Defeating cancer requires more than one treatment method: An 8-year retrospective case series using multiple nutritional and herbal agents, 2014 update

© Colleen Huber, NMD

Naturopathic Medical Doctors of Arizona,
1250 E. Baseline Rd., Suite 205, Tempe, AZ 85283. USA.

There has been no financial support for this research. The author has received no funding, nor is affiliated with any industrial or commercial entity other than her own private medical practice.

December 28, 2014. This paper is an update of the 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 editions of this paper.

Abstract

INTRODUCTION: Research has shown that for cancer to occur in the body multiple normal functions must break down. Therefore multiple-component treatments may be the only successful way to treat cancer. We used well-tolerated natural substances to assess their usefulness in combination anti-neoplastic therapy. The following has been the goal of our clinic in treating cancer patients: It is not enough to repair genetic damage or to stop angiogenesis and neglect to reverse all other cancer-causing problems. It is also not enough to attack metastases and leave the primary tumor in a comfortable environment. In order to defeat cancer, it must be attacked at every level and with every method necessary to reverse cancer's multiple-layered assault on the body, even if that means that some of the various treatments have redundant effects. And this all must be accomplished while maintaining the maximum possible wellbeing of the patient, and without sickening or weakening the patient.

METHODS: We treated a total of 379 patients with cancer from October 2006, when we opened our practice, until July 1, 2014, when we stopped collecting data for this year's update of this paper, originally written in 2009. Data from all 379 patients who came to us with a diagnosis of cancer are included in this paper, excluding only those cancer patients who decided against further treatment after less than two weeks in our care. Patients' stage is recorded as the stage at first arrival to our clinic, which is not necessarily the stage when first diagnosed. We treated with natural methods alone, choosing among methods with research-established anti-neoplastic effect, both oral and intravenous, dietary and supplemented, nutritional and herbal, having a preference for those with high patient tolerance and compatibility, and varying with individual needs and tolerance, according to the standard naturopathic principle of "Treat the whole person."

FINDINGS: Many patients voluntarily left our practice, against our advice, primarily for financial reasons, while still having cancer. Of the remaining patients, 175 either went into confirmed, complete remission, which we define by no evidence of cancer remaining in the body on imaging, or have remained in good to excellent wellbeing, as determined retrospectively by prolonged stable health of at least 6 months after leaving our care and needing no other physician supervised cancer care, and as confirmed by annual telephone conversation with either the patient or a family member. Those patients in remission stayed in our care an average of 3.7 months; those who left, 2.7 months, (this data last measured in 2010). Eight additional patients went into remission after leaving our clinic, and while being treated at a different clinic, and it is unlikely that our treatments were the decisive factor in that remission. We were still treating 22 patients at July 1, 2014 plus giving ongoing maintenance treatments to some of those who are still in remission. 44 died while still our patients. Of those 44, 12 died after a significant dietary dispute with us. That is 32 patients died although they received our treatments and complied with our requested diet. 22 more were killed by hospital procedures and/or chemotherapy and/or radiation side effects while still our patients. 45 total patients chose to have chemotherapy while having our treatments. Yet, of the 175 who went into remission, only 12 had chosen to have chemotherapy while having our treatments. Stages 1, 2, 3 and early Stage 4 patients at start of treatment had much better outcomes than late Stage 4 patients in general.

INTERPRETATION: The 32 patients who complied with our dietary and treatment protocol, and still did not survive their cancers must be seen as an 8% failure rate if considered of all 379 patients, or a 15% failure rate if taken of the 210 patients who stayed to complete our treatments. Therefore, these treatment strategies are still not adequate to eliminate all patients' cancers and must be further developed. However, our success rate of 93% in steadfast patients following all protocols as recommended, from Stage I through early Stage IV (Table 5) is unprecedented and unequalled in both conventional and natural medicine in all clinics that report their results in detail as we do in this paper. There is also a 93% rate of sustained remission in individual patients who elect to follow our recommendation to have monthly follow-up treatments. 26 of those 28 patients are still in remission. (Table 9). 27 of those patients are alive and well (97%). Because of this consistent success in treating cancer since 2006, we believe that the experiences of over 300 cancer patients detailed below has demonstrated the need for simultaneous well-tolerated anti-neoplastic treatments, across all cancers and stages of cancer.

Introduction

Cancer treatment has been constrained by the prevailing view that a single agent must be isolated and tested for its either successful or failing role as the therapeutic agent to eliminate cancer. This viewpoint is disastrous for most patients, for the following reasons. Many agents are needed to fight cancer, primarily because it arises after several normal mechanisms break down, and because cancer preys on the body in numerous ways simultaneously, and because no single agent, whether chemotherapeutic or natural, has yet been found that has enough anti-neoplastic strategic effects to reverse all of those abnormalities in all patients, in effect, to be "the cure" for cancer. At our clinic in Tempe, AZ, USA we therefore simultaneously employ multiple naturally derived unpatented, and therefore inexpensive, substances for use in cancer patients.

Background

As John Boik has described, cancer becomes possible, and has its only opportunity to arise in the body, when seven different events, such as genetic damage, angiogenesis, immune system evasion, etc. all occur,[1] as listed below. Then, once established, cancer is adaptable enough to be able to thrive and grow with the continuation of just one or a few of those deviant events.

Boik describes the seven pro-cancer events as follows:

1) genetic instability or vulnerability to mutation, necessarily the first of the variety of events that lead to a tumor;
2) abnormal gene expression, in this case that produce proteins that facilitate cancer, or at least do not prevent it;
3) abnormal and autonomous cell signal transduction, which allows cancer cells to grow through self-stimulation rather than depending on growth factors from other cells;
4) Abnormal cell-to-cell communication, which sets a tumor apart from its neighboring cells metabolically, leaving the tumor in a position to ignore homeostatic mechanisms and, unlike cells throughout the rest of the body, to act in the best interests of the tumor rather than in the best interests of the organism.

5) Angiogenesis, the creation of blood vessels and resultant hoarding by the tumor of disproportionately large amounts of blood-borne molecules;
6) Invasion and metastasis, which not only results from the aggressive nature of the tumor, but also the low integrity (sometimes from previous injury), and too friable nature of the surrounding normal tissue and basement membranes;
7) Evasion of the immune system, which involves both camouflage functions and immune-disabling functions of cancer cells.

Once established in the body, cancer seems to have the ability to thrive and reproduce despite most of the efforts against it by chemotherapy oncologists, and without necessarily requiring all seven of the above pro-cancer events to still be in place. Therefore, without certain knowledge of the precise mechanisms governing any one patient's cancer, and without the luxury of time to learn of all those mechanisms in each individual patient, any therapy that targets fewer than those seven major disturbances leaves the body of the cancer patient potentially vulnerable to the disastrous result of allowing continued growth of existing tumors. Shortchanging the patient of a diverse range of available, effective, well-tolerated, well-targeted, compatible, complementary and feasible treatment options also would allow too many of the conditions to persist that gave rise to tumors previously and may do so again. This would leave fertile ground and pro-neoplastic conditions that produced the cancer in the first place. For this reason, successful cancer therapy should be multi-purposed and with multiple agents, many more than are now used with each patient by chemotherapy oncologists.

We have used natural therapies for cancer treatment, because they are well adapted for multi-agent use. Unrefined plant materials have tens of thousands or more phytochemical components, originally useful for protecting a plant from extreme or adverse conditions in its environment, and ultimately employed as described below by naturopathic physicians in adaptation to the needs of the human patient. The nutrients, each with a well-established role in the complex tapestry of metabolic pathways, serve to enable defensive functions of the body, such as strengthening, repair and immune activity. Licensed naturopathic physicians, because of thorough medical training, having more classroom hours and more than twice the number of courses in medical school as medical doctors[2], as well as extensive training in the use of natural agents, are well suited to choose appropriate combinations of natural therapies for the individual cancer patient. We also take advantage of the greater compatibility among natural substances than is possible with combinations of numerous pharmaceuticals. It seems obvious that a meal may contain many different foods without the need for conscious consideration of potential interactions among nutrients and plant molecules. In the same way, we have combined many different nutrients and plant materials in each cancer patient's treatment protocol, with regard for the specific cancer burden in the body, the origin of the cancer, the nature of that particular patient's cancer and any co-morbid conditions.

Materials and Methods

Dietary interventions are of the utmost importance in cancer therapy, especially keeping blood sugar low. The significant majority of research on the subject establishes a correlation between blood glucose and tumor growth. Using PET imaging preferentially for tumor evaluation,

clinicians make use of the fact that tumors take up blood glucose disproportionately over benign tissue, which implies an especially glucose-dependent metabolism in cancer cells.
Research has shown a correlation between blood sugar or glycemic load and cancer growth for pancreatic cancer,[3] [4] [5] [6] breast cancer,[7] [8] [9] [10] prostate cancer,[11] [12] gastric cancer, [13] [14] colorectal cancer,[15] [16] [17] [18] ovarian cancer,[19] [20] endometrial cancer,[21] [22] and liver and biliary tract cancers.[23] [24] Given all of this evidence, it would be reckless for a physician to allow a cancer patient to assume that sugar intake is harmless. We therefore ask all of our cancer patients to avoid sweeteners, such as sugar, honey, maple syrup, corn syrup, as well as fruit juices, because such foods tend to have the highest glycemic indices. Use of stevia is encouraged if and when a sweetener is desired. For the same reason, we asked patients to also limit other refined carbohydrates, specifically flour products. Whole natural foods: vegetables, fruits, whole grains, eggs, dairy and other animal proteins are encouraged as the entire diet, with the widest available variety in those groups. Many patients arrive to our clinic already consuming all of those types of foods. Some patients have chosen a vegan diet. Others have chosen an ovo-lacto-vegetarian diet. Many others are omnivores. We have not actively pushed our patients to one or the other of these diets, because we tried to maintain the primary dietary focus on the avoidance of sweeteners. Use of soy is discouraged because of its mineral-depleting and phytoestrogenic components, which in some studies has been linked to a possible association with cancer.

Of equal emphasis with diet are the intravenous nutrients that we administer three times per week to each cancer patient. These consist of high-dose intravenous vitamin C (ascorbic acid), as well as other nutrients chosen for specific anti-neoplastic effect with regard to the patient's type of cancer. For solid malignant tumors, we address the problem of pH, by infusing both sodium bicarbonate to alkalinize systemically, as well as other specifically anti-cancer nutrients, tailored to the individual patient's tumor load, type of cancer and other health circumstances. B vitamins and minerals and other nutrients are often added for synergistic effect with Vitamin C, or because of their history of reducing and eliminating tumors, or their usefulness in converting malignant tumors into benign tissue.

Naturopathic training emphasizes the treatment of the individual with regard to the entire symptom picture. Therefore, there is no specific formula to be repeated in a rigid way from one patient to the next, or even for the same patient from one day to the next. Quantities of the different components of this combination vary among individual patients depending on symptoms, signs and type of cancer. Quantities also vary as the patient's needs change. All components are kept far below the LD50 for each component, and are only administered if they have not produced any side effects in our patients.

Research has established that ascorbic acid taken orally cannot attain sufficiently high concentrations in the bloodstream to kill cancer cells.[25] [26] However, intravenous use of ascorbic acid has been shown to rise to concentrations that have killed cancer cells in vivo [27] [28] [29] and in vitro.[30] [31] [32] The ascorbic acid that we use is in much higher dose than would be tolerated orally, yet at a level where there is sufficient concentration of vitamin C in the bloodstream to create a substantial concentration of the products of vitamin C in the extracellular fluid.[33] Intravenous doses of ascorbic acid have been found to produce from 25 to 70 times as much plasma concentration as may be attained by oral dosing.[34] Research has confirmed that Vitamin C in such high concentration kills cancer cells while leaving normal tissue unharmed.[35] [36] Indeed the

cancer patients whom we treat do not have side effects from these treatments, with few exceptions. Three of the exceptions were allergies to specific B vitamins in three individuals. Two of the three went into remission after we had removed the offending agent early on.

