Scholars LITERATURE

La Prensa Medica Argentina

Review Article

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47275/2953-4763-458
Volume 112 Issue 2

Homeopathy and the Placebo Effect

Mihael Drofenik[1,2*]

[1]Jožef Stefan Institute, Materials Synthesis, Ljubljana, Slovenia
[2]University of Maribor, Faculty of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Maribor, Slovenia

Abstract

Although homeopathy has a long historical tradition, its apparent therapeutic effects began to be interpreted differently after Hahnemann introduced the process of succussion into remedy preparation. Since then, it has often been assumed that the clinical effects reported with highly diluted preparations-where the probability of retaining molecules of the original substance is extremely low-must arise from placebo responses rather than pharmacological activity. This view is based on the assumption that succussion produces solutions devoid of active constituents, thereby rendering any therapeutic benefit attributable to patient expectations. However, this interpretation neglects the physicochemical consequences of mechanical processing. Systematic, blinded testing of symptom development in healthy volunteers ("provings") using multiple potencies, in comparison with mechanically untreated water, may provide a more precise understanding of the relationship between placebo processes and homeopathic practice.

Keywords: Homeopathy, Hahnemann's methodology

Correspondence to: Mihael Drofenik, Jožef Stefan Institute, Materials Synthesis, Ljubljana, Slovenia and University of Maribor, Faculty of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Maribor, Slovenia.

Citation: Drofenik M (2026) Homeopathy and the Placebo Effect. Prensa Med Argent, Volume 112:2. 458. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47275/2953-4763-458

Received: January 15, 2026; **Accepted:** March 23, 2026; **Published:** March 27, 2026

Introduction

According to the foundational doctrine of homeopathy, any pharmacologically active substance produces a characteristic pattern of symptoms when administered to healthy individuals. Disease, likewise, presents with a specific configuration of symptoms. Homeopathy proposes that a disease can be treated by administering a highly diluted preparation of a substance that, in its crude form, produces a similar symptom profile-summarized in the principle similia similibus curentur ("like cures like") [1].

Hahnemann's methodology contrasted sharply with that of contemporary allopathic medicine. Conventional pharmacology identifies diseases through symptoms and selects agents intended to counteract them. In contrast, homeopaths conducted systematic provings in healthy volunteers to catalogue symptom profiles which were then matched to patient presentations. This practice elevated the historically noted "Law of Similars," attributed to Hippocrates, into the central organizing principle of homeopathic therapy.

Over the last two centuries, numerous hypotheses have attempted to explain the mechanism underlying homeopathic action, including the vital force [1], hormesis [2], water memory [3], informational models [4], psychological or placebo-based explanations [5], and quantum entanglement [6]. None has yet achieved broad empirical validation within the framework of contemporary biomedical science.

A more recent line of theorizing suggests that the therapeutic effect depends on the presence of a compound capable of producing similar symptoms in both healthy and diseased individuals-the simillimum [7, 8]. This idea has been explored through models of homeostatic regulation [9, 10] and through analogies to Le Châtelier's principle [11]. In the latter formulation, disease is interpreted as a dynamic disequilibrium between health-supporting and pathology-promoting molecular processes. A homeopathic remedy is proposed to shift this equilibrium, causing a transient worsening ("homeopathic aggravation") followed by improvement [12, 13].

To address aggravation and increase therapeutic efficacy, Hahnemann introduced serial dilution combined with vigorous mechanical processing (succussion). The theory asserts that this procedure "potentizes" a remedy-even at dilutions exceeding Avogadro's number-despite the presumed absence of intact molecules of the starting material.

Homeopathic Practice and the Placebo Question

Contemporary evaluations of homeopathy often rely on assumptions that contradict empirically validated physical and chemical principles, resulting in substantial skepticism within evidence-based medicine. While reports of laboratory evidence related to homeopathic preparations exist, they remain controversial and insufficiently replicated [14]. At the same time, discussion of the placebo effect-an established psychobiological response-plays an important role in evaluating homeopathic practice. Nevertheless, historical records documenting homeopathic treatment of pediatric patients, animals, and outbreaks such as 18th century cholera suggest clinical effects unlikely to be explained solely by placebo [14].

A widely repeated argument against homeopathy maintains that, because highly potentialized remedies may contain no molecules of the original substance, any clinical improvement must therefore be placebo

mediated. This reasoning assumes that succussion yields a solution completely devoid of active material. The interpretation has become entrenched to the extent that further scientific analysis is often deemed unnecessary.

However, this assumption is problematic when evaluated from a materials-science perspective. Nano particulate fragments are known to withstand prolonged mechanical processing, and succussion may produce progressive fragmentation of remedy particles. This process may release molecular species from particle surfaces, potentially generating stabilized molecular forms with increased biological accessibility, membrane permeability, and reactivity [15]. Under this hypothesis, potentization does not merely dilute active material but transforms a particulate suspension into a molecularly enriched solution containing species cleaved from nanoparticle surfaces.

The crucial point is that the continuous formation of such species during succussion could allow measurable concentrations of simillimum-derived molecules to persist through multiple dilutions-until the point at which the final remnants of nanoparticles are eliminated. The result would be a medicinal solution whose constituents arise not from the original crude material, but from mechanical processing itself.

These claims, however, remain scientifically unresolved. Analytical detection of ultra-low concentrations is technically challenging, and there is currently no standardized, independently replicated evidence demonstrating that biologically relevant quantities of active material persist in high-potency homeopathic solutions.

