



The National Pulse.

RADICALLY INDEPENDENT.

LIVE

Friday, August 11, 2023

 The Pulse

 Analysis

 Streaming

Sign in

Unlock pulse+

Analysis only on pulse+



GOP Releases Yet Another Biden Family Grift 'Memo' That No One Will Read.

 RAHEEM J. KASSAM


Epps's Jan 6th Interview Was Even Weirder Than His 'I Orchestrated It' Text.

 RAHEEM J. KASSAM


Agent Smith is Going to Win Trump the Election.

 RAHEEM J. KASSAM


The NBA Struggles to Square the Circle With Ice Cube.


 RAHEEM J. KASSAM

Videos only on pulse+

SEE ALL



ZOO YORK CITY UNLEASHED – EP 97

 Fleccas Talks


21 HOURS AGO



JACK MONTGOMERY

NEWS

SCIENCE

'TrUsT tHe ScIeNcE!' – Study Retractions Up 13,650% in 22 Years.

The number of scientific papers retracted annually rose from just 40 in 2000 to almost 5,500 in 2022, representing a whopping 13,650% change over the past 22 years, with researchers estimating an astonishing 100,000 would have to be withdrawn every year with more thorough vetting.

Delivering a blow to the “trust the science” cheerleaders, [Retraction Watch's](#) co-founders Ivan Oransky and Adam Marcus [detail](#) the alarming issues with modern science for the left-wing *Guardian* newspaper.

The surge in bogus papers is driven in part by the fact that scientists are often “required... to publish papers in order to earn and keep jobs or to be promoted,” which leads to some turning to so-called “paper mills” that “sell everything from authorships to entire manuscripts to researchers who need to publish lest they perish.”

Only around a fifth of retractions are a result of “honest error,” Oransky and Marcus note, highlighting serious misconduct cases such as that of Joachim Boldt, a German anesthesiologist whose falsified data on an ineffective blood substitute was once widely cited and led to many people being harmed.

A related [issue](#) is the so-called replication crisis. It has become increasingly apparent that the results found in many scientific papers – possibly a majority of them – cannot be reproduced by other researchers. In 2015, for example, efforts to reproduce psychology studies published in supposedly high-quality journals [failed](#) 61 out of 100 times, with [similar](#) results in 2018.

The issue is also present in the hard sciences, with efforts by the University of Virginia to reproduce five “landmark” cancer studies failing in one case and producing inconclusive results in two others – hinting that “the science” may be mostly wrong across the board.

 Source

 Discuss

 Share