

A Discussion on the Impact of Research Ethics Misconduct in the Haruko Obokata Incident (Postprint)

Authors: Tian Yan, Zhou Cheng, Zhou Cheng

Date: 2018-01-11T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] The Haruko Obokata case involved research ethics misconduct, including fabrication and falsification of experimental data. Analyzing this incident and its detrimental effects on scientific research and the scientific community facilitates understanding of the consequences of research ethics misconduct. [Method/Process] By employing Theodore Garland’s scientific method process model and the “Guide to Responsible Conduct of Research” , one can analyze how Haruko Obokata and her team disrupted the research process and deviated from scientists’ research responsibilities. [Results/Conclusion] In this incident, researchers failed to adhere to research ethics norms during data collection, resulting in peer distrust, damage to their own interests, and public condemnation.

Full Text

An Analysis of Research Ethics Misconduct in the Haruko Obokata Incident and Its Impact

Tian Yan¹, Zhou Cheng¹

¹Center for Social Studies of Science, Peking University, Beijing 100871

Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] The Haruko Obokata incident involved fabrication and falsification of experimental data, representing a clear case of research ethics misconduct. Analyzing this incident and its damage to scientific research and the scientific community helps us understand the broader impacts of such ethical violations. [Method/Process] Using Garland Theodore’ s scientific method process model and the *Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research*, we examine

how Obokata and her team disrupted the research process and deviated from scientists' research responsibilities. **[Result/Conclusion]** In this incident, researchers failed to follow research ethics norms during data collection, leading to peer distrust, damage to their own interests, and public condemnation.

Keywords: Haruko Obokata; research ethics; misconduct

Classification Numbers: B82-057; G311

When the Haruko Obokata incident erupted in 2014, it immediately became a scandal in the Japanese scientific community. The stark contrast between the high expectations previously held for Obokata and the subsequent accusations she faced raises important questions: What exactly caused the scientific community to question her research findings? What specific aspects of research ethics misconduct were involved? And why did Obokata embark on this path of ethical violation? To answer these questions, we must first revisit the key nodes of the incident, analyze its causes and consequences, and identify the factors that led to this problem.

1. Educational and Research Background of the Main Subject

The Haruko Obokata incident, also known as the STAP cell scandal, is named after the central figure who triggered intense debate. Before examining the incident itself, we must first understand Obokata's educational and research background to analyze her actions from a biographical perspective. Haruko Obokata was born in 1983 (Showa 58) and enrolled in the Faculty of Science and Engineering at Waseda University in April 2002, majoring in applied chemistry with a focus on microbiology. In her autobiography, she described her childhood motivation for choosing this field: a desire to help a friend suffering from juvenile rheumatism. After graduating from Waseda in March 2006, she pursued master's studies in applied chemistry at the same university. However, she soon shifted her research focus to life medicine, becoming a research student at Tokyo Women's Medical University under the supervision of Masayuki Yamato, whose research centered on regenerative medicine, tissue engineering, and stem cell biology. Under Yamato's guidance, Obokata began working on cell sheet research at the Advanced Medical Research Center (TWIns), presenting her findings at both domestic and international conferences. In March 2008, she published her first paper as lead author on subcutaneous transplantation of autologous oral mucosal epithelial cell sheets, a study in the field of regenerative medicine demonstrating the use of tissue engineering methods for subcutaneous transplantation.

In April 2008, Obokata entered the doctoral program in life medicine at Waseda University and became a special researcher of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. Through recommendations from her original supervisor Koji Kojima and Masayuki Yamato, she conducted short-term research at Harvard Medical School in the same year, studying spore-like cells in Charles Vacanti's

s laboratory. In August 2009, she submitted a paper on stem cell research to *Nature*, which was rejected in spring 2010. Despite this setback, she continued her research on Stimulus-Triggered Acquisition of Pluripotency (STAP) cells, hypothesizing that differentiated animal somatic cells could revert to a stem cell-like state through stimulation alone. Since the scientific community widely believed that differentiated animal cells could not regain pluripotency through stimulation alone, her research lacked support at Harvard. However, Teruhiko Wakayama, director at the RIKEN research institute, offered assistance. In an interview, Wakayama stated: “Although I initially thought it was impossible, I enjoy attempting the impossible, so I decided to help.” In 2011, Obokata published a paper in *Tissue Engineering* and submitted her doctoral dissertation, “Research on Pluripotent Stem Cells Common to All Three Germ Layers,” on February 15, earning her Ph.D. in engineering from Waseda University on March 15. Beginning in April 2011, she served as a guest researcher in the Genome Reprogramming Research Team at RIKEN’s Center for Developmental Biology (CDB), led by Wakayama. With this support, her research on pluripotent cells advanced, eventually leading to the *Nature* submission that triggered the subsequent scandal.

