Magnetic Fields in Medicine: Proven Treatments, Promising Research, and the Quantum Question

Human Health Strategies® | Patient and family education

Magnetic fields already do remarkable things in medicine. They help create detailed pictures of the brain without an incision. Carefully delivered magnetic pulses can help some people whose depression has persisted despite treatment. Certain prescription devices support bone healing in precisely defined circumstances.

Those successes make the next questions genuinely interesting. Could different pulses improve joint function? What can the tiny magnetic signals from our organs reveal? Might discoveries about cells, spaceflight, and quantum physics lead to new treatments?

The most useful approach is neither blanket skepticism nor boundless enthusiasm. It is to ask what the field actually does, how it is delivered, and whether people—or animals—benefit in well-designed studies. A magnet is not a treatment plan by itself. Fortunately, the real science is interesting enough without giving it a superhero cape.

Use this guide alongside professional care. This is education, not an individualized prescription or veterinary recommendation. Do not replace depression treatment, fracture care, pain management, or an animal's veterinary assessment with an unverified device. Implanted electronics, metal near a treatment site, pregnancy, and certain medical conditions require device-specific review.

Evidence Summary

• Depression TMS is an established clinical option for selected patients. Particular prescription systems have FDA clearance for specified forms of major depressive disorder after inadequate benefit from antidepressant treatment. Conventional repetitive TMS and intermittent theta-burst stimulation are not equivalent to general-purpose PEMF mats. [1] [2] [3]

• Benefits are meaningful, but outcomes vary. A sham-controlled trial reported remission in 14.1% with active rTMS versus 5.1% with sham at its primary endpoint. Longer courses, different protocols, and routine-practice studies answer different questions and may report higher rates. [4]

• Bone-growth devices have narrow, legitimate uses. Certain PEMF devices have FDA approval for specific orthopedic indications, such as an adjunct to cervical fusion in patients at high risk of non-fusion. This does not establish whole-body pain relief or general wellness benefits. [5]

• Other PEMF applications remain mixed or emerging. Osteoarthritis studies suggest possible benefits for some outcomes, but protocols vary. A 2026 controlled knee trial improved an extension-strength outcome without demonstrating better pain/function scores or cartilage thickness. [6] [7]

• Quantum physics is part of real medicine. Nuclear magnetic resonance underlies MRI. The words "quantum," "energy," and "resonance," however, do not supply clinical evidence for an unrelated product. [8]

• Spaceflight and cardiac fields invite curiosity, not shortcuts. The ISS remains within Earth's gravity and geomagnetic environment. NASA-associated cell research is not proof of an astronaut PEMF treatment. The heart's tiny magnetic signal is measurable with sensitive instruments; interpersonal emotional transmission through that signal has not been established. [9] [10] [11] [12]

• Animals need their own evidence. Small veterinary studies report positive, negative, and mixed findings. A result in a dog, a horse, or a laboratory preparation cannot establish effectiveness across pets, livestock, and humans. [13] [14]

1. One word, several very different technologies

“Magnetic therapy” groups together interventions that differ as much as a flashlight and a surgical laser. Both involve light; no one should assume they have interchangeable clinical effects. Likewise, the presence of a magnetic field does not tell us whether a device can image tissue, stimulate nerves, support bone healing, or simply attract a paper clip.

A static magnetic field is relatively steady. A magnetic bracelet typically supplies this kind of exposure. A time-varying field changes, and a changing magnetic field can induce an electric field in tissue. Pulsed electromagnetic field, or PEMF, describes a broad family of exposures delivered in pulses—not one standardized medical treatment.

Transcranial magnetic stimulation, or TMS, delivers controlled pulses through a coil near the head. At appropriate intensities, the induced electric field can stimulate nerve cells. Repetitive TMS, or rTMS, applies a sequence of pulses; intermittent theta-burst stimulation, or iTBS, is one patterned form. TMS is electromagnetic in a physical sense, but clinically its equipment, targeting, dose, supervision, and evidence must be distinguished from low-intensity consumer PEMF devices. [1] [2]

Technology	What it is used or studied for	The important boundary
MRI	Diagnostic imaging through magnetic resonance	An imaging success does not prove a separate magnetic treatment works.
Prescription TMS/rTMS/iTBS	Defined psychiatric indications, including depression for particular systems	Device, diagnosis, protocol, and patient selection matter.
Named prescription PEMF bone-growth systems	Device-specific indications—for example, high-risk cervical fusion for Cervical-Stim, established traumatic nonunion for listed Physio-Stim models, or spinal-fusion adjunct/salvage for Spinal-Stim	One system’s bone-healing indication does not establish a class-wide claim or generalized pain relief. [5] [15]
Other targeted or whole-body PEMF	Research or marketed uses involving pain, joints, recovery, and other symptoms	Findings cannot be transferred freely between machines or conditions.
Static magnets	Often sold in jewelry, insoles, or pads	Evidence does not convincingly support static magnets for pain relief.

