

## **Collaborative Discussion 2: Peer Response 3 (261 words)**

Dear Amrol,

Thank you for your contribution to this discussion! I strongly agree that adhering to ethical practices transcends any specific industry considerations and is a responsibility of all parties involved. However, as you rightly highlighted, in this particular example of Whizzz cereal, there is a real potential concern of harm towards public health and safety. I appreciate your citing of the appropriate professional organisations, particularly the British Dietetic Association and Association for Nutrition, which adds additional credibility to the ethical framework you have presented. Additionally, you have acknowledged the need for a balanced approach while recognising that certain situations may require emphasising negative findings, showing nuanced ethical thinking.

Where I believe you could strengthen your argument, especially considering whether a balanced approach is appropriate in comparison to emphasising the negative results, is the importance of technically astute statistical testing based on the given data as is. The core ethical issue of selective reporting and “p-hacking” or data dredging, is central to Abi's dilemma, and incorporating appropriate statistical testing can support Abi in making the right ethical action and manage the potential impacts (Saini et al., 2014). Additional consideration needs to be had on Abi's actions versus those of the cereal maker. Abi always has the option of external reporting as a potential action if the manufacturer insists on publishing only positive results.

You have established important ethical principles regarding professional responsibility and public safety, especially considering the areas of public health, and your arguments could be further strengthened by incorporating consideration of ethical use of statistical analyses. Thanks again for your discussion.

#### References:

Saini, P., Loke, Y.K., Gamble, C., Altman, D.G., Williamson, P.R. & Kirkham, J.J. (2014) Selective reporting bias of harm outcomes within studies: findings from a cohort of systematic reviews. *Bmj*, 349.