

Public health implications of wireless technologies

Cindy Sage^{a,*}, David O. Carpenter^b

^a Sage Associates, 1396 Danielson Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93108, USA

^b Institute for Health and the Environment, University at Albany, Rensselaer, NY, USA

Received 18 January 2008; accepted 30 January 2009

Abstract

Global exposures to emerging wireless technologies from applications including mobile phones, cordless phones, DECT phones, WI-FI, WLAN, WiMAX, wireless internet, baby monitors, and others may present serious public health consequences. Evidence supporting a public health risk is documented in the BioInitiative Report. New, biologically based public exposure standards for chronic exposure to low-intensity exposures are warranted. Existing safety standards are obsolete because they are based solely on thermal effects from acute exposures. The rapidly expanding development of new wireless technologies and the long latency for the development of such serious diseases as brain cancers means that failure to take immediate action to reduce risks may result in an epidemic of potentially fatal diseases in the future. Regardless of whether or not the associations are causal, the strengths of the associations are sufficiently strong that in the opinion of the authors, taking action to reduce exposures is imperative, especially for the fetus and children. Such action is fully compatible with the precautionary principle, as enunciated by the Rio Declaration, the European Constitution Principle on Health (Section 3.1) and the European Union Treaties Article 174. © 2009 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Wireless technology; Brain cancer; Radiofrequency; Cell phones; Wireless antenna facilities; Childrens' health

1. Introduction and background

Exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMF) has been linked to a variety of adverse health outcomes that may have significant public health consequences [1–13]. The most serious health endpoints that have been reported to be associated with extremely low frequency (ELF) and/or RF include childhood and adult leukemia, childhood and adult brain tumors, and increased risk of the neurodegenerative diseases, Alzheimer's and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS). In addition, there are reports of increased risk of breast cancer in both men and women, genotoxic effects (DNA damage and micronucleation), pathological leakage of the blood–brain barrier, altered immune function including increased allergic and inflammatory responses, miscarriage and some cardiovascular effects [1–13]. Insomnia (sleep disruption) is reported in studies of people living in very low-intensity RF environments with WI-FI and cell tower-level exposures [85–93]. Short-term effects on cognition, memory and learning, behavior, reaction time, attention and concentration, and altered

brainwave activity (altered EEG) are also reported in the scientific literature [94–107]. Biophysical mechanisms that may account for such effects can be found in various articles and reviews [136–144].

The public health implications of emerging wireless technologies are enormous because there has been a very rapid global deployment of both old and new forms in the last 15 years. In the United States, the deployment of wireless infrastructure has accelerated greatly in the last few years with 220,500 cell sites in 2008 [14–16]. Eighty-four percent of the population of the US own cell phones [16]. Annualized wireless revenues in 2008 will reach \$144 billion and US spending on wireless communications will reach \$212 billion by 2008. Based on the current 15% annual growth rate enjoyed by the wireless industry, in the next 5 years wireless will become a larger sector of the US economy than both the agriculture and automobile sectors. The annualized use of cell phones in the US is estimated to be 2.23 trillion minutes in 2008 [16]. There are 2.2 billion users of cell phones worldwide in 2008 [17] and many million more users of cordless phones.

Over 75 billion text messages were sent in the United States, compared with 7.2 billion in June 2005, according to

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 805 969 0557; fax: +1 805 969 5003.
E-mail address: sage@silcom.com (C. Sage).

CTIA, the Wireless Association, the leading industry trade group [16]. The consumer research company Nielsen Mobile, which tracked 50,000 individual customer accounts in the second quarter of this year, found that Americans each sent or received 357 text messages a month then, compared with 204 phone calls. That was the second consecutive quarter in which mobile texting significantly surpassed the number of voice calls [17].

The Electronics Industries Alliance (EIA) represents 80% of the \$550 billion US electronics industry “that provides two million jobs for American workers.” Its members include companies from the consumer electronics and telecommunications industries, among others [17].

There is intense industry competition for market share. Telecom taxes form an immense revenue generator for the government sector. Sale of the airwaves (auctions selling off wireless bandwidth) is a multi-million dollar industry for governments, and multi-billion dollar global advertising budgets are common. Lobbying dollars from the telecom-related industries are estimated to be \$300 million annually. The media is nearly silent on health issues, perhaps in part because of global advertising revenues that compromise journalistic independence and discourage balanced coverage of health, equity and economic issues.

2. Evidence supporting a public health risk

Even if there is only a small risk to health from chronic use of and exposure to wireless technologies, there is the potential for a profound public health impact. RF radiation now saturates the airwaves, resulting in exposure to both users and non-users. The effects are both short-term (sleep disruption, hormone disruption, impairment of cognitive function, concentration, attention, behavior, and well-being) and they are almost certainly long-term (generational impacts on health secondary to DNA damage, physiological stress, altered immune function, electrosensitivity, miscarriage risks, effects on sperm quality and motility leading to infertility, increased rates of cancer, and neurological diseases including Alzheimer’s disease and ALS—at least for ELF exposures). (Chapters 5–12 of the BioInitiative Report [1] and papers in this Supplement.)

There is credible scientific evidence that RF exposures cause changes in cell membrane function, metabolism and cellular signal communication, as well as activation of proto-oncogenes and triggering of the production of stress proteins at exposure levels below current regulatory limits. There is also generation of reactive oxygen species, which cause DNA damage, chromosomal aberrations and nerve cell death. A number of different effects on the central nervous system have also been documented, including activation of the endogenous opioid systems, changes in brain function including memory loss, slowed learning, motor dysfunction and performance impairment in children, and increased frequency of headaches, fatigue and sleep disorders. Melatonin secretion

is reduced, resulting in altered circadian rhythms and disruption of several physiological functions. (Chapters 5–12 of the BioInitiative Report [1] and papers in this Supplement.)

These effects can reasonably be presumed to result in adverse health effects and disease with chronic and uncontrolled exposures, and children may be particularly vulnerable [1,19]. The young are also largely unable to remove themselves from such environments. Second-hand non-ionizing radiation, like second-hand smoke may be considered of public health concern based on the evidence at hand.

2.1. Malignant brain tumors

At present, the most persuasive evidence for cancer resulting from RF exposure is that there is a significantly increased risk of malignant glioma in individuals that have used a mobile phone for 10 or more years, with the risk being elevated only on the side of the head on which the phone is used regularly (ipsilateral use) [1,3,4,6–8,18]. While the risk for adults after 10 or more years of use is reported to be more than doubled, there is some evidence beginning to appear that indicates that the risk is greater if the individual begins to use a mobile phone at younger ages. Hardell et al. [18] reported higher odds ratios in the 20–29-year-old group than other age ranges after more than 5 years of use of either analog or cordless phones. Recently in a London symposium Hardell reported that after even just 1 or more years of use there is a 5.2-fold elevated risk in children who begin use of mobile phones before the age of 20 years, whereas for all ages the odds ratio was 1.4. Studies from Israel have found that the risk of parotid gland tumors (a salivary gland in the cheek) is increased with heavy cell phone use [7]. The risk of acoustic neuroma (a benign but space-occupying tumor on the auditory nerve) is also significantly increased on the ipsilateral side of the head after 10 or more years of mobile phone use [1,3]. This relationship has also been documented in some of the published reports of the WHO Interphone Study, a decade-long 13-country international assessment of cell phone risks and cancer [6,8].

Kundi reports that “(E)pidemiological evidence compiled in the last 10 years starts to indicate an increased risk, in particular for brain tumors (glioma, meningioma, acoustic neuroma), from mobile phone use. Considering biases that may have been operating in most studies the risk estimates are rather too low, although recall bias could have increased risk estimates. The net result, when considering the different errors and their impact is still an elevated risk” [19].

The latency for most brain tumors is 20 years or more when related to other environmental agents, for example, to X-ray exposure. Yet, for cell phone use the increased risks are occurring much sooner than twenty years, as early as 10 years for brain tumors in adults and with even shorter latencies in children. This suggests that we may currently be significantly underestimating the impact of current levels of

use of RF technology, since we do not know how long the average latency period really is. If it is 20 years, then the risk rate will likely be much higher than an overall doubling of risk for cell phone users if the peak comes later than 10 years. It may also signal very troubling risks for those who start using cell phones, and perhaps all wireless devices, in early childhood. We may not have proof of effect for decades until many hundreds of thousands of new cases of malignant gliomas are set in motion by long-term cell phone use.

The preliminary evidence that mobile phone use at younger ages may lead to greater risk than for older persons is of particular concern. There is a large body of evidence that childhood exposure to environmental agents poses greater risk to health than comparable exposure during adulthood [20,21]. There is reason to expect that children would be more susceptible to the effects of EMF exposure since they are growing, their rate of cellular activity and division is more rapid, and they may be more at risk for DNA damage and subsequent cancers. Growth and development of the central nervous system is still occurring well into the teenage years so that neurological changes may be of great importance to normal development, cognition, learning, and behavior.

A greater vulnerability of children to developing brain cancer from mobile phone use may be the consequence of a combination of patterns of use, stage of development and physical characteristics related to exposure. In addition to the fact that the brain continues to develop through the teen years, many young children and teenagers now spend very large periods of time using mobile phones. The brain is the main target organ of cell phones and cordless phones, with highest exposure to the same side as the phone is used. Further, due to anatomical reasons, the brain of a child is more exposed to RF radiation than the brain of an adult [22,23]. This is caused by the smaller brain size, a thinner pinna of the ear, thinner skin and thinner skull bone permitting deeper penetration into the child's brain. A recent French study showed that children absorb twice the RF from cell phone use as do adults [24].

In addition to concerns about cancer, there is evidence for short-term effects of RF exposure on cognition, memory and learning, behavior, reaction time, attention and concentration, altered brainwave activity (altered EEG) [95–108], and all of these effects argue for extreme caution with regard to exposure of children. The development of children into adults is characterized by faster cell division during growth, the long period needed to fully develop and mature all organ systems, and the need for properly synchronized neural development until early adulthood. Chronic, cumulative RF exposures may alter the normal growth and development of children and adversely affect their development and capacity for normal learning, nervous system development, behavior and judgment [1,97,102].

