

## Re: Put your babies on statins

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2004-08/0066.html>

---

**From:** Robert (*Robert\_at\_hotmail.com*)

**Date:** 08/01/04

Date: Sat, 31 Jul 2004 19:42:01 -0700

"Herman Rubin" <hrubin@odds.stat.purdue.edu> wrote in message  
news:cehd6v\$268o@odds.stat.purdue.edu...

> *In article <10gg4at6assd6c9@corp.supernews.com>,*

> *Robert <Robert@hotmail.com> wrote:*

>

> > *"Herman Rubin" <hrubin@odds.stat.purdue.edu> wrote in message*

> > *news:ce8udv\$3gjc@odds.stat.purdue.edu...*

> > > *In article <lzHNc.3492\$3L7.1370@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>,*

> > > *Bill <xxx@yy.zz> wrote:*

>

> > > > *"Zee" <zwalanga@yahoo.com> wrote in message > And: Some industry  
studies*

> > *say*

>

> .....

>

> > > > *What about the real meta-analysis rather than the so-called ones? I  
think*

> > *the*

> > > *one you are referring to had one person associated with industry  
and*

> > *two*

> > > *that were not. What is your theory on this? They all got together and*

> > > *conspired?*

>

> > > *It is rare that a correct meta-analysis is performed in*

> > > *most of these situations. One cannot do it properly*

> > > *without having the results of all studies, including the*

> > > *"insignificant" ones.*

>

> > *That would never happen as not all studies are published. Companies have  
a*

> > *propriety interest in not revealing corporate private studies which might*

> > *put them at a disadvantage competitively.*

>

> *I have addressed this issue; good fraud legislation will*

> *take care of this point.*

- >
- > *However, this will not solve the problem. We can consider,*
- > *for example, dietary sodium. I doubt that any companies are*
- > *getting rich on low-sodium foods. The meta-analyses are in*
- > *sharp disagreement. However, what I gather from the review*
- > *paper in \_Science\_, the journal of the American Association*
- > *for the Advancement of Science, is that some people are*
- > *sensitive to sodium, and the other factors may be far more*
- > *important for the rest. Papers without "significant" results*
- > *are rarely published.*

Some diabetics are more sensitive to sodium as far as hypertension. Significant results not published? How can you judge something that is not published? There are various reasons why something isn't published. Private companies do private company research not intended for publication. University research is all about publishing. Editors must approve "significant" articles after reviewing.

- >
- > *The other point of that is when*
- > *>other individuals perform research, such as individuals which proudly*
- remark
- > *>non drug money input, have a predetermined intended interest and results*
- > *>show a negative anti-interest finds they don't publish that. They may*
- tweek
- > *>the study to obtain results they wanted and then publish those.*
- > *>It takes money to perform research and those people providing it already*
- > *>have a predetermined interest.*
- > *>It is pretty much like a court of law where competing expert witnesses*
- are
- > *>bought and paid for.*
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > --
- > *This address is for information only. I do not claim that these views*
- > *are those of the Statistics Department or of Purdue University.*
- > *Herman Rubin, Department of Statistics, Purdue University*
- > *hrubin@stat.purdue.edu Phone: (765)494-6054 FAX: (765)494-0558*