



A CLINICAL APPROACH TO CASES SHOWING NO RESPONSE AFTER THE FIRST PRESCRIPTION IN HOMOEOPATHIC PRACTICE: A NARRATIVE REVIEW

Aravind Akshan G K¹, Nashath P², John Joseph M³

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Practice of Medicine, Government Homoeopathic Medical College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery, National Institute of Homoeopathy, Kolkata, West Bengal, India.

³Intern, Government Homoeopathic Medical College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India.

ARTICLE INFO:

Article History:

Received On: 28/08/2026

Accepted On: 25/09/2026

Published On: 29/09/2026

eISSN No: 3048-6270

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.59939/3048-6270.2026.v4.i3.5>

Website:

<https://www.homoeopathicchronicles.com/archives/volume-iv-issue-iii>

Keywords: No-response cases; remedy selection; potency: repetition of dose; Obstacles to cure; Intercurrent remedy; wait and watch approach; Homoeopathic case management;

ABSTRACT: Background - In homoeopathic clinical practice, the response following the first prescription plays a crucial role in determining the subsequent course of treatment. However, clinicians frequently encounter situations in which a patient reports no perceptible improvement after administration of a remedy that appears to be well indicated. Such cases are often referred to as “no-response” cases and present a significant challenge in clinical management³.

Objective - To review the possible causes of non-response following the first prescription in homoeopathic practice and to describe systematic approaches for evaluating and managing such cases.

Methods - A narrative review was developed using the classical homoeopathic works cited in this manuscript, including Hahnemann's Organon of Medicine, Kent's Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy, and standard texts addressing case analysis, posology, and the second prescription. The literature was selected for its direct relevance to non-response, remedy selection, potency, repetition, observation, and obstacles to cure which describes several possible explanations for an apparent lack of response, including incomplete case assessment, remedy mismatch, posological decisions, continuing exposures. The literature was analysed thematically under physician-related, patient-related and medicine-related factors. Three clinical illustrations were used to demonstrate the process of case reassessment and subsequent management.



INTRODUCTION

Homoeopathy is a therapeutic system based on the principle of **similia similibus curentur**, wherein a remedy capable of producing symptoms in a healthy individual is used to treat similar symptoms in a diseased state¹. The success of homoeopathic treatment depends largely on accurate case taking, correct evaluation of symptoms, and selection of the most appropriate remedy.

While the first prescription is based on the totality of symptoms presented by the patient, the **interpretation of the patient's response to that prescription** is equally important for guiding further treatment².

Among the various responses that may follow administration of a homoeopathic remedy—such as improvement, aggravation, partial amelioration, or alternation of symptoms—the complete absence of response presents a unique clinical challenge. A “no-response” case refers to a situation in which the patient experiences **no observable change in symptoms after the administration of a remedy within a reasonable period of observation**³.

Before classifying a case as non-responsive, the clinician should establish whether the presenting complaint represents a clinically significant disease, a transient or mild indisposition, or a symptom requiring urgent evaluation. Hahnemann discusses slight indispositions in §150 of the Organon¹. In present-day clinical practice, this distinction also requires assessment of duration, severity, functional impact, red flags, and the likely natural course⁴. A mild, self-limiting complaint should not automatically prompt another prescription, while serious or progressive symptoms require appropriate medical assessment.

This review article examines the possible causes of non-response in homoeopathic practice and outlines systematic approaches for analysing and managing such cases.

METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This study was conducted as a narrative review to explore the possible causes of non-response following the first prescription in homoeopathic practice and to examine the approaches described in classical and contemporary literature for the assessment and management of such cases.

Literature Search Strategy: Relevant literature was identified through consultation of standard classical homoeopathic textbooks. Keywords and combinations of terms included “non-



response,” “first prescription,” “second prescription,” “remedy selection,” “potency,” “repetition of dose,” “obstacles to cure,” “acute and chronic diseases,” and “intercurrent remedies,” in the context of homoeopathic practice.

Data Synthesis: The selected literature was analysed descriptively and organised into three principal categories: physician-related factors, patient-related obstacles to cure and medicine-related factors. The review also examined the assessment of non-response, posological considerations and management approaches described in the literature.

Clinical Illustrations: The Clinical illustrations presented in this review were derived from actual patient cases managed in the OPD of Government Homoeopathic Medical College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India. These cases were selected to demonstrate the application of case reassessment in situations where no improvement was reported following the initial prescription. The cases were organised according to baseline presentation, initial intervention, follow-up findings, reassessment and subsequent outcome. These illustrations are descriptive and are not intended to establish the causal efficacy of any particular remedy or management approach.

