

Are medical professionals trained and qualified scientists? Not really!

Saeed A. Qureshi, Ph.D. (principal@pharmacomechanics.com)

The disastrous social and economic outcomes of health authorities' reaction in controlling the pandemic and projected deaths are well known now. The spread and campaign of inciting fear in public have been intense and continuous - all in the name of achieving public health and safety. Authorities continue with their draconian measures, with the advice from medical professionals and experts laced with slogans of following scientific principles and practices.

On the other hand, the current situation raises questions about the legitimacy and correctness of medical professionals' claims concerning science.

This article provides an argument that medical professionals never gained education and training to conduct scientific research and experimentation. The lack of expertise in science appears to have resulted in false claims about the virus's existence, isolation, spread and illness, and the development of treatment such as vaccines. It is suggested that in the future, such an issue should be handled by academically trained scientists in relevant fields such as chemistry, especially analytical chemistry.

The recent declaration of the coronavirus pandemic has caused a social and economic disaster worldwide. This disastrous outcome resulted from health authorities' reaction to controlling the spread of illness and projected many deaths.

On the other hand, numerous claims have been made concerning current and future human sufferings, including an alleged large number of

deaths. However, scientific evidence of the claimed disease and its spread and the cure remains suspect and unconfirmed. The spread and campaign of inciting fear in public have been intense and continuous. Moreover, everyday human lives worldwide have been destroyed by a precautionary measure of shutting down businesses and stay-at-home orders for the public (aka lockdowns).

The irony is that apparently, there is no end in sight for ending the situation (scare of the virus). The suggested remedies are some anecdotal precautions such as wearing face masks, keeping social distances, use of sanitizers. In addition, prophylactic use of hastily (often on the go) and unscientifically developed vaccines has been intensely promoted. Authorities continue with their draconian measures, with the advice (considered science-based) from medical professionals and experts, exacerbating public well-being and everyday life. All in the name of public health and safety.

The current situation raises questions about the legitimacy and appropriateness of medical claims and the associated "scientific" basis. Any second opinion provided about the disease and its mitigation is forcefully rejected. Any comment or suggestion not in line with the official opinion or approach is promptly deleted or classified as unscientific. Interestingly, stopping or deleting such suggestions, by definition, is against scientific practice and principles. Science requires and thrives on open and factual discussions.

BIOANALYTICX

Everything about pharmaceutical testing



It is critical to note that the pandemic being proclaimed a health-related issue; hence, the medical profession assigned itself the custodian of its description and management.

The profession classified that the pandemic as a new viral-based disease and assigned itself to develop a cure. It would be critical to note that although the disease is classified as viral, no specific virus to date has been isolated, identified, or linked to the newly classified illness. This anomaly raises serious doubt about the scientific aspect of the illness and its management.

A quick search on Google on the definition of medical professionals and physicians, provided below, clearly shows no mention of the word science or scientist associated with these professions. Therefore, by definition, the medical profession should not be classified as a science subject and a practicing physician as a scientist. As per the definitions, the medical profession is a trade, and physicians its tradespersons trained accordingly.

A medical professional:

- Means a physician or other person authorized by the applicable law to prescribe drugs in this state or another state (<https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/medical-professional>).
- A health professional (or healthcare professional) may provide health care treatment and advice based on formal training and experience (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Health_professional)

- Health professionals maintain health in humans through the application of the principles and procedures of evidence-based medicine and caring (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK298950/>).
- A medical professional is a qualified doctor who abides and is fully committed to the ethical principles and values of the medical profession. (<https://tinyurl.com/4peuwzcm>)

A physician

- A person qualified to practice medicine. (Definitions from Oxford Languages)
- A person trained and licensed to practice medicine; a medical doctor (<https://www.yourdictionary.com/physician>).
- A physician, medical practitioner, medical doctor, or simply doctor is a professional who practices medicine, which is concerned with promoting, maintaining, or restoring health through the study, diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment of disease, injury, and other physical and mental impairments (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Physician>)
- A physician is a general term for a doctor who has earned a medical degree. Physicians work to maintain, promote, and restore health by studying, diagnosing, and treating injuries and diseases (<https://www.webmd.com/a-to-z-guides/what-is-physician>).

BIOANALYTICX

Everything about pharmaceutical testing



However, medical experts or physicians are often commonly assumed and customarily promoted as science experts or scientists. It could be argued and easily be established that this indulgence of medical professionals in science, without training in science and its methodologies, has resulted in enormous problems for the healthcare system, more recently evident from the pandemic issue.

On the other hand, some examples of defining a scientist from the literature (Google search) are provided below.

A scientist:

- A person who is studying or has expert knowledge of one or more of the natural or physical sciences. “a research scientist” (Definitions from Oxford Languages)
- An expert in science, especially one of the physical or natural sciences (<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/scientist>).
- A scientist is someone who has studied science and whose job is to teach or do research in science (<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/scientist>).
- A person who is engaged in and has expert knowledge of science, especially biological or physical science (<https://www.yourdictionary.com/scientist>).

How do science and its experimentation work?

The scientific processes focus only on the natural world. Anything that is considered supernatural or abstract does not fit into the definition of science.

Science is a systematic and logical approach to discovering and establishing natural processes. A critical aspect in this regard is that **science aims for measurable results through testing and analysis.**

Two critical underpinnings to the scientific method are: (1) The hypothesis must be testable. An experiment should include a dependent variable (which does not change) and an independent variable (which does change); (2) An investigation should include an experimental group and a control group. The control group is what the experimental group is compared against.

