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**Week 4 Reflection (Parts 1 and 2)**

**1.A** I do believe that the source of contamination is most probably artificial due to nature other events such as manipulation of images submitted. Considering the players in the paper I believe that Wakayama is the most likely candidate. He would be most likely since he was most secretive in terms of sharing the process of creation of chimera mice. And also since he was the only with exclusive access to all parts of the experiments.

**1.B** I believe that the paper was accepted into a popular journal, Nature, mainly for two reasons. 1) For big names involved in the paper that mark a revolutionary scientific idea, that would immediately contribute to the gains of the journal itself. 2) Due to the involvement of highly creditable scientists that were least like to commit such act.

Since major modification to the method was established on the second round of experiments, the previous review marking the paper as “magical” did not have enough ground with the new method and therefore was not considered heavily.

A journal’s motivation in this case would be to publish the next revolutionary idea in science no matter what (including taking risks).

An editor on the other is highly motivated similarly, but also has the responsibility of coordinating with reviewers to verify the claims made by the paper. However the motivation is highly skewed towards the views of the journal.

Ideally reviewer is highly motivated to pass on papers that are highly valid without any regard to their value. However in this case, they are not required to replicate and thus base their reviews solely on the paper submitted since they might have their own research to take care of.

**2** I agree that all scientific literature should be open access, however, not necessarily immediately after publication. Since this case increases the risk of transmission of false information within population, at which point it would be very hard for the information to be removed if the paper is then proved to be wrong, like STAP papers.

One alternative is to set a time upon which they should be made open access, so that before the literature reached public it would have enough time to mature if they are valid and removed if they are not.

In this case we see that public will eventually get access to the information that valuable to them and are also protected from the cases such as STAP cell paper, where certain literature will have enough time to go through scientific process and either come out as a matured paper or removed due to their invalid conclusions.

One of the best example of this is almost universally accepted, Theory of Evolution, where Darwin continued to work on this literature well after discovery before finally deciding to publish. Which by that time had collected many pieces of evidence that supported the literature even more.