

A New Forum for the Biomedical Sciences: Advancing Research and Collaboration

Dr. Carlos Hernández^{1*}, Dr. Ana López²

¹Faculty of Medicine, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico

²Department of Public Health, University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

Abstract. New Biomedical Sciences is a new scientific journal of the biomedical sciences that is addressed at Graduate Students, Post-Doctoral Scientific Researchers and Principal Scientific Researchers who still work at the bench with their brains and hands. New Biomedical Sciences is not intended for armchair scientists who have long ago stopped doing biomedical sciences at the bench with their brains and hands and have no idea how hard it is to come up with an original experiment, do the experiment, collect the results, analyze the results, and write the paper without resorting to Data Fabrication, Data Falsification and Dishonest Scientific Reporting. The latest scandals in the inability of Governmental and Scientific leaderships (including those of the United States, United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain, Sweden and Brazil) to deal with SARS-COV-2 infections and virulence around the world, and the publication of sub-standard and made up scientific articles are tell tale signs that there is something fundamentally wrong with the way the biomedical sciences are practiced and disseminated nowadays. It is submitted that the so-called top journals in the biomedical sciences that are mostly run by ex-post-docs who could not make it in the highly competitively world of research universities and other research institutions, and by other arm-chair scientists who have long ago stopped doing biomedical sciences at the bench with their brains and hands bear the collective responsibility of the disastrous state of our craft and also of the inability to control SARS-COV-2 infections and virulence (deaths) around the world. None of the so-called top scientific journals (or the lowest of the low scientific journals) have published any significant papers that could have mitigated the hundreds of thousands of deaths (still counting) due to SARS-COV-2 infections around the world. Although, they do not see it

as their responsibility, the fact that they profit enormously from it makes them guilty of dereliction of their duties. The publication of the now retracted papers by Lancet and New England Journal of Medicine, and the subsequent zigzagging and incompetence of the World Health Organization is but the tip of the iceberg.

These entities are playing with the lives of the average people and they should be ashamed and made accountable of their actions (and inactions). At the very least, they should be investigated and prosecuted criminally if need be because lives in the hundreds of thousands (still counting) and trillions of dollars (still counting) have been lost.

New Biomedical Sciences is a new scientific journal for those who practiced the biomedical sciences at the bench with their brains and hands. That the biomedical sciences as we know it to-day are in a state of crisis is an understatement. The current crisis generated by SARS-COV-2 infections and virulence, and the inability of the Governmental and Scientific leaderships of most countries, including those of United States and the European countries, including United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Belgium, the Netherlands and Belgium to prevent and mitigate deaths due to SARS-COV-2 infections are the latest manifestations of that crisis. The major problem is that in the past, despite the hundreds of billions of dollars wasted every year, the incompetence, ignorance and corruption of Governmental and Scientific leaderships were invisible to the public. Now with millions of people infected with SARS-COV-2, hundreds of thousands of deaths and trillions of dollars lost world wide, the average person is witnessing and experiencing the full effects of the incompetence, ignorance and corruption of Governmental and Scientific leaderships. The Governmental leaderships of most countries, including United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Belgium,

Netherlands and Brazil are not trained scientific researchers in the biomedical sciences so they must rely on the scientific leaderships whom they have appointed. It appears that they have appointed mostly incompetent and ignorant so-called pundits and scientific experts to advise them and to run their national scientific and medical research agencies and higher education agencies. For example, in the United States, we have "two bumbling idiot savants" who are running the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases with annual budget of over 40 US billion dollars to waste [1]. (As the former Prime Minister of United Kingdom, Mrs Margaret Thatcher had once said: "It is not a question of what one wants. It is a question of what is available". It is impossible to conciliate with the facts that the Director of the National Institute of Health (NIH), Francis Collins and the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), Anthony Fauci who is at least 85 years old, are the only two persons in the United States qualified and available to run the NIH and NIAID.) In the United Kingdom, the Governmental and Scientific leaderships have shown their incompetence to deal with the current crisis by not taking steps that should have been taken so much so

that United Kingdom is now basket case of Europe with the highest number of people infected with SARS-COV-2 and the highest number of deaths due to SARS-COV-2 infections, and also one of the highest IP 10000 (Infectivity) and DP 10000 (Virulence) for SARS-COV-2 in Europe [2]. What is quite amazing is that no-one seems to care. In France, the Governmental and Scientific leaderships showed their unpreparedness and incompetence by having the highest DP 10000 (Virulence) for SARS-COV-2 in Europe despite claiming the implementation of broad testing and toying with Hydroxychloroquine at one time [2-4]. At the world level, we have seen how the highly unqualified Director General of the World Health Organization (WHO) with a budget of over six billion US dollars to waste per year, Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus showed his ignorance and incompetence with everyone of his uttering. For example, on or around January 23, 2020, he declared with the support of the WHO leadership and that of the United States' Department of Health and Social Services, the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, the Centers for Disease Control, and other National Agencies that there was no need to worry about COVID-19 globally and that COVID-19 was

not a global health emergency. On or around March 19, 2020, he had to eat his words by declaring that the Corona Virus Disease (COVID-19) is a world-wide pandemic [5,6], almost two months late. More recently, under his leadership, the World Health Organization stated that there was no concern with SARS-COV-2 mutating at a rapid rate [7] when studies after studies showed that SARS-COV-2 was mutating, is mutating and will continue to mutate [8-18]. Perhaps, the Hydroxychloroquine fiasco illustrates best what is wrong with the state of the biomedical sciences. All the evidence showed that Hydroxychloroquine is not only useless at treating patients infected with SARS-COV-2 but it is also dangerous as it is associated with higher risks of cardiac arrest and abnormal ECG findings [19-32]. First, due to lack of ideas, the World Health Organization, caught on the bandwagon initiated by Gautret et al. [33] started a large-scale clinical trial paid for in large part by the United States. After the papers by Mehra et al. [34,35] came out, the World Health Organization stopped their Hydroxychloroquine clinical trial. After the papers by Mehra et al. [34,35] was retracted by Lancet, the World Health Organization wanted to restart their Hydroxychloroquine clinical trial. Do they ever read the scientific literature with their brains? It must be noted

that prior to the publication of the paper by Mehra et al [34,35], there were reports that described unnecessary deaths of COVID-19 patients associated with Hydroxychloroquine treatment [19-21,30-32].

There are many reasons behind the unpreparedness and chaotic response to SARS-COV- infection and virulence that has now caused over five hundred thousand deaths (still counting) worldwide and over one hundred and fifty thousands deaths in the United States (still counting) alone, over three trillions dollars unnecessary expenditure (still counting), and perhaps an economic depression unseen before: (I) Governmental and Scientific Leaderships are clueless, incompetent and panic-stricken: One would think that with all the brain power of the so-called scientific experts, economic experts, strategists and thinkers, the Governmental and Scientific leaderships would have no problem dealing with a parasitic entity (not even a full fledged organism) smaller than a speck of dust SARS-COV-2 which the CEO of a Vaccine Company benefiting billions of dollars from the largesse of confused and panicking Government officials characterized as "not a complicated virus". The so-called Scientific Experts and Pundits have promised that they

will come up with one or more vaccine(s) at the end of year. Yet those who are real experts and who still work at the bench with their brains and hands know that an effective vaccine against SARS-COV-2 are years and not months away (unless some unscrupulous people will publish a fake study and the incompetent scientific journals will gobble the fake study like flies and publish it and then retract it!).