Prenatal exposure to EMF has been identified as a possible risk factor for childhood leukemia (1). Maternal use of cell phones has been reported to adversely affect fetal brain development, resulting in behavioral problems in those children by

the time they reach school age [25]. Their exposure is involuntary in all cases. Children are largely unable to remove themselves from exposures to harmful substances in their environments.

2.2. Plausible biological mechanisms for a relationship between RF exposure and cancer

2.2.1. DNA damage and oxidative stress

Damage to DNA from ELF and from RF cell phone frequencies at very low intensities (far below FCC and ICNIRP safety limits) has been demonstrated in many studies [1,2,26–35]. Both single- and double-strand DNA damage have been reported by various researchers in different laboratories. This is damage to the human genome, and can lead to mutations which can be inherited, or which can cause cancer, or both.

Non-ionizing radiation is assumed to be of too low energy to cause direct DNA damage. However both ELF and RF radiation induce reactive oxygen species, free radicals that react with cellular molecules including DNA. Free-radical production and/or the failure to repair DNA damage (secondary to damage to the enzymes that repair damage) created by such exposures can lead to mutations. Whether it is greater free-radical production, reduction in anti-oxidant protection or reduced repair capacity, the result will be altered DNA, increased risk of cancer, impaired or delayed healing, and premature aging [36–54]. Exposures have also been linked to decreased melatonin production, which is a plausible biological mechanism for decreased cancer surveillance in the body, and increased cancer risk [34,39,44,46,47,49,50,54]. An increased risk of cancers and a decrease in survival has been reported in numerous studies of ELF and RF [55–69].

2.2.2. Stress proteins (heat shock proteins or HSP)

Another well-documented effect of exposure to low-intensity ELF and RF is the creation of stress proteins (heat shock proteins) that signal a cell is being placed under physiological stress) [70–80]. The HSP response is generally associated with heat shock, exposure to toxic chemicals and heavy metals, and other environmental insults. HSP is a signal of cells in distress. Plants, animals and bacteria all produce stress proteins to survive environmental stressors like high temperatures, lack of oxygen, heavy metal poisoning, and oxidative stress.

We can now add ELF and RF exposures to this list of environmental stressors that cause a physiological stress response. Very low-level ELF and RF exposures can cause cells to produce stress proteins, meaning that the cell recognizes ELF and RF exposures as harmful. This is another important way in which scientists have documented that ELF and RF exposures can be harmful, and it happens at levels far below the existing public safety standards. An additional concern is that if the stress goes on too long, the protective effect is diminished. The reduced response with prolonged exposure means the cell is less protected against

damage, and this is why prolonged or chronic exposures may be harmful, even at very low intensities.

2.2.3. RF-induced gene expression changes

Many environment agents cause diseases, including cancer, not by direct damage to DNA but rather by up- or down-regulation of genes that regulate cell growth and function. Usually there are many genes whose expression is changed, and it is difficult to determine the exact changes responsible for the disease. Both ELF and RF exposures have been shown to result in altered gene expression. Olivares-Banuelos et al. [81] found that ELF exposure of chromaffin cells resulted in changed expression of 53 transcripts. Zhao et al. [82] investigated the gene expression profile of rat neurons exposed to 1800 MHz RF fields (2 W/kg) and found 24 up-regulated genes and 10 down-regulated genes after a 24-h exposure. The altered genes were involved in multiple cellular functions including cytoskeleton, signal transduction pathways and metabolism. Kariene et al. [83] exposed human skin to mobile phone radiation, and found by punch biopsy that 8 proteins were significantly altered in expression, consistent with gene induction. Several other studies have found altered gene expression following RF exposure, although none have been found that explain specific disease states [84].

DNA activation at very low ELF and RF levels, as in the stress response, and DNA damage (strand breaks and micronuclei) at higher levels, are molecular precursors to changes that are believed to lead to cancer. These, along with gene induction, provide plausible biological mechanisms linking exposure to cancer.

The biochemical pathways that are activated are the same for ELF and for RF exposures, and are non-thermal (do not require heating or induced electrical currents). This is true for the stress response, DNA damage, generation of reactive oxygen species as well as gene induction. Thus it is not surprising that the major cancers resulting from exposure to ELF and RF are the same, namely leukemia and brain cancer. The safety standards for both ELF and RF, based on protection from heating, are irrelevant and not protective. ELF exposure levels of only 5–10 mG have been shown to activate the stress response genes (<http://www.bioinitiative.org>, Sections 1 and 7 [1]).

3. Sleep, cognitive function and performance

The relationship of good sleep to cognition, performance and healing is well recognized. Sleep is a profoundly important factor in proper healing, anti-inflammatory benefits, reduction in physical symptoms of such as tendonitis, over-use syndrome, fatigue-induced lethargy, cognition and learning. Incomplete or slowed physiological recovery is common when sleep is impaired. Circadian rhythms that normalize stress hormone production (cortisol, for example) depend on synchronized sleep patterns.

People who are chronically exposed to low-level wireless antenna emissions report symptoms such as problems in sleeping (insomnia), as well as other symptoms that include fatigue, headache, dizziness, grogginess, lack of concentration, memory problems, ringing in the ears (tinnitus), problems with balance and orientation, and difficulty in multi-tasking [85–93,99]. In children, exposures to cell phone radiation have resulted in changes in brain oscillatory activity during some memory tasks [97,102]. Cognitive impairment, loss of mental concentration, distraction, speeded mental function but lowered accuracy, impaired judgment, delayed reaction time, spatial disorientation, dizziness, fatigue, headache, slower motor skills and reduced learning ability in children and adults have all been reported [85–108].

These symptoms are more common among “electrosensitive” individuals, although electrosensitivity has not been documented in double-blind tests of individual identifying themselves as being electrosensitive as compared to controls [109,110]. However people traveling to laboratories for testing are pre-exposed to a multitude of RF and ELF exposures, so they may already be symptomatic prior to actual testing. There is also evidence that RF exposures testing behavioral changes show delayed results; effects are observed after termination of RF exposure. This suggests a persistent change in the nervous system that may be evident only after time has passed, so is not observed during a short testing period.

3.1. Plausible biological mechanisms for neurobehavioral effects

3.1.1. The melatonin hypothesis

While there remains controversy as to the degree that RF and ELF fields alter neurobehavioral function, emerging evidence provides a plausible mechanism for both effects on sleep and cognition. Sleep is controlled by the central circadian oscillator in the suprachiasmatic nucleus, located in the hypothalamus. The activity of this central circadian oscillator is, in turn, controlled by the hormone, melatonin, which is released from the pineal gland [111]. There is considerable evidence that ELF exposure reduces the release of melatonin from the pineal gland—see Section 12 of the Bioinitiative Report [1]. There has been less study of the effects of RF exposure on melatonin release, but investigations have demonstrated a reduced excretion of the urinary metabolite of melatonin among persons using a mobile phone for more than 25 min per day [112]. In a study of women living near to radio and television transmitters, Clark et al. [113] found no effect on urinary melatonin metabolite excretion among pre-menopausal women, but a strong effect in post-menopausal women.

The “melatonin hypothesis” also provides a possible basis for other reported effects of EMFs. Melatonin has important actions on learning and memory, and inhibits electrophysiological components of learning in some but not all areas of the brain [114,115]. Melatonin has properties as a free-radical scavenger and anti-oxidant [116], and consequently,

a reduction in melatonin levels would be expected to increase susceptibility to cancer and cellular damage. Melatonin could also be the key to understanding the relationship between EMF exposure and Alzheimer's disease. Noonan et al. [117] reported that there was an inverse relationship between excretion of the melatonin metabolite and the 1–42 amino acid form of amyloid beta in electric utility workers. This form of amyloid beta has been found to be elevated in Alzheimer's patients.

3.1.2. Blood–brain barrier alterations

Central nervous system effects of EMFs may also be secondary to damage to the blood–brain barrier (BBB). The blood–brain barrier is a critical structure that prevents toxins and other large molecules that are in peripheral blood from having access to the brain matter itself. Salford et al. [118] have reported that a 2-h exposure of rats to GSM-900 radiation with a SAR of 2–200 mW/kg resulted in nerve cell damage. In a follow-up study, Eberhardt et al. report that 2-h exposures to cell phone GSM microwave RF resulted in leakage of albumin across the blood–brain barrier and neuronal death [119]. Neuronal albumin uptake was significantly correlated to occurrence of damaged neurons when measured at 28 days post-exposure. The lowest exposure level was 0.12 mW/kg (0.00012 W/kg) for 2 h. The highest exposure level was 120 mW/kg (0.12 W/kg). The weakest exposure level showed the greatest effect in opening the BBB [118]. Earlier blood–brain studies by Salford and Schirmer [120,121] report similar effects.

4. What are sources of wireless radiation?

There are many overlapping sources of radiofrequency and microwave emissions in daily life, both from industrial sources (like cell towers) and from personal items [cell and cordless phones, personal digital assistants (PDAs), wireless routers, etc.]. Published data on typical levels found in some cities and from some sources are available at <http://www.bioinitiative.org> [1,122–124].

Cell phones are the single most important source of radiofrequency radiation to which we are exposed because of the relatively high exposure that results from the phone being held right against the head. Cell phones produce two types of emissions that should be considered. First, the radiofrequency radiation (typically microwave frequency radiation) is present. However, there is also the contribution of the switching battery pack that produces very high levels of extremely low frequency electromagnetic field [125–127].

Cordless telephones have not been widely recognized as similar in emissions to cell phones, but they can and do produce significant RF exposures. Since people tend to use them as substitutes for in-home and in-office corded or traditional telephones, they are often used for long periods of time. As the range of cordless phones has increased (the distance away that you can carry on a conversation is related to the power

output of the phone), the more powerful the RF signal will be. Hence, newer cordless phones may in some cases be similar to the power output of cell phones. The cumulative emissions from cell and cordless phones taken together should be recognized when considering the relative risks of wireless communication exposures.

