

Viewpoint: Confirmation bias, conflicts of interest plague 'science' behind glyphosate cancer claims

Anti-biotech activists hate the herbicide glyphosate, sold by Monsanto under the brand name Roundup. Those activists won a victory in 2015, when the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) issued a report classifying glyphosate as a "[probable human carcinogen](#)." That conclusion stood in stark contrast to the findings of every [regulatory agency](#) that has [evaluated glyphosate](#) over the past two decades, all of which have [found](#) the herbicide safe for people and the environment.

How did the World Health Organization diverge so sharply from the scientific consensus? By suppressing extensive evidence of glyphosate's safety. [October 2017] Reuters acquired a draft copy the IARC's glyphosate report. In the chapter on animal testing, references to numerous studies that found no link between glyphosate and cancer had been [systematically deleted](#). The IARC [refused to explain](#) how that happened other than to refer to its consensus review process.

Meanwhile, a [subsequent analysis](#) of how the IARC evaluated the animal testing studies found that "the classification of glyphosate as a probable human carcinogen was the result of a flawed and incomplete summary of the experimental evidence."

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis. Read full, original post: [The Deceptive Art of Confirmation-Biased 'Science': Condemning Glyphosate](#)