

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

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

[Yue Liu](#) *

Posted Date: 24 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202507.1953.v1

Keywords: replication crisis; statistical significance; scientific misconduct; publication bias; peer review bias; cargo cult science; minority viewpoints; innovation suppression



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Article

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

Yue Liu

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

Abstract

The scientific community faces a paradox: research findings that appear to be strongly supported by experimental data with high statistical probability are often false. Despite John Ioannidis's seminal 2005 assertion that "most published research findings are false," the scientific establishment continues to operate under the assumption that findings with high probability support are correspondingly likely to be true. This paper examines why this fundamental misconception persists and explores the underlying causes of false findings in scientific literature. Through analysis of the replication crisis, statistical bias, and case studies including microwave absorption theory and Kanazawa's beauty-daughters hypothesis, we demonstrate how flawed statistical standards and theoretical deficiencies in mainstream theories create a systematic bias toward false positive results. The paper argues that the emphasis on replication experiments, originally proposed by Feynman to combat "cargo cult science," has paradoxically contributed to the problem by flooding journals with non-innovative content that dilutes truly innovative research. Furthermore, the modern peer review system systematically suppresses minority viewpoints that challenge mainstream theories, treating them as "pseudoscience" despite the historical reality that scientific progress is typically driven by non-mainstream minorities rather than conformist research.

Keywords: replication crisis; statistical significance; scientific misconduct; publication bias; peer review bias; cargo cult science; minority viewpoints; innovation suppression

1. Introduction

The reliability of scientific literature has become a central concern in contemporary research, with mounting evidence suggesting that a substantial proportion of published findings cannot be replicated or are fundamentally flawed [1,2]. John Ioannidis's provocative 2005 paper "Why Most Published Research Findings Are False" established a mathematical framework demonstrating that under common research conditions, the probability that a research claim is true may be less than 50% [3]. This revelation has profound implications for scientific progress and public trust in research.

The problem extends beyond mere statistical significance testing to encompass broader issues of theoretical foundations, peer review bias, and the incentive structures that govern scientific publishing [4,5]. The phenomenon is particularly pronounced in fields where mainstream theories contain unrecognized deficiencies, creating systematic biases that favor false positive results over genuine discoveries [3].

A fundamental paradox emerges when examining the conditions that enable transformative scientific breakthroughs: the very low-probability events that drive genuine innovation are systematically suppressed by the regulatory mechanisms designed to ensure scientific quality. Historical analysis reveals that major scientific advances—from Newton's laws of gravitation to

Einstein's theories of relativity—emerged without the modern peer review system that now dominates scientific publishing [6]. These revolutionary discoveries represent statistical outliers that, under today's publication standards, would likely be rejected as "improbable" or "inconsistent with established theory."

The scientific community must no longer rely on the assumption that 'high-probability events are necessarily correct' to suppress minority but potentially revolutionary findings. Equating high statistical confidence with truth not only neglects the fact that innovation often arises from the tails of probability distributions but also effectively deprives low-probability events of opportunities for publication and funding.

The solution to the above mentioned paradox lies not in more stringent regulation, but in adopting a laissez-faire approach to scientific inquiry that mirrors the spontaneous order observed in natural systems. Just as nature achieves remarkable complexity through unregulated self-organization—creating life itself through countless unguided molecular interactions—scientific progress flourishes when freed from excessive institutional constraints [7,8]. The economic principle of laissez-faire, which demonstrates that markets achieve optimal outcomes through minimal government intervention, offers a compelling model for scientific governance [9,10]. When applied to academic research, this approach suggests that loosening constraints and allowing natural governance may be the most effective strategy for enabling the low-probability events that constitute genuine scientific breakthroughs.

The following analysis examines how the current system of scientific publishing and peer review has created an environment that systematically favors false findings while suppressing innovative research. More importantly, it explores how adopting principles of spontaneous order and minimal regulatory interference could restore science's capacity for genuine discovery and theoretical advancement.

2. The Replication Crisis and the Paradox of Non-Innovative Publications

2.1. *The Flood of Replication Studies*

The contemporary emphasis on replication studies has created an unintended consequence: the flooding of scientific journals with non-innovative articles that lack genuine scientific novelty. Originally proposed by Richard Feynman to combat "cargo cult science," replication experiments were intended to serve as a quality control mechanism to verify the reliability of experimental findings [11,12]. However, the modern implementation has deviated significantly from Feynman's original intent.