2. Key Nodes and Impact of the Incident

Under Wakayama’s guidance, Obokata successfully created chimeric mice and submitted her work to *Nature* in April 2012, but the submission was rejected. She subsequently submitted to *Cell* and *Science*, both of which also rejected the manuscript. In this context, Yoshiki Sasai and Hitoshi Niwa joined the research team in December 2012 and January 2013, respectively. The two papers with Obokata as first author were resubmitted to *Nature* in March 2013 and finally accepted, published on January 30, 2014: one on the STAP cell production method and another as a letter on pluripotency verification. Following publication, Obokata instantly became a celebrated figure in Japanese science and public life, with media praising her as a “beautiful and ambitious ‘rising star’ .” This adulation reflected the scarcity of female scientists in Japan, and Obokata’s achievements sparked admiration for female independence. However, this intense praise made the subsequent retraction even more socially shocking.

Shortly after the papers appeared online, Paul Knoepfler questioned their reproducibility and, together with other research groups, attempted to replicate the results. Of eleven experimental attempts, ten failed to reproduce Obokata’s findings, while the remaining one could not fully substantiate the claims. On February 17, 2014, RIKEN and *Nature* officially launched an investigation. Waseda University established a doctoral dissertation investigation committee on March 28. On April 1, RIKEN released its final report, identifying that Figure 1i [Figure 1: see original paper] had been spliced together, while Figures 2d [Figure 2: see original paper] and 2e were images of spherical cells made from mouse bone marrow cells from her doctoral thesis, not STAP cells made from spleen cells as claimed, and that cited papers lacked proper attribution. In June, Obokata

agreed to retract both articles, which were officially withdrawn on July 2. On August 5, 2014, Yoshiki Sasai committed suicide. On October 7, Waseda University's investigation committee decided to revoke Obokata's doctoral degree, granting a one-year review period. After this period, on November 2, 2015, Waseda officially revoked her degree. On December 19, test results confirmed that Obokata, Niwa, and others could not reproduce the STAP cell experiments. Obokata officially resigned from RIKEN on December 21.

The incident caused an uproar among both Japanese academics and the public, with extensive media coverage at home and abroad. For example, *The Washington Post* published an article on July 3 titled "How Japan's most promising young stem-cell scientist duped the scientific journal *Nature*—and destroyed her career." The scandal forced RIKEN's CDB to accept dissolution, retaining only Masayo Takahashi's laboratory for iPS cell clinical research while abolishing other developmental biology departments. Jiro Nariai argued that this decision contradicted RIKEN's original mission, as the CDB, known for its "basic research" strengths, should have maintained its advantages rather than becoming a clinical medicine stronghold like a hospital. However, the severe damage from the "Haruko Obokata incident" made this tradition unsustainable.

From Obokata's initial submission to *Nature* in April 2012 to the January 30, 2014 publication, nearly two years passed. Yet within six months of publication, academic peers, focusing on experimental irreproducibility, discovered fabrication and falsification in her papers, exposing the misconduct. Why did Obokata's research attract such widespread attention? One major reason was that regenerative medicine, concerning national health and human welfare, requires substantial government funding, and its results directly affect public futures. While induced pluripotent stem (iPS) cells, developed before STAP cells, resembled embryonic stem cells, their production required introducing transcription factors. Obokata's team claimed that STAP cells could be produced more simply, without transcription factor intervention. Although this hypothesis was attractive, when experimental data failed to provide proof, fabrication and falsification became Obokata's chosen path.

