

North American Homeopathic Patient Survey 2014

Summary of Results

July 2014

This Study was Conducted in the Spring of 2014 by the



American Medical College *of* Homeopathy
Transforming Lives

Department of Research

Principal Investigator

Todd Rowe, MD, MD(H), CCH, DHt

Project Coordinator

Manna Semby

Acknowledgements

The North American Homeopathic Patient Survey 2014 would not have been possible without the support and input of numerous organizations and individuals. Thank you to the following who assisted in survey design and data analyses.

Iris Bell, MD(H), PhD
Jay Bornemann
Christina Chambreau, DVM
Carole Eastman, ND
Patrick Hesselmann, HMA
Pam Pappas, MD, MD(H)
Thelma Rowe, PsyD
Richard Pitt, CCH, RSHom(NA)
Harry Swope, ND, CCH
Gabrielle Traub, (M.Tech) Hom
David Warkentin, PA

The North American Homeopathic Patient Survey was approved by the American Medical College of Homeopathy Institutional Review Board.

This 2014 Survey Summary of Results was prepared by Dr. Todd Rowe, American Medical College of Homeopathy and Many Semby.

Table of Contents

2013 Survey - Highlights.....	4-7
2013 Survey – Key Results.....	8-16
2013 Survey - General Comments and Conclusions.....	17

2014 Survey - Highlights

Introduction:

The purpose of The North American Homeopathic Patient Survey is to provide a national overview of the professional landscape and distinctive demographics of Homeopathic Patients within the Homeopathic profession. The goal of this repeated cross-sectional survey is to provide the Homeopathic community with periodic reports (every seven to ten years) to assist them in assessing their strengths and weaknesses as well as securing detailed data to better project the profession's current state and possible future.

This Survey was first conducted in 2007. The full results can be found at <http://www.amcofh.org/research/community>.

The Methodology:

The second Survey was conducted in 2014. This Survey remained unchanged from the one conducted in 2006 with the exception of a few modified questions. These questions were added based on the 2007 results and provided greater clarity. The 2014 Survey consisted of 41 questions and took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The 2014 Survey was available on-line from January 1, 2014 through March 31, 2014. A small percentage of Surveys were also mailed to individuals who did not possess email addresses. Further, requests for participation were sent to those Homeopathic Patients who had forwarded emails expressing interest.

The sampling methodology used was to request that the following sources distribute the Surveys (per defined participation criteria) to their employees, members, licensees, and individuals on their mailing lists.

- ✓ All North American Homeopathic Membership Organizations
- ✓ All North American Homeopathic Schools
- ✓ Homeopathic Software Companies
- ✓ Homeopathic Pharmaceutical Companies
- ✓ Homeopathic Conference Directors
- ✓ Homeopathic Certification Organizations
- ✓ State Homeopathic Licensure Agencies
- ✓ State Homeopathic Associations
- ✓ National Homeopathic Booksellers
- ✓ Forwarded Emails from Homeopathic Practitioners

There were 1054 Surveys returned with 89% fully completed. Of those, 12% were from Canadian respondents. The total Survey response was roughly equal to the number of respondents in the 2007 Survey.

The survey was approved by the AMCH Institutional Review Board.

Limitations:

Key limitations in the conduct and analyses of the 2014 Survey included:

- The manner in which the sample was generated (use of secondary sampling methodology) may have influenced the number of respondents.
- Limited confidence in the representativeness of the sample due to the sampling methodology used.
- The time frame between the two Surveys may have been too long to have confidence in comparisons between data.
- In any survey, the economy is always an important variable to consider. It can influence respondents, both positively and/or negatively in the way they perceive a survey, the questions in a survey, and their own individual reactions to the questions themselves.
- The survey respondents themselves may also be a limiting factor. Each come from differing perspectives, and may base their responses on their own psycho-social-cultural perspectives.

