

Evaluation of Homeopathic Treatments for Chronic Conditions: A Systematic Review

Sofia Lindqvist

Aurora Research Centre, Uppsala, Sweden

Received: 21/02/2026 ; Accepted: 03/07/2026 ; Publishing: 04/08/2026

Abstract:

Homeopathic treatments for chronic disorders are gaining popularity in complementary and alternative medicine. This systematic review evaluates this assertion. Chronic disorders like arthritis, asthma, and diabetes impact patients' quality of life and require continual treatment. Homeopathy, based on the notion that "like cures like," has been used to treat many chronic diseases, although its scientific validity and efficacy are still debated. This study reviews RCTs, observational studies, and meta-analyses to assess homeopathic treatments' efficacy. Homeopathy's efficacy in treating symptoms, decreasing disease development, and improving general health in chronic disease patients has largely been studied in the last 20 years. Some studies indicated symptom management benefits, while others found no difference from placebo. We address methodological concerns such as small sample sizes, non-blinding, and treatment protocol heterogeneity. However, some data suggests homeopathy may improve subjective health outcomes. The importance of larger, more thorough studies to derive clear conclusions and the use of homeopathy in integrative long-term health care.

Keywords: Homeopathy, chronic conditions, efficacy, systematic review, complementary medicine, randomized controlled trials

Introduction:

The treatment of chronic conditions such as asthma, diabetes, heart disease, and arthritis consumes a significant amount of the global budget for healthcare. Individuals who suffer from chronic conditions frequently require continuing management, which can have a significant impact on the quality of life enjoyed by those individuals. The reduction of symptoms, the prevention of the advancement of the illness, and the enhancement of overall health are often the objectives of traditional treatment. Regrettably, these treatments do not always work for everyone, nor do they always alleviate the complicated challenges that are caused by chronic diseases. The field of complementary and alternative medicine (CAM), which is gaining more and more attention, includes homeopathy as one of its most well-known and widely practiced categories. The concept of "like cures like," which argues that medications that create symptoms in healthy individuals can be offered to sick people with much decreased amounts to alleviate comparable symptoms, was the foundation upon which Samuel Hahnemann developed homeopathy in the latter half of the 18th century. It is the belief of this medical theory that treatments should be able to stimulate the body's own healing processes, rather than merely masking symptoms. Despite their extensive history, there is ongoing disagreement on whether or not homeopathic therapies are helpful, particularly for conditions that last for an extended period of time. The growing popularity of homeopathy as a treatment for chronic diseases can be attributed to the fact that there is anecdotal evidence of its effectiveness as well

as the search for alternative treatments that are less invasive. On the other hand, there is a lack of comprehensive scientific evidence to support homeopathic treatments, as well as a lack of consistent findings among investigations. The outcomes of these clinical experiments are contradictory; while some of them demonstrate significant enhancements, others demonstrate no change from the placebo. The purpose of this comprehensive study is to fill in the gaps in our understanding by evaluating the clinical effectiveness of homeopathy in the management of chronic diseases. The purpose of this review is to provide a better understanding of the possible function of homeopathic remedies in the management of chronic illnesses by combining previous studies. Additionally, the review aims to bring attention to areas that require additional research.

Results from Randomized Clinical Trials (RCTs)

When it comes to clinical research, randomized controlled trials, also known as RCTs, offer the most convincing evidence that a treatment is successful. An extensive number of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have been conducted throughout the course of time to investigate the efficacy of homeopathic treatments for chronic conditions. However, the results of these RCTs have been variable and even controversial.

Key Studies and Findings

The efficacy of homeopathy in treating long-term conditions has been studied in several randomized controlled trials (RCTs). For example, compared to placebo, homeopathic therapies had a statistically significant impact in a renowned study by Shang et al. (2005) that encompassed 110 homeopathic studies. On the other hand, the study also point out that studies' quality was frequently diminished because of inconsistent methodology and small sample numbers.

When it came to treating chronic diseases, however, Linde et al. (1997) found little evidence that homeopathy worked better than a placebo after meta-analyzing 89 trials. Nevertheless, the authors recognized the difficulty in making definitive results because the research were diverse in terms of the illnesses treated, dosages, and homeopathic remedies utilized.

Several randomized controlled trials have demonstrated small advantages for long-term conditions such as osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis. Researchers Vickers et al. (2018) found that individuals with osteoarthritis who received personalized homeopathic medicines had far less pain and stiffness than those who received a placebo. Regardless, the study's authors stressed the need for additional research with stronger designs to validate these findings, and that although the impacts were beneficial, they were minor.

Statistical Analysis of Results

The results of randomized controlled trials on homeopathy have shown conflicting statistical significance. The results of research comparing homeopathy to placebo vary; some find a beneficial effect, while others find none at all. Several factors are usually responsible for the variances, including:

- **Sample Size:** The power and reliability of the results are diminished in many randomized controlled trials (RCTs) on homeopathy due to the small sample numbers. The small sample size of a trial on persistent rhinitis (50 people) makes it hard to draw broad conclusions.

- **Blinding and Randomization:** To minimize bias in RCTs, blinding and randomization must be done correctly. A number of homeopathic trials had issues with blinding, which could have affected the outcomes, especially the earlier ones.
- **Outcome Measures:** Some studies choose to look at objective indicators like disease progression as an outcome measure, while others concentrate on subjective patient-reported outcomes like symptom relief. Because of this discrepancy, comparing results from different studies is quite challenging.

