StapCells: Self-paced Qs

Number of participants: 33

1. What would happen if we apply 'integrity' as an ethical concept to this case?

30 respondents

If there is an automatic process that can detect the editted plots can help prevent this kind of misconducting

Obokata was not honest with the limitation of her research and did not communicated it clearly enough seeing the investment that was put in the research. They also might be money motivated.

Falsified data reported leads to a failure to uphold integrity. This data would then be used to conduct further experiments under the assumption that it was correct to begin with

The researchers of this project engaged in deceptive behavior when reporting the project. The results of this project cannot be replicated and lack replicability.

Reproducing results before accepting a paper may ensure integrity, but consume time.

This research failed to uphold integrity, which can be inferred from various decisions that they had taken during the course of this research, such as manipulating images with sensitive data. The institution should also have been careful before publishing the research. Therefore, it was a collective failure.

In this case study both the researchers involved is the supervisor and the phd student failed to uphold integrity. They published false results which had far reaching consequences. They should have upheld integrity cuz in the scientific community, all results will be tried to be replicated to build more work on top on it. So here both the student and supervisor have made the issue and not to mention the publication house has reviews who should have pointed out the issue.

If the epistemic norms should have provided a structure that does not allow the research to be published without verification that it can be repeated and was conducted with suitable rigor.

Obokata completely ignored this aspect and probably lied about her research, as there was no way to make these stap cells. so she should have tried it several times before publishing

The problem would not exist to begin with

Integrity would have ensured that the results were reproducible from the start - that the prioritisation of reproducibility in data would have revealedd fundamental flaws in the procedure prior to re;ease of the pindings

The researchers did not truthfully report their findings. Instead of using the real results of their research, they used cells taken from elsewhere to pass of as STAP cells that they obtained. Therefore, the results were not replicable, even when the researchers were told to repeat the experiment afterwards.

it would ensure that results are not manipulated and would hold researchers accountable for their results to ensure

All peoples who allowed the work to be published lacked integrity.

Such misconduct would not happen and there will be audits on the result to make sure the integrity of the results.

Evidently, the lead researchers and their collaborators failed to display integrity by fabricating a positive outcome for their experiments. They were not truthful about the manner in which they obtained their results. Had they shown integrity, they would have been explicit about the cells they were working with, and would've done a comparison experiment with the types of cells they claimed they were working on. They failed to appreciate that closing pointless doors is as useful to science as opening new ones.

The scientists would check in at every stage to see if all parts of the process was honest. Before publishing everyone should be held accountable

The scientists did not uphold integrity when they knowingly falsified their results and experiments.

If there is no truth that is integrity in any STEM research reportings (Or other research reportings) what is the point of doing research.. we can just come up with things “there! We have found the cure for cancer!” What’s stopping us from any claims or “discoveries”?

❤ 1

The researchers did not truthfully report their findings, breaking integrity. This also led to a lack of replicability, as the research had not been carried out with integrity. Additionally, those involved in the distribution of the data also felt that they had not carried out their role with integrity, despite not having collected or interpreted the data.

If integrity were in place, these consequences would not have occurred as the data was clearly manipulated and not true

Integrity would prevent the authors or at least make them think twice before manipulating/faking results/data. If it is followed it could save a lot of people from doing academic misconduct. It should be followed strictly and results should be reproducable

❤ 1

Integrity is essential in scientific research. This refers to the avoidance of fake results or falsifying methods, such as the embryo cells placement. Failure to follow this principle not only leads to the disqualification of the research, but may also pull the field months or years back due to misplaced trust in fake results.

The researchers did not expect their study to be replicated by others (for some reason). The method that they reported was missing/misleading key details.

❤ 1

Integrity should be considered in every steps of experiment and supervised by peer regularly

The research should not have been published in the first place had the supervisor taken due diligence to review the research outcome.

