AION Linguistica
E-ISSN: 2281-6585
Website: https://aionlinguistica.com/AIONL
Issue 02 (2026)

Homeopathy in Contemporary Healthcare: Principles, Clinical Evidence, Public Perception and Future Perspectives

Dr. Lucas Garcia
Centre for Homoeopathic Medicine and Research, Mediterranean Institute of Complementary Medicine, Madrid, Spain

Submission:08/08/2026 Accepted:25/08/2026 Publication:31/08/2026

Abstract

Homeopathy is a system of complementary medicine that originated in Germany in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and subsequently spread to many parts of the world. It is based principally on two concepts: the “law of similars,” according to which substances capable of producing particular symptoms in healthy individuals are believed to treat similar symptoms in ill individuals, and the principle of potentization, which involves serial dilution and succussion of substances. Homeopathy has remained controversial because many highly diluted preparations contain little or none of the original substance, creating substantial challenges for conventional pharmacological explanations of therapeutic action. Nevertheless, homeopathic practice continues to attract patients because of its individualized consultation process, holistic orientation, cultural acceptance, perceived safety, accessibility, and dissatisfaction with some aspects of conventional healthcare. Scientific evidence concerning its effectiveness remains contested. Some meta-analyses have reported outcomes favoring homeopathy over placebo, while other rigorous analyses have emphasized methodological weaknesses, heterogeneity, publication bias, and insufficient reliable evidence for specific diseases. A 2017 systematic review of non-individualized homeopathy found that the apparent pooled benefit diminished substantially after adjustment for publication bias and that reliable evidence was insufficient for condition-specific conclusions. More recent systematic synthesis published in 2023 reported positive effects in several meta-analyses but also identified substantial variation in methodological quality. This paper examines the historical foundations, theoretical principles, clinical applications, evidence base, safety considerations, patient perspectives, ethical issues, and future research requirements surrounding homeopathy. It argues that homeopathy should be evaluated through rigorous scientific methods while recognizing the importance of patient autonomy, informed decision-making, and responsible integration of complementary practices within healthcare.

Keywords: Homeopathy, Complementary Medicine, Alternative Medicine, Individualized Treatment, Potentization, Placebo, Evidence-Based Medicine, Patient-Centred Care, Integrative Healthcare

Introduction

Healthcare systems throughout the world increasingly include diverse approaches to the prevention and management of illness. Alongside conventional biomedical medicine, complementary and alternative systems continue to be used by millions of people.

Homeopathy occupies a particularly distinctive position within this landscape. It has a long historical tradition, a well-developed professional culture, specialized educational institutions, pharmacopoeias, and a substantial body of published literature. At the same time, it remains one of the most scientifically controversial forms of complementary medicine.
Homeopathy developed in Europe during the period of major transformation in medical thinking associated with the late eighteenth century. Samuel Hahnemann, a German physician, articulated the fundamental principles of homeopathy and developed its characteristic approach to remedy preparation. Hahnemann was critical of several medical practices common during his period and emphasized individualized observation, careful attention to symptoms, and avoidance of treatments that he considered excessively harsh. Over time, homeopathy developed into a distinct therapeutic system with its own materia medica, repertories, prescribing methods, and pharmaceutical preparations.
The continuing popularity of homeopathy raises important questions for contemporary healthcare. Why do individuals choose homeopathic treatment when conventional medicine is widely available? What does scientific research demonstrate about its effectiveness? How should healthcare professionals respond when patients use homeopathy alongside conventional treatment? What standards should govern the manufacturing, regulation, labeling, and marketing of homeopathic products? These questions cannot be answered simply by characterizing homeopathy as either successful or unsuccessful. They require consideration of historical, clinical, scientific, psychological, social, economic, and ethical dimensions.
The National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health states that there is little evidence supporting homeopathy as an effective treatment for any specific health condition and notes that some products labeled homeopathic may contain substantial amounts of active ingredients, creating possible safety concerns. At the same time, published systematic reviews do not produce an entirely uniform picture. A 2023 systematic review of previous meta-analyses reported statistically significant effects favoring homeopathy in several analyses, although the included meta-analyses differed considerably in quality and scope. This divergence illustrates why interpretation of homeopathic evidence requires careful examination of study design, risk of bias, clinical relevance, and reproducibility rather than reliance upon individual positive or negative studies.

