



Prana HOMEOPATHY

Highlights of Research and Writings on Homeopathy

Contents

Introduction.....	2
Homeopathy: Medicine for the 21st Century.....	2
Why Homeopathy Makes Sense	4
How healthy are chronically-ill patients after eight years of homeopathic treatment? Results from a long term observational study.....	5
Homeopathy and conventional medicine: an outcomes study comparing effectiveness in a primary care setting.....	5
Homeopathy versus conventional treatment in respiratory tract complaints.....	6
Homeopathy and Allergies/Asthma	6
Long History of Success	6
Cost-Effectiveness Issues.....	6
Conclusion	11

Introduction

Research on the latest drug for the most popular disease diagnoses is held up as the Holy Grail of medicine. There have been MANY double blind, placebo controlled studies to determine the effectiveness of homeopathy on numerous diagnoses. The following is a summary of some of the studies and other writings on Homeopathy. Naturally, not every pathology has been studied as it relates to homeopathy. It is difficult to gain funding for something that cannot be patented. But homeopathy doesn't treat disease. It treats people and enables the body to heal itself.

You may find this research fascinating and wonder why you hadn't heard about it sooner. But there is no time like the present to begin getting healthy.

Although this is not an exhaustive list, some of the research topics covered in this document include homeopathic research on:

- How homeopathy works
- Homeopathy around the world
- Long term health effects of people who use homeopathy for chronic illness
- Decreases in prescription drug usage due to homeopathy
- Cost effectiveness of homeopathy
- Decrease in number of sick days taken
- Asthma
- Allergies
- Chronic Respiratory Disease
- Common Cold
- Ear infections
- Eczema
- Homeopathic dentistry
- Homeopathy vs. Anti-biotics
- Hyperactivity
- Infertility
- Respiratory Tract Infections

Much more research is also available on the effectiveness of homeopathy.

Much of the following comes from *Homeopathic Family Medicine*, an eBook by Dana Ullman. Also included are summaries of research as reported on the internet.

Homeopathy: Medicine for the 21st Century

Homeopathy has been aptly characterized as a "medicine for the 21st century." It is a powerful yet gentle method of augmenting a person's own immune and defense system. It is a sophisticated method of individualizing medicines to the totality of physical and psychological

aspects of a person, not simply to his or her disease. And it is a tried and true method of healing people who experience a wide range of acute, chronic, and even hereditary ailments.

That said, it must also be acknowledged that homeopathy is not a cure-all. Homeopathy cannot cure everything or everyone. Some people's immune and defense system is so weakened or compromised that nothing can elicit a healing response. Some people require surgery for healing to occur. And some people cannot be healed for unknown reasons.

Despite these limitations for select individuals, homeopathy can often profoundly improve a person's health. It can provide relief from an ailment, and it can evoke a true cure. It can help to heal various physical complaints, and it can transform and improve a person's emotional and mental state. It can heal various diseases, and it can help to prevent new ones from developing.

Although these statements are indeed bold, homeopathy has over 200 years of evidence to support them. The primary reason that homeopathy became popular in the 19th century was the remarkable results that homeopathic physicians experienced in treating people suffering from the infectious disease epidemics that raged at the time. Epidemics of cholera, scarlet fever, typhoid, and yellow fever were rampant and killed large numbers of people who became ill with them. And yet, death rates in homeopathic hospitals were commonly one-half or even one-eighth of the death rates in the conventional medical hospitals (Coulter, 1975, 1977; Bradford, 1900).

These magnificent results helped homeopathy grow in the United States, so much so that by the turn of the 20th century, there were 22 homeopathic medical schools, including Boston University, University of Michigan, New York (Homeopathic) Medical College, University of Minnesota, amongst others. Approximately 15% of American doctors considered themselves homeopathic physicians, and there were over 100 homeopathic hospitals (Coulter, 1975).

Homeopathy's popularity declined sharply after the turn of the century, primarily due to the active efforts of the American Medical Association and its collaboration with American drug companies.

Although homeopathy's status in the U.S. declined, homeopathy in Europe and parts of Asia continued to grow. Between 30-40% of French doctors and 20% of German doctors prescribe homeopathic medicines. Over 40% of British doctors refer patients to homeopathic doctors, and 45% of Dutch physicians consider these natural medicines to be effective (Fisher and Ward, 1994). According to a report from the government of Norway, homeopathy is the most frequently used complementary and alternative medicine therapy in five out of 14 European countries: France, Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, and Switzerland (NOU, 1998). Homeopathic medicines are used by between 20 and 25% of European Union citizens (Resolution, 1997).

