

# The Untouchable Crisis: Academic Silence, Authority Conformity, and the Suppression of Critical Discourse in Modern Science

Yue Liu

College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Shenyang Normal University,  
Shenyang, P. R. China, 110034, yueliusd@163.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5924-9730>

## Abstract

This paper examines the pervasive culture of academic conformity and systematic resistance to critical discourse in contemporary science, using the ongoing disputes in microwave absorption theory as a paradigmatic case study. Through analysis of publication patterns, peer review practices, and institutional responses to theoretical challenges, we reveal a deeply entrenched system that prioritizes authority and consensus over rigorous scientific inquiry. The study demonstrates how legitimate theoretical corrections and critical analyses are systematically suppressed through editorial gatekeeping, reviewer bias, and institutional pressure, creating what we term "academic silence zones" where fundamental problems remain unaddressed. We argue that this phenomenon represents a crisis that undermines the foundational principles of scientific progress and threatens the integrity of knowledge production. The findings suggest that the current academic system has evolved into what Feynman termed "cargo cult science", where the forms of scientific practice are maintained while the essential spirit of critical inquiry is abandoned.

**Keywords:** academic conformity, authority bias, peer review bias, scientific misconduct, cargo cult science, microwave absorption theory, research integrity, publication bias

## 1. Introduction

Modern academia faces an unprecedented crisis that few dare to acknowledge: the systematic suppression of legitimate scientific criticism and the entrenchment of authority-based conformity that stifles genuine scientific progress<sup>1-3</sup>. While scholars extensively document problems in peripheral aspects of academic life, the core issue—that contemporary science has become largely immune to self-correction—remains largely unexamined due to its threatening implications for established power structures<sup>4-7</sup>.

Max Planck's oft-cited observation that "science progresses one funeral at a time" was intended as a descriptive observation of human nature, not a prescriptive model for scientific progress<sup>8,9</sup>. Yet contemporary academic culture has institutionalized this

dysfunction, creating systems where challenging established theories becomes virtually impossible regardless of their demonstrable errors. This paper argues that we have witnessed the emergence of what we term "institutionalized cargo cult science"—academic practices that maintain the superficial appearance of rigorous inquiry while systematically excluding the critical examination that drives genuine scientific progress<sup>10-12</sup>.

The microwave absorption field provides a particularly illuminating case study because it involves fundamental physics concepts accessible to undergraduate students, yet systematic errors persist unchallenged across thousands of publications<sup>7</sup>. The resistance encountered by theoretical corrections in this field exemplifies broader patterns of academic dysfunction that extend far beyond any single discipline<sup>1,13-17</sup>.

## **2. The Authority Conformity Complex in Modern Science**

### **2.1 The Psychology of Academic Deference**

Authority bias, defined as the tendency to attribute greater accuracy to opinions from authority figures regardless of content quality, represents one of the most pernicious forces in contemporary academic discourse<sup>5</sup>. Research demonstrates that this bias operates through multiple psychological mechanisms, including the reduction of critical thinking, implicit trust in authority figures, and systematic deference to established hierarchies<sup>18-20</sup>.

In academic contexts, this bias manifests through several distinct pathways. First, the appointment of editorial boards and peer reviewers based primarily on institutional prestige and citation metrics rather than demonstrated analytical competence creates gatekeeping systems inherently biased toward maintaining existing theoretical frameworks<sup>13,14,21</sup>. Second, the "publish or perish" culture incentivizes conformity by making career advancement dependent on acceptance by these same authority-biased systems<sup>22,23</sup>.

The Milgram experiments famously demonstrated that individuals will continue harmful actions when directed by authority figures, even when their personal judgment contradicts such actions<sup>24</sup>. Contemporary academic peer review systems exhibit analogous dynamics, where reviewers systematically reject manuscripts that challenge established authorities, regardless of the logical validity of the challenges<sup>5-7,15</sup>.

### **2.2 The Institutionalization of Groupthink**

Thomas Kuhn's analysis of paradigm shifts revealed how scientific communities resist fundamental theoretical changes<sup>25-27</sup>. However, Kuhn assumed that eventually, accumulated anomalies would force paradigm shifts<sup>28</sup>. Contemporary academic

structures have evolved mechanisms that prevent this natural process by systematically filtering out anomaly-identifying research before publication<sup>7, 16, 29, 30</sup>.

