

## **REVIEW OF PHARMACY REMUNERATION & REGULATION INTERIM REPORT**

---

Response by: Michael Tomlinson Phd (Cantab.), DipHom, FCIS, FGIA

### **INTRODUCTION**

I write to oppose Option 3-4 in the interim review, which would prevent the sale of homeopathic products in PBS-approved pharmacies.

It would be an exceptional and undue imposition of government control over consumer health choices to single out one class of medicines to be banned from sale in pharmacies, especially a class of medicines that is self-evidently not harmful. There is no precedent for government prohibition on the sale of a class of medicines with such a well-developed profile of positive scientific studies. Prohibition would be an extreme infringement of civil liberties.

Homeopathy has an unusually long recorded history of positive therapeutic effects. The track-record of a core group of these medicines goes back more than 200 years. The effects of these medicines have been systematically recorded and collated in various ways over that period, most recently through scientific investigation.

The sections that follow outline the reasons why homeopathic medicines should be regarded as having therapeutic effects, essentially due to the concordance between many different forms of evidence of those effects.

### **ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE**

#### **Overview**

It is common in quality assurance in other contexts to place reliance on the concept of 'triangulation'. The concept of triangulation is a powerful one and yields more reliable findings than reliance on one form of evidence alone. Essentially the objective is to find different forms of evidence that are aligned, all pointing to the effectiveness of a process or intervention but from different perspectives.

In the case of homeopathy, we can cite the combination of:

- 'provings', in which generations of homeopaths have laid the foundations of the materia medica through trials of the 'primary effects' (i.e. the initial adverse effects) of homeopathic medicines, which correspond to the symptoms being treated
- the work of master practitioners/scholars, who aggregated the evidence from provings and clinical experience into the materia medica and repertories used as the basis for prescribing

- high quality case studies such as those on the site: [Homeopathy 4 Everyone. Homeopathic Medicine & Homeopathy Remedies](#)
- observational studies of large numbers of homeopathic patients with one or many different conditions and the outcomes of their treatments, not contrasted with a control group
- randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of which many hundreds have been published in the peer-reviewed scientific literature, many of them positive.
- studies of the effects of homeopathic medicines on other biological systems, such as the growth rates of plants and animals
- other animal studies
- studies on the physical structure of homeopathic medicines.

### Clinical Evidence

The recorded clinical effects over 200 years have been collated in works such as Frans Vermeulen's *The Concordant Materia Medica* (Vermeulen 2003).

The most rigorous and comprehensive systematic review of all the RCTs to date by Mathie et al (2014) found reliable studies that were positive for homeopathy, although the effect sizes reported were small. The overall conclusions were cautiously positive and consistent with the position that homeopathic medicines have therapeutic effects. Further studies are needed, especially ones that are adapted to the specific conceptual framework of homeopathic medicine.

A highly-rated example of a series of positive RCTs includes the series of RCTs on homeopathic treatment for childhood diarrhea (Jacobs et al 2003).

Some examples follow of the concordance between recorded clinical experience and contemporary research.

Homeopathy has been shown to produce major improvements in injuries. For example, the homeopathic literature has shown *Natrum sulphuricum* to be effective in brain injuries for at least the last 100 years (see entry in Vermeulen 2003). In 1999 the effectiveness of homeopathic treatment for brain injuries was also demonstrated in a trial by Chapman et al. There were small numbers of patients in the trial (common in unfunded trials), but the combined forms of evidence are persuasive.

There is a similar mix of evidence showing that homeopathic *Symphytum* can accelerate the healing of fractures. Clinical experience has been recorded and aggregated again for over 100 years (Vermeulen 2003). In addition, there is a positive randomised controlled trial (Sharma, Sharma and Sharma 2012). Further work is now being undertaken by the Homeopathy Research Institute: [Can homeopathic medicines accelerate fracture healing?](#)

To this, we can add observational studies of large numbers of homeopathic patients and the outcomes of their treatments. For example, the study on all patients treated with homeopathy

at the Lucca hospital over seven years Rossi et al (2009) found that 74% reported at least moderate improvement. Similarly, 70% of patients in the six-year Bristol study reported by Spence et al (2005), reported positive health changes. These are high-quality studies of showing the effectiveness of homeopathy in the field, in actual practice, as opposed to the artificial statistically controlled sample populations in RCTs.

These are only examples of the material body of evidence available for the effectiveness of homeopathic medicines. Further substantive evidence is outlined at the following sites:

- National Center for Homeopathy [Research Library](#)
- [Research - The Faculty of Homeopathy](#)
- [Research - European Committee for Homeopathy](#)
- Homeopathy Research Institute (HRI): [Current projects](#)

In 2015, the National Health and Medical Research Council reached unfavourable conclusions on the basis of a selective sample of RCTs, but these conclusions have been rebutted by the Homeopathy Research Institute. The full version of HRI's analysis is not yet public, but a short summary is available from: <https://www.hri-research.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/HRI-Response-to-NHMRC-Information-Paper.pdf>

A Health Technology Assessment Report commissioned by the Swiss Government (Bornhöft G and Matthiessen P (eds) 2011) found that:

- The evidence from laboratory studies and clinical research shows that homeopathy is effective, and homeopathy as practised in Switzerland is cost-effective and safe.
- 20 of 22 systematic reviews of clinical trials showed a positive direction of evidence in favour of homeopathy

A comprehensive list of evidence curated by Iris Bell and Stephen Gold in 2016 listed 5,000 scientific references that need to be considered before reaching a contrary conclusion.

