

Johannes Fleckenstein

Wissenschaftszentrum, Deutsche Ärztesgesellschaft für Akupunktur, München, Deutschland

Gemeinsame Stellungnahme führender Fachgesellschaften für Akupunktur und TCM im DACH-Raum zur BMJ-Debatte über die WHO-Strategie

Originalpublikation

Philips CA, Caulfield T, de Jong C et al. (2026) WHO's misguided push for complementary and alternative medicine. *BMJ* 393:e100062. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2026-100062>.

Das Editorial von Philips et al. im *British Medical Journal* [BMJ]; [7] übt scharfe Kritik an der *Global Traditional Medicine Strategy 2025–2034* der Weltgesundheitsorganisation WHO. Die Autoren argumentieren, die Strategie senke wissenschaftliche Standards, indem sie Beobachtungs- und Real-World-Daten legitimiere, anstatt strikt randomisiert kontrollierte Studien (RCTs) vorzusetzen. Zudem warnen sie vor Patientenschäden – primär toxischen Leberschäden (HILI) durch unregulierte pflanzliche Präparate – sowie vor einer Verdrängung evidenzbasierter Therapien und politisch motivierter Instrumentalisierung.

Die zahlreichen Reaktionen internationaler Wissenschaftler und Fachgesellschaften widersprechen dieser pauschalen Verurteilung vehement, auf der Homepage von BMJ sind 26 sogenannte Rapid Responses zum Thema nachzulesen [15]. Die Reaktionen fordern Methodenpluralismus, strikte Qualitäts- und Sicherheitsregulierung sowie differenzierte wissenschaftliche Evaluierung, anstatt traditionelle und integrative Medizinsysteme pauschal als unbewiesen abzuwerten oder unregulierte Marktprodukte mit ärztlich geführter Praxis gleichzusetzen.

Leider wurde eine gemeinsame, von den führenden Fachgesellschaften für Akupunktur und TCM im DACH-Raum (Deutschland[D]-Österreich[A]-Schweiz[CH]) initiierte Antwort nicht als Rapid Response angenommen. Sie können diese nun im Originalwortlaut in der *Deutschen Zeitschrift für Akupunktur* nachlesen.

Re: WHO's misguided push for complementary and alternative medicine

We read with great interest the Editorial by Philips et al. [7] regarding the World Health Organization's (WHO) *Global Traditional Medicine Strategy 2025–2034*. While we share the authors' unwavering commitment to patient safety, rigorous scientific standards, and the mitigation of health misinformation, we contend that their broad sweeping critique conflates unregulated lay practices with evidence-based, medically supervised integrative medicine.

The authors rightly highlight severe risks associated with unverified herbal products, adulteration, and hepatotoxicity. However, framing complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) as a monolithic entity of "unproved interventions" obscures decades of high-level clinical research. Physician-provided interventions—such as medical acupuncture—possess a robust, continuously expanding body of evidence. Meta-analyses involving tens of thousands of patients confirm that acupuncture is significantly more effective than both sham acupuncture and the usual care for chronic pain conditions [10] or, for example, post-operative nausea and vomiting [5], exhibiting long-term sustained treatment effects [8, 10]. Based on this high-level evidence, such modalities have long been incorporated into national clinical practice guidelines and standard healthcare delivery (e.g., the NICE guideline on low back pain and sciatica in over 16s [14] or the Society for Ambulatory Anesthesia guidelines for the management of post-operative nausea and vomiting [2]).

Furthermore, the editorial's focus on uncertified over-the-counter botanicals overlooks established national safety frameworks designed precisely to address these vulnerabilities. In countries such as Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, Chinese herbal therapy (CHT) operates within strict statutory quality controls: raw drug materials undergo mandatory pharmaceutical testing for heavy metals, pesticides, and contaminants prior to pharmacy dispensing. Moreover, national monitoring networks like the Center for Safety of Chinese Herbal Medicine (CTCA) actively track and analyze adverse drug reactions, demonstrating that professional, physician-led prescribing yields a high margin of safety [11]. In contrast to the numerous cases of herb-induced liver injury (HILI) associated with uncertified dietary supplements, only two deaths in Europe have been reported since the 1990s in association with quality-assured Chinese herbal medicines [3, 9].