The peer review system, originally designed to ensure quality control, has become a conformity enforcement mechanism. Studies demonstrate that peer reviewers exhibit systematic bias against research that challenges established theories, often rejecting papers based on ideological grounds rather than methodological rigor<sup>31</sup>. This creates what we term "epistemological lock-in," where entire fields become incapable of self-correction.

### **2.3 The Cargo Cult Transformation**

Richard Feynman's concept of "cargo cult science" describes research that follows the superficial forms of scientific inquiry while lacking the essential integrity that makes science effective<sup>32, 33</sup>. Contemporary academia exhibits all the characteristics Feynman identified: elaborate methodological rituals, statistical sophistication, and prestigious publication venues, yet with diminished capacity to identify and correct fundamental errors.

The transformation occurs through several mechanisms<sup>1, 22, 23, 31</sup>. First, the emphasis on publication quantity over quality incentivizes researchers to produce incremental variations on existing themes rather than engage in the risky work of fundamental criticism. Second, the specialization of academic disciplines creates intellectual silos where cross-domain criticism becomes virtually impossible. Third, the increasing complexity of academic bureaucracy creates multiple layers of gatekeeping that systematically filter out disruptive insights.

## **3. Case Study: The Microwave Absorption Theory Disputes**

### **3.1 The Nature of the Theoretical Problems**

The field of microwave absorption materials provides an exceptionally clear example of systematic theoretical errors that persist despite their demonstrable incorrectness<sup>7</sup>. Fundamental misconceptions about impedance matching theory, film versus material properties, and absorption mechanisms appear consistently across thousands of publications in prestigious journals.

These errors are not subtle or debatable points of interpretation. They involve basic physics principles taught in undergraduate courses, such as the proper application of transmission line theory and electromagnetic wave propagation<sup>34, 35</sup>. The persistence of such elementary errors across decades of research by numerous independent groups suggests systematic dysfunction in the field's quality control mechanisms.

Recent attempts to publish theoretical corrections have encountered systematic rejection across multiple journals, despite the inability of reviewers to identify specific errors in the corrective analyses<sup>34, 36</sup>. This pattern suggests that the resistance is not based on scientific disagreement but on institutional bias against challenging established frameworks<sup>1, 13</sup>.

### **3.2 Systematic Editorial Resistance**

Documentation of editorial responses to theoretical corrections reveals consistent patterns of resistance that cannot be explained by normal scientific disagreement<sup>7, 34</sup>. Reviewers frequently demand that corrective papers include unnecessary experimental work, despite the theoretical nature of the corrections. Other common responses include claims that the corrections "lack novelty" (despite identifying previously unrecognized errors) or that they "do not contribute sufficiently to the literature" (despite potentially correcting thousands of publications).

Perhaps most revealing are instances where reviewers explicitly acknowledge their inability to identify errors in the corrective analysis while still recommending rejection<sup>7, 34</sup>. This pattern suggests that the peer review process has become divorced from its ostensible function of ensuring scientific accuracy<sup>13, 14, 21</sup>.

The concentration of rejections across multiple journals points to systematic bias rather than random variation in reviewer expertise. When the same corrective analysis receives similar hostile responses from independent editorial teams, it suggests coordinated resistance to theoretical challenge rather than legitimate scientific disagreement<sup>1, 13, 14</sup>.

### **3.3 The Persistence Paradox**

The microwave absorption case illustrates what we term the "persistence paradox": the inverse relationship between error obviousness and correction probability in contemporary academia. Elementary errors that should be easily correctable become virtually uncorrectable precisely because their elementary nature threatens the credibility of large numbers of established researchers<sup>2, 31, 37</sup>.

This paradox explains why entire research communities can persist in systematic error for decades. The social and professional costs of acknowledging fundamental errors create powerful incentives for their denial, regardless of the scientific evidence. As the number of publications based on flawed foundations increases, the resistance to correction intensifies rather than diminishes<sup>4, 38, 39</sup>.

