

ORIGINAL PAPER

The research evidence base for homeopathy: a fresh assessment of the literature

RT Mathie*

Faculty of Homeopathy, 15 Clerkenwell Close, London, EC1R 0AA, UK

Background. The claims made for the clinical effects of homeopathy are controversial. The results of several meta-analyses of clinical trials are positive, but they fail in general to highlight specific medical conditions that respond well to homeopathy.

Aims. This review examines the cumulative research from randomised and/or double-blind clinical trials (RCTs) in homeopathy for individual medical conditions reported since 1975, and asks the question: What is the weight of the original evidence from published RCTs that homeopathy has an effect that is statistically significantly different from that in a comparative group?

Method. Analysis of the 93 substantive RCTs that compare homeopathy either with placebo or another treatment.

Results. 50 papers report a significant benefit of homeopathy in at least one clinical outcome measure, 41 that fail to discern any inter-group differences, and two that describe an inferior response with homeopathy. Considering the relative number of research articles on the 35 different medical conditions in which such research has been carried out, the weight of evidence currently favours a positive treatment effect in eight: childhood diarrhoea, fibrositis, hayfever, influenza, pain (miscellaneous), side-effects of radio- or chemotherapy, sprains and upper respiratory tract infection. Based on published research to date, it seems unlikely that homeopathy is efficacious for headache, stroke or warts. Insufficient research prevents conclusions from being drawn about any other medical conditions.

Conclusions. The available research evidence emphasises the need for much more and better-directed research in homeopathy. A fresh agenda of enquiry should consider beyond (but include) the placebo-controlled trial. Each study should adopt research methods and outcome measurements linked to a question addressing the *clinical significance of homeopathy's effects*. *Homeopathy* (2003) 92, 84–91

Keywords: homeopathy; research design; evidence-based medicine; clinical trials

Introduction

To sceptics, homeopathy is an archaic and ineffective method of treatment that proclaims an implausible mode of action. In contrast, the individual and collective experience of homeopathic practitioners

presents a convincing picture of its clinical effectiveness. Homeopathy's possible mechanisms of action remain intangible theories, and it will be important ultimately to substantiate these. The principal issues for the present and immediate future, however, are whether there is compelling research evidence that homeopathy actually does exert a remedial effect, and whether such an effect is remedy-specific.

What comprises 'compelling evidence'? Many homeopaths are cheerfully sustained by their own successful clinical experience: 'We know it works, so why do research to prove it?' However, if homeopathy truly enables people attain better health, then it is

*Correspondence : (new address from April 2003): RT Mathie, Faculty of Homeopathy, Hahnemann House, 29 Park Street West, Luton, Bedfordshire, LU1 3BE, UK.
E-mail: rmathie@trushomeopathy.org
Received 19 November 2002; revised 19 December 2002; accepted 6 January 2003

vitaly important that it achieves much wider respect within medicine at large. To do this, homeopathy must convince sceptics 'by rigorous research evidence' of its *clinical effectiveness*. It must also face up to the challenge of demonstrating the specific *efficacy* of at least some of its medicines. These challenges are best met by data obtained from randomised controlled clinical trials (RCTs), where homeopathy is compared to another intervention or with placebo. Some homeopaths throw up their hands in horror at such a proposition, but new research programmes can grow from observational (cohort) studies,¹ for example, which can inform later RCTs.

A key to success of any study design is that clinical outcome measures must properly reflect the whole-person approach to healthcare that typifies homeopathy. Quality of life assessment and other patient-centred measures, for example, may be at least as important as the measurement of biochemical markers or other physical determinants of health status. After all, in an holistic therapy like homeopathy, the individual symptom- (and thus remedy-) picture often does not equate to a named disease, and so it is inappropriate to measure only disease-specific outcomes in such studies.

Another vital concern is that any statistically significant difference/s between treatment groups in trials should not automatically be equated to clinical importance. It is only the latter that truly matters, and this must be properly accommodated in the power calculations (and thus statistical conclusions) connected with clinical trials. The existing homeopathic research literature has not reflected this issue well—emphasis has been placed on statistical significance with incomplete regard to the clinical value of any inter-group differences observed.

What is the current evidence from which new research in homeopathy can develop? Given the limitations of past research in homeopathy, the optimum question that can be asked of the available evidence base is limited to: *What is the weight of the original evidence from published RCTs that homeopathy has an effect that is statistically significantly different from that in a comparative group?*

Only since 1975 have rigorous research methods been applied to homeopathy. Prior literature comprised only four minor trials or brief communications.^{2–5} The work reported up to 1997 is captured in the comprehensive meta-analysis of placebo-controlled trials of homeopathy published by Linde *et al* in *The Lancet*.⁶ Nearly half the trials cited in that paper showed a homeopathic treatment effect statistically significantly greater than that of placebo; none of the trials found placebo more effective than homeopathy. The authors concluded that homeopathy's clinical effects are not attributable solely to placebo, though they could not single out any medical condition for which homeopathy seemed clearly efficacious.⁶

Since 1997, some 50 new clinical trials or meta-analyses in homeopathy have been published. Many of these newer trials have essentially the same Null hypothesis: '*Homeopathy has an effect which is not statistically significantly different from that of placebo*'; in effect, the Null hypothesis that was rejected by Linde's meta-analysis. In 2002, the NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination based at the University of York, UK, published an overview of all the published systematic reviews and meta-analyses in homeopathic research.⁷ The authors conclude: 'There are currently insufficient data ... to recommend homeopathy as a treatment for any specific condition'. This statement is hardly distinguishable from one of Linde's conclusions 5 years earlier.