Survey Outcomes:

Ultimately we discovered many things that were suspected in the homeopathic community but never documented. In addition there were some surprising results, which are described below. Our hope is to continue to repeat this study approximately every seven years. Noteworthy outcomes, predicated on the analyses of the 2014 Survey and comparisons with 2007 Survey results, are suggested below using the following categories (See 2014 Survey – Key Results for more detailed information):

Demographics

- The average age of homeopathic patients has increased by 6% (51 years old) in the last seven years
- Patients are mostly female (85%) which represents a 4% increase from the previous study
- Patients are mostly Caucasian (85%)
- Participants were from nearly all 50 states and provinces; CA, PA, Ontario, AZ, MA and TX were most well represented
- Patients are typically married (67%); this is considerably higher than the national average (48%)
- The most common occupation for homeopathic patients is Health Care Providers (22.5%)
- There was a significant reduction in retired persons participating in the survey (56%)
- Homeopathic patients tend to be well educated (most common is Bachelor's Degree with 32%)
- Homeopathic patients tend to be sensitive to conventional medication

Nature of Current Treatment

- Patients who were more sensitive to conventional medication also tended to be more sensitive to homeopathic medication, but had better results in treatment
- The average length of time in treatment was 6.5 years
- The average frequency of visits to a homeopathic practitioner was every 2.6 months
- 90% of respondents received classical homeopathy and 10% received complex homeopathy

- Complex homeopathic treatment was more common in poor responders to treatment
- The majority (55%) of the most recent homeopathic remedies received were polychrest remedies
- The most commonly taken remedies were Natrum muriaticum, Sepia, Arnica Montana, Phosphorous and Lycopodium clavatum.
- 10% of remedies received were LM potencies
- 200C is the most commonly prescribed potency (28%)
- The most common reason for seeking treatment was general health; psychiatric, musculoskeletal and infectious disease complaints were also most common
- Most homeopathic patients learned about homeopathy through friends and family (32%)
- The most common way to find a homeopathic practitioner was by referral of a friend (33%)
- Most homeopathic patients pay for treatment out of pocket (85%)
- The average length of time in treatment before improvement was 2.4 months
- Most patients described homeopathy as being extremely important in their overall health
- Antidoting was described as an issue in 56% of patients
- Side effects occurred in 61% of patients but were mostly described as very mild; 73% of these symptoms were a return of old symptoms
- High compliance rates in treatment were generally seen (86%)
- Cost of treatment on average was \$431 per year out of pocket
- The cost of medication per year averaged \$70
- What patients liked best about homeopathic treatment included:
 - Effective (27%)
 - Safety (25%)
 - Natural (10%)
 - Treating Whole Person (8%)
 - Convenient(8%)
- What patients liked least about homeopathic treatment included:
 - Slowness (13%)
 - High cost (11%)
 - Hard work (10%)
 - Side Effects (7%)
 - Access to practitioners and remedies (6%)
 - Politics (5%)

Past Treatment

- More formal educational pathways to educate Practitioners prevailed over apprenticeships.
- There was a significant decrease in the use of distance learning
- Most homeopathic patients had significant allopathic treatment before engaging in homeopathy with little improvement
- Most homeopathic patients had little past alternative medicine treatment before homeopathy

Treatment Success

- Overall treatment success rate was 78.6% and this was unchanged from the previous survey

- Patients who get better results include women, animals, participants receiving classical homeopathic treatment, Dermatological complaints, Emergency Medicine complaints, Gastroenterological complaints, participants with High Compliance, participants with a Higher Understanding of homeopathy, participants who have been longer in treatment, Obstetric complaints, those participants receiving polychrest remedies for their last prescription, Pulmonological complaints, Low Potency prescriptions, and Urological complaints.
- Participants who got worse results include LM potencies, cardiological complaints, participants using only complex homeopathy, participants visiting their practitioner more frequently, males, immunological complaints, ophthalmological complaints, otolaryngological complaints, and those participants who had not engaged in homeopathic treatment for very long.
- Women were more successful than men in treatment
- Higher costs of treatment was inversely proportional to success
- Low compliance with treatment produced more poor results
- Self reporting of understanding of how homeopathy works produced better results
- LM potencies were described as less successful
- Patient perception of results using complex homeopathy was that this was less successful than classical homeopathy
- Patients were able to reduce their conventional medication by 65% on average which resulted in a cost savings on average of \$30 per month

