

GLP podcast/video: The case for weight-loss drugs; It's immoral to oppose CRISPR animals? Bad science and 'forever chemicals'



We don't always know why anti-depressants and obesity drugs work, but that shouldn't discourage patients from taking medications that can improve their lives. Gene-editing could boost animal welfare and expand access to nutritious food around the world. Is it therefore immoral to oppose the use of CRISPR-edited animals in agriculture? A slew of recent headlines has claimed that America's water supply contains dangerous chemicals. There is no science behind that alarming speculation.

Podcast:

Video:

Join hosts Dr. Liza Dunn and GLP contributor Cameron English on episode 238 of **Science Facts and Fallacies** as they break down these latest news stories:

- [**Viewpoint: Antidepressants and obesity medications work — but we don't know why. Here's why that's a problem**](#)

Anti-depressants and recently approved weight-loss drugs like Ozempic have something in common: they seem to work very well for many patients, who experience few negative side effects and manage to take control of their mental health or weight. This message is often obscured because we don't always know why these drugs work for some people but not others. That uncertainty drives fearful media coverage and engenders skepticism among the public. Can the available evidence help clarify how these medications work?

- [**Viewpoint: With meat demand expected to grow by 50% by 2050, it's 'immoral' to oppose gene-edited animals**](#)

As developing nations grow wealthier, demand for meat and other animal products will increase. Using gene editing technologies like CRISPR, scientists can breed animals that are disease resistant, and farmers who lose fewer cows, pigs and chickens to costly diseases can produce much more food than was previously possible. These observations prompt an intriguing question: is it immoral to oppose animal gene editing if it gives more people access to a sustainable food supply? One scientist says yes. Let's take a closer look at his argument.

Follow the latest news and policy debates on sustainable agriculture, biomedicine, and other 'disruptive' innovations. Subscribe to our newsletter.

[**SIGN UP**](#)

- **PFAS: EPA's Campaign to Promote Fear Over Facts**

The US has widespread access to safe, clean drinking water—which is a key “measure of progress against poverty, disease, and death,” [according to](#) the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Unfortunately, recent news coverage has misused research conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to allege that our water supply contains harmful chemicals. There is zero evidence to justify such an alarming claim.

Dr. Liza Dunn is a medical toxicologist and the medical affairs lead at Bayer Crop Science. Follow her on X [@DrLizaMD](#)

Cameron J. English is the director of bio-sciences at the [American Council on Science and Health](#). Visit [his website](#) and follow him on X [@camjenglish](#)