

# 1 Neurodoron® in patients with neurasthenia – A randomized, 2 double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial

3 Juliane Hellhammer<sup>1</sup>, Luitgard Spitznagel-Schminke<sup>2</sup>, Cristina Semaca<sup>2</sup>, Rebecca Hufnagel<sup>2</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup> Contract Research Institute daacro, Science Park, Max-Planck-Strasse 22, 54296, Trier, Germany

5 <sup>2</sup> Weleda AG, Möhlerstrasse 3-5, 73525 Schwäbisch Gmünd, Germany

## 6 1 Abstract

7 **Introduction:** The term neurasthenia has been introduced in the late 19th century. Stress was  
8 indicated as one of the main triggers. Many treatment options are available to reduce the associated  
9 symptoms. Complementary and alternative medicine (CAM) is widely used due to its long tradition and  
10 positive safety profile. This Phase IV placebo-controlled clinical trial was designed to demonstrate  
11 efficacy and safety of the CAM-product Neurodoron® in patients with neurasthenia.

12 **Methods:** This monocentre, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group clinical trial  
13 was conducted in a dedicated outpatient German trial site. Women and men aged 18 and above were  
14 randomized to receive either Neurodoron® or matching placebo if they reported typical symptoms of  
15 neurasthenia and a severe psychiatric disorder could be excluded. The primary objectives were a  
16 reduction in characteristic symptoms of nervous exhaustion and perceived stress as well as  
17 improvement in general health status after 6 weeks of treatment.

18 **Results:** 204 patients underwent screening, 78 were randomized in each treatment group, and 77  
19 patients each received treatment (intention-to-treat (ITT) population = 154 patients). For none of the  
20 primary efficacy variables, an advantage in favor of Neurodoron® could be demonstrated in the pre-  
21 specified analysis (p-values between 0.505 to 0.773, Student's t-test). In a post-hoc analysis of intra-  
22 individual differences after 6 weeks treatment, a significant advantage of Neurodoron® vs. placebo  
23 was shown for characteristic symptoms of nervous exhaustion (irritability (p = 0.020); nervousness  
24 (p = 0.045), Student's t-test). Adverse Event (AE) rates were similar between treatment groups, in both  
25 groups 6 AEs were assessed as causally related to treatment (severity mild or moderate). No AE  
26 resulted in discontinuation of treatment.

27 **Conclusion:** A significant improvement of neurasthenia was seen for the total study population at the  
28 end of the treatment period. Superiority of Neurodoron® vs. placebo could not be demonstrated with  
29 the pre-specified analysis. However, the post-hoc analysis suggests Neurodoron® as a beneficial option  
30 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**  
over placebo for the treatment of neurasthenia, especially given its confirmed markedly good safety.

31

32 Number of words (Abstract): 322

33

34 **Short Title: Neurodoron® for treatment of neurasthenia**

35 Correspondence should be addressed to Rebecca Hufnagel; rhufnagel@weleda.de; phone: +49 (0)

36 7171 919 0

37

38 **Trial registration:** GCTR-ID (“German Clinical Trials Register”-ID): DRKS00003261

39 **Keywords:** Neurodoron®, anthroposophic medicine, nervous exhaustion, neurasthenia, stress,  
40 irritability, nervousness, randomized controlled clinical trial

## 41 2 Introduction

42 Originally, “neurasthenia“, meaning exhaustion of the “nerve strength“, was introduced – presumably  
43 independently – by two US-American physicians, Edwin Holmes Van Deusen and George Miller Beard,  
44 at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century [1, 2]. Nowadays, the term neurasthenia is more closely associated with  
45 the New York neurologist Beard, who primarily saw the city's upper middle-class patients [3]. He used  
46 the term neurasthenia to refer to an acute or mainly chronic, functional condition of the nervous  
47 system, characterized by a range of predominantly somatic symptoms, including headaches,  
48 dyspepsia, lack of concentration, irritability, insomnia, and hopelessness in the absence of any organic  
49 disease [1, 4]. For Beard, stress in private or business life due to modern civilization with a shift from  
50 manual labor to mental work was one of the main triggers for neurasthenia [5]. This cause, combined  
51 with the scientific approach of attributing neurasthenia to a primarily physical disease rather than a –  
52 at these times – stigmatizing psychic illness, resulted in a well-accepted disease that could be treated  
53 by a neurologist (and not by a psychiatrist). A vast group of nervous disorders was initially assigned to  
54 neurasthenia, due to its vague and broad definition and its social acceptance [6, 7]. But over the further  
55 decades its importance diminished, partly also due to this broad definition, but also because Beard’s  
56 theory of “nerve strength” could not be proven on a physiological level [6].

57 However, neurasthenia experienced a revival with a shift to mental symptoms [8]. In 1977, the  
58 diagnosis neurasthenia was included in the manual of the international statistical classification of  
59 diseases, injuries, and causes of death [9]. Nowadays, the term neurasthenia is used for patients with  
60 chronic exhaustion or fatigue who have characteristic symptoms and in whom organic causes can be  
61 excluded [4, 10, 11].

62 Data on frequency of neurasthenia vary: an international WHO-multicenter study gives numbers  
63 between 1.3% and 10.8% in the general population [12]. In a WHO-report on health care, the  
64 prevalence of pure neurasthenia ranged between 0.3% (Athens and Bangalore) and 3.7%  
65 (Manchester). A long-term study in Switzerland suggests that prevalence increases with age (0.7% for  
66 22-year-olds to 3.8% for 41-year-olds) [13]. The persistent exhaustion often leads to absenteeism and  
67 thus causes economic costs [14].

68 Treatment options for chronic fatigue include cognitive and behavioral therapies, as well as exercise  
69 therapy or a gradual increase of activity [15]. Henningsen, Zipfel, and Herzog propose a graded  
70 therapeutic approach including the administration of pharmacotherapy as a symptomatic treatment  
71 [16] but currently there is no internationally accepted standard therapy for neurasthenia.

72 There is minor evidence for the efficacy of antidepressant and immunoglobulin therapies, no evidence  
73 could be found for an efficacy of corticosteroid and interferon therapies [15, 16]. Some of the

74 benzodiazepines have shown efficacy in establishing sleep maintenance, but have side effects, e.g.  
75 next-day sedation, and can only be used to a limited extent or for a limited period of time due to the  
76 addictive and habituation effect [17]. Even in the absence of randomized controlled clinical trials  
77 (RCTs), resting, sparing behavior, and inactivity are considered clearly contraindicated [15].

78 However, drug treatment to alleviate the symptoms is feasible. The characteristic symptoms, such as  
79 nervousness, irritability, restlessness, and sleep disorders, can be well influenced with complementary  
80 and alternative medicine (CAM) approaches, such as natural compounds, a safe alternative to  
81 conventional medicine [18]. The effect is shown by various clinical studies for different herbal and  
82 homeopathic remedies [19-24]. However, no data from RCTs had been available yet.