There has been a recent increase in the number of research papers that carry the more original Null hypothesis: '*Homeopathy has an effect which is not statistically significantly different from that of another active treatment*'. Such comparative trials of clinical effectiveness are included in the focus of the present review.

The present paper reports the total currently available statistical evidence from the published research literature for and against the specific efficacy or clinical effectiveness of homeopathy, based on the frequency with which the above two Null hypotheses have been rejected or not rejected in clinical trials. This is neither a meta-analysis nor a formal systematic review—the paucity and heterogeneity of published research in homeopathy limits the value of such formalised approaches. The originality of the present approach lies mainly in the following: (a) it considers the number of individual trials in homeopathy that report outcome statistics, and by type of medical condition studied; (b) it reports only full, published, research papers; (c) it includes comparative as well as placebo-controlled trials. The coverage reflects the entire range of medical conditions in which the effects of homeopathy have been the subject of research and, like Linde *et al*,⁶ it only includes trials that are randomised and/or double-blinded. Based on my review, I conclude by recommending some opportunities for future research development in homeopathy.

Literature search methods

This review examines all published clinical trials on human subjects that appeared in the literature from 1975 until December 2002, and which compared homeopathic treatment with placebo or with another medication, where a randomised and/or double-blind study design has been used. The analysis includes only full papers reporting original research, and excludes conference proceedings, brief communications, book chapters and theses. Reports of case series, clinical outcomes (cohort) studies and other non-controlled investigations are also excluded. All forms of homeopathic intervention are included, from

classical to single-remedy and isopathy. Principal information sources were: The National Library of Medicine (Medline); The Cochrane Library; The Centralised Information Service for Complementary Medicine (CISCOM); The British Homoeopathic Library (Hom-Inform); cross-referencing between published papers.

Two principal outcomes are identified: 'Null hypothesis rejected' and 'Null hypothesis *not* rejected'. For papers in the category *Null hypothesis rejected*, the findings are classed as either 'positive' (ie *for* homeopathy) or 'negative' (ie *against* homeopathy), based on a two-tailed test. A *positive* trial is one where at least one outcome measure was statistically significantly improved by homeopathy compared with placebo or alternative treatment ($P \leq 0.05$). A *negative* study is one where homeopathic treatment was statistically significantly inferior to the compared treatment (placebo, in the two actual cases cited below) in at least one outcome measure ($P \leq 0.05$). *Null hypothesis not rejected* is the conclusion from a study where no significant inter-group difference in outcome/s is evident ($P > 0.05$). In most cases, these conclusions have been based on the authors' own reported hypothesis testing; for results obtained in a few less accessible or non-English language papers, a probability of $P \leq 0.05$ was equated with a reported odds ratio ($\pm 95\%$ confidence interval) ≥ 1 .⁶

A *balance of evidence* in favour of one of the above three categories or classes for a given medical condition is concluded if, using simple arithmetic, it contains at least two more papers than the sum of the papers in the other two categories or classes. This approach has been adopted separately for placebo-controlled and comparative trials.

Results of literature search and analysis

The database scrutinised and reported here comprises a total of 93 original articles in homeopathic research. Of this total, 79 trials were placebo-controlled, while the remaining 14 compared homeopathy with a conventional medical treatment (controlled comparative trials). Table 1 lists all those medical conditions (35 in total), in 11 broad types, for which there exists at least one published clinical research trial in homeopathy that satisfies the inclusion criteria for this analysis.

Given the above criteria, 52 of the total 93 published papers are in the category 'Null hypothesis rejected' (Table 1); the remaining 41 papers are thus in the category 'Null hypothesis not rejected' (ie no conclusive difference between homeopathy and a comparison group). Of the 52 articles, 50 are classed as 'positive' and two are 'negative'. Within the 50 'positive' reports, 47 observed a homeopathic effect superior to placebo. The three others found homeopathy to be superior to another treatment for the given condition—otitis media,⁸ osteoarthritis⁹ and back pain.¹⁰ As regards the two 'negative' articles (rheumatoid arthritis,¹¹ tissue healing after dental

surgery¹²), the placebo group had a significantly better clinical response in at least one outcome measure than patients treated with a homeopathic remedy.

Balance of evidence: placebo-controlled trials

Examining the relative number of papers published for each of the three categories or classes of evidence, the present weight of evidence favours homeopathic treatment effectiveness in eight conditions:

- childhood diarrhoea;
- fibrositis (fibromyalgia);
- hayfever/allergic rhinitis;
- influenza;
- pain (of various origins);
- side-effects of radio-/chemotherapy;
- sprains;
- upper respiratory tract infection.

A weight of evidence suggesting homeopathy has no effect above placebo is apparent in three medical conditions:

- headache;
- stroke;
- warts.

For the remaining 20 conditions in which studies have been carried out, there is insufficient weight of evidence either to favour or to find no support for homeopathy (Table 1). Some of these trials are examples of the 'double positive paradox',¹³ where a homeopathy group and a placebo group have indistinguishable results but both manifest some clinical improvement.

