WHAT SCIENCE?

This Issue: Teeming With Tuna Misinformation

- Inside we ignore FDA science that says women can eat 56 ounces per week
- Read how we disregard over 100 peer-reviewed mercury in fish studies
- See us apply the same review techniques we use on toasters to your health

HOT: OMITTING FACTS ABOUT SEAFOOD
Here’s What We Omitted in Our Tuna Story:

1. The Facts
There has never been a confirmed case of mercury poisoning in the United States caused by normal seafood consumption.

2. The Numbers
FDA’s own conservative calculations say pregnant women can eat up to 56 ounces per week of albacore tuna, yet we recommend zero ounces.

3. The Research
The official draft advice on seafood consumption relies on over 100 peer-reviewed studies on mercury in fish. Those studies led the FDA to recommend pregnant women eat more fish than they currently do.

The Scientific Consensus on Seafood: What to Ignore

The independent research supporting the health benefits of seafood consumption has been growing for decades, as has the consensus that misinformation on seafood contributes to a serious, ongoing public-health harm.

Researchers have found that low seafood consumption is the second biggest dietary contributor to preventable death in the U.S. By maintaining a diet rich in seafood the study found some 84,000 cardiac-related deaths could be prevented each year.

A long-term study by the University of Rochester showed that children whose mothers cut back on seafood during pregnancy had significantly lower IQs. Those children missed out on key nutrients like Omega-3 fatty acids – which every major health organization says are essential for healthy brain development.

Women are already eating perilously little seafood, thanks in part to overblown warnings about mercury. A team of researchers for Harvard warned that this persistent scare-mongering poses a grave danger to public health. “[T]here is great public confusion over the risks of eating seafood. Unfortunately, the media and others may have contributed to this confusion by greatly exaggerating the unsubstantiated claim of a health risk from fish. These results from over two decades of research clearly show there is a health risk if adults don’t eat fish.”
Five Times We Completely Blew It.

1. **Canned Tuna**
   FDA and EPA warned that pregnant and breastfeeding women are eating dangerously little seafood in response to overblown mercury fears. So we decided to spook them even more with dubious numbers. We’re confident it will sell magazines.

2. **Child Safety Seats**
   In 2007, Consumer Reports claimed that 10 of 12 tested child car seats failed crash tests, most “disastrously.” Just two weeks later, we had to withdraw the report because we badly bungled the tests. In the New York Times, a former Consumer Reports board member called it “a whopper of a mistake.” Boy did we feel like “dummies.”

3. **Hybrid Cars**
   In 2006, we made a bunch of miscalculations and erroneously reported that a number of hybrid vehicles wouldn’t save their owners money over time. In fact, many of those models were cash savers, and we had to retract our report. Whoops!

4. **Pet Food**
   In 1998, we tested pet food and claimed one brand lacked sufficient nutrition. Turns out we made “systemic errors” in the way we measured various nutrients and had to back off our claims.

5. **Tipping Points**
   In 2000, a jury found that a number of statements we printed about an SUV’s tendency to tip over during turns “were untrue and one was published with reckless disregard for the truth.”

NAME THAT BRAND

CAN YOU GUESS WHAT ONCE VENERABLE MAGAZINE IS NAMED IN THIS QUOTE?

“_____________ is dangerously out of touch with science on this matter,” said NFI spokesman Gavin Gibbons in an email to reporters. “This is not about ______________ and ‘industry’ disagreeing. It is about ______________ promoting its own reckless, hyperbolic, quasi-science and in the process damaging its own credibility.”

ANSWER: CONSUMER REPORTS
Your Top Health Questions Answered!

What the Experts at the FDA Are Saying:

- “[T]he methodology employed by Consumer Reports overestimates the negative effects and overlooks the strong body of scientific evidence published in the last decade.”

- “The Consumer Reports analysis is limited in that it focuses exclusively on the mercury levels in fish without considering the known positive nutritional benefits attributed to fish.”

- “The current science no longer supported categorizing fish solely by mercury levels.”

100+ peer-reviewed studies we dismiss

Available at bookstores or at ConsumerRemorse.lol/books