The Entrenched Problems of Scientific Progress: An Analysis of Institutional Resistance and Systemic Barriers to Innovation

Yue Liu *

Posted Date: 25 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

Keywords: scientific progress; institutional resistance; peer review; paradigm shifts; academic gatekeeping; scientific fraud; Planck's principle

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

Article

The Entrenched Problems of Scientific Progress: An Analysis of Institutional Resistance and Systemic Barriers to Innovation

Yue Liu

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

Abstract

This paper examines the pervasive and deeply rooted problems that impede scientific progress, with particular focus on institutional resistance to new ideas and systemic barriers that prevent the advancement of knowledge. Through analysis of historical patterns and contemporary examples, we investigate three primary manifestations of these entrenched problems: Max Planck's principle regarding generational change in science, the phenomenon of academic fraud and gatekeeping, and the specific case of persistent theoretical errors in scientific fields. Our findings reveal that scientific progress is often hindered not by lack of evidence or rational discourse, but by institutional inertia, power structures, and the human tendency to resist paradigm-shifting ideas. The peer review system, while intended to maintain quality standards, has evolved into a mechanism that frequently stifles innovation and perpetuates established orthodoxies. We conclude that addressing these entrenched problems requires fundamental reform of scientific institutions, greater transparency in evaluation processes, and recognition that scientific advancement often occurs despite, rather than because of, existing gatekeeping mechanisms.

Keywords: scientific progress; institutional resistance; peer review; paradigm shifts; academic gatekeeping; scientific fraud; Planck's principle

1. Introduction

The advancement of scientific knowledge has never been a purely rational process guided solely by empirical evidence and logical reasoning [1]. Throughout history, the scientific community has grappled with deeply entrenched problems that resist solution despite clear evidence of their existence and harmful effects. These problems manifest across multiple dimensions of scientific practice, from individual resistance to new ideas to systemic failures in quality control and institutional gatekeeping [2,3].

As Max Planck observed in his scientific autobiography, "A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it" [1,4–6]. This observation, colloquially known as "science progresses one funeral at a time," highlights a fundamental tension in scientific progress: the resistance of established scientists to paradigm-shifting ideas, even when supported by compelling evidence [5,7].

The persistence of these problems raises critical questions about the nature of scientific institutions and their capacity for self-correction. Why do demonstrably false theories persist for decades? How do fraudulent researchers maintain their positions for years despite mounting evidence of misconduct? What role do peer review and academic hierarchies play in either facilitating or hindering scientific progress? "some scientists wondered how a questionable line of research persisted for so long … experts were just too timid to take a stand. [8]"

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

This paper examines these questions through three interconnected lenses: the theoretical framework of Planck's principle, documented cases of academic fraud and institutional failure, and the specific example [9,10] of persistent theoretical errors in specialized fields. Our analysis reveals that these are not isolated incidents but rather manifestations of systemic problems that require fundamental institutional reform.

2. Planck's Principle: The Generational Nature of Scientific Change

2.1. Theoretical Foundation

Max Planck's observation about scientific progress represents more than mere cynicism; it reflects a fundamental insight into the sociology of scientific knowledge. As documented in empirical studies, the principle has received substantial empirical support [4,5]. Research examining the premature death of eminent scientists has found that scientific subfields often experience increased vitality and innovation following the departure of established authorities [5].

The principle suggests that scientific revolutions are "non-rational, rather than spread through 'mere force of truth and fact'" [1]. This challenges the idealized view of science as a purely objective enterprise and acknowledges the role of human psychology, social structures, and institutional inertia in shaping scientific progress [3,11].

2.2. Empirical Evidence

Studies analyzing the impact of scientific authority on field development have provided quantitative support for Planck's principle. When examining how the premature death of 452 eminent life scientists altered the vitality of their respective subfields, researchers found significant increases in publication rates and new entrants to these fields following the scientists' deaths [5]. Importantly, this increase did not represent a simple redistribution of existing researchers but rather an influx of scientists from other subfields, suggesting that established authorities may indeed create barriers to entry and innovation [5].

The phenomenon extends beyond individual cases to broader patterns of scientific resistance. Historical analysis reveals that many groundbreaking discoveries initially faced significant opposition from the scientific establishment [2,3]. Examples include resistance to atomic theory in the late 1800s, the rejection of exoplanet research as "career-destroying" in the 1980s, and the initial dismissal of prion research [2].

