

A "dual-track" system for academia in China against misconduct.

Zhizhong Ye¹, Yue Zhang^{1,2*}

¹Shenzhen Futian hospital for Rheumatic Diseases, Sanming Program of Medicine in Shenzhen, China

²Department of Rheumatology and Immunology, the First Clinical College of Harbin Medical University, China

Accepted on 12 December 2018

Editorial

We applaud progress against misconduct but our academic system needs more due to bureaucrats in the university and research institute as recently noticed [1]. China's "dual-track" government-private economy amazingly makes China the world's second-largest economy and a key engine for global growth. We expect a change from the centralized government-based system of assessing Science and Technology (S&T) talent and performance towards a prospective government-private "dual-track" model in academy would boost S&T. We need also more private foundations, like Bill Gates foundations, then experts and a community-based system for assessing Science and Technology (S&T) research talent and performance, extensively private investments in R&D, etc.

For much of China's medical community, success is largely determined by a the majority of China medicine society and is sometimes judging their success with a ranked shortlist that is influenced by power, wealth and party abeyance and loyalty rather than characteristics of research freedom, fairness, equality and innovations, so largely does the whole academy [2]. Consequently, some research institution bureaucrats are not answerable to the people or truth, but they do answer to the higher echelons of the power structure. Sometimes one single top leader in an institution decides everything. If something goes wrong, this is blamed on one organization committee, so it seems that nobody truly takes responsibility. The single-track system for assessing research also heavily relies on journal impact factor, and logically, such a single politics partly-rooted academy system encourages and it might eventually lead to a long-rooted tradition of nepotism and patronage, leading to conflicts of interest and misconduct, although we agree that multiple parameters need in such assessment. China's central government system has imposed very strict regulations on misconducts for years but scandals still affect China like a cancer, which reoccurs. We may consider it as cancer relapses in most patients until death, although chemical/radiation therapy works at best for months alongside patients own metastatic genomics unless one novel immunological system may re-establish, indeed cancer immunotherapy may equip some cancer patients with one "novel" system by using their own immune system to eliminate aggressive cancers. The 2018

Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine was awarded to James P. Allison and Tasuku Honjo for discoveries that have led to re-activate such immune system and drive it to wipe out cancers. These therapies can defeat cancer relapse. This also revolutionizes the classic views on tumor cells and it therefore made a paradigm shift in clinical oncology.

China's war against misconducts might face challenges if she initially intends to block its incidents. Advanced dual-track system and a new mentality would engage stakeholders in defining research for the projects mission and research agenda. Historically, China has made such changes: for example, the legendary Emperor Yu dredged and channeled rivers to drain floodwaters alongside Great Flood around 1900 BCE rather than damming them; today, making payments *via* WeChat and AliPay has thwarted cash thieves in China. Besides, the VAR technology makes world up fairer. It seems that Japan's private and governments "dual-track" like R&D system has brought them 17 Nobel laureates this century. Shenzhen has exemplified its leading role in innovations including its third-party assessments. China's former general single-centralized evaluation system likely lags behind unmet needs of the universities' innovations, possibly fosters its administration bureaucracy to bring in corruptions and misconduct, and limits our contributions to the world in innovations [3].

References

1. NA. China sets a strong example on how to address scientific fraud. *Nature*. 2018;558:162
2. Xie Y. It 's whom you know that counts. *Science*. 2017;55:1022.
3. Tang L, Hu G. Evaluation woes: metrics beat bias. *Nature*. 2018;559:331.

*Correspondence to:

Dr. Yue Zhang,

Department of Rheumatology and Immunology,

The First Clinical college of Harbin medical University, China,

Email: toronto101@163.com