83 The present drug, Neurodoron, is a CAM representative from anthroposophic medicine. Data from a  
84 non-interventional study (NIS) performed with physicians in Germany from 2008 to 2009 confirmed  
85 that it is a valuable alternative for treatment of stress-related nervous fatigue [24]. Based on these  
86 findings the objectives of the presented clinical trial were to demonstrate efficacy and safety of  
87 Neurodoron® by means of an RCT, a method regarded as gold standard in clinical research. Following  
88 the RCT, a pharmacy-based NIS was conducted between 2014 and 2016, which confirmed the  
89 beneficial effects of Neurodoron® in self-medication [25].

90 Neurodoron® is an anthroposophic medicinal product that is supposed to support the body systems in  
91 order to rebalance mind and body. Anthroposophic medicine, as part of CAM, is an integrative  
92 multimodal treatment system based on a holistic understanding of disease and treatment, which was  
93 developed in the early 1920s in Germany and Switzerland [26, 27]. Meanwhile, a curriculum for  
94 becoming a certified anthroposophic physician is available in numerous countries. Europe is most  
95 strongly represented, but also countries from all other continents, except for Africa and the Antarctic.  
96 The training takes different lengths of time, e.g. 3 years in Germany, and a conventional medical degree  
97 is a prerequisite. Anthroposophic medicines are also prescribed by conventional physicians without  
98 special training [27].

99 In the early 1950s, Dr. Kurt Magerstaedt developed Neurodoron® to support people to better cope  
100 with exam stress. In 1954, the product was first launched in Germany, followed by Switzerland, Austria,  
101 France, Ukraine, Italy, and UK. Since 2007, Neurodoron® has been listed in Germany with the indication  
102 nervous exhaustion and metabolic weakness, based on case reports from medical practitioners  
103 indicating that Neurodoron® seems to be efficient in treating stress related health complaints [28].  
104 Neurodoron® contains *Aurum metallicum praeparatum*, *Kalium phosphoricum*, and *Ferrum-Quarz*  
105 (Weleda AG, Schwäbisch Gmünd, Germany). According to the anthroposophical approach, the three  
106 components of Neurodoron® are to support the three existing systems, namely the nervous-sensory  
107 system, the rhythmic system and the metabolic-limb system, thus helping to rebalance mind and body.

## 108 **3 Methods**

### 109 **3.1 Clinical trial design**

110 This clinical trial was a monocentric, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled parallel group  
111 phase IV superiority trial, conducted at a dedicated clinical trial site in Berlin, Germany. The clinical  
112 trial was coordinated by the contract research organization ACM Allied Clinical Management GmbH.  
113 Prior to enrollment of the patients, the trial was approved by the relevant competent authorities and  
114 the ethics.

115 Four trial visits and a 6-weeks treatment phase were scheduled. Written informed consent was  
116 obtained from each patient at the screening visit, prior to trial enrollment. If a patient was eligible to  
117 participate in the trial, randomization and initiation of treatment occurred at baseline (Visit 1). At  
118 baseline, and at the two consecutive trial visits – after 2 (Visit 2) and another 4 weeks (Visit 3 / final  
119 visit) – patients rated 12 characteristic symptoms, their perceived stress (Perceived Stress  
120 Questionnaire, PSQ) and their general health status (Short Form Health Survey, SF-36). Blood samples  
121 for safety laboratory were taken at screening and final visit. All procedures per trial visits and the flow  
122 chart are shown in the supplemental material I.

### 123 **3.2 Clinical trial population**

124 Main eligibility criteria were based on the diagnosis F48.0 (ICD-10 [29]), i.e. persistent and distressing  
125 complaints of feelings of exhaustion after minor mental effort or persistent and distressing complaints  
126 of feelings of fatigue and bodily weakness after minor physical effort for at least 3 months.  
127 Furthermore, at least one of the following characteristic symptoms had to be present: muscular aches  
128 and pains, dizziness, tension headaches, sleep disturbance, inability to relax and irritability. Male and  
129 female patients aged at least 18 years were excluded if they reported an organic cause for the  
130 complaints or presented with a certain severe psychiatric disorder. A full list of inclusion and exclusion  
131 criteria is available in the supplemental material II.

### 132 **3.3 Randomization and intervention**

133 Trial patients were randomly assigned to either Neurodoron® or placebo in a 1:1 ratio. The  
134 randomization list was generated using a validated computerized system (EDP random number  
135 generator (SAS Version 9.2; RANUNI function)) by an independent institute. The block size was not  
136 revealed to the investigator. Investigational medicinal product (IMP) containers were numbered  
137 sequentially. Each eligible patient was assigned to the next available IMP container number by the  
138 investigator at the investigational site. Neither investigator nor patient could identify group  
139 assignment based on the IMP container. The randomization list was broken only after finalization of  
140 the statistical analysis plan and the subsequent database lock.

### 141 **3.4 Investigational medicinal product (IMP)**

142 On the market for more than 50 years and known as *Kalium phosphoricum comp.* (Weleda AG,  
143 Schwäbisch Gmünd, Germany) until 2007, the IMP has been listed under the name Neurodoron® as an  
144 anthroposophic medicine with the indication of nervous exhaustion and metabolic weakness (German  
145 registration number 6646311.00.00, German Commission C monograph [30]). One tablet of  
146 Neurodoron® contains the following active ingredients: 83.3 mg *Aurum metallicum praeparatum*  
147 *trituration (trit.)* D10, 83.3 mg *Kalium phosphoricum trit.* D6, 8.3 mg *Ferrum-Quarz trit.* D2 (excipients:  
148 wheat starch and lactose). The corresponding matching placebo was identical in form, color, size, taste  
149 and smell and contained the same ingredients, except for the active ingredients. Tablets were to be  
150 taken orally 3 times a day with a little liquid for 6 weeks.

### 151 **3.5 Objectives**

152 The aim of this trial was to strengthen the evidence for the safety and efficacy of Neurodoron® on  
153 nervous exhaustion.

#### 154 *3.5.1 Primary objectives*

155 Primary objective of this superiority trial was to demonstrate efficacy of Neurodoron® by reducing  
156 characteristic symptoms of nervous exhaustion and perceived stress and by improving the general  
157 health status. Respective outcome measures (characteristic symptoms, perceived stress questionnaire  
158 (PSQ), SF-36) were assessed at trial end and compared to treatment start. Superiority of the verum  
159 was considered evident if a statistically significant improvement of Neurodoron® over placebo could  
160 be demonstrated, based on the mean sum score of the characteristic symptoms.

161 In a post-hoc analysis, also the single symptoms and the subscales of the PSQ and SF-36 were analyzed.

#### 162 *3.5.2 Secondary objectives*

163 Secondary objectives of this trial were to assess the efficacy of Neurodoron®:

- 164 • on intensity of tedium (Tedium Measure) at Visits 1, 2, and 3
- 165 • based on the efficacy ratings of both patients and physicians at treatment end.

166 In addition, safety of the Neurodoron® treatment was to be confirmed based on the type and  
167 frequency of clinically relevant laboratory value changes at treatment end vs. screening. Additionally,  
168 the frequency and severity of (serious) adverse events throughout the trial and the tolerability ratings  
169 of both patients and physicians at treatment end were assessed for safety evaluation.