Recent data reveals that replication studies have proliferated dramatically, with journals increasingly accepting manuscripts that merely confirm existing mainstream theories without adding new insights. A 2021 study found that papers failing to replicate original findings are cited 153 times more than those that successfully replicate, paradoxically giving failed studies greater influence in the scientific literature [11,13]. This phenomenon demonstrates how the academic publishing system has become corrupted by misplaced priorities.

2.2. *Dilution of Innovative Research*

The massive increase in replication studies has created a serious problem: truly innovative research becomes increasingly difficult to locate and retrieve in the literature. As noted by statistical blogger Andrew Gelman, the scientific community is "drowning in junk science" produced by researchers who treat both research and statistical analysis as mere bureaucratic paperwork rather than genuine inquiry [14]. This proliferation of low-quality replication studies creates a statistical noise that obscures genuinely innovative contributions.

The problem is exacerbated by the fact that many replication studies simply repeat the same flawed statistical standards and theoretical assumptions as the original research. Rather than critically examining the underlying theoretical frameworks, these studies perpetuate the same errors

while appearing to provide independent verification [15,16]. This creates a false sense of scientific consensus around fundamentally flawed theories.

2.3. *The Systematic Bias Against Innovation*

Modern scientific publishing has developed a systematic bias against truly innovative research [11,17]. Studies have shown that papers with "interesting" or novel findings are more likely to be accepted for publication even when they are less likely to be true [13]. This creates a perverse incentive structure where researchers are rewarded for producing conformity results rather than methodologically rigorous but incremental advances.

The emphasis on conformity paradoxically leads to the suppression of genuine innovation. When truly innovative research challenges mainstream theoretical frameworks, it faces significant barriers to publication due to peer review bias. Meanwhile, superficially novel but ultimately false findings receive widespread attention and citation, distorting the scientific record [18].

3. The Suppression of Minority Viewpoints in Scientific Publishing

3.1. *The Authoritarian Nature of Modern Peer Review*

The modern peer review system has evolved into a mechanism that systematically suppresses minority viewpoints and dissenting opinions. Research has documented extensive evidence of bias in peer review processes, including institutional affiliation bias, status bias, and paradigm confirmation bias [19–21]. These biases create a system where journals effectively impose their own conception of "correctness" on the scientific community, preventing research from exploring directions that mainstream scientists consider "incorrect."

A comprehensive analysis of peer review bias reveals that reviewers and editors often exhibit strong preferences for findings that support established theories while discriminating against research that challenges mainstream paradigms. This phenomenon is particularly pronounced when dealing with research that comes from less prestigious institutions or challenges well-established theoretical frameworks.

3.2. *The Mischaracterization of Minority Viewpoints as "Pseudoscience"*

One of the most problematic aspects of the modern peer review system is the tendency to dismiss minority viewpoints as "pseudoscience" or "crankery" without proper scientific evaluation. This tendency reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of how scientific progress actually occurs. Historical analysis shows that major scientific breakthroughs typically come from minority perspectives that initially face resistance from the mainstream scientific community [22].

The suppression of minority viewpoints is often justified by claims that these perspectives represent "low probability" events that are likely to be false. However, this logic fails to account for the fact that truly innovative scientific discoveries are, by definition, low-probability events from the perspective of existing paradigms. The history of science is replete with examples of revolutionary discoveries that were initially rejected by peer reviewers and journal editors [21].

3.3. *The Role of "Paper Mills" in Flooding Journals*

The proliferation of "paper mills" - organizations that mass-produce fraudulent research papers - has created additional problems for the scientific literature [23–25]. These operations flood journals with fake studies that often support mainstream theories, further inflating the apparent evidence base for established paradigms while making it more difficult for genuine innovative research to gain attention.

Paper mills exploit the existing biases in the publication system by producing papers that appear to confirm established theories using fabricated data [23]. This creates a vicious cycle where false support for mainstream theories increases while genuine dissenting voices are marginalized. The

problem has become so severe that major publishers have been forced to retract thousands of papers and close entire journals [24].

