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In his article “Science Reporting Evidence-Based Journalism,” author David Brown discusses the potential problems of science journalism. To Brown, all scientific journalism should begin with the basis of evidence. Ideally, journalists would present evidence objectively, but sometimes, Brown argues, journalists embed their opinion so deeply in the article that the readers cannot discern their own beliefs about the topic because the information is delivered with such bias.

According to Brown, scientific journalism also suffers because editors shy away from scientific topics. Editors are accustomed to journalism that relies on what others think about a certain subject because it sells more. However, Brown believes scientific opinion is conditional or subjective because new information is constantly discovered, thereby challenging old theories. Thus, evidence is what the reader needs to know since it does not change. For instance, in 2006, the American College of Cardiology discovered a drug that shrunk the size of blockages in arteries. It was reported as the first miracle drug, though numerous medicines existed previously. Such exaggerations hurt the credibility of science reporting. Brown states that, in today’s society, saying something numerous times tends to make the topic become truth, like the occurrence in 2006. Brown concludes with two suggestions to stop such happenings of misinterpreted scientific journalism: scientific reporting must be done without exaggeration, and it should give enough evidence to readers to allow them to form their own opinions.
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