NCCIH, the National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health, distinguishes static magnets from electromagnetic approaches and describes the variable evidence for pain conditions. That distinction is a better starting point than deciding that all magnets are either medical breakthroughs or medical nonsense. [16]

Dose is more than a frequency

Frequency tells us how often something repeats. It does not tell us the full exposure. Field strength, pulse shape, pulse width, rate of change, coil geometry, distance from tissue, treatment duration, and number of sessions all matter. A device operating at the same frequency as a studied device may deliver a very different dose.

The intended outcome matters just as much. Less pain today, stronger muscles in six months, radiographic bone fusion, and remission of depression are separate results. Good research names the result before the experiment rather than choosing the most flattering measurement afterward.

2. Electrical cells and the quantum question

Our bodies are electrically active. Cells maintain differences in electrical potential across their membranes by controlling charged particles, including sodium, potassium, and calcium ions. Nerves and muscles use these processes to signal and act. The heart's coordinated electrical activity drives contraction and produces a measurable magnetic signal.

This is a useful foundation, but it does not mean every cell is a depleted battery waiting for an external field. Different tissues have different electrical and magnetic properties. The important question is whether a particular exposure interacts with a particular biological process strongly and specifically enough to improve health—not whether "energy" exists.

Magnetic effects also occur at an atomic scale. Nuclear spin is a quantum property; some nuclei, including the hydrogen nuclei abundant in the body, interact with magnetic fields in ways that can be measured. In MRI, a strong magnetic field, radiofrequency pulses, and carefully controlled field gradients allow signals from tissue to be turned into images. No miniature compass needles need to be imagined literally inside every cell. [8]

MRI is a beautiful example of a complicated physical principle becoming a practical medical tool. It also illustrates the standard that makes the achievement trustworthy: defined equipment, reproducible signals, known limitations, and safety procedures. MRI uses no ionizing radiation, but it is not risk-free. Metal, implanted devices, radiofrequency heating, and other safety considerations require screening. [8]

What "quantum medicine" can mean

Quantum physics helps explain matter, chemistry, and technologies used throughout medicine. But "quantum medicine" is not, by its name alone, a single accepted clinical discipline with one validated diagnostic method or treatment. Products using that phrase may have entirely different mechanisms—or no clearly specified mechanism at all.

Ask a straightforward question: What exactly is being measured or changed, and what evidence shows that this helps patients? A useful answer should identify a physical quantity, a device, a condition, and a meaningful outcome. "It harmonizes your frequencies" is not enough to determine whether a scan can diagnose disease or a treatment improves it.

Nor does uncertainty make every possibility equally likely. A new mechanism can deserve investigation before clinical benefit is established. It should then be described as a hypothesis, not sold as a completed discovery. Curiosity and careful testing belong on the same team.

3. Depression: where magnetic stimulation has earned a clinical role

Depression can affect sleep, appetite, concentration, relationships, and the ability to imagine a future. When an adequate treatment has not helped enough, having another evidence-based option matters.

TMS does not require surgery or, in ordinary depression treatment, anesthesia. A clinician positions a coil near a selected brain region and delivers a prescribed series of pulses. The goal is to influence brain networks involved in mood, not to "recharge" the whole body. Treatment usually takes place while the person is awake. [3]

What FDA clearance actually covers

In the United States, regulatory language belongs to the specific device and its labeling. The original NeuroStar system entered through FDA's De Novo classification pathway for adults with major depressive disorder who had not improved satisfactorily with one prior antidepressant medication at a minimally effective dose and duration in the current episode. Later systems and changes have their own decisions. [1]

For example, FDA cleared the MagVita TMS Therapy System with Theta Burst Stimulation in 2018 for adult major depressive disorder after unsatisfactory improvement with prior antidepressant medication in the current episode. This was a device-specific 510(k) clearance, not blanket approval of every theta-burst schedule or electromagnetic product. These historical decisions illustrate the distinction; the clinic should verify the current labeling for the exact system and patient population being proposed. [2]

“Treatment-resistant depression” also has different operational definitions in studies and coverage policies. Failure of one medication is not identical to failure of several adequate trials. Diagnosis, prior treatments, episode characteristics, coexisting conditions, and insurance requirements all affect the decision.

How much benefit can people expect?

First separate response, often defined as at least a 50% improvement on a depression rating scale, from remission, meaning symptoms have fallen below a specified threshold. Neither word guarantees that depression will never return.

An important independent sham-controlled trial, published in 2010, analyzed 190 antidepressant-free patients. It compared left-prefrontal rTMS with a convincing sham procedure. The fixed treatment phase lasted three weeks, with additional blinded treatment available to improvers. At the primary endpoint, remission was 14.1% with active treatment and 5.1% with sham. The absolute difference was about nine percentage points; the article reported a number needed to treat of 12. [4]

That finding supports a real antidepressant effect. It also shows why a relative improvement can sound more dramatic than the everyday reality: most participants did not reach remission during that blinded treatment comparison. Later open-label improvement cannot simply be counted as additional proof of benefit over sham.