4. The Theoretical Argument for Theory-Driven Research

4.1. *The Superiority of Theory-Driven Approaches*

One of the most compelling arguments for reforming the current system comes from research demonstrating that theory-driven approaches are more likely to produce reliable results than purely empirical or replication-based research [18,26,27]. Theory-driven research involves the explicit formulation of theoretical frameworks that guide hypothesis generation and testing, leading to more robust and interpretable findings.

Studies have shown that theory-driven research is associated with higher methodological rigor and more reliable results [27]. This approach requires researchers to make explicit theoretical commitments that can be evaluated and potentially falsified, leading to more productive scientific discourse. In contrast, the current emphasis on replication studies often lacks theoretical depth and fails to advance scientific understanding [18].

4.2. *The Problem with Atheoretical Replication*

The current emphasis on replication studies often involves atheoretical approaches that simply repeat experimental procedures without addressing underlying theoretical issues. This approach fails to recognize that the reliability of empirical findings depends critically on the theoretical frameworks within which they are interpreted [18]. When theoretical frameworks are flawed, simple replication will only perpetuate the same errors.

Research in psychology and other fields has shown that the emphasis on novelty and statistical significance, rather than theoretical rigor, has contributed to the replication crisis [18]. The solution is not more replication studies but rather a shift toward theory-driven research that explicitly addresses theoretical assumptions and their implications.

5. The Historical Context: Science as a Minority Enterprise

5.1. *The Role of Minorities in Scientific Progress*

Historical analysis reveals that major scientific advances typically come from minority perspectives that initially face resistance from the mainstream scientific community. Examples include the acceptance of continental drift theory, the bacterial theory of ulcers, and the development of quantum mechanics - all of which were initially rejected by mainstream scientists [22].

This pattern suggests that the current emphasis on suppressing minority viewpoints is fundamentally counterproductive to scientific progress. The peer review system's bias toward mainstream consensus may be preventing the very type of innovative thinking that leads to scientific breakthroughs [22].

5.2. *The Sociology of Scientific Change*

Research in the sociology of science has shown that scientific change typically involves a process where minority viewpoints gradually gain acceptance through persistent advocacy and empirical support [28]. This process is threatened by peer review systems that systematically exclude minority perspectives from publication.

The tendency for minority viewpoints to be dismissed as "low probability" events reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of how scientific change occurs. While any individual minority viewpoint may indeed be false, the systematic suppression of all minority viewpoints without serious evaluation prevents the scientific community from identifying those rare instances where minority perspectives represent genuine advances [29].

6. Case Studies in Scientific Suppression

6.1. *The Microwave Absorption Theory Case*

The microwave absorption theory provides a compelling example of how mainstream scientific theories can contain fundamental flaws that go unrecognized for decades [30–33]. Before the establishment of wave mechanics theory for microwave absorption, all experimental reports appeared to support the prevailing impedance matching theory [34,35]. Only after the development of more sophisticated theoretical frameworks did it become clear that the experimental data previously thought to support the mainstream theory actually contradicted it [36–39].

This case illustrates how theoretical deficiencies can systematically bias the interpretation of experimental results, leading to false conclusions that persist until more adequate theoretical frameworks are developed. The case also demonstrates the importance of theoretical innovation in scientific progress.

6.2. *Systematic Suppression of Dissenting Views*

Research has documented numerous cases where dissenting scientific viewpoints have been systematically suppressed through peer review bias and editorial decisions [40,41]. These cases often involve research that challenges established theoretical frameworks or highlights problems with mainstream approaches.

The suppression of dissenting views is particularly problematic in fields where mainstream theories have significant economic or political implications. In such cases, the peer review system can become a mechanism for protecting vested interests rather than promoting scientific truth.

7. The Economics of Scientific Publishing and Innovation Suppression

7.1. *Publication Incentives and Innovation*

The current academic publishing system creates perverse incentives that discourage genuine innovation while rewarding the production of superficially novel but ultimately false findings. The emphasis on publication quantity over quality leads researchers to focus on producing papers that can pass peer review rather than making genuine contributions to scientific knowledge [14,42–44].

This system is particularly problematic for researchers pursuing minority viewpoints or challenging mainstream theories. Such researchers face significant barriers to publication, making it difficult to build careers around innovative research that challenges established paradigms [17,40].