## **4. The Broader Crisis of Scientific Integrity**

### **4.1 Publication Bias and the Distortion of Knowledge**

Contemporary scientific literature suffers from pervasive publication bias that systematically distorts the apparent state of knowledge<sup>39-42</sup>. Studies consistently show that positive results are far more likely to be published than negative results, creating a literature that presents a systematically false picture of scientific understanding<sup>16</sup>.

The scope of this distortion extends far beyond the simple underrepresentation of negative results. Publication bias creates cascading effects where subsequent research builds on false foundations, leading to entire research programs based on irreproducible findings<sup>7,16</sup>. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews, supposedly the highest forms of evidence synthesis, become instruments of error propagation rather than knowledge refinement<sup>2,39,40,43</sup>.

The replication crisis, extensively documented across multiple disciplines, represents only the visible surface of this deeper problem<sup>23,44,45</sup>. While unreproducible results are eventually identified, the systematic biases that produce them remain largely unaddressed<sup>5,16,29,30</sup>.

## **4.2 The Predatory Publishing Ecosystem**

The emergence of predatory publishing represents a symptom of deeper pathologies in the academic system rather than merely an external threat<sup>46-48</sup>. Predatory journals thrive because they exploit the same incentive structures that drive dysfunction in legitimate publishing: the prioritization of publication quantity over quality.

Perhaps more concerning is the evidence that predatory publishing may actually serve important functions within the current academic ecosystem<sup>46,47</sup>. By providing outlets for research that cannot meet the conformity requirements of mainstream journals, predatory publishers may paradoxically serve as pressure valves that prevent the accumulation of critical perspectives that might otherwise force system-wide reform.

The existence of predatory journals also provides convenient excuses for dismissing legitimate criticism. Research that challenges established frameworks can be discredited by association with predatory publishing, regardless of its actual merit<sup>46,47</sup>.

## **4.3 The Failure of Institutional Quality Control**

Academic institutions have largely failed to address the systematic problems in scientific discourse, often because these institutions benefit from the current dysfunction<sup>1,22</sup>.

Universities derive prestige and funding from publication volume and citation metrics, creating institutional incentives that directly conflict with quality control.

Research integrity offices, supposedly designed to address scientific misconduct, typically focus on clear-cut cases of fabrication and plagiarism while ignoring the more

pervasive problems of systematic bias and theoretical stagnation<sup>1,49</sup>. This narrow focus allows institutions to claim commitment to integrity while avoiding the more challenging work of addressing systemic dysfunction.

The peer review system, despite extensive criticism, remains largely unchanged because it serves the interests of established academic hierarchies<sup>21,50</sup>. Proposals for reform typically focus on superficial modifications rather than addressing the fundamental problem of authority bias in scientific evaluation.

## **5. The Culture of Academic Silence**

### **5.1 The Manufacture of Consensus**

Contemporary academic discourse exhibits what we term "manufactured consensus"—the appearance of scientific agreement achieved through systematic exclusion of dissenting perspectives rather than genuine intellectual convergence<sup>16</sup>. This process operates through multiple mechanisms, including editorial gatekeeping, reviewer bias, and professional sanctions against persistent critics.

The manufacture of consensus creates particularly pernicious effects in fields where theoretical foundations are questionable. By preventing critical examination of basic assumptions, academic communities can maintain theoretical frameworks that would not survive open scrutiny. The resulting "consensus" becomes increasingly divorced from empirical reality as anomalous findings accumulate but remain unpublishable<sup>3,16,38</sup>.

### **5.2 Professional Sanctions and Career Consequences**

Researchers who persist in challenging established frameworks face systematic professional sanctions that extend far beyond simple publication rejection<sup>4-6</sup>. These sanctions include difficulty obtaining funding, exclusion from professional networks, and institutional pressure to conform or leave academia.

The subtlety of these sanctions makes them particularly effective at suppressing dissent. Rather than obvious persecution, critics face gradual erosion of professional opportunities that can be attributed to various ostensibly legitimate factors<sup>51,52</sup>. This creates a climate where self-censorship becomes the rational strategy for career survival.