Balance of evidence: comparative trials

There is insufficient evidence either to favour or to find no support for homeopathy in nine of the 10 medical conditions in which studies have been carried out (Table 1). Within the group of conditions 'upper respiratory tract infection', however, a weight of evidence suggests that homeopathy and conventional medicine (aspirin in both papers concerned) are equally effective in treating the common cold.^{14,15}

Discussion

Number of published trials in homeopathy

The total number of original full research papers over a 27 year time-span ($n = 93$) is very modest, for research in homeopathy is still in an early stage of development. The largest total number of articles for any particular type of condition is 10 (upper respiratory tract infection). For 12 of the 35 included medical conditions, a single published trial is all that exists. The paucity of research literature is a serious drawback for meta-analyses and formal systematic reviews in homeopathy. In the last 5 years, however,

Table 1 Medical conditions for which there is at least one published randomised/double-blind clinical research trial in homeopathy

Condition		Total	Published trials					
			Placebo-controlled			Comparative		
			Null hypothesis rejected		Null hypothesis not rejected	Null hypothesis rejected		Null hypothesis not rejected*
			+	-	±	+	-	±
Atopy	Asthma	4	2 ^{32,33}		2 ^{34,35}			
	Hayfever/allergic rhinitis	9	6 ³⁶⁻⁴¹		2 ^{42,43}		1 ⁴⁴	
Cardiovascular	Hypertension	2			1 ⁴⁵		1 ⁴⁶	
Dermatology	Insect bite-induced erythema	2	1 ⁴⁷		1 ⁴⁸			
	Leg ulcers	1			1 ⁴⁹			
	Seborrheic dermatitis	1	1 ⁵⁰					
	Warts	2			2 ^{51,52}			
Ear Nose & Throat	Influenza	2	2 ^{53,54}					
	Otitis media	2	1 ²⁸		1 ⁸			
	Upper respiratory tract infection [^]	10	7 ⁵⁵⁻⁶¹		1 ⁶²		2 ^{14,15}	
Gastroenterology	Childhood diarrhoea	3	3 ⁶³⁻⁶⁵					
	Irritable bowel syndrome	2	1 ⁶⁶		1 ⁶⁷			
	Post-operative ileus	3	2 ^{68, 69}		1 ⁷⁰			
Gynaecology	Female infertility	1					1 ⁷¹	
	Menopausal syndrome	1					1 ⁷²	
	Pre-menstrual syndrome	2	1 ⁷³		1 ⁷⁴			
	Tissue recovery after childbirth	1			1 ⁷⁵			
Musculo-skeletal	Fibrositis (fibromyalgia)	2	2 ^{76,77}					
	Muscle soreness/stiffness/cramps	5	2 ^{78,79}		3 ⁸⁰⁻⁸²			
	Osteoarthritis	4			1 ⁸³			
	Rheumatoid arthritis	5	3 ⁸⁶⁻⁸⁸	1 ¹¹	1 ⁸⁹		2 ^{84,85}	
	Sprains	2	2 ^{90,91}					
Neurology and Mental Health	Anxiety	1	1 ⁹²					
	Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder	1	1 ⁹³					
	Headache	2			2 ^{94,95}			
	Migraine	3	1 ⁹⁶		2 ^{97,98}			
	Stroke	2			2 ^{99,100}			
	Vertigo	1					1 ¹⁰¹	
Pain	Pain (miscellaneous)	7	4 ¹⁰²⁻¹⁰⁵		1 ¹⁰⁶	1 ¹⁰	1 ¹⁰⁷	
Tissue trauma	Minor burns	1			1 ¹⁰⁸			
	Miscellaneous tissue trauma	3	1 ¹⁰⁹		1 ¹¹⁰			
	Radiotherapy/chemotherapy (side effects)	3	3 ¹¹¹⁻¹¹³		1 ¹¹⁴			
	Superficial bruising	1			1 ¹¹⁴			
Tropical disease	Cholera	1			1 ¹¹⁵			
	Malaria	1					1 ¹¹⁶	
Total		93	47	2	30	3	0	11

References cited by superscript beside the number of articles published. *Key to symbols:* * Two studies set up formally as equivalence trials.^{44,101} + positive trial; - negative trial; ± inconclusive trial; ^includes common cold, cough, sinusitis and pharyngitis.

such syntheses of (usually very few) published trials have provided support for homeopathic treatment in hayfever,¹⁶ post-operative ileus¹⁷ and rheumatoid arthritis.¹⁸ Other meta-analyses or systematic reviews have concluded there is insufficient evidence for or against homeopathy in asthma,¹⁹ influenza,²⁰ muscle soreness,²¹ osteoarthritis,²² prophylaxis for migraine or headache²³ and in tissue trauma treated with *Arnica*.²⁴

Publication bias towards the reporting of 'positive' homeopathic treatment effects has been a well-founded concern, and is properly recognised in meta-analyses,^{6,25,26} though no single trial is individually

suspected of biased reporting.²⁷ There is thus very likely to be overall exaggeration of reported positive treatment effects in the homeopathic research literature cited in the present review.

Quality of published trials in homeopathy

This review deliberately does not categorise published trials in homeopathy by their intrinsic scientific quality, for information on this issue is already available. Only 29% of placebo-controlled trials in homeopathy published before 1997 were judged to possess 'high' methodological quality.⁶ A statistical re-evaluation

of Linde's meta-analysis noted that treatment effects were larger in smaller studies and in those with inadequate blinding of outcome assessment.²⁷ Exaggeration of treatment effect can also be expected in the 14 comparative trials highlighted in the present review: the sample sizes of these 14 studies (mean, 97 patients; range, 10–184) are broadly equivalent to those for placebo-controlled trials reported by Linde *et al* (118; 5–1270).⁶

An example of some of the key issues can be taken from the two studies that have examined the effectiveness of homeopathy in otitis media in children. In the first of these papers, more patients on homeopathy than those on standard care were found to have a normal tympanogram after a treatment period of 12 months.⁸ The second article reported decreased symptom scores in acute otitis media after 24 and 64 h in patients receiving homeopathy compared with those given placebo.²⁸ These were the only statistically significant effects observed in either investigation. Both studies were preliminary in nature and had small sample sizes—33 and 75 patients, respectively. Both study designs involved randomisation of patients, but of course the comparative trial was not double-blinded.⁸ The intrinsic quality of these studies is higher than average in the homeopathic research literature.

