**Summary of the Paper**

The article by Baker explains the ongoing reproducibility crisis in scientific research publications, which feature survey of 1,576 researchers. The survey revealed that over 70% of scientists are unable to reproduce another researcher's experiment, and more than half have struggled to replicate their own findings. Despite this, most researchers still relied on published literature to make their research work. The main figure illustrates the reproducibility crisis across scientific fields, with chemistry and physics showing the highest confidence (~60% reproducible) and biology and medicine lower (~50%). Over 70% of scientists in chemistry and biology have failed to reproduce others' experiments. Key contributors to irreproducibility include selective reporting and pressure to publish (>80%), poor statistical analysis (~75%), and lack of replication (~70%). It also examines corrective measures, such as improving study design, strengthening statistical methods, and fostering better mentorship. While there is no universal agreement on how to address reproducibility challenges, the survey indicates strong support for institutional and journal-driven policies aimed at improving research transparency and reliability.

**Reflection on Reproducibility in My Experience**

My own experience with reproducibility in scientific research aligns with the challenges highlighted in the article. While working on isolating *Lecanosticta acicola* and extracting its DNA, I attempted to follow previously published methods. However, many of these techniques did not yield the expected results, causing setbacks and requiring extensive troubleshooting. This raises concerns about the level of detail provided in some studies and the feasibility of replicating reported methodologies in different laboratory settings. I contacted some of the published article authors, though they responded but nor with accurate details of what I wanted. The lack of standardized protocols and missing crucial details in published papers can make reproducibility a frustrating process. My experience underscores the need for clearer methodological documentation and greater emphasis on validation before publication, ensuring that results are not only novel but also robust and reproducible across different research environments.