(II) Scientific Publishing Companies are derelict of their duties: There are three major Scientific Publishing Companies run mostly by ex-post-docs that control most of the world's scientific publishing. They and the other independent publishing companies (e.g Journal of Biological Chemistry which publishes more scientific articles that cannot be reproduced! than any other scientific journals) are only driven by profit motive. Where is the outrage for publishing fake studies?. Where are the so-called scientific experts who reviewed the now retracted papers? Why were they so incompetent and clueless about the scientific worthiness of those retracted papers which are only the tip of the iceberg? What qualifications did they have to review those papers? Shouldn't the Editor in Chiefs of Lancet and New England Journal of Medicine immediately resign for

their incompetence ignorance and aloofness? (In United Kingdom, the Scottish Chief Medical Officer and a Scientific Advisor to the Prime Minister were forced to resign because they flouted the lock down mandate [36,37]. What about the other so-called top scientific journals, including Science, Nature and Cell and their associated publications that are run by ex-post-docs. Shouldn't they also suffer collective retribution since they have also contributed to the publication of scientific publications of extremely low quality and of dubious scientific value, and published not a single publication that deal with effective control of SARS-COV-2 infections and virulence. (III) The quality of scientific personnel is of dubious standard: Why was the Scientific Leadership caught with their "pants down" and unable to offer any scientifically inspired response strategy to control SARS-COV-2 infections and virulence (deaths in the hundreds of thousands and counting!). Unfortunately, in the past thirty years or so, most Graduate Students in the biomedical sciences have not received proper instruction and training. Instead, they have only been taught by Principal Scientific Researchers who are mostly arm-chair scientists who have stopped doing biomedical sciences at the bench with their brains and hands that purchasing ready

made kits like buying hamburgers at Mac Donald was the right and only way to do some "Mickey Mouse" experiments. The Graduate Students have never been instructed in the history and philosophy of science. Consequently, they have no idea what Inductive, Deductive and Hypothetico Deductive Methods of Scientific Inquiry are. They have no idea who Karl Popper, Thomas Kuhn, and Paul Feyerabend (to name but a few) are and have not read and understood "Logic of Scientific Discovery", "Structure of Scientific Revolution" and "Against Method". They and their Principal Scientific Researchers have not been instructed in the formulation of questions neither. If they do not know how to ask scientific questions, how can one expect them to provide answers to questions that they could not formulate in the first place. Very few Graduate Students and Principal Scientific Researchers have been instructed in the Principles of Scientific Ethics and what Scientific Misconduct, Scientific Fraud and Dishonest Scientific Fraud are. Is it a wonder that the scientific literature is filled with garbage scientific articles that in most part cannot be reproduced even by the people who generated them in the first place?

(IV) There are too many arm-chair scientists and so-called Principal Scientific Researchers who have stopped doing biomedical sciences at the bench with their brains and hands: There used to be a time when most Principal Scientific Researchers knew what they were doing and they did their work at the bench with their brains and hands. Two of my scientific heroes are Rosalind Franklin and Frederic Sanger. Rosalind Franklin was badly treated because she was a woman and Jewish. Rosalind Franklin was the person who first concluded that DNA was a double helix and provided the evidence of the DNA double by the technique of X-ray crystallography which she learned in Paris in the laboratory of Jacques Mering. Even in the time of Rosalind Franklin, there were "Tricksters". The data which Rosalind Franklin and her student collected with their brains and hands was stolen and presented to James Watson who had no qualm in using the data and not acknowledging that he and Crick used the data to come up with their structure of DNA [38]. For reasons that remain unexplained and mysterious, none of the so-called top journals that are run by ex-post-docs have bothered to explore the issue and "render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar". Is it because they are clueless about the History and Philosophy of Science, and Principles of

Scientific Ethics. Very few Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences have formal instruction in the History and Philosophy of Science, and Principles of Ethics.

(V) There is something wrong when a large proportion of published scientific articles in the biomedical sciences cannot be reproduced by other Scientific Researchers and those who generated them in the first place: A survey by the American Society for Cell Biology [39] showed that a massive 70% of its members stated that they had tried but were unable to reproduce the results of a published scientific article. What was shocking was that almost 40% of the responders wrote that the problem of irreproducibility persisted because incompetent Scientific Researchers were involved. Almost 48% of the Responders agreed that poor laboratory record keeping was a factor, ~39 % agreed that pressure to publish was a factor, ~21 % agreed that poor methodological training was a factor, and ~40% agreed that poor statistical knowledge was a factor. A Nature journal survey [40] described a most shocking survey which showed that "More than 70% of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce another scientist's experiments, and more than half have failed to reproduce their own

experiments". It is indeed despairing that people would call themselves Scientific Researchers when they cannot even reproduce their own experiments. Nature is the journal that published Watson and Crick's claim that they discovered the structure of DNA [38], the uttering of Pierre Beneviste on the "memory of water" [41] and the subsequent farcical and one of the weirdest publication in a scientific journal by Maddox et al. [42], the publication of a paper on cold fusion following the declaration of Fleischmann and Pons that they had discovered the means to produce energy by cold fusion [43], and the claim by Okabata et al. that they had found a simple, cheap and easy method for the production of adult stem cells [44,45], to name but a few. A study by Gasparyan et al [46] showed that the so-called "top-tier" journals, including Nature with 51 retracted articles, Science with 73 retracted articles, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, and Journal of Biological Chemistry with 82 articles retracted, have the highest number retractions. According to Bhumika Bhatt [47], with more than 270 retracted articles etched on its belt, Journal of Biological Chemistry occupies the top honor (or dishonor). Nature, Science PloS One, Tumor Biology also made the top 10 honor

(dishonor) list of most retracted articles [47]. Bik et al [48] analyzed 20621 scientific articles and found that about 3.8 % (783) contained images that were manipulated and contended that as many as 35000 papers in the biomedical scientific literature ought to be retracted [49]. Bik [50] informed us that most scientific journals and research institutions do not respond to allegations of manipulated data. To show the extent of Data Fabrication and Data Falsification, Ostvold's study [48] came to the conclusion that almost 25% of papers published in cancer research contain data duplication and questioned the reliability of the literature in the biomedical sciences. Ostvold's study [51] also informed us that most scientific journal do not respond to allegations of manipulated or fabricated data in their publications. The Director of the National Institutes of Health, Francis S. Collins [52] stated that "Let's be clear: with rare exceptions, we have no evidence to suggest that irreproducibility is caused by scientific misconduct. In 2012, the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) of the US Department of Health and Human Services pursued only 12 such cases. Even if this represent only a fraction of the actual problem, fraudulent papers are vastly outnumbered by the hundreds of thousands published each year in good faith". The

statement of Francis S. Collins shows that he is living in an alternative world. The reason the ORI pursued so few cases every year is because it has no authority to investigate any allegations of Scientific Misconduct. The investigation is done by the Research Institutions where the allegations of Scientific Misconduct took place. Only when the Research Institutions find that there is evidence of Scientific Misconduct, does the ORI intervene. In most cases, the allegations are swept under the carpet [53,54].