### **5.3 The Psychology of Institutional Loyalty**

Academic institutions cultivate cultures of institutional loyalty that discourage fundamental criticism. Researchers are socialized to identify their professional success with the success of their institutions and disciplines, creating psychological barriers to acknowledging systematic problems<sup>18,19</sup>.

This loyalty operates through both positive and negative reinforcement. Researchers who conform to institutional expectations receive recognition, resources, and professional advancement. Those who challenge fundamental assumptions face isolation and professional marginalization. Over time, this conditioning produces academic communities composed primarily of individuals psychologically invested in defending existing frameworks regardless of their empirical adequacy<sup>20, 31</sup>.

## **6. The Dynamics of Theoretical Stagnation**

### **6.1 The Authority Ratchet Effect**

Once theoretical frameworks become associated with prestigious institutions and prominent researchers, they acquire a kind of intellectual momentum that becomes increasingly difficult to overcome. We term this the "authority ratchet effect"—the tendency for theoretical frameworks to become more entrenched over time as they accumulate institutional support, regardless of their empirical adequacy<sup>5, 6</sup>.

This effect operates through several mechanisms. First, challenges to established theories are interpreted as challenges to the authority of their proponents, triggering defensive responses rather than scientific evaluation. Second, the careers of numerous researchers become dependent on the continued acceptance of established frameworks, creating powerful constituencies for theoretical conservatism. Third, the complexity of modern academic institutions makes coordinated theoretical revision extremely difficult, even when individual researchers recognize problems.

### **6.2 The Institutional Memory Problem**

Modern academic institutions exhibit what we term "institutional memory problems"—the systematic loss of knowledge about why particular theoretical frameworks were originally adopted and what evidence would be required to revise them. This occurs because academic training focuses on current consensus rather than the historical development of ideas<sup>3, 11, 26</sup>.

The result is academic communities that defend theoretical positions they do not fully understand, based on authorities they cannot critically evaluate. When challenges arise, these communities lack the intellectual resources to engage in meaningful theoretical revision, defaulting instead to defensive rejection of criticism<sup>38</sup>.

### **6.3 The Innovation Paradox**

Contemporary academia faces what we term the "innovation paradox"—institutional structures nominally designed to promote intellectual creativity that systematically suppress the kind of fundamental criticism essential for genuine theoretical progress.

This paradox arises because true innovation often requires challenging established authorities, but academic reward systems are designed to reinforce authority-based hierarchies.

The result is a system that produces abundant incremental variations on existing themes while remaining largely incapable of fundamental theoretical revision. The appearance of innovation masks an underlying intellectual stagnation that becomes apparent only when viewed from longer historical perspectives<sup>17</sup>.

## **7. Implications and Consequences**

### **7.1 The Erosion of Scientific Authority**

The systematic suppression of legitimate scientific criticism undermines the very foundations of scientific authority. When academic institutions prioritize conformity over accuracy, they gradually lose the intellectual credibility that justifies public trust in scientific expertise<sup>5</sup>.

This erosion creates cascading effects throughout society. Public policy decisions based on flawed scientific consensus can produce harmful outcomes that undermine confidence in scientific institutions. The growing public skepticism toward scientific authority, while often misplaced in specific instances, reflects an accurate perception that academic institutions have become disconnected from the rigorous truth-seeking that originally justified their social role<sup>40</sup>.

### **7.2 The Resource Allocation Problem**

The persistence of flawed theoretical frameworks represents a massive misallocation of intellectual and financial resources. When entire research programs are based on incorrect foundations, the resulting research produces little genuine value despite consuming enormous resources<sup>7</sup>.

The microwave absorption case illustrates this problem clearly. Thousands of publications based on flawed theoretical understanding represent millions of person-hours and enormous financial investments that have produced minimal genuine scientific progress. The opportunity cost—the genuine discoveries that might have been made with those resources—represents an incalculable loss to human knowledge.

### **7.3 The Training and Education Crisis**

Contemporary academic training produces researchers who are skilled in the superficial forms of scientific practice but lack the intellectual independence necessary for genuine scientific criticism<sup>29, 30</sup>. This occurs because academic socialization emphasizes conformity to established authorities rather than the development of critical thinking skills.

