

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1016/J.ENVPOL.2018.07.019

Thermal and non-thermal health effects of low intensity non-ionizing radiation: An international perspective — [Source link](#)

Dominique Belpomme, Lennart Hardell, Igor Belyaev, Ernesto Burgio ...+2 more authors

Institutions: Örebro University, Russian Academy of Sciences, University at Albany, SUNY, University of Queensland

Published on: 01 Nov 2018 - Environmental Pollution (Environ Pollut)

Related papers:

- [Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission](#)
- [World Health Organization, radiofrequency radiation and health - a hard nut to crack \(Review\)](#)
- [EUROPAEM EMF Guideline 2016 for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of EMF-related health problems and illnesses](#)
- [Oxidative mechanisms of biological activity of low-intensity radiofrequency radiation](#)
- [Effects of Cell Phone Radiofrequency Signal Exposure on Brain Glucose Metabolism](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/thermal-and-non-thermal-health-effects-of-low-intensity-non-5arfvybxlx>

Accepted Manuscript

Thermal and non-thermal health effects of low intensity non-ionizing radiation: An international perspective

Dominique Belpomme, Lennart Hardell, Igor Belyaev, Ernesto Burgio, David O. Carpenter



PII: S0269-7491(18)31015-7

DOI: [10.1016/j.envpol.2018.07.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.07.019)

Reference: ENPO 11323

To appear in: *Environmental Pollution*


Received Date: 6 April 2018

Revised Date: 31 May 2018

Accepted Date: 4 July 2018

Please cite this article as: Belpomme, D., Hardell, L., Belyaev, I., Burgio, E., Carpenter, D.O., Thermal and non-thermal health effects of low intensity non-ionizing radiation: An international perspective, *Environmental Pollution* (2018), doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2018.07.019.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Thermal and non-thermal health effects of low intensity non-ionizing radiation: an international perspective.

Short title: Effects of non-ionizing radiation

Dominique Belpomme^{1,2,*¶}, Lennart Hardell^{1,3,¶}, Igor Belyaev^{1,4,5,¶}, Ernesto Burgio^{1,6} and David O. Carpenter^{1,7,8¶}

1. European Cancer Environment Research Institute, Brussels, Belgium.

2. Paris V University Hospital, Paris, France

3. Department of Oncology, Orebro University Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Orebro, Sweden.

Current address: The Environment and Cancer Research Foundation
Örebro, Sweden

4. Department of Radiobiology, Cancer Research Institute, Biomedical Research Center, Slovak Academy of Science, Bratislava, Slovak Republic

5. Laboratory of Radiobiology, Institute of General Physics, Russian Academy of Science, Moscow, Russian Federation.

6. Istituto Scientifico Biomedico Euro Mediterraneo, Mesagne, Italy

7. Institute for Health and the Environment, University at Albany, Albany, New York, United States of America

8. Child Health Research Centre, The University of Queensland, Faculty of Medicine, Brisbane, Australia

*Corresponding author: dcarpenter@albany.edu

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

Response to Reviewer's Comments:

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Environmental Pollution. I have received comments from reviewers on your manuscript. Your paper should become acceptable for publication pending suitable minor revision and modification of the article in light of the appended reviewer comments. Further to the issues raised by the reviewers, I have a major concern regarding the way EHS has been described in this manuscript:

In summary there is presently sufficient clinical, biological and radiological data emanating from different independent international scientific research groups for EHS to be acknowledged as a well-defined, objectively characterized pathological disorder. As a result, patients who self-report that they suffer from EHS should be diagnosed and treated utilizing presently available objective biological tests, among which are the dosage of peripheral blood biomarkers and the use of imaging techniques such as PET, fMRI and TDU and, when available, UCTS.

To my understanding, whether EHS is a pathological disorder or not is still a matter of an ongoing debate. For example, a very recently (March 27, 2018) published review by the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES) has concluded that presently the available body of evidence is not supportive for defining EHS as a pathological disorder caused by EMF exposure (<https://www.anses.fr/en/content/hypersensitivity-electromagnetic-waves-research-efforts-should-be-scaled-and-suitable-care>). Therefore, asserting that EHS as a "well-defined objectively characterized pathological disorder" due to EMF exposure is not consistent with calling this paper as "an international consensus report" because this debate has not been settled yet. My understanding is that while much of evidence supporting EHS as a pathological disorder caused by EMF exposure is observational, RCTs generally do not support this notion and we know that RCTs are more robust than observational studies in establishing a causal link. Moreover, oxidative stress and systemic inflammation which have been postulated to be among the main explanations for the biological plausibility of EHS are quite non-specific and also shared with other environmental stressors such as air pollution, while observational studies supporting EHS notion have mainly failed to address these co-exposures in their analyses. Based on these, the existing knowledge neither establish nor rejects this notion and more studies are required conclude this debate. There is therefore a need to have a more balanced (and evidence-based) perspective and tone down the way EHS has been described, while reflecting the uncertainties/limitations of the available evidence and highlight the need (and recommendations) for further studies.

Response: This is a reasonable comment, and we have toned down some the language and have added some additional data to support our view. The title has been changed from "an international consensus report" to "an international perspective." The paragraph quoted above has been modified to make it clear that it is the strong opinion of the authors that there is sufficient information such that EHS should be considered as a well-characterized disease, rather than implying that everyone else agrees with this conclusion.

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

-Reviewer 1-

The manuscript offers sort of a scoping review of the evidence for low-level effects of EMFs, predominantly RF-ELF but also concerning to some degree ELF-EMF. While the manuscript contains nothing new, the compilation of different strands of evidence offers a new look especially by combining evidence from the field of cancer research, in vitro mechanistic studies, electrohypersensitivity, and other evidence especially about neurodevelopmental and neurodegenerative diseases. The manuscript is well structured, argumentation is consistent and chapters tied by a red thread. Although evidence presented is focusing on findings supporting low-level effects, this bias is justified due to the flooding of the literature with research financed by parties with vested interests. There are only a few errors as detailed below and I only recommend to mention in the introduction that the paper does not offer a complete overview of the body of evidence, but concentrates on findings that provide a holistic picture of processes explaining most if not all adverse effects from EMF exposure.

We have emphasized, as requested, that this paper does not offer a complete overview of the whole body of evidence. See lines 328 to 341.

Last highlight: Delete 'that' after 'recognize' **Done**

Lines 45/46: The expression 'at intensities that do not cause tissue heating' is not appropriate because also low-frequency EMFs are mentioned. Change this to 'at low intensities'. **Done. We have revised this and related phrases throughout the manuscript to substitute "low intensity" when referring to all EMFs, and the term "non-thermal" when the reference is only to RF-EMFs.**

Lines 64/65: Change 'their longer lifetime' to 'their potential for longer lifetime exposure'. **Done**

Line 97: The classification of IARC was in 2001. **The meeting was in 2001 but the report published in 2002. This has been corrected.**

Line 116: The name is 'International EMF Project' not 'Radiation Programme' **This is correct and the change has been made.**

Line 202: The name is 'Carlberg' **No, the appropriate reference here is Cardis et al.**

Tables 1 to 3: In the summary line omit >1640 h and write 'longest cumulative hours of use' or something similar because Coureau didn't use this cutoff. **Done**

Line 343: Omit 'a' before 'significantly' **Done**

Line 344: Omit [44] **Done**

Line 421: Delete 'a' before 'greater' **Done**

Line 433: There is an expression missing after 'into' **This has been corrected. The missing word was "neurons".**

Line 445: Start a new paragraph before 'The specific...' **Done**

- 107 Line 455/456: The name is 'Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks' **This**
 108 **change has been made.**
- 109 Lines 493, 969: The name is 'Oberfeld' **Corrected**
- 110 Line 595: Blank missing **This has been corrected.**
- 111 Line 604: What means 'individualized'? **The legend has been corrected to state "Patient mean values**
 112 **and standard deviations of biomarker levels in comparison with normal reference values as well as**
 113 **the percentage of patients with abnormal values in the peripheral blood in subjects with EHS or both**
 114 **EHS and MCS."**
- 115 Table 4: Place column headers 'mean±SD' and '% above normal range' and replace '24 H' by '24-h',
 116 footnote *** is unclear, it likely means that the data are restricted to those not under neuroleptic
 117 medication. **Done**
- 118 Line 633: The name is Hawkins. The work of Salford should also be mentioned. **The typo has been**
 119 **corrected and the reference to Persson, Salford and Brun has been added.**
- 120 Line 672: Replace 'dosage' by 'concentration' **Done**
- 121 Lines 716/717: It rather should read 'expression and induction' **The change has been made.**
- 122 Line 737: Correct typo 'aal' **Done**
- 123 Line 754: Correct typo 'synergisitc' **Done**
- 124 Line 801: BBF was previously defined, you should use the abbreviation **Done**
- 125 Line 805, 972: Disease needs not be capitalized **This has been corrected throughout.**
- 126 Line 815: The name is Blank **This has been corrected.**
- 127 Line 818: Delete [172] **Done**
- 128 Line 830: As much as I remember this was a SNP not several genes. **This has been corrected. They**
 129 **looked at several genes but only one showed the association.**
- 130 Lines 848, 1237: The name is Dasdag **This has been corrected throughout.**
- 131 Line 902: Write 'base station' **Done**
- 132 Line 975: The work of Huss et al. BOEM 2018 about ALS should be mentioned as well. **This reference**
 133 **has been added.**

Reviewer 2

The current manuscript focused on the vital role of ELF-EMF and RF-EMF which may cause health hazards. The authors raised concerns about the insufficient attention on these non-ionizing EMFs. They also made appeals to set human-protective standards towards electromagnetic fields at non-thermal intensities and paid more attention to children and the potential hazard. I suggest accepting this manuscript after they addressed the following corrections.

Major concerns:

1) EMF has also been reported to have some effects in neurocognitive processes^{1,2}. Also, the direct between EMF and human illness are not very clear³. The authors should at least cite some works and discussion it.

1 Sandyk, R. Brief communication: electromagnetic fields improve visuospatial performance and reverse agraphia in a parkinsonian patient. *Int J Neurosci* **87**, 209-217 (1996).

2 Podda, M. V. *et al.* Extremely low-frequency electromagnetic fields enhance the survival of newborn neurons in the mouse hippocampus. *The European journal of neuroscience* **39**, 893-903, doi:10.1111/ejn.12465 (2014).

3 Zhang, Y., Liu, X., Zhang, J. & Li, N. Short-term effects of extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields exposure on Alzheimer's disease in rats. *Int J Radiat Biol* **91**, 28-34, doi:10.3109/09553002.2014.954058 (2015).

Response: We have added a paragraph showing some of these "beneficial" effects to the section on oxidative stress, lines 921 to 930. The Zhang reference has been added as well as some others that support this position that not all EMF actions are necessarily hazardous. This is especially clear from the long-term use of pulsed EMFs to promote bone healing, which is now referenced.

2) The organization of this manuscript can be improved. For example, in line 431, the authors listed some possible mechanisms at the cellular and molecular levels. However, the mechanisms are discussed in detail starting from line 709.

