



ASBMB Council

Officers

Judith S. Bond	President
Heidi E. Hamm	President-elect
Peggy J. Farnham	Secretary
Kenneth E. Neet	Treasurer
Merle Olson	Treasurer-elect

Council Members

William R. Brinkley	Councilor
Joan W. Conaway	Councilor
Robert A. Copeland	Councilor
Lila M. Gierasch	Councilor
Frederick P. Guengerich	Councilor
William J. Lennarz	Councilor
Peter J. Parker	Councilor
William S. Sly	Councilor
William L. Smith	Councilor
Suzanne Pfeffer	Councilor
Linda Pike	Councilor

Ex-Officio Members

Dennis Voelker
Chair, Meetings Committee

George M. Carman
Laurie S. Kaguni
Co-chairs, 2006 Program Committee

J. Ellis Bell
Chair, Education and Professional Development Committee

Juliette Bell
Chair, Minority Affairs Committee

William R. Brinkley
Chair, Public Affairs Advisory Committee

Anthony E. Pegg
Chair, Publications Committee

Herbert Tabor
Editor, JBC

Ralph A. Bradshaw
Editor, MCP

Edward A. Dennis
Editor, JLR

ASBMB Today

is a monthly publication of The American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

Editorial Advisory Board

Irwin Fridovich
Richard W. Hanson
Bettie Sue Masters
J. Evan Sadler
Robert D. Wells

Comments

Please direct any comments or questions concerning *ASBMB Today* to:

John D. Thompson
Editor, *ASBMB Today*
9650 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, MD 20814-3996
Phone: 301-634-7145; Fax: 301-634-7126
E-mail: jthompson@asbmb.org

For information on advertising contact FASEB AdNet at 800-433-2732 ext. 7157 or 301-634-7157, or email adnet@faseb.org.

Ethics in Science: What Has Happened to It?

To the Editor:

There has been a recent rash of reports about falsifying data in scientific articles that were published in good journals (e.g., *Science*), however, there is a more subtle and important danger to science, i.e., warping the discussion in a paper to prove a false theory by ignoring all of the data in the literature that are contrary to the false theory, and by misinterpreting (deliberately?) one's own experimental data, and by incorrectly re-interpreting the data of others, and by incorrectly reporting the results of others.

Then there is the wonderment of why the reviewers of well-known journals (e.g., *BioEssays*, *Proc Natl Acad Sci*, *J Bacteriol*, *Annu Rev Genet*, *J Biol Chem*) did not catch these falsehoods and bad science, and/or why the editors did not choose appropriate reviewers.

All of these improper actions came recently from several papers published in "good journals" by one laboratory. This laboratory, and its graduates, are determined to prove that excision repair is the only repair function that exists in cells after exposure to ultraviolet (UV) radiation, even though there exists 30 years of work showing the importance of recombinational DNA repair. Recombinational DNA repair accounts for 50% of survival after UV irradiation, and excision repair accounts for 50%, i.e., not the 100% that some authors would have you believe (for a review on recombinational DNA repair, and the citation of some of these bad papers.

An author from another laboratory states that "It has recently become

clear that the recombinational repair of stalled replication forks is the primary function of homologous recombination systems in bacteria." This statement totally ignores the problems that a cell faces when its DNA, which was replicated prior to UV irradiation, is damaged, and where two DNA duplexes exist, and where replication restart has no relevance, but recombinational DNA repair is very important. To be generous, these authors seem to be totally unaware of the literature.

What can be done to make authors read the literature, and make editors send papers to reviewers who are knowledgeable of the literature, and for editors to make sure that the reviewers do their jobs properly?

It is really stupid to falsify data, because the basis of science is to repeat published data, and then to take research on that subject to the next level. Therefore, false data will soon be found out, but at great expense to science.

However, the more subtle form of falsification, about which I speak, is usually believed (it came from a "good" laboratory, and was published in "good" journals), and it will remain in the scientific literature forever as "fact", and it will waste the time and money of unsuspecting students and scientists who will design experiments based upon these bad papers.

In religion one can often be forgiven for one's sins, **but no one should be forgiven for sins against science.**

Kendric C. Smith, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
Stanford University School of Medicine