PDAs such as the BlackBerry, Treo and iPhone units are 'souped-up' versions of the original voice communication devices (cell phones). They often produce far higher ELF emissions than do cell phones because they use energy from the battery very intensively for powering color displays and during data transmission functions (email, sending and receiving large files, photos, etc.) [125–127]. ELF emissions have been reported from PDAs at several tens to several hundreds of milligauss. Evidence of significantly elevated ELF fields during normal use of the PDA has public health relevance and has been reported in at least three scientific papers [125,128,129]. In the context of repetitive, chronic exposure to significantly elevated ELF pulses from PDAs worn on the body, relevant health studies point to a possible relationship between ELF exposure and cancer and pregnancy outcomes [130–133].

We include discussion of the ELF literature for two reasons. As mentioned above ELF activates the same biology as RF, it contributes to the total EMF burden of the body. In addition, PDAs and cell phones emit both radiofrequency/microwave radiation (RF) and extremely low frequency ELF from the battery switching of the device (the power source). Studies show that some devices produce excessively high ELF exposures during voice and data transmission. ELF is already classified as a 2B (Possible) Carcinogen by IARC, which means that ELF is indisputably an issue to consider in the wireless technology debate. ELF has been classified as a Group 2B carcinogen for all humans, not just children. The strongest evidence came from epidemiological studies on childhood leukemia, but the designation applies to all humans, both adults and children [1,25].

Wireless headsets that allow for conversations with cell phones at a distance from the head itself reduce the emissions. Depending on the type of wireless device, they may operate (transmit signal) only during conversations or they may be operational continuously. The cumulative dose of wireless headsets has not been well characterized under either form of use. Substantial cumulative RF exposure would be expected if the user wears a wireless headset that transmits a signal continuously during the day. However a critical factor is where the cell phone is placed. If worn on a belt with a headset, the exposure to the brain is reduced but the exposure to the pelvis may be significant.

Cell towers (called "masts" in Europe and Scandinavian countries) are wireless antenna facilities that transmit the cell phone signals within communities. They are another major source of RF exposures for the public. They differ from RF exposures from wireless devices like cell phones in that they produce much lower RF levels (generally 0.05 to 1–2 $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ in the first several hundred feet around them) in comparison to several hundred microwatts per centimeter

squared for a cell phone held at the head. However they create a constant zone of elevated RF for up to 24 h per day, many hours per day, and the exposure is whole body rather than localized at the head. These facilities are the distribution system for wireless voice communications, internet connections and data transmission within communities. They are often erected on free-standing towers. They may be constructed on telephone poles or electrical poles. They may be built into the façade or rooftops of buildings behind wood screening. These are called stealth installations for wireless antenna facilities. Some installations are camouflaged to resemble ‘false trees or rocks’. They emit RF to provide cell service to specific “cells” or locations that receive the signal.

Other forms of wireless transmission that are common in areas providing cell service are wireless land area networks (WLAN), (WiMAX) and WIFI networks. Some cities are installing city-wide WIFI service to allow any user on the street to log into the internet (without cables or wire connections). WIFI installations may have a signal reach for a few hundred feet where WiMAX installations may transmit signal more than 10 miles, so produce a stronger RF emission for those in close proximity. Each type has its particular signal strength and intended coverage area, but what they have in common is the production of continuous RF exposure for those within the area. We do not know what the cumulative exposure (dose) might be for people living, working or going to school in continuously elevated RF fields, nor are the possible health implications yet known. However, based on studies of populations near cell sites in general, there is a constellation of generally observed health symptoms that are reported to occur [85–107]. In this regard it is important to note that children living near to AM radio transmitters have been found to elevated risks of leukemia [134,135]. While AM radio RF fields are lower in frequency than that common in mobile phones, this is a total body irradiation with RF. The fact that leukemia, not brain cancer, is apparent in these studies suggests that leukemia is the cancer seen at the lowest levels of both ELF and RF fields under the circumstances of whole-body exposure.

Commercial surveillance systems or security gates pose an additional source of strong RF exposures. They are ubiquitous in department stores, markets and shops at the entry and exit points to discourage shoplifting and theft of goods. Security gates can produce excessively high RF exposures (although transitory) and have been associated with interference with pacemakers in heart patients. The exposure levels may approach thermal public safety limits in intensity, although no one expects a person to stand between the security gate bars for more than 6 min (safety limits for uncontrolled public access are variable depending on the frequency, but are all averaged over a 6-min exposure period).

RFID chips (radiofrequency identification chips) are being widely used to track purchases and for security of pets, and in some cases to keep track of patients with Alzheimer’s disease and of children. RFID chips are implanted in fabrics, inserted in many types of commercial goods, and can be implanted

under the skin. They create a detectable signal to track the location of people and goods.

5. Problems with existing public health standards (safety limits)

If the existing standards were adequate none of the effects documented above should occur at levels to which people are regularly exposed. The fact that these effects are seen with our current ambient levels of exposure means that our existing public safety standards are obsolete. It also means that new, biologically based public exposure standards for wireless technologies are urgently needed. Whether it is feasible to achieve low enough levels that still work and also protect health against effects of chronic RF exposure – for all age groups – is uncertain. Whether we can protect the public and still allow the kinds of wireless technology uses we see today is unknown.

The nature of electromagnetic field interactions with biological systems has been well studied [136–144]. For purposes of standard-setting processes for both ELF and RF, the hypothesis that tissue damage can result only from heating is the fundamental flaw in the misguided efforts to understand the basic biological mechanisms leading to health effects.

The thermal standard is clearly untenable as a measure of dose when EMF stimuli that differ by many orders of magnitude in energy can stimulate the same biological response. In the ELF range, the same biological changes occur as in the RF, and no change in temperature can even be detected. With DNA interactions the same biological responses are stimulated in ELF and RF ranges even though the frequencies of the stimuli differ by many orders of magnitude. The effects of EMF on DNA to initiate the stress response or to cause molecular damage reflect the same biology in different frequency ranges. For this reason it should be possible to develop a scale based on DNA biology, and use it to define EMF dose in different parts of the EM spectrum. We also see a continuous scale in DNA experiments that focus on molecular damage where single and double strand breaks have long been known to occur in the ionizing range, and recent studies have shown similar effects in both ELF and RF ranges [144].

Existing standard-setting bodies that regulate wireless technologies, assume that there are no bioeffects of concern at exposure levels that do not cause measurable heating. However, it has been established beyond any reasonable doubt that bioeffects and some adverse health effects occur at far lower levels of RF and ELF exposure where no heating (or induced current) occurs; some effects are shown to occur a thousand times or more below the existing public safety limits. New, biologically based public exposure limits are urgently needed. New wireless technologies for cell and cordless phones, other wireless communication and data transmission systems affect living organisms in new ways that our antiquated safety limits have not foreseen, nor protected against.

The exposure of children to electromagnetic fields has not been studied extensively; in fact, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) standards for exposure to radiofrequency radiation are based on the height, weight and stature of a 6-foot tall man, not scaled to children or adults of smaller stature. They do not take into account the unique susceptibility of growing children to exposures, nor are there studies of particular relevance to children.

In addition there is a problem in the consideration of the level of evidence taken into consideration by these bodies. There have not been adequate animal models shown to have cancer as an endpoint, and a perception that no single mechanism is proven to explain these associations. Thus these committees have tended to ignore or minimize the evidence for direct hazard to humans, and believe there is no proof of cause and effect. These bodies assume from the beginning that only conclusive scientific evidence (absolute proof) will be sufficient to warrant change, and refuse to take action on the basis of a growing body of evidence which provides early but consequential warning of risks.

The Radiofrequency Interagency Working Group of the US governmental agencies involved in RF matters (RFI-AWG) issued a Guidelines Statement in June of 1999 that concluded the present RF standard “may not adequately protect the public” [145]. The RFI-AWG identified fourteen (14) issues that they believe are needed in the planned revisions of ANSI/IEEE RF exposure guidelines including “to provide a strong and credible rationale to support RF exposure guidelines”. In particular, the RFI-AWG criticized the existing standards as not taking into account chronic, as opposed to acute exposures, modulated or pulsed radiation (digital or pulsed RF is proposed at this site), time-averaged measurements that may erase the unique characteristics of an intensity-modulated RF radiation that may be responsible for reported biologic effects, and stated the need for a comprehensive review of long-term, low-level exposure studies, neurological-behavioral effects and micronucleus assay studies (showing genetic damage from low-level RF) [145]. This important document from relevant US agencies questions existing standards in the following ways: (a) selection of an adverse effect level for chronic exposures not based on tissue heating and considering modulation effects; (b) recognition of different safety criteria for acute and chronic exposures at non-thermal or low-intensity levels; (c) recognition of deficiencies in using time-averaged measurements of RF that does not differentiate between intensity-modulated RF and continuous wave (CW) exposure, and *therefore may not adequately protect the public*; (d) having standards based on adult males rather than considering children to be the most vulnerable group.

6. Prudent public health responses

Emerging environmental health problems require preventative public health responses even where scientific and

medical uncertainties still exist, but where policy decisions today may greatly reduce human disease and societal costs tomorrow.

Policy decisions in public health must address some amount of uncertainty when balancing likely benefits and estimated costs. Although new insight will allow better appreciation of difficult issues, such as those occurring in environmental and occupational health, an expanded perspective may also enlarge the list of problems that need to be managed. Ignoring the problems carries its own costs (as deferring a decision is a decision in itself). With environmental and other public health problems becoming increasingly complex and international in scope, scientific documentation alone rarely justifies simple solutions [146].

Social issues regarding the controversy over public and occupational exposures to ELF and RF center on the resolute adherence to existing ICNIRP and FCC/IEEE standards by many countries, in the face of growing scientific evidence of health risks at far lower levels [10]. The composition of these committees, usually with excessive representation of the physics and engineering communities rather than public health professionals, results in a refusal to adopt biologically based exposure standards. Furthermore, there is widespread belief that governments are ignoring this evidence and there is widespread distrust of and lack of confidence in governments and their health agencies. The basis on which most review bodies and standard-setting agencies have avoided the conclusion that the science is strong enough to warrant new safety limits for ELF and RF is to require a demonstration of absolute proof before taking action. A causal level of evidence, or scientific certainty standard is implicit in nearly all reviews of the ELF and RF science, although this runs counter to good public health protection policies.