❤ 1

Applying integrity as an ethical concept would hold the researchers responsible and accountable for the wastage of resources and the death of a person

it would ensure scientists do not manipulate their results as this would violate their integrity towards science

The researchers involved were deceptive when reporting their research. This is a failure to uphold integrity.

it should acts as a moral compass that transforms ethical rules into concrete, honest actions, resulting in higher trust, accountability, and long-term sustainability for individuals and organizations

2. Who is impacted by the research described in the case?

31 respondents

RIKEN, Obokata and Vacanti were directly impacted by the work published in the nature articles, as they are the institution and co-authors of the research. Sisei was indireclty impacted by the results, being the supervisor of Obokata and putting her work under his supervision under scrutiny as a knock on effect of the RIKEN research.

It impacted the scientific community, research institutions, funders, collaborators and the individuals directly involved in the scandal.

Well the supervisor, the phd student, the company that hired her, Waseda University, Deputy Director of the Riken Center, Nobel Prize winner Ryoji Noyori and all researchers who tried to replicate the research.

Obokata; Yoshiki Sasai, Deputy Director of the Riken Center and Obokata's supervisor; Ryoji Noyori, the head of Riken Center; the Riken Center.

Investors, the researchers themselves, and even leading to death. Academic quualification was revoked.

This impacts not only the researcher and the institution, but also the entire society, because it was a publication with improper checks.

The author, the supervisors, the institution, the companies

The researcher, the publisher, the institution where the research was carried out, possible benefactors that were given false hope of STAP based solutions for medical issues

One impact is on the other laboratories, who wasted time and money on trying to reproduce something that would not be replicable due to the false report. Researchers who were involved in the research but were unaware of the false reporting could be shamed.

The government/organisations that made the investments (lost money), the researchers that tried to replicate the study and similar (lost time), the university/ lab/Nature that suffered reputational harms, the public that was deceived and may not trust in future

Many staekholders have been negatively impacted by this: the community which the resarch could have helped, the reseach institute, the reviewers, and the university accrediting phds, fellow reesearchers being misled

All of Haruko's peers. Research is built upon other research.

The research impacts not only the researcher who conducted it, but also those working in the same institution. Beyond the researchers, people who may potentially receive treatments from research into pluripotent cells are affected by the loss of investment into the field.

funding corporations, academic reputation of Nature and universities.

Academics in the field were misled, as were those who rely on stem cell treatment for their healthcare given the extent to which this result was publicised, the nobel prize being awarded. Things get almost bizarrely catestrophic after suicides occur as well, given the extent to which these people felt their relationships were tarnished. And their families were left to grieve.

The directors and employees of the Riken Center that were involved in the STAP cells research, Waseda University, as well as other researchers who were also working in the same research topic

The researchers themselves (ruining their reputation and incurring penalties & punishments); the associated university (damage to reputation, wasted resources); the medical field (wasted time and effort that could have gone towards more productive research had they not been deceived); Nature (damage to reputation); those in need of medical help (wasted resources means that actual advances which could help people were delayed)

The main stakeholders are fellow researchers, since future studies may use this research as a baseline. Also, the supervisors of the researcers may be exposed to shame and dishonorment if unethical practices are used, since they are in charge of ensuring the quality of the work released by their researchers.

The researcher, as she lost her degree, her supervisor, as he lost his life, also Waseda University, as it lost its integrity and public trust.

The academia in general

University, research scientists, the industry expectations and budgets

Colleagues, funding organisations, peopel acquainted with the highly regarded institutes involved

The researcher, the supervisor, the company that hired the researcher, patients who could have potentially been benefiting from this research outcome, investors, organisations that awarded the the certifications and awards

People who could've been saved from the outcomes of the research, the person who commited suicide, the authors and their affiliated institutions.

Other researchers, patients, the entire university staff

The Riken institute, the researchers involved, and maybe even patients in hospitals who need stem cells

The institution and its reputation. The individuals associated with it, including the person who took their own life and the family of that person. The board members/ governors of the institution. The institution's collaborators. People who worked in the lab. The project's funders.

the university, the government, friends and family of involved people, mainly the doctors, the journal, the scientific community, the labs and even the consumers

People who suffer from diseases that depend on stem cell research, everyone who worked at Riken center, Waseda University and Japanese taxpayers who funded Riken center

obokata, RIKEN, patient and public groups

Fellow researchers, investors