

# Photoepilation Results of Axillary Hair in Dark-Skinned Patients by IPL: A Comparison Between Different Wavelength and Pulse Width

JONG HEE LEE, MD, PhD,\* CHANG HUN HUH, MD,\* HO JOON YOON, MD,\*  
KWANG HYUN CHO, MD, PhD,\* AND JIN HO CHUNG\*, MD, PhD

**BACKGROUND** Recently, intense pulsed light (IPL) sources have been shown to provide long-term hair removal.

**OBJECTIVE** This study examined the photoepilatory effects of different wavelengths and pulse width application in the same device and compared their efficiencies in Asian skin.

**METHODS** Twenty-eight Korean women were treated using HR (600–950 nm filter) and 27 using HR-D (645–950 nm filter) in the axillar area. Four treatments were carried out at intervals of 4 to 6 weeks; follow-ups were conducted 8 months after the last treatment. Mean energy settings were  $14.9 \pm 2.0 \text{ J/cm}^2$  for HR and  $17.1 \pm 0.6 \text{ J/cm}^2$  for HR-D. Longer pulse widths were applied in case of HR-D treatment. Hair counts and photographic evaluation of skin sites were made at baseline and at the last follow-up. Final overall evaluations were performed by patients and clinicians.

**RESULTS** Average clearances of 52.8% and 83.4% were achieved by HR and HR-D, respectively. No significant adverse effects were reported after HR-D treatment. One case each of hypopigmentation and hyperpigmentation was reported for HR.

**CONCLUSION** An IPL source by removing 45 nm of the emitted spectra and applying longer pulse width was found to provide a safer and more effective means of photoepilation in Asian patients.

*This clinical study was fully sponsored by the Danish Dermatologic Development A/S (Hoersholm, Denmark).*

Conventional hair removal techniques include shaving, waxing, tweezing, chemical depilation, and electrolysis.<sup>1,2</sup> However, all these methods result in temporary hair removal and are sometimes irritating. In recent years, the use of lasers to remove unwanted body hair has attracted considerable interest, and a variety of wavelengths have been shown to remove hair effectively on the scientific basis of selective photothermolysis.<sup>3,4</sup> The currently used photoepilation devices

include ruby, alexandrite, long-pulsed Nd:YAG, diode lasers and intense pulsed light (IPL).<sup>4,5</sup> However, the management of dark skin phenotypes remains problematic because melanin pigments in the epidermis competitively absorb light intended for hair follicle melanin pigments, the primary target of photoepilation.<sup>6–10</sup>

IPL is a high-intensity polychromatic light. Unlike laser systems, these flashlamps work by using incoherent light in the wavelength

range 515–1,200 nm,<sup>11</sup> and by using different filters, a wide range of wavelengths are possible for IPL systems. Various studies have reported that 33 to 80% hair reduction is achieved over follow-up periods ranging from 12 weeks to 21.1 months.<sup>11–16</sup> However, direct comparison among studies is not possible, because of differences in treatment device, wavelength application, and treatment conditions. Previous hair removal studies using second generation IPL sources (Ellipse Flex, Danish

\*Department of Dermatology College of Medicine, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

Dermatologic Development, Hørsholm, Denmark) in Caucasian skin types by Troilius and colleagues<sup>12</sup> determined efficacy by using hair counts, and found 80.2% removal in the bikini area 8 months after a final fourth treatment.

In this study, the efficacy and safety of the same IPL system (Ellipse Flex, Danish Dermatologic Development) was examined in Korean women. Hair removal was evaluated, and the efficacy and safety of a new applicator emitting 645–950 nm light were compared with that of the conventional applicator emitting 600–950 nm light to find out the most optimal treatment conditions for photoepilation in dark-skinned patients.

