

# Re: cheap safe drug kills most cancers

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.cancer/2007-01/msg00150.html>

---

- *From:* "Laurie Forbes" <[laforbes@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:laforbes@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 23 Jan 2007 23:01:17 GMT
- 

<[a2rjh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:a2rjh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1169527439.316180.186710@xx](mailto:news:1169527439.316180.186710@xx)

laurie,

chris and i basically agreed (another thread) that this should be pursued further (not up to me though) and put on the clinical trial fast-track. reducing the cancerous tumor and proceeding with conventional surgical treatment

is not new in this field.

why not open a door to more economical way that will lead to the same end result. all that i am trying to say is give a cheaper option (as you put it) to buy more time. the funds, time, energy can be diverted or concentrated to fine tune other methods.

If this stuff is as good as it looks, I would think that phase 2 trials would begin ASAP (phase 1 not necessary (or not as necessary) as toxicity/tolerance has already been established in unrelated studies). One problem is however the drug itself is not patentable as it has been in existence a long time. The U of A researchers have taken out a patent on its proposed \*new\* use but that is considered a "soft" patent and would not stop others from using it (this from the principle investigator). The upshot of not being strongly patentable is of course drug manufacturers would not be interested in pursuing costly clinical trials (which can run into hundreds of millions of dollars). The investigators therefore hope to attract government, academic or medical research foundation monies to pursue this further.

Another potential issue is that the drug has apparently not yet been tried in humans with cancer (only in test tube or mice with implanted human cancers). So, it may not work in humans or the toxicity profile might be

Re: cheap safe drug kills most cancers

unfavourable in cancer patients.

I guess we will have to wait to see how it pans out in the trials, or, maybe until people start trying it on their own (which I suspect will happen; I know I would if faced with no other choices).

Laurie Forbes

.