In the larger THREE-D study, approximately three-minute iTBS sessions were compared with 37.5-minute conventional 10-Hz rTMS sessions, five days weekly for four to six weeks. The study found iTBS noninferior to the established protocol. Reported response/remission rates were approximately 49%/32% for iTBS and 47%/27% for conventional rTMS. [17] [18]

This was an active-comparator trial, not a sham-controlled trial. Its rates cannot be directly compared with the shorter blinded study as though the difference proved a better machine. Participants, medications, treatment duration, and research questions differed. The practical advance was that a much shorter stimulation session could provide similar clinical benefit under the studied conditions.

Faster schedules and personalized targeting

Accelerated approaches deliver multiple sessions per day, sometimes with individualized imaging-based targeting. FDA’s 2022 clearance for the Magnus system with SAINT Technology included a small randomized sham-controlled study of 29 participants. The FDA summary reported remission in 11 of 14 active-treatment participants versus 2 of 15 sham participants. [19]

Those are striking results—and very small denominators. The trial stopped early at a planned interim analysis, which adds caution about how precisely the effect size is known. Such evidence supports investigation and carefully selected clinical use of the named system; it does not mean every accelerated protocol offers the same chance of success, or that a high percentage from one small trial is a personal guarantee.

The separate low-intensity T-PEMF research track

Lower-intensity transcranial PEMF, or T-PEMF, has also been studied for depression. It should not disappear from the discussion merely because it differs from established TMS.

A 2010 sham-controlled, double-blind study tested five weeks of a seven-coil T-PEMF helmet alongside unchanged antidepressant treatment. The electrical fields generated were orders of magnitude weaker than those from rTMS. The study reported a favorable depression-scale effect size of 0.62, with a 95% confidence interval of 0.21–1.02, and few mild treatment-emergent side effects. An effect size is not a remission percentage. [20]

A 2025 publication describes a planned 96-person, eight-week sham-controlled trial of a home-use MoodHeadBand. It is a protocol, not evidence that those participants improved. This is an emerging device-specific research program, not validation of any PEMF mat and not an FDA depression indication. European regulatory arrangements should not be described as U.S. FDA clearance. [21]

4. A treatment course includes safety and a plan for afterward

A conventional TMS course often means appointments on most weekdays for several weeks. A three-minute iTBS stimulation period does not make the entire visit three minutes: positioning, assessments, travel, and waiting still take time. Ask about the practical burden before committing, especially when fatigue, work, caregiving, or transport is difficult.

Clinicians should confirm the diagnosis, review prior treatment, establish a symptom baseline, and discuss reasonable alternatives. Depression that is part of bipolar disorder requires a different assessment from unipolar depression. Psychosis, urgent suicidality, and other serious features may change the most appropriate treatment and setting. [3]

Screening is part of the benefit

Common short-term effects include scalp discomfort and headache. A seizure is a rare but serious risk. Coil clicks can be loud, so suitable hearing protection matters. Staff should be trained to recognize and manage adverse events rather than treating “noninvasive” as a synonym for “nothing can happen.” [22] [3]

Discuss:

• Seizures, brain injury, neurologic illness, and any previous reaction to stimulation.

• All medicines and supplements, alcohol or drug use, withdrawal risk, and significant sleep deprivation.

• Implanted stimulators, cochlear implants, pumps, pacemakers, and metal near the stimulation site; compatibility depends on the exact device and location.

• Pregnancy or plans for pregnancy, hearing problems, and other relevant medical conditions.

• Past mania or hypomania, emerging agitation, worsening mood, or suicidal thinking.

Do not stop medication suddenly to qualify for a procedure. A change in sleep, medication, or substance use during the course may warrant reassessment. New unusually elevated mood, markedly reduced need for sleep, impulsivity, or worsening distress should be reported promptly. [3]

Improvement needs follow-up

TMS is not a lifetime vaccination against depression. Some people sustain benefit; others relapse or need retreatment. Continued medication, psychotherapy, symptom monitoring, and an agreed relapse plan may remain important.

The updated consensus review describes maintenance TMS as promising while noting uncertainty about the best schedule. A 2025 randomized study, MAINT-R, compared weekly maintenance rTMS with lithium over 24 weeks in 75 people who had responded to an acute rTMS course; all continued venlafaxine. Seven participants relapsed in each group, and the primary depression-score outcome did not differ significantly. This informs maintenance care for selected responders; it does not establish one universal maintenance prescription or prove that follow-up is unnecessary. [3] [23]

Ask how improvement will be measured, when lack of benefit will trigger a change, what maintenance might cost, and whom to contact if symptoms return. In an immediate mental-health emergency, seek emergency care; in the United States, call or text 988 for crisis support. Do not wait for the next device session.

5. Bone healing: a specific success, not a general endorsement

Bone is living tissue. When a fracture does not heal or a fusion is at elevated risk of failure, a clinician may consider a prescribed bone-growth stimulator alongside appropriate orthopedic care.

