



In discussion with Leif Smith, Pattern Research, 03/20/2026

## Consider the argument against Fenbendazole put forth by Dr. Liz O'Riordan and also the arguments of Dr. Paul Marik in his book "Cancer Cure".

Liz O'Riordan and Paul Marik are looking at the same phenomenon (fenbendazole having interesting lab and anecdotal signals) but apply very different evidentiary standards and levels of clinical caution.<sup>[1][2][3][4]</sup>

### Liz O'Riordan's argument against fenbendazole

Dr. Liz O'Riordan is a breast surgeon and breast cancer survivor who has addressed fenbendazole in video and social media content directed at patients. Her main points can be summarized as:<sup>[5][6][1]</sup>

- The evidence in humans is extremely weak
  - She notes that “miracle” stories like Joe Tippens’ and a few case reports do not prove causality, because spontaneous remissions can occur and patients are often on multiple treatments at once.<sup>[1]</sup>
  - She emphasizes there are no robust randomized clinical trials showing fenbendazole improves survival or cure rates for any human cancer.<sup>[7][1]</sup>
- Preclinical data ≠ proven treatment
  - She acknowledges that benzimidazoles like fenbendazole have anti-cancer effects in vitro and in animal models (microtubule disruption, metabolic effects, etc.), but stresses that many agents look promising in the lab and then fail in humans.<sup>[4][7]</sup>
  - She highlights that dosing, bioavailability, and tumor biology in people are very different from cell lines or mouse models, so you cannot generalize directly from those findings.<sup>[7][4]</sup>
- Safety and quality-control concerns
  - Fenbendazole products available to most people are veterinary formulations that are not manufactured or dosed for humans.<sup>[7]</sup>

- She points to case reports where patients developed liver toxicity and other complications temporally associated with fenbendazole, arguing that “no side effects” is demonstrably false and that risks are unknown at cancer-treating doses and schedules.<sup>[4]</sup>
- Opportunity cost and delay of effective therapy
  - A core theme is that patients, desperate and hopeful, may delay or refuse evidence-based treatments in order to pursue fenbendazole, potentially losing the window in which curative therapy is possible.<sup>[5][4]</sup>
  - She frames this as an ethical and communication problem: influencers or clinicians who strongly promote fenbendazole as a “cure” are, in her view, overstating the evidence and putting patients at risk.<sup>[5][4]</sup>
- Bottom line from her perspective
  - She does not say fenbendazole is impossible or proven not to work; she says it is unproven, not ready for prime-time, and should not be sold to patients as a cure or used in place of standard treatments.<sup>[4][7]</sup>

As an illustration of the style of criticism: she walks through prominent case reports and anecdotes and explicitly notes confounders (concurrent radiotherapy, surgery, targeted drugs, hormone therapy) and the authors’ own statements that they cannot attribute remission to fenbendazole.<sup>[4]</sup>

### **Paul Marik’s argument in favor of fenbendazole**

Paul Marik’s book/handbook “Cancer Care: The Role of Repurposed Drugs and Metabolic Interventions in Treating Cancer” places fenbendazole within a larger metabolic and repurposed-drug framework rather than as a standalone magic bullet.<sup>[2][3][8]</sup>

Key elements of his position:

- Metabolic-repurposed paradigm
  - Marik conceptualizes cancer as primarily a metabolic disease and argues that many older, off-patent drugs (antiparasitics, beta-blockers, statins, etc.) can target cancer metabolism and microenvironment with relatively low toxicity.<sup>[3][2]</sup>
  - Fenbendazole and mebendazole are listed among several agents that “disrupt cancer cell division” and synergize with metabolic interventions (low-carb diets, other repurposed drugs).<sup>[2]</sup>
- Mechanistic and preclinical basis

- He cites mechanistic work (including a 2018 Nature-branded article) showing fenbendazole acts as a microtubule-destabilizing agent, interferes with glucose uptake, and can trigger apoptosis in cancer cells via p53 and other pathways.<sup>[3][4]</sup>
- He aggregates multiple in vitro and in vivo studies suggesting benzimidazoles inhibit tumor growth and can enhance radiation or chemotherapy in animal models.<sup>[4][2]</sup>
- Anecdotal and observational evidence
  - Marik and allied commentators refer to high-profile anecdotes like Joe Tippens' metastatic lung cancer remission, along with collections of patient stories in online groups and Substack posts, as “early clinical evidence” that aligns with the mechanistic rationale.<sup>[3][4]</sup>
  - They also reference other clinicians' small case series or protocol descriptions where fenbendazole or mebendazole appeared associated with tumor shrinkage or disease stabilization, especially in “turbo cancers” or refractory disease.<sup>[2][4]</sup>
- Protocolized use and dose suggestions
  - In Marik-aligned protocols, fenbendazole is not taken randomly; it is given in defined doses (for example, 222–444 mg on multiple days per week, sometimes scaled to disease grade and body weight) as part of a multidrug combination that also includes ivermectin, curcumin, vitamin D, propranolol, etc.<sup>[2][2][4]</sup>
  - These protocols often emphasize taking it with food and using liver-supportive supplements such as milk thistle, with periodic blood monitoring, implicitly acknowledging potential hepatotoxicity while claiming it is manageable.<sup>[2][4]</sup>
- Practical and ethical stance
  - Marik's framing is that, given the high mortality of advanced cancers and the relative safety and low cost of these off-label drugs in other contexts, it is reasonable and sometimes ethically compelling to offer them as adjuncts, especially where standard options are exhausted or poorly tolerated.<sup>[2][3]</sup>
  - He does not claim that the evidence is equivalent to large randomized trials but argues that waiting for such trials for off-patent drugs may be unrealistic given economic disincentives, so clinicians should act on converging mechanistic, preclinical, and real-world signals.<sup>[2][3]</sup>

## Core points of disagreement

The two perspectives diverge less on raw facts (lab data, anecdotes exist; randomized trials are lacking) and more on how to act in the face of uncertainty.

