

## Letter to the Editor

### Time to Act

Exaggerated claims of asbestos risks in Thailand first appeared in the media a few years after importation of the mineral for industrial use, and such claims surge from time to time. Pros and cons of the discussion, however, are evidently derived from non-scientific misunderstanding and sometimes fraud, seemingly occurring against a political background which has proven confounding.<sup>1, 2</sup> More recently, arguments have been emerging based on the evidence of atmospheric asbestos pollution in Thailand,<sup>3, 4</sup> the results of which did not conform with the incidence of asbestos-related diseases in the country. The results of postmortem examination of lung tissue for types of asbestos bodies, to determine whether they are amphibole or chrysotile minerals, have been sought.

At this point, finally setting aside political decisions, it is the time to act in light of the ample scientific opinion on the industrial uses of chrysotile in this country. The debate should come to an end.

**Somchai Bovornkitti**

**The Academy of Science, The Royal Society of Thailand, Bangkok**

#### References

1. Bovornkitti S, ed. *Proceedings of the Forum on the Use of Chrysotile in Thai Industries and Health Impacts*. Bangkok: The Royal Institute of Thailand; c2014:112.
2. Bovornkitti S, Pitukpakorn M. Asbestos-related Diseases in Thailand: Past Experiences; Current and Future Perspectives. *Tham Med J*. 2019;19:215-219.
3. Incharoen P, Hama T, Arsa L, et al. Asbestos burden in the Autopsy Lung Tissue from General Thai Population. *The Open Respir Med J*. 2019;13:5-10.
4. Sriumpai S, Bovornkitti S, Pacharee P. Asbestos Bodies in Randomized Autopsied Lungs in Thailand. *J Med Assoc Thai*. 1985;68:174-182.