ChatGPT

History and Development of Biophoton Research

Introduction

Biophoton research examines the ultra-weak light emitted by living organisms, a phenomenon first noted nearly a century ago. Biophotons are distinct from ordinary bioluminescence; they are spontaneous, extremely low-intensity photons produced by cellular processes rather than by dedicated light-producing enzymes [1] [2]. Although these emissions are weak – on the order of a few hundred photons per second per square centimeter of tissue – modern photon detectors can capture them in dark, controlled conditions [3] [4]. Scientists have long wondered whether such faint light is merely a by-product of metabolism or could play a functional role in biological communication. Over the past decades, biophoton research has evolved from early discoveries met with skepticism to a multidisciplinary field straddling mainstream biophysics, biomedical applications, and even fringe theories related to energy medicine and consciousness. This paper reviews the historical development of biophotonics, from its scientific foundations and key figures to its exploration in Western and Soviet contexts. It also examines the proposed links between biophotons and cellular communication, medical diagnostics, as well as more speculative paradigms. Throughout, the often parallel contributions of Soviet/Russian researchers – who at times pursued "biological field" concepts more boldly than their Western counterparts – are highlighted as integral to the biophoton story.

Origins and Early Discoveries: Gurwitsch's "Mitogenetic Radiation"

In the 1920s, Russian embryologist **Alexander G. Gurwitsch** conducted pioneering experiments that first revealed ultra-weak photon emissions from living tissue. In 1923, Gurwitsch arranged two onion root tips in close proximity, separated by a transparent window [5]. He observed an increase in the rate of cell division (mitosis) in one root when the tip of another was pointed toward it – an effect that persisted when a quartz window (which transmits ultraviolet light) was placed between the roots, but disappeared if an ordinary glass barrier was used [6] [7]. Gurwitsch concluded that the inducer root emitted some form of **non-chemical signal** that could stimulate mitosis in the detector root. He termed this signal **"mitogenetic radiation,"** proposing it to be an ultra-weak **ultraviolet light** emission involved in cell-to-cell communication [6] [8]. This bold hypothesis – that cells might communicate via photons – was essentially the birth of biophoton research.

Gurwitsch's findings created a stir and initially attracted interest in the 1920s and 1930s. A few other researchers reported similar observations, and some even attempted physical detection of the radiation using early detectors (e.g. modified Geiger counters) [9]. However, as scientists struggled to **replicate** the mitogenetic effect consistently, skepticism grew. Many of the early experiments were hampered by insufficient controls and statistical methods by today's standards [10]. The eminent chemist **Irving Langmuir** in 1953 famously dismissed Gurwitsch's "mitogenic rays" as an example of *"pathological science"* – results shaped by wishful thinking rather than objective reality [11] [12]. By the 1940s, mainstream biology's focus had shifted toward biochemical and genetic explanations of cell behavior, and reports of mitogenetic radiation faded to the fringes.

Despite Western skepticism, interest in Gurwitsch's ideas persisted in the Soviet Union. Gurwitsch himself continued to refine his "biological field" theory of development, which posited that morphogenesis was guided by field effects (with mitogenetic radiation being one component) [13]. In 1941, his contributions were formally recognized when he **received the Stalin Prize** for the discovery of mitogenetic radiation and its potential application to **cancer diagnosis** [14]. In fact, Soviet clinicians experimented with mitogenetic radiation as a cheap, simple diagnostic tool for cancer in the 1930s–40s, under the rationale that normal and malignant tissues might differ in their ultra-weak UV emission. While this application was never fully validated (and remained virtually unknown in the West at the time) [15] [14], it shows how Soviet science of that era was willing to explore Gurwitsch's phenomenon in practical medicine.