There is no question that global implementation of the safety standards proposed in the Bioinitiative Report, if implemented abruptly and without careful planning, have the potential to not only be very expensive but also disruptive of life and the economy as we know it. Action must be a balance of risk to cost to benefit. The major risk from maintaining the status quo is an increasing number of cancer cases, especially in young people, as well as neurobehavioral problems at increasing frequencies. The benefits of the status quo are expansion and continued development of communication technologies. But we suspect that the true costs of even existing technologies will only become much more apparent with time. Whether the costs of remedial action are worth the societal benefits is a formula that should reward precautionary behavior. Prudent corporate policies should be expected to address and avoid future risks and liabilities, otherwise, there is no market incentive to produce safe (and safer) products.

The deployment of new technologies is running ahead of any reasonable estimation of possible health impacts and estimates of probabilities, let alone a solid assessment of risk. However, what has been missing with regard to EMF has been an acknowledgement of the risk that is demonstrated by

the scientific studies. There is clear evidence of risk, although the magnitude of the risk is uncertain, and the magnitude of doing nothing on the health effects cost to society is similarly uncertain. This situation is very similar to our history of dealing with the hazards of smoking decades ago, where the power of the industry to influence governments and even conflicts of interest within the public health community delayed action for more than a generation, with consequent loss of life and enormous extra health care costs to society. New standards are warranted now, based on the totality of scientific evidence; the risks of taking no-action, the large population at risk, costs associated with ignoring the problem in new and upgraded site selection and construction, and the loss of public trust by ignoring the problem.

Direct medical and rehabilitative health costs associated with treatment for diseases that are reasonably related to wireless technologies may be very large. Although there is uncertainty involved in how much disease is related to wireless exposures, the mere scale of the problem with several billion users of cell phones and even larger impacts on bystander populations (from cell site exposures, from other WI-FI and wireless exposures in-home and commercial use, etc.) the associated public health costs will likely be monumental. Furthermore the costs to families with cancers, neurological diseases or learning disabilities in children related in part or in whole to wireless technologies extend beyond medical costs. They may reasonably extend to family disruption and family psychological problems, losses in job productivity and income loss.

The history of governments and their official health agencies to deal with emerging and newly identified risks to health is not good [147–149]. This is particularly true where industry investments in new products and technologies occur without full recognition, disclosure or even knowledge of possible health consequences. Large economic investments in polluting industries often make for perilously slow regulatory action, and the public health consequences may be very great as a result [150,151].

Free markets do not internalize the costs to society of “guessing wrong”. Unexpected or hidden health costs of new technologies may not be seen for many years, when the ability to recall or to identify the precise exposures related to disease outcomes is difficult or impossible. The penalty nearly always falls to the individual, the family or the taxpayer and not to the industry that benefits economically—at least in free-market economies. Thus, the profits go to industry but the costs may go to the individual who can suffer both diminished quality of life and health and economic disadvantage. If all disease endpoints that may be reasonably related to chronic exposure to electromagnetic fields are considered even a small attributable fraction for one or more industries, it will have enormous global impact on public health. The public health implications are immense. But they can be reduced by strong government and public health interventions providing information on alternatives to wireless technologies, public education campaigns, health advisories,

Table 1

Public health implications of wireless technologies argue for change in governmental and health agency actions.

Secure US and EU legislative mandates for safer technologies for communication and data transmission, for security and surveillance needs.
Promote wired alternatives for voice and data communication (cable, fiber-optic)
Discourage or ban use of cell phones by children and young teen-agers
Provide permanent (unremovable) labels on cell phones “Not for use by children under the age of 16”
Implement national public education campaigns on health issues (cell phones, cordless phones, PDAs, wireless internet, city-wide WI-FI, WLAN and WiMAX exposures
Promote industry redesign for safer products: support innovation for alternatives and solutions
Slow or stop deployment of wireless technologies to discourage reliance on wireless technologies for communication and security needs
Put the burden of proof on industry to show “new wireless tech” is safe before deployment
Adopt and enforce restricted use areas for sensitive or more vulnerable segments of society including low-EMF environments in public areas and “No Cell” zones in airports, hospitals, schools
Acknowledge FCC and ICNIRP thermal safety standards are obsolete for wireless technologies
Appoint new standard-setting bodies familiar with biological effects to develop new guidelines for public safety limits.
Develop new biologically based standards that address low-intensity, chronic exposures
Require standard of evidence and level of proof = public health
Reject “causal” standard of evidence for taking action on science
Make industry financially liable for “guessing wrong” and ignoring health risks

requirements for redesign of wireless devices, proscription of use of wireless devices by children and teenagers, strong and independent research programs on causes and prevention of EMF-related diseases, and consultation with all stakeholders on issues relating to involuntary exposures (bystander or second-hand radiation exposures from wireless technologies) (Table 1).

The scientific information contained in this Supplement argues for thresholds or guidelines that are substantially below current FCC and ICNIRP standards for localized exposures to wireless devices and for whole-body exposure. Uncertainty about how low such standards might have to go to be prudent from a public health standpoint should not prevent reasonable efforts to respond to the information at hand. No lower limit for bioeffects and adverse health effects from RF has been established, so the possible health risks of wireless WLAN and WI-FI systems, for example, will require further research. No assertion of safety at any level of wireless exposure (chronic exposure) can be made at this time. The lower limit for reported human health effects has dropped 100-fold below the safety standard (for mobile phones and PDAs); 1000–10,000-fold for other wireless (cell towers at distance; WI-FI and WLAN devices). The entire basis for safety standards is called into question, and it is not unreasonable to question the safety of RF at any level.

It is likely that for both ELF and RF, as for other carcinogens, there is no threshold of exposure that is without risk, but the magnitude of the risk increases linearly with the level of exposure. Our society will not go back to the pre-electric and pre-wireless age, but the clear evidence of health hazards to the human population from exposure mandates that we develop ways in which to reduce exposure through education, new technologies and the establishment of biomedically based standards.

7. Conclusions and recommended actions

New ELF limits are warranted based on a public health analysis of the overall existing scientific evidence. These limits should reflect environmental levels of ELF that have been demonstrated to increase risk for childhood leukemia, and possibly other cancers and neurological diseases. ELF limits should be set below those exposure levels that have been linked in childhood leukemia studies to increased risk of disease, plus an additional safety factor. It is no longer acceptable to build new power lines and electrical facilities that place people in ELF environments that have been determined to be risky. These levels are in the 2–4 milligauss (mG) range (0.2–0.4 μT), not in the 10 s of mG or 100 s of mG. The existing ICNIRP limit is 1000 mG (100 μT) and 904 mG (90.4 μT) in the US for ELF is outdated and based on faulty assumptions. These limits are can no longer be said to be protective of public health and they should be replaced. A safety buffer or safety factor should also be applied to a new, biologically based ELF limit, and the conventional approach is to add a safety factor lower than the risk level.

While new ELF limits are being developed and implemented, a reasonable approach would be a 1 mG (0.1 μT) planning limit for habitable space adjacent to all new or upgraded power lines and a 2 mG (0.2 μT) limit for all other new construction. It is also recommended that a 1 mG (0.1 μT) limit be established for existing habitable space for children and/or women who are pregnant (because of the possible link between childhood leukemia and *in utero* exposure to ELF). This recommendation is based on the assumption that a higher burden of protection is required for children who cannot protect themselves, and who are at risk for childhood leukemia at rates that are traditionally high enough to trigger regulatory action. This situation in particular warrants extending the 1 mG (0.1 μT) limit to existing occupied space. “Establish” in this case probably means formal public advisories from relevant health agencies. While it is not realistic to reconstruct all existing electrical distribution systems, in the short-term; steps to reduce exposure from these existing systems need to be initiated, especially in places where children spend time, and should be encouraged. These limits should reflect the exposures that are commonly associated with increased risk of childhood leukemia (in the 2–5 mG (0.2–0.5 μT) range for all children, and over 1.4 mG (0.14 μT) for children age 6 and younger). Nearly all of

the occupational studies for adult cancers and neurological diseases report their highest exposure category is 4 mG (0.4 μT) and above, so that new ELF limits should target the exposure ranges of interest, and not necessarily higher ranges.

Avoiding chronic ELF exposure in schools, homes and the workplace above levels associated with increased risk of disease will also avoid most of the possible bioactive parameters of ELF discussed in the relevant literature.

It is not prudent public health policy to wait any longer to adopt new public safety limits for ELF. These limits should reflect the exposures that are commonly associated with increased risk of childhood leukemia (in the 2–5 mG (0.2–0.5 μT) range for all children, and over 1.4 mG (0.14 μT) for children age 6 and younger). Avoiding chronic ELF exposure in schools, homes and the workplace above levels associated with increased risk of disease will also avoid most of the possible bioactive parameters of ELF discussed in the relevant literature.

The rapid deployment of new wireless technologies that chronically expose people to pulsed RF at levels reported to cause bioeffects, which in turn, could reasonably be presumed to lead to serious health impacts, is a public health concern. There is suggestive to strongly suggestive evidence that RF exposures may cause changes in cell membrane function, cell communication, metabolism, activation of proto-oncogenes and can trigger the production of stress proteins at exposure levels below current regulatory limits. Resulting effects can include DNA breaks and chromosome aberrations, cell death including death of brain neurons, increased free-radical production, activation of the endogenous opioid system, cell stress and premature aging, changes in brain function including memory loss, retarded learning, performance impairment in children, headaches and fatigue, sleep disorders, neurodegenerative conditions, reduction in melatonin secretion and cancers (BioInitiative Report Chapters 5–10, 12) [1].

This information now argues for thresholds or guidelines that are substantially below current FCC and ICNIRP standards for whole-body exposure. Uncertainty about how low such standards might have to go to be prudent from a public health standpoint should not prevent reasonable efforts to respond to the information at hand. No lower limit for bioeffects and adverse health effects from RF has been established, so the possible health risks of wireless WLAN and WI-FI systems, for example, will require further research and no assertion of safety at any level of wireless exposure (chronic exposure) can be made at this time. The lower limit for reported human health effects has dropped 100-fold below the safety standard (for mobile phones and PDAs); 1000–10,000-fold for other wireless (cell towers at distance; WI-FI and WLAN devices). The entire basis for safety standards is called into question, and it is not unreasonable to question the safety of RF at any level.

