



Why I'm upping my recommendations for this "controversial" supplement

And all the natural ways it can transform your health starting today

I often warn about the tragic results when mainstream researchers—who have no *real* knowledge of diet, nutrition, or dietary supplementation—get their hands on government funding to “make a little research.”

These academic research machines will study *anything*. They have labs, scientists, “medical writers,” legions of statisticians, and administrative bureaucrats at the ready. They’re addicted to amassing more and more research dollars from taxpayers to fund unnecessary studies to feed the hungry mouths of their research staffs.

That’s the only justification I can find for a new, fatally flawed meta-analysis conducted by researchers from seven countries (proving that academic research machines know no boundaries).

This international team analyzed 10 studies of more than 77,000 older men and women and reached this startling conclusion: Omega-3 fatty acids derived from fish oil *do not* reduce the risk of cardiovascular disease.¹

Of course, this flies in the face of *decades* of research on the benefits of omega-3s and fish oil for heart health. Dozens of studies show omega-3s protect against abnormal heart rhythms, reduce blood pressure, and improve the function

of blood vessels. They also lower blood lipids and counter chronic inflammation.

In fact, the evidence is so pervasive that the FDA even issued one of its very rare, qualified health claims for omega-3s, saying these fatty acids may reduce the risk of coronary heart disease.

Not to mention the hundreds of additional studies showing omega-3s’ ability to lower the risk of Alzheimer’s disease, dementia, cognitive decline, and cancer.

There’s very little doubt, outside of mainstream medicine, that omega-3s from fish oil are among the most important nutrients for all aspects of your health.

But you certainly wouldn’t know that from this new meta-analysis. Which, as it turns out, looked at studies that used pitifully small dosages.

The final straw for faulty fish oil dosages

Now that the sardine is out of the can, there’s a flood of criticism about this flawed meta-analysis, which was published in the January issue of *JAMA Cardiology*. In fact, my colleague, Dr. Jeff Bland, called it “one of the most controversial studies in recent history.”²

While I certainly agree, I did derive one positive benefit from

this otherwise useless study. And it’s a *big* one. In fact, it’s led me to entirely rethink the fish oil dosages I’ve long recommended to readers like you for optimal health.

Based on the latest *real* science, here’s what I *now* recommend for fish oil consumption based on the following dietary scenarios...

If you eat A LOT of fish...

If you eat fatty fish or seafood (like wild-caught Pacific salmon, Atlantic mackerel, trout, shrimp, or sardines or anchovies in olive oil) at every meal—every day—there’s really no need for you to take fish oil supplements. But unless you’re a character from *The Old Man and the Sea*, it’s quite unlikely your fish intake is that high—at least, for most Americans...

If you eat quite a bit of fish...

If you eat fatty fish or seafood almost every day (about 3 to 5 times per week), then you only need to supplement with **1 to 3 grams** of fish oil daily.

In this issue:

Seven keys to a whole-body health reboot..... 4

The big fat reason why so much prostate cancer research is flawed 6

Marc S. Micozzi, M.D., Ph.D., is a worldwide leader in nutritional and complementary/alternative medicine. He has had a distinguished career as a researcher and physician executive at the National Institutes of Health and Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Washington, DC, and the College of Physicians in Philadelphia PA. He has published over 30 medical and trade books, and founded and edited the first scientific journal, and the first textbook, on complementary/alternative and nutritional medicine, now going into a 6th edition (2018) and continuously in print since 1995.

Dr. Micozzi's *Insiders' Cures* is published monthly by OmniVista Health Media, L.L.C., 100 W. Monument St., Baltimore, MD 21201 for \$74 per year (\$6.16 an issue).

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Insiders' Cures*, 100 W. Monument St. Baltimore, MD 21201.

Author: Marc S. Micozzi, M.D., Ph.D.
 Publisher: Katherine Wheeler
 Executive Editor: Amanda Angelini

All material in this publication is provided for information only and may not be construed as medical advice or instruction. No action should be taken based solely on the contents of this publication; readers should consult appropriate health professionals on any matter relating to their health and wellbeing. The information provided in this publication is believed to be accurate and sound, based on the best judgment available to the authors, but readers who fail to consult with appropriate health authorities assume the risk of any injuries. The opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the publisher. The publisher is not responsible for errors or omissions.

