



EEB 603 – Reproducible Science



BOISE STATE
UNIVERSITY

Is there a reproducibility crisis in Science?



Baker (2016) *Nature*

RESULTS FROM A SURVEY ON REPRODUCIBLE SCIENCE

Based on a survey conducted on 1,576 researchers published in *Nature* (Baker, 2016):

- 70% of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce another scientist's experiment(s).
- >50% of surveyed researchers have failed to reproduce their own experiments.

<https://www.nature.com/news/1-500-scientists-lift-the-lid-on-reproducibility-1.19970>


RESULTS FROM A SURVEY ON REPRODUCIBLE SCIENCE

Based on a survey conducted on 1,576 researchers published in *Nature* (Baker, 2016):

- Although 52% of surveyed researchers agree that there is a significant “crisis” of reproducibility, less than 30% think that failure to reproduce published results means that results are probably wrong and most say that they trust published literature.
- 73% of the respondents said that they think that **at least half of the papers in their field can be trusted. This would mean that 50% of published studies are not reproducible and/or convey wrong conclusions.**

**Intense competition
and time pressure
==
irreproducible
research**

→ We all need to
change our
practices to turn
this situation
around



Is there causality between these factors?

Baker (2016) *Nature*

WHAT FACTORS COULD BOOST REPRODUCIBILITY?

Respondents were positive about most proposed improvements but emphasized training in particular.




Baker (2016) *Nature*

HAVE YOU EVER TRIED TO PUBLISH A REPRODUCTION ATTEMPT?

Although only a small proportion of respondents tried to publish replication attempts, many had their papers accepted.

● Published ● Failed to publish



<http://rescience.github.io/>

Reproducible Science is good. Replicated Science is better.

ReScience C is a *platinum open-access* peer-reviewed journal that targets computational research and encourages the explicit [replication](#) of already published research, promoting new and open-source implementations in order to ensure that the original research is [reproducible](#). You can read about the ideas behind ReScience C in the article [Sustainable computational science: the ReScience initiative](#)

To achieve this goal, the whole publishing chain is radically different from other traditional scientific journals. ReScience C lives on [GitHub](#) where each new implementation of a computational study is made available together with comments, explanations and tests. Each submission takes the form of an issue that is publicly reviewed and tested in order to guarantee that any researcher can re-use it. If you ever replicated computational results (or failed at) from the literature in your research, ReScience C is the perfect place to publish your new implementation.


ReScience C is collaborative and open by design. Everything can be forked and modified. Don't hesitate to [write a submission](#), [join us](#) and to [become a reviewer](#).

TECHNOLOGY FEATURE • 24 AUGUST 2020

Challenge to scientists: does your ten-year-old code still run?

Missing documentation and obsolete environments force participants in the Ten Years Reproducibility Challenge to get creative.

Jeffrey M. Perkel



<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-02462-7#:~:text=Conceived%20in%202019%20together%20with,ten%20or%20more%20years%20earlier.>

Resurgence of
retracted papers?



SHARE



What a massive database of retracted papers reveals about science publishing's 'death penalty'

By Jeffrey Brainard, Jia You | Oct. 25, 2018, 2:00 PM

Rethinking retractions

Better editorial oversight, not more flawed papers, might explain a flood of retractions

Nearly a decade ago, headlines highlighted a disturbing trend in science: The number of articles retracted by journals had increased 10-fold during the previous 10 years. Fraud accounted for some 60% of those retractions; one offender, anesthesiologist Joachim Boldt, had racked up almost 90 retractions after investigators concluded he had fabricated data and committed other ethical violations. Boldt may have even harmed patients by encouraging the adoption of an unproven surgical treatment. Science, it seemed, faced a mushrooming crisis.

The alarming news came with some caveats. Although statistics were sketchy, retractions appeared to be relatively rare, involving only about two of every 10,000 papers. Sometimes the reason for the withdrawal was honest error, not deliberate fraud. And whether suspect papers were becoming more common—or journals were just getting better at recognizing and reporting them—wasn't clear.

<https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2018/10/what-massive-database-retracted-papers-reveals-about-science-publishing-s-death-penalty>

Retraction Watch

Tracking retractions as a window
into the scientific process

<https://retractionwatch.com/>

PAGES

How you can support Retraction
Watch

Meet the Retraction Watch staff

About Adam Marcus

About Ivan Oransky

Papers that cite Retraction
Watch

Privacy policy

Retracted coronavirus (COVID-
19) papers

Retraction Watch Database User
Guide


Retraction Watch Database
User Guide Appendix A: Fields

Retraction Watch Database
User Guide Appendix B:
Reasons

Last time I taught this class:

The list of retracted COVID-19 papers is up to 133


Fall 2022: 254 papers retracted



To the list of COVID-19 papers that have been retracted so far, add this:

COMMENT | [ONLINE FIRST](#)

Retraction—Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis

[Mandeep R Mehra](#)  [Frank Ruschitzka](#)  [Amit N Patel](#)Published: June 05, 2020 • DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31324-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31324-6) •  Check for updates

Reference

Article Info

Linked Articles

After publication of our *Lancet* Article,¹ several concerns were raised with respect to the veracity of the data and analyses conducted by Surgisphere Corporation and its founder and our co-author, Sapan Desai, in our publication. We launched an independent third-party peer review of Surgisphere with the consent of Sapan Desai to evaluate the origination of the database elements, to confirm the completeness of the database, and to replicate the analyses presented in the paper.