## Patients and Methods

### Study Groups

The study group consisted of 55 female volunteers who wished to remove their axillary hair. All volunteers received verbal and written information about the objectives, procedures, and the risks associated with the study, and written consent was obtained from all subjects before enrollment. Twenty-eight volunteers were treated with IPL sources emitting 600–950 nm with a mean of 800 nm (HR), and 27 volunteers were treated with the same IPL source emitting 645–950 nm with a mean of 830 nm (HR-D). Volunteers treated with HR were aged between 21 and 47 years

with a mean of 28.7 years, and HR-D patients were aged between 21 and 43 years with a mean of 29.9 years. Areas to be treated were designed to cover all axillary hair-growing areas. Fitzpatrick skin types ranged from II to IV (II 1/III 20/IV 7) for HR, and from III to IV (III 11 and IV 16) for HR-D. Volunteers with sunburn history within 4 weeks before the treatment were excluded. Waxing, chemical depilatories, and sun-tanning were discontinued at least 4 weeks prior to treatment and during the treatment period, and for 4 weeks following treatment.

### Photoepilation and Clinical Assessment

Before IPL treatment, hairs in the treatment areas were shaved. This IPL device does not have any epidermal cooling device. For that reason, just before the treatment, cooled optical coupling gels were applied evenly onto the treated area in order to prevent any epidermal injuries. All patients received 4 sessions of treatment at 4 to 6-week intervals. The treatment parameters used in this study are shown in Table 1. A 1 cm<sup>2</sup> grid was used to count hairs

at baseline and at 8 months after the last 4th treatment. Treatment sites were localized with respect to a defined anatomical landmark, and were confirmed by referring to standardized photographs. Hairs were counted from magnified photographs (3 × 5 inches) by one of two investigators in a blind manner. Hair removal efficiencies (HREs) were calculated as percentages of the number of hairs removed versus baseline. Side effects and any pain (using visual analog scales of 0–10) experienced during the procedures were recorded at each visit. At the last follow-up, patients and clinicians performed a final overall evaluation of the hair reduction treatment by using a 6-point scale (i.e., worse, none, poor—0 to 24%, fair—25 to 49%, good—50 to 74%, and excellent—75 to 100% reduction). Additional beneficial effects, e.g., pigmented spots and skin texture, were documented.

### Statistical Evaluation

The Wilcoxon test for paired differences was used to compare before and after hair counts, and final overall evaluations were made by clinicians and subjects.

TABLE 1. Treatment Parameters used in this Study

	HR	HR-D
Wavelength	600–950 nm	645–950 nm
Pulse duration	Thick hair: 40 ms Medium hair: 20 ms	Thick hair: 50 ms Medium hair: 25 ms
Fluence	Just enough to give a perifollicular edema and redness after 3 min waiting time Maximum fluence for volunteers to endure	
Treatment interval	4–6 weeks	
Follow-ups	8 months after the last treatment	

The Student's *t*-test was used to compare the effects of HR and HR-D, and the skin type results obtained for a given light source. Statistical significance was accepted at the 5% level.

## Results

Of the 28 volunteers treated with HR, 24 (II 1/III 16/IV 7) successfully completed the 4-treatment protocol and the 8-month follow-up after the fourth treatment. Of the 27 treated with HR-D, 24 (III 9 and IV 15) completed the four-treatment protocol and the 8-month follow-up.

All study subjects showed statistically significant hair reduction

after treatment ( $p < .001$ ) (Figure 1). There were no statistically significant differences of initial hair counts between each group ( $p = .581$ ). The initial hair count within the assessed area ( $1 \text{ cm}^2$ ) in the HR-treated group was  $15.1 \pm 3.5$  and in the HR-D-treated group,  $14.7 \pm 3.8$ . The number of hairs within  $1 \text{ cm}^2$  grid at the last follow-up was  $7.2 \pm 3.7$  in the HR-treated group and  $2.5 \pm 1.8$  in the HR-D-treated group, which showed statistically significant differences ( $p < .001$ ) (Table 2). Overall HRE was  $52.8 \pm 21.7\%$  for HR and  $83.4 \pm 10.9\%$  for HR-D. HRE for HR-D was statistically significantly higher than for HR

( $p < .001$ ). Mean fluences applied during the treatment were  $14.9 \pm 2.0 \text{ J/cm}^2$  for HR and  $17.1 \pm 0.6 \text{ J/cm}^2$  for HR-D, which was also significantly different. Pain levels during procedures as reported by subjects were  $6.5 \pm 2.4$  for HR and  $3.3 \pm 1.3$  for HR-D, which was significantly different ( $p < .05$ ) (Table 3). Final overall evaluations by study subjects and clinicians are detailed in Figure 2.

