



Homeopathy in Migraine Management: Classical Principles and Current Evidence

Dr. Yashwantrao Baliram Patil¹, Dr. Abhijeet Vasantrao Mural²

¹ Professor & HOD, Department of Homeopathic Pharmacy, Shri. Chamundamata Homeopathic 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: dravml4@gmail.com

Abstract

Migraine is more than an episodic headache; recurrent pain, nausea, and intolerance to light or sound can disrupt education, employment, and everyday responsibilities. When symptoms persist or standard medicines are poorly tolerated, some patients consider homeopathic care as an additional option. This narrative review outlines the classical homeopathic approach to migraine and critically examines the cited evidence. Sources include traditional texts, placebo-controlled studies, published reviews, and contemporary clinical guidance. In classical practice, remedy selection is individualized according to the character of pain, accompanying symptoms, and circumstances that aggravate or relieve the attack. Such descriptions clarify how homeopathy is practised, but they are not evidence that a preparation is effective. In two small randomized studies, the principal diary outcomes did not demonstrate a clear benefit over placebo. A review of headache studies likewise found that methodological limitations prevented dependable conclusions. Apparent improvement during treatment can arise from natural fluctuation in attack frequency, the therapeutic consultation, changed routines, or expectations of benefit. Research must distinguish

these influences from a remedy-specific effect. On current evidence, homeopathy should not replace established migraine care. Future trials require explicit diagnostic standards, equivalent consultations in both groups, concealed allocation, a prospectively defined primary outcome such as monthly migraine days, adequate follow-up, and systematic safety reporting.

Keywords: *Migraine; homeopathy; individualized treatment; clinical evidence; placebo; headache.*

Introduction

Migraine is a neurological disorder whose effects often extend well beyond head pain. Attacks commonly produce pulsating pain, sometimes on one side, that becomes worse during routine movement. Nausea, vomiting, photophobia, and phonophobia may accompany the headache. In migraine with aura, temporary visual, sensory, or language disturbances can precede or accompany an episode.[1] Recurrent attacks may result in absence from work or study, withdrawal from planned activities, and anxiety about the next episode.

Management has two broad purposes: controlling an ongoing attack and lowering future attack frequency when prevention is indicated. Evidence from controlled research supports several acute options,

including triptans and certain anti-inflammatory medicines.[2] Preventive treatment has also evolved. An American Headache Society position statement published in 2024 placed therapies directed at calcitonin gene-related peptide (CGRP) among first-line preventive choices.[3] Selection should nevertheless be individualized according to comorbidity, previous response, tolerability, availability, and patient preference.

Despite these advances, some patients remain interested in homeopathy. A typical homeopathic consultation is extensive, and the prescribed preparation is selected from the individual clinical picture. The internal logic of this selection process must, however, be distinguished from proof of therapeutic efficacy. According to the US National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health, convincing evidence for homeopathy in specific disorders remains limited.[4]

Aim and review approach

The purpose of this review is to explain classical homeopathic prescribing in migraine, summarize frequently cited remedy pictures, and critically interpret the reported clinical evidence. It also addresses patient safety and methodological priorities for future investigation.

A selective narrative method was adopted. Classical sources were considered together with migraine trials, reviews of homeopathic research, bibliographic records, accessible abstracts and full texts, and guidance from recognized health agencies. Searches focused on migraine and homeopathy, individualized prescribing, placebo response, headache trials, and study quality. Traditional therapeutic descriptions were kept analytically separate from clinical outcome evidence. Because the review did not collect original patient data, conduct a formal risk-of-bias appraisal, or perform meta-analysis, it should not be regarded as an exhaustive systematic review.

Classical principles and case taking

One of the foundational ideas of homeopathy is Similia Similibus Curentur, commonly expressed as ‘like cures like.’ It proposes that a substance linked with a pattern of symptoms in a healthy person may be prescribed in homeopathic form to a patient showing a comparable pattern. Repeated dilution forms part of the preparation of many remedies. These statements describe the doctrine of

homeopathy; they should not be interpreted as established mechanisms for treating migraine.[4]

Individualized prescribing allows patients with the same biomedical diagnosis to receive different remedies. Aphorism 153 of Hahnemann’s Organon emphasizes features that make one case distinctive.[5] Consequently, case taking explores the site and quality of pain, its timing, associated manifestations, and factors that worsen or ease it. In homeopathic terminology, these modifying circumstances are known as modalities.

The enquiry may also include sleep, food intake, emotional strain, menstrual association, and complaints occurring outside the headache. One patient may link attacks to inadequate sleep, whereas another may notice a pattern after missed meals or near menstruation. These details are clinically useful for describing the illness and its burden. Their place in traditional remedy differentiation does not, by itself, demonstrate preventive or therapeutic efficacy.