170

## 171 **3.6 Measurements of trial parameters**

### 172 *3.6.1 Demographic and anthropometric data*

173 Age, gender, height, weight, smoking status, marital status and professional situation were recorded.

### 174 *3.6.2 Characteristic symptoms related to nervous exhaustion*

175 Characteristic symptoms of nervous exhaustion were rated on a four-level Likert scale ranging from “0  
176 = absent” to “3 = severe” and a symptom sum score was calculated (maximum value 36). 12 symptoms  
177 were assessed: irritability, restlessness, nervousness, listlessness, depressive mood, mood swings,  
178 anxiety states, troubles to concentrate/lack of concentration, headache, sleep disorders, digestive  
179 disorders, muscular pain/tensions.

### 180 *3.6.3 Perceived Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) [31]*

181 For assessment of individually perceived stress, the revised German version of the PSQ-20 was used, a  
182 reliable and validated tool in stress research [32, 33]. It contains 20 items which can be assigned to  
183 four subscales (worries, tension, joy, and demands). The patients make their assessment on a four-  
184 level Likert scale ranging from "1 = almost never" to "4 = usually". Scores for the subscales and the  
185 total score are obtained by calculating the mean and a subsequent linear transformation to values  
186 between 0 and 100. For calculation of the total score the values for “joy” are inverted. Thus, higher  
187 total scores indicate more severe perceived stress.

### 188 *3.6.4 Short Form-36 Health Survey SF-36 [34]*

189 Health-related quality of life was evaluated using the validated SF-36. This questionnaire is composed  
190 of 36 items (with different scores from 1-2 to 1-6) and assesses mental, physical and social health  
191 aspects. The 36 items of the SF-36 are summarized in eight subscales (vitality, physical functioning,  
192 bodily pain, general health perceptions, physical role functioning, emotional role functioning, social  
193 role functioning, and mental health). In addition, the subscales are computed into a physical and  
194 mental sum score using SAS and SPSS. For calculation of the scores, the recorded numeric values are  
195 linearly transformed to a 0 to 100 range (all items are converted in the same direction, so the higher  
196 the score the better the quality of life). In a second step, items in the same scale are averaged.

### 197 *3.6.5 Tedium Measure [35]*

198 The Tedium or Burnout Measure was developed by Pines and Aronson [35] and is used for self-rating  
199 of burnout. This tool consists of 21 items that are scored on a 7-level Likert scale ranging from “never”  
200 to “always”, assessing the degree of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion. The Tedium Measure  
201 is calculated according to the authors' specifications and can reach values between 2.1 and 5.9. High  
202 values of the Tedium Measure describe a high extent of tedium or burnout. Pines et al. [36] offer

203 interpretations for the test scores: values  $\leq 3$  suggest no problems, values between 3 and 4 indicate a  
204 high risk, and values  $> 5$  an acute crisis.

### 205 *3.6.6 Efficacy and tolerability rating by patient and physician*

206 Trial patients and investigators rated the efficacy and tolerability of the IMP separately on a four-level  
207 Likert scale ranging from “very good” to “unsatisfactory”.

### 208 *3.6.7 Safety*

209 The number and severity of adverse events after intake of IMP was recorded for both groups  
210 independently from the causality. The laboratory values at screening and treatment end were  
211 examined as an additional safety parameter, as was the tolerability ratings by the patient and physician  
212 (3.6.6), and physical examination (baseline and treatment end) and vital signs (all trial visits).

## 213 **3.7 Sample size and statistical analysis**

214 The calculation of the sample size was based on the characteristic symptoms associated with nervous  
215 exhaustion and resulted in 182 patients to be enrolled to obtain 146 evaluable patients, 73 in each  
216 treatment group (assumptions: 25% advantage of Neurodoron<sup>®</sup> over placebo at treatment end (with  
217 Neurodoron<sup>®</sup> (sum symptom score/mean): 7.1 ( $\pm$  5.1), drop-out rate: 20% ( $\alpha$ : 0.05,  $\beta$ : 0.2)).

218 All statistical analyses were performed with SAS Version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) or  
219 SPSS 20 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

220 All demographic and baseline data were descriptively analyzed. The homogeneity of treatment groups  
221 was tested.

222 For confirmatory analysis, the three primary efficacy variables were tested in hierarchical order in the  
223 intention-to-treat (ITT) population, i.e., in all patients who had administered at least one dose of the  
224 IMP and had no missing values. Therefore, depending on the variable analyzed, the number of patients  
225 considered for analyses varied slightly (max.  $n = 154$ ). All analyses were carried out using Student's  
226 t-test for two independent samples on the same one-sided alpha-level of 0.025 (equivalent to 0.05  
227 two-sided). All analyses performed for the primary endpoint were also performed with the per-  
228 protocol (PP) population ( $n = 131$ ).

229 A post-hoc analysis was performed for the three primary efficacy variables with SPSS 22 and  
230 Statistica 14. While the original analysis was planned on the sum scores, the post-hoc analysis was  
231 performed for evaluation of intra-individual differences based on single symptoms (characteristic  
232 symptoms), and subscales (PSQ, SF-36), respectively (Student's t-test for two independent samples).  
233 The two treatment groups were also analyzed over time using analysis of variance with repeated  
234 measures (repeated measures ANOVA) with three time points (Visit 1, Visit 2, Visit 3).



235 The secondary efficacy variables were exploratively analyzed. For this purpose, group comparisons  
236 were carried out using statistical tests (Tedium Measure: Student's t-test for two independent samples,  
237 efficacy rating by patient and physician: chi-square test); the results of these analyses were indicative  
238 yet not confirmatory.

## 239 **4 Results**

240 Between September 2011 and July 2012, 204 patients were screened, 156 patients were invited for  
241 baseline/visit 1, 154 patients underwent treatment with  $n = 154$  in the ITT and safety population (SP),  
242 and  $n = 131$  in the PP population (fig. 1). The last trial visit took place in September 2012. In this trial,  
243 154 patients were randomized and received allocated treatment of which 113 were female (73.4%)  
244 and 41 male (26.6%). Mean age of the patients was 53.1 ( $\pm 13.1$ ). The mean treatment duration was  
245  $41.9 \pm 4.5$  days (Neurodoron<sup>®</sup>  $41.7 \pm 5.0$  days, Placebo  $42.1 \pm 3.9$  days), the median treatment duration  
246 was 42.0 days, range 10.0 – 50.0 days (Neurodoron<sup>®</sup> 42.0 days, range 10.0 – 48.0 days, Placebo 42.0  
247 days, range 19.0 – 50.0 days). When comparing baseline characteristics between the Neurodoron<sup>®</sup> and  
248 the placebo group, patients of the placebo group were more often ex-smokers (32.5%) compared to  
249 patients of the Neurodoron<sup>®</sup> group (22.1%), but there were more smokers in the Neurodoron<sup>®</sup> group  
250 (26.0% vs. 15.6%). Patients of the Neurodoron<sup>®</sup> group were more often employed workers compared  
251 to patients of the placebo group (40.3% vs. 27.3%). The residual baseline characteristics did not differ  
252 > 10% between both groups (tab. 1).

