

The Tumor as a Wound That Refuses to Close

Absurd Health Institute | Frontier Medical Concept Paper 37 | Volume 8

Series: Cancer, Growth and Repair

Article type: Causal hypothesis and mechanistic argument; not an original clinical study

Corrective edition: 17 October 2026

The proposition we defend

Cancer can exploit the biological instructions of repair. We argue that, in defined tumor types, persistent wound-like signaling is not a mere description of the stroma but a causal resource that supports invasion, angiogenesis and immune evasion. Mutation remains central to malignancy, yet the mutated clone grows within tissue that can become organized to support it.

Tumors often recruit programs also seen in wound healing: angiogenesis, stromal activation, extracellular matrix remodeling and immune-cell recruitment. The “wound that refuses to close” analogy asks whether persistent repair-like signaling becomes part of the ecology sustaining cancer, without claiming that injury alone causes malignancy.

Why the mechanism deserves to be taken seriously

Malignant clones acquire mutations and epigenetic changes that alter proliferation and survival. Transforming growth factor beta, growth factors, immune-cell cytokines and activated fibroblasts can influence the local environment. Hypoxia and mechanical matrix signals may shape invasion and therapy response. Cancer cells can exploit these ordinary tissue programs while remaining fundamentally abnormal clonal populations.

The causal argument

Wounds transiently recruit fibroblasts, vascular remodeling, extracellular matrix deposition and immune responses. Tumors can maintain similar programs indefinitely, with malignant cells supplying signals that activate stroma and activated stroma returning growth and survival cues. The positive feedback is the point: fibrotic matrix changes cell mechanics; hypoxia promotes angiogenic signals; altered immune recruitment can protect rather than eliminate abnormal cells. A tumor niche can therefore maintain aggressive behavior even when one oncogenic signal is pharmacologically suppressed. The wound analogy becomes valuable only when a particular repair component is experimentally shown to contribute to tumor fitness.

Causal architecture under closer examination

The cancer–wound analogy becomes causal when one identifies a wound-healing program that a tumor cannot afford to lose. Angiogenesis supports delivery, activated fibroblasts restructure the matrix, and immune-cell recruitment can influence both defense and tolerance. Malignant cells exploit these functions but do not necessarily control them completely. A stiff stromal environment may reinforce mechanical signaling; poor vascular organization may generate hypoxia, encouraging aggressive adaptation; and some immune populations can be recruited into tumor-supportive roles. These systems form feedback loops with the malignant clone. The most important question is whether a defined stromal state increases tumor fitness relative to the same clone in a less permissive context. That comparison is especially powerful because it demonstrates that cancer phenotype is not a single direct output of mutation. It does not mean mutation is dispensable. In many tumors, cell-intrinsic oncogenic circuits remain decisive, and environmental manipulations may have limited effect without killing cancer cells. Furthermore some stromal barriers restrain spread, so indiscriminate removal of fibroblasts or matrix can worsen outcomes.

A concrete physiological case

Consider two tumor models carrying matched driver alterations but implanted into different stromal environments. In a highly fibrotic, angiogenic niche one invades more rapidly; in a normalized environment it remains more constrained. That experiment would demonstrate an environmental contribution without claiming the healthy niche reverses malignant mutations. Patient tumors are more complex, and changing stroma can sometimes facilitate rather than restrain progression.

Original conceptual illustration

A tumor with a dense desmoplastic stroma may exhibit changes in drug delivery and immune access. But the first question remains the tumor's cellular pathology and molecular behavior. A wound-healing analogy gains value only when it identifies a particular stroma-dependent mechanism that explains a clinical observation. It should never be used to suggest that malignancy is merely an unhealed wound that can be closed by lifestyle measures.

What established physiology already supports

The relationships among activated fibroblasts, angiogenesis, matrix remodeling and tumor evolution are established cancer biology. The controversial editorial stance is to make these tissue programs central to causal explanation rather than treating them as background reactions to autonomous malignant cells.