Homeopathy is so popular in Europe today that it is no longer appropriate to consider it "alternative medicine" there.

Homeopathy is even more popular in parts of Asia. There are over 165 four- and five-year homeopathic colleges in India, and there are almost 200,000 homeopathic doctors there. Homeopathy is used in virtually every country in the world today, and millions of people take a homeopathic medicine every day.

Why Homeopathy Makes Sense

Homeopathy's principle of similars makes a profound contribution to understanding healing because inherent in this principle is a deep respect for the wisdom of the human body. Homeopathy's emphasis on individualizing a medicine to the totality of a person's symptoms, not just a person's specific disease is also wonderfully logical.

The difficult-to-understand part of homeopathy is the extreme microdoses used. In fact, according to present laws of physics, once a homeopathic medicine is diluted 1:10 24 times or 1:100 12 times, there should be no remaining molecules of the original substance.

However, as it turns out, new high tech research in 2010 has confirmed that the 30C and 200C potencies have evidence of the original molecular structure (Chikramane PS, Suresh AK, Bellare, 2010). Using market samples of metal-derived medicines from reputable manufacturers, scientists at the Department of Engineering at the Indian Institute of Technology have demonstrated for the first time using Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM), electron diffraction and chemical analysis by Inductively Coupled Plasma-Atomic Emission Spectroscopy (ICP-AES), the presence of physical entities in these extreme dilutions in the form of nanoparticles of the starting metals and their aggregates.

Homeopaths acknowledge that there may not be many remaining molecules left in such medicines, but they also assert that a more powerful energy, essence, or information of the original substance seems to remain and actually increases with each potentization. They assert that 200 years of clinical experience by homeopaths throughout the world have confirmed and continue to confirm this observation. They acknowledge that they don't know how their medicines work, though various individuals have developed compelling theories.

One metaphor that may help us understand how and why extremely small doses of medicinal agents may work derives from present knowledge of modern submarine radio communications. Normal radio waves simply do not penetrate water, so submarines must use an extremely low frequency radio wave. However, the terms "extremely low" are inadequate to describe this specific situation because radio waves used by submarines to penetrate water are so low that a single wavelength is typically as long as a submarine itself or even tens of miles long!

If one considers that the human body is 70-80% water, perhaps the best way to provide pharmacological information to the body and into intercellular fluids is with nanopharmacological doses.

It is known that sound travels faster and easier in water than in air. Because homeopathic medicines are made in double-distilled water, it is quite possible that this pure water become imprinted with the information or frequency of the medicinal substance.

One of the most simple yet sophisticated explanations for how homeopathic doses maintain an active biological effect has been developed by two professors at the University of Arizona, Drs. Gary Schwartz and Linda Russek, and further characterized by two MD/homeopaths, Iris Bell, MD, PhD and David Riley, MD. They postulate the systematic memory hypothesis (Schwartz and Russek, 1999; Schwartz, Russek, Bell, Riley, 2000). They assert that the water retains a memory of the medicinal substance, even after repeated dilutions. Further, they postulate that information and energy (IE) is stored in complex dynamical systems and that by *reducing* the

material concentration (the physical dosage) of molecular systems in a diluent (such as water) and at the same time *increasing* the IE concentration (the IE dosage) in the diluent through repeated succussions (vigorous shakings) leading to increased systemic memory, IE resonance effects may be enhanced (Schwartz, Russek, Bell, Riley, 2000).

This memory may be analogous to taking a smaller and then smaller piece of a hologram. The picture of the whole original hologram remains in the decreasingly smaller piece.

The concept of memory is actually not without precedence and acceptance within chemistry. Martin Chaplin, PhD, CChem, professor at South Bank University (London) notes: There is a similar strange occurrence to homeopathy in enzyme chemistry where an effectively non-existent material still has a major effect; enzymes prepared in buffers of known pH retain (remember) those specific pH-dependent kinetic properties even when effectively dry; these molecules seemingly having an effect in their absence somewhat against common sense at the simplistic level. Water does store and transmit information, concerning solutes, by means of its hydrogenbonded network. Changes to this clustering network brought about by solutes may take some time to re-equilibrate. Succussion may also have an effect on the hydrogen bonded network (shearing encourages destructuring) and gaseous solutes (with critical effect on structuring (Chaplin, 2002).|

The *New Scientist* reported on research from two chemists whose research supports the observations and experiences of homeopaths (Coghlan, 2001). A German chemist Kurt Geckeler and his colleague Shashadhar Samal created a type of molecular structure called fullerenes, and they found that the molecules clustered together when they were diluted with water. These researchers were surprised and amazed to find that the size of the particles actually increased the more they were diluted. The researchers then sought to test other substances and confirmed their original observations.