Causes of Failure of Remedy Action

The absence of response following administration of a homoeopathic remedy may arise from multiple causes³. These causes may be broadly categorised into physician-related factors, patient-related obstacles to cure, and medicine-related factors.

1. Physician-Related Factors

a. Defective Case Taking

Accurate case taking is the cornerstone of homoeopathic practice. If the physician fails to obtain a complete understanding of the patient’s symptoms, the remedy selected may not correspond to the totality of the case. Defective case taking may occur due to several reasons, including insufficient time spent with the patient, overemphasis on pathological diagnosis, or neglect of mental and general symptoms.

Boger emphasised that careful evaluation of the complete symptom totality is essential in selecting the correct remedy.⁵



b. Incorrect Selection of the Similimum

Even when case taking is adequate, the physician may select a remedy that does not correspond sufficiently to the totality of symptoms. This may occur when prescribing is based on a few prominent symptoms rather than the complete symptom picture.

Partial prescribing may provide temporary relief but often fails to produce sustained improvement. In such cases, the patient may report no change after the remedy is administered.

Allen emphasised that characteristic symptoms play an important role in differentiating remedies in clinical practice⁶

Potency and patient response: Classical authors discuss differing approaches to potency selection^{1,2,3}. Such descriptions should be reported as historical or theoretical posological guidance, not as validated dose-response relationships¹⁰. In particular, claims that a low potency cannot act in a patient with strong vitality or that a high potency cannot act in advanced pathology are not established clinical rules and should not be used as the sole basis for changing treatment.

- Evolution across Organon editions: The 5th edition discusses dose and repetition in relation to the disease course and the patient's response. The 6th edition further develops Hahnemann's approach to administration in water and modification of successive doses¹. The relevant sections commonly discussed in this context include §245–248, but wording and pagination vary by translation and edition. Authors should verify quotations and section references against the precise edition cited. In both editions, observation of the response is central to the decision to repeat or modify a dose.
- Accordingly, posological reassessment should be individualised and should not consist of automatic escalation or repetition^{1,2}. In contemporary clinical care, potency or repetition decisions must never delay indicated investigations, evidence-based treatment, or referral.

c. Improper Repetition of the Remedy

Another factor that may contribute to a lack of response is improper repetition of the remedy. Excessive repetition may disrupt the remedy's action, while insufficient repetition may fail to maintain the therapeutic stimulus². Hahnemann emphasised the importance of judicious repetition based on the response of the patient.



d. Patient-Related Factors: Obstacles to Cure

Hahnemann emphasised that the physician must not only prescribe the appropriate remedy but also identify and remove obstacles to cure¹. These obstacles may prevent the remedy from acting effectively.

e. Maintaining Causes

Maintaining causes, also known as **causa occasionalis**, refer to factors that perpetuate disease¹. These may include environmental exposures, occupational hazards, emotional stress, or unhealthy lifestyle habits. Unless these factors are addressed, the action of the remedy may remain limited.

For example, a patient with chronic gastritis who consumes excessive coffee may fail to respond to a remedy such as *Nux vomica* until the dietary habit is corrected.

f. Diet and Regimen

Certain substances are traditionally considered capable of interfering with the action of homoeopathic remedies. These include coffee, camphor, strong aromatic substances, and certain medicinal preparations¹. Although modern clinical experience varies regarding these substances, moderation and caution are generally advised.

g. Structural Pathology

In advanced pathological conditions involving extensive tissue destruction, the vitality of the organism may be significantly reduced². In such situations, the response to dynamic medicines may be limited³. The physician must evaluate whether the disease has progressed beyond the stage where a complete cure is possible.

2. Medicine-Related Factors

a. Deterioration of the Remedy

Homoeopathic remedies are sensitive preparations and may lose potency if exposed to unfavourable conditions such as heat, sunlight, or strong odours. Improper storage may lead to deterioration of the remedy and consequently reduce its effectiveness.

b. Quality of the Dispensing Medium

The vehicle used for dispensing remedies—such as alcohol or sugar globules—should be of good quality. Inferior dispensing media may compromise the stability and activity of the remedy.



Distinguishing True No-Response from Delayed Action

A patient may not immediately recognise small changes, particularly when symptoms fluctuate. Follow-up should therefore document the principal complaint, function, sleep, appetite, energy, quality of life, objective findings where available, and any adverse events or changes in other treatment. Improvement in general symptoms may be clinically relevant, but it should not be assumed to precede local improvement in every disease. General improvement often precedes improvement in local symptoms. If such changes are observed, the remedy may still be acting and should not be changed prematurely.

