Adverse Drug Reactions (Adrs) And Homeopathy A Comprehensive Review

Dr. Sumit Goel[1], Dr. Divya Menon[2], Dr. Parizad F. Damania[3], Dr. Aakash Rai[4]
Dr. Sanchita Shende[5]
[1]*Dean – Smt Chandaben Mohanbhai Patel Homoeopathic Medical College; Shree Mumbadevi Homeopathic Hospital, Mumbai*
[2]*Assistant Professor – Homoeopathic Pharmacy and Coordinator, Pharmacotherapeutic Committee – Smt Chandaben Mohanbhai Patel Homoeopathic Medical College; Shree Mumadevi Homeopathic Hospital, Mumbai*
[3]*Professor – Homoeopathic Pharmacy - Smt Chandaben Mohanbhai Patel Homoeopathic Medical College, Mumbai*
[4]*Assistant Professor – Case Taking and Repertory and Quality Manager - Smt Chandaben Mohanbhai Patel Homoeopathic Medical College; Shree Mumadevi Homeopathic Hospital, Mumbai*
[5]*Assistant Professor – Physiology and Biochemistry - Smt Chandaben Mohanbhai Patel Homoeopathic Medical College, Mumbai*

***Abstract*—Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) represent a major challenge to global healthcare systems, contributing significantly to patient morbidity, mortality, prolonged hospital stays, and increased economic burden. While ADRs associated with conventional (allopathic) medicines are well documented, systematically monitored, and regulated through robust pharmacovigilance frameworks, the safety profile of homeopathic medicines remains less clearly defined and often debated. This comprehensive review examines ADRs from a dual perspective—conventional pharmacotherapy and homeopathy—with a particular focus on definitions, classification, epidemiology, regulatory oversight, and comparative safety profiles.**

The paper reviews global pharmacovigilance mechanisms, including those of the WHO, USA, EU, and India, highlighting the inclusion of homeopathy within national reporting systems such as the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India. The theoretical foundations of homeopathy—especially the principles of "like cures like" and ultra-high dilution—are discussed in relation to claims of minimal toxicity. Available evidence from case reports, systematic reviews, and observational studies indicates that although homeopathic medicines generally demonstrate fewer and milder adverse effects than conventional drugs, they are not entirely risk-free.

The review also addresses methodological and conceptual challenges in studying ADRs in homeopathy, such as individualized prescribing, lack of dose–response relationships, under-reporting, and the distinction between true ADRs and "homeopathic aggravations." Overall, the findings suggest that homeopathy has a distinct and comparatively lower-risk ADR profile, yet warrants systematic pharmacovigilance, standardized adverse event reporting, and stringent quality control to ensure patient safety. Integrating homeopathy into evidence-based safety monitoring frameworks is essential for responsible and informed clinical practice.

***Index Terms*—Adverse Drug Reactions (ADRs); Pharmacovigilance; Homeopathy Safety; Homeopathic Aggravation; Conventional vs Homeopathic Medicine; Drug Toxicity; WHO Pharmacovigilance; FDA Homeopathy Guidelines; Drug Regulation; Ultra-dilution; Traditional Medicine Safety; Homeopathy Adverse Events; Herbal and Homeopathic Risks; Comparative Drug Safety; Homeopathic Potency**

I. INTRODUCTION

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) are defined by WHO as "noxious and unintended responses to a drug at doses normally used in humans" [1]. ADRs remain a

major cause of patient morbidity, mortality and healthcare burden worldwide [1][2]. For example, European studies find a median of 3.5% of hospital admissions are ADR-related (based on 22 studies) and about 10–11% of inpatients experience an ADR during hospitalization [3][2]. WHO estimates similarly ~5% of admissions and patients are ADR-involved, contributing to roughly 197,000 deaths annually in the EU [4]. In older adults these figures are even higher – ADRs and related events cause up to 30% of hospital admissions in geriatric patients [5]. Importantly, many ADRs (perhaps half) are considered preventable.