Western and Soviet Research Trajectories (1930s–1970s)

By the mid-20th century, biophoton research diverged into two tracks. In the **West**, Gurwitsch's claims were largely neglected or treated with disbelief after initial replication failures. Only a few isolated researchers kept the flame alive, often framing the phenomenon in safer terms like "ultra-weak luminescence" or **biological chemiluminescence** (to emphasize known chemical reaction origins) [16]. For example, in the 1950s and 1960s, Italian biophysicist **Luigi Colli** and colleagues in Japan (e.g. **Kunio Inaba**) used improved photomultiplier tubes to measure tiny light emissions from seedlings and bacterial cultures, attributing them to ordinary oxidative metabolism rather than exotic new forces [16]. In 1974, Australian researchers T.I. **Quickenden** and R.N. Que Hee finally **replicated Gurwitsch's onion experiment** under rigorous conditions, detecting a weak UV emission consistent with Gurwitsch's reports [17]. By deliberately using modern detectors in dark conditions, they provided Western confirmation that living cells do emit ultra-weak photons, even if the biological significance was unclear. These efforts reframed biophoton phenomena as a legitimate (if niche) area of biochemistry and biophysics, setting the stage for a broader revival.

Meanwhile, in the **Soviet Union**, biophoton research (often termed "ultraweak emissions" or studied under the umbrella of **bioenergetics**) progressed more continuously and openly. Soviet science did not enforce a strict separation between biology and physics [18], allowing concepts like electromagnetic fields in biology to be taken seriously. Gurwitsch's own laboratory in Leningrad persisted through the 1940s (until political pressures intervened) [19], and after his death in 1954, his daughter **Anna Gurwitsch** continued the work with a small team [20]. In **1962**, Anna Gurwitsch and co-workers succeeded in confirming the **existence of mitogenetic radiation** using advanced photomultiplier technology, providing the first direct physical detection of the ultra-weak UV emissions that her father had inferred decades earlier [17] [21]. This milestone went largely unnoticed in Western literature at the time but was a crucial validation of the phenomenon.

Soviet researchers expanded the scope of biophoton investigations. Notably, in the 1960s–70s, **Vladimir P. Kaznacheev** in Novosibirsk conducted an extensive series of over 12,000 experiments on what he called "remote intercellular interactions" [22]. Kaznacheev's team cultured pairs of tissue flasks, treating one culture with a virus or toxic agent, and separated them with either quartz or glass barriers. Remarkably, the healthy culture often began to show pathological changes **mimicking the diseased culture** – but only when separated by UV-transparent quartz, not by glass [22] [23]. In other words, some influence from the infected cells could traverse a quartz window to affect the sterile cells, suggesting an **electromagnetic signal (likely UV)** carried the "disease" information [23]. These results, published in Soviet journals (e.g. *Bulletin of Experimental Biology and Medicine* in 1980), implied that cells could communicate distress or death via biophoton-like emissions [24]. Around the same time, researcher **A. L. Bat'yanov** showed that isolated mitochondria could also interact at a distance: stimulating one batch of mitochondria chemically led to measurable metabolic changes in another batch behind a quartz window [25] [26]. Such Soviet findings were far ahead of their time in proposing a photonic form of cellular communication, and they remained largely unknown to Western scientists until the Cold War waned.

By the late 1970s, therefore, the Soviet context had fostered a robust if unconventional line of biophoton inquiry, treating it as evidence of fundamental **"biological field"** interactions. This paralleled a broader Soviet interest in fields and radiation in biology – including studies of organismal "biofields," Kirlian photography of auras, and electromagnetic therapies – some of which veered into pseudoscience, but much of which was pursued earnestly by credentialed scientists [27] [18]. In contrast, Western science was only beginning to re-engage with ultra-weak photon research, largely stripped of any mystical connotations and grounded in biochemistry.

Fritz-Albert Popp and the Biophoton Revival

The modern resurgence of biophoton research owes much to **Fritz-Albert Popp**, a German biophysicist who in the 1970s–80s independently "rediscovered" these phenomena and gave them the name *biophotons*. Popp became intrigued by reports of ultraweak cellular luminescence and in **1984** published evidence that living cells (and even isolated DNA) emit photons in the optical range [28]. He **coined the term "biophoton"** to denote these photons of biological origin, specifically distinguishing them from ordinary bioluminescence (which involves enzyme-mediated light production) [29]. Popp proposed an audacious theoretical interpretation: that biophotons within an organism form a **coherent electromagnetic field** that coordinates biochemical processes and intra- and intercellular communication [30]. In this view, the cellular light emission is not random "noise" from metabolism but instead is a highly ordered signal – perhaps even a mechanism for a holistic regulation of life, akin to an organism "speaking" in light [31] [32].

