

How Financial Math Shapes What Counts as "Science": A Report on Treatment Legitimacy

August 2026

Why This Was Compiled

This is not a continuation of an argument. I'm done debating "science" with people who are defending a viewpoint that's really about their own perception and identity — that conversation doesn't move on evidence, because evidence was never the actual variable. This document exists instead as a fact check: a grounded look at where the numbers and the studies actually come from, out of genuine curiosity as an American citizen navigating this health system, not as ammunition for another round of the same disagreement.

The Lens

The size of a compound's evidence base is a function of its business model, not a referendum on its legitimacy.

That's the single idea this whole report walks outward from. It's a claim about *how research gets funded*, not a claim about which treatments work. It doesn't require deciding that supplements are secretly proven or that pharmaceuticals are corrupt — it just asks a quieter question underneath the usual argument: when someone says "there's no science behind that," what actually produced the science that *does* exist behind the alternative? Once that question is on the table, a lot of the certainty on either side gets a little more interesting, and a little less settled.

The rest of this report tests that lens against real numbers: how much money moves through each side, what gets studied and why, and one concrete condition (MCAS/histamine treatment) where the pattern is easiest to see clearly.

Part 1: What "There's No Science" Is Actually Measuring

"There's no science behind that" sounds like a statement about truth. It's more accurate to

read it as a statement about *funding history* — and those aren't the same thing, even though they get treated as interchangeable in most conversations.

It's factually true that most supplements lack large randomized controlled trials. What's worth sitting with is *why*: a drug patent grants roughly 20 years of exclusive sale rights, which is what makes a \$300M+ trial financially rational in the first place — a company can recoup that cost because no one else can sell the same molecule during the patent window. A compound like quercetin, found naturally in onion skins and apple peels, can't be exclusively owned by anyone. No company has the same incentive to fund a trial for it, no matter how promising the mechanism looks in the lab. The missing piece isn't scientific curiosity — it's a business case that was never going to pencil out.

So “untested” and “doesn't work” quietly get treated as the same thing, when the more accurate read is: *untested because nobody could own the exclusive right to sell it, not because anyone looked and found nothing*. That distinction doesn't settle the question of what works. It just means the absence of a trial isn't itself evidence of anything — and it's worth holding that lightly, on every side of this, including the ones that feel most certain.

Part 2: The Financial Architecture Underneath the Rhetoric

Three data points carry the whole argument:

- **Global supplement industry, all categories: ~\$210–230B (2026).** Real money, but a fraction of the comparison below.
- **Global pharmaceutical industry: ~\$1.6–1.77 trillion (2025).**
- **Global pharmaceutical R&D spending *alone*, not counting revenue: ~\$300 billion/year.**

That last figure is the whole argument in one number: **pharma's annual research budget is larger than the entire global supplement industry's total revenue.** Not its research budget — its total sales, every product, every country, every year. That gap isn't a gap in scientific seriousness on either side; it's a gap in what's ownable.

A drug patent grants 20 years of exclusive sale rights, which is what makes a \$300M+ trial program financially rational — the company can recoup it, because nobody else can sell the same molecule during that window. A supplement made from a compound found in onion skins or apple peels can't be exclusively owned by anyone, so no company has the same incentive to fund the trial, no matter how promising the mechanism looks. This is true even when the supplement's mechanism is well-characterized at the cellular level — the missing piece isn't scientific curiosity, it's a business case.

This cuts against easy narratives on both sides. It's not that pharma is corrupt and supplements are pure — the supplement industry has its own profit incentives, inconsistent quality control, and marketing excess. It's that *neither* industry's evidence base is a clean signal of truth; both are shaped by what pays for the research. Pointing that out isn't anti-science. It's actually a more scientific position than either "trust the studies" or "trust the natural stuff" — because it asks what produced the studies in the first place.

