

RVC OPEN ACCESS REPOSITORY – COPYRIGHT NOTICE

This is the peer-reviewed, manuscript version of an article published in *Veterinary Record*. The final version is available online via <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/vr.j4914>.

The full details of the published version of the article are as follows:

TITLE: The authors of 'Comparison of veterinary drugs and veterinary homeopathy: part 1 and 2', respond

AUTHORS: Martin Whitehead, Danny Chambers, Peter Lees, Ludovic Pelligand, Pierre-Louis Toutain and Martin Whiting

JOURNAL TITLE: *Veterinary Record*

PUBLISHER: BMJ Publishing Group

PUBLICATION DATE: 28 October 2017

DOI: 10.1136/vr.j4914

IN response to De Beukelaer and others'¹ comments on our review^{2,3} of veterinary homeopathy, we welcome the opportunity to emphasise our concerns regarding this unethical practice by commenting on the points raised:

As explained in our review, homeopathy requires the existence of a 'healing force' with multiple supernatural properties. According to scientific understanding, such an entity is extremely implausible, as homeopaths – including De Beukelaer and others – acknowledge. To counter this problem, homeopaths⁴ coined the term "plausibility bias" in an attempt to make scientific understanding appear a negative thing and gullibility a positive thing. 'Plausibility bias' presumably applies in the case of all similarly implausible claims – ghosts, clairvoyance, telekinesis, miracles, yetis, etc. Given the consensus that homeopathy is implausible, we believe it imperative that homeopathy's supernatural nature be explained to clients prior to treatment so clients can give proper informed consent.

De Beukelaer and other's main criticism of our review is that 'plausibility bias' prevented us fairly evaluating the evidence regarding efficacy of homeopathy. We dispute that and show below that their examples do not support that claim:

In early meta-analyses of homeopathy, as more and more trials were excluded on the basis of increasing threshold of trial quality, the strength of the positive findings for homeopathy declined but not to zero. Hahn (2013)⁵ argued that this non-zero finding implied that homeopathy has efficacy. Hahn's argument is invalid as it falsely assumes that the best available trials excluded all non-specific effects and biases.

Later systematic reviews and meta-analyses by homeopaths^{6,7,8} acknowledge the imperfections of the current best available trials. Mathie and others' (2014)⁶ systematic review concluded "*individualised homeopathy may have small, specific treatment effects... The low or unclear overall quality of the evidence prompts caution in interpreting the findings.*" Mathie & Clausen's (2014)⁷ systematic review concluded that the data "*preclude generalisable conclusions about efficacy of a particular homeopathic medicine or the impact of individualised homeopathic intervention in any given medical condition in animals.*" Their subsequent meta-analysis⁸ found only "*very limited evidence that clinical intervention in animals using homeopathic medicines is distinguishable from corresponding intervention using placebos. The low number and quality of the trials hinders a more decisive conclusion.*" Although phrased positively for homeopathy, these conclusions are all consistent with a lack of effect.

This point is illustrated by Camerlink and others' (2010)⁹ trial, purported to show that homeopathic *Coli* reduced diarrhoea in piglets. Despite being the only trial showing a statistically significant result for veterinary homeopathy (corrected $p=0.02$; the statistics used in the paper⁹ were incorrect) graded as 'reliable evidence' in Mathie and Clausen's systematic review⁷ and meta-analysis⁸, it had major flaws¹⁰ (detailed critique supplied on request).

Regarding laboratory evidence for homeopathy, the systematic review of Witt and others (2007)¹¹ concluded "*no positive result was stable enough to be reproduced by all investigators. A general adoption of succussed controls, randomization and blinding would strengthen the evidence of future experiments*"; identical to our review's conclusion regarding laboratory evidence.

We fully support the EU Commission One Health Action Plan Against Antimicrobial Resistance¹², as we have discussed elsewhere¹³. Novel drugs and alternatives to antibiotics are much needed. However, those alternatives must be efficacious, and best evidence is that homeopathic remedies are not. Doehring & Sundrum (2016)¹⁴ reviewed this area and concluded that, on farms, "*replacing or reducing antibiotics with homeopathy currently cannot be recommended*" because of lack of evidence of efficacy.

Some forms of complementary and alternative medicine may be efficacious. However, best evidence is that homeopathy is not. In human cancer patients, alternative medicine use instead of conventional treatment is associated with substantially increased risk of death^{15,16,17}.