The result is successive generations of researchers who are increasingly incapable of fundamental theoretical revision. While they possess sophisticated technical skills, they lack the intellectual courage and analytical independence necessary to challenge flawed foundations. This creates a self-perpetuating cycle where intellectual conformity becomes increasingly entrenched over time.

## **8. Conclusion**

This analysis reveals that contemporary academic science faces a crisis far more fundamental than typically acknowledged in discussions of research integrity and scientific reform. The systematic suppression of legitimate scientific criticism has created institutional structures that are largely immune to self-correction, despite maintaining the superficial appearance of rigorous inquiry.

The microwave absorption case study demonstrates that these problems extend beyond familiar issues like publication bias and predatory publishing to encompass the basic mechanisms of theoretical evaluation and revision. When elementary errors in fundamental physics can persist unchallenged across thousands of publications in prestigious journals, it suggests systematic dysfunction in the intellectual foundations of academic science.

The solutions to these problems require recognition that they represent institutional pathology rather than individual moral failure. Superficial reforms focused on publication practices or ethics training cannot address the deeper issues of authority bias and institutional conformity that drive systematic theoretical stagnation.

Genuine reform would require fundamental changes in academic incentive structures, editorial practices, and institutional cultures. However, such changes face enormous resistance because they threaten the interests of established academic hierarchies. This suggests that improvement may ultimately depend on external pressure rather than internal reform—a conclusion that itself illustrates the depth of the current crisis.

The continuation of current trends threatens to transform academic science into an elaborate system of credentialed opinion rather than rigorous inquiry. Preventing this outcome requires acknowledging that the problems identified here represent existential threats to the scientific enterprise rather than peripheral concerns that can be addressed through incremental reform.

Liu, Yue, [The Untouchable Crisis](#): Academic Silence, Authority Conformity, and the Suppression of Critical Discourse in Modern Science, 2025, [yueliusd.substack.com](http://yueliusd.substack.com)

## **References**

- (1) Mousavi, T.; Abdollahi, M. A review of the current concerns about misconduct in medical sciences publications and the consequences. *Daru* **2020**, *28* (1), 359-369. DOI: 10.1007/s40199-020-00332-1 From NLM Medline.
- (2) Nissen, S. B.; Magidson, T.; Gross, K.; Bergstrom, C. T. Publication bias and the canonization of false facts. *Elife* **2016**, *5*. DOI: 10.7554/eLife.21451 From NLM Medline.
- (3) *Resistance to New Ideas*. <https://www.scienceforthepublic.org/science-issues/resistance-to-new-ideas> (accessed).
- (4) Khadilkar, S. S. Scientific Misconduct: A Global Concern. *J Obstet Gynaecol India* **2018**, *68* (5), 331-335. DOI: 10.1007/s13224-018-1175-8 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
- (5) Liu, Y. The Reluctance to Criticize the Errors of the Majority: Authority, Conformity, and Academic Silence in Scholarly Discourse. *preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202507.2515.
- (6) Liu, Y. The Entrenched Problems of Scientific Progress: An Analysis of Institutional Resistance and Systemic Barriers to Innovation. *Preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1.
- (7) Liu, Y. Non-Mainstream Scientific Viewpoints in Microwave Absorption Research: Peer Review, Academic Integrity, and Cargo Cult Science. *preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202507.0015.v2
- (8) Brown, B. R. *Max Planck, the unlikely founder of quantum physics, knew how to change his mind*. 2015. <https://slate.com/technology/2015/06/max-plancks-principle-physics-and-constant-he-knew-how-to-change-his-mind.html> (accessed).
- (9) Kam, B. *Walking the Planck*. 2020. <https://clerestory.netlify.app/planck/> (accessed).
- (10) Valero, C. S. *The Not-So-Strange Case of Cargo Cult in Computer Science Research*. 2024. <https://www.cesarsotovalero.net/blog/the-not-so-strange-case-of-cargo-cult-in-computer-science-research.html> (accessed).
- (11) Feynman, R. *Cargo Cult Science, From a Caltech commencement address given in 1974*. 1974. <https://sites.cs.ucsb.edu/~ravenben/cargocult.html> (accessed).
- (12) Aarts, A. A. *Three manuscripts that may explain why I no longer like terms such as "the incentives", "publish or perish", and "the system"*. 2025. <https://statmodeling.stat.columbia.edu/2025/04/04/why-i-no-longer-use-the-term-cargo-cult-science/> (accessed).
- (13) Smith, R. Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals. *J R Soc Med*. **2006**, *99* (4), 178-182. DOI: 10.1258/jrsm.99.4.178.
- (14) *How to fix the 'broken' peer review system*. 2022. <https://www.durham.ac.uk/research/current/thought-leadership/the-peer-review-system-is-broken-we-asked-academics-how-to-fix-it/> (accessed).
- (15) Liu, Y. Scientific Accountability: The Case for Personal Responsibility in Academic Error Correction. *Qeios* **2025**, Preprint. DOI: 10.32388/m4ggkz.
- (16) Liu, Y. Why Are Research Findings Supported by Experimental Data with High Probability Often False? --Critical Analysis of the Replication Crisis and Statistical Bias in Scientific Literature. *Preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202507.1953.v1.
- (17) Liu, Y. *Why Has Physics Come to a Standstill?* 2025. <https://yueliusd.substack.com/p/why-has-physics-come-to-a-standstill> (accessed).

