure two times higher than the admissible TRV. This hypothesis is well verified in the Medenine area, where most children suffer from dental fluorosis.

3.1.4.2.3. Risk of skeletal fluorosis. Our results showed that the infants of 5 of 24 Tunisian regions (20%), mainly located in the south of the country (Medenine, Gabes, Tataouine, and Zidi-Bouzaid), are more likely to be exposed to a level of fluoride higher than the TRV recommended by Health Canada of 200 mg kg⁻¹ bw d⁻¹, which might cause a skeletal fluorosis.

3.1.4.2.4. Cases of exceeding the exposure safety limit on Tunisia. According to the French Higher Public Health Council (CSHPF), the safety limits for daily fluoride exposure are 4, 0.7, and 0.4 mg day⁻¹ for adults, children, and infants respectively (Hercberg, 2001). The percentages of cases exceeding the safety limit of CSHPF are 33, 20, and 3% for infants, children, and adults, respectively. Fig. 3 presents the details of these cases in the different Tunisian regions.

These findings highlights that the young consumers (infants and children) are more exposed to the risks of fluoride than adults in Tunisia. Table 4 represents Tunisian demographic details over the 24 governorates including total population in the study area that are likely to be exposed to the fluoride by drinking water. Among these populations, the visible symptoms of fluoride exposure are skeletal fluorosis, dental fluorosis and tooth cavities.

Table 2
Summary of referential TRVs used in the characterization of fluoride effects. These TRVs are related to chronic doses of fluoride. (data are extracted from Anses (Anses - French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety, 2007)).

Reference	Work	TRV	Value	Population	Effects
Health Canada	1996	N/A	122 μ g kg ⁻¹ bw day ⁻¹	22 to 26 months	dental fluorosis
US EPA (IRIS 2001)	1950	RfD	60 μ g kg ⁻¹ bw day ⁻¹	children	dental fluorosis
ATSDR	1990	MRL	60 μ g kg ⁻¹ bw day ⁻¹	postmenopausal woman	Increase in non-vertebral fractures
	1994				
Health Canada	LCPE 1993	N/A	200 μ g kg ⁻¹ bw day ⁻¹ (12 mg/day)	Adults	Skeletal fluorosis
Reported Dietary Allowance	2001	Safety limit	0.4–4 mg day ⁻¹	Infants to adults	N/A
WHO	IPCS 2002	N/A	6 mg/day	Adults	Skeletal fluorosis

N/A: Not Available.

B_w: Average body weight.

MRL: Minimum Risk Level.




Fig. 1. Fluoride exposure levels for different Tunisian regions over three age groups (infants, children and adults).

Table 3
The daily consumption of water and average body weight (Petersen, 2003).

Population	Daily water consumption [L day ⁻¹]	Average body weight [kg bw]
Infants	0.75	5
Children	1	10
Adults	2	60




Fig. 2. Hazard Quotient (HQ) in different Tunisian regions.




Fig. 3. Cases of exceeding the safety limit of fluoride exposure among infants (a), children (b), and adults (c) in the different Tunisian delegations.

Table 4

Summary of the model parameters and the referential values.

Sites	Demographic Data (INS - 2014)				Exposed population (%) over the total Tunisian population		
	Total Population	Infants (%)	Children & Teenager (%)	Adults (%)	Infants	Children & Teenager	Adults
Ariana	576,088	9.47	40.04	50.49			
Béja	303,032	8.14	36.69	55.17			
Ben Arous	631,842	9	38.33	52.67			
Bizerte	568,219	8.92	38.61	52.47			
Gabes	374,300	9.32	41.21	49.47	0.09	0.27	
Gafsa	337,331	9.23	40.71	49.97			
Jendouba	401,477	7.70	37.71	45.41			
Kairouan	570,436	10.33	41.93	47.74	0.35	0.93	
Kasserine	439,243	10.29	44.70	45.01	0.18	0.56	
Kébili	156,961	10.10	40.83	49.07			
Kef	243,156	7.46	37.29	55.25			
Mahdia	410,812	10.20	42.49	47.31	0.19	0.27	
Manouba	379,518	8.29	38.25	52.77			
Mednine	479,520	9.77	40.65	50.42	0.26	1.06	0.57
Monastir	548,828	9.94	44.17	45.89	1.86		
Nabeul	787,918	9.15	39.04	51.81	0.11		
Sfax	955,421	9.22	39.93	50.85	0.25	0.77	
Sidi Bouzid	429,912	9.73	42.75	47.52	0.21	0.71	
Siliana	223,087	9.14	38.82	52.04			
Sousse	674,818	9.56	41.92	48.52			
Tataouine	149,453	9.34	43.95	46.71	0.05	0.25	0.25
Tozeur	107,912	9.49	41.17	49.34	0.04		
Tunis	1,056,247	7.88	36.95	55.17			
Zaghouan	176,945	9.90	39.81	50.29			

4. Conclusions

In this study, Fluoride concentrations in drinking tap water were determined in the different geographical zones of Tunisia. Risk assessment of Fluoride exposure was assessed depending on the age of consumers (Infants, children, and adults). Our results suggested that approximately 75% of the Tunisian population is at risk for dental decay, 25% have a potential dental fluorosis risk, and 20% might have a skeletal fluorosis risk according to the limits of fluoride in drinking water recommended by WHO. This study covered only the tap water as main source of drinking water for Tunisians; therefore, further investigations on other sources of drinking water are highly recommended.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Centre International des Technologies de l'Environnement de Tunis (CITET, Tunis, Tunisia) and the Agence Nationale de Contrôle Sanitaire et Environnemental des Produits (ANCSEP, Tunis, Tunisia) for their assistance and technical help during this study.