Homeopathy is theoretically implausible and best evidence indicates it is ineffective in practice. Therefore, its use, in place of conventional treatments, on animals that may be suffering, is unethical^{2,3}. In our view, the RCVS is failing in its duty as regulator of the veterinary profession and upholder of standards of animal welfare, by not expressing resolute disapproval of veterinary surgeons' use of this pseudoscientific, magical practice.

Martin Whitehead,

Chipping Norton Veterinary Hospital, Banbury Road, Chipping Norton, Oxon OX7 5SY, UK
e-mail: martincnvets@gmail.com

Peter Lees, Ludovic Pelligand, Pierre-Louis Toutain, Martin Whiting, Royal Veterinary College, Hawkshead Campus, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL9 7TA, UK

Danny Chambers,

Hall Manor, Kelly, Lifton, Devon, PL16 OHQ, UK

References

1. DE BEUKELAER, E., RENOUX, H., NICOLAI, T. & TOURNIER A. (2017) *Veterinary Record*, this issue
2. LEES, P., CHAMBERS, D., PELLIGAND, L., TOUTAIN, P.-L. WHITING, M. & WHITEHEAD, M.L. (2017) Comparison of veterinary drugs and veterinary homeopathy: part 1. *Veterinary Record* **181**,170-176
3. LEES, P., CHAMBERS, D., PELLIGAND, L., TOUTAIN, P.-L. WHITING, M. & WHITEHEAD ML. (2017) Comparison of veterinary drugs and veterinary homeopathy: part 2. *Veterinary Record* **181**,198-207
4. RUTTEN, L., MATHIE, R.T., FISHER, P., GOOSSENS, M. & VAN WASSENHOVEN, M. (2013) Plausibility and evidence: the case of homeopathy. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* **16**:525-532
5. HAHN, R.G. (2013) Homeopathy: meta-analyses of pooled clinical data. *Forschende Komplementärmedizin* **20**:376-81
6. MATHIE, R.T., LLOYD, S.M., LEGG, L.A., CLAUSEN, J., MOSS, S., DAVIDSON, J.R.T. & FORD, I. (2014) Randomised placebo-controlled trials of individualized homeopathic treatment: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Systematic Reviews* **3**:142
7. MATHIE, R. T. & CLAUSEN, J. (2014) Veterinary homeopathy: systematic review of medical conditions studied by randomised placebo-controlled trials. *Veterinary Record* **175**, 373-381
8. MATHIE, R. T. & CLAUSEN, J. (2015) Veterinary homeopathy: meta-analysis of randomised placebo-controlled trials. *Homeopathy* **104**, 3-8

9. CAMERLINK, I., ELLINGER, L. BAKKER, E.J. & LANTINGA, E.A. (2010) Homeopathy as replacement to antibiotics in the case of *Escherichia coli* diarrhoea in neonatal pigs. *Homeopathy*, **99**:57-62
10. http://www.rationalvetmed.org/papers_c.html#Camerlink2010 Accessed 18 October 2017
11. WITT, C.M., BLUTH, M., ALBRECHT, H., WEISSHUHN, T.E., BAUMGARTNER, S. & WILLICH, S.N. (2007) The in vitro evidence for an effect of high homeopathic potencies—a systematic review of literature. *Complementary Therapies in Medicine* **15**,128-138
12. EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2017) A European One Health Action Plan against Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR)
https://ec.europa.eu/health/amr/sites/amr/files/amr_action_plan_2017_en.pdf
13. TOUTAIN, P-L., FERRAN, A.A., BOUSQUET-MELOU, A., PELLIGAND, L. & LEES, P. 2016 Veterinary Medicine needs new Green Antimicrobial Drugs *Frontiers in Microbiology*, doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.01196
14. DOEHRING, C. & SUNDRUM, A. (2016) Efficacy of homeopathy in livestock according to peer-reviewed publications from 1981 to 2014. *Veterinary Record* **179**, 628
15. CHANG, Y.E., GLISSMEYER, M., TONNES, S., HUDSON, T. & JOHNSON, N. (2006) Outcomes of breast cancer in patients who use alternative therapies as primary treatment. *The American Journal of Surgery* **192**,471-473
16. HAN, E., JOHNSON, N., DELAMELENA, T., GLISSMEYER, M. & STEINBOCK, K. (2011). Alternative therapy used as primary treatment for breast cancer negatively impacts outcomes. *Annals of Surgical Oncology* **18**:912-916
17. JOHNSON, S.B., PARK, H.S. GROSS, C.P. & YU, J.B. (2017) Use of Alternative Medicine for Cancer and its Impact on Survival. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* (2018) 110(1): doi: 10.1093/jnci/djx145