

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

# The egos and the goals of reporting results

Dear Editor,

We read with great interest the editorial on 'fraud in scientific publishing', written by Scully and Baum (2006), which showed us one of the ways to prevent the publication of fraudulent research in outstanding journals. Unfortunately, it is clear that frauds will continue to occur, and journals will have to continue to find ways to avoid publishing untruthful results. It is time to take this problem even more seriously. First, its magnitude is hard to estimate. Misconduct in science is certainly not restricted to those major scandals that spread on the news. It also includes failure to explain weakness in data, selective reporting of results, failure to publish negative results, practice of irresponsible authorship and wasteful (i.e. repetitive) publication (Snyder and Loring, 2006). The intense pressure created to generate publications is probably a major contributor to fraud (Institute of Medicine and National Research Council, 2002). Morality provides only a general guide to conduct, and not all individuals belonging to the same society agree with that particular code. But how can we protect science from those who attempt to ruin its reputation? Auditing seems to be the most obvious strategy to identify fraudulent research, while teaching and good models may be the basic pillars for primary prevention. Scientists should understand that research misconduct can have devastating consequences on the patients, the researcher himself, the colleagues and the institution where it occurred (Weed, 1998). Maybe we should start earlier, emphasizing the importance of

philosophy and ethics to school age children. It is never too late for that. We should never forget Charles Darwin's sentence – 'science consists in grouping facts so that general laws or conclusions may be drawn from them'. The future of science totally depends on how reliable scientists are.

**DD Rosa<sup>1</sup>, AC Pasqualotto<sup>2</sup>, G Schwartzmann<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Paterson Institute for Cancer Research,  
Manchester, UK;

(Research supported by CAPES, Brazil.)

<sup>2</sup>School of Medicine, University of Manchester,  
Manchester, UK;

(Research supported by CAPES, Brazil.)

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Medicine, Federal University of Rio Grande  
do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

E-mail: [dornellesrosa@hotmail.com](mailto:dornellesrosa@hotmail.com)

## References

- Institute of Medicine and National Research Council (2002). *Integrity in scientific research: creating an environment that promotes responsible conduct* [WWW document]. URL [http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/rcr/rcr\\_misconduct/introduction/index.html](http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/rcr/rcr_misconduct/introduction/index.html) [accessed on 18 September 2006].
- Scully C, Baum B (2006). Fraud in scientific publishing. *Oral Dis* **12**: 357.
- Snyder EY, Loring JF (2006). Beyond fraud – stem-cell research continues. *N Engl J Med* **354**: 321.
- Weed DL (1998). Preventing scientific misconduct. *Am J Public Health* **88**: 125–129.