Don’t trust the modern environmental epidemiologists!
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Air pollution is responsible for more than 400,000 premature deaths/year in Europe – so German newspapers and other media complained at 9 September 2020, referring to the European Environment Agency [1]. If you ask the scientific base of this statement with severe political and economic consequences, you will find numerous studies since many years. Nearly all these studies describe “associations”, “interactions” or model calculations regarding air pollution and regional incidences, but for the author not a convincing proof for causality. Correlations don’t proof causal interactions, they include a high risk of stochastic statistics. A similar case exists in the risk-level of NOx, decided by the EU as 40 μg/m³ (mean of year) to “protect human health and the environment” [2]. In Germany the MAK-value amounts to 950 μg/m³ (i.e. 23 times higher) for longlife expositions at workplaces, based on thorough toxicologic studies.

There is a high interest of environmental politicians to propagate such “bad news” (400,000 deaths/year in Europe) and the public media like such news. So the author, claiming about this scenario, got the following answer from the German ministry of health (23 September 2020 09:02): Usual toxicologic and clinical studies, often used to confirm a causality, are not suitable answering such questions (with reference to Bradford Hill criteria [3]).

Why biometrical epidemiologists work on year after year for such research? Perhaps political and public attention guarantee good chances for successful third-party-funding and acquisition of impact scores, very favorable in the actual scientific business.

So the author is interested to discuss these considerations for getting new insights.
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