

Andrew Gilruth

From: Paul McGuinness <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 16 October 2026 16:23
To: Andrew Gilruth
Cc: OM Editorial Complaints
Subject: Re: Formal complaint under Clause 1 (Accuracy): '10 ecosystem killers'

Hi Andrew

Thanks for getting in touch and bringing this one to my attention.

I agree with you completely that the red grouse section of that article could be misleading under that headline, and as a result we have removed it from the piece altogether. We've also added a correction to the article in question, explaining that we have removed it to avoid any confusion or misunderstanding.

For context, we often edit pieces from various articles together to make these 'listicle' articles, where we can engage with readers about a number of different species that have similar behaviours, etc. In this case, human error means that what seemed innocent when putting the article together could have led to information be misconstrued. I have reminded the editorial team of the importance of taking due care when creating such pieces so as to avoid the risk of misleading readers.

We recognise the complex and often controversial issues around grouse moors, and have published many balanced articles on the subject down the years. I have pointed some of the newer members of our editorial team to these for a fuller understanding of the issues at stake.

Thanks again for bringing this to my attention and I'm glad that we were able to action your complaint so quickly.

Kind regards
Paul

--

Group Editor
BBC Wildlife & BBC Countryfile Magazine
discoverwildlife.com
countryfile.com

--

Group Editor
BBC Wildlife & BBC Countryfile Magazine
discoverwildlife.com
countryfile.com

Paul McGuinness
Group Editor
[REDACTED]



ourmedia.co.uk

Eagle House, Bristol BS1 4ST

ourmedia limited is a company registered in England and Wales under number 05715415. Registered office: Eagle House, Colston Avenue, Bristol, BS1 4ST, United Kingdom.

ourmedia limited accepts no liability for the content of this email, or for the consequences of any actions taken on the basis of the information provided, unless that information is subsequently confirmed in writing. Any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company.

NatureScot also publishes a [Peatland ACTION case study from Hope's Estate](#), demonstrating how restoration can support grouse management while improving habitat and reducing erosion, with an expected reduction in carbon losses. This illustrates why your assertion that these landscapes are managed to serve the interests of a single species requires qualification.

The Scottish Government's independent [Werritty Review \(2019\), in its assessment of muirburn](#), also found evidence that burning conducted in accordance with the Muirburn Code can increase plant, bird and invertebrate biodiversity compared with unburnt moorland, particularly on dry heath. It recognised detrimental effects in some circumstances and described the evidence on net carbon losses under regular muirburn as inconclusive. These findings underline why habitat type and management practice matter, and why your categorical claims require qualification.