

# Comparison of Different Total Ionic Strength Adjustment Buffer Compositions for Determination of Low Level Fluoride in Environmental Water Samples with Fluoride Ion Selective Electrode

Tedlaye Forsido (✉ [tedlayef@yahoo.com](mailto:tedlayef@yahoo.com))

Tshwane University of Technology - Arcadia Campus <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2566-0307>

Peter Ndibewu

Tshwane University of Technology

---

## Research

**Keywords:** Fluoride, environmental water samples, ISE, TISABs, CDTA, EDTA, Acetate, Citrate, Pilanesberg

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-231958/v1>

**License:**   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

---

# Abstract

## Background

Fluoride content of environmental water samples collected from the vicinity of Pilanesberg National Park was determined using a fluoride ion selective electrode ( $F^-$ ISE). Different total ionic strength adjustment buffers (TISABs) EDTA, CDTA, Citrate and Acetate buffers, were compared for their effectiveness in releasing fluorine into the solution in its ionic form, by adjusting the pH and ionic strength of the solution, as well as by chelating polyvalent cations present in the samples. Nine water samples were collected from different sites around the park, where there is a decommissioned fluorspar mine, and an extinct volcano; for fluoride content. Quantification was carried out by means of multipoint calibration covering the range of interest in all treatments.

## Result

The fluoride concentration was calculated using the Nernst equation with values obtained from the calibration graph. It was found that CDTA and EDTA buffers were the best TISABs as they produced a better linearity, slope and recovery in that order, where as the other acetate also produced better parameters and results than the untreated water samples.

## Conclusion

CDTA and EDTA TISAB solutions perform better than the others for fluoride content determination from environmental water samples.

## Background

Fluoride is considered as one of the essential microelements for humans to be healthy (Bhattacharya et al., 2016; Narsimha & Sudarshan, 2018). It presents in most, if not all body tissues, with the highest levels in bones, dentine and teeth. Smaller quantities in the order of 1.0 mg/L in ingested water are usually considered to have beneficial effects on the rate of avoidance of dental carries, particularly among children (Kanduti et al., 2016; Ullah et al., 2017;). However, excessive intake results in pathological changes to teeth and bones, such as mottling of teeth (dental fluorosis) followed by skeletal fluorosis (Hosokawa et al., 2016; Joseph & Johnson, 2016; Kurdi, 2016). Higher levels of fluoride lead to increases in the levels of dental mottling (de Oliveira et al., 2016; Sebastian et al., 2016; Akuno et al., 2019), and changes in bone structure, namely skeletal fluorosis (Oweis, 2018; Unde et al., 2018; Guth et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020). Fluorosis is caused by intake of high fluoride predominantly through drinking water containing concentrations more than 1.0 mg/L (Maadid et al., 2017; Narsimha & Sudarshan, 2017; Demelash et al., 2019).

Neel et al. (2016) and Linhares et al. (2019) stated that fluoride accumulates in bones and teeth as fluorapatite and cause bones to become brittle. Other metabolic changes also have been reported in soft tissues such as thyroid, reproductive organs, brain, liver and kidneys (Chinia, 2017; Luo et al., 2017; Shahab et al., 2017; Malin et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2019). Fluoride may induce periosteal reaction, hyperostosis, osteoporosis, osteosclerosis, osteophytosis or osteomalacia in various combinations (Fossey et al., 2016; Perumal. 2017).

The effect of fluoride is also observed on plants. Excessive accumulation of fluoride in leaves results in the appearance of necrosis at the tips and margins of leaves (Gheorghe & Ion, 2011; Rhimi et al., 2016). Fluoride may induce changes in metabolism, decreased growth and yield, leaf chlorosis and in extreme cases plant death (Choudhary et al., 2019).

Hence it is imperative to monitor the amount of fluoride in water bodies as well as the soil. The content of fluoride in samples can be determined by using several techniques, including potentiometry using a fluoride ion selective electrodes (ISE), ion chromatography (IC), inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS), capillary electrophoresis, solvent-extraction coupled to fluorimetry, polarography and colourimetric techniques based on dyes. Methods based on flow injection analysis (FIA), using different detection methodologies have also been reported; each method with its own advantages and disadvantages (Yahyavi et al. 2016; Walia et al., 2017; Rocha et al., 2018). Potentiometry involves the usage of fluoride ion selective electrode ( $F^-$ ISE), miniaturized analytical devices, which can deliver real-time and on-line information on the presence of fluoride ions in complex samples (Ameer et al., 2018; Cuartero et al., 2019).