253


254 Tab. 1: Characteristics of trial patients, ITT-population (n = 154)

Characteristic	Category	Statistics	Neurodoron® n = 77	Placebo n = 77	Total n = 154
Age (years)		Mean (SD)	52.9 (13.0)	53.2 (13.2)	53.1 (13.1)
		Median (Min; Max)	55.0 (22; 76)	55.0 (18; 76)	55.0 (18; 76)
Age group	18-40 years	n (%)	13 (16.9)	11 (14.3)	24 (15.6)
	41-64 years	n (%)	51 (66.2)	55 (71.4)	106 (68.8)
	>=65 years	n (%)	13 (16.9)	11 (14.3)	24 (15.6)
Gender (n (%))	Female	n (%)	57 (74.0)	56 (72.7)	113 (73.4)
	Male	n (%)	20 (26.0)	21 (27.3)	41 (26.6)
Height (cm)		Mean (SD)	166.8 (7.4)	168.7 (8.1)	167.7 (7.8)
		Median (Min; Max)	165.0 (155; 189)	168.0 (147; 187)	166 (147; 189)
Weight (kg)		Mean (SD)	72.4 (14.2)	77.8 (16.3)	75.1 (15.5)
		Median (Min; Max)	69.0 (44; 114)	77.0 (51; 115)	73 (44; 115)
Smoking status (n (%))	Ex-smoker	n (%)	17 (22.1)	25 (32.5)	42 (27.3)
	Non-smoker	n (%)	40 (51.9)	40 (51.9)	80 (51.9)
	Smoker	n (%)	20 (26.0)	12 (15.6)	32 (20.8)
Marital status (n (%))	Single	n (%)	23 (29.9)	27 (35.1)	50 (32.5)
	Married or in a relationship	n (%)	31 (40.3)	25 (32.5)	56 (36.4)
	Separated or divorced	n (%)	21 (27.3)	24 (31.2)	45 (29.2)
	Widowed	n (%)	2 (2.6)	1 (1.3)	3 (1.9)
Professional situation (n (%))	Self-employed	n (%)	9 (11.7)	14 (18.2)	23 (14.9)
	Employed	n (%)	31 (40.3)	21 (27.3)	52 (33.8)
	Unemployed	n (%)	9 (11.7)	17 (22.1)	26 (16.9)
	Pupils/students/trainees	n (%)	6 (7.8)	4 (5.2)	10 (6.5)
	Retired	n (%)	19 (24.7)	19 (24.7)	38 (24.5)
	Housewife/househusband	n (%)	3 (3.9)	2 (2.6)	5 (3.3)

255

256

257



258 \* Multiple reasons possible

259

260 **Fig. 1** CONSORT Flowchart of the trial patients showing the distribution of the patients from initial assessment  
 261 to analysis of trial data.

262

## 263 4.1 Reasons for neurasthenia

264 Reasons for neurasthenia were comparable between the treatment groups (Tab. 2). Patients (n = 154)  
265 reported work or school as the most common cause of neurasthenia (Neurodoron: 53.2%, Placebo: 49.  
266 4%), followed by housekeeping (Neurodoron: 33.8%, Placebo: 31.2%). Apart from reasons associated  
267 with work/school or all reasons associated with the familial situation, other not further specified  
268 reasons were frequently documented (Neurodoron: 45.5%, Placebo: 37.7%).

269 Tab. 2: Reasons for neurasthenia, ITT-population (n = 154)

Reason(s)*	Statistics	Neurodoron® n = 77	Placebo n = 77	Total n = 154
Work or school	n (%)	41 (53.2)	38 (49.4)	79 (51.3)
Housekeeping	n (%)	26 (33.8)	24 (31.2)	50 (32.5)
Raising children	n (%)	10 (13.0)	14 (18.2)	24 (15.6)
Care for relatives	n (%)	4 (5.2)	7 (9.1)	11 (7.1)
Care for disabled	n (%)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	1 (0.6)
Partnership conflict / divorce	n (%)	4 (5.2)	9 (11.7)	13 (8.4)
Other reasons	n (%)	35 (45.5)	29 (37.7)	64 (41.6)


270 \*multiple entries possible

## 271 4.2 Primary efficacy analysis

### 272 4.2.1 Efficacy on 12 characteristic symptoms of nervous exhaustion

273 The mean symptom sum score at visit 3 did not differ significantly in the a priori analysis between the  
274 placebo and the Neurodoron® group ( $p = 0.728$ , fig. 2, tab. 3).


275 A post-hoc analysis showed that the symptom sum score decreased significantly in both groups over  
276 time. Additionally, 10 out of 12 characteristic symptoms abated to a larger extent in the Neurodoron®  
277 group when compared to placebo. Two of them, the symptoms irritability ( $p = 0.020$ ) and nervousness  
278 ( $p = 0.045$ ), were significantly reduced (fig. 3). Also, the change in the sum score of the Neurodoron®  
279 group (baseline minus visit 3 =  $4.3 \pm 0.6$ ) was more pronounced than in the placebo group ( $2.8 \pm 0.7$ ),  
280 without reaching statistical significance ( $p = 0.091$ ).



281  
 282 **Fig. 2** Symptom sum score (12 symptoms) of nervous exhaustion over trial period shown as means and standard  
 283 error (SE), ITT-population (n = 154); ratings 0 = absent, 1 = mild, 2 = moderate, 3 = severe, max. score: 36; V1:  
 284 Visit 1, V2: Visit 2, V3: Visit 3.

285  
 286 **Tab. 3:** Primary efficacy results at visit 3 (after 6 weeks of treatment), ITT population (n = 154)

Primary efficacy variables	Treatment group		Difference (Placebo minus Neurodoron®) [95% CI]	p-value (t-test)	
	Neurodoron® n = 77	Placebo n = 77			
Symptom sum score (Mean (SD))	10.6 (5.7)	10.9 (6.0)	0.3 [-1.5; 2.2]	0.728	
PSQ (Mean (SD))	41.9 (18.0)	40.0 (18.3)	-1.9 [-7.8; 3.9]	0.505	
SF-36	Physical scale (Mean (SD))	46.9 (9.0)	47.3 (9.0)	0.4 [-2.5; 3.3]	0.773
	Mental scale (Mean (SD))	43.1 (12.0)	44.4 (12.0)	1.3 [-2.6; 5.1]	0.510




288  
 289 **Fig. 3** Post-hoc analysis, intra-individual differences (baseline minus visit 3) in the 12 characteristic symptoms of  
 290 nervous exhaustion shown as mean and SE, ITT-population (n = 154); ratings per symptom: 0 = absent, 1 = mild,  
 291 2 = moderate, 3 = severe.


292  
 293 **4.2.2 Efficacy on perceived stress**

294 At baseline perceived stress as measured with the PSQ was significantly higher in subjects of the  
 295 Neurodoron® arm when compared to placebo in the a priori analysis. Post treatment no difference  
 296 between groups was observed any more in the pre-specified analysis (p = 0.505, tab. 3, fig. 4).