(VI) The so-called top scientific journals including Nature, Science, Lancet and New England Journal of Medicine have "Mickey Mouse" peer review systems. It has been argued that they themselves do not need to be practicing and thinking Scientific Researchers because they rely on so-called scientific experts and pundits to advise them on the scientific merit of a submitted manuscript. This argument is faulty and farcical because the so-called scientific experts and pundits are themselves not qualified to review anything. Don't these ex-post-docs Editors and arm-chair scientists have brains and guts to at least read manuscripts that are submitted to them and make some useful comments instead of the formulaic response letters that they send to

everyone. The Editor in Chief of Nature, an admitted ex-post-doc who could not make it in the competitive world of real-life research made a big fanfare when she was appointed, about openness and fairness in Nature's Peer Review [55]. The so-called Open Peer Review System that Nature set up under its New Editor in Chief illustrates the general problems of so-called top scientific journals. Instead of focusing on the quality of the papers that they publish, they decided to waste financial, personnel and brain resources on cosmetic and farcical tinkering of an obsolete publishing system that has been surpassed by advances in technology. Who are the so-called experts and pundits who act as reviewers of papers submitted to Nature and its long list of associated journals? Those so-called experts are arm-chair scientists who have long ago given up doing scientific work at the bench with their brains and hands. They talk a lot but say nothing. They ought to go back to the lab, do some work with their brain and hands, and wear some dirty lab coats. They will learn that it is hard to come up with an experiment, perform the experiment, collect the data, analyze the data and write the paper without resorting to Data Fabrication, Data Falsification and Dishonest Scientific Reporting. If they did that simple exercise,

they will know and realize that the so-called top scientific journals have published a mountain of useless data most of which cannot be reproduced by the people who generated them in the first place. How many times have I received comments from Reviewers who had nothing to say about the scientific and technical worth of my submitted papers but nevertheless insisted that more work was necessary before publication. The consequence of the pin head's view of science of these so-called scientific experts and pundits is that one is now inundated with mountains of useless and confusing data that no-one cares to read, understand and reproduce.

There used to be a time when a scientific paper would consist of at the most six to eight simple figures that would be illustrative, illuminating and sufficient to reveal to the reader the new ideas and theories being expounded. Nowadays, one figure would consist of up to ten sections of mostly scientific surplusages. Who can detect Data Fabrication, Data Falsification and Dishonest Scientific Reporting in these scientific surplusages. Certainly not the so-called scientific experts and pundits, and ex-post-docs with fancy titles of Editor in Chief, Editor and Associate Editors. How else can

one explain the publications of Devenas et al., Maddox et al., Jones et al., and Obakata et al. in Nature [41-45]. How else can one explain the publications of Hwang et al., Kaidi et al., Berret et al. and Cho et al. in Science [56-62]. How else can one explain the publication of Mehra et al. Lancet [34]. How else can one explain the publication of Mehra et al. in New England Journal of Medicine [35]. The problems of publishing papers with Fabricated Data, Falsified Data and Dishonest Scientific Data are not restricted to so-called top scientific journals but permeate even traditional scientific journals, including the once venerated Journal of Biological Chemistry and Journal of Neurochemistry. How else can one explain the publications of Platholi et al. [63], Hemmings et al. [64] Trapasso et al. [65], D'Souza et al. [66], Lakshmi et al. [67], Wang et al. [68], Trazzi et al. [69], Wu et al. [70], Yang et al. [71], Wang et al. [72], Chen et al. [73], Wang et al. [74], Li et al. [75], Wang et al. [76], Wang et al. [77], Ma et al. [78], Liu et al. [79], Ye et al. [80], Wang et al. [81], and Liu et al. [82] (too many to cite here) in the Journal of Biological Chemistry. The corresponding author of last twelve papers described above is the one and only Cao, X., upon whom the journal, Nature bestowed the title of "Lifetime Achievement Award For

Mentoring In Science” [83]. It just shows that the so-called top journal is awashed with cronyism and comedic actions. Karuo Sakobe with the lofty title of Research Integrity Manager of the Journal of Biological Chemistry is another ex-post-doc who is so busy dealing with obvious cases of Data Fabrication, and Data Falsification which are mostly manipulation or duplication of Western Blots that she has no time dealing with less obvious cases, including advanced biochemistry that she does not understand and has no training in [63,64].

[The Editor in Chief, Editors, Associate Editors and the Editorial Manager of the Journal of Biological Chemistry must resign from their positions. It is a disgrace and unacceptable that they have brought a once illustrious scientific journal that was run by the likes of Herbert Tabor and Edwin G. Krebs to its current lows with an impact factor of ~4 and total cites of ~24000 from ~7.4 and ~113000 in 2000, and ~5.5 and ~64000 in 2010. The high number of citations that the Journal of Biological Chemistry like to quote and sell include self-citations. There is a report on ResearchGate that states that the impact factor for the Journal of Biological Chemistry is currently less than 2. These figures not only show the irrelevance of the

Journal of Biological Chemistry to-day but they also show that despite the huge number of published papers, no-one is citing them. Is it because the Journal of Biological Chemistry publishes almost anything these days and have to retract papers on an almost weekly basis. It is indeed quite sad and incomprehensible that the current incompetent Editor in Chief, Editors and Associate Editors of the once venerable Journal of Biological Chemistry and the journal of choice of all biochemists did not have the “presence-d’esprit” and the strategic fore-sight to preempt the coming of new publishing technology and their supersedence by the long lists of journals associated with Nature, Science and Cell whose policies and strategies are to cause the bankruptcy and closure of all “once illustrious and revered journals like the Journal of Biological Chemistry”. The fact that the current Editor in Chief, Editors and Associate Editors of Journal of Biological Chemistry agreed to be taken over by the behemoth Elsevier shows that they are a bunch of “bumbling idiots and incompetents”. Now they are going to use Elsevier Model to gouge the Scientific Researchers by charging them extra fees for publishing so-called open access papers. Why should the authors who do the work

have to pay so that publishing companies like Elsevier can put their papers on the internet. The publishing companies and the readers must pay for what they want to read in the internet and not the other way round. No-one knows how much they are going to charge. I would not be surprised if they charge more than two thousand dollars per paper. Members of the American Society of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology already pay an annual membership fee to have access to the Journal of Biological Chemistry. Now, if they still wish [who wants to nowadays except for tricksters?] to publish in their own journal which they own, they will be forced to pay gouging open access publishing fees dictated by Elsevier. It is the death of the Journal of Biological Chemistry and Elsevier will merely be nailing the coffin. It is a disgrace and highway robbery. I can publish the papers of the Journal of Biological Chemistry at a fraction of the costs that Elsevier is going to charge Members of the American Society of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology to publish in their own journal.]