In potentiometry TISABs are required to adjust the pH and ionic strength of the sample solution. In addition any polyvalent cations present in the solution that might interfere with the analysis, need to be removed by complexing them (Tokalioglu et al., 2004, ThermoFisher, 2016; Harhash et al., 2017; Mettler-Toledo, 2018). The theoretical slope of the graph obtained from the calibration standards is 59.2 mV at 25° C for monovalent anions (Dabrowska et al., 2019; Fakhri et al., 2020). The slope of the calibration graph is the mV response per decade of concentration change. Measured slope generally lie in the range  $54 \pm 5$  mV/decade and will have a negative value for negative ions.

## Materials And Methods

The water samples were collected from suspected areas in and around Pilanesberg National Park using previously cleaned and dried plastic sampling bottles. A total of nine water samples including rivers, shallow lakes, stagnant accumulated rain water bodies and a tap water were collected. Four different types of TISAB solutions were used for treating the samples as complexing agents.

Ethylene di amine tetra acetate (EDTA) buffer, sodium acetate buffer, tri-sodium citrate buffer and cyclohexylene di amine tetra acetate (CDTA) buffer were used. All the standards and samplesolutions

were treated with the same amount of TISAB in all cases. The recipes for the preparation of the TISABs were obtained from the literature.

The TISAB solutions were prepared using the following procedure.

Acetate buffer was prepared by dissolving 0.75 M sodium acetate, 0.01 M sodium citrate, 58.0 g sodium chloride and 57 mL glacial acetic acid in approximately 500 mL de-ionised water. The pH of the resulting solution was adjusted to 5.5 with 5 M sodium hydroxide solution. The solution was diluted to a volume of 1 L with de-ionized water (Nico, 2000).

EDTA buffer was prepared by dissolving 4 g di-sodium EDTA in approximately 500 mL water; 57 mL of glacial acetic acid and 58.0 g sodium chloride were added and stirred until completely dissolved. The pH of the resulting solution was adjusted to 5.5 with 5 M sodium hydroxide. The solution was diluted to a volume of 1 L with de-ionized water (Skoog *et al.*, 2004).

Citrate buffer was prepared by dissolving 0.3 g tri-sodium citrate in approximately 500 mL deionised water. 58.0 g sodium chloride and 57 mL glacial acetic acid were added to the solution. After cooling the solution to room temperature, the pH of the solution was adjusted to 5.5 with 5 M sodium hydroxide. The solution was diluted to a volume of 1 L with de-ionized water (Nollet, 2007).

CDTA buffer was prepared by dissolving 4.0 g CDTA in 500 mL water. 57 mL glacial acetic acid and 58 g sodium chloride were added to the solution and mixed well. After cooling to room temperature, the pH was adjusted to 5.5 with 5 M sodium hydroxide and made up to 1 L with de-ionized water (Nollet, 2007).

The standard fluoride solution was prepared using the following procedure.

A 1000 mg/L fluoride solution was prepared by weighing 2.210 g of sodium fluoride; dissolved in deionised water and made up to the 1000 mL mark. The working standard solutions with concentration 0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2, 5, 10 and 100 mg/L were prepared from the stock solution by dilution on the day of analysis.

The instruments used in the analyses were a DC219 Metler Toledo fluoride combination electrode (Columbus Ohio, USA), Metrohm fluoride ion selective electrode and Metrohm Ag/AgCl reference electrode (Herisau, Switzerland), a Metrohm 744 pH meter (Herisau, Switzerland), a Metler Toledo S30 SevenEasy ion meter (Columbus Ohio, USA) were used for potentiometric measurements.

Statistical analysis was performed using Statistica software (Statsoft, 2009) one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) at 95% confidence level. In addition, non-parametric Krouskal-Wallis ANOVA and *t*-Tests were performed to determine any significant differences between the analytical procedures.

In all analyses certified quality check standard fluoride solution (Fluka, Steinheim Switzerland) was run along side the samples.

# Sample Preparation

The water samples were mixed with TISABs in a 1:1 proportion; 50 mL of water sample was mixed with 50 mL of the respective TISAB solution.