Balance of research evidence

The above caveats (low volume, publication bias, low quality) are important in considering the research evidence base of homeopathy. Nevertheless, positive effects of homeopathic treatment are apparent in 50 published trials (over half of the included research literature). This represents a body of research where, for at least one outcome measure per trial, the Null hypothesis has been rejected in favour of homeopathy. Three of the papers (in otitis media, osteoarthritis and back pain) provide research evidence that homeopathy can actually be superior to conventional treatment.^{8–10} Only two trials have found homeopathy to have less effect than placebo.

Based on the relative number of placebo-controlled studies with positive results, the balance of research evidence currently favours homeopathy in childhood diarrhoea, fibrositis, hayfever, influenza, pain, side-effects of radio-/chemotherapy, sprains and upper respiratory tract infection. Based on published research to date, it seems unlikely that homeopathy is efficacious for headache, stroke or warts.

Insufficient research in 20 medical conditions prevents clear conclusions from being drawn. There has been no research at all in homeopathy for many other ailments. It is thus not surprising that comprehensive meta-analyses or systematic reviews in homeopathy have not discerned any clear pattern of medical conditions that appear especially promising for effective homeopathic intervention.²⁹ Meanwhile, homeopathic practitioners continue to chronicle their successful clinical cases.³⁰

Future opportunities and direction in homeopathic research

Key issues that must be addressed in future research development in homeopathy include: the research question, the associated trial design and the outcome measures chosen. Fresh research should consider carefully whether placebo-controlled trials and physical determinants of health are necessarily the wisest approach. Such approaches may be particularly inappropriate in researching homeopathy for chronic illness or where the treatment does not address a named disease. Conditions of this nature are nearly always treated by individualised homeopathy, where remedy selection is based on a person's 'constitutional' character, and so non-placebo-controlled designs using 'quality of life' measures, for example, might be the most relevant. The most appropriate place for placebo-controlled trials in homeopathy might be in examining acute (as opposed to chronic) medical conditions, where any homeopathic treatment effect is likely to be swift acting, and thus better discernable. The fact that prescribing is relatively simple (minimal range of indicated remedies) in some acute conditions could offer useful advantages in study design. It may be noteworthy that acute, rather than chronic, conditions feature prominently among those for which homeopathy has the greatest weight of positive research evidence in placebo-controlled trials.

Investigators might also consider testing the effects of homeopathy as an adjunct to conventional medication, thus reflecting its complementary nature. Equivalence trials offer another promising way forward. In these, a conclusion of 'similar clinical outcome' between homeopathy and an orthodox treatment would be based on an ability to accept statistically equivalent confidence intervals in the two groups of data.³¹ This approach would be greatly preferable to assuming equivalence based merely on failure to reject the Null hypothesis in a typical superiority trial, as is the case in nearly all of the 41 examples presented here. Formal equivalence trials could enable researchers to examine more robustly the relative safety and cost-effectiveness of homeopathy compared with a conventional medicine that was shown to possess similar treatment effectiveness in a particular clinical situation.

It remains to be seen whether passage of time sees the publication of increased numbers and quality of published research papers relevant to homeopathy that report *clinically* significant findings in its favour. For its practitioners, such robust research data would have an important impact in improving the credibility as well as the intrinsic quality of the homeopathy that they provide to their patients.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Conrad Harris, Peter Fisher and Bob Leckridge for their helpful comments on the manuscript in the early stages of its preparation.