A cautionary target level for pulsed RF exposures for ambient wireless that could be applied to RF sources from cell tower antennas, WI-FI, WI-MAX and other similar sources

is proposed. The recommended cautionary target level is 0.1 microwatts per centimeter squared ($\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$) (or 0.614 V per meter or V/m) for pulsed RF where these exposures affect the general public; this advisory is proportionate to the evidence and in accord with prudent public health policy. A precautionary limit of $0.1 \mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ should be adopted for outdoor, cumulative RF exposure. This reflects the current RF science and prudent public health response that would reasonably be set for pulsed RF (ambient) exposures where people live, work and go to school. This level of RF is experienced as whole-body exposure, and can be a chronic exposure where there is wireless coverage present for voice and data transmission for cell phones, pagers and PDAs and other sources of radiofrequency radiation. An outdoor precautionary limit of $0.1 \mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ would mean an even lower exposure level inside buildings, perhaps as low as $0.01 \mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$. Some studies and many anecdotal reports on ill health have been reported at lower levels than this; however, for the present time, it could prevent some of the most disproportionate burdens placed on the public nearest to such installations. Although this RF target level does not preclude further rollout of WI-FI technologies, we also recommend that wired alternatives to WI-FI be implemented, particularly in schools and libraries so that children are not subjected to elevated RF levels until more is understood about possible health impacts. This recommendation should be seen as an interim precautionary limit that is intended to guide preventative actions; and more conservative limits may be needed in the future.

Broadcast facilities that chronically expose nearby residents to elevated RF levels from AM, FM and television antenna transmission are also of public health concern given the potential for very high RF exposures near these facilities (antenna farms). RF levels can be in the 10 s to several 100 s of $\mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ in residential areas within half a mile of some broadcast sites (for example, Lookout Mountain, Colorado and Awbrey Butte, Bend, Oregon). Like wireless communication facilities, RF emissions from broadcast facilities that are located in, or expose residential populations and schools to elevated levels of RF will very likely need to be re-evaluated for safety.

For emissions from wireless devices (cell phones, personal digital assistant or PDA devices, etc.) there is enough evidence for increased risk of brain tumors and acoustic neuromas now to warrant intervention with respect to their use. Redesign of cell phones and PDAs could prevent direct head and eye exposure, for example, by designing new units so that they work only with a wired headset or on speakerphone mode.

These effects can reasonably be presumed to result in adverse health effects and disease with chronic and uncontrolled exposures, and children may be particularly vulnerable. The young are also largely unable to remove themselves from such environments. Second-hand radiation, like second-hand smoke is an issue of public health concern based on the evidence at hand.

In summary, the following recommendations are made:

- ELF limits should be set below those exposure levels that have been linked in childhood leukemia studies to increased risk of disease, plus an additional safety factor. It is no longer acceptable to build new power lines and electrical facilities that place people in ELF environments that have been determined to be risky (at levels generally at 2 mG (0.2 μT) and above).
- While new ELF limits are being developed and implemented, a reasonable approach would be a 1 mG (0.1 μT) planning limit for habitable space adjacent to all new or upgraded power lines and a 2 mG (0.2 μT) limit for all other new construction. It is also recommended for that a 1 mG (0.1 μT) limit be established for existing habitable space for children and/or women who are pregnant. This recommendation is based on the assumption that a higher burden of protection is required for children who cannot protect themselves, and who are at risk for childhood leukemia at rates that are traditionally high enough to trigger regulatory action. This situation in particular warrants extending the 1 mG (0.1 μT) limit to existing occupied space. “Establish” in this case probably means formal public advisories from relevant health agencies.
- While it is not realistic to reconstruct all existing electrical distributions systems, in the short-term; steps to reduce exposure from these existing systems need to be initiated and should be encouraged, especially in places where children spend time.
- A precautionary limit of $0.1 \mu\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ (which is also 0.614 V per meter) should be adopted for outdoor, cumulative RF exposure. This reflects the current RF science and prudent public health response that would reasonably be set for pulsed RF (ambient) exposures where people live, work and go to school. This level of RF is experienced as whole-body exposure, and can be a chronic exposure where there is wireless coverage present for voice and data transmission for cell phones, pagers and PDAs and other sources of radiofrequency radiation. Some studies and many anecdotal reports on ill health have been reported at lower levels than this; however, for the present time, it could prevent some of the most disproportionate burdens placed on the public nearest to such installations. Although this RF target level does not preclude further rollout of WI-FI technologies, we also recommend that wired alternatives to WI-FI be implemented, particularly in schools and libraries so that children are not subjected to elevated RF levels until more is understood about possible health impacts. This recommendation should be seen as an interim precautionary limit that is intended to guide preventative actions; and more conservative limits may be needed in the future.

References

- [1] C. Sage, D.O. Carpenter (Eds.), BioInitiative Working Group BioInitiative Report: A Rationale for a Biologically-based Public

- Exposure Standard for Electromagnetic Fields (ELF and RF), 2007. <http://www.bioinitiative.org>.
- [2] REFLEX Program. Risk evaluation of potential environmental hazards from low frequency electromagnetic field exposure using sensitive in vitro methods. A project funded by the European Union under the programme Quality of Life and Management of Living Resources, Key Action 4 (2004).
 - [3] L. Hardell, C. Sage, Biological effect from electromagnetic field exposure and public exposure standards, *Biomed. Pharmacother.* 62 (2008) 104–109, doi:10.1016/j.bipha.(2007)12.004.
 - [4] L. Hardell, M. Carlberg, F. Söderqvist, K. Hansson Mild, Meta-analysis of long-term mobile phone use and the association with brain tumours, *Int. J. Oncol.* 32 (2008) 1097–1103.
 - [5] P. Kan, S.E. Simonsen, J.L. Lyon, J.R.W. Kestle, Cellular phone use and brain tumor: a meta-analysis, *J. Neurooncol.* (2007), doi:10.1007/s11060-007-9432-1.
 - [6] E. Cardis, Interphone Study Memo, International Agency for Cancer Research, October 2008.
 - [7] S. Sadetzki, A. Chetrit, A. Jarus-Hakak, E. Cardis, Y. Deutch, S. Dvendenani, A. Zultan, I. Novikov, L. Freedman, M. Wolf, Cellular phone use and risk of benign and malignant parotid gland tumors—a nationwide case–control study, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* (2008), doi:10.1093/aje/kwm325.
 - [8] A. Lahkola, T. Salminen, J. Raitanen, S. Heinavaara, M.J. Schoemaker, H.C. Christensen, M. Feychting, C. Johansen, L. Klæboe, S. Lonn, A.J. Swerdlow, T. Tynes, A. Auvinen, Meningioma and mobile phone use—a collaborative case–control study in five North European countries, *Int. J. Epidemiol. Adv. Access* (August) (2008), doi:10.1093/ije/dyn155.
 - [9] T. Takebayashi, S. Akiba, Y. Kikuchi, et al., Mobile phone use and acoustic neuroma risk in Japan, *Occup. Environ. Med.* 63 (2007) 802–807.
 - [10] D.O. Carpenter, C.L. Sage, Setting prudent public health policy for electromagnetic field exposures, *Rev. Environ. Health* 23 (2) (2008) 91–117.
 - [11] D.O. Carpenter, C.L. Sage, BioInitiative Working Group, Key scientific evidence and public health policy options, BioInitiative Report at <http://www.bioinitiative.org>, 17 (2007).
 - [12] European Commission, Health and Consumer Protection, Scientific Committee on SCENIHR Report on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks—Possible Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) on Human Health, 2007.
 - [13] World Health Organization, Extremely Low Frequency Fields Environmental Health Criteria Monograph 238, 2007. <http://www.who.int/peh-emf/project/en> and http://www.who.int/peh-emf/meetings/elf_emf_workshop_2007/en/index.html.
 - [14] http://news.cnet.com/Emerging-markets-fuel-cell-phone-growth/2100-1039_3-6159491.html.
 - [15] <http://news.softpedia.com/news/2-14-billion-cell-phone-subscribers-in-2005-2120.shtml>.
 - [16] http://www.ctia.org/media/industry_info/index.cfm/AID/10323.
 - [17] <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/20/us/20messaging.html> and Members Info, Electronics Industries Alliance Website, November, 2000.; Members Info, Electronics Industries Alliance Website, November 2000.
 - [18] L. Hardell, M. Carlberg, K. Hansson Mild, Pooled analysis of two case–control studies on use of cellular and cordless telephones and the risk for malignant brain tumours diagnosed in 1997–2003, *Int. Arch. Environ. Health* 79 (2006) 630–639, doi:10.1007/s00420-006-0088-5.
 - [19] M. Kundi, The controversy about a possible relationship between mobile phone use and cancer, *Environ. Health Persp.* (September) (2008), doi: 101289/ehp.11902.
 - [20] J. Pronczuk–Garbino (Ed.), Children’s Health and the Environment: A Global Perspective, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2005, p. 367.
 - [21] World Health Organization, Children’s Health and Environment: A Review of Evidence: A Joint Report from the European Environmental Agency and The World Health Organization, 2002. <http://www.who.int/peh-emf>.
 - [22] O.P. Gandhi, G. Lazzi, C.M. Furse, Electromagnetic absorption in the human head and neck for mobile telephones at 835 and 1900 MHz, *IEE Trans. Microw. Theory Tech.* 44 (1996) 1884–1896.
 - [23] O.P. Gandhi, G. Kang, Some present problems and a proposed experimental phantom for SAR compliance testing of cellular telephones at 835 and 1900 MHz, *Phys. Med. Biol.* 47 (2002) 1501–1518.
 - [24] J. Wiart, A. Hadjem, M.F. Wong, I. Bloch, Analysis of RF exposure in the head tissues of children and adults, *Phys. Med. Biol.* 53 (2008) 3681–3695; J. Wiart, A. Hadjem, M.F. Wong, I. Bloch, Analysis of RF exposure in the head tissues of children and adults, *Wiart Phys. Med. Biol.* 53 (June) (2008) 2771–2783.
 - [25] H.A. Divan, L. Kheifets, C. Obel, J. Olsen, Prenatal and postnatal exposure to cell phone use and behavioral problems in children, *Epidemiology* 19 (4) (2008).
 - [26] International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection, Guidelines for limiting exposure to time-varying electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields (up to 300 GHz). *Health Phys.* 74(4) (1998) 494–522. <http://www.icnirp.de>.
 - [27] Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc (IEEE), Section 4.2 of “IEEE Standard for Safety Levels with Respect to Human Exposure to Radio Frequency Electromagnetic Fields, 3 kHz to 300 GHz,” ANSI/IEEE C95.1-1992. New York, NY, 1992.
 - [28] H. Lai, N.P. Singh, Single and double strand DNA breaks in rat brain cells after acute exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation, *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 69 (1996) 513–521.
 - [29] S. Ivancsits, A. Pilger, E. Diem, O. Jahn, H.W. Rudinger, Cell type-specific genotoxic effects of intermittent extremely-low frequency electromagnetic fields, *Mutat. Res.* 583 (2005) 184–188.
 - [30] J. Phillips, et al., DNA damage in molt-4 lymphoblastoid cells exposed to cellular telephone radiofrequency fields in vitro, *Bioelectrochem. Bioenerg.* 45 (1998) 103–110.
 - [31] R.J. Aitken, L.E. Bennetts, D. Sawyer, A.M. Wiklendt, B.V. King, Impact of radio frequency electromagnetic radiation on DNA integrity in the male germline, *Int. J. Androl.* 28 (2005) 171.
 - [32] J.Y. Kim, S.Y. Hong, Y.M. Lee, S.A. Yu, W.S. Koh, J.R. Hong, T. Son, S.K. Chang, M. Lee, In vitro assessment of clastogenicity of mobile-phone radiation (835 MHz) using the alkaline comet assay and chromosomal aberration test, *Environ. Toxicol.* 23 (2008) 319.
 - [33] S. Lixia, K. Yao, W. Kaijun, I. Deglang, H. Huajun, G. Xiangwei, W. Baohong, Z. Wei, L. Jianling, W. Wei, Effects of 1.8 GHz radiofrequency field on DNA damage and expression of heat shock protein 70 in human lens epithelial cells, *Mutat. Res.* 602 (2006) 135.
 - [34] R. Paulraj, J. Behari, Single strand DNA breaks in rat brain cells exposed to microwave radiation, *Mutat. Res.* 596 (2006) 76.
 - [35] M. Mashevich, D. Folkman, A. Kesar, A. Barbul, R. Korenstein, E. Jerby, L. Avivi, Exposure of human peripheral blood lymphocytes to electromagnetic fields associated with cellular phones leads to chromosomal instability, *Bioelectromagnetics* 24 (2003) 82.
 - [36] I.G. Akoev, M.S. Pashovkina, L.P. Dolgacheva, T.P. Semenova, V.L. Kalmykov, Enzymatic activity of some tissues and blood serum from animals and humans exposed to microwaves and hypothesis on the possible role of free radical processes in the nonlinear effects and modification of emotional behavior of animals, *Radiat. Biol. Radioecol.* 42 (3) (2002) 32–330.
 - [37] C. Blackman, et al., The influence of 1.2 μ T, 60 Hz magnetic fields on melatonin and tamoxifen-induced inhibition of MCF-7 cell growth, *Bioelectromagnetics* 22 (2) (2001) 122–128.
 - [38] D.E. Blask, S.M. Hill, Effects of melatonin on cancer: studies on MCF-7 human breast cancer cells in culture, *J. Neural Transm. Suppl.* 21 (1986) 433–449.