Response: This paragraph from line 431 has been moved and incorporated in the section on other mechanistic issues.

3) It is better to add definitions of ELF-EMFs and RF-EMFs at the beginning of the manuscript.

The definitions were given in the 9th and 10th lines of the Introduction and we have expanded this definition.

-Reviewer 3

- The authors archived evidences which supported harmful effects of non-ionizing radiation exposure, in terms of epidemiology, toxicology, and biological mechanisms. This narrative review is comprehensive and logically summarized to reach the conclusion.

However, the process of weighing between evidences supporting and not-supporting harmful effects was not provided, which could be performed by quality evaluation and funding sources of each study in both sides, i.e., showing harmful and null or even beneficial effects. If the review included studies in opposite sides as well, being a balanced review, with a critical evaluation, would be more persuasive to the readers.

Response: We have added a paragraph (lines 329 to 341) that address this concern, as well as the comment by Reviewer 2 requesting we make clear that this is not intended to be a comprehensive review of the subject. This is an important consideration, especially that related to funding sources. However to add all of that information to this manuscript would make it unreasonably long. We have instead recounted the numbers of peer-reviewed publications showing or not showing genotoxicity and oxidative stress as an indication of the relative weight of evidence on at least one aspect of concern.

Abstract:

Exposure to low frequency and radiofrequency electromagnetic fields at low intensities poses a significant health hazard that has not been adequately addressed by national and international organizations such as the World Health Organization. There is strong evidence that excessive exposure to mobile phone-frequencies over long periods of time increases the risk of brain cancer both in humans and animals. The mechanism(s) responsible include induction of reactive oxygen species, gene expression alteration and DNA damage through both epigenetic and genetic

processes. *In vivo* and *in vitro* studies demonstrate adverse effects on male and female reproduction, almost certainly due to generation of reactive oxygen species. There is increasing evidence the exposures can result in neurobehavioral decrements and that some individuals develop a syndrome of “electro-hypersensitivity” or “microwave illness”, which is one of several syndromes commonly categorized as “idiopathic environmental intolerance”. While the symptoms are non-specific, new biochemical indicators and imaging techniques allow diagnosis that excludes the symptoms as being only psychosomatic. Unfortunately standards set by most national and international bodies are not protective of human health. This is a particular concern in children, given the rapid expansion of use of wireless technologies, the greater susceptibility of the developing nervous system, the hyperconductivity of their brain tissue, the greater penetration of radiofrequency radiation relative to head size and their potential for a longer lifetime exposure.

Introduction: Electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are packets of energy that have no mass. They vary in frequency and wavelength. At the high end of the electromagnetic spectrum there are cosmic and X-rays that have enough energy to cause ionization, and therefore are known as ionizing EMFs. Below in frequency

and energy are ultraviolet, visible light and infrared EMFs. Excessive exposure to ultraviolet EMFs poses clear danger to human health, but life on earth would not be possible without visible light and infrared EMFs. Below these forms of EMF are those used for communications (radiofrequency or RF-EMFs, 30 kHz-300 GHz) and those generated by electricity (extremely low-frequency or ELF-EMFs, 3 Hz-3 kHz). These EMFs do not have sufficient energy to directly cause ionization, and are therefore known as non-ionizing radiation. RF-EMFs at sufficient intensity cause tissue heating, which is the basis of operation of the microwave oven. However the question to be addressed here is human health effects secondary to exposures to non-ionizing EMFs at low intensities that do not cause measureable heating.

In spite of a large body of evidence for human health hazards from non-ionizing EMFs at intensities that do not cause measureable tissue heating, summarized in an encyclopedic fashion in the Bioinitiative Report (www.bioinitiative.org), the World Health Organization (WHO) and governmental agencies in many countries have not taken steps to warn of the health hazards resulting from exposures to EMFs at low, non-thermal intensities, nor have they set exposure standards that are adequately health protective. In 2002 the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC, 2002), part of the WHO, declared ELF-EMFs to be “possibly

carcinogenic to humans”, and in 2011 they made a similar declaration for RF-EMFs (Baan et al., 2011; IARC, 2013). The classification of RF-EMFs as a “possible” human carcinogen was based primarily on evidence that long-term users of mobile phones held to the head resulted in an elevated risk of developing brain cancer. One major reason that the rating was not at “probable” or “known” was the lack of clear evidence from animal studies for exposure leading to cancer. The US National Toxicology Program has released preliminary results of a study of long term exposure of rats to cell phone radiation which resulted in a statistically significant increase in brain gliomas, the same cancer found in people after long-term cell phone use, and schwannomas, a tumor similar to the acoustic neuroma also seen after intensive mobile phone use (Wyde et al., 2016). Similar results in rats have been reported in an independent study at the Ramazzini Institute with exposures similar to those from a mobile phone base station (Falcioni et al., 2018). This evidence, in conjunction with the human studies, demonstrates conclusively that excessive exposure to RF-EMF results in an increased risk of cancer. In light of this new evidence for cancer in rodents in response to prolonged exposure to mobile phone frequencies, the IARC rating should be raised at least to “probable” (Group 2A) if not “known” (Group 1).

Unfortunately the International EMF Project of the WHO, which is part of the Department of Public Health, Environment and Social Determinants of Health in Geneva, has consistently minimized health concerns from non-ionizing EMFs at intensities that do not cause tissue heating (WHO, 2014). In this regard WHO has failed to provide an accurate and human health-protective analysis of the dangers posed to health, especially to the health of children, resulting from exposure to non-thermal levels of electromagnetic fields. The Department of Public Health, Environment and Social Determinates of Disease takes its advice on the issues related to human health effects of non-ionizing EMFs from the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). Almost all members of the core group preparing the new Environmental Health Criteria (EHC) document for the WHO are members of ICNIRP (Starkey, 2016; Hardell, 2017), a non-government organization (NGO) whose members are appointed by other members. In spite of recent efforts to control for conflicts of interest, ICNIRP has a long record of close associations with industry (Maisch, 2006). When queried as to why the WHO would take recommendations from such a group, WHO staff replied that ICNIRP is an official NGO which works closely with the WHO. Why this should exclude other scientific research groups and public health professionals is unclear, particularly since most members of ICNIRP are not active researchers in this field. We are particularly concerned that a new

WHO EHC document on RF-EMFs is scheduled to be released soon, and that the members of the EHC Core Group and the individuals whose assistance has been acknowledged are known to be in denial of serious non-thermal effects of RF-EMFs in spite of overwhelming scientific evidence to the contrary (Starkey, 2016; Hardell, 2017).

Others have dismissed the strong evidence for harm from ELF- and RF-EMFs by arguing that we do not know the mechanism whereby such low energetic EMFs might cause cancer and other diseases. We have definitive evidence that use of a mobile phone results in changes in brain metabolism (Volkow et al., 2011). We know that low-intensity ELF- and RF-EMFs generate reactive oxygen species (ROS), alter calcium metabolism and change gene expression through epigenetic mechanisms, any of which may result in development of cancer and/or other diseases or physiological changes (see www.bioinitiative.org for many references). We do not know the mechanisms behind many known human carcinogens, dioxins and arsenic being two examples. Given the strength of the evidence for harm to humans it is imperative to reduce human exposure to EMFs. This is the essence of the “precautionary principle”.

There are a number of reasons for our concern. In the past the major exposure of the general population to RF-EMFs came from radio and television signals. Now there are almost as many mobile phones as there are people in the world, all of them being exposed to RF-EMFs. There are mobile phone towers everywhere, and in many developing countries there are no land-lines that allow communication without exposure to RF-EMFs. There is rapid movement in many developed countries to place small cell transmitting devices (5G) operating at higher frequencies (24-70 GHz) every approximately 300 meters along sidewalks in residential neighborhoods. There are other significant sources of exposure, coming from WiFi, smart meters and soon from automobiles operating without a human driver. Therefore human exposure has increased dramatically in recent years, and continues to increase rapidly. While we already are seeing harm from these exposures, the degree of harm will only increase with time because of the latency that is known to occur between exposure and development of diseases such as cancer.

Standards for protection of human health from EMFs vary greatly around the world. Many countries set standards based on the false assumption that there are no adverse health effects of RF-EMFs other than those that are caused by tissue heating. This is the case in North America, Australia and some European

countries. Many countries from the former Soviet Union have much more restrictive standards. However information from cellular and human studies show biological effects that constitute hazards to human health at exposure levels that are often exceeded during daily life.

This report follows a recent non-official meeting in Geneva with WHO representatives, where the authors urged WHO to acknowledge low intensity effects of ELF-EMFs and non-thermal health effects of RF-EMFs. This report does not attempt to present a complete overview of the subject [see the Bioinitiative Report (www.bioinitiative.org) for that] but rather to provide a holistic picture of the processes explaining most or all of the adverse effects of EMF exposures. It summarizes the evidence for cancer resulting from exposure to EMFs, and identifies other diseases or pathological conditions such as Alzheimer's disease and hypofertility that have been shown to be associated with excessive exposure to low-intensity EMFs. We also focus on electrohypersensitivity (EHS) in both children and adults and cognitive and behavioural problems in children resulting from the increasing exposure. Finally we discuss what is known about the mechanisms whereby non-thermal EMF radiation can cause disease with special reference to EMF-related free radical production and epigenetic and genetic mechanisms.

Mobile phone use and the risk for glioma, meningioma and acoustic neuroma:

The brain is the main target for exposure to RF-EMF radiation during use of handheld wireless phones, both mobile and cordless phones (Cardis et al., 2008; Gandhi et al., 2012). An increased risk for brain tumors has been of concern for a long time. The results of the Swedish National Inpatient Register have documented an increasing incidence of brain tumors in recent years (Carberg and Hardell, 2017). In May 2011 RF radiation in the frequency range 30 kHz–300 GHz was evaluated to be a Group 2B, i.e. a “possible” human carcinogen, by IARC (Baan et al., 2011; IARC, 2013). This was based on an increased risk for glioma and acoustic neuroma in human epidemiological studies. In the following an updated summary is given of case-control studies on brain and head tumors; glioma, meningioma and acoustic neuroma. The Danish cohort study on ‘mobile phone users’ (Johansen et al., 2001; Schütz et al., 2006) is not included due to serious methodological shortcomings in the study design, including misclassification of exposure (see Söderqvist et al., 2012a).

Glioma

Glioma is the most common malignant brain tumor and represents about 60 % of all central nervous system (CNS) tumors. Most of these are astrocytic tumors that can be divided into low-grade (WHO grades I-II) and high-grade (WHO grades III-IV). The most common glioma type is glioblastoma multiforme (WHO grade IV) with peak incidence in the age group 45-75 years and median survival less than one year (Ohgaki and Kleihues, 2005). Three research groups have provided results in case-control studies on glioma (Interphone, 2010; Coureau et al., 2014; Hardell and Carlberg, 2015). Hardell and colleagues have published results from case- control studies on use of wireless phones and brain tumor risk since the end of the 1990s (Hardell et al., 1999; for more discussion see Carlberg and Hardell, 2017).