II. DEFINITION AND CLASSIFICATION

ADRs may be classified by mechanism and predictability. The classic Rawlins–Thompson scheme distinguishes: - Type A (Augmented): Dose-dependent, predictable from pharmacology (e.g. bleeding from anticoagulants). - Type B (Bizarre): Idiosyncratic or allergic, not dose-related (e.g. penicillin anaphylaxis). - Additional categories (C–F) include chronic effects (e.g. adrenal suppression from steroids), delayed effects (teratogenicity or carcinogenesis), end-of-use (withdrawal phenomena), and failure of therapy.

III. EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL IMPACT OF ADRs

ADRs impose a substantial global burden. Systematic reviews show that roughly 3–10% of all hospital admissions are attributable to ADRs [3][2], and ADRs account for a leading cause of in-hospital mortality (often cited as 4th–6th leading cause of death) [6][4]. Among inpatients, up to 10–17% of patients develop an ADR during their stay [3][2]. Elderly and polypharmacy patients are at particularly high risk; geriatric studies report up to 30% of admissions in older populations are ADR-related [5]. Common ADRs include gastrointestinal hemorrhage, liver and kidney injury, cardiac arrhythmias, and hypersensitivity reactions. These events prolong hospitalization, add costs, and often lead to disability. For example, serious ADRs may extend hospital stay by days and contribute to morbidity. Economically, ADRs are estimated to add billions of dollars in costs to health systems each year.

IV. REGULATORY AND PHARMACOVIGILANCE FRAMEWORKS

Pharmacovigilance systems exist globally to detect, assess and prevent ADRs. The WHO Programme for International Drug Monitoring (coordinated by Uppsala Monitoring Centre) collates national reports in the global VigiBase database [7][8]. WHO has published guidance on ADR detection and reporting, underscoring that "ADRs are responsible for 5% of hospital admissions and are the 4th to 6th leading cause of death in hospitals"[6].

- United States: The FDA's MedWatch system mandates manufacturers to report all serious ADRs; healthcare professionals are encouraged to report voluntarily. Recent FDA guidance (2017) introduced a risk-based approach for homeopathic products, focusing oversight on remedies with non-oral use, vulnerable populations, or unproven claims [9]. The 2017 FDA plan calls for scrutiny of homeopathic remedies that "do not meet legal standards for quality, strength, or purity" or are intended for serious conditions [9].
- European Union: EMA coordinates EudraVigilance for EU-wide ADR reports. Regulation (EU) 1235/2010 and Directive 2010/84/EU require Marketing Authorization Holders to maintain pharmacovigilance systems. Notably, homeopathic medicines in the EU can be registered under a simplified "homeopathic medicinal product" scheme (Directive 2001/83/EC) without proof of efficacy, and their pharmacovigilance requirements are often minimal unless national law adds provisions. In practice, serious ADRs from homeopathy may still be reported via national PV centers, but there is no uniform EU mandate for homeopathic products.
- India: The Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission's Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI) collects ADRs across all medical systems. Importantly, PvPI includes ASU & H medicines (Ayurveda, Siddha, Unani, Homeopathy) [10]. Between 2010–2018 India reported ~185,000 ADRs, of which 7,541 involved homeopathic medicines [10], indicating formal PV inclusion of homeopathy. Several countries have analogous

programs; for instance, Belgium and France require ADR reporting for all marketed homeopathic remedies, and Germany's Paul-Ehrlich-Institut provides PV oversight for homeopathic pharmaceuticals.