HREs according to skin type treated with HR showed 61.5% in subjects of skin type II received a mean fluence of  $17.0 \text{ J/cm}^2$ , 46.5% in skin type III received  $15.7 \text{ J/cm}^2$ , and 40.3% in skin type IV received  $13.0 \text{ J/cm}^2$ . Significant correlations were found between applied fluences and HRE ( $p < 0.01$ ). For HR-D, skin type III received an average fluence of  $17.2 \text{ J/cm}^2$  and skin type IV, an average of  $17.1 \text{ J/cm}^2$ . HRE was not found to be dependent on skin type (skin type III 80.1% vs IV 85.4%) (Table 4).

In one volunteer (skin type III) treated with HR, perifollicular hyperpigmentation was observed at the third treatment session, and thus treatment was discontinued. In another volunteer treated with HR, mild hypopigmentation was observed at the second treatment session. This patient decided to continue treatment, and at the 9 month follow-up her skin had regained its normal color. However, no adverse effect was observed during or after HR-D treatment.



**Figure 1.** A and C show pretreatment status. B and D demonstrate post-treatment status 8 months after the last treatment. Volunteers refrained from shaving for 4 weeks prior to their last follow-up. No prominently growing axillary hairs were observed in D. However, thinned axillary hairs are seen in B.

**TABLE 2. The Hair Counts within 1 cm<sup>2</sup> Grid at Baseline and 8 Months after the Last Treatment. Initial Axillary Hair Status is Nearly Same Between Each Group (Student's *t*-test, *p* = .581)**

	HR			HR-D		
	PreTx	PostTx	HRE (%)	PreTx	PostTx	HRE (%)
1	23	9	60.9	19	3	84.2
2	20	15	25.0	19	4	78.9
3	23	14	39.1	19	8	57.9
4	12	10	16.7	19	3	84.2
5	14	5	64.3	14	2	85.2
6	9	4	55.6	11	1	90.9
7	15	5	66.7	12	4	66.7
8	16	5	68.8	14	1	92.9
9	11	3	72.7	9	2	77.8
10	16	11	31.3	10	0	100.0
11	15	3	80.0	20	3	85.0
12	14	4	71.4	14	4	71.4
13	19	5	73.7	18	3	83.3
14	13	3	76.9	20	0	100.0
15	16	10	37.5	13	1	92.3
16	15	8	46.7	12	2	83.3
17	11	9	18.2	10	1	90.0
18	12	5	58.3	12	1	91.7
19	13	9	30.8	13	2	84.6
20	12	2	83.3	16	2	87.5
21	14	5	64.3	12	1	91.7
22	18	5	72.2	20	2	90.0
23	16	13	18.8	9	3	68.4
24	15	10	33.3	17	6	64.7
Average	15.1	7.2	52.8	14.7	2.5	83.4
Standard deviation	3.5	3.7	21.7	3.8	1.8	10.9

HRE is calculated as a percentage of the number of removed hairs compared with the baseline count.  
Tx = treatment.

**TABLE 3. Hair Removal Efficiency (HRE) After Treatment with HR or HR-D**

	HR	HR-D
Skin type	II 1/III 16/IV 7	III 9/IV 15
Applied fluency (J/cm <sup>2</sup> )	14.9 ± 2.0	17.1 ± 0.6**
Pulse width (ms)	20, 40	25, 50
% hair reduction (%)	52.8 ± 21.7	83.4 ± 10.9**
Pain level	6.5 ± 2.4	3.3 ± 1.3**
Side effects	2/24	None

Applied fluency and % hair reduction were significantly different for the HR and HR-D modalities. Pain levels were checked using a visual analog scale by volunteers at each visit, and the results obtained also demonstrate that treatment with HR-D may reduce pain during the depilation procedure as compared with HR. Student's *t*-test, \*\**p* < .01.