A random effects model was used for meta-analyses of published studies, based on test for heterogeneity in the overall group ("all mobile"). Note that only the Hardell group also assessed use of cordless phones. Thus their reference category included cases and controls with no use of wireless phones in contrast to the other studies investigating only mobile phone use. In Table 1 results for highest cumulative use in hours of mobile phones is given. All studies reported statistically significant increased risk for glioma and the meta-analysis yielded an odds ratio (OR) = 1.90 [95 % confidence interval (CI) = 1.31-2.76]. For ipsilateral mobile phone use the

risk increased further to OR = 2.54 (95 % CI = 1.83-3.52) in the meta-analysis

based on 247 exposed cases and 202 controls.

Carlberg and Hardell (2014) found shorter survival in patients with glioblastoma multiforme associated with use of wireless phones compared with patients with no use. Interestingly mutation of the p53 gene involved in disease progression has been reported in glioblastoma multiforme in patients with mobile phone use ≥ 3 hours per day. The mutation was statistically significantly correlated with shorter overall survival time (Akhavan-Sigari et al., 2014). Further support for the increased risk of glioma associated with mobile phone use has been obtained in additional analyses of parts of the Interphone study (Cardis et al., 2011; Grell et al., 2016; Momoli et al., 2017).

Table 1. Numbers of exposed cases (Ca) and controls (Co) and odds ratio (OR) with 95 % confidence interval (CI) for glioma in case-control studies in the highest category of cumulative hours of mobile phone use.

	All			Ipsilateral		
	Ca/Co	OR	95 % CI	Ca/Co	OR	95 % CI
Interphone 2010						

Cumulative use $\geq 1,640$ h	210/154	1.40	1.03 – 1.89	100/62	1.96	1.22 – 3.16
Coureau et al 2014						
Cumulative use ≥ 896 h	24/22	2.89	1.41 – 5.93	9/7	2.11	0.73 – 6.08
Hardell, Carlberg 2015						
Cumulative use $\geq 1,640$ h	211/301	2.13	1.61 – 2.82	138/133	3.11	2.18 – 4.44
Meta-analysis						
Longest cumulative use	445/477	1.90	1.31 – 2.76	247/202	2.54	1.83 – 3.52

Meningioma

Meningioma is an encapsulated, well-demarcated and rarely malignant tumor. It is the most common benign tumor and accounts for about 30% of intracranial neoplasms. It develops from the pia and arachnoid membranes that cover the CNS. It is slowly growing and gives neurological symptoms by compression of adjacent structures. The most common symptoms are headaches and seizures. The incidence is about two times higher in women than in men. Meningioma develops mostly among middle aged and older persons (Cea-Soriano et al., 2012). Carlberg and Hardell (2015) included meningioma in their case-control studies. The results of the meta-analysis for cumulative exposure in the highest category are given in Table 2. In total there was an increased (but not statistically significant) risk for

cumulative exposure but the increased risk was statistically significant for ipsilateral use of mobile phones (OR = 1.49, 95% CI = 1.08-2.06).

Table 2. Numbers of exposed cases (Ca) and controls (Co) and odds ratio (OR) with 95 % confidence interval (CI) for meningioma in case-control studies in the highest category of cumulative hours of mobile phone use.

	All			Ipsilateral		
	Ca/Co	OR	95 % CI	Ca/Co	OR	95 % CI
Interphone 2010						
Cumulative use $\geq 1,640$ h	130/107	1.15	0.81 – 1.62	46/35	1.45	0.80 – 2.61
Coureau et al 2014						
Cumulative use ≥ 896 h	13/9	2.57	1.02 – 6.44	6/4	2.29	0.58 – 8.97
Carlberg, Hardell 2015						
Cumulative use $\geq 1,640$ h	141/301	1.24	0.93 – 1.66	67/133	1.46	0.98 – 2.17
Meta-analysis						
Longest cumulative use	284/417	1.27	0.98 – 1.66	119/172	1.49	1.08 – 2.06

Acoustic neuroma

Acoustic neuroma, also called vestibular schwannoma, is a benign tumor located on the eighth cranial nerve from the inner ear to the brain. It is usually encapsulated and grows in relation to the auditory and vestibular portions of the nerve. It grows slowly and due to the narrow anatomical space may give compression of vital brain stem structures. First symptoms of acoustic neuroma are usually tinnitus and hearing problems. Results for use of mobile phones in Interphone (2011) and Hardell et al. (2013) are given in Table 3. Statistically significant increased risk was found for cumulative ipsilateral use $\geq 1,640$ h yielding OR = 2.71 (95 % CI = 1.72-4.28).

The study by Moon et al. (2014) was not included in the meta-analysis because data on cumulative mobile phone use with numbers of cases and controls were not given. Support of an increased risk was seen in the case-case part of the study (Moon et al., 2014) and also in the report by Sato et al. (2011). Pettersson et al. (2014) made a case-control study on acoustic neuroma in Sweden not overlapping the Hardell et al. (2013) study. An increased risk for the highest category of cumulative use of both mobile phone (≥ 680 h OR = 1.46, 95 % CI = 0.98-2.17) and cordless phone (≥ 900 h OR = 1.67, 95 % CI = 1.13-2.49) was found. Hardell et al. (2013) did not include that study in their meta-analysis due to the many scientific shortcomings in the study, e.g. laterality analysis was not made for

cordless phone, the numbers in the laterality analysis for mobile phone are not consistent in text and tables and the 'unexposed' reference category included subjects using either mobile and cordless phone, which is clearly not correct (Hardell and Carlberg, 2014).

Table 3. Numbers of exposed cases (Ca) and controls (Co) and odds ratio (OR) with 95 % confidence interval (CI) for acoustic neuroma in case-control studies in the highest category of cumulative hours of mobile phone use.

	All			Ipsilateral		
	Ca/Co	OR	95 % CI	Ca/Co	OR	95 % CI
Interphone 2011						
Cumulative use $\geq 1,640$ h	77/107	1.32	0.88 – 1.97	47/46	2.33	1.23 – 4.40
Hardell et al 2013						
Cumulative use $\geq 1,640$ h	27/301	2.40	1.39 – 4.16	19/133	3.18	1.65 – 6.12
Meta-analysis						
Cumulative use $\geq 1,640$ h	104/408	1.73	0.96 – 3.09	66/179	2.71	1.72 – 4.28

In Summary

Based on case-control studies there was a consistent finding of increased risk for glioma and acoustic neuroma associated with use of mobile phones. Similar results were found for cordless phones in the Hardell group studies, although such use was not reported by the other study groups. The findings are less consistent for meningioma although somewhat increased risk was seen in the meta-analysis of ipsilateral mobile phone use. A longer follow-up time is necessary for this type of slow growing tumor.

The results on glioma and acoustic neuroma are supported by results from animal studies showing co-carcinogenic and tumor promoting effects from RF-EMF (Tillmann et al., 2010; Lerchl et al., 2015). Recent results from the National Toxicology Program (NTP) study showed genotoxicity of RF radiation in rats and mice exposed to RF-EMF (Smith-Roe et al., 2017). That result supports previous findings of DNA strand breaks in rat brain cells exposed to RF-EMF (Lai and Singh, 1997).

Of importance also is that the results in the NTP and Ramazzini studies both demonstrated an increased incidence of tumors of the same type, glioma and malignant schwannoma, as has been seen in humans with mobile phone use (Wyde et al., 2016; Falcioni et al., 2018). Acoustic neuroma (vestibular schwannoma) is a

similar type of tumor as malignant schwannoma, although benign. In fact, rates of brain tumors are increasing in Sweden and use of wireless phones has been suggested to be the cause (Hardell and Carlberg, 2017).

Other diseases and pathological conditions attributed to low-intensity EMFs:

The evidence for harm from RF-EMF is strongest for cancer as a consequence of intensive mobile phone use, especially gliomas, glioblastomas and acoustic neuromas. But there is other evidence for elevation in risk of leukemia among children living near to very high intensity radio transmission towers (Michelozzi et al., 2002; Ha et al., 2007). This is particularly interesting because leukemia is the cancer most associated with elevated exposure to ELF-EMFs arising from power lines (Ahlbom et al., 2000; Greenland et al., 2000). There is some evidence for elevations in breast cancer risk among women who wear their mobile phones in their bra (West et al., 2013). Heavy use of a mobile phone was associated with significantly elevated rates of ipsilateral parotid tumors in studies from both Israel (Sadetzki et al., 2007) and China (Duan et al., 2011). No increased risk was found in a Swedish study, but the results were limited by low number of participants and

lack of data on heavy and long-term use of wireless phones (Soderqvist et al., 2012b).

There are other significant human health hazards of concern. There is strong animal and human evidence that exposure to RF-EMFs as well as ELF-EMFs reduces fertility in both males (reviewed by McGill and Agarwal, 2014) and females (Roshanger et al., 2014). An association between spontaneous abortion and non-thermal EMF exposure including ELF-EMFs was reported in several case-control studies (Dodge, 1970; Juutilainen et al., 1993; Li et al., 2017). The increased use of mobile phones and increased exposure coming from WiFi, smart meters and other wireless devices has been paralleled in time with male hypofertility and sperm abnormalities in semen (Rolland et al., 2013). These effects may be related to holding an active wireless laptop in a man's lap or having an active mobile phone on their belt, but more study is needed. There is evidence that isolated human sperm exposed to RF-EMFs are damaged by generation of reactive oxygen species (Agarwal et al., 2009).

There are other diseases or physiologic alterations which have been reported to be associated with exposure to non-thermal EMFs in humans and in animals (Belyaev et al., 2016). Alzheimer disease has been shown to be significantly associated with

chronic ELF-EMF occupational exposure in prospective epidemiological studies (Garcia et al., 2008; Davanipour et al., 2009). Exposure to RF-EMFs has been reported to increase neuropsychiatric and behavioural disorders (Johansson et al., 2010; Divan et al., 2012), trigger cardiac rhythm alteration and peripheral arterial pressure instability (Havas, 2013; Saili et al., 2015), induce changes in immune system function (Lyle et al., 1983; Grigoriev et al., 2010; Sannino et al., 2011; 2014) and alter salivary (Augner et al., 2010) and thyroid (Koyu et al., 2005; Mortavazi et al., 2009; Pawlak et al., 2014) function. There is an urgent need for more study of these diseases or biological alterations in relation to exposure to both ELF- and RF-EMFs.

An Emerging Concern: Cognitive and neurobehavioral problems in children:

Children, and especially fetuses, are more vulnerable than adults for most environmental exposures (Sly and Carpenter, 2012). This is because their cells are rapidly dividing and their organ systems are not mature. As a result, events that perturb cellular function early in life can result in abnormalities that last. There is a building body of evidence indicating that exposure to RF-EMFs has adverse effects on cognition and neurobehavior, especially in children and adolescents. Concern about the particular sensitivity of children to RF-EMFs emitted from mobile phone

was first raised in 2000 by a British independent expert group (IEG, 2000) that noted that the increased sensitivity to EMFs of children could be due not only to the natural vulnerability of the developing nervous system, but also to the smaller head size and thickness of the skull. These factors, plus the higher conductivity of the young nervous system, result in greater penetration of RF-EMFs into the brain (Gandhi et al., 1996). Of concern is the fact that any adverse effects during development may have life-long consequences and that young people, because they will have a longer life span, will receive a greater cumulative exposure than adults (Kheifets et al., 2005; Hansson Mild et al., 2006).