Our independent peer reviewers informed us that Surgisphere would not transfer the full dataset, client contracts, and the full ISO audit report to their servers for analysis as such transfer would violate client agreements and confidentiality requirements. As such, our reviewers were not able to conduct an independent and private peer review and therefore notified us of their withdrawal from the peer-review process.

We always aspire to perform our research in accordance with the highest ethical and professional guidelines. We can never forget the responsibility we have as researchers to scrupulously ensure that we rely on data sources that adhere to our high standards. Based on this development, we can no longer vouch for the veracity of the primary data sources. Due to this unfortunate development, the authors request that the paper be retracted.

We all entered this collaboration to contribute in good faith and at a time of great need during the COVID-19 pandemic. We deeply apologise to you, the editors, and the journal readership for any embarrassment or inconvenience that this may have caused.


Retraction Note | Published: 01 June 2020

Retraction Note: miR-34a blocks osteoporosis and bone metastasis by inhibiting osteoclastogenesis and Tgif2

Jing Y. Krzeszinski, Wei Wei, HoangDinh Huynh, Zixue Jin, Xunde Wang, Tsung-Cheng Chang, Xian-Jin Xie, Lin He, Lingegowda S. Mangala, Gabriel Lopez-Berestein, Anil K. Sood, Joshua T. Mendell & Yihong Wan 

Nature **582**, 134(2020) | [Cite this article](#)

3611 Accesses | **3** Altmetric | [Metrics](#)

 The [original article](#) was published on 25 June 2014

Retraction to: *Nature* <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13375> Published online 25 June 2014

Upon re-examination of the bone histomorphometry data in Extended Data Figs. 1i, 2d, 3h, 4h, 5n, 6e, 9g and 10f of this Letter, anomalies were found that call into question the integrity of these data. These concerns undermine the confidence in the study and the authors thus wish to retract the Letter in its entirety. The authors regret this situation and apologize to the scientific community. All authors agree with the Retraction, but author Xunde Wang did not respond.


Retraction Note | [Open Access](#) | [Published: 05 November 2015](#)

Retraction Note: TREEFINDER: a powerful graphical analysis environment for molecular phylogenetics

[Gangolf Jobb](#) , [Arndt von Haeseler](#) & [Korbinian Strimmer](#)

BMC Evolutionary Biology **15**, Article number: 243 (2015) | [Cite this article](#)

8537 Accesses | **5** Citations | **124** Altmetric | [Metrics](#)

 The [original article](#) was published in BMC Evolutionary Biology 2004 4:18

Retraction

The editors of *BMC Evolutionary Biology* retract this article [\[1\]](#) due to the decision by the corresponding author, Gangolf Jobb, to change the license to the software described in the article. The software is no longer available to all scientists wishing to use it in certain territories. This breaches the journal's editorial policy on software availability [\[2\]](#) which has been in effect since the time of publication. The other authors of the article, Arndt von Haeseler and Korbinian Strimmer, have no control over the licensing of the software and support the retraction of this article.

Reproducibility and research integrity



Research integrity is an important driver of reliable and trustworthy research, and includes issues such as reproducibility and replicability. There is a need to promote robust research, starting at the lab bench and extending to the dissemination of findings to the scientific community, as well as to the public.

Following a [call from the UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee](#) for evidence on reproducibility and research integrity, and the roles different institutions play in this, [BMC Research Notes](#) has partnered with the [UK Reproducibility Network](#) to provide a platform to share feedback on the topic with the wider scientific community.

<https://www.biomedcentral.com/collections/reproducibility>

Research Integrity and Peer Review

[Home](#) [About](#) [Articles](#) [Submission Guidelines](#)

Search articles within this journal



Announcing the launch of In Review



Aims and scope

Research Integrity and Peer Review is an international, open access, peer reviewed journal that encompasses all aspects of integrity in research publication, including peer review, study reporting, and research and publication ethics. Particular consideration is given to submissions that address current controversies and limitations in the field and offer potential solutions. We welcome research into peer review and editorial decision making, however reports of individual journal or publisher decisions or actions will not be considered.

<https://researchintegrityjournal.biomedcentral.com>



Peer Review Week

Peer Review Week (PRW) 2022 is September 19-23. This year's theme is ["Research Integrity: Creating and supporting trust in research."](#)

<https://peerreviewweek.wordpress.com/>

Reproducible Science aims at linking Data, Code and Publication