297 In both groups perceived stress decreased significantly over time on the overall score and on all  
 298 subscales, as shown in the post-hoc analysis. A comparison of the PSQ subscales for pre-post treatment  
 299 differences revealed a significantly greater increase of joy under Neurodoron® treatment (p = 0.037,  
 300 fig. 5).



301  
 302 **Fig. 4** PSQ total score over treatment period of 6 weeks shown as means and SE, ITT-population (n = 154); total  
 303 score between 0 to 100 (considering 4 subscales (worries, tension, joy, demands)). V1: Visit 1, V2: Visit 2, V3:  
 304 Visit 3.




305  
 306 **Fig. 5** Post-hoc analysis, intra-individual differences (baseline minus visit 3) in the 4 PSQ subscales shown as  
 307 mean and SE, ITT-population (n = 154); scores of subscales between 0 and 100. # 'Joy' values are inverted for  
 308 calculation of total score and are shown inverted for better understanding, respectively.

309 **4.2.3 Health-related quality of life (SF-36)**


310 Results of the SF-36 showed no significantly stronger improvement at visit 3, neither of the physical  
311 nor the mental sum scores for the Neurodoron® arm when compared to placebo ( $p = 0.773$  (physical  
312 sum score),  $p = 0.510$  (mental sum score), tab. 3, fig. 6a/b).

313 A post-hoc analysis showed that all subscales improved significantly over the treatment period, but  
314 the extent of improvement did not reach levels of statistical significance when comparing groups.  
315 Descriptively, patients treated with Neurodoron® had a greater improvement on the subscales social  
316 role functioning, vitality, mental health, general health perceptions, physical role functioning and  
317 physical functioning, while patients treated with placebo improved more regarding emotional role  
318 functioning and reported less bodily pain (fig. 7).




319





320

321 **Fig. 6a+b** SF-36: Physical and mental sum scores (score range 0-100) over trial period shown as means and SE, ITT-  
 322 population (n = 154). V1: Visit 1, V2: Visit 2, V3: Visit 3.



323

324 **Fig. 7** Post-hoc analysis, SF-36: Changes in subscale scores (score range 0-100) of 8 subscales over treatment  
 325 period of 6 weeks shown as means and SE, ITT-population (n = 154).


326 The sensitivity analyses performed with the PP-population for all primary variables showed an  
327 equivalent outcome to the ITT analyses. The additionally performed supportive analyses with replaced  
328 missing values also confirmed the primary analysis.

### 329 4.3 Secondary efficacy and safety analysis

#### 330 4.3.1 Tedium Measure

331 In the a priori analysis, statistically significant differences between both groups were seen at baseline  
332 ( $p = 0.032$ ) and visit 2 ( $p = 0.030$ ) (fig. 8), with lower values for the placebo group, indicating a lower  
333 level of exhaustion. At visit 3 however, no statistical significance regarding group differences were  
334 seen.

335 In a post-hoc analysis, results for the Tedium Measure showed a significant improvement for both  
336 groups over the course of the trial.




337  
338 **Fig. 8** Tedium Measure (21 items) of level of exhaustion over trial period shown as means and SE, ITT-population  
339 ( $n = 154$ ); Tedium Measure (min./max. score: 2.1/5.9). V1: Visit 1, V2: Visit 2, V3: Visit 3.

340

341 **4.3.2 Efficacy from patients and physicians' point of view**


342 51.3% of the patients evaluated the efficacy of Neurodoron® as good or very good. The efficacy of  
343 Neurodoron® was rated more frequently as good or very good by the patients than placebo (37.7%)  
344 without reaching statistical significance (fig. 9). The assessment of efficacy from the physicians'  
345 perspective is very similar to that of the patients: 51.3% of physicians assessed Neurodoron® as good  
346 or very good, compared with 36.4% for placebo.



347 **Fig. 9:** Subjective assessment of the efficacy of Neurodoron® (by patient and physician) at final visit after 6 weeks  
348 of treatment, ITT-population (n = 154); assessment options: very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.  
349

350 **4.3.3 Subjective assessment of safety from patients and physicians' point of view**

351 96.1% of the patients evaluated the safety of Neurodoron® as good or very good vs. 97.4% in the  
352 placebo group (fig. 10). The physicians' assessment was also in line with that of the patients: 97.3% of  
353 the physicians evaluated Neurodoron® as well or very well tolerated (97.4% for placebo treatment).  
354 72.4% of the Neurodoron® patients would recommend the product (placebo group: 62.3%).



355

356 **Fig. 10** Subjective assessment of the safety of Neurodoron® (by patient and physician) at final visit after 6 weeks  
 357 of treatment, ITT-population (n = 154); assessment options: very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.

358 **4.3.4 Safety evaluation of Neurodoron®**

359 46 AEs (n = 32) were reported in the Neurodoron® group vs. 33 in the placebo group (n = 28). For both  
 360 groups 6 AEs (Neurodoron®: n = 6, placebo: n = 5) were rated as causally related to the IMP. These AEs  
 361 were all assessed as mild or moderate and mainly affected the gastrointestinal tract. One patient in  
 362 the placebo group interrupted the IMP-intake, but there were no dropouts due to AEs or lack of  
 363 efficacy. One serious adverse event occurred in the Neurodoron® group (postoperative joint  
 364 dislocation). There was no causal relationship to the IMP. Overall, the most frequently reported AEs  
 365 were diseases of the respiratory tract, chest and mediastinum (Neurodoron®: n = 13, placebo: n = 9),  
 366 gastrointestinal tract (Neurodoron®: n = 4; placebo: n = 7), nervous system (Neurodoron®: n = 5,  
 367 placebo: n = 4) and diseases of the skeletal muscles, connective tissue and bones (Neurodoron®: n = 6,  
 368 placebo: n = 4). There were no signs for abnormalities in the blood tests.

369

## 370 5 Discussion

371 The first scientific mention of the diagnosis neurasthenia dates back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century [1, 2]. Current  
372 prevalences for neurasthenia are between 1.3% and 10.8% [12]. One of the major reasons for  
373 neurasthenia is stress [1]. In the 2010s, adults report being more stressed than in the 1990s [37]. In  
374 parallel, mental illnesses are increasingly responsible for absenteeism from work; in Germany, for  
375 example, mental illnesses led to the highest number of sick days in 2020 [38]. This development  
376 increases the pressure on effective and safe treatment options.

377 Neurodoron® is an anthroposophic medicine for treatment of nervous exhaustion and metabolic  
378 weakness and has been on the market for over 50 years. In the authorization procedure, medical  
379 experience from long-standing use and specific characteristics were included, as for all medicinal  
380 products classified as phytotherapy, homeopathy, or anthroposophic medicine. Clinical data from NIS  
381 are available for Neurodoron®, the present RCT aims at confirming efficacy. While RCTs with their high  
382 internal validity are regarded as gold standard when it comes to proving efficacy of medicinal products,  
383 non-interventional trials are well perceived as supplementary sources of information, especially  
384 because they provide high external validity, i.e. their results can be generalized to all affected patients  
385 [39, 40]. A meta-analysis by Concato et al. even pointed out that the results of well-designed  
386 observational studies do not systematically overestimate the magnitude of treatment effects  
387 compared with those in RCTs on the same topic [41].