Table 1 summarizes key aspects of ADR monitoring frameworks:

Region/Agency	Conventional Medicine PV	Homeopathic Medicine PV
WHO / Global	WHO Programme for Int'l Drug Monitoring (VigiBase), WHO PV guidelines, training, capacity-building[8].	WHO Traditional Medicine Strategy (2014–2023) encourages integration; WHO has produced quality/safety monographs for homeopathy (2005) but no separate homeopathy PV. Homeopathy sometimes included under T&CM PV programs.
USA (FDA)	Mandatory ADR reporting (MedWatch) for all marketed drugs; FDAAA, Sentinel, REMS programs.	Homeopathic products regulated as OTC under FD&C Act; 2017 FDA guidance targets high-risk homeopathic products for enforcement[9]; manufacturers encouraged (but not mandated) to report adverse events.
EU (EMA)	EU PV Legislation (Reg. 1235/2010; Dir. 2010/84/EU); EudraVigilance collects ICSRs; centralized PV procedures.	Homeopathic products can be registered via simplified procedures (Dir. 2001/83/EC) often without clinical data; PV obligations minimal. Some EU countries (e.g. France, Germany) mandate ADR reporting for homeopathic drugs on their markets.
India (PvPI)	PvPI (IPC) collects ADRs via national centers; covers allopathic and traditional (ASU & H) medicines.	National AYUSH PV program under CCRH/PvPI; homeopathic ADR reporting included[10]. PvPI data shows thousands of homeopathy-related ADRs (2010–2018)[10].

V. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF HOMEOPATHY AND SAFETY PRINCIPLES

Homeopathy is a 200-year-old system based on Hahnemann's principles of "Similia Similibus Curentur" (like cures like) and the "law of minimum dose". According to homeopathic theory, a substance that causes certain symptoms in healthy people can treat similar symptoms in illness, when given in extremely diluted form. Homeopathic remedies are prepared by successive dilutions and succussion (vigorous shaking). Potencies are expressed in C (1:100) or X (1:10) scales. By 12C (24X) dilution, it is unlikely that any molecules of the original substance remain. Therefore, in principle, homeopathic remedies are thought to carry no pharmacologically active dose in higher potencies.

This ultra-high dilution leads proponents to claim minimal or no side effects: "the lower the dose…the greater its effectiveness", with most homeopathic products having "so diluted that no molecules of the original substance remain" [11]. The NCCIH (NIH) notes, however, that some homeopathic products contain measurable active ingredients (especially low-potency tinctures) and "could cause side effects and drug interactions" [12].

Homeopathy also distinguishes "homeopathic aggravation" from adverse effects: a transient worsening of symptoms following a remedy, viewed as a temporary sign of remedy action rather than true harm [13]. This concept complicates safety assessment, since patients or practitioners may interpret side effects as expected "healing crises". In conventional pharmacology, any harmful reaction (worsening symptoms, new symptoms) would be classified as an ADR, whereas homeopathy may re-label some symptom flares as "aggravations". This difference underscores the need for clear definitions when studying homeopathic "adverse events" [13].

Adverse Events Associated with Homeopathic Remedies

Despite the high dilutions, clinical evidence shows that homeopathic remedies are not universally free of adverse effects. A number of case reports, case series and observational studies have documented side effects and harms associated with homeopathy [14][15]. These include allergic reactions, intoxications (e.g. plant or mineral poisoning when using low dilutions), aggravations of chronic conditions, and indirect harms from delaying effective conventional treatment.

- In a systematic review of 38 case reports/series (pre-2015), Posadzki et al. found 1159 patients with homeopathy-related adverse events [14]. These ranged from mild allergic rashes to severe toxicities; notably, four fatalities were reported (three children). The most implicated remedy was Rhus toxicodendron (poison ivy) in low potency, causing contact dermatitis and systemic reactions. Other cases involved Belladonna-induced anticholinergic toxicity and mistletoe injections causing cardiovascular events. Eight reports highlighted indirect harm: patients who substituted homeopathy for needed conventional care suffered disease progression.
- A 2022 meta-analysis of 41 observational homeopathy studies found that 87% reported adverse effects (graded mild-to-moderate) in their homeopathy treatment groups [15]. Most of these were minor (headache, nausea, allergic skin reactions). However, this analysis also found that homeopathic aggravations (self-reported symptom flares) were noted in ~22.5% of studies (all low-grade). Crucially, the pooled analysis showed that patients receiving conventional medicine or herbal treatments experienced adverse effects significantly more often than those receiving homeopathy ($p<0.0001$) [15]. In other words, the proportion of patients reporting any adverse effect was lower with homeopathic therapy. Stub et al. concluded that, while homeopathy is not entirely free of side effects, its ADR profile appears milder overall than that of conventional or herbal medicines [15][16].
- The NCCIH also cautions that some commercial homeopathic products, especially those unlabeled or of poor quality, may cause unintended harm [12]. For instance, heavy-metal contamination has been reported in some remedies, and high alcohol content in mother tinctures can lead to intoxication if overused. Homeopathic drops or ointments containing potent natural alkaloids (atropine, aconitine, etc.) have resulted in anticholinergic syndrome or cardiac arrhythmias in rare cases.

