The Power of the Misunderstood Placebo Effect

Chase Hughes

Applied Behavior Research, Frontiers

June 15, 2023

Research on the Placebo Effect and Healing

The placebo effect, often viewed as a mere illusion, underscores the human mind's ability to catalyze physiological change and self-healing. This study emphasizes the need to reassess healthcare approaches, incorporating the significant influence of mental processes on health and wellness.

Introduction

Often dismissed as an oddity or a peculiarity in medical science, the placebo effect is typically viewed as a psychological response to the mere illusion of treatment. However, this oversimplified interpretation belies the profound insight the placebo effect offers

into the intrinsic healing capabilities of the human mind. The phrase' placebo effect' itself carries an undue connotation of deception, distracting us from its true implication: the tangible evidence of the mind's influence over bodily function.

At its core, the placebo effect is a testament to the mind's power to affect physiological change. It is a vivid demonstration of how beliefs, expectations, and thoughts can have direct, measurable impacts on our health. Neurobiological evidence confirms that placebo treatments can lead to genuine changes in areas of the brain associated with mood, pain perception, and various bodily functions. This is not a trick, but rather, a manifestation of the potent interconnection between our mind and body - a demonstration of our brain's capacity to repair, heal, and alter our physical state.

The placebo effect underscores a profound truth: our bodies are not separate from our thoughts but are intimately influenced by them. This interconnectedness allows the brain, via a complex network of neurons and chemical messengers, to transmit the 'healing messages' prompted by positive expectations to various body systems. Consequently, the immune system might become more active, or the production of stress hormones might decrease - all based on the 'information' received from the mind. This mind-body dialog, therefore, holds enormous potential for promoting health and recovery.

Labeling this as merely an 'effect' is an understatement, if not a disservice to our understanding of human healing capabilities. It might be more accurate to call it a demonstration of self-directed healing or mind-mediated recovery. It is a wake-up call to reevaluate the role of mental processes in healthcare, inviting us to consider an integrative approach, in which the mind's influence is not an anomaly, but a **fundamental element** of health and wellness.

The Placebo Effect and Healing

For the past 60 years, the placebo effect has caused fascination, confusion, and irritation within the field of biomedicine. Despite accelerating scientific research in the past decades, particularly in the field of neurobiological mechanisms, there has been a lack of sufficient effort to develop a comprehensive theory on the placebo effect (Miller, Colloca & Kaptchuk, 2009). While there may not be a universally agreed-upon definition of the placebo effect, this term is commonly understood as the positive outcome resulting from the psychological and physiological factors associated with the clinical encounter. Such factors may include the patient's beliefs, expectations, and the therapeutic relationship between the patient and the healthcare provider.

Often, the placebo effect is observed in clinical trials where a control group is given a placebo, or inert substance, instead of the active treatment being studied. The placebo effect serves as a benchmark against which the effectiveness of the actual treatment is evaluated. There are instances where the placebo effects can manifest as a genuine improvement in symptoms, suggesting that the patient's perception and mindset play a significant role in their overall health outcomes. A study by Miller, Colloca & Kaptchuk (2009) on illness and interpersonal healing of the placebo effect acknowledges that the placebo effect can indeed coexist with and enhance the effectiveness of medical interventions that have been proven to have specific treatment efficacy. In clinical practice, it is recognized that both the specific physiological effects of a treatment and the non-specific elements of the clinical encounter can contribute to positive health outcomes. While the specific effects of a treatment are based on its pharmacological or physiological properties, the non-specific elements, including the placebo effect, stem from the context, communication, and therapeutic relationship between the healthcare provider and the patient (Miller, Colloca & Kaptchuk, 2009).

Miller, Colloca & Kaptchuk, (2009) further provides that the nature of interactions between health practitioners and their patients, both through verbal and nonverbal communication, can influence the patient's expectations and beliefs, thereby potentially amplifying the placebo effect. For instance, the way a healthcare provider explains the treatment, shows empathy, and conveys confidence can contribute to the patient's overall perception of the treatment's effectiveness. This can subsequently influence the patient's psychological state, potentially leading to improved outcomes, even if the treatment itself has no specific physiological effect.

Notably, while the placebo effects have the capacity to improve treatment outcomes, a study by Dorn et al. (2007) confirmed that it is not a substitute for evidence-based medical interventions. The placebo effect should not be relied upon as the sole form of treatment, and rigorous scientific evaluation is still necessary to establish the specific efficacy of medical interventions. Additionally, we should not confuse the placebo effect with a cure or a substitute for evidence-based medical treatments. Instead, it confirms why considering the psychological and contextual factors in the treatment process is essential and emphasizes the need for rigorous scientific evaluation of medical interventions. Dorn et al. (2007) and Bendsten et al. (2003) have acknowledged that the evidence of placebo effects primarily comes from two types of experimental research: randomized placebo-controlled clinical trials and laboratory experiments.

