

IARC defends methodology, 'probably carcinogenic' glyphosate designation against criticisms

The World Health Organization's cancer agency is firmly defending its finding that a widely used herbicide is "probably carcinogenic" despite reports cited by key House lawmakers.

...

[Oregon Rep. Suzanne Bonamici] entered into the hearing record a series of responses IARC Director Christopher Wild has sent to the panel in recent months.

Wild specifically criticized two stories from Reuters reporter Kate Kelland that suggested the evaluation, known as a monograph, excluded key information.

...

One claimed that Aaron Blair, a U.S. National Cancer Institute epidemiologist who led the glyphosate review, excluded from the assessment forthcoming research that he knew would find no link between the herbicide and cancer.

That was because "IARC Monographs are based on independent scientific review of published and not on the basis of unpublished or 'secret data' unavailable publicly," Wild explained in a Nov. 20, 2017, [letter](#).

...

The other story from last year flagged by Science Committee leaders claimed that IARC omitted evidence that went against its conclusion that glyphosate likely causes cancer in humans and edited a draft review significantly before it was released to the public.

But most of the differences between that draft and the final monograph "specifically relate to a review article" that litigation against Monsanto Co., which uses glyphosate in its popular Roundup herbicides, revealed was ghostwritten by the company, Wild said.

Read full, original post: [WHO rebuts GOP, media on glyphosate cancer warning](#)