2 More Criticisms of Content in Journal 'Science'

By Thom Golab — February 18, 2020

In criticizing the journal Science, when it rains it pours.

A few days ago, Dr. Berezow wrote about how the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the journal Science increasingly put their thumbs on the scale when choosing what science to report and share.

Dr. James Enstrom, a member of our Board of Trustees and Board of Scientific Advisors, has also taken Science to task, specifically, over the EPA’s planned revision of the rules governing science transparency. You can find a more detailed explanation of the controversy here. Dr. Enstrom, along with another member of our Board of Scientific Advisors, Dr. Stan Young, argue that, “This rule is needed because certain EPA-related findings are etiologically implausible and the authors of these findings refuse to address criticism and/or to conduct requested reanalysis.” Their specific concerns, classic studies of air pollution that have been used by the EPA to set air pollution standards. You can find their entire arguments here.
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