- [39] J.B. Burch, J.S. Reif, C.W. Noonan, T. Ichinose, A.M. Bachand, T.L. Koleber, M.G. Yost, Melatonin metabolite excretion among cellular telephone users, *Int. J. Rad. Biol.* 78 (2002) 1029–1036.
- [40] Girgert, et al., Induction of tamoxifen resistance in breast cancer cells by ELF electromagnetic fields, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 336 (2005) 1144–1149.
- [41] Harland, et al., Environmental magnetic fields inhibit the antiproliferative action of tamoxifen and melatonin in a human breast cancer cell line, *Bioelectromagnetics* 18 (1997) 555–562.
- [42] Harland, et al., Evidence for a slow time-scale of interaction for magnetic fields inhibiting tamoxifen's antiproliferative action in human breast cancer cells, *Cell Biochem. Biophys.* 31 (3) (1999) 295–306.
- [43] A. Ilhan, A. Gurel, F. Armutcu, S. Kamisli, M. Iraz, O. Akyol, S. Ozen, Ginkgo biloba prevents mobile phone-induced oxidative stress in rat brain, *Clin. Chim. Acta* 340 (1–2) (2004) 153–162.
- [44] Ishido, et al., Magnetic fields (MF) of 50 Hz at 1.2 μ T as well as 100 μ T cause uncoupling of inhibitory pathways of adenyl cyclase mediated by melatonin 1a receptor in MF-sensitive MCF-7 cells, *Carcinogenesis* 22 (7) (2001) 1043–1048.
- [45] H. Koylu, H. Mollaoglu, F.N. Ozguner, Melatonin modulates 900 Mhz microwave-induced lipid peroxidation changes in rat brain, *Toxicol. Ind. Health* 22 (5) (2006) 211–216.
- [46] R.P. Liburdy, T.R. Sloma, et al., ELF magnetic fields, breast cancer, and melatonin: 60 Hz fields block melatonin's oncogenic action on ER+ breast cancer cell proliferation, *J. Pineal Res.* 14 (1993) 89–97.
- [47] R.P. Liburdy, et al., Magnetic Fields, melatonin, tamoxifen and human breast cancer cell growth, in: R.G. Stevens, B.W. Wilson, L.E. Anderson (Eds.), *The Melatonin Hypothesis—Breast Cancer and Use of Electric Power*, Battelle Press, Columbus, Richland, 1997, pp. 669–700.
- [48] L.I. Loberg, Gene expression in human breast epithelial cells exposed to 60 Hz magnetic fields, *Carcinogenesis* 20 (1999) 1633–1636.
- [49] Luben, et al., Replication of 12 mG EMF effects on melatonin responses of MCF-7 breast cancer cells in vitro, in: Abstract A-1 of the 1996 Annual Review of Research on Biological Effects of Electric and Magnetic Fields from the Generation, Delivery and Use of Electricity, San Antonio, TX, November 17–21, 1996, p. 1.
- [50] Luben, et al., Independent replication of 60-Hz 1.2 μ T EMF effects on melatonin and tamoxifen responses of MCF-7 cells in vitro, in: Abstract A-3.4, Bioelectromagnetics Society Annual Meeting, St. Pete Beach, FL, June 7–11, 1998, pp. 17–18.
- [51] Morris, In vitro exposure of MCF-7 human breast cancer cells to 60-Hz magnetic fields, in: Abstract p-125A, Bioelectromagnetics Society Annual Meeting, St. Pete Beach, FL, June 7–11, 1998, pp. 204–205.
- [52] F. Oktem, F. Ozguner, H. Mollaoglu, A. Koyu, E. Uz, Oxidative damage in the kidney induced by 900-MHz-emitted mobile phone: protection by melatonin, *Arch. Med. Res.* 36 (4) (2005) 350–355.
- [53] F. Ozguner, G. Aydin, H. Mollaoglu, O. Gokalp, A. Koyu, G. Cesur, Prevention of mobile phone induced skin tissue changes by melatonin in rat: an experimental study, *Toxicol. Ind. Health* 20 (6–10) (2004) 133–139.
- [54] F. Ozguner, A. Altinbas, M. Ozaydin, A. Dogan, H. Vural, A.N. Kisioglu, G. Cesur, N.G. Yildirim, Mobile phone-induced myocardial oxidative stress: protection by a novel antioxidant agent caffeic acid phenethyl ester, *Toxicol. Ind. Health* 21 (9) (2005) 223–230.
- [55] A.W. Guy, C.K. Chou, L.L. Kunz, J. Crowley, J. Krupp, Effects of long-term low-level radiofrequency radiation exposure on rats. US Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine Brooks Air Force Base, Texas TR-85-64 Final Report August 1985, Approved for public release: distribution is unlimited.
- [56] C.K. Chou, Long-term low level microwave irradiation of rats, *Bioelectromagnetics* 13 (1992) 469–496.
- [57] H. Dolk, et al., Cancer incidence near radio and television transmitters in Great Britain, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 145 (1) (1997) 1–9.
- [58] V. Garaj-Vrhovac, D. Horvat, Z. Koren, The relationship between colony-forming ability, chromosome aberrations and incidence of micronuclei in V79 Chinese hamster cells exposed to microwave radiation, *Mutat. Res.* 263 (3) (1991) 143–149.
- [59] V. Garaj-Vrhovac, A. Fucic, D. Horvat, The correlation between the frequency of micronuclei and specific chromosome aberrations in human lymphocytes exposed to microwave radiation in vitro, *Mutat. Res.* 281 (3) (1992) 181–186.
- [60] V. Garaj-Vrhovac, Micronucleus assay and lymphocyte mitotic activity in risk assessment of occupational exposure to microwave radiation, *Chemosphere* 39 (13) (1999) 2301–2312.
- [61] M. Ha, H. Im, M. Lee, H.J. Kim, B.C. Kim, Y.M. Gimm, et al., Radio-frequency radiation exposure from AM radio transmitters and childhood leukemia and brain cancer, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 166 (2007) 270–279.
- [62] B. Hocking, et al., Cancer incidence and mortality and proximity to TV towers, *Med. J. Aust.* 165 (11–12) (1996) 601–605.
- [63] B. Hocking, Decreased survival for childhood leukemia in proximity to TV towers, in: Poster Presented at the Annual Scientific Meeting of the Royal Australian College of Physicians in Adelaide, SA, Australia, May, 2000.
- [64] D.E. Foliart, B.H. Pollock, G. Mezei, R. Iriye, J.M. Silva, K.L. Epi, L. Kheifets, M.P. Lind, R. Kavet, Magnetic field exposure and long-term survival among children with leukemia, *Brit. J. Cancer* 94 (2006) 161–164.
- [65] A. Huss, A. Spoerri, M. Egger, Röösl for the Swiss national cohort study, residence near power lines and mortality from neurodegenerative diseases: longitudinal study of the Swiss population, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* (November) (2008) (Epub ahead of print).
- [66] F. Marinelli, D. La Sala, G. Ciccotti, L. Cattini, C. Trimarchi, S. Putti, A. Zamparelli, L. Giuliani, G. Tomassetti, C. Cinti, Exposure to 900 MHz electromagnetic field induces an imbalance between pro-apoptotic and pro-survival signals in T-lymphoblastoid leukemia CCRF-CEM cells, *J. Cell Physiol.* 198 (2) (2004) 324–332.
- [67] P. Michelozzi, C. Ancona, D. Fusco, F. Forastiere, C.A. Perucci, Risk of leukemia and residence near a radio transmitter in Italy, *Epidemiology* 9 (Suppl.) (1998) 354.
- [68] M. Repacholi, et al., Lymphomas in $E\mu$ -Pim1 transgenic mice exposed to pulsed 900 MHz electromagnetic fields, *Radiat. Res.* 147 (1997) 31–40.
- [69] A. Stang, et al., The possible role of radiofrequency radiation in the development of uveal melanoma, *Epidemiology* 12 (1) (2001) 7–12.
- [70] M. Blank (2007). Section 7, pp. 1–40. Evidence for Stress Response (Stress Proteins). In *BioInitiative Report: A Scientific Perspective on Health Risk of Electromagnetic Fields*. Published Online 31 August 2007, <http://www.bioinitiative.org/report/index.htm>.
- [71] C. Daniells, I. Duce, D. Thomas, P. Sewell, J. Tattersall, D. de Pomerai, Transgenic nematodes as biomonitors of microwave-induced stress, *Mutat. Res.* 399 (1998) 55–64.
- [72] D. de Pomerai, et al., Non-thermal heat-shock response to microwaves, *Nature* 405 (2000) 417–418.
- [73] S. Kwee, et al., The biological effects of microwave radiation, in: *Proceedings of the Second World Congress for Electricity and Magnetism in Biology and Medicine*, Bologna, Italy, June, 1997.
- [74] S. Kwee, et al., Changes in cellular proteins due to environmental non-ionizing radiation. I. Heat-shock proteins, *Electro Magnetobiol.* 20 (2001) 141–152.
- [75] D. Leszczynski, S. Oenväära, J. Reivinen, R. Kuokka, Non-thermal activation of the hsp27/p38MAPK stress pathway by mobile phone radiation in human endothelial cells: molecular mechanism for cancer- and blood-brain barrier-related effects, *Differentiation* 70 (2002) 120–129.
- [76] D. Leszczynski, R. Nylund, S. Joenvaara, J. Reivinen, Applicability of discovery science approach to determine biological effects of mobile phone radiation, *Proteomics* 4 (2) (2004) 426–431.
- [77] S. Lixia, Y. Ke, W. Kaijun, L. Dequiang, H. Huajun, G. Xiangwei, W. Baohong, Z. Wei, L. Jianling, W. Wei, Effects of 1.8 GHz