Certain named PEMF bone-growth stimulators received FDA premarket approval, a different pathway from the cited depression TMS clearances. Cervical-Stim, for example, was approved as an adjunct to cervical fusion surgery in patients at high risk for non-fusion. In its randomized controlled study, six-month fusion among evaluable participants was 83.6% with active treatment versus 68.6% with control. Missing follow-up data were substantial and were examined in sensitivity analyses. By 12 months, the evaluable fusion rates were 92.8% and 86.7%, respectively, and the difference was not statistically significant; a composite clinical-symptom success measure also did not differ significantly at six or 12 months. [5]

The primary endpoint was fusion assessed on imaging. That is a concrete, clinically relevant result, but it is not proof that a general PEMF pad treats every kind of neck pain. The FDA record for specified Physio-Stim models, for example, limits use to an established nonunion acquired after trauma, excludes vertebrae and flat bones, limits defect width, and defines established nonunion by absence of visibly progressive healing. The same record describes Spinal-Stim as a spinal-fusion adjunct and as nonoperative salvage for failed spinal fusion when at least nine months have elapsed since the last surgery. Those statements belong to those models—not every bone stimulator or PEMF product. [15]

Some other noninvasive bone-stimulation technologies use capacitive coupling, combined magnetic fields, or low-intensity pulsed ultrasound rather than PEMF. Even devices grouped under the same broad clinical purpose can have different signals and indications; their evidence is not interchangeable. [24]

A device does not remove the need to assess alignment, stability, infection, blood supply, nutrition, smoking, or other reasons healing may be delayed. Nor should pain improvement alone be used to assume a fracture has united. The orthopedic team should define how healing will be checked and when the plan needs reconsideration.

The encouraging lesson is precision: a physical stimulus can have a useful medical role when the patient, tissue, device, and outcome match the evidence.

6. Pain and joints: promising signals, uneven results

PEMF research extends beyond bone union. Knee osteoarthritis is one of the more studied areas, with trials assessing pain, stiffness, function, and related measures. A 2024 systematic review included 17 trials and 1,197 participants and described favorable findings alongside substantial differences in devices and treatment schedules. [6]

Those differences matter. A review can summarize many studies without turning them into one reproducible treatment. Small samples, varied controls, multiple outcome measures, short follow-up, and selective reporting can make apparent benefits less dependable than a headline suggests. A percentage improvement within one treatment group is not necessarily the improvement attributable to treatment over placebo.

A 2026 randomized sham-controlled trial offers a useful example. Sixty people with persistent mild-to-moderate knee osteoarthritis received either PEMF or sham sessions for eight weeks, with follow-up extending to 12 months. The active group had a favorable knee-extension strength result at six months. However, the study did not show between-group improvements in WOMAC patient-reported outcomes, cartilage thickness, joint-space width, lean muscle mass, walking time, or chair-standing performance. [7]

This is not a failed curiosity. Improved muscle strength could be valuable if replicated and translated into daily function. But the result is not evidence that cartilage regrew or that participants had broadly better pain and mobility. Different endpoints deserve separate sentences.

NCCIH discusses electromagnetic approaches for several pain conditions while emphasizing uncertainty and the need for condition-specific evidence. Some prescription electromagnetic devices have specific postoperative pain or swelling uses; that does not authorize broad claims for unrelated products. Static magnetic jewelry has not shown convincing pain-relief benefit. [16]

Considering an adjunct responsibly

If a clinician considers a trial of an appropriate device, agree in advance on what success would look like: for example, a meaningful change in a validated pain/function score or an activity that matters to the person. Keep other treatment changes documented so that an improvement is not automatically attributed to the newest purchase.

Exercise or rehabilitation, weight management when appropriate, medication decisions, and evaluation for more serious disease should not be displaced by a device. Include a stop or reassessment date. A product can be noninvasive and still have opportunity costs: money, time, delayed diagnosis, and the quiet frustration of being told to buy another package when the first did not help.

An older systematic review of whole-body PEMF devices found insufficient evidence to recommend their therapeutic use from the available small, short studies. That historical review does not settle every newer application, but it reinforces why evidence for targeted medical devices cannot be borrowed to support broad wellness mats. [25]

7. NASA, the ISS, and the magnetic environment

Space research asks extraordinary biological questions under unusual conditions. It has also generated real investigations of electromagnetic exposure. Keeping the experiments distinct makes their significance clearer.

Microgravity is not the disappearance of gravity

The International Space Station and its occupants are in continuous free fall around Earth. The spacecraft, the crew, and the objects around them fall together, producing the experience of weightlessness. Earth’s gravity remains strong at that altitude; “microgravity” does not mean that Earth has stopped pulling. [9]

The ISS also travels through Earth’s geomagnetic field. The German Aerospace Center’s MagVector experiment explicitly studies interactions with that field. Conditions vary with location and the station’s own environment, but the ISS is not generally cut off from terrestrial magnetism. [10]

NASA identifies altered gravity, radiation, isolation and confinement, distance from Earth, and hostile or closed environments as major spaceflight hazards. Reduced mechanical loading contributes to muscle and bone changes; fluid shifts and other adaptations also matter. Radiation is another distinct problem. These established concerns do not demonstrate a generalized illness caused by deprivation of Earth’s magnetic field. [26]

What NASA-associated PEMF research actually shows

A NASA Technical Reports Server record describes an experiment involving cultured human neuronal progenitor cells exposed to a specified pulsed field. The record reports changes in proliferation, morphology, and gene expression. It is a conference abstract about cell research, not a trial treating astronauts. [11]