388 In the present RCT from 2011/2012, 204 patients were screened and 154 patients (77 in each group)  
389 were analyzed. Regarding baseline demographics, the two treatment groups differed only in terms of  
390 employment status and smoking behavior. Neither factor has yet been shown or is expected to be the  
391 sole cause of nervous exhaustion. Therefore, homogeneity of both groups at the beginning of  
392 treatment concerning demographics can be assumed. The proportion of women (73.4%) and the mean  
393 age of enrolled patients (53.1 years) was comparable to the two NIS conducted with Neurodoron®  
394 (physician-based NIS [24]: 78.0% and 50.3 years vs. 73.9% and 44.8 years in the pharmacy-based NIS  
395 [25]). Regarding symptom severity at baseline, patients of the Neurodoron® group showed a slightly  
396 more severe symptomatology of neurasthenia compared to the placebo group, with significant  
397 differences for the parameters perceived stress (PSQ) and Tedium Measure. This may have impacted  
398 the efficacy analysis.

399 The efficacy results of this double-blind RCT showed a significant improvement of neurasthenia after  
400 treatment of 6 weeks in both treatment groups for the investigated efficacy parameters. This is  
401 remarkable, as patients were suffering from persistent and distressing complaints of neurasthenia for  
402 more than 3 months prior to trial enrollment according to the ICD-10 criteria F48.0 [29]. However, the

403 results did not achieve showing superiority of Neurodoron® over placebo in any of the pre-specified  
404 outcome measures. When looking at the course of the efficacy endpoints over the 6 weeks treatment  
405 time, Neurodoron® seems to be associated with a more pronounced improvement compared to  
406 placebo, without reaching significance in any of the a priori defined endpoints. Exemplary, 10 out of  
407 12 characteristic symptoms of neurasthenia decreased more in the Neurodoron® group. Interestingly,  
408 a post-hoc analysis revealed some statistically significant group differences in favor of Neurodoron®,  
409 e.g. it showed that this anthroposophic medicinal product successfully reduced the characteristic  
410 stress symptoms nervousness and irritability. The intraindividual change after treatment with  
411 Neurodoron is similar for irritability (RCT: 0.5 scores, NIS: 0.6 scores) and nervousness (RCT: 0.6 scores,  
412 NIS: 0.5 scores). This indicates that the effect sizes between RCT and NIS are comparable, which is in  
413 line with Concato's conclusion that effect sizes are not necessarily overestimated in NIS [41].  
414 Furthermore, it improved the globally perceived stress in the subscale "joy". It may well be that a larger  
415 sample size would have shown superiority of Neurodoron® over placebo in the pre-specified efficacy  
416 parameters. Sample size calculation of the RCT was based on the positive efficacy results of a physician  
417 based NIS performed with Neurodoron® in 2008/2009 [24]. The pharmacy-based NIS from 2014-2016  
418 confirmed the good efficacy results of the physician-based NIS.

419 Three major differences between the two clinical study designs are likely to have contributed to the  
420 different findings. First of all, the NIS were not controlled. Therefore, the placebo effect is likely to  
421 reduce the magnitude of the Neurodoron® efficacy in the RCT. The placebo effect is particularly well  
422 documented for pain treatment [42-47]. In an inverse placebo RCT the placebo effect size was  
423 investigated. Patients who were told that they were being treated with a verum showed a decrease in  
424 pain perception, whereas patients who knew that they were receiving placebo had an unchanged pain  
425 perception 6 weeks after baseline as at baseline [48]. As neurasthenia has a strong mental component,  
426 it is likely that this indication is also prone for a strong placebo response. The effect size of placebo  
427 cannot be determined by the chosen design of the clinical trial. However, the results of the  
428 characteristic symptoms of neurasthenia observed in the RCT and the pharmacy-based NIS might be  
429 interpreted in this way. A second difference in the study design is the indication. Typical for an RCT,  
430 the inclusion diagnosis had clear and narrow criteria (F48.0 ICD-10) resulting in a more controlled  
431 setting. For the past physician-based NIS [24] as well as for the pharmacy-based NIS that was  
432 performed after this RCT [25], the inclusion indication was broader and referred to patient-reported  
433 stress-related disorders, according to the authorized indication. Therefore, patients may have  
434 presented to the NIS with both less severe as well as more severe symptoms of nervous fatigue. As  
435 Neurodoron® is an OTC product, it can be assumed that the patients of the pharmacy-based NIS best  
436 represent the affected patient population. Due to the rigorous patient selection in the RCT, it is  
437 possible that the treatment effect of Neurodoron® in the RCT differs from the effect seen in the two

438 NIS. Lastly, the design of the NIS allowed a holistic treatment of this complex indication. From a CAM  
439 perspective, disease management pursues an overall therapeutic approach including  
440 recommendations concerning lifestyle changes to improve patient's quality of life as a whole. In the  
441 RCT, patients were instructed to keep medication as for baseline, and they were prompted not to  
442 change their usual habits regarding daily activities such as sports, non-medicamentous therapies etc.  
443 As neurasthenia, or nervous exhaustion, is often due to mental complaints / chronic stress, a holistic  
444 approach that addresses the root of the complaints, is likely to show a stronger effect than treating  
445 the symptoms alone.

446 As shown above, the positive results of both NIS could be reproduced in the pre-specified primary  
447 efficacy evaluation of the RCT. However, as neurasthenia also improved in patients of the placebo  
448 group, the primary efficacy endpoint was not met. For the secondary efficacy parameters, the results  
449 are similar: The patients' constitution significantly improved in both groups until treatment end, but  
450 no significant differences were found between groups. For patients in the Neurodoron® group,  
451 changes over the course of the trial indicate greater improvement in symptoms for all efficacy  
452 endpoints. For example, though not as convincing as efficacy ratings in the NIS, Neurodoron's®  
453 subjective efficacy rating was more frequently considered by physicians and patients to be "good" or  
454 "very good" (both 51.3%) than placebo (37.7% and 36.4%).

455 Regarding safety, very few and non-severe side effects were reported for the entire trial. Overall, no  
456 differences were observed between Neurodoron® and placebo in the safety evaluation. The subjective  
457 safety rating of Neurodoron® was extraordinarily good with values between 96.1% (patients) and  
458 97.4% (physicians) and assessment of AEs did not suggest any specific risks. These safety data confirm  
459 the available very good safety profile from the NIS and the continuous market monitoring with regard  
460 to product safety via the sponsor's pharmacovigilance system.

## 461 **6 Conclusions**

462 This double-blind RCT adds information on an anthroposophic remedy and completes the overall  
463 picture consistently substantiating that Neurodoron® helps relieve stress related symptoms. This  
464 supports Neurodoron® being a good choice with regard to CAM approaches in patients with  
465 neurasthenia. Safety of Neurodoron® can be assessed as markedly good. RCTs with a comparable  
466 design and a higher number of patients may well clearly show that Neurodoron® is superior to placebo  
467 in the treatment of neurasthenia. Future clinical studies could strengthen outcomes by including  
468 biomarkers for a stress related dysregulation of the physiological system.

