



## **Polarized light Versus Pulsed Electromagnetic Field Therapy On Healing of Venous Ulcers**

**Shaimaa A. Abaas<sup>a</sup>, Zizi M. Ibrahim<sup>b,c</sup>, and Heba M. Mohamady<sup>a</sup>**

<sup>a</sup>Lecturers Department of Physical Therapy for Surgery and Burn, Faculty of Physical Therapy, Cairo university, Cairo , Egypt

<sup>b</sup>Assistant Prof. Department of Physical Therapy for Surgery and Burn, Faculty of Physical Therapy, Cairo University ,Cairo , Egypt

<sup>c</sup>Assistant Prof of Physical Therapy, College of Health and Rehabilitation, Princess Noura Bint Abdul Rahman University, Saudi Arabia-Rhyiadh

**Abstract :** Venous leg ulcer is a common problem, frequently leads to disability. The aim of this work to evaluate efficacy of polarized light versus pulsed electromagnetic field therapy in accelerating venous ulcers healing. Forty five patients (both sexes) with leg venous ulcers, their age from 45-60 years were randomly divided into three groups. Group (I) received pulsed electromagnetic field therapy **PEMF**. Group (II) received the polarized bioptron light **BLT**; both groups also received conservative traditional ulcer care. Group (III) (Control group) received only the conservative traditional medical care. Measurement of wound surface area was used as a method of assessment. The results showed that both pulsed electromagnetic field therapy and the polarized were effective in accelerating healing of venous ulcers ( $p < 0.05$ ), while pulsed electromagnetic field therapy was more beneficial than polarized light in decreasing ulcer surface area and improving healing of the venous ulcers.

**Key words :** Polarized light; Pulsed electromagnetic field therapy; Venous ulcer; Wound surface area.

**Shimaa A. Abaas *et al*** /International Journal of ChemTech Research, 2017, 10(5): 427-434.

\*\*\*\*\*