In randomized placebo-controlled clinical trials, participants are randomly assigned to different groups. One group receives the active treatment, such as a drug or medical

procedure, while the other group receives a placebo, which is an inactive substance or sham procedure. The participants and researchers are usually unaware of who is receiving the active treatment or the placebo, which helps minimize bias. During these trials, researchers measure the outcomes and symptoms of the participants before and after the treatment. It is often observed that patients in the placebo arm, who are receiving the inactive substance, show improvements in their symptoms compared to their pretrial baseline (Dorn et al., 2007). These improvements can sometimes be substantial and comparable to those seen in the active treatment group.

Also, laboratory experiments specifically designed to evaluate the placebo effect contribute to its evidence. These experiments are conducted under controlled conditions, where researchers administer a placebo to participants and measure various outcomes, such as pain perception, mood, or cognitive performance. These studies aim to isolate and understand the psychological and physiological mechanisms underlying the placebo effect. It can be, therefore, stated that the results from placebo-controlled clinical trials and laboratory experiments provide strong evidence for the existence of placebo effects. They demonstrate that the belief in receiving a beneficial treatment can lead to fundamental physiological and psychological changes in individuals, even when they are knowingly receiving an inactive substance or sham intervention.

A number of studies on clinical trials of the placebo effects have found that the improvements observed in the placebo arm of clinical trials could be influenced by factors other than the placebo effect (Hrobjartsson 2002; Miller & Rosenstein 2006). The two often mentioned factors are the natural history of the condition and regression to the mean. The natural history of a condition refers to the course it would take without any specific treatment. Some conditions naturally improve over time, and participants in a clinical trial, including those in the placebo group, may experience this improvement regardless of the intervention they receive (Hrobjartsson, 2002). Regression to the mean is a statistical phenomenon suggesting the extreme measurements or symptoms which tend to move closer to the average over time. If participants are enrolled in a clinical trial based on their unusually high or severe symptoms, it is possible that, over time, those symptoms may naturally regress towards the average, regardless of the intervention received. Indeed, these factors can contribute to the improvements observed in the placebo group. However, the placebo-controlled design of clinical trials helps control for these effects to some extent (Miller & Rosenstein, 2006).

By comparing the placebo group to the active treatment group, researchers can account for the natural history of the condition and regression to the mean. If the placebo group shows significantly greater improvement compared to the baseline and similar improvements to the active treatment group, it suggests that the placebo effect has

played a role in the observed outcomes ((Hrobjartsson, 2002)). While it is challenging to completely rule out the influence of natural history and regression to the mean, rigorous study designs, including randomization and blinding, are employed to minimize these confounding factors. These designs increase confidence in attributing the observed improvements to the placebo intervention and its surrounding clinical context.

Recently, Hrobjartsson and Gotzsche have updated their meta-analysis of a randomized trial compromising placebo and no-treatment groups. The trial comprised a data set from 234 trials and 16,570 patients. The findings from this study suggest that placebo effects have been observed in clinical trials, particularly in relation to subjective outcomes such as pain relief and relief from nausea. These effects were found to be more prominent in certain subgroups and under specific conditions (Hrobjartsson, 2009). A key observation from the study showed that the placebo effects were more pronounced when physical interventions were used as placebos compared to pill-based placebos. This suggests that the physical act of receiving treatment, even if it is inert, may have a more substantial psychological impact on patients.

Another thing that was noted in the randomized trial is that placebo effects were more significant for patient-reported outcomes compared to outcomes reported by observers or healthcare providers (Hrobjartsson, 2002). This highlights the subjective nature of placebo effects, where patients themselves perceive improvements in their symptoms or well-being. Whether patients were informed about the possibility of receiving a placebo intervention was another factor noted to have influenced the placebo effect. When patients were unaware that they might be receiving a placebo, the placebo effects appeared to be more pronounced. This shows that the belief and expectation of receiving an active treatment play a role in enhancing placebo responses.

Additionally, placebo effects were more prominent in trials explicitly designed to study placebo effects. These trials likely incorporated specific methodologies or elements to optimize the placebo response, such as providing comprehensive patient support, emphasizing the potential benefits of the intervention, or creating a strong therapeutic context (Hrobjartsson, 2002). While the effects of placebos may be modest overall, these findings highlight the importance of considering contextual factors and individual beliefs and expectations when evaluating placebo responses. The specific design of the trial, the type of placebo intervention used, patient knowledge of receiving a placebo, and the nature of the outcomes being measured can all influence the magnitude of the observed placebo effects.

Over the past several decades, the reality of placebo effects has been demonstrated repeatedly in laboratory experiments. These experiments have provided valuable insights into the physiological and neurobiological mechanisms underlying the placebo effect. Historical experiments, such as those conducted by Stuart Wolf in 1950, laid the foundation for understanding placebo effects (Benedetti, 2021). Wolf's experiments involved a janitor with a stomach fistula and two pregnant women, and they demonstrated how the power of suggestion and belief could influence physiological responses. In the past 30 years, laboratory studies have expanded our understanding of placebo effects by showing that placebo interventions can lead to measurable changes in neurotransmitters, hormones, and immune regulators (Benedetti, 2021). These studies have shed light on the complex interactions between psychological factors and physiological processes in placebo responses.

