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Introduction

Homeopathy can be defined as 'a therapeutic method that often uses highly diluted preparations of substances whose effects when administered to healthy subjects correspond to the manifestation of the disorder (symptoms, clinical signs and pathological states) in the unwell patient' (1). It is one of the most popular forms of complementary and alternative medicine in the UK and elsewhere (2). The reasons for this widespread use are probably complex, but the assumption that homeopathy is safe is certainly an important factor (1).

Although most homeopathic remedies are highly diluted, direct adverse effects (AEs) have been reported (3). Indirect risks mainly relate to replacing effective conventional treatments with ineffective homeopathic preparations (3,4).

The aim of this systematic review was to provide a summary and critical evaluation of the published evidence regarding direct and indirect AEs associated with homeopathy.

Method

Electronic literature searches were conducted in January 2012 to identify case series (CS) and case reports (CR) of AEs associated with homeopathy in human patients. The following electronic databases were used: MEDLINE, EMBASE, AMED, CINHAL and ISI. Details of the search strategy are presented in the Appendix. In addition, our own extensive department files were hand-searched for further articles.

No restrictions of language or time of publication were imposed. To be included, CS or CR had to pertain to AEs associated with the use of any type of homeopathic remedy in human patients. Data from spontaneous reporting systems were included as well. We also included reports where harm was not because of a homeopathic remedy, but was associated with the use of homeopathy as a replacement of conventional treatments. Information from the included CS or CRs were extracted according to predefined criteria and assessed by two independent reviewers. Causality was estimated based on the description provided by the authors of the primary articles. Any disagreements were settled through discussion.

Results

Our searches generated 378 articles, of which 340 had to be excluded (Figure 1). Thus, 35 reports met our eligibility criteria (5–40). Table 1 summarises direct AEs associated with the use of homeopathy. Table 2 presents indirect AEs related to the substitution of conventional care with homeopathy.
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Figure 1 Flow diagram

The total number of patients amounted to 1159 (of those 1142 AEs were classified as direct and 17 as indirect AEs). The included articles originated from Austria, (5) Belgium, (20,31) Brazil, (16) Denmark, (23) France, (10,13,15) Germany, (36,38,40) Holland, (37) India, (32) Ireland, (18) Israel, (9,17,26) Italy, (11) Mexico, (29) Spain, (6,8,33) Sweden, (19) Switzerland, (25,39) UK(21,28) and the US (14,22,24). They were published between 1978 and 2010.


Direct AEs included abdominal pain, flatulence, acute erythroderma, acute pancreatitis, severe allergic reactions, atopic dermatitis, burning lips, nausea, emesis, apnoea, cyanosis, regurgitation, anaphylaxis, arsenical keratosis and cancer, bladder cancer, bul- lous pemphigoid, severe asthenia, cardiac arrest, cognitive-behavioural disorders, coma, death, dermatitis, severe pulmonary involvement, emesis, euphoria, extreme agitation, hyponatraemia and hypoalbuminaemia, erythema, limb oedema, irritability and albuminuria, melanosis and keratosis, skin lesions, acute gastrointestinal illness, leukopaenia, thrombocytopenia, diffuse dermal melanosis, metabolic acidosis, weight loss, chronic diarrhoea, morbiliform and pruritic rash with hospital admission, multiple alopecia and hair loss, pain, pancreatitis, problem with balance, somnolence, pruritus, swelling and erythroderma, renal failure with metabolic acidosis, interstitial nephritis and hyperkalaemia, severe acute tubulointerstitial nephritis, severe bradycardia, reversible conduction defect, hypotension and syncpe, severe swelling, bleeding, rashes, sneezing, rhinitis, slight lethargy, symptoms of thall poisoning, tachypnea, high fever, lower limb areflexia, hypotension, pupillary abnormalities, gait ataxia, widespread leukocytosis and widespread maculopapular vesicular rash. Direct AEs of homeopathy occasionally resulted in serious outcomes including cancer, death, dialysis, toxic polyneuropathy and quadriaparesis. In several instances, patients presenting AEs required hospital admission (7,14,18,19,24) and pharmacotherapy (5,18,29,35,36).