For questions regarding your subscription, please contact reader services at www.drnicozzi.com.

Copyright © 2018 OmniVista Health Media, L.L.C., 100 W. Monument St., Baltimore, MD 21201. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without written permission of the publisher.

Make sure you choose a product that contains:

- 400-950 mg of EPA fatty acids
- 300-700 mg of DHA fatty acids

If you eat a moderate amount of fish...

If you eat fish or seafood two to three times a week, I recommend taking **4 to 5 grams** of fish oil every day.

This supplement should include:

- 1,400-1,800 mg of EPA fatty acids
- 1,000-1,300 mg of DHA fatty acids

If you don't eat any fish...

Sadly, and somewhat shockingly, the majority of Americans fall into this category. In this case, I recommend supplementing every day with **6 grams** of fish oil.

Choose a product that contains:

- 2,000 mg of EPA fatty acids
- 1,500 mg of DHA fatty acids

Why getting the right dose is vital when it comes to fish oil

So how did this new, faulty meta-analysis actually help me reach this important new breakthrough on fish oil and omega-3 dosages?

Well, it has to do with the miniscule amounts of omega-3s in the studies the researchers analyzed. Daily dosages ranged from only 226 mg to 1,800 mg (1.8 grams) per day.

Let's pause for just a second. I'd like to quickly point out that all of the *real* studies have found—and I've always recommended—you should be taking omega-3s and fish oil in food quantities, which are typically measured in *grams*, not milligrams.

But the researchers shamelessly included studies in their meta-analysis that used blatantly non-therapeutic and sub-therapeutic

doses of fish oil. They should've known better! Using wrong, lowly doses should've been a red flag for these researchers to exclude those particular studies from further analysis.

But even in this flawed analysis, there were three studies that used a (barely adequate) dose of 1,800 mg of fish oil per day (whereas the other seven used pitifully low dosages well below that).

And the data from these three studies actually DID still show the benefits of supplementing with fish oil.

The findings are in line with another meta-analysis published in August 2017, in the *Journal of Clinical Lipidology*, showing a statistically significant 8 percent reduction in deaths from heart disease among people who took more than 1 gram of fish oil per day.³

Unintentionally, the *JAMA Cardiology* meta-analysis actually *confirms* what we know about omega-3s. It's the dose that matters—always. And taking less than 2 grams of omega-3 EPA/DHA per day just isn't going to do that much, unless you're one of the few Americans who eats fish almost every day.

The lack of therapeutic fish oil dosages used in the meta-analysis likely explains the following statement from the study authors: "No matter how the researchers looked at the data, they could find no association of the supplements with lowered risk for death from heart disease, or with nonfatal heart attacks, or other major cardiovascular events."

And, not surprisingly, researchers also found that the puny amounts of fish oil studied had little to no effect

on people with prior heart disease, diabetes, or high cholesterol levels, or on people using statins (although not much can help people who are taking statins, aside from quitting them).

How do you choose a quality fish oil supplement?

There's one more very important consideration that's been completely ignored in all of the commentary about the *JAMA Cardiology* study. And that's the *quality* of the fish oil product being used.

I first pointed out this fact in the October 2013 issue of *Insiders' Cures*, when I revealed the truth behind a fishy study supposedly linking fish oil to prostate cancer (for more information, see page 7).

Among many other methodological problems with this study was the researchers' failure to consider the sources of the omega-3s and fish oil, including the key question of quality.

Because, when it comes to supplements, it's just as important to have the best *quality* (ingredients), as it is to have the right *quantity* (dosages).

Without knowing the quality of the supplements you buy, you're taking a big chance. In other words, what you don't know *can* indeed hurt you. Especially with fish oil.

So here's what you need to know when choosing—and using—fish oil supplements.

- **Labeling:** This is perhaps one of the most important steps you can take when choosing a good fish oil. Pay attention to the “Supplement Facts” label on the back of the bottle, where the EPA/DHA concentration is listed.

This is what's really important...

Some cheaper fish oils may have 2,000 mg of omega-3 fish oil listed on the front of the bottle, but—as the “Supplement Facts” label will show—only a measly 300 mg of that is EPA/DHA.