In addition to this directly and selectively cytotoxic effect on cancer cells, vitamin C has been shown to form collagen[37] and to inhibit hyaluronidase[38] leading to stronger membrane integrity and tensile strength[39] of normal tissue, which inhibits invasion[40] and thus metastases.

Empirical data shows an inverse correlation between vitamin D intake and cancer incidence.[41] [42] [43] Research over the last decade has confirmed the essential role that Vitamin D plays in cancer prevention and treatment.[44] [45] [46] [47] Vitamin D has been shown to induce differentiation,[48] and apoptosis,[49] to reduce proliferation by effect on signal transduction,[50] to improve intercellular communication by means of gap junction communication preservation,[51] to inhibit angiogenesis,[52] [53] and to inhibit metastasis.[54] At our clinic, most cancer patients are prescribed a regular dose of Vitamin D3 that is compatible with customary sunlight exposure, current pharmaceuticals if any, as well as the assessed condition of the liver and gallbladder and calcium metabolizing mechanisms.

Vitamin A is a less-widely appreciated but quite crucial part of the treatment protocol for its immune-stimulating property[55] and inhibition of cancer cell migration[56]. Another very important quality of Vitamin A with regard to neoplastic cells is its ability to introduce differentiation.[57] [58] It has also been shown to induce apoptosis in cancer cells,[59] as well as growth inhibition.[60] Although there have been some objections made to Vitamin A for an allegedly competitive and detrimental effect to vitamin D,[61] vitamin A seems to be vindicated by a preponderance of older research that supports the use of vitamin A and vitamin D dosed together.[62] [63] [64]

We frequently add the recommendation to take Essiac tea (Resperin Canada Limited, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada), because of its long history in North America, over most of the last century of folk use (outside of conventional medicine) against a wide variety of cancers. Essiac was developed by a Canadian nurse, René Caisse, together with the Ojibwe people of Canada. It is a combination of four herbs, Arctium lappa, Rheum palmatum, Rumex acetosella, and Ulmus fulva. Later versions of Essiac, using additional herbs with some pro-estrogenic effect, have been linked to breast tissue proliferation,[65] and we do not recommend those altered formulas. Essiac has been found to have in vitro cytotoxic effects specifically against neoplastic cells, without damage to normal cells.[66] Its main effect seems to be protective against DNA damage.[67] It also seems to have anti-proliferative effect.[68]

For some of our patients, we have also used digestive enzymes apart from meals, for a presumed proteolytic effect against tumors. Various digestive enzymes, and bromelain in particular, have been found to heighten immune system response to cancer [69] [70] and to inhibit metastasis.[71] [72]

For different cancers there are additional appropriate treatments. For example, Kenneth Proefrock NMD has done extensive original work with nebulizers, as well as in many other areas of medicine, which he taught us to use with lung cancer patients, as well as others with metastases the lungs, to good effect.[73] Whereas all of the rest of our treatments arrive to the lungs by way of the bloodstream, Dr. Proefrock has introduced such nebulized botanicals and

nutrients as required by the individual patient by way of the airways, thus carrying anti-neoplastic treatments to lung tissue via its other major port of entry.

Findings

Of the 379 cancer patients whom we have treated long-term, all came to us with a diagnosis of cancer from another physician, none originally diagnosed by us. Those who are reported below stayed for at least two weeks in our care, including the use of intravenous anti-neoplastic nutrients. As of June 30 of each year, we stopped collecting data for that year, and we began annual telephone outreach to all of the surviving patients who have been diagnosed with cancer, and who have stayed at least two weeks in our care. Those results are reported below. Since we began collecting this data for the 2009 edition of this paper, automated telephone dialing seems to have become more pervasive in the United States, and the public's defense against such frequent interruptions have become more varied and creative. Therefore, it is now harder to reach our patients and their families. If a patient was referred by another, sometimes we have to return to the source of the referral for updated information. Of the 379 individual patients meeting the above criteria, 44 have died of cancer while still our patients under our care, and of those 44, 12 did not comply with our main dietary advice to avoid sweeteners. Therefore, 44 – 12 = 32 patients died while under our care and complying with all of our protocols. 175 have gone into complete remission or assumed complete remission, substantiated by PET/CT or other imaging, and/or biopsy, and/or stable good health for at least 6 months after stopping our treatments.

Specific results are shown in Table 1. A summary is shown in Table 2.

Table 1: Outcomes of naturopathic treatment of 379 cancer patients

Patient #s assigned for reporting purpose only (referred to by name only in clinic)	**Stage** at start of treat-ment If a med. onco-logist said 'no hope of recovery regard-less of treat-ment' (NHR)	**Type** of cancer	**Conventional therapies** also used during our treatments: Chemotherapy (C) Radiation(R) Surgery (Su) Prior chemotherapy but still had tumor load after chemotherapy (PC) Prior radiation (PR); Prior surgery (PS)			**Final result**: Evidence of no active cancer after our treatment, (R). If we later learn that cancer later recurred, it is indicated below. Assumed remission after long time well (AR) Proven reduced tumor load but not remission (Red), Proven increased tumor load (Inc), New metastases (Met) Tumor softened (Sof) Death (D), Death after dietary dispute (DDD) Left (L) Left against medical advice (L AMA) Our treatments had no apparent effect (NOFX) Could not afford to continue treatments long enough (No$) No further information (NFI) Still treating (Current)	**Quality of Life at end of treatment** Improved (Imp) Worsened (Wor) High-functioning, meaning easily performing activities of daily living, both at home and away (HF) High- functioning with Exercise (HFwE) Same from beginning to end of treatment (Sa) Patient is employed (Job)
			C	**R**	**Su**		
1	4	neuro-endocrine tumor	No	No	No	Dietary dispute; tumor is slow-growing.	HFwE/Sa
2	1	prostate	No	No	No	R x 4 years	Feeling fine/Job
3	3	breast	No	No	No	R NFI	HF/Job
4	2	liver	No	No	No	Red, L AMA, NFI	HFwE/Sa
5	1	breast	No	No	Yes	Red, Sof, L AMA –No$ D, 1 year after leaving	HF/Wor
6	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Job
7	4	testicular teratoma	No	No	Yes	R x 2 years; recent recurrence	Was HFwE/Job; recurrence was fast
8	1	breast	No	No	No	L AMA, NFI	HF/Sa
9	1	breast	No	No	Yes	Uncertain; conflicting results on imaging, L AMA, NFI	HF
10	4	breast	No PC	No	Yes	R, NFI	Sa
11	1	prostate	No	No	No	R. NFI	HFwE/Sa/Job
12	1	breast	No	No	No	AR. Red, Sof, L, NFI	HFwE/Sa
13	1	basal cell ca	No	No	No	Waiting to know results	HF/Sa
14	1	MGUS	No	No	No	R, then labs worsened months after tx	Yet strength stayed up after tx, Imp
15	4 NHR	pancreatic	PC	PR	PS	NOFX, D	Arrived very sick, very late, severe pain
16	1	prostate	No	No	No	R x 7 years	HFwE/Sa

17	4	colon	No	No	No	L after 3 txs → NFI	Unsure of how to proceed
18	Un-known	prostate	No	No	No	We referred to another clinic for staging.	"Still working on it."
19	4 NHR	breast	No	No	Yes	Sof; rare allergy to txs. →L → radiation tx, NFI	Sa
20	4	breast	PC	PR	PS	No $ → L AMA	"doing okay"
21	4 NHR	breast	PC	PR	PS	Gave up on txs, L AMA D	Too sick to come in; house calls only 3x
22	4 NHR	prostate	No	No	No	R. NFI	HFwE/Job
23	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R. NFI	HFwE/Job
24	4 NHR	breast	No	No	PS	NOFX, D	Arrived very sick, late
25	3	breast	No	No	PS	Now growth of atypical cells in other breast, L AMA	HFwE/Job
26	4 NHR	breast	No	Yes	No	NOFX → L → radiation → died	Arrived very late.
27	1	mesothe-lioma	Yes	No	No	Inc., L, then 1 mo, then DDD	Wor
28	1	prostate	No	No	No	R elsewhere	HF/Sa
29	2	lung	No	No	No	R x years. Now battling Valley Fever.	HFwE/Job
30	2	Hodgkins lymphoma	No	No	No	AR. L, then one year,, then 6 mos chemo, then R, NFI	HF, Imp, then Wor after dietary difference
31	3	breast	No	No	Yes	Red, Sof, dispute over txs and diet, Lama, DDD	No tx for 1 yr after large mass found
32	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R x 4 years, although eating sugar	HFwE/Job
33	2	breast	No	Yes	PS	Uncertain results→ L AMA → decided to get chemo → now St 4	"Not so good now"
34	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Sa/Job
35	4	breast	No	No	No	2 weeks of treatment → L AMA → NFI	Very ill on arrival; unsure of how to proceed
36	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R, then EtOh and sugar, then recurrence → mastectomy	HFwE/Sa
37	3	breast	No	No	Yes	AR	HFwE/Sa
38	3	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF/Sa
39	4 NHR	SCC	No	No	No	L before remission→ several months→ D	HFwE/Sa
40	1	parotid adenoma	No	Yes	Yes	R	HFwE/Sa
41	3	breast	No	No	Yes	AR. NFI	HF/Sa
42	3	breast	No	No	No	R	HF/"always busy"
43	3	lung	No	No	No	L after strong dietary dispute, then 1 mo, then, DDD, L AMA	Sa
44	3	colon	No	No	Yes	L AMA, NFI	Sa

45	4	lymphoma	No	No	No PS	Red, then left to do chemo→ 5 rds→D	Imp till chemo, then worsened quickly
46	4	breast	No	No PR	No PS	R	HF/Sa
47	4	breast	No	No	No	L after a few weeks, D	Sa
48	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Job
49	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R x 6 years	HFwE/S/Job Diet dispute → tumor returned → more treatments → in Remission again
50	4	prostate	PC	PR	No	Only 10 treatments, L AMA, D	Sa
51	4	lung	No	No	No	R x 2 yrs, then recurred, then no treatment at all, then D	Imp/Job
52	4	bladder	No	No	No	R	HFwE/Sa, in her nineties
53	1	prostate	No	No	No	AR. NFI.	Imp
54	1	prostate	No	No	No	AR, NFI	HF/same
55	2	lung	No	Yes	No	R, then radiation, then radiation poisoning, then fall, then broken hip, then D.	Wor from radiation treatments; D of fall and broken hip after Remission
56	2	colon	Yes	No	No PS	R, ate sweets, recurrence, No$ → went to chemo → just finished	Recuperating from chemo
57	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R, but lymphedema after all lymph resected	HFwE/Sa/Job
58	4 NHR	lung	No	No	No	L AMA-No$, then 2 mos. Then D	HF/same
59	1	SCC	Yes	No	No	R	HF
60	4 NHR	rectal	No	Yes	Yes	L AMA after a few txs; D	Arrived very sick, very late; left early
61	4	lung; mets to brain	No	No	No	Of 8 brain tumors, 5 eliminated in treatment. Then L AMA. Then some months. Then D	Imp; HF/Job
62	2	brain	No	No	No	R. NFI.	HFwE/Job
63	4	prostate	No	No	No	Improved, then L AMA Then several months, then D	Impr.
64	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE (15 mi bike rides)/ Sa
65	4	SCC of the throat	No PC	No PR	No PS	L AMA due to no $	Imp/ HFwE
66	2	breast	No	No	No	AR. Current	Imp; HFwE
67	4	breast	No	No	No	L AMA	HF/Sa
68	2	CLL	No	No	No	Mixed results. Current.	Numbers worsened during our treatment, but all symptoms and strength improved.