How else can one explain the publication of Nishi et al. and Unal et al. [79,80] in the Journal of Neurochemistry. What the so-called top journals fail to realize is that one retracted paper is too many considering the

"brain power" at their disposal and profits that they make every year. It is hypocritical from their part to retract papers that should not have been accepted and published in the first place. What ever happened to the so-called scientific experts and pundits who are supposed to have reviewed these retracted papers. Were they smoking something that they should not have while reviewing these retracted papers or were they just plain incompetent and clueless. If the Editor in Chief of Nature and other so-called top scientific journals were really serious about openness and fairness, she would institute an investigation of openness, fairness, justification and corruption in the initial review of manuscripts by committees of ex-post-docs who could not hack it in the world of real research. That is where all the problems lie. By virtue of their lack of training, general knowledge of the biomedical sciences and incapacity for strategic, critical and long term thinking, it is submitted that it is impossible for them to detect Data Fabrication, Data Falsification and Dishonest Data Reporting, let alone determine that a manuscript contains a truly original idea, theory and sets of new data. The ex-post-docs with fancy titles of Editor in Chief, Editors, Associate Editors etc. are challenged to name a single exceptional

paper that they have published, and could have made a significant difference in the number of deaths due to SARS-COV-2 infections. The so-called top scientific journals, including Nature, Nature Medicine, Science, Science Translational Medicine, Cell, Cell Reports Medicine, to name but a few and their ex-post-docs and arm-chair scientist Editor in Chiefs, Editors and Associate Editors, are responsible in large part of hundreds of thousands of deaths (still counting) due to SARS-COV-2 infections and virulence because they sat on their asses and did not publish a single scientific article that would have forewarned the equally incompetent Government officials of the impending pandemic that has so far cost hundreds of thousands of deaths (still counting) and trillions of dollars (still counting). If they had any sense of the heavy responsibility that they bear, they would honorably resign (or be fired) and let practicing Scientific Researchers determine what should and should not be published. (Perhaps the next problem that one could encounter is whether there are any practicing Scientific Researchers still who work with their brains and hands left! A survey must be made to determine who actually do the real work with their brains and hands in the laboratory! In France, there is a class of

Scientific Researchers called "Ingenieurs d' Etudes" who are the "slaves" of the scientific establishment. They are the ones who perform most of the "scientific work" but could never receive credits for originality and independence of thoughts.) It was Smith, R., the former Editor the British Medical Journal who described Peer Review as "a flawed process at the heart of science and journals" and complete farcical and subjective process [81]. A legitimate question that has not been asked concerns the real job description of an Editor of a scientific journal. Is it to accept and publish manuscripts based on a flawed and farcical so-called Peer Review Process or an active and intelligent Editorial Process that is based on his/her knowledge of the subject- matter. After all, how difficult can it be to read a few manuscripts per day and make an editorial decision on whether to accept and publish based on one's capacity to read, comprehend, think and analyze. Also, the job of an Editor is to take the responsibility and acknowledge one's fault when a paper with fabricated and falsified is published under one's watch. Let us not be hypocritical about it. Scientific papers ought to be chosen and published by an Editor who is a practicing Scientific Researcher who still works at the bench with his/her brains and hands and who have breath of knowledge in

the subject matter and not by ex-post-docs who could not make it in the real world of research or an arm-chair scientist who has long ago stopped working at the bench with his/her brain and hands.

New Biomedical Sciences differs from the so-called top scientific journals (and the other traditional scientific journals) because it is run and edited by a Scientific Researcher who still works at the bench with his brain and hands. The Editor of New Biomedical Sciences knows how hard it is to come up with an experiment, perform the experiment, collect the data, analyze the data and write the paper without resorting to Data Fabrication, Data Falsification and Dishonest Scientific Reporting. The Editor of New Biomedical Sciences knows the difference between a manuscript that is written by a Scientific researcher who works at the bench with his/her brains and hands and one that is written by a so-called scientific expert or arm chair scientist who has long ago stopped working at the bench with his/her brain and hand. New Biomedical Sciences (i) will not be peer-reviewed by so-called pundits and scientific experts who have no idea what biomedical sciences are and how biomedical sciences are practiced at the bench, and who have long ago stopped working at the bench

with their brains and hands. It is an aberration, tragic and comical/farcical that the direction of biomedical sciences are now being dictated by so-called top scientific journals (and also scientific journals with puny impact factor) that are run by ex-post-docs who could not make it in the highly competitively world of research universities and other research institutions, and by other arm-chair scientists who have long ago stopped doing biomedical sciences at the bench with their brains and hands, (ii) will only publish papers with significant new ideas, new theories, and new results that have or will have relevance in understanding and curing disease states that afflict humans, (iii) will only publish Review Articles that contain new ideas, new concepts and new theories, and not just replicas (rehash) of published scientific articles (Scientific Researchers who work at the bench with their brains and hands know how to read the scientific literature. There is no need for arm-chair scientists to summarize the boring scientific literature for them), (iv) will only publish papers that are simple but illuminates a high degree of new knowledge, ideas and theories. New Biomedical Sciences believes that the purpose of a scientific paper is not to inundate and confuse the reader with irrelevant and mundane facts that cannot be

reproduced in most cases even by the people who generated them in the first place but to illuminate the reader with new knowledge, ideas and theories. New Biomedical Sciences will not for tricksters who resort to Data Fabrication, Data Falsification and Dishonest Scientific Reporting, and violate Scientific Ethics Rules. New Biomedical Sciences challenges the so-called pundits and scientific experts to spend a few months in the laboratory at the bench doing some simple experiments on their own without the help of post-docs and research associates and see how hard it is to come up with an original experiment, do the experiment, collect the results, analyze the results, and write the paper without resorting to Data Fabrication, Data Falsification and Dishonest Scientific Reporting.

References.

