Research Article

Scientific Accountability: The Case for Personal Responsibility in Academic Error Correction

Yue Liu[1]

1. College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Shenyang Normal University, Shenyang, China

This paper examines the prevalent academic principle of "addressing the issue but not the person" in scientific error correction and argues for a paradigm shift toward "addressing both the issue and the person." Through analysis of contemporary journal policies, institutional practices, and philosophical foundations of scientific integrity, we demonstrate that the current approach creates unequal accountability standards, inhibits effective error correction, and undermines the self-correcting nature of science. Drawing on Richard Feynman's concept of scientific integrity and empirical evidence from research misconduct studies, we propose that personal accountability is not only compatible with scientific progress but essential for maintaining scientific integrity. Our analysis reveals how true scientific accountability requires researchers to take personal responsibility for their claims while distinguishing this from personal attacks or character assassination.

Corresponding author: Yue Liu, yueliusd@163.com

1. Introduction

The contemporary scientific community has widely adopted the principle of "addressing the issue but not the person" when correcting scientific errors. This approach, while ostensibly promoting objectivity and civility, has created what we argue is a fundamentally asymmetrical system of accountability that undermines the very foundations of scientific integrity[1][2]. When scientists are correct and receive recognition, both their work and their persons benefit; however, when errors are discovered, the prevailing norm demands that only the work be criticized while the individual remains shielded from personal responsibility[3].

 doi.org/10.32388/M4GGKZ

This asymmetry has profound consequences for the scientific enterprise. Research indicates that the current system of error correction is inadequate, with many journals reluctant to publish corrections and institutional mechanisms often failing to ensure accountability[2][4]. The reluctance to directly address personal responsibility in scientific misconduct has contributed to a culture where errors persist, misleading conclusions remain uncorrected, and public trust in science is undermined[5][6][7][8].

2. The Asymmetrical Nature of Current Accountability Standards

2.1. The Double Standard of Recognition and Responsibility

The prevailing "issue-only" approach to error correction represents a fundamental inequality in how scientific accountability operates[1]. When research succeeds and generates positive outcomes, scientists rightfully receive personal recognition, career advancement, and professional acclaim. Their names become associated with discoveries, theories bear their names, and they benefit personally from their scientific contributions[9]. However, when serious errors emerge, the same individuals who claimed personal credit are suddenly shielded behind the principle that criticism should target only the work, not the person[10].

This asymmetry is particularly problematic given research showing that first authors are 38% more likely to be responsible for scientific misconduct than authors listed in the middle of bylines, and corresponding authors are 14% more likely to bear responsibility[3]. Yet institutional policies often treat all authors equally when distributing blame, creating a disconnect between actual responsibility and accountability mechanisms[10].

2.2. Institutional Barriers to Effective Error Correction

Contemporary journal policies exemplify the problems created by avoiding personal accountability. Many prestigious journals, including some in materials science and applied sciences, explicitly prohibit the publication of error correction letters[11]. Research Square refuses to accept preprints focused on error correction, while other platforms create bureaucratic obstacles that discourage error reporting[2].

The nature of these institutional barriers reflects a deeper cultural problem. When error correction must be couched in diplomatic language that avoids directly challenging the responsible parties, the resulting communications often become so circumspect as to obscure the very problems they purport to address[2].

[6]. Scientists must engage in what amounts to academic doublespeak, acknowledging problems while simultaneously affirming the overall validity of flawed work[1].

3. The Foundations of Scientific Integrity: Feynman's Vision

3.1. Cargo Cult Science and the Integrity Imperative

Richard Feynman's seminal 1974 Caltech commencement address on "Cargo Cult Science" provides crucial insight into the nature of scientific integrity[12][13]. Feynman identified a "specific, extra type of integrity" required of scientists—one that involves "bending over backwards to show how you are maybe wrong"[12][14]. This integrity, he argued, is not merely about avoiding lies but about accepting personal responsibility for one's scientific claims[13].

Feynman's concept directly challenges the contemporary avoidance of personal accountability in science. He explicitly stated that scientists have a responsibility "certainly to other scientists, and I think to laymen" to maintain this higher standard of integrity[13]. This responsibility cannot be divorced from the person making the claims—it is inherently personal and requires individual accountability[14].

3.2. The Personal Nature of Scientific Responsibility

The requirement for personal accountability in science stems from the fundamental nature of scientific practice. Unlike fiction writers who may use pseudonyms, scientists publish under their real names, provide institutional affiliations, and include contact information specifically to enable direct communication about their work[1]. This transparency reflects the understanding that scientific claims carry personal responsibility[15].

