

Homeopathy as an Effective Medicine is a Pending Subject

José Luis Carranza Cortés*

Physician Anesthesiologist, Outpatient Surgery Unit, Nayarit Health Services, Mexico

***Corresponding Author:** José Luis Carranza Cortés, Physician Anesthesiologist, Outpatient Surgery Unit, Nayarit Health Services, Mexico.

Received: June 24, 2019; **Published:** July 08, 2019

Alternative medicine in which homeopathic medicine is contemplated has aroused a meeting of opinions. In this trial, the effectiveness of treatments granted by this type of therapy is discussed, contrary to modern medicine, where greater importance is given to careful evaluation with scientific support of management patients with high-risk or difficult-to-prognostic conditions. The practice of homeopathy is coated with mantras, dogmas and obscurantism, which has not allowed it to make presence as a real medical alternative for the community.

Introduction

Homeopathy was created by German physician Samuel Hahnemann (1755 - 1843), who argued that a patient could be cured of his illness if he used a medicine that was capable of producing the same symptoms of the disease in healthy patients, but to a lesser degree than common manifestation of pathology [1].

When citizens dilute the principle of rationality, they find themselves in fascination to resort to other kinds of practices being victims of propaganda, where superstition, esoteric and the ideological spread and finds victims who are eager for results rapids; it doesn't matter if the application of these therapies don't have a scientific support.

Homeopathic medicine covers the above requirements; this is how pseudosciences take advantage of citizens, who in the limited knowledge, become users of medicine that cures non-existent diseases. The term pseudosciences may leave doubts as to its definition, the following factors have been proposed for classification and as described by Paul Kurtz [2]:

1. They do not use rigorous experimental methods in their research.
2. They lack a contrasting conceptual structure.
3. They claim to have achieved positive results, although their evidence is rebuttable and their generalizations have not been corroborated by impartial investigators.

Homeopathy in their therapies uses extreme dilutions of an active substance and argue that they are able to have the same effects as the undiluted principle.

Argumentative body

Homeopathic dilutions are so extreme that there is no possibility of finding a single molecule (altering the number of Avogadro), of this principle. A homeopathic dilution CH_{14} , which is typical in some of the medicines currently sold in pharmacies in this sector, contains 10 - 28 parts solute principle for each part of solvent water regularly.

Homeopathy is based on arguments not supported by the scientific method; the "doctors" who practice it at luden who do not understand their so-called theoretical foundations, because they were conceived many years ago and are rejected because modern science is not

able to clarify its complexity. They avoid experimentation in such a way that they are protected against failures, and if the patient is cured is thanks to the benefit offered by the therapy, if there is no improvement in the suffering the cause is due to the error in the selection of the correct modality.

Meta-analysis studies of homeopathic medicine studies are reported in the Cochrane database, with the following results:

1. "Still no evidence for homeopathy" A study analyzed 57 systematic reviews that included 176 studies to determine the validity of therapy and concluded that there is no evidence that homeopathy is more effective than placebo [3].
2. Homeopathy for chronic asthma [3]. There is not enough evidence to reliably analyze the possible role of homeopathy in asthma.
3. Homeopathy for dementia [4]. In view of the absence of evidence, it is not possible to comment on the use of homeopathy as a treatment in dementia.
4. Homeopathy for treatment of irritable bowel syndrome [5]. No conclusion can be reached in this study due to the low number of participants and high risk of bias in relation to the use of homeopathy.
5. Homeopathy for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder or hyperkinetic disorder [6]. The results found no evidence of effectiveness for homeopathy in overall symptoms, central symptoms or results related to attention disorders, deficit or hyperactivity.
6. Non-hormonal interventions for hot flushes in women with a history of breast cancer [6]. Homeopathy, acupuncture, and magnetic therapy show no difference in the number or severity of hot flash episodes.
7. Homeopathy for induction of labour [6]. The evidence is insufficient to recommend homeopathy as a method of inducing child-birth.
8. Homeopathic medicines for adverse effects of cancer treatments [7]. Preliminary data were found regarding the possible prophylactic effectiveness of topical calendula and Traumeel in acute dermatitis and stomatitis. These results should be confirmed and further studies are required.
9. Homeopathic Oscilloccinum for preventing and treating influenza and influenza-like illness [8]. There is not enough quality evidence to draw robust conclusions about the use of Oscilloccinum in the prevention or treatment of influenza and influenza-like disease.

Closing

There are plenty of reasons to consider homeopathy to be pseudoscience; its theoretical bases are not scientific, the absolute character of its foundation post seems sanitized. Hahnemann's hypothesis has never been proven and preparations used, given their extreme dilution, should have no effectiveness, beyond the placebo effect, as confirmed by most clinical trials and systematic reviews (Meta-analysis) carried out to assess its effectiveness. WHO also expressed opposition to the use of homeopathic treatments to treat several diseases with a high mortality rate [9].

The antidote to these practices of obscurantism and against the irresponsibility of the pharmaceutical industry is called Evidence-Based Medicine, which has as its basis the following reasoning: constituency, explicit and judicious use of the best for decision-making for individual patient care. It describes the assessment of the level of evidence of the structure of each clinical research paper, considers in its analysis from controlled clinical trials, to the comments emanating from expert tables.

The only cure in this kind of outdated and deceptive practices that surprise patients, with promises of cure of all their ills, is the increase of the educational -cultural- level, the population, the dissemination of information and the unrestricted application of the programs priority health, so as not to leave the citizens in helplessness and in the hands of consumers.

Bibliography

1. Science museum. Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843). "Brought to life. Exploring the history of medicine". Recuperado (2019).
2. Kurtz Paul. "Is parapsychology a science?". *The Skeptical Inquirer*, Volume 3. N^o.2, reimpresso en *Paranormal Borderlands of Science*, ed. Kendrick Frazier, Prometheus Books (1978/1981): 5-23.
3. Paul Glasziou. "Still does not evidence for homeopathy". *BMJ Blogs* (2016).

4. McCarney RW, *et al.* "Homeopathy for dementia". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2003): CD003803.
5. Peckham EJ, *et al.* "Homeopathy for treatment of irritable bowel syndrome". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2013): CD009710.
6. Heirs M and Dean ME. "Homeopathy for attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder or hyperkinetic disorder". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2007): CD005648.
7. Kassab S, *et al.* "Homeopathic medicines for adverse effects of cancer treatments". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2009): CD004845.
8. Mathie RT, *et al.* "Homeopathic Oscillocochinum for preventing and treating influenza and influenza-like illness". *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (2015): CD001957.
9. MF caparrós. "WHO discourages the use of homeopathy for the treatment of AIDS or malaria". *El País Newspaper (SPAIN)* (2009).

Volume 5 Issue 8 August 2019

©All rights reserved by José Luis Carranza Cortés.