Though Popp's coherence theory was (and remains) controversial, his empirical work undeniably reignited interest. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Popp and collaborators demonstrated that biophoton emission is a universal property of life – from bacteria to plants to humans – and they developed improved methods to quantify this ultraweak light [33] [34]. For instance, Popp showed that stressed or damaged cells tend to emit more photons, and he famously claimed one could distinguish the quality of biological samples via photon counts. In one experiment, his group could reportedly tell **organic produce from conventional produce** by differences in photon emission, as organic tomatoes and eggs showed measurably different ultraweak light signatures [35]. Popp's team also noted periodic fluctuations in human photon emission that correspond to circadian rhythms and left-right body symmetry, hinting at links between biophoton output and physiological regulation [36]. Such findings suggested that biophoton measurements might serve as a **noninvasive diagnostic window** into the body's state [36], an idea with obvious appeal.

Equally important, Popp helped institutionalize the field. In 1996 he founded the **International Institute of Biophysics (IIB)** in Neuss, Germany – a network that brought together research groups from around the world (19 groups from 13 countries at its peak) to study biophotons and coherent biological fields [37]. This included Western scientists and also some Russian/Ukrainian colleagues, symbolically uniting the parallel research traditions. In fact, a few years prior, in 1994, Moscow State University had hosted the *First International Gurwitsch Conference* on biophotonics and coherent systems, commemorating what would have been Gurwitsch's 120th birthday [38]. That conference, attended by scientists from Russia, Germany, China, Italy, the Netherlands and more, underscored how Popp and Russian biophysicist **Lev Beloussov** (who co-organized it) were working to bridge Eastern and Western lines of investigation [38]. The late 20th century thus saw biophoton research transformed from a neglected curiosity into a small but lively international field.

Crucially, by the early 2000s **consensus had emerged on one point**: virtually all living cells do indeed emit ultraweak photons as a byproduct of metabolic chemistry [33]. This is now well-established experimentally, largely due to improved photomultiplier and CCD techniques that can detect singlephoton events. However, **interpretations diverge** on why organisms emit this light and whether it has functional significance. The majority of biochemists view biophotons as a form of **chemi-luminescence** arising from oxidative reactions (e.g. reactive oxygen species creating excited molecules that release photons upon returning to ground state) [16] [39]. According to this view, the light is simply an epiphenomenon – a faint glow produced by normal metabolism, correlated with cellular activity but not *causal*. For example, lipid peroxidation and other free-radical reactions in cells can emit photons in the UV/visible range, so higher photon counts might just indicate higher oxidative stress [40].

On the other hand, **Popp and like-minded researchers** posit that these photons may be more than metabolic noise – perhaps a **bioregulatory signal**. Popp's coherent field theory holds that biophotons are emitted and also absorbed within the organism, forming an internal communication network that could complement (or even orchestrate) biochemical signals [30] [32]. He pointed out that the measured emission intensities (on the order of 10^2–10^3 photons/cm^2/second at the body surface) [41], though tiny, might reflect a much denser photon field within cells or tissues if the light is largely trapped and internally reflected. There is also the intriguing fact that DNA can store and re-emit light (Popp found that DNA in vitro can re-emit absorbed UV photons as "delayed luminescence" [42]), suggesting a possible repository of electromagnetic information in the genome.

To date, **definitive proof for a functional biophoton signaling system is lacking**, and most mainstream scientists remain skeptical that such weak light could significantly influence biology [43] [44]. As discussed later, detecting and discriminating any signaling amid thermal noise and other confounders is extremely challenging. Nonetheless, Popp's work ensured that the question – *"What do biophotons do?"* – could be seriously investigated rather than dismissed outright. His legacy, alongside Gurwitsch's, is a field of research that continues to test the boundaries of our understanding of cell communication.

