Research Article

Global Journal of Clinical Trials

How to Conduct Robust Scientific Trials in Complementary and Alternative Medicine - Methodological Challenges and Solutions

Prof Rajeev Gupta. MBBS, MD, MRCP(UK), FRCPCH, MBA

Consultant Paediatrician National Health Services UK, Chairman Advisory Board, International Organisation of Integrated Health Practitioners

***Correspondence Author:**
Rajeev Gupta, Consultant Paediatrician National Health Services UK, Chairman Advisory Board, International Organisation of Integrated Health Practitioners.

Citation: Rajeev Gupta. How to Conduct Robust Scientific Trials in Complementary and Alternative Medicine - Methodological Challenges and Solutions. Glob J Clin Trials, 2026, 1(1), 01-07.

Received Date: 17 July 2026 **Accepted Date:** 25 July 2026 **Published Date:** 01 Aug 2026

Abstract

Complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) has experienced substantial global growth over recent decades, driven by increasing public interest in holistic healthcare, chronic disease management, patient empowerment, preventive medicine, and dissatisfaction with limitations of conventional biomedical approaches in certain chronic conditions. Despite widespread utilisation of interventions such as acupuncture, yoga, meditation, Ayurveda, herbal medicine, Tai Chi, chiropractic treatment, osteopathy, homeopathy, mindfulness-based therapies, naturopathy, and various mind-body interventions, scientific acceptance and integration into mainstream healthcare systems remain constrained by concerns regarding the quality, reproducibility, and methodological rigour of existing evidence. Conventional randomised controlled trial (RCT) methodologies were primarily developed for pharmaceutical interventions involving single active molecules delivered in standardised doses under highly controlled conditions. Many CAM interventions, however, are inherently complex, individualised, practitioner-dependent, multimodal, and context-sensitive, creating substantial methodological challenges when applying conventional biomedical research frameworks. Consequently, robust scientific evaluation of CAM requires methodological adaptation without compromising scientific validity or introducing bias. This article reviews the principles required for designing rigorous CAM trials, including study design, randomisation, control selection, blinding, outcome measures, placebo effects, standardisation, practitioner variability, statistical considerations, implementation science, health economics, systems biology approaches, pragmatic trial designs, real-world evidence generation, and emerging opportunities using artificial intelligence and digital health technologies. Adoption of these approaches may improve the quality of evidence available for CAM interventions and facilitate rational integration of evidence-based complementary therapies into modern healthcare systems.

Introduction

Healthcare systems worldwide face unprecedented challenges associated with ageing populations, increasing prevalence of chronic non-communicable diseases, multimorbidity, mental health disorders, obesity, chronic pain syndromes, social isolation, and escalating healthcare expenditure [1,2]. Conventional biomedical approaches have achieved remarkable success in acute illness, infectious disease control, trauma care, surgery, emergency medicine, and intensive care, yet often struggle with conditions characterised by behavioural, psychosocial, lifestyle, inflammatory, neuroendocrine, and environmental determinants [3]. Consequently, increasing numbers of patients seek complementary approaches including yoga, meditation, acupuncture, Ayurveda, herbal medicine, nutritional interventions, Tai Chi, and mind-body therapies to improve wellbeing and manage chronic symptoms [4].

The World Health Organization has recognised the importance of traditional and complementary medicine and has encouraged member states to develop evidence-informed policies regarding its integration into healthcare systems [5]. However, one of the principal barriers to integration remains the perceived weakness of the evidence base supporting many interventions. Critics frequently argue that CAM lacks robust evidence, while proponents

often argue that conventional research methodologies are poorly suited to evaluating complex holistic interventions. Both perspectives contain elements of truth. The challenge for modern healthcare research is therefore not whether CAM should be studied scientifically, but rather how it can be studied scientifically in ways that preserve methodological rigour while respecting the complexity and individualisation of these interventions [6].

The Randomised Controlled Trial as the Gold Standard - Randomised controlled trials remain the most powerful method for determining causal relationships between interventions and outcomes because randomisation minimises selection bias, balances known and unknown confounding variables, and allows estimation of treatment effects with high internal validity [7]. Pharmaceutical trials generally involve a single intervention, a clearly defined mechanism of action, fixed dosing schedules, and relatively objective outcomes such as blood pressure, mortality, or biochemical markers.