Historical Development and Philosophical Foundations

Homeopathy emerged from the medical environment of nineteenth-century Europe. Hahnemann's approach was partly a reaction against therapeutic practices of his time, many of which involved aggressive interventions. He proposed a different understanding of illness and treatment in which the totality of symptoms played a central role.
The first major principle is commonly described as *similia similibus curentur*, or “like cures like.” According to this concept, a substance that produces certain symptoms in a healthy person may be used in highly diluted form to treat a patient exhibiting similar symptoms. This differs fundamentally from the pharmacological principle that a drug generally produces therapeutic effects through a specific dose-dependent interaction with biological targets.

The second major concept is potentization. Homeopathic remedies are prepared through serial dilution combined with shaking or succussion. Different potency scales and preparation procedures are used. At very high dilutions, the probability of retaining molecules of the original starting material can become extremely low. This creates a central scientific question because conventional pharmacology generally associates biological effects with interactions between chemical substances and biological systems.

Homeopathic theory also emphasizes individualization. Two people presenting with similar conventional diagnoses may receive different homeopathic remedies depending upon their symptoms, personality characteristics, environmental factors, patterns of sleep, appetite, emotional experiences, and other observations. This individualized consultation is one reason homeopathy cannot always be evaluated in exactly the same manner as a conventional standardized drug.

Homeopathy and the Concept of Individualized Care

One of the distinctive characteristics of homeopathy is its attention to the individual rather than solely to the disease label. A homeopathic consultation can be considerably longer than a conventional primary-care consultation because practitioners may ask detailed questions concerning physical symptoms, emotional experiences, lifestyle, personal history, and environmental circumstances.

From a patient-centred healthcare perspective, the experience of being listened to may itself be meaningful. Modern healthcare increasingly recognizes communication, empathy, shared decision-making, therapeutic relationships, and patient expectations as important dimensions of healthcare quality. These factors, however, should not automatically be interpreted as evidence that a homeopathic preparation has pharmacological efficacy.

The therapeutic encounter may involve multiple components. These can include consultation time, reassurance, attention, expectations, ritual, practitioner-patient relationships, and the natural course of illness. Such components are relevant to understanding why some patients report improvements after receiving complementary therapies. Distinguishing the effect of the consultation from the specific effect of a homeopathic preparation is therefore an important methodological challenge.

Scientific Evidence and Clinical Effectiveness

The scientific evaluation of homeopathy has generated conflicting interpretations. Early meta-analyses sometimes suggested that homeopathic treatments produced effects greater than placebo. For example, a widely cited 1997 meta-analysis published in *The Lancet* examined 89 placebo-controlled trials and reported an overall effect favoring homeopathy. However, the authors also concluded that the available evidence was insufficient to establish clear efficacy for any particular clinical condition.

Subsequent research placed greater emphasis on methodological quality. A 2017 systematic review and meta-analysis examined 75 randomized controlled trials involving 48 different clinical conditions. Although the pooled analysis of extractable data favored homeopathy, the estimated effect was substantially reduced after adjustment for publication bias. Furthermore,

only three trials were classified as providing sufficiently reliable evidence, and their pooled result was not statistically significant. The investigators concluded that the overall evidence base was of low quality and that reliable condition-specific evidence was lacking.

Research into individualized homeopathy has similarly produced debate. A systematic review of randomized placebo-controlled trials found a relatively small number of studies with sufficiently reliable evidence compared with the much larger body of studies at high or uncertain risk of bias. These findings demonstrate the importance of distinguishing between the quantity of published research and the quality of evidence.