Hering described that improvement in chronic disease often follows a definite direction known as **Hering's law of cure**⁷

The “Wait and Watch” Approach

Acute versus chronic presentations:

In acute illness, the time course may be rapid and deterioration can occur over a short period. Reassessment should therefore be timely and proportionate to severity; urgent warning signs require immediate conventional medical evaluation and must not be managed by observation alone. In chronic illness, a longer observation interval may sometimes be reasonable when the condition is stable, but it should be defined in advance and supported by objective or patient-reported outcome measures. In chronic cases, deep-acting remedies may take several weeks to produce noticeable effects^{2,3}. Premature repetition or change of remedy may interfere with the natural course of the remedy's action².

Placebo and nonspecific effects:

Placebo controls are principally a research method for estimating effects beyond those associated with receiving an intervention; they do not establish an individual patient's baseline susceptibility. Symptom tracking and documentation of concurrent care can improve interpretation of follow-up.

Re-evaluation of the Case

If no improvement occurs after an adequate observation period, the physician should reconsider the case in its entirety. This includes reassessing the symptom totality, identifying and maintaining causes, and evaluating possible miasmatic influences^{2,3}.



Management Strategies

1. Removal of Obstacles to Cure

The first step in management is addressing factors that interfere with the action of the remedy. Patients should be advised regarding appropriate diet, lifestyle modification, and avoidance of substances that may hinder treatment¹.

2. Modification of Potency or Repetition

If the remedy appears correct but fails to act, the physician may consider adjusting the potency or dosing method^{2,3}. Increasing the potency or altering the mode of administration may sometimes stimulate the vital reaction.

3. Use of Intercurrent Remedies

In certain chronic cases, the action of the indicated remedy may be obstructed by underlying miasmatic influences. In such situations, an intercurrent remedy may be used to remove the block^{1,2,3}.

Commonly used intercurrent remedies include *Psorinum*, *Medorrhinum*, *Tuberculinum*, and *Syphilinum*. In some cases, remedies such as *Sulphur* or *Carbo vegetabilis* may help stimulate the vital reaction.

4. Fresh Case Taking

If the previous measures fail, the physician should consider taking the case afresh. Fresh case taking may reveal symptoms that were previously overlooked or may uncover new characteristics that guide the selection of a more appropriate remedy.

Clinical Illustrations

Case 1 – Non-response Associated with a Potential Maintaining Cause

Baseline presentation: A 35-year-old male presented to the Outpatient Department with a two-year history of chronic gastritis and acid reflux. The clinical history was also characterised by irritability, a sedentary lifestyle and a craving for stimulants. The persistence of gastrointestinal complaints prompted an individualised assessment of the patient's symptoms, lifestyle and possible maintaining factors.

Initial intervention: Nux vomica 200 C/ 1 dose was prescribed⁹.



Initial follow-up: At two weeks, the patient reported no improvement.

Reassessment: Further history identified consumption of six to seven cups of strong coffee daily.

Subsequent intervention and outcome: Coffee was identified as a maintaining cause. Coffee intake was reduced and Nux vomica 200C was repeated; improvement was reported within one week.

Clinical interpretation: This case illustrates the importance of reassessing lifestyle and environmental factors when a patient reports no improvement following the first prescription. The identification and modification of a potential maintaining cause formed an important part of the subsequent management. However, because the lifestyle modification and remedy repetition occurred together, the individual contribution of each intervention to the reported improvement cannot be determined.

Case 2 – Reassessment in the Context of a Suspected Tubercular Diathesis

Baseline presentation: A 12-year-old female presented with recurrent episodes of tonsillitis and enlarged tonsils. The history included frequent consumption of cold items, which was documented as part of the patient's lifestyle history. The recurrent nature of the complaints and the associated tonsillar enlargement prompted an individualised case assessment.

Initial intervention: Baryta carbonica 200 C/1 dose was prescribed⁶.

Initial follow-up: No improvement was reported after one month.

Reassessment: The family history was interpreted by the authors as suggestive of a tubercular diathesis.

Subsequent intervention and outcome: Tuberculinum 1M was administered as an intercurrent remedy, followed by Baryta carbonica 200C; gradual improvement was reported.