Complementary medicine interventions frequently differ substantially from this model. Yoga programmes may include physical postures, breathing exercises, meditation, philosophical education, behavioural modification, dietary advice, social support, and practitioner interaction simultaneously. Ayurvedic treatment often involves personalised assessment of constitution, dietary interventions, lifestyle advice, herbal medicines, detoxification therapies, and behavioural recommendations that vary between individuals. Acupuncture outcomes may depend upon practitioner expertise, therapeutic alliance, treatment environment, patient expectations, and treatment individualisation [8]. Consequently, attempts to reduce these interventions to a single isolated component may unintentionally remove important therapeutic mechanisms and underestimate effectiveness.

Defining the Research Question - Robust CAM research begins with a precise and clinically relevant research question. Investigators should clearly define whether the objective is efficacy testing, effectiveness testing, mechanistic understanding, cost-effectiveness analysis, implementation evaluation, or comparative effectiveness assessment [9].

Efficacy trials ask whether an intervention works under ideal conditions. Effectiveness trials examine whether interventions work in routine clinical practice. Mechanistic studies seek to understand biological pathways, while implementation studies examine scalability and feasibility. Confusion between these objectives frequently contributes to poorly designed CAM studies. For example, a tightly controlled efficacy trial of yoga in hypertension may not accurately reflect how yoga is delivered in real-world community settings, whereas a pragmatic community trial may provide excellent information regarding effectiveness but less insight into underlying mechanisms.

Choosing Appropriate Study Designs - Although parallel-group randomised controlled trials remain the standard approach, alternative designs may be more suitable for CAM interventions depending upon the research question [10].

Pragmatic trials evaluate interventions under real-world clinical conditions and are particularly useful for therapies such as yoga, acupuncture, and integrative medicine clinics. Cluster randomised trials may randomise healthcare centres or communities rather than individual patients, reducing contamination effects. Factorial designs allow simultaneous evaluation of multiple interventions such as diet and yoga programmes. Adaptive trials permit protocol modification based upon interim findings, increasing efficiency and reducing participant burden.

Stepped wedge designs are particularly useful when interventions are expected to provide benefit and withholding treatment may raise ethical concerns. In such studies all participants eventually receive the intervention, but implementation occurs in a randomised sequence across groups. N-of-1 trials may be valuable for highly personalised therapies where individual response variability is substantial.

Randomisation - Randomisation remains fundamental to reducing bias in CAM research [11]. Simple randomisation may be adequate in large studies but can produce imbalance in smaller trials. Block randomisation improves group balance, while stratified randomisation ensures equal distribution of important variables such as age, sex, disease severity, medication use, socioeconomic status, and baseline health behaviours.

Allocation concealment is equally important. Investigators responsible for recruitment should remain unaware of upcoming allocations to prevent conscious or unconscious manipulation of enrolment decisions. Centralised computer-generated randomisation systems remain preferable to envelope-based methods that may be vulnerable to tampering or prediction.

Selection of Control Groups - Control selection represents one of the greatest methodological challenges in CAM research [12]. Pharmaceutical placebo tablets are relatively straightforward to construct, whereas credible placebo equivalents for acupuncture, yoga, meditation, chiropractic manipulation, or massage are considerably more difficult.

Potential controls include waiting list controls, usual care controls, attention controls, active comparator interventions, sham procedures, and minimal intervention controls. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages. Waiting list controls may overestimate treatment effects because participants receive no intervention and expectations differ markedly between groups. Usual care controls reflect real-world practice but cannot distinguish specific from non-specific effects. Sham acupuncture controls may inadvertently stimulate physiological responses and therefore underestimate true treatment effects.

The choice of control should depend upon the research question. If policymakers wish to know whether yoga plus standard care is superior to standard care alone, usual care controls may be entirely appropriate. If researchers wish to determine whether acupuncture needles exert effects beyond contextual therapeutic factors, sham controls may be necessary.

Blinding - Blinding reduces performance and detection bias and remains a cornerstone of robust clinical research [13]. Double blinding is straightforward in pharmaceutical trials but frequently impossible in CAM interventions where practitioners and patients are aware of treatment allocation.

Nevertheless, partial blinding strategies can improve methodological quality. Outcome assessors, statisticians, laboratory personnel, imaging specialists, and adjudication committees should remain blinded wherever possible. Participant expectations should be measured because expectation itself may influence outcomes through neurobiological placebo pathways involving dopamine, endogenous opioids, serotonin, and reward circuitry [14].

