Thanks for sharing your post with us. I agree with what you wrote. I wrote 2 posts on that nudge meta-analysis in January.

The first post (https://statmodeling.stat.columbia.edu/2022/01/07/pnas-gigo-grp-wtf-approaching-the-platonic-ideal-of-junk-science/) focused on how ridiculously large the estimate was, and how the paper included lots of [invalid] studies, and how it's an embarrassment that the National Academy of Sciences published it--but I guess it's no surprise since the National Academy of Sciences is the mainstream of the mainstream, and the nudge researchers are very powerful within academia.

My second post (https://statmodeling.stat.columbia.edu/2022/01/10/the-real-problem-of-that-nudge-meta-analysis-is-not-that-it-include-12-papers-by-noted-fraudsters-its-the-gigo-of-it-all/) discussed how the problem was not so much the inclusion of obviously bad studies, as that the original studies have internal selection bias leading to overestimated effect sizes. So it's not just that the meta-analysis flawed by the inclusion of a mix of studies (although, yes, that's a problem) but also that there's no real reason to trust the studies that go into the meta-analysis. So, yeah, GIGO.

More generally, I'm concerned how meta-analysis has become an all-purpose tool for people to use inappropriately (see discussion here: https://statmodeling.stat.columbia.edu/2022/02/28/answering-some-questions-about-meta-analysis-using-ivermectin-as-an-example/) with a focus on the typically-meaningless population mean.