Repertorization arranges the collected symptoms through an indexed relationship between clinical features and remedies. The shortlisted preparations are then compared with their descriptions in the materia medica.[6] Although this process structures traditional prescribing, a repertory score has not been validated as a predictor of treatment response. It must never substitute for medical evaluation when a headache is new, atypical, or changing.

Remedies described in the traditional literature

Seven preparations commonly mentioned in classical materia medica are presented in Table 1.[6] The entries document traditional symptom pictures and should not be read as clinical recommendations. Moreover, the studies reviewed in this article do not establish efficacy of any listed remedy for a defined migraine presentation.

Table 1 Traditional headache patterns associated with selected homeopathic remedies

Remedy	Traditional description	Associated features
Belladonna	Sudden, intense pulsating head pain	Light, sound, or jarring movement may aggravate the symptoms
Sanguinaria canadensis	Periodic pain described as	Sleep or a dark environment is

	travelling from the occiput toward the right eye	traditionally associated with relief
Iris versicolor	Head pain occurring with marked gastrointestinal disturbance	May include nausea, vomiting, or a burning digestive sensation
Gelsemium sempervirens	A dull, weighted sensation in the head	May occur with weakness, sleepiness, or visual symptoms
Natrum muriaticum	Repeated attacks of throbbing headache	Sun exposure, menstruation, or emotional distress may form part of the picture
Nux vomica	Headache traditionally linked with dietary excess or disturbed routine	Irritability, digestive complaints, or sensitivity to stimuli may coexist
Spigelia anthelmia	Sharp or neuralgic pain, often focused around the left eye	Movement, touch, or bending may intensify the pain

Source: Adapted from Boericke's materia medica.[6]

The overlap between these traditional pictures and ordinary migraine symptoms also cautions against prescribing from one feature alone. Nausea, photophobia, and throbbing pain occur widely in migraine. Their presence may resemble a materia medica entry, but resemblance cannot show that a remedy alters attack frequency or severity. Demonstrating such an effect requires a properly controlled comparison.

Clinical evidence

Placebo controlled migraine trials

In the randomized double-blind trial by Whitmarsh et al., 63 participants entered the study. Following a one-month baseline assessment, individualized

homeopathic treatment or placebo was administered for three months. Sixty participants completed the trial, equally divided between groups. Attack frequency decreased by 19% with homeopathy and by 16% with placebo, but the overall between-group difference was not statistically significant. Interpretation is further limited by baseline imbalance and the modest sample size.[7]

Straumsheim et al. allocated 73 patients at random, and 68 completed the protocol. After one month of observation, participants received individualized homeopathy or indistinguishable placebo for four months. Improvement occurred in both arms, while diary data revealed no significant separation between them. A neurologist-rated outcome did favour homeopathy for attack frequency ($P = 0.04$).[8] Because the assessor rating and diary results did not agree, the isolated positive result provides limited evidence and should not be presented without the negative primary comparison.

Reviews and research quality

Owen and Green examined six prospective investigations of homeopathy for headache: four randomized studies and two observational reports, including three studies specifically concerned with migraine. Their review found that the evidence then available was inadequate either to recommend or to dismiss homeopathy for the headache disorders evaluated.[9] Published in 2004 and based on a small heterogeneous evidence base, the review supports a conclusion of uncertainty rather than efficacy.

Research quality across homeopathy more generally was assessed by Herman et al. in 99 clinical studies. Of the 85 controlled investigations, 42% were judged at high risk of bias and a further 24% at unclear risk. The authors emphasized the need for stronger design and reporting standards.[10] These proportions concern homeopathic research across multiple conditions and must not be interpreted as a migraine-specific effect estimate.

Overall, the migraine literature cited here does not show a consistent benefit of individualized homeopathic preparations beyond placebo. Small participant numbers, variable outcome definitions, baseline differences, and discordant findings weaken the certainty of any positive interpretation. Nor do the available data identify a subgroup likely to respond to a particular remedy. Although a selective review cannot exclude every hypothetical effect, these

studies do not provide a sufficient basis for routine clinical use.

Understanding improvement during treatment

Symptoms may genuinely improve after care begins without the prescribed preparation being the cause. Migraine varies naturally from month to month, and patients commonly seek treatment when attacks are unusually troublesome. Subsequent movement toward their usual frequency may therefore be mistaken for a treatment response, a phenomenon termed regression toward the mean. Concurrent changes in sleep, diet, stress, or conventional medication may also influence the course.