Research on scientific misconduct supports this view. Studies show that accountability structures work best when they align responsibility with those most likely to have control over and knowledge of research processes[3][10]. The current system's failure to clearly establish personal accountability has contributed to the persistence of scientific errors and misconduct[1][7][16].

4. Distinguishing Accountability from Personal Attack

4.1. The Nature of Scientific Error

It is crucial to distinguish between holding scientists personally accountable for their claims and engaging in personal attacks or character assassination[1]. Scientific errors are an inevitable part of the research process, with estimates suggesting that over 90% of published research contains some form of error[1][17]. The goal of accountability is not to shame researchers for honest mistakes but to ensure that they take responsibility for correcting errors when discovered[6].

Research in error management demonstrates that organizations with healthy error cultures—those that acknowledge mistakes while maintaining support for individuals—actually perform better than those that either ignore errors or engage in blame without support[18][19]. The key is creating systems that encourage both personal responsibility and institutional support for error correction[20][21].

4.2. Error Tolerance and Scientific Progress

Studies from Harvard and other institutions have documented how acknowledging errors can actually benefit scientific progress[22]. The University of Virginia's Reproducibility Project found that over half of canonical psychology experiments could not be replicated, but this discovery led to important improvements in research practices rather than career destruction for the original researchers[23][24][25].

The reluctance to admit errors, conversely, can transform honest mistakes into scientific misconduct. When researchers know they are wrong but persist in defending erroneous positions due to social pressure or career concerns, the ethical nature of their behavior fundamentally changes[1][26]. Personal accountability serves as a crucial mechanism for preventing this transformation[10].

5. Personal Accountability as a Safeguard Against Scientific Misconduct

5.1. The Escalation from Error to Misconduct

The transition from honest error to scientific misconduct often occurs when researchers, faced with evidence of their mistakes, choose to maintain false positions rather than accept responsibility[1]. The

current system's emphasis on avoiding personal accountability paradoxically enables this escalation by removing the social and professional incentives for prompt error correction[10].

Research integrity investigations consistently show that early acknowledgment of errors prevents more serious misconduct charges[16][27]. When scientists take personal responsibility for mistakes, they typically face minimal professional consequences and often gain respect for their integrity[6]. However, when errors are concealed or defensively maintained, the resulting investigations can destroy careers and institutional reputations[28].

5.2. Institutional Responsibility and Individual Accountability

Recent research has clarified the relationship between institutional and individual responsibility in scientific misconduct[20][29]. While institutions must create environments that support responsible research practices, individual accountability remains essential for maintaining scientific integrity[16]. The most effective approaches combine institutional support with clear individual responsibility[20].

Studies of research misconduct cases reveal that attempts to diffuse responsibility across institutions or research teams often fail to prevent recurring problems[3][10]. Personal accountability, when properly implemented, provides the psychological and professional incentives necessary for maintaining scientific standards[30].

6. The Persistence of Discredited Theories in Academic Publishing

6.1. The Bandwagon Effect in Post-Refutation Publishing

When mainstream theories are challenged by contradictory evidence, a particularly troubling phenomenon emerges: the continued publication of research based on discredited foundations[31][32]. This occurs despite clear evidence that the underlying theoretical framework has been refuted. The academic community often continues to publish work applying mainstream theories even after they have been scientifically disproven, creating what researchers have termed a "bandwagon effect" in academic publishing[33][34][35].

This persistence is not merely an academic curiosity but represents a fundamental failure of the scientific self-correction mechanism. The social influences and herding behavior documented in scientific research communities mean that researchers may continue following established paths even when

evidence suggests those paths lead nowhere[36]. The career pressures facing scientists—including the need for students to graduate, faculty to pass evaluations, and institutions to maintain funding—create powerful incentives to maintain the status quo rather than engage with challenging new evidence.

6.2. Collective Responsibility Diffusion

The principle of "addressing only the issue but not the person" becomes particularly problematic in these circumstances because it enables collective responsibility diffusion. When entire research communities continue publishing work based on discredited theories, individual researchers can justify their actions by arguing that "if everyone is wrong, then I don't need to take personal responsibility"[34][35][36]. This represents a clear manifestation of the tragedy of the commons in scientific research, where the collective pursuit of individual career advancement undermines the overall integrity of the scientific enterprise.

