BATCH TEST LABORATORIES LIMITED

Independent Analytical Testing & Quality Verification

CASE STUDY 002

The Redemption Batch

The reship arrived. Every vial was tested again. Here is what the results said — including the numbers that missed the mark.

1. THE ARRIVAL

Case Study 001 ended with a promise pending. After three batches failed third-party identity testing in August 2026 — no identifiable peptide detected in any of them — our supplier committed to a reship via new logistics, with security seals and authentication caps. We recorded that account as what it was: their account, unattributed and unverifiable. What we could verify was the science. So we waited for the reship.

On 29 September 2026, four batches arrived from the supplier: BPC-157 10mg (BC10-20260929-01), TB-500 10mg (BT10-20260929-01), MOTS-C 40mg (MS40-20260929-01), and a BPC-157 + TB-500 blend (BB20-20260929-01). Two further batches joined the same testing run: a second MOTS-C 40mg, purchased separately from an alternate source to fulfil orders, and Retatrutide 60mg, which we tested for a third party as a paid service and did not sell.

The reship got no special treatment, favourable or otherwise. The same seven-point physical inspection. The same independent third-party laboratory. The same publication of results, whatever they turned out to be. That sameness is the entire point: a process that only publishes good news is not a testing process.

2. THE TESTING

All six batches passed the seven-point in-house inspection with no anomalies. Samples went to Uzorak, an independent laboratory in Zagreb, Croatia — the second approved laboratory in our rotation alongside Janoshik, and the laboratory that had already verified our first two green Certificates of Analysis in September. Results came back on 5–6 October 2026.

3. THE RESULTS

Every batch came back with peptide identity confirmed. Every verify link below is live and publicly checkable:

BPC-157 10mg	Identity confirmed. Purity 99.45%. Net content 12.36mg per vial against 10mg stated — over, as agreed. Report F72-330.
TB-500 10mg	Identity confirmed. Purity 98.81%. Net content 12.11mg per vial against 10mg stated — over, as agreed. Report H29-315.
MOTS-C 40mg	Identity confirmed. Purity 99.58%. Net content 37.83mg per vial against 40mg stated — 94.6% of stated, just under our 95% review threshold. The COA carries a REVIEW flag on that row, and the batch was accepted with the flag visible. Report Z40-270.
BPC-157 + TB-500 blend	Both components identified: BPC-157 10.03mg and TB-500 9.77mg, 19.80mg total against 20mg stated. The formal blend report gives identity and mass; Uzorak additionally confirmed by correspondence that the total peak area of both components in the raw chromatogram data is 98.74% — the blend purity figure ('purity' being a term laboratories avoid for blends). Report R87-162.

Batches outside the main-supplier agreement	Retatrutide 60mg (report P70-442): identity confirmed, purity 98.49%, net content 66.90mg against 60mg stated. Second MOTS-C 40mg (report T00-354): identity confirmed, purity 98.53%, net content 44.35mg against 40mg stated. Neither is covered by our main supplier's ≥99.0% agreement: the Retatrutide was tested for a third party as a paid service and none was sold by us; the MOTS-C was accepted as an order-fulfilment purchase from an alternate source.

All six reports are verifiable at uzorak.com/verify using the report IDs above: F72-330, H29-315, Z40-270, R87-162, P70-442, T00-354.

4. WHAT THIS PROVES — AND WHAT IT DOESN'T

Let us be precise, because precision is the whole brand.

Proven (Tier 0 — direct evidence): the four reship batches contain the named peptides, at or above stated mass, with purities from 98.81% to 99.58%. The new logistics chain, with its security seals and authentication caps, delivered genuine product this time. The August failures remain failures: those three batch designations stay retired, their red reports public, their verify links live.

Consistent with, but not proven (Tier 2 — attributed): our supplier's account that a freight forwarder intercepted and swapped the August shipment. A passing reship is what that account would predict — but a passing reship is also what a supplier who simply sent better product would produce. We cannot distinguish between the two, and we will not pretend to. What we hold the supplier to is not their story but their numbers.

5. THE AGREEMENT, MOVING FORWARDS

Out of this episode came a formal understanding with our supplier, recorded in correspondence:

• **Agreed numbers:** third-party purity of at least 99.0%, and net content at stated mass or above. These are the standards every future main-supplier batch will be held to.

• **Accountability, shown not told:** we issued our supplier a specimen document in our standard format showing exactly what happens when a future batch misses those numbers — immediate hold, no Certificate of Analysis, retired designation, published results, and a remedy: replacement or credit, with replacements re-tested from scratch. Our supplier has seen the red badge before anyone needed to wear it. That is what a quality agreement looks like when both sides intend to keep it.

• **Two laboratories, one standard:** Janoshik and Uzorak both perform our third-party verification. Independence is the point; the roster simply makes it harder to be unlucky twice.

6. THE LESSONS

Accountability works in both directions.

> The supplier replaced the goods, upgraded their logistics, and accepted a written standard for the future. None of that required threats — only published evidence and a clear process. Transparency did the negotiating.

'Presumed counterfeit pending verification' has an ending.

> We never called the August batches proven counterfeits, because we could not prove intent or origin. The reship doesn't retroactively prove anything either. But it does close the loop honestly: the failures were real, the remedy was real, and the replacement product is verified genuine.

Transparency about marginal results builds more trust than claims of perfection.

> The MOTS-C net content came in at 94.6% of stated — just under our review threshold. We could have buried that. Instead the COA carries a REVIEW flag, the acceptance basis is printed on the document, and this case study tells you about it. A testing company that only shows you its best days is a marketing company.

The process is the product.

> Reship, new supplier, alternate source — the process did not change. Same checks, same laboratories, same publication. When the only variable that changes between failure and recovery is the product itself, the process is doing its job.

7. WHERE THINGS STAND

The four reship batches are Complete: green Certificates of Analysis issued and publicly verifiable. The two alternate-source batches are likewise verified and accepted. The three August batches remain retired — their red reports stay published, because a testing history that deletes its failures is not a history.

Zero vials of the failed batches are in circulation. Several sealed units remain in our archive as teaching exhibits — physical reminders of the lesson that started this series: the container is not the contents.

Test everything. Publish everything. Let the results speak.

Correction, 1 Nov 2026: *this case study first said the Retatrutide 60mg batch was bought from an alternate source to fulfil orders. It was tested for a third party as a paid service, and none was sold by us. We correct our record in the open rather than editing it quietly. The results are unchanged.*