Four subjects did not complete the HR treatment; one complained of perifollicular hyperpigmentation,

but the others gave no reason for cessation. Three volunteers did not complete the HR-D study due

to follow-up loss for unknown reasons.

## Discussion

The effectiveness of different optical depilation devices varies considerably due to the different wavelengths, energy levels, pulse durations, and biological variables such as anatomical location, epidermal pigmentation, duration of the hair follicle cycle, and androgen status.<sup>11,17</sup> The target chromophores of photoepilation are the melanin-rich hair shafts



**Figure 2.** Final overall evaluations by volunteers and clinicians of the treatment results obtained using HR and HR-D. HR-D was awarded high final overall scores by patients and clinicians. Worse, no improvement; poor, <25% improvement; fair, 25 to 50% improvement; good, 50 to 75% improvement; excellent, >75% improvement; HR(C), the final evaluation by the clinician in the patients treated with HR; HR(P), the final evaluation by the patients treated with HR; HR-D(C), the final evaluation by the clinician in the patients treated with HR-D; HR-D(P), the final evaluation by the patients treated with HR-D.

**TABLE 4.** Hair Removal Efficiency (HRE) According to Skin Type.

	HR		HR-D	
	Fluence (J/cm <sup>2</sup> )	HRE (%)	Fluence (J/cm <sup>2</sup> )	HRE (%)
Skin type II	17.0	61.5	–	–
Skin type III	15.7	46.5	17.2	80.1
Skin type IV	13.0	40.3	17.1	85.4

No Statistically Significant Differences in HRE or in Applied Fluences were Observed Between Skin Types III and IV Treated with HR-D. On the other Hand, HREs after HR treatment were found to be significantly dependent on skin type. Moreover, the clinical outcome in HR-treated group clearly shows that higher fluence applications produced better HRE results.

and bulbs. However, competing chromophores exist, e.g., epidermal melanin and other light-absorbing components, such as Hb in blood vessels.<sup>16,18</sup> Asian skin has a higher epidermal melanin content than Caucasian skin and is more prone to epidermal injuries and adverse pigmentary reactions after IPL treatment. Therefore, the management of dark skin phenotypes remains problematic for laser and IPL assisted treatments.<sup>5,19–21</sup>

An increasing number of studies have confirmed the long-term hair removal efficacies of IPL systems that emit a broad spectrum of longer wavelengths.<sup>12–16,22–25</sup> Flashlamp-assisted hair removal enables a wide choice of emitting wavelengths to be chosen simply by choosing different cut-off filters, and thus this modality may be effective in a wide range of skin types, especially in darker skins.<sup>5,25</sup> In published investigations of the IPL system, light

spectra, pulse durations, numbers of pulses, fluence, and the use of skin cooling vary considerably, making direct comparisons difficult. Moreover, the evaluation of hair removal efficiencies has not been performed in the same IPL device with modification of treatment parameters under the same clinical condition. Also, the optimal conditions required for optical depilation using the IPL system in Asian skins have not been determined. In this study, the optimal condition of high hair removal efficiencies in Asian skins was investigated with a modification of wavelengths and pulse widths in the same IPL device under the same clinical condition.

HR emits a wavelength in the range of 600–950 nm (average wavelength 800 nm), whereas HR-D emits a wavelength in the range of 645–950 nm (average wavelength 830 nm). The HR-D applicator was fitted with a lower cut-off filter (at 645 nm), and thus eliminated shorter wavelengths (600–645 nm) absorbed by epidermal melanin pigment. This probably reduced epidermal absorption and caused the treatment to be less painful. Table 4 shows that with the same wavelengths and pulse width applications, applied fluence may be the most important factor of HRE, which concurs with the report by Liew and colleagues.<sup>21</sup> The main limitation that prevents clinicians from applying higher fluences is pain occurring during the procedure,<sup>22</sup> because as applied fluence

is increased, treatment pain also increases. Pain levels documented by volunteers were significantly higher during HR than HR-D treatment, which implies that wavelengths shorter than 600–645 nm are better absorbed by epidermal melanin and may evoke more pain to patients.