There are several reasons to be concerned. Animal studies have shown that *in utero* RF-EMF exposure from mobile phones affects fetal programming and leads to alteration in neurodevelopment and behavior of offsprings (Aldad et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2015). Exposure of young rats to non-thermal intensities impairs learning and spatial memory secondary to a deleterious impact of EMFs on hippocampal, pyramidal or cortical neurons. Similar detrimental cognitive and behavioral defects were also observed in adult animals exposed to low-intensity EMFs (Bas et al., 2009; Deshmukh et al., 2015; Kumari et al., 2017; Shahin et al., 2017). The exposure induces markers of oxidative stress and inflammation in the brain (Dasdag et al., 2012; Megha et al., 2015).

552
553 There are human data consistent with these animal studies. Divan et al. (2008)
554 reported that prenatal and to a lesser degree postnatal exposure to cell phones is
555 associated with emotional and hyperactivity problems in 7-year old children. This
556 finding was confirmed in a second replicative study involving different participants
557 (Divan et al., 2012). Birks et al. (2017) used data from studies in five cohorts from
558 five different countries (83,884 children) and concluded that maternal mobile
559 phone use during pregnancy increased the risk that the child will show
560 hyperactivity and inattention problems. A meta-analysis involving 125,198
561 children (mean age 14.5 years) reported statistically significant associations
562 between access to and use of portable screen-based media devices (e.g. mobile
563 phones and tablets) and inadequate sleep quality and quantity and excessive
564 daytime sleepiness (Carter et al., 2016). Early life exposure to lead has long been
565 known to cause a reduction in cognitive function and shortened attention span
566 (Needleman et al., 1979). Two studies have shown that prenatal (Choi et al., 2017)
567 or postnatal (Byun et al., 2017) mobile phone exposure results in greater
568 neurobehavioral effects in children with elevated lead levels than those seen with
569 elevated lead alone. These results raise concern that EMFs may have synergistic
570 actions with other environmental contaminants known to cause a reduction in

intelligence quotient (IQ) and attention, such as polychlorinated biphenyls, methyl mercury, environmental tobacco smoke and probably others (Carpenter, 2006).

Finally the problem should be considered at the societal, worldwide level. Many adolescents (Lenhart et al., 2015) and even very young children and infants (Kabali et al., 2015) use cordless devices immoderately, to such a point that the common intensive use of devices in children and adolescents has been ascribed as an addiction (Paz de la Puente et al., 2007; Roberts et al., 2014).

The specific absorption rate (SAR)-based ICNIRP safety limits were established on the basis of simulation of EMF energy absorption using standardized adult male phantoms, and designed to protect people only from the thermal effects of EMFs. These assumptions are not valid for two reasons. Not only do they fail to consider the specific morphological and bioclinical vulnerabilities of children, but also they ignore the effects known to occur at non-thermal intensities. The same criticisms apply to other so called “independent” advisory groups or agencies, such as the Advisory Group of Non-Ionizing Radiation in the UK (AGNIR, 2012), the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety in France (ANSES, 2013), and the Scientific Committee on Emerging Newly Identified Health Risk (SCENIHR, 2009), all of whom deny the detrimental health effects of

low intensity, non thermal EMF exposure and make recommendations based only on thermal SAR considerations.

Although several scientific authorities, such as the US American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP, 2013), and the Russian National Committee on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (RNCNIRP, 2011) have made specific recommendations to not allow the use of mobile phones by children and to limit their use by adolescents, unfortunately these age categories remain a target for marketing of mobile phone devices [<http://www.who.int/peh-emf/project/mapnatreps/RUSSIA%20report%202008.pdf>]. The RNCNIRP has warned that if no rational, health-based safety limits are adapted for children and adolescents and no measures are taken to limit the use of cordless devices, we can expect disruption of memory, decreases in learning and cognitive capabilities, increases in irritability, sleep disturbance, and loss of stress adaptation in this population. There will also be long-term effects, including an increase in brain cancer, infertility, EHS, Alzheimer disease and other neurodegenerative diseases (RNCNIRP, 2011; Markov and Grigoriev, 2015). National and international bodies, particularly the WHO, will bear major responsibility for failing to provide specific science-based guidance and recommendations so as to avoid such global pandemic health threats.

**Electrohypersensitivity, Microwave Illness or Idiopathic Environmental
Intolerance Attributed to Electromagnetic Fields:**

There is a segment of the human population that is unusually intolerant to EMFs. The term “electromagnetic hypersensitivity” or “electrohypersensitivity (EHS)” to describe the clinical conditions in these patients was first used in a report prepared by a European group of experts for the European Commission (Bergqvist et al., 1997). Santini et al. (2001; 2003) reported similar symptoms occurring in users of digital cellular phones and among people living near mobile phone base stations.

In 2004, because of the seemingly increasing worldwide prevalence, WHO organized an international scientific workshop in Prague in order to define and characterize EHS. Although not acknowledging EHS as being caused by EMF exposure, the Prague working group report clearly defined EHS as “a phenomenon where individuals experience adverse health effects while using or being in the vicinity of devices emanating electric, magnetic or electromagnetic fields” (www.who.int/pehemf/.../EHS_Proceedings_June2006.pdf). Following this meeting, WHO acknowledged EHS as an adverse health condition (WHO, 2005).

According to the Prague Workshop recommendations, it was proposed to use the term “idiopathic environmental intolerance (IEI) attributed to electromagnetic fields” (IEI-EMF) because of the lack of a proven causal link with EMF exposure (Hansson Mild et al., 2006). This pathological disorder is identical to what has been previously described under the term “microwave illness” (Carpenter, 2015).

This syndrome is characterized by fatigue, chronic pain and impaired cognitive function (see the Paris appeal, <http://appel-de-paris.com/?lang=en>). The precise mechanism(s) whereby environmental exposure to either ELF- or RF-EMFs can cause the development of this syndrome are still uncertain. However several lines of experimental and clinical data are sufficiently strong so as to indicate that ELF-EMFs and RF-EMFs exposure is associated with adverse biological and clinical health effects in humans as well as animals (Rea et al., 1991; McCarty et al., 2011; Belpomme et al., 2015; Hedendahl et al., 2015; Irigaray et al., 2018). The prevalence of EHS has been estimated to range 1 to 10% in developed countries (Hallberg and Oberfeld, 2006) but appears today to be around 3% (Huang et al., 2018).

Since WHO official reports on mobile phone exposure and public health (WHO, 2014) and more particularly on EHS (WHO, 2005), much clinical and biological

progress has been made to identify and objectively characterize EHS, as was summarized during the international scientific consensus meeting of the 5th Paris Appeal Congress that took place in May 2015 in Brussels at the Royal Belgium Academy of Medicine (ISD, 2015). EHS has many characteristics in common with other IEI pathological disorders, including chronic fatigue syndrome, fibromyalgia, Gulf War Illness and especially the syndrome of multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS), which Belpomme et al. (2015) have shown to be associated with EHS in many patients who report being electrohypersensitive.

Bioclinical identification and characterization of electrohypersensitivity:

In a prospective study involving systematic face-to-face questionnaire-based interviews and clinical physical examinations of more than a thousand patients who self-reported having EHS or EHS and MCS, Belpomme and colleagues reported that EHS is a well-defined clinico-biological entity, characterized by the progressive occurrence of common neurologic symptoms, including headache, tinnitus, hyperacusis, superficial and/or deep sensibility abnormalities, skin lesions, fibromyalgia, vegetative nerve dysfunction and reduced cognitive capability. These symptoms are repeatedly reported by the patients to occur each time they are exposed to EMFs, even of weak intensity. They result in chronic insomnia,

fatigue, emotional lability and depressive tendency (Belpomme et al., 2015; Irigaray et al., 2018b).

Table 4 presents the detailed symptomatic picture which was obtained during face-to-face interviews with subjects with EHS in comparison to those with both EHS and MCS and to a series of apparently healthy control subjects that showed no evidence of EHS and/or MCS. As shown in the Table, the symptoms reported are consistent with those in other published questionnaire-based studies of EHS patients (Dodge, 1970; Johansson et al., 2010; Nordin et al., 2014; Medeiros et al., 2016; Roosli, 2008). The clinical symptoms observed in EHS or EHS/MCS patients are statistically significantly much more frequent than those in apparently normal controls. Although many of these symptoms are non-specific, the general clinical picture resulting from their association and frequency strongly suggests that EHS can be recognized and identified as a specific neurological disorder.

Table 4: Clinical symptom occurrence in EHS and EHS/MCS patients in comparison with normal controls*.

	EHS	EHS/MCS	p**	Normal controls	p***	p****
Headache	88 %	96 %	0.065	0%	<0.0001	<0.0001
Dysesthesia	82 %	96 %	0.002	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Myalgia	48 %	76 %	<0.0001	6 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Arthralgia	30 %	56 %	<0.001	18 %	0.067	<0.0001
Ear heat/otalgia	70 %	90 %	<0.001	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001

Tinnitus	60 %	88 %	<0.0001	6 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Hyperacusis	40 %	52 %	0.118	6 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Dizziness	70 %	68 %	0.878	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Balance disorder	42 %	52 %	0.202	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Concentration/Attention deficiency	76 %	88 %	0.041	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Loss of immediate memory	70 %	84 %	0.028	6 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Confusion	8 %	20 %	0.023	0 %	0.007	<0.0001
Fatigue	88 %	94 %	0.216	12 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Insomnia	74 %	92 %	0.001	6 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Depression tendency	60 %	76 %	0.022	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Suicidal ideation	20 %	40 %	0.003	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Transitory cardiovascular abnormalities	50 %	56 %	0.479	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Ocular deficiency	48 %	56 %	0.322	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Anxiety/Panic	38 %	28 %	0.176	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Emotivity	20 %	20 %	1	12 %	0.176	0.176
Irritability	24 %	24 %	1	6 %	<0.001	<0.001
Skin lesions	16 %	45 %	<0.0001	0 %	<0.0001	<0.0001
Global body dysthermia	14 %	8 %	0.258	0 %	<0.0001	<0.007

*This data results from the clinical analysis of the 100 first clinically evaluated cases issued from the already published series of EHS and/or MCS patients who have been investigated for biological markers [Belpomme et al., 2015]. It has been compared symptomatically with data obtained from a series of 50 apparently normal subjects matched for age and sex, used as controls.