7.2. *The Role of Citation Metrics*

The current emphasis on citation metrics and journal impact factors further exacerbates the problem of innovation suppression. Papers that support mainstream theories are more likely to be cited, creating a feedback loop that reinforces existing theoretical frameworks while marginalizing dissenting viewpoints [25].

This system is particularly vulnerable to manipulation by paper mills and other fraudulent actors who can artificially inflate citation counts through coordinated citation campaigns [25]. The result is a scientific literature that appears to support mainstream theories through sheer volume of citations rather than genuine scientific merit.

8. Enabling Low-Probability Scientific Breakthroughs: Laissez-Faire, Deregulation and Academic Freedom

Having established the systemic problems with current scientific publishing and peer review, we now turn to examine how these low-probability but transformative scientific discoveries might

be enabled through deliberate deregulation and the adoption of laissez-faire principles in academic research.

8.1. *The Challenge of Low-Probability Events*

Transformative discoveries—whether the appearance of self-replicating molecules in the Hadean ocean or the sudden rise of a revolutionary theory—are statistical outliers. In conventional hypothesis testing they sit in the far tails of the distribution, where prior probability R is vanishingly small. When institutional rules narrow the search space or penalise deviation, the effective R approaches zero and the likelihood of observing such events collapses.

8.2. *Laissez-Faire and Deregulation as Catalysts*

Economic history shows that laissez-faire environments amplify variance and thereby enlarge the opportunity set for rare but high-impact innovations. Multi-state U.S. banking deregulation, for example, increased both the volume and risk profile of patenting by young firms, especially in exploratory domains [45]. Similar patterns appear after foreign-bank entry liberalisations [46] and in electricity markets opened to competition, where patent output rises once regulatory barriers fall [47]. The core mechanism mirrors Darwinian selection: when constraints loosen, entrepreneurial “mutation rate” rises, increasing the absolute number of low-probability successes.

8.3. *Planned Economies Versus Market Economies*

Planned economies intentionally suppress variance to maximise predictability. Comparative studies find that centralised systems systematically under-produce patents and radical technological shifts relative to market economies, where competitive pressure rewards exploratory risk-taking [48–50]. In the extreme, a perfectly central plan drives variance toward zero, mathematically eliminating the tails from which disruptive events arise [51]. Put succinctly: regulation minimises error but also minimises surprise.

8.4. *Nature’s “Unregulated Laboratory” and the Limits of Design*

Despite decades of well-funded abiogenesis and synthetic-cell projects, no laboratory has yet produced a self-sustaining human, animal or plant de novo [52–55]. By contrast, undirected natural processes assembled ribonucleotides, protocells and eventually multicellular organisms through astronomical numbers of parallel micro-experiments over geological time. The implication is straightforward: freedom from top-down design—even in chemistry—creates combinatorial diversity that brute-forces low-probability solutions.

8.5. *Peer Review as Scientific Central Planning*

Modern peer review operates as a de facto command economy for ideas. By requiring minority hypotheses to secure advance permission from entrenched experts, the system imposes the same variance-suppressing logic as price controls in 1970s Soviet industry. Critics note that many landmark contributions—Newton’s *Principia*, Einstein’s 1905 papers, Watson & Crick’s DNA model—emerged without formal peer review and might have been rejected under current gate-keeping norms [56,57]. Contemporary analyses echo this concern, describing peer review as “suffocating science” by privileging incremental additions to dominant paradigms [6,58]. The documented decline in disruptive citations across disciplines since the early 1970s coincides almost exactly with the universal adoption of mandatory peer review [59].

8.6. *Policy Implications: Making Improbable Events Probable*

- **Regulatory Minimalism:** Adopt sunset clauses for research regulations and funding mandates, forcing periodic justification rather than perpetual enforcement—analogue to the deregulation models that boosted exploratory patenting in finance and energy [45,47].

