



Praxis2Practice Consulting

In collaboration with

Occidental Institute Research Foundation

Penticton, British Columbia CANADA



E-Mail: carolyn@praxis2practice.com

Website: <https://praxis2practice.com/> | <https://oirf.com/>

*An exclusive translated article for Praxis2Practice Supporters,
published October 2026 by Praxis2Practice Consulting . . .*

Electromagnetic and Bioresonant Therapies In Integrative Oncology

Plausibility, Impact and Current State of Knowledge

By Helena Pöhlmann, BHIthSc, HP

From an article in CO'med, Volume 32, July 2026
Translation & redaction by: Carolyn L. Winsor, P2P Consulting

© Copyright 2026, CO'med, Helena Pöhlmann, Germany
AI Digital and online translation assistance utilized.

Cancer medicine is making progress, but side effects and stresses remain. This is why many patients are interested in non-invasive procedures. This article classifies electromagnetic and bioresonant methods – as a supplement, not as a substitute for standard therapy.

Bioelectrical Basics: Membrane Potential, Fields and Tissue Organization

Living systems generate electrical potentials and currents. **Burr** described "L-fields" as ordering field structures of biological development and health^[1]. **Becker** showed that bioelectrical signals influence regeneration and differentiation and that disturbances of electrical polarity can be associated with pathology^[2]. Modern work by **Levin** and colleagues positions the membrane potential (V_{mem}) as an instructive signal: Modulation of ion transport, gap junctions and tissue polarity can create stable patterns that coordinate cell behavior^[3 - 5]. This is relevant for oncology because tumor cells often show depolarized states and altered ion currents – factors that can promote invasiveness and proliferation.

Structured Water and Cellular Coherence As a Biophysical Link

How weak fields modulate biological systems is being discussed, among other things, about water-protein structures. **Ling** described intracellular water as ordered and closely coupled to macromolecules (Association Induction Hypothesis)^[6, 7]. **Pollack** popularized the "fourth phase" (exclusion zone water), an ordered, charge-separated water structure that can absorb energy and transfer it into order^[8]. The coupling between charge separation, membrane processes and energy metabolism – possible interfaces at which electromagnetic interventions could be initiated – is biophysically interesting.

Biophotons and Field Communication

Popp and colleagues described ultraweak photon emission ("biophotons") and discussed coherence as a feature of ordered biological systems^[9, 10]. **Van Wijk** and **Van Wijk** together summarized data on human biophoton emission and linked them to oxidative metabolism and stress states^[11]. Even if this does not lead to a direct derivation of therapy, the findings support the assumption that biological regulation is not exclusively chemically mediated.

Cancer As a Disorder of Systemic Regulation: Genetic, Metabolic, Bioelectrical

The classical paradigm emphasizes mutations and oncogenic signaling pathways^[12]. In addition, systemic models were established: **Warburg** described aerobic glycolysis as a characteristic tumor feature^[13]; **Seyfried** argues for a primary metabolic disorder with mitochondrial dysfunction^[14]. Bioelectrical perspectives are compatible with this because membrane potentials and ion gradients are closely linked to mitochondrial function, redox balance, and cell cycle control. In this context, **Allegretti** discussed field-based therapeutic approaches as an attempt to influence regulatory disorders^[15].

Procedures In Overview

Pulsed Electromagnetic Fields (PEMF)

PEMFs are the best studied and established in orthopedics^[16]. The literature describes effects on calcium signaling pathways, gene expression, mitochondrial function as well as healing processes^[17]. In experimental models, PEMF can modulate differentiation and apoptosis pathways^[18]. For oncological objectives, the data situation is heterogeneous and strongly parameter-dependent; clinically, the focus has so far been predominantly on supportive goals (e.g. pain, fatigue, regeneration). The dose-response relationship is decisive: frequency, intensity, pulse shape and duration of exposure determine whether an effect occurs at all and in which direction it occurs.

Tumor Treating Fields (TTF)

TTFs, i.e. tumor-treating electric fields, are a special case because they have shown efficacy as field-based therapy in randomized trials. **Kirson** et al. described that low-intensity, medium-frequency alternating fields interfere with mitosis, including via forces on polar macromolecules and spindle structures^[19]. In animal models, a proliferation-inhibiting effect has been shown^[20]. Clinical studies in (relapsed) glioblastoma have shown advantages over the “physician's choice” of chemotherapy and have established TTF as a clinically approved option^[21]. TTF thus forms an important bridge between biophysics and evidence-based oncology.