Research on herding behavior in scientific communities has shown that "when careers depend on research assessment and the number of publications in established journals, the incentives tip towards following the crowd rather than publicising unconventional theories or apparently anomalous findings" [36]. This creates a vicious cycle where the very mechanism intended to ensure scientific quality—peer review and publication in established journals—becomes a barrier to scientific progress.

7. The Weaponization of Error Correction: Accusations of Field Destruction

7.1. The Anversa Case: A Paradigmatic Example

The case of Piero Anversa provides a stark illustration of how accusations of "destroying a research field" or "ruining careers" can be weaponized against those who identify scientific errors. Anversa, a former Harvard Medical School professor and director of the Center for Regenerative Medicine, had his research empire built on what was ultimately revealed to be fraudulent data spanning nearly two decades[33][37].

From 2001 to 2018, Anversa published research claiming that c-kit positive stem cells could regenerate damaged heart muscle tissue. This work, published in prestigious journals including Nature, Cell, and The New England Journal of Medicine, spawned an entire subfield of cardiovascular regenerative medicine. When other researchers consistently failed to replicate his results, Anversa's response was

telling: he would dismiss critics as "idiots" and those who questioned his methods within his laboratory were immediately fired.

The eventual revelation that 31 of Anversa's papers contained fabricated or falsified data led to their retraction by Harvard Medical School and Brigham and Women's Hospital in October 2018. The scope of the fraud was staggering: Anversa had received over $50 million in federal funding based on fraudulent research, and the global investment in heart stem cell research—including substantial investments from China—reached hundreds of millions of dollars[38].

7.2. The Systematic Suppression of Dissent

The Anversa case demonstrates how accusations of field destruction can be used to silence legitimate criticism. For over a decade, researchers who questioned the reproducibility of heart stem cell research were marginalized or ignored. The case reveals several key mechanisms by which error correction was suppressed:

Peer Review Manipulation: Anversa's stature in the field meant that papers challenging his work were often sent to him for review, where they would be rejected or subjected to harsh criticism. Meanwhile, his own papers received favorable reviews from peers who were reluctant to challenge such a prominent figure.

Institutional Protection: The reluctance of prestigious institutions to acknowledge fundamental flaws in high-profile research created a protective environment for fraudulent work. It was not until 2014—over a decade after the original publications—that Jeffrey Molkentin from Cincinnati Children's Hospital definitively demonstrated that c-kit cells do not generate heart muscle cells.

Career Consequences: As noted by researchers in the field, "this research area has suffered devastating damage, and an entire generation of young researchers has suffered devastating damage"[39]. The tragedy is that legitimate researchers who invested their careers in this field became victims of the very system that was supposed to protect scientific integrity.

8. The Exponential Growth of Vested Interests

8.1. The Multiplication of Stakeholders

As fraudulent research persists and gains acceptance, the number of stakeholders with vested interests in maintaining the status quo grows exponentially. This phenomenon is clearly illustrated in the heart stem

cell research scandal, where the extended timeline of the fraud allowed multiple layers of vested interests to develop.

The progression follows a predictable pattern: initial fraudulent research attracts follow-up studies, which in turn attract more researchers, funding agencies, biotechnology companies, and clinical trial participants. Each group that becomes involved develops financial, professional, or personal stakes in the continued validity of the research. By the time the fraud is exposed, the ecosystem of vested interests has become so complex that correction becomes extraordinarily difficult.

8.2. The Political Economy of Scientific Error

The Anversa case illustrates how scientific errors can become entrenched through the creation of what economists would recognize as a "political economy" of error. Multiple stakeholders—including researchers, institutions, funding agencies, biotechnology companies, and patients—develop interests in maintaining the illusion of scientific validity even when the underlying research is fundamentally flawed.

This dynamic is particularly dangerous because it transforms scientific error from a technical problem into a political one. Rather than being resolved through the normal processes of scientific correction, entrenched errors require external intervention—often from regulatory agencies or institutional investigations—to be addressed. The case demonstrates how the principle of "addressing only the issue but not the person" can become a shield for protecting elaborate systems of scientific fraud.

Research on the heart stem cell field revealed that "as more and more published erroneous papers accumulated, with increasing numbers of follow-up researchers, everyone became vested interests holders, and they tacitly allowed these erroneous viewpoints to continue circulating"[34]. This represents a clear example of how the avoidance of personal accountability can enable the persistence of scientific misconduct on a massive scale.