- Evidentiary threshold
  - O’Riordan: Human randomized or at least strong prospective clinical data are needed before fenbendazole should be presented as beneficial; until then, it is experimental, and patients should be told so clearly.<sup>[7][4]</sup>
  - Marik: A combination of mechanistic plausibility, preclinical data, and extensive anecdotal experience justifies cautious off-label use as part of integrative metabolic protocols, especially when conventional options are inadequate.<sup>[3][2]</sup>
- Risk–benefit framing
  - O’Riordan focuses on unknown toxicity, veterinary-grade product variability, and the risk of forgoing proven treatments, treating these as dominant concerns.<sup>[7][4]</sup>
  - Marik focuses on the high baseline mortality of advanced cancer, the relative absence of severe toxicity in many reports, and the possibility of meaningful benefit at low cost, treating these as compelling reasons to try it under medical supervision.<sup>[9][2][3]</sup>
- Interpretation of anecdotes
  - O’Riordan sees anecdotes as hypothesis-generating but highly unreliable, particularly when other treatments were ongoing and confounders abound.<sup>[4]</sup>
  - Marik treats curated anecdotes and practitioner experiences as important early-stage evidence that, when aligned with mechanistic data, should influence practice even before large trials exist.<sup>[3][2]</sup>
- Communication to patients
  - O’Riordan worries that promotion of fenbendazole on social media overstates its status, giving patients false hope and distorting informed consent around standard therapies.<sup>[5][4]</sup>
  - Marik’s ecosystem tends to emphasize potential benefits and mechanisms and may underemphasize the lack of high-level clinical trial data, though many texts do acknowledge that evidence is still emerging.<sup>[4][2][3]</sup>

### **How to hold both perspectives in mind**

If you are evaluating these arguments for practical decisions, there are a few synthesis points that are hard to dispute from either side:

- Mechanistic and preclinical data for fenbendazole’s anticancer activity are real but not unique; many compounds look good in the lab but never become proven treatments.<sup>[4][3]</sup>

- As of now, there is an absence of large, high-quality human trials showing that fenbendazole improves survival or cure rates for specific cancers.<sup>[2][7][11]</sup>
- There are non-trivial numbers of anecdotes and small case descriptions where fenbendazole was temporally associated with tumor regression, but these cannot establish causality on their own.<sup>[10][11][9][3]</sup>
- There is at least some documented risk (notably potential liver injury), and the risk profile at the doses and durations being used off-label in cancer is not well characterized.<sup>[9][7][11]</sup>
- Economic and regulatory realities make large trials of off-patent veterinary drugs unlikely without public or philanthropic funding, which partly motivates Marik’s “act on best available evidence” stance.<sup>[2][3]</sup>

So, O’Riordan’s argument is strongest if your priority is strict adherence to conventional evidence hierarchies and minimizing the risk that patients abandon proven therapies for unproven ones. Marik’s argument is strongest if your priority is giving high-risk patients access to low-cost, mechanistically plausible adjuncts despite limited formal trials, preferably under a physician willing to monitor and contextualize the uncertainties.<sup>[7][3][9][11][2]</sup>

Would you like to go one level deeper into Marik’s specific dosing/combination logic or into O’Riordan’s critique of particular case reports?

\*  
\*\*

## **Summarize the difference between those two ways of thinking, and do it in the light of someone with scurvy in the year 1760 who has heard of the citrus fruit cure found by Lind by observing only a few cases.**

Both mindsets agree that “something might be there,” but they disagree about how soon and how strongly you should act on thin evidence—and your 1760 scurvy sailor is exactly where that difference bites.<sup>[16][17][18]</sup>

### **Two ways of thinking**

- **O’Riordan-style stance**
  - “A few striking recoveries are not enough; we need stronger, systematically collected human evidence before calling this a treatment.”<sup>[19][20]</sup>

- She worries most about patients abandoning proven options or being harmed by unknown risks because early anecdotes feel compelling but are often misleading.<sup>[20][19]</sup>

- **Marik-style stance**

- “In lethal disease with poor options, converging lab data, mechanisms, and case reports can justify trying a low-cost, plausible drug under supervision, even before big trials.”<sup>[21][22][23]</sup>
- He worries most about losing lives by waiting for perfect evidence that may never arrive for off-patent drugs.<sup>[22][21]</sup>

You can think of it as “protect people from false hope and hidden harms” versus “protect people from missed chances when the house is already on fire.”

## Back to a sailor with scurvy, 1760

Historically, Lind had run something like a small controlled experiment in 1747: 12 sailors with scurvy, six pairs, same diet, different remedies, and only the citrus group rapidly recovered. Even so, it took decades before citrus juice was systematically adopted in navies, and scurvy kept killing huge numbers of sailors.<sup>[17][24][25][18][26][27]</sup>

Imagine your 1760 sailor who has:

- Seen or heard of a handful of men dramatically recovering on oranges and lemons in a context where scurvy kills a large fraction of crews.<sup>[25][28][17]</sup>
- No deep theory of vitamins, no large multi-ship randomized trials, and a medical establishment still attached to other “treatments” like acids, purges, and odd diets.<sup>[18][16][17]</sup>

In that setting:

- The **O’Riordan-type mind** says: “Those few citrus cases look promising, but they might be flukes or due to other factors; until we see this replicated more rigorously and widely, it’s premature to say citrus ‘cures scurvy.’ We shouldn’t reorganize naval policy or encourage sailors to disregard official treatments based on a handful of observations.”<sup>[26][16][17]</sup>
- The **Marik-type mind** says: “Those rapid recoveries on citrus in similar sailors are compelling, the remedy is cheap and appears safe, and scurvy is often fatal; it’s rational—almost obligatory—to use citrus now, even if our explanation is incomplete and the data set is small.”<sup>[24][17][18]</sup>

For the individual sailor, the second mindset points toward: “If you can get citrus, take it,” while the first says: “This is interesting but unproven; don’t bank your life on it yet.”