## Results And Discussion

The amount of fluoride in the water samples was calculated using the Nernst equation.

$$E_0 = m \log [F^-] + E$$

Where:  $E_0$  is the potential difference reading from the ionalyser

$m$  is the slope of the calibration graph

$\log [F^-]$  is the logarithm of the concentration of fluoride ion

The calibration parameters obtained for the different treatments are given in Table 1.

As is evident from the parameters, the slopes of the calibration graphs are in the acceptable range, the lowest -53.7 and the highest -59.1 mV/decade. The linearity ( $R^2$ ) is also good, (0.9955 to 0.9999)

Results for the water samples are reported in Table 2. The fluoride content in the same sample shows considerable difference with different treatments (TISABs). In the majority of the cases (7 out of the 9) CDTA produced a higher fluoride content, whereas in all cases the non-treated sample produced the lowest fluoride content.

Recovery tests were also done on all of the samples and the percentage recovery for each treatment is given in Table 3. The percentage recovery was found to be in the acceptable range for all treatments. Again CDTA produced recovery close to the true value as compared to the rest and in 7 of the 9 samples non-treated samples resulted in the lowest recovery.

**Table 1.** The calibration parameters obtained for the different treatments

TISAB	Equation	Linearity ( $R^2$ )
CDTA	-59.1X+120.8	0.9999
EDTA	-59.0X+120.6	0.9996
Citrate	-56.6X+118.4	0.9991
Acetate	-56.3X+117.9	0.9960
No Buffer	-53.7X+114.2	0.9955

**Table 2:** Fluoride content in water samples with different treatments (TISABS)

Sample Id	Fluoride content, mg/L (Result $\pm$ SD, n=3) TISAB			
	Acetate	CDTA	Citrate	EDTA
1	1.79 $\pm$ 0.17	2.06 $\pm$ 0.20	1.85 $\pm$ 0.12	1.98 $\pm$ 0.12
2	0.88 $\pm$ 0.10	1.05 $\pm$ 0.16	0.99 $\pm$ 0.20	1.00 $\pm$ 0.23
3	4.22 $\pm$ 0.14	4.41 $\pm$ 0.16	4.40 $\pm$ 0.19	4.41 $\pm$ 0.20
4	0.90 $\pm$ 0.10	1.01 $\pm$ 0.16	0.99 $\pm$ 0.21	0.96 $\pm$ 0.09
5	3.06 $\pm$ 0.14	3.33 $\pm$ 0.08	3.20 $\pm$ 0.12	3.29 $\pm$ 0.15
6	2.21 $\pm$ 0.09	3.08 $\pm$ 0.08	2.46 $\pm$ 0.11	2.42 $\pm$ 0.14
7	0.28 $\pm$ 0.14	0.40 $\pm$ 0.10	0.40 $\pm$ 0.10	0.45 $\pm$ 0.13
8	0.13 $\pm$ 0.10	0.21 $\pm$ 0.07	0.17 $\pm$ 0.06	0.16 $\pm$ 0.05
9	1.02 $\pm$ 0.24	1.27 $\pm$ 0.15	1.08 $\pm$ 0.15	1.14 $\pm$ 0.12

**Table 3:** Fluoride recovery with different treatments (methods)

Percent Recovery					
Sample ID	No Buffer	EDTA Buffer	CDTA Buffer	Citrate Buffer	Acetate Buffer
1	92.5	97.0	98.0	94.5	94.5
2	89.0	95.0	101	92.0	92.0
3	93.3	99.1	98.0	97.8	97.6
4	91.0	101	101	92.0	94.0
5	96.3	101	99.3	96.3	98.0
6	96.4	100	100	98.4	96.0
7	96.0	94.0	94.0	90.0	90.0
8	75.0	95.0	100	95.0	90.0
9	90.0	101	98.0	95.0	94.0

It was found that seven of the nine water samples produced fluoride concentration above the threshold

recommendation limit by World Health Organisation (WHO), which is 1.0 mg/L. Sample numbers 1, 3, 5 and 6 recorded above 1.8 mg/L, 4.2 mg/L, 3.1 mg/L and 202 mg/L fluoride in that order.

## Conclusion

EDTA and CDTA buffers proved comparably the best TISABs between the compared buffers with CDTA slightly bettering EDTA with respect to linearity, slope and higher fluoride content. The linearity for the calibration graph was 0.9999, the slope – 59.1mV/Decade and recovery ranging between 94.0 and 101%. The percentage recovery is on par for EDTA and CDTA. Citrate has the third recovery which was better than acetate.

