MERCOLA
Take Control of Your Health

# Landmark Alzheimer's Study Retracted After Evidence of Data Manipulation

Analysis by Dr. Joseph Mercola | March 06, 2025

## STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- A 2006 landmark Alzheimer's study published in the journal Nature has been retracted after investigators uncovered manipulated images, calling into question nearly two decades of research and treatment strategies
- The study introduced Aβ*56, a specific form of amyloid beta, as a cause of memory loss. However, independent forensic analysis revealed that key data were fabricated, raising doubts about whether this protein even exists
- As a result of this data manipulation, billions of dollars in research funding and drug development have been wasted on treatments targeting amyloid plaques, while other potential causes of Alzheimer's, such as metabolic dysfunction and inflammation, were largely ignored
- The University of Minnesota, where the fraudulent research was conducted, failed to find misconduct in an internal review, highlighting serious concerns about institutional bias and the need for independent oversight in scientific investigations
- Patients and families must take an active role in questioning studies, funding sources and treatment claims to identify reliable research

**For years, billions of dollars in research funding and drug development have focused on amyloid plaques as the primary cause of Alzheimer's disease. Drug companies designed treatments to target these plaques, yet clinical trials failed to produce meaningful results — and a recent discovery may explain why.**

A landmark Alzheimer's study that shaped nearly two decades of research has been retracted due to manipulated images, calling into question the foundation of one of the most dominant theories in Alzheimer's research. The study introduced a specific form of amyloid beta protein as a major driver of memory loss. However, the images that "proved" this protein's existence were altered — and now, the entire claim is unraveling.

If the amyloid beta never existed — or was never the Alzheimer's trigger researchers thought it was — then millions of research dollars have been misspent and patients have been led down the wrong path, wasting valuable time and money on ineffective treatments.

If the data behind a widely accepted theory has been falsified, then what else in the field might be based on unreliable evidence? If fabricated data can influence a field as critical as Alzheimer's research, can we trust that medical science is getting it right?

## Landmark Alzheimer's Study Exposed for Data Manipulation

In July 2022, an investigative report published in Science[1] uncovered manipulated images in a 2006 landmark Alzheimer's study published in the journal Nature. This study[2] introduced the amyloid beta protein Aβ*56 (pronounced "amyloid beta star 56") as a key driver of memory loss.

- **Landmark study influenced Alzheimer's research for nearly two decades —** Aside from being widely cited, it also shaped funding decisions, drug development and clinical trials.
- **Forensic image analysis has revealed that the data was altered —** This called into question not only the validity of the findings of that individual paper, but also the integrity of the broader amyloid hypothesis.
- **The study claimed that Aβ*56 was directly linked to memory impairment in mice —** Led by neuroscientist Sylvain Lesné of the University of Minnesota, the study was a groundbreaking assertion at the time, as it suggested a new pathway for treatment.

Researchers assumed that targeting this protein could slow or even halt Alzheimer's progression.[3]

- **Evidence of manipulation became evident —** When Vanderbilt University physician and neuroscientist Matthew Schrag began investigating in 2021, he found unmistakable signs of image manipulation.

  Key Western blot images (a protein identification method) were duplicated, altered, or spliced to fit Lesné's hypothesis. According to the Science article, "Some Alzheimer's experts now suspect Lesné's studies have misdirected Alzheimer's research for 16 years."[4]

- **Other forensic image analysts came to the same conclusion —** Molecular biologist Elisabeth Bik and independent consultant Jana Christopher also reviewed Schrag's findings and confirmed that many of the images in Lesné's papers were manipulated. Some figures appeared to have been pieced together from different experiments, and in some cases, protein bands were copied and pasted to fabricate results.[5]

- **This deception made Aβ*56 seem far more significant than it actually was —** Alzheimer's experts are now even questioning its existence. According to Science, multiple labs have failed to detect Aβ*56 despite attempts to replicate Lesné's findings.[6]

## Decades of Alzheimer's Research Built on a Faulty Foundation

It now appears Lesné's fabrications have misdirected an entire field of research. Scientists worldwide built on this faulty data, spending millions in funding and years of work on follow-up studies and clinical trials. If Aβ*56 is nothing more than a fabrication, then countless studies using it as a foundation are likely invalid as well.[7]

- **Failure to catch this fraud earlier raises troubling questions about scientific oversight —** Journals, institutions, and peer reviewers all failed to identify these manipulated images for nearly two decades. "The Nature paper has been cited in

about 2,300 scholarly articles — more than all but four other Alzheimer's basic research reports published since 2006, according to the Web of Science database," Science reports.[8]

- **Prestigious journals used multiple research papers with fabricated data —** The Journal of Neuroscience, for example, published multiple papers from Lesné that contained doctored images, yet it was only after Schrag's investigation that concerns were raised.