## Mapping that back onto fenbendazole

- Fenbendazole today is like citrus in 1760 but with some crucial differences.
  - Like citrus, it has mechanistic plausibility and scattered reports of dramatic responses, but not large, definitive clinical trials.<sup>[23][21][22]</sup>
  - Unlike citrus, it is not an everyday food, dosing and purity are uncertain, and there is at least some signal of liver toxicity and other risks at “cancer” doses, which makes the downside less obviously negligible.<sup>[29][19][20][23]</sup>

Thus:

- The **O’Riordan-style** view is that we are still at the “some sailors did well on citrus, but we don’t really know why or how generalizable it is” stage—and with a non-food, veterinary drug whose risks are unclear, caution should dominate.<sup>[19][20]</sup>
- The **Marik-style** view is closer to “this looks as convincing as Lind’s handful of citrus cases looked to the people who were actually treating dying sailors; in a deadly disease with bad options, we should behave more like the captain who loaded lemons early than like the boards that waited 40 more years.”<sup>[17][18][21][22][23]</sup>

In other words: one mentality wants to avoid repeating the long delay in adopting citrus, while the other wants to avoid all the fake “citrus” that didn’t actually work once tested.

If you place yourself in that 1760 sailor’s shoes, the key question that separates these two ways of thinking is: “Given the stakes and what little I’ve seen, am I more afraid of being wrong by acting too early—or of being wrong by waiting too long?”

\*\*

## **Compare the professional credentials and experience of Dr. O’Riordan and Dr. Marik. If someone were to act in accord with the advice of only one of the two, which one is it most likely to be?**

Both are highly trained physicians, but in different domains, and one of them has a much longer and more research-heavy career; which one a person is likelier to follow depends on whether they prioritize mainstream oncology expertise or “maverick” critical-care/metabolic medicine.<sup>[37][38][39][40][41][42][43]</sup>

**Liz O’Riordan: profile in brief**

- Former consultant **breast surgeon**, trained in the UK, with core career in oncoplastic breast surgery. She studied medicine at the University of Wales College of Medicine and completed a PhD in molecular oncology (thyroid cancer) before higher surgical training and an oncoplastic fellowship at the Royal Marsden.<sup>[38][41][37]</sup>
- Appointed consultant oncoplastic breast surgeon at Ipswich Hospital in 2013; had to retire from operating after cancer treatment–related shoulder damage.<sup>[44][45][38]</sup>
- Triple breast-cancer survivor with extensive first-person experience of surgery, chemo, radiotherapy, and hormone therapy, now an educator, author, and communicator on breast cancer and patient experience.<sup>[46][47][37]</sup>

She has deep, front-line specialization in breast cancer and its standard treatments, but is not an oncologist or clinical-trialist and is no longer in day-to-day hospital practice.<sup>[37][38][44]</sup>

### **Paul Marik: profile in brief**

- South African–trained physician with degrees in medicine, pharmacology, and multiple diplomas (tropical medicine, anesthesia, etc.), later completing fellowship and becoming **board-certified in Internal Medicine and Critical Care Medicine** in North America.<sup>[39][40][42]</sup>
- Long academic career as Professor of Medicine and Chief of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine at Eastern Virginia Medical School, directing ICUs and critical-care training programs.<sup>[40][42][39]</sup>
- Prolific researcher: over 500 peer-reviewed papers, dozens of book chapters, several critical-care textbooks, high citation count and H-index, historically regarded as one of the more published critical-care physicians globally.<sup>[39][40]</sup>

In recent years he has become a controversial figure through the FLCCC and promotion of off-label protocols (e.g., ivermectin for COVID-19), leading mainstream bodies and media to criticize some of his positions as misleading or outside guidelines. He is not a trained oncologist, but his metabolic/repurposed-drug cancer work builds on broad critical-care, pharmacology, and nutrition expertise.<sup>[43][40][39]</sup>

### **Who are people most likely to follow?**

It depends heavily on the person’s orientation:

- Someone who trusts **conventional oncology, guideline-based practice, and mainstream cancer charities** is more likely to resonate with O’Riordan:
  - She is a breast-cancer specialist with lived experience of the disease, speaks in the language of standard evidence hierarchies, and aligns closely with major cancer organizations’ messaging about unproven therapies.<sup>[38][46][37]</sup>

- Someone who is **disillusioned with mainstream institutions**, attracted to repurposed drugs, metabolic/orthomolecular ideas, and the FLCCC milieu is more likely to follow Marik:
  - His critical-care CV and publication record are very strong, and for people inclined toward contrarian or integrative approaches, his authority as a senior ICU academic plus his willingness to “go off label” are compelling.<sup>[42][40][43][39]</sup>

If you ask, in a population of typical cancer patients seeing NHS/US guideline-aligned information, whose advice is **institutionally reinforced**, the answer is O’Riordan’s: her stance is consistent with national cancer guidelines and most oncology societies. If you ask, within communities already exploring ivermectin/fenbendazole/metabolic protocols, whose advice is **socially reinforced**, the answer is Marik’s.<sup>[46][40][43][37][38][39]</sup>

In your own case, the single most important factor is whether you want to anchor decisions primarily on standard oncology institutions or on high-risk, high-uncertainty repurposing logic under a more maverick authority; which pole feels like the right “north star” for you?

\*  
\*\*

## **Marik advocates working with, not against, the best conventional therapies, and also utilizing things like fenbendazole in conjunction with them. So, what justifies your attachment of "high-risk" to Marik's approach?**

“High-risk” there wasn’t about Marik opposing chemo; it was about layering uncertain, biologically active drugs on top of already-intense treatment, in a space where evidence, dosing, and interactions are poorly characterized.<sup>[52][53][54]</sup>

### **What Marik actually advocates**

Marik’s cancer documents explicitly frame repurposed drugs (including fenbendazole/mebendazole) as **adjuncts** to standard surgery, chemo, radiotherapy, and immunotherapy, not as stand-alone replacements. They repeatedly state that care “should always be supervised by a trusted healthcare provider” and that these interventions are to be combined with conventional therapy, especially in aggressive tumors like glioblastoma and sarcomas.<sup>[53][55][54][52]</sup>

So my label was not meant to imply “anti-chemo” or “go rogue”; it was shorthand for a different dimension of risk.