8.3. The Broader Implications for Scientific Integrity

The exponential growth of vested interests around fraudulent research has profound implications for scientific integrity. When entire research communities become economically and professionally dependent on maintaining false paradigms, the normal mechanisms of scientific self-correction break down. The case illustrates how the current system's emphasis on avoiding personal accountability can

actually facilitate the growth of scientific misconduct by making it difficult to hold individuals responsible for their role in perpetuating fraud.

The documented failure of the heart stem cell research community to self-correct over nearly two decades demonstrates that scientific integrity requires more than just technical competence—it requires personal accountability and the courage to challenge established authorities when evidence suggests they are wrong. The case provides compelling evidence that the integration of personal responsibility into scientific practice is not just desirable but essential for preventing the kind of large-scale scientific fraud that can waste billions of dollars and delay genuine medical progress.

9. Implications for Scientific Practice and Policy

9.1. Reforming Error Correction Mechanisms

The evidence presented suggests several reforms to current error correction practices. First, journals should explicitly encourage direct, honest communication about scientific errors rather than requiring diplomatic circumlocution[2][11]. Second, institutional policies should clearly establish individual responsibility while providing support for researchers who acknowledge mistakes[20]. Third, the scientific community should recognize and reward those who identify errors in published work[2][21]. Current systems often punish error detection while protecting those who make errors, creating perverse incentives that undermine scientific self-correction[5][11][21].

9.2. Cultural Change in Scientific Communities

Implementing effective personal accountability requires broader cultural changes in scientific communities[40][41]. Organizations must develop what researchers term "error management cultures" that combine high standards for accuracy with support for individuals who acknowledge mistakes[18][19].

This cultural transformation aligns with broader movements toward transparency and reproducibility in science[23][25]. As scientific institutions increasingly recognize the limitations of purely objective approaches to research integrity, the integration of personal accountability becomes essential for maintaining public trust[5][42].

10. Conclusion: Toward a New Framework of Scientific Accountability

The evidence presented in this analysis—from the theoretical foundations established by Feynman to the empirical documentation of large-scale scientific fraud—demonstrates that the current system of "addressing only the issue but not the person" is fundamentally inadequate for maintaining scientific integrity. The Anversa case, along with similar scandals in stem cell research and other fields[31][32], illustrates how the avoidance of personal accountability can enable fraud to persist for decades, wasting billions of dollars and undermining public trust in science.

The path forward requires a fundamental reimagining of scientific accountability that combines institutional support with clear personal responsibility. This includes:

Institutional Reforms: Journals and funding agencies must develop mechanisms that encourage direct, honest communication about scientific errors rather than diplomatic circumlocution. The current system that protects established authorities while marginalizing critics must be replaced with one that rewards intellectual honesty regardless of hierarchical position.

Cultural Change: The scientific community must embrace what Feynman called the "specific, extra type of integrity" that requires researchers to take personal responsibility for their claims. This means acknowledging that scientific integrity is not just about technical competence but about personal character and the courage to admit mistakes when they occur.

Preventive Mechanisms: The exponential growth of vested interests around fraudulent research suggests that early intervention is crucial. Systems must be developed that can identify and correct scientific errors before they become entrenched through the accumulation of follow-up research and institutional investments.

The stakes could not be higher. As the Anversa case demonstrates, the failure to implement effective accountability mechanisms can result in the waste of billions of dollars, the destruction of promising research careers, and the delay of genuine medical advances that could save lives. The scientific community has a moral obligation to future generations to ensure that the pursuit of knowledge is guided by integrity, honesty, and personal accountability rather than by the protection of established interests and the avoidance of difficult truths.

Only through the integration of personal accountability into the fabric of scientific practice can science fulfill its promise as a reliable means of understanding the natural world and improving human welfare. The alternative—a system that prioritizes diplomatic nicety over scientific truth—is not just ineffective but actively harmful to the scientific enterprise and the society that depends on it.

Statements and Declarations

Funding

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

There are no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Ethics Approval for Research Involving Humans or Animals

Not applicable.