- radiofrequency field on DNA damage and expression of heat shock protein 70 in human lens epithelial cells, *Mutat. Res.* (2006), doi:10.1016/j.mrfmmm.2006.08.010.
- [78] M. Simko, C. Hartwig, M. Lantow, M. Lupke, M.O. Mattsson, Q. Rahman, J. Rollwitz, Hsp 70 expression and free radical release after exposure to non-thermal radiofrequency electromagnetic fields and ultrafine particles in human Mono Mac 6 cells, *Toxicol. Lett.* 161 (2006) 73–82 (Elsevier Science Direct).
- [79] S. Velizarov, The effects of radiofrequency fields on cell proliferation are non-thermal, *Bioelectrochem. Bioenerg.* 48 (1999) 177–180.
- [80] D. Weisbrot, H. Lin, L. Ye, M. Blank, R. Goodman, Effects of mobile phone radiation on reproduction and development in *Drosophila melanogaster*, *J. Cell Biochem.* 89 (1) (2003) 48–55.
- [81] T. Olivares-Banuelos, L. Navarro, A. Gonzalez, R. Drucker-Colin, Differentiation of chromaffin cells elicited by ELF MF modifies gene expression pattern, *Cell Biol. Int.* 28 (2004) 273–279.
- [82] R. Zhao, S. Zhang, Z. Xu, L. Ju, D. Lu, G. Yao, Studying gene expression profile of rat neuron exposed to 1800 MHz radiofrequency electromagnetic fields with cDNA microarray, *Toxicology* 235 (2007) 167–175.
- [83] A. Karinen, S. Heinavaara, R. Nylund, D. Leszczynski, Mobile phone radiation might alter protein expression in human skin, *BMC Genomics* 9 (2008) 77, doi:10.1186/1471-2164-9-77.
- [84] J. Vanderstraeten, L. Verschaeve, Gene and protein expression following exposure to radiofrequency fields from mobile phones, *Environ. Health Persp.* 116 (2008) 1131–1135.
- [85] G. Abdel-Rassoul, O.A. El-Fateh, M.A. Salem, A. Michael, F. Farahat, M. El-Batanouny, E. Salem, Neurobehavioral effects among inhabitants around mobile phone base stations, *Neurotoxicology* 28 (2007) 434–440.
- [86] P. Acherman, Exposure to pulsed high-frequency electromagnetic field during waking affects human sleep EEG, *Neuroreport* 11 (15) (2000) 3321–3325.
- [87] E.S. Altpeter, T.H. Krebs, Study on health effects of the shortwave transmitter station of Schwarzenburg, Bern, Switzerland, University of Bern BEW Publications Study No. 56, The Federal Office of Energy, 1995.
- [88] A.A. Borbely, et al., Pulsed high-frequency electromagnetic field affects human sleep and sleep electroencephalogram, *Neurosci. Lett.* 275 (3) (1999) 207–210.
- [89] R. Huber, T. Graf, K.A. Cote, L. Wittmann, E. Gallmann, D. Matter, J. Schuderer, N. Kuster, A.A. Borbely, P. Achermann, Exposure to pulsed high-frequency electromagnetic field during waking affects human sleep EEG, *Neuroreport* 11 (15) (2000) 3321–3325.
- [90] K. Mann, Effects of pulsed high-frequency electromagnetic fields on human sleep, *Neuropsychobiology* 33 (1996) 41–47.
- [91] G. Oberfeld, The microwave syndrome—further aspects of a Spanish study, in: *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Bioelectromagnetic Effects of Electromagnetic Fields*, Kos, Greece, 2004.
- [92] R. Santini, M. Seigne, L. Bonhomme-Faivre, S. Bouffet, E. Defrasne, M. Sage, Symptoms experienced by users of digital cellular phones: a pilot study in a French engineering school, *Pathol. Biol. (Paris)* 49 (3) (2001) 222–226.
- [93] R. Santini, P. Santini, P. Le Ruz, J.M. Danze, M. Seigne, Survey study of people living in the vicinity of cellular phone base stations, *Electromag. Biol. Med.* 22 (2003) 41–49.
- [94] TNO Physics and Electronics Laboratory, The Netherlands, Effects of Global Communication System Radio-frequency Fields on Well-being and Cognitive Functions of Human Beings With and Without Subjective Complaints, Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research (2003), pp. 1–63.
- [95] E.S. Altpeter, T.H. Krebs, Study on health effects of the shortwave transmitter station of Schwarzenburg, Bern, Switzerland, University of Bern BEW Publications Study No. 56, The Federal Office of Energy, Switzerland, 1995.
- [96] S.E. Chia, Prevalence of headache among handheld cellular telephone users in Singapore: a community study, *Environ. Health Persp.* 108 (11) (2000) 1059–1062.
- [97] H. Chiang, et al., Health effects of environmental electromagnetic fields, *J. Bioelectr.* 8 (1989) 127–131.
- [98] H. D'Costa, et al., Human brain wave activity during exposure to radiofrequency field emissions from mobile phones, *Aust. Phys. Eng. Sci. Med.* 26 (4) (2003).
- [99] H.P. Hutter, H. Moshhammer, P. Wallner, M. Kundi, Subjective symptoms, sleeping problems and cognitive performance in subjects living near mobile phone base stations, *Occup. Environ. Med.* 63 (2006) 307–313.
- [100] M. Koivisto, et al., Effects of 902 MHz electromagnetic field emitted by cellular telephones on response times in humans, *Neuroreport* 11 (2000) 413–415.
- [101] M. Koivisto, et al., The effects of electromagnetic field emitted by GSM phones on working memory, *Neuroreport* 11 (2002) 1641–1643.
- [102] A.A. Kolodyski, V.V. Kolodyska, Motor and psychological functions of school children living in the area of the Skrunnda radio location station in Latvia, *Sci. Total Environ.* 180 (1996) 87–93.
- [103] C.M. Krause, L. Sillanmaki, M. Koivisto, A. Haggqvist, C. Saarela, A. Revonsuo, M. Laine, H. Hamalainen, Effects of electromagnetic field emitted by cellular phones on the EEG during a memory task, *Neuroreport* 11 (4) (2000) 761–764.
- [104] C.M. Krause, L. Sillanmaki, M. Koivisto, A. Haggqvist, C. Saarela, A. Revonsuo, M. Laine, H. Hamalainen, Effects of electromagnetic fields emitted by cellular phones on the electroencephalogram during a visual working memory task, *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 76 (12) (2000) 1659–1667.
- [105] J. Lass, et al., Effects of 7 Hz-modulated 450 MHz electromagnetic radiation on human performance in visual memory tasks, *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 73 (10) (2002) 937–944.
- [106] A.A. Marino, E. Nilsen, C. Frilot, Nonlinear changes in brain electrical activity due to cell phone radiation, *Bioelectromagnetics* 24 (5) (2003) 339–346.
- [107] G. Oberfeld, et al., The microwave syndrome—further aspects of a Spanish study, in: *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Bioelectromagnetic Effects of Electromagnetic Fields*, Kos, Greece, 2004.
- [108] A. Preece, et al., Effect of a 915-MHz simulated mobile phone signal on c function in man, *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 75 (1999) 447–456.
- [109] S.J. Regel, S. Negovetic, M. Roosli, V. Berdinas, J. Schuderer, A. Huss, U. Lott, N. Kuster, P. Achermann, UMTS base station-like exposure, well-being and cognitive performance, *Environ. Health Persp.* 114 (2006) 1270–1275.
- [110] S. Eltiti, D. Wallace, A. Ridgewell, K. Zougkou, R. Russo, F. Sepulveda, D. Mirshekar-Syahkal, P. Rasor, R. Deeble, E. Fox, Does short-term exposure to mobile phone base station signals increase symptoms in individuals who report sensitivity to electromagnetic fields? A double-blind randomized provocation study, *Environ. Health Persp.* 115 (2007) 1603–1608.
- [111] E.F. Pace-Schott, J.A. Hobson, The neurobiology of sleep: genetics, cellular physiology and subcortical networks, *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 3 (2002) 591–605.
- [112] J.B. Burch, J.S. Reif, C.W. Noonan, T. Ichinose, A.M. Bachand, T.L. Koleber, M.G. Yost, Melatonin metabolite excretion among cellular telephone users, *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 78 (2002) 1029–1036.
- [113] M.L. Clark, J.B. Burch, M.G. Yost, Y. Zhai, A.M. Bachand, C.T. Fitzpatrick, J. Ramaprasad, L.A. Cragin, J.S. Reif, Biomonitoring of estrogen and melatonin metabolites among women residing near radio and television broadcasting transmitters, *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* 49 (2007) 1149–1156.
- [114] L.M. Wang, N.A. Suthana, D. Chaudhury, D.R. Weaver, C.S. Colwell, Melatonin inhibits hippocampal long-term potentiation, *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 22 (2005) 2231–2237.