Brain imaging techniques have, in recent years, been employed to investigate the neurobiological mechanisms underlying placebo effects. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) has largely been used by researchers to study the patterns of brain activities during placebo interventions (Colloca et al., 2008). These studies have provided insights into the regions of the brain involved in placebo responses and have helped unravel the underlying neural pathways. One significant breakthrough was the discovery, starting in the late 1970s, that placebo analgesia (pain relief) is mediated by the release of endogenous opioids—natural pain-relieving substances produced by the body (Collaca et al., 2008). This finding provided scientific credibility to the placebo phenomenon by identifying specific biological mechanisms involved.

The significant increase in research on placebo effects has challenged dismissive attitudes within biomedicine and has highlighted the importance of considering the placebo response in clinical practice. Understanding the underlying biological mechanisms has contributed to the recognition of placebo effects as genuine phenomena with real physiological consequences. By investigating the physiological and neurobiological aspects of the placebo effect, researchers have managed to provide scientific support for its existence and demonstrate its potential relevance in various medical contexts.

Notably, while laboratory studies have provided valuable insights into the underlying mechanisms of placebo effects, their direct applicability to clinical settings and long-term effects in patients remains an open question. Many experiments focused on placebo mechanisms have typically enrolled healthy volunteers and focused on understanding placebo analgesia or other specific phenomena (Miller et al., 2009). The relevance of the findings derived from these studies to placebo effects in clinical pain conditions or other medical conditions may not always be clear. The responses observed in healthy individuals may not necessarily translate directly to patients with complex medical

conditions. Moreover, most studies examining placebo effects in patients have primarily focused on short-term effects, typically lasting from minutes to hours or a few days. These short-term effects may not fully capture the complexities and dynamics of placebo responses in real-world clinical settings, where treatment effects and patient outcomes are evaluated over longer durations.

There is indeed a need for translational placebo research involving patient-subjects to better understand the clinical implications of placebo effects over time. Such research would help shed light on how placebo effects can be harnessed and enhanced to improve patient care (Miller et al., 2009). By studying placebo responses in patients with diverse medical conditions and assessing their long-term effects, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the potential therapeutic benefits and challenges associated with placebo interventions. By conducting translational research that bridges the gap between laboratory experiments and clinical practice, scientists can address the questions surrounding the clinical relevance and long-term implications of placebo effects. This research can help inform the development of effective and ethical approaches to leverage placebo responses in patient care, ultimately benefiting individuals with various medical conditions.

The Placebo Effect and Healing

Different commentators have, over the past 30 years, described the distinction between disease and illness. The description has been fruitful in locating the placebo effect within the field of healing. Disease refers to the biological dysfunction or abnormality within the human organism. It is primarily the focus of diagnosis and treatment within the biomedical model. It can be said, therefore, that understanding of a disease is often in terms of pathophysiology, which involves the scientific study of the underlying biological processes and mechanisms that contribute to the development and progression of a particular condition. Illness, on the other hand, refers to the subjective experience of detriments to health, including the symptomatic manifestation of disease. It encompasses the personal and lived experience of being unwell, which can include physical, psychological, and social dimensions. Illness is understood phenomenologically, emphasizing the first-person perspective and the unique ways in which individuals perceive, interpret, and navigate their health challenges.

Importantly, a disease primarily affects the body, while illness affects the person as a whole. Disease is rooted in biological dysfunction or abnormality, while illness is a complex interplay of physical sensations, emotions, beliefs, and cultural factors. It is possible for a person to have a diagnosable disease without experiencing noticeable

symptoms or illness. Conversely, individuals can experience illness without a clear diagnosable disease, as the experience of being unwell can result from various factors beyond purely biological dysfunction. Also worth noting is that disease and illness are not mutually exclusive categories. In various instances, the pathophysiology of a disease gives rise to characteristic symptoms, which are experienced subjectively as illness (Carel, 2008). For example, a person with a specific disease may experience pain, fatigue, or other symptoms that impact their overall well-being and quality of life. In this way, illness and disease often coexist, and their relationship can be dynamic and complex. Understanding both the pathophysiology of disease and the lived experience of illness is crucial for comprehensive healthcare. Recognizing the interplay between the biological and phenomenological aspects allows healthcare professionals to provide more holistic and patient-centered care that addresses not only the underlying disease but also the individual's subjective experience of illness.

In clinical settings/situations, the scientific evidence relating to the placebo effect suggests that placebo effects are primarily salient in ameliorating illness. This is particularly in relieving symptoms and distress, rather than directly curing or controlling the underlying disease.

One extensively studied area of placebo research is the effects of placebos on pain and related forms of distress, which are prominent manifestations of illness. Studies that are focused on this area have shown that placebo interventions can provide short-term symptomatic relief through various mechanisms, including the release of endogenous opioids and dopamine. For example, laboratory experiments have demonstrated the ability of placebos to induce analgesic effects and alleviate pain perception.