NASA’s technology-transfer material on cartilage regeneration describes exposure of cultured human cartilage cells to tested electromagnetic waveforms and offers related technology for licensing. This is interesting translational work: researchers are exploring whether a physical stimulus might influence tissue biology. A patent or prototype, however, does not establish improved pain, function, or healing in patients. [27]

A review of NASA's official ISS investigation catalog did not locate a record confirming a therapeutic PEMF unit used to protect astronaut health. That is a qualified search finding, not proof that no related hardware has ever flown under any name. The available cell-culture and technology-transfer records should not be represented as proof of routine astronaut treatment, NASA endorsement of a consumer mat, or replacement of a supposedly missing planetary frequency. [28]

Space science remains inspiring on its actual terms. Learning how tissues respond to unusual environments can produce good questions for Earth-based medicine. The next step is the clinical experiment, not the promotional leap.

8. Schumann resonances: a real planetary signal

Lightning excites electromagnetic resonances in the cavity between Earth's surface and the ionosphere. These Schumann resonances include a fundamental near 7.8 Hz and higher-frequency modes. Their properties vary; 7.83 Hz is not a perfectly fixed planetary metronome. [29]

The magnetic signals are extremely weak, and measuring them requires equipment designed to separate them from environmental noise. They are not the same thing as Earth's much larger, relatively steady geomagnetic field. A frequency label alone does not convey signal strength, exposure geometry, or biological dose.

Brain rhythms can share a frequency without sharing a cause

"Brainwaves" are repeating patterns researchers extract from neural activity; they are not free-floating thoughts or a single field surrounding the mind. EEG records voltage differences at scalp electrodes, while MEG records the tiny magnetic fields produced by neural currents. NIMH describes MEG signals outside the head at about 10 {¹ t tesla, detected with a helmet containing 275 superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) sensors. [30]

Clinical EEG terminology conventionally places theta at 4 to less than 8 Hz and alpha at 8–13 Hz, but published conventions use somewhat different edges and expert guidance may adjust bands to a person's individual alpha-frequency peak. The Schumann fundamental near 7.8 Hz therefore sits close to the conventional theta–alpha boundary; higher atmospheric modes near 14, 20, and 26 Hz fall in the conventional beta range, and the mode near 33 Hz falls in gamma. That overlap is mathematically unsurprising because both sets occupy low-frequency spectra—it does not make an atmospheric resonance the source, clock, or nutritional requirement of those neural rhythms. [31] [32] [29]

Frequency is only one coordinate. The relatively steady geomagnetic field, time-varying Schumann signals, scalp voltages, and femtotesla-scale MEG signals differ in field type, amplitude, waveform, direction, source, coupling, and exposure duration. Matching one number in hertz does not establish entrainment, a therapeutic dose, emotional transfer, or a health requirement. Each of those claims would need its own controlled evidence.

It is reasonable to investigate whether natural electromagnetic variation relates to biology. But an association between an environmental measure and a health outcome is not yet proof that the signal caused the outcome. Sleep, weather, light, activity, seasonal patterns, statistical choices, and other variables may matter.

The evidence reviewed for this guide does not establish that people need continuous exposure to a particular Schumann frequency to remain healthy, or that reproducing it with a consumer device treats disease. NASA's astronaut-health hazard material does not identify Schumann-frequency replacement as an established countermeasure. [26]

A shared frequency is not a shared function. Two songs can contain the same note without being the same song; two physical systems can involve similar frequencies without one being a treatment for the other.

9. The heart's field and the feeling of another person

The heart generates electrical currents, and those currents produce a magnetic field. Magnetocardiography measures cardiac magnetic signals; magnetoencephalography measures magnetic signals associated with brain activity. These approaches detect biological activity rather than demonstrating a transferable healing field.

NIST reported a miniature sensor detecting the heart's magnetic signature in picoteslas—trillionths of a tesla. In that experiment, the sensor was positioned 5 millimeters above the left chest, with exceptional magnetic shielding. This is a remarkable measurement accomplishment, not a demonstration that an unassisted person can read the signal across a room. [12]

Magnetic fields do not have a simple wall at a fixed distance, but their strength declines with distance. Detectability depends on source geometry, sensor sensitivity, orientation, background noise, shielding, and signal processing. A claim that a heart field "extends several feet" needs those conditions to be meaningful. It is not a dependable universal detection distance.

Presence can matter without a magnetic explanation

People can feel calmer, more alert, or uneasy around someone else. Facial expression, tone of voice, posture, personal history, expectation, and shared circumstances provide many routes for that experience. Calling the experience an "aura" may be a personal or spiritual description; it is not an established medical measurement of moral character, health, or emotional energy.

The evidence reviewed here does not establish that people detect another person's emotions through cardiac magnetic emissions, independently of ordinary sensory and social cues. This leaves room to value empathy, intuition, and connection without presenting a specific unverified mechanism as fact.

