

A Public Display of Rejections by the “Top” Journals

Shi V. Liu

Eagle Institute of Molecular Medicine
Apex, NC 27502, USA

Corresponding with SVL@logibio.com

(Received 2006-12-29; revised 2006-12-31; accepted 2006-12-31; published 2006-12-31)

HIGHLIGHT

The 2006 rejections on Shi V. Liu’s submissions to the impact-factor-wise “top” journals are displayed here. It is hoped that this public display of rejections may help readers to know what the “top” journals like to publish and do not like to publish.

ABSTRACT

Following a tradition started in 2005 this journal once again listed all rejections by the “top” journals for the submissions made by Shi V. Liu in 2006. Most of these rejected manuscripts were later published in various new-generation journals. Readers are encouraged to read these publications as well as the reasons of rejections disclosed in the notes for these publications. By comparing what were stated in these publications with what are contained in those published by the “top” journals it is hoped that readers can realize the prejudice and even the hypocrisy of the impact-factor-wise “top” journals in deciding what they want to publish.

KEY WORDS

Rejection, Top journal, Criticism, Communication, Editorial prejudice, Publishing misconduct

Beginning 10 2005, *Logical Biology* started a section called Reflection. It provides author(s) an opportunity to timely reflect some important aspect of his/her research/publishing experiences in that passing year.

The first Reflection paper was a revelation of “top” journals’ rejections that I collected in 2005 (*Logical Biol.* 5: 372-377, 2005). Looking at the table listing all the rejections (by traditional mainstream journals) and then publications (in new-generation journals), I was amazed with solidarity of the “top” journals in rejecting my views.

With that kind of iron-wall that I had faced in 2005 I thought I should stop the “stamp collection” effort for the rejections. However, I found it is really difficult for me to quit this “hobby”. As a matter of fact, as more and more latter publications in “top” journal echoed back what I have published

before or as more and more high-profile publications became more and more ridiculous from my perspective, I found that I have to submit even more to those “top” journals to let them know the knowledge existed for their questions or alternative views different from their mainstream views.

My submissions in 2006 (see Table 1) were so frequent that once the editor of *Nature* wrote to me that they will reply to my submission. After complaining this unprofessional attitude and unethical behavior to its editor-in-chief *Nature* resumed normal reply to my later submissions. However, this procedure “courtesy” did not change any of the deeply berried hatred or despise of the editors towards my submissions. It just made the rejections coming quicker. Sometimes I really felt that my submissions were automatically rejected even without being carefully read. As said by my

scientific friend, the “top” journals might well have placed my name in some “blacklists”. Who could forget such a “crazy” author who sometimes submitted 2 or 3 items in a week to a single journal?

But whether I was a crazy author or they were some insane editors needs time to test. For this reason, I am preserving here most of my 2006 submissions to the “top” journals that were rejected. Most of these rejected papers were quickly published by new-generation journals. So readers can read them to make their own judgment on the fairness and legitimacy of the rejections.

An often used excuse for “top” journals to make a rejection is their “space limitation”. However, I have found out that in most case that is just a cover up for their limitation on different views (*Sci. Ethics* 1: 67-71, 2006). This censorship (*Sci. Ethics* 1: 74-76, 2006) can be clearly seen in examples that I have collected from a series of extremely short correspondences/letters that were rejected by the “top” journals in 2005 (*Sci. Ethics* 1: 17-19, 2006). The refusal of the “top” journals to publish such short correspondences/letters exposing clear cases of scientific misconduct (*Logical Biol.* 5: 70-72, 2005) constituted publishing misconduct by these so-called “scientific” journals (*Sci. Ethics* 1: 17-19, 2006).

Many of my submissions are actually aimed at the publishing misconduct of the impact-factor-wise “top” journals. In 2005 the so-called “top” journals have rejected a series submissions from me criticizing the various defects and deceptions in the citation number-based “top” 10s (*Logical Biol.* 5: 131-134, 135-136, and 137-139, 2005) and ironical situation of earning more citations from the retractions (*Logical Biol.* 5: 125-127 and 128-130, 2005). Many times I have directly criticized the scams played by the “top” journals when they used the invalid impact factor to promote their journals. However, these criticisms are naturally rejected by them.

A lot of my submissions criticized the mistakes existing in some high-profile publications. However, such normal scientific debates are not easy if not impossible in the “top” journals when alternative views are against the mainstream views, especially when such criticisms are made by scientific “no body” against scientific “big shot”. In 2005, I made side-by-side comparison of what were rejected and what were published by the so-

called “top” journals (*Logical Biol.* 5: 372-377, 2005). However, it is impossible to make such side-by-side comparison for my 2006 submissions because there are too many to do.