As I mentioned earlier, if you eat fish two or three times a week, you need about 4 to 5 grams (4,000 to 5,000 mg) of omega-3 fish oil daily with 1,400 to 1,800 mg of EPA fatty acids and 1,000 to 1,300 mg of DHA fatty acids. You can revisit my full list of dosage recommendations on page 2.

- **Bottling:** Look for fish oil supplements in dark-colored bottles only. Clear containers allow light to shine on the supplement, which can cause oxidization, thus making the supplement go rancid.
- **Quantity:** Although it's tempting to save some money by buying in bulk, it's not recommended with fish oil. It keeps for about 90 days after opening. So the longer fish oil sits around in a big jug, the more likely it is to spoil—and ultimately, those few extra dollars you saved will have entirely gone to waste.
- **Expiration:** Speaking of going to waste, always check the expiration date on the label before you buy. Make sure that you'll have plenty of time to make your way through an entire bottle before it spoils.
- **Storage:** As I mentioned above, light can cause your fish oil supplement to go rancid, and the same goes for heat. Don't keep this supplement in your bathroom medicine cabinet if you tend to take hot showers. Instead, I recommend keeping your fish oil in a cool, dark location, like the refrigerator.

Supplements—and dosages—you can trust

It's often difficult to know whether those big bottles of fish oil you see in your local pharmacy or grocery store meet quality standards—especially when it comes to important processes like purification, distillation, and testing. So you have to choose only supplements from sources you know and trust.


If not, you may find you're taking supplements that are useless or even harmful. And that warning also applies to researchers who don't know the sources of the fish oil they use in their studies.

For these reasons, I took it upon myself to do the research and source high-quality ingredients and manufacturers, so you don't have to do the legwork.

For more details on supplements, I encourage you to take a look at my website, www.DrMicozzi.com. (Just type the keyword, “fish oil,” into the search bar.)

All in all, one result from the faulty *JAMA Cardiology* study is clear. We need to be taking greater quantities of omega-3 fish oils (4 to 5 grams per day for most people) for optimal results.

These amounts are higher than what we'd been led to believe are “adequate” dosages—and higher than what I've previously recommended. But the new meta-analysis drove home the point that doses that are too low don't work.

Why take the chance, especially if you don't get enough fish in your diet? So please, always check the label of your fish oil supplement to ensure you're taking the correct daily doses of EPA and DHA. 

Seven keys to a whole-body health reboot

Plus, the instant, effortless, and easy “trick” to feeling better TODAY

We keep hearing more and more about how microbiomes are critical to virtually every aspect of human health.

This is certainly true of the gastrointestinal (GI) microbiome, where trillions of healthy “probiotic” bacteria live and help protect you from deadly infections and diseases.

Research is increasingly showing that the GI microbiome is a key axis for the “psychoneuroimmunology” system that influences how well your brain and your nervous, endocrine, and immune systems all function together.

But as big and important as the GI microbiome is, there's another key microbiome living on the largest organ of your body—the skin.

Plenty of research shows an imbalanced skin microbiome can lead to psoriasis, eczema, acne, and rosacea. This imbalance can also increase your susceptibility to the damage caused by inflammation, which affects not just your skin, but your entire body. And believe it or not, an imbalance of bacteria on your skin can even make you more attractive to disease-carrying mosquitoes.¹

And new research further solidifies why balancing your skin bacteria is so important. Findings from a recent study show the probiotic bacteria that make up your skin microbiome can actually kill several types of skin cancer cells.

I'll share more about this research in just a moment. But first, let's take a closer look at how the body's various microbiomes work... and

the simple steps you can take to help improve and maintain their health.

How dietary supplements—and drugs—influence the GI microbiome

Without knowing about the modern science of psychoneuroimmunology, ancient Ayurvedic and Chinese medicine understood that digestion is the key to all aspects of health—including reversing chronic conditions. That's why restoring normal GI function is a cornerstone of Eastern medical therapies.

So it's not surprising that now, modern science is telling us that healthy digestion, and your overall health, begins with your microbiome.

We're also learning more and more about how nutrients and botanicals (and some drugs, especially antibiotics) work by influencing your microbiome.