References

1. ^a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i *Zhaksylyk A, Zimba O, Yessirkepov M, Kocyigit BF (2023). "Research Integrity: Where We Are and Where We Are Heading." J Korean Med Sci. **38**(47):e405. doi:10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e405.*
2. ^a, b, c, d, e, f *Vorland CJ, Brown AW, Ejima K, Mayo-Wilson E, Valdez D, Allison DB (2020). "Toward Fulfilling the Aspirational Goal of Science as Self-Correcting: A Call for Editorial Courage and Diligence for Error Correction." Eur J Clin Invest. **50**(2):e13190. doi:10.1111/eci.13190.*
3. ^a, b, c, d *Hussinger K, Pellens M (2019). "Scientific Misconduct and Accountability in Teams." PLoS One. **14**(5):e0215962. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0215962.*
4. ^ *Castillo A (2023). "Mistakes Happen in Research Papers. But Corrections Often Don't." STAT. https://www.statnews.com/2023/01/10/corrections-retractions-journals/.*
5. ^a, b, c *Ordway D-M (2021). "By Changing Their Framing of Scientific Failures and Discoveries, Journalists Can Bolster Trust in Science: New Research." The Journalists Resource.*
6. ^a, b, c, d *Regmi S (2024). "Addressing Errors in Scientific Publishing: The Role of Errata." J Nepal Med Assoc. **62**(277):558–559. doi:10.31729/jnma.8759.*

7. ^a ^b Liu Y, Liu Y, Drew MGB (2025). "Recognizing Problems in Publications Concerned with Microwave Absorption Film and Providing Corrections: A Focused Review." Ind Eng Chem Res. **64**(7):3635–3650. doi:10.1021/acs.iecr.4c04544.
8. ^ Liu Y (2025). "Non-Mainstream Scientific Viewpoints in Microwave Absorption Research: Peer Review, Academic Integrity, and Cargo Cult Science." doi:10.20944/preprints202507.0015.v2.
9. ^ Barker K (2002). "Accountability and Authorship." Science. https://www.science.org/content/article/accountability-and-authorship.
10. ^a ^b ^c ^d ^e ^f Helgesson G, Eriksson S (2018). "Responsibility for Scientific Misconduct in Collaborative Papers." Med Health Care Philos. **21**(3):423–430. doi:10.1007/s11019-017-9817-7.
11. ^a ^b ^c Grcar J (2023). "Comments and Corrigenda in Scientific Literature." Am Sci. **101**:16.
12. ^a ^b Feynman R (1974). "Cargo Cult Science." https://sites.cs.ucsb.edu/~ravenben/cargocult.html.
13. ^a ^b ^c Feynman RP, Leighton R (2010). "Surely You're Joking, Mr. Feynman", Adventures of a Curious Character. W. W. Norton & Company.
14. ^a ^b Hanlon M (2013). "Cargo Cult Science." Eur Rev. **21**(S1):S51–S55. doi:10.1017/s1062798713000124.
15. ^ Mohan Kumar P (2024). "Authorship Accountability: Ensuring Integrity in Scientific Publishing." Int Dent J Stud Res. **12**(3):108–109. doi:10.18231/j.idjsr.2024.021.
16. ^a ^b ^c Mann DL, Rasmussen LM (2023). "Who Should Be Accountable for Scientific Accountability?" JACC Basic Transl Sci. **8**(8):1040–1042. doi:10.1016/j.jacbts.2023.08.001.
17. ^ Nobe_laureate_Tasuku_Honjo (n.d.). "90% of the Opinions of the Top Journals of CNS Are Incorrect." https://dataverse.harvard.edu/file.xhtml?fileId=5112613&version=1.1#.
18. ^a ^b Seckler C (2025). "The Key to Success Is an Error-Management Culture." The Choice. https://thechoice.escp.eu/tl-dr/the-key-to-success-is-an-error-management-culture/.
19. ^a ^b Lin M, Xie M, Li Z (2023). "Organizational Error Tolerance and Change-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment and Moderating Role of Public Service Motivation." Psychol Res Behav Manag. **16**:4133–4153. doi:10.2147/PRBM.S431373.
20. ^a ^b ^c ^d Briskin JL, Gunsalus CK (2025). "Fostering Accountability: How Institutions Can Promote Research Integrity with Practical Tools and Knowledge." J Law Med Ethics. **53**(1):67–73. doi:10.1017/jme.2025.40.
21. ^a ^b ^c Vazire S (2020). "A Toast to the Error Detectors." Nature. **577**(7788):9. doi:10.1038/d41586-019-03909-2.
22. ^ McFarland B (2015). "On Being Wrong in Science."

