

OP-023

Fundamental research models on high dilution homeopathy—A project on the state of repetitionP.C. Endler^a, K. Thieves^a, S. Baumgartner^b, L. Bonamin^c^aInteruniversity College, Health Sciences, Graz, Austria^bKIKOM, University of Berne, Complementary Medicine, Berne, Switzerland^cUniversity id Sao Paulo, Postgraduate, Sao Paulo, Brazil

Question: This project identifies and classifies fundamental studies in high potency homeopathy that have been submitted to multicentre/independent repetitions.

Method: We considered biochemical, immunological, botanical, cell biological, organ biological and zoological studies on high potencies, i.e. beyond a dilution of 10e–23. The main sources of information were MEDLINE and HOMBREX as well as literature reviews.

Arrangement of papers:

1. *First publications* on studies that have meanwhile led to follow-up studies.
2. Publications on repetitive studies referring to (1), the results of which are consistent with (1), i.e. where a *comparable* effect was found.
3. Publications on repetitive studies referring to (1), the results of which are consistent in themselves, but are different from (1), i.e. where a *different*, though homogeneous, effect was found.
4. Publications on repetitive studies referring to (1), the results of which are inconsistent or consistently negative, i.e. where *no* effect was found.

Study types 1–4 were then differentiated:

- A. Studies that were performed by one laboratory person.
- B. Internal repetitions and multicentre studies, normally leading to a team authorship publication.
- C. Independent external repetitions.

Results: As of May 2009, a total of 76 studies have been found. Of these, 27 were first publications, namely 19 performed by one researcher and 8 performed in a multicentre setting. In the attempt to reproduce one of these initial studies, 37 follow-up studies yielded comparable results, namely 5 performed as a repetition by the same researcher, 28 performed as a repetition in a multicentre setting in contact with the researcher from the first study and 4 as a repetition in a fully independent setting. Two studies showed a consistent, yet different result from the

initial study. In the attempt to reproduce one of the 27 initial studies, 10 studies yielded negative results, namely 3 performed as a repetition in a multicentre setting in contact with the researcher from the first study and 7 as a repetition in a fully independent setting.

Conclusion: To perform this overview classification, a certain broadness of clusters concerning methodological details of the studies concerned was necessary, albeit further classification may need refinement of categories, this being of importance also for laboratory research recommendations. Data will be discussed and published in detail in Homeopathy, London.

10.1016/j.eujim.2009.08.136