

By excluding industry's glyphosate studies, IARC dismisses most relevant research says critic

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis.

A little more than a year ago, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), reviewed studies on glyphosate and concluded it's a "probable human carcinogen."

IARC's findings "baffled" the scientific community, including regulators, Hank Campbell, president of the American Council on Science and Health, told *Legal Newsline*. . . .

. . . .

When IARC puts a panel together, it won't call on experts from the industry — or those who have consulted for the industry, he said.

That leaves out a number of smart people in a field where consulting with the industry is the mark of a high-caliber academic, he added.

Leaving out industry studies also dismisses a substantial portion of relevant research.

"Obviously (regulatory agencies) also put the burden of proof on companies to prove something is safe," he said. "Companies must pay for studies to show that, not taxpayers. So if you say you won't allow industry studies, you leave out everything except academic epidemiology."

Read full, original post: [Controversial body's glyphosate research isn't reliable, critics say](#)