Part 3: The Case Study — MCAS, Histamine, and the Missing Middle

This is where the abstract argument becomes concrete, because MCAS is a condition where **the asymmetry is visible on both sides at once.**

- **There is no FDA-approved drug for MCAS.** It's managed entirely off-label.
- **Cromolyn**, the one prescription drug built specifically as a mast cell stabilizer, has been approved for decades — and still has weak human efficacy data. Lab studies found it largely ineffective at inhibiting histamine release from human lung and intestinal mast cells. It persists in use less because of strong trial evidence and more because it's the only labeled option.
- **Quercetin**, the supplement most often used for the same mechanism, has only two human monotherapy trials — but one lab comparison found it outperformed cromolyn at blocking human mast cell mediator release in cell culture.
- **The common antihistamines** (loratadine, cetirizine, levocetirizine/Xyzal) *were* well-studied — decades ago, while they were still on-patent. That evidence base didn't disappear once they went generic, but new research investment did, because there's no longer a commercial return on asking further questions about drugs anyone can manufacture cheaply.

Put plainly: **nothing used to treat MCAS specifically is well-studied for MCAS specifically** — not the prescription option, not the supplement. The population is small, the condition is complex, and neither a patent-holder nor a supplement brand has the financial incentive to fund the kind of large trial that would settle the question. The confidence gap between "this is FDA-approved" and "this is just a supplement" is mostly a labeling and liability distinction, not a proof-of-efficacy distinction, in this specific condition.

Part 4: Root-Cause vs. Reactive Medicine — Why the Timing

Argument Gets Erased

The deeper issue isn't just which molecule gets studied — it's *when* medicine is designed to intervene. Root-cause approaches (gut permeability, histamine load, mast cell stability, nervous system regulation) aim to prevent the acute event. Pharmacological rescue (the “pharmacology of the land,” antihistamines, steroids, epinephrine) exists to manage the acute event once it's already happening.

These are not competing claims about the same moment — they're different moments in the same process. But because the acute-rescue side has the larger evidence base (built, again, on drugs old enough and profitable enough to have been trialed decades ago), it gets treated as *the* scientific position, while the preventive side gets treated as unscientific by comparison — even though the two are answering different questions. A stabilizing protocol that keeps someone out of the ER isn't in competition with the drugs used *in* the ER; discontinuing the former is what created the need for the latter, not evidence that the former was worthless.

This is the actual shape of what happened here: a maintenance protocol was working, got interrupted for financial/coverage reasons, and its absence produced the acute flare that then required the emergency pharmacology — which is a systems failure (insurance not covering preventive/root-cause care) wearing the costume of a “supplements don't work” story.

Part 5: Synthesis

Put the three parts together and the mechanism is simple:

1. **Patentability determines what gets a research budget.**
2. **Research budget determines what has “evidence” in the conventional sense.**
3. **“Evidence” gets treated as a proxy for truth, safety, and legitimacy — when it's really a proxy for what was profitable to test.**
4. **That confusion becomes rhetoric** (“there's no science behind that”) that sounds neutral but is actually inherited marketing language — first funded by whoever had the patent, then repeated in good faith by people who never chose it, including doctors and family members who genuinely believe they're being rational.

None of this requires believing every supplement works or that pharma is malicious. It requires separating two different questions that “is there science behind this” collapses into one: *does it work*, and *was it profitable enough to formally test*. Those questions have

different answers for almost everything discussed here, on both sides of the aisle.

Sources

Market and evidence data compiled from: Precedence Research, Fortune Business Insights, Persistence Market Research, Coherent Market Insights, Towards FnB, Business Research Insights, Statista, IntuitionLabs, ResearchAndMarkets, DataIntel, 24MarketReports, Data Insights Market, Mordor Intelligence, Global Growth Insights, Cognitive Market Research, Spherical Insights, Grand View Research, Verified Market Reports, IndexBox, PLOS One (Weng et al.), and PMC/NCBI clinical review articles. See the companion market-data report (allergy-mcas-industry-comparison.md) for the full side-by-side figures.