That's important for our view of how dietary supplements (and drugs) can affect human health. The natural products industry is finally discovering the concept of “bioavailability,” which determines just how much of an oral supplement's active ingredients are properly digested and then transferred into your bloodstream.

It turns out that many effective botanicals have only limited bioavailability—but they still influence the all-important probiotic bacteria in the GI tract. In fact, these botanical supplements go to work in the gut immediately—*before* they ever get into your

bloodstream or reach your bodily tissues (what I like to call “biome-availability”).

Natural solutions for a healthy microbiome

Part of a botanical's effectiveness in the GI tract is due to its polyphenols—key active ingredients found in almost all plants.

Polyphenols generally have *low* bioavailability. In fact, research shows that only about 10 percent of these substances make it into your bloodstream from your GI tract.² However, their influence on your gut bacteria is incredibly powerful.

In a 2015 study, 244 participants who supplemented with a blend of polyphenols from herbal remedies reported they had less bloating, diarrhea, and gas.³ Meaning the polyphenols worked *directly* in your GI tract to provide relief. So in actuality, the herbal remedies' “bioavailability” didn't even matter!

Another recent study found that foods and botanicals rich in polyphenols had a strong impact on the effectiveness of the immune system.⁴ This makes sense because your GI's microbiome houses more immune cells than any other part of the body.

Elderberry in particular showed remarkable effects for protecting against the flu, despite its limited absorption into the bloodstream. Instead, this benefit is due to elderberry's ability to trigger the production of a specific flu-fighting substance in the microbiome.

Polyphenols are most commonly found in fruits and vegetables (preferably organic) and whole grains (preferably non-GMO).

There are also significant amounts of polyphenols in a few foods some so-called health “experts” point to as “vices” or “guilty pleasures”—specifically dark chocolate, wine, coffee, and tea. So by simply eating a clean, balanced, and sensible diet, you’re naturally improving the health of your GI microbiome.

How your skin microbiome keeps other parts of your body healthy

Just as all of the organs and tissues in your body are interrelated, so are your microbiomes. So the factors keeping your gut microbiome healthy—or unhealthy—apply to your skin microbiome as well.

In fact, your skin microbiome influences your overall health in very specific ways...

For example, natural practitioners have talked for many years about the importance of a mother passing on her skin probiotics to her infant during breastfeeding. These probiotics help give the baby even more natural immunity.

I’ve also reported on studies showing the importance of children being exposed to normal soil bacteria on their skin for immune health.

In other words, contrary to what so many parents have been brainwashed into believing, keeping children isolated in sterile environments and giving them increasing numbers of vaccines (many of which are dangerous and ineffective, as I often report) is NOT the key to keeping them healthy.

In fact, children are ultimately far

healthier when they’re allowed to play outside and get dirty.

Which leads me to the new study I mentioned earlier. Researchers at the University of California, San Diego, have identified a probiotic skin bacteria that can actually inhibit the growth of skin cancers.⁵

These bacteria are called 6-HAP, and they’re thought to impair the synthesis of DNA in growing cancer cells. The researchers discovered that mice lacking 6-HAP bacteria developed multiple skin tumors after exposure to ultraviolet light, while mice with 6-HAP didn’t develop any tumors.

Further research revealed that mice given intravenous 6-HAP every 48 hours for two weeks experienced no toxic effects. And when the mice had malignant melanoma tumors transplanted onto their skin, the size of the tumors was reduced by more than *50 percent*.

Surprising toxins for the skin microbiome

There are many factors that affect your skin’s microbial flora, including age, gender, personal hygiene, environmental factors, your body’s pH levels, your clothing, and the amount you sweat. Obviously, some of these factors are out of your control.

But as evidenced by the study above, it’s imperative to work *with* the body’s normal defenses, especially your skin’s probiotic bacteria. And making some simple changes to the factors you can control will go a long way towards helping your skin bacteria flourish.

The easiest place to start is determining which products you should—and shouldn’t—put on your skin.

