Swaziland Homeopathy Project ARV Study

Comparison of patient and practitioner evaluations for patients receiving homeopathic treatment compared with no treatment

Patient Scores

HIV+	ARVs				No ARVs		
	No. of patients	Average Score	std dev		No. of patients	Average Score	std dev
No Treatment	75	5.07	0.12		94	5.45	0.15
Homeopathic	30	7.33	0.23		31	7.13	0.25
Difference		2.27	0.04			1.67	0.05
		significant at 99.9% confidence levels				significant at 99.9% confidence levels	

t		52.06
effective df		18

highly significant: t for 18 df
0.001 probability = 3.922

99.9% confidence interval		2.27
+/-		0.17
range from		2.10
to		2.44

t		34.98
effective df		19

highly significant: t for 19 df,
0.001 probability = 3.883

99.9% confidence interval		1.67
+/-		0.19
range from		1.49
to		1.86

Practitioner Scores

HIV+	ARVs				No ARVs		
	No. of patients	Average Score	std dev		No. of patients	Average Score	std dev
No Treatment	75	5.07	0.12		99	5.21	0.15
Homeopathic	30	7.13	0.24		31	7.19	0.24
Difference		2.06	0.05			1.98	0.05
		significant at 99.9% confidence levels				significant at 99.9% confidence levels	

t		44.35
effective df		18

highly significant: t for 18 df
0.001 probability = 3.922

99.9% confidence interval		2.06
range from		0.18
to		1.88
		2.24

t		43.13
effective df		18

highly significant: t for 18 df
0.001 probability = 3.922

99.9% confidence interval		1.98
range from		0.18
to		1.80
		2.16

The results show that for all patients, whether scored by the patient or the practitioner, and whether on ARVs or not, there was a significant improvement in evaluations of health for patients receiving homeopathic treatment.

Comparison of average patient and practitioner evaluations for patients on ARVs compared to those not on ARVs

Patient Scores

HIV+	No Treatment				Treatment		
	No. of patients	Average Score	std dev		No. of patients	Average Score	std dev
ARVs	75	5.07	0.12		30	7.33	0.23
No ARVs	94	5.45	0.15		31	7.13	0.25
Difference		0.39	0.02			0.20	0.06
		significant at 99.9% confidence levels				significant at 99% confidence levels	

t		18.57
effective df		166

highly significant: t for 120 df,

t		3.34
effective df		50

significant: t for 40 df,

0.001 probability = 3.373				0.01 probability = 2.704		
99.9% confidence interval		0.39		99% confidence interval		0.20
+/-		0.07		+/-		0.17
range from		0.32		range from		0.04
to		0.46		to		0.37

Practitioner Scores

HIV+	No Treatment				Treatment		
	No. of patients	Average Score	std dev		No. of patients	Average Score	std dev
ARVs	75	5.07	0.12		30	7.13	0.24
No ARVs	99	5.21	0.15		31	7.19	0.24
Difference		0.15	0.02			0.06	0.06
	significant at 99.9% confidence levels				not significantly different		

t		7.07	t		1.04
effective df		186	effective df		62
highly significant: t for 120 df,			not significantly different: t for 60 df,		
0.001 probability = 3.373			0.05 probability = 2.000		
99.9% confidence interval		0.15	95% confidence interval		0.06
+/-		0.07	+/-		0.17
range from		0.08	range from		-0.10
to		0.21	to		0.23

The results show that for patients not receiving homeopathic treatment, there was a significant difference in the evaluation of their health comparing those patients on ARVs with those not on ARVs, those not on ARVs being healthier.

For those patients receiving homeopathic treatment, the patients' evaluation of their health indicated a significant difference between those on ARVs and those not on ARVs, with those on ARVs showing better health evaluations. This difference was not as marked as the comparison of those not receiving homeopathic treatment. When considering the practitioners' evaluations, this difference between those on ARVs and not on ARVs was not statistically significant.