69	4	CLL and SCC	PC	No	No	R from CLL; then dispute over tx, then Lama, then D of SCC.	Imp, then dispute, then Wor
70	3	lymphoma	No PC	No	No	R	Imp; HFwE
71	1	MGUS	No	No	No	Current	HF
72	4	prostate	No PC	No PR	No PS	NOFX, D	Arrive very sick, very late; Sa
73	4	stomach	No PC	No	No	AR, NFI	Imp, but improved more after surgery
74	4	breast, infl.	No PC	No	No PS	NOFX, D	Pt did most but not all of our recommended treatments
75	1	Waldenstrom's lymphoma	No	No	No	Numbers go up and down with allergens, but much better strength now	Imp mostly; strenuous exercise. Recreational travel.
76	2	lymphoma	No	No	No	AR, NFI	Imp
77	4 NHR	breast	No PC	No PR	No PS	Had 4 txs, then L AMA, then D	Arrived very sick, late
78	1	rectal	No	Yes	No	Dispute about how to treat. L AMA. Tumor shrunk and grew with irritation; average same size; then chemo →D	HFwE/same
79	4 NHR	Breast and NET	No PC	No PR	No PS	We eliminated all distal metastases Current	Imp; out of wheelchair, out of walker, off oxygen, now exercising
80	4 NHR	lung	No	No	No	Stable cancer D of pneumonia	Weak; Same, but died of pneumonia
81	4 NHR	small cell lung	No PC	No	No	L AMA, NFI	HF/Job
82	4	esophageal	Yes	No	No	Only 1 treatment per month; only having treatment in order to endure chemotx	Same; Red
83	4	breast, 4th recur.	No, PC	No PR	No PS	R, then alleged recurrence and several years of chemo→ D	HFwE/Job/same
84	1	squamous cell	No	No	Yes	R, but now eating sugar again	HF/Job/Same
85	1	breast	No	No	No	L AMA, NFI	HFwE/same
86	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R x 4 years	HFwE/same
87	1	thyroid	No	No	No	R x 4 years	Concurrent Lyme Disease
88	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R, NFI	HFwE/Sa/Job
89	4	SCC	No	No	No PS	L AMA → D	HF/Sa
90	1	breast	No, PC	No PR	No PS	R x 5 years	HF/Sa/Job
91	1	breast	No PC	No PR	No PS	AR; currrent	HFwE

92	1	breast	No	No	Yes	L AMA→ chemo → ca has recurred 3x since.	Imp, then wor since chemo
93	1	testicular	Yes	No	Yes	R; L AMA → had chemo; NFI	HF
94	1	prostate	No	No	No	L AMA. PSA rose <1, but back pain improved	HF; mixed results
95	4 NHR	kidney	No	No	No	L AMA-No$, NFI, then 1.5 years, no other treatment, then D	HF/Sa
96	4	colon	Yes	No	No	L AMA, NFI	Sa
97	4	colon	No PC	No PR	No PS	Had a few txs; L AMA due to no $ → a few months → D	HFwE during treatments
98	4 NHR	ovarian	No	No	No	L AMA, then 2 mo, gave up, then D	Entered very ill, same
99	4	uterine	No	No	Yes	R	Zumba, yoga, very active
100	4	prostate	No	No	No	L AMA due to no $	Imp
101	3	squamous cell tongue	No	No	No PS	L AMA, DDD; very strong dietary dispute	Imp, then Wor
102	1	lymphoma	Yes	No	No	AR, then was forced by family into chemotherapy against patient's wishes. NFI	Imp, responded immediately to natural treatments; all lymph nodes down to normal prior to L
103	3	uterine	No	No	Yes	AR	HFwE
104	4	ovarian	No, PC	No	Yes	R, then recurrence, then resumed tx → L AMA → a few months → D	Imp,Wor, Imp L AMA
105	4	breast	PC	PR	PS	L AMA; No $ → only occasional treatment	HF; on an aromatase inhibitor
106	1	breast	No	No	No PS	R x 4 years	HFwE/Job/Sa
107	4	Lynch Syndrome: colon, ovarian, uterine cancers; all primary	No, PC	No	No, PS	R. NFI	Imp
108	1	glioblastoma	No	No	No	L AMA. Planned surgery and NFI	Imp
109	4 NHR	esophageal	No	No	No	L after 3 weeks; NFI	Wor
110	2	uterine	No	No	Yes	R x 4 years	HFwE/Imp/Job
111	4	Gastroeso-phageal junction	No	No	Sten t only	L AMA → D	Arrived sick
112	4 re-curred NHR	ovarian	No PC	No	Yes	Stopped treatment at worst possible time, much too early L AMA → D	Imp significantly to HFwE/Job; then stopped treatment against clinic advice; then Wor significantly

113	4 NHR; several dozen mets from neck to feet	colon	Yes	No	Yes	D from chemotherapy side effect.	Only 3 of our treatments. Improved; went back for more chemo → D
114	1	CLL	No	No	No	AR, L with no lymphadenopathy, borderline leukocytosis	HFwE/Sa/Job 71yo, bikes miles, hand built cabin
115	4	prostate	No	No	No	R	HFwE/Imp/Job
116	2 NHR	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/ Sa
117	1 NHR	lung	No	Yes	No	R, then D of Pulm fibr, not lu ca	Wor from pulm fibrosis not ca
118	2 NHR	vulvar	No PC	No	No	Strong dietary dispute. L AMA, then 2 mo, then no treatment, then DDD	Wor from chronic antibiotic resistant infection
119	4 NHR	neuro-endocrine	No PC	No PR	No	NOFX, A few weeks, then D	Very sick; widely metastasized on arrival.
120	4	lymphoma	Yes	No	No	R, then recurrence, now uncertain status	HFwE/Sa/Job; hikes Grand Canyon
121	4	lung	No	No	No	L AMA	Imp
122	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	Sa
123	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF “very active”
124	4 NHR	GIST	Yes	No	No	D	Came in with huge tumor load; metabolic activity of cancer decreased. Wor from complications, ascites and chemotherapy.
125	3 NHR	cervical	No	No	No	R x 6 years	HFwE/Sa/Job
126	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R, after short treatment	HFwE/Sa/Job
127	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Sa/Job
128	4	pancreatic	No	No	No	L AMA, due to no $ for treatment → D	Imp
129	4	ovarian and breast	No	No	Yes	L AMA. NFI → D	Imp., HF/Sa
130	2 NHR	lung	No	No	No	Red, Met, then L AMA, then 6 months, then D	HF/Sa
131	4	prostate	Yes	Yes	No	R, then family bullied into conventional tx. L AMA. NFI.	Imp then L AMA, then Wor
132	2	squamous cell tongue	No	No	No	L AMA to have radiation, then NFI	Wor/HFwE/Job
133	4 NHR	breast	Yes	Yes	Yes	L AMA to have chemotherapy, then 1 mo, then D	Same; severe lymphedema
134	2	breast	No	No	No	R	HFwE/Sa/Job

135	4	ovarian and peritoneal	No	No	Yes	R x 3 years, then recurrence	HFwE/Imp
136	4	breast	No, PC	No, PR	Yes	L AMA-No$, NFI, then chemo, then 3mos then D	HF/Sa. Until L AMA, then chemo, then Wor, then D
137	4 NHR	breast	No	No	Yes	R x 5 years	HFwE in her 70's/Sa/horseback riding; then hip replacement; now recuperating
138	1	colorectal	No	Yes	No	L AMA for other alternative therapy. R	HFwE/Sa
139	4	lymphoma	No PC	No PR	No PS	Stable through months of treatment. Then L AMA	Sa
140	4 NHR	liver	No	No	No	L AMA after a few weeks → D	Arrived very late, very sick. Had refused dialysis, despite urgent need
141	4 NHR	melanoma	No	No	No	Decided against any tx. L AMA for hospice, then 1 month, then D	Arrived very late, very sick, huge tumor burden
142	4	multiple myeloma	Yes	No	No	R after adipose stem cell therapy; recurrence	HFwE and travel, Sa; now recuperating from bone marrow transplant
143	4	breast	No	No	No	Pt was treated briefly, then decided against all recommended txs. Even though insurance covered them → 1 year → D	Sa
144	4 NHR	bladder	No, PC	No	No, PS	R Critical electrolyte levels after K+ regulation destroyed and much kidney tissue destroyed from no fluids given in hospice → D	Entered very ill from hospice; greatly improved, regained consciousness, w/E. No cancer found on MRI one day before death
145	4	lymphoma	No	No	No	R; NFI	Sa/job/travel
146	1	cervical	No	No	Yes	R x 6 years	HFwE/job, Imp
147	4	testicular	No	No	Yes	L AMA after seldom treatments → cancer progressed	Got weaker, sicker
148	4	breast	No PC	No	Yes	Current	HF Sa
149	2	gastric	Yes	Yes	No	L AMA; R	Weak, sick, then recovered, then back to HF/Job
150	4	breast	No	No	No	R x 4 years	Imp; HFwE/ strenuous Job

151	4	lymphoma	Yes	No	No	AR. Then chemo→ recurrence. Now we are treating again. Current.	Imp during treatments. Then Wor during chemo. Now Imp again; HFwE
152	1	lung	No	No	No	R. Then stopped treatment, then MI, then D	Imp
153	1	prostate	No	No	No	R	Imp; HFwE/Job
154	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R x 4 years	HF/Sa/Job
155	1	prostate	No	No	No	R	Imp
156	1	breast	No	Yes	Yes	R, then recur, then R	HFwE/Sa/Job
157	4 NHR	lymphoma	No	No	No	NOFX, D from concurrent liver disease	Pt arrived very sick, very late; liver was mostly non-functioning from late-stage cirrhosis
158	4	melanoma	No	No	Yes	L AMA; long distance patient returned home	Sa
159	3	non small cell lung	No	No	No	D unexpectedly; no cause reported	HFwE/Job
160	2	colon	No	No	PS	R	HF/Sa
161	4 NHR	brain	No	No	No	No $, no insurance. L after a few treatments, then D	Arrive very sick, very late
162	2	esophageal	No PC	No PR	No PS	L AMA. NFI	HF with controlled pain
163	4 NHR	pancreatic	No PC	No PR	No PS	NOFX, L, then 2 months, then D	Pt arrived very sick, very late
164	4	breast	No	No	No	Interrupted tx repeatedly, when consistency was advised; L AMA, NFI	Wor
165	4 NHR	esophagus	No PC	No	No	Strong dispute over diet, then L, then hospital, then DDD	Imp, then Wor
166	1	prostate	No	No	No	R. NFI	HF/Sa/Job
167	2	breast	No	No	PS	Uncertain results	HF/Sa
168	4	breast	No, PC	No, PR	No PS	A few weeks of treatments. Then collapsed veins, could not receive treatments, then L, then D	Imp, then Wor
169	4 NHR	pancreatic	No	No	No	L AMA, went to another clinic, then D	Sa
170	4 NHR	prostate	No	No	No	Imp, from hospice to outpatient, then L AMA, then 1 mo. Then D	Imp. Then Wor
171	2	lung	No	No	No	AR → still smoked → recurred →D	HFwE/travel/Sa till recurrence

172	4 NHR	colon	No	No	Yes	L AMA, then barbiturate overdose, then D	Imp, then left, then Wor, then Hospital
173	1	ovarian	No	No	Yes	R with only a few of our treatments. We likely deserve no credit for this.	HFwE/ Strenuous job
174	2	prostate; renal cell ca	No	PR	PS	R, stopped Lupron; PSA rose <1.	HFwE/Job
175	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Job
176	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R with only a few of our treatments. We likely deserve no credit for this.	HFwE, Job
177	2	ovarian	No PC	No	Yes	R, then dietary dispute, then recurrence → DDD	Imp, HF w/E, Job, then Wor
178	4	prostate	No	No PR	No PS	L AMA after a few weeks → chemo; MI during chemo; waiting for results	No HFwE
179	4 NHR	glioblastoma	No	No	No PS	D	Imp, then Wor
180	4	breast	No	No	No	Refused most natural treatments offered; waiting for results	Imp
181	1	prostate	No	No	No	R	HFwE/Sa/Job
182	4	breast	No	No	No	Lama after 2 weeks; NFI	Sa
183	4 NHR	ovarian	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE in 80's
184	4	breast	No, PC	Yes	Yes	Inc (while improving stamina), Met, radiation →D	Imp/HFwE (intense exercise), 69 yo then radiation then rapidly Wor, then died
185	1	prostate	No	No	No	AR	HFwE/Sa/Job strenuous. 70 hrs wk in his 70's.
186	1	prostate	No	No	No	R	HF/Sa
187	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE
188	4	colon	No	No	No PS	R	HF/Sa/retired
189	4	colon	No PC	No	No PS	R x 4 years	Imp HFwE/Job
190	2	breast	Yes	No	Yes	Red, then disa-greement about diet, then Inc, Met, L AMA, then 12 mos, then D	Wor
191	4	prostate	No	No	No	R, PSA from >100 to <6. NFI.	Imp; well
192	4	breast	No PC	No PR	No PS	L AMA → went to chemotherapy → D	Arrived very sick