In the context of chronic conditions marked by pain or distress, such as certain types of chronic pain or psychiatric disorders, significant and lasting symptomatic relief following sham acupuncture or other placebo interventions have been reported by patients. These effects have been observed when comparing placebo interventions to no-treatment control groups or usual care control groups (Rajagopal, 2006). It is, however, important to note that there is limited reliable evidence to support the notion that placebo interventions can directly cure or control the disease by modifying the underlying pathophysiology. The evidence for placebo interventions producing objective benefits in treating disease beyond relieving distressing symptomatic manifestations is generally lacking. This lack of solid evidence regarding the ability of placebo interventions to influence the course of the disease is highlighted in a meta-analysis conducted by Hrobjartsson and Gotzsche in 2001. The analysis included 114 trials with placebo and no-treatment control groups (Hrobjartsson & Gotzsche, 2001). The results showed that placebo treatment was only found to be superior to no-treatment control groups for continuous subjective outcomes, such as pain relief.

Miller and Kaptchuk (2008a) have suggested that the connection between the placebo effect and the confusing concept of the placebo hampers the understanding of the placebo effect. There are a number of negative and often misleading characterizations of the placebo effect. These characterizations can hinder our understanding of the therapeutic potential and nuanced nature of placebo responses. One common misconception is that placebos are inert or have no effects at all. While placebos themselves may not have direct pharmacological or physiological effects, they can still elicit genuine and measurable therapeutic responses. Placebo interventions can activate a cascade of psychological and neurobiological processes that contribute to symptom relief and subjective improvements in patients. Therefore, it is inaccurate to dismiss placebos as completely ineffective or meaningless. Another misleading characterization is the notion that placebo effects are purely non-specific. While it is true that placebo responses can be observed across various conditions and treatments, they are not indiscriminate or unrelated to the specific context. Placebo effects can vary depending on factors such as the patient's expectations, the therapeutic context, and the specific condition being treated (Miller & Kaptchuk, 2008b). Placebo responses can be influenced by factors such as conditioning, patient-clinician interactions, and the beliefs and attitudes of both the patient and the healthcare provider. These factors contribute to the individualized and context-dependent nature of placebo effects.

In clinical practice, placebo treatments are sometimes referred to as "impure" placebos, where an active agent without specific efficacy for the patient's condition is given. While the intention may be to please or placate the patient, the therapeutic effects of placebo interventions are not solely based on deception or misleading suggestions. The psychological and physiological mechanisms underlying placebo responses extend beyond mere suggestion or deception. Ethical considerations should be considered when using placebo interventions, ensuring informed consent and transparent communication with patients (Tilbert et al., 2008). Within randomized controlled trials (RCTs), which are often considered the gold standard in evidence-based medicine, placebo effects are sometimes seen as noise or nuisance variables that need to be controlled for. While it is essential to differentiate between specific treatment effects and placebo effects, it is also important to recognize that placebo responses can play a significant role in treatment outcomes. Understanding and properly accounting for placebo responses in clinical trials can provide valuable insights into the overall therapeutic effectiveness of interventions.

Placebo Effects and Stress Response

The cognitive benefits of clinical interventions can be attributed to various mechanisms that are associated with stress reduction, decreased anxiety, and improved mood.

Fricchione & Stefano, (2005) suggest that one of these potential mechanisms is the modulation of the mesolimbic and mesocortical pathways involved in stress response, which may contribute to the beneficial effects of positive clinical expectancy. Vase et al. (2005) further found that anxiety levels correlate with placebo analgesia effects, suggesting that the reduction of anxiety itself can contribute to the pain-relieving effects of placebos. Interestingly, this correlation has been observed independent of the opioid system, indicating that other mechanisms may be involved (Vase et al., 2005). The reduction of negative emotions is considered a critical component of placebo analgesia, further supporting the idea that psychological factors play a significant role in placebo responses (Vase et al., 2005). Perceived stress has also been shown to impact placebo responsiveness in cognitive enhancement, highlighting the influence of stress on placebo effects in different contexts (Oken et al., 2008).

Experimental manipulation of expectancy in placebo analgesia studies has been found to alter cortisol levels. Cortisol is a hormone associated with stress response, and its modulation suggests that placebo effects can have physiological consequences (Benedetti et al., 2003). Studies have further found that non-suppression of cortisol on a dexamethasone suppression test has been associated with a poorer response to placebo, indicating a potential relationship between cortisol regulation and placebo responsiveness (Oken et al., 2008). Psychoneuroimmunology, which studies the interactions between psychological processes, the nervous system, and the immune system, may also contribute to placebo responses. Conditioning and the various facets of medical provider-patient interactions can impact stress levels and potentially influence placebo responses through psychoneuroimmunological mechanisms (Ader et al., 2001). These findings highlight the multidimensional nature of placebo responses, involving cognitive, emotional, and physiological factors. The psychoneuroimmunological aspects, along with the impact of stress and various interactions within the medical provider-patient relationship, contribute to the complex mechanisms underlying placebo responses. Understanding these mechanisms is crucial for developing more effective and personalized healthcare interventions.