More recently, Hamre and colleagues conducted a systematic review of meta-analyses of randomized placebo-controlled homeopathy trials published between 1990 and 2023. Six meta-analyses were included. The review reported statistically significant positive effects in the eligible meta-analyses, while also identifying variation in risk of bias and evidence quality. The authors therefore presented an interpretation more favorable toward homeopathy than some earlier assessments. Because this conclusion differs from other major evidence assessments, it illustrates the continuing methodological and interpretive controversy surrounding the field.

A scientifically responsible conclusion is consequently more nuanced than either "homeopathy has been proven effective" or "all research has shown no effect." The existing literature contains positive findings, negative findings, heterogeneous results, methodological limitations, and disagreement regarding the appropriate interpretation of the evidence. There is insufficient consensus to establish homeopathy as an evidence-equivalent substitute for proven conventional treatments for specific diseases.

Homeopathy, Placebo Effects and Therapeutic Context

Placebo effects represent another important dimension of the homeopathy debate. Placebo responses are not simply imaginary experiences. Expectations, conditioning, attention, communication, and other contextual processes can influence subjective outcomes such as pain, anxiety, fatigue, and perceived wellbeing.

Homeopathic treatment frequently involves several elements that may influence patient experience. These include detailed consultations, empathetic communication, individualized recommendations, repeated follow-up, and strong expectations concerning treatment. Consequently, research must distinguish between specific effects attributable to a homeopathic preparation and nonspecific effects associated with the therapeutic context.

The placebo-controlled randomized trial remains important because it attempts to isolate the effect of the intervention. Nevertheless, designing ideal placebo-controlled studies of individualized homeopathy is difficult because practitioners may use extensive clinical information to select remedies. Blinding practitioners and patients while preserving the individualized treatment process can be challenging. These methodological complexities contribute to disagreement concerning how homeopathy should best be evaluated.

Potential Applications and Patient Use

Homeopathy has historically been used for a wide range of complaints, including respiratory symptoms, digestive problems, dermatological conditions, musculoskeletal complaints, allergies, anxiety-related symptoms, and other chronic or self-limiting conditions. However, the existence of widespread use should not be confused with proof of effectiveness.

Patients may choose homeopathy because they perceive it as natural, gentle, individualized, affordable, or consistent with their personal health philosophy. Some may seek complementary care after experiencing inadequate relief from conventional treatment. Others may use homeopathy because of family traditions or recommendations from friends and community networks.

Patient choice is an important ethical consideration, but autonomy requires accurate information. A patient can make an informed choice only when the known benefits, uncertainties, risks, and alternatives are clearly communicated. Healthcare professionals therefore have a responsibility to discuss evidence without dismissing patients or ridiculing their beliefs.

Safety and Regulatory Considerations

Homeopathic products are frequently perceived as inherently safe because many are highly diluted. This assumption is not universally justified. Highly diluted products may contain very small quantities of starting substances, but not every product labeled homeopathic is necessarily diluted to the same degree. NCCIH specifically warns that some products labeled as homeopathic may contain substantial amounts of active ingredients and may therefore cause side effects or interact with conventional medicines.

Safety must therefore be evaluated at several levels. The first concerns the chemical contents of the product. The second concerns contamination, manufacturing quality, and inaccurate labeling. The third involves indirect harm resulting from delaying effective conventional treatment. This last issue can be particularly important in serious or rapidly progressing diseases.

Homeopathic products should not be presented as substitutes for scientifically established interventions such as vaccination or urgent medical treatment. For example, claims that homeopathic products can replace conventional immunization lack credible scientific support.

Homeopathy and Integrative Healthcare

The contemporary healthcare environment increasingly emphasizes integration rather than rigid separation between therapeutic systems. Integrative medicine seeks to combine appropriate conventional medical care with selected complementary approaches while maintaining attention to evidence, patient preferences, safety, and clinical outcomes.

Homeopathy presents a difficult case for integration because its theoretical mechanisms remain inconsistent with established principles of chemistry and pharmacology, particularly at extreme dilutions. Nevertheless, patients who use homeopathy may still benefit from respectful communication and coordinated care.