193	4	breast, inflam	No	No PR	Yes	Skin metastases were resistant to treatment, then improved, LAMA, then worsened months after treatments → D	Active/Job, till sudden flaring of inflammatory br ca
194 J	4	lung	No	No	No	L AMA → on chemotherapy	NFI
195	4	tongue	PC	PR	PS	Blood glucose went 170 to 400's from hospital treatment between consults with us => D suddenly of DM2	Died of diabetes mellitus
196	1	multiple myeloma	No	No	No	R, then recent elevated blood labs	Never much improvement in fatigue
197	3	prolympho-cytic leukemia	No	No	No	R Pt left to have chemotherapy → Now in remission.	Pt stayed miserable with extreme relentless muscle pain; our treatments had no effect. Now feeling great and working again
198	4	breast	No	No	No PS	L AMA, NFI	Sa
199	1	breast	No	No	Yes	AR; NFI	HFwE/Sa/Job
200	1	prostate	Yes	No	No	No$ for tx → chemo; waiting for results	Strong until chemo
201	4	colon	No	No	Yes	R, then >1 year, NFI, then D	HF/Imp during treatment
202	1	thyroid	No	No	No	R	Imp, Job, HFwE
203	1	colon	No	No	No PS	R x 4 years	HF/Job
204	4; 36 bone mets. at start of treat-ment	lung	Yes	Yes	No	NOFX, D	Wor. Neither chemotherapy nor our treatments worked for this patient.
205	2	breast	Yes	No	Yes	No insurance → few treatments → L AMA → on chemotherapy → feeling sick	Wor
206	4 NHR	liver and colon	No	No, PR	No PS	L AMA, NFI	Imp
207	4 NHR	squamous cell tongue	No	No	No	Red, L AMA, then 3 months, then D	Imp, and speaking again, then Wor, then left, then died
208	4 NHR	prostate	Yes	Yes	Yes	L AMA, NFI	Close to death at time of 1st visit, then 2 treatments, then improved, then left.
209	4	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF

210	4 NHR	liver	No PC	No PR	No PS	Red, Wor, L AMA, then D	Wor from rapid tumor breakdown, without adequate elimination, left
211	2	breast	No	No	PS	R	HFwE, Job
212	4	liver	No	No	No	L AMA due to family pressure → no tx →D	Imp
213	1	breast	Yes	Yes	Yes	R	HFwE, Job
214	4	breast	Yes	No	No PS	R Then more chemo→ D	Sa
215	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	Mostly feeling good
216	4	prostate	No	No	No	Current	Sa, HFwE, bench presses 200 lbs in his 70's.
217	1	colon	No	No	No	R Most treatments at a different clinic	HFwE
218	4 NHR	squamous cell in throat	No	No	No	R Then dietary dispute, then recurrence and L AMA → DDD	HFwE/Sa
219	2	lymphoma	No	No	No	Dramatic improvement from 1st treatment, then family dispute, then left	Imp
220	4 NHR	lymphoma	No PC	No	No	Strong dispute over course of treatment; L AMA →2 months, then D	L. Then 2 months, then infection, then D of infection
221	4 NHR	ovarian	PC	PR	PS	Red, then L AMA, then Inc. Then chemo → D	Worse after L AMA
222	4NHR	pancreatic	No	No	No	Not a candidate for Whipple; well for months; AR. Then L AMA, then recurred widespread → D	Imp. Red. HFwE/Sa/Job; "Feeling great" before L AMA
223	4 NHR	breast	No	Yes	No	Rx 2 yrs, then recurrence to bones; Then radiation AMA→ radiation poisoning →D quickly after radiation	Imp HF/Job, then Wor from radiation
224	4	sarcoma	No PC	No	Yes	Current	Worse after invasive procedures
225	4 NHR	ovarian	No PC	No PR	Yes	R, L AMA-No$, then same for 6 months, then weaker, then surgical complications from double colostomy, then D	Low functioning; ill and weak. Arrived after several years of low dose chemo.
226	3	liver	No	No	No	R, then D from complications from liver burden	HFwE, then Wor
227	4 NHR	lung	No	No	No	L AMA after 2 weeks; NFI	Very weak; arrived late; Sa
228	1	breast	No	No	No	R x 5 years	HF/Sa/Job

229	1	breast	No PC	No	No PS	R for years. Then recurred. Now radiation.	HFwE Sa/Job; then hiked Grand Canyon
230	4	ALL leukemia	No PC	No	No	R x 4 years	Imp, HFwE
231	4	lung	No	No	No	L AMA → uncertain outcome	Arrived sick; Sa
232	4	lung	Yes	Yes	Yes	L AMA → D	Did not seem interested in any txs.
233	1	lymphoma	No	No	No	Very few treatments. L AMA. NFI	
234	4	breast	No	No	No	AR	Sa
235	4	breast	No	No	Yes	Current	Imp
236	2	colorectal	No	No	No	Treated for 3 weeks → L AMA → taking hemp → uncertain outcome	Sa
237	4 NHR	breast	No	No	No	D	Arrived very late, very advanced; our treatments did not help
238	4	breast	No PC	No	No PS	L AMA → went to a different clinic	Feeling well
239	1	squamous cell	No	No	No PS	R	HFwE, Sa
240	4	Hodgkins lymphoma	No PC	No	No	Left to have chemotherapy. NFI	HFwE, Imp
241	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF
242	3	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF/Job
243	1	prostate	No	No	Yes	R	Same
244	1	brain	No	No	No	R x 5 years	HFwE/Sa/Job
245	3	breast	No	Yes	Yes PS	R, then 2 years, then recurrence, then lumpectomy. R again	Imp, HFwE/Sa
246	3	colon	Yes	No	Yes	Red by 80%, L then 2 mos D from surgical complications	Imp
247	1	thymus	No	No	Yes	R Then years. Then recurred→ no tx→ D	HFwJob, travel
248	3	thyroid	No	No	Yes	AR. NFI	Sa
249	1	squamous cell	No	No	No	L AMA due to no $ after only 2 weeks. Then went to do chemotx and radiation. Now R	Sa
250	4 NHR	cervical, recurred to colon before starting our treatments	No	No	No PS	NOFX, D	Wor. Cancer did not respond to our treatments
251	2	colon	No	No	Yes	R. NFI	HF, Job

252	4	ovarian	Yes	No	PS	L AMA	Did well during treatments. Then NFI. Now in hospice
253	4 NHR	Unknown origin	No PC	No PR	No	D	Arrived very sick, very late
254	2	multiple myeloma	No	No	No	L AMA, then 2 years then D	Same
255	4	NHL	Yes	No	No	Natural treatments alone shrunk tumor 84%, but then persuaded to start chemo → then cancer resisted, then grew.	Walked 2 mi/day prior to chemo. Then chemo. Now very sick, hospice.
256	4	pancreatic	No PC	No PR	No PS	AR, but with damage to lung from cancer and repeated thoracentesis. Then 1 year, then D in sleep.	HF w daily walks till end.
257	4	NHL	No	No	No	L AMA. NFI	Sa
258	1	pancreatic	No PC	No	No PS	R, then 2 months, then DDD	HFwE
259	4	breast	No PC	No	No PS	Imp, then Wor, L AMA to have chemotx. AR. NFI	HFwE; ran or walked 2 mi/day while on our txs.
260	4 NHR	mediastinum	No	No	No	Imp, then went hiking, had MI → D	HFwE
261	1	prostate	No	No	No	L AMA. Had MI. R	HFw E/Job again after MI. "Now healthier than in the last 10 years."
262	4 NHR	gastric	No PC	No	No	NOFX, L then 1 mo, then D	Came from hospice, Sa, then Wor, then hospital, then D Cancer did not respond to our treatments.
263	4	breast	No	No	No PS	AR, then 2 months, then bone mets, then D	HFwE during treatment. 2 mos later, bone mets, Wor.
264	4 NHR	pancreatic	No, PC	No	No	Red, then disa-greement about diet, then Inc, DDD	Imp then Wor
265	4	lymphoma	No	No	No	L AMA; chose chemotherapy instead → D	Imp in our care
266	4NHR	breast	No	No PR	No PS	AR NFI	HFwE
267	1	prostate	No	No	No	R x 3 years. Then D in late 70's	HFwE/Sa/Job; active performing musician in his 70s while in our care
268	4	prostate	Yes	No	Yes	L AMA. NFI	Imp

269	3	breast	No	No	No	L AMA; chose to go have chemotherapy, NFI	HF/Sa/Job while in our care
270	3 NHR	breast	No	No	No	L AMA, NFI	HFwE/Sa while in our care
271	2	multiple myeloma	No PC	No	No	AR Imp quickly; could not afford to continue treatment. Then recurrence; then stem cell tx. R	HFwE/ speed-walking
272	4	lymphoma	No	No	No	R x 4 years	Active in community in her 70's
273	4	colon	No	No	Yes	Long drive → L AMA NFI	HF except for long drive
274	4	multiple myeloma	No	No	No	Sporadic treatments with intense travel; L AMA, then D from pneumonia	HF/Job Numbers improved with our treatments; then went down with travel.
275	4 NHR	lung	No	No	No	L AMA. Then DDD	HFwE during tx. Brain mets shrunk.
276	1	SCC	No	No	Yes	L AMA after a few treatments. NFI	Sa
277	4	colon	PC	PR	PS	L AMA → chemo	Dietary dispute; stable condition
278	4 NHR	thyroid	No PC	No	Yes	Came in after being assigned to hospice; L AMA, D	Sa; Left against medical advice, then some months, then D
	2	breast	No	No	Yes PS	R, then recurrence, then lumpectomy. Current.	HFwE, Sa
280	4	lung	No PC one time	No	No	Imp dramatically, then L AMA, then Wor, then D	HF/Sa
281	4	hairy cell leukemia	No	No	No	Surgeons refused surgery→ splenic rupture → D	HF till splenic rupture
282	4	prostate	No	No	No	Current	HF/Sa
283	4	Breast, inflam.	No	No	No	R	Brief, unrelated acute injuries
284	4 NHR	Breast, inflam.	No PC	No	No PS	NOFX, D	Pt arrived very sick, very late.
285	4 NHR	breast	No, PC	No	No, PS	Killed by overdose of morphine in hospital, D	Came in 27 yrs after 1st diagnosis and after recent worsening of symptoms
286	2	macroglobulinemia	No	No	No	R x 4 years	Imp HFwE/stretching
287	4	breast, cervical	No	No	No	Long distance → L AMA	HFwE/Job; Imp
288	2	squamous cell of neck	No	No	No	R x 5 years	Dramatic Imp; stayed well living in an RV
289	1	thyroid	No	No	No	R x 4 years	HF/Job/Sa

