

•  
2 days ago

Quote

You have been banned from participating in [REDACTED]. You can still view and subscribe to [REDACTED], but you won't be able to post or comment.

Note from the moderators:

You have been banned for breaking the rules of this sub. Re: NO shaming, downvoting, sarcasm, or displaying otherwise demeaning and negative behavior in response to others stating evidence-backed facts or discussing safe, healthy, science-based parenting choices and/or the results thereof.

If you have a question regarding your ban, you can contact the moderator team for [REDACTED] by replying to this message.

**Reminder from the Reddit staff:** If you use another account to circumvent this subreddit ban, that will be considered a violation of [the Content Policy](#) and can result in your account being [suspended](#) from the site as a whole.

[u/dark\\_unicorn](#)

•  
2 days ago

Quote

Report

Yes, I do have questions.

Why am I being banned? And if I am, why are other commenters not?

Mainly because, the other commenters to my posts were deliberately trying to bait me. They were not reading articles in their entirety, selectively quoting, and changing the goalposts on their statements when challenged. And often taking my comments out of context, while taking their own within their own context.

The user [REDACTED] actually asked for a source, then when provided with one, continued to attack my posts saying that without sources I was contravening the sub. This in spite of a source having been provided.

In addition to this, they were providing pseudo-replicated studies, not scientific ones. If this is a science based sub, why are non-scientifically valid studies permitted? Why is [REDACTED] not being banned for this?

I really need a proper explanation. I provided my position and was continually harassed. Is that behaviorist acceptable in this sub?

[REDACTED] called a valid scientific study, with a clear experimental design, 'silly.'

They also used straw man arguments, changing the subject of the original post from baby food, and my comment, to 'Highly processed garbage.' Deliberately misrepresenting my comment. How is this permissible is what is supposed to be a science based sub?

[REDACTED] also made the comment that a whole food diet constituted 'as balanced a diet as humanly possible.' When asked for citations for this claim, instead provided a bunch of articles that weren't relevant and didn't address their ascertainment at all. Once again, why is this ok?

[REDACTED] deliberately misdefined what 'processed food' means in order to push their own agenda. Directly contravening objective facts. Then when challenged simply stated their colloquial interpretation to be fact.

Regarding downvoting - I have downvoted any comments that I deemed to be deliberately aggressive, to constitute bullying, or deliberately misrepresenting information. Which is not outside reddit requirements.

[u/dark\\_unicorn](#)

•  
2 days ago

Quote  
Report

Just for some additional perspective... [REDACTED] posted a link to this article to push their agenda: <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/shortcuts/2013/sep/10/truth-about-baby-food>

However, the purpose of this study was to show that home made food often exceeds nutritional requirements for babies. The article they posted was an opinion piece using selective parts from the study to push their own narrative. The article itself admits that babies don't need to eat as much solids as they're fed.

Clearly, [REDACTED] didn't actually read or analyze the article, otherwise they would have realized that the study it's talking about is the one from Glasgow, that I had posted originally!

So I ask again... why is this sort of behavior allowed?

[REDACTED]

•

2 days ago  
Quote

You are being banned for breaking a rule listed on the side of the sub. I'll get into the second part of that question in a moment.

You asserted that *numerous* studies had found that prepackaged baby food was superior in nutritional value to homemade baby food, and provided one link to a magazine article that in no way supported this claim. Which valid study was called 'silly'? Are you quite certain there is such a study and that you're not referring to the Huffington Post article you linked?

How, exactly, are PubMed (a US national scientific journal) articles, or any other articles linking peer reviewed research 'non-scientifically valid', especially in comparison to your 'source'?

Whole food is, in basic terms, the opposite of processed food. Think a piece of sirloin vs a hotdog. Studies finding nutritional deficits and health concerns associated with the consumption of processed food are automatically, therefore, showing that consuming whole foods is the healthier choice. You mistook 'whole food' as meaning 'raw food' when that is not the case. No one called you any kind of derogatory name, attacked you, or otherwise bullied you in any way whatsoever.

Finally, let me address the reason why those other users weren't banned. [REDACTED] has never, to the best of my knowledge, broken any of the rules of the sub. And [REDACTED] Lol. I'm not sure how to break it to ya but ...I am [REDACTED]. It's my sub. And not only did you clearly break the rules I have listed on the sidebar, but you tried to lie to me about what I posted and said to you. You don't deserve to remain a part of my sub. You've proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that banning you was the right choice.

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

2 days ago  
Quote  
Report

The study called 'silly' was the Glasgow study.