469

## 470 **7 Statements**

### 471 **7.1 Ethics approval**

472 This clinical trial has been registered on the “German Clinical Trials Register” (ID: DRKS00003261) and  
473 on EudraCT as 2010-024189-23. The trial protocol, informed consent document(s), and any other  
474 appropriate trial-related documents were reviewed and approved by an independent Ethics  
475 Committee and the relevant regulatory authorities.

### 476 **7.2 Consent**

477 All trial patients gave their written informed consent to participate in the clinical trial prior to any trial  
478 related procedures.

### 479 **7.3 Acknowledgements**

480 The authors would like to thank Bettina Bergtholdt, MD and director of emovis GmbH, a dedicated  
481 study site situated in Berlin, Germany, for the conduct of the RCT and Jörg Korb (Managing Director of  
482 ACM Allied Clinical Management GmbH) as well as Almut Günzel, Sandra Hildebrandt and Stefan  
483 Franke (former employees of ACM) for their excellent trial management and monitoring. The authors’  
484 thanks also go to Hansjörg Wesp (MD, former employee of Weleda AG), Martin Schnelle (MD, Weleda  
485 AG) and Antje Gottberg (MD, former employee of CSG Clinische Studien Gesellschaft, IGES Group) for  
486 their contribution to the trial design and input for any medical matters. Also, we are grateful to Nicole  
487 Weber and Katja Schmidt ((former) employees of daacro GmbH & Co. KG) for their support in writing  
488 the manuscript. Special thanks go to all the anonymous patients for their valuable contribution to the  
489 trial. The trial was financed by Weleda AG.

### 490 **7.4 Authorship confirmation statement**

491 RH was responsible for conception and design of the trial and CS took care of data analyses and their  
492 correctness as well as data presentation. LS and JH drafted the manuscript and contributed  
493 substantially to the interpretation of the data. All authors reviewed the manuscript rigorously and  
494 critically and approved the final article.

### 495 **7.5 Conflicts of interest**

496 RH, CS and LS are employees of Weleda AG, Germany. JH is the CEO of daacro GmbH & Co. KG, a clinical  
497 research organization in Germany and declares having received an honorarium for writing the  
498 publication. No further interests have to be declared.

### 499 **7.6 Funding information**

500 The trial was financed by the Weleda AG, Arlesheim, Switzerland.

501



502 **7.7 Data availability statement**

503 The data that support the findings of this clinical trial are not publicly available due to containing  
504 information that could compromise the privacy of research participants. Disclosure of data would not  
505 be in accordance with the European General Data Protection Regulation.

## 506 8 References

- 507 1. Beard, G., *Neurasthenia, or nervous exhaustion*. The Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, 1869. **80**(13): p. 217-221.
- 508
- 509 2. Van Deusen, E.H., *Observations on a form of nervous prostration, (neurasthenia,) culminating*  
510 *in insanity*. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1869. **25**(4): p. 445-461.
- 511 3. Lillestol, K., '*Neurasthenia gastrica*' revisited: perceptions of nerve-gut interactions in nervous  
512 *exhaustion, 1880-1920*. Microb Ecol Health Dis, 2018. **29**(2): p. 1553438.
- 513 4. Schäfer, M.L., [*On the history of the concept neurasthenia and its modern variants chronic-*  
514 *fatigue-syndrome, fibromyalgia and multiple chemical sensitivities*]. Fortschr Neurol Psychiatr,  
515 2002. **70**(11): p. 570-82.
- 516 5. Beard, G.M., *American nervousness, its causes and consequences: a supplement to nervous*  
517 *exhaustion (neurasthenia)*. 1881, New York (NY): G.P. Putnam's Sons. p. 9-17.
- 518 6. Aho, K., *Neurasthenia revisited: On medically unexplained syndromes and the value of*  
519 *hermeneutic medicine*. Journal of Applied Hermeneutics, 2018. **6**: p. 1-14.
- 520 7. Angell, E.B., *Neurasthenia*. The American Journal of Nursing, 1915. **15**(5): p. 364-371.
- 521 8. Bholá, P. and S.K. Chaturvedi, *Neurasthenia: tracing the journey of a protean malady*. Int Rev  
522 Psychiatry, 2020. **32**(5-6): p. 491-499.
- 523 9. World Health Organization, *Manual of the international statistical classification of diseases,*  
524 *injuries, and causes of death: based on the recommendations of the ninth revision conference,*  
525 *1975, and adopted by the Twenty-ninth World Health Assembly*. Vol. 1. 1977: World Health  
526 Organization. p. 193.
- 527 10. Linde, A., [*Chronic fatigue syndrome--a functional somatic syndrome*]. Therapeutische  
528 Umschau, 2007. **64**(10): p. 567-74.
- 529 11. Wessely, S., *Neurasthenie*, in *Psychiatrie der Gegenwart*, H.H. Helmchen, F; Lauter, .; Sartorius,  
530 N, Editor. 2000, Springer: Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Barcelona, Hongkong, London,  
531 Mailand, Paris, Singapur, Tokio. p. 209-224.
- 532 12. Üstün, T.B., *WHO Collaborative Study: an epidemiological survey of psychological problems in*  
533 *general health care in 15 centers worldwide*. International Review of Psychiatry, 1994. **6**(4): p.  
534 357-363.
- 535 13. Gamma, A., et al., *The spectra of neurasthenia and depression: course, stability and transitions*.  
536 Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci, 2007. **257**(2): p. 120-7.
- 537 14. Sartorius, N., *Diagnosis and classification of neurasthenia*. Basic and clinical science of mental  
538 and addictive disorders. Bibliotheca Psychiatrica, ed. L.L.S. Judd, B.; Filip, V. 1997, Basel:  
539 Karger. p. 1-5.
- 540 15. Gaab, J. and U. Ehlert, *Chronische Erschöpfung und Chronisches Erschöpfungssyndrom*. Vol. 26.  
541 2005: Hogrefe Verlag.
- 542 16. Henningsen, P., S. Zipfel, and W. Herzog, *Management of functional somatic syndromes*.  
543 Lancet, 2007. **369**(9565): p. 946-55.
- 544 17. Rosenberg, R.P., *Sleep maintenance insomnia: strengths and weaknesses of current*  
545 *pharmacologic therapies*. Ann Clin Psychiatry, 2006. **18**(1): p. 49-56.
- 546 18. Ward, L. and G.M. Pasinetti, *Recommendations for development of botanical polyphenols as*  
547 *"natural drugs" for promotion of resilience against stress-induced depression and cognitive*  
548 *impairment*. Neuromolecular medicine, 2016. **18**(3): p. 487-495.
- 549 19. Hubner, R., R. van Haselen, and P. Klein, *Effectiveness of the homeopathic preparation*  
550 *Neurexan compared with that of commonly used valerian-based preparations for the*  
551 *treatment of nervousness/restlessness - an observational study*. ScientificWorldJournal, 2009.  
552 **9**: p. 733-45.
- 553 20. Maisenbacher, J., *Baldrian und Melisse--milde Psychopharmaka*. Therapiewoche, 1992. **42**: p.  
554 2140-2144.
- 555 21. Müller, S.F. and S. Klement, *A combination of valerian and lemon balm is effective in the*  
556 *treatment of restlessness and dyssomnia in children*. Phytomedicine, 2006. **13**(6): p. 383-7.