How healthy are chronically-ill patients after eight years of homeopathic treatment? Results from a long term observational study

[**\(Publish link\)**](#)

A total of 3,709 patients from 103 practices in Germany and Switzerland were followed for eight years to determine health status changes from homeopathic treatment.

The results: Disease severity decreased significantly between baseline, 2 and 8 years. Physical and mental quality of life scores also increased considerably. Younger age, female gender and more severe disease at baseline were factors predictive of better therapeutic success.

Conclusion: Patients who seek homeopathic treatment are likely to improve considerably. These effects maintain for as long as 8 years.

Homeopathy and conventional medicine: an outcomes study comparing effectiveness in a primary care setting.

Jan 2001

Homeopathy versus conventional treatment in respiratory tract complaints

In an outcome study, 30 practitioners in four countries enrolled 500 consecutive patients with at least one of three complaints: upper respiratory tract complaints including allergies; lower respiratory tract complaints including allergies; or ear complaints. Of 456 patients, 281 received homeopathy and 175 conventional treatment. The primary outcomes criterion was response to treatment, defined as cured or major improvement after 14 days of treatment. Results showed a response rate of 82.6% in the homeopathy group compared to 67.3% in the group receiving conventional medicine. The authors concluded that homeopathy appeared to be at least as effective as conventional treatment of patients with the three conditions studied.

Riley D, Fischer M, Singh B, Haidvogel M, Heger M. Homeopathy and conventional medicine: an outcomes study comparing effectiveness in a primary care setting. J Altern Complement Med 2001; 7: 149–159.

Homeopathy and Allergies/Asthma

Allergies are one of the more common pathologies for which people seek help from homeopaths. In fact, the idea of allergy shots was borrowed from Homeopathy. Studies have been done on the effectiveness of homeopathy and allergies.

Long History of Success

The authors of this study referred to below had previously conducted two other experiments using homeopathic medicine in the treatment of another allergic condition, hay fever. One of these studies was also published in *The Lancet* (October 18, 1986).

Along with their recent asthma study, the authors performed a meta-analysis, reviewing all of the data from the three studies that totaled 202 subjects. The researchers found a similar pattern in the three studies. Improvement begins within the first week and continues through to the end of the trial four weeks later (research has not yet investigated longer time frames).

The results of this meta-analysis were so stunning that the authors concluded that either homeopathic medicines work or controlled clinical trials do not. Because modern science bases itself on controlled clinical trials, it is more likely that homeopathic medicines are effective.

Homeopaths have a long history of successful allergy treatment, and they have made important contributions to our present understanding of allergies. In fact, it was a British homeopath, C.H. Blackely, who in 1871 first noted that seasonal sneezing and nasal discharge were the result of exposure to pollen. An American homeopath, Dr. Grant L. Selfridge, was one of three physicians to start the organization that became the present American Academy of Allergy.

Cost-Effectiveness Issues

Besides studies that verify the efficacy of homeopathic medicines, there is also a need for more studies evaluating the cost-effectiveness of homeopathic care. Of the studies that have already been conducted, there is presently positive evidence indicating that homeopathic care is more cost-effective than conventional and other alternative care, though more rigorous work is needed in this area as well.

A prospective cohort study of patients with chronic diseases (Children: allergic rhinitis, asthma, atopic eczema; Adults: low back pain, headache, insomnia, major depression, chronic sinusitis) were recruited from homeopathic and conventional practitioners (Becker-Witt, Keil, Roll, et al, 2005). A total of 178 children and 315 adults were evaluated over a 12-month period.

The analyses of the 493 patients (315 adults, 178 children) indicated greater improvement in patients' assessments after homeopathic versus conventional treatment (adults: homeopathy from 5.7 to 3.2; conventional, 5.9-4.4; $p=0.002$; children from 5.1 to 2.6 and from 4.5 to 3.2).

Physician assessments were also more favorable for children who had received homeopathic treatment (4.6-2.0 and 3.9-2.7; $p<0.001$). Overall costs showed no significant differences between both treatment groups (adults, 2155 versus 2013, $p=0.856$; children, 1471 versus 786, $p=0.137$). This research concluded that patients seeking homeopathic treatment had a better outcome overall compared with patients on conventional treatment, whereas total costs in both groups were similar.