Scientists, when conducting research, use scientific methods and experiments to collect measurable and empirical evidence.

The first crucial step is identifying questions and generating possible answers (hypotheses). The steps of the scientific method are often like this:

Conduct and reproduce the experiments until there are agreements between observations and theory. The reproducibility of published experiments is the foundation of science. No reproducibility – no science.

Concerning the coronavirus pandemic, the following would describe the claims (hypotheses) requiring experimental/scientific evidence:

1. There exists a virus called SARS-CoV-2.
2. The virus causes illness (respiratory infection, COVID-19) which could cause deaths.
3. The virus spread from person to person.

BIOANALYTICX

Everything about pharmaceutical testing



4. The presence of the virus could be monitored using a test commonly known as a PCR test.
5. Covering the face with a face mask protects against virus spread
6. Keeping a distance (approximately 6 feet) between people protects against virus spread.
7. A vaccine is needed as a treatment considering the viral nature of the infection.
8. A vaccine has been developed for protection from the virus.

However, there is not a single legitimate scientific/experimental evidence provided in support of the claims made, as explained below:

1. Claims have been made that the virus exists and has been isolated. However, no physical sample or specimen of the virus has been provided or available anywhere in the world. Therefore, the claim is scientifically false and invalid.
2. One of the critical requirements, as noted above, is that the study/testing must be conducted in parallel with a control group. The claims of virus existence are based on studies without parallel control groups. Study inferences are primarily based only on testing a single person – no reproducibility aspect has been considered—a violation of scientific principle.
3. The word isolation has been used to describe “virus isolate,” not the actual

“isolated virus” that linguistically and scientifically represents two different items. A “virus isolate” is a culture, mixture, or soup, not a purified isolated virus. It is like considering chicken soup as chicken. This misrepresentation reflects a lack of understanding of scientific principles at the basic level.

4. The claim that the virus has been confirmed by establishing the RNA sequence of the virus. However, no empirical link between the two, i.e., virus and RNA sequence, has been provided. The RNA sequence-based identification of the virus remains an opinion, not a science-based fact.
5. The images of the SARS-CoV-2 virus (a ball with spikes) frequently shown in the literature are computer-generated image, not a picture of an actual virus. Such practice should be considered scientific deception and fraud.
6. There is no experimental evidence provided showing the spread of the virus from person to person.
7. There has been no experimental evidence provided supporting the claims that face masks protect from the virus spread. Scientific evidence supporting mask use cannot be provided because it would require a physical virus specimen and a valid analytical method to monitor the virus movement through the mask. However, none is available. Hence, implementing mask use does not have any scientific or experimental evidence.

BIOANALYTICX

Everything about pharmaceutical testing



8. Promoted studies with aerosol or droplets without the virus's actual presence or use to monitor masks' efficacy in protecting from virus transfer and spread is illogical thinking and false science.
9. There has been no scientific evidence supporting the new or novel disease narrative other than opinions. The illness is commonly identified with flu-like symptoms. The science and its methods require that the illness must be clearly defined with one or more measurable and quantifiable parameters.
10. It has been suggested that illness is a respiratory tract infection caused by the virus. No measurable or physical link to the infection with the virus has been provided. It remains an opinion, not a scientific observation or fact. The suggested cause of the virus is based on opinions as no virus has been isolated from any patient.
11. No evidence or experimental testing has been provided to dismiss any other potential causes of the infection.
12. Routine PCR tests are conducted to establish the presence of the virus or infection without their appropriate validation for the virus or its RNA. Scientifically, results from any test lacking proper validation cannot be accepted. This practice clearly shows a lack of understanding of the basic scientific principles. Therefore, all PCR test results are scientifically false and have to be dismissed, without exceptions!
13. The suggestion of a vaccine to treat the virus is scientifically invalid. How could a treatment against the virus be developed and recommended when there is no virus specimen available and no valid test for the virus detection?
14. However, magically vaccines have been developed – a treatment (vaccine) without the availability of virus specimens and valid tests. The development of vaccines could be considered the height of ignorance and incompetency in the subject (science) or the modern-day highest level of scientific fraud.

From the above discussion, it is evident that the medical profession did not follow scientific principles in researching to discover the virus and its monitoring and developing a treatment for the illness. It should be evident that, as per the definitions provided above, the profession has never been trained to conduct such scientific studies. Conducting scientific research is not part of the profession. The profession is making huge errors leading to damage to public health and its own professional credibility as medical practitioners. Hence such practice should be stopped immediately.

Often, medical professionals defend their thinking and studies as scientific, based on peer-reviewers' opinions and assessments. Unfortunately, as peers, reviewers, and experts have the same learning experiences, practices, and mindsets, they cannot critically evaluate the scientific aspects. Hence errors can not be observed and corrected.

BIOANALYTICX

Everything about pharmaceutical testing



The medical professionals should get their work reviewed by externals to their medical field, particularly from experts in chemical isolation and characterization, for a critical and unbiased assessment. Until such time, the medical research practice and publications will remain cult-like presentations and teaching – inaccurate, and unscientific. The public will remain in perpetual observance of non-existing “new” diseases and treatments and possibly pandemics.

Suggestions for further reading:

The science of medicines is not science at all – virus monitoring and vaccine developments confirmed it ([link](#)).

BIOANALYTICX

Everything about pharmaceutical testing