** Significance levels (p values) obtained for compararison between the EHS and EHS/MCS groups.

*** Significance levels (p values) obtained for compararison between the EHS and normal control groups.

**** Significance levels (p values) obtained for compararison between the EHS/MCS and normal control groups.

Because of the multiple and relatively common symptoms and the lack of recognized objective diagnosis criteria, studies on EHS were left with only the patient's self-reported interpretation for many years. As a result, EHS has unfortunately been considered to be a psychiatric disease of unknown origin. This helps explain why most mainstream public health and societal bodies claim there is not sufficient data proving that the clinical symptoms experienced and reported by EHS patients are caused by EMF exposure. Therefore they refuse to acknowledge EHS as a true neuropathological disorder. This negative point of view was supported by some blind or double blind studies showing that most individuals who report they suffer from EHS were not able to identify when they were exposed to either EMFs or sham controls (Rubin et al., 2011; Eltiti et al., 2015). However other studies have found that EHS subjects can identify EMF exposure in a statistically significant manner when they are blinded to whether or not the exposure was on (Rea et al., 1991; McCarty et al., 2011).

To account for these seemingly negative results a nocebo effect was suggested (Medeiros et al., 2016; ANSES, 2017). However there is presently no consensus on a biological mechanism through which a nocebo effect could occur (Chrousos

and Gold, 1992; Jakovljevic, 2014). Moreover, results obtained in a carefully designed psycho-clinical study in self-reporting EHS patients are not consistent with an initial placebo response to perceived EMF exposure, even though it is plausible that after the onset of the disease such phenomena may intervene secondarily through an acquired learning and conditioning process (Dieudonne, 2016). In addition, a meta-analysis of cross sectional studies has documented a 38% greater risk of development of headaches among mobile phone users than non-users, and an increasing risk of headache with longer daily call duration (Wang et al., 2017).

Belpomme, Irigaray and colleagues recently identified several biomarkers in EHS and/or MCS patients which allow physicians to identify and objectively characterise EHS as a true somatic pathological disorder, discounting the hypothesis of a causal psychosomatic or placebo-related process. These came in part from a prospective clinical and biological analysis of a series of several hundred consecutive cases of individuals who self-reported that they suffered from EHS or both EHS and MCS (Belpomme et al., 2015) and more recently from the prospective analysis of an additional series of EHS patients (Irigaray et al., 2018b). Table 5 summarizes the different biomarkers that have been measured in the peripheral blood of these patients and the results which have been obtained based

on the EHS and EHS/MCS patient groups. Note that among the different markers, the 6-hydroxymelatonin sulfate/creatinine ratio in urine appears to be the best marker to be used in medical practice since it has been found to be decreased in all cases evaluated to date (Belpomme et al., 2015).

Table 5. Patient mean values and standard deviations of biomarker levels in comparison with normal reference values as well as the percentage of patients with abnormal values in the peripheral blood in subjects with EHS or both EHS and MCS (Belpomme et al., 2015).

	Patients groups			
Biomarker and Normal reference values	EHS		EHS/MCS*	
	Mean+/-SD	% Above normal	Mean +/- SD	% Above Normal
hs-CRP < 3 mg/l	10.3 +/- 1.9	15 %	6.9 +/-1.7	14.3 %
Vitamine D >30 ng/ml	20.6 +/- 0.5	69.3 %	14.5 +/- 1.3	70.1 %
Histamine< 10 nmol/l	13.6 +/- 0.2	37 %	13.6 +/- 0.4	41.5 %

IgE < 100 UI/ml	329.5 +/- 43.9	22 %	385 +/-70	24.7 %
S100B < 0.105 µg/l	0.20 +/- 0.03	14.7 %	0.17 +/-0.03	19.7 %
Hsp 70 < 5 ng/ml	8.2 +/- 0.2	18.7%	8 +/- 0.3	25.4%
Hsp 27 < 5ng/ml	7.3 +/- 0.2	25.8 %	7.2 +/- 0.3	31.8 %
Anti-O-myelin auto- antibodies**	Positive	22.9 %	Positive	23.6 %
24-h urine 6- OHMS/creatinine ratio > 0.8***	0.042 +/- 0.003	100 %	0.048 +/- 0.006	100 %

hs-CRP, high-sensitivity C-reactive protein; IgE, Immunoglobulin E; S100B, S100 calcium binding protein B; Hsp 27, heat shock protein 27; Hsp 70, heat shock protein 70; anti-O-myelin auto-antibodies, auto-antibodies against O-myelin; 6-OHMS, 6-hydroxymelatonin sulfate.


*There is no statistically significant difference between the two groups of patients for the different biomarkers analysed, suggesting that EHS and MCS share a common pathological mechanism for genesis.

**qualitative test

***Data restricted to those not on neuroleptic medication as the simultaneous use of several psychotherapeutic drugs may also be associated with a decrease of this 24-h urine ratio by modifying melatonin metabolism.

By measuring different major oxidative stress-related biomarkers, such as thiobarbituric acid reactive substances (TBARS), oxidized glutathione (GSSG) and nitrotyrosine (NTT) in EHS patients, Irigaray et al. (2018b) have recently shown that near 80% of the EHS patients present with detectable oxidative stress biomarkers (Figure 1). More than 40% of EHS patients present with at least one positive biomarker, 20% with two and 15% with all three of the biomarkers investigated. This indicates that in addition to the inflammation-related biomarkers previously associated with EHS, EHS patients are also characterized by exhibiting biomarkers of oxidative stress (Belpomme et al., 2015; Irigaray et al., 2018a and b).

Fig 1: Percentage of EHS self-reporting patients having positive TBARs, GSSG and/or NTT oxidative stress biomarkers measured in the peripheral blood.



“Positive” biomarkers correspond to marker levels above the upper normal limit; “total” corresponds to the patients with one or more positive biomarker levels. Black bars show the percentage of patients with one, two or all three of the biomarkers for TBARS, GSSG and NTT. The white bars show the percentage of patients with either TBARS or GSSG or both oxidative stress markers.

The significance of the different biomarkers measured in the peripheral blood of EHS and EHS/MCS patients is that these result imply that these patients present with some degree of oxidative/nitrosative stress, inflammation and autoimmune response. Increased levels of several of these markers (notably protein S100B and NTT) may reflect hypoxia-associated oxidative stress-induced blood brain barrier (BBB) opening. It has been previously hypothesized that opening of the BBB can be caused by environmental stressors, be they chemicals or EMFs. This may have occurred in these patients, as has been shown to occur in several (but not all) animal experiments involving EMF exposure (Oscar and Hawkins, 1977; Persson et al., 1997; Eberhardt et al., 2008; Sirav and Seyhan, 2009). Comparable data

using metabolic and genetic biomarkers were also obtained in another large series of EHS patients (DeLuca et al., 2014). Overall these data indicate that the clinical use of biomarkers allows the objective characterisation and identification of EHS and MCS as two etiopathologic facets of a unique pathological disorder, and also allows insight into the genesis of these two diseases.

The development of new imaging techniques has also greatly increased our ability to objectively characterize EHS and MCS. Using ultrasonic cerebral tomosphygmography (UCTS) (Parini et al., 1984), EHS- and EHS/MCS-patients were found to show a significant decrease in mean pulsometric index in several middle cerebral artery-dependant portions of the temporal lobes, especially in the capsulo-thalamic area, which is part of the limbic system and the thalamus. This suggests that EHS and EHS/MCS may be associated with a brain blood flow (BBF) deficiency and/or neuronal dysfunction in these brain structures (Belpomme et al., 2015; Irigaray et al., 2018a and b).

In addition, using positron emission tomography (PET) it has been shown that short term exposure to pulse-modulated RF-EMF causally affects regional BBF in normal subjects using a mobile phone (Aalto et al., 2006; Huber et al., 2005), a finding that may account for the modifications observed in the sleep and waking

EEG (Huber et al., 2002). By use of functional MRI (fMRI) in EHS patients exposed chronically to ELF-EMFs, regional BBF changes have been reported in the frontal lobes, such as abnormal default mode network and more particularly a decrease in BBF and cerebral metabolism. These observations indicate that fMRI may also be a tool for diagnosis of EHS and clinical follow up of patients (Heuser and Heuser, 2017). A decreased BBF-associated pulsometric index decrease in both hemispheres was also recently observed by the Belpomme group by using transcranial Doppler ultrasound (TDU) (Purlanastia and Sorond, 2012) applied to the middle cerebral artery in a study involving 120 EHS and/or MCS patients. This study revealed a decrease in pulsatility index and an increase in diastolic flow velocity in 70% of the 120 cases investigated to date.

In summary it is the strong opinion of the authors that there is presently sufficient clinical, biological and radiological data emanating from different independent international scientific research groups for EHS, whatever its causal origin, to be acknowledged as a well-defined, objectively characterized pathological disorder. As a result, patients who self-report that they suffer from EHS should be diagnosed and treated utilizing presently available objective biological tests, among which are the concentration of peripheral blood biomarkers and the use of imaging techniques such as PET, fMRI and TDU and, when available, UCTS. Whatever its

etiological origin and mechanism of action, EHS should be acknowledge by the WHO as a real and distinct neurological and pathological disorder (McCarty et al., 2011; Hedendahl et al., 2015) and thus be included in the International Classification of Diseases.


Possible etiopathogenic processes involved in genesis of electro-hypersensitivity:

EMFs, both RF-EMFs at non-thermal intensities and ELF-EMFs, have been found to cause persistent adverse biological effects in birds (Balmoir, 2005 Balmoir and Hallberg, 2007; Frey, 1993), plants (Roux et al., 2008; Maffei, 2014), microorganisms (Fojt et al., 2004) and mammals. Therefore the effects observed in humans cannot be due to only a nocebo or psychosomatic effect. These biological effects may be due both to the pulsed and polarised characteristics of man-made EMFs emitted by electric or wireless technologies as opposed to the terrestrial non-polarized and continuously emitted natural EMFs (Blackman, 2009; Belyaev, 2015).

The inflammatory and oxidative/nitrosative states that have been documented in EHS patients are remarkable since they confirm the data obtained experimentally

in animals exposed to non-thermal EMFs (Esmekaya et al., 2011; Burlaka et al., 2013), and especially in the brain (Megha et al., 2015; Kesari et al., 2011). The limbic system–associated capsulo-thalamic abnormalities that the Belpomme group has observed in EHS and/or MCS patients (Belpomme et al., 2015; Irigaray et al., 2018 a and b) may likely correspond to the hippocampal neuronal alterations caused by EMF exposure in the rats (Bas et al., 2009; Furtado-Filho et al., 2015; Deshmukh et al., 2013). Figure 2 summarizes our hypothesis regarding the inflammation and oxidative stress-related mechanisms which may account for EMF- and/or chemically-related health effects in the brain and consequently for EHS genesis.

Fig 1. Hypothetical EHS/MCS common etiopathogenic model based on neuroinflammation and oxidative/nitrosative stress-induced blood brain barrier disruption (Belpomme et al., 2015).