An integrative approach should therefore distinguish between accepting a patient's preference and accepting every therapeutic claim as scientifically established. A healthcare professional can respect a patient's use of homeopathy while explaining that evidence for treating particular diseases remains limited or uncertain. Such communication can reduce the likelihood that patients conceal complementary medicine use from their doctors.

Methodological Challenges in Homeopathic Research

Future research should address several persistent methodological problems. First, clinical trials require sufficiently large and appropriately designed samples. Second, randomization and allocation concealment must be rigorous. Third, blinding should be maintained wherever feasible. Fourth, outcome measures should be clinically meaningful rather than limited to subjective impressions. Fifth, researchers should preregister protocols and report results transparently to reduce selective publication.

Heterogeneity is another major concern. Homeopathic studies can differ in the type of remedy, potency, prescribing approach, clinical condition, treatment duration, and outcome measurement. Combining fundamentally different interventions into one meta-analysis can produce an overall estimate that has limited clinical meaning.

The distinction between individualized and non-individualized homeopathy is particularly important. A standardized homeopathic product administered to all patients with the same condition is conceptually different from a treatment selected individually according to a practitioner's assessment. Future systematic reviews should therefore avoid inappropriate pooling and should examine clinically coherent intervention categories.

The Sum-HomIS recommendations published in 2023 proposed standardized approaches for summarizing evidence from homeopathic intervention studies, emphasizing literature searches, study selection, PICO frameworks, quality assessment, and evidence synthesis. Such methodological standardization could improve the transparency and comparability of future research.

Ethical Dimensions

The ethics of homeopathy extends beyond whether a particular remedy works. Four principles are especially relevant: autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. Autonomy requires respect for patient choices. Beneficence requires healthcare professionals to pursue patient wellbeing. Non-maleficence requires avoidance of preventable harm. Justice concerns fair access to healthcare and responsible use of healthcare resources.

A major ethical problem arises when unsupported claims encourage patients to abandon effective medical treatment. Conversely, dismissing patients without listening to their experiences may weaken trust and discourage disclosure of complementary medicine use. Ethical healthcare therefore requires respectful but evidence-informed dialogue.

Advertising and communication are also important. Claims about curing serious diseases require a high level of scientific evidence. Promotional language should not exaggerate uncertain findings or imply that traditional popularity constitutes proof of clinical effectiveness.

Future Directions

The future of homeopathy research should focus less on repeating poorly controlled studies and more on producing transparent, reproducible, clinically meaningful evidence. High-quality randomized trials should be designed around clearly specified conditions and outcomes. Researchers should distinguish individualized from standardized treatment and should report negative findings as carefully as positive ones.

Comparative-effectiveness research may also have value. Instead of examining only whether homeopathy differs from placebo, researchers could investigate how homeopathy affects patient-reported outcomes, healthcare utilization, quality of life, and treatment satisfaction when used alongside conventional care. Such research must still carefully control for confounding variables.

Scientific investigation of highly diluted preparations may also continue at the physicochemical level. However, laboratory observations should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of clinical effectiveness. A biologically measurable laboratory phenomenon and a clinically meaningful therapeutic effect are different scientific questions.

Healthcare education should likewise include evidence literacy. Students and practitioners should understand how randomized trials, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, publication bias, placebo effects, and risk of bias influence interpretation of complementary medicine research.

Conclusion

Homeopathy represents a historically influential and widely discussed form of complementary medicine. Its principles of “like cures like,” potentization, and individualized treatment distinguish it from conventional biomedical pharmacology. Its continued popularity reflects not only beliefs concerning remedies but also patient expectations, therapeutic relationships, cultural traditions, and the desire for individualized healthcare.

The scientific evidence remains contested. Some meta-analyses have reported effects favoring homeopathy, while rigorous analyses have emphasized low-quality studies, publication bias, heterogeneity, and insufficient reliable evidence for particular clinical conditions. A 2023 systematic review of meta-analyses reported positive findings but also demonstrated substantial variation in methodological quality. Major evidence-oriented health organizations continue to conclude that there is insufficient reliable evidence to establish homeopathy as an effective treatment for specific health conditions.