## Abbreviations

CDTA Cyclohexylenedinitrilo)tetraacetic Acid

EDTA, Ethylene di-Amine Tetra Acetate

FIA Flow Injection Analysis

FISE Fluoride Ion Selective Electrode

IC Ion Chromatography

ICP-MS Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometer

ISE Ion Selective Electrode

TISAB Total Ionic Strength Adjustment Buffer

## Declarations

**Ethics approval and consent to participate:** Not applicable

**Consent for Publication:** All authors agree to the publication of this article

### Availability of Data and Material

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article

### Competing Interests

The authors declare there is no conflict of interest

### Funding

The authors would like to thank Tshwane University of Technology for funding the study

### **Authors' contribution**

All authors contributed to the study conception and design.

T Forsido and P. Ndibewu performed material preparation, data collection and analysis.

T. Forsido wrote the first draft of the manuscript and P. Ndibewu commented on previous versions of the manuscript.

**Conceptualization:** T. Forsido and P. Ndibewu;

**Methodology:** T. Forsido;

**Formal analysis and investigation:** T. Forsido;

**Writing** - original draft preparation: T. Forsido; Writing - review and editing: P. Ndibewu; funding acquisition: P. Ndibewu;

**Resources:** P. Ndibewu;

**Supervision:** P. Ndibewu.

All authors read and approved the final manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

### **Acknowledgement**

The authors would like to thank Tshwane University of Technology for funding the study

## **References**

1. Akuno, M. H., Nocella, G. Milia, E. P. and Gutierrez, L. 2019. Factors Influencing the Relationship between Fluoride in Drinking Water and Dental Fluorosis: A Ten-Year Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Water and Health*; **17**(6): 845–862.
2. Ameer, N., Mustafa, G., Khan, I., Zahid, M., Yasinzai, M., Shahab, S., Asghar, N., Ullah, I., Ahmad, A., Munir, A., Khan, H., Badshah, S., Shahid, I., Ahmad, M.N., Zia, A. and Ahmad, S. 2018. Chemical Sensors: Promising Tools for the Online Monitoring of Fluorides. *Fluoride*; **51**(3):252–266.
3. Bhattacharya, P.T., Misra, S.R. and Hussain, M. 2016. Nutritional Aspects of Essential Trace Elements in Oral Health and Disease: An Extensive Review. *Scientifica*; **2016**, Article ID 5464373.
4. Chiniah, J.P.R. 2017. *Exposure to Fluoride: Adverse Outcome and Toxicity in Review*. Thesis. Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Porto, Portugal.
5. Choudhary, S., Rani, M., Devika, S., Patra, A., Rajesh Singh, R. K. and Prasad, S. K. 2019. Impact of Fluoride On Agriculture: A Review On Its Sources, Toxicity in Plants and Mitigation Strategies.