Indirect AEs included deterioration of pulmonary allergy, deterioration of sarcoidosis glomerulonephritis, hypertensive heart failure and encephalopathy, haemophilus influenzae meningitis, septicaemia high fever and seizures, malignant melanoma, multiple organ system failure, oedema, pneumococcal pneumonia with purulent pericarditis and coma, sepsis and death and severe aggravation of atopic dermatitis. Indirect AEs of homeopathy resulted in the following clinical outcomes: death, permanent hyper-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year) (Reference)</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Homeopathic remedy (potency)</th>
<th>Concomitant treatment</th>
<th>Adverse event</th>
<th>Possible explanation</th>
<th>Causality</th>
<th>Treatment / clinical outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audicana (2001) (6)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mercurius Heel® containing Mercurius solubilis Hahnemanni (D10), Hepar sulfuris (D8), Lachesis (D12), Phytolacca (D4), Allantus glandulos (D3), Echinacea angustifolia (D3), Belladonna (D4)</td>
<td>Merbromin</td>
<td>Widespread maculopapular vesicular rash</td>
<td>Allergic reaction/mercury intoxication*</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Systemic corticosteroids and antihistamines Post-inflammatory hypopigmentation remained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviner (2010) (7)</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gali-col Baby containing Phosphorica, Bryonia, Nux-vomica, Cuprum metallicum and Veratrum album (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>ALTE including apnoea, cyanosis, regurgitation, flaccidity or vomiting</td>
<td>Overdosing, toxicity*</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Hospital admission. Lumbar puncture, lactate, ammonia, ECG, EEG, brain sonography, gastrogafi imaging, and echocardiogram. All fully recovered within 13 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barquero, Romero (2004) (8)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nux vomica and Rhus tox (n.m.)</td>
<td>Glimepiride</td>
<td>Acute pancreatitis, necrosis of the pancreatic head</td>
<td>Unclear†</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>ICU admission. Respiratory distress, gastrointestinal bleeding and death after 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermez (2008) (10)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sedativ PC (6 ingredients in 6CH)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>DRESS syndrome, severe pulmonary involvement</td>
<td>Hypersensitivity*</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>Full recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinali (2004) (11)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Rhus Toxicodendron mother tincture (alcohol solution) 2. Rhus Toxicodendron (7CH)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Widespread dermatitis, leukocytosis</td>
<td>Allergic reaction*</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>Full recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Case series and case reports of AEs directly related to homeopathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year) (Reference)</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Homeopathic remedy (potency)</th>
<th>Concomitant treatment</th>
<th>Adverse event</th>
<th>Possible explanation</th>
<th>Causality</th>
<th>Treatment/clinical outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curry (2006) (14)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caesium chloride (n.m.)</td>
<td>Chemotherapy, anaesthetic agents, CoQ10, coral calcium, bovine colostrum, seal oil, multivitamin, vitamin D,</td>
<td>Cardiac arrest</td>
<td>Cesium intoxication* or interactions with anaesthetic agents†</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Full recovery. NFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duque-Estrada (2009) (16)</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Injection of Lilium compositum, Solanum compositum, Thuya, and Tanacetum (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Hair loss</td>
<td>Unclear*</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Complete recovery after 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell (1995) (18)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oral Hypericum perforatum and Ledum palustre (n.m.)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Severe acute tubulointerstitial nephritis</td>
<td>Unclear†</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Hospital admission. Hemodialysis and methylprednisone. Improved renal function after 14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsman (1991) (19)</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C.1. a. AKO-PLEX containing: Juglans (D6), Silicea (D12), Antimonium (D12), Arnica (D6), Sarsaparilla (D6), Daisies (D6), Matereum (D6), Dulcamara (D6) b. Forte Saponaria containing: Gramin jugul., Rhamnus cath., Viola od., Cichor., Cent., Inula, Nastur., Sapon., Seroph. Bellis, Viola tr., Dulcam, Hydrocot, Merer, Sarsa. Thuya (all at D6) c. OT 10 containing: Sennae, Frangula, Phaseol., Mentha pip., Rubi, Fucus, Mokae, Taraxacum, Betula alba. C.2. Three different unspecified preparations (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>C.1. Atopic dermatitis C.2. Severe swelling, bleeding and rashes</td>
<td>Allergic reaction*</td>
<td>Likely in both cases</td>
<td>C1 – Hospital admission. Topical steroids and antihistamines. Full recovery within several months. C2 – Hospital admission. NFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year) (Reference)</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>Homeopathic remedy (potency)</td>
<td>Concomitant treatment</td>
<td>Adverse event</td>
<td>Possible explanation</td>
<td>Causality</td>
<td>Treatment/clinical outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geukens (2001)(20)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aconitum 1000, Baryta carbonica, Cantharis 1000, Gambogia, Pulsatilla, Rhus tox (M and 10 M)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Heart disease and bladder cancer</td>
<td>Undescribed†</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Radiotherapy. Full recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodyear (1993) (21)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nine different remedies, including iron and arsenic (both at 6°C)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Hyponatraemia, hypoalbuminaemia, erythaema and limb oedema</td>
<td>Undescribed*</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Hospital admission. Sodium chloride solution, albumin infusions, intravenous fluduracillin and benzylpenicillin, potassium peroxigenate baths, topical corticosteroids and antibiotics. Persistent mild eczema at 4 months follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guha (1999) (22)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tincture of aconite</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Severe bradycardia, reversible conduction defect, hypotension and syncope</td>
<td>Aconitum intoxication*</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Marked improvement in symptoms within a few hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr (1986) (24)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regeneration Tablets- a mixture of 19 ingredients (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Pancreatitis, pain, nausea, vomiting</td>
<td>Protoanemomin and saponic glycosides toxicity†</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Hospital admission. Conservative treatment. Full recovery after 6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuenzli (2004) (25)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Topical and/or oral calcium, sulphur, lycoptodium, mercurius, cantharis, rhus toxicodendron, calcium carbonicum, sepia and tuberculinum (n.m.)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bullous pemphigoid, severe asthaenia</td>
