

Indoor Tanning Are Industry Funded - Adrianna Rizzuto

Score: 5/5

The purpose of this article written by Maria Cohut is to inform consumers of bias within industry funded studies. Cohut writes this informative article in a completely unbiased way using independent sources to back claims she makes.

Indoor tanning is an unfavoured risky practice that has been studied by both the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the World Health Organization (WHO). Cohut explains that with the negative results determined by the CDC and WHO there are still studies conducted that have reached the opposite conclusion. Some studies for indoor tanning conclude that the practice is safe to take part in, and even possibly beneficial.

Cohut looks into how these studies can exist when there is proof against them, she found that the researchers that had beneficial or positive outcomes from tanning studies received tanning industry fundings. Funding skews the results of studies to the favoured outcome by causing researchers to focus on the positives and not mentioning the negatives. Cohut proves this with the use of a study by the BMJ, authors looked at studies and research concerning indoor tanning where they found that 78% of the industry funded studies reached a positive outcome, and only 4% of non industry funded studies had the same results.

Cohut does not sway from the title and intent of the article and proves throughout the article, with help from independent sources, that industry funding can in fact skew the results of research and studies. She is sure to include that the scale of the positively skewed research is relatively small, but is still harmful to a person who is misinformed. This is the first study done on the subject, but the results of monitoring funded studies prove a conflict of interest. Overall, the article does a good job explaining how industry funding can interfere with studies by skewing the results to a biased and favoured outcome.