Deutsche Zeitschrift für Akupunktur
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s42212-026-00854-w>

Eingegangen: 6. September 2026

Angenommen: 24. September 2026

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Medizin Verlag GmbH, ein Teil von Springer Nature 2026

Liste der Unterzeichner

Center for Safety of Chinese Herbal Medicine (CTCA – Centrum für Therapiesicherheit in der Chinesischen Arzneitherapie) – Yumiko von Hasselbach, Axel Wiebrecht, Nina Zhao-Seiler

International Society for Chinese Medicine (Societas Medicinae Sinensis, Internationale Gesellschaft für Chinesische Medizin e. V. (SMS)) – Moritz Hempfen, Yumiko von Hasselbach

Berufsverband Deutscher Akupunkturärzte e. V. (BA) – Oskar Schmid

German Medical Acupuncture Society (Deutsche Ärztgesellschaft für Akupunktur e. V. (DÄGfA)) – Sabine Schierl, Andreas Woschke, Kevin Hua, Axel Wiebrecht, Oskar Schmid, Johannes Fleckenstein

Scientific Chapter of the DÄGfA (Wissenschaftszentrum DÄGfA) – Andreas Woschke, Kevin Hua, Axel Wiebrecht, Johannes Fleckenstein

Association for Classical Acupuncture and Traditional Chinese Medicine (Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Klassische Akupunktur und Traditionelle Chinesische Medizin e. V. (AGTCM)) – Sonja Schadt, Nina Kammhuber

Society for the Documentation of Empirical Material on Chinese Herbal Therapy (Gesellschaft für die Dokumentation von Erfahrungsmaterial der Chinesischen Arzneitherapie (DECA)) – Anne Gim, Fritz Friedl

Vienna School of TCM (Wiener Schule für TCM) – Werner Vogl

Association of Swiss Medical Societies for Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine (ASA als Dachverband der Schweizer Organisationen SACAM und AGMAR) – Emanuel Sonderegger

Swiss Professional Association for TCM (TCM Fachverband Schweiz) – Simon Becker, Nina Zhao-Seiler

Clinic for Anesthesiology, Intensive Care, Emergency and Pain Medicine, University Medicine Greifswald (Klinik für Anästhesiologie, Anästhesie, Intensiv-, Notfall- und Schmerzmedizin, Universitätsmedizin Greifswald), Germany – Taras Usichenko

Department of Anesthesia, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada – Taras Usichenko

Center for Evidence based Medicine, Unit for Complementary Medicine, Sigmund Freud Universität (SFU) Vienna, Austria – Peter Panhofer

Over recent decades, extensive research has evaluated CHT, examining both its physiological mechanisms of action and clinical efficacy across diverse medical conditions. Notably, several high-quality randomized-controlled trials have demonstrated statistically significant benefits of CHT in patients with myocardial infarction [13], heart failure [1], and impaired glucose metabolism [4]. Furthermore, large-scale cohort studies, again including several thousand patients, indicate that CHT, for example, is associated with a reduced incidence of cardiovascular events among individuals with chronic kidney disease [6] or improved overall survival in breast cancer populations [12]. Importantly, active pharmacovigilance and systematic tracking within trial settings reveal that CHT is well tolerated, showing no significant difference in adverse event rates compared to control arms.

Scientific progress relies on nuanced evaluation rather than ideological polarization. The proper clinical response to unregulated health claims is not the indiscriminate rejection of traditional systems, but the strict enforcement of physician qualifications, standardized quality control, and the continuous scientific evaluation of complementary therapies. Public health policies and institutional stakeholders must likewise support this field by allocating financial resources and fostering rigorous research in integrative medicine. Patients worldwide are best served when evidence-based integrative modalities are safely embedded within conventional healthcare systems.

