ISSN NO.

IJRNCISM: International Journal of Research in Nobel Classical Indian System of Medicine

www.ncismjournal.com

Volume: 01 Issue: 03 August - 2026

Article History: Received: 24-08-2026 Accepted: 27-08-2026 Published: 30-08-2026

Homeopathy in Irritable Bowel Syndrome: Clinical Applications and Research Gaps

Dr. Yashwantrao Baliram Patil[1], Dr. Abhijeet Vasantrao Mural[2]

[1] Professor & HOD, Department of Homoeopathic Pharmacy, Shri. Chamundamata Homoeopathic Medical College & Hospital, Jalgaon, Maharashtra, India. Email: vhacademics@gmail.com

[2] Ph.D. Scholar, DKMM HMC, Chh. Sambhaji Nagar, Maharashtra, India. Associate Professor & HOD, Department of Homoeopathic Materia Medica, Government Homoeopathy Medical College & Hospital, Jalgaon, Maharashtra, India. Email: dravm14@gmail.com

Abstract

Irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) is a common disorder of gut–brain interaction characterized by recurrent abdominal pain and altered bowel habits. Symptoms fluctuate over time and may affect food choices, sleep, work, emotional wellbeing, and quality of life. Because no single treatment helps every patient, some individuals seek homeopathy and other complementary approaches. This narrative review evaluates homeopathy in IBS from clinical and research perspectives. Contemporary gastroenterology literature, trials and reviews of homeopathy, and historically important homeopathic texts were considered. A homeopathic consultation individualizes prescribing according to pain, stool pattern, modalities, associated symptoms, and personal characteristics rather than IBS subtype alone. Small trials and observational studies have reported improvement in patient-reported symptoms, but the evidence is limited by few participants, heterogeneous interventions, variable comparators, risk of bias, and short follow-up. The most comprehensive systematic review found the evidence insufficient for reliable conclusions. Extended consultation and therapeutic engagement may influence expectation, stress, coping, and symptom reporting, but these contextual effects do not establish remedy-specific efficacy. Homeopathy should not replace evaluation for celiac disease, inflammatory bowel disease, colorectal cancer, or other organic pathology, nor should it displace guideline-based dietary, psychological, or pharmacological care. If chosen, it is best used transparently as an adjunct. Future trials should separate consultation effects from remedy effects, use Rome-defined populations and validated endpoints, and report long-term response and safety.

Keywords

Homeopathy; irritable bowel syndrome; disorder of gut–brain interaction; integrative medicine; gut–brain axis; complementary medicine

1. Introduction

IBS affects an estimated 5–10% of people globally, although prevalence varies with diagnostic criteria and population [1]. It is defined by recurrent abdominal pain related to defecation or accompanied by altered stool frequency or form, without an explanatory structural disease after appropriate assessment [2]. Patients are classified as IBS with constipation, diarrhea, mixed bowel habits, or unclassified pattern.

IBS is now understood as a disorder of gut–brain interaction. Motility, visceral sensitivity, microbiota, mucosal immune activity, intestinal permeability, central pain processing, stress, and learned responses may contribute in different proportions [3]. Treatment is therefore individualized and may combine diet, exercise, soluble fiber, subtype-specific medicines, and gut-directed psychological therapy [4].

When symptoms persist, patients may seek homeopathy. The system uses the law of similars—*similia similibus curentur*—individualization, and minimum dose, as described in the *Organon of Medicine* [5]. Its popularity does not resolve the question of efficacy, and the available IBS evidence requires careful appraisal.

Aim and Objectives

The review aims to evaluate the potential role of homeopathy in IBS and identify the limitations of current research. It summarizes IBS mechanisms and established care, describes homeopathic prescribing, reviews trials and systematic evidence, discusses safety, and proposes priorities for future studies.

2. Methodology of Literature Review

A narrative search covered PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, Embase, the Cochrane Library, and Google Scholar. Terms included “homeopathy,” “irritable bowel syndrome,” “gut–brain axis,” “functional gastrointestinal disorder,” “complementary medicine,” and “randomized controlled trial.” Randomized and observational studies, systematic reviews, guidelines, and relevant classical texts published mainly between 1990 and 2025 were considered. Duplicate records, abstracts without full reports, editorials, and studies lacking adequate clinical information were excluded. This was not a registered systematic review and does not provide a pooled effect estimate.

