

## "Scientific Method" - Deceptive Substitution For Science

Saeed A. Qureshi, Ph.D. ([principal@pharmacomechanics.com](mailto:principal@pharmacomechanics.com))

There have been intense discussions on the "Scientific Method" approach concerning viruses and virology (extended into Germ Theory) on social media such as FaceBook and Telegram.




Figure 1: The Scientific Method (Scientific inquiry) includes creating a hypothesis through inductive reasoning, testing it through experiments and statistical analysis, and adjusting or discarding the hypothesis based on the results. ([link](#))

Specifically, the approach is used to discredit virology as a false and fraudulent science because virology does not follow the "Scientific Method" in showing or proving the existence of viruses. In some cases, the argument has been extended to other scientific practices and concepts, well-characterized and well-

established, such as atoms and molecules, stating ("Scientific Method") evidence lacking for their existence and authenticity.

It is unclear what the motive behind such a dishonest claim, mainly made by people who often designated themselves as "scientists/researchers," in particular some physicians and their associates, considering the medical profession as scientific or science-based, even superior to the actual science subjects.

As a science student with extensive working experience in science (chemistry, actual science), I ([link](#)) would like to explain and clarify this mischievous claim so that such discussions can be stopped as fraudulent explanations and practices in the name of science.

In actual science, a scientific method means a test or procedure to measure something, like a scientific method/test for measuring vitamin D in blood. It is called a scientific method because it is based on the actual science (chemistry) of a chemical molecule/compound called vitamin D. Not only extensive scientific concepts and experimentations are involved in the characterization of the vitamin molecule, but the method itself has to be validated, showing its capability to measure by scientifically confirming vitamin D. Here, the scientific method (for vitamin D) is not just a label but reflects that the method has the support of science behind it. Therefore, in actual science, the scientific method means a method with full support and validation by science. This is how scientists, experts, and the general public understand science and scientific methods.

**BIOANALYTICX**  
Everything about pharmaceutical testing



While critically evaluating the claims of PCR testing, I found that it is not a valid scientific method; however, it is considered and promoted as a scientific method/test. It is not a scientific method because the technique or its development does not follow the science or its principles. Science requires a proper scientific method to be validated against the reference standard, the virus. However, it has not been validated because no virus sample is available. This leads to the conclusion that the virus does not exist, and more importantly, it is based on evaluating the "method or test" (PCR) itself ([link](#)).

It is important to note that the actual scientific method is based on understanding the science (chemistry). It categorically established that the virus does not exist, not the labeled "Scientific Method." Therefore, people should not describe the label "Scientific Method," implying that it shows or proves the absence or non-existence of the virus – it never did. Such claims should be considered as misinformation and the promotion of false science. It will always be in a "work in progress" status.

This situation may be explained further with another example concerning face masks' efficacy for virus protection.

The CDC provided the following supporting evidence for the efficacy of the mask use (note earlier, CDC categorically declined the relevance and efficacy of the masks).

*There is increasing evidence that cloth face coverings help prevent people who have COVID-19 from spreading the virus to others.*

*The results of the Missouri case study provide further evidence on*

*the benefits of wearing a cloth face covering.*

*The investigators found that none of the stylists' 139 clients or secondary contacts became ill, and all 67 clients who volunteered to be tested showed no sign of infection.*

*(from the book, "Slaying the Virus and Vaccine Dragon." [link](#))*

This is a clear example of following the "Scientific Method," i.e., there is observation, research, hypothesis, testing/experiment (PCR, "sequencing," culturing, etc.), data/analysis, and a conclusion. It would be difficult to argue that the CDC did not follow the "Scientific Method." Their conclusion that face masks provide protection is valid based on the "Scientific Method" approach.

On the other hand, if one looks at the issue of mask efficacy from the perspective of an actual science or its method, it has to be handled very differently. In that case, the actual scientific method and or experimentation will be completely different, for example:

A straightforward laboratory experiment will be conducted using a two-chamber container separated by a mask or its material (Figure 2), providing airflow with the virus from one side to the other. By sampling both sides of the chamber and measuring the amounts of virus, one can quickly determine the virus-holding capability of the mask or any other filtering media. This is an actual scientific method commonly employed to test the absorption of particles/materials by filters. This would be a simple high school or undergraduate-level laboratory test that could

**BIOANALYTICX**  
*Everything about pharmaceutical testing*



be done within days. However, no such simple experiment has been conducted.




Figure 2: Proper/true scientific method for assessing the face mask efficacy ([link](#))

Such an experiment requires some quantity of actual virus and a scientifically validated test method to quantify the virus. Experts do not tell the public that the actual virus and a valid test to monitor it are NOT available, as it will cause the whole virus and pandemic issue to collapse. Hence, they look for other options to continue the story of virus scare and protection; one such option is the "Scientific Method" approach, which will never provide a definite/empirical answer to the claim/hypothesis but with a desired and opportunistic outcome.

I can provide many other examples where medical and pharmaceutical experts claim to follow the "Scientific Method" or "science" when they are invalid scientific methods based on fake science. The experts, particularly those with medical backgrounds, have not studied science, so they are unaware of how scientific

experiments are (or should be) conducted. Therefore, they must use the term "Scientific Method" to sell rubbish (experiments and conclusion) as science. So, the fact remains that the mask efficacy has not been established and changes with the "need," as noted above.

In short, one should be careful in accepting the so-called "Scientific Method," approach which must be avoided. For all practical purposes, it is a coverup for the continued use of fake science.

# BIOANALYTICX

*Everything about pharmaceutical testing*