### **Mechanism of Action**

The Faculty of Homeopathy has summarised the current status of research on the properties of homeopathic medicines (with 16 scientific references)

(<http://facultyofhomeopathy.org/research/basic-science-research/>) as follows:

[One possible] mechanism is suggested by the results of research on molecular clustering in water solutions, which has shown that as a solution is made more and more dilute, very stable and larger 'clumps' of material develop in dilute solutions rather than in more concentrated solutions. This means that residual molecular clusters of the original substance might be present in homeopathic dilutions. Succussion might also be responsible for creating very tiny bubbles (nanobubbles) that could contain gaseous inclusions of oxygen, nitrogen, carbon dioxide and possibly the homeopathic source material.

A recent meta-analysis evaluated 67 in-vitro biological experiments in 75 research publications and found that high-potency effects were reported in nearly 75% of all replicated studies; however, no positive result was stable enough to be reproduced by all investigators. One example of a series of in-vitro experiments in homeopathy is the model of the allergic response to antibody using the human basophil degranulation test. The earliest study reported inhibition of degranulation with ultra-molecular dilutions of anti-IgE. These initial experiments did not prove to be reproducible. Subsequent studies using a modified method, and using ultra-molecular dilutions of histamine, have shown positive results however. These findings have been reproduced in several independent laboratories, as well as in a multi-centre series of experiments.

Bell et al (2012) developed a comprehensive model of the actions of homeopathic medicines on biological systems, based on integrating the findings of 247 scientific papers.

While the research into possible mechanisms of action is incomplete, it is material and indicative. The development of sophisticated models for the actions of homeopathic medicines makes it increasingly difficult to dismiss homeopathy on a priori grounds.

## CONCLUSION

Preventing pharmacies from selling homeopathic products flies in the face of the evidence accumulated over 200 years. The only justification for such an extreme intervention would be that homeopathic medicines are not distinguishable from water and therefore must be inactive on first principles. This position is inconsistent with the status of the current research on this issue referred to above. The emerging evidence indicates that homeopathy is a form of nanomedicine. The accumulated clinical evidence demonstrates its effectiveness in practice.

**The profile of evidence of homeopathic medicines is not consistent with the profile of evidence for substances that lack any clinical effects. It is only consistent with substances that do have therapeutic effects.**

Homeopathic medicine provides options for patients (such as those with brain injuries) where few or no mainstream options for treatment exist. Preventing or impeding access to these options would be contrary to the government's duty of care for its citizens.

## REFERENCES

Bell and Koithan 2012, A model for homeopathic remedy effects: low dose nanoparticles, allostatic cross-adaptation, and time-dependent sensitization in a complex adaptive system, BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine, 12:191 <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6882/12/191>.

Bell and Gold 2016: Homeopathy Research Evidence Base: References  
[http://homeopathyusa.org/uploads/Homeopathy\\_Research\\_Evidence\\_Base\\_7-7-16.pdf](http://homeopathyusa.org/uploads/Homeopathy_Research_Evidence_Base_7-7-16.pdf)

Bornhöft G and Matthiessen P (eds) 2011, Homeopathy in Healthcare – Effectiveness, Appropriateness, Safety, Costs: An HTA report on homeopathy as part of the Swiss Complementary Medicine Evaluation Programme, trans. from the German by Margaret M Saar, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer-Verlag, 2011.

Chapman et al 1999, Homeopathic treatment of mild traumatic brain injury: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial, [J Head Trauma Rehabil](#), 14(6):521-42.

Jacobs et al 2003, *Pediatr Infect Dis J*, 22:229-34:  
[http://www.wellandtrulyhealthy.co.uk/files/Jacobs\\_meta\\_analysis.pdf](http://www.wellandtrulyhealthy.co.uk/files/Jacobs_meta_analysis.pdf).

Mathie et al 2014, [Randomised placebo-controlled trials of individualised homeopathic treatment: systematic review and meta-analysis](#), *Systematic Reviews* 3:142, DOI: 10.1186/2046-4053-3-142.

NHMRC Information Paper: 'Evidence on the Effectiveness of Homeopathy for Treating Health Conditions'. National Health and Medical Research Council, March 2015.

Rossi et al 2009, Homeopathy in the public health system: a seven-year observational study at Lucca Hospital (Italy). [Homeopathy](#), 98(3):142-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.homp.2009.04.001.

Sharma S, Sharma N, Sharma R 2012, Accelerating the healing of bone fracture using homeopathy: a prospective, randomized double-blind controlled study. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine, 12(Suppl 1): O61).

Spence D, Thompson E, Barron S 2005, Homeopathic Treatment for Chronic Disease: A 6-Year, University-Hospital Outpatient Observational Study, *JACM*, 11(5):793-798.

Vermeulen, Frans, *The Concordant Materia Medica*, Melijn Publishers, Haarlem, 2003.