23. ^a, ^b*Science Gets Better at Being Wrong (2015). Wired. https://www.wired.com/2015/12/science-gets-better-at-being-wrong/.*

24. ^*Massari P (2025). "When It's Right to Be Wrong." Harvard University. https://gsas.harvard.edu/news/when-its-right-be-wrong.*

25. ^a, ^b*Thompson L (2022). "When Being Wrong Is a Good Thing for Science." Elsevier. https://confidenceinresearch.elsevier.com/item/when-being-wrong-is-a-good-thing-for-science.*

26. ^*Kalichman M (2016). "Research Misconduct Prevention." http://research-ethics.org/topics/research-misconduct/.*

27. ^*Cicerone RJ, Vest CM, V FH (2009). "Research Misconduct." In On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research: Third Edition. National Academy of Sciences. p 15.*

28. ^*Springer Nature Retracted 2,923 Papers Last Year (2025). Retraction Watch. https://retractionwatch.com/2025/02/17/springer-nature-journal-retractions-2024/.*

29. ^*Davies B, Savulescu J (2022). "Institutional Responsibility Is Prior to Personal Responsibility in a Pandemic." J Value Inq. **58**(2):1–20. doi:10.1007/s10790-021-09876-0.*

30. ^*Douglas H (2023). "Structuring Institutions for Responsible and Accountable Science." Philos Sci. **91**(5):1149–1158. doi:10.1017/psa.2023.128.*

31. ^a, ^b*Liu Y, Drew MGB, Liu Y (2025). "Theoretical Insights Manifested by Wave Mechanics Theory of Microwave Absorption—Part 1: A Theoretical Perspective." Preprints.org. doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0314.v4.*

32. ^a, ^b*Liu Y, Drew MGB, Liu Y (2025). "Theoretical Insights Manifested by Wave Mechanics Theory of Microwave Absorption — Part 2: A Perspective Based on the Responses from DeepSeek." Preprints.org. doi:10.20944/preprints202503.0314.v3.*

33. ^a, ^b*Harvard Calls for Retraction of Dozens of Studies by Noted Cardiologist, "Some Scientists Wondered How a Questionable Line of Research Persisted for So Long ... Experts Were Just Too Timid to Take a Stand" (2018). New York Times. http://www.staradvertiser.com/2018/10/16/news/harvard-calls-for-retraction-of-dozens-of-studies-by-noted-cardiologist/.*

34. ^a, ^b, ^c*操秀英 (2018). "骗了全世界十余年 干细胞"学术大牛"走下神坛" [Cheating the World for More Than Ten Years, the "Academic Giant" of Stem Cells Falls from the Altar]. https://digitalpaper.stdaily.com/http www.kjrb.com/kjrb/html/2018-10/18/content 405851.htm.*

35. ^a, ^b*万纹 (2018). "大牛落马！哈佛心脏干细胞顶尖专家因造假撤回31篇论文" [Big Shot Falls! Harvard's Top Heart Stem Cell Expert Retracts 31 Papers Due to Fraud]. https://www.ebiotrade.com/newsf/2018-10/20181016172221408.htm.*

36. ^a, b, cBaddeley M (2015). "Herding, Social Influences and Behavioural Bias in Scientific Research: Simple Awareness of the Hidden Pressures and Beliefs That Influence Our Thinking Can Help to Preserve Objectivity." *EMBO Rep.* **16**(8):902–905. doi:10.15252/embr.201540637.

37. ^刘霞 (2018). "针对哈佛大学专家论文造假 美政府暂停心脏干细胞研究" [US Government Suspends Heart Stem Cell Research Due to Harvard Expert's Paper Fraud]. http://news.china.com.cn/2018-10/31/content_69208137.htm.

38. ^Huang H, Ma D, Ren Q (2018). "China's Massive Investment in Stem Cell Studies Based on Bogus Science." Caixin Global. https://www.caixinglobal.com/2018-10-23/chinas-massive-investment-in-stem-cell-studies-based-on-bogus-science-101338181.html.

39. ^慕溪 (2018). "哈佛干细胞专家论文造假导致行业倒退十年" [Harvard Stem Cell Expert's Paper Fraud Causes Industry to Regress Ten Years]. https://news.sciencenet.cn/htmlnews/2018/11/420334.shtm.

40. ^Kuo P (2018). "It's All Right to Be Wrong in Science." NIST. https://www.nist.gov/blogs/taking-measure/its-all-right-be-wrong-science.

41. ^Walter S (2024). "Managing Director Knowledge: 9 Tips for a Constructive Culture of Fault Tolerance." https://managementberatung-coaching.de/en/error-culture-tips/.

42. ^Elliott KC, Resnik DB (2015). "Scientific Reproducibility, Human Error, and Public Policy." Bioscience. **65**(1): 5–6. doi:10.1093/biosci/biu197.

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.