



NAUTILUS

July 23, 2014

Dear Dr. Coldiron,

Thank you for bringing to our attention your concerns about the *Nautilus* article, "America is Getting the Science of Sun Exposure Wrong." We appreciate the opportunity to have an open dialogue with you. However we can not accept your characterization of the article as carrying misinformation, and none of the facts which you raise in your letter contradict those reported in the story.

The article does not advocate tanning, nor does it claim an absence of DNA damage to skin cells from low-level exposure, nor a zero risk of skin cancer for some skin types. It does point out the hazards of underexposure to the sun, particularly for those with darker skin.

We recognize that the role of vitamin D in disease is actively being debated, and reference a very recent review from the *European Journal of Cancer* on the topic, which states that vitamin D levels are inversely associated with cancer risk, for certain kinds of cancers. Your opinion that encouraging sun exposure to get vitamin D is "highly irresponsible" is not shared by Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, which is rather the whole point of the article.

The article does not claim that a direct causal effect has been proven between sun exposure and lowered melanoma risk. It points to two studies which suggest a correlation, which is approximately equal to the level of evidence routinely accepted in your field.

We feel the article performs a service to the reader by presenting a balanced view of the risks and rewards of sun exposure, consistent with the Academy's own stated goals of educating the public to act in their own best interest.

Sincerely,

Dr. Michael Segal, PhD
Editor in Chief
Nautilus