

THE CLAIM CHECK

Six checks before you believe a claim.

Use these questions on any peptide post, video or sales page.

01

Exact molecule

Does the study test the same molecule and formulation? A fragment, salt or similarly named compound may be different.

02

Relevant people

Was it a human study? How many people participated? Were they healthy adults, surgical patients or people with a specific diagnosis?

03

Fair comparison

Was there a randomized comparison group? A before-and-after story alone cannot rule out other explanations.

04

Meaningful outcome

Did the study measure the benefit being advertised? A hormone level, laboratory marker or cell effect is not automatically a clinical benefit.

05

Time and uncertainty

How long was follow-up? How many people left the study? Does the result include uncertainty, and were harms assessed?

06

Product and incentive

Does a regulated product match the claim? Who funded the study, and does the person promoting it earn money from a sale?

USEFUL OUTPUT

"The source supports _____ in _____ over _____. It does not establish _____."

CASE 01 / OBSERVATIONAL EVIDENCE

BPC-157

A pain report is not a tissue-repair trial.

CLAIM TO EXAMINE

A small human study proves BPC-157 repairs sports injuries.

WHAT A SELECTED SOURCE ACTUALLY SHOWS

A 2021 retrospective report identified 17 patients with knee pain and reached 16 by phone. Twelve had received BPC-157 alone; 11 reported improvement. Four had received a combination. There was no randomized placebo group, and the report did not use standardized measures of function or quality of life. [01]

WHAT YOU CANNOT INFER

This can generate a research question. It cannot separate treatment effects from natural recovery, expectations or other care. Reported pain relief does not establish healed cartilage or tendon, and a knee-pain observation does not establish benefit for every sports injury.

REGULATORY / SAFETY CONTEXT

The FDA's 2026 briefing describes BPC-157 free base and acetate as outside approved drug ingredients and discusses limited human evidence, including older meeting abstracts. It is inaccurate to say there has never been human research. It is also inaccurate to treat that research as proof of general injury repair. [02]

QUESTION WORTH ASKING

Was healing measured objectively, or did people simply report feeling better?

[01] Open source

[02] Open source