Placebo Effect and Pain

The pain system is one of the most extensively studied models for investigating placebo effects. Studies have shown that placebo responses can lead to a reduction in pain perception, and this has been observed in various experimental settings. For example, research involving the removal of impacted third mandibular molars (wisdom teeth) has demonstrated placebo effects in pain reduction. Placebo responders, who experienced a decrease in pain perception after receiving an inert substance, showed a reversal of this effect when naloxone, an opioid antagonist, was administered. In contrast, individuals

who did not respond to the placebo showed no change in pain perception when naloxone was given (Levine & Gordon, 1984). This suggests that the placebo response in pain reduction may be mediated, at least in part, by the activation of the endogenous opioid system.

Furthermore, studies have shown that the time it takes for the placebo response to occur can vary. Following intravenous administration of an inert drug, the improvement in pain ratings was observed to have a latency of approximately 45 minutes (Levine et al., 1979). This indicates that the placebo response may involve complex temporal dynamics, with the effects gradually emerging over time. The magnitude of the placebo response in pain reduction appears to be influenced by the initial pain ratings of the individuals. Subjects who reported higher levels of pain at the beginning of the study tended to experience a greater placebo response in terms of pain reduction (Levine et al., 1979). This suggests that baseline pain intensity may modulate the susceptibility to placebo effects, with individuals experiencing more significant improvements if they start with higher levels of pain. These findings demonstrate the relevance of the pain system as a model for understanding placebo effects. The involvement of the endogenous opioid system and the influence of initial pain ratings provide insights into the mechanisms underlying placebo responses in the context of pain perception.

Several studies have shown that naloxone does not completely block the placebo analgesic effect. This, therefore, suggests that other mechanisms are also involved in producing the pain-relieving effects of placebos (Gracely et al.1983). Subsequent research has provided further insights into the mechanisms underlying placebo analgesia. While a portion of the placebo analgesic effect is mediated through opioid pathways, it has been shown that not all placebo effects rely on the activation of the endogenous opioid system (Oken, 2008). In an experimental pain model involving ischemic arm pain in healthy individuals, participants were given either an opioid (morphine) or a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) called ketorolac. The analgesic effects observed on the following day, when participants were given saline but were told it was an active drug, are presumed to be related to the placebo effect. Interestingly, the improvement in pain perception, which is thought to be partially related to conditioning, could be completely blocked with naloxone following morphine administration but not following ketorolac administration (Amanzio and Benedetti, 1999). This suggests that the placebo analgesic effect can operate through different mechanisms depending on the specific type of analgesic used.

Another study using the same experimental pain model explored the influence of open (visible) versus hidden (concealed) injections of analgesic on placebo responses. The

results of this study further supported the role of conditioning in placebo analgesia (Benedetti et al., 2003).

Overall, these findings highlight the complex and multifaceted nature of placebo analgesia. While opioid pathways play a significant role in some placebo responses, other mechanisms, such as conditioning, may also contribute to the analgesic effects observed. Understanding the various mechanisms involved in placebo analgesia can help guide future research and potentially lead to more effective pain management strategies. Amanzio et al. (2001) explored the impact of open versus hidden injections of analgesics on placebo responses in terms of pain tolerance. The findings indicated that subjects had greater pain tolerance following open injections compared to hidden injections of analgesics. The greater pain tolerance observed in the open condition was associated with a significantly greater variability among participants.

Furthermore, the administration of naloxone, an opioid antagonist, following open administration of the analgesic ketorolac decreased the analgesic response to a level similar to that observed following hidden administration. This suggests that the improvement in analgesic response in the open condition compared to the hidden condition was mediated through opioid pathways. Similar conclusions were reached in patients who underwent thoracotomy and could not be given naloxone. The higher variability observed in the open condition is an important finding. The measure being evaluated, which was the total analgesic dose required by the patients, was significantly lower in the open condition compared to the hidden condition but still exhibited a greater variance. This indicates that the responsiveness to placebo varied more across subjects in the open condition than the blinded response to analgesics. In other words, individual responses to placebo were more diverse and less consistent compared to the responses observed when participants were unaware of whether any medication was administered. These findings highlight the complex nature of placebo responses, suggesting that factors such as openness to treatment and individual variability can influence the magnitude and consistency of placebo effects. The involvement of opioid pathways in mediating placebo responses further underscores the importance of considering multiple mechanisms in understanding the analgesic effects of placebos.

Indeed, in addition to opioids, the neuropeptide cholecystokinin (CCK) has been implicated in the placebo analgesic effect (Oken, 2008). Proglumide, an antagonist of CCK, has been shown to enhance the placebo effect in experimental pain conditions. Interestingly, this effect was observed only in individuals who were placebo responders, while placebo non-responders did not experience any change in pain with proglumide administration.