290	4	esophageal	No	No	No	2 weeks treatment. Then L AMA	Sa
291	1	ovarian	No PC	No	No PS	L AMA. Then chemotx. Then R	HFwE/Job/Sa
292	4	cholangio-carcinoma	No	No	No	NOFX→ D	Arrived very sick, very late
293	4 NHR	breast	No	No	No	D	Arrived very late, very sick, in severe pain.
294	1	prostate	No	No	No PS	R x 4 years	HFwE/retired now/ ”feeling great”
295	1	breast/ Paget’s	No	No	Yes	R x 4 years. “Addicted to sugar” → recurrence → Current	HF/Sa
296	4	colorectal	No	No	Yes	Long distance; L AMA. NFI	HFwE
297	2	CLL	No	No	No	Up and down leukocytes. Current.	HFwE/Sa
298	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Sa/Job
299	4	colon	No	No	Yes	Inconsistent with tx, L AMA → some months → DDD	HF/Sa
300	2	prostate	No	No	No	R x 5 years	HFwE/Strenuous outdoor Job
301	4 NHR	colon	No	No	No	D	Worse from rapid tumor breakdown without adequate elimination. Arrived very sick, very late with huge tumor burden
302	4 NHR	prostate	No	No	Yes	L AMA. NFI	Intense back pain. Sa
303	4 NHR	breast	Yes	No	Yes	Very briefly treated by us, on a brief break from chemo. NFI	Weak; Sa
304	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Imp
305	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE
306	3 NHR	giant cell endometrial	No, PC	No, PR	Debulking but not resection PS	R x 5 years	Imp/HFwE/Job
307	4	melanoma	No	Yes	Yes	R, then 2 years off diet, then DDD	Imp/HFwE during treatment
308	2	liver	Yes	Yes	Yes	L for surgery, then D from Valley Fever	Well until chemo and radiation and surgery, then Wor
309	1	prostate	No	No	No	R x 4 years	Sa/Job
310	2	breast	No	No	Yes	AR; current	HFwE
311	2	kidney	No	No	No	R	Red, Imp. HFwE/Job during tx
312	3	breast	No	No	No	Current	HFwE, but mass increased

313	1	prostate	No	No	No PS	Out of state → L AMA PSA rising again	HFwE/Job/Sa
314	4	colon	No	No	No	R, NFI	Imp
315	4	breast	No	No PR	No PS	L AMA. NFI	HFwE
316	1	breast	No	No	No	L AMA. NFI	HFwE
317	1	prostate	No	No	No	R	HFwE. Lots of walking.
318	2	CLL	No	No	No	Lymphocytes up and down with stress.	HFwE
319	1	prostate	No	Yes	No	R	HFwE, Job
320	1	prostate	No	No PR	No PS	R x 4 years	HFwE. Then broke arm.
321	4	breast	Yes	No	Yes	Chemo-resistant mets; no $ for tx. 5 years of chemo → then no more offered → D	Sa, Job during our regular treatments
322	3	squamous cell	No	No	No	R. NFI	HF/Job
323	3	brain	No	No	No	NOFX → D	Wor
324	4	gastric	No	No	No	R, but no surgery available for damage created by tumor, D from complications	Imp/ HF, then Wor from complications, after cancer was gone on imaging.
325	3	lymphoma	No, PC	No	No	R, then recurrence; then AR, then recurred, but L AMA→ D	HF/Sa/Strenuous outdoor Job for years after R. Then recurred, then chemo → Wor
326	4	lung	No, PC	No	No	L AMA-No$, NFI, then D 2 yrs later	Sa
327	4 NHR	colon	No PC	No PR	No PS	Cancer had metastasized from neck to feet, and to most major organs before patient started our treatments. NOFX, NFI	Our treatments did not work for this patient
328	4	breast	No	No	No	Only a few treatments → L AMA due to no $ → D	Arrived very late; one breast totally consumed with cancer
329	1	colon	No	No	No	AR. Improved imaging, but not conclusive.	HF
330	2	breast	No	No	No	L AMA, NFI	HFwE/Sa
331	4	breast	No	No	No	L AMA, NFI	Sa
332	1	SCC and colon	No	PR	PS	R	HF
333	4	pancreatic	Yes	Yes	No	No $ → L AMA. D from chemo reactions	HF till 2nd chemo treatment, then hospital
334	1	rectal	No	No	Yes	R. Then chemo → D	Sa; strenuous outdoor job during tx

335	3	lung	No	No	No	AR, L AMA, then had chemo, then quickly sickened and D	Pneumonia during treatment, complications, hospital. But tumors gone.
336	3	prostate	No	No	Yes	AR	HF. Strenuous job.
337	1	breast	No PC	No	No PS	R	HFwE
338	1	gallbladder	No	No	No	AR; stable, then chemo. "Chemo made my cancer worse." NFI	HF/Sa, then Wor during chemo
339	2	breast	No	No	No	R	HFwE/Job
340	3	breast	No	No	No	L AMA. NFI	HF/Sa, in her 80's
341	1	CLL	No	No	No	R	HFwE "feeling great"
342	4	NHL	No PC	No	No PS	R "Naturopathic medicine rescued me."	Imp
343	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFw/E, strenuous; "boot camp"
344	1	breast	No	No	Yes	L AMA. NFI	HF Sa
345	3	squamous cell	No	No	No PS	NOFX, D	Our treatments had no effect for this patient.
346	1	prostate	No	No	No	R	HFwE/ Job
347	3	colon	No PC	No	No PS	AR. NFI	HF/Sa
348	4	prostate	No	No	No	NOFX, D	Our treatments had no effect for this patient.
349	3	testicular	No, PC	No	No	R x 5 years	HFwE/Strenuous outdoor job
350	1	CLL	Yes	No	No	R, then no follow-up. Then lymphocytes are rising again.	HF/Sa
351	4	adenoid palate	No	No, PR	No	L AMA, then 1 year, then D	Same
352	1	prostate	No	No	No	L AMA, NFI	HF/Sa
353	4	liver	No	No	No PS	Severe stroke from drug rxn interrupted tx. Then D from stroke complications.	HFwJob; Imp; then severe drug rxn→stroke
354	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R x 5 years.	HF wE/Sa
355	1	colon	No	No	No	Imp; AR. Then recurrence, then D	HFwE/Sa; bicycled miles per day during tx
356	4	liposarcoma	No	No	Yes	R.	Imp. HFwE
357	4	colon	No PC	No	No	L AMA, then two months, then D	Arrived very sick, very late
358	4	breast	No PC	No PR	No	D of complications from liver mets	Arrived very sick, very late; improved before travel interrupted treatments
359	4	esophagus	Yes	No, PR	No	Severely sickened with each chemo treatment, then D	Wor after chemo treatments.

360	4	cervical	Yes	Yes	Yes	AR. After diagnosis and our treatment, but before chemo, "I have never felt better in my adult life."	HF/Imp/Wor/Imp/Red/ Job
361	4	ovarian	Yes	No	Yes	Severe rxns to chemotherapy → D	Imp, then Wor after chemo
362	3	squamous cell, throat	No	No	No	Stable for several months; L, Wor. D	HF/Sa during tx. But our treatments seemed to have no effect.
363	3	kidney	No	No	Yes	AR	Red
364	3	breast	No PC	No PR	No PS	R x 2 years, then recurrence; "I'm convinced you kept me alive as long as I am." NFI	HF/Sa/Job, then left then Wor
365	1	breast	No	No	No	R, NFI	HF/Sa
366	1	breast	No	No	No	Stable. Tumor shrunk during our treatment, then L AMA. Then tumor returned to size at diagnosis.	HFwE/Sa
367	1	cervical	No	No	No	No $ → L AMA	HF
368	4	cervical	Yes	No, PR	No	L, then 1 month, D of chemotherapy side effects	Arrived very sick, very late. Sa
369	2 NHR	breast	No	No	No	Spontaneous remission (Patient only had one of our treatments then no$, then L AMA.) AR with no other tx → we probably deserve no credit for outcome. Then recurrence, then seldom txs due to no$ Then D	HF/Sa then L then Wor
370	2	breast	No PC	No	Yes	Recurrence after chemo; inconsistent tx and severe chemo rxns → D	Up and down
371	4 NHR	colon	No, PC	No, PR	No, PS	Came in late stage, after hospice, NOFX, L, then 1 week, D of hepatic coma	Arrived very sick; very late.
372	4	lung	No	No	No	Pt discouraged from effect of brain mets → L, then one month, then D	Wor from brain mets, but Imp lungs
373	1	lymphoma	No	No	Yes	R prior to surgery (clear pathology report). NFI	HFwE/Job
374	2	liver	Yes	No, PR	No	L, NFI	Sa
375	1	bladder	No	No	No	R	HFwE/Job

376	2	bladder	No	No	No	Continued smoking. L AMA. D	
377	3	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF
378	1	prostate	No	No	No	L AMA. AR. NFI	HF Strenuous Job
379	4	lymphoma	Yes	No	No	L AMA to have chemotherapy → Severe rxns to chemo → D	HF until chemo

The results in Table 1 are summarized as follows:

Table 2: Summarized outcomes of naturopathic treatment of 379 cancer patients

	Outcome	Number of patients	Average number of months this group of patients stayed for treatments *	Number in each group also receiving chemotherapy	Number in each group also receiving radiation	Number in each group also receiving surgery
a	Remission or assumed remission	175	3.7	12	11	59
b	Still being treated, not yet in remission	22	4.0	1	0	3
c	Died while still only in our care, following all of our protocols	32	2.2	0	1	1
d	Iatrogenic death in hospitals or by MDs	22	2.7	15	4	7
e	Of those who left before finishing treatment, number who died after leaving (except for DDD)**	45	2.7	2	3	10
f	Death after dietary dispute	12	No data	1	1	3
g	No current information but never known to be in remission	46	1.4	5	1	10
h	Remission occurred elsewhere	8	No data	4	1	0
i	Waiting to know status, or conflicting information	17	No data	5	2	6
	Total	**379**		**45**	**24**	**99**

***This column has not been updated since 2010, due to the labor-intensive nature of this research, and not much expected change or significance of any change.**
**** Please see legend of abbreviations at the head of Table 1. For example, DDD: death after dietary dispute.**

I have called all of the cancer survivors every summer to annually update the data for this paper, based on patients' subjective reporting of their wellbeing. Although it would be more scientifically and statistically valuable to insist on, with all former patients, and to receive updated, comprehensive, whole body imaging to confirm continued remission, expecting

compliance with such a demand is not feasible. We therefore have to rely only on subjective reporting of health status by telephone. Speaking by telephone year after year with former patients who consider themselves well, whose last imaging was clear, with no further cancer treatment since leaving our clinic, have been grouped together in the category of "remission" in this study. "Assumed remission" (AR) satisfied fewer of these criteria, but involved at least stable good health of at least 6 months following cessation of our treatments. I could not reach 46 patients (Table 2, row g).

We may or may not continue gathering data for future editions of this paper, due to very little change found in the proportions and percentages of the various categories of patients year over year, as well as the increasingly labor-intensive nature of the research, as the patient population grows. However, we would like to continue try to contact all of the patients year after year, and to continue to report on each individual's outcome.

This paragraph summarizes Table 2, with reference herein to labelled rows of Table 2.
116 patients (rows e+g+h+i) left our practice before completing our treatments. 22 patients (row d) were killed in hospitals by medical procedures, non-cancer iatrogenic causes or simultaneous chemotherapy. The above numbers do not include any of the currently treated patients. Of the 219 patients (rows a+c+f) who were steadfast in treatment until either remission or death, 175 (row a) went into remission, and 44 patients (rows c+f) died while still our patients in our care alone. Of those 44, 12 (row f) died after a significant dietary dispute with us. The remainder is 32 patients (row c) who died while still our patients, under our care alone, following all of our protocols. This reflects a failure rate of 32 / 379 =row c / total = 8% of the total patients we treated, or a failure rate of 32 / 207 = rows c / (a+c) = 15% of the patients who were steadfast in their treatments and followed all of our recommendations. Of the 224 patients (rows a+c+i) who were steadfast in treatment, if we simply look at survivors, without confirmation of remission, then our success rate = (rows a+c+i – row c) / rows a+c+i = /(175+32+17) – 32 / (175+32+17) =(224 – 32) / 224 = 100% - 14% = 86%.

224 steadfast patients minus 22 killed by iatrogenic causes, minus 12 who died after a dietary dispute leaves 190 patients who were steadfast and made prudent decisions. If we consider that we had 175 patients in remission of 190 who were steadfast and made prudent decisions in the treatments, then the remission rate is 92%. Late Stage IV patients tend to not do well with our treatments, although even early stage IV patients seem to have a good likelihood of going into remission.