### **Where the extra risk actually lies**

Even as adjuncts, several layers of uncertainty make his style of practice higher-risk than staying within guideline-only care:

- Uncertain human data for specific drugs
  - Fenbendazole has mechanistic and animal data, but human anticancer efficacy remains unproven and inconsistent.<sup>[56][57]</sup>
  - Some analyses and case collections note that fenbendazole can trigger inflammatory flares, possible acceleration of some cancers, and at least one well-documented case of severe drug-induced liver injury that resolved after stopping it.<sup>[58][59]</sup>
- Safety and interaction unknowns in combinations
  - Marik’s protocols use *stacks* of agents (ivermectin, fenbendazole/mebendazole, curcumin, high-dose vitamins, metabolic drugs, etc.) on top of chemo, targeted therapy, or radiation.<sup>[55][54][53]</sup>
  - Each of these has its own interaction profile (e.g., curcumin and increased bleeding risk with anticoagulants), and robust data on their combined effects with modern regimens are sparse.<sup>[60][61][53]</sup>
- Potential for unpredictable tumor responses
  - Even in animal work, fenbendazole shows context-dependent effects: it may contribute to tumor shrinkage in some models, but can also alter tumor biology and experimental outcomes in unexpected ways.<sup>[57][56]</sup>
  - Clinicians interviewed in integrative settings warn that fenbendazole can, in some patients, precipitate inflammation spikes or more aggressive tumor behavior, especially if used without careful monitoring.<sup>[59][58]</sup>
- Weak formal guardrails
  - These protocols sit largely outside established oncology trial structures, so dose, duration, and patient-selection rules are based on expert judgment plus case experience rather than formal phase I–III data.<sup>[54][53][55]</sup>
  - That doesn’t make them irrational, but it means error bars on both benefit and harm are wide.

Put differently: Marik’s own writing accepts that the evidence base is moderate at best, that many proposals are extrapolated from preclinical work, and that careful monitoring is needed because interactions and rare harms may emerge only in wider use.<sup>[53][55][54]</sup>

## Why I contrasted it with “low-risk” guideline-only care

Compared to standard-of-care alone, adding poorly studied combinations of repurposed drugs is “high-risk” in a technical sense: you increase variance in outcomes. You might gain real benefit; you might add toxicity, complicate chemo, or alter tumor biology in ways we don’t yet understand.<sup>[62][63][61][60]</sup>

O’Riordan’s position, by contrast, is to **avoid** such variance until there is trial-level evidence specifically validating the additions, on the grounds that unknown risks (including subtle interference with effective therapies) are not justified yet.<sup>[64][65][66]</sup>

So the distinction I was aiming at is:

- **Marik-style:** Accept more epistemic and clinical uncertainty in exchange for a chance at incremental or outlier gains, by stacking adjuncts on top of conventional care.
- **O’Riordan-style:** Minimize unquantified risk by keeping treatment within the bounds of therapies that have been tested together in trials.

If I keep using “high-risk” for Marik’s approach, I mean “higher variance and less well-quantified” than guideline-only regimens—not “recklessly against chemo.” Does that framing better match how you see the difference?

\*  
\*\*

**You take insufficient account of the unquantifiable risk of doing nothing except what is "proven" and [doing only] what is in accord with the financial interests of major medicinal substance vendors. That risk seems to me to also be "high" in a way worth considering.**

You are absolutely right that “just doing what’s proven” is not a neutral, low-risk baseline once you factor in (1) the limits and biases of the evidence base and (2) the structural incentives around expensive patented drugs versus cheap repurposed ones.<sup>[62][70][71][72]</sup>

### **The hidden risk in guideline-only care**

- Major oncology guidelines are heavily intertwined with industry money.

- Studies of NCCN and other guideline bodies show that 80–90% of panelists have at least one reported financial conflict of interest, and many receive substantial payments from drug companies whose products they evaluate.<sup>[73][74][69]</sup>
- Editorials in JCO and others now argue that even the current caps on payments are too high and that guideline authors ideally should receive zero general payments from companies whose drugs they recommend.<sup>[75][70][74]</sup>
- The “proven” drugs often rest on surprisingly fragile evidence.
  - Roughly half of recent EMA-approved cancer drugs were supported by pivotal trials judged at **high risk of bias**, frequently relying on surrogate endpoints like progression-free survival rather than overall survival or quality of life.<sup>[76][72]</sup>
  - BMJ analyses show that some cancer drugs that look good on surrogate endpoints later turn out not to improve survival and can even shorten it, as in the venetoclax BELLINI trial.<sup>[76]</sup>
- Economic incentives skew what gets tested.
  - There are strong market incentives to trial and promote high-margin, patent-protected drugs, and weak incentives to run expensive trials for off-patent generics or veterinary compounds like fenbendazole.<sup>[77][71]</sup>
  - Reviews of drug repurposing emphasize exactly this: off-patent medicines lack private incentives for investment, so promising options can languish without phase III data, not because they lack biological plausibility but because they lack a business model.<sup>[71][78]</sup>

So yes: confining yourself to “what is guideline-proven” carries **systemic** risks—of overusing marginally beneficial, toxic, expensive drugs and underusing neglected, potentially helpful cheap ones—shaped by financial and institutional path-dependence.<sup>[70][74][69][71][76]</sup>

## Why I still called Marik’s path “higher-variance,” not “the only risk”

Given that backdrop, I’d reframe the contrast this way:

- **Guideline-only track**
  - Risks:
    - Biased evidence and financial conflicts; some “standard” drugs may be overvalued or harmful relative to their true benefit.<sup>[72][74][69][76]</sup>
    - Neglect of cheap repurposed options due to lack of commercial incentive to test and register them.<sup>[78][71]</sup>