Regarding neuroimaging studies using positron emission tomography (PET) and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), research conducted on healthy subjects

during experimental pain has shown similarities in the activation patterns of brain areas involved in opioid-induced analgesia and placebo-induced analgesia. However, there are differences in the spatial extent and degree of cerebral activation between the opioid effect and the placebo effect, with the opioid effect often showing greater activation. Additionally, variations in activation patterns have been observed between individuals who are high placebo responders and those who are low placebo responders (Wager et al., 2004). Based on these findings, it can be argued that multiple neurochemical systems, including opioids and neuropeptides like CCK, may contribute to the placebo analgesic effect. Moreover, individual differences in placebo responsiveness can be reflected in distinct patterns of cerebral activation. Further research is needed to fully understand the specific mechanisms underlying these effects and how they relate to variations in placebo responsiveness.

Placebo Effect and Response to Parkinson's Disease

In studies examining the placebo effect in Parkinson's disease, researchers have observed that approximately one-sixth of subjects showed improvement when receiving placebo treatment (Goetz et al., 2002). It's important to note that these studies did not include a no-treatment control group, which limits the ability to determine the specific contribution of placebo versus natural progression or other factors. Furthermore, when objective improvements on the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale were observed, they were not consistently related to subjective changes, raising the possibility of examiner biases or other factors influencing the outcomes.

A systematic review of the placebo effect in Parkinson's disease found no significant associations between placebo responsiveness and factors such as age, gender, religion, level of education, or duration of the disease (Goetz et al., 2002). This suggests that placebo responses in Parkinson's disease may not be strongly influenced by these demographic or disease-related factors. While a subset of individuals with Parkinson's disease may show objective improvements in response to placebo treatment, further research is needed to better understand the mechanisms and factors involved in these responses, as well as to address potential biases and confounding factors that could influence the results.

PET scans using [11C] raclopride were conducted on patients with Parkinson's disease, both without the administration of any drugs and after receiving blinded administration of either placebo or apomorphine. The patients who received a placebo showed a significant decrease in raclopride binding in the neostriatum, indicating endogenous dopamine release. The changes in raclopride binding reflecting dopamine release in the

caudate and putamen were approximately 20% (Goetz et al., 2002). It's important to note that motor testing was not performed simultaneously with the PET scans, so the direct relationship between the PET results and motor improvements is unclear. In the context of surgery for Parkinson's disease, expectancy effects have been found to produce outcomes comparable to the actual surgery itself. In a study where subjects believed they received real surgery, they had better outcomes compared to those who believed it was sham surgery, regardless of whether they actually received the real or sham surgery (McRae et al., 2004).

Furthermore, in a small group of Parkinson's disease patients with subthalamic stimulators, better motor performance was observed when subjects believed the stimulator was functioning compared to when they were told it was being turned down (Pollo et al., 2002). There also appeared to be increased firing rates in the subthalamic region associated with the placebo effect (Benedetti et al., 2007). This shows that placebo effects can have an impact on neurochemical and neural activity in Parkinson's disease, potentially influencing motor performance and related outcomes. Further research is needed to better understand the mechanisms underlying these effects and to determine how they can be utilized to enhance patient care.

Placebo Effect and Multiple Sclerosis

In some intervention studies, multiple assessments are conducted prior to the initiation of active treatment. This, as a result, allows for a partial evaluation of the placebo effect by comparing the data from the placebo treatment phase to the baseline period. For example, in a study involving interferon b-1a in multiple sclerosis, the placebo control group showed a 20% decrease in MRI lesion number compared to the baseline period (Giovannoni et al., 2002). Another interferon b-1a trial with a single baseline assessment also observed a placebo-group improvement in MRI, specifically in the number of gadolinium-enhanced lesions. It is, however, challenging to differentiate the placebo effect from the natural history of the disease in published multiple sclerosis trials due to the unpredictable course of the condition. Factors such as disease progression and spontaneous fluctuations in symptoms can contribute to changes observed during the placebo phase. Further research and rigorous study design are necessary to better understand the specific contributions of the placebo effect in multiple sclerosis treatment trials.

Epilepsy

In anticonvulsant trials, it has been observed that significant improvements in seizure frequency, often defined as a 450% reduction, can occur in the placebo arms of the

studies (Jones et al., 2002). However, similar to multiple sclerosis, the course of epilepsy is unpredictable, and there have been no trials specifically designed to directly evaluate the placebo effect with a natural history control. Most current anticonvulsant trials are either add-on trials or comparison trials, which may limit the availability of further data on the placebo effect. In the case of patients with non-epileptic seizures of psychogenic origin, their typical seizures may be induced by placebo interventions such as saline injection, tilt table maneuvers, or simple suggestion. However, due to the high false positive rate associated with inducing seizures through placebo, routine clinical use of placebo for this purpose is not recommended.