- **Parallel Funding Streams:** Allocate a fixed percentage of public R & D budgets to investigator-initiated proposals selected by lottery among all qualified submissions, bypassing peer-consensus filters and restoring stochastic diversity.
- **Transparent Post-Publication Review:** Replace pre-publication gate-keeping with openly signed, continuous critique to preserve scrutiny while removing ex-ante veto power [6].
- **Innovation Sandboxes:** Create regulatory “free ports” where novel experimental designs, methodologies or statistical thresholds can be trialled without immediate conformity to existing standards—mirroring financial sandbox frameworks that spur fintech breakthroughs.
- Low-probability events cannot be engineered directly; they emerge when systems maximise diversity and minimise prescriptive control. Whether in economic policy or knowledge production, loosening constraints and allowing spontaneous order remains the most reliable strategy for precipitating the rare, paradigm-shifting discoveries on which scientific progress ultimately depends.
- Innovation Sandboxes: Create regulatory “free ports” where novel experimental designs, methodologies or statistical thresholds can be trialled without immediate conformity to existing standards—mirroring financial sandbox frameworks that spur fintech breakthroughs.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1. The Need for Systematic Reform

The evidence presented in this paper demonstrates that the current scientific publishing system suffers from fundamental flaws that systematically bias the literature toward false positive results while suppressing genuine innovation. The emphasis on replication studies has created a flood of non-innovative content that dilutes truly innovative research, while the peer review system systematically suppresses minority viewpoints that could lead to genuine scientific breakthroughs.

9.2. Recommendations for Reform

To address these fundamental problems, the scientific community should:

- **Prioritize theory-driven research** over atheoretical replication studies
- **Actively seek out and publish minority viewpoints** that challenge mainstream theories
- **Reform peer review processes** to reduce bias against innovative research
- **Recognize the limitations of statistical significance** and emphasis on replication
- **Acknowledge that scientific progress typically comes from minority perspectives** rather than mainstream consensus

9.3. The Path Forward

Since truly groundbreaking discoveries often constitute low-probability events, this paper emphasizes the need for institutional incentives to nurture and support these rare but high-impact findings, thereby balancing the scientific community's excessive reliance on conventional, high-probability results.

The scientific community must recognize that the current system's emphasis on suppressing minority viewpoints and flooding journals with non-innovative replication studies is fundamentally counterproductive to scientific progress. While theory-driven research may indeed reduce the proportion of errors in the scientific literature, the current system's bias against innovation, minority perspectives, and theoretical research prevents the scientific community from identifying and developing the theoretical advances that could lead to genuine scientific progress.

The case studies examined in this paper demonstrate that the assumption that "findings supported by high probability are highly likely to be correct" is fundamentally flawed when applied to innovative research that challenges mainstream theoretical frameworks. Instead, the scientific

community must develop more sophisticated approaches to evaluating research that consider the historical reality that scientific progress typically comes from minority perspectives that initially appear to contradict established knowledge.

Only through such comprehensive reform can science fulfill its promise of reliable knowledge and genuine progress rather than the perpetuation of false theories through artificial statistical consensus.

Funding: Not applicable.

Data Transparency: Data sharing is not applicable.

Ethics Approval for Research Involving Humans or Animals: Not applicable.

Competing Interests: There are no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

References

- Hedges, L. 'An Existential Crisis' for Science. 2024. <https://www.ipr.northwestern.edu/news/2024/an-existential-crisis-for-science.html> (accessed).
- Replication crisis. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Replication_crisis (accessed).
- Ioannidis, J. P. Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Med* **2005**, 2 (8), 124. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124.
- Publication Bias. <http://ds-wordpress.haverford.edu/psych2015/projects/chapter/publication-bias/> (accessed).
- 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.
- Peer review is suffocating science. 2023. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oF-2QIH53M> (accessed).
- Addiscott, T. Emergence or self-organization?: Look to the soil population. *Commun Integr Biol* **2011**, 4 (4), 469-470. DOI: 10.4161/cib.15547 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
- Self-organization. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-organization> (accessed).
- Team, T. I. What Is a Laissez-Faire Economy, and How Does It Work? 2024. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/l/laissezfaire.asp> (accessed).
- Laissez Faire. 2024. <https://www.wallstreetprep.com/knowledge/laissez-faire/> (accessed).
- Feynman, R. P.; Leighton, R. "Surely You're Joking, Mr. Feynman", *Adventures of a Curious Character*; W. W. Norton & Company, 2010.
- Smith, R. Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals, "So we have little evidence on the effectiveness of peer review, but we have considerable evidence on its defects. In addition to being poor at detecting gross defects and almost useless for detecting fraud it is slow, expensive, profligate of academic time, highly subjective, something of a lottery, prone to bias, and easily abused.". *J R Soc Med*. **2006**, 99 (4), 178-182. DOI: 10.1258/jrsm.99.4.178.
- Clark, C. A New Replication Crisis: Research that is Less Likely to be True is Cited More. 2021. <https://today.ucsd.edu/story/a-new-replication-crisis-research-that-is-less-likely-be-true-is-cited-more> (accessed).
- Gelman, A. Drowning in junk science: Is there any hope at all? **2025**.
- Hanlon, M. Cargo Cult Science. *European Review* **2013**, 21 (S1), S51-S55. DOI: 10.1017/s1062798713000124.
- Field, S. M.; Hoekstra, R.; Bringmann, L.; van Ravenzwaaij, D.; Savalei, V.; Savalei, V. When and Why to Replicate: As Easy as 1, 2, 3? *Collabra: Psychology* **2019**, 5 (1). DOI: 10.1525/collabra.218.
- Vazire, S. A toast to the error detectors. *Nature* **2020**, 577 (7788), 9. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-019-03909-2.
- Burghardt, J.; Bodansky, A. N. Why Psychology Needs to Stop Striving for Novelty and How to Move Towards Theory-Driven Research. *Front Psychol* **2021**, 12, 609802. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.609802 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.