Clinical interpretation: This case demonstrates the role assigned to family history and miasmatic assessment in classical homoeopathic case analysis when the initial prescription is followed by no reported improvement. The subsequent prescription was based on the authors' interpretation of the case within this theoretical framework. The reported improvement following the subsequent intervention is a descriptive observation and does not independently establish the role of the intercurrent remedy or the proposed miasmatic influence.



Case 3 – Non-response Following Initial Remedy Selection and Subsequent Case Reassessment

Baseline presentation: A 45-year-old female presented with right-sided migraine. The initial consultation focused on the presenting headache and its laterality as a characteristic feature for remedy differentiation. Following the initial assessment, a remedy was selected based on the symptom information available at that time.

Initial intervention: *Sanguinaria canadensis* 200/1 dose was prescribed based on laterality⁸.

Initial follow-up: The patient reported no improvement after two weeks.

Reassessment: Further case taking recorded thermal chilliness, craving for sweets, and relief from warmth.

Subsequent intervention and outcome: *Silicea* 200C was prescribed on the revised symptom totality, after which marked improvement was reported.

Clinical interpretation: This case highlights the importance of obtaining a comprehensive symptom totality and reconsidering the initial remedy selection when no improvement is reported. It illustrates how additional individualising characteristics elicited during a fresh case assessment may influence subsequent remedy differentiation. Nevertheless, the reported improvement following the revised prescription is an individual clinical observation and cannot, by itself, establish the efficacy of the selected remedy.

DISCUSSION

The absence of perceived improvement after an initial prescription is a clinical observation, not by itself an explanation of why the patient has not improved. The first task is to verify the diagnosis, establish the expected natural history, assess severity and red flags, and review adherence, concurrent interventions, and possible adverse effects. In this respect, the manuscript's categories of physician-related, patient-related, and medicine-related factors provide a practical checklist, but they are an organising framework derived from homoeopathic literature rather than a validated classification of causes.

Classical authors such as Hahnemann and Kent emphasise careful case observation and caution in making a second prescription. Hahnemann's discussion of dose and repetition in § 245–248, particularly the later posological refinements in the 6th edition, provides the historical basis



for distinguishing observation from automatic repetition. These recommendations should be accurately attributed to the relevant edition and interpreted as classical homoeopathic doctrine; they do not, on their own, demonstrate comparative clinical efficacy¹⁰. Similarly, concepts such as miasmatic influence and intercurrent prescribing belong to the homoeopathic theoretical framework and should be presented as such, without implying that they are independently established biomedical mechanisms.

LIMITATIONS

This is a narrative review and does not provide a systematic or exhaustive assessment of the literature, a formal risk-of-bias analysis, or a quantitative estimate of treatment effects. The discussion of potency, repetition, miasms, and intercurrent remedies is largely based on classical homoeopathic sources. A future structured review, with a documented database search and critical appraisal of contemporary clinical evidence, would be required to assess the effectiveness and safety of specific approaches to non-response.

CONCLUSION

A lack of response following a homoeopathic prescription should prompt careful reassessment rather than immediate abandonment of the remedy. Systematic evaluation of physician-related factors, patient-related obstacles, and medicine-related issues is essential. Through careful analysis and adherence to classical homoeopathic principles, many cases that initially appear non-responsive can ultimately achieve favourable outcomes.

REFERENCES (VANCOUVER STYLE)

1. Hahnemann S. *Organon of Medicine*. 6th ed. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2013.
2. Kent JT. *Lectures on Homoeopathic Philosophy*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2004.
3. Roberts HA. *The Principles and Art of Cure by Homoeopathy*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2005.
4. Close S. *The Genius of Homoeopathy*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2001.
5. Boger CM. *Principles and Practice of Homoeopathy*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2002.



6. Allen HC. *Keynotes and Characteristics with Comparisons of Some of the Leading Remedies*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2003.
7. Hering C. *The Guiding Symptoms of Our Materia Medica*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2005.
8. Boericke W. *Pocket Manual of Homoeopathic Materia Medica*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2007.
9. Farrington EA. *Clinical Materia Medica*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2004.
10. Dunham C. *Homoeopathy: The Science of Therapeutics*. New Delhi: B Jain Publishers; 2001.

***Address for Correspondence:** Aravind Akshan G K, Assistant Professor, Department of Practice of Medicine, Government Homoeopathic Medical College, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, India.

Email: draravindakshanmd@gmail.com

This article is Open Accessible and licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](#). You are welcome to use this work non-commercially as long as author is credited by citing the work.



How to cite this Article: WILL BE UPDATED SOON.....