It cannot be emphasized enough that cancer treatment has been far more effective at our clinic when patients began treatment as early as possible after diagnosis. For all stages of cancer between Stage I and early Stage IV, the success rate is between 87% and 93% (Table 5). However, for late Stage IV, the success rate has been only 29%. After a certain critical juncture of loss of vitality and overwhelming tumor burden, our treatments seem to be as unlikely to work for the patient as any other available treatment. We therefore strongly advise against a strategy of postponing natural treatments until after chemotherapy stops working.

These results must be seen in the context of when, in the course of the cancer disease process, a patient decides to, or learns of the opportunity to, embark on naturopathic treatment. The

overwhelming majority of patients who come to us never heard of the possibility of such treatments until very shortly before arriving to our clinic. Therefore, we do not have the advantage of meeting the patients at the time of diagnosis, as the medical oncologists have. Rather, valuable time is often lost, and we only have the opportunity to begin treatment after the chemotherapy oncologist has given up on the patient. This makes our job immensely harder than it would have been if we could have started a timely treatment.

33 of 44 patients who died were Stage IV at start of treatment. This paragraph describes the ordeals of some of those individuals. One Stage IV patient had over 36 bone metastases, over 50 total metastases, and chose to have chemotherapy during our treatment (Patient #204). Four others began treatment with a tumor load that was approximately a cubic foot in the abdomen (Patients #112, 124, 301 and 356). Others chose not to follow our main dietary recommendation during the last month of their treatment, i.e. not to eat sweetened foods (Patients #264 and 275). This pancreatic cancer patient's tumors had reduced considerably during our treatments. Of the 2 pancreatic tumors, one disappeared completely, and the other shrank to approximately half the volume. This was after they had not been reduced at all by previous chemotherapy, and his oncologists had given no hope of recovery (NHR in Table 1). During this time, the patient stayed very physically active, doing construction work in his own house at age 67. Several weeks went by, and then new pain arose. The patient then admitted to starting to eat cookies every night after dinner for the past month, which was contrary to our main dietary treatment focus, to be described below. Within 2 weeks he was dead of pancreatic cancer with new metastases. Numerous others in this group had also declined our main dietary recommendation. Another had an extensive, fast-growing inoperable glioblastoma at start of treatment, had improved briefly, then worsened and died (Patient #179). Others had cancer that our treatments simply had no effect on. Another decided to enter hospice before finishing our treatments, and we could not obtain information about how much morphine he had been given (Patient #170). And yet another had an unfortunate combination of severe constipation with fast tumor breakdown (Patient #210). This combination allows toxins to build very quickly in the body, and we could not clear them out fast enough to save her life.

Most of the late stage cancer patients who died while still only in our care arrived to our clinic very late in their disease process, years after first diagnosis, and after one of two things: 1) they had been told by an oncologist that there was no remaining hope, or 2) they had never seen an oncologist and had a growing tumor burden that had been untreated for years.

Table 3: Patients who died while only in our care, and stage at arrival

Stage	Total number of deceased patients, while in our care	Total patients who died despite following all of our protocols, including diet	DDD = death after dietary dispute
I	2	0	2
II	2	0	2
III	7	4	3
Early Stage IV, still functioning, activities of daily living	13	8	5
Late Stage IV, very sick, very late arrival to our clinic	20	20	0
Total	**44**	**32**	**12**

Table 4: Patients in remission or assumed remission during our care, and stage at arrival

Stage	Number of patients	Previous chemotherapy with active cancer at start of our treatments	Number in each group also receiving chemotherapy concurrently	Number in each group receiving radiation concurrently	Number in each group receiving surgery concurrently
I	76	5	4	6	25
II	37	1	3	2	15
III	20	6	0	1	8
Early IV	34	8	4	3	10
Late IV	8	3	1	0	1
Total	**175**	**23**	**12**	**12**	**59**

Table 5: Success rate by stage of cancer, for patients following all of our protocols including diet (Column 6), compared with all regardless of diet (Column 7)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Stage on arrival	**Total patients treated until remission or death**	**Remission**	**Died, Not DDD**	**DDD**	**Remission ÷ Total = Success rate Including dietary protocol**	**Remission ÷ Total = Success rate** Including DDD**
I	*76	76	0	2	***100%**	**97%
II	*37	37	0	2	***100%**	**95%
III	*24	20	4	3	***83%**	**74%
Early IV	*42	34	8	5	***81%**	**72%
Late IV	*28	8	20	0	***29%**	**29%
Total	*207	175	32	12	***85%**	**80%
Stage I through early Stage IV	*179 **(not including DDD)**	167	12	12	***93%**	**87%

***This number does not include those who did not follow our dietary recommendations.**
**** These percentages in Column 7 were derived from the figures in each row of:**
[Column 3 ÷ (Column 2 + Column 5)].

Only 12 of the 175 patients we treated who went into remission also had concurrent chemotherapy (Table 4). Of all our other patients who went into remission, most had refused current chemotherapy prior to starting our treatments, although some had chosen to have it in the past. It is common for a patient who finds their way to our clinic to comment that cancer is difficult enough to endure, without the additional burden of the ill health attributable to chemotherapy alone. Our clinic's policy is never to insist that a patient either have chemotherapy or avoid it, because of the profound and severe effects on the health of such drugs, and because there is already excessive pressure on the patient by family and/or oncologists to choose one or another course of action, and because we have the utmost respect for the individual's inherent and self-evident right to make his/her own healthcare decisions without coercion.

Of the patients who had chemotherapy along with our treatments, all commented on feeling stronger and better able to tolerate their chemotherapy with our treatments. One patient whose tumor volume had reduced by 80% subjectively attributed this good result to both our treatments as well as chemotherapy, an evaluation that seems to defy proof or disproof (Patient #246), at least in his case.

59 of our 175 patients to go into remission also had either surgical resection or debulking of their tumors while getting our treatments. This would suggest that surgery is often a reasonable choice, perhaps even a life-saving choice, when available, and that the combination of surgical tumor resection and natural treatments was a feasible strategy for a successful outcome, although not always required for a successful outcome.

One of our patients now in remission for 5 years is and has been for years the only known survivor of Stage 3 giant cell endometrial carcinoma (Patient #306), at least according to published medical literature.[74] This remission occurred with only natural treatments after all three conventional cancer treatments, chemotherapy, radiation and surgery, were each tried multiple times and failed for this patient.

Table 6: Results for patients who left to have chemotherapy prior to 2013

Went into remission following chemotherapy	**Died following chemotherapy**	**Not in remission, but surviving both chemotherapy and cancer as of mid-2013**	**Evidence of remission from our treatments alone prior to starting chemotherapy**	**Total who left our clinic to have chemotherapy (total of all outcomes)**
4	9	5	6	**24**

Table 6 has not been updated since July 2013. It shows that leaving our treatments to pursue chemotherapy only possibly benefited 4 of the 24 patients who had left. However, it is possible that those 4 would have gone into remission if they had continued with our treatments alone. This table was not updated this year, because a large majority of those who were thought to have left for chemotherapy could not be reached by phone. As of now, we have not attributed either pessimistic or optimistic outcomes to those we cannot reach; we simply record "NFI" in Table 1. Sometimes good or bad information comes much later. This year we were absolutely delighted to welcome to our clinic visits from two cancer survivors, after only our treatments, who had not been in contact with us for 5 years and 4 years respectively (Patients #288 and 295). One lives in an RV trailer, and happened to be passing through our area again.

Table 7: Results for patients for whom the treatments had no apparent effect, as of 2013

Stage at start of treatments	**Number of patients**	**Of these, how many had prior or current chemotherapy**	**Of those never having chemotx, waited years with growing mass before seeing a doctor**
Stage I	1	0	0
Stage II	0	0	0
Stage III	1	0	0
Early Stage IV	4	3	1
Late Stage IV	12	6	5

Total	**18**	**9**	**6**

Table 7 shows that 15 of the 18 people for whom our treatments had no apparent effect either had prior chemotherapy or waited years with a growing mass before seeking treatment. This is likely because the patient's tumor burden became more resilient either due to the chemotherapy-imparted resistance to treatment or due to an unopposed sizeable cancer burden having the opportunity to establish an intractable stronghold in the body.

We have data for change in tumor size for relatively few patients. It must be considered that by the time a person seeks the help of a naturopathic physician for any ailment, they have often rejected, for one reason or another, the conventional medical system, leading to a distrust and disdain for conventional imaging. Imaging such as PET/CT fusion is a "hard sell" to such people. ("You want me to have radioactive glucose after telling me not to eat sugar?") Further biopsy was even less likely to be acceptable to our patients. Many of those patients left our practice for one reason or another, as discussed below, before we had any information about changing tumor size. A strong will must be present in a person to ignore the exhortations of oncologists and worried loved ones, and to pursue treatment by a naturopathic physician. This strong will easily enables rebellion against naturopathic physicians and our recommendations as well. Because we have so little information on which patients actually had increased or decreased tumor load, we have not yet had the advantage of the best way to determine the success or failure of our treatments. At present, we primarily rely on MRI imaging of the part of the torso or head or neck with the known tumor burden prior to finishing the treatments. For the blood dyscrasias, we rely on blood tests. After finishing the treatments, we recommend smaller treatments one time per month indefinitely. The local residents of course find this to be more feasible than those who temporarily moved close to our clinic for the treatments. For those who cannot pursue follow-up treatments, our contact has been one time per year with each patient, every summer, by telephone, to inquire about the current state of health. However, many of the patients in remission choose to maintain an ongoing intravenous nutrient treatment one time per month. Of those patients in remission coming in for one time per month ongoing intravenous nutrient treatments, only one of those patients has come out of remission. Therefore, we recommend this strategy for all of the cancer patients who have been treated by us.

There is another factor that we kept track of from July 2010 to June 2011: that year we also called people who came in to our clinic for an initial consult, but did not start our treatments. Of the 4 who visited that year, but never started our treatments, and whose family we were able to contact by phone, all four have died, according to their family members. We are no longer calling people in this category, because we are focusing our attention on the people who chose to undergo our treatments.

It cannot be assumed that those for whom our treatments failed to reduce cancer are entirely worse off. Most have described a better quality of life since starting the treatments. For example, one of the patients with stage IV breast cancer, and an increased tumor load since starting our treatments, described herself as more fit than ever since beginning our treatments, far more healthy than when she had previous chemotherapy, at 68 years old, walking 2 miles up and down hills in 22 minutes, gradually improving her time right up to the time she chose to have

concurrent radiation, at which point her wellbeing, her energy, her tumor burden and her disease state began to worsen dramatically (Patient #184). Although we have not yet found the necessary combination of therapies to reduce and eliminate such a resilient cancer as hers, this patient expressed to us that the quality of life that she gained from our treatments was tangible and valuable to her.

It also cannot be assumed that conventional treatments would succeed when ours did not. For example, an ovarian cancer patient (Patient #112) was persuaded by family members to stop our treatments and resume chemotherapy, even though chemotherapy had not eliminated her cancer in the past, and our subsequent treatments did in fact reduce the tumors to a fraction of their original size, in only a fraction of the usual treatment time. When this patient complied with her family members and resumed chemotherapy, the remaining tumor mass grew again, steadily through two months of chemotherapy. The oncologist then gave up and offered her no more chemotherapy and directed her to hospice care. A number of other patients also did very well in measures of tumor size and wellbeing with our treatments. Then in some cases, chemotherapy oncologists or family members persuaded or pressured or coerced the patient to have chemotherapy instead. Usually, that patient then quickly declined and died.