Placebo Effects and Contextual Healing

Placebo effects should not be viewed simply as nuisance variables but rather as important components of therapeutic response [15]. Emerging neuroscience demonstrates that expectations, therapeutic rituals, practitioner empathy, trust, social interaction, and treatment environments produce measurable physiological effects involving endogenous opioids, oxytocin release, dopamine signalling, stress reduction, immune modulation, and autonomic regulation.

Many CAM interventions intentionally harness these mechanisms through prolonged consultations, holistic assessment, compassionate communication, and active patient engagement. Robust research should therefore distinguish between specific treatment effects and contextual therapeutic effects while recognising that both contribute to patient outcomes.

Standardisation Versus Individualisation - One of the greatest tensions in CAM research lies between standardisation and individualisation [16]. Pharmaceutical trials favour rigid treatment protocols to minimise variability. Traditional systems such as Ayurveda and traditional Chinese medicine prioritise personalised treatment based upon constitutional assessment and pattern recognition.

A practical compromise involves semi-standardised protocols. Core interventions are delivered to all participants while allowing predefined individual modifications according to explicit rules. This approach preserves ecological validity while maintaining sufficient standardisation for reproducibility.

Practitioner Effects - Practitioner expertise can substantially influence treatment outcomes in many CAM interventions [17]. Differences in experience, communication skills, empathy, technical competence, and therapeutic style may explain a significant proportion of outcome variability. Trials should therefore document practitioner qualifications, years of experience, certification status, treatment fidelity, adherence to protocols, and inter-practitioner variability. Statistical models may include practitioner clustering effects to account for these influences.

Selection of Outcome Measures - Selection of outcome measures should reflect both biomedical and patient-centred perspectives [18]. Reliance solely upon biochemical markers may fail to capture clinically meaningful improvements in quality of life, wellbeing, resilience, coping ability, sleep quality, emotional functioning, or social participation.

Robust CAM trials should ideally include multiple domains including objective biomarkers, clinical outcomes, patient-reported outcomes, functional measures, health-related quality of life indices, healthcare utilisation data, and economic outcomes. Examples include blood pressure, inflammatory biomarkers, medication reduction, hospital admissions, absenteeism, physical functioning scores, mental health questionnaires, and patient satisfaction measures.

Biomarkers and Mechanistic Studies - Mechanistic understanding strengthens scientific credibility and facilitates acceptance among biomedical communities [19]. Increasing evidence suggests that CAM interventions influence inflammatory pathways, autonomic function, neuroplasticity, stress hormones, immune regulation, epigenetic mechanisms, mitochondrial function, oxidative stress, and microbiome composition.

Future studies should incorporate biomarker panels including cortisol, heart rate variability, cytokines, inflammatory markers, metabolomics, microbiome analyses, neuroimaging, gene expression studies, and epigenetic profiling to better understand biological mechanisms underlying clinical improvements.

Sample Size and Statistical Power - Many CAM studies suffer from inadequate sample sizes and insufficient statistical power [20]. Underpowered studies increase risks of false negative findings and exaggerated effect estimates.

Sample size calculations should be performed prospectively using clinically meaningful effect sizes, anticipated dropout rates, and appropriate significance thresholds. Multi-centre collaboration may be required to recruit sufficient participant numbers and improve generalisability.

Handling Missing Data - Attrition represents a major challenge in long-duration lifestyle interventions including yoga and meditation programmes [21]. Participants may discontinue because of illness, travel, time pressures, or reduced motivation. Robust statistical approaches such as multiple imputation and mixed-effects modelling should replace simplistic complete-case analyses that introduce bias. Intention-to-treat analysis remains essential because it

preserves benefits of randomisation.

Health Economic Evaluation - Healthcare systems increasingly require evidence of value rather than efficacy alone [22]. Economic evaluations should therefore accompany major CAM trials and include direct healthcare costs, medication use, hospital admissions, outpatient attendance, productivity losses, work absenteeism, and quality-adjusted life years.

Cost-effectiveness analyses are particularly important for community-based interventions such as yoga programmes, mindfulness training, and integrative health coaching that may produce relatively small improvements across large populations.

Implementation Science - Even highly effective interventions fail if they cannot be implemented at scale [23]. Implementation science examines barriers, facilitators, training requirements, stakeholder engagement, organisational culture, reimbursement structures, and sustainability. Hybrid effectiveness-implementation trials represent an important future direction because they evaluate clinical outcomes and implementation processes simultaneously.