Biophotons in Cellular Communication and Diagnostics

A central question driving biophoton research has been whether cells **use photonic signals to communicate** or coordinate functions. Gurwitsch's original onion-root experiments were essentially about intercellular communication, and the Soviet studies by Kaznacheev powerfully suggested that stress or death signals could propagate via photons. In recent years, a number of carefully controlled experiments have revisited these ideas. For example, researchers have cultured cells in divided dishes (or "dish-on-dish" setups) where cell populations share only an optical connection. Some studies found that if one group of cells is subjected to a stimulus or induced into apoptosis (programmed death), neighboring cells in a separate but optically coupled chamber exhibit synchronous responses – such as changes in calcium ion flux or gene expression – despite the lack of any chemical contact [45]. Intriguingly, when an opaque barrier is introduced, the effect disappears [45]. This indicates that **light transmission** in the UV/visible range could indeed be carrying biologically relevant information between cells. In one case, if cancer cells were placed above healthy cells (with only glass or filters between), the healthy cells showed altered growth and morphology – but not if a black screen was used to block all light [45]. Such experiments, while not yet conclusive, support the notion of **"non-chemical, non-contact" cell signaling** via biophotons.

Within the body, a particularly provocative idea is that neurons might communicate not only through electrochemical impulses but also via photons. Brain tissue is an active source of ultraweak photon emission [46]. Researchers have detected photons being emitted from excised neural tissue and even from the brains of living animals. Some have hypothesized that the threadlike myelinated **axons of neurons could act as light conduits** or waveguides, channeling biophotons over short distances [46]. A recent theoretical paper asked *"Are there optical communication channels in the brain?"*, noting that if neurons both emit and detect photons, this could represent an entirely new layer of neurocommunication (though one operating at the edge of physical detectability) [46]. Another line of inquiry has linked biophotons to the process of **cell division** itself: Gurwitsch's mitosis-stimulating rays find echo in modern observations that cells under stress (like exposure to radiation) emit photons that can induce a "bystander effect," causing nearby unirradiated cells to undergo DNA damage or death, presumably via photon-mediated signaling [47]. These so-called radiobiological *bystander signals* have been observed in experiments where one cell population is irradiated and a neighboring population behind quartz experiences effects as if it too were exposed [47]. The implication is that dying cells release a burst of photons that can trigger stress responses in others – a possible defensive warning system.

The prospect of harnessing biophotons for **medical diagnostics** has also tantalized researchers. Since the 1920s, it was noted that healthy vs. diseased tissues might differ in their ultraweak light emissions. Gurwitsch's early idea of cancer diagnosis by photon emission was premature, but modern studies have revisited similar concepts. For instance, scientists have measured human biophoton emission with photomultipliers and found that the counts can vary with physiological state: metabolic rate, oxidative stress, and even the side of the body (left-right symmetry) all correlate with emission intensity [36]. Some research indicates that cancerous cells emit a different spectrum or level of photons compared to normal cells, potentially offering a **label-free optical biomarker** of malignancy [48]. Likewise, increased ultraweak emission has been recorded during inflammation and tissue injury, presumably reflecting elevated oxidative reactions [49]. The hope is that one day a *"biophoton scan"* could detect early pathological changes in cells before conventional symptoms appear. Indeed, a few exploratory studies have reported that human subjects with certain diseases show altered photon emission patterns from their hands or forehead, though such results require careful replication [48].

Another intriguing application is in evaluating food and biomaterials. As noted, Popp and others demonstrated that the **freshness or organic quality** of foods might be discernible via their photon emissions [35]. The idea is that healthier, more orderly systems (like organic produce or viable seeds) have a lower, more coherent photon emission, whereas stressed or spoiled systems emit higher, more chaotic bursts of photons. This remains on the fringe of practical analytics, but it has inspired some agri-food companies to consider photon counting as a measure of product quality.