Across 36 years of acute and preventive migraine research, Bruijn et al. observed improvement in many participants who received placebo.[11] Expectation, clinician attention, and spontaneous symptom variation can all contribute to this response. This does not imply that the person's pain lacks reality. Instead, it shows why change observed within a single treatment group cannot establish a specific pharmacological or remedy effect.

Extended consultation may itself provide value by giving patients time to explain their experience and by reinforcing regular routines or diary completion. Such contextual benefits deserve recognition, but they are conceptually different from an effect of the preparation. Trials can separate the two more effectively when both groups receive consultations of comparable length and quality.

Lifestyle and routine migraine care

Consistent sleep, regular meals, adequate hydration, and appropriate activity form a practical foundation for migraine management. A headache diary can assist patients and clinicians in recognizing temporal patterns and possible associations with stress, caffeine, or the menstrual cycle.[12] Trigger advice should arise from the individual record rather than from the assumption that all patients respond to the same factors.

Useful diary entries include the date, duration, and intensity of headache, associated manifestations, functional interference, and medicines used. NICE guidance additionally advises recording suspected triggers and any menstrual relationship.[13] Serial records help determine whether a management strategy is working, although they remain patient-reported observations rather than objective laboratory measurements.

Persistent disability should prompt reconsideration of both diagnosis and management, including appropriate acute and preventive therapies. A preference for homeopathy must not lead to withdrawal of effective treatment or postponement of necessary assessment.[4] When a homeopathic product is used, its exact name and preparation should be documented and shared with all clinicians involved.

Warning signs and product safety

Emergency evaluation is indicated for an abrupt, exceptionally severe headache or headache accompanied by new focal weakness, confusion, or seizure. Urgent assessment is also appropriate after significant head trauma, with fever, or when a new severe headache develops during pregnancy or the postpartum period.[12] These warning features require medical investigation, not reinterpretation as a homeopathic symptom pattern.

A marked departure from a person's established headache pattern also warrants further evaluation. The same applies to a new headache in a patient with immunosuppression or a relevant history of malignancy, and to headache associated with otherwise unexplained vomiting.[13] A previous migraine diagnosis should never obscure newly emerging red flags.

Safety is determined by the actual composition and manufacturing quality of a product, not by its label. The FDA has identified homeopathic products containing measurable active substances, contaminants, or dilution errors. Belladonna and Nux vomica, for example, originate from toxic materials.[14] Concentrated source preparations, low dilutions, and highly diluted products therefore cannot be grouped as if they carried identical risk. A homeopathic designation is not, on its own, assurance of safety.

A complete safety evaluation must consider both harm from a product and harm caused by deferring effective care. Clinical deterioration should be assessed on medical grounds rather than described automatically as a favourable reaction to treatment. Open communication becomes especially important when patients combine several medicines or complementary products.

Priorities for future research

A rigorous future trial might recruit adults who satisfy established criteria for episodic migraine.[1]

Participants could complete a baseline diary before random allocation to individualized homeopathy or matched placebo. Both arms should receive equivalent consultations and continued access to indicated conventional management. A 12- to 24-week intervention, followed by observation, would permit assessment of both immediate and sustained differences.

Before dispensing, the practitioner would select the individualized remedy and send the prescription to an independent pharmacy, which would issue either that preparation or a matching placebo according to concealed allocation. Participants, practitioners, and outcome assessors should remain blinded. The protocol must also define how remedy or dilution changes can occur without compromising concealment. This model retains individualized selection while preserving a credible controlled comparison.

Investigators should prospectively nominate one primary endpoint, for example change in monthly migraine days. Secondary endpoints might cover pain intensity, acute medication consumption, days with activity restriction, and validated disability instruments such as MIDAS or HIT-6. Together, these measures capture both symptom burden and its consequences for daily functioning.

Sample size calculations should reflect a clinically important between-group difference rather than simple convenience. Prospective registration should precede enrolment. Reports should account for withdrawals, incomplete diaries, treatment modifications, and adverse events in each arm, while also describing product origin, dilution, and prescribing decisions. Analyses should retain participants in their assigned groups and present effect estimates with uncertainty. Even a positive study would require independent confirmation before practice recommendations changed.

Discussion

The decisive question is not whether traditional descriptions guide remedy choice, but whether the selected preparation improves outcomes beyond the consultation and accompanying care. Controlled trials are best suited to address this issue. In the studies cited, their principal diary comparisons did not demonstrate a definite advantage for homeopathy over placebo.[7,8]

None of this diminishes the clinical importance of attentive listening. A detailed history, understandable explanation, and planned review benefit patient care in any therapeutic system. However, the value of these interactions cannot serve as indirect evidence for remedy efficacy. Patient experience should be respected while therapeutic claims remain proportionate to controlled findings.