The link I provided contained a link to the Glasgow study. [REDACTED] also referred to this study, but through a Guardian article. If I am being banned for how I linked the study, then so should [REDACTED].

PubMed is not exactly a reputable journal. It contains some good observational studies, but very few scientific ones. I just wonder, do you understand how journals work? You are aware that writers and peer reviewers are not paid for their contributions, right? You are aware that submissions are more like advertising for the writers? Basically to get their names out to secure more grant funding. So both writers and peer reviewers have a vested interest. Which means all their work needs to be critically analysed before accepting blindly. I would know... I have both written and participated in peer review for a number of journals.

And the claim I made was that homemade foods are not always necessarily healthier. Which was listed as a result in the Glasgow study.

I didn't mistake the meaning of whole foods. Whole foods are plant based foods that are unrefined, or processed, as little as possible. That is the literal definition. Using the justification of taking a colloquial definition doesn't change that fact.

As for scientific validity, that comes down to methodology. If the method contains type 1, or type 2 statistical errors, the study is not scientifically valid. Similarly, if the experimental design contains pseudoreplication, the results are not scientifically valid. Can you explain to me why the Glasgow study wasn't valid, and why all of [REDACTED]'s links were, based on the statistical requirements for scientific validity.

I just got to the bit we're you admit to being [REDACTED]. And it all makes sense now. The lack of understanding of the material, the miscomprehension, the animosity, the unwillingness to debate, and inability to critically think. I hate to break it to you, but as a professional scientist, it's clear you have little understanding of scientific method. So then why have you been tasked with moderating a 'scientific' sub?

So I now understand that the reason for the ban is due to your inability to address technical scientific concepts and to challenge assumptions. But this is no fault of mine. I see you're allowed to break all the rules, and when someone challenges your lack of understanding, you simply ban them out of spite.

[REDACTED]

.

a day ago  
Quote

There have been a number of studies, mostly from the UK, that show store bought food is actually healthier than homemade in many cases.

There are many more from other sources. You'll find them easily with a search.

You're lying. Straight up. These are direct quotes from your comments. I've searched endlessly and only found the Scottish study you referenced, linked in several contemporary articles, which came to the conclusion that homemade baby food is unquestionably more nutritious, but that baby food specifically made from certain recipes can contain more fat and calories than is recommended for children ages 4 mos to 4 years.

"The study, led by researchers in Scotland, found that home-cooked foods made based on *recipes in cookbooks for infants and preschoolers* provided up to 77 percent more nutrients than similar foods that were commercially prepared."

"About 50 percent of the home-cooked *recipes* evaluated in the study exceeded calorie recommendations for young children in the United Kingdom, containing about 51 percent more calories than recommended, on average. And 37 percent of the *recipes* exceeded dietary fat recommendations."

"65 percent of the ready-made meals analyzed by the researchers met calorie recommendations. However, these foods provided less dietary fat than young children need for growth and development, and also had a lower than recommended protein content."

Nowhere does it state in the study in question, nor in any other study, article, journal, or anywhere else, let alone in "many" of these, that commercially prepared, prepackaged baby food, is, and I quote, directly from your comment, "actually healthier than homemade", or even that, also taken directly from your comment, "The vast majority of baby food is actually very good quality." Nor did ever specifically mention that, again I'll quote you directly: "These were healthy recipe cookbooks for kids." And seasoning and oil being unhealthy for babies is patently false. Outside of giving children unhealthy amounts of sodium, sugar, or adding very hot spices, the idea that seasoning your child's food is a myth, and kids actually need plenty of good fats in their diet for proper development.

Let's address another falsehood you're trying to use to back up your claims. Here is the first result for the definition of whole food, as well, copied and pasted directly from the source: "whole food - /' hōl food/ noun BRITISH: food that has been processed or refined as little as possible and is free from additives or other artificial substances." Here is the second definition, from Merriam-Webster: "whole food - noun - definition of whole food: a natural food and especially an unprocessed one." Here is the third one, from Dictionary.com: "wholefood [hohl-food ] noun British:

food with little or no refining or processing and containing no artificial additives or preservatives; natural or organic food. A fourth, from Collins English Dictionary: Wholefoods are foods which have not been processed much and which have not had artificial ingredients added." A fifth, from Cambridge Dictionary: "Whole foods: food that has not had any of its natural features taken away or any artificial substances added." Another one, from SF Gate: "Whole foods mainly include plant-based foods such as vegetables, fruits and nuts, and animal foods such as eggs, meat, fish and poultry." And another: "Whole foods are as close to their natural form as possible whilst still being fit to eat (i.e., no one is suggesting eating raw meat, lol) and as they only undergo the bare minimum of processing."