The Canadian Homeopathic Patient

- They tend to be younger than their American counterparts
- Their success rates are lower

2014 Survey - Key Results

Key results from the 2014 Survey follow. To best reflect changes since the 2007 Survey, meaningful comparisons are provided. Ultimately we discovered many things that were suspected in the homeopathic community but never documented. In addition there were some surprising results, which are described below. Our hope is to continue to repeat this study approximately every seven years. There was a reduction in the overall response rate to this survey of 9% from the previous survey (1054 respondents for this survey).

Demographics

The average age of homeopathic patient respondents was 51 years. This represented a 6% increase from the previous study. Canadian participants were slightly younger (49.4) than US participants (52.1). Participants receiving complex homeopathic medicine were slightly younger (49.6). Those participants with poor results tended to be younger (49.8). Those participants who described a high understanding of treatment tended to be older (53) as well as those with high compliance (52.6) and frequent antidoting (52.5). Those participants who engaged in homeopathic treatment for shorter periods of time tended to be younger (48.9) compared to those who had engaged for longer periods (52.8). Participants seeking help for the following conditions tended to be older: Endocrinology (52.3), Immunology (52.6), Infectious Disease (53.0), Musculoskeletal (55.5) and Pulmonology (53.7). Participants engaging in more self care tended to be older (53.7). Those participants who visited their practitioner more frequently tended to be younger (49.3).

85% of total respondents were female. This represented a 4% increase from the previous study. This was lower in poor responders to homeopathic treatment (70%). Women were also noted to more often be sensitive to conventional medications (90.9%) and to homeopathic medicines (88.4%).

85% of patient respondents were Caucasian. This represented a 3% decrease from the previous survey. There was a 5% increase in Hispanic participation and a 60.3% increase in Asian participation.

Only 2% of respondents indicated only an animal. 42% reported treating both themselves and their animals.

88% of the respondents were from the United States and 12% were from Canada. This is exactly what would be expected based on population differential between the two countries.

Respondents were from nearly all 50 states in the US and all Canadian provinces. Most well represented were: California, Pennsylvania, Ontario, Arizona, Massachusetts and Texas.

67% of the patient respondents were married. This is considerably higher than the national average in the United States (48%). This also represented a 4% increase from the previous survey while marital rates in the US are in the process of declining. Poor responders were more often married (80%).

Occupation of homeopathic patients varied greatly. Most well represented were:

- Health Care Providers: 22.5%
- Business: 6.7%
- Retired: 11.2%
- Education: 6.3%
- Homemaker: 10.5%
- Student: 3.4%

This represented a 56% decrease in participation by Retired Persons from the previous survey

Homeopathic patients tend to be well educated. Most commonly they have a bachelor's level of education. There was a 3% increase in participants with a bachelor's level of education compared to the previous survey.

A common reason for patients to seek out homeopathic treatment is sensitivity to conventional medications (see #39). Most patients described themselves as at least moderately sensitive. There was a 12% increase in participants who described themselves as extremely sensitive from the previous survey.

Patients who were sensitive to conventional medications were also more sensitive to homeopathic medications. There was a significant correlation. There was also a significant increase in participation sensitivity to homeopathic medicine compared to the previous survey (on average 28.9%).

Most of the patient respondents were engaged in constitutional homeopathic care (87.6%). There was a 36.2% decrease in self-care only from the previous survey.

The average was 6.5 years and the median was 5 years. This represented a 23.5% reduction from the previous survey. The average for those who visited their practitioner more frequent was lower (4.4 years). The average for poor responders was significantly lower (2.9 years). The average for elderly patients was longer (7.5 years).

The average frequency of visits to the homeopathic practitioner was 2.6 months (median 2 months). This represented a 32% decrease from the previous survey.