1. Tung, H.Y.L. (2020) J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Articles, Vol. 2, pp46-69.
The SARS-COV-2 and COVID-19 Saga: Derelict of duty is a form of Scientific Misconduct.
2. Tung, H.Y.L. and Limtung, P. (2020) ResearchGate,
DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.25358.38723.
SARS-COV-2 Infection and Virulence: Comparison between United Kingdom and Germany, and other European countries.
3. Fourcade, M., Kresge, N. and Nussbaum, A. (2020) Bloomberg, Issue of April 20, 2020.
Malaria drug hype lures Macron as hope of gets ahead of science.
4. Dearment, A. (2020) MedCity News, Issue of May 27, 2020.
Pas plus: France yanks authorization for hydroxychloroquine in Covid-19.
5. Kupferschmidt, K. (2020) Science, Issue of February 10, 2020.
Mission impossible? WHO director fights to prevent a pandemic without offending China.
6. Nebehay, S., Macfie, N. and Chopra, T. (2020) Reuters World News, Issue of February 3, 2020.
WHO chief says widespread travel ban not needed to beat China virus.
7. Feuer, W. (2020) CNBC News, Issue of June 03, 2020.
WHO says coronavirus has not meaningfully mutated to a more lethal or contagious form.
8. Korber, B., Fisher, W.M., Gnanakaran, S., Yoon, H., Theiler, J., Abfalterer, W., Foley, B., Giorgi, E.E., Bhattacharya, T., Parker, M.D., Partridge, D.G., Evans, C.M., Freeman, T.M., de Silva, T.I., Sheffield COVID-19 Genomics Group, LaBranche, C.C. and Montefiori, D.C. (2020) bioRxiv,
DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.29.069054.
Spike mutation pipeline reveals the emergence of a more transmissible form of SARS-CoV-2.
9. Hu, J., He, C.L., Gao, Q., Zhang, G.J., Cao, X.X., Long, Q, X., Deng, H.J., Huang, L.Y., Chen, J, Wang, K, Tang, N. and Huang, A.L. (2020) bioRxiv,
DOI: 10.1101/2020.06.20.161323
The D614G mutation of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein enhances viral infectivity and decreases neutralization sensitivity to individual convalescent sera.

10. Patiño-Galindo, J. Á., Filip, I., AlQuraishi, M., and Rabadan, R. (2020). bioRxiv, DOI:10.1101/2020.02.10.942748
Recombination and lineage-specific mutations led to the emergence of SARS-CoV-2.
11. Wu, A., Niu, P., Wang, L., Zhou, H., Zhao, X., Wang, W., Wang, J., Ji, C., Ding, X., Wang, X., Lu, R., Gold, S., Aliyari, S., Zhang, S., Vikram, E., Zou, A., Lenh, E., Chen, J., Ye, F., Han, N., Peng, Y., Guo, H., Wu, G., Jiang, T., Tan, W. and Cheng, G. (2020) bioRxiv, DOI: 10.1101/2020.02.29.971101
Mutations, Recombination and Insertion in the Evolution of 2019-nCoV
12. Ou, J., Zhou, Z., Zhang, J., Lan, W., Zhao, S., Wu, J., Seto, D., Zhang, G. and Zhang, Q. (2020) bioRxiv, 10.1101/2020.03.15.991844
RBD mutations from circulating SARS-CoV-2 strains enhance the structure stability and infectivity of the spike protein
13. Tung, H.Y.L. and Limtung, P. (2020) ResearchGate, DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32014.38726.
Mutations in the phosphorylation sites of SARS-COV-2 encoded Nucleocapsid protein and structure model of sequestration by Protein 14-3-3.
14. Panchetti, M., Marini, B., Benedetti, F., Giudici, F., Mauro, E., Storici, P., asciovecchio, C., Angeletti, S., Ciccozzi, M., Gallo, R.C. and Ippodrino, R. (2020) J. Trans. Med., DOI: 10.1186/s12967-020-02344-6.
Emerging SARS-CoV-2 mutation hot spots include a novel RNA-dependent-RNA polymerase variant.
15. Phan T. (2020) Infect. Genet. Evol., DOI: 10.1016/j.meegid.2020.104260.
Genetic diversity and evolution of SARS-CoV-2.
16. Dawood, A.A. (2020) New Microbes and New Infections, DOI: 10.1016/j.mni.2020.1000673.
Mutated COVID-19 may foretell a great risk for mankind in the future.
17. Yin, C. (2020) Genomics, DOI: 10.1016/j.ygeno.2020.04.016.
Genotyping coronavirus SARS-CoV-2: methods and implications.
18. Benvenuto, D., Demir, A.B., Giovanetti, M., Bianchi, M., Angeletti, S., Ascarella, S., Cauda, R., Ciccozzi, M. and Cassones, A. (2020) J. Med. Virol. DOI: 10.1002/jmv.26104.
Evidence for mutations in SARS-CoV-2 Italian isolates potentially affecting virus transmission.
19. Lane, J.C.E. et al. (2020) medRxiv, DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.08.20054551.
Safety of hydroxychloroquine, alone and in combination with azithromycin, in light of rapid wide-spread use for COVID-19: a multinational, network cohort and self-controlled case series study.
20. Magnanoli, J., Narendran, J.S., Pereira, F., Cummings, T., Hardin, J.W., Sutton, S.S. and Ambati, J. (2020) medRxiv, DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.16.20065920.
Outcomes of hydroxychloroquine usage in United States veterans hospitalized with Covid-19.
21. Borba, M.G.S., de Almeida Val, F., Sampaio, V.S., Alexandre, M.A.A., Melo, G.C., Brito, M., Mouratildeo, M.P., Sousa, J.D.B., Baia-da-Silva, D., Guerra, M.V.F., Hajjar, L.A., Pinto, R.C., Balieiro, A.A.S., Naveca, F.G., Xavier, M.S., Salomao, A., Siquera, A.M., Schwarzbolt, A., Croda, J.H.R., Nogueira, M.L., Romero, G.A.S., Bassat, Q., Fontes, C.J., Albuquerque, B.C., Daniel-Ribeiro, C.T.,

Monteiro, W.M., Lacerda, M.V.G. and CloroCovid-19 Team (2020) medRxiv,

DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.07.20056424.

Chloroquine diphosphate in two different dosages as adjunctive therapy of hospitalized patients with severe respiratory syndrome in the context of coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) infection: Preliminary safety results of a randomized, double-blinded, phase IIIb clinical trial (CloroCovid-19 Study).

22. Tang, W., Cao, Z., Han, M., Wang, Z., Chen, J., Sun, W., Wu, Y., Xiao, W., Liu, S., Chen, E., Chen, W., Wang, X., Yang, J., Lin, J., Zhao, Q., Yan, Y., Xie, Z., Li, D., Yang, Y., Liu, L., Qu, J., Ning, G., Shi, G. and Xie, Q. (2020) medRxiv,

DOI: 10.1101/2020.04.10.20060558

Hydroxychloroquine in patients mainly with mild to moderate COVID-19: an open-label, randomized, controlled trial.

23. Molina, J.M., Delaugerre, C., Goff, J.L., Mela-Lima, B., Ponscarne, D., Goldwirt, L. and de Castro, N. (2020) *Medecine et Maladies Infectieuses* (2020),

DOI: 10.1016/j.medmal.2020.03.006

No Evidence of Rapid Antiviral Clearance or Clinical Benefit with the Combination of Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin in Patients with Severe COVID-19 Infection.

