Abstract: After induction of apoptosis, with hydrochloric Terazosine, acting on the elimination of the prostate tissue due to the preceding atrophy - marasmus due to Dutasteride or Finasteride, the most rapid in immediate/medium-term and long-term practice for reduction of prostate tissue may be promoted in comparison to the separate action of - N- or -F. At the same time, our conclusion is revealed, crucially secure and self-evidenced that, resulting by this fact, the prostate cancer is promoted and achieved in actions and not words, thanks to the crucial elimination of time - and not only - margin for the development of malignancy either further evolution - as happens often - of an already existing hidden, which has not reached yet and will not reach the limit of 1/100 cells (or approximate time limit of 8-10 years old). Furthermore, elimination on time of dysplastic-metaplastic cells due to stimulation of production and, inevitably, destruction from P53, the protein of apoptosis that destroys selectively all cells that are not functioning well from morphological point of view. With Fenretidine, an explosive collaborative prevention, harmless to the prevention of cancer to special population groups mentioned in the description and the indications of our practice. The additions of Verapamile/Diltiazem, within the frame of particularities of action and application field, distinguish in the annulment of MDR, the imprisonment of Pgp170 and in fact save the population of patients we address to. TECHNIQUE LEVEL We know nothing respective to our entire methodological conclusion.
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