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 PM 2.5 is considered as a deadly minute microscopic particle that exists in the air as a pollutant. It enters the deepest parts of the lungs and causes early deaths among the people. It is considered as deadlier then alcohol, smoking and sodium intake. It is one of the most toxic environmental risk factors that is affecting the population all over the world.

 Environmental epidemiology is concerned about the impact of the environment on human health. According to Clean Air Scientific Advisory, the EPA position regarding the particles does not hole a stable ground as its report casually linked the premature death with these air pollutants without providing scientific proves. Environmental epidemiology is not a pseudoscience all the claims but must be verified through scientific evidence. Epidemiology gathers data from valid resources however, its ability to gather data is restricted. Also, it constrained by the swift changes that occur by emergency situations in the healthcare sector. By the time the data is collected verified and analyzed, it usually becomes outdated. But it cannot be considered as pseudo-science just because the other factors also contribute to human health. This view of the anti-regulatory parliament members is not valid.

 The effects of pollution can hit any type of population despite its socio-economic influence. It effects are more significant in the populations that already are suffering from the health conditions. Socioeconomic factors have little influence on the pollution situation. Clean Air and scientific Advisory committee provide advice to the EPA on the Air quality standards. According to the law EPA needs to set standards for the air pollutants based on their influence and priority order to maintain the safety. However, this committee has taken out all the epidemiologists from its team. It was further weekend by the by Mr. Wheeler when he disbanded 20 member advisory panel for PM 2.5 that included the environmental epidemiologists. This review panel was responsible for measuring the concentration and reviewing the PM 2.5 standards. No research can be done on the standards of air quality without environmental epidemiologists.

Dr. Tony Cox is not a good representative for the clean air committee, because he is using a narrow statistical approach in his studies and his actions to remove epidemiological studies from his research is a proof of this. The academic scientists and epidemiologists both are critical in formulating policies and regulating air standards. Only with a balanced approach, the policies can be formulated to maintain the air and environmental standards to save the vast American population from getting sick from the high concentration of PM 2.5 particles.