

Published on Open Parachute 3rd March 2018

Ken Perrott @OpenParachute 8h

Replying to [@DrLimeback](#) [@MSoFluoride](#)

Paul Connett claims the Mexican study indicates a 1 ppm increase in urinary F causes a 5-6 point decrease in IQ and claims this is very large and highly significant. But he does not understand the statistical analyses.

Ken Perrott @OpenParachute 8h

Replying to [@DrLimeback](#) [@MSoFluoride](#)

Using the data from this study and calculating prediction intervals I found a 1 ppm change in urinary F caused an IQ change of 6 + or - 25. i.e. -19 to 31. Not at all significantly different from zero. The data has a high variability.

Ken Perrott @OpenParachute 8h

Replying to [@Dan_Germouse44](#) [@DrLimeback](#) [@MSoFluoride](#)

I do not dismiss the study - I just understand how to interpret the data - it is highly variable. Absolutely nothing to do with fluoridation - its a matter fo statistical analysis.

Ken Perrott @OpenParachute 8h

Replying to [@Dan_Germouse44](#) [@DrLimeback](#) [@MSoFluoride](#)

I would say Paul Connett's visit to NZ was an embarrassing failure. Came across as an extremist idiot on TV and attracted only 3 MPs to his parliamentary meeting.

Ken Perrott @OpenParachute 8h

Replying to [@Dan_Germouse44](#) [@DrLimeback](#) [@MSoFluoride](#)

A change in IQ of -19 to +31 points with a 1 ppm change in urinary F means the change is not significant. The prediction interval is HUGE - the figure Connett uses is meaningless.