- [115] M. Ozcan, B. Yilmaz, D.O. Carpenter, Effects of melatonin on synaptic transmission and long term potentiation in two areas of mouse hippocampus, *Brain Res.* 1111 (2006) 90–94.
- [116] R.J. Reiter, L. Tang, J.J. Garcia, A. Munoz-Hoyos, Pharmacological actions of melatonin in oxygen radical pathophysiology, *Life Sci.* 60 (1997) 2255–2271.
- [117] C.W. Noonan, J.S. Reif, J.B. Burch, T.Y. Ichinose, M.G. Yost, K. Magnusson, Relationship between amyloid beta protein and melatonin metabolite in a study of electric utility workers, *J. Occup. Environ. Med.* 44 (2002) 769–775.
- [118] L.G. Salford, A.E. Brun, et al., Nerve cell damage in mammalian brain after exposure to microwaves from GSM mobile phones, *Environ. Health Persp.* 111 (2003) 881–883.
- [119] J.L. Eberhardt, B.R.R. Persson, A.E. Brun, L.G. Salford, L.O.G. Malmgren, Blood–brain barrier permeability and nerve cell damage in rat brain 14 and 28 days after exposure to microwaves from GSM mobile phones, *Electromagn. Biol. Med.* 27 (2008) 215–229. doi:10.1080/1536370802344037.
- [120] L.G. Salford, et al., Permeability of the blood brain barrier induced by 915 MHz electromagnetic radiation continuous wave and modulated at 8, 16, 50 and 200 Hz, *Microsc. Res. Tech.* 27 (1994) 535–542.
- [121] A. Schirmacher, Electromagnetic fields (1.8 GHz) increase the permeability of sucrose of the blood–brain barrier in vitro, *Bioelectromagnetics* 21 (2000) 338–345.
- [122] Y. Hamnerius, Microwave exposure from mobile phones and base stations in Sweden, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Cell Tower Siting*, sponsored by the University of Vienna & Land-Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria, June 7–8, 2000.
- [123] E.D. Mantiply, Summary of measured radiofrequency electric and magnetic fields (10 kHz–30 GHz) in the general and work environment, *Bioelectromagnetics* 18 (1997) 563–577.
- [124] Sage Associates, 2004. An Overview of Low-intensity radiofrequency/microwave radiation studies relevant to wireless communications and data, *Bioelectromagnetics Society Annual Meeting*, Washington DC, June, 2004.
- [125] C. Sage, O. Johansson, S.A. Sage, Personal digital assistant (PDA) cell phone units produce elevated extremely-low frequency electromagnetic field emissions, *Bioelectromagnetics* 28 (7) (2007) 581–582.
- [126] C. Sage, O. Johansson, Response to comment on personal digital assistant (PDA) cell phone units produce elevated extremely-low frequency electromagnetic field emissions, *Bioelectromagnetics* (July) (2007), 17654541.
- [127] C. Sage, O. Johansson, Response to comment on measuring ELF fields produced by mobile phones and personal digital assistants (PDAs), *Bioelectromagnetics* (July) (2007), 17654536.
- [128] M. Tuor, S. Ebert, J. Schuderer, N. Kuster, Assessment of ELF magnetic fields from five mobile handsets, in: *ITIS Foundation, Conference Presentation*, Monte Verita, 2005.
- [129] T. Linde, K.H. Mild, Measurement of low frequency magnetic fields from digital cellular telephones, *Bioelectromagnetics* 18 (1997) 184–186 (Brief communication).
- [130] B. Armstrong, G. Theriault, P. Guenel, J. Deadman, M. Goldberg, P. Heroux, Association between exposure to pulsed electromagnetic fields and cancer in electrical utility workers in Ontario and Quebec, Canada, and France 1970–1989, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 140 (1994) 805–820.
- [131] G.M. Lee, R.R. Neutra, L. Hristova, M. Yost, R.A. Hiatt, A nested case–control study of residential and personal magnetic field measures and miscarriages, *Epidemiology* 13 (1) (2002) 21–31.
- [132] K.D. Li, R. Oudouli, S. Wi, T. Janevic, I. Golditch, T.D. Bracken, R. Senior, R. Rankin, R. Iriye, A population-based prospective cohort study of personal exposure to magnetic fields during pregnancy and the risk of spontaneous abortion, *Epidemiology* 13 (2002) 9–20.
- [133] G. Theriault, M. Goldberg, A.B. Miller, B. Armstrong, P. Guenel, J. Deadman, E. Imbernon, T. To, A. Chevalier, D. Cyr, C. Wall, Cancer risks associated with occupational exposure to magnetic fields among utility workers in Ontario and Quebec, Canada and France: 1970–1989, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 139 (1994) 550–572.
- [134] P. Michelozzi, A. Capon, U. Kirchmayer, F. Forastiere, A. Biggeri, A. Barca, C.A. Perucci, Adult and childhood leukemia near a high-power radio station in Rome, Italy, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 155 (2002) 1096–1103.
- [135] M. Ha, H. Im, M. Lee, H.J. Kim, B.C. Kim, Y.M. Gimm, J.K. Pack, Radio-frequency radiation exposure from AM radio transmitters and childhood leukemia and brain cancer, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 166 (2007) 270–279.
- [136] C. Sage, D.O. Carpenter (Eds.), *BioInitiative Working Group BioInitiative Report: A Rationale for a Biologically-based Public Exposure Standard for Electromagnetic Fields (ELF and RF)*, 2007. www.bioinitiative.org;
- C. Blackman, H. Lai, Chapters 6 and 14 of the BioInitiative Report, 2007.
- [137] A. Chiabrera, B. Bianco, E. Moggia, J.J. Kaufman, *Bioelectromagnetics* 21 (4) (2000) 312–324.
- [138] D.J. Panagopoulos, L.H. Margaritis, in: A.C. Harper, R.V. Bures (Eds.), *Mobile Telephony Radiation Effects on Living Organisms*, 2008, pp. 107–149. ISBN 978:1-60456-436-5.
- [139] W.R. Adey, in: P.J. Rosch, M.S. Markov (Eds.), *Potential Therapeutic Applications of Nonthermal Electromagnetic Fields: Ensemble Organization of Cells in Tissue as a Factor in Biological Field Sensing*, *Bioelectromagnetic Medicine*, 2004, pp. 1–16.
- [140] S. Engstrom, in: P.J. Rosch, M.S. Markov (Eds.), *Magnetic Field Generation and Dosimetry*, *Bioelectromagnetic Medicine*, 2004, pp. 39–50.
- [141] A. Pilla, in: F.S. Barnes, B. Greenebaum, (Eds.), *Mechanisms and Therapeutic Applications of Time-varying and Static Magnetic Fields in Biological and Medical Aspects of Electromagnetic Fields*, third edition, 2007, pp. 351–412.
- [142] M. Blank, R. Goodman, Initial interactions in electromagnetic field-induced biosynthesis, *J. Cell. Physiol.* 199 (2004) 359–363.
- [143] M. Blank, R. Goodman, A biological guide for electromagnetic safety: the stress response electromagnetic initiation of transcription at specific DNA sites, *Bioelectromagnetics* 25 (2004) 642–646.
- [144] M. Blank, *BEMS Soc. Newslett.* (January–February) (2008) 6–7.
- [145] G. Lotz, Letter from Greg Lotz, PhD, Chief Physical Agents Effects Branch, Division of Biomedical and Behavioral Science, National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health to Richard Tell, Chair, IEEE SCC28 (SC4) Risk Assessment Work Group, June 17, 1999.
- [146] P. Grandjean, Implications of the precautionary principle for primary prevention and research, *Am. Rev. Public Health* 25 (2004) 199–223.
- [147] D. Davis, *The Secret History of the War on Cancer*, Basic Books, 2008.
- [148] R. Proctor, *Cancer Wars*, Harper Collins Publishers, 1995.
- [149] European Environmental Agency, *Late Lessons from Early Warnings. The Precautionary Principle 1896–2000*. Copenhagen, Denmark, 2001.
- [150] P. Landrigan, How much do chemicals affect our health? *Discover Mag.* (2008).
- [151] California Air Resources Board, *Appendix III Proposed Identification of Environmental Tobacco Smoke as a Toxic Air Contaminant. Part B—Health Effects*, 2005.