- International Journal of Chemical Studies*; **7**(2): 1675-1680.
6. Cuartero, M.;Parrilla, M. and Crespo, G. A.2019. Wearable Potentiometric Sensors for Medical Applications. *Sensors*;**19**(363): 1-24.
  7. Dabrowska, S., Migdalski, J. and Lewenstam, A. 2019. A Breakthrough Application of a Cross-Linked Polystyrene Anion-Exchange Membrane for a Hydrogencarbonate Ion-Selective Electrode. *Sensors*;**19**(1268): 1-14.
  8. Demelash, H., Beyene, A., Abebe, Z. and Melese, A. 2019. Fluoride Concentration in Ground Water and Prevalence of Dental Fluorosis in Ethiopian Rift Valley: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *BMC Public Health*; **19**(1298): 1-9.
  9. de Oliveira, L.F.B., Souza, J.G.S., Mendes, R.I.P., Oliveira, R.C.N.,Oliveira, C.D., Lima, C.V. and Martins, A.M.E.d.L. 2016. Is there an Association Between the Presence of Dental Fluorosis and Dental Trauma Amongst School Children? *Ciênc. saúdecoletiva*; **21**(3): 967-976.
  10. Fakh, I., Durnan, O.,Mahvash, F.,Napal, I., Centeno, A., Zurutuza, A.,Yargeau, V. andSzkopek, T. 2020. Selective Ion Sensing With High Resolution Large Area Graphene Field Effect Transistor Arrays. *Nature Communications*;**11**(3226): 1-12.
  11. Fossey, S.,Vahle, J., Long, P., Schelling, S., Ernst, H., Boyce, R.W., Jolette, J., Bolon, B., Bendele, A., Rinke, M., Healy, L., High, W., Roth, D.R., Boyle, M. and Leininger, J. 2016. Nonproliferative and Proliferative Lesions of the Rat and Mouse Skeletal Tissues (Bones, Joints, and Teeth). *J ToxicolPathol*; **29**(3): 49S–103S.
  12. Gheorghe, I.F. and Ion, B. 2011. The Effects of Air Pollutants on Vegetation and the Role of Vegetation in Reducing Atmospheric Pollution, The Impact of Air Pollution on Health, Economy, Environment and Agricultural Sources, Dr. Mohamed Khallaf (Ed.), ISBN: 978-953-307-528-0, InTech, Available from: <http://www.intechopen.com/books/the-impact-of-air-pollution-on-health-economy-environment-andagricultural-sources/the-effects-of-air-pollutants-on-vegetation-and-the-role-of-vegetation-in-reducingatmospheric-pollu>
  13. Guth, S., Hüser, S., Roth, A., Degen, G., Diel, P., Edlund, K., Eisenbrand, G., Engel, K. H., Epe, B., Grune, T., Heinz, V., Henle, T., Humpf, H. U., Jäger, H., Joost, H. G., Kulling, S. E., Lampen, A., Mally, A., Marchan, R., Marko, D., ... Hengstler, J. G. 2020. Toxicity of Fluoride: Critical Evaluation of Evidence for Human Developmental Neurotoxicity in Epidemiological Studies, Animal Experiments and in Vitro Analyses. *Archives of Toxicology*; **94**(5), 1375–1415.
  14. Harhash, A.Y., ElSayad, I.I. and Zaghloul. A.G.S. 2017. Comparative *in Vitro* Study on Fluoride Release and Water Sorption of Different Flowable Esthetic Restorative Material. *European Journal of Dentistry*; **11**(2): 174-179.
  15. Hosokawa, M., Sugaya, C., Tsunoda, M., Kodama, Y., Sugita-Konishi, Y., Ohta, H. and Yokoyama, K. 2016. The Effects of Fluoride on the Bones and Teeth from ICR-Derived Glomerulonephritis (ICGN) Mice and ICR Mice after Subacute Exposure. Research Report. *Fluoride*; **49**(4 Pt 1):417-428.
  16. Joseph, S.E. and Johnson, A. 2016. Effects of Fluorosis and its Prevention: Review. *International Journal of Current Research*; **8**(09): 37641-37643.