This was less frequent for those pursuing complex homeopathic treatment (2.1 months). The majority of patient respondents received classical homeopathic treatment. This represented a 2.1% increase in the number of participants who only used classical homeopathy and a 2.4% increase in the number of participants who only used complex homeopathy. Complex homeopathic treatment was significantly more common in those doing self-care (15.9%). Complex homeopathic treatment was more common in males (10.9%). Complex homeopathic treatment was more common in poor responders (20%).

8% of patient respondents did not know the name or strength of the last homeopathic medicine taken. This represented a dramatic reduction from the previous survey. 1% stated that they were not told. See Appendix C for a more detailed listing of all responses for homeopathic medicines. 200C was the most common potency chosen (27.6%), although 30C and 1M were nearly as common. The usage of LM potencies did not increase from the previous survey.

Over 50% of the homeopathic medicines most recently taken were one of 32 polychrest remedies (see below):

- Natrum muriaticum: 5.3%
- Arnica Montana: 3.5%
- Sepia: 4.4%
- Phosphorous: 3.0%

- Lycopodium: 3.0%
- Nux vomica: 2.8%
- Sulfur: 2.8%
- Pulsatilla: 2.7%
- Silica: 2.7%
- Calcarea carbonica: 1.7%
- Lachesis: 1.8%
- Thuja: 1.8%
- Carcinosisin: 1.7%
- Ignatia amara: 1.5%
- Rhus toxicodendron: 1.5%
- Arsenicum album: 1.3%
- Staphysagria: 1.3%
- Aurum metallicum: 1.2%
- Hypericum perforatum: 1.2%
- Causticum: 1.2%
- Ruta gravelolens: 1.2%
- Tuberculinum: 1.0%
- Belladonna: .8%
- Cocculus indica: .7%
- Bryonia alba: .7%
- Aconite: .7%
- Falco peregrinus: .7%
- Ferrum phosphoricum: .7%
- Gelsemium sempervirens: .7%
- Medorrhinum: .7%
- Natrum carbonicum: .7%
- Stramonium: .7%
- Other: 43%

The most common reason for patients to seek treatment was general health (20.6%). Psychiatric (16.2%), musculoskeletal (8.1%) and infectious diseases (7.7%) were also strong. This distribution is similar to what was seen on the previous survey.

The most common method of learning about homeopathic treatment was from friends and family (32.0%). This speaks to the importance of spreading the word about homeopathic medicine through word of mouth. However, this response showed an 18% reduction from the previous survey. The response of internet showed a 35% increase from the previous survey.

The most common method of finding a homeopathic practitioner was referral by a friend (33.3%). This speaks to the importance of marketing one's practice by providing effective quality care. The usage of the internet represented a 35.8% increase from the previous survey.

A significant majority of patients pay for treatment out of pocket (85.3%). This was largely unchanged from the previous survey.

Most patients had significant past conventional medical treatment (19.3%). There overall was an increase in the amount of conventional treatment prior to homeopathic treatment by 15%. However, it was common that there was no success with this treatment (21.4%).

Approximately 50% of patient respondents had had very little exposure to alternative medicine treatment before seeking homeopathic treatment. This indicates that homeopathic medicine is often the first portal in seeking alternative treatment. However, compared to the previous study, there was an increase in past alternative treatment by approximately 10%. For those who did participate in alternative medicine treatments prior to their homeopathic treatment, this

was described as mildly successful (27.3%). Overall there was a decrease in success with past alternative treatment compared to the previous survey (5%)

The majority of homeopathic patient respondents had not sought previous homeopathic care (50%). This is important to note. The majority of homeopathic patients do not change homeopathic practitioners over time and either continue with the same practitioner or leave homeopathic medicine altogether. This was relatively unchanged from the previous survey. A majority of respondents had at least moderately improved in prior treatment. Presumably patients transfer from one homeopath to another because of either lack of success in treatment or because their homeopathic practitioner is no longer able to treat them (retirement, moving out of state etc.).