One controlled 2019 experiment reported brain-wave responses to certain rotations of Earth-strength magnetic fields. Participants did not show apparent conscious awareness of those stimuli. Whatever its implications for human magnetoreception, it tested a very different exposure from another person's tiny cardiac signal and did not demonstrate emotional transmission or aura perception. [33]

Sensitive instruments discovering more about the body are a genuine wonder. They do not make human closeness less meaningful; they simply answer a different question.

10. Veterinary medicine: dogs, horses, cats, and livestock

Animals deserve the same discipline about evidence as people. They also cannot tell us in words what feels different, so objective measures and blinded assessment are particularly valuable. An attentive owner's observation matters, but expectations can influence ratings even when the animal has no understanding of the device.

A systematic review of veterinary electrotherapies found a small, diverse literature across dogs, horses, and cats, with variable study quality and both positive and null results. Different waveforms, doses, conditions, and endpoints prevent a broad conclusion that "PEMF works for animals." [13]

Dogs: encouraging possibilities, mixed measurements

A 2024 randomized, blinded crossover study tested one PEMF session against placebo in eight dogs with hip osteoarthritis. It found no demonstrable improvement in owner-assessed pain or overall gait performance. A statistically significant stride-length finding did not amount to clearer, better mobility; some active-treatment stride measurements became shorter. [34]

A separate six-week randomized placebo-controlled study involved 21 dogs with osteoarthritis. It reported a favorable gait-symmetry finding, but the owner-completed LOAD scores and combined overall treatment-effectiveness score did not differ significantly between groups. That makes the evidence mixed rather than a general demonstration of pain relief. [14]

Another 2025 randomized study assigned 20 dogs with hip osteoarthritis to PEMF or no intervention. Its abstract reports that pain scores improved over sessions within the treated group, but it does not provide a sham-controlled or clearly quantified active-versus-control pain effect; joint range of motion and thigh circumference did not differ between groups. The absence of sham treatment limits separation of treatment-specific benefit from handling and owner expectations. This is encouraging but preliminary evidence, not a reason to withdraw effective analgesia. [35]

Postoperative wound or rehabilitation findings are also distinct from chronic joint pain. A dog recovering from spinal surgery should not receive a borrowed protocol based solely on a study of another condition.

Horses and cats

In a controlled crossover study summarized in the veterinary review, 20 working polo ponies received active or placebo blanket treatment. The study did not demonstrate improved back-pain sensitivity or thoracolumbar flexibility. Small experimental bone studies likewise do not establish faster return to sport, tendon healing, or improved performance. [13]

For cats, the reviewed evidence included a tiny experimental spinal-cord-injury study, not strong trials demonstrating benefit for naturally occurring arthritis or general wellness in household cats. A blanket marketed for several species does not make the evidence multispecies.

Livestock: exploratory work is not established treatment

A 2025 University of New Hampshire undergraduate honors thesis examined PEMF exposure and milk-related outcomes in dairy cows. It found no between-group improvement in milk yield during treatment and no significant treatment-group difference in somatic cell counts across the reported periods. Somatic cell count is an udder-health indicator, not by itself proof of infection clearance. The study was brief, exploratory, and not a peer-reviewed clinical efficacy trial. [36]

This work can help generate future studies. It does not establish treatment of mastitis, replacement of necessary antimicrobial care, better fertility, or general productivity benefits across cattle, sheep, pigs, or poultry.

For any animal, start with a diagnosis and a veterinarian’s plan. Ask which study matches the species and condition, how improvement will be measured, and when standard treatment must change. Do not delay assessment of acute lameness, neurologic signs, fever, wounds, or a sick animal because a device is available. Comfort, handling stress, cost, and animal welfare all count.

11. Questions worth asking before choosing a device

Good questions make room for useful innovation while filtering out claims that travel farther than their evidence.

1. What exact condition are we treating? Request a diagnosis rather than a broad label such as “low energy” or “inflammation.”

2. What is the exact device and regulatory indication? Ask for the model, current labeling, and FDA decision number when a U.S. regulatory claim is made. “FDA registered” is not the same as clearance or approval of a treatment claim.

3. Does the research use this device and dose? Frequency alone is not a match. Ask about waveform, intensity, placement, session length, and course duration.

4. What was the comparison? Sham-controlled, active-comparator, uncontrolled, cell, and animal studies answer different questions.

5. What changed, by how much, and for how long? Separate response from remission, pain from function, biomarkers from health, and short-term results from durability.

6. Who did not benefit or was excluded? Small, selected research groups may not represent a person with several medical conditions.

7. What are the safety checks? Exact implant compatibility, hearing protection where relevant, clinician supervision, and an adverse-event plan should be concrete.

8. What will continue alongside treatment? An adjunct should not silently become a replacement for needed care.

9. What is the reassessment and cost plan? Include travel, maintenance, insurance limitations, device rental or purchase, and a stopping point.

10. Who funded the study, and has it been independently replicated? Industry support does not automatically invalidate research, but transparency and independent confirmation strengthen confidence.

Be especially cautious when one product is said to treat unrelated diseases, identify hidden problems without validated testing, or work because it is “NASA,” “quantum,” or “the Earth’s frequency.” A credible clinician or researcher can explain both the possibility and the boundary.

Frequently Asked Questions

Is PEMF the same treatment as depression TMS?