- **Even after being alerted, some journals hesitated to act —** John Forsayeth, a top Alzheimer's researcher, admitted, "Journals and granting institutions don't know how to deal with image manipulation."[9]

- **Even more concerning, the University of Minnesota's internal review did not find evidence of research misconduct for at least two of the questioned images —** This raises the issue of whether institutions are capable of objectively investigating their own researchers, especially when funding and reputation are on the line.

  Independent experts argue that these cases need external oversight to prevent conflicts of interest from interfering with scientific accountability.[10]

## It's the Patients Who Ultimately Pay the Price

The implications for Alzheimer's patients and their families are devastating. Decades of research focused on amyloid-targeting treatments, largely based on studies like this one, have failed to yield effective therapies. Meanwhile, other promising research avenues — such as inflammation, metabolic dysfunction and immune system involvement — have been sidelined.[11]

- **Schrag's investigation has forced re-examination of journals —** Researchers are now scrutinizing other studies published by Lesné, and some papers have already been corrected or retracted. However, the process is slow, and many of these flawed studies continue to be cited.

- **Experts warn that this case may be just the tip of the iceberg —** Scientific fraud is notoriously difficult to detect, and journals often lack the resources or willingness to properly investigate suspicious data.

- **This issue opens greater concerns about biomedical science integrity —** The collapse of this study doesn't just undermine confidence in Alzheimer's research, but also raises larger concerns about the integrity of biomedical science.

  If a fabricated study can go undetected for nearly 20 years in one of the most heavily funded fields, how many other areas of research have been similarly compromised? And more importantly, how many patients have suffered because of these scientific misdirections?

The scientific community now faces an urgent reckoning, not just in correcting the past but in ensuring that future research is held to higher standards of accountability and transparency.

## Senior Author Agrees to Redact Faulty Alzheimer's Study

After nearly two years of scrutiny, one of the authors of the compromised study has spoken up and agreed to retract it. Having been cited nearly 2,500 times, the paper is now set to become one of the most-cited retractions in scientific history.[12]

- **Co-author admits to data manipulation —** Karen Ashe, the senior author of the study and a neuroscientist at the University of Minnesota, admitted that some of the figures in the study were in fact manipulated.

  On the journal discussion site PubPeer, she wrote: "Although I had no knowledge of any image manipulations in the published paper until it was brought to my attention two years ago, it is clear that several of the figures in Lesné et al. (2006) have been manipulated … for which I as the senior and corresponding author take ultimate responsibility."[13]

- **However, she insists that the conclusions of the study remain valid —** Many researchers have openly challenged this claim. Ashe continues to defend her work,

recently publishing a new study in Science that she claims confirms the findings of the 2006 paper. However, Schrag and other independent researchers have strongly disputed these claims, stating that the new data is just as unreliable as the original study.

- **A flaw in the peer review process —** Journals rely on peer review to assess the validity of studies, but image analysis is often not part of this process. As a result, fraudulent or manipulated data can pass through undetected, influencing entire fields of research before anyone takes a closer look.

- **Lead author rejects the retraction —** Lesné, who is actually Ashe's protégé, has not agreed to the retraction. He remains a professor at the University of Minnesota while continuing to receive funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

- **University claims that "no research misconduct occurred" —** This raises serious concerns about institutional bias, as universities have financial and reputational interests in protecting their faculty members. Independent experts argue that such investigations should be handled by third-party organizations to ensure transparency and accountability.

Furthermore, scientific journals have been slow to react — many waited for the University of Minnesota's internal investigation to conclude before deciding on retractions. This cautious approach has frustrated researchers who believe immediate action is needed.