24. Mahevas, M., Tran, V.-T., Roumier, M., Chabrol, A., Paule, R., Guillaud, C., Gallien, S., Lepeule, R., Szwebel, T.-A., Lescure, X., Schlemmer, F., Matignon, M., Khellaf, M., Crickx, E., Terrier, B., Morbieu, C., Legendre, P., Dang, J., Schoindre, Y., Pawlotski, M., Michel, M., Perrodeau, E., Carlier, N., Roche, N., De Lastours, V., Mouthon, L., Audureau, E., Ravaut, P., Godeau, B. and Costedoat, N. (2020) medRxiv,

DOI: /10.1101/2020.04.10.20060699.

No evidence of clinical efficacy of hydroxychloroquine in patients hospitalized for COVID-19 infection with oxygen requirement: results of a study using routinely collected data to emulate a target trial.

25. Hulme, O.J., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Dankier, P., Madelung, C.F., Siebner, H.R., Helweg-Larsen, J., Gronau, Q., Benfield, T.L. and Madsen, K.H. (2020) medRxiv,

DOI: 10.1101/2020.03.31.20048777.

A Bayesian reanalysis of the effects of hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin on viral carriage in patients with COVID-19.

26. Dahly, D., Gates, S. and Morris, T. (2020) Zenodo,

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3725560.

Statistical review of Hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin as a treatment of COVID-19 ; results of an open-label-non randomized clinical trial (Version 1.1)

27. Bik, E. (2020) *Science Integrity Digest*, <https://scienceintegritydigest.com/2020/03/24/thoughts-on-the-gautret-et-al-paper-about-hydroxychloroquine-and-azithromycin-treatment-of-covid-19-infections/>

Thoughts on the GAutret et al. paper about Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin treatment of COVID-19 infections.

28. Tung, H.Y.L. (2020) *J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Art.*, Vol. 2, pp70-77.

Investigative critique of the paper entitled "Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin as a treatment of covid-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial", authored by Gautret, P., Lagier, J.-C., Parola, P., Hoang, V.T., Meddeb, L., Mailhe, M., Doudier, B., Courjon, J., Giordanengo, V., Vieira, V.E., Tissot, H., Honere, S., La Scola, B., Rolain, J.-M., Brouqui, P. and Raoult, D., and published *International Journal of Antimicrobial*

- Agents [Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents (2020), DOI:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105949].
29. FDA News Release (2020) <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-revokes-emergency-use-authorization-chloroquine-and-coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-revokes-emergency-use-authorization-for-chloroquine-and-hydroxychloroquine>.
30. Rosenberg, E.S., Dufort, M., Udo, T., Wilbershied, A., Kumar, J., Tesopriero, J., Weinberg, P., Kirkwood, J., Muse, A., Dehovitz, J., Blog, D.S., Hutton, B., Holtgrave, D. and Zucker, H.A. (2020) JAMA, DOI: 10.1001/jama.2020.8630. Association of Treatment With Hydroxychloroquine or Azithromycin With In-Hospital Mortality in Patients With COVID-19 in New York State.
31. Mercurio, N.J., Yen, C.F., Shim, D.J., Maher, T.R., McCoy, C.M., Zimetbaum, P.J. and Gold, H.S. (2020) JAMA Cardiol., DOI: 10.1001/jamacardio.2020.1834 Risk of QT Interval Prolongation Associated With Use of Hydroxychloroquine With or Without Concomitant Azithromycin Among Hospitalized Patients Testing Positive for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19).
32. Bessière F, Rocca H, Delinière A, (2020) JAMA Cardiol., DOI:10.1001/jamacardio.2020.1787 Assessment of QT Intervals in a case series of patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection treated with hydroxychloroquine alone or in combination with azithromycin in an intensive care unit.
33. Gautret, P., Lagier, J.-C., Parola, P., Hoang, V.T., Meddeb, L., Mailhe, M., Doudier, B., Courjon, J., Giordanengo, V., Vieira, V.E., Tissot, H., Honore, S., La Scola, B., Rolain, J.-M., Brouqui, P. and Raoult, D., and published International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents (2020) Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents, DOI:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105949. Hydroxychloroquine and Azithromycin as a treatment of covid-19: results of an open-label non-randomized clinical trial.
34. Notice of Retraction (2020) Lancet, DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736. Retracted: Hydroxychloroquine or Chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis by Mehra, M.R., Dasai, S.S., Rutschitzka, F. and Patel, A.N. published on May 21, 2020, DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20) 31180-6.
35. Notice of Retraction (2020) New Eng. J. Med., DOI: 10.1056/NEJMC2021225. Retracted: Cardiovascular disease, drug therapy and mortality in Covid-19 by Mehra, M.R., Desai, S.S., Kuy, S., Henry, T.D. and Patel, A.N. published on May 1, 2020, DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa2007621.
36. Carell, S. (2020) The Guardian, Issue of April 5, 2020. Scotland's chief medical officer quits over second home row.
37. BBC News (2020) May 6, 2020. Coronoravirus: Prof Neil Ferguson quits government role after 'undermining' lock down.
38. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) in In the Matter of Scientific Misconduct and Fraud, Cactoa Scientific Publishers, Inc., New York, New York, U.S.A., pp45-49. In the Matter of Rosalind Franklin v. James Watson and Francis Crick.

39. <https://www.ascb.org/science-policy-public-outreach/advocacy-policy/ascb-task-force-reproducibility-in-science/>
40. Baker, M. (2016) *Nature*, Vol. 533, pp452-454.
1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility.
41. Devenas, E., Beauvais, F., Amara, J. et al. (1988) *Nature*, Vol. 333, pp816-818.
Human basophil degranulation triggered by very dilute antiserum against IgE.
42. Maddox, J., Randi, J. and Stewart, W.W. (1988) *Nature*, Vol. 334, pp287-291.
"High-dilution" experiments a delusion.
43. Jones, S., Palmer, E., Czirr, J. (1989) *Nature*, 338, pp737-740.
Observation of cold nuclear fusion in condensed matter.
44. Retraction Notice (2014 *Nature*, Vol 511, pp112-112.
Retraction of the papers entitled "Stimulus-triggered fate conversion of somatic [cells into pluripotency" authored by Obokata, H. et al. [*Nature*, Vol. 505, pp641- 647.] and Bidirectional development potential in reprogrammed cells with acquired pluripotency authored by Obokata, H. et al. [*Nature*, Vol. 505, pp676- 680.
45. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) *J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Article*, Vol 1, pp143-145.
Why was the Scientific Article Entitled "Stimulus-triggered fate conversion of somatic cells into pluripotency" authored by Haruko Okabata et al., and published in *Nature* [*Nature* (2014) Vol. 505, pp641-647] retracted.
46. Gasparyan, A.Y. , Ayvazyan, L., Akazhanov, N.A. and Kitas, G.D. (2014) *Croat Med. J.*, Vol. 55, pp61-72.
Self-correction in biomedical publications and the scientific impact.
47. Bhatt, B. (2019) *Molecular Biology Data Science*, Issue of March 23, 2019,
<https://bhumikabhatter.org/on-retractions-in-biomedical-literature.html>.
On retraction in biomedical literature.
48. Bik, E.M., Casadevall, A. and Fang, F.C. (2016) *mBio*,
DOI: 466 10.1128/mBio.00809-16.
The prevalence of inappropriate image duplication in biomedical research publications.
49. Bik, E.M., Fang, F.C., Kullas, A., Davis, R.J. and Casadevall, A. (2018) *Mol. Cell. Biol.*,
DOI: 10.1128/MCB.00309-18.
Analysis and correction of inappropriate image duplication: The molecular and cellular biology experience.
50. Turan, J. (2020) *Physiology News*, DOI: 10.36866/pn.118.10.
The science and art of detecting data manipulation and fraud: An interview with Elizabeth Bik.
51. Ostvold, (2016) *Sci. Eng. Ethics*, Vol. 22, pp487-496.
Incidence of Data Duplications in a Randomly Selected Pool of Life Science Publications.
52. Collins, F.S. and Tabak, L.A. (2014) *Nature*, Vol. 505, pp612-613.
Policy: NIH plans to enhance reproducibility.
53. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) in *In the Matter of Scientific Misconduct and Fraud*, Cactoa Scientific Publishers, Inc., New York, New York, U.S.A., pp5-26.
Definition of Scientific Misconduct, Scientific Fraud and Dishonest Scientific Report.
54. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) *J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Article*, Vol.1, pp 5-9.