Literatur

- Cheang I, Yao W, Zhou Y et al (2024) The traditional Chinese medicine Qiliqiangxin in heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Nat Med* 30:2295–2302. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-024-03169-2>
- Gan TJ, Belani KG, Bergese S et al (2020) Fourth Consensus Guidelines for the Management of Postoperative Nausea and Vomiting. *Anesth Analg* 131:411–448. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000004833>
- Perharic-Walton L, Murray V (1992) Letters to the Editor: Toxicity of Chinese herbal remedies. *The Lancet* 340:674. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736\(92\)92208-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(92)92208-W)
- Ji H, Zhao X, Chen X et al (2024) Jinlida for Diabetes Prevention in Impaired Glucose Tolerance and Multiple Metabolic Abnormalities: The FOCUS Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 184:727–735. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaintern-med.2024.1190>
- Lee A, Zhang JZ, Xie J et al (2025) Stimulation of the wrist acupuncture point PC6 for preventing postoperative nausea and vomiting: a network meta-analysis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 9:CD003281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD003281.pub5>
- Liao YC, Wu MY, Lin CL et al (2026) Chinese herbal medicine treatment and the association with long-term major adverse cardiac events in patients with chronic kidney disease: A propensity-score matched cohort study. *BioMedicine (Taipei)* 16:12–23. <https://doi.org/10.37796/2211-8039.1699>
- Philips CA, Caulfield T, de Jong C et al (2026) WHO's misguided push for complementary and alternative medicine. *BMJ* 393:e100062. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2026-100062>
- Sherman RE, Anderson SA, Dal Pan GJ et al (2016) Real-World Evidence - What Is It and What Can It Tell Us? *N Engl J Med* 375:2293–2297. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMs1609216>
- Vautier G, Spiller RC (1995) Safety of complementary medicines should be monitored. *BMJ* 311:633. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7005.633b>
- Vickers AJ, Vertosick EA, Lewith G et al (2018) Acupuncture for Chronic Pain: Update of an Individual Patient Data Meta-Analysis. *J Pain* 19:455–474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2017.11.005>
- Wiebrecht A (2019) Center for Safety of Chinese Herbal Therapy (CTCA) and the safety of Chinese Herbal Medicine. (RCHMJ) 2019. RCHMJ:23–28
- Winardi D, Wu CH, Chiang JH et al (2023) The Use of San-Huang-Xie-Xin-Tang Reduces the Mortality Rate among Breast Cancer Patients. *Cancers* 15:1213. <https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers15041213>
- Yang Y, Li X, Chen G et al (2023) Traditional Chinese Medicine Compound (Tongxinluo) and Clinical Outcomes of Patients With Acute Myocardial Infarction: The CTS-AMI Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 330:1534–1545. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.19524>
- NICE guideline (2016) Overview | Low back pain and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management | Guidance | NICE. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng59>. Zugegriffen: 8. Aug. 2026

15. WHO's misguided push for complementary and alternative medicine | The BMJ.
<https://www.bmj.com/content/393/bmj-2026-100062/rapid-responses>. Zugriffen: 06. September 2026

Korrespondenzadresse



Johannes Fleckenstein
Wissenschaftszentrum,
Deutsche Ärztesgesellschaft für Akupunktur
Würmtalstraße 54, 81375 München, Deutschland
fleckenstein@daegfa.de

Förderung. Für diese Arbeit wurde keine Förderung erhalten.

Autorenrollen

Alle Autorinnen und Autoren waren gleichermaßen an der Erstellung dieses Beitrags beteiligt.

Interessenkonflikt. Die Autor:innen dieses Artikels erhalten Honorare für Lehre und spezielle Aufgaben seitens ihrer Fachgesellschaften.