

What is wrong with self-promoting truth?

Dear Scientists,

Please note that Nature has deleted my comment (posted with another name because all of my real name accounts in Nature were not working for some reasons) shown below:

Shi V. Liu MD PhD

Dear Cool Hot,

The following post you wrote on the Nature News website has been hidden by the moderator in accordance with our terms and conditions.

Open Letter to iPS/Cancer Researchers::::: Based on my discovery of "induced pluripotent stem cells" (iPSCs) as incorrectly programmed stem cells (iPSCs) or, in other words, man-made cancer stem cells (mmCSCs), I have invented a method "ANTI-TUMOR AGENTS SCREEN USING IPCS" in which the term "iPCs" is defined as incorrectly programmed cells to include iPSCs (incorrectly programmed stem cells) and iPNSCs (incorrectly programmed non-stem cells)./// Anticipating likely challenge that "induced pluripotent stem cells" are not incorrectly programmed stem cells and are even "cancer-free" I have withheld the filing of patent application of the above invention until now when I saw "independent" confirmations of my discovery coming out from around the world in some "top" journals such as Nature Biotechnology's publication of Yamanaka's "Variation in the safety of induced pluripotent stem cell lines" (overloaded with oncogenes) and the recent same-day publication in Nature of five research papers showing enhanced generation of iPSCs (by knocking out tumor-suppressing mechanisms)./// Now, the publication of this Cell paper just further strengthened the importance of my invention because, as the authors of this Cell paper stated, "screens for agents that specifically kill epithelial cancer stem cells (CSCs) have not been possible due to the rarity of these cells within tumor cell populations and their relative instability in culture"./// My invention will take advantage of a rich set of incorrectly programmed stem cells (iPSCs) made to believe as induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs). Compared with other natural CSCs, these mmCSCs are all "immortalized" so they are very stable. They are also relatively well characterized at least to the extent that they can be distinguished now from embryonic stem cells (ESCs). So, mmCSCs disguised as "induced pluripotent stem cells" (iPSCs) may be better vehicles for screening anti-tumor/anti-cancer agents/drugs./// I have communicated my ideas with the corresponding authors (three of them) and got a positive response already. Now I am writing this Comment to serve as a PUBLIC APPEAL to iPS/cancer researchers to join me in discovering anti-tumor/anti-cancer agents/drugs by using iPSCs as surrogates for natural cancer stem cells. I am going to give the utility of my invention free of charge to the first group who contacts me from the following countries where iPSCs have been generated as far as I know: Japan, USA, China, Great Britain, Canada, Germany, and Spain. For those who are still doubting my deep insights on the nature and risk of iPSCs (see many PUBLICATIONS at <http://im1.biz/iPS.htm>), I challenge them to try my invention with

selective CSC inhibitors such as salinomycin identified in this Cell publication and other likely candidates suggested in my earlier PUBLICATION "Cancer Cell Formation by iPSC Techniques: Mechanisms and Testing Approaches" (Logical Biology 9 (1):22-41, 2009). If their iPSCs can be killed by anti-tumor/anti-cancer agents/drugs and that killing is even selective, please report those CONFIRMATIONS of my discovery of iPSCs as mmCSCs to the public, with appropriate acknowledgement to my contribution. Shi V. Liu (SVL8EPA@gmail.com; <http://im1.biz>)

Self-promotion.

-Nature News editors

Shi V. Liu's response:

If a scientist is not even allowed to speaking out truth he has found, what a scientist can do? If a scientific journal knew the truth but still cheat the world, is that journal still a scientific journal?