Scientific Misconduct, Scientific Fraud

And Dishonest Scientific Report

55. Thielking, M. (2018) STAT, Issue of May 4, 2018.

Meet Nature's new Editor in Chief, a geneticist who reads scientific papers like page turners.

56. Retraction Notice (2019) Nature, Vol. 568, pp567-567.

Retraction of the paper entitled "KAT5 tyrosine phosphorylation couples chromatin sensing to ATM signalling", authored by Kaidi, A. and Jackson, S.P. published in Nature (2013) Vol. 498, pp70-74.

57. Hwang, W.S. et al. (2004) Science Vol. 303, pp1669-1674.

Evidence of a pluripotent human embryonic stem cell line derived by cloned blastocyst.

57. Hwang, W.S. et al. (2005) Science, Vol. 308, pp1777-1783.

Patient specific embryonic stem cells derived from human SCNT blastocysts.

58. Kennedy, D. (2006) Science, Vol. 311, pp5759.

Editorial Retraction.

59. Wade, N. (2006) The New York Times. Issue of November 29, 2006.

Journal faulted in publishing korean's claims.

60. Retraction Notice (2019) Science, Vol. 364, pp247-247.

Retraction of the paper entitled "Human SIRT6 promotes DNA end resection through Ctlp deacetylation", authored by Kaidi, A. et al. published in Science (2010) Vol. 329, pp1348-1353.

61. Retraction Notice (2019) Science, DOI: 10.1126/science.aba2173.

Retraction of the paper authored by Berret, E., Kintscher, M., Palchadhuri, S. Osypenko, D.,

Kochubey, O. and Schneggenberger, R.G. published in Science, (2019)

DOI: 10.1126/science.aaw0474.

62. Retraction Notice (2020) Science, DOI: 10.1126/science.aba6100.

Retraction of the paper entitled "Site-selective enzymatic C-H amidation for synthesis of diverse lactams" by Cho, I., Jia, Z. and Arnold, F.H. published in Science (2019)

DOI: 10.1126/science.aaw9068.

63. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Article, Vol 1, pp20-35.

Evidence of Data Fabrication, Data Falsification, Dishonest Scientific Report, Theft of Idea and Theft of Data in the Scientific Article "Regulation of Protein Phosphatase-1₁ by Cdc25C-associated kinase 1 (C-TAK1) and PFTAIRE Protein Kinase" Authored By "Jimcy Platholi, Anna Federman, Julia A. Detert, Paul Heerdt and Hugh C. Hemmings, Jr." and Published in the Journal of Biological Chemistry [J. Biol. Chem (2014) Vol 289, pp23893-23900.].

64. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Article, Vol 1, pp36-42.

Showing Data Fabrication and Data Falsification in the Scientific Article "Synthetic Peptide Analogs of DARPP-32 (Mr 32,000 Dopamine- and cAMP-regulated Phosphoprotein), an Inhibitor of Protein Phosphatase-1" authored by "Hugh C. Hemmings, Jr., Angus C. Nairn, James I. Elliot, and Paul Greengard", and published in the Journal of Biological Chemistry [J. Biol. Chem. (1990) Vol. 265, pp20369-20376].

65. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) J. Inves. Cri. Pub. Sci. Article, Vol. 1, pp93-95.

Why was the Scientific Article Entitled "FHIT interaction with ferredoxin reductase triggers generation of reactive oxygen species and apoptosis of cancer

cells" authored by Trapasso, F., Pichiorri, F., Gaspari, M., palumbo, T., Ageilan, R.I., Gaudio, E., Okumura, H., Tuliano, R., Di Leva, G., Fabbri, M., Birk, D.E., Raso, C., Green-Church, K., Spagnouli. L.G., Venuta, S., Huebner, K. and Croce, C.M." and published in the Journal Biological Chemistry [J. Biol. Chem. (2008) Vol. 283, pp 13736-13744.] retracted.

66. Retraction Notice (2015) J. Biol. Chem., Vol. 290, pp25849-25849.

Retraction of the paper entitled "G protein-coupled receptor kinase-2 is a novel regulator of collagen synthesis in adult human cardiac fibroblasts" authored by D'Souza, K.M., Malhotra, R., Philip, J.L., Staron, M.L., Theccanat, T., Jeevanandam, V. and Akhter, S.A. published in J. Biol. Chem. (2011) Vol. 286, pp15507-15516.

67. Notice of Retraction (2019) J. Biol. Chem., Vol. Retraction of the paper entitled "Down-regulated peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor γ (PPAR γ) in lung epithelial cells promotes a PPAR γ agonist-reversible proinflammatory phenotype in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)" authored by Lakshmi, S.P., Reddy, A.T., Zhang, Y., Scirba, F.C., Mallampalli, R.K., Duncan, S.R. and Reddy, R.C." published in J. Biol. Chem (2014) Vol. 289, pp6383-6393.

68. Notice of Retraction (2020) J. Biol. Chem., Vol. 295, pp6249-6249.

Retraction of the paper entitled " Distinct roles of Apel protein, an enzyme involved in DNA repair, in high or low linear energy transfer ionizing radiation-induced cell killing" authored by Wang, H., Wang, X., Chen, G., Zhang, X., Tang, X., Park, D., Cucinotta, F.A., Yu, D.S., Deng, X., Dynan, W.S., Doetsh, P.W. and Wang, Y., published in J. Biol. Chem. (2014) Vol. 289, pp30635-30644.