This study evaluated cost differences, including hospital stay, outpatient treatment, medication, and sick pay, as determined by insurance payments. Despite the fact that homeopaths tend to spend considerably more time with each patient, the study found that there was no significant total cost difference between patients undergoing homeopathic treatment vs. conventional medical treatment. Many health policy makers and insurance company executives incorrectly assume that homeopathic treatment adds to the cost of a person's health care, but this study disproves this assumption, and other studies suggest that great savings accrue to individuals and governments that utilize homeopathic treatment.

One study conducted by the French government in 1991 showed a significantly reduced cost from homeopathic care versus conventional medical care (Social Security Statistics, 1991). The totality of costs associated with homeopathic care per physician was approximately one-half of the totality of care provided by conventional primary care physicians. However, because homeopathic physicians, on average, saw significantly fewer patients due to the more laborintensive tendency of homeopathic care, the overall cost per patient under homeopathic care was still a significant 15% less. It is also interesting to note that these savings appear to increase the longer a physician has been using homeopathy. A follow-up study in 1996 confirmed these results (Caisse Nationale de l'Assurance Maladie des Travailleurs Salaris, 1996).

This survey also noted that the number of paid sick leave days by patients under the care of homeopathic physician were 3.5 times less (598 days/year) than patients under the care of general practitioners (2,017 days/year). These figures suggest further benefit and savings to the homeopathic approach to care. Homeopathic medicines are reimbursable under the French health care system, in part because they cost considerably less than conventional drugs (on average, the cost of a homeopathic medicine is 7 French francs versus 23.00 French francs for conventional drugs). Although homeopathic medicines in France represent 5% of all medicines prescribed by physicians, they represent only 1.2% of all drug reimbursements due to their lower cost per prescription.

Another study in Seattle, Washington, which compared the utilization and cost of homeopathic, naturopathic, and acupuncture services found that homeopathic care was the least costly and that patient visits to homeopaths were less than to other alternative care professionals (this study,

however, did not concurrently compare or evaluate patient visits or costs for conventional medical care) (Jacobs and Smith, 1996; Jonas and Jacobs, 1996).

The Royal London Homeopathic Hospital conducted an audit of a sample of their patients during a three-week period (Sharples and van Haselen, 1998). A total of 541 questionnaires were handed out, 506 returned, and 499 were analyzed. This survey found that 63% of patients had their complaint for more than five years. Of the patients who were on conventional medications when they initially sought homeopathic care, 29% had stopped and an additional 32% had decreased their medication, while only 4% increased their medication. Sixty-two percent indicated that their main complaint had moderately or very much improved compared to their status before treatment at the homeopathic hospital.

Researchers at the University of Bristol evaluated health status and health care costs in 14 different NHS services that provided CAM treatment (Wye, Sharp, Shaw, 2009). General health scores improved to varying degrees, usually from .5% to 9%, though the health care costs tended to be higher, except for homeopathic treatment which showed a reduction in health care costs. This study also found that several services saw dramatic reductions in prescription drug costs, ranging from 39% to 57%, as well as an almost one-third reduction in visits to general practitioners.

This study, like others before it (Jonas and Jacobs, 1996), indicates that the vast majority of complaints seen by homeopaths are for chronic, long-term illness. Because these studies showed significant improvement in patient health and in reduction of medication, this data is of special interest to managed care companies. Additional evidence of good results of successful and potentially cost-effective treatment with homeopathic medicines was shown by the Glasgow Homeopathic Hospital that conducted an audit of 100 consecutive patients. They found that 81% had a condition for which conventional medical treatment was not effective and for which 47% had seen a specialist. After one year, 60% experienced significant improvement in the condition about which they were most concerned, 49% had a sustained improvement in their quality of life, and 37% managed a sustained reduction in their conventional medications (HomInform, 1997).

Another study that also provided evidence of rapid resolution of **ear infection** in children given a homeopathic medicine was a trial of 230 children (Frei and Thurneysen, 2001). This study also compared the economic costs of homeopathic vs. conventional medical treatment. The children were given an individually chosen homeopathic medicine. If pain reduction was not sufficient after just six hours, another individually chosen homeopathic medicine was prescribed. The researchers found that 39% of patients experienced sufficient pain reduction in the first 6 hours and another 33% after just 12 hours. Those children whose earache did not resolve after 18 hours were prescribed an antibiotic. The improvement from homeopathic treatment was 2.4 times faster than in children prescribed a placebo (the speed of improvement for patients given a placebo was determined by an earlier meta-analysis of those children given a placebo in a conventional medical treatment trial). The cost of the homeopathic medicine was 14% cheaper than antibiotic treatment.