Aging and Dementia

Oken et al. (2008) undertook a study involving healthy 65- to 85-year-old subjects that showed that those who took a pill they were told was a cognitive enhancer performed better on cognitive tests, including word list delayed recall, compared to those who did not take any pill. There was a suggestion that the placebo effect was stronger in subjects who rated themselves as having higher levels of stress and in older subjects. Trials on Alzheimer's have observed short-term improvements in cognition in the placebo arms during the first 1-2 months of double-blind placebo-controlled trials (Rogers et al., 1996; Wilcock et al., 2000). Despite being modest, the improvements made (averaging only 0.5-1 point on the Alzheimer Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive Subscale) are unlikely to be solely attributed to learning effects. This is because they do not carry over into succeeding test sessions.

It has further been found that many patients with Alzheimer's disease in clinical trials who receive placebo have the tendency to fare better than what would be expected based on prior natural history control data. While this could be attributed to the placebo effect, other factors such as subject selection and Hawthorne effects (where patients perform better due to the attention received during the trial) may also contribute to the observed outcomes.

A study done by Benedetti et al. (2006) suggests that it is essential to consider that individuals with Alzheimer's disease may experience diminished or absent placebo effects at certain stages of the disease, possibly related to frontal dysfunction. Benedetti et al. (2006) further evaluated the placebo analgesia in patients with Alzheimer's disease. The study's findings showed that the placebo effect was present when the patients had a higher Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) score but disappeared at a follow-up assessment a year later when their MMSE score had declined. The size of the placebo effect was not correlated with the MMSE score but was associated with frontal lobe function, indicating that less impaired frontal function was associated with greater expectancy effects (Benedetti et al., 2006).

Conclusion

Different researchers have argued that scientific research on the placebo effect has lacked a systematic theoretical paradigm and has been akin to "normal science" according to Kuhn's framework (Kuhn, 1970). As one way of trying to bridge this gap, these researchers have proposed a theory of the placebo effect that is grounded in interpersonal healing and the distinction between disease and illness. Their aim is to bring conceptual clarity to the understanding of the placebo effect when exploring these interconnected themes. However, they also acknowledge the limited rigorous evidence regarding the clinical significance of the placebo effect. To bridge this gap, they recommend conducting experimental inquiries that can translate scientific knowledge into improved patient care. They have, with empathy, cited the importance of testing the theoretical paradigm's applicability and usefulness in guiding patient-centered research as the ultimate test of its validity. The authors also draw attention to ethical considerations surrounding the optimization of placebo effects and the minimization of nocebo effects in clinical practice. The need to address these ethical issues in both patient care and placebo research is another thing these authors have emphasized, as it ensures justifiability.

This shows the dire need for the development of a comprehensive theoretical paradigm for the placebo effect, rigorous research to establish its clinical significance, and ethical considerations to guide its application in healthcare settings.

The authors have further emphasized the importance of developing a biological understanding of the placebo effect to enhance people's health beyond the realm of positive thinking. They suggest that placebo effects are mediated through changes in both the neocortical and subcortical systems of the brain. It becomes possible to maximize the benefits and improve the outcomes of healthcare systems when we understand the biological mechanisms underlying the placebo effect. They also argue that sustaining the placebo effect is crucial, as some therapies and therapists may have been successful in improving health by effectively utilizing these beneficial effects. To achieve this, reinforcement of the placebo response is necessary, and current placebo effect studies should aim to avoid extinguishing these beneficial responses through a lack of reinforcement. The essence of improving clinical trial design and interpretation by better understanding and characterizing the non-specific responses that comprise the placebo effect have further been highlighted. The understanding could be one way of ensuring that intervention groups are better matched in terms of placebo responsiveness or expectancy of improvement, particularly in the case of non-blinded interventions. The majority of authors have advocated for a biological understanding of the placebo effect

to optimize health outcomes. The need for sustaining and reinforcing placebo responses and stressing the importance of considering placebo responsiveness in clinical trial design and interpretation have further been emphasized.

References

Ader R., Felten D. L, Cohen N., (2001). Psychoneuroimmunology.

San Diego: Academic Press.

Amanzio, M., & Benedetti, F. (1999). Neuropharmacological dissection of placebo analgesia: expectation-activated opioid systems versus conditioning-activated specific subsystems. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *19*(1), 484-494.

Amanzio, M., Pollo, A., Maggi, G., & Benedetti, F. (2001). Response variability to analgesics: a role for non-specific activation of endogenous opioids. *Pain*, *90*(3), 205-215.

Bendtsen, L., Mattsson, P., Zwart, J. A., & Lipton, R. B. (2003). Placebo response in clinical randomized trials of analgesics in migraine. *Cephalalgia*, *23*(7), 487-490.

Benedetti F, Pollo A, Lopiano L, Lanotte M, Vighetti S, Rainero I. Conscious

expectation and unconscious conditioning in analgesic, motor, and

hormonal placebo/nocebo responses. J Neurosci 2003; 23: 4315–23.