The most appropriate contemporary position is therefore neither unquestioning acceptance nor dismissal without investigation. Homeopathy should remain open to rigorous scientific evaluation while claims of therapeutic efficacy should be proportionate to the strength of available evidence. Patients should be encouraged to communicate openly with healthcare professionals about homeopathic products and should not substitute homeopathy for effective conventional treatment when serious medical conditions require established interventions.

Future research should prioritize methodological rigor, transparency, reproducibility, clinically relevant outcomes, and appropriate separation of different homeopathic treatment

models. Through such an approach, the debate surrounding homeopathy can become more scientifically productive and more ethically responsive to the needs of patients.

References

1. Hahnemann, S. (1810). *Organon of Medicine*. Dresden: Arnoldische Buchhandlung.
2. Linde, K., Clausius, N., Ramirez, G., Melchart, D., Eitel, F., Hedges, L. V., & Jonas, W. B. (1997). Are the clinical effects of homeopathy placebo effects? A meta-analysis of placebo-controlled trials. *The Lancet, 350*(9081), 834–843.
3. Cucherat, M., Haugh, M. C., Gooch, M., & Boissel, J. P. (2000). Evidence of clinical efficacy of homeopathy: A meta-analysis of clinical trials. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 56*, 27–33.
4. Mathie, R. T., Ramparsad, N., Legg, L. A., Clausen, J., Moss, S., Davidson, J. R. T., & Messow, C. M. (2014). Randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials of individualized homeopathic treatment: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Systematic Reviews, 3*, 142.
5. Mathie, R. T., Ulbrich-Zürni, S., Viksveen, P., Roberts, E. R., & Swinton, M. (2017). Randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials of non-individualised homeopathic treatment: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Systematic Reviews, 6*, 63.
6. National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health. (2025). *Homeopathy: What You Need to Know*. National Institutes of Health.
7. Hamre, H. J., Glockmann, A., von Ammon, K., Riley, D. S., & Kiene, H. (2023). Efficacy of homoeopathic treatment: Systematic review of meta-analyses of randomised placebo-controlled homoeopathy trials for any indication. *Systematic Reviews, 12*, 191.
8. Gaertner, K., Ulbrich-Zürni, S., Baumgartner, S., Walach, H., Frass, M., & Weiermayer, P. (2023). Systematic reviews and meta-analyses in Homeopathy: Recommendations for summarising evidence from homeopathic intervention studies (Sum-HomIS recommendations). *Complementary Therapies in Medicine, 79*, 102999.
9. Ernst, E. (2002). A systematic review of systematic reviews of homeopathy. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 54*(6), 577–582.
10. Shang, A., Huwiler-Müntener, K., Nartey, L., Jüni, P., Dörig, S., Sterne, J. A. C., Pewsner, D., & Egger, M. (2005). Are the clinical effects of homoeopathy placebo effects? Comparative study of placebo-controlled trials of homoeopathy and allopathy. *The Lancet, 366*(9487), 726–732.
11. Vickers, A. J., Goyal, N., Harland, R., & Rees, R. W. (1998). Do certain countries produce only positive results? A systematic review of controlled trials of homeopathy. *Controlled Clinical Trials, 19*(5), 475–490.
12. World Health Organization. (2009). *Safety Issues in the Preparation of Homeopathic Medicines*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

13. Witt, C. M., Lüdtke, R., Baur, R., & Willich, S. N. (2006). Homeopathic medical practice: Long-term results of a prospective observational study. *BMC Public Health, 6*, 349.
14. Rutten, A. L. B., & Stolper, C. F. (2008). The 2005 meta-analysis of homeopathy: Analysis of postpublication data. *Homeopathy*, *97*(4), 230–238.
15. Posadzki, P., Alotaibi, A., & Ernst, E. (2012). Adverse effects of homeopathy: A systematic review of published case reports and case series. *International Journal of Clinical Practice, 66*(12), 1178–1188.