

If this approach is so good, why other doctors do not use it?

I do not have an exact answer to this question, but I have several guesses that can form one answer.

Perhaps, no research work has been conducted concerning reticular formation stimulation theory. Or at least I have no information about similar researchers and their results. That is the reason why I decided to share my observations. It happened in 1998 when for the first time I got a positive effect while using this approach. Severe headache lasting over a month disappeared after Papaverine injection 0,2 ml in the trapezius muscle.

Afterwards I used this treatment approach thousand of times, analyzed results hoping to understand the mechanism of this phenomenon and reached effects. Work in this field lasted for 13 years despite frequent failures and disappointments. That is why it became possible to elicit patterns to answer many questions that nobody thought about before. I am sure, everybody who will use RANC approach will develop a hypothesis concerning the phenomenon mechanisms. Sure enough, the treatment approach that helps nervous system to recover truly exists.

Tradition is a factor that should be also taken into account. There should be a solid evidence to change views on a particular matter, especially it concerns medicine. Besides, even mentioned evidences do not guarantee that traditional views will change into new ones. Such changes may happen only if majority of specialists in one field will accept it. This acceptance is impossible without the information about the existence of a phenomenon. And that is the biggest problem because even when platypus fur was shown to first Australia explorers, they could not believe in a weird creature existence. So I decided to publish on the Internet articles describing my observations and hypothesis about RANC for discussion.

**neurologist A.A.Ponomarenko**