Mechanisms whereby low intensity electromagnetic fields cause biological effects and harm:

Arguments used in the past to attempt to discount the evidence showing deleterious health effects of ELF-EMFs and RF-EMF exposure at non-thermal SAR levels were based on the difficulties encountered in understanding the underlying biological effects and the lack of recognized basic molecular mechanisms accounting for these effects. This is no longer the case. There are a number of well-documented effects of low intensity EMFs that are the mechanistic basis behind the biological effects documented above (www.bioinitiative.org). These include induction of oxidative stress, DNA damage, epigenetic changes, altered gene expression and induction including inhibition of DNA repair and changes in intracellular calcium metabolism. Both low-intensity ELF-EMF and non-thermal RF-EMF effects depend on a number of physical parameters and biological variables and physical parameters, which account for the variation in health outcomes (Belyaev, 2015; Belyaev, Alipov et al., 1999). Importantly, the most severe health effects are observed with prolonged chronic exposures even when intensities are very low (Belyaev, 2017). The physics of non-equilibrium and non-linear systems and quantum mechanics are at least in part the basis of the physical mechanisms responsible for the non-thermal molecular and biological effects of

non-thermal EMF radiation (Belyaev, 2015), although a detailed report on these actions is beyond the scope of this review.

Lower RF-EMF intensity is not necessarily less bioactive or less harmful. Non-thermal EMF effects can be observed at intensities which are very close to ordinary background levels and quite similar to intensities emitted by mobile phone base stations. There are time windows for observation of non-thermal EMF effects which may be dependent upon the endpoint measured, the cell type and the duration and power density of exposure. Non-thermal RF-EMF effects are affected by static magnetic fields and electromagnetic stray fields, which result in the variation of non-thermal EMF effects from mobile phones because of adjacent electrical appliances, power lines and other sources of ELF and static magnetic fields, including changes in the geomagnetic field (Gapeev et al., 1999 a and b).

Cell-to-cell interactions potentiate the response to non-thermal EMFs (Belyaev, Shcheglov et al., 1996). Biological responses to EMFs have been shown to be influenced by sex and age (Zhang et al., 2015; Sirav and Seyhan, 2016). Physiological parameters such as the stage of cell growth, oxygen, divalent ions and temperature are important variables affecting cellular responses to EMFs (Liburdy and Vanek, 1987; Sannino et al., 2011).

Combined exposures

EMFs at non-thermal intensities may interfere with other environmental stressors, showing an interplay of molecular pathways and resulting in either beneficial or detrimental health effects, depending on the nature and conditions of co-exposures (Novoselova et al., 2017; Ji et al., 2016). One example is the demonstration that RF-EMF exposure modulates the DNA damage and repair induced by ionizing radiation (Belyaev, Shcheglov et al., 1993). Another example is the synergistic of exposure to lead and EMFs on cognitive function in children described above (Choi et al., 2017; Byun et al., 2017). These co-exposure factors should be considered when assessment of detrimental effects, including carcinogenicity, is performed.

Not all of the effects of EMFs on the nervous system and other organs are necessarily harmful. The best example of a positive effect is the well-documented and clinically useful benefit of applied magnetic fields to promote bone healing (Bassett, 1994). Both ELF-EMF (Zhang et al., 2015) and RF-EMF (Arendash et al., 2010) have been reported to slow cognitive decline in rodent models of

Alzheimer's disease. Some human studies report a facilitating effects of cognitive performance (Lee et al., 2001) while Koivisto et al., (2000) reported an increase in response time and vigilance tasks but a decrease in mental arithmetic tasks. These studies clearly show that EMFs have biological effects at non-thermal intensities, but suggest that not all biological effects are necessarily harmful.

Duration of exposure and dose intensity:

Such parameters as power density, dose, and duration of exposure have been analyzed for development of reliable safety standards, which would protect against the detrimental health effects of chronic exposure to RF-EMFs at non-thermal intensities. Some studies show no effect under fixed short-term exposures, but this does not imply that there are no effects from longer-term exposures (Choi et al., 2014). Exposure in studies showing RF-EMF effects was on average twice the duration as those with no significant effects (Cucurachi et al., 2013). The response to non-thermal EMFs depends on both power density and duration of exposure. Importantly, the same response is observed with lower power density but prolonged exposure as at higher power density and shorter exposure (Nordenson et al., 1994). While SAR is a good surrogate for thermal RF effects from acute exposures, many studies have shown that SAR should be either replaced by "dose-

specific absorption" or power density complimented by duration of exposure for description of non-thermal RF effects (Belyaev, 2015). Recent studies have provided more evidence for the greater importance of dose and duration of exposure than SAR alone for biological and health effects from long-term exposures to non-thermal RF-EMFs (Furtado-Filho et al., 2015).

Oxidative Stress:

Non-ionizing radiation does not have sufficient energy to directly break chemical bonds, and therefore the DNA damage that occurs with non-ionising EMF exposures is primarily a consequence of generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), resulting in oxidative stress. There are numerous animal experiments which clearly demonstrate that non thermal EMFs can cause oxidative stress (Esmekaya et al., 2011; Burlaka et al., 2013), particularly in the brain (Shahin et al., 2017; Dasdag et al., 2012; Megha et al., 2015; Furtado-Filho et al., 2015). Oxidative stress is known to play a central role in development of cancer and aging and serves as a signaling agent in the inflammatory response (Holmstrom and Finkel, 2014).

The brain is a particularly important organ for sensitivity to EMFs. Brain cancer resulting from EMF exposures is a serious concern, and EHS is a disease of the

central nervous system. Several mechanisms at the cellular and molecular levels have been reported that may be the basis of these non-thermal RF-EMF effects on brain function. ELF- and/or RF-EMF exposure at embryonic or early postnatal stages can alter *in vivo* synaptic efficacy and plasticity of neurons (Balassa et al., 2014), a finding which was further supported by *in vitro* studies showing a significant decrease in the differentiation of neural stem cells into neurons (Eghlidospour et al., 2017), the alteration of transcript levels of neuronal differentiation-related genes and impairment of neurite outgrowth of embryonic neural stem cells exposed to ELF- or RF-EMFs (Ma et al., 2014). These observations support the conclusion that low-intensity but prolonged exposure to non-thermal EMFs may have adverse effects on neurogenesis during development and indicate how important it is to protect the fetus and young child from excessive exposure to all mobile devices.

Animal studies have documented that 900 MHz or 2.45 GHz non thermal RF-EMF exposure in rats, either short term or chronic, can trigger neuronal dysfunction and even apoptosis of hippocampal pyramidal cells (Bas et al., 2009; Shahin et al., 2017) and cerebellum Purkinje cells (Sonmez et al., 2010) through induction of oxidative stress. Exposure of pregnant dams elicited EMF oxidative stress-induced neuronal pathologic changes in offspring (Odaci et al., 2016). Such pathological

changes could be due to ROS-induced opening of the BBB (Nordal and Wong, 2005) and/or to ROS-associated brain hypoxia caused by a decrease in EMF-induced BBF and/or EMF-induced hemoglobin deoxygenation (Mousavy et al., 2009; Muehsam et al., 2013). The resulting hypoxia may induce metabolic neuronal dysfunction as in the case of EHS patients (Belpomme et al., 2015) but also neuronal cell death by either apoptosis or necrosis as in the case of Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia (Bell and Zlokovic, 2009).

While some consider the laboratory data on EMFs as being inconsistent, showing either detrimental or no effects and on occasion even beneficial effects, the vast majority still show detrimental effects. For example Henry Lai in the Bioinitiative Report Research Summaries Update of November, 2017, Chapter 6 on Genotoxic Effects, reported that i) of 46 studies on ELF genotoxicity with the comet assay as the end point, 34 studies (74%) showed detrimental effects, ii). Of 189 total studies on ELF and oxidative stress, 162 (87%) showed a positive correlation, and iii) of 200 studies on RF and free radicals, 180 (90%) showed detrimental effects. One reason for variability between laboratory studies is the strong dependence on low-threshold EMF effects on a number of physical and biological variables (Belyaev, 2010).

Genetic and epigenetic mechanisms:

Genetic effects are the most direct cause for carcinogenicity. This is true both for genotoxic changes caused by exposure to EMFs and existing polymorphic genetic differences within a population that increase susceptibility to cancer. DNA can no longer be considered to be unaffected by environmental EMF levels, as many studies have shown that DNA can be activated and damaged by EMFs at levels that have been considered to be safe (Blank and Goodman, 1999).

The primary mechanism through which low-intensity EMFs can alter DNA is through ROS production. Lai and Singh (2004) first reported that a 2 hr exposure of rats to 60 Hz EMFs at 0.1-0.5 mT resulted in DNA strand breaks in neurons, and provided evidence that this effect was mediated by free radical formation and blocked by free radical scavengers. Vijayalaxmi and Prihoda (2009) in a meta-analysis of 87 publications found a biologically small but statistically significant difference between DNA damage in ELF-EMF-exposed somatic cells as compared to controls, and reported evidence for epigenetic changes for some outcomes. For ELF-EMFs this breakage effect was stronger when exposure was intermittent rather than continuous (Nordenson et al., 1994).

Yang et al. (2008) have reported an OR = 4.31 (1.54-12.08) for leukemia in children living within 100 m of a high voltage powerline if they had a certain polymorphism of a DNA repair gene.

Exposure to RF-EMFs can also induce DNA damage under specific conditions (Markova et al., 2005). Tice et al. (2002) and Vijayalaxmi et al. (2013) reported DNA damage and micronuclei formation in cultured human leukocytes and lymphocytes upon exposure to RF-EMF signals of at least 5 W/kg. Not all cell types showed similar responses. Schwarz et al. (2008) reported micronucleus changes in fibroblasts but not lymphocytes exposed to 1950 MHz EMFs. Kesari et al. (2014) also demonstrated DNA strand breaks in the brains of rats exposed for 2 hr per day for 60 days to a 3G mobile phone. Changes in DNA secondary structure (Semin, 1995; Diem, et al., 2005) and chromosome instability (Mashevich, 2003) have been observed upon exposure to RF-EMFs emitted by mobile phones.

Epigenetic changes, rather than genetic changes in DNA, may underlie many or even most of the biological effects of non-thermal EMFs (Sage and Burgio, 2017). Non-thermal EMFs are epigenetic stressors which can alter gene expression by acting through physical or biochemical processes and be reflected as chromatin remodeling (Belyaev, Alipov et al., 1997), histone modification (Wei et al., 1990)

or altered microRNA (Dasdag et al., 2015) at intensities far below those that cause measureable tissue heating.

Chromatin plays a key regulatory role in controlling gene expression and, more particularly, the access of transcription factors to DNA. It has been shown that extremely low intensity RF-EMF exposure, i.e. at intensities comparable to that of mobile phone and towers, results in changes in chromatin conformation and gene expression (Belyaev, Alipov et al., 1997; Belyaev and Kravchenko, 1994; Belyaev, Koch et al., 2006; Belyaev, Markova et al., 2009). In a large number of cells and tissues, compaction of chromatin in specific loci may lead to gene silencing, loss of histone regulatory effects and DNA repair capacity (Wei et al., 1990). Belyaev and collaborators (Markova et al., 2005; Belyaev, Markova et al., 2009) have shown that exposure to RF-EMFs emitted by GSM mobile phone alters chromatin conformation in human lymphocytes and inhibits formation of p53-binding protein 1 (53BP1) and phosphorylated histone H2AX (γ -H2AX) DNA repair foci.

