

Even the most thorough peer-review at the ‘best’ journals not up to snuff?

Björn Brembs 

Published March 12, 2014

Citation

Brembs, B. (2014, March 12). Even the most thorough peer-review at the ‘best’ journals not up to snuff?. *Bjoern.brembs.blog*. <https://doi.org/10.59350/jcqnk-7b525>

Keywords

Science Politics, GlamMagz, Peer-review

Abstract

Talk about egg on face! Nature “the world’s best science” Magazine sets out to publish back-to-back papers on – of all topics – stem cell science. The same field that brought Science Magazine Who-Suk Hwang and Elsevier’s Cell Mitalipov’s ‘errors’. [...] [↓ Read the rest of this entry...](#)

Copyright

Copyright © Björn Brembs 2014. Distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Talk about egg on face! *Nature* “the world’s best science” Magazine sets out to publish back-to-back papers on – of all topics – stem cell science. The same field that brought *Science Magazine* Who-Suk Hwang and Elsevier’s *Cell* Mitalipov’s ‘errors’. So *Nature* was warned and, presumably, they got down to business and did the very best they could to prevent *Cell*’s and *Science*’s mishaps to happen to them. They screened the manuscripts for 9 months, probably requiring some extra experimentation and after this procedure went on to publish the two papers, showing that an unlikely and trivially easy treatment could generate stem cells. And then, perhaps not too surprisingly for people reading this obscure blog, of course [the unthinkable happened](#): barely a week after publication, the first issues were spotted, lanes were spliced in gels, images duplicated. Later, as failures to replicate accumulated, calls for retractions were issued – this time even by one of the papers’ authors who had previously claimed he had reproduced the technique.

What was it that took ‘the internet’ a week that “the world’s best science” magazine could not detect in 9 months? The wisdom of the crowd. [There is no evidence](#) to justify the standing of “the world’s leading journals” and the rising tide of post-publication review embarrassing legacy review only corroborates this insight: GlamMagz are undeserving of their status.