No. Both involve electromagnetic phenomena, but established depression TMS uses specified coils, targeting, stimulation doses, and clinical protocols. Lower-intensity T-PEMF is a separate research area. Neither category makes a general-purpose mat an evidence-based depression treatment. [2] [20]

Can TMS help after antidepressants have not worked?

Yes, it is an evidence-based option for selected patients. It does not help everyone, and outcomes depend on the diagnosis, prior treatment, protocol, and definition of improvement. Ask about the exact system’s current indication and a realistic response, remission, and follow-up plan. [4] [3]

Does FDA approval of a bone stimulator prove that PEMF relieves pain?

Not in general. Approval applies to the named device and indication. A study showing more radiographic fusion cannot establish pain relief from another device, much less treatment of unrelated illnesses. [5]

Are magnetic devices safe with a pacemaker or other implant?

Do not assume compatibility. Risk depends on the implant, location, exposure, and manufacturer instructions. Ask the treating team to review the exact implant and treatment device before use; a seller’s generic reassurance is not a compatibility assessment. [16] [22]

Does NASA research establish that astronauts need PEMF?

No. NASA-associated cell research and prototype technology are real, but they do not establish an astronaut treatment requirement. The ISS remains within Earth’s geomagnetic environment, and the reviewed official catalog did not confirm a therapeutic PEMF installation. [11] [10] [28]

Can the heart’s magnetic field explain why someone feels calming?

The field is real; that interpersonal mechanism has not been established. Instrument detection close to the chest is not proof of human emotional sensing at a distance. A relationship can be genuinely calming without a magnetic explanation. [12]

Is a veterinary PEMF device worth trying?

That depends on the diagnosis, evidence for the particular protocol, safety, cost, and veterinarian's judgment. Current evidence is too mixed to promise benefit across species or conditions. If used as an adjunct, agree on measurable goals and preserve necessary treatment. [13] [14]

A grounded kind of optimism

Magnetic medicine is already more than an interesting idea. It includes sophisticated imaging, clinically useful brain stimulation, and specific orthopedic tools. It also includes early research that may or may not become tomorrow's treatment.

The best way to honor that promise is to keep the distinctions visible. A cell finding is a beginning. A controlled clinical benefit is a further achievement. A safer, more affordable, durable improvement in everyday life is the goal. There is plenty of room for wonder along that path—and every reason to bring good questions with us.

Sources

1. NeuroStar TMS System: Evaluation of Automatic Class III Designation (K061053)

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2008; corrected classification letter 2017 | primary regulatory classification order

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrhdocs/pdf6/k061053.pdf

2. MagVita TMS Therapy System with Theta Burst Stimulation: K173620

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2018-08-14 | 510(k) clearance and summary

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrhdocs/pdf17/K173620.pdf

3. Consensus review and considerations on TMS to treat depression: A comprehensive update endorsed by the National Network of Depression Centers, the Clinical TMS Society, and the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology

Clinical Neurophysiology | 2025; online 2024-12-19 | updated evidence review and expert consensus

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC11825283

4. Daily Left Prefrontal Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Therapy for Major Depressive Disorder: A Sham-Controlled Randomized Trial

Archives of General Psychiatry | 2010 | primary randomized sham-controlled trial

https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapsychiatry/fullarticle/210744

5. Cervical-Stim Model 505L Cervical Fusion System: Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data (P030034)

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2004-12-23 | PMA approval evidence including randomized controlled trial

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrhdocs/pdf3/p030034b.pdf

6. Current Evidence Using Pulsed Electromagnetic Fields in Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review

Journal of Clinical Medicine | 2024-03-28 | systematic review

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC11012419

7. Pulsed Electromagnetic Field Therapy for Mild-to-Moderate Knee Osteoarthritis: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial

Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle | 2026-01-26 | randomized sham-controlled trial

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC12834700

8. Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)

National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering | undated | official technology and safety explainer

https://www.nibib.nih.gov/science-education/science-topics/magnetic-resonance-imaging-mri

9. Microgravity and ISS

European Space Agency | undated | official physics explainer

https://www.esa.int/Education/OrbitYourThesis/MicrogravityandISS2

10. MagVector/MFX-2: a planetary laboratory on the ISS

German Aerospace Center (DLR) | undated | official ISS experiment description

https://www.dlr.de/en/research-and-transfer/projects-and-missions/horizons/magvector-mfx-2

11. An Optimization of Pulsed ElectroMagnetic Fields Study

NASA Technical Reports Server | 2006 | conference abstract; laboratory cell study

https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/20070004785

12. NIST Mini-Sensor Traces Faint Magnetic Signature of Human Heartbeat

National Institute of Standards and Technology | 2010-10 | official research explanation

https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2010/10/nist-mini-sensor-traces-faint-magnetic-signature-human-heartbeat

13. A Systematic Review of Complementary and Alternative Veterinary Medicine in Sport and Companion Animals: Electrotherapy

Animals | 2022-12-23 | systematic veterinary evidence review

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC9817672

14. Influence of pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMF) therapy on osteoarthritis in dogs

BMC Veterinary Research | 2025-10-03 | small randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12917-025-05036-9