Antibacterial soaps and hand sanitizers. The FDA has finally figured out that good old soap and water is just as effective—and much less dangerous for your health—than antibacterial soaps and hand sanitizers. Specifically, the triclosan and triclocarban ingredients in these products not only kill good bacteria, but they’ve also been shown to disrupt hormones.⁶

I recommend natural or organic soaps without sulfates (lathering agents that have been linked to cancer) and artificial fragrances.

Antiperspirants and mainstream deodorants. To understand why these seemingly innocuous products are harmful to your health, you need to know the basic mechanisms of sweat and odor.

Sweat itself has no smell—except when it’s released from apocrine glands in your underarms and groin area. That type of sweat contains protein and fats from the food you eat...and when mixed with the bacteria on your skin, they produce body odor.

Antiperspirants contain triclosan to kill those bacteria. And they also use a chemical called aluminum chlorohydrate to plug your underarm pores and keep sweat from even forming in the first place. This might seem like a benefit, but it’s actually very dangerous. Sweat is one of the chief ways your body sheds toxins—yet antiperspirants actually artificially *block* this normal biologic function.

Chemical deodorants also contain triclosan, but they don’t contain aluminum chlorohydrate—making them marginally better than antiperspirants. But certainly not ideal.

Fortunately, there are now natural

deodorants called “crystals,” which are clear, round blocks of mineral salts. When you wet the crystal and roll it under your arms, it spreads a thin layer of these salts, creating an invisible barrier between your sweat and bacteria. So you don't block your sweat glands or kill your skin bacteria—you just keep them from mingling.


It may take your body a few days to adjust to deodorant crystals, meaning you might experience some body odor at first. And you'll still sweat. But, remember—sweat is a good thing and helps to rid your body of toxins.

Cosmetics, lotions, sunscreens, and other skin products. The same rules apply to ANY product you apply to your skin. Look for natural ingredients without added fragrances. Demand for natural cosmetics and personal hygiene products is increasing, and they're widely available in most natural food stores as well as numerous online retailers.

For more simple ways to naturally support both of your body's microbiomes, refer to the sidebar on the right.

When it comes down to it, it's just as important to choose wisely when

it comes to what you put *on* your body as it is what you put *in* it.

Take care of the skin you're in—probiotic bacteria and all. 

7 simple steps to naturally support your microbiomes

You may have heard that keeping your body's microbiomes healthy is as simple as popping a probiotic pill.

However, I'm not at all sold on these popular supplements. The problem is that the science—so far—hasn't shown that probiotic supplements *consistently* works for most people.

Of course, your body needs probiotic bacteria to stay healthy. But you can nurture and grow this “good” bacteria without relying on questionable supplements.

Here's what I recommend to keep ALL your body's microbiomes healthy.

- 1) **Avoid antibiotics**, which fight infection by destroying all of the bacteria in your microbiomes—including helpful probiotic bacteria.
- 2) **Don't use antibacterial soaps and sanitizers**, which disrupt your skin's microbiome by killing off the good bacteria. Not to mention, your good probiotic bacteria educate your own cells on how to produce your own natural “antibiotics” that kill off harmful intruders.
- 3) **Use natural, mineral “crystal”**

deodorants that keep your skin's probiotics intact, rather than chemical deodorants and antiperspirants that kill all skin bacteria.

- 4) **Follow a balanced diet** that includes polyphenol-rich fruits, vegetables, and herbs. Shop organic and GMO-free when you can.
- 5) **Eat fermented foods** that introduce and/or support healthy bacteria in your gut. My favorites include plain yogurt, cheese, and sauerkraut, as well as traditionally-processed Korean kimchi, soy sauce, and fish sauce.
- 6) **Stay away from processed carbs and sugary foods**, which disrupt the good bacteria in your gut.
- 7) **Drink to your health with polyphenol-rich coffee and tea.** Home-brewed beer and wine can also be a good, natural source of probiotics, as long as they're not pasteurized. Plus, you'll get the health benefits of moderate alcohol consumption.

With these seven simple steps, you'll easily transform all your body's microbiomes—and your health will naturally follow suit.

The big fat reason why so much prostate cancer research is flawed

Men have long been ill-served when it comes to prostate cancer prevention and treatment.

Billions of dollars have been spent studying the causes of breast cancer (largely barking up the wrong trees and ignoring the *real* factors). But research on prostate cancer has been a pittance, almost like an

afterthought.