EMFs in both the ELF and RF ranges may epigenetically affect DNA by inducing the expression of stress response genes and consequently the synthesis of chaperone stress proteins (Blank and Goodman, 2011 a and b). A specific gene sequence has been identified that acts as a sort of antenna, specifically sensitive and responsive to EMFs (Blank and Goodman, 2011b). This is a gene sequence

coding for HSP70, a protein belonging to a family of conserved, ubiquitously expressed “heat shock proteins” that sense danger signals and protect cells from the most disparate stress conditions. This is an unambiguous demonstration that EMF exposure even at non-tissue heating intensities has the potential to be harmful to cells and organisms. The HSP70 promotor contains different DNA regions that are specifically sensitive to diverse stressors, thermal and non-thermal. The EMFs are specifically perceived by the sequences sensitive to non-thermal stimuli. During the process of HSP70-response induction, EMFs can activate directly the HSP70 gene promoter (Rodriquez-De la Fuente et al., 2010) which contains a magnetic field-responsive domain (Lin et al., 1999; 2001).

EMF-related HSP70 and HSP27 stress responses have been detected in the hippocampus of rats exposed to non-thermal EMFs (Yang et al., 2012). Shahin et al. (2017) reported that mice exposed to 2G mobile phones continuously for four months showed elevated ROS, lipid peroxidation, total nitrate and nitrite concentrations and malondialdehyde levels in homogenates of different tissues, and decreased levels of several antioxidant enzymes. These observations justify the use of these markers to characterize EHS in patients who report that they are sensitive to EMFs.

The EMF effects have been suggested to be mediated by the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPk) cascades, which is a central signaling transduction pathway which governs all stress-related cellular processes occurring in response to extracellular stimuli (Friedman et al., 2007). It has been shown that long term exposure of cells to mobile phone frequencies or to ELF-EMFs (Goodman et al., 2009) activates the extracellular-signal regulated kinase (ERK), which is one of the four MAPk cascades so far identified.

Non-thermal RF-EMFs may also alter expression of other genes. As long ago as 1988 Byus et al. showed that 450 MHz RF increased ornithine decarboxylase activity in hepatoma cells. Markova et al. (2005) exposed human fibroblasts and mesenchymal stem cells to mobile phone RF-EMFs with analysis of tumor suppressor p53 binding protein 1. Formation of 53BP1 foci was inhibited in both cells types, but the stem cells always showed a greater response. Fragopoulou et al. (2011) exposed mice to either a typical mobile phone or a wireless DECT base station and analyzed the brain proteome. They found significant alteration in 143 specific proteins (ranging from a 0.003 fold downregulation to up to a 114-fold overexpression.) Luo et al. (2013) exposed pregnant women undergoing a first trimester abortion to a mobile phone applied to the abdomen and performed a proteomic analysis of placental villous tissue. They report 15 proteins which were

significantly altered by at least 2- to 2.5-fold in exposed women as compared to control women. Twelve of these proteins were identified. Yan et al. (2008) exposed rats to mobile phones 6 hr per day for 126 days, and found upregulation of specific mRNAs that regulated several proteins, including calcium ATPase, neural cell adhesion molecule, neural growth factor and vascular endothelial growth factor. EMFs at non thermal levels may not only alter the expression of many proteins but also may directly affect protein conformation (Fragopoulou et al., 2011; Bohr and Bohr, 2013; Beyer et al., 2013) and modify enzyme activity (Vojisavljevic et al., 2010), so altering the regulating capacity of the epigenome. These are epigenetic, not genetic, effects (Sage and Burgio, 2017).

Non-thermal EMF exposure can epigenetically interfere with the differentiation and proliferation programs of stem cells in fetal and adult tissues through ROS production (Wolf et al., 2007; Falone et al., 2007; Ayse et al., 2010; Park et al., 2014). Stem cells are the most sensitive cells to EMF exposure (Eghidospour et al., 2017; Markova et al., 2010) and this is particularly the case for neural stem cells of the hippocampus (Leone et al., 2014).

The endogenous natural ionic currents and electrical fields in the human body (Jaffe and Nuccitelli, 1977) are vulnerable to the oscillary properties of non-

thermal EMFs. These consequently may cause detrimental effect on cell differentiation and proliferation in adult tissues (Levin, 2003) in addition to the effects on cell differentiation, proliferation and migration in the fetus (Wolf et al., 2007; Ayse et al., 2010; Leone et al., 2014). Fetal programming cannot be reduced to only genetic programs. Developmental processes are essentially epigenetic (Leone et al., 2014), and exposure to epigenetic stressors such as non-thermal EMFs are much more dangerous for the fetus than for the adults.

Calcium Regulation:

There has long been evidence that EMFs alter several aspects of calcium function. This is important because calcium regulates many different aspects of cell function. Bawin and Adey (1976) reported that very weak ELF-EMFs trigger efflux of calcium from isolated chick brain, although the implications of this observation were not clear. Later they reported a similar action of RF-EMFs (Adey et al., 1982). Pulsed low-frequency EMFs promote bone healing and promote calcium uptake into bone (Spadaro et al., 2002) and osteoblasts (Zhang et al., 2010). 50 Hz EMFs increase the number of voltage-gated calcium channels in neuroendocrine cells (Grasso et al., 2004) and presynaptic nerve cell terminals (Sun et al., 2016). Wei et al. (2015) found that ELF-EMFs also altered the

frequency of calcium transients in cardiomyocytes and decreased calcium concentrations in sarcoplasmic reticulum. These changes in calcium in heart muscle may be the basis for the cardiovascular effects reported in humans on exposure to EMFs (Havas, 2013). In spite of numerous studies reporting altered calcium metabolism upon exposure to both ELF- and RF-EMFs, the overall implications of these effects are still not clear. However, some have suggested (Ledoigt and Belpomme, 2013) that calcium activation of proteins could be the initial event that results in altered protein configuration, leading to generation of ROS and ultimately activating the molecular pathways to cancer.

Public Health Implications of Human Exposure to EMFs:

The incidence of brain cancer in children and adolescents has increased between 2000 and 2010 (Ostrom et al., 2015). Gliomas are increasing in the Netherlands (Ho et al., 2014), glioblastomas are increasing in Australia (Dobes et al., 2011) and England (Philips et al., 2018) and all brain cancers are increasing in Spain (Etxeberrua et al., 2015) and Sweden (Hardell and Carlberg, 2017). The latency period between initial exposure and clinical occurrence of brain cancer is not known but is estimated to be long. While not all reports of brain cancer rates show an increase, some do. The continually increasing exposure to EMFs from all

sources may contribute to these increases. The prevalence of EHS is unknown, but various reports suggest that it is between 1 and 10% of the population (Hallberg and Oberfelds, 2006; Huang et al., 2018). Male fertility has been declining (Geoffroy-Siraudin et al., 2012; Levine et al., 2017). EMFs increase the risk of each of these diseases and others. Alzheimer's disease is increasing in many countries worldwide and its association with ELF-EMF occupational exposure has been clearly demonstrated through several independent epidemiological studies (Davanipour and Sobel, 2009; Sobel et al., 1996; Qiu et al., 2004) and a meta-analysis of these studies (Garcia et al., 2008). A recent meta-analysis (Huss et al., 2018) has reported an increased risk of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in workers occupationally exposure to ELF-EMFs.

Safety limits for RF exposure have been based (until today) on the thermal effects of EMFs. But these standards do not protect people, particularly children, from the deleterious health effects of non-thermal EMFs (Nazuroglu et al., 2013; Mahmoudabadi et al., 2015). Each of these diseases is associated with decrements in health and quality of life. Brain cancer patients often die in spite of some improvement in treatment, while EHS patients present with increased levels of distress, inability to work, and progressive social withdrawal. The ability for humans to reproduce is fundamental for the maintenance of our species.

1186

1187 The scientific evidence for harm from EMFs is increasingly strong. We do not
1188 advocate going back to the age before electricity or wireless communication, but
1189 we deplore the present failure of public health international bodies to recognize the
1190 scientific data showing the adverse effects of EMFs on human health. It is
1191 encouraging that some governments are taking action. France has removed WiFi
1192 from pre-schools and ordered Wi-Fi to be shut off in elementary schools when not
1193 in use ([http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/12/11/france-ipose-total-ban-](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/12/11/france-ipose-total-ban-mobile-phones-schools/)
1194 [mobile-phones-schools/](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/12/11/france-ipose-total-ban-mobile-phones-schools/)). The State of California Department of Public Health has
1195 issued a warning on use of mobile phones and offered advice on how to reduce
1196 exposure (State of California, 2017). There are many steps that are neither difficult
1197 nor expensive that can be taken to use modern technology but in a manner that
1198 significantly reduces threats to human health.

1199

1200 It is urgent that national and international bodies, particularly the WHO, take this
1201 significant public health hazard seriously and make appropriate recommendations
1202 for protective measures to reduce exposures. This is especially urgently needed for
1203 children and adolescents. It is also important that all parts of society, especially the
1204 medical community, educators, and the general public, become informed about the

1205 hazards associated with exposure to EMFs and of the steps that can be easily taken
1206 to reduce exposure and risk of associated disease.

1207

1208

References

- Aalto S, Haarala C, Brück A, Sipilä H, Hämäläinen H, Rinne JO. 2006. Mobile phone affects cerebral blood flow in humans. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab.* 26: 885-890.
- AAP (American Academy of Pediatrics). 2013. American Academy of Pediatrics Demands FCC Protect Children from Cell Phone & Wireless Radiation. Letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics to the FCC Regarding Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Radiation Standards. Available at: the FCC's web site at <http://bit.ly/17tQclg>. <http://www.saferemr.com/2013/09/american-academy-of-pediatrics-demands.html>.
- Adey WR, Bawin SM, Lawrence AF. 1982. Effects of weak amplitude-modulated microwave fields on calcium efflux from awake cat cerebral cortex. *Bioelectromagnetics* 3: 295-307.
- Agarwal A, Desai NR, Makker K, Varghese A, Mouradi R, Sabanegh E, et al. 2009. Effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic waves (RF-EMW) from cellular phones on human ejaculated semen: an in vitro pilot study. *Fertil Steril.* 92: 1318-1325.
- AGNIR (Advisory Group of Non-Ionizing Radiation). 2012. Health effects from radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. Report of the independent advisory group on non-ionising radiation. April 2012.
- Ahlbom A, Day N, Feychting M, Roman E, Skinner J, Dockerty J, et al. 2000. A pooled analysis of magnetic fields and childhood leukaemia. *Br J Cancer* 84: 692-698.
- Akhavan-Sigari R, Baf MM, Ariabod V, Rohde V, Rahighi S. 2014. Connection between cell phone use, p53 gene expression in different zones of glioblastoma multiforme and survival prognoses, *Rare Tumors* 2014;6;5350, doi:10.4081/rt.2014.5350.
- Aldad TS, Gan G, Gao XB, Taylor HS. 2012. Fetal radiofrequency radiation exposure from 800-1900 MHz-rated cellular telephones affects neurodevelopment and behavior in mice. *Sci Rep.* 2: 312.