15. Physio-Stim and Spinal-Stim: PMA supplement P850007/S027

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2005-04-05; FDA database accessed 2026-09-23 | official device-specific PMA supplement record

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpma/pma.cfm?ID=P850007S027

16. Magnets For Pain: What You Need To Know

National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health | undated | government patient evidence overview

https://www.nccih.nih.gov/health/magnets-for-pain-what-you-need-to-know

17. Effectiveness of theta burst versus high-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation in patients with depression (THREE-D): a randomised non-inferiority trial

The Lancet | 2018 | primary randomized active-comparator noninferiority trial; abstract

https://europepmc.org/article/MED/29726344

18. Predictors of remission after repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for the treatment of major depressive disorder: An analysis from the randomised non-inferiority THREE-D trial

eClinicalMedicine | 2020 | secondary analysis of primary randomized trial

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC7200243

19. Magnus Neuromodulation System with SAINT Technology: K220177

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2022-09-01 | 510(k) clearance and clinical evidence summary

https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrhdocs/pdf22/K220177.pdf

20. Transcranial low voltage pulsed electromagnetic fields in patients with treatment-resistant depression

Biological Psychiatry | 2010 | primary sham-controlled double-blind study; abstract

https://europepmc.org/article/MED/20385376

21. Active versus sham transcranial pulsed electromagnetic field headband treatment for major depression: protocol for a double-blinded randomised trial

BMJ Open | 2025 | trial protocol, not results

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC12542551

22. Safety and recommendations for TMS use in healthy subjects and patient populations, with updates on training, ethical and regulatory issues: Expert Guidelines

Clinical Neurophysiology | 2021 | expert safety guidelines; abstract

https://europepmc.org/article/MED/33243615

23. Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation as Maintenance Treatment of Depression: The MAINT-R Randomized Clinical Trial

JAMA Network Open | 2025 | randomized active-comparator maintenance trial; abstract

https://europepmc.org/article/MED/40522661

24. FDA Executive Summary: Orthopaedic and Rehabilitation Devices Panel, Bone Growth Stimulators

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2020-09 | official regulatory panel evidence overview

https://www.fda.gov/media/141850/download

25. Therapeutic effects of whole-body devices applying pulsed electromagnetic fields (PEMF): a systematic literature review

Bioelectromagnetics | 2011 | systematic review; abstract

https://europepmc.org/article/MED/21938735

26. 5 Hazards of Human Spaceflight

NASA Human Research Program | undated | official human-spaceflight health overview

https://www.nasa.gov/hrp/hazards/

27. Noninvasive Therapy for Cartilage Regeneration

NASA Technology Transfer | undated | prototype and licensing technology description

https://technology.nasa.gov/patent/msc-tops-96

28. International Space Station Research: All Experiments Report

NASA | undated; accessed 2026-09-23 | official investigation catalog and qualified negative-search record

https://www.nasa.gov/missionpages/station/research/experiments/explorer/AllExperimentsReport.xlsx

29. A new portable ELF Schumann resonance receiver

EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking | 2018 | primary instrument and atmospheric-physics paper

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s13638-018-1157-7

30. Magnetoencephalography (MEG) Core Facility

National Institute of Mental Health | undated; accessed 2026-09-23 | official research-facility explainer

https://www.nimh.nih.gov/research/research-conducted-at-nimh/research-areas/research-support-services/meg

31. A revised glossary of terms most commonly used by clinical electroencephalographers and updated proposal for the report format of the EEG findings: Revision 2017

International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology / Clinical Neurophysiology Practice | 2017 | peer-reviewed expert terminology guideline

https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6123891/

32. IFCN EEG Research Workgroup: Recommendations on Frequency and Topographic Analysis in Clinical Research Studies of Resting State EEG Rhythms

International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology EEG Research Workgroup | 2020-02-28 | expert workgroup recommendations presentation

https://www.ifcn.info/docs/Babiloni-IFCN-Guidelines-resting-state-EEG-in-clinical-research-GBC-Workgroup-1-CUBA%20-Meeting-Feb-28-2020.pdf

33. Transduction of the Geomagnetic Field as Evidenced from Alpha-band Activity in the Human Brain

eNeuro | 2019 | controlled human laboratory experiment

https://www.eneuro.org/content/6/2/ENEURO.0483-18.2019

34. A prospective, randomised, controlled, double blinded, cross-over study on the effect of a single session of pulsed electromagnetic field therapy on signs of hip osteoarthritis in dogs

Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica | 2024-07-26 | small randomized blinded placebo-controlled crossover trial

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s13028-024-00754-w

35. Pulsed electromagnetic field therapy for pain control in dogs with hip osteoarthritis: A randomized clinical study

Veterinary Research Communications | 2025-10-20 | small randomized no-intervention-controlled trial; abstract

https://europepmc.org/article/MED/41114882

36. Effect of Pulsed Electromagnetic Field Therapy on Milk Quality in Organic Dairy Cows

University of New Hampshire Scholars Repository | 2025 | undergraduate honors thesis; exploratory randomized study

https://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1899&context=honors