

# An incorrect PCR corona test and the consequences

If there is already a measurement error in a basic calculation, which is part of an overall calculation, this error is propagated. All quantities, key figures, resulting from this calculation are therefore also subject to error - this process is called **error propagation**.

**In laboratory measurements, three sources of error must be distinguished:**

1. experimental errors (by practical mistakes)
2. systemic errors (inherent in every experiment)
3. statistical errors (random)

The defectiveness of the PCR corona test (Drosten test) lies in the experimental parameters and the execution and was already disclosed internationally in 2020 (1,2,3,4). Particularly problematic is the so-called Ct value (number of cycles), which is not standardized, so that any laboratory can run the PCR until a positive result appears.


Worldwide, most PCR corona tests use between 35 and 40 cycles (Ct). **The limit for a serious measurement is a Ct of 25!** In this respect, most tests are wrong: Healthy people are incorrectly identified as sick.

The Lisbon Court of Appeals commented in a Nov. 11, 2020 ruling: *"On the basis of the scientific evidence currently available, this test [the RT-PCR test] is not capable, in and of itself, of establishing beyond doubt whether the positivity actually corresponds to infection with the SARS-CoV-2 virus, for several reasons, two of which are of primary importance: The reliability of the test depends on the number of cycles used; the reliability of the test depends on the viral load present."* (5)

## PCR test unsuitable for government measures

Prof. Dr. Andreas Stang, Director of the Institute for Medical Informatics, Biometry and Epidemiology (IMIBE) at the University Hospital Essen, published his research on the PCR corona test in May 2021: A positive test result is not sufficient to ensure that people infected with SARS-CoV-2 can infect others with the coronavirus, making the **PCR test unsuitable as a basis for pandemic measures**. His team has evaluated approximately 190,000 PCR tests. (6)

**All metrics based on the PCR test are subject to error:**



Other **key figures** are: **Mortality** and **occupancy of intensive care beds**.

**Mortality:** Autopsies performed so far in Hamburg (Prof. Püschel) and currently in Rostock (Prof. Büttner), among others, cast strong doubt on the official figures of COVID deaths. (7) Also, there is no evidence of excess mortality from Corona.

**Intensive care beds:** The Federal Audit Office (8) revealed that many hospitals reported fewer free intensive care beds in order to collect money from the government! In this respect, a collapse of the intensive care units was **never** imminent. The federal government knew about it since January 2021 through a letter from the RKI. Previously, an independent group of experts had also expressed doubts about the utilization of the intensive care unit with COVID-19 patients. (9)

**Conclusion: All Corona key figures are wrong!**

### References

1. External peer review of the RTPCR test to detect SARS-CoV-2 reveals 10 major scientific flaws at the molecular and methodological level: consequences for false positive results. Borger P. et al., Nov 2020. <https://cormandrostenreview.com/report/>
2. Correlation Between 3790 Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction–Positives Samples and Positive Cell Cultures, Including 1941 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Isolates. Jaafar R. et al., June 2021. <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/72/11/e921/5912603>
3. Analytical sensitivity and efficiency comparisons of SARS-COV-2 qRT-PCR primer-probe sets. Vogels Ch. et al., April 2020. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.30.20048108v3>
4. Predicting Infectious Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 From Diagnostic Samples. Bullard J. et al., May 2020. <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/71/10/2663/5842165?login=true>
5. Tribunal da Relação de Lisboa, Nov.2020. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1t1b01H0Jd4hsMU7V1vy70yr8s3jIBedr/view>
6. The performance of the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test as a tool for detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection in the population. Stang A. et al., May 2021. [https://www.journalofinfection.com/article/S0163-4453\(21\)00265-6/fulltext](https://www.journalofinfection.com/article/S0163-4453(21)00265-6/fulltext)
7. Erste Ergebnisse der Obduktionen der im Zusammenhang mit den SARS-CoV-2-Infektionen Verstorbenen aus der Unimedizin Rostock. Zack F. et al., April 2021. <https://www.aek-mv.de/upload/file/aerzte/Aerzteblattx/A%CC%88MV%204-2021.pdf>
8. <https://cdn.businessinsider.de/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/19-8745-BRH-Bericht-uber-Prufung-ausgewahlter-coronabedingter-Ausgaben-1.pdf> - Juni 2021.
9. [http://www.matthias.schrapppe.com/index\\_htm\\_files/thesenpapier\\_adhoc3\\_210516\\_endfass.pdf](http://www.matthias.schrapppe.com/index_htm_files/thesenpapier_adhoc3_210516_endfass.pdf) - Mai 2021.