Treatment Success

The overall treatment success average was 78.6%. This was unchanged from the previous survey. The highest subcategory was treatment success in general well being (70.0%). The improvement in energy was the weakest of treatment results (74.5%). Not everyone who presents for homeopathic treatment has a perceived energy problem.

Please see below for a table of the breakdown of factors that influence treatment success. Patients who get better results include women, animals, participants receiving classical homeopathic treatment, Dermatological complaints, Emergency Medicine complaints, Gastroenterological complaints, participants with High Compliance, participants with a Higher Understanding of homeopathy, participants who have been longer in treatment, Obstetric complaints, those participants receiving polychrest remedies for their last prescription, Pulmonological complaints, Low Potency prescriptions, and Urological complaints.

Participants who got worse results include LM potencies, cardiological complaints, participants using only complex homeopathy, participants visiting their practitioner more frequently, males, immunological complaints, ophthalmological complaints, otolaryngological complaints, and those participants who had not engaged in homeopathic treatment for very long.

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Result</u>	<u>Surveys</u>
Gender	Women get better results than men	2007; 2014
Age	Younger patients do not respond as well to treatment; elderly patients show an average response	2007 only; 2014 showed similar results
Species	Animals show the same response rate as humans	2007 only; 2014 showed an improved response rate for animals
Marital Status	Married Patients Get Better Results	2007 only; 2014 showed similar results
Educational Level	Average Response Rate for	2007; 2014

	both Less Educated and More Well Educated Populations	
Sensitivity to Conventional Medication	Slightly Improved Response Rate	2007; average response rate in 2014
Sensitivity to Homeopathic Medication	Slightly Improved Response Rate	2007; 2014
Classical Homeopathy	Average Response Rate	2007; 2014
Complex Homeopathy	Slightly Reduced Response Rate	2007; 2014
Combined Classical and Complex	Average Response Rate	2007; 2014
Long Length of Treatment	Slightly Improved Response Rate	2007; 2014
Frequent Visits to Practitioner	Average Response Rate	2007; Reduced Response Rate in 2014 Survey
Past Treatment Responders	Slightly Improved Response Rate	2007; 2014
Past Treatment Failures	Average Response Rate	2007; 2014
High Cost	Reduced Response Rate	2007; 2014
Cardiology, Dermatology, Gastrointestinal, Musculoskeletal, Neurological, Psychiatric, Pulmonary chief complaint	Average Response Rate	
Endocrinology chief complaint	Reduced response rate	
Gynecology, Immunology, Infectious Disease, chief complaint	Improved Response Rate	
Polychrest Prescriptions	Average Response Rate	2007; Improved Response Rate 2014
Frequent Antidoting	Reduced Response Rate	2007; Improved Response Rate 2014
Strong Side Effects	Reduced Response Rate	2007; Average Response Rate 2014

Low Compliance With Treatment	Reduced Response Rate	2007; 2014
Understanding How Homeopathy Works	Improved Response Rate	2007; 2014
LM Potencies	Reduced Response Rate	2014

The high overall success rates are an argument that homeopathic treatment is far more than placebo. Placebo response rates typically range from 30-40% success rates. A 79% overall success rate is not consistent with placebo treatment. In addition, it would be expected if homeopathy was placebo, that success rates would be higher early in treatment and less successful later in treatment. This survey showed that the opposite was the case.

Women often respond better to treatment in all forms of healthcare and this was no surprise. Men often drop out of treatment earlier and are less compliant with treatment in all forms of healthcare.

Patient sensitivity is an interesting finding as well. Conventional wisdom is that this makes successful treatment more difficult. However, it is possible that patient sensitivity may also broaden the response of a patient to potential remedies that are not the similimum but are merely similar.

Clearly spending a lot of money on homeopathic treatment is not an indicator of success in treatment. If anything, it is the opposite. The most skilled homeopathic practitioners are not necessarily the ones that charge the most.