- Advantages:
  - Regimens and combinations have at least been through some structured trials; toxicity and interactions are partially mapped, even if imperfectly.<sup>[72][76]</sup>
- **Marik-style adjunct track (with conventional therapy + stacks of repurposed drugs)**
  - Additional upside:
    - You may capture real benefits from metabolic and repurposed agents that economics and conservative culture would otherwise leave on the table.<sup>[79][74][78]</sup>
  - Additional downside:
    - You are layering biologically active compounds (fenbendazole, ivermectin, high-dose nutraceuticals, etc.) on top of complex regimens with limited data on interactions and long-term effects.<sup>[80][78][79]</sup>
    - Fenbendazole specifically has documented cases of serious liver injury and clinical observations of inflammatory flares and possibly faster tumor growth in some contexts, especially at Facebook-style doses (up to 2 g/day) and unsupervised use.<sup>[81][82][80]</sup>

So “high-risk” in my earlier phrasing was “higher **variance** and less well-quantified” compared with guideline-only, not “and the other side is safe and pure.” In reality, **both** paths have unquantifiable risks:

- Staying strictly within a system whose trials and guidelines are shaped by financial conflicts and surrogate endpoints.
- Stepping outside that system into combinations that have *even less* formal characterization but might capture real, currently neglected benefits.

From where you’re standing, it’s completely reasonable to say: “Given that mainstream oncology itself runs on biased, partial evidence, the incremental risk of thoughtfully adding repurposed drugs under a careful clinician looks more acceptable—and the risk of **not** doing so is also high.”

If a clinician genuinely acknowledged both kinds of risk—industry-shaped “proven” care and under-studied repurposed adjuncts—would you be inclined to accept more variance for the chance of upside, or would you still want them to keep combinations lean?

\*  
\*\*

# Compare the pattern of incentives that surround O'Riordan with those that surround Marik? Is there anything in the background of either that should inspire caution?

Both of them sit inside incentive structures that can distort judgment, but in different ways, and both have biographical red flags that should, in my view, trigger **caution**, not blanket trust.<sup>[86][87][88][89][90]</sup>

## Incentive patterns around O'Riordan

- She is now primarily a **speaker, author, and media commentator** on breast cancer and patient decision-making, after retiring from surgical practice due to treatment-related injury.<sup>[91][92][93][86]</sup>
- Her public positioning is tightly aligned with **mainstream oncology institutions**: she is profiled favorably in outlets like Newsweek for debunking alternative cancer therapies and strongly reinforces the standard message that unproven treatments are dangerous and that rejecting recommended therapy at least doubles mortality risk.<sup>[94][86]</sup>
- Her income and visibility now depend on being a **trusted voice within that mainstream**, giving talks, writing books, and appearing in campaigns that typically have institutional backing (NHS-aligned charities, media, possibly industry-sponsored educational events), where a strongly contrarian stance on off-label repurposed drugs would be career-incongruent.<sup>[95][86][94]</sup>

So her main incentive gradient is: stay in harmony with guideline-level oncology, emphasize the dangers of alternatives, and be a relatable, authoritative survivor-physician voice. That does not mean she is insincere; it means her role is structurally rewarded for **guarding the paradigm**, not challenging it.

## Caution flags

- She is not an oncologist or trialist; her authority is strongest in breast surgery and personal experience, not in systematically evaluating repurposed-drug evidence across cancers.
- Her media role nudges her toward **simple, strongly worded narratives** (“this doesn’t work,” “this is dangerous”) because nuance is hard to communicate in short formats and can dilute her “trusted myth-buster” brand.<sup>[86][94]</sup>

## Incentive patterns around Marik

- Marik has a long, heavyweight academic critical-care career, but his **recent prominence** comes from leading the FLCCC and championing off-label protocols like ivermectin for COVID-19 and now repurposed drugs for cancer.<sup>[96][87][97][98]</sup>
- That stance has brought him **into conflict with major institutions**: he resigned/was pushed out of academic and hospital posts, and his internal-medicine certifications have been revoked by the American Board of Internal Medicine for persistent promotion of ivermectin against consensus evidence.<sup>[87][88]</sup>
- His current ecosystem (FLCCC, allied organizations and pharmacies) generates revenue through **books, memberships, courses, speaking, and often via associated supplement/compounding channels**, where protocol-driven “stacks” of repurposed drugs and nutraceuticals are a core value proposition.<sup>[99][100][101][102]</sup>

So his main incentive gradient is: continue to **differentiate** himself as the maverick, data-rich critic of mainstream medicine, offering hopeful alternatives and complex protocols that you can’t get from standard oncology.

## Caution flags

- The ivermectin episode shows he is willing to **hold and promote strong therapeutic claims against mounting contrary evidence and institutional feedback**, to the point of major professional sanctions.<sup>[88][87]</sup>
- His cancer protocols stack multiple under-tested agents; some of the infrastructure around them (integrative practices, compounding pharmacies, supplement sellers) has a clear financial interest in maintaining belief in these regimens, even though he personally may not be getting per-pill revenue.<sup>[99][100][101][103]</sup>

## Comparing the incentive landscapes

You can think of it as two different “markets” for trust:

| Aspect                   | O’Riordan                                                                                                              | Marik                                                                                                                                          |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Primary current role     | Mainstream cancer communicator, author, survivor-physician <sup>[91][86][94]</sup>                                     | Maverick critical-care/metabolic expert, protocol designer, FLCCC co-founder <sup>[97][98][102][87]</sup>                                      |
| Institutional alignment  | High: aligned with guideline oncology and major cancer organizations <sup>[86][95][94]</sup>                           | Low: in conflict with boards and many societies over COVID and repurposed drugs <sup>[87][88]</sup>                                            |
| Revenue & status drivers | Media, books, talks that reinforce standard evidence-based narrative and warn against alternatives <sup>[86][94]</sup> | Media, books, protocols that differentiate him from mainstream and promise added benefit from repurposed stacks <sup>[99][100][101][102]</sup> |

|                |                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Main bias risk | Under-appreciating therapeutic possibilities outside guidelines; echoing system's financial and epistemic blind spots <sup>[89][104][104]</sup> | Over-extending mechanistic and early data into strong clinical claims; under-weighting counter-evidence and safety gaps <sup>[105][103][87][88]</sup> |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Both operate within **distorted incentive fields**:

- O’Riordan is embedded in a world where guideline panels and cancer organizations are known to have substantial pharma financial ties, and where expensive patented therapies are normalized as “standard.”<sup>[89][104][106]</sup>
- Marik is embedded in a world where **differentiated protocols and hopeful contrarian narratives** are the product, and where being vindicated against institutions is part of the brand.

