

Edited by Jennifer Sills

Basic science: Bedrock of progress

ALMOST 4 YEARS ago, one of us (F.S.C.) wrote an Editorial (1) affirming the continued importance of basic research to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) mission. The Editorial emphasized that basic scientific discovery is the engine that powers the biomedical enterprise, and NIH continues to spend more than half its budget supporting basic research projects. This is critical, because the private sector generally funds projects that yield a more rapid return on investment.

Despite these assurances, some members



of the community believe that NIH's interest in basic science is flagging. For example, investigators have told us that the requirement for a "Public Health Relevance" statement in every NIH research grant application suggests that every project must relate directly to a public health concern—that NIH places less value on projects that cannot be expected to yield an immediate public health benefit. This is simply not true. As we wrote in our Strategic Plan (2), we recognize that many of the most important medical advances trace back to basic research that had no explicit disease link. To address this concern, we have revised our application instructions (3) so that the Public Health Relevance statement reflects the NIH mission and our commitment to supporting a robust, diverse research portfolio, including the pursuit of basic biological knowledge.

We are particularly concerned that misperceptions about NIH's priorities and interests may be causing investigators to submit fewer basic research applications. For example, the National Institute of

Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS) noticed a gradual and significant decline in the number of basic grants awarded between 1997 and 2012 (4). This decrease in awards was not a consequence of peer review given that basic grant applications actually did substantially better in review than applied research proposals. Instead, the major driver of this decline was a decrease in the number of fundamental basic research applications submitted.

The taxpayer investment in NIH has yielded spectacular returns from basic science over the long term. These range from the discoveries of the low-density lipoprotein receptor (5) and the development of CRISPR-associated protein-9 nuclease (6, 7) to recent substantial advances in structural biology through cryo-electron microscopy (8). For this track record of success to continue, we must continue our vigorous support of the pursuit of fundamental knowledge. All of NIH's senior leaders believe strongly that progress toward these goals occurs most rapidly when investigators pursue their passions, whether they lie in basic research or in applied, disease-focused studies. By supporting a broad portfolio of basic, translational, population, and clinical research, NIH will continue to lead the way toward a healthier future.

Francis S. Collins,^{1*} James M. Anderson,² Christopher P. Austin,³ James F. Battey,⁴ Linda S. Birnbaum,⁵ Josephine P. Briggs,⁶ Janine A. Clayton,⁷ Bruce Cuthbert,⁸ Robert W. Eisinger,⁹ Anthony S. Fauci,¹⁰ John I. Gallin,¹¹ Gary H. Gibbons,¹² Roger I. Glass,¹³ Michael M. Gottesman,¹⁴ Patricia A. Gray,¹⁵ Eric D. Green,¹⁶ Franziska B. Greider,¹⁷ Richard Hodes,¹⁸ Kathy L. Hudson,¹ Betsy Humphreys,¹⁹ Stephen I. Katz,²⁰ George F. Koob,²¹ Walter J. Korshetz,²² Michael S. Lauer,²³ Jon R. Lorsch,²⁴ Douglas R. Lowy,²⁵ John J. McGowan,²⁶ David M. Murray,²⁷ Richard Nakamura,²⁸ Andrea Norris,²⁹ Eliseo J. Perez-Stable,³⁰ Roderic I. Pettigrew,³¹ William T. Riley,³² Griffin P. Rodgers,³³ Paul A. Sieving,³⁴ Martha J. Somerman,³⁵ Catherine Y. Spong,³⁶ Lawrence A. Tabak,¹ Nora D. Volkow,³⁷ Elizabeth L. Wilder³⁸

¹Office of the Director, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²Division of Program Coordination, Planning, and Strategic Initiatives, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³National Center for Advancing Translational Science, NIH, Rockville, MD 20850, USA. ⁴National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ⁵National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, NIH, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, USA. ⁶National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ⁷Office of Research on Women's Health, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ⁸National Institute of Mental Health, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA.