2.3. Contemporary Manifestations

Modern science continues to exhibit patterns consistent with Planck's principle. The peer review system, while intended to maintain quality standards, often functions as a mechanism for enforcing orthodoxy and resisting unconventional ideas [12,13]. Studies have shown that highly influential papers are frequently rejected by prestigious journals, with some of the most impactful work being initially dismissed by gatekeepers [14].

This dynamic is particularly problematic in fields where established theories face challenges from new evidence or alternative frameworks. The resistance is not merely academic but can have practical consequences for research funding, career advancement, and the pace of scientific discovery [15,16].

3. Academic Fraud and Institutional Gatekeeping

3.1. The Stem Cell Research Scandals

The case of Hwang Woo-suk represents one of the most significant episodes of scientific fraud in recent history, demonstrating how institutional failures can allow misconduct to persist for extended periods [17–19]. Hwang's fraudulent claims about human embryonic stem cell research

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

were published in Science, one of the world's most prestigious journals, and remained unchallenged for over a year despite mounting evidence of fabrication [18,19].

The scandal reveals multiple layers of institutional failure. The peer review process, supposedly designed to detect such problems, failed to identify obvious data fabrication [18]. The research community's initial reluctance to challenge a prominent scientist allowed the fraud to persist longer than it otherwise might have [19]. Most significantly, the case demonstrates how scientific prestige and institutional politics can override normal quality control mechanisms [20].

Similar patterns emerge in other major fraud cases. The STAP cell controversy in Japan showed how institutional pressure and the desire for groundbreaking discoveries can lead to the publication and initial acceptance of fabricated research [21]. The case of Piero Anversa's fraudulent cardiac stem cell research persisted for over a decade, affecting multiple clinical trials and research directions [22].

3.2. Systemic Vulnerabilities

These cases reveal systemic vulnerabilities in scientific institutions that extend beyond individual misconduct. The peer review system, as currently implemented, shows fundamental limitations in detecting fraud and ensuring research quality [23]. Studies demonstrate that reviewers typically catch only 25-30% of deliberately introduced errors in submitted manuscripts [23]. More concerning, most reviewers never examine the raw data underlying published claims, precisely where fraud is most likely to occur [23].

The problem is compounded by publication incentives that reward sensational claims conforming to mainstream theory over rigorous validation within theory against established one. As one analysis noted, the invention of peer review may have actually "encouraged bad research" by creating pressure to produce results that satisfy reviewers rather than accurately reflect scientific reality [23].

3.3. Institutional Resistance to Reform

Despite clear evidence of these problems, scientific institutions have shown remarkable resistance to fundamental reform. The peer review system persists largely unchanged despite decades of criticism and evidence of its limitations [12,13]. Attempts to implement more transparent or rigorous evaluation processes face opposition from established interests who benefit from current arrangements [13,15].

This resistance reflects deeper power structures within academic institutions. Research has shown that academic gatekeeping often serves to protect existing hierarchies and exclude dissenting voices rather than genuinely improve scientific quality [16,24]. The result is a system that may actually impede scientific progress while claiming to advance it.

4. Case Study: Persistent Theoretical Errors

4.1. The Microwave Absorption Theory Example

The field of microwave absorption provides a particularly instructive example of how theoretical errors can persist for decades despite clear evidence of their invalidity. As documented in recent publications, fundamental errors in the theoretical understanding of microwave absorption in films have dominated the field for several decades, leading to widespread confusion and misdirected research efforts [9,25].

The errors stem from a basic confusion between the properties of materials and films, leading to the development of incorrect impedance matching theories and absorption mechanisms. Despite the availability of clear mathematical and physical demonstrations of these errors, the incorrect theories continue to be used and taught, perpetuated through the peer review system and academic tradition [9,26].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

4.2. Mechanisms of Persistence

Several factors contribute to the persistence of these errors. First, the scientific community has become accustomed to using incorrect theories and shows resistance to adopting new, correct frameworks even when they are demonstrably superior [9]. This represents a classic example of paradigm inertia, where established practices resist change regardless of evidence.

Second, the peer review system actively reinforces existing errors by rejecting papers that challenge established theories, regardless of their scientific merit [9,25]. Reviewers trained in incorrect theories naturally resist alternatives that contradict their understanding, creating a self-perpetuating cycle of error.

Third, the specialization of modern science means that few researchers have the breadth of knowledge necessary to identify fundamental errors that cross disciplinary boundaries [25]. This allows errors to persist within specialized communities even when they would be obvious from related fields.