- 557 22. Orth-Wagner, S., W. Ressin, and I. Friederich, *Phytosedativum gegen Schlafstörungen.*  
558 *Klinische Wirksamkeit und Verträglichkeit eines Phytosedativums mit Auszügen von*  
559 *Baldrianwurzel, Hopfenzapfen und Melissenblättern.* Z Phytother, 1995. **16**(3): p. 147-156.
- 560 23. Park, S.J., et al., *Clinical study on constitutional herbal tea for treating chronic fatigue.* J  
561 Pharmacopuncture, 2014. **17**(4): p. 55-60.
- 562 24. Rother, C. and J. Oexle, *Einsatz von Neurodoron® bei Patienten mit nervöser Erschöpfung*  
563 *aufgrund von Stress.* Der Merkurstab, 2010. **63**: p. 171-177.
- 564 25. Hellhammer, J., et al., *Neurodoron® for Stress Impairments: A Prospective, Multicenter Non-*  
565 *Interventional Trial.* Evid Based Complement Alternat Med, 2022. **2022**: p. 1-11.
- 566 26. Glöckler, M., *Anthroposophische Arzneitherapie für Ärzte und Apotheker [Anthroposophic*  
567 *medication therapy for physicians and pharmacists].* 2014, Stuttgart: Deutscher Apotheker  
568 Verlag. p. 1-1, 1-2.
- 569 27. Kienle, G.S., et al., *Anthroposophic medicine: an integrative medical system originating in*  
570 *Europe.* Glob Adv Health Med, 2013. **2**(6): p. 20-31.
- 571 28. Arendt, A.K., Markus; Kuck, Angela; Kummer, Karl-Reinhard; Schwarz, Reinhard; Simon,  
572 Ludger; Soldner, Georg; Sommer, Markus, *Vademecum Anthroposophische Arzneimittel.*  
573 Merkurstab. Vol. 61, Supplement 1. 2008, Filderstadt: Gesellschaft Anthroposophischer Ärzte  
574 in Deutschland e.V., Medizinische Sektion der Freien Hochschule für Geisteswissenschaft,  
575 Dornach/Schweiz. p. 236-237.
- 576 29. World Health Organization, *The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders:*  
577 *diagnostic criteria for research.* Vol. 2. 1993, Geneva: World Health Organization. p. 109-110.
- 578 30. BfArM, *Anthroposophische Arzneimittel: Aufbereitungsmonographien der Kommission C zu*  
579 *Kalium phosphoricum comp. Bundesanzeiger Nr. 43a vom 02.03.1991, incl. Korrektur:*  
580 *Bundesanzeiger Nr. 170 vom 10.09.1993.*
- 581 31. Levenstein, S., et al., *Development of the Perceived Stress Questionnaire: a new tool for*  
582 *psychosomatic research.* J Psychosom Res, 1993. **37**(1): p. 19-32.
- 583 32. Fliege, H., et al., *Validierung des "perceived stress questionnaire"(PSQ) an einer deutschen*  
584 *Stichprobe.[Validation of the "Perceived Stress Questionnaire"(PSQ) in a German sample.]*  
585 *Diagnostica*, 2001. **47**(3): p. 142-152.
- 586 33. Fliege, H., et al., *The Perceived Stress Questionnaire (PSQ) reconsidered: validation and*  
587 *reference values from different clinical and healthy adult samples.* Psychosom Med, 2005.  
588 **67**(1): p. 78-88.
- 589 34. Morfeld, M., I. Kirchberger, and M. Bullinger, *SF-36 Fragebogen zum Gesundheitszustand:*  
590 *Deutsche version des short Form-36 health survey.* 2 ed. 2011: Hogrefe.
- 591 35. Pines, A. and E. Aronson, *Career burnout: Causes and cures.* 1988: Free press. p. 218-222.
- 592 36. Pines, A.M., E. Aronson, and D. Kafry, *Ausgebrannt, Vom Überdruß zur Selbstentfaltung.* 10 ed.  
593 2006, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. p. 49-50.
- 594 37. Almeida, D.M., et al., *Charting adult development through (historically changing) daily stress*  
595 *processes.* American Psychologist, 2020. **75**(4): p. 511.
- 596 38. Techniker Krankenkasse, *Entspann dich, Deutschland. TK-Stressstudie 2021.*  
597 [https://www.tk.de/resource/blob/2118106/626a9a9c255b5ece9da170a5f2cf5647/stressstu](https://www.tk.de/resource/blob/2118106/626a9a9c255b5ece9da170a5f2cf5647/stressstudie-2021-pdf-zum-download-data.pdf)  
598 [die-2021-pdf-zum-download-data.pdf](https://www.tk.de/resource/blob/2118106/626a9a9c255b5ece9da170a5f2cf5647/stressstudie-2021-pdf-zum-download-data.pdf), 2021: p. 52.
- 599 39. Akobeng, A.K., *Assessing the validity of clinical trials.* J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr, 2008. **47**(3):  
600 p. 277-82.
- 601 40. Anglemyer, A., H.T. Horvath, and L. Bero, *Healthcare outcomes assessed with observational*  
602 *study designs compared with those assessed in randomized trials.* Cochrane Database Syst Rev,  
603 2014(4): p. MR000034.
- 604 41. Concato, J., N. Shah, and R.I. Horwitz, *Randomized, controlled trials, observational studies, and*  
605 *the hierarchy of research designs.* N Engl J Med, 2000. **342**(25): p. 1887-92.
- 606 42. Benedetti, F., et al., *Neurobiological mechanisms of the placebo effect.* J Neurosci, 2005.  
607 **25**(45): p. 10390-402.
- 608 43. Benedetti, F., *Placebo and the new physiology of the doctor-patient relationship.* Physiol Rev,  
609 2013. **93**(3): p. 1207-46.

- 610 44. Carlino, E., A. Pollo, and F. Benedetti, *Placebo analgesia and beyond: a melting pot of concepts*  
611 *and ideas for neuroscience*. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol*, 2011. **24**(5): p. 540-4.
- 612 45. Sauro, M.D. and R.P. Greenberg, *Endogenous opiates and the placebo effect: a meta-analytic*  
613 *review*. *J Psychosom Res*, 2005. **58**(2): p. 115-20.
- 614 46. Tracey, I., *Getting the pain you expect: mechanisms of placebo, nocebo and reappraisal effects*  
615 *in humans*. *Nat Med*, 2010. **16**(11): p. 1277-83.
- 616 47. CAMDOC Alliance, *The regulatory status of complementary and alternative medicine for*  
617 *medical doctors in Europe*. 2010. **13**: p. 19.
- 618 48. Gerdesmeyer, L., et al., *Randomized Placebo-Controlled Placebo Trial to Determine the Placebo*  
619 *Effect Size*. *Pain Physician*, 2017. **20**(5): p. 387-396.
- 620