The PSA cancer screening test—which is still relentlessly pushed onto men—has been totally discredited, yet is still in widespread use.

As a result, excessive screening has led to an aggressive increase in the number of diagnosed “fake

cancers.” Meaning that, in reality, you could live a perfectly healthy life with a relatively harmless form of prostate cancer, as long as it's closely monitored.

But instead, you might be subjected to aggressive treatment.

If you ask me, invasive biopsies and surgeries are overused, abused, and

often unneeded. (If you'd like to read the study data to support this, I recommend referring back to my February 2018 *Daily Dispatch* titled, "Routine cancer screenings may cause unnecessary risks." Simply type the article title into the search bar on www.DrMicozzi.com.)

Sadly, when it comes down to what exactly causes prostate cancer (as well as other prostate diseases) and how to prevent them, there has been more "fake news" than real news.

That includes a highly questionable new study that spawned a *New York Times* headline proclaiming that a "High-Fat Diet May Fuel Spread of Prostate Cancer."¹

And sadly, this is hardly the first time we've heard about misguided studies concluding diets containing *any* type of naturally-occurring fat contribute to prostate and other cancers.

Read on, and I'll tell you why this medieval crusade against fats is just flat-out false. And I'll also tell you what you *really* need to know to keep your prostate healthy.

The harmful, haunting effects of more than 70 years of faulty research

The theory that fats contribute to cancer may be wrong, but it's certainly not new. During the 1980s, I remember poring over early scientific articles from the 1940s that indeed appear to show that fats contribute to cancer.

That old, outdated idea launched a thousand expensive, flawed, and failed studies that got us nowhere.

Case in point is a shameful study on fish oil and prostate cancer that I reported on in the October 2013 *Insiders' Cures* ("What you REALLY need to know about fish, omega-3s, and prostate cancer risk").

Back then, researchers tried to claim that omega-3s in fish oil (among the healthiest nutrients on the planet) supposedly increased the risk of prostate cancer. But among many other flaws in the study, the researchers paid no attention to the *sources* and *quality* of the fish oil. (I talk about this in detail on page 3.)

I suspect another reason for the researchers' erroneous conclusion is that omega-3s are essential fatty acids. And the "experts" just can't seem to wrap their heads around the idea that anything with the word "fat" is not automatically bad for your health—and can actually be quite helpful.

Why a deeply flawed study still makes the headlines

Take, for instance, the newest study I mentioned earlier "linking" fats and prostate cancer.²

Researchers gave 10 mice a variety of diets, and then analyzed the diets' effects on two genes linked to cancer.

Some mice were fed a diet that was 60 percent fat, which would be unrealistically high for a human diet. Other mice received a 17 percent fat diet, which is extremely low. (While I'm no expert on mouse diets, the optimal human diet gets about 40 percent of its calories from fats).

It's important to note that abnormal, artificial diets—like those given to the mice—are invariably associated with other huge dietary distortions, which influence every health factor the researchers were trying to study.

What's more, the high-fat mouse diet also included several other non-fat ingredients which have been shown to promote cancer in other mouse studies. What a joke!

Finally, the mice were also given

an "obesity drug" called fatostatin (I kid you not), which was created to stop the body from making fat, instead releasing the energy from the food you eat.

Perhaps the researchers were really just trying to study this new drug, and incidentally showed some kind of side effect on prostate cancer through fat metabolism? Maybe they were afraid their so-called obesity drug wouldn't really work in humans (like other obesity drugs), so they went fishing for some other benefit?

Regardless, any study on 10 mice should *not* be rewriting history in the pages of the *New York Times*...

Here's the real evidence about fats and cancer

The bottom line is that in actual humans, there has never been any conclusive evidence that dietary fat consumption, including saturated fats, is associated with prostate cancer—in fact, just the opposite.

The European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study is likely one of the longest-term research studies addressing this topic. And after tracking more than 142,000 men for almost nine years, EPIC found *no association* between dietary fat (including saturated, monounsaturated, and polyunsaturated fats) and the risk of prostate cancer.³

So why does the "fat causes cancer" myth continue to persist? I'm beginning to think it's an attempt to deflect our attention away from sugar—the *real* problem behind metabolic diseases like cancer.