Those who had previously not responded to homeopathic treatment had an average success rate when treated by a new homeopathic practitioner. This argues for the importance of referral of cases that are not responding to treatment and helps to dispel the myth that if a patient does not respond well to one practitioner, that they will not respond well to another.

Not unsurprisingly, low compliance with treatment reduced success rate in treatment. What is interesting is how good the success rate was, despite the low compliance with treatment. Patient compliance may not be as important of a factor in homeopathic treatment as it is in conventional medicine.

Having a good understanding of how homeopathy works improves success rates in treatment. Having little understanding of homeopathic treatment works reduces success rates in treatment. This may have something to do with compliance.

Low potencies were found to be more successful particularly than LM remedies. The reason for this is unclear. There has been some suggestion in the homeopathic community that 200C may not be as effective as a potency compared to other potencies. This research did not bear that out.

Lastly and perhaps most controversial were the findings in regards to complex homeopathic treatment vs. classical homeopathic treatment. Patients perceived that the classical homeopathic treatment was more effective. This was consistent with the results from the previous survey. Both forms of treatment were clearly effective. Please note that this does not

necessarily argue that one form of treatment is more effective than another, it only argues about patient perceptions of treatment results.

Comparison Table of Classical Homeopathic, Complex Homeopathic and Combined Classical and Complex Homeopathic Forms of Treatment

	<u>Classical Only</u>	<u>Complex Only</u>	<u>Classical and Complex</u>
Cost of treatment	Lower	Higher	Average
Cost of medication	Lower	Higher	Average
Overall patient reported success rates	Average	Lower	Average

Nature of Treatment

The average length in treatment before success was 2.4 months (median 5 weeks). This represented an 18% reduction from the previous survey.

Males tended to take longer to see results (2.9 months) and those who were charged more for treatment (4 months). Animals tended to take less time to respond to treatment (3.6 weeks).

The average reduction in conventional medication related to homeopathic treatment was 65%. This represented a 7% reduction from the previous study. This was less for those patients who had frequent visits to their practitioner(60.8%), patients treated with complex homeopathy (52.7%) and those whose treatment was more expensive (61.1%). It was higher for those who had been in treatment for a long time (69.8%).

Patients with a chief complaint that was emergency medicine (75%), dermatology (74.7%), gastroenterological (70.7%) and oncological (70%) had the greatest success in reducing their medication.

Animal participants (37.8%), participants receiving complex homeopathic prescriptions (52.7%), dental chief complaint (45%), pediatric participants (51.1%), endocrinological (47%), ophthalmological (57.5%) and environmental medicine (57%) had the least success in reducing their medications.

The average cost savings from reducing conventional medication was \$28 per month or \$336 per year. This represents a 307% reduction from the previous study. The reason for this dramatic change is unknown. Many of the patient respondents reported that the cost savings would be much higher if they did not have insurance that paid for their medication. The cost savings was higher for those with a chief complaint that was oncological, and lowest for animals and those with a chief complaint that was emergency medicine.

Most patients saw homeopathy as vital in their overall healthcare. The most common response to this question was extremely important (66%).

Antidoting is relatively uncommon in treatment. The most common response was Not At All

(43%). This was a 7% increase from the previous study.

Side effects were also described as being infrequent in treatment. Compared to conventional medicine, side effects were reported at about 20% of the overall frequency. The most common response was Not At All (38.2%). This represented a 3.8% increase from the previous study. Those with frequent side effects had a lower success rate in treatment.

The majority of side effects to treatment represented a return of old symptoms (73.1%). However, one quarter of side effects to treatment represented new symptoms (26.9%). These may have been old symptoms that were not identified as a return of old symptoms or may have been proving symptoms of homeopathic treatment.

Compliance was high. The most common response was Extremely High (46.9%). This indicates that compliance for treatment is generally higher in homeopathic medicine than in conventional medicine. Those with high compliance tended to have higher success rates.

Most homeopathic patients indicated that they understood the nature of homeopathic treatment. Those that indicated a high understanding had better success rates in treatment and those that indicated a low understanding have worse success rates.