Artificial Intelligence and Digital Technologies

Artificial intelligence offers substantial opportunities for improving CAM research quality [24]. Machine learning algorithms can identify responder subgroups, optimise intervention personalisation, detect early treatment signals, analyse complex multidimensional datasets, and improve predictive modelling. Wearable technologies enable continuous monitoring of physical activity, sleep quality, heart rate variability, stress responses, and physiological outcomes. Digital phenotyping may provide objective behavioural measurements that complement traditional questionnaires and clinical assessments.

Systems Biology and Whole Systems Research - Reductionist biomedical models may inadequately capture the complexity of holistic interventions [25]. Whole systems research examines interactions between biological, psychological, social, behavioural, environmental, and spiritual dimensions of health simultaneously. Systems biology approaches incorporating network analysis, computational modelling, metabolomics, proteomics, and machine learning may provide more appropriate frameworks for understanding multimodal interventions that act through multiple interacting pathways.

Robust Scientific Trials in Yoga Research - Yoga represents one of the most challenging interventions to study using conventional biomedical methodologies because it is inherently a complex, multidimensional intervention involving simultaneous effects on physical activity, flexibility, muscle strength, autonomic nervous system regulation, respiratory physiology, mindfulness, stress reduction, emotional regulation, sleep quality, social interaction, behavioural modification, self-efficacy, and spiritual wellbeing [26]. Unlike a pharmaceutical intervention involving administration of a single chemical compound, yoga interventions involve multiple interacting therapeutic components that may exert synergistic effects through numerous biological pathways simultaneously.

The first requirement for robust yoga research is precise intervention specification. Investigators should clearly describe the style of yoga employed, including whether the intervention involves Hatha Yoga, Iyengar Yoga, Ashtanga Yoga, Vinyasa Yoga, Kundalini Yoga, therapeutic yoga, chair yoga, or integrated yoga programmes. The frequency, duration, intensity, instructor qualifications, sequence of postures, breathing techniques, meditation practices, and home practice requirements should be reported in sufficient detail to permit replication by other researchers [27].

The second major challenge involves control selection. Comparison with no intervention frequently exaggerates treatment effects because participants receive substantial attention, group interaction, and behavioural support within yoga programmes. Appropriate control groups may include stretching programmes, walking interventions, educational programmes, physiotherapy, relaxation training, or active exercise programmes with similar contact time. Such comparisons allow investigators to determine whether benefits derive from physical exercise alone or from specific components unique to yoga practice [28].

Objective biomarkers may substantially strengthen yoga trials. Heart rate variability provides information regarding autonomic balance and vagal tone. Salivary cortisol may reflect hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis regulation. Functional magnetic resonance imaging can evaluate neuroplastic changes in brain networks involved in emotional regulation and attention. Inflammatory markers including interleukin-6, tumour necrosis factor alpha, and C-reactive protein provide insight into immunological mechanisms [29].

Methodological Issues in Acupuncture Trials - Acupuncture research has generated some of the most sophisticated methodological debates within CAM research because the design of placebo or sham controls is particularly problematic [30]. Traditional sham needles that do not penetrate the skin may nevertheless stimulate mechanoreceptors and produce physiological responses through tactile stimulation, expectation effects, and neurobiological placebo mechanisms. Consequently, sham acupuncture may not represent an inert placebo equivalent in the same manner as placebo tablets in pharmaceutical trials.

Modern acupuncture trials increasingly employ three-arm designs involving true acupuncture, sham acupuncture, and usual care groups. Such designs allow investigators to

estimate both specific physiological effects and contextual therapeutic effects. Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated that acupuncture may activate brain regions involved in pain processing, emotional regulation, autonomic control, and reward pathways, thereby providing mechanistic plausibility for observed clinical outcomes [31].

Practitioner variability is particularly important in acupuncture research because outcomes may depend upon needle depth, needle manipulation, duration of stimulation, point selection, treatment frequency, diagnostic framework, and practitioner expertise. Trials should therefore carefully document practitioner qualifications, years of experience, training pathways, and adherence to treatment protocols [32].

Scientific Evaluation of Ayurvedic Medicine - Ayurveda presents unique challenges for scientific evaluation because diagnosis and treatment are fundamentally individualised and based upon concepts including dosha balance, prakriti constitution, agni function, ama accumulation, and disease progression through multiple pathological stages [33]. Conventional biomedical methodologies often seek standardised interventions delivered identically to all participants, whereas Ayurvedic clinical practice emphasises personalised treatment plans that may differ considerably between individuals presenting with apparently similar biomedical diagnoses.

