

# Plausibility bias (Letter to editor).

Jesús Aguilar Andrade.

Cita:

Jesús Aguilar Andrade (2022). *Plausibility bias (Letter to editor)*. *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine*, N/A, S/P-S/P.

Dirección estable: <https://www.aacademica.org/jesus.aguilar.andrade/8>

ARK: <https://n2t.net/ark:/13683/paSf/DFq>



Esta obra está bajo una licencia de Creative Commons.  
Para ver una copia de esta licencia, visite  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.es>.

*Acta Académica es un proyecto académico sin fines de lucro enmarcado en la iniciativa de acceso abierto. Acta Académica fue creado para facilitar a investigadores de todo el mundo el compartir su producción académica. Para crear un perfil gratuitamente o acceder a otros trabajos visite: <https://www.aacademica.org>.*

# BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine

Published on: 22 November 2022

## Plausibility bias

Jesús A Andrade, Student, Mexico. Independent.

The article by Gartlehner et al. [1] is interesting because it allows the homeopathic community to elaborate on potential publication bias in clinical trials of homeopathy. There are, however, several questionable elements: in the article, and in the announcement made on the BMJ web, it is concluded that there was a high proportion of trials not preregistered, but at the same time Gartlehner acknowledges in the press that over time there has been a substantial improvement in the preregistration of trials [2]; it is mentioned that homeopaths must improve, but at the same time it is implied that "homeopathy cannot work".

On the second point, it is worth mentioning that in the article Gartlehner et al cite two trials, one by Grimes [3] and the other by Grams [4]. These essays are based on a biased selection of literature and have elementary errors. For example, Grimes says that Jacques Benveniste's famous study was published in "1987" and that Madaleine Ennis' work was negative when in fact it was positive [5]. Grimes bases his conclusions on theoretical claims (a simple calculation of Avogadro's constant) and not on experimental studies that at the time were available (e.g. [6]). Grams, on the other hand, only cites some old articles from 1992 and 1993 without mentioning more recent studies (e.g. [7]).

### References:

1. Gartlehner G, Emprechtinger E, Hackl M, Gartlehner J, Nonninger J, et al. (2022). Assessing the magnitude of reporting bias in trials of homeopathy: a cross-sectional study and meta-analysis. *BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine*; 27(1): 1-20.
2. Doheny K. (2022). Homeopathy: do 'cherry-picked?' studies exaggerate benefits? WebMD. Available in: <https://www.webmd.com/balance/news/20220401/homeopathy-benefits-may-be-e...>
3. Grimes R. (2012). Proposed mechanisms for homeopathy are physically impossible. *Focus on Alternative and Complementary Therapies*; 17(3): 149-155.
4. Grams N. (2019). Homeopathy – where is the science? A current inventory on a pre-scientific artifact. *EMBO Reports*; 20(3): 1-50.
5. Belon P, Cumps J, Ennis M, Mannaioni P, Sainte J, et al. (1999). Inhibition of human basophil degranulation by successive histamine dilutions: results of a European multicentre trial. *Inflammation Research*; 48 (S1): 17–18.
6. Demangeat L. (2009). NMR water proton relaxation in unheated and heated ultrahigh aqueous dilutions of histamine: evidence for an air-dependent supramolecular organization of water. *Journal of Molecular Liquids*; 144(1): 32-39.
7. Laudy S & Belon P. (2009). Inhibition of basophil activation by histamine: a sensitive and reproducible model for the study of the biological activity of high dilutions. *Homeopathy*; 98(4): 186-197.

**Conflict of Interest:** None. I am not a homeopath, but I have researched the subject of homeopathy from a social and historical point of view.