Despite these leads, it must be emphasized that **biophoton-based diagnostics are not yet part of mainstream medicine**. The signals are extremely weak and can be influenced by many trivial factors (instrumental noise, ambient light leaks, etc.). Rigorous double-blind studies and standardized protocols are needed to ensure that any claimed diagnostic value isn't an artifact. A major critique is that while correlations between photon emission and biological conditions have been observed, **causation and specificity remain unproven** [39] [50]. For example, a stressed cell might emit more photons, but that doesn't necessarily mean photons are orchestrating the stress response – they could just be a glow of oxidative stress. As one reviewer pointed out, any functional role for biophotons in communication or regulation is still *"highly speculative and controversial,"* and there is no consensus yet that cells have dedicated photoreceptors to sense such weak light [51]. In essence, biophotons are a fascinating physiological epiphenomenon; exploiting them for communication or diagnosis remains an open frontier.

Alternative Paradigms: Energy Medicine and Consciousness

Biophotons occupy a curious intersection between established science and the fringes of "energy medicine." The fact that living cells emit light – however faint – has captured the imagination of those seeking scientific explanations for aura-like fields, acupuncture, and even consciousness. Over the years, a variety of **alternative medicine paradigms** have latched onto biophoton research to support their theories, often extending the science into speculative territory.

One such concept is the **"biofield,"** broadly defined as an endogenous electromagnetic field purported to surround and permeate living organisms. In 1992 the U.S. National Institutes of Health even adopted "biofield" as a term for a class of therapy, and researchers like **Beverly Rubik** have argued that the biofield is a real, measurable component of physiology [52]. Biophotons are frequently cited as a core mechanism of the biofield. Rubik (2002) and others hypothesize that the biofield is a complex electromagnetic field generated by the superposition of ultraweak photon emissions and other electromagnetic emanations from cells, and that it plays a role in regulating health and healing [52] [53]. This line of thought merges biophoton science with ancient concepts of *qi* or life energy, suggesting that what spiritual traditions called an "aura" or life-force could be the cumulative glow of cellular light.

Indeed, some proponents explicitly equate **biophotons with the aura**. They claim that the human body's biophoton field forms a luminous halo detectable by special means – essentially a scientific basis for Kirlian photography and aura-viewing [54]. According to various alternative healers, these biophotons are *"stored in the DNA"* of our cells and enable *"instantaneous communication between all parts of the body"*, acting as a holistic information network orchestrating our health [55]. In this view, illness arises when the biophoton communications are disrupted or incoherent, and healing can be achieved by restoring coherence to the body's light emissions [56]. Such ideas, while inspired by Popp's coherence theory, go well beyond current evidence. They venture into a modern form of **vitalism**, asserting a master "energy field" that governs life – a notion that mainstream biology abandoned in the 19th century but that is being revived in some alternative circles with a quantum-physics veneer [57] [58].

Energy medicine modalities like Reiki, therapeutic touch, and acupuncture have also invoked biophotons in their explanatory models. For example, acupuncture practitioners have long claimed the existence of meridians – channels of energy flowing through the body. Intriguingly, Popp and colleagues in 2005 published a study using infrared-sensitive cameras that they interpreted as visualizing networks of higher photon emission corresponding to acupuncture meridians on the human body [59]. They reported that infrared biophoton imaging revealed line patterns similar to meridian maps, especially after stimulation of acupuncture points [59]. If validated, this could offer a bridge between Eastern medicine concepts and Western biophysics, though skeptics caution that such results are preliminary. Similarly, a few experiments have suggested that practices like meditation or hands-on healing might alter a person's biophoton emission. In one study, subjects practicing meditation showed slight changes in photon emission from the forehead and hands [60]. Another experiment by van Wijk et al. (2005) found that the number of photons emitted from a healer's hands could transiently increase during a "laying on of hands" ritual [61]. These findings are intriguing, but they often appear in journals of complementary medicine and lack widespread replication. **Mainstream science remains unconvinced** that any such modalities measurably influence biophoton output in a reproducible way [62] [63].

