

## Controversy Over Vitamin D Board Selections.

By John Cannell, MD

Dr. Cannell is founder of the Vitamin D Council. For more information, visit [www.vitaminDcouncil.org](http://www.vitaminDcouncil.org)

The Institute of Medicine (IOM) has quietly announced composition of the next vitamin D Food and Nutrition Board (FNB), a committee that will set recommendations for both adequate intake and upper limits well into the next decade.

Unfortunately, the scientists who have led the vitamin D revolution for the last ten years are all excluded. The debarred include, Drs. Vieth, Giovannucci, Garland, Hollis, Heaney, Wagner, Norman, Hankinson, Whitting, Hanley, etc.. For example, Dr. Hollis actually wrote and received an FDA Investigational New Drug (IND) for vitamin D in 2003 that has allowed both him and many other investigators to perform vitamin D studies with doses well above the current upper limits. Why is he not on the committee? Dr. Vieth has performed many of the recent upper limit pharmacological dosing studies in humans. Why did the IOM exclude Dr. Vieth?

Many of the excluded experts recently criticized the IOM using the strongest language to date: "Astonishingly, the FNB says that the adequate intake for vitamin D is the same for the largest pregnant woman as for the smallest premature infant (200 IU/d), frightening advice for pregnant women, in light of animal studies



that showed that gestational vitamin D deficiency causes both neuronal injury and autistic-like gross morphological changes in the brains of offspring. Furthermore, the FNB upper limits for a 1-year-old, 9-kg (20 lb) child and a 30-year-old, 135-kg (300 lb) adult are also the same

2,000 IU/d and are based on their selective focus on one flawed study. Ample new data from well-conducted clinical trials support raising the upper limit to 10,000 IU. The 1997 FNB recommendations offend the most basic principles of pharmacology and toxicology, leading us to conclude that the current official guidelines and limitations for vitamin D intakes are scientifically indefensible."

Are these statements the reason the IOM excluded these vitamin D experts? Perhaps the IOM dislikes criticism more than it loves candor? If any member of the new board disagrees with the consensus of the board, will that scientist be allowed to produce a minority opinion without risking the loss of research grants in the future?

### References:

Cannell JJ, Vieth R, Willett W, Zasloff M, Hathcock JN, White JH, Tanumihardjo SA, Larson-Meyer DE, Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Lamberg-Allardt CJ, Lappe JM, Norman AW, Zittermann A, Whiting SJ, Grant WB, Hollis BW, Giovannucci E. Cod liver oil, vitamin A toxicity, frequent respiratory infections, and the vitamin D deficiency epidemic. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol.* 2008 Nov;117(11):864-70.