3. The Scientific Research Process and Norms of the Scientific Community

To analyze how research ethics misconduct in the Haruko Obokata incident impacted scientific research, we must first clarify the general scientific research process. Garland Theodore proposed a scientific method process model that begins with observation based on existing general theories, followed by question formulation. Question-posing is crucial for advancing scientific experiments, prompting scientists to propose various hypotheses and make predictions based on them. However, scientists must collect data to prove their hypotheses. If collected data cannot adequately support a hypothesis, it must be narrowed, expanded, or even rejected, with experimental predictions reformulated. If data can support the hypothesis, its validity can be established, eventually forming

a general theory. As Lakatos noted, “the most admirable scientific theories cannot prohibit any observable state of affairs.” Hypotheses lack reliability until confirmed through observation and experimentation, which provides support and ensures validity.

Figure 1 The process model of scientific methods

To analyze the impact of research ethics misconduct in the Obokata incident, we must also understand scientists’ research responsibilities and ethical standards. The ethics emphasized in scientific research are not personal morality but research ethics. The *Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research* stipulates that researchers should follow three principles: first, be worthy of the trust their colleagues place in them; second, have an obligation to themselves; and third, serve the public. The first two principles specifically address research ethics norms. Adhering to these norms is essential because, from the perspective of scientific development, only hypotheses verified through reproducible experiments and withstand peer scrutiny can be established as reliable scientific theories, providing a solid foundation for future research. From the researchers’ perspective, only by seeking truth from facts and maintaining research integrity can they ensure the stability of their scientific careers.

Beyond the scientific community, public supervision is also crucial for research ethics construction. Feyerabend argued that “laypeople can and must supervise science.” Although the public often cannot participate in the core of scientific research, science as a socially supported activity should be constrained by and serve society. The *Guide* stipulates that researchers should serve the public, and their integrity directly affects whether societal investment yields appropriate returns. The public has the right to accuse, criticize, and even hold researchers accountable for misconduct, as researchers, while enjoying social support, bear obligations to the public—not only to produce results serving public interests but also to uphold basic research ethics norms.

4. Analysis of Research Ethics Misconduct in the Haruko Obokata Incident

From the perspective of Garland Theodore’ s scientific method process model, Obokata and her team’ s work initially followed the general scientific research path. Prior to Obokata, Shinya Yamanaka and his team had won the 2012 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine for their research on induced pluripotent stem cells, demonstrating that her research built upon previous scientific achievements. As a member of the scientific community, Obokata received training in regenerative science in Japan, conducted extensive observations and experiments, and formulated her research question: whether differentiated somatic cells could return to a stem cell state through stimulation. Based on her exchange experiences at Harvard, she proposed the STAP cell hypothesis and predicted it could be experimentally verified.

However, the problem emerged during the “data collection to test predictions”

phase, when Obokata and her team failed to comply with research ethics norms established by the scientific community. They attempted to fabricate research evidence through data fabrication and falsification, ultimately facing community skepticism, refutation, and accusations of ethical misconduct. Consequently, in the data collection phase for hypothesis testing, academic fraud rendered their conclusions unsupported. Since individual or team contributions become part of the shared scientific knowledge base, peer supervision and evaluation become extremely rigorous. This scrutiny ensures research standardization and verifiability while making researchers more cautious when publishing results.

Regarding the impact of research ethics misconduct, the *Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research* identifies three criteria: being worthy of peer trust, being responsible to oneself, and serving the public. When researchers violate ethics, they face loss of trust from the scientific community, interruption or termination of their careers, and public condemnation. While general moral norms are behavioral guidelines in social activities, research ethics are specific standards for scientific researchers. By publishing fraudulent papers in *Nature*, Obokata violated research ethics, preventing her findings from becoming verifiable scientific knowledge and causing the scientific community to distrust her work. This incident also damaged RIKEN's authority and forced Obokata to resign, harming both the institution and herself. Furthermore, as partial funders and beneficiaries of scientific research, the public—especially in regenerative science fields affecting public welfare—have the right to hold researchers accountable. Obokata's misconduct not only negatively impacted the scientific community but also triggered public demands for accountability.

Analyzing Obokata's academic fraud is not the ultimate goal; the key question is why she engaged in it. Her educational background as a Waseda Ph.D. student and Harvard Medical School short-term researcher means she understood basic research ethics norms. So why did she choose the path of academic misconduct despite the risk of expulsion from the scientific community? From her personal perspective, after multiple rejections from top-tier journals, she continued collaborating with other researchers and submitted papers with fraudulent data, indicating a 侥幸心理 (mentality of taking chances). From the perspective of the scientific community's internal environment, when a researcher continuously seeks academic recognition through research achievements, it suggests that the research system itself encourages such behavior. However, because academic review and regulatory systems are insufficient to effectively curb misconduct before publication, similar cases are unsurprising. Therefore, despite various questions about Obokata's ethical standards, the crucial issue is that science has yet to develop a matching academic supervision system. Under research pressure, even with clear scientific method norms and community ethical requirements, some researchers still take risks and commit ethical violations.