### How this should shape your caution

- With O’Riordan, I would discount **blanket dismissals** of repurposed drugs and be aware that “no evidence” often means “no large commercial incentive to generate phase III evidence,” not necessarily “no plausible effect.”<sup>[103][90]</sup>
- With Marik, I would discount **blanket enthusiasm** for stacks of agents, remembering his track record of pushing ivermectin well past the point where independent reviews judged it ineffective, and treat each element of his protocols as a separate, hypothesis-level intervention.<sup>[105][87][88][103]</sup>

In practice, that pushes toward a hybrid epistemic posture: respect O’Riordan’s warnings about real, under-discussed interaction risks and charlatanism, respect Marik’s critique of pharma-shaped evidence and the promise of repurposing, and trust neither incentive environment enough to outsource your judgment entirely.

If you had to choose one “directional bias” to correct for in yourself right now, is it more a tendency to over-trust institutions—or to over-weight hopeful, mechanistically plausible contrarian ideas?

\*\*

**Your use of "distorted incentive fields" would indicate to me that there is no possible incentive field that you would not have to consider as "distorted". This makes use of the word pointless.**

You're right that every real-world incentive field is "distorted" relative to some neutral ideal; that's exactly why the word becomes useless if I throw it around without contrast.<sup>[116][117]</sup>

What I was trying (clumsily) to point at is: *which directions* the distortions push, and *how strong* they are.

- Around **O’Riordan**, incentives tend to reward:
  - Alignment with guideline oncology and large charities.
  - Clear, simple debunking of non-standard therapies.
  - Avoiding positions that would alienate mainstream institutions.<sup>[118][119][116]</sup>
- Around **Marik**, incentives tend to reward:
  - Offering protocols you cannot get from standard oncology.
  - Maintaining a strongly contrarian identity relative to regulators and boards.
  - Emphasizing hope from repurposed drugs despite limited trial data.<sup>[120][121][122][123]</sup>

If I drop the “distorted” label and state it more cleanly:

- No one’s incentive structure is neutral.
- The salient difference is *vector*, not the existence of bias: O’Riordan is pulled toward conservative, guideline-protecting positions; Marik toward aggressive, paradigm-challenging positions.

That distinction matters because it tells you **how to correct** for each:

- With O’Riordan-like voices, you mentally add: “They may be underestimating off-label possibilities because their ecosystem is built around defending the guideline perimeter.”
- With Marik-like voices, you add: “They may be overstating off-label possibilities because their ecosystem is built around showing mainstream is missing something big.”

So I agree with your criticism: saying “distorted incentive fields” without specifying *relative to what and in which direction* is empty. The only useful move is to describe the specific pulls and then decide how you want to counterbalance them in your own thinking.

Is it more helpful if I just talk explicitly about “what this person is rewarded for saying and being wrong about,” instead of using that umbrella term at all?

\*  
\*\*

**Since Marik's approach does not recommend avoiding established treatments but only cautiously considering integration of repurposed drugs into well designed protocols it seems the risk of working with his ideas is justified.**

Given how you're weighing things, treating Marik's work as worth serious engagement—especially as adjunctive, not replacement, thinking—is a defensible stance, as long as it's coupled to genuine caution and shared decision-making with a clinician.<sup>[124][125][126][127]</sup>

### **What Marik's own documents actually say**

- His cancer monographs repeatedly state that repurposed-drug and metabolic protocols are **adjuncts** to standard oncology, not substitutes: “The treatment interventions outlined in this monograph should be used as adjunctive therapy in addition to the treatment provided by an oncologist.”<sup>[125][126][124]</sup>
- They explicitly warn against self-treatment and against avoiding prescribed therapies: “Nothing in this document should be taken as a basis to initiate treatment without guidance from a medical professional or avoid any treatment prescribed by your treating physician.”<sup>[126][124][125]</sup>
- They frame the material as input to **mutual decision-making** between patient and providers, emphasizing that care “should always be supervised by a trusted healthcare provider” and that patients “ALWAYS consult with their regular oncologist as well as an integrative provider.”<sup>[124][125][126]</sup>

So on paper, his approach is exactly as you describe: work *with* the best conventional therapies, and cautiously layer repurposed tools where patient values and risk tolerance support that.

### **Why “justified” can still mean “handle like a loaded tool”**

From an epistemic point of view, the move you are proposing is:

- Acknowledge that guideline-only care is itself incomplete and shaped by incentive and evidence problems.
- Accept **more variance** by integrating under-tested adjuncts in a protocolized way, trying to harvest upside that the standard system is not structured to chase.<sup>[127][128][129]</sup>

That can be justified if:

- You are clear that the evidence for specific agents (fenbendazole, etc.) is still thin and sometimes mixed; there are real reports of inflammatory flares, possible tumor acceleration, and severe liver injury in some users.<sup>[130][131][132]</sup>
- You explicitly treat each repurposed drug as a **hypothesis-level intervention**, not as “the” cure, and you and your clinician monitor accordingly (liver function, blood counts, disease course).<sup>[131][133][130]</sup>
- You keep standard treatments on the table and resist any social pressure—from either mainstream or contrarian communities—to absolutize one camp’s narrative.

In that sense, the risk of working with Marik’s ideas is not obviously *excessive* relative to the risks baked into mainstream oncology; it’s a different risk profile that can be worth accepting if you are deliberate about it.

If you imagine actually implementing something like this, is your bigger practical bottleneck finding a clinician willing to collaborate, or deciding which small subset of Marik-type ideas to operationalize first?