- (18) Stallen, M.; Sanfey, A. G. The neuroscience of social conformity: implications for fundamental and applied research. *Front Neurosci* **2015**, *9*, 337. DOI: 10.3389/fnins.2015.00337 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
- (19) Haslam, S. A.; Reicher, S. D. Contesting the "Nature" Of Conformity: what Milgram and Zimbardo's studies really show. *PLoS Biol* **2012**, *10*(11), e1001426. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1001426 From NLM Medline.
- (20) Skillicorn, N. Authority Bias: Why we submit to the ideas and orders of others.
- (21) Wilson, G. *Peer review is meant to prevent scientific misconduct. But it has its own problems.* 2025. <https://theconversation.com/peer-review-is-meant-to-prevent-scientific-misconduct-but-it-has-its-own-problems-248015> (accessed).
- (22) Udesky, L. 'Publish or perish' culture blamed for reproducibility crisis. *Nature* **2025**. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-024-04253-w From NLM Publisher.
- (23) Coddington, M. *Scientists Blame "Publish or Perish" Culture for Reproducibility Crisis.* 2025. <https://www.technologynetworks.com/biopharma/news/scientists-blame-publish-or-perish-culture-for-reproducibility-crisis-395293> (accessed).
- (24) *Milgram experiment.* [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Milgram\\_experiment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Milgram_experiment) (accessed).
- (25) Parker, D. Kuhnian revolutions in neuroscience: the role of tool development. *Biol Philos* **2018**, *33*(3), 17. DOI: 10.1007/s10539-018-9628-0 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
- (26) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Structure\\_of\\_Scientific\\_Revolutions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Structure_of_Scientific_Revolutions) (accessed).
- (27) McLeod, S. *Thomas Kuhn: Paradigm Shift.* 2023. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/kuhn-paradigm.html> (accessed).
- (28) Layman, C. A.; Rypel, A. L. Beyond Kuhnian paradigms: Normal science and theory dependence in ecology. *Ecol Evol* **2023**, *13*(7), e10255. DOI: 10.1002/ece3.10255 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
- (29) Liu, Y. The Misapplication of Statistical Methods in Liberal Arts: A Critical Analysis of Academic Publishing Bias Against Theoretical Research *SSRN* **2025**. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.5376778.
- (30) Liu, Y. Theoretical Primacy in Scientific Inquiry: A Critique of the Empirical Orthodoxy in Modern Research. *SSRN* **2025**. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.5379953.
- (31) Alam, S. Trends in research integrity concerns and the evolving role of the publisher. *Insights the UKSG journal* **2024**, *37*. DOI: 10.1629/uksg.663.
- (32) Chakraborty, A. *Cargo Cult Science: When You Follow The Instructions But Don't Understand The Process.* 2025. <https://coffeeandjunk.com/cargo-cult-science/> (accessed).
- (33) Stark, P. B. *Cargo-cult statistics and scientific crisis.* 2018. <https://significancemagazine.com/cargo-cult-statistics-and-scientific-crisis/> (accessed).
- (34) Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. Recognizing Problems in Publications Concerned with Microwave Absorption Film and Providing Corrections: A Focused Review. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* **2025**, *64*(7), 3635–3650. DOI: 10.1021/acs.iecr.4c04544.
- (35) Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B.; Liu, Y. A physics investigation of impedance matching theory in microwave absorption film—Part 1: Theory. *Journal of Applied Physics* **2023**, *134*(4),