One possible methodological solution involves stratified pragmatic trial designs in which participants undergo conventional biomedical diagnosis together with Ayurvedic assessment. Treatment is then individualised according to predefined Ayurvedic protocols while maintaining transparency regarding treatment selection algorithms. Statistical analysis can subsequently evaluate both overall effectiveness and subgroup responses according to constitutional categories [34].

Herbal medicine studies require particular attention to quality control because variations in cultivation methods, geographical origin, harvesting techniques, extraction procedures, storage conditions, contamination, adulteration, and standardisation of active compounds may substantially influence biological activity. Robust herbal medicine trials should include phytochemical characterisation, contaminant screening, Good Manufacturing Practice certification, and batch consistency analyses [35].

Homeopathy Research Methodology - Homeopathy remains one of the most controversial areas within complementary medicine research because proposed mechanisms remain difficult to reconcile with contemporary pharmacological understanding [36]. Nevertheless, scientific evaluation should remain independent of theoretical plausibility and should instead focus upon reproducible empirical outcomes.

Double-blind placebo-controlled trials remain technically feasible in homeopathy because active remedies and placebo preparations can be manufactured with identical appearance and administration schedules. However, individualisation remains a challenge because homeopathic treatment frequently involves lengthy consultations and highly personalised remedy selection. Pragmatic effectiveness studies comparing individualised homeopathy plus usual care against usual care alone may therefore provide useful information regarding clinical outcomes irrespective of mechanistic debates [37].

Dietary and Nutritional Intervention Trials - Dietary interventions represent another important area of integrative medicine research but are associated with significant methodological challenges due to poor adherence, contamination between groups, recall bias, and difficulties in blinding participants [38]. Long-term dietary adherence should be objectively monitored using food diaries, digital applications, biomarkers, metabolomics, microbiome profiling, and wearable technologies where possible.

Cluster randomised designs involving schools, workplaces, communities, or healthcare practices may improve adherence and reduce contamination. Emerging digital nutritional monitoring technologies may significantly improve future dietary research quality by reducing reliance upon self-reported dietary intake measures [39].

Mixed Methods Research - Many important outcomes associated with CAM interventions may not be adequately captured through quantitative methodologies alone. Improvements in resilience, self-awareness, spiritual wellbeing, coping ability, emotional regulation, self-efficacy, meaning, purpose, and patient empowerment frequently emerge during qualitative interviews despite limited changes in conventional clinical outcome measures [40].

Mixed methods studies combining quantitative clinical outcomes with qualitative interviews may therefore provide a more complete understanding of intervention effects. Such approaches align particularly well with patient-centred healthcare models and may help explain mechanisms underlying observed behavioural and physiological changes [41].

Real-World Evidence and Learning Health Systems - Healthcare systems increasingly recognise the importance of real-world evidence alongside traditional randomised trials [42]. Electronic health records, wearable devices, mobile applications, patient portals, and digital health platforms generate enormous quantities of observational data that may complement conventional clinical trials.

Learning health systems continuously collect outcome data, analyse effectiveness, identify responder characteristics, and adapt treatment recommendations in near real time. Such approaches may prove particularly

valuable for highly personalised interventions where response heterogeneity is substantial [43].

Artificial Intelligence and Precision Integrative Medicine - Artificial intelligence may fundamentally transform future CAM research by enabling precision integrative medicine approaches [44]. Machine learning algorithms can identify patient subgroups most likely to respond to particular interventions based upon demographic characteristics, genetics, metabolomics, microbiome composition, behavioural patterns, psychological profiles, and social determinants of health.

Future adaptive trials may involve continuous optimisation of intervention combinations involving pharmaceuticals, exercise, yoga, nutrition, mindfulness training, and behavioural interventions according to individual response trajectories. Such approaches move beyond conventional one-size-fits-all healthcare models towards personalised systems medicine [45].

Reporting Standards for Complementary Medicine Trials - Poor reporting quality remains a significant limitation within CAM research literature [46]. Investigators should adhere to established reporting frameworks including CONSORT guidelines for randomised controlled trials, CONSORT extensions for non-pharmacological interventions, STRICTA guidelines for acupuncture studies, and TIDieR guidelines for intervention description and replication.