4.3. Implications for Scientific Progress

The persistence of theoretical errors has significant implications for scientific progress. Research based on incorrect theoretical foundations inevitably produces misleading results, wasting resources and misdirecting future investigations [9,27]. More fundamentally, the inability to correct clear errors raises questions about the self-correcting nature of science and the effectiveness of existing quality control mechanisms.

5. The Peer Review Crisis

5.1. Systematic Problems

The peer review system faces a comprehensive crisis that threatens its fundamental purpose of maintaining scientific quality [12,13,28]. Multiple studies have documented serious problems with the current system, including bias, unreliability, slowness, and susceptibility to abuse [29–31]. Perhaps most concerning, the system often fails to achieve its primary goal of identifying and preventing the publication of flawed research [23,28].

Meta-analyses of peer review effectiveness consistently show poor inter-reviewer reliability, with correlations between independent reviewers' assessments typically around 0.34—only slightly better than chance [23]. This unreliability undermines the entire premise of peer review as a quality control mechanism [23].

5.2. Gatekeeping Functions

Rather than serving as an objective quality filter, peer review often functions as a gatekeeping mechanism that enforces conformity to existing paradigms. [12,13] Studies have shown that editors and reviewers tend to reject papers that challenge established theories or present unconventional findings, regardless of their scientific merit [14]. This creates a systematic bias against innovative research and paradigm-shifting discoveries [14].

The gatekeeping function is particularly problematic because it occurs before publication, preventing innovative ideas from reaching the broader scientific community [23]. This contrasts with the historical model of scientific communication, where ideas were published first and then subjected to scrutiny and debate [23].

5.3. Alternative Models

Growing recognition of these problems has led to calls for fundamental reform or abandonment of the peer review system [12,23]. Some researchers advocate for post-publication peer review, where papers are published immediately and then subjected to open scrutiny. Others propose more radical

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

changes, such as eliminating formal peer review entirely in favor of direct publication with appropriate disclaimers [23].

The COVID-19 pandemic provided a natural experiment in rapid scientific communication, with preprint servers playing a crucial role in disseminating research findings. This experience demonstrated that scientific evaluation can occur effectively without traditional gatekeeping mechanisms [23].

6. Discussion

6.1. Systemic Nature of the Problems

The evidence presented reveals that problems impeding scientific progress are not isolated incidents but rather systemic features of how scientific institutions currently operate. From Planck's principle to peer review failures to the persistence of theoretical errors, a common pattern emerges: established systems resist change and innovation, even when such change is clearly beneficial [1,3,23].

This resistance occurs at multiple levels: individual (scientists resistant to new ideas), institutional (journals and funding agencies enforcing orthodoxy), and cultural (scientific communities that punish deviation from accepted norms) [11,15,16]. The result is a scientific enterprise that, while claiming to pursue truth and knowledge, often functions to preserve existing power structures and theoretical frameworks [16,24].

6.2. The Role of Power Structures

Academic institutions exhibit complex power dynamics that significantly influence scientific progress [16,32,33]. Established scientists, prestigious journals, and funding agencies wield considerable influence over what research gets conducted, published, and accepted [16,33]. These power structures can create barriers to innovation and maintain the status quo even when change would be beneficial [16,34].

The concentration of power in the hands of a relatively small number of gatekeepers creates systemic vulnerabilities. When these gatekeepers have strong incentives to maintain existing paradigms—whether due to intellectual investment, career considerations, or institutional politics—the entire system becomes resistant to necessary change [16,24].

6.3. Implications for Scientific Progress

These entrenched problems have significant implications for the pace and direction of scientific progress. If Planck's principle is correct, then major advances may be unnecessarily delayed by generational resistance [4,5]. If peer review systematically excludes innovative research, then paradigm-shifting discoveries may be suppressed or delayed [14,23]. If theoretical errors persist due to institutional inertia, then entire fields may develop along incorrect paths for extended periods [9,27].

The cumulative effect of these problems may be a significant slowdown in scientific progress. Some researchers have noted a decline in research productivity and breakthrough discoveries in recent decades, which may be partially attributable to the institutional problems identified here [23,35].

