Layne Norton Gets Fact Checked...then DELETES Comments! @biolayne1 Transcript

(Transcripts are generated by AI and may contain errors)

Bias, deleted comments, and lack of corrections

So it's data over feelings until it conflicts with his bias. And yes, he has a bias just like everyone else. In fact, He's deleted my comments and others on multiple occasions when we point out some errors in the videos that he's made and he is now restricted my account and blocked other people I know.

Even when were trying to engage in what I would say is a pretty respectful manner. For example, see this comment from his recent video on protein and kidney health, where he made numerous errors.

He claimed the study he was talking about was a meta-analysis when it was actually a cohort study, he said they were looking at chronic kidney disease incidents when they actually looked at all-cause mortality, and the stats he cited were nowhere to be found, including in the table he showed on screen while he citing these stats.

And look, mistakes happen. But if it was just a mistake, why not issue a correction? Instead, he's deleting comments and just sweeping them under the rug as if he didn't make any mistakes.

Protein and kidney health video errors

Now, if I was a follower of his, I would have a problem with that. And this isn't an isolated incident. I actually have saved a highlight on my page titled Biolane, although he has claimed that I have aggressively attacked him.

You can read through that story highlight and let me know if you think that's the case. Keep in mind that this is the person who said I aggressively attack him, This is no different than the people who put their babies on a vegan diet, okay?

Also, f*** you as well. But someone you can't claim as aggressive is Simon Hill, and he has also made some videos respectfully criticizing Lane's content.

but again, he's just never addressed those criticisms and actually continues to repeat the claims that were criticized. When you look at the forest plots, it almost favors protein with every single one.

The one nutrient that total protein, animal protein and dairy protein were either the same as or a little bit worse than was polyunsaturated fats.

Respectful criticism and repeated claims

But Lane, replacing calories from refined carbs, carbs from whole grains or saturated fat with animal proteins did not significantly improve someone's odds of healthy aging.

Replacing 3% of energy from animal with plant protein improves someone odds healthy ageing So while he will debate people like Paul Saladino who really have no idea what they're talking about, he doesn't seem that interested in engaging in debate or discussion with those who offer valid criticisms and could potentially poke holes in some of his content.

Bias in evidence-based nutrition debates

And the point here isn't to say that he's a terrible source of information or anything like that. The point is that people you view to be very evidence-based, myself included, I hope, are not immune to making mistakes or being biased.

And it's not only carnivores or vegans who can be biased, you can have a very strong bias for including both animal and plant foods. Ego can certainly be involved when it comes to whether you admit you were wrong or not.

And I want to finish by quoting Lane himself. Everyone says they love data until the data conflicts with their bias.