After all, sugar has a lobbying group and fat doesn't. The "big sugar" bullies need something to pick on, so they pummel know-

nothing government bureaucrats, mainstream medicine, and the “lamestream” media with the ridiculous message that fat is unhealthy than sugar.

It's simply not true. As long as you take into account a couple of important caveats...

Know the difference between “good” and “bad” fats

While I've repeatedly advised that saturated fat isn't the demon it's been made out to be by the mainstream, there are two types of fats that should be on your radar—and off your plate.

Trans fats. These artificial fats are created by adding hydrogen to liquid vegetable oils in order to make them more solid. Also known as “partially hydrogenated oils,” trans fats are found in baked goods and other processed and packaged foods.

But fortunately, that's coming to an end. As I reported back in 2015, the FDA gave food manufacturers a deadline of June 2018 to remove all trans fats from their products. (You can find this in my *Daily Dispatch* titled, “40 years of research reveals no health problems from saturated fats.”)

So this month we're witnessing history, and the trans-fat nightmare should *finally* be over.

But remember, you still don't want to be eating processed and packaged foods. Just because they don't have trans fats doesn't mean these abominations aren't packed with other dangerous ingredients.

Omega-6s. Earlier, I discussed the omega-3 fatty acids found in fish oil. There are also omega-6 fatty acids, which occur naturally

in plant oils, nuts, and seeds. But they're also a common ingredient in fast food and processed foods. So it's no surprise that the modern American diet tends to be way too high in omega-6s.

A healthy ratio of omega-6s to omega-3s is 2:1 or even 1:1. But for many Americans, it's more like 15:1 or 16:1. And that's particularly bad for your prostate—not to mention your overall health.

Some research shows that higher omega-6 levels may stimulate prostate cancer cell growth, while higher omega-3s inhibit the growth. And one study showed that higher fish consumption (with omega-3s) was associated with a nearly two-thirds (63 percent) reduced risk of death from prostate cancer.⁴

My all-natural prostate health protocol

While you should avoid trans fats and watch your consumption of omega-6 fatty acids, other fats are perfectly healthy for your prostate—and every other part of your body.

For optimal prostate health, start with a balanced diet that's made up of about 40 percent fats from nuts, seeds, vegetable oils, fish, seafood, meat, and dairy. I also recommend the following daily dietary supplements:

Fish oil. Choose a high-quality supplement with both EPA and DHA omega-3s. I now recommend 4 to 5 grams of fish oil per day (see page 2 for more about this new breakthrough).

Lycopene. In the mid-1980s, I was on the research team that first discovered the importance of this carotenoid in human nutrition and

metabolism. Since then, studies have shown lycopene to be a powerhouse for prostate health and prevention of prostate cancer. I recommend 10 to 12 mg per day.


Vitamin D. I wrote recently about research showing that men with low levels of vitamin D in their blood had 2.6 times more risk of developing aggressive prostate cancer than men with high levels of D. I recommend 10,000 IU of vitamin D daily.

Vitamin E. This fat-soluble vitamin has been shown in studies to help protect against prostate cancer. I recommend 200 IU per day.

Selenium. There's plenty of research showing that this mineral is essential for prostate health. I recommend 100 mcg daily.

Avoid prescription drugs. Finally, *stay away* from the popular but useless drugs prescribed inappropriately for “low-T.” As I've often reported, these drugs have not only been linked to increased incidence of heart attacks and strokes, but there's also some research showing they may actually *boost* the risk of prostate cancer.

In the meantime, I'm currently pulling together all of the latest research for a new, comprehensive online learning protocol on prostate cancer.

I'll keep you informed on my progress—and as always, you'll be the first to know when this lifesaving protocol is ready for release! Be sure to stay tuned to my *Daily Dispatch* e-letter for the latest updates (simply sign up via my website, www.DrMicozzi.com). 

Citations for all articles available online at www.DrMicozzi.com

EDITORS NOTE: We have a correction regarding May's issue. In the sidebar on page 7, the word “Zeaxanthi” was misspelled. It should read “Zeaxanthin.” We apologize for any confusion.