However, the following key differences between my views and the mainstream views may be worth of emphasizing:

A. I claimed that all life forms are mortal including unicellular organisms and tissue cells but immortality is now a big theme in “top” journal publications;

B. I claimed that no cell differentiation occurs in unicellular organisms but high-profile “top” journal publications still played the cell differentiation tune for unicellular organisms such as *Caulobacter*;

C. I claimed that life on earth had multiple independent origins and it is impossible for all extend life forms to have a common ancestor. However, conventional wisdom in evolution studies all believed that there was a last common ancestor for the so-called “tree of life”;

D. I described a universal fundamental aging mechanism that link aging of molecules to the aging of cells and to the aging of (multicellular) organisms. However, “top” journals are still publishing papers which claim the immortality of tissue cells and the stochastic nature of the molecular aging;

E. I declared that “cell cycle” is a wrong term and cell does not cycle and cannot be divided but all others mainstream researchers are still confusing the cell reproduction cycle with cell life cycle in their so-called “cell cycle” research;

F. I pointed out the limitation in understanding the Hayflick Limit and the mistake in equating the cessation of cell reproduction with “senescence” but mainstreamer are still using “replicative senescence” as an intrinsic form of aging;

I deplored the wrong ideas of curing cancer by inducing “senescence” but “top” journals are still keep publishing many “hot” papers on “inducing senescence to cure cancer”.

There are many more of my submissions that are just singing the opposite tunes to the “top” journals’ publications. Thus, it is only natural for them to silence these inharmonic sounds.

However, history will tell whether “top” journals action is valid and ethical.

Table 1. Shi V. Liu's 2006 Collection of Rejections from Traditional Journals.

No.	Title	Submitted (mm-dd)	Rejected by	Published In 2006*
1	Piggyback on a Nobel Prize or Show Its True Spirit	01-09 01-12 02-01	<i>Cell</i> <i>Nature</i> <i>Lancet</i>	<i>LB</i> 5: 12
2	A Slap on the Face of "Science"	01-09	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 3
3	Nature's instinct to revenge	01-09	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 8
4	Sorry, I Am Not Your Grandfather	01-17	<i>Cell</i>	<i>P</i> 1: 5
5	Not a good time to cheer for peer review	01-17	<i>Nature</i>	
6	Is Kennedy Out of Touch or Else?	01-22	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 14
7	Retracted papers are still unmarked and being cited continuously	02-01	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 22
8	Lessons Not Learnt Or Not Revealed	02-06	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 24
9	Pioneering open review journals under-appreciated	02-11	<i>Nature</i>	
10	Stewart, Nyström, and Cooper: Please Behave as a Corresponding Author!	02-11	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 59
11	Eccentric microbes or eccentric microbiologists?	02-14 03-16	<i>Nature</i> <i>Nat. Rev.</i> <i>Microbiol.</i>	<i>P</i> 1: 33
12	Why <i>Science</i> moves so slowly?	02-16	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 37
13	Schatten's misbehavior is more disgusting than Hwang's misconduct	02-16	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 30
14	The Dog Year's Fight against Scientific Misconduct and Corruption	02-19	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 64
15	The Pittsburgh Investigation on Gerald Schatten: An O.J. Simpson Trial in Science?	02-20	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 40
16	Contradictory findings and alternative opinions are even barred by society meeting	02-20	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 33
17	Depositing research materials is hard to implement and wouldn't curtail scientific fraud	02-22	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 28
18	Refutation to surrender published data for re-analysis	02-23	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 35
19	Accessibility of online supplemental materials	03-01	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 47
20	Bacterial Magnetotaxis: Fact or Sensation? – A Critical Review and a Different Perspective	03-02	<i>Science</i>	<i>LB</i> 6: 16
21	Stop playing the magnetotactic navigation tune for bacteria	03-02	<i>Nature</i>	<i>LB</i> 6: 22
22	Kennedy's Mailbag: What Are Revealed and What Are Not Revealed?	03-03	<i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 79
23	The impact factor scam in scientific publishing	03-07	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 72
24	Limitation of space or limitation on views	03-09 03-15	<i>Nature</i> <i>Science</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 67
25	Censorship, misconduct, fraud, peer review, publishing pressure, and impact factor	03-24	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 74
26	Eccentric microbes or eccentric microbiologists? – Recapturing a 15-year-long fight against dogma	03-28	<i>Nat. Rev.</i> <i>Microbiol.</i>	<i>P</i> 1: 33
27	Stop Playing the Cell Differentiation Tune for <i>Caulobacter</i>	04-05	<i>Cell</i>	<i>LB</i> 6: 31
28	Intellectual exploitation and credit robbery in scientific research and publishing	04-06	<i>Nature</i>	<i>SE</i> 1: 77