Transparent reporting should include intervention details, practitioner qualifications, treatment fidelity assessment, adverse events, adherence rates, participant expectations, co-interventions, protocol deviations, and statistical analysis plans. Pre-registration of protocols and publication of negative findings are equally important for reducing publication bias [47].

Regulatory and Ethical Considerations - Ethical standards for CAM trials should be identical to those applied in conventional medical research [48]. Participants should receive clear information regarding expected benefits, uncertainties, potential risks, alternative treatment options, and available evidence supporting interventions under investigation.

Safety monitoring is particularly important for herbal medicine studies because herb-drug interactions may occur through effects upon cytochrome P450 enzymes, coagulation pathways, cardiovascular physiology, glucose metabolism, or immune function. Independent data monitoring committees may be appropriate for large-scale trials involving vulnerable populations or higher-risk interventions [49].

Future Directions in Integrative Medicine Research - The future of CAM research is likely to move beyond simplistic debates regarding whether interventions "work" and instead focus upon identifying which interventions work, for whom they work, under what circumstances they work, through which mechanisms they work, and whether they provide value for healthcare systems and society [50]. Such an approach aligns closely with the principles of precision medicine, systems biology, implementation science, behavioural medicine, and population health. The ultimate objective should not be the defence or criticism of any particular healthcare philosophy but rather the generation of robust, reproducible, transparent, and clinically meaningful evidence capable of improving patient outcomes and informing healthcare policy decisions.

Conclusion

Robust scientific evaluation of complementary and alternative medicine is both possible and essential for the future development of evidence-based integrative healthcare. The central challenge is not whether scientific methods should be applied to CAM, but rather how they can be adapted to account for complexity, individualisation, practitioner variability, and contextual healing without sacrificing methodological rigour. High-quality randomised trials, pragmatic effectiveness studies, mechanistic investigations, implementation research, health economic evaluations, and systems biology approaches all have important roles to play. Future CAM research should embrace methodological pluralism while maintaining the highest standards of transparency, reproducibility, statistical integrity, and scientific objectivity. By combining rigorous science with an appreciation of complexity, researchers can generate evidence capable of informing clinical practice, guiding policy decisions, and supporting rational integration of effective complementary therapies into modern healthcare systems.

References

1. World Health Organization. Global status report on noncommunicable diseases. Geneva: WHO; 2022.
2. Bloom DE, Cafiero ET, Jané-Llopis E, et al. The global economic burden of non-communicable diseases. Geneva: World Economic Forum; 2011.
3. Bodenheimer T, Wagner EH, Grumbach K. Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness. JAMA. 2002;288:1775-1779.
4. Clarke TC, Black LI, Stussman BJ, Barnes PM, Nahin RL. Trends in the use of complementary health approaches among adults in the United States. Nat Health Stat Report. 2015;79:1-16.
5. World Health Organization. WHO Traditional Medicine Strategy 2014–2023. Geneva: WHO; 2013.
6. Verhoef MJ, Lewith G, Ritenbaugh C, et al. Whole systems research in complementary and alternative medicine. J Altern Complement Med. 2005;11:S3-S12.
7. Friedman LM, Furberg CD, DeMets DL. Fundamentals of Clinical Trials. 5th ed. New York: Springer; 2015.
8. Patwardhan B, Vaidya ADB, Chorghade M. Ayurveda and natural products drug discovery. Curr Sci. 2004;86:789-799.
9. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, et al. Developing and evaluating complex interventions. BMJ. 2008;337:a1655.
10. Zwarenstein M, Treweek S, Gagnier JJ, et al. Improving the