References

- 1 Mathie RT. Clinical outcomes research: contributions to the evidence base for homeopathy. *Homeopathy* 2003; **92**: 56–57.
- 2 Paterson J. Report on the mustard gas experiments (Glasgow and London). *Br Hom J* 1943; **33**: 1–12.
- 3 Ritter H. Ein homöotherapeutischer doppelter Blindversuch und seine Problematik. *Hippokrates* 1966; **12**: 472–476.
- 4 Kennedy CO. A controlled trial. *Br Hom J* 1971; **60**: 120–127.
- 5 Ustianowski PA. A clinical trial of Staphysagria in postcoital cystitis. *Br Hom J* 1974; **63**: 276–277.
- 6 Linde K, Clausius N, Ramirez G, *et al*. Are the clinical effects of homeopathy placebo effects? A meta-analysis of placebo-controlled trials. *Lancet* 1997; **350**: 834–843.
- 7 NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. Homeopathy. *Effective Health Care Bulletin* 2002; **7**(3): 1–12.
- 8 Harrison H, Fixsen A, Vickers A. A randomized comparison of homeopathic and standard care for the treatment of glue ear in children. *Complement Ther Med* 1999; **7**: 132–135.
- 9 van Haselen RA, Fisher PAG. A randomized controlled trial comparing topical piroxicam gel with a homeopathic gel in osteoarthritis of the knee. *Rheumatology* 2000; **39**: 714–719.
- 10 Gmünder R, Kissling R. The efficacy of homeopathy in the treatment of chronic low back pain compared to standardized physiotherapy. *Z Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb* 2002; **140**: 503–508.
- 11 Fisher P, Scott DL. A randomized controlled trial of homeopathy in rheumatoid arthritis. *Rheumatology* 2001; **40**: 1052–1055.
- 12 Kaziro GS. Metronidazole (Flagyl) and Arnica montana in the prevention of post-surgical complications, a comparative placebo controlled clinical trial. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1984; **22**: 42–49.
- 13 Reilly D. Randomised controlled trials for homeopathy: when is useful improvement a waste of time? Double positive paradox of negative trials. *Br Med J* 2002; **325**: 42.
- 14 Gassinger CA, Wunstel G, Netter P. A controlled clinical trial for testing the efficacy of the homeopathic drug Eupatorium perfoliatum D2 in the treatment of common cold. *Arzneimittelforschung* 1981; **31**: 732–736.
- 15 Maiwald VL, Weinfurter T, Mau J, Connert WD. Therapy of common cold with a homeopathic combination preparation in comparison with acetylsalicylic acid. A controlled, randomized double-blind study. *Arzneimittelforschung* 1988; **38**: 578–582.
- 16 Lütke R, Wiesenauer M. A meta-analysis of homeopathic treatment of pollinosis with Galphimia glauca. *Wien Med Wochenschr* 1997; **147**: 323–327.
- 17 Barnes J, Resch K-L, Ernst E. Homeopathy for postoperative ileus? A meta-analysis. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 1997; **25**: 628–633.
- 18 Jonas WB, Linde K, Ramirez G. Homeopathy and rheumatic disease. *Rheum Dis Clin North Am* 2000; **26**: 117–123.
- 19 Linde K, Jobst KA. Homeopathy for chronic asthma. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2000; **2**: CD000353.
- 20 Vickers AJ, Smith C. Homeopathic Oscillocoquinum for preventing and treating influenza and influenza-like syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2000; **2**: CD001957.
- 21 Ernst E, Barnes J. Are homeopathic remedies effective for delayed-onset muscle soreness? A systematic review of placebo-controlled trials. *Perfusion (Nürnberg)* 1998; **11**: 4–8.
- 22 Long L, Ernst E. Homeopathic remedies for the treatment of osteoarthritis: a systematic review. *Br Hom J* 2001; **90**: 37–43.
- 23 Ernst E. Homeopathic prophylaxis of headaches and migraine? A systematic review. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1999; **18**: 353–357.
- 24 Ernst E, Pittler MH. Efficacy of homeopathic arnica: a systematic review of placebo-controlled clinical trials. *Arch Surg* 1998; **133**: 1187–1190.
- 25 Cucherat M, Haugh MC, Gooch M, Boissel J-P. Evidence of clinical efficacy of homeopathy. A meta-analysis of clinical trials. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2000; **56**: 27–33.
- 26 Kleijnen J, Knipschild P, ter Riet G. Clinical trials of homeopathy. *Br Med J* 1991; **302**: 316–23.
- 27 Sterne JAC, Egger M, Davey Smith G. Systematic reviews in health care: investigating and dealing with publication and other biases in meta-analysis. *Br Med J* 2001; **323**: 101–105.
- 28 Jacobs J, Springer DA, Crothers D. Homeopathic treatment of acute otitis media in children: a preliminary randomized placebo-controlled trial. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2001; **20**: 177–183.
- 29 Ernst E. A systematic review of systematic reviews of homeopathy. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2002; **54**: 577–582.
- 30 Rieberer G. Who's that talking? *Homeopathy* 2002; **91**: 106–108.
- 31 Jones B, Jarvis P, Lewis JA, Ebbutt AF. Trials to assess equivalence: the importance of rigorous methods. *Br Med J* 1996; **313**: 36–39.
- 32 Matusiewicz R. The effect of a homeopathic preparation on the clinical condition of patients with corticosteroid-dependent bronchial asthma. *Biomed Ther* 1997; **15**: 70–74.
- 33 Reilly D, Taylor MA, Beattie NGM, *et al*. Is evidence for homeopathy reproducible? *Lancet* 1994; **344**: 1601–1606.
- 34 Freitas L, Goldenstein E, Sanna OM. A relação médico-paciente indireta e o tratamento homeopático na asma infantil. *Rev Homeopatia* 1995; **60**: 26–31.
- 35 Lewith G, Watkins AD, Hyland ME, *et al*. Use of ultramolecular potencies of allergen to treat asthmatic people allergic to house dust mite: double blind randomised controlled clinical trial. *Br Med J* 2002; **324**: 520–523.
- 36 Reilly DT, Taylor MA. Potent placebo or potency? A proposed study model with initial findings using homeopathically prepared pollens in hayfever. *Br Hom J* 1985; **74**: 65–75.
- 37 Reilly DT, Taylor MA, McSharry C, Aitchison T. Is homeopathy a placebo response? Controlled trial of homeopathic potency, with pollen in hayfever as model. *Lancet* 1986; **ii**: 881–886.
- 38 Taylor MA, Reilly D, Llewellyn-Jones RH, *et al*. Randomised controlled trial of homeopathy versus placebo in perennial allergic rhinitis with overview of four trial series. *Br Med J* 2000; **321**: 471–476.
- 39 Wiesenauer M, Häussler S, Gaus W. Pollinosis therapy with Galphimia glauca. *Fortschr Med* 1983; **101**: 811–814.
- 40 Wiesenauer M, Gaus W, Häussler S. Behandlung der Pollinosis mit Galphimia glauca: Eine Doppelblindstudie unter Praxisbedingungen. *Allergologie* 1990; **13**: 359–363.
- 41 Wiesenauer M, Lütke R. The treatment of pollinosis with Galphimia glauca D4—a randomized placebo-controlled double-blind clinical trial. *Phytomedicine* 1995; **2**: 3–6.
- 42 Aabel S. Prophylactic and acute treatment with the homeopathic medicine Betula 30c for birch pollen allergy: a double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled study of consistency of VAS responses. *Br Hom J* 2001; **90**: 73–78.
- 43 Wiesenauer M, Gaus W. Double-blind trial comparing the effectiveness of the homeopathic preparation Galphimia potentiation D6, Galphimia dilution 10⁻⁶ and placebo on pollinosis. *Arzneimittelforschung* 1985; **35**: 1745–1747.
- 44 Weiser M, Gegenheimer LH, Klein P. A randomized equivalence trial comparing the efficacy and safety of Luffa comp.-Heel nasal spray with cromolyn sodium spray in the treatment of seasonal allergic rhinitis. *Forsch Komplementarmed* 1999; **6**: 142–148.
- 45 Bignamini M, Bertoli A, Consolandi AM, *et al*. Controlled double-blind trial with Baryta carbonica 15 CH versus placebo in a group of hypertensive subjects confined to bed in two old people's homes. *Br Hom J* 1987; **76**: 114–119.
- 46 Hitzzenberger G, Korn A, Dorcsi M, *et al*. Controlled randomized double-blind study for the comparison of the