⁹Office of AIDS Research, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹⁰National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹¹Clinical Center, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹²National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹³Fogarty International Center, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹⁴Office of Intramural Research, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹⁵National Institute of Nursing Research, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹⁶National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹⁷Office of Research Infrastructure Programs, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹⁸National Institute on Aging, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ¹⁹National Library of Medicine, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²⁰National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²¹National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²²NINDS, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²³Office of Extramural Research, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²⁴National Institute of General Medical Sciences, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²⁵National Cancer Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²⁶Office of Management, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²⁷Office of Disease Prevention, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²⁸Center for Scientific Review, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ²⁹Center for Information Technology, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³⁰National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³¹National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³²Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³³National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³⁴National Eye Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³⁵National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³⁶Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³⁷National Institute on Drug Abuse, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA. ³⁸Office of Strategic Coordination, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: collinsf@mail.nih.gov

REFERENCES

1. F. S. Collins, *Science* **337**, 503 (2012).
2. NIH, NIH-Wide Strategic Plan (www.nih.gov/about-nih/nih-wide-strategic-plan).
3. NIH, Grant Application Instructions (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/how-to-apply-application-guide/forms-d/general/g.220-r&r-other-project-information-form.htm#8>).
4. S. Landis, Back to Basics: A call for fundamental neuroscience research (<http://blog.ninds.nih.gov/2014/03/27/back-to-basics/>).
5. M. S. Brown, J. L. Goldstein, *Science* **232**, 34 (1986).
6. M. Jinek et al., *Science* **337**, 816 (2012).
7. L. Cong et al., *Science* **339**, 819 (2013).
8. A. Bartesaghi et al., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**, 11709 (2014).

A research symbiont

M. MCNUTT ("#IAMARESEARCHPARASITE," Editorial, 4 March, p. 1005) can be proud to be a "research parasite." The creators of this term, Longo and Drazen (1), miss the very point of scientific research when they write that researchers may "even use the [open] data to try to disprove what the original investigators had posited." It is at the core of the scientific paradigm that researchers take nothing as final truth. In fact, using research data to try to disprove a result is

good scientific practice, especially in light of the replication crisis (2–4).

However, Longo and Drazen are right that scientific data sharing deserves recognition. They suggest that credit for data sharing should take the form of co-authorship, but co-authorship as the sole instrument of credit will unnecessarily restrict the potential of data sharing and could be a detriment to the original researcher (for instance, if the resulting publications lack quality) (5). In the case of replication studies and meta-analyses, co-authorship makes no scientific sense.

A more suitable instrument would be a much higher appraisal of data sharing by research communities through citations of data sets, awards, and the consideration of data “production” in career prospects, funding applications, and evaluations. With this end in mind, research parasites are beneficial for the organism as a whole.

**Benedikt Fecher^{1,2,3*} and
Gert G. Wagner^{1,4}**

¹German Institute for Economic Research, 10117, Berlin, Germany. ²Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Internet and Society, 10117, Berlin, Germany.

³Leibniz Association, 10115, Berlin, Germany. ⁴Max Planck Institute for Human Development, 14195, Berlin, Germany.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: benedikt.fecher@hiig.de

REFERENCES

1. D. L. Longo, J. M. Drazen, *N. Engl. J. Med.* **374**, 276 (2016).
2. Open Science Collaboration, *Science* **349**, aac4716 (2015).
3. C. F. Camerer *et al.*, *Science* **351**, 1433 (2016).
4. C. J. Anderson *et al.*, *Science* **351**, 1037 (2016).
5. T. Rohlfing, J.-B. Poline, *NeuroImage* **59**, 4189 (2012).

Pseudonymous fame

J. BOHANNON'S In Depth story “Fight over author pseudonyms could flare again” (26 February, p. 902) described problems stemming from authors using the pseudonymous screen names under which they had done their research instead of their real names. The most famous case of pseudonymous authorship occurred over a century ago in the form of William Sealy Gosset's famous 1908 paper “The probable error of a mean,” for which he used the simple pseudonym Student (*1*). This work set the stage for what is now known as Student's *t* test, a hypothesis-testing tool familiar to practically every analyst and statistician. Gosset was employed by Arthur Guinness and Sons brewery in Dublin, and legend holds that his use of a pen name was prompted by the company's concern for secrecy in their use of statistical methods for quality control.

