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Coca-Cola 'spends millions on research to prove that fizzy drinks don't make you fat'

Drinks giant has financial links to experts who cast doubt on link between fizzy drinks and obesity



Marion Nestle, a professor of nutrition, food studies and public health at New York University, told The Times: "In my opinion no scientist should accept funding from Coca-Cola. It's totally compromising. Period. End of discussion."

Coca-Cola Great Britain said: "We want to be open about our funding of academic research and support of third party organisations. We rely on scientific research to make decisions about our products and ingredients and commission independent third parties to carry out this work.
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**Chocolate, a Cure for Depression, Study Says**
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**Mood state effects of chocolate**
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**Abstract**

Background: Chocolate consumption has long been associated with enjoyment and pleasure. Popular claims confer on chocolate the properties of being a stimulant, relaxant, euphoriant, aphrodisiac, tonic and antidepressant. The last claim stimulated this review.   
  
Method: We review chocolate's properties and the principal hypotheses addressing its claimed mood altering propensities. We distinguish between food craving and emotional eating, consider their psycho-physiological underpinnings, and examine the likely 'positioning' of any effect of chocolate to each concept.   
  
Results: Chocolate can provide its own hedonistic reward by satisfying cravings but, when consumed as a comfort eating or emotional eating strategy, is more likely to be associated with prolongation rather than cessation of a dysphoric mood.   
  
Limitations: This review focuses primarily on clarifying the possibility that, for some people, chocolate consumption may act as an antidepressant self-medication strategy and the processes by which this may occur.   
  
Conclusions: Any mood benefits of chocolate consumption are ephemeral. (c) 2006 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility**
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More than 70% of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce another scientist's experiments, and more than half have failed to reproduce their own experiments. Those are some of the telling figures that emerged from *Nature*'s survey of 1,576 researchers who took a brief online questionnaire on reproducibility in research.

Data on how much of the scientific literature is reproducible are rare and generally bleak. The best-known analyses, from psychology[1](http://www.nature.com/news/1-500-scientists-lift-the-lid-on-reproducibility-1.19970#b1) and cancer biology[2](http://www.nature.com/news/1-500-scientists-lift-the-lid-on-reproducibility-1.19970#b2), found rates of around [40%](http://www.nature.com/news/over-half-of-psychology-studies-fail-reproducibility-test-1.18248) and [10%](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v483/n7391/full/483531a.html), respectively.

Failing to reproduce results is a rite of passage, says Marcus Munafo, a biological psychologist at the University of Bristol, UK, who has a long-standing interest in scientific reproducibility. When he was a student, he says, “I tried to replicate what looked simple from the literature, and wasn't able to. Then I had a crisis of confidence, and then I learned that my experience wasn't uncommon.”

A minority of respondents reported ever having tried to publish a replication study. When work does not reproduce, researchers often assume there is a perfectly valid (and probably boring) reason. What's more, incentives to publish positive replications are low and journals can be reluctant to publish negative findings. In fact, several respondents who had published a failed replication said that editors and reviewers demanded that they play down comparisons with the original study.
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**Particles break light-speed limit**

**Neutrino results challenge cornerstone of modern physics.**   
Geoff Brumfiel

An Italian experiment has unveiled evidence that fundamental particles known as neutrinos can travel faster than light. Other researchers are cautious about the result, but if it stands further scrutiny, the finding would overturn the most fundamental rule of modern physics — that nothing travels faster than 299,792,458 metres per second.

The experiment is called OPERA (Oscillation Project with Emulsion-tRacking Apparatus), and lies 1,400 metres underground in the Gran Sasso National Laboratory in Italy. It is designed to study a beam of neutrinos coming from CERN, Europe's premier high-energy physics laboratory located 730 kilometres away near Geneva, Switzerland. Neutrinos are fundamental particles that are electrically neutral, rarely interact with other matter, and have a vanishingly small mass. But they are all around us — the Sun produces so many neutrinos as a by-product of nuclear reactions that many billions pass through your eye every second.

Has OPERA found super-speedy neutrinos? CERN

The 1,800-tonne OPERA detector is a complex array of electronics and photographic emulsion plates, but the new result is simple — the neutrinos are arriving 60 nanoseconds faster than the speed of light allows. "We are shocked," says Antonio Ereditato, a physicist at the University of Bern in Switzerland and OPERA's spokesman.

**Breaking the law**

The idea that nothing can travel faster than light in a vacuum is the cornerstone of Albert Einstein's special theory of relativity, which itself forms the foundation of modern physics. If neutrinos are travelling faster than light speed, then one of the most fundamental assumptions of science — that the rules of physics are the same for all observers — would be invalidated. "If it's true, then it's truly extraordinary," says John Ellis, a theoretical physicist at CERN.