Perhaps the most profound (and speculative) intersection is with **consciousness studies**. A minority of theorists have proposed that biophotons might be involved in brain function and even the production of conscious experience [64] [65]. The brain's neurons fire electrochemically, but as noted, they also emit photons – could these photons play a role in the brain's information processing? One hypothesis by neurobiologist **Johannito Bókkon** suggests that biophotons in the brain could be responsible for internal visual imagery – essentially that when we imagine light, our neurons might actually be emitting tiny flashes of real light, which other neurons could possibly detect (a highly conjectural idea) [66] [67]. Other researchers have speculated about quantum coherence in microtubules (structures in neurons), where trapped photons might enable quantum processes relevant to consciousness (as put forth by Stuart Hameroff and colleagues) [68] [69]. These theories are very much on the fringe, and they face the enormous challenge of explaining how such minuscule photon signals could overcome thermal noise and meaningfully influence neuronal activity [70]. Nevertheless, the allure of “light of the mind” continues to inspire research at the edge of neuroscience and quantum biology.

In summary, while biophoton research itself is a legitimate biophysical field, it has become **entangled with fringe science** due to its apparent consonance with holistic and mystic notions. Care must be taken to separate what has been empirically demonstrated (ultraweak photon emission exists and correlates with some biological states) from what is speculative or unproven (that these emissions form an actual communication network, or field, that regulates health or consciousness). Critics warn that some biophoton enthusiasts are effectively resuscitating vitalism in new clothes [71] [72]. Extraordinary claims – such as biophotons enabling spiritual healing or instant cell-to-cell consciousness – require extraordinary evidence, which is currently absent. Still, the cross-pollination of ideas has had one positive effect: it has encouraged more comprehensive investigations of the **“electromagnetic body”**. Even if biophotons turn out not to be communication signals, exploring their behavior has led scientists to catalog many ultra-subtle electromagnetic aspects of life that were previously ignored [73]. As one review noted, numerous weak bio-electromagnetic activities (far below thermal noise levels) have been identified in the body, with some evidence of effects on growth, wound healing, and pain reduction [74]. Biophotons thus fit into a broader context of bioelectromagnetics that challenges us to understand how biology operates across not just molecular and electrical domains, but optical ones too.

Conclusion

The history of biophoton research is a testament to scientific curiosity at the margins – a field born in bold conjecture, tempered by decades of controversy, and now gradually illuminating (quite literally) new facets of biology. From Alexander Gurwitsch’s rudimentary onion-root experiments to today’s ultrasensitive photonic imagers, the core fact has been established: *living cells emit light.* The journey to understand **why** they emit light, and whether it matters, is ongoing. Western scientists, once dismissive, now acknowledge ultraweak photon emission as a real biochemical phenomenon linked to oxidative metabolism [16]. Soviet and Russian researchers, less fettered by conventional doctrine, long treated biophotons as clues to a deeper electromagnetic basis of life, and they propelled the research forward in ways that Western science is only now catching up to [18] [22]. This synthesis of approaches has enriched the field, bringing together rigorous physical measurements with expansive biological theorizing.

Today, biophotonics straddles **multiple worlds**. In mainstream biophysics, it informs studies of oxidative stress, cellular metabolism, and potential novel signaling pathways. In biomedical engineering, it hints at new diagnostic methods (imagine assessing tissue health by its faint glow). In the realm of alternative medicine, it provides a tantalizing scientific vocabulary to discuss ancient concepts of energy and balance – though not yet the validation such practices seek. And on the speculative edges of science, biophotons spark debate about consciousness and quantum biology, forcing us to confront the limits of our understanding of life’s subtle dynamics.

The role of Soviet-era and post-Soviet Russian science in this saga is especially noteworthy. Decades before it was “okay” in the West to talk about cells communicating via light, Soviet scientists were meticulously documenting those very interactions [22]. They integrated biophotons into a broader perspective of **field-based biology**, influencing technologies from crop bioenergetics to space medicine (where understanding the body’s EM field has practical importance) [75] [76]. In the post-Soviet period, Russian and Western scientists have increasingly collaborated, as seen in international conferences and joint studies, merging experimental techniques with conceptual frameworks. This cross-cultural scientific dialogue continues to drive the research forward.