To achieve the selective destruction of target chromophores, an appropriate pulse duration must be determined for laser or flashlamp-assisted photoepilation.<sup>26</sup> The thermal relaxation time (TRT) is defined as the time taken for an increase in temperature to reduce by 1/2 of its peak value. A pulse time substantially longer than the TRT reduces heat conduction from the target to adjacent tissue,<sup>9</sup> whereas too short a pulse time is likely to develop an epidermal burn. The TRT of epidermal melanosomes is 1 to 2 ms, and that of a hair shaft, 40 to 100 ms.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, a pulse time between that of epidermal melanin and hair follicles is probably most effective for selectively destroying hair follicles without damaging surrounding tissues. However, the concept of an appropriate pulse time for hair removal is under debate. Since recently, longer pulse widths are favored to improve clinical efficacy without significantly increasing the risk of adverse effects.<sup>5,9,27,28</sup> Dierick<sup>29</sup> argued that the actual target during hair removal is not the pigmented structure, but rather components removed from a pigmented struc-

ture, like the follicular stem cells that lie in the hair follicle outer root sheath. Pulses longer than the TRT of hair shafts were found to allow the propagation of the thermal damage front through the entire volume of hair, and to damage follicular stem cells. This study also shows that the longer pulse widths application produced better permanent hair removal results for the same number of treatments.

Adverse effects were documented in two subjects treated with HR. One complained of perifollicular hyperpigmentation, and dropped out, while the other presented with hypopigmentation, which improved at the last follow-up. Crust formation, vesicles, paradoxical effects, scarring, and superficial burning, which are documented side-effects of IPL photoepilation,<sup>22</sup> were not detected in the volunteers treated with HR over the 8-month follow-up after their last session. Pigmentary disturbances are troublesome, but are common in those with a dark skin phenotype after laser and IPL treatment. However, no adverse outcome was observed in volunteers treated with HR-D over an 8-month follow-up period after the last session, although in general, axilla is a nonsun-exposed area and is associated with a lower risk of complication.

This study has the limitation that direct comparisons of applied fluences between each treated

group are not reasonable because the applied pulse widths were different. The same applies to the clinical outcome. However, there were no statistically significant differences of demographic profiles and initial hair-growing status between each group, and overall HRE was increased with the application of longer wavelengths and pulse widths in the same IPL device. Therefore, the elimination of shorter wavelengths and the elongation of pulse duration appeared to allow more effective hair removal without significant side effects. It is important to note that this improvement is obtained with exactly the same equipment, on the same type of patients treated exactly on the same area. Careful selection of band of wavelength to be used and extended pulse duration for darker-skinned patients can increase the efficacy of hair removal by more than 80%. The filtered IPL source used was found to be a safer, more effective method of long-term permanent hair removal in darker-skinned Asian patients.

## References

1. Hussain M, Polnikorn N, Goldberg DJ. Laser-assisted hair removal in Asian skin: efficacy, complications and the effect of single versus multiple treatments. *Dermatol Surg* 2003;29:249–54.
2. Bedewi AF. Hair removal with intense pulsed light. *Laser Med Sci* 2004;19:48–51.
3. Anderson RR, Parrish JA. Selective photothermolysis; precise microsurgery by selective absorption of pulsed radiation. *Science* 1983;220:524–7.
4. Liew SH. Laser hair removal: guidelines for management. *Am J Clin Dermatol* 2002;3:107–15.