6.4. Potential Solutions

Addressing these entrenched problems requires fundamental institutional reform rather than incremental changes [12,15,23]. Potential solutions include:

- **Reform of peer review systems**: Moving toward more open, transparent, and accountable evaluation processes that reduce bias and gatekeeping functions [13,28].
- **Diversification of evaluation mechanisms**: Reducing reliance on traditional journals and peer review in favor of more diverse and decentralized evaluation systems [23].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

- **Cultural change**: Promoting scientific cultures that value innovation, dissent, and paradigm-challenging research over conformity to established theories [2,16].
- **Structural reforms**: Modifying academic incentive systems to reward genuine scientific contribution rather than publication in prestigious venues [15,36].
- **Increased transparency**: Making scientific evaluation processes more open and accountable to reduce the influence of hidden biases and power dynamics [13,24].

7. Conclusions

The problems examined in this paper—from Planck's principle to peer review failures to persistent theoretical errors—represent deeply entrenched features of contemporary scientific institutions rather than temporary aberrations. These problems arise from fundamental tensions between the ideal of science as an objective pursuit of truth and the reality of science as a human enterprise embedded in complex social, institutional, and political structures.

The evidence suggests that current scientific institutions often impede rather than facilitate scientific progress. The peer review system, academic hierarchies, and established paradigms create barriers to innovation and change that may significantly slow scientific advancement. The persistence of clear errors and fraudulent research demonstrates the limitations of existing quality control mechanisms.

However, recognition of these problems also creates opportunities for reform. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown that rapid scientific communication and evaluation can occur without traditional gatekeeping mechanisms. Advances in technology and communication create new possibilities for more open and democratic scientific evaluation.

Ultimately, addressing these entrenched problems requires acknowledging that scientific progress is not automatic or inevitable but depends critically on the institutional structures that support or hinder it. Reform of these institutions—toward greater openness, transparency, and genuine quality control—may be essential for unleashing the full potential of scientific research to address the challenges facing humanity.

The path forward requires courage to challenge established systems, wisdom to design better alternatives, and persistence to overcome the inevitable resistance from entrenched interests. As Planck observed, science advances one funeral at a time—but perhaps, with conscious effort and institutional reform, we can accelerate this process without waiting for generational change.

Funding: No funds, grants, or other support were received.

Data Transparency: Data sharing is not applicable to this opinion piece as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

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

Ethics Approval for Research Involving Humans or Animals: No human participants or animals were involved in this research.

References

1. *Planck's principle*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planck%27s_principle (accessed.
2. *Resistance to New Ideas*. https://www.scienceforthepublic.org/science-issues/resistance-to-new-ideas (accessed.
3. Hayes, A. *What Is a Paradigm Shift? Definition, Example, and Meaning*. 2025. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/paradigm-shift.asp (accessed.
4. Partan, E. *Study: Does Science Advance One Funeral at a Time?* 2019. https://www.capeandislands.org/show/living-lab-radio-on-cai/2019-12-02/study-does-science-advance-one-funeral-at-a-time (accessed.
5. *Does science advance one funeral at a time?* 2021. https://campuspress.yale.edu/humanbrain/does-science-advance-one-funeral-at-a-time/ (accessed.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