Yes, most *vegans* and *vegan* websites will say this should also be a totally plant-based diet, but to claim that their specific definition is the correct one just to twist the facts to fit your case is far more intentionally disingenuous than using readily available research to back a claim that a whole food diet is just about the healthiest way to eat. I've never seen a study of any kind that claims to prove otherwise.

Here is an article that explains what a whole food diet actually is: <https://www.webmd.com/food-recipes/features/the-whole-foods-diet#1>. So basically anything else you feel should be a part of your or your child's diet could be termed "processed garbage", because it's unnecessary and nearly invariably unhealthy according to basically every science-backed guideline out there.

██████████ called one of the quotes from the *article* you linked "silly", and nowhere did anyone argue the validity of the study referenced in that article, simply debated your attempts to slant the results to fit your factually incorrect narrative.

You can use whatever words you want to use to try to get whatever nonsense across that you feel will somehow help your case, but the fact is, based on this interaction alone, it is clear that YOU are the one who displays, as you said, a "lack of understanding of the material, the miscomprehension [sic], the animosity, the unwillingness to debate, and inability to critically think". You are partially correct about one of the lesser/more personal reasons for the ban being an "inability to address technical scientific concepts and to challenge assumptions", however, that inability is yours. It doesn't matter what you claim to be -- as the old adage says, actions speak louder than words!

You broke the rules, were rightfully banned for it, then dishonestly tried to spin the discussion to appear that you were the victim, and (hilariously) tried to implicate me in your fictional tale of victimization, and when you were called out, rather than admitting you'd fucked up, you continued to lie, and then resorted to ad hominem abusive, ridiculously fallacious tactics to try to bolster your bruised ego. Do you not understand that we all have access to the same Google searches you do, when you invent these claims, and can easily check for ourselves and see with our own eyes that you are making these things up to back up your stance? I get the feeling you assume you're the brightest soul around in any given situation (based on your attempts to blatantly lie and manipulate/gaslight as evidenced above), and people who do that are never actually very intelligent. But of course, as it tends to be part of a larger pathological thought process, I don't expect you to have an epiphany and realize you might do better to stop thinking that way.

So I'm sure I'll be receiving some pat reply presuming that you know more about scientific method than anyone else involved, and that you're somehow telepathically able to determine my background, intellectual capacity, and education level based on the fact that I didn't smile and agree with your false claims and banned you for breaking the rules here. It's too bad you didn't just choose to be a decent, honest human being, or I'd have lifted the ban. It actually turns out that way most of the time. I have a rule of banning first, and then using the person's response to decide if it was the right decision. I find that to be most effective in determining whether I've made a mistake or not, and as I said, in your case, you've totally confirmed that my decision was the right one.

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

a day ago

Quote

Report

You're arguing nonsense. Most of it irrelevant. And only semantics. Stick to the facts.

You also need to look up manipulation and gaslighting. Because you'll see it's actually you that is behaving this way. You are a bully.

I see the most important aspect of my response was ignored. The part about scientific methodology. You failed to address pseudoreplication and statistical errors, I'm guessing because you don't understand it.

How can someone who doesn't understand this, be the moderator of a science sub? The answer is, they can't. Which is why you're doing such a bad job at it. And why you're so aggressive and bitter.

Please educate yourself.

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

a day ago

Quote

Report

You had no intention of lifting the ban. You're ignorance was put on display and you didn't like that. This is about your insecurity. Nothing more.



•

a day ago

Quote

You're pretty entertaining. Glad you're able to convince yourself of all of that, but from over here, it sounds a whole lot more like you're regurgitating everything people have said about *you* over the years, and hoping some bit of it actually applies to me so I'll take offense. (Hint: You haven't had any luck yet. Maybe keep reaching deeper into the trove of accurate criticisms others have addressed to you -- you might actually find one that hits close enough to bug me a little. Who knows.)

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

a day ago

Quote

Report

I'm fairly certain i have found an insult that bugs you.... you're unable to describe with any detail what methodology is required for valid scientific conclusions.

You keep deflecting that question with personal insults. Because, quite simply, you don't know. Your credibility is shot.

Fortunately, after a quick look at your subs members and posts, it clear you're just a drop in the ocean. You're the one doing most of the posting... and this sub is essentially a ghost town. Lucky too, considering that you have no understanding of what science is. So your misinformation is limited to less than two thousand people.