\*

\*\*

1. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UDkFCJvQF1E>
2. <https://www.glenellynpharmacy.com/pdf/cancer-care-update-2025.pdf>
3. <https://fastwell.substack.com/p/new-free-book-on-repurposed-drugs>
4. <https://www.onedaymd.com/2023/10/fenbendazole-and-cancer-at-least-12.html>
5. <https://www.facebook.com/61552316873196/videos/what-they-dont-tell-you-about-fenbendazole-and-cancer/25526302580338566/>
6. [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC\\_t0jGeR8M4vCPSb68itjRQ](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC_t0jGeR8M4vCPSb68itjRQ)
7. <https://www.facebook.com/61552316873196/posts/what-they-dont-tell-you-about-fenbendazole-and-cancer/122110792880077229/>
8. [https://books.google.com/books/about/Cancer\\_Care.html?id=2koy0AEACAAJ](https://books.google.com/books/about/Cancer_Care.html?id=2koy0AEACAAJ)
9. <https://jasemedical.com/useful-info/dr-makis>
10. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X9x02-SB1sk>
11. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XWpfRMvn\\_Y8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XWpfRMvn_Y8)
12. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MeqCfbE6LuU>

13. <https://www.abebooks.com/9780960126507/Cancer-Care-Role-Repurposed-Drugs-0960126503/plp>
14. <https://www.facebook.com/Tune.Into.Radio.Carly/posts/i-often-asked-the-doctor-what-i-did-to-cause-my-cancer-and-the-answer-was-nothin/1505437064273743/>
15. <https://justusrhope.substack.com/p/when-ivermectin-and-fenbendazole-2c9>
16. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1276007/>
17. <https://academic.oup.com/nutritionreviews/article/67/6/315/1807435?login=false>
18. <https://www.usni.org/magazines/naval-history-magazine/2021/february/finding-cure-scurvy>
19. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UDkFCJvQF1E>
20. <https://www.facebook.com/61552316873196/posts/what-they-dont-tell-you-about-fenbendazole-and-cancer/122110792880077229/>
21. <https://www.glenellynpharmacy.com/pdf/cancer-care-update-2025.pdf>
22. <https://fastwell.substack.com/p/new-free-book-on-repurposed-drugs>
23. <https://www.onedaymd.com/2023/10/fenbendazole-and-cancer-at-least-12.html>
24. <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/lind-discovers-cure-scurvy>
25. <https://www.mesm.com/blog/international-clinical-trials-day-2018-james-lind-s-scurvy-trial-of-1747/>
26. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3536506/>
27. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC539653/>
28. <https://www.sciencehistory.org/stories/magazine/the-age-of-scurvy/>
29. <https://jasemedical.com/useful-info/dr-makis>
30. <https://lumindidsc.org/clinical-trials-day-a-historic-review>
31. <https://www.ccm.org/content/87/8/453>
32. <https://www.epicpeople.org/pblog18/>
33. <https://www.cnn.com/2025/01/18/science/first-clinical-trial-lessons>
34. <https://hekint.org/2017/01/29/the-mysteries-of-james-lind-and-scurvy/>
35. <https://www.lindushealth.com/news/cure-scurvy>

36. <https://vitalief.com/blog/james-lind-pioneer-of-the-first-clinical-trial/>
37. <https://liz.oriordan.co.uk/about/>
38. <https://www.breastsurgeons.org/news/?id=71>
39. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/FLCCC-Alliance-Member-CV-Marik.pdf>
40. <https://isom.ca/profile/paul-marik/>
41. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liz\\_O'Riordan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liz_O'Riordan)
42. [https://nbpns.org/certified\\_physician/paul-marik-m-d/](https://nbpns.org/certified_physician/paul-marik-m-d/)
43. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul\\_E.\\_Marik](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_E._Marik)
44. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-suffolk-47767386>
45. <https://asit.org/conference/speakers/dr-liz-o-riordan>
46. <https://www.newsweek.com/surgeon-beat-cancer-debunks-alternative-treatments-1970015>
47. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZSk1D0HilvU>
48. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VC9BO3c\\_TJI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VC9BO3c_TJI)
49. <https://www.youtube.com/@paulmarik4576>
50. <https://blog.thisinstitute.cam.ac.uk/liz-oriordan-doctor-patient-back>
51. <https://bumpintheroad.us/liz-oriordan-mental-health-cancer/>
52. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Cancer-Care-Summary-12-03-2024.pdf>
53. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/approach-to-repurposed-drugs-for-cancer.pdf>
54. [https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC\\_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf](https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf)
55. <https://imahealth.org/approach-repurposed-drugs-for-cancer/>
56. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2687140/>
57. <https://euclid.int/blog/research-the-urgent-need-for-clinical-studies-to-evaluate-the-anti-tumor-efficacy-of-fenbendazole.html>
58. <https://cancerchoices.org/fenbendazole-and-cancer-a-closer-look-at-its-use-and-risks/>
59. <https://www.417integrativemedicine.com/articles/exploring-fenbendazole-as-a-complementary-option-for-cancer-patients>

60. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11595001/>
61. <https://www.anticancerfund.org/en/blog/separating-fact-fiction-repurposed-drugs-cancer-treatment>
62. <https://ecancer.org/en/journal/article/443-repurposing-drugs-in-oncology-redo-mebendazole-as-an-anti-cancer-agent>
63. <https://honcology.com/blog/emerging-research-on-repurposing-medicines-in-cancer-treatment>
64. <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/latest-news/what-to-know-about-fenbendazole.html>
65. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UDkFCJvQF1E>
66. <https://www.facebook.com/61552316873196/posts/what-they-dont-tell-you-about-fenbendazole-and-cancer/122110792880077229/>
67. <https://www.facebook.com/PatientPower.Info/posts/when-facing-cancer-its-natural-to-look-at-every-possible-optionincluding-alterna/1347624720696407/>
68. <https://sciencebasedmedicine.org/paul-marik-disparaging-chemotherapy-in-order-to-sell-cancer-quackery/>
69. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5135489/>
70. <https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/OP.24.00032>
71. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/pharmacology/articles/10.3389/fphar.2025.1670845/full>
72. <https://arc-w.nihr.ac.uk/news/risk-of-bias-in-evidence-underpinning-approval-of-new-cancer-drugs-raises-questions/>
73. <https://www.cancernetwork.com/view/many-authors-nccn-guidelines-have-financial-conflicts-interest>
74. <https://acsjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/cncr.32997>
75. <https://www.oncologynewscentral.com/article/stronger-rules-needed-for-oncology-financial-conflicts-of-interest-critics-argue>
76. <https://www.biospace.com/study-raises-concern-over-risk-of-bias-in-ema-approved-cancer-trials>
77. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7866447/>
78. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11595001/>
79. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/approach-to-repurposed-drugs-for-cancer.pdf>
80. <https://cancerchoices.org/fenbendazole-and-cancer-a-closer-look-at-its-use-and-risks/>
81. <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/latest-news/what-to-know-about-fenbendazole.html>
82. <https://karger.com/cro/article/14/2/886/820730/Drug-Induced-Liver-Injury-in-a-Patient-with>

83. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8105509/>
84. <https://www.cancertherapyadvisor.com/features/oncology-guideline-research-conflict-of-interest-continue-plague-research/>
85. <https://pharmaekonomi.substack.com/p/the-strange-economics-of-cancer-drugs>
86. <https://www.newsweek.com/surgeon-beat-cancer-debunks-alternative-treatments-1970015>
87. <https://www.cnn.com/2024/03/27/health/fda-ivermectin-lawsuit>
88. <https://www.unmc.edu/healthsecurity/transmission/2024/08/14/doctors-accused-of-spreading-misinformation-lose-certifications/>
89. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5135489/>
90. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/pharmacology/articles/10.3389/fphar.2025.1670845/full>
91. <https://liz.oriordan.co.uk/about/>
92. <https://www.breastsurgeons.org/news/?id=71>
93. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-suffolk-47767386>
94. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j\\_ogUpdo96w](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j_ogUpdo96w)
95. <https://oncodaily.com/100/influential-women-in-oncology-18394>
96. <https://www.courthousenews.com/fifth-circuit-sides-with-ivermectin-prescribing-doctors-in-their-quarrel-with-the-fda/>
97. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/FLCCC-Alliance-Member-CV-Marik.pdf>
98. <https://isom.ca/profile/paul-marik/>
99. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Cancer-Care-Summary-12-03-2024.pdf>
100. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/approach-to-repurposed-drugs-for-cancer.pdf>
101. <https://imahealth.org/approach-repurposed-drugs-for-cancer/>
102. [https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC\\_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf](https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf)
103. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11595001/>
104. <https://acsjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/cncr.32997>
105. <https://cancerchoices.org/fenbendazole-and-cancer-a-closer-look-at-its-use-and-risks/>
106. <https://www.cancernetwork.com/view/many-authors-nccn-guidelines-have-financial-conflicts-interest>

107. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dfjqHIW- vA>
108. <https://www.facebook.com/61552316873196/posts/after-200-people-sent-me-a-clip-from-a-melrobbins-podcast-today-worh-drdawnmussa/122110408268077229/>
109. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OmrAGc7Z0lk>
110. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11271980/>
111. [https://www.blackburn.senate.gov/2025/7/health\\_care/blackburn-skrmetti-call-for-ftc-investigation-into-questionable-online-marketing-of-alternatives-to-fda-approved-weight-loss-medications](https://www.blackburn.senate.gov/2025/7/health_care/blackburn-skrmetti-call-for-ftc-investigation-into-questionable-online-marketing-of-alternatives-to-fda-approved-weight-loss-medications)
112. <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DQfLbT0DJZv/>
113. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11868475/>
114. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/cdc-foundation-aims-to-improve-cancer-outcomes-through-new-initiative-aimed-at-education-and-empowerment-301222355.html>
115. <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DTu3Yy-DmFV/>
116. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5135489/>
117. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/pharmacology/articles/10.3389/fphar.2025.1670845/full>
118. <https://www.newsweek.com/surgeon-beat-cancer-debunks-alternative-treatments-1970015>
119. <https://acsjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/cncr.32997>
120. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/approach-to-repurposed-drugs-for-cancer.pdf>
121. [https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC\\_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf](https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf)
122. <https://www.cnn.com/2024/03/27/health/fda-ivermectin-lawsuit>
123. <https://www.unmc.edu/healthsecurity/transmission/2024/08/14/doctors-accused-of-spreading-misinformation-lose-certifications/>
124. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Cancer-Care-FLCCC-Dr-Paul-Marik-v2.pdf>
125. [https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC\\_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf](https://publish-01.obsidian.md/access/7941b97b404803ac444082ff8b5c8e66/bins/pdf/FLCCC_Cancer-Care-July-31-2023.pdf)
126. <https://imahealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/Cancer-Care-Summary-12-03-2024.pdf>
127. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10372169/>
128. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11595001/>

129. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/pharmacology/articles/10.3389/fphar.2025.1670845/full>
130. <https://cancerchoices.org/fenbendazole-and-cancer-a-closer-look-at-its-use-and-risks/>
131. <https://cancerchoices.org/therapy/mebendazole-or-fenbendazole/safety/>
132. <https://karger.com/cro/article/14/2/886/820730/Drug-Induced-Liver-Injury-in-a-Patient-with>
133. <https://www.417integrativemedicine.com/articles/exploring-fenbendazole-as-a-complementary-option-for-cancer-patients>
134. <https://imahealth.org/treatment-protocols/>
135. <https://imahealth.org/protocol-categories/prevention/>
136. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12410886/>
137. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/6079469232124674/posts/28325044470473832/>
138. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/megahealing/posts/786134746689522/>
139. <https://www.fenbendazole.org/fenbendazole-information/fenbendazole-safety-and-side-effects/>
140. [https://www.accc-cancer.org/docs/projects/sdm/shared-decision-making-publication\\_final.pdf?sfvrsn=994b7f55\\_0](https://www.accc-cancer.org/docs/projects/sdm/shared-decision-making-publication_final.pdf?sfvrsn=994b7f55_0)
141. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/381515980441462/>
- 142.