Frequency-Specific Microcurrent Therapy and Bioelectrical Stimulation

Microcurrent methods have been investigated primarily in pain and inflammation contexts. **McMakin** describes clinical applications; studies report, among other things, cytokine changes in fibromyalgia-associated settings ^[22, 23] Robust studies are lacking for oncological endpoints. However, as a supportive measure (pain, neuropathy symptoms, regeneration), a methodologically sound test is plausible, provided that safety aspects (implants, port systems, electrode position) are observed.

Bioresonance and Resonance Models

In practice, "bioresonance" is often offered as frequency diagnostics and frequency therapy. Scientifically, the term is vague. It makes sense to separate plausible resonance models from clinical claims. **Cosic** formulated a resonance recognition model in which biomolecular interactions are described as frequency-specific electromagnetic coupling^[24]. **Fröhlich** postulated collective oscillation states (long-range coherence) in biological systems^[25, 26], and **Pokorny** discussed electromagnetic activity as part of cellular organization even in disease states^[27]. This theoretical work substantiates plausibility, but does not replace clinical proof of efficacy. For oncological indications, these have so far been largely lacking.

Acoustic and Vibroacoustic Methods

Mechanical oscillations act via mechanotransduction, autonomic regulation and stress axes. Cymatics experiments that make oscillations visible show that sound can organize patterns in matter^[28]. Clinically, music and vibroacoustic interventions are mainly used to reduce stress and anxiety. For hard oncological outcomes, the evidence is predominantly indirect, but relevant for quality of life and stress reduction^[29]. Since stress and inflammatory axes influence the tumor microenvironment, such procedures can be useful in an integrative setting.

Mechanisms of Action: What Is Plausible, What Is Proven?

Electric and electromagnetic fields can influence cell behavior. **McCaig** et al. described electrical control of migration, proliferation, and differentiation^[30]. **Funk** et al. summarized electromagnetic effects from cell biology up to medicine^[31].

Discussed mechanisms include:

- Modulation of ion channels and calcium signaling pathways^[18, 30]
- Cytoskeletal reorganization^[32, 33]
- Resonance coupling to macromolecules^[24]
- Influences via radical pair chemistry ("magnetobiological" effects)^[34]

In oncology, a research agenda can be derived from this: Which parameters are reproducibly effective, which endpoints are clinically relevant and which patient groups benefit?

Safety, Genotoxicity and Dosimetry

Safety discussions are part of the fields. *Lai and Singh* reported DNA strand breaks after acute microwave exposure in an animal model^[37]. Overviews discuss the variability of such findings^[38]. *Diem* et al. described non-thermal DNA damage in cell cultures^[39]. At the same time, work shows that non-thermal effects are strongly dependent on physical and biological variables and that reproducibility is central^[35, 36]. For therapeutic applications, this means that parameters must be precisely documented (frequency, intensity, duration, field geometry), and clinical trials require clear safety endpoints.

Integrative Classification: Patient Demand, Communication and Goal Setting

The use of complementary procedures is common in oncology. The prevalences vary depending on the country and depending on which procedures in each case are classified as "complementary"^[41, 42]. This results in a communication obligation: Clinicians should ask about CAM use, check risks and define goals. For electromagnetic/bioresonant procedures, supportive endpoints are primarily useful (e.g. sleep, pain, fatigue, stress, regeneration). Controlled studies with patient-relevant outcomes, standardised parameters and transparent reporting are required for a serious assessment.

Conclusion

Electromagnetic and bioresonant methods are based on comprehensible biophysical concepts and show experimentally measurable effects. To date, tumor treating fields have been clinically evidence-based in defined indications [19 - 21]. Supportive application for PEMF and microcurrent methods is plausible with a need for further research, while "bioresonance" as an independent tumor therapy is currently largely insufficiently proven. Standardization, dosimetry, controlled studies and realistic clinical target definitions are crucial.

Helena Pöhlmann

Keywords: Integrative Oncology, Pulsed Electromagnetic Fields (PEMF), Tumor Treating Fields (TTF), Bioresonance



Helena Pöhlmann, BHIthSc (Adl.), HP, Master Univ. (Rome), is a health scientist and naturopath [Heilpraktiker] with many years of experience in pharmacy. She has been running a practice for integrative medicine in Lower Bavaria since 2013 and works as a clinical support for users of the Research Genetic Cancer Center (RGCC). She is one of the first German graduates of the Master's program in Bioresonance at Camillus University, Rome.