And good for you, being so proud of yourself for being a bully and a hypocrite. Don't change.

And no... no ones ever said anything bad about me. Only you. And it's clearly just you deflecting your insecurity, stemming from your ignorance. So I'm not bothered.

In fact, I'm quite enjoying watching you dig yourself an even deeper hole every time you reply. At this rate, you should be reaching China soon. And considering your understanding of science, you probably believe that's possible.



•

a day ago

Quote

"...no ones ever said anything bad about me" Lmao. You're absolutely, without a doubt, a pathological liar. And it's pretty hilarious that you continue to desperately try to come up with *something* that might possibly be close enough to actuality to upset me, in order to satisfy your desperate, vehement desire to hurt my feelings. Unfortunately for you, not only are your insults so far from the truth as to be more humorous than hurtful, I could not possibly care less what some pretend internet scientist with an obvious double digit IQ thinks of me or my sub or really, pretty much anything. Feel free to continue to offer me bits of free entertainment with your outraged, furious hissy fits, if you wish, but it's really not worth the hysterics you're putting yourself into when you're so far off base and so massively and blatantly out of your depth.

██████████

•

a day ago

Quote

I literally feel like I'm dealing with Donald Trump here, are you Trump? Seriously. Lol.

██████████

•

19 hours ago

Quote

Report

What is pseudoreplication?

Summarize in two sentences.

██████████

•

11 hours ago

Quote

It's an issue where there isn't an actual, *valid* amount of replication in a study to really prove anything at all; it's like if you wanted to test whether some new immune boosting remedy worked, so you just gave it to the toddlers at one preschool and used a different preschool as the control, any differences in illness rates might be due to other factors at the two different schools rather than the fact that one school is taking the remedy and the other isn't. Usually it's when the subject and control groups aren't randomized enough in some way, there aren't enough different subjects, etc., so it allows whatever unknown variables that exist in any experiment to theoretically affect the outcome enough to render the results invalid.

I'm guessing you must have had a terrible time with this in college so you're trying to use it as some kind of 'test' of my knowledge, because you think it's some nearly impossible subject to comprehend, which is just amusing in general. And the fact that you expect me to believe that you reviewed the sources of each link I posted and evaluated every one for possible pseudoreplication (assuming that information was even presented) is ...well, it's pretty typical of you at this point. Not surprising at all. I'll be awaiting your reply in which you try to tell me that my explanation is totally wrong, but somehow aren't able to provide any sources for your claims, while vehemently insisting that you never had difficulty understanding anything in college, that everyone loves you, and maybe some cryptic references to covfefe. And... GO!

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

8 hours ago

Quote

Report

Nope.... wrong. Good misinterpretation though.

And thank you again for proving you're a fraud.

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

7 hours ago

Quote

Report

I'll give you points for trying though. But your attempt to explain just leaves out so much important information. It's obvious that this was a Google cut and paste.... otherwise it wouldn't have taken you this long and you wouldn't have skirted the question for so long.

But more importantly, you claim you understand. So then why are you defending studies riddled with non valid conclusions?

It comes down to two possibilities: 1. You don't and your explanation was a Google copy and paste job. (This is my guess) 2. You are willfully ignorant, and a hypocrite, and like to peddle misinformation that suits your own personal agenda.

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

7 hours ago

Quote

Report

Actually, I have a PhD.... and GO!

██████████

•

7 hours ago

Quote

After our preceding interaction, I'm genuinely embarrassed for you that you felt you needed to say that. Oof.

██████████

•

6 hours ago

Quote

*Bullshitting intensifies bigly*

[u/dark\\_\\_unicorn](#)

•

4 hours ago

Quote

Report

Of course I needed to say it. I feel like you're really not getting the magnitude of how much of a fraud you are.

You have proven you have no qualifications and no understanding of scientific methodology.

You keep spouting that I'm trying to insult you, but I'm only providing astute observations - which you're taking as personal insults. Which says it all really.

I also noticed, through a very brief perusal of your history, you only post studies in your own sub, yet never in larger scientific subs. The ones with millions of members. Nor do you engage in any scientific debate outside your own echo chamber. Very telling.

██████████

•

2 hours ago

Quote

Hahahahaha!! You know what, I think I'll take this whole exchange and screenshot it all and post it on one of those subs. Let's see what everyone else thinks of your insane gaslighting and outrageous bullshit. Ready??