<td>Mercury intoxication*</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Oral prednisone and sulfapyridine. Rapid improvement within 2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menniti-Ippolito (2008) (27)</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Various remedies-both mono and poly-preparations, including Kalium Bichromicum and Mercurius Sublimatus Corrosivus (from D1)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Allergic reactions</td>
<td>Immune allergic reactions, hypersensitivity†</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>n.r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk (1986) (28)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Injection of Nat Mur 200 (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Acute erythroderma</td>
<td>Unknown*</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>ICU admission. n.r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montoya-Cabrera (1991) (29)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mercurius 6a (D6)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Dermatitis, irritability and albuminuria</td>
<td>Mercury intoxication*</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>D-penicillamine administration. Full recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostelmans (2004) (30)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loco X112 drops (n.m.)</td>
<td>Alcohol and amphetamine</td>
<td>Extreme agitation</td>
<td>Interactions of alcohol, thyroid extract free T3 and T4, diethylpropionate, and amphetamine and amphetamine * and †</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Diazepam, propofol. Full recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year) (Reference)</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>Homeopathic remedy (potency)</td>
<td>Concomitant treatment</td>
<td>Adverse event</td>
<td>Possible explanation</td>
<td>Causality</td>
<td>Treatment/clinical outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potier (1998) (31)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified remedies (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m. but patients with history of depression, cholecystectomy, neurological and vascular accidents.</td>
<td>Coma</td>
<td>Bromate intoxication*</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Antibiotics, mucolytics and haemodialysis. Full recovery within 15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasad (2006) (32)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified remedy (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m. but patient with a history of neck swelling, cough, haemoptysis, shortness of breath, fever and weight loss</td>
<td>Arsenical keratosis and cancer</td>
<td>Arsenic intoxication*</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Hospital admission. Chemotherapy. Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens (1978) (35)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified remedy (n.m.)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Migraine, retrosternal oppression, paresthesias, pain, burning sensation,</td>
<td>Thall intoxication*</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Prussian blue and potassium chloride. Full recovery within 1-week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkoglu-Raach (2010) (36)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Natakehi™ containing <em>Penicillium chrysogenum</em> (D4)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Renal failure with metabolic acidosis, interstitial nephritis and hyperkalaemia</td>
<td>Allergic reaction* and t</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Corticosteroids and haemodialysis. Full recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Ulsen (1988) (37)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pentackan Sinnabam (D4)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Severe exacerbation of eczema with swelling</td>
<td>Chromium intoxication*</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>No improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Mach (2006) (38)</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>Unspecified remedies (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Mostly mild symptoms (no details provided)</td>
<td>Unclear*</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>n.r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (year) (Reference)</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>Homeopathic remedy (potency)</td>
<td>Concomitant treatment</td>
<td>Adverse event</td>
<td>Possible explanation</td>
<td>Causality</td>
<td>Treatment/clinical outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wille (2010) (39)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Xylitol containing homeopathic globules</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Severe metabolic acidosis, weight loss, chronic diarrhoea</td>
<td>Enteral bicarbonate loss*</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>ICU admission. Full recovery after 3 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AEs, adverse effects; ALTE, apparent life-threatening event; DRESS, drug rash with eosinophilia and systemic symptoms; ECG, electrocardiogram; EEG, electroencephalogram; ICU, intensive care unit; NFI, no further information; n.r., not reported; SB, sinus bradycardia; TdP, torsades de pointes; VF, ventricular fibrillation; C, case.
*As judged by the author of primary report.
†As judged by the present author.
Table 2 Case series and case reports of AEs related to substitution of conventional care with homeopathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year) (Reference)</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Homeopathic remedy (potency)</th>
<th>Concomitant treatment</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Possible explanation</th>
<th>Causality</th>
<th>Treatment/clinical outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benmeir (1991) (9)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ointment and unspecified remedies (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Malignant melanoma</td>
<td>Negligence and lack of CT; †</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>Surgery. Full recovery after 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De launay (2000)(15)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ledum palustre (5CH) and Malaria officinalis (4 CH)</td>
<td>Conventional prophylactic drugs, NFI</td>
<td>Multiple organ system failure</td>
<td>Parasitaemia †</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>ICU admission. Intensive care for 2 months. NFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelson (1999) (17)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified remedy (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Deterioration of sarcoidosis</td>
<td>Discontinuation of CT †</td>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>Hospital admission. Corticosteroids. NFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsman (1991) (19)</td>
<td>Case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unspecified ointment</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>Malignant melanoma</td>
<td>Delayed diagnosis †</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibsen (1987) (23)</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unspecified remedies (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>C.1–C.4. Severe aggravation of atopic dermatitis</td>
<td>Discontinuation of CT †</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>ICU admission. Full recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lim (2011) (41)</td>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unspecified remedies (n.m.)</td>
<td>n.m.</td>
<td>C.1. Malnutrition, sepsis and death C.2. Malnutrition and oedema C.3. Seizures</td>
<td>Negligence and lack of CT † ‡</td>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>Hospital admission. NFI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AEs, adverse effects; ICU, intensive care unit; CT, conventional treatment; NFI, no further information; n.m., not mentioned; C, case.