A Proposed Strategy for Clarification

A rigorous approach to disentangling specific pharmacological effects from placebo-related mechanisms would involve the use of double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trials conducted in healthy volunteers. Comparable experimental paradigms have previously been implemented, with results suggesting a modest yet statistically detectable differentiation between symptom patterns associated with homeopathically prepared remedies and those observed under placebo conditions [16-18].

In the present framework, multiple potencies of a single remedy would be evaluated against mechanically untreated pure water, allowing systematic comparison across preparation methods. Specifically

- Moderately potentized preparations are expected to contain detectable quantities of the original substance and, if pharmacologically active, should elicit characteristic symptom profiles consistent with the simillimum concept.
- Extremely potentized preparations, which are theoretically devoid of original molecules, would serve to assess whether the processes of dilution and succussion produce effects distinguishable from both untreated water and placebo-related responses.
- Mechanically untreated water would function as the baseline control condition.

Should extremely potentized preparations yield reproducible symptom patterns that are absent in the untreated water condition, any observed effects would necessarily be attributable either to solvent modifications induced by mechanical processing or to placebo-related mechanisms. Conversely, the absence of differences between extremely potentized preparations and untreated water would argue against the existence of succussion-specific effects.

Conclusion

The widespread assumption that homeopathy functions solely as a placebo phenomenon oversimplifies a complex historical and methodological scenery. While the introduction of succussion has contributed to persistent confusion, particularly the belief that high potencies necessarily contain no active constituents, this assumption remains experimentally unvalidated. Because analytical chemistry reaches intrinsic limits at extreme dilutions, the most reliable approach for determining the therapeutic relevance of homeopathic preparations is carefully designed, blinded experimentation in healthy subjects. Only comparative studies involving multiple potencies and mechanically untreated water can clarify whether observed effects arise from specific pharmacological mechanisms, succussion-related processes, or placebo responses.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express a sincere gratitude to Lenka Tenžera for her professional support and suggestions in the presentation of this homeopathy principle.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Hahnemann S (2005) Organon of Medicine. B. Jain Publishers.
2. Henschler D (2006) The origin of hormesis: historical background and driving forces. Hum Exp Toxicol 25: 347-351. https://doi.org/10.1191/0960327106ht642oa
3. Davenas E, Beauvais F, Amara J, Oberbaum M, Robinzon B, et al. (1988) Human basophil degranulation triggered by very dilute antiserum against IgE. Nature 333: 816–818. https://doi.org/10.1038/333816a0
4. Guajardo G, Wilson J (2005) Models for explaining the homeopathic healing process: a historical and critical account of principles central to homeopathy. Homeopathy 94: 44-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.homp.2004.10.001
5. Niazi SK (2024) Placebo effects: neurological mechanisms inducing physiological, organic, and belief responses-a prospective analysis. Healthcare 12: 2314. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12222314
6. Walach H (2003) Entanglement model of homeopathy as an example of generalized entanglement predicted by weak quantum theory. Forsch Komplementarmed Klass Naturheilkd 10: 192–200. https://doi.org/10.1159/000073475
7. Vithoulkas G (2014) The Science of Homeopathy. In Alonissos: International Academy of Classical Homeopathy. Grove Press, New York.
8. Bellavite P, Signorini A (2002) The Emerging Science of Homeopathy: Complexity, Biodynamics, and Nanopharmacology. North Atlantic Books, Berkeley.
9. Bell IR (2020) The complexity of the homeopathic healing response part 1: the role of the body as a complex adaptive system in simillimum-initiated recovery from disease. Homeopathy 109: 42–50. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1694998
10. Bell IR (2020) The complexity of the homeopathic healing response part 2: the role of the homeopathic simillimum as a complex system in initiating recovery from disease. Homeopathy 109: 51–64. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1694999
11. Drofenik M (2022) A new explanation of homeopathy. Prensa Med Argent 108(1): 1-5. https://doi.org/10.47275/0032-745x-355
12. Drofenik M (2025) The principle of homeopathy. Prensa Med Argent 111(4): 1-3. https://doi.org/10.47275/2953-4763-449
13. Drofenik M (2020) Thermodynamic aspects of homeopathy. In Alternative medicine update 2020, pp 131-145.
14. Freeman's Homeopathic Pharmacy. Freeman's Chemist and Homoeopathic Pharmacy (1995–2024).
15. Drofenik M, Tenžera L (2024) Homeopathy and medicine. La Prensa Med Argent 110(4): 1-3. https://doi.org/10.47275/0032-745X-417

16. Walach H, Sherr J, Schneider R, Shabi R, Bond A, et al. (2004) Homeopathic proving symptoms: result of a local, non-local, or placebo process? a blinded, placebo-controlled pilot study. Homeopathy 93: 179–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.homp.2004.07.006

17. Mollinger H, Schneider R, Loffel M, Walach H (2004) A double blind, randomized, homeopathic pathogenetic trial with healthy persons: comparing two high potencies. Forsch Komplementarmed Klass Nat 11: 274–280. https://doi.org/10.1159/000082120

18. Dominici G, Bellavite P, di Stanislao C, Gulia P, Pitari G (2006) Double-blind, placebo-controlled homeopathic pathogenetic trials: symptom collection and analysis. Homeopathy 95: 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.homp.2006.04.003