

Jake H. Waskett

CircList - Google Groups

July 21st 2007

Re: [Circlist] Re: Infant and Child Circumcision - to discuss or not.

Jake Waskett <j...@waskett.org>

I have mixed feelings about CIRP, personally.

On one hand, it is an extremely useful resource, containing the full text (albeit with added notes and highlighting) of several hundred papers, the majority of which are from peer-reviewed journals.

On the other hand, there are several problems. First, their summary pages are atrocious, highly biased, and frequently misrepresenting their own references (I don't understand why they do this when they supply the full text of those references - do they assume that the reader is too stupid to check?). Second, their selection of papers is poor, reflecting a desire to promote an anti-circumcision agenda rather than to share knowledge. As such, their selection is weighted towards opinion pieces and letters (often from anti-circumcision activists) rather than epidemiological studies.

I think that CIRP is intended to be used in a top-down fashion (starting with the summary pages). If used as such, it is highly misleading. However, it can be used in a better way. If one starts with an unbiased resource (such as PubMed) and identifies literature of interest, then CIRP can be useful in obtaining the full text of a fraction of those articles.

Unfortunately, few have the time - or indeed the intelligence - to fully research these issues. Consequently it is all too easy to find CIRP-quoting anti-circumcision 'educators'.

Jake

On Sat, 2007-07-21 at 21:45 +1000, Ben 63549 wrote:

> Don't get too bent out of shape I was only using cirp.org as an example feel
> free to give more unbiased examples, that matter is of less importance than
> my other comments.