- ANSES (French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety) 2013. Radiofrequences et sante. October 2013.
- ANSES (French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety) 2017. Hypersensibilite electromagnetique ou intolerance environnementale idiopathique attribuee aux champs electromagnetiques. Pre-rapport du groupe de travail "Radiofrequence et Sante."
- Arendash GW, Sanchez-Ramos J, Mori T, Mamcarz M, Lin X, Runfeldt M et al. 2010. Electromagnetic field treatment protects against and reverses cognitive impairment in Alzheimer's disease mice. *J Alzheimer's Dis* 19: 191-210.
- Augner C, Hacker GW, Oberfeld G, Florian M, Hitzl W, Hutter, et al. 2010. Effects of exposure to GSM mobile phone base station signals on salivary cortisol, alpha-amylase, and immunoglobulin A. *Biomed Environ Sci*. 23: 199-207.
- Ayşe IG, Zafer A, Sule O, Işıl IT, Kalkan T. 2010. Differentiation of K562 cells under ELF-EMF applied at different time courses. *Electromag. Biol. Med*. 29: 122-130.
- Baan R, Grosse Y, Lauby-Secretan B, El Ghissassi F, Bouvard V et al. 2011. Carcinogenicity of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. *Lancet Oncol* 12: 624-626.
- Balassa T, Varró P, Elek S, Drozdovszky O, Szemerszky R, Világi I, et al. 2014. Changes in synaptic efficacy in rat brain slices following extremely low-frequency magnetic field exposure at embryonic and early postnatal age. *Int. J. Dev. Neurosci*. 31: 724-30.
- Balmori A. 2005. Possible effects of electromagnetic fields from phone masts on a population of white stork (*Ciconia ciconia*). *Electromag. Biol. Med*. 24: 109-119.
- Balmori A, Hallberg O. 2007. The urban decline of the house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*): a possible link with electromagnetic radiation. *Electromag. Biol. Med*. 26: 141-151
- Bas O, Odaci E, Kaplan S, Acer N, Ucok K, Colakoglu S. 2009. 900 MHz electromagnetic field exposure affects qualitative and quantitative features of hippocampal pyramidal cells in the adult female rat. *Brain Res*. 1265: 178-185.

Bassett A. 1994. Therapeutic uses of electric and magnetic fields in orthopaedics. In: *Biological Effects of Electric and Magnetic Fields*, DO Carpenter and S Ayrapetyan, Eds. Vol. 2, pp. 13-48.

Bawin SM, Adey WR. 1976. Sensitivity of calcium binding in cerebral tissue to weak environmental electric fields oscillating at low frequency. *Proc Nat Acad Sci* 73: 1999-203.

Bell RF, Zlokovic BV. 2009. Neurovascular mechanisms and blood-brain barrier disorder in Alzheimer's disease. *Acta Neuropathol.* 118: 103-113.

Belpomme D, Campagnac C, Irigaray P. 2015. Reliable disease biomarkers characterizing and identifying electrohypersensitivity and multiple chemical sensitivity as two etiopathogenic aspects of a unique pathological disorder. *Rev. Environ. Health.* 30: 251-271.

Belyaev IY. 2010. Dependence of non-thermal biological effects of microwaves on physical and biological variables: implications for reproducibility and safety standards. *Eur J Oncol Library* 5: 187-218.

Belyaev I. 2015. Biophysical mechanisms for nonthermal microwave effects. In: Markov M, editor. *Electromagnetic Fields in Biology and Medicine*. Boca Raton, London, New York: CRC Press. 2015; pp. 49-68.

Belyaev I. 2017. Duration of Exposure and Dose in Assessing Nonthermal Biological Effects of Microwaves. *Dosimetry in Bioelectromagnetics*: CRC Press; p 171-184.

Belyaev IY, Alipov YD, Harms-Ringdahl M. 1997. Effects of zero magnetic field on the conformation of chromatin in human cells. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1336: 465-73.

Belyaev IY, Alipov YD, Harms-Ringdahl M. 1999. Effects of weak ELF on *E. coli* cells and human lymphocytes: Role of genetic, physiological, and physical parameters. In: Bersani F, editor. *Electricity and Magnetism in Biology and Medicine*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publ. pp. 481-484.

- Belyaev I, Dean A, Eger H, Hubmann G, Jandrisovits R, Kern M, et al. 2016. EUROPAEM EMF Guideline 2016 for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of EMF-related health problems and illnesses. *Rev. Environ. Health* 31: 363-397.
- Belyaev IY, Koch CB, Terenius O, Roxstrom-Lindquist K, Malmgren LO, Sommer W, et al. 2006. Exposure of rat brain to 915-MHz GSM microwaves induces changes in gene expression but not double stranded DNA breaks or effects on chromatin confirmation. *Bioelectromagnetics* 27: 295-306.
- Belyaev IYa, Kravchenko VG. 1994. Resonance effect of low-intensity millimeter waves on the chromatin conformational state of rat thymocytes. *Z Naturforsch C* 49: 352-358.
- Belyaev IY, Markovà E, Hillert L, Malmgren LO, Persson BR. 2009. Microwaves from UMTS/GSM mobile phones induce long-lasting inhibition of 53BP1/gamma-H2AX DNA repair foci in human lymphocytes. *Bioelectromagnetics* 30: 129-141.
- Belyaev IY, Shcheglov VS, Alipov YD, Polunin VA. 1996. Resonance effect of millimeter waves in the power range from $10(-19)$ to $3 \times 10(-3)$ W/cm² on *Escherichia coli* cells at different concentrations. *Bioelectromagnetics* 17: 312-321.
- Belyaev IY, Shcheglov VS, Alipov YD, Radko SP. 1993. Regularities of separate and combined effects of circularly polarized millimeter waves on *E. coli* cells at different phases of culture growth. *Bioelectrochem Bioenergetics* 31: 49-63.
- Bergqvist U, Vogel E, Editors. 1997. Possible health implications of subjective symptoms and electromagnetic fields. A report prepared by a European group of experts for the European Commission, DGV. Arbete och Hälsa, 19. Swedish National Institute for Working Life, Stockholm, Sweden. Available from: <http://www2.niwl.se/forlag/en/>.
- Beyer C, Christen P, Jelesarov I, Fröhlich J. 2013. Experimental system for real-time assessment of potential changes in protein conformation induced by electromagnetic fields. *Bioelectromagnetics* 34: 419-428.
- Birks L, Guxens M, Papadopoulou E, Alexander J, Ballester F, Estarlich M, et al. 2017. Maternal cell phone use during pregnancy and child behavioral problems in five birth cohorts. *Environ. Int.* 104: 122-131.

- Blackman C. 2009. Cell phone radiation. Evidence from ELF and RF studies supporting more inclusive risk identification and assessment. *Pathophysiology* 16: 205-216.
- Blank M, Goodman R. 1999. Electromagnetic fields may act directly on DNA. *J Cell Biochem* 75: 369-374.
- Blank M, Goodman R. 2011a. Electromagnetic fields stress living cells. *Pathophysiology* 16: 71-78.
- Blank M, Goodman R. 2011b. DNA is a fractal antenna in electromagnetic fields. *Int J Radiat Biol.* 87: 409-415.
- Bohr H, Bohr J. 2013. Microwave enhanced kinetics observed in ORD studies of a protein. *Bioelectromagnetics* 21: 68-72.
- Burlaka A, Tsybulin O, Sidorik E, Lukin S, Polishuk V, Tsehmistrenko S, et al. 2013. Overproduction of free radical species in embryonal cells exposed to low intensity radiofrequency radiation. *Exp Oncol.* 35: 219-225.
- Byun YH, Ha M, Kwon HJ, Hong YC, Leem JH, Salong J, et al. 2017. Mobile phone use, blood lead levels, and attention deficit hyperactivity symptoms in children: A longitudinal study. *PLOS One* 8: e59742.
- Byus CV, Karun K, Pieper S, Ady WR. 1988. Increased ornithine decarboxylase activity in cultured cells exposed to low energy modulated microwave fields and porbol ester tumor promoters. *Cancer Res* 48: 4222-4226.
- Cardis E, Armstrong BK, Bowman JD, Giles GG, Hours M, Krewski D, et al. 2011. Risk of brain tumours in relation to estimated RF dose from mobile phones: results from five Interphone countries. *Occup Environ Med.* 68: 631-640.
- Cardis E, Deltour I, Mann S, Moissonnier M, Taki M, Varsier N, et al. 2008. Distribution of RF energy emitted by mobile phones in anatomical structures of the brain. *Phys Med Biol.* 53: 2771-2783.
- Carlberg M, Hardell L. 2014. Decreased survival of glioma patients with astrocytoma grade IV (glioblastoma multiforme) associated with long-term use of mobile and cordless phones. *Int J Environ Res Publ Health* 11: 10790-10805;.

- Carlberg M, Hardell L. 2015. Pooled analysis of Swedish case-control studies during 1997-2003 and 2007-2009 on meningioma risk associated with the use of mobile and cordless phones. *Oncol Rep.* 33: 3093-3098.
- Carlberg M, Hardell L. 2017. Evaluation of mobile phone and cordless phone use and glioma risk using the Bradford Hill viewpoints from 1965 on association or causation. *Biomed Res Int.* 2017: 9218486. doi: 10.1155/2017/9218486
- Carpenter DO. 2006. Environmental contaminants and learning and memory. *Int Congress Series* 1287: 185-189.
- Carpenter DO. 2015. The microwave syndrome or electro-hypersensitivity: historical background. *Rev Environ Health.* 30: 217-222.
- Carter B, Rees P, Hale L, Bhattacharjee D, Paradkar MS. 2016. Association between portable screen-based media device access or use and sleep outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr.* 170: 1202-1208.
- Cea-Soriano L, Wallander MA, García Rodríguez LA. 2012. Epidemiology of meningioma in the United Kingdom. *Neuroepidemiology* 39: 27-34.
- Choi KH, Ha M, Ha EH, Park H, Kim Y, Hong YC, et al. 2017. Neurodevelopment for the first three years following prenatal mobile phone use, radiofrequent radiation and lead exposure. *Environ Res* 156: 810-817.
- Choi SB, Kwon MK, Chung JW, Park JS, Chung K, Kim DW. 2014. Effects of short-term radiation emitted by WCDMA mobile phones on teenagers and adults. *BMC Public Health* 14: 438.
- Chrousos GP, Gold PW. 1992. The concepts of stress and stress system disorders. Overview of physical and behavioral homeostasis. *JAMA* 267: 1244-1252.
- Coureau G, Bouvier G, Lebailly P, Fabbro-Peray P, Gruber A, Leffondre K, et al. 2014. Mobile phone use and brain tumours in the Cerenat case-control study. *Occup Environ Med.* 71: 514-522.

- Cucurachi S, Tamis WL, Vijver MG, Peijnenburg WJ, Bolte JF, de Snoo GR. 2013. A review of the ecological effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF). *Environ Int* 51: 116-40