For the 116 patients who decided to leave before finishing our treatments, it is difficult to assess the degree of success or failure. Reasons for leaving were often not given. There was sometimes a phone message requesting to cancel the future appointments without explanation. However, when we were told reasons for leaving, the following were common:

1) Financial reasons: no insurance reimbursement made it hard to continue paying for our treatments out of pocket. This was by far the most common reason given. This was expected to change in 2014 when the Affordable Care Act mandated insurance reimbursement of naturopathic medicine, to the best of our understanding, under new private insurance plans. However, that mandate has not yet been implemented. Some insurance companies were much better about reimbursing for naturopathic medicine than others.
2) The patient did not feel that anything important was happening with the treatment. There was a strange viewpoint expressed by some patients that cancer is not very frightening, once they saw that they, as well as all of the other non-chemotherapy cancer patients in our IV rooms maintained their vitality, their hair and their bodily functions, and almost always with improved fitness. This led some to the dangerously wrong conclusion that cancer was easy to conquer, could probably have happened at home with store-bought nutrients, and that our treatments had not accomplished much, and perhaps had not even contributed to their continued wellbeing, and that they would have remained well anyway.
3) A related viewpoint was that improvement in the patient's condition should have been faster and more dramatic. If the condition seemingly stayed the same, some patients viewed this as evidence of failure, of not defeating cancer fast enough, and concluded that the treatment was not working, and that they should not waste any more time or money pursuing it, and that it was time to leave and explore other avenues.
4) Family members or oncologists disapproved of natural cancer treatment and persuasively urged chemotherapy exclusively.

5) The patient had traveled from another state to receive our treatments, but wanted to return home to be with family, regardless of expected outcome.

***Table 8: Summary of quality of life changes, as of July 2011, by assessment of naturopathic physician along with patient self-evaluation during naturopathic care of the patients whose wellbeing stayed the same or improved prior to July 2011**

Quality of life changes	Number of patients	Number in each group who went into remission	Number in each group also receiving chemotherapy
Came in with high wellbeing / Still the same way	92	70	3
Came in occupationally functional but not physically fit /Ultimately improved vitality	34	25	3
Came in occupationally functional but not physically fit / Still the same way	17	3	4
Total	**143**	**98**	**10**

***Note: This table has not been updated since the 2011 edition of this paper, due to the labor-intensive nature of this research, and not much expected change in proportion of the different groups.**

If one considers quality of life as a criterion for success, then of the patients who stayed well or got better during our treatments, 143 patients out of 165 who had come to us prior to July 2011, make a success rate of 87%. For most of the remaining 13% of total patients, they mostly came to us after exhausting all conventional cancer treatments and were mostly late stage 4, or had other co-morbidities. These co-morbidities included: pulmonary fibrosis, asbestosis, uranium poisoning, radiation poisoning, more than 15 CT scans done on one individual, chronic antibiotic-resistant infections, Clostridium difficile, scleroderma, cirrhosis, pneumonia, asthma, diabetes, rapid tumor breakdown with poor elimination, radiation illness, chemotherapy intolerance, complications from previous surgery, blood clots where the tumor had compressed multiple veins before the tumor was eliminated, hepatic coma.

Table 9: Patients choosing to have monthly follow-up treatments

	Stage	Cancer	C	R	S	CANCER OUTCOME	WELLBEING
1	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Job
2	2	lung	No	No	No	R x years. Now battling Valley Fever.	HfwE/Job
3	3	breast	No	No	Yes	R	Hf/Sa
4	4	breast	No	No PR	No PS	R	HF/Sa
5	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Job
6	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HfwE (15 mi bike rides)/ Sa
7	2	breast	No	No	No	R. Current	Imp; HfwE
8	1	Waldenstrom's lymphoma	No	No	No	Numbers go up and down with allergens, but much better strength now	Imp mostly; strenuous exercise; recreational travel
9	4	uterine	No	No	Yes	R	
10	2 NHR	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/ Sa
11	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Sa/Job
12	4	ovarian and peritoneal	No	No	Yes	R x 3 years, then recurrence	HFwE/Imp
13	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HfwE/Job
14	1	prostate	No	No	No	R	HFwE/Sa/Job
15	4 NHR	ovarian	No	No	Yes	Rx 3 years	HFwE in 80's
16	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HfwE
17	4	colon	No	No	No PS	R	HF/Sa/retired
18	4	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF
19	1	breast	Yes	Yes	Yes	R	HfwE, Job
20	4	ALL leukemia	No PC	No	No	R x 4 years	Imp, HFwE
21	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF
22	3	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF/Job
23	2	breast	No	No	Yes PS	R, then recurrence, then lumpectomy. Current.	HFwE, Sa
24	2	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFwE/Imp
25	3 NHR	giant cell endometrial	No, PC	No, PR	Debulking but not resection PS	R x 5 years	Imp/HFwE/Job
26	1	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HFw/E, strenuous; "boot camp"
27	1	bladder	No	No	No	R	HfwE/Job
28	3	breast	No	No	Yes	R	HF

Summary of table of follow-up treatments: Total pts. = 28. Total still in remission = 26 = 93% of total.

It is important to note that not all of the patients did all that was recommended by us. For example, although we recommend beginning our treatments immediately after diagnosis, almost all patients delayed naturopathic treatment for months to years after initial diagnosis of cancer, mostly due to lack of information to the public about the effectiveness of natural treatments for cancer. The enormous disadvantage of such delay to the naturopathic physician's work and effectiveness cannot be overstated. Chemotherapy is known to impart a resilience to tumors that makes it hard for any subsequent treatment to have an effect. It is surprising that our success has been as high as it is, given the severe disadvantage of beginning natural treatments months to years after cancer has had a head start in its growth and takeover of the body, as well as the debilitation of the general health of the patient.

Other patients chose to disregard the dietary recommendations that we made or to only observe the recommendations partially. Others chose to have fewer in-office treatments than were recommended. Others decided to choose only some of the recommended treatments due to financial constraints or inconvenience. However, as our clinic has demonstrated longer, sustained success with an ever-increasing number of patients, and a majority obviously well patients are present and visible in our clinic on our busiest workdays, and the value of our treatment protocols become obvious to more and more visitors to our clinic, both patients and their family members, compliance with our recommendations has generally been much better during the last few years than previously, with regard to both diet and on-site treatments.

Some of the patients who came out of remission had discontinued our main dietary recommendation. This was especially disappointing to us because for example, Patient #307, after being out of contact for almost two years after going into remission, called to inform us that she was now physically active and had at last stopped smoking. (She had smoked all through our treatments.) She had gone off of the diet, and then developed recurrence of cancer and died. Another patient (Patient #49) went quickly back into remission.

Most patients chose not to follow our recommendation to have monthly follow-up treatments after remission. But of those who did, 28 patients, 26 of them are still in remission. That is 93%.

Discussion

175 patients went into remission during our treatments of a total of 207 who complied with all of our treatment protocols until either remission or death. This is 175 / 207 = 85% success over all stages and all types of cancer. For Stages I through early Stage IV, it is 167 / 179 (remission / total) = 93% success rate. If we consider that only 175 patients went into remission, out of the total 379 patients who did our treatment for at least two weeks, then only 175 / 379 = 46% have gone into remission, which is quite low. However, the 379 number includes those who only had sporadic treatments, and those who ignored our dietary and exercise recommendations, and those who were killed by chemotherapy and other iatrogenic procedures. Therefore, we do not consider the 46% as representative of what happens with patients who follow our recommendations steadfastly, and therefore does not reflect the work of our clinic. If one considers those who were steadfast in their treatments and died, divided by all who were steadfast in their treatments, then the failure rate is 32 / 207 = 15% of the patients who were

steadfast in their treatments and followed all of our recommendations. Of the 224 patients who were steadfast in treatment, if we simply look at survivors, without confirmation of remission, then our success rate = (224 – 32) / 224 = 86%.

Numerous natural agents were simultaneously employed to reduce or inactivate or necrose or eliminate human neoplasms in vivo. We chose to use these agents together because cancer is a multifactorial disease and has not yet been fought effectively in a majority of patients with a single agent. Specific combinations of natural substances were chosen with regard to the type of cancer and circumstances of each individual cancer patient. Licensed naturopathic physicians are well-qualified to design such treatment programs because of our broad and extensive training with natural and conventional substances and how to combine them. Because of our unprecedented and consistent success in treating cancer since 2006, we believe we have demonstrated the need for simultaneous well-tolerated anti-neoplastic treatments.

Successful outcomes were more likely with steadfast patient compliance during the entire duration of the treatment process. Although our results are a strong improvement over any other cancer treatment protocols that we have found, both conventional and natural, if measured by either patient remission or survival, these treatment strategies are still not adequate to eliminate all patients' cancers and must be further developed.

[1] Boik, John. Natural Compounds in Cancer Therapy. Oregon Medical Press. 2001; p.2.
[2] Huber, Colleen. Naturopathic Medical Education: Does it Measure Up? A curriculum comparison among three naturopathic medical colleges, Yale University School of Medicine and Arizona College of Osteopathic Medicine, conducted at Southwest College of Naturopathic Medicine, April 14, 2005.
[3] Chan J, Wang F, Holly E. Sweets, sweetened beverages, and risk of pancreatic cancer in a large population based case-control study. Cancer Causes & Control. 2009 Aug; 20(6): 835-46.
[4] Rossi M et al. Dietary glycemic index and glycemic load and risk of pancreatic cancer: a case-control study. Ann Epidemiol. 2010 Jun. 20(6): 460-465.
[5] Mueller N et al. Soft drink and juice consumption and risk of pancreatic cancer: the Singapore Chinese Health Study. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2010 Feb. 19(2). 447-455.
[6] Larsson S. Consumption of sugar and sugar-sweetened foods and the risk of pancreatic cancer in a prospective study. Am J Clin Nutr. 2006 Nov. 84(5). 1171-1176.
[7] Tavani A et al. Consumption of sweet foods and breast cancer risk in Italy. Ann Oncol. 2006 Feb. 17(2). 341-345.
[8] Larsson, S, Bergkvist L, Wolk A. Glycemic load, glycemic index and breast cancer risk in a prospective cohort of Swedish women. Int J Cancer. 2009 Jul 1; 125(1): 153-7.
[9] Wu A, Yu M, Tseng C. et al. Dietary patterns and breast cancer risk in Asian American women. Am J Clin Nutr. 2009 Apr; 89(4): 1145-54.
[10] Bradshaw P et al. Consumption of sweet foods and breast cancer risk: a case-control study of women on Long Island, New York. Cancer Causes Control. 2009 Oct. 20(8). 1509-1515.
[11] Freedland S, Aronson, W. Dietary intervention strategies to modulate prostate cancer risk and prognosis. Curr Opin Urol. 2009 May; 19(3): 263-7.
[12] Drake I et al. Dietary intakes of carbohydrates in relation to prostate cancer risk: a prospective study in the Malmo Diet and Cancer cohort. Am J Clin Nutr. 2013 Dec. 96(6): 1409-18.
[13] Ikeda F, Doi Y, Yonemoto K, et al. Hyperglycemia increases risk of gastric cancer posed by Helicobacter pylori infection: a population-based cohort study. Gastroenterology. 2009 Aprei(4): 1234-41.
[14] Bertuccio P, Praud D, Chatenoud L, et al. Dietary glycemic load and gastric cancer risk in Italy. Br J Cancer. 2009 Feb 10; 100(3): 558-61.
[15] Wang B, Bobe G, La Pres J, Bourquin L. High sucrose diets promote intestinal epithelial cell proliferation and tumorigenesis in APC mice by increasing insulin and IGF-1 levels. Nutr Cancer. 2009; 61(1): 81-93.
[16] Wang B, Bobe G, La Pres, Bourquin L. Dietary carbohydrate source alters gene expression profile of intestinal epithelium in mice. Nutr Cancer. 2009; 61(1): 146-55.
[17] Nayak S. A case control study of roles of diet in colorectal carcinoma in a South Indian population. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2009 Oct-Dec. 10(4). 565-568.
[18] Williams C. Dietary patterns, food groups, and rectal cancer risk in whites and African-Americans. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2009 May. 18(5). 1552-1561.
[19] Augustin L, Polesel J, Bosetti C, et al. Dietary glycemic index, glycemic loan and ovarian cancer risk: a case-control study in Italy. Ann Oncol. 2003 Jan; 14(1): 78-84.
[20] Silvera S et al. Glycaemic index, glycaemic load and ovarian cancer risk: a prospective cohort study. Public Health Nutr. 2007 Octo. 10(10). 1076-1081.
[21] King M, et al. Consumption of sugary foods and drinks and risk of endometrial cancer. Cancer Causes Control. 2013 Jul 24(7) 1427-1436.
[22] Mulholland H. et al. Dietary glycaemic index, glycaemic load and endometrial and ovarian cancer risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Cancer. 2008 Aug 5. 99(3). 434-441.
[23] Fedirko V, et al. Glycemic index, glycemic load, dietary carbohydrate, and dietary fiber intake and risk of liver and biliary tract cancer in Western Europeans. Ann Oncol. 2013 Feb. 24(2). 543-553.
[24] Moerman C. Consumption of foods and micronutrients and the risk of cancer of the biliary tract. Prev Med. 1995 nov. 24(6). 591-602.
[25] Creagan E, Moertel C, O'Fallon J, et al. Failure of high-dose Vitamin C (ascorbic acid) therapy to benefit patients with advanced cancer. A controlled trial. New Engl J Med 1979 Sep 27. 301(13): 687-90.
[26] Moertel C, Fleming T, Creagan E., et al. High-dose vitamin C versus placebo in the treatment of patients with advanced cancer who have had no prior chemotherapy. A randomized double-blind comparison. New Engl J Med. 1985 Jan 17; 312(3): 137-41.
[27] Cameron E, Campbell A. The Orthomolecular treatment of cancer: II. Clinical trial of high-dose ascorbic acid supplements in advanced human cancer. Chem Biol Interact. 1974; 9: 285-315.
[28] Cameron E, Pauling L. Supplemental ascorbate in the supportive treatment of cancer: prolongation of survival times in terminal human cancer. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 1976. 73. 3685-89.
[29] Cameron E., Pauling L. Supplemental ascorbate in the supportive treatment of cancer: re-evaluation of prolongation of survival times in advanced human cancer. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 1978 Sep; 75(9): 4538-42.

