Adverse health effects of indoor mold exposure

To the Editor:

We read with interest your recent position paper on the controversial subject of adverse health effects of mold exposure.1 When anyone writes a position paper, we question whose ox is being gored. You state in your article that “it is important for the members of the allergy–clinical immunology community who are frequently asked by patients, parents, and other interested parties to render opinions.”1 Who are these other interested parties? Was there a separate agenda for this position paper that also, in part, represent an agenda for the defense.2,3

What evidence to the contrary do you have that you have summarily dismiss the findings of Gray, Thrasher, Crago, Campbell, and Vojdani?4 Could you have selectively dismissed the many other references that we cited? What are the “unproved assertions that exposure to indoor molds caused a variety of ill-defined illnesses”?5 What, for example, is ill defined about neurotoxicity, a disorder ranking in the top 10 causes of occupational injury?6 Is PCR identification of Stachybotrys species and its mycotoxins not “specific” enough for “fungus–fungal products purported to cause the mold-related illness”?7

If you condemn the “measurement of clinically useful tests of autoimmunity,” as well as “a wide range of nonspecific immunologic parameters,” how would you know whether there are adverse reactions to the immune system? The practice of occupational and environmental medicine requires the objective evaluation of biomarkers of exposures and biomarkers of the effect of exposures to establish causation. Your statement that “testing is expensive and does not provide useful information that will benefit in diagnosis, management, or both of disease and is to be discouraged” makes us suspicious of the message of this position paper.

We agree that mold exposure has become a litigious issue. But are we as physicians to choose sides? Or are we to evaluate objectively the alleged effects of toxic mold exposure?8 We suspect your interpretation of what is and what is not supported by scientific evidence might, at least in part, represent an agenda for the defense.
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How solid is the Academy position paper on mold exposure?

To the Editor:

I disagree with much of the position paper by Bush et al.1 There is much evidence supporting illness caused by water-damaged, moldy, or damp indoor spaces. Classic allergy accounts for only part of the problem. I am allotted only 500 words, and therefore the numbered statements lead to important references (see this article’s additional references in the Online Repository at www.jacionline.org).