In conclusion, biophoton research has moved from the periphery toward a more accepted (if still enigmatic) place in science. We now know that *"we are all beings of light,"* at least in the ultraweak sense [77]. The open questions revolve around what that light does. Does it play a regulatory role in normal physiology such as cellular growth, circadian rhythms, or neural signaling? Or is it simply a faint candle fl icker of metabolism, carrying no more meaning than a car's engine heat? The consensus of evidence so far leans toward the latter – a by-product – but tantalizing anomalies keep the former hypothesis alive [51] [78]. As detector technology improves and interdisciplinary research grows, we may soon have a clearer picture. Biophotonics stands as a beautiful example of how scientific understanding evolves: one generation's "pathological science" can become another generation's tool for discovery [79]. The history and development of biophoton research remind us that nature still has secrets to shine upon us – sometimes in the most subtle of lights.

References (APA style)

- Beloussov, L. V., & Popp, F. A. (1995). *Proceedings of the First International Alexander Gurwitsch Conference on Biophotonics*. Moscow: Moscow State University Press.
- Cifra, M., Fields, J. Z., & Farhadi, A. (2011). Electromagnetic cellular interactions. *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology, 105*(3), 223–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbiomolbio.2010.07.003
- Kaznacheev, V. P., & Mikhailova, L. P. (1981). *Ultraweak Superlight in Intercellular Interactions*. Novosibirsk: Nauka (in Russian). [Key findings summarized in Kaznacheev et al. (1980) *Bulletin of Experimental Biology and Medicine, 89*, 345–348.]
- Mould, R. R., Mackenzie, A. M., Nunn, A. V. W., et al. (2024). Ultra weak photon emission — a brief review. *Frontiers in Physiology, 15*, 1348915. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2024.1348915
- Popp, F. A., Nagl, W., Li, K. H., Scholz, W., et al. (1984). Biophoton emission – new evidence for coherence and DNA as source. *Cell Biophysics, 6*(1), 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02788579
- Popp, F. A. (2003). Properties of biophotons and their theoretical implications. *Indian Journal of Experimental Biology, 41*(5), 391–402.
- Rubik, B. (2002). The biofield hypothesis: its biophysical basis and role in medicine. *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine, 8*(6), 703–717. https://doi.org/10.1089/10755530260511711
- Rubik, B., Muehsam, D., Hammerschlag, R., & Jain, S. (2015). Biofield science and healing: history, terminology, and concepts. *Global Advances in Health and Medicine, 4*(Suppl), 8–14. https://doi.org/10.7453/gahmj.2015.038.suppl
- Scholkmann, F., Fels, D., & Cifra, M. (2013). Non-chemical and non-contact cell-to-cell communication: a short review. *American Journal of Translational Research, 5*(6), 586–593.
- Point, S. (2019). Biophotons: la conscience sans la science. *Science et Pseudo-sciences, (328)*. (Critical review of biophoton research in the context of fringe claims).

---

[1] [3] [11] [15] [16] [27] [39] [41] [42] [43] [44] [46] [50] [52] [53] [57] [58] [59] [60] [61] [62] [63] [70] [71] [72] [73] [74] [78]
Biophoton — Wikipédia
https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biophoton

[2] [4] [7] [8] [9] [10] [12] [23] [24] [25] [26] [28] [29] [30] [31] [34] [35] [36] [45] [47] [66] [67] [68] [69] [79] Frontiers | Ultra weak photon emission—a brief review
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/physiology/articles/10.3389/fphys.2024.1348915/full

[5] [6] [13] [14] [17] [19] [20] [32] [33] [38] [77] BRMI | History - Alexander Gurwitsch
https://www.brmi.online/gurwitsch

18 21 22 75 76 Russian Field Medicine: Electromagnetic Approaches to Healthcare – Hans Konstapel Blogs
https://constable.blog/2025/07/29/russian-field-medicine-electromagnetic-approaches-to-healthcare/

37 Fritz-Albert Popp - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fritz-Albert_Popp

40 48 49 51 54 55 56 64 65 Biophotons : la conscience sans la science de thérapies quantiques
https://www.afis.org/Biophotons-la-conscience-sans-la-science