*The most commonly used.
†As judged by the author of primary report.
‡As judged by the present author.
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tension, hydrocephalus and the need for neurosurgical drainage.

The duration of AEs ranged from a few hours (22) to 7 months (9,16). Eighteen patients experienced a full recovery (6,7,9–12,14,16,18,21–25,29–31,33,35,36,39) and four died (8,26,32,41). In six cases, details of AEs were insufficient for a judgment regarding cause and effect (13,19,27,28,34,37,38,40). In 17 cases, causality was deemed to be likely, certain in six, almost certain in 12 and unclear in one. The AEs were caused by allergic reactions, (5,6,8,11,19,27,34,36,39) ingestion of toxic substances (6,7,12,21,22,24,25,29–33,35,37) and substitution of conventional care (9,13,15,17,19,23,26,41).

**Discussion**

Our systematic review was aimed at summarising and critically evaluating the available evidence from CS and CR regarding AEs of homeopathy in human patients. According to our findings, homeopathy can lead to AEs, some of which are serious. A recent report on the safety of homeopathy by the European Council for Classical Homeopathy (ECCH) concluded that homeopathy is ‘safe to use’. However, this report was incomplete and included only a third of the CRs/CS located by us for the present review (42). The ECCH-report also commented on the safety of homeopathy relative to conventional treatments. It seems likely that homeopathic remedies cause far less and fewer AEs than conventional drugs, however, such a comparison might be misleading as not the absolute risk of an intervention, but its risk-benefit balance would determine the value of any medical treatment. If the benefit is small or non-existent, even a minute risk would tilt this balance into the negative.