5. Battle EF, Hobbs LM. Laser-assisted hair removal for darker skin types. *Dermatol Ther* 2004;17:177-83.
6. Chan HH, Ying SY, Ho WS, Wong DS, Lam LK. An in vivo study comparing the efficacy and complications of diode laser and long-pulsed NdYAG laser in hair removal among Chinese patients. *Dermatol Surg* 2001;27:950-4.
7. Alster TS, Tanzi EL. Laser surgery in dark skin. *Skinmed* 2003;2:80-5.
8. Kono T, Nozaki M, Chan HH. Diode laser assisted hair removal in Asians: a retrospective study of 101 Japanese patients. *Laser Surg Med* 2001;13:245-9.
9. Landthaler RK, Hohenleutner MU. Optimizing treatment parameters for hair removal using long-pulsed Nd: YAG lasers. *Laser Med Sci* 2004;18:219-22.
10. Chan HH, Alam M, Kono T, Dover JS. Clinical application of lasers in Asians. *Dermatol Surg* 2002;28:556-63.
11. Diericks CC. Hair removal by lasers and intense pulsed light sources. *Semin Cutan Med Surg* 2000;19:267-75.
12. Troilius A, Troilius CA. Hair removal with a second generation broad spectrum intense pulsed light irradiator-a long term follow-up. *J Cutan Laser Ther* 1999;2:173-8.
13. Gold MH, Bell MW, Foster TD, Street S. Long term epilation using the EpiLight broad band, intense pulsed light hair removal system. *Dermatol Surg* 1997;23:909-13.
14. Sadick NS, Weiss RA, Shea CR, Nagel H, Nicholson J. Long term photoepilation using a broad spectrum intense pulsed light source. *Arch Dermatol* 2000;136:1336-40.
15. Weiss RA, Weiss MA, Morwaha S, Harrington AC. Hair removal with a non-coherent filtered flashlamp intense pulsed light source. *Lasers Surg Med* 1999;24:128-32.
16. Bjerring P, Cramers M, Egekvist H, Christiansen K, Troilius A. Hair reduction using a new intense pulsed light irradiator and a normal mode ruby laser. *J Cutan Laser Ther* 2000;2:63-71.
17. Dierickx C, Alora MB, Dover JS. A clinical overview of hair removal using lasers and light sources. *Dermatol Clin* 1999;17:357-66.
18. Liew SH, Grobbelaar AO, Gault PT, Sander R, Green C, Linge C. The effect of ruby laser light on ex vivo hair follicles: clinical implications. *Ann Plast Surg* 1999;42:249-54.
19. Alster TS, Bryan HBS, Williams CM. Long-pulsed Nd:YAG laser assisted hair removal in pigmented skin: a clinical and histological evaluation. *Arch Dermatol* 2001;137:885-9.
20. Galadari I. Comparative evaluation of different hair removal lasers in skin type IV, V, and VI. *Int J Dermatol* 2003;42:68-70.
21. Liew SH, Grobbelaar A, Gault D, Sanders R, Green C, Linge C. Hair removal using the ruby laser: clinical efficacy in Fitzpatrick skin types I-V and histological changes in epidermal melanocytes. *Br J Dermatol* 1999;140:1105-9.
22. Gerardo A, Camil CB, Juan F. Side-effects after IPL photoepilation. *Dermatol Surg* 2002;28:1131-4.
23. Johnson F, Dovale M. Intense pulsed light treatment of hirsutism: case reports of skin phototypes V and VI. *J Cutan Laser Ther* 1999;1:233-7.
24. Gold MH, Bell MW, Foster TD, Street S. Long term epilation using the EpiLight broad band, intense pulsed light hair removal system. *Dermatol Surg* 1997;23:909-13.
25. Schroeter CA, Groenewegen JS, Reineke T, Neumann HAM. Hair reduction using intense pulsed light source. *Dermatol Surg* 2004;30:169-73.
26. Rogachefsky AS, Becker K, Weiss G, Goldberg DJ. Evaluation of a long-pulsed Nd:YAG laser at different parameters: an analysis of both fluence and pulse duration. *Dermatol Surg* 2003;28:932-6.
27. Alster TS, Bryan H, Williams CM. Long pulsed NdYAG laser assisted hair removal in pigmented skin. *Arch Dermatol* 2001;137:885-9.
28. Altshuler GB, Anderson RR, Manstein D, Zenzie HH, Smirnov MZ. Extended theory of selective photothermolysis. *Lasers Surg Med* 2001;29:416-32.
29. Dierickx CC. Hair removal by lasers and intense pulsed light sources. *Dermatol Clin* 2002;20:135-46.

---

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: Jin Ho Chung, MD, Department of Dermatology, Seoul National University College of Medicine, 28 Yongon-Dong, Chongno-Gu, Seoul 110-744, Korea, or e-mail: [jhchung@snu.ac.kr](mailto:jhchung@snu.ac.kr)