- treatment of patients with essential hypertension with homeopathic and with pharmacologically effective drugs. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* 1982; **94**: 665–670.
- 47 Hill N, Stam C, Tuinder S, van Haselen RA. A placebo controlled clinical trial investigating the efficacy of a homeopathic after-bite gel in reducing mosquito bite induced erythema. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1995; **49**: 103–108.
 - 48 Hill N, Stam C, van Haselen RA. The efficacy of Prrikweg gel in the treatment of insect bites: a double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Pharm World Sci* 1996; **18**: 35–41.
 - 49 Garrett B, Harrison PV, Stewart T, Porter I. A trial of homeopathic treatment of leg ulcers. *J Dermatol Treatment* 1997; **8**: 115–117.
 - 50 Smith SA, Baker AE, Williams JH. Effective treatment of seborrheic dermatitis using a low dose, oral homeopathic medication consisting of potassium bromide, sodium bromide, nickel sulfate, and sodium chloride in a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Altern Med Rev* 2002; **7**: 59–67.
 - 51 Kainz JT, Kozel G, Haidvogel M, Smolle J. Homeopathic versus placebo therapy of children with warts on the hands: a randomized, double-blind clinical trial. *Dermatology* 1996; **193**: 318–320.
 - 52 Labrecque M, Audet D, Latulippe LG, Drouin J. Homeopathic treatment of plantar warts. *Can Med Assoc J* 1992; **146**: 1749–1753.
 - 53 Ferley JP, Zmirou D, Adhemar D, Balducci F. A controlled evaluation of a homeopathic preparation in the treatment of influenza-like syndromes. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1989; **27**: 329–335.
 - 54 Papp R, Schuback G, Beck E, et al. Oscilloccinum in patients with influenza-like syndromes: a placebo-controlled double-blind evaluation. *Br Hom J* 1998; **87**: 69–76.
 - 55 de Lange de Klerk ES, Blommers J, Kuik DJ, et al. Effect of homeopathic medicines on daily burden of symptoms in children with recurrent upper respiratory tract infections. *Br Med J* 1994; **309**: 1329–1332.
 - 56 Mössinger P. Untersuchung zur Behandlung des akuten Fliessschnupfens mit Euphorbium D3. *Allg Homöopath Ztg* 1982; **227**: 89–95.
 - 57 Lecoq PL. Les voies thérapeutiques des syndromes grippaux. *Cahiers Biothérapie* 1985; **87**: 65–73.
 - 58 Mössinger P. Untersuchung über die Behandlung des akuten Pharyngitis mit Phytolacca D2. *Allg Homöopath Ztg* 1976; **221**: 177–83.
 - 59 Weiser M, Clasen BPE. Controlled double-blind study of a homeopathic sinusitis medication. *Biol Ther* 1995; **13**: 4–11.
 - 60 Bordes LR, Dorfman P. Evaluation de l'activité antitussive du sirop Drosetux: étude en double aveugle versus placebo. *Cahiers d'O R L* 1986; **21**: 731–734.
 - 61 Diefenbach M, Schilken J, Steiner G, Becker HJ. Homeopathic therapy in respiratory tract diseases. Evaluation of a clinical study in 258 patients. *Zeitschr für Allgemeinmedizin* 1997; **73**: 308–314.
 - 62 Wiesenauer M, Gaus W, Bohnacker U, Häussler S. Efficiency of homeopathic preparation combinations in sinusitis. Results of a randomized double blind study with general practitioners. *Arzneimittelforschung* 1989; **39**: 620–625.
 - 63 Jacobs J, Jimenez LM, Gloyd S, et al. Homeopathic treatment of acute childhood diarrhoea: a randomized clinical trial in Nicaragua. *Br Hom J* 1993; **82**: 83–86.
 - 64 Jacobs J, Jimenez LM, Gloyd SS, et al. Treatment of acute childhood diarrhea with homeopathic medicine: a randomized clinical trial in Nicaragua. *Pediatrics* 1994; **93**: 719–725.
 - 65 Jacobs J, Jimenez LM, Malthouse S, et al. Homeopathic treatment of acute childhood diarrhea: results from a clinical trial in Nepal. *J Altern Complement Med* 2000; **6**: 131–139.
 - 66 Rahlfs VW, Mössinger P. Asa foetida in the treatment of the irritable colon: a double-blind trial. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr* 1979; **104**: 140–143.