References

- [1] Haruko Obokata. *That Day* [M]. Tokyo: Kodansha, 2016: 6.

- [2] Haruko Obokata, Masayuki Yamato, Koji Nishida, Satoshi Tsuneda, Mitsuo Okano. Subcutaneous transplantation of oral mucosal epithelial cell sheets fabricated on temperature-responsive culture dishes [C]. The 7th Annual Meeting of the Japanese Society for Regenerative Medicine, March 14, 2008.
- [3] H. Obokata, M. Yamato, K. Nishida, S. Tsuneda, T. Okano. Subcutaneous transplantation of autologous oral mucosal epithelial cell sheets fabricated on temperature-responsive culture dishes [C]. Society for Biomaterials 2007 Annual Meeting, 2017, 4: 17-21.
- [4] H. Obokata, M. Yamato, J. Yang, K. Nishida, S. Tsuneda, T. Okano. Subcutaneous transplantation of autologous oral mucosal epithelial cell sheets fabricated on temperature-responsive culture dishes. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research* [J], 2007, 86(4): 1088-1096.
- [5] Takeshi Mori. The Three Faces of Haruko Obokata [J]. *Bungeishunju*, 2014, 92(11): 148-15.
- [6] YOMIURI ONLINE (Yomiuri Shimbun). Ms. Obokata's Enthusiasm Was Different...Professor Wakayama of Collaborative Research [EB/OL]. [2017-10-12]. <http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/error.html?rUri=%2Fyol%2Fscience%2Fnews%2F20140202-OYT1T00332.htm>.
- [7] Haruko Obokata. *Isolation of pluripotent adult stem cells discovered from tissues derived from all three germ layers* [D]. Japan: Waseda University, 2011.
- [8] Obokata H., Wakayama T., Sasai Y., et al. Retraction: Stimulus-triggered fate conversion of somatic cells into pluripotency [J]. *Nature*, 2014, 505(1): 641-647.
- [9] Obokata H., Sasai Y., Niwa H., et al. Retraction: Bidirectional developmental potential in reprogrammed cells with acquired pluripotency [J]. *Nature*, 2014, 505(1):
- [10] Momoko Suda. *The Fabricating Scientist: The STAP Cell Incident* [M]. Tokyo: Bungeishunju, 2014: 30.
- [11] Hōtarō Obata. *The Bad Guys Who Flocked to STAP Cells* [M]. Tokyo: Shinchosha, 2014: 70.
- [12] TERRENCE MCCOY. How Japan's most promising young stem-cell scientist duped the scientific journal Nature—and destroyed her career [EB/OL]. [2017-10-12]. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2014/07/03/how-japans-most-promising-young-stem-cell-scientist-duped-the-scientific-journal-nature-and-destroyed-her-career/?Post%20generic=%3Ftid%3Dsm_{{twitter}}
- [13] Jiro Nariai. *Desire and Ethics in Life Sciences* [M]. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 2014: 125.
- [14] Garland Jr., Theodore. The Scientific Method as an Ongoing Process [EB/OL]. [2017-10-20]. http://idea.ucr.edu/documents/flash/scientific_{method}/story_{html5}.html.
- [15] Imre Lakatos. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes* [M]. Translated by Lan Zheng. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 1986: 22.
- [16] National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine. *Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research On Being a Scientist: A Guide to Responsible Conduct in Research* (Third ed.) [M]. Washington: The National Academies Press, 2009: 2.

[17] Paul Feyerabend. *Science in a Free Society* [M]. Translated by Lan Zheng. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 1990: 103.

Author Contributions:

Tian Yan: Collected materials, constructed framework, wrote content;

Zhou Cheng: Proposed topic, provided writing guidance, reviewed and revised.

Received Date: 2017-11-30

Revised Date: 2017-12-06

Responsible Editor: Tang Guoyuan

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv –Machine translation. Verify with original.