Benedetti, F., Pollo, A., & Colloca, L. (2007). Opioid-mediated placebo responses boost pain endurance and physical performance: is it doping in sport competitions? *Journal of Neuroscience*, *27*(44), 11934-11939.

Benedetti, F. (2021). *Placebo effects: understanding the mechanisms in health and disease*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Carel, H. (2008). Illness. Stocksfield.

Colloca, L., Benedetti, F., & Porro, C. A. (2008). Experimental designs and brain mapping approaches for studying the placebo analgesic effect. *European journal of applied physiology*, *102*, 371-380.

Dorn, S. D., Kaptchuk, T. J., Park, J. B., Nguyen, L. T., Canenguez, K., Nam, B. H., ... & Lembo, A. J. (2007). A meta-analysis of the placebo response in complementary and alternative medicine trials of irritable bowel syndrome. *Neurogastroenterology & Motility*, *19*(8), 630-637.

Giovannoni, G., Munschauer, F. E., & Deisenhammer, F. (2002). Neutralising antibodies to interferon beta during the treatment of multiple sclerosis. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, *73*(5), 465-469.

Goetz, C. G., Leurgans, S., & Raman, R. (2002). Placebo-associated improvements in motor function: comparison of subjective and objective sections of the UPDRS in early Parkinson's disease. *Movement disorders: official journal of the Movement Disorder Society*, *17*(2), 283-288.

Gracely, R. H., Dubner, R., Wolskee, P. J., & Deeter, W. R. (1983). Placebo and naloxone can alter post-surgical pain by separate mechanisms. *Nature*, *306*(5940), 264-265.

Hróbjartsson, A. (2002). What are the main methodological problems in the estimation of placebo effects? *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, *55*(5), 430-435.

Hrobjartsson, & Gotzsche P.C., (2001). Is the placebo powerless? An analysis of clinical trials comparing placebo with no treatment. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2001; 344:1594–1602.

Levine, J. D., Gordon, N. C., Bornstein, J. C., & Fields, H. L. (1979). Role of pain in placebo analgesia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *76*(7), 3528-3531.

Levine, J. D., & Gordon, N. C. (1984). Influence of the method of drug administration on analgesic response. *Nature*, *312*(5996), 755-756.

Jones RE, Moes N, Zwickey H, Cunningham CL, Gregory WL, Oken B.

Treatment of experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis with alpha

Placebo effects Brain (20 08), 131, 2812^2823 2821

lipoic acid and associative conditioning. Brain, Behavior, and Immunity

2008, 22: 538–43

McRae, C., Cherin, E., Yamazaki, T. G., Diem, G., Vo, A. H., Russell, D., ... & Freed, C. R. (2004). Effects of perceived treatment on quality of life and medical outcomesin a double-blind placebo surgery trial. *Archives of general psychiatry*, *61*(4), 412-420.

Miller, F. G., Colloca, L., & Kaptchuk, T. J. (2009). The placebo effect: illness and interpersonal healing. *Perspectives in biology and medicine*, *52*(4), 518.

Miller, F. G., & Kaptchuk, T. J. (2008a). The power of context: reconceptualizing the placebo effect. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, *101*(5), 222-225.

Miller, F. G., & Kaptchuk, T. J. (2008b). Deception of subjects in neuroscience: an ethical analysis. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *28*(19), 4841-4843.

Miller, F. G., & Rosenstein, D. L. (2006). The nature and power of the placebo effect. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, *59*(4), 331-335.

Oken, B. S., Flegal, K., Zajdel, D., Kishiyama, S., Haas, M., & Peters, D. (2008). Expectancy effect: impact of pill administration on cognitive performance in healthy seniors. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *30*(1), 7-17.

Pollo, A., Torre, E., Lopiano, L., Rizzone, M., Lanotte, M., Cavanna, A., ... & Benedetti, F. (2002). Expectation modulates the response to subthalamic nucleus stimulation in Parkinsonian patients. *Neuroreport*, *13*(11), 1383-1386.

Rajagopal, S. (2006). The placebo effect. *Psychiatric bulletin*, *30*(5), 185-188.

Tilburt, J. C., Emanuel, E. J., Kaptchuk, T. J., Curlin, F. A., & Miller, F. G. (2008). Prescribing "placebo treatments": results of national survey of US internists and rheumatologists. *Bmj*, *337*.

Vase, L., Robinson, M. E., Verne, G. N., & Price, D. D. (2005). Increased placebo analgesia over time in irritable bowel syndrome (IBS) patients is associated with desire and expectation but not endogenous opioid mechanisms. *Pain*, *115*(3), 338-347.

Wager, T. D., Rilling, J. K., Smith, E. E., Sokolik, A., Casey, K. L., Davidson, R. J., ... & Cohen, J. D. (2004). Placebo-induced changes in FMRI in the anticipation and experience of pain. *Science*, *303*(5661), 1162-1167.

Contact:

To contact Chase Hughes, or to learn more about Applied Behavior Research, go to www.chasehughes.com.