6. Planck, M. *Scientific Autobiography and Other Paper*; William & Norgate, 1950.
7. Schwarzer, L. *Science Progresses One Funeral at a Time!* 2023. https://gpplasma.com/blog/plancks-principle-on-the-evolution-of-science (accessed.
8. Harvard calls for retraction of dozens of studies by noted cardiologist, "some scientists wondered how a questionable line of research persisted for so long … experts were just too timid to take a stand", https://www.staradvertiser.com/2018/10/16/news/harvard-calls-for-retraction-of-dozens-of-studies-by-noted-cardiologist/. *New York Times*, 2018, 16 Oct 2018. http://www.staradvertiser.com/2018/10/16/news/harvard-calls-for-retraction-of-dozens-of-studies-by-noted-cardiologist/.
9. 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.
10. 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
11. Hoffma, n. J. *Why the web has challenged scientists' authority – and why they need to adapt*. 2018. https://theconversation.com/why-the-web-has-challenged-scientists-authority-and-why-they-need-to-adapt-91893 (accessed.
12. Aczel, B.; Barwich, A. S.; Diekman, A. B.; Fishbach, A.; Goldstone, R. L.; Gomez, P.; Gundersen, O. E.; von Hippel, P. T.; Holcombe, A. O.; Lewandowsky, S.; et al. The present and future of peer review: Ideas, interventions, and evidence. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2025**, *122* (5), e2401232121. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2401232121 From NLM Medline.
13. Allen, K.-A.; Reardon, J.; Crawford, J.; Walsh, L. *The peer review system is broken. We asked academics how to fix it*. 2022. https://theconversation.com/the-peer-review-system-is-broken-we-asked-academics-how-to-fix-it-187034 (accessed.
14. Siler, K.; Lee, K.; Bero, L. Measuring the effectiveness of scientific gatekeeping. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2015**, *112* (2), 360-365. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1418218112.
15. Evans, M. I.; Britt, D. W. Resistance to Change. *Reprod Sci* **2023**, *30* (3), 835-853. DOI: 10.1007/s43032-022-01015-9 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
16. *The Politics of Science, Gatekeeping Innovation & The Price of Control: How Organizational Interests Compromise Research Integrity*. 2025. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/politics-science-gatekeeping-innovation-price-control-k%C5%AFl%C5%9Dh%C5%99%C4%99%C5%9D%C5%A7h%C3%A3--eucmc (accessed.
17. Buratovich, M. A. *Scientist Is Indicted for Faking His Research on Creating Stem Cells*. 2022. https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/law/scientist-indicted-faking-his-research-creating-stem-cells (accessed.
18. Resnik, D. B.; Shamoo, A. E.; Krimsky, S. Fraudulent human embryonic stem cell research in South Korea: lessons learned. *Account Res* **2006**, *13* (1), 101-109. DOI: 10.1080/08989620600634193 From KIE Medline.
19. van der Heyden, M. A.; van de Ven, T.; Opthof, T. Fraud and misconduct in science: the stem cell seduction: Implications for the peer-review process. *Neth Heart J* **2009**, *17* (1), 25-29. DOI: 10.1007/BF03086211 From NLM PubMed-not-MEDLINE.
20. *Stem cell scandal: shockwaves hit UK*. 2006. https://sciencebusiness.net/news/74037/Stem-cell-scandal:-shockwaves-hit-UK (accessed.
21. *The Biggest Fraud in Stem Cell History*. 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aYvnpezbpKE (accessed.
22. O'Riordan, M. *Stem Cell Research—Shattered After Fabrication Scandal—Needs to Rebuild, Says EHJ Editor*. 2019. https://www.tctmd.com/news/stem-cell-research-shattered-after-fabrication-scandal-needs-rebuild-says-ehj-editor (accessed.
23. 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.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.2152.v1

24. Dormandy, K. *Gatekeeping in Science*. 2024. https://blogs.cardiff.ac.uk/openfordebate/gatekeeping-in-science/ (accessed.
25. 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
26. 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.
27. Liu, Y.; Liu, Y.; Drew, M. G. B. A re-evaluation of the mechanism of microwave absorption in film – Part 3: Inverse relationship. *Materials Chemistry and Physics* **2022**, *290*, 126521. DOI: 10.1016/j.matchemphys.2022.126521.
28. Proctor, D. M.; Dada, N.; Serquina, A.; Willett, J. L. E. Problems with Peer Review Shine a Light on Gaps in Scientific Training. *mBio* **2023**, *14* (3), e0318322. DOI: 10.1128/mbio.03183-22 From NLM Medline.
29. Murphy, B. D. *Is Science Broken? The Failure of Peer Review*. YouTube, 2021. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M2ZvEEvTuP8 (accessed 2025 Apr 1).
30. *Peer review is suffocating science*. 2023. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oF-2QJHy53M (accessed.
31. Weinstein, E. *The Problem With Peer Review*. YouTube, 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U5sRYsMjiAQ (accessed 2025 1, Apr).
32. Luo, Z.; Junfeng, M.; Abbasi, B. N.; Zilong, L. Institutional structure and governance capability in universities: an empirical study from the perspectives of time, space, and quantity dimensions. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* **2024**, *11* (1). DOI: 10.1057/s41599-024-03558-5.
33. Jauch, L. *Power and Academia, an endless story*. 2021. https://elephantinthelab.org/power-and-academia-an-endless-story/ (accessed.
34. Valdez, J. W.; Sharma, S.; Gould, J. Systemic territoriality in academia: The Gollum effect's impact on scientific research and careers. *One Earth* **2025**, *8* (6). DOI: 10.1016/j.oneear.2025.101314.
35. Braben, D. W. *Scientific Freedom: The Elixir of Civilization*; WILEY-INTERSCIENCE, 2008.
36. Hostler, T. *Scientific reform, post-academic research, and academic identity*. 2023. https://markrubin.substack.com/p/scientific-reform-post-academic-research (accessed.