69. Notice of Retraction (2020) J. Biol. Chem., Vol. 295, pp3392-3392.

Retraction of the paper entitled " The amyloid precursor protein (APP) triplicated gene impairs neuronal precursor differentiation and neurite development through two different domains in the Ts65Dn mouse model for Down syndrome", authored by Trazzi, S., Fuchs, C., Valli, E., Perini, G., Bartesagni, R. and Ciani, E., and published in J. Biol. Chem. (2013) Vol. 288, pp20817-20829.

70. Notice of Retraction (2020) J. Biol. Chem. DOI: 10.1074/jbc.w120.014401.

Retraction of the paper entitled "Proepithelin stimulates growth plate chondrogenesis via nuclear factor κ B p65-dependent mechanism", authored by Wu et al., and published in J. Biol. Chem. (2011) Vol. 286, pp24057-24067.

71. Expressions of Concern (2020) J. Biol. Chem. DOI: 10.1074/jbc.ECL20.014562.

Expression of Concern with respect to the papers entitled "Expression of Concern: Cyclin L2, a novel RNA polymerase II-associated cyclin, is involved in pre-mRNA splicing and induces apoptosis of human hepatocellular carcinoma cells", authored by Yang et al., published in J. Biol. Chem. (2003) Vol. 279, pp11639-11648.

72. Expressions of Concern (2020) J. Biol. Chem., DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014563.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled "Bone Marrow Stromal Cell-derived Growth Inhibitor Inhibits Growth and Migration of Breast Cancer Cells via Induction of Cell Cycle Arrest and Apoptosis", authored by Wang et al., and published in J. Biol. Chem. (2004) Vol. 280, pp4374-4382.

73. Expressions of Concern (2020) J. Biol. Chem., DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014564.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled “The Lysosome-associated Apoptosis-inducing Protein Containing the Pleckstrin Homology (PH) and FYVE Domains (LAPF), Representative of a Novel Family of PH and FYVE Domain-containing Proteins, Induces Caspase-independent Apoptosis via the Lysosomal-Mitochondrial Pathway”, authored by Chen et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem.* (2005) Vol. 280, pp40985-40995.

74. Expression of Concern (2020) *J. Biol. Chem.*, DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014565.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled ‘A Novel Endogenous Human CaMKII Inhibitory Protein Suppresses Tumor Growth by Inducing Cell Cycle Arrest via p27 Stabilization’, authored by Wang et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem* (2008), Vol. 283, pp11565-11574.

75. Expression of concern (2020) *J. Biol. Chem.*, DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014566.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled “Ca²⁺/Calmodulin-dependent Protein Kinase II Promotes Cell Cycle Progression by Directly Activating MEK1 and Subsequently Modulating p27 Phosphorylation”, authored by Li et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem* (2009), Vol. 284, pp3021-3027.

76. Expression of Concern (2020) *J. Biol. Chem.*, DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014567.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled “Melittin, a Major Component of Bee Venom, Sensitizes Human Hepatocellular Carcinoma Cells to Tumor Necrosis Factor-related Apoptosis-inducing Ligand (TRAIL)-induced Apoptosis by Activating CaMKII-TAK1-JNK/p38 and Inhibiting IκBα Kinase-NFκB”, authored by Wang et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem.*(2009) Vol. 284, pp3804-3813.

77. Expression of Concern (2020) *J. Biol. Chem.*, DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014568.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled “Notch1 Signaling Sensitizes Tumor Necrosis Factor-related Apoptosis-inducing Ligand-induced Apoptosis in Human Hepatocellular Carcinoma Cells by Inhibiting Akt/Hdm2-mediated p53 Degradation and Up-regulating p53-dependent DR5 Expression”, authored by Wang et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem.* (2009) Vol. 284, pp16183-16190.

78. Expression of Concern (2020) *J. Biol. Chem.*, DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014569.

Expression of Concern with respect to the paper entitled “Endogenous Human CaMKII Inhibitory Protein Suppresses Tumor Growth by Inducing Cell Cycle Arrest and Apoptosis through Down-regulation of the Phosphatidylinositide 3-Kinase/Akt/HDM2 Pathway”, authored by Ma et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem.* (2008) Vol. 284, pp24773-24782.

79. Expression of Concern (2020) *J. Biol. Chem.*, DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014570.

Expression of Concern with respect to the paper entitled “Human Phosphatidylethanolamine-binding Protein 4 Promotes Transactivation of Estrogen Receptor α (ER α) in Human Cancer Cells by Inhibiting Proteasome-dependent ER α Degradation via Association with Src”, authored by Liu et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem.* (2010) Vol. 285, pp21934-21942.

80. Expression of Concern (2020) *J. Biol. Chem.*, DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014571.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled “The E3 Ubiquitin Ligase Neuregulin Receptor Degradation Protein 1 (Nrdp1) Promotes M2 Macrophage Polarization by Ubiquitinating and Activating Transcription Factor CCAAT/Enhancer-binding Protein β (C/EBP β)”, authored by Ye et al., and published in *J. Biol. Chem.* (2008) Vol. 287, pp26740-26748.

81. Expression of Concern (2020) J. Biol. Chem., DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014572.

Expression of concern with respect to the paper entitled "Zinc Finger Protein 64 Promotes Toll-like Receptor-triggered Proinflammatory and Type I Interferon Production in Macrophages by Enhancing p65 Subunit Activation", authored by Wang et al., and published in J. Biol. Chem. (2013) Vol. 288, pp24600-24608.

82. Expression of Concern (2020) J. Biol. Chem., DOI: 10.1074/jbc.EC120.014573.

Expression of Concern with respect to the paper entitled "Blockade of Fas Signaling in Breast Cancer Cells Suppresses Tumor Growth and Metastasis via Disruption of Fas Signaling-initiated Cancer-related Inflammation", authored by Liu et al., and published in J. Biol. Chem. (2014) Vol. 289, pp11522-11535.

83. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Article, Vol. 2, pp23-27.

Data Fabrication and Data Falsification in the paper "Regulation of DARPP-32 dephosphorylation at PKA

and Cdk5-sites by NMDA and AMPA receptors" authored by Nishi, A., Bibb, J.A., Matsuyama, S., Hamada, M., Higushi, H., Nairn, A.C. and Greengard, P., and published in the Journal of Neurochemistry. [J. Neurochem. (2002) Vol. 5, pp832-841].

80. Retraction Notice (2020) J. Neurochem., DOI: 10.1111/jnc.14931.

Retraction of the paper entitled "At diabetes-like concentration, glucose down-regulates the placental serotonin transport system in a cell-cycle-dependent manner," authored by Unal, R., Ahmed B.A., Jeffus B.C., Harney J.T., Lyle C.S., Wu Y.-K., Chambers T.C., Reece E.A. and Kilic F., published in J. of Neurochem., Vol. 101, pp937-948.

81. Smith, R. (2006) J. R. Soc. Med., Vol 94, pp178-182.

Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals.
