Routinely picked up by newsweeklies, network research that appeared in journals. Indeed, newspaper editors openly acknowledge their dependence on them. At The New York Times, “We do rely on them for the starting point of many of our stories and that will not change.” There are limits to the science reporters, who are generally not scientists themselves, can do. Most journal articles have emphasized to form what we understand, the greatest difficulty for science reporters is to catch what journal editors have missed.

Newsweek recently published two papers by the South Korean researcher Dr. Hwang Woo Suk. The journal Science meticulously checked what he had denied for months: Dr. Hwang had fabricated evidence that he had cloned human cells. But the editors of Science were not alone in telling the world of Hwang’s research. Newspapers affiliated with journals that had initially trumpeted the news, as they often do with information served up by the leading scientific journals. Newsweek is valid. But we’re still in sort of the same situation thing unfolded,” said Rob Stein, a science reporter at The Washington Post. “I’m reading papers a lot more closely than I had in the past, just to sort of satisfy myself that any individual piece of research is valid. But we’re still in sort of the same situation that the journal editors are, which is that if someone wants to completely fabricate data, it’s hard to figure that out.”

But other than heightened skepticism, not a lot has changed in how newspapers treat scientific journals. Indeed, newspaper editors openly acknowledge their dependence on them. At The Los Angeles Times, at least half of the science stories that run on the front page come directly from journals, said Ashley Dunn, the paper’s science editor. Gideon Gil, the health and science editor for The Boston Globe, said that two of the three science stories that run on a typical day were from research that appeared in journals.

Beyond newspapers, science journals are routinely picked up by newswires, network news, talk radio and Web sites, reporters consult regularly are Nature, Science, The New England Journal of Medicine and The Journal of the American Medical Association. “I think they and we have been burned enough that they’re making efforts,” Perlman said. “They’re being more careful now, and I think reporters are too. I don’t think I have definitely have more of a ‘Hey, let’s look more carefully’ attitude now that I did 10 or 15 years ago.”

Donald Kennedy, the editor of Science, said in a statement in December that the journal itself was not an investigative body. But when reporting on journal findings, most news outlets fail to caution that studies must be replicated to be truly authenticated. “Beyond Hwang, the more fundamental issue is that journals do not and cannot guarantee the truth of what they publish,” said Nicholas Wade, a science reporter for The New York Times. Publishing of a paper only means that, in the view of the referees who green-light it, it is interesting and not obviously false. In other words, all of the results in these journals are tentative.4

Man in the Moon’s Cataclysmic Birth Revealed

Shock waves from ancient lunar lava flow may be responsible for creating the Earth’s single most famous face - the “Man in the Moon.” People have long pointed to dark patches on the Moon’s surface as a human face, and they know how they formed. Now, scientists have solved the mystery by taking the drug graphical model of the Moon and matching it with the gravity signatures of rocks on the way to the core, write newscientists.

Their findings suggest that what impacts the Moon’s surface were so great they caused a giant bulge on the near side, and the Earth’s gravitational pull further jigged at this bulge. Those colossal movements opened cracks in the crust and let magma, from the lunar mantle, flood onto the surface, at a time when the Moon was still geologically active. This solidified to form what we now see from Earth as the eye, nose and mouth of the Man in the Moon. "Where you have impact craters, you get an anomalous distribution of mass, and that’s what shows up on the lunar gravity field model," explains Ralph von Frese, a geologist at Ohio State.

"The impacts were huge enough to disrupt the Moon to its core, and at the same time we can measure four billion years later." The researchers used gravity fluctuations measured by NASA’s Clementine and Lunar Prospector satellites to map the Moon’s interior.