Cost

The average cost of treatment was \$430.98/year (median \$350). This represented a 26% reduction from the previous study. The reason for this is unclear. Factors that reduced the cost of treatment included animals, participants in Canada, those participants whose chief complaint was general health, those patients who received high potency prescriptions, male participants, participants who were not sensitive to homeopathic medicines.

Factors that increased the cost of treatment included treatment of cardiological complaints, complex homeopathic treatment, those participants with frequent antidoting, those participants with more frequent visits to their practitioner, those participants who were highly compliant, those patients who received LM potencies, those participants who received small remedies

The average annual cost of homeopathic medicine was \$70.22 (median 50). This represented a 39.1% decrease from the previous survey. The average cost reduction in allopathic medication was \$336 per year making an overall cost for homeopathic treatment per year including medication and cost savings to be \$165.20.

Factors that reduced the cost of medication included self care, participants who were not sensitive to medication, usage of low potencies, classical homeopathic treatment only and treatment of animals.

Factors that increased the cost of medications included young participants, small remedies, participants who were sensitive to allopathic medicine, poor responders to treatment, participants who were highly compliant with treatment, participants who had more frequent visits to their practitioner, complex homeopathic treatment, LM potencies.

What patients liked best about treatment, was that homeopathy is effective (26.7%), that it is safe (24.5%), that it is holistic and natural (9.6%). A careful study of the responses to this question provide a good guide for the best methods to market homeopathic medicine. These results are comparable to the previous survey.

What patients liked least about treatment was the slow pace of healing (12.7%). Other common responses were liking everything about treatment (22.6%), high cost (11.3%), that it is hard work (9.7%), side effects to treatment (6.8%) and accessing practitioners and remedies (5.5%).

The issue of the slow pace of healing is interesting. Some patient respondents claimed that what they like best about homeopathic treatment was the fast pace of healing in the previous question. However, the idea of the relative slowness of treatment is typical of the quick fix mentality that is prevalent in western culture.

Cost was a significant factor for many patients. There were many responses indicating that they wished that their insurance covered the cost of homeopathic treatment.

Although difficult to measure, this survey indicates insufficient numbers of homeopathic practitioners in the United States. 6% of the homeopathic patient respondents indicated that a scarcity of homeopathic practitioners was their primary complaint about homeopathic treatment. Many of the homeopathic patient respondents complained about traveling long distances to see their homeopathic practitioner.

Of interest was a new category of responses pertaining to skepticism and political climate that was not seen on the previous survey. 4.6% of respondents felt this was their primary concern about treatment.

2014 Survey - General Comments and Conclusions

As with any research conducted, it is hoped and desired that helpful interpretations can be made from data analyses. This is certainly the case with the 2014 Survey results. The following are general comments and conclusions regarding the 2014 Survey and the Homeopathic profession.

The Survey - Validity and Reliability

As a result of the consultation by the well versed and experienced Practitioners in the field assisting in the design of the Survey, content validity was achieved. Because the Survey was consistently repeated over time (with the only exception of adding two new success/satisfaction measures), the Survey can now be considered generally reliable.

Homeopathic Treatment

Clearly, the profession itself is evolving and changing over time. The good news is that success rates in practice remain high (nearly 80%) and consistent over time. This high rate of success can be achieved regardless of the methodology or style of practice used. These consistently high rates of success provide a strong argument that homeopathy is much more than placebo.

Homeopathic patients are generally very pleased with treatment and focus in on high success rates, low cost, lack of side effects and holistic nature of treatment as the keys that attract them to treatment.

In terms of areas of potential growth, the patient population does lack diversity. It is primarily Caucasian, practice is concentrated in only some US states, and homeopathic patients themselves are "graying". This suggests that better and more effective recruitment of younger individuals who come from different ethnicities should be considered. Further, consideration of political action to establish homeopathy as a viable and effective healthcare discipline in low density states may also attract more individuals to the profession, strengthen educational offerings, and could increase consumer awareness that homeopathy is a beneficial and effective means of treating illness and promoting wellness.