**Scenario**

A research team from a prominent laboratory published an article in a prestigious academic journal. It was considered a breakthrough paper that answered a major question in a scientific field. Papers produced in a laboratory normally list many people in the laboratory as authors, but the first named author is the primary person responsible for the paper. The first author of this paper was a postdoctoral researcher, working under her supervisor at the time. After the researcher left for another job, other researchers in the laboratory were unable to repeat the results following exactly the same methods. The supervisor, suspecting possible scientific misconduct, requested that the researcher return to the laboratory to redo her experiments and confirm the authenticity of her results, but she declined. An institutional investigation into the experiment concluded that there was no conclusive evidence that the results were actually achieved, but also that there was no conclusive evidence of misconduct or fabrication. The article was retracted without the researcher's agreement. The retraction damaged the researcher's career and reputation in the scientific community.

Detail Analysis:-

The following Paragraph can be analyzed in three school of thoughts:-

* The Marxist School of Thinking
* The Capitalist School of Thinking
* The Ethical Way

***The Marxist School of Thought & Capitalist School of Thought***

In any circumstances these school of thoughts always think about their personal gain irrespective of the disasters that prevail upon humanity. The Marxist and the capitalists will treat everyone in god way as long as there is some agenda behind things are people are bent according to them otherwise they would be labelled bad.

Just like in this Case suppose the researcher leaves and the results are not recreated, the ruling party will decide its best to recover the scientist in every possible way even if it means threatening his life. These should never be adopted in any way and by all means a middle way must be used.

***The Ethical Way***

When we take a ethical analysis with logic we can define our middle way in which we can use to avoid all the difficulties .

* Did the researcher have an obligation to return to the laboratory to repeat the results?

Logically No , the researcher does not have any obligation to do so . Once the contract for leaving is signed by the company the company cannot force the scientist to join again. They must find a competent scientist which may lead to making of the same result. However the company may give him a better salary or lure him with a better offer in order to bring him back.

* The decision to retract the article was based on two factors: the absence of records corroborating the researcher's results and the laboratory's inability to repeat the results. Are those the right standards to use?

Yes, if we give a deep dive into the paragraph and put ourself in the same situation it would occur to us that the standard to write and article and pulling it are quite right as if it was asked by someone to perform again it could not be done due to incompetence and inability of Scientists.

* Assume there were four authors on the paper, including the researcher and the supervisor. Should the supervisor and the other authors also share responsibility for the retraction, and if yes on what basis?

No, they Should not share the responsibility because they were working as a team and when the team loses the responsibility falls on the captain or the coach. In this scenario the main scientist left and the rest were unable to reproduce his results which never existed in the first place so they should not be blamed for such an unfortunate event.