An audit of clinical outcome in 455 consecutive patients (1100 consultations) was conducted evaluating private homeopathic treatment of a chronic illness in which conventional treatment had either: failed, reached a plateau in effect, or was contra-indicated by side effects, age or condition of the patient (Sevar, 2005). Three hundred and four patients (66.8%) derived benefit

from homeopathic treatment. One hundred and forty-eight patients (32.5%) were able to stop or maintain a substantial reduction in their conventional drugs. The 10 most frequent clinical conditions treated were eczema, anxiety, depression, osteoarthritis, asthma, back pain, chronic cough, chronic fatigue, headaches and essential hypertension. These 195 patients constitute 43% of the total, 151 of them (77%) were improved. Although this study did not evaluate the economic benefits from homeopathic treatment, the fact that almost one-third of the patients stopped or maintained a substantial reduction in their use of conventional drugs suggests that a great cost savings occurred.

Other smaller studies have also confirmed the cost-effectiveness of homeopathic care. One pilot study in Great Britain suggested that doctors practicing homeopathic medicine issued fewer prescriptions and at a lower cost than their conventional medical colleagues (Swayne, 1992), while another pilot study in Germany evaluated a single homeopathic dentist's practice and suggested that it was more cost-effective than conventional dental care (Feldhaus, 1993).

One other example of a cost benefit to homeopathic care was witnessed in a small study of the homeopathic treatment for infertility (Gerhard et al., 1991). This study showed that homeopathic care for infertility was 30 times less expensive per successful delivery than the match comparison group given conventional care.

A prospective uncontrolled observational multicenter outcome study was conducted in Norway using 80 homeopaths from 1996 to 1998 (Steinsbekk, Ludtke, 2005). A total of 1,097 patients were recruited, of which 654 completed the follow-up questionnaire. Of particular significance was the observation that seven out of ten patients visiting a Norwegian homeopath reported a meaningful improvement in their main complaint 6 months after the initial consultation. Also, the proportion of patients using conventional medication reduced from 39% to 16%. The main complaint in patients improved by at least 10mm on the VAS (Visual Analog Scale) for 71% (95% confidence interval 67-74%) of patients. The average reduction was 32mm (95% CI 30-35 mm). Fifty-one per cent (95% CI 48-55%) of the patients had an improvement in their general well being of more than 10 mm. The mean reduction in the whole group was 14mm (95% CI 12-16 mm). Regression analysis showed that lower age and higher baseline score were predictors of better outcome.

The European Committee for Homeopathy conducted a review of human trials using a Quality of Life questionnaire, and found that homeopathy reduced costs and allowed a better improvement in work-days lost compared with conventional practice (Van wassenhoven, 2005). This study also found that in evaluating the treatment of 6,915 patients, 70% experienced significant clinical improvement by using homeopathic medicines (this percentage was even higher in children receiving homeopathic medicine).

They also found:

- 89% improvement in patients with bronchial asthma, and an even higher percentage if evaluating results beyond two years
- 75% improvement in homeopathic patients (vs. 65% improvement in conventional medical patients) for hyperactive children

-
- 67.3% respiratory tract infections (vs. 56% with conventional treatment) – note: 22% of the patients receiving conventional medical treatment reported side effects, while only 7.8% of patients received homeopathic treatment reported side effects).

Two Israeli physicians reported on a retrospective analysis of patients with allergies who had received individually chosen homeopathic medicines (Frenkel and Hermoni, 2002). Their clinic's database revealed that 27 of 31 patients who had used conventional drugs in the treatment of their allergies (antihistamines, steroids, and decongestants) showed a reduced usage of their drugs after given homeopathic treatment. Two patients experienced an increase in drug usage, and two patients showed no change. Of the 17 patients who did not use conventional drugs in the treatment of their allergies, 13 remained non-users and four had these drugs prescribed within 3 months after receiving homeopathic treatment.

These researchers found that the patients given homeopathic medicines experienced a significant drop in drug costs for three months of 60%.

