

From: edward archer <archer1@evolvingfx.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 12:10 PM

To: Onufrak, Stephen (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DNPAO) <seo5@cdc.gov>; Zaganjor, Hatidza (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DNPAO) (CTR) <xgq0@cdc.gov>; Pan, Liping (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DNPAO) <Imp6@cdc.gov>; Lee, Seung Hee (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DNPAO) <xde5@cdc.gov>; Park, Sohyun (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DNPAO) <geo7@cdc.gov>; Harris, Diane M. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DNPAO) <hva6@cdc.gov>

Cc: Web Info Quality (CDC) <infoquality@cdc.gov>

Subject: Retraction/correction request: Methodologic issues with your recent article in JAND

Dear Dr. Onufrak and colleagues,

As you may be aware, recent research demonstrated that dietary surveys, questionnaires, and recalls are pseudo-scientific and produce data that are both physiologically implausible and “inadmissible” as scientific data (please see links below). Nevertheless, you and your co-authors omitted this large body of contrary evidence.

Additionally, you and your co-authors ignored the discipline-wide prohibition against presenting self-reported energy intakes as valid estimates of actual energy intake or percent of actual energy intake. Please see Subar AF, Freedman LS, Tooze JA, et al. Addressing Current Criticism Regarding the Value of Self-Report Dietary Data. *J Nutr.* 2015;145(12):2639-2645.

As such, your paper is extremely misleading and may be in violation of the Data Quality Act because you were not diligent in "ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated".

Given that you and your co-authors were not “objective” and explicitly ignored a large and growing body of contrary evidence, will you retract the article or publish a correction? Readers unfamiliar with my work will be misled and think your results and conclusions were based on valid dietary data when they were not.

If you choose not to correct or retract your article, you may consider this email a formal request for you to correct your errors with respect to information quality as required by the data quality act. InfoQuality@cdc.gov is CCed.

To be precise, my colleagues and I published scathing methodological critiques in [Frontiers in Nutrition](#) and [European Heart Journal](#) (Is the PURE Study pure Fiction?) and a series of ‘[Controversy & Debate](#)’ papers in the *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* demonstrating the scientific illiteracy of nutrition epidemiologic methods such as food frequency questionnaires (FFQs), 24-hour dietary interviews, and food records, surveys, & diaries (please see links below).

In our articles we addressed logical fallacies, reactivity, lying, false memories, forgetting, mis-estimation, pseudo-quantification, the invalidity of nutrient databases, the [physiologic implausibility](#) and [inadmissibility](#) (i.e., meaninglessness) of epidemiologic dietary data, the non-quantifiability of measurement error, and the fact that nutrition epidemiologists choose to remain

ignorant of the escalating debate on '[diet-centrism](#)' (please see link below) by refusing to read, acknowledge, or cite decades of rigorous contrary evidence.

As you may know, the genesis of the 'Controversy & Debate' series was when Miguel Angel Martinez-Gonzalez, the senior author of the recently retracted and re-published PREDIMED study (Mediterranean Diet & CVD; New Eng J. Med.), challenged me to a debate on the validity of memory-based dietary assessment methods (M-BMs). Unfortunately, Miguel and Nerea failed to address any of the 'Black Swans' (i.e., contrary evidence) we raised and offered mere *ipse dixit* statements and fallacious arguments (e.g., *ignoratio elenchi*, *ad hominem*, *ad populum*).

Links to our work:

Frontiers in Nutrition: [The Failure to Measure Dietary Intake Engendered a Fictional Discourse on Diet-Disease Relations](#)

European Heart Journal: [Is the PURE study pure fiction?](#)

Journal of Clinical Epidemiology: [Controversy and Debate: Memory based Methods Paper 1: The Fatal Flaws of Food Frequency Questionnaires and other Memory-Based Dietary Assessment Methods](#)

Journal of Clinical Epidemiology: [Controversy and Debate: Memory-Based Dietary Assessment Methods Paper #3](#)

Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases: [In Defense of Sugar: A Critique of Diet-Centrism](#)

Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases: [The Demonization of 'Diet' Is Nothing New](#)

Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases: [The Contributions of 'Diet', 'Genes', and Physical Activity to the Etiology of Obesity: Contrary Evidence and Consilience](#)

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Edward Archer, PhD., MS
Chief Science Officer
EvolvingFX[±]
Cell: 850.570.3162