reporting of pragmatic trials. BMJ. 2008;337:a2390.
11. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 Statement. BMJ. 2010;340:c332.
12. Linde K, Niemann K, Schneider A, Meissner K. How large are the nonspecific effects of sham treatments? BMC Med. 2010;8:75.
13. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. 2nd ed. Wiley; 2019.
14. Benedetti F. Placebo Effects: Understanding the Mechanisms in Health and Disease. Oxford University Press; 2014.
15. Finniss DG, Kaptchuk TJ, Miller F, Benedetti F. Biological, clinical and ethical advances of placebo effects. Lancet. 2010;375:686-695.
16. Ritenbaugh C, Verhoef M, Fleishman S, et al. Whole systems research and CAM. Altern Ther Health Med. 2003;9:48-57.
17. Kelley JM, Kraft-Todd G, Schapira L, Kossowsky J, Riess H. The influence of the patient-clinician relationship on healthcare outcomes. PLoS One. 2014;9:e94207.
18. Patrick DL, Burke LB, Gwaltney CJ, et al. Content validity in patient-reported outcomes. Value Health. 2011;14:967-977.
19. Irwin MR, Olmstead R. Mitigating cellular inflammation in older adults. Brain Behav Immun. 2012;26:1045-1049.
20. Julious SA. Sample Sizes for Clinical Trials. CRC Press; 2009.
21. Little RJA, Rubin DB. Statistical Analysis with Missing Data. 3rd ed. Wiley; 2019.
22. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, et al. Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes. Oxford University Press; 2015.
23. Proctor EK, Landsverk J, Aarons G, et al. Implementation research in mental health services. Adm Policy Ment Health. 2009;36:24-34.
24. Topol EJ. Deep Medicine: How Artificial Intelligence Can Make Healthcare Human Again. Basic Books; 2019.
25. Hood L, Friend SH. Predictive, preventive, personalised and participatory medicine. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2011;8:184-187.
26. Sherman KJ. Guidelines for developing yoga interventions for randomized trials. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med. 2012;2012:143271.
27. Ward L, Stebbings S, Sherman KJ, et al. Challenges in yoga research methodology. Complement Ther Med. 2014;22:847-853.
28. Cramer H, Lauche R, Langhorst J, Dobos G. Yoga for chronic diseases: systematic review and meta-analysis. Mayo Clin Proc. 2013;88:1182-1191.
29. Pascoe MC, Bauer IE. A systematic review of randomised control trials on the effects of yoga on stress measures and mood. J Psychiatr Res. 2015;68:270-282.
30. MacPherson H, Altman DG, Hammerschlag R, et al. Revised Standards for Reporting Interventions in Clinical Trials of Acupuncture (STRICTA). PLoS Med. 2010;7:e1000261.
31. Napadow V, Kettner N, Liu J, et al. Hypothalamus and amygdala response to acupuncture. Hum Brain Mapp. 2007;28:157-171.
32. White A, Cummings M, Filshie J. An Introduction to Western Medical Acupuncture. Elsevier; 2018.
33. Patwardhan B, Mashelkar RA. Traditional medicine-inspired approaches to drug discovery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2009;8:803-811.
34. Narahari SR, Aggithaya MG, Suraj KR. Integrative Ayurveda clinical research methodology. J Ayurveda Integr Med. 2010;1:91-95.
35. Bent S. Herbal medicine in the United States: review of efficacy and safety. J Gen Intern Med. 2008;23:854-859.
36. Shang A, Huwiler-Müntener K, Nartey L, et al. Are the clinical effects of homoeopathy placebo effects? Lancet. 2005;366:726-732.
37. Mathie RT, Lloyd SM, Legg LA, et al. Randomised placebo-controlled trials of individualised homeopathic treatment. Syst Rev. 2014;3:142.
38. Satija A, Hu FB. Cardiovascular benefits of dietary interventions. Circulation Research. 2018;123:779-798.
39. Subar AF, Kirkpatrick SI, Mittl B, et al. The Automated Self-Administered 24-hour Dietary Recall. Am J Epidemiol. 2012;176:991-998.
40. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. Sage Publications; 2018.
41. Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods research. Health Serv Res. 2013;48:2134-2156.
42. Sherman RE, Anderson SA, Dal Pan GJ, et al. Real-world evidence in medical product development. N Engl J Med. 2016;375:2293-2297.
43. Friedman CP, Rubin JC, Sullivan KJ. Toward an information infrastructure for global health improvement. Yearb Med Inform. 2017;26:16-23.
44. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: convergence of artificial intelligence and human intelligence. Nat Med. 2019;25:44-56.
45. Hood L, Flores M. A personal view on systems medicine and predictive healthcare. EPMA J. 2012;3:6.
46. Boutron I, Moher D, Altman DG, et al. Extending the CONSORT statement to non-pharmacologic treatment interventions. Ann Intern Med. 2008;148:295-309.
47. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, et al. Better reporting of interventions using the TIDieR checklist. BMJ. 2014;348:g1687.
48. World Medical Association. Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. JAMA. 2013;310:2191-2194.
49. Izzo AA, Ernst E. Interactions between herbal medicines and prescribed drugs. Drugs. 2009;69:1777-1798.
50. Greenhalgh T, Papoutsi C. Studying complexity in health services research. BMC Med. 2018;16:95.