The strongest counterargument—and the answer

The strongest objection is that genetic drivers already explain proliferation, invasion and clonal selection. The reply is not that genetics is unimportant; it is that genome and ecosystem jointly determine realized behavior. A stromal model must predict changes under identical tumor genotype, controlling immune effects and drug delivery. Some fibrosis also restrains tumor growth, so indiscriminate stromal depletion can be harmful.

The analogy must not displace genetic causation, tumor evolution or the fact that many wounds heal without cancer. Persistent wound signaling can be an effect of malignancy, not its original cause. Distinct cancers use different stromal dependencies.

The discriminating experiment

Use paired tumors with matching genomic drivers but distinct stromal conditions. Manipulate a defined fibroblast pathway, matrix feature or angiogenic cue and measure invasion, immune infiltration and treatment response. A robust tissue-ecology mechanism should change these endpoints reproducibly while clonal genetics remain substantially comparable. Failure would limit the role of that particular wound program.

One should specify a tumor subtype and ask whether a defined wound-repair pathway predicts tumor progression or therapeutic resistance after controlling for tumor genotype and stage. If manipulating the pathway has no independent effect, it is not a useful sustaining mechanism.

Decisive comparisons and limits of inference

A serious experiment needs matched tumor genotypes and controlled microenvironments. One could vary matrix stiffness or fibroblast signaling in an organoid or animal model while tracking invasion, clonal growth, drug penetration and immune access. A result limited to molecular marker shifts would be insufficient: actual malignant behavior must change. Reversal experiments are especially persuasive. If restoring a defined tissue feature reduces invasion in a susceptible model and re-establishing the abnormal feature restores invasion, the environmental causal chain becomes stronger. Studies should also follow whether the tumor evolves resistance to the new context. The practical limitation is that modulating the tumor environment is not interchangeable with dietary modification or unvalidated "terrain therapy," because the effective intervention and tissue endpoint must be defined. The controversial thesis already goes far beyond a routine review: cancer can capture programs intended for temporary repair and hold surrounding tissues in a state that serves malignant expansion. Understanding the captured program

may reveal dependencies not visible in the tumor genome alone, yet translating that idea requires the same rigorous safety and efficacy standards as other oncology therapies.

A second prediction from the original model

A repair-program explanation matters only if a defined stromal or inflammatory pathway predicts tumor behavior beyond malignancy-specific genotype and stage. Otherwise it remains an analogy that offers no therapeutic leverage.

Why the hypothesis matters if correct

Cancer can recruit a persistent version of the programs that normally resolve after injury: vascular growth, fibroblast activity, matrix remodeling and immune-cell participation. The provocative claim is that these programs sometimes become dependencies of malignant behavior rather than incidental reactions. A matched-genotype comparison across different stromal environments could demonstrate that identical malignant cells invade or respond to treatment differently because of the surrounding tissue. The model has to admit an important complication: some stromal features also restrain tumors, so indiscriminate “normalization” may sometimes increase danger. Its proper research question is which wound-like circuit supports which tumor phenotype. This could complement genetic and immune therapies by targeting a defined environmental dependency. The thesis does not establish that inflammation alone causes cancer or that dietary terrain correction can replace oncology. It argues that malignant growth can capture a normal repair program and keep the surrounding tissue in a state that makes progression easier.

The clinical and conceptual consequence

The bold conclusion is that some tumors behave like wounds whose termination machinery has been captured by malignancy. Effective therapy may need to interrupt both malignant-cell programs and the surrounding tissue’s continuing invitation to grow.

The idea informs oncological research but is not evidence that fasting, anti-inflammatory supplements or a healthier “terrain” can replace effective cancer treatment.

The idea informs oncological research but is not evidence that fasting, anti-inflammatory supplements or a healthier “terrain” can replace effective cancer treatment.

Source bibliography: verification pending

- Liu F et al. Mechanosignaling through YAP and TAZ drives fibroblast activation and fibrosis. *Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol*. 2015.
- Colom B et al. Mutant clones in normal epithelium outcompete and eliminate emerging tumours. *Nature*. 2021.

Editorial and clinical boundaries

This paper advances a causal thesis and identifies observations that would support or defeat it. It does not establish a new diagnosis or treatment, and it should not be used to discontinue medically indicated care. Bibliographic entries inherited from the original edition have not all been independently verified.