Donna Wilcock, a neuroscientist at Indiana University and editor of the Alzheimer's & Dementia journal, said: "It's unfortunate that it has taken 2 years to make the decision to retract. The evidence of manipulation was overwhelming."[14]

## How to Protect Yourself from Misinformation in Medical Research

If you or a loved one is dealing with Alzheimer's — or any other chronic condition — you deserve real answers based on solid science. Unfortunately, flawed studies and

misleading claims are common, making it crucial to evaluate research critically. While no method guarantees accuracy, the following strategies can help you distinguish reliable science from marketing hype.

- **Question the source —** Headlines rarely tell the whole story. Instead of accepting claims at face value, ask:

    1. Who funded the research?
    2. Has the study been replicated?
    3. Do independent researchers confirm the results?

    Pharmaceutical companies and news outlets often promote studies that align with financial interests. Always look beyond the surface before believing a new "breakthrough."

- **Follow the money and recognize bias —** Many Alzheimer's drugs have failed in clinical trials, yet funding continues to flow toward amyloid-targeting treatments. Studies that conveniently support billion-dollar drug markets while dismissing simple, lifestyle-based solutions should raise red flags.

- **Think critically and stay proactive —** The exposure of scientific fraud in Alzheimer's research proves that blind trust in the system is dangerous. Be your own advocate:

    1. Read studies critically.
    2. Seek multiple perspectives.
    3. Pay attention to researchers who challenge mainstream narratives.

The most effective solutions are often the simplest ones — those rooted in diet, movement, and a supportive environment.

## Strategies to Support Brain Health

Instead of relying on questionable pharmaceutical interventions, focus on evidence-based lifestyle choices that nourish and protect your brain.

- **Optimize your diet for cellular energy —** Your brain depends on proper fuel to function. Key dietary strategies include:
    - Eliminating processed foods and seed oils that promote inflammation.
    - Reducing exposure to environmental toxins like plastics and heavy metals.
    - Prioritizing high-quality animal proteins, with one-third of intake as collagen.
    - Consuming 250 to 300 grams of well-tolerated carbohydrates daily to support brain function.
- **Optimize your mitochondrial function —** Poor mitochondrial health is linked to neurodegenerative diseases like Alzheimer's. To support energy production in the brain:
    - Get daily sunlight exposure, ideally at solar noon.
    - Avoid seed oils and excessive polyunsaturated fats (PUFAs), which impair mitochondrial function.
    - Consider pharmaceutical-grade methylene blue under professional guidance.
    - Maintain stable blood sugar by eating enough carbs and avoiding prolonged fasting.

Misinformation in medical research is real, but you don't have to fall for it. By questioning science and prioritizing foundational health strategies, you can make informed choices that truly support brain function. The truth is out there — you just have to be willing to look for it.

## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) About Landmark Alzheimer's Study Retraction

**Q: Why was the 2006 Alzheimer's study retracted?**

**A:** The study, published in Nature, was retracted after investigators found manipulated images, raising doubts about the validity of its findings. It introduced Aβ*56, a form of amyloid beta, as a cause of memory loss, but forensic analysis revealed data fabrication, questioning the protein's existence.

**Q: How did this fraudulent study impact Alzheimer's research?**

**A:** The study heavily influenced Alzheimer's research for nearly two decades, leading to billions of dollars in funding for amyloid-targeting treatments. However, these treatments largely failed, and alternative causes of Alzheimer's, such as metabolic dysfunction and inflammation, were overlooked.

**Q: Why did it take so long to uncover the data manipulation?**

**A:** Scientific journals, institutions and peer reviewers failed to detect the fraudulent images for almost 20 years. The University of Minnesota's internal review did not initially find misconduct, highlighting concerns about institutional bias and the need for independent oversight in scientific investigations.

**Q: What does this mean for Alzheimer's patients and their families?**

**A:** Patients have been misled into pursuing ineffective amyloid-targeting treatments, while potential alternative therapies were neglected. Families should critically evaluate medical research, question funding sources and stay informed about emerging treatment approaches.

**Q: How can we ensure the reliability of medical research?**

**A:** Patients and researchers must scrutinize studies by assessing funding sources, checking for independent verification, and questioning results that align with financial interests. Transparency, independent oversight, and a shift toward broader Alzheimer's research beyond amyloid plaques are essential for future progress.

## Sources and References


- [1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11] Science, July 1, 2022
- [2, 3] Nature, 2006, volume 440, pages 352–357
- [12, 14] Science, June 4, 2024
- [13] PubPeer, A specific amyloid-beta protein assembly in the brain impairs memory