You can't argue with the numbers. And a number you can't argue with is the p-value, a number that instantly tells us whether effects are real or not. There's nothing like this in qualitative research. Instead they waste time thinking about their results, whereas us quantitative people have a simple and universal arbiter of truth.

And look at how good we are getting at excellent p-values with these data from PubMed of nearly 1 million p-values. Only 19% of results are not statistically significant, almost everything we trial is effective thanks to p-values. And we are brilliant at getting p-values just below the 0.05 threshold, not because we are endlessly re-analysing our data, oh no, it's because our years of experience mean we know what will work before we even run the experiment.

Does it matter than most researchers cannot correctly define a p-value or confidence interval? No. The system is more important than the persiflage of language. We'll leave that endless debate around wording and definitions to our qualitative colleagues.

We have amazing data displays that qualitative research does not. Look at the colours. 3d. Does it matter that you can’t see the result in the far corner? No! It’s a surprise, and what is life without surprises. Magnificent pie charts, 3d pie charts. We are literally in another dimension to our qualitative colleagues.

We have amazing new methods that our qualitative colleagues do not. Does it matter that most of them are not actually new, and were invented before anyone had heard the phrase "machine learning"? No. We are simply cleverer than are qualitative colleagues at branding, and that's born out in the funding. Simply add the phrase "machine learning" to your next grant application and watch what happens. Am I worried that people who don't understand a t-test are now using machine learning? No. These super "new" methods are so sophisticated that it does not matter if you don't understand them, they will still give great answers. And if they don't give great answers, there are literally hundreds of assumptions that you can tweak to get a better answer. Soon we will have conquered all non-significant p-values.

I say that you can't argue with the numbers, and we have lots of numbers. Here's a great example, presenting mean ages to two decimal places. Does it matter than the second decimal place is less than a week and is essentially a random number? No. Even though these 75 year olds have been on the planet for over 3,900 weeks, these researchers appreciate that every week counts.

And we are simply the best when it comes to the most highly cited papers. Here are the top most five cited papers of all time, each one a quantitative study, none a qualitative study, and there's not one in sight in the top 50 (I stopped looking after 50, us quantitative researchers are busy people). Does it matter that citations are a crude measure of quality that are often bland, field-dependent, error-prone, and can be manipulated? No. Because they are a number and the scientific community has agreed that citations measures quality, so there.

And we have the best journals. Here are the top five journals by impact factor, another fantastic number. All of them focused on quantitative research, not a qualitative journal in site. And the world’s best journal “Ca-A Cancer Journal for Clinicians” has in the last three years got 10 times more citations than all the qualitative journals put together. Just one quant journal beating all the qualitative journals. And does it matter that chasing journal impact factors have caused widespread gaming by researchers, editors and publishers, and has forced scientists to focus on work that's more citable regardless of its importance? No. Because we have a simple system, you get promoted because you managed to publish in "cell" and you don't get promoted because you published in "cells" with an 's'. Simples. We don't even need to read your papers to see what you did, saving time for everyone. What’s the promotion system in qualitative research? Nobody gets promoted because they’re working in qualitative research.

Quantitative researchers are smashing it in predictions models. We now have over 85,000 published prediction models. Soon every disease will have hundreds of prediction models; so the number of models is easily beating the number of diseases, that's progress. Even those diseases that are inherently stochastic and unpredictable, us quantitative people do not let that fact get in our way.

And what predictions do I have for quantitative research? I think we will embrace a robotic future whilst our qualitative colleagues continue to rely on the antiquated ideas of human thoughts and experience. And we are already leading the way. Here's the web site of an Australian HREC, you can see they recommend a tool to help you choose a test. Statoolio, what a great name. No need for any human statistician anymore. And what if they call it a static app instead of a statistics app? That does not matter, as soon there'll be no need for statisticians, whereas static will always be important. And does it matter that this tool gives the wrong advice about what tests to use? No. The wrong advice is now more popular than the right advice, hence the wrong advice is actually right.

And it was churlish of me to highlight a spelling mistake, because these mistakes are common. For example, here's a JAMA paper using "statically significant", and here's the trend in spelling errors showing the growing popularity of "statically significant". Is it a problem that we are literally seeing more casual inference rather than causal inference? No. This is the way language changes, for example "awful" used to have positive connotations as it meant something that filled you with awe. So these new phrases may now be classed as errors, but will soon be the norm and will likely be reinforced by the wonderfully derivative chatgpt. So I look forward to seeing more "reserach".

If you didn't like my support for quantitative research, then don't worry, I'm one of only a handful of statisticians left and I am well over half-way through my career. Soon you won’t have to even ignore my advice as it won’t even be there. Instead, we'll see the quantitative world driven forward by people with fresh ideas. Like surgeons who've read about statistics on the internet. Or possibly we'll even see statisticians replaced by the algorithms they invented. Chef's kiss. Meanwhile I will start my new career as a surgeon with no qualifications in surgery, fairs fair?