Several limitations constrain this article. It is a selective narrative account, relies partly on older migraine studies, and does not add a systematic search, meta-analysis, or formal certainty grading. Its conclusions therefore apply to the evidence discussed rather than to every publication in the field. Even within that scope, the available findings are insufficient to justify substituting homeopathy for established migraine therapy. More robust trials would need to determine whether any clinically relevant effect exists and whether it can be reproduced.

Conclusion

Classical homeopathy manages migraine through an individualized history and comparison with traditional remedy pictures. The clinical studies considered in this review do not demonstrate a dependable benefit beyond placebo. Appropriate diagnosis, attention to daily routines, and access to evidence-based acute and preventive treatment should remain central to care. Patients who choose homeopathy should inform their clinicians, and its use must not postpone necessary treatment. Further investigation is justified only where rigorous controls, predefined outcomes, adequate follow-up, and complete safety reporting are built into the study design.

References

1. Headache Classification Committee of the International Headache Society (IHS). The International Classification of Headache Disorders, 3rd edition. Cephalalgia. 2018;38(1):1–211. doi:10.1177/0333102417738202.
2. Karlsson WK, Ostinelli EG, Zhuang ZA, Kokoti L, Christensen RH, Al-Khazali HM, et al. Comparative effects of drug interventions for the acute management of migraine episodes in adults: systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ. 2024;386:e080107. doi:10.1136/bmj-2024-080107.
3. Charles AC, Digre KB, Goadsby PJ, Robbins MS, Hershey A; American Headache Society. Calcitonin

gene-related peptide-targeting therapies are a first-line option for the prevention of migraine: an American Headache Society position statement update. *Headache*. 2024;64(4):333–341. doi:10.1111/head.14692.

4. National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health. Homeopathy: what you need to know [Internet]. Bethesda (MD): NCCIH; [cited 2026 Sep 22]. Available from: <https://www.nccih.nih.gov/health/homeopathy>

5. Hahnemann S. *Organon of medicine*. Aphorism 153, sixth edition [Internet]. In: The Organon, aphorisms 151–160. The School of Homeopathy; [cited 2026 Sep 22]. Available from: <https://www.homeopathyschool.com/the-school/editorial/the-organon/aphorism-151-160/>

6. Boericke W. Pocket manual of homoeopathic materia medica: comprising the characteristic and guiding symptoms of all remedies (clinical and pathogenetic). 9th ed. Philadelphia: Boericke & Runyon; 1927.

7. Whitmarsh TE, Coleston-Shields DM, Steiner TJ. Double-blind randomized placebo-controlled study of homoeopathic prophylaxis of migraine. *Cephalalgia*. 1997;17(5):600–604. doi:10.1046/j.1468-2982.1997.1705600.x.

8. Straumsheim P, Borchgrevink C, Mowinckel P, Kierulf H, Hafslund O. Homeopathic treatment of migraine: a double blind, placebo controlled trial of 68 patients. *Br Homeopath J*. 2000;89(1):4–7. doi:10.1054/homp.1999.0332.

9. Owen JM, Green BN. Homeopathic treatment of headaches: a systematic review of the literature. *J Chiropr Med*. 2004;3(2):45–52. doi:10.1016/S0899-3467(07)60085-8.

10. Herman PM, Crawford CC, Maglione MA, Newberry SJ, Amieux PS, Blyden-Taylor K, et al. The current state of the quality of homeopathic clinical research. *Complement Ther Med*. 2025;88:103108. doi:10.1016/j.ctim.2024.103108.

11. Bruijn NRA, Huessler EM, MaassenVanDenBrink A, Fronczek R, Diener HC, Ferrari MD, et al. Placebo response in acute and prophylactic treatment of migraine: a systematic review and meta-analysis covering 36 years of research. *Neurol Clin*. 2026;44(1):23–45. doi:10.1016/j.ncl.2025.08.011.

12. National Health Service. Migraine [Internet]. London: NHS; 2026 Mar 10 [cited 2026 Sep 22]. Available from: <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/migraine/>

13. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Headaches in over 12s: diagnosis and management. Clinical guideline CG150. Recommendations [Internet]. London: NICE; 2012 [cited 2026 Sep 22]. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg150/chapter/recommendations>

14. US Food and Drug Administration. Homeopathic products [Internet]. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; [cited 2026 Sep 22]. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/understanding-over-counter-medicines/homeopathic-products>