[30] Bram S, Froussard P, Guichard M, et al. Vitamin C preferential toxicity for malignant melanoma cells. Nature 1980 Apr 17; 284(57)::629-31.
[31] Leung P, Miyashita K, Young M, et al. Cytotoxic effect of ascorbate and its derivatives on cultured malignant and non-malignant cell lines. Anticancer Res. 1993 Mar-Apr; 13(2): 475-80.
[32] Sakagami H, Satoh K, Hakeda Y, et al. Apoptosis-inducing activity of vitamin C and vitamin K. Cell Mol. Biol 2000 Feb; 46(1): 129-43.
[33] Chen Q, Espey M, Krishna M, et al. Pharmacologic ascorbic acid concentrations selectively kill cancer cells: action as a pro-drug to deliver hydrogen peroxide to tissues. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2005 Sep; 102(38): 13604-09.
[34] Padayatty S., Sun H, Wang Y, et al. Vitamin C pharmacokinetics: implications for oral and intravenous use. Ann Intern Med 2004 Apr 6;140(7): 533-37.
[35] Chen Q, Espey M, Krishna M, et al. Pharmacologic ascorbic acid concentrations selectively kill cancer cells: action as a pro-drug to deliver hydrogen peroxide to tissues. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2005 Sep. 102(38): 13604-09.
[36] Padayatty S, Riordan H, Hewitt S, et al. Intravenously administered vitamin C as cancer therapy: three cases. Canadian Med Assn J. 2006 Mar 28; 174(7): 937-42.
[37] Akiyama M, Nakamura M. Bone regeneration and neovascularization processes in a pellet culture system for periosteal cells. Cell Transplant. 2009 Apr 15. pii: CT-1917. (Epub ahead of print).
[38] Yogeeta S, Gnanapragasam A, Senthilkumar S, et al. Synergistic salubrious effect of ferulic acid and ascorbic acid on membrane-bound phosphatases and lysosomal hydrolases during experimental myocardial infarction in rats. Life Sci. 2006 Dec.23; 80(3): 258-63.
[39] Lin Y, Tan F, Marra K, et al. Synthesis and characterization of collagen/hyaluronan/chitosan composite sponges for potential biomedical applications. Acta Biomater. 2009 Apr 2. (Epub ahead of print).
[40] Petrella B. Assessment of local proteolytic milieu as a factor in tumor invasiveness and metastasis formation: in vitro collagen degradation and invasion assays. Methods Mol Biol 2009; 511:75-84.
[41] Penna-Martinez M, Ramos-Lopez E. Stern J, et al. Vitamin D receptor polymorphisms in differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Thyroid. 2009 Jun; 19(6): 623-8.
[42] Robien K, Cutler G, Lazovich, D. Vitamin D intake and breast cancer risk in post-menopausal women: the Iowa Women's Health Study. Cancer Causes Control. 2007 Sep; 18(7): 775-82.
[43] Epstein E, Lindqvist P, Geppert B, et al. A population-based cohort study on sun habits and endometrial cancer. Br J Cancer. 2009 Jun 23; [Epub ahead of print].
[44] Giovannucci E. The epidemiology of vitamin D and cancer incidence and mortality: a review. Cancer Causes Control. 2005 Mar; 16(2): 83-95.
[45] Wei M, Garland C, Gorham E, et al. Vitamin D and prevention of colorectal adenoma: a meta-analysis. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2008 Nov; 17(11): 2958-69.
[46] Garland C, Gorham E, Mohr F. Vitamin D for cancer prevention: global perspective. Ann Epidem 2009 Jul;19(7):468-83.
[47] Giovannucci E. Vitamin D and cancer incidence in the Harvard cohorts. Ann Epidem. 2009 Feb 19(2): 84-8.
[48] Shen M, Yen A. Nicotinamide cooperates with retinoic acid and 1,25 dihydroxyvitamin D(3) to regulate cell differentiation and cell cycle arrest of human myeloblastic leukemia cells. Oncology 2009; 76(2): 91-100.
[49] Kizildag S, Ates H. Treatment of K562 cells with 1,25 dihydroxyvitamin D(3) induces distinct alterations in the expression of apoptosis-related genes BCL-2, BAX, BCL(XL) and p21. Ann Hematol. 2009 May 28. (Epub ahead of print.)
[50] Wu W, Zhang X, Zanello L. 1alpha, 25 dihydroxyvitamin D(3) anti-proliferative actions involving vitamin D receptor-mediated activation of MAPK pathways and AP-1/p21 (waf1) upregulation in human osteosarcoma. Cancer Lett. 2007 Aug 28. 254(1): 75-86.
[51] Fujioka T, Suzuki Y, Okamoto T, et al. Prevention of renal cell carcinoma by active vitamin D(3). World J Surg. 2000 Oct; 24(10): 1205-10
[52] Bao B, Yao J, Lee Y. 1alpha, 25-dihydroxyvitamin D3 suppresses interleukin-8-mediated prostate cancer cell angiogenesis. Carcinogenesis. 2006 Sep; 27(9): 1883-93.
[53] Chung I, Han G, Seshadri M, et al. Role of Vitamin D receptor in the antiproliferative effects of calcitriol in tumor-derived endothelial cells and tumor angiogenesis in vivo. Cancer Res. 2009 Feb 1; 69(3):. 967-75.
[54] Yudoh K, Matsuno H, Kimura T. 1alpha, 25-dihydroxyvitamin D3 inhibits in vitro invasiveness through the extracellular matrix and in vivo pulmonary metastasis of mouse melanoma. J Lab Clin Med. 1999 Feb 133(2): 120-8.
[55] Moro J, Iwata M, von Andriano U. Vitamin effects on the immune system: vitamins A and D take centre stage. Nat Rev Immunol. 2008 Sep; 8(9): 685-98.
[56] Guan J, Zhang H, Wen Z, Gu Y, Cheng Y, Sun Y, Zhang T, Jia C, Lu Z, Chen J. Retinoic acid inhibits pancreatic cancer cell migration and EMT through the downregulation of IL-6 in cancer associated fibroblast cells.
Cancer Lett. 2013 Dec 11. pii: S0304-3835(13)00816-1. doi: 10.1016/j.canlet.2013.12.006. [Epub ahead of print]
[57] Montrone M, Martorelli D, Rosato A, et al. Retionoids as critical modulators of immune functions: new therapeutic perspectives for old compounds. Endocr Metab Immune Disorder Drug Targets. 2009 June; 9(2): 133-31.

[58] Kusmartzev S, Su Z, Heiser A, Dannull J, et al. Reversal of myeloid cell-mediated immunosuppression in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. Clin Cancer Res.2008 Dec 15; 14(24): 8270-8.
[59] Okuno M, Kojima S, Matsushima-Nishiwaki R, et al. Retinoids in cancer chemoprevention. Curr Cancer Drug Targets. 2004 May; 4(3): 285-98.
[60] Wu Q, Dawon, M, Zheng Y, et al. Inhibition of trans-retinoic acid-resistant human breast cancer cell growth by retinoid X receptor-selective retinoids. Mol Cell Biol 1997 Nov; 17(11): 6598-608.
[61] Cannell J, Vieth R, Willett W, et al. Cod liver oil, vitamin A toxicity, frequent respiratory infections and the vitamin D deficiency epidemic. Ann Otol, Rhinol, Laryngol. 2008 Nov; 117(11): 864-70.
[62] Makishima M, Honma Y, Hozumi M et al. Effects of inhibitors of protein tyrosine kinase activity and/or phosphatidylinositol turnover on differentiation of some leukemia myelomonocytic leukemia cells. Leukemia Res 1991; 15(8): 701-08.
[63] Sokolski J, Sartorelli A. Induction of the differentiation of HL-60 promyelocytic leukemia cells by nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents in combination with low levels of vitamin D3. Leuk Res 1998 Feb; 22(2): 153-61.
[64] Shen M, Yen A. Nicotinamide cooperates with retinoic acid and 1,25 dihydroxyvitamin D(3) to regulate cell differentiation and cell cycle arrest of human myeloblastic leukemia cells. Oncology 2009; 76(2): 91-100.
[65] Kulp K, Montgomery J, Nelson D, et al. Essiac and Flor-essence herbal tonics stimulate the in vitro growth of human breast cancer cells. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2006 Aug; 98(3). 249-59.
[66] Seely D, Kennedy D, Myers S, et al. In vitro analysis of the herbal compound Essiac. Anticancer Res. 2007 Nov-Dec; 27(6B). 3875-82.
[67] Leonard S, Keil D, Mehlman T, et al. Essiac tea: scavenging of reactive oxygen species and effects on DNA damage. J Ethnopharmacol. 2006 Jan 16; 103(2): 288-96.
[68] Ottenweller J, Putt K, Blumenthal E, et al. Inhibition of prostate cancer cell proliferation by Essiac. J Altern Complement Med. 2004 Aug; 10(4): 687-91.
[69] Hale L, Hynes B. Bromelain treatment of human T cells removes CD44, CD45RA, E2/MIC2, CD6, CD7, CD8 and Leu 8/LAM1 surface molecules and markedly enhances CD2-mediated T cell activation. J Immunol 1992 Dec 15; 149(12): 3809-16.
[70] Eckert K, Grabowska E, Strange R, et al. Effects of oral bromelain administration on the impaired immunocytotoxicity of mononuclear cells from mammary tumor patients. Oncol Rep. 1999 Nov-Dec; 6(6): 1191-9.
[71] Batkin S, Taussig S, Szekerezes J. Antimetastatic effect of bromelain with or without its proteolytic and anticoagulant activity. J cancer Res Clin Oncol. 1988; 114(5): 507-8.
[72] Báez R, Lopez T, Salas C, et al. In vivo antitumoral activity of stem pineapple (Ananas Comosus) bromelain. Planta Med 2007 Oct; 73(13): 1377-83.
[73] Proefrock K. Botanical considerations for lung cancer patients. (Lecture) Southwest Conference on Botanical Medicine. Tempe, AZ USA. 2001.
[74] Jones, M, Young, R, Scully R. Endometrial adenocarcinoma with a component of giant cell carcinoma. Int J Gynecol Pathol. 1991; 10(3): 260-270.