17. Kanduti, D., Sterbenk, P. and Artnik, B. 2016. Fluoride: A Review of Use and Effects on Health. *Mater Sociomed*, **28**(2): 133-137.
18. Kurdi, M.S. 2016. Chronic Fluorosis: The Disease and Its Anaesthetic Implications. *Indian J Anaesth*; **60**(3): 157–162.
19. Linhares, D.P.S., Garcia, P.V. and Armindo Rodrigues, A.d. 2019. Fluoride in Volcanic Areas: A Case Study in Medical Geology. *Environmental Health - Management and Prevention Practices*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.86058>.
20. Luo, Q., Cui, H., Deng, H., Kuang, P., Liu, H., Lu, Y., Fang, J., Zuo, Z., Deng, J., Li, Y., Wang, X. and Zhao, L. 2017. Histopathological Findings of Renal Tissue Induced by Oxidative Stress Due to Different Concentrations of Fluoride. *Oncotarget*, **8**(31): 50430-50446.
21. Maadid, H., El Mzouri, E., Mabrouk, A. and Koulali, Y. 2017. Fluoride Content in Well Waters for Human and Animal Consumption with Reported High Incidence Levels of Endemic Fluorosis in BeniMeskine(Morocco). *Euro-Mediterr J Environ Integr*, **2**(11): 1-6.
22. Malin, A.J., Lesseur, C., Busgang, S.A., Curtin, P., Wright, R.O. and Sanders, A.P. 2019. Fluoride Exposure and Kidney and Liver Function among Adolescents in the United States: NHANES, 2013–2016. *Environment International*; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105012>.
23. Mettler-Toledo. 2018. Successful Ion Measurement, perfectION™ Combination Fluoride Electrode: Successful Ion Measurement. User Manual.
24. Narsimha, A. and Sudarshan, V. 2017. Contamination of Fluoride in Groundwater and Its Effect on Human Health: A Case Study in Hard Rock Aquifers of Siddipet, Telangana State, India. *Appl Water Sci*; **7**:2501–2512.
25. Narsimha, A. &Sudarshan, V. 2018. Drinking Water Pollution with Respective of Fluoride in the Semi-Arid Region of Basara, NirmalDistrict, Telangana State, India. *Data in Brief*,**16**: 752–757.
26. Neel, E.A.A., Aljabo, A., Strange, A., Ibrahim, S., Coathup, M., Young, A.M., Bozec, L. and Mudera, V. 2016. Demineralization–Remineralization Dynamics in Teeth and Bone. *International Journal OfNanomedicine*, **11**: 4743–4763.
27. Oweis, R. 2018. *Associations between Fluoride Intakes, Bone Outcomes and Dental Fluorosis*. Thesis; The University of Iowa.
28. Perumal, M. 2017. Skeletal Fluorosis in Chronic Renal Failure - A Case Report *University Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences*; **3**(3): 1-5.
29. Rhimi, N.,Mezghani, I., Elloumi, N.,Nasri, M.and Abdallah, F.B. 2016. Morphological and Anatomical Responses of Pear and Almond Trees to Fluoride Air Pollution. *Fluoride*,**49**(2)156-164.
30. Rocha, D. P., Anjos, G.T.C., Neri, T.S., Tronto, J., Pinto, F.G., Silva S.G. and Coelho, N.M.M. 2018. A Flow Injection Procedure Using Layered Double Hydroxide for on Line Pre-Concentration of Fluoride. *Talanta*: **178**:102–108.
31. Sebastian, S.T., Soman, R.R. and Sunitha, S. 2016. Prevalence of Dental Fluorosis among Primary School Children in Association with Different Water Fluoride Levels in Mysore District, Karnataka. *Indian Journal of Dental Research*; **27**(2): 151-154.

32. Shahab, S., Mustafa, G., Khan, I., Zahid, M., Yasinzai, M., Ameer, N., Asghar, N., Ullah, I., Nadhman, I., Ahmed, A., Munir, I., Mujahid, A., Hussain, T. and Ahmad, M.N. 2017. Effects of Fluoride Ion Toxicity on Animals, Plants, and Soil Health: A Review. Research Review. *Fluoride*; **50**(4):393–408.
33. ThermoFisher. 2016. Thermo Scientific Orion Fluoride Ion Selective Electrode User Manual; 254792-001 • Revision B.
34. Tokalioglu, E., Kartal, S. and SAhin, U. 2004. Determination of Fluoride in Various Samples and Some Infusions Using a Fluoride Selective Electrode. *Turk J Chem*; **28**: 203 – 211.
35. Ullah, R., Zafar, M. Z. and Shahani, N. 2017. Potential Fluoride Toxicity from Oral Medicaments: A review. *Iranian Journal of Basic Medical Sciences*; **20**(8): 1-8.
36. Unde, M. P., Patil, R.U. and Dastoor, P.P. 2018. The Untold Story of Fluoridation: Revisiting the Changing Perspectives. *Indian journal of occupational and environmental medicine*; **22**(3):121-127.
37. Walia, T., Abu Fanas, S., Akbar, M., Eddin, J. and Adnan, M. 2017. Estimation of Fluoride Concentration in Drinking Water and Common Beverages in United Arab Emirates (UAE). *The Saudi Dental Journal*; **29**:117-122.
38. Wang, J., Xu, H., Cheng, X., Yang, J., Yan, Z., Ma, H., Zhao, Y., Ommati, M.M., Mantharia, R.K. and Wang, J. 2020. Calcium Relieves Fluoride-Induced Bone Damage through the PI3K/AKT Pathway. *Food Funct.*; **11**, 1155-1164.
39. Wei, W., Pang, S. and Sun, D. 2019. The Pathogenesis of Endemic Fluorosis: Research Progress in the Last 5 Years. *J Cell Mol Med.*; **23**:2333–2342.
40. Yahyavi, H., Kaykhali, M. and Mirmoghaddam, M. 2016. Recent Developments in Methods of Analysis for Fluoride Determination. *Crit Rev Anal Chem*; **46**(2): 106-121.