

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-000098/26
to the Commission
Christine Anderson (ESN), Friedrich Pürner (NI)
(13 January 2026)**

Subject: Retraction of influential glyphosate safety review following litigation disclosures and implications for EU risk assessments

In 2025, the journal *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* retracted the widely cited 2000 review by Williams, Kroes and Munro on the safety of glyphosate and Roundup ⁽¹⁾.

The retraction followed disclosures that emerged in US litigation concerning Monsanto, including internal company documents indicating undisclosed industry involvement in the drafting and positioning of the review, raising concerns about conflicts of interest and the scientific integrity of the assessment.

1. Is the Commission aware of this retraction and of the specific reasons given by the journal, and has this information been formally transmitted to the European Food Safety Authority and the European Chemicals Agency in the context of their assessments of glyphosate?
2. Can the Commission specify whether this review, or conclusions derived from it, were relied upon directly or indirectly in EU risk assessments or authorisation procedures for glyphosate, including as supporting literature in Rapporteur Member State dossiers or agency evaluations?
3. Given that the retraction followed litigation-related disclosures indicating undisclosed industry involvement in scientific publications, does the Commission intend to ask the competent agencies to assess whether other studies or reviews relied upon in the glyphosate risk assessment may be affected by similar integrity or conflict-of-interest concerns, and if not, why not?

Submitted: 13.1.2026

**Answer given by Mr Várhelyi on behalf of the European Commission
(23 March 2026)**

The Commission is aware of the retraction mentioned by the Honourable Members but has not requested the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) or the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) for an opinion.

The retraction concerns a review article, which analyses other scientific publications or studies and does not constitute original primary research.

EFSA considered the importance of such review articles (including the retracted publication) in the assessment of glyphosate in 2017 ⁽¹⁾, and found that such review articles have low weight in scientific assessments ⁽²⁾.

In the hazard assessment conducted as part of the procedure leading to the last renewal of approval of glyphosate, the retracted paper is not cited in the opinion of the Risk Assessment Committee of ECHA ⁽³⁾.

It is also not referenced in the relevant parts of the EFSA Conclusion from July 2023 ⁽⁴⁾ or referenced in the assessment of long-term toxicity and carcinogenicity ⁽⁵⁾.

Therefore, it played no role in the last review of the approval of glyphosate, and the retraction does not impact at all the overall assessment and conclusions reached.

The Commission is not in a position to investigate conflict of interests or any other bias in academic publishing as this is the responsibility of the journal editors.

However, every literature study referenced in an application dossier is assessed for its relevance and reliability, in the same way as regulatory studies conducted by applicants under good laboratory practice and following validated methodologies.

¹ <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273230025002387>.

⁽¹⁾ https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/topic/20170608_glyphosate_statement.pdf.

⁽²⁾ 'The weight of these two review papers in the overall scientific assessment of glyphosate was therefore very limited because EU experts had access to, and relied primarily on, the findings of the original guideline studies and the underlying raw data to produce their own conclusions. The review papers simply served to summarise or substantiate the industry position on glyphosate that had been presented, as required by the regulatory framework, in the applicant's dossier and in the commenting rounds during the assessment'.

⁽³⁾ European Chemicals Agency (2022). Opinion of the Committee for Risk Assessment proposing harmonised classification and labelling of glyphosate (ISO); N-(phosphonomethyl)glycine (EC Number: 213-997-4; CAS Number: 1071-83-6) <https://echa.europa.eu/registry-of-clh-intentions-until-outcome/-/dislist/details/0b0236e185e41a77>.

⁽⁴⁾ The final list of 'Tests, studies and information submitted' in Volume 2 of the Renewal Assessment Report.

⁽⁵⁾ Volume 3 — B.6.5 (AS) of the Renewal Assessment Report.

Such regulatory studies are also subject to the provisions of the Transparency Regulation⁽⁶⁾ and all raw data must be submitted, which provides a higher level of transparency compared to peer-reviewed literature studies.

⁽⁶⁾ Regulation (EU) 2019/1381 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on the transparency and sustainability of the EU risk assessment in the food chain and amending Regulations (EC) No 178/2002, (EC) No 1829/2003, (EC) No 1831/2003, (EC) No 2065/2003, (EC) No 1935/2004, (EC) No 1331/2008, (EC) No 1107/2009, (EU) 2015/2283 and Directive 2001/18/EC <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2019/1381/oj>.