

THEOLOGY

SO FEW RETRACTIONS

10.09.2009

[NG](#) has a remarkable retraction – one of the few that are ever published which is a fact that that may otherwise rise severe doubts on the current science system.

Re-examination of the families and the molecular genetic data by a neurologist and a geneticist who were not involved in the original study has revealed major differences from the published data in two of the three published pedigrees ... The number of clinically affected individuals was much lower than was previously reported, and large parts of the pedigree structures and epilepsy phenotypes are different. Most importantly, re-examination revealed the existence of several asymptomatic mutation carriers.

The most remarkable point – 24 authors agree with the retraction including some that I know by person – while one does not:

Armin Heils did not agree to coauthor this retraction.

Funny, there is report about [Heils](#) titled “[Kurzschluss im Gehirn](#)” (short-circuit in the brain) while [LJ](#) has more details; obviously the [NGFN hype](#) about many “discoveries” is also largely unsubstantiated.

Addendum 12-9-2009

[Spiegel online](#) (serious) and [blog comments on contributing authors](#) (less serious). Retraction rates per institution may be quite useful, but in the [opposite direction](#) ...