References

- Anses - French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, 2015. (Report No. 2012-SA-0142). Maisons-Alfort.
- Anses - French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, 2007. (Report No. EAUX-Ra-LimitesRef). Maisons-Alfort.
- Alaya, M.B., Saidi, S., Zemni, T., Zargouni, F., 2014. Suitability assessment of deep groundwater for drinking and irrigation use in the Djefara aquifers (Northern Gabes, south-eastern Tunisia). *Environ. Earth Sci.* 71 (8), 3387–3421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12665-013-2729-9>.
- Akiniwa, K., 1997. Re-examination of acute toxicity of fluoride. *Fluoride* 30 (2), 89–104.
- Barbier, O., Arreola-Mendoza, L., Del Razo, L.M., 2010. Molecular mechanisms of fluoride toxicity. *Chem. Biol. Interact.* 188, 319–333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cbi.2010.07.011>.
- Dhar, V., Bhatnagar, M., 2009. Physiology and toxicity of fluoride. *Indian J. Dent. Res. Off. Publ. Indian Soc. Dent. Res.* 20, 350–355. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0970-9290.57379>.
- Doornaert, B., Pichard, A., 2006. Valeurs toxicologiques de référence: comment

- choisir. *Environ. Risques Santé* 5, 191–198.
- Fluoride in Drinking Water, 2006. A Scientific Review of EPA's Standards. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
- Freeze, R.A., Lehr, J.H., 2009. The Fluoride Wars: How a Modest Public Health Measure Became America's Longest Running Political Melodrama. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gupta, R.C., 2011. *Veterinary Toxicology: Basic and Clinical Principles*. Academic Press.
- Gessner, B.D., et al., 1994. Acute fluoride poisoning from a public water system. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 330, 95–99.
- Hercberg, S., 2001. Les bases de la politique nutritionnelle de santé publique en France : Le constat et les recommandations du HCSP. *OCL - Ol. Corps gras Lipides* 8 (1), 7–12.
- Hong, L., Levy, S.M., Broffitt, B., Warren, J.J., Kanellis, M.J., Wefel, J.S., Dawson, D.V., 2006. Timing of fluoride intake in relation to development of fluorosis on maxillary central incisors. *Community Dent. Oral Epidemiol.* 34, 299–309. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0528.2006.00281>.
- Horowitz, H.S., 1996. The effectiveness of community water fluoridation in the United States. *J. Public Health Dent.* 56, 253–258.
- Jones, S., Burt, B.A., Petersen, P.E., Lennon, M.A., 2005. The effective use of fluorides in public health. *Bull. World Health Organ.* 83, 670–676.
- Ketata, M., Gueddari, M., Bouhila, R., 2011a. Hydrochemical characterization of fluoride rich groundwater: a case study. In: *Fluoride: Properties, Applications and Environmental Management*, pp. 183–206.
- Ketata, M., Hamzaoui, F., Gueddari, M., Bouhila, R., Ribeiro, L., 2011b. Hydrochemical and statistical study of groundwaters in Gabes-south deep aquifer (south-eastern Tunisia). *Phys. Chem. Earth* 36, 187–196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2010.02.006>.
- Park, S.-K., Kwon, J.-H., 2016. The fate of two isothiazolinone biocides, 5-chloro-2-methylisothiazol-3(2H)-one (CMI) and 2-methylisothiazol-3(2H)-one (MI), in liquid air fresheners and assessment of inhalation exposure. *Chemosphere* 144, 2270–2276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.10.136>.
- Perennes, J.J., 1993. L'eau et les hommes au Maghreb: contribution à une politique de l'eau en Méditerranée. KARTHALA Editions.
- Petersen, P.E., 2004. Challenges to improvement of oral health in the 21st century—the approach of the WHO Global Oral Health Programme. *Int. Dent. J.* 54, 329–343.
- Petersen, P.E., 2003. The world oral health report 2003: continuous improvement of oral health in the 21st century—the approach of the WHO global oral health programme. *Community Dent. Oral Epidemiol.* 31 (Suppl. 1), 3–23.
- Petersen, P.E., Lennon, M.A., 2004. Effective use of fluorides for the prevention of dental caries in the 21st century: the WHO approach. *Community Dent. Oral Epidemiol.* 32, 319–321. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0528.2004.00175.x>.
- Podgorny, P.C., McLaren, L., 2015. Public perceptions and scientific evidence for perceived harms/risks of community water fluoridation: an examination of online comments pertaining to fluoridation cessation in Calgary in 2011. *Can. J. Public Health* 106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12769/cjph.106.5031>.
- Ramirez-Martinez, A., Wesolek, N., Morisset, T., Coyat, C., Parent-Massin, D., Roudot, A.-C., 2014. Exposure to dishwashing liquid assessed in university

- students from brest city: a preliminary study—a first approach to household products exposure in France. *Hum. Ecol. Risk Assess. Int. J.* 20, 1608–1628. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2013.879018>.
- U.S. EPA, 2005. Supplemental Guidance for Assessing Cancer Susceptibility from Early-life Exposure to Carcinogens.
- Warren, J.J., Levy, S.M., Broffitt, B., Cavanaugh, J.E., Kanellis, M.J., Weber-Gasparoni, K., 2009. Considerations on optimal fluoride intake using dental fluorosis and dental caries outcomes—a longitudinal study. *J. Public Health Dent.* 69, 111–115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-7325.2008.00108.x>.
- Wassie, F., Spanoghe, P., Tessema, D.A., Steurbaut, W., 2012. Exposure and health risk assessment of applicators to DDT during indoor residual spraying in malaria vector control program. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.* 22, 549–558. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/jes.2012.45>.