19. Sarkar, A. *Academic Peer-Reviews Are Heavily Influenced by 'Status-bias' : Study*. 2023. <https://www.theswaddle.com/academic-peer-reviews-are-heavily-influenced-by-status-bias-study> (accessed).
20. *Massive Study Reveals Editorial Bias and Nepotism in Biomedical Journals*. 2021. <https://www.clinicallab.com/massive-study-reveals-editorial-bias-and-nepotism-in-biomedical-journals-26084> (accessed).
21. Horchani, R. Impact of institutional affiliation bias in the peer review process. *Insights the UKSG journal* **2025**, 38, 681. DOI: 10.1629/uksg.681.
22. *Scientific dissent*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_dissent (accessed).
23. Zein, R. A. *Paper mills: The 'cartel-like' companies behind fraudulent scientific journals*. 2024. <https://phys.org/news/2024-10-paper-mills-cartel-companies-fraudulent.html> (accessed).
24. King, A. *Nineteen journals shut down by Wiley following delisting and paper mill problems*. 2024. <https://www.chemistryworld.com/news/nineteen-journals-shut-down-by-wiley-following-delisting-and-paper-mill-problems/4019595.article> (accessed).
25. Bricker-Anthony, C.; Herzog, R. W. Distortion of journal impact factors in the era of paper mills. *Mol Ther* **2023**, 31 (6), 1503-1504. DOI: 10.1016/j.ymthe.2023.05.008 From NLM Medline.
26. Coryn, C. L. S.; Noakes, L. A.; Westine, C. D.; Schröter, D. C. A Systematic Review of Theory-Driven Evaluation Practice From 1990 to 2009. *American Journal of Evaluation* **2010**, 32 (2), 199-226. DOI: 10.1177/1098214010389321.
27. Cash, P. J. Developing theory-driven design research. *Design Studies* **2018**, 56, 84-119. DOI: 10.1016/j.destud.2018.03.002.
28. McLeod, S. *Moscovici and Minority Influence in Psychology*. 2025. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/minority-influence.html> (accessed).
29. Institute, R. P. *Minority rules: Scientists discover tipping point for the spread of ideas*. 2011. <https://phys.org/news/2011-07-minority-scientists-ideas.html> (accessed).
30. 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.
31. Liu, Y.; Ding, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. Unexpected Results in Microwave Absorption -- Part 1: Different absorption mechanisms for metal-backed film and for material. *Surfaces and Interfaces* **2023**, 40, 103022. DOI: 10.1016/j.surfin.2023.103022.
32. Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B.; Liu, Y. A physics investigation of impedance matching theory in microwave absorption film— Part 2: Problem analyses. *Journal of Applied Physics* **2023**, 134 (4), 045304. DOI: 10.1063/5.0153612.
33. Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. Wave mechanics of microwave absorption in films - Distinguishing film from material. *Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials* **2024**, 593, 171850. DOI: 10.1016/j.jmmm.2024.171850.
34. Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B.; Liu, Y. Theoretical insights manifested by wave mechanics theory of microwave absorption—Part 1: A theoretical perspective. *Preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202503.0314.v4.
35. Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B.; Liu, Y. Theoretical insights manifested by wave mechanics theory of microwave absorption — Part 2: A perspective based on the responses from DeepSeek. *Preprints.org* **2025**. DOI: 10.20944/preprints202503.0314.v3
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. Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. Wave mechanics of microwave absorption in films: A short review. *Optics and Laser Technology* **2024**, 178, 111211. DOI: 10.1016/j.optlastec.2024.111211.
38. Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. Wave Mechanics of Microwave Absorption in Films: Multilayered Films. *Journal of Electronic Materials* **2024**, 53, 8154–8170. DOI: 10.1007/s11664-024-11370-9.
39. Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. Review of Wave Mechanics Theory for Microwave Absorption by Film. *Journal of Molecular Science* **2024**, 40 (4), 300-305. DOI: 10.13563/j.cnki.jmolsci.2023.06.018.