 - 67 Rahlfs VW, Mössinger P. Treatment of irritable colon. A multicenter placebo-controlled double-blind study in general practice. *Arzneimittelforschung* 1976; **26**: 2230–2234.
 - 68 Aulagnier G. Action d'un traitement homéopathique sur la reprise du transit post opératoire. *Homéopathie* 1985; **6**: 42–45.
 - 69 Dorfman P, Amodéo C, Ricciotti F, et al. Iléus post-opératoire et homéopathie: bilan d'une évaluation clinique. *Cahiers Biothérapie* 1992; **114**: 33–39.
 - 70 Groupe de Recherches et d'Essais Cliniques en Homéopathie. Evaluation of two homeopathic products on the resumption of transit after digestive surgery. A multicentre controlled trial. *Presse Med* 1989; **18**: 59–62.
 - 71 Gerhard I, Monga B, Roebruck P, Runnebaum B. Homeopathy versus conventional therapy in female infertility: Interim analysis of a randomized study. *Forsch Komplementarmed* 1997; **5**: 262–269.
 - 72 Beer AM, Sturm R, Kupper F. Der Einsatz eines homöopathischen Syndrom im Vergleich zur Hormonsubstitution. *Erfahrungsheilkunde* 1995; **44**: 336–340.
 - 73 Yakir M, Kreitler S, Brzezinski A, et al. Effects of homeopathic treatment in women with premenstrual syndrome: a pilot study. *Br Hom J* 2001; **90**: 148–153.
 - 74 Chapman EH, Angelica J, Spitalny G, Strauss M. Results of a study of the homeopathic treatment of PMS. *J Am Inst Homeopath* 1994; **87**: 14–21.
 - 75 Hofmeyr GJ, Piccioni V, Blauhof P. Postpartum homeopathic Arnica montana: a potency-finding pilot study. *Br J Clin Pract* 1990; **44**: 619–621.
 - 76 Fisher P. An experimental double-blind clinical trial method in homeopathy. Use of a limited range of remedies to treat fibrositis. *Br Hom J* 1986; **75**: 142–147.
 - 77 Fisher P, Greenwood A, Huskisson EC, et al. Effect of homeopathic treatment on fibrositis (primary fibromyalgia). *Br Med J* 1989; **299**: 365–366.
 - 78 Tveiten D, Bruseth S, Borchgrevink CF, Norseth J. Effects of the homeopathic remedy Arnica D30 on marathon runners: a randomized, double-blind study during the 1995 Oslo Marathon. *Complement Ther Med* 1998; **6**: 71–74.
 - 79 Hariveau E. La recherche clinique a l'institut Boiron. *Homéopathie* 1987; **5**: 55–58.
 - 80 Schmidt C. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial: Arnica montana applied topically to subcutaneous mechanical injuries. *J Am Inst Homeopath* 1996; **89**: 186–193.
 - 81 Jawara N, Lewith G, Mullee M, et al. Homeopathic Arnica and Rhus Toxicodendron for delayed onset muscle soreness: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Br Hom J* 1997; **86**: 10–15.
 - 82 Vickers AJ, Fisher P, Smith C, et al. Homeopathic Arnica 30x is ineffective for muscle soreness after long-distance running: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Clin J Pain* 1998; **14**: 227–231.
 - 83 Shipley M, Berry H, Broster G, et al. Controlled trial of homeopathic treatment of osteoarthritis. *Lancet* 1983; **i**: 97–98.
 - 84 Nahler G, Metelmann H, Sperber H. Treating osteoarthritis of the knee with a homeopathic preparation: results of a randomized, controlled, clinical trial in comparison to hyaluronic acid. *Biomed Ther* 1998; **16**: 186–191.
 - 85 Shealey CN, Thomlinson RP, Cox RH, Borgmeyer V. Osteoarthritic pain: a comparison of homeopathy and acetaminophen. *Am J Pain Manage* 1998; **8**: 89–91.
 - 86 Gibson RG, Gibson SL, MacNeill AD, Buchanan WW. Homeopathic therapy in rheumatoid arthritis: evaluation by double-blind clinical therapeutic trial. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1980; **9**: 453–459.
 - 87 Wiesenauer M, Gaus W. Wirksamkeitsnachweis eines Homöopathikums bei chronischer Polyarthrit. Eine randomisierte Doppelblindstudie bei niedergelassenen Ärzten. *Akt Rheumatol* 1991; **16**: 1–9.