Literature

- 1) Washington Research Foundation. Dr Harold S Burr [Internet]. [Ort unbekannt]: Washington Research Foundation; [Datum unbekannt] [zitiert 2025 Aug 15]. Verfügbar unter: [URL fehlt].
- 2) Becker RO, Selden G. The Body Electric. New York: William Morrow; 1985.
- 3) McLaughlin KA, Levin M. Bioelectric signaling in regeneration. Dev Biol. 2018;433(2):177-189.
- 4) Levin M. Bioelectric mechanisms in regeneration. Semin Cell Dev Biol. 2009;20(5):543-556.
- 5) Zhang GJ, Levin M. Bioelectricity as signaling cue. Mol Biol Cell. 2025;36(2):pe2.
- 6) Ling GN. In Search of the Physical Basis of Life. New York: Plenum Press; 1984.
- 7) Ling GN. Life at the Cell and Below-Cell Level. New York: Pacific Press; 2001.
- 8) Pollack GH. The Fourth Phase of Water. Seattle: Ebner & Sons; 2013.
- 9) Popp FA. Biophotons. In: Integrative Biophysics. [Ort unbekannt]: Springer; 2003. [Seitenzahlen fehlen].
- 10) Popp FA, Nagl W, Li KH, Scholz W, Weingärtner O, Wolf R. Biophoton emission: new evidence for coherence and DNA as source. Cell Biophys. 1984;6(1):33-52.
- 11) Van Wijk R, Van Wijk EPA. Human biophoton emission. Forsch Komplementarmed. 2005;12(2):77-83.
- 12) Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell. 2011;144(5):646-674.
- 13) Warburg O. On the origin of cancer cells. Science. 1956;123(3191):309-314.
- 14) Seyfried TN, Shelton LM. Cancer as a metabolic disease. Nutr Metab (Lond). 2010;7:7
- 15) Allegretti M. Therapeutic Waves. [Ort unbekannt]: [Verlag unbekannt]; 2020:261-264.
- 16) Bassett CAL. Beneficial effects of electromagnetic fields. J Cell Biochem. 1993;51(4):387-393.
- 17) Markov MS, Ryaby JT, Kaufman JJ, Pilla AA, editors. Pulsed Electromagnetic Fields for Clinical Applications: CRC Press; 2020.
- 18) Ma T, Gao L, Zhao L, Hao X, Tian P, Zhang J, et al. Electromagnetic fields regulate calcium-mediated cell fate of stem cells: osteogenesis, chondrogenesis and apoptosis. Stem Cell Res Ther. 2023;14:147
- 19) Kirson ED, Gurfich Z, Schneiderman R, Dekel E, Itzhaki A, Wasserman y et al. Disruption of cancer cell replication by alternating electric fields. Cancer Res. 2004;64(9):3288-3295.
- 20) Kirson ED, Dbaly V, Tovarys F, Vymazal J, Soustiel JF, Itzhaki A. et al. Alternating electric fields arrest cell proliferation in animal tumor models and human brain tumors. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2007;104(24):10152-10157
- 21) Stupp R, Wong ET, Kanner AA, Steinberg D, Engelhard H, Heidecke V et al. NovoTTF-100A versus physician's choice chemotherapy in recurrent glioblastoma: a randomised phase III trial of a novel treatment modality Eur J Cancer. 2012;48(14):2192-2202.
- 22) McMakin CR. Frequency-Specific Microcurrent in Pain Management. [Ort unbekannt]: Elsevier; 2011.
- 23) McMakin CR, Gregory WM, Phillips TM. Cytokine changes with microcurrent treatment of fibromyalgia associated with cervical spine trauma. J Bodyw Mov Ther. 2005;9(3):169-176.
- 24) Cosic I. Macromolecular bioactivity: is it resonant interaction between macromolecules? Theory and applications. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng. 1994;41(12):1101-1114.

- 25) Fröhlich H. Long-range coherence and energy storage in biological systems. *Int J Quantum Chem.* 1968;2(5):641-649.
 - 26) Fröhlich H. The extraordinary dielectric properties of biological materials and the action of enzymes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci US A.* 1975;72(11):4211-4215.
 - 27) Pokorny J, Pokorny J, Kobilková J. Postulates on electromagnetic activity of biological systems and cancer. *Integr Biol (Camb).* 2013;5(12):1439-1446.
 - 28) Jenny H. *Cymatics: A Study of Wave Phenomena and Vibration.* 2nd ed. Newmarket: Macromedia; 2001.
 - 29) Campbell D. *The Mozart Effect: Tapping the Power of Music to Heal the Body, Strengthen the Mind, and Unlock the Creative Spirit.* New York: Harper-Collins; 1997
- Full literature list available through the publisher CO'med.



**Published by Praxis2Practice Consulting,
With Occidental Institute Research Foundation**
Penticton, BC Canada
Website: <https://praxis2practice.com/> | <https://oirf.com/>
Email: carolyn@praxis2practice.com

