GLP podcast: AAP refuses to print rebuttal to anti-GMO study; Billion-dollar anti-pesticide 'money grab'; Ultra-processed food won't make you obese?

he American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) published a spurious attack on GM crops and pesticides, then reneged on its commitment to print a rebuttal. What happened? The Environmental Working group (EWG) is collaborating with tort lawyers to attack yet another pesticide. A prominent nutrition researcher has grown skeptical of some of his earlier conclusions about "ultra-processed" food. Let's examine the evidence that led him to change his mind.

Podcast:

Join host GLP contributor Cameron English and guest host Dr. Kevin Folta on episode 256 of Science Facts and Fallacies as they break down these latest news stories:

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

The AAP's flagship journal *Pediatrics* came under fire early this year for publishing a guidance document questioning the safety of biotech crops and pesticides. After several scientists contacted the journal to offer constructive criticism, AAP agreed to print a rebuttal to the original article. Inexplicably, AAP abruptly changed course, refusing to publish a response or even interact with the experts who criticized its analysis of GM crops.

• <u>Viewpoint: Money grab — How the Environmental Working Group works hand-in-hand with tort lawyers to generate billion-dollar junk suits</u>

Just two business days after EWG published a study attacking the herbicide chlormequat, tort lawyers in New York used the paper to justify filing a class-action lawsuit in California. They're suing Quaker Oats, which is owned by Pepsi, alleging that trace amounts of chlormequat in the breakfast cereal could cause fertility issues and harm developing babies. The study itself provides no evidence to support these allegations, so what are the lawyers thinking? It appears we have a pending billion-dollar junk lawsuit on our hands.

 Hyper-palatable food: Scientist who published the seminal study showing the dangers of all ultra-processed food backs away from his theory

It has become fashionable in recent years to blame America's growing obesity problem on "ultra-processed" food: highly palatable snacks and other packaged options that contain sugar, salt and fat. But this hypothesis might lose some of its prominence now that a prominent researcher in the field has backed away from his 2019 study linking processed food to weight gain. Dr. Kevin Hall, a scientist at the National Institutes of Health, now says there is little evidence that processing explains our rapid weight gain; the real problem may be that these foods are so flavorful that many people choose to eat more of them than

they should, which promotes weight gain. Hall has plans to conduct a new clinical study to test this hypothesis.

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

Cameron J. English is the director of bio-sciences at the <u>American Council on Science and Health</u>. Visit <u>his website</u> and follow him on X <u>@camjenglish</u>