Overall, clinical evidence suggests that adverse events from homeopathy tend to be idiosyncratic and often minor, but can be serious if the product is insufficiently diluted or misused [14][12]. Allergic reactions (e.g. from lactose carrier or herbal impurities) and aggravations are the most common. Systematic monitoring of homeopathic ADRs is scant, so the true incidence is hard to gauge [17]. Nonetheless, existing reports underscore that homeopathy is not inherently risk-free: careful quality control and reporting are needed.

VI. COMPARATIVE ADR PROFILES

Conventional Drugs vs Homeopathic Medicines

Homeopathic and allopathic therapies differ fundamentally in their ADR profiles. Conventional drugs often have well-characterized, dose-related toxicity. For example, opioid analgesics commonly cause constipation, nausea and sedation (Type A effects); antibiotics can cause predictable organ toxicities and unpredictable anaphylaxis (Type B). Their ADR rates are substantial: many prescription drugs produce side effects in 10–30% of users in practice. By contrast, homeopathic remedies, especially at high dilutions (12C and above), contain no pharmacologically active dose by design, so classical toxicities are unlikely.

Feature	Conventional (Allopathic) Drugs	Homeopathic Remedies
Active Ingredient	Known chemical or biological substance at therapeutic dose.	Typically, extremely diluted; often no molecules of source substance remain.
Mechanism of	Direct pharmacological toxicity, immune	Usually not dose-related (no dose);

Feature	Conventional (Allopathic) Drugs	Homeopathic Remedies
ADRs	hypersensitivity, idiosyncrasy (Type A/B etc).	ADRs mainly hypersensitivity to carriers or impurities, or idiosyncratic responses.
Typical ADRs	Organ-specific toxicities (hepatotoxicity, nephrotoxicity, cardiotoxicity), GI upset, allergic rashes, bleeding, etc.	Allergic reactions (rare), symptom "aggravation", local irritation; intoxication possible if raw (e.g. high alcohol tinctures).
Incidence	Common – e.g. 10–20% of treated patients may report some side effect; serious ADRs in ~1–5%.[3]	Low – observational studies report significantly fewer AEs in homeopathy vs conventional therapies[15]; serious ADRs appear rare.
Reporting & Evidence	Extensive data from RCTs and PV databases; mandatory reporting by manufacturers; well-established signal detection.	Sparse data: mostly case reports or small studies; under-reporting likely; no standardized AE reporting in most trials[17].

Conventional medications exhibit a broad spectrum of well-defined ADRs related to dose and drug class, whereas homeopathic ADRs (when they occur) are typically idiosyncratic (e.g. allergen exposure) or related to improper preparation. Clinical trials rarely report homeopathic ADRs, but observational data suggest fewer and milder events. Stub et al. found significantly lower rates of adverse effects with homeopathy than with conventional drugs [15]. Nevertheless, because homeopathy lacks a dose–response effect, predicting an ADR in advance is not straightforward; each reported event tends to be investigated on a case-by-case basis.

VII. CHALLENGES IN STUDYING ADRS IN HOMEOPATHY

Monitoring ADRs in homeopathy faces unique hurdles.