29	Old Problems Need Real Solutions	04-07	<i>Science</i>	
30	Life Scientists Need Logical Thinking	04-17	<i>Microbe</i>	LB 6: 33
31	Aging, Diseases and Cure of Aging?	04-21	<i>Science</i>	
32	Exaggeration is common in scientific world	05-11	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 83
33	An inappropriate comparison	05-25	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 85
34	Citation Should Credit Pioneering Researchers and Original Works	06-09	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 94
35	Top journals' top retraction rates	06-17	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 91
36	Justice delayed. Would it be denied?	06-19	<i>Science</i>	SE 1: 89
37	Put the immortality concept to death	07-13	<i>Nature</i>	LB 1: 52
38	New Biology: Old Terms yet New Concepts	07-24	<i>Microbe</i>	P 1: 49
39	An emperor with no clothes	08-10 08-15 08-21	<i>Nature</i> <i>Science</i> <i>PNAS</i>	P 1: 59
40	Revisit semi-conservative DNA replication and immortal DNA strand hypothesis	08-15 08-24 08-27	<i>Nature</i> <i>Cell</i> <i>Science</i>	LB 6: 54
41	Let's hope Perelman win the maths 'Nobel'	08-13	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 100
42	A true scientist with a decent character	08-14	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 101
43	Just as predicted but differently explained	08-15	<i>Nat. Cell Biol.</i>	TW 1: 9
44	Are Stem Cells Really Immortal Cells?	08-15 09-09	<i>Stem Cell</i> <i>Cell</i>	LB 6: 71
45	Cell Division versus Cell Reproduction	08-15 08-21	<i>Cell</i> <i>Science</i>	LB 6: 62
46	Why We Keep Losing Excellence in Young Scientists?	08-20	<i>Cell</i>	LB 6: 65
47	Stem mother cells stay alive after cell reproduction but will eventually die	08-23	<i>Nat. Med.</i>	TW 1: 9
48	Stop miss-spinning good data into wrong conclusions	08-23	<i>Nat. Rev. Genet.</i>	TW 1: 9
49	Is semi-conservative DNA replication invalid?	08-25	<i>Nature</i>	LB 6: 69
50	'Ethical' stem cells are truly unethical!	09-08	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 103
51	Untruthful and unethical publications should be purged from scientific literature	09-09	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 111
52	No Evidence for Cell "Division"	09-15	<i>Science</i>	
53	A self-contradictory and deeply confused Editorial	09-21	<i>Nature</i>	TW 1: 6
54	Increased cloning efficiency over differentiation hierarchy: True paradigm shift or false outlier presentation?	11-06	<i>Nat. Genet.</i>	LB 6: 110
55	Cheating cannot be just corrected	11-08	<i>Nature</i>	SE 1: 111
56	Extragenic DNA oasis for fruitful post-genomic biological discovery	11-09	<i>Nature</i>	LB 6: 88
57	Too Many Concerns but No Real Action	11-09	<i>Science</i>	SE 1: 115
58	Difference in Opinion Is OK but Distortion of History Is Unacceptable	11-18	<i>PNAS</i>	SE 1: 119
59	Cheating Should Perish from Scientific Literature		<i>PLoS Biol.</i>	LB 6: 90
60	Nobel Prize: For Ground-Breakers or Trend-Catchers?	12-04	<i>Science</i>	SE 1: 117
61	Seeking truth and sticking to the truth	12-07	<i>Science</i>	P 1: 69
62	Chenglu Tsou (1923-2006) A true scientist with high ethical standard	12-07	<i>Nature</i>	P 1: 69

63	Risk Assessment May Not Work against Fraud but Will Harm Communication of True Discovery	12-12	<i>Science</i>	<i>TW</i> 1: 16
64	Cell does not cycle and cannot be divided	12-14	<i>Nature</i>	<i>LB</i> 6: 103
65	Stem Cells' Self-Renewal or Cell Biologists' Self-Cheating?	12-18 12-19	<i>Nat. Med.</i> <i>Cell</i>	<i>LB</i> 6: 106

* Abbreviations for new-generation journals. *LB* = *Logical Biology*, *SE* = *Scientific Ethics*, *P* = *Pioneer*, *TW* = *Top Watch*.

Update added on 2007-01-05:

The following two rows should be added back to the end of Table 1.

These two rows were initially included in the table but then deleted because *Nature* and *Science* had not rejected them as quickly as they normally do (to me). However, both submissions are now rejected by the respective journal for the regular reason – space limitation.

66	Aging mechanism fully described but not accepted	12-22	<i>Nature</i>	
67	On <i>Science</i> 's Breakthrough of the Year	12-27	<i>Science</i>	

These papers will be published soon in *Scientific Ethics* and *Top Watch*, respectively.