Gosset's case notwithstanding, pseudonyms will hopefully not become a more

regular occurrence. Ephemeral screen names may be acceptable for Internet message boards, but their use in research papers may ultimately lower the public's perception of the transparency, integrity, and timelessness of the permanent scientific record of human knowledge.

Michael C. Wendt

McDonnell Genome Institute and Departments of Mathematics and Genetics, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63108, USA.
E-mail: mwendt@watson.wustl.edu

REFERENCE

1. Student, *Biometrika* **6**, 1 (1908).

TECHNICAL COMMENT ABSTRACTS

Comment on “Single-trial spike trains in parietal cortex reveal discrete steps during decision-making”

Michael N. Shadlen, Roozbeh Kiani, William T. Newsome, Joshua I. Gold, Daniel M. Wolpert, Ariel Zylberberg, Jochen Ditterich, Victor de Lafuente, Tianming Yang, Jamie Roitman

Latimer *et al.* (Reports, 10 July 2015, p. 184) claim that during perceptual decision formation, parietal neurons undergo one-time, discrete steps in firing rate instead of gradual changes that represent the accumulation of evidence. However, that conclusion rests on unsubstantiated assumptions about the time window of evidence accumulation, and their stepping model cannot explain existing data as effectively as evidence-accumulation models.

Full text at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aad3242>

Response to Comment on “Single-trial spike trains in parietal cortex reveal discrete steps during decision-making”

Kenneth W. Latimer, Jacob L. Yates, Miriam L. R. Meister, Alexander C. Huk, Jonathan W. Pillow

Shadlen *et al.*'s Comment focuses on extrapolations of our results that were not implied or asserted in our Report. They discuss alternate analyses of average firing rates in other tasks, the relationship between neural activity and behavior, and possible extensions of the standard models we examined. Although interesting to contemplate, these points are not germane to the findings of our Report: that stepping dynamics provided a better statistical description of lateral intraparietal area spike trains than diffusion-to-bound dynamics for a majority of neurons.

Full text at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.aad3596>

EXTENDED PDF FORMAT
SPONSORED BY



Basic science: Bedrock of progress

Francis S. Collins, James M. Anderson, Christopher P. Austin, James F. Battey, Linda S. Birnbaum, Josephine P. Briggs, Janine A. Clayton, Bruce Cuthbert, Robert W. Eisinger, Anthony S. Fauci, John I. Gallin, Gary H. Gibbons, Roger I. Glass, Michael M. Gottesman, Patricia A. Gray, Eric D. Green, Franziska B. Greider, Richard Hodes, Kathy L. Hudson, Betsy Humphreys, Stephen I. Katz, George F. Koob, Walter J. Koroshetz, Michael S. Lauer, Jon R. Lorsch, Douglas R. Lowy, John J. McGowan, David M. Murray, Richard Nakamura, Andrea Norris, Eliseo J. Perez-Stable, Roderic I. Pettigrew, William T. Riley, Griffin P. Rodgers, Paul A. Sieving, Martha J. Somerman, Catherine Y. Spong, Lawrence A. Tabak, Nora D. Volkow and Elizabeth L. Wilder (March 24, 2016)
Science **351** (6280), 1405. [doi: 10.1126/science.351.6280.1405-a]

Editor's Summary

This copy is for your personal, non-commercial use only.

- Article Tools** Visit the online version of this article to access the personalization and article tools:
<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/351/6280/1405.1>
- Permissions** Obtain information about reproducing this article:
<http://www.sciencemag.org/about/permissions.dtl>

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published weekly, except the last week in December, by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. Copyright 2016 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science; all rights reserved. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.