1. The ultra-dilution of most remedies means there is often no quantifiable active ingredient to measure, making standard pharmacological toxicology inapplicable.
2. Homeopathic treatments are also highly individualized (different patients may receive different remedies and potencies for the same condition), complicating aggregation of data.
3. Additionally, the concept of "homeopathic aggravation" blurs the line between expected healing responses and true adverse events [13].
4. Another major challenge is under-reporting. Both practitioners and patients often believe homeopathy is inherently safe, so minor side effects may go unreported.
5. There is no universally adopted ADR-reporting system specific to homeopathy. As Stub et al. noted, "the development and implementation of a standardized reporting system of adverse effects in homeopathic studies is warranted" [16].
6. Quality control and labeling also pose issues: lack of stringent manufacturing oversight in some countries can lead to contaminated or mislabeled products, whose adverse effects may then be incorrectly attributed.
7. Randomized trials of homeopathy tend to focus on efficacy and often do not systematically collect safety data. Even observational studies rarely differentiate remedy-related ADRs from disease fluctuations. The myriad potencies (6X, 30C, 200C, etc.) and differing national regulations further complicate any pharmacovigilance.

In short, the lack of dose, heterogeneous practices, and sparse data mean the true ADR profile of homeopathy is difficult to ascertain. This is in stark contrast to allopathic medicines, whose ADR detection is supported by robust PV legislation and clinical trial requirements.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Adverse drug reactions are a critical concern in modern healthcare, with well-documented incidence and regulatory oversight in conventional medicine. Homeopathy, by contrast, operates on radically different principles that imply minimal direct toxicity. While most homeopathic remedies appear to have a much lower ADR rate than conventional drugs, the system is not entirely free of harm. Case reports and observational data confirm that allergic reactions, toxicities from low-potency preparations, and indirect harm (from foregoing needed treatment) can occur.

Studying ADRs in homeopathy poses challenges of dilution, standardization and reporting. The available literature suggests that homeopathic treatments have fewer and generally milder side effects than equivalent allopathic or herbal therapies, but also highlights the need for systematic pharmacovigilance. Integrative medicine perspectives emphasize homeopathy's safety, but caution that its use should be judicious. International bodies encourage integration of traditional medicine into health systems in a safe, evidence-based manner.

In summary, homeopathic medicines have a distinct safety profile from conventional drugs: they are unlikely to cause dose-dependent toxicity, yet can still produce idiosyncratic adverse events. Health professionals should recognize both the low-risk nature of homeopathy and the gaps in evidence. Rigorous pharmacovigilance – including adverse event reporting and quality control – is warranted for homeopathy just as it is for any therapeutic modality. Doing so will ensure that patient safety remains paramount, whether treatments are mainstream pharmaceuticals or alternative remedies[16][8].

REFERENCES

[1] Frontiers | A comprehensive analysis of adverse drug reactions in 2020–2023: case studies https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/pharmacology/articles/10.3389/fphar.2025.1628347/full

[2] Epidemiology of Adverse Drug Reactions in Europe: A Review of Recent Observational Studies | Drug Safety https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40264-015-0281-0

[3] Hospital admissions due to adverse drug reactions and adverse drug events in older adults: a systematic review | Age and Ageing | Oxford Academic https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article/54/8/afaf231/8239079

[4] [Pharmacovigilance and its importance in homoeopathy https://www.homoeopathicjournal.com/articles/865/7-2-70-234.pdf

[5] The importance of pharmacovigilance https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/10665-42493

[6] Homeopathy | NCCIH https://www.nccih.nih.gov/health/homeopathy

[7] Adverse effects in homeopathy. A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies – PubMed https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33303386/

[8] Adverse effects of homeopathy: a systematic review of published case reports and case series – PubMed https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23163497/

[9] Impact of Homeoprophylactic Arsenicum album 30c on COVID-19 Vaccine-related Adverse Events: A Combined Retrospective-Prospective Cohort Study – PubMed https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40355111/