3. Homeopathic Perspective

Homeopathy was introduced by Samuel Hahnemann in the late eighteenth century and later developed through *materia medica*, repertory, and clinical traditions. Prescribing is not based on the diagnostic label alone. The practitioner considers the character and location of pain, timing, stool form and urgency, aggravating and relieving factors, food responses, sleep, mood, and other individual features. This detailed history may support therapeutic alliance, but it also makes intervention fidelity and blinding difficult in trials.

4. Modern Understanding of IBS

Visceral hypersensitivity can make normal distension painful, while altered motility contributes to constipation, diarrhea, or alternating stools. Microbial composition and fermentation may affect gas production, barrier function, and immune signaling. A subgroup shows low-grade mucosal activation, but no single biomarker diagnoses IBS. Communication between the enteric nervous system, autonomic pathways, endocrine signals, immune

mediators, and the brain explains why stress and sleep can modify gastrointestinal symptoms.

A positive IBS diagnosis should be accompanied by an assessment for alarm features and relevant alternative conditions. Gastrointestinal bleeding, anemia, unintentional weight loss, nocturnal progressive symptoms, fever, a mass, strong family history, or late onset may require investigation. Celiac testing and other assessment are selected according to presentation and local guidance.

5. Evidence-Based Management

Management begins with explanation, a positive diagnosis, regular meals, physical activity, and identification of important triggers without unnecessary restriction. A dietitian-supervised low-FODMAP intervention may help selected patients but requires structured reintroduction. Soluble fiber is useful for many patients, whereas poorly chosen fiber can worsen bloating. Antispasmodics, peppermint oil, laxatives, antidiarrheals, secretagogues, neuromodulators, or other subtype-specific agents are chosen according to symptoms and availability. Cognitive behavioral therapy and gut-directed hypnotherapy have evidence for persistent symptoms [4].

6. Homeopathic Prescribing in IBS

Frequently discussed medicines include *Nux vomica*, *Lycopodium clavatum*, *Colocynthis*, *Arsenicum album*, *Aloe socotrina*, *Podophyllum peltatum*, *Carbo vegetabilis*, and *Argentum nitricum*. In practice, *Nux vomica*, *Alumina*, or *Bryonia alba* may be considered in constipation patterns, while *Podophyllum peltatum*, *Aloe socotrina*, or *Argentum nitricum* may be discussed in diarrhea patterns. These are descriptions of prescribing tradition, not established disease-specific treatments. No individual remedy has been shown reliably to treat IBS beyond placebo.

7. Proposed Explanations for Reported Improvement

Possible explanations include natural symptom fluctuation, regression to the mean, expectation, therapeutic attention, changes in diet or behavior, reduced stress, and nonspecific placebo effects. Water-memory, hormesis, and nanoparticle hypotheses have also been proposed, but no mechanism is established for highly diluted remedies [6]. A rigorous trial must therefore control consultation time and therapeutic interaction rather than compare an extensive homeopathic package with minimal usual-care contact.

8. Clinical Evidence

The evidence base comprises a small number of randomized trials and observational reports, most evaluating individualized care. Some studies report changes in abdominal pain, bloating, stool pattern, global symptom scores, or quality of life. Interpretation is limited by small samples, variable prescribing, incomplete allocation concealment, inconsistent outcomes, and short treatment periods.

Observational improvement cannot establish causation because IBS relapses and remits and has a substantial contextual response. Simultaneous dietary change, reassurance, repeated follow-up, and altered healthcare-seeking may contribute. The Cochrane review found too few reliable data to determine whether homeopathy is effective or safe for IBS [7]. Broader reviews of homeopathy likewise emphasize bias, heterogeneity, and uncertainty [8,9].

9. Safety and Diagnostic Responsibility

Highly diluted products from regulated manufacturers generally have little direct

pharmacological toxicity. Lower dilutions may contain active substances, and poor-quality products may be contaminated or mislabeled. The principal clinical risk is indirect: recurrent pain or altered bowel habit may be attributed to IBS without adequate assessment, delaying diagnosis of inflammatory bowel disease, celiac disease, infection, microscopic colitis, or malignancy. Persistent or changing symptoms require reassessment. Complementary care should be disclosed and coordinated rather than used as a reason to stop effective treatment [10].