A retrospective observational study was conducted on 105 out of 233 patients suffering from chronic respiratory disease attending the Homeopathic Clinic of the Campo di Marte Hospital in Lucca (Tuscany, Italy) between October 1998 and May 2003 (Rossi, Crudeli, Endrizzi, 2009). The costs of conventional medicinal products were evaluated using Anatomic Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification, specific for the pathology in question, and the general costs in the year preceding the first appointment at the Homeopathic Clinic vs. the first and second year subsequent to homeopathic treatment. The costs of conventional drugs for a group of patients affected by asthma (8 patients) and recurrent respiratory infections (16 patients) with long term use of conventional medicine treated by homeopathy were compared with the expenses of conventional drugs of a matched group of 16 and 32 patients, respectively.

Costs of pharmacological therapy specific for respiratory diseases were reduced by 46.3% (n=105) in the first year (P<0.01); and by 47.5% (n=72) in the second year (P<0.01) of homeopathic treatment. Reduction in general drug costs during homeopathic therapy was 42.4% in the first year (P<0.01); and -49.8 in the second year (N.S.). Costs for patients affected by chronic asthma showed a reduction in expenses of 71.1% for specific medicines relative to the group in homeopathic treatment vs. an increase of 12.3% in the group treated only with conventional drugs after the first year of follow-up and, respectively, a reduction of -54.4% for homeopathic treatment vs. +45.2% after the second year. For patients with recurrent respiratory infections, a reduction of 35.8% in the homeopathic group in the first year, compared to an increase 8.6% of costs for specific drugs in the control group; in the second year the respective figures were -43.6% versus +7.8% in the control group. The researchers concluded that homeopathic treatment for respiratory diseases (asthma, allergic complaints, Acute Recurrent Respiratory Infections) was associated with a significant reduction in the use and costs of conventional drugs. Costs for homeopathic therapy are significantly lower than those for conventional pharmacological therapy.

A pharmaeconomic study was conducted in Italy to assess the impact of different, cost-specific pharmacological strategies on the recurrence rate of prescriptions in the treatment of cold symptoms (Basili, Lagona, di Sarsina, 2009). Data were obtained from a prospective cohort study reporting individual prescriptions histories of subjects experiencing cold symptoms, obtained by a stratified random sample of 316 subjects, clustered into 139 Italian families,

followed up for 40 months. The families involved in this study were from a list of Italian journalists because their insurance company allows for reimbursement of both allopathic and homeopathic drugs. Costs of homeopathic and allopathic treatments were recorded within each prescription. The authors acknowledged that some individuals used only allopathic medicines (29%), some used only homeopathic medicines (12%), while the majority of people used a mixture of treatments. This analysis found that patients who used homeopathic medicines experienced a reduced risk of prescription re-occurrence as compared with those people who used allopathic drugs.

A study was conducted with 499 children between 18 months and 4 years of age who had had at least five bouts of acute rhinopharyngitis (cold and sore throat) in 1999 and who had consulted a physician in 2000 either for preventive treatment or for treatment of a current episode (Trichard, Chaufferin, and Nicoloyannis, 2005). A post-hoc analysis was conducted of these children, 268 of whom were treated by a homeopathic MD and 231 who were treated by a non-homeopathic MD. The researchers evaluated the children who had received at least one homeopathic medicine but no antibiotics and compared them with those children who were treated with antibiotics but no homeopathic medicines.

The researchers found that the children who were prescribed a homeopathic medicine were significantly more likely to experience a positive result of treatment compared with those children prescribed an antibiotic (2.71 vs. 3.97, $P < 0.001$). The researchers also found that the children given a homeopathic medicine had significantly fewer complications and a higher quality of life. Further, the study found that the parents of the children given the homeopathic medicine had significantly less sick-leave days than the parents of children given an antibiotic (9.5% vs. 31.6%; $P < 0.001$). Despite these various benefits from homeopathic treatment, there was no statistical difference in direct medical costs between those children treated with homeopathic or conventional medicine.

Because of the body of evidence showing efficacy from homeopathic treatment of people with eczema, a study was conducted to compare the medical and economic differences between homeopathic and conventional medical treatment (Witt, Brinkhaus, Pach, 2009). In a prospective multicenter comparative observational non-randomised study, 135 children (homeopathy $n = 48$ vs. conventional $n = 87$) with mild to moderate atopic eczema were included. The primary outcome was the SCORAD (Scoring Atopic Dermatitis) at 6 months. Further outcomes at 6 and 12 months also included quality of life of parents and children, use of conventional medicine, treatment safety and disease-related costs.

Conclusion

We hope you have enjoyed the bits and pieces of homeopathic research that has been presented in this document. *Homeopathy, the fastest growing health care therapy in the world, is*

- Individualized
- Effective
- Gentle
- Affordable
- Non-invasive
- Non-allergenic, Non-addictive
- Non-toxic