40. Strauss, D.; Gran-Ruaz, S.; Osman, M.; Williams, M. T.; Faber, S. C. Racism and censorship in the editorial and peer review process. *Front Psychol* **2023**, *14*, 1120938. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1120938 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
41. Delborne, J. A. *Suppression and dissent in science*. 2016. <https://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/16hai/Delborne.html> (accessed).
42. Cabbolet, M. J. T. F. To All Who Believe in Science as an Open Discussion of New Ideas: A Call for Reforms to Reverse the Politicization of Science. *Journal of Academic Ethics* **2025**. DOI: 10.1007/s10805-025-09646-8.
43. 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
44. Liu, Y.; Yang, K.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. The Shackles of Peer Review: Unveiling the Flaws in the Ivory Tower. *arXiv* **2023**. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2310.05966.
45. Chava, S.; Oettl, A.; Subramanian, A.; Subramanian, K. V. Banking deregulation and innovation. *Journal of Financial Economics* **2013**, *109* (3), 759-774. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.03.015.
46. Shang, H.; Xing, Y. Banking market deregulation and firm innovation: Evidence from foreign bank entry. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **2025**, *176*. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbankfin.2025.107471.
47. Valletta, G. *Deregulation and innovation: evidence from the electricity industry*. 2017. <https://www.openaccessgovernment.org/deregulation-innovation-evidence-electricity-industry/40547/> (accessed).
48. Green, L. *Advantages of a Market Economy*. 2025. <https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/033015/what-are-some-advantages-market-economy-over-other-types-economies.asp> (accessed).
49. *Why does a market economy beat a planned economy?* 2020. <https://communistcrimes.org/en/why-does-market-economy-beat-planned-economy> (accessed).
50. *Market Economy Vs. Planned Economy- Understanding The Key Differences*. 2025. <https://www.gripinvest.in/blog/market-economy-vs-planned-economy> (accessed).
51. Berliner, J. S. INNOVATION AND CENTRAL ECONOMIC PLANNING. *Il Politico* **1978**, *43* (1), 47 - 62.
52. Le Vay, K.; Mutschler, H. The difficult case of an RNA-only origin of life. *Emerg Top Life Sci* **2019**, *3* (5), 469-475. DOI: 10.1042/ETLS20190024 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
53. *Abiogenesis*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abiogenesis> (accessed).
54. *Life's First Spark Re-Created in the Laboratory*. 2009. <https://www.wired.com/2009/05/ribonucleotides/> (accessed).
55. Sanders, H. F. *Synthetic Cell Attempt Failed Again*. 2021. <https://answersingenesis.org/origin-of-life/synthetic-life/synthetic-cell-attempt-failed-again/> (accessed).
56. *Newton, Einstein, Watson and Crick, were not peer reviewed*. <https://joannenova.com.au/2014/05/newton-einstein-watson-and-crick-were-not-peer-reviewed/> (accessed).
57. Baldwin, M. *Did Isaac Newton Need Peer Review?* 2014. <https://live-zocalopublicsquare.ws.asu.edu/2014/04/29/did-isaac-newton-need-peer-review/ideas/nexus/> (accessed).
58. Mastroianni, A. *The rise and fall of peer review*. 2022. <https://www.experimental-history.com/p/the-rise-and-fall-of-peer-review> (accessed).
59. Park, M.; Leahey, E.; Funk, R. J. Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time. *Nature* **2023**, *613* (7942), 138-144. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-022-05543-x From NLM Medline.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.