

Statement of Disagreement by the First Author:

I **strongly disagree** with the journal's decision to retract the paper, "Homeopathic Treatment as an Add-On Therapy May Improve Quality of Life and Prolong Survival in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: A Prospective, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Double-Blind, Three-Arm, Multicenter Study."

Firstly, it is essential to clarify that **individualizing both the homeopathic medicinal products (HMPs) and potency to suit each patient is a fundamental requirement for individualized homeopathic treatment (IHT) to be efficacious**. Describing changes in the dosage of HMPs would not provide any information for physicians who are not trained in homeopathy. Years of training in homeopathy, as provided at the Medical University of Vienna for many years until 2018, for example, enable the meaningful use of homeopathy. The information provided is sufficient for a practitioner trained in 'individualized homeopathic treatment' (IHT) to repeat the study because this is a specific, well-defined and characterized technique used worldwide. **The dosing strategy for the Q potency preparations was transparently reported in the paper.**

Secondly, regarding **Undeclared Conflict of Interest**, I fail to see how: all HMPs were paid for from trial funds and provided by a central, independent homeopathic pharmacy, which sent them to patients free of charge by mail, so that no conflict of interest could arise: there were no financial agreements between the pharmacy and any of the authors. Furthermore, there was no marketing of HMPs at the Medical University of Vienna.

I have reviewed the journal's concerns and maintain that the study was **conducted ethically and rigorously**, and the data presented are **valid and accurately reported as already confirmed before**. I believe the paper makes a significant contribution to the discussion around integrative oncology and stands up to scientific scrutiny. Over the years, I have provided detailed responses to all questions and concerns raised, which sufficiently address all methodological questions and potential misinterpretations of the results.

The retraction, in my view, is not supported by evidence of scientific misconduct or fundamental error, as required to necessitate its removal from the scientific record, and it **does not serve the interests of open scientific discourse to go ahead with a retraction**.

I request that this statement be included in the final retraction notice.