- 88 Köhler T. Wirksamkeitsnachweis eines Homöopathikums bei chronischer Polyarthritits - eine randomisierte Doppelblindstudie bei niedergelassenen Ärzten. *Der Kassenarzt* 1991; **13**: 48–52.
- 89 Andrade LE, Ferraz MB, Atra E, *et al.* A randomized controlled trial to evaluate the effectiveness of homeopathy in rheumatoid arthritis. *Scand J Rheumatol* 1991; **20**: 204–208.
- 90 Böhmer D, Ambrus P. Behandlung von Sportverletzungen mit Traumeel-Salbe—Kontrollierte Doppelblindstudie. *Biol Med* 1992; **21**: 260–268.
- 91 Zell J, Connert WD, Mau J, Feuerstake G. Treatment of acute sprains of the ankle joint. Double-blind study assessing the effectiveness of a homeopathic ointment preparation. *Fortschr Med* 1988; **106**: 96–100.
- 92 McCutcheon LE. Treatment of anxiety with a homeopathic remedy. *J Appl Nutr* 1996; **48**: 2–6.
- 93 Lamont J. Homeopathic treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. A controlled study. *Br Hom J* 1997; **86**: 196–200.
- 94 Gaus W. Biometrische Aspekte der “Munchener Kopfschmerzstudie” Allgem. *Homöopath Zeit* 1997; **242**: 245–249.
- 95 Walach H, Haeusler W, Lowes T, *et al.* Classical homeopathic treatment of chronic headaches. *Cephalalgia* 1997; **17**: 119–126.
- 96 Brigo B, Serpelloni G. Homeopathic treatment of migraines: a randomized double-blind controlled study of sixty cases (homeopathic remedy versus placebo). *Berlin J Res Homöopath* 1991; **1**: 98–106.
- 97 Whitmarsh TE, Coleston-Shields DM, Steiner TJ. Double-blind randomized placebo-controlled study of homeopathic prophylaxis of migraine. *Cephalalgia* 1997; **17**: 600–604.
- 98 Straumsheim P, Borchgrevink C, Mowinckel P, *et al.* Homeopathic treatment of migraine: a double blind, placebo controlled trial of 68 patients. *Br Hom J* 2000; **89**: 4–7.
- 99 Savage RH, Roe PF. A double blind trial to assess the benefit of Arnica montana in acute stroke illness. *Br Hom J* 1977; **66**: 207–220.
- 100 Savage RH, Roe PF. A further double blind trial to assess the benefit of Arnica montana in acute stroke illness. *Br Hom J* 1978; **67**: 210–222.
- 101 Weiser M, Strosser W, Klein P. Homeopathic vs conventional treatment of vertigo: a randomized double-blind controlled clinical study. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 1998; **124**: 879–885.
- 102 Dorfman P, Lasserre MN, Tetau M. Préparation à l'accouchement par homéopathie—experimentation en double insu versus placebo. *Cahiers Biothérap* 1987; **94**: 77–81.
- 103 Dorfman P, Amodeo C, Ricciotti F, *et al.* Evaluation de l'activité d'arnica 5CH sur les troubles veineux après perfusion prolongée. *Cahiers Biothérap* 1988; **98**(Suppl): 77–82.
- 104 Ernst E, Saradeth T, Resch KL. Complementary treatment of varicose veins—a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Phlebology* 1990; **5**: 157–163.
- 105 Jeffrey SL, Belcher HJ. Use of Arnica to relieve pain after carpal-tunnel release surgery. *Altern Ther Health Med* 2002; **8**: 66–68.
- 106 Hart O, Mullee MA, Lewith G, Miller J. Double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized clinical trial of homeopathic arnica C30 for pain and infection after total abdominal hysterectomy. *J R Soc Med* 1997; **90**: 73–78.
- 107 Stam C, Bonnet MS, van Haselen RA. The efficacy and safety of a homeopathic gel in the treatment of acute low back pain: a multi-centre, randomised, double-blind comparative clinical trial. *Br Hom J* 2001; **90**: 21–28.
- 108 Leaman AM, Gorman D. Cantharis in the early treatment of minor burns. *Arch Emerg Med* 1989; **6**: 259–261.
- 109 Chapman EH, Weintraub RJ, Milburn MA, *et al.* Homeopathic treatment of mild traumatic brain injury: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *J Head Trauma Rehabil* 1999; **14**: 521–542.
- 110 Lökken P, Straumsheim PA, Tveiten D, *et al.* Effect of homeopathy on pain and other events after acute trauma: placebo controlled trial with bilateral oral surgery. *Br Med J* 1995; **310**: 1439–1442.
- 111 Balzarini A, Felisi E, Martini A, De Conno F. Efficacy of homeopathic treatment of skin reactions during radiotherapy for breast cancer: a randomised, double-blind clinical trial. *Br Hom J* 2000; **89**: 8–12.
- 112 Kulkarni A, Nagarkar BM, Burde GS. Radiation protection by use of homeopathic medicines. *Hahnemann Homöopath Sand* 1998; **12**: 20–23.
- 113 Oberbaum M, Yaniv I, Ben-Gal Y, *et al.* A randomized, controlled clinical trial of the homeopathic medication *Traumeel S* in the treatment of chemotherapy-induced stomatitis in children undergoing stem cell transplantation. *Cancer* 2001; **92**: 684–690.
- 114 Campbell, A. Two pilot controlled trials of Arnica montana. *Br Hom J* 1976; **65**: 154–158.
- 115 Gaucher C, Jeulin D, Peycru P, Amengual C. A double blind randomized placebo controlled study of cholera treatment with highly diluted and succussed solutions. *Br Hom J* 1994; **83**: 132–134.
- 116 van Erp VM, Brands M. Homeopathic treatment of malaria in Ghana: open study and clinical trial. *Br Hom J* 1996; **85**: 66–70.