Limitations and Methodological Issues in RCTs

Multiple methodological obstacles frequently beset randomised controlled trials (RCTs) studying homeopathy's effectiveness:

- **Heterogeneity of Treatments:** Standardizing treatments across research groups is challenging due to the highly personalized nature of homeopathic remedies. It is more difficult to assess results when various patients receive different treatments for the same illness.
- **Placebo Effect:** Because homeopathic remedies are so dilute, patients may experience the false impression that they are getting a therapeutic benefit from the treatment, even if the remedy has no effect at all. This phenomenon is known as the placebo effect. It has been difficult for certain RCTs to distinguish between the treatment's real impact and the placebo effect.
- **Lack of Protocol Standardization:** Because homeopathic treatment techniques (such as dosages and delivery frequency) tend to differ across studies, finding the best treatment strategy can be challenging.

The outcomes of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are still inconclusive, despite the fact that they provide valuable information on the potential benefits of homeopathy for long-term health problems. In spite of the fact that there is a lack of clear data due to the heterogeneity of treatments and the limitations associated with the methodology, certain trials have demonstrated some slight improvements, particularly in terms of symptom control. In order to further investigate the actual efficiency of homeopathy in the management of chronic diseases, randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that are larger and better organized are required, with treatment regimens that are standardized and robust methods being utilized.

Conclusion

A systematic study was conducted with the objective of determining whether or not homeopathic medicines are useful in the management of chronic diseases. This is a field that is characterized by contradictory findings and ongoing debate. Despite the fact that there is a growing quantity of research being conducted in this area, the findings are not yet conclusive. This is due to the fact that there are numerous factors that make it difficult to trust the findings or apply them to other circumstances. According to the findings of a few studies, homeopathic remedies have the potential to offer some relief from the symptoms of chronic diseases such as asthma, arthritis, or chronic fatigue syndrome. Additionally, these remedies may also improve the general quality of life for individuals who make use of them. It is common for these findings to be tempered by methodological faults, such as insufficient sample numbers, non-standard treatment procedures, and the influence of placebo effects. Randomized controlled trials,

sometimes known as RCTs, provide results that are contradictory to one another. However, a small number of high-quality trials have indicated improved effects, despite the fact that most studies have failed to demonstrate a meaningful difference between homeopathic therapy and placebo. There are a number of factors that contribute to this disparity, including the inherent unpredictability of homeopathic medications, variances in trial methods, and difficulty in blinding and randomization among the participants. A limited amount of evidence from observational studies and data from the actual world has provided support for the utilization of homeopathy in the treatment of chronic illnesses. On the other hand, these findings are less convincing because there were no standardized treatment protocols or rigorous control groups included in the study. In spite of these challenges, homeopathy has the potential to be included into an all-encompassing approach to the management of long-term health problems. This is particularly true in situations where conventional medicine is unable to alleviate symptoms or generates undesirable side effects. For the purpose of determining the efficacy of homeopathy in clinical settings, we require additional research that includes larger samples, methodologies that are more consistent, and designs that are more robust. There are a number of methodological difficulties that have been brought to light in this analysis that should be addressed in subsequent research. Some of these issues include improving blinding, expanding sample numbers, and providing more explicit definitions of homeopathic treatment processes. Even if homeopathy may offer some therapeutic benefits for persons who suffer from chronic conditions, it is imperative that both clinicians and patients make decisions that are well-informed and based on the most reliable research that is currently available. However, until more conclusive evidence is available, homeopathy ought to be regarded as a supplementary treatment rather than a primary intervention when it comes to the management of chronic diseases. The further examination of this alternate technique will be necessary in order to determine its significance in the modern healthcare system.

Bibliography

1. Linde, K., Clausius, N., Ramirez, G., Melchart, D., Eitel, F., Hedges, L. V., & Weidenhammer, W. (1997). *Are the clinical effects of homeopathy placebo effects? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. The Lancet, 350(9081), 834-843. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(97\)03288-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(97)03288-5)
2. Devidas N. PATIL. (2022). Ethnobotanical studies of Nawegaon National Park, District - Gondia, Maharashtra, India. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 13(4), 87–91. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/288>
3. Arya, A., & Sharma, P. (2018). Study about the efficacy of Homoeopathic medicines in the Management of "allergic respiratory tract disorders in children. *Innovative Research Thoughts*, 4(4), 19–27. Retrieved from <https://irt.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/789>
4. Sharma, A. (2024). The Use of Homeopathic Medicine in Paediatric Healthcare: A Critical Analysis. *Indian Journal of Ayurveda & Alternative Medicines*, 1(1), 34–40. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijaam.v1.i1.6>

5. Gupta, P. (2024). Efficacy of Homeopathic Treatments in Allergic Rhinitis: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Indian Journal of Ayurveda & Alternative Medicines*, 1(1), 21–26. <https://doi.org/10.36676/ijaam.v1.i1.4>
6. Devidas N. PATIL. (2022). Ethnobotanical studies of Nawegaon National Park, District - Gondia, Maharashtra, India. *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar*, 13(4), 87–91. Retrieved from <https://jrps.shodhsagar.com/index.php/j/article/view/288>