An audit of the Bristol Homeopathic Hospital among 116 patients reported that 11% of them experienced AEs, including headaches, lethargy or vomiting (43). This percentage figure is difficult to interpret as the authors categorise diarrhoea, eczema, gastrointestinal upset, hair loss, infections, nausea, migraines, pains, rash, skin irritation, tension headaches, tiredness/fatigue as ‘homeopathic aggravations’, new symptoms and/or return of old symptoms. Our own review of the evidence for or against the existence of homeopathic aggravations included 24 placebo-controlled trials reporting aggravations, and we came to the conclusion that ‘this systematic review does not provide clear evidence that homeopathic aggravations exist’ (44).

In the majority of cases, the possible mechanism of action involved allergic reactions or ingestion of toxic substances. Preparations of heavy metals, such as arsenic, cadmium, mercury or iron, which are frequently used in homeopathy can be toxic, (45) if not highly diluted. Other poisons regularly employed in homeopathy include aconitum, kerosene or thallium, which also can lead to serious health problems in sufficiently low dilutions.

We identified both direct and indirect AEs of homeopathy. The former related to the homeopathic remedy itself and the latter predominantly referred to the replacement of effective conventional therapies with ineffective homeopathic remedies. It was often impossible to distinguish precisely between the two types of AEs. The information whether a fully qualified and registered homeopath applied, the homeopathic remedy was frequently missing. Similarly, other valuable details were often not included in the primary publications. In 94.7% of cases, the potencies were described as below 12 C, the point beyond which the likelihood of a single molecule being present in the remedy approaches zero. It is plausible that low dilutions of homeopathic preparations cause direct AEs, particularly allergic reactions. One might argue that incidences classified as indirect AEs by us are not truly AEs of homeopathy, but are the result of less than competent healthcare. We have therefore tried to differentiate as clearly as possible between the two. One might also wonder why relatively few indirect AEs have been reported. Most experts view the use of ineffective homeopathic treatments for serious conditions is potentially more harmful than the harm done by homeopathic remedies. One explanation could be that indirect harm of this nature rarely gets reported. Evidence of indirect AEs highlight the need for all homeopaths to be adequately trained such that harm of this nature can be avoided in future.

The preference of homeopathy over conventional medicine when dealing with serious, life-threatening conditions may cause serious harm, and this issue relates to the question of practitioner training (15,17,26). The treatment of cervical streptococcal lymphadenitis, acute lymphatic leukaemia, bacterial pneumonia and atopic dermatitis with homeopathic remedies is clearly dangerous (4,26,46) simply because homeopathy is not effective for any of these conditions. Other examples of serious conditions that have been treated homeopathically include anxiety, (47) depression, (48) eczema, (49) insomnia, (50) migraine prophylaxis and rheumatic conditions (51). The fact that such cases are being reported, albeit rarely, seems worrying. Again, we would therefore stress the need for making sure all homeopaths are medically competent.

We were unable to extract the data from one article that combined homeopathy with other modalities, such as herbas and dietary supplements. e.g. (52); in this retrospective analysis of cases, homeopathy had the second highest hospitalisation index with a total of 255 AEs reported.
Our systematic review has several strengths; we conducted extensive literature searches, did not impose restrictions according to language or time of publication, assessed the reported cases according to predefined criteria and tried to exclude bias where we could. We were able to include more AEs than any previous review has done. However, our systematic review also has a number of important limitations. They pertain to the potential incompleteness of the evidence. AEs of homeopathy are likely to be underreported; therefore, the number of cases summarised herein is less meaningful than the fact that such incidents exist at all. The often low quality of the primary reports further limits the conclusiveness of our findings. Several reports lacked sufficient detail, which renders the interpretation of their findings problematic (13,15,23,27,28,34,37,38,40). Given such caveats, a cause-effect relationship between the homeopathy and the AEs was frequently difficult to establish. We did not include systematic reviews, clinical trials, surveys and cohort studies in our review. A systematic review of the AEs of homeopathy, concluded that the incidence of AEs of homeopathic remedies was greater than that of placebo in controlled clinical trials; AEs included headache, tiredness, skin eruptions, dizziness, bowel dysfunctions and allergic reactions (53). Our review of CR and CS is thus not comprehensive. Crucially, it does not tell us anything about the incidence of AEs. Considering the widespread use of homeopathy worldwide and the relative paucity of the reported AEs, it might be very low. Collectively, these limitations render our review less conclusive than we had hoped.

In conclusion, several reports of AEs of homeopathy have been published and some AEs had serious consequences. Clinicians should be aware of the risks associated with homeopathy.
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