045303. DOI: 10.1063/5.0153608.

(36) Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. A Re-evaluation of the mechanism of microwave absorption in film – Part 2: The real mechanism. *Materials Chemistry and Physics* **2022**, *291*, 126601. DOI: 10.1016/j.matchemphys.2022.126601.

(37) Braithwaite, L. *Why do we always trust the doctor, even though they might be wrong?* <https://thedeisionlab.com/biases/authority-bias> (accessed).

(38) *Planck's principle*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planck%27s\\_principle](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planck%27s_principle) (accessed).

(39) Joober, R.; Schmitz, N.; Annable, L.; Boksa, P. Publication bias: what are the challenges and can they be overcome? *J Psychiatry Neurosci* **2012**, *37*(3), 149-152. DOI: 10.1503/jpn.120065 From NLM Medline.

(40) Murad, M. H.; Chu, H.; Lin, L.; Wang, Z. The effect of publication bias magnitude and direction on the certainty in evidence. *BMJ Evid Based Med* **2018**, *23*(3), 84-86. DOI: 10.1136/bmjebm-2018-110891 From NLM Medline.

(41) Nair, A. S. Publication bias - Importance of studies with negative results! *Indian J Anaesth* **2019**, *63*(6), 505-507. DOI: 10.4103/ija.IJA\_142\_19 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.

(42) Nikolopoulou, K. *What Is Publication Bias?* 2023. <https://www.scribbr.com/research-bias/publication-bias/> (accessed).

(43) *Publication bias*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Publication\\_bias](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Publication_bias) (accessed).

(44) *Replication crisis*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Replication\\_crisis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Replication_crisis) (accessed).

(45) Weitzman, H. *A Way Out of the Replication Crisis*. 2021.

<https://www.chicagobooth.edu/review/way-out-replication-crisis> (accessed).

(46) Yeo-Teh, N. S. L.; Tang, B. L. Wilfully submitting to and publishing in predatory journals - a covert form of research misconduct? *Biochem Med (Zagreb)* **2021**, *31*(3), 030201. DOI: 10.11613/BM.2021.030201 From NLM Medline.

(47) Elmore, S. A.; Weston, E. H. Predatory Journals: What They Are and How to Avoid Them. *Toxicol Pathol* **2020**, *48*(4), 607-610. DOI: 10.1177/0192623320920209 From NLM Medline.

(48) Guba, K. *From plagiarism to predatory journals: academic misconduct, misrepresentation, and gaming*. 2019. <https://eher.org/from-plagiarism-to-predatory-journals/> (accessed).

(49) Zhaksylyk, A.; Zimba, O.; Yessirkepov, M.; Kocyigit, B. F. Research Integrity: Where We Are and Where We Are Heading. *J Korean Med Sci* **2023**, *38*(47), e405. DOI: 10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e405 From NLM Medline.

(50) Irfanullah, H. *Peer Review Has Lost Its Human Face. So, What's Next?* 2025.

<https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2025/04/09/peer-review-has-lost-its-human-face-so-whats-next/> (accessed).

(51) *A story about trying to report scientific misconduct*.

[https://www.reddit.com/r/AskAcademia/comments/l63ds8/a\\_story\\_about\\_trying\\_to\\_report\\_scientific/](https://www.reddit.com/r/AskAcademia/comments/l63ds8/a_story_about_trying_to_report_scientific/) (accessed).

(52) *I tried to report scientific misconduct. How did it go?*

<https://crystalprisonzone.blogspot.com/2021/01/i-tried-to-report-scientific-misconduct.html> (accessed).