

Biotech activists caught plagiarizing web polemic in journal article challenging GMO safety consensus

Did you ever read something and swear you have read it somewhere else before? It happens to me now and then, particularly when something is so memorably awful that it burns a special place in my brain.

Here is one such instance. A 2015 paper published by [Hilbeck et al.](#), co-authored by luminaries including Shiva, Hansen, Heinemann, Antoniou and others, is substantially lifted word for word from a 2013 website.

Since its publication in January 2015, anti biotech activists have reminded us again and again, of the peer-reviewed journal that soundly declares no consensus on GMO crops. The paper, published in *Environmental Sciences Europe*, is a 'Discussion' paper, which means it is a non-peer reviewed opinion piece.

As a scientist, reviewer and editor I have a lot of problems with such work. These can spark discussion and speculation, but are obviously distinguished as ideas representing a viewpoint that may not be supported by evidence.

The part that bothers me is, that aside from an abstract, reference numbers and concluding paragraph, it is virtually word-for-word cut-n-paste from a website constructed in 2013. Use of online plagiarism check tools indicate that there is 0% chance of the published work being original.

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the variety of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [Lazy or Plagiarism?](#)