Response to the *The Scientist* Article

An article was recently published by the online journal *The Scientist*. We deplore the low quality of journalism used in writing this article and would like to provide further information to interested readers on various points raised by this article.

The articles questioned 1) the effect of endogenous stem cell release on health; 2) the efficacy of StemEnhance, and 3) the safety of StemEnhance.

**Effect of endogenous stem cell release on health**

*The Scientist* quoted a number of scientists stating that the role of adult stem cells in the body has not reached a consensus among scientists. If a consensus had been reached the writing of this article by *The Scientist* would have been obsolete. If a consensus had been reached there would be no confrontation of ideas to talk about. As with virtually any development in the history of science, novel ideas are at first supported by little evidence and are opposed by those involved in more conventional thinking. With time and with the accumulation of evidence, or lack thereof, ideas grow into a theory or disappear.

The field of adult stem cell research is vast and prolific, and the number of studies confirming the role of adult stem cells in tissue regeneration is undeniable. Indisputable demonstration of the role of endogenous stem cell release in health will be made in the next few years and consensus will be reached, at least on therapeutic applications, which have already begun. Why *The Scientist* decided to only report the opinions of scientists opposing this view is a question to ask the author Kerry Grens. We deplore the disinformation they offered their own readers. It has been solidly demonstrated that increasing the number of circulating stem cells can lead to significant health benefits (see references).

For example a pertinent quote would have been that of Dr. Prentice from Georgetown University. “[Adult stem cells] have significant capabilities for growth, repair, and regeneration of damaged cells and tissues in the body, akin to a built-in repair kit or maintenance crew that only needs activation and stimulation to accomplish repair of damage. […] direct stimulation of endogenous stem cells within a tissue may be the easiest, safest, and most efficient way to stimulate tissue regeneration.” (Prentice, 2003)

**The efficacy of StemEnhance**

*The Scientist* quoted, among others, Dr. William Frishman from the New York Medical College in Valhalla as saying, "I would look at this with great, great, great skepticism." It is unfortunate that *The Scientist* has put respectable scientists in the position of expressing an opinion on a product about which they have no knowledge. Why is *The Scientist* seeking the opinion of scientists having no knowledge of StemEnhance rather than scientists having a first hand experience of its clinical use?
Before bringing StemEnhance to the marketplace, STEMTech HealthSciences sought the opinions of experts in the field of stem cell research. We requested opinions on two specific issues: 1) the role of stem cells in the human body, and 2) the effect of StemEnhance on stem cells. These scientists did not answer a few questions during a phone interview; they reviewed the entire scientific literature for relevant studies that they analyzed in great details. They also reviewed our data and the records of our studies and laboratory work. They concluded that adult stem cells indeed constituted the natural renewal system of the body, that more stem cells in the blood indeed supports health. They further supported the conclusion from the available data that StemEnhance supports the natural release of stem cells from the bone marrow in safe manner. Independent clinical research on StemEnhance validating the efficacy of our product has recently been accepted for publication in a scientific journal.

We could have provided all this information, had the author Kerry Grens asked. Instead, she chose to offer her readers the opinion of Stephen Barrett at the MLM-Watch, a man who lost his medical license and whose “testimony should be accorded little, if any, credibility”, as stated in writing by a Judge of the Superior Court of California. She also presented as pertinent the opinion of Dale Peterson of the Wellness Clubs of America, a man who sells dietary supplements on his website and is eager to bring down other successful providers in order to boost his own sales. We will let the reader draw his own conclusion as to the professionalism of the journalism offered by *The Scientist*.

**The safety of StemEnhance**

Likewise when considering the safety of StemEnhance, the author Kerry Grens elected to seek the advice of scientists who had no knowledge of the data of StemEnhance. It is obvious that any respectable scientist who does not have knowledge about a specific product or plant will err by answering on the cautious side. It seems rather obvious that if one wants to get a relevant answer about a product one should seek the opinion of scientists having knowledge and experience with that product. We could have given Grens the reference of many doctors and clinicians using StemEnhance in their practice. Furthermore, had she asked STEMTech, we could have provided a copy of a study showing that consumption of the human equivalent of up to 400 capsules a day led to no signs of toxicity in mice, including no sign of cancer. Aside from that study, the simple fact that the raw material from which StemEnhance is made has been safely consumed by consumers for over 20 years, attests to the safety of StemEnhance.

*Ibid* biased approach is indirectly made obvious by the quoted response of William Frishman from the New York Medical College in Valhalla. Frishman is quoted saying, “Here [with StemEnhance] you're giving a general stem cell booster. Some people might have occult malignancies and all of a sudden you're giving them a stem cell booster.” Frishman cannot be blamed for expressing his view, but had he any knowledge of the mechanism of action of StemEnhance he would have known that it is not a
“general stem cell booster” but simply a stem cell mobilizer, which has nothing to do with the stimulation of occult malignancies.

Finally, the author mischaracterized our approach regarding the FDA and clinical trials. StemEnhance is a dietary supplement and STEMTech HealthSciences has absolutely no concern about any revocation of its status as a dietary supplement. In order to ensure long-term supply to the thousands of people who enjoy the health benefits of StemEnhance, STEMTech HealthSciences has adopted the position of complying in a very strict and conservative manner with the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act of 1994 (DSHEA), the law regulating dietary supplements. The company makes absolutely no claims about its product beyond the “structure and function” claims allowed by DSHEA. Our products simply support the natural release of adult stem cells. We actively monitor the individuals who distribute our product to ensure compliance with applicable law. If we find anyone making improper claims about our product, we move swiftly to correct them, and repeat offenders are forced to terminate their relationship with us.
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