10. Comparison with Established Care

Guideline-based IBS care uses positive diagnostic criteria, subtype and dominant symptoms, evidence-supported diet, medicines, and psychological treatment. Homeopathy uses individualized symptom matching and a prolonged consultation, but remedy-specific mechanisms and efficacy remain unconfirmed. It may be chosen as an adjunct by an informed patient if it does not delay investigation or replace effective care. The distinction should be stated clearly during consent.

Parameter	Guideline-based IBS management	Homeopathy
Treatment basis	IBS subtype, dominant symptoms, comorbidity, and evidence	Individualized total symptom pattern
Mechanism	Dietary, pharmacological, psychological, and gut–brain pathways	Remedy-specific mechanism remains unconfirmed
Evidence	Moderate for several selected interventions	Low certainty and insufficient for firm conclusions
Main safety issue	Intervention-specific adverse effects or over-restriction	Delayed investigation or replacement of effective care
Clinical role	Standard individualized care	Optional adjunct with informed consent and coordination

11. Critical Analysis

IBS is particularly susceptible to contextual improvement because symptoms vary and are closely linked with expectation, stress, and clinician interaction. These features make a person-centered consultation valuable while also making uncontrolled studies unreliable. The central unresolved question is whether individualized remedies add benefit beyond a matched consultation and placebo. Current evidence does not answer that question with adequate certainty [11]. Absence of a validated disease biomarker does not prevent good trials; validated symptom severity, adequate relief, pain interference, stool pattern, and quality-of-life measures are available.

12. Research Gaps

Large multicenter trials are lacking. Future studies should use Rome criteria, stratify IBS subtype, preregister the prescribing model, and ensure allocation concealment and blinded outcome assessment. A three-arm design—individualized homeopathic consultation plus remedy, matched consultation plus placebo, and guideline-based care—could separate remedy and consultation effects. Follow-up should extend beyond the immediate treatment period. Adverse events, medication changes, dietary co-interventions,

healthcare utilization, and work impairment should be reported.

13. Future Perspectives

Microbiome, metabolomic, or inflammatory measures may be included in exploratory work, but they should not replace patient-centered endpoints or be used to imply mechanism from correlation. Comparative effectiveness research could examine whether adding a structured homeopathic consultation changes satisfaction, self-management, or symptom burden. Both positive and negative results should be published, and reporting should follow CONSORT extensions relevant to individualized homeopathy.

14. Conclusion

IBS is a chronic disorder of gut–brain interaction that often requires several complementary elements of care. Some patients report improvement during individualized homeopathic treatment, but the small and methodologically weak evidence base does not establish a reproducible remedy-specific effect. Homeopathy should not replace diagnostic assessment, dietary or psychological therapy, or indicated medicines. If a patient elects to use it, an adjunctive and openly coordinated approach is safest. Well-controlled studies that match consultation exposure and use validated long-term outcomes are required before firm clinical claims can be made.

15. References

[1] Black CJ, Ford AC. Global burden of irritable bowel syndrome. Gastroenterology. 2020;158(5):1235–1237.

[2] Drossman DA. Functional gastrointestinal disorders: History, pathophysiology, clinical features and Rome IV. Gastroenterology. 2016;150(6):1262–1279.

[3] Ford AC, Sperber AD, Corsetti M, Camilleri M. Irritable bowel syndrome. Lancet. 2020;396(10263):1675–1688.

[4] Lacy BE, Pimentel M, Brenner DM, Chey WD, Keefer LA, Long MD, et al. ACG Clinical Guideline: Management of Irritable Bowel Syndrome. Am J Gastroenterol. 2021;116(1):17–44.

[5] Samuel Hahnemann. Hahnemann S. *Organon of Medicine*. 6th ed. Boericke W, editor. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2022. Aphorisms 1–291. p. 1–312.

[6] National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health. Irritable bowel syndrome and complementary health approaches. Bethesda (MD): NCCIH; Updated 2024.

[7] Peckham EJ, Cooper K, Roberts ER, Agrawal A, Brabyn S, Tew G. Homeopathy for treatment of irritable bowel syndrome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2019;9:CD009710. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009710.pub3.

[8] Vickers AJ, Zollman C. ABC of complementary medicine: Homeopathy. BMJ. 1999;319(7217):1115–1118.

[9] Ernst E. Homeopathy: What does the best evidence tell us? Med J Aust. 2010;192(8):458–460.

[10] Ernst E. Homeopathy: The undiluted facts. Trends Pharmacol Sci. 2007;28(7):320–322.

[11] Bell IR, Schwartz GE. Adaptive network nanomedicine: An integrated model for homeopathic medicine. Homeopathy. 2013;102(1):66–81.

[12] Bellavite P, Marzotto M, Olioso D, Moratti E, Conforti A. High-dilution effects revisited. Homeopathy. 2014;103(1):22–43.

[13] Ford AC, Lacy BE, Talley NJ. Irritable bowel syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2017;376(26):2566–2578.

[14] Chey WD, Kurlander J, Eswaran S. Irritable bowel syndrome: A clinical review. JAMA. 2015;313(9):949–958.

[15] Camilleri M. Diagnosis and treatment of irritable bowel syndrome. BMJ. 2021;373:n1441.

[16] Mearin F, Lacy BE, Chang L, Chey WD, Lembo AJ, Simren M, et al. Bowel disorders. Gastroenterology. 2016;150(6):1393–1407.

[17] Enck P, Aziz Q, Barbara G, Farmer AD, Fukudo S, Mayer EA, et al. Irritable bowel syndrome. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2016;2:16014.

[18] Simrén M, Barbara G, Flint HJ, Spiegel BMR, Spiller RC, Vanner S, et al. Intestinal microbiota in functional bowel disorders. Gut. 2013;62(1):159–176.

[19] Mayer EA, Tillisch K, Gupta A. Gut/brain axis and the microbiota. J Clin Invest. 2015;125(3):926–938.

[20] Ford AC, Moayyedi P, Chey WD, Harris LA, Lacy BE, Saito YA, et al. American College of Gastroenterology monograph on management of irritable bowel syndrome. Am J Gastroenterol. 2018;113(Suppl 2):1–18.

[21] NICE Guideline NG61. Irritable bowel syndrome in adults: diagnosis and management. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; 2017 (updated 2021). p. 1–40.

[22] Black CJ, Drossman DA, Talley NJ, Ruddy J, Ford AC. Functional gastrointestinal disorders and disorders of gut–brain interaction. Lancet. 2020;396(10263):1664–1674.

[23] Ford AC, Harris LA, Lacy BE, Quigley EMM, Moayyedi P. Systematic review with meta-analysis: The efficacy of prebiotics, probiotics, synbiotics and antibiotics in IBS. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2018;48(10):1044–1060.

[24] Moayyedi P, Quigley EMM, Lacy BE, Lembo AJ, Saito YA, Schiller LR, et al. The effect of fiber supplementation on irritable bowel syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Gastroenterol. 2014;109(9):1367–1374.

[25] Ruepert L, Quartero AO, de Wit NJ, van der Heijden GJ, Rubin G, Muris JW. Bulking agents, antispasmodics and antidepressants for the treatment of irritable bowel syndrome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2011;(8):CD003460.

[26] Camilleri M, Boeckxstaens G. Dietary and pharmacological treatment of abdominal pain in IBS. Gut. 2017;66(5):966–974.

[27] What do Cochrane systematic reviews say about the management of irritable bowel syndrome? Sao Paulo Med J. 2022;140(6):825–833.

[28] Hahnemann S. *Materia Medica Pura*. Vol. 1. Reprint ed. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2018. p. 1–612.

[29] Boericke W. Pocket Manual of Homeopathic *Materia Medica* and Repertory. Reprint ed. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2021. p. 1–1033.

[30] Kent JT. Lectures on Homeopathic *Materia Medica*. Reprint ed. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2016. p. 1–1143.

[31] Kent JT. Lectures on Homeopathic Philosophy. Reprint ed. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2015. p. 1–306.

[32] Roberts HA. The Principles and Art of Cure by Homeopathy. Reprint ed. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2014. p. 1–366.

[33] Nash EB. Leaders in Homeopathic Therapeutics. Reprint ed. New Delhi: B. Jain Publishers (P) Ltd.; 2019. p. 1–487.