Viewpoint: Journal Pediatrics reneges on its commitment to print response to botched article claiming GMOs are harmful to children. Here's what they censored



lot has been said about the journal *Pediatrics* December 2023 Clinical Report on "<u>Use of</u> <u>Genetically Modified Organism (GMO)-Containing Food Products in Children</u>". The poor scholarship and citation bias are alarming, and the bias against safe technology is clear.

### Volume 153, Issue 1

January 2024

PEDIATRICS	
Alf 1923 Radio Gary Milanian Mar Hadapi Iragan Ingata 1 di Balahan di se	admittación canal altracer Republica Maria Hanna de Rac Mariana Maria I facer de RECENTES DERES RECENTES DERES
- Decision	COMPENSATION CO.
Real Real Relation Strong to 1911 Internet of Traduct State of Transporter Materials, 111 Internet	Reserve Manadage in Paralities, 2 (1), investing and 2 (1) interar-
Statute of Residence in Marin & State	Realty for March Antibatic Starture for Valority (0) (1.1) Realty and (1.1) After Star
Paralities to Mathematile Estimately Protects Reviews	RENEW ARTICLE 1999 and March Store Republican's Storing at all
And well in Angela (and think on Tab. 400 or of Anderson & at	STATE OF THE ART REVEN
Renteredists Relation for a Difference Register	Patholics Report Reports, Recognition, Patholipus, 3.1. Minute control of Programming
Reporting to Photoscologic Radicald Res 1 of 2012 of Res. Divisio, and Found Resid Radio Radio A Desp with Dapas	SPECIAL ARTICLE Patients Spectromet Researcher (11 Second of Research Report Researcher)
Names and Address of the Winston of Taxabalian	Increasing Discretion Reservices Trading in the ID
Referred BD, Resetting and Mile BD 1 of Page 4 of Registering in Provid Start Reset Ingent and	Realth Carro Ration Research Indiants Researching
8 - References et al	CASE REPORTS
Teachine in teachine Series (1.4. House of 1.4. Results in a differentiative field and Results (1.4. Andress of 1.4.	6 Sam of Research Rectages Trade With Incontribut 1 Contact National Activity
Annual and Annual and Annual Annua	Water of Next Service Interface War 1999 Service
Respective Park Inproving States of A. J. Support of all	d it torow put? Apriled
POINT INC. POPULATION	Inglaterate if for Agentenian in New Agenesia 1 Party of a
Although the fault Burley Burley State	Phone Tric and Dischark ACADOMY OF PEDACTINES MRP or PART for Respiration Recentles and Informa- 7 Amount of all
8 Matulia Approach is Excellent Threater Injuries ( 3 Papers et p)	<sup>1</sup> Security of Parlament and Parlament Reads in Security 2017 Interface decomposition of Parlament Reads of Security 2017
READING TO BEEL AND	secondary way is carry and accurate
EDUTY, DVERSITY, INCLUDIN, AND JUSTICE	SUPPLISED? 1- accompanies this lease other for followed in tegrosses and formation follows for Others We Autor forgetally in terms. Security

FROM THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS | CLINICAL REPOR

# Use of Genetically Modified Organism (GM Products in Children **FREE**

Steven A. Abrams, MD, FAAP 🔤 ; Jaclyn Lewis Albin, MD, FAAP; Philip J. Landrigan, MD COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Address correspondence to Steven A. Abrams, MD, FAAP. E-mail:sabrams613@gmail. *Pediatrics* (2024) 153 (1): e2023064774.

\Xi Views 🗸

https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2023-064774 Article history 🕑

Split-Screen

р р р р р р р р р р р р р р р р

When I wrote to editor-in-chief Dr. Lewis. First, he indicated that I was invited to submit a response to the article that would be posted below the article on its website. I submitted my response, and it was not published on the site. My guess is that it illuminated the bankruptcies of the article in a manner that ran counter to the authors', editor's and journal's narrative.

So I'll publish my comment here.

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

Dear Pediatrics Readership,

The article by Abrams et al. represents a stunning example of how misinformation spreads- even through a credible conduit. *Pediatrics* is a respected journal, so when a paper implies a technology is dangerous, physicians and the general public take note. That's good. But if the message runs counter to the scientific consensus built from tens of thousands of studies, regulatory approvals, and 50 years of use, it confuses the issue and breaks trust for those of us

that communicate science. Worse, it breaks the credibility of Pediatrics, a journal that needs to lead scientific discourse.

As an editor, reviewer and scientific author, I was shocked by the disconnect between this work and the broad scientific consensus. The article lacks scholarly rigor, suffers from omission, and seeks to create a narrative rather than correctly communicate evidence. While there are many problems with this work, some of the most glaring problems are:

#### 1.

Failed Central Premise. There is no direct evidence that glyphosate causes cancer at dietary or occupational exposures. The IARC, other agencies within the World Health Organization, and dozens of international regulators stand by this conclusion. This is not stated in the review.

#### 2.

Citation Bias. Cited evidence comes from a meta-analysis by Zhang et al., 2019, which showed a relatively slight increase in risk of a family of rare blood cancers. Critics indicate that this work compared disparate datasets to find an association at only the highest exposure and time point (Kabat et al., 2021). Abrams et al. also cite a single paper by perennially incorrect authors that genetically engineered crops ("GMOs") are not safe (Hillbeck et al., 2016). The largest study of 54,000 applicators over decades shows no association with non-Hodgkin lymphoma, but the authors curiously fail to cite that (Andriotti et al., 2018).

#### 3.

Omission of Limitations. While the cited research articles are clear about critical limitations of the studies, these authors cite the same work as conclusive evidence of the dangers of glyphosate.

#### 4.

Confusing Hazard and Risk. The authors continually conflate detection with risk. The dose makes the poison and analytical chemistry techniques can detect concentrations orders of magnitude below physiological relevance.

#### 5.

Logical Fallacy. The authors continually make the argument from ignorance, stating that "more study is needed" when the crops and herbicide have been massively studied, and risks and benefits are well described.

These are just several of the problems with this work. Many independent scientists and physicians have criticized the work online, so multiple dissections are available. While it is impossible to

know intent, the language used and messaging seems highly motivated, like almost a commercial for organic crop production.

We remain open to the idea that genetic engineering and associated chemistries could carry undue risk. But that conclusion comes from evidence leading to consensus, not cherry-picked and assembled morsels that manufacture risk in a biased narrative

Here is a response by Kevin Folta et al. to the Pediatrics article.

## Are children and pregnant women risking their heal "GMO" foods? The American Association of Pediatrics says 'yes'. The real question: Is the AAP endangerin vulnerable?

Andrea Love, Jessica Steier, Kevin Folta, Nicole Keller | January 18,





The authors are invited to join me in discussion on the Talking Biotech Podcast anytime to discuss the work.

Kevin M. Folta is a professor, keynote speaker and podcast host. Follow Professor Folta on X @kevinfolta

A version of this article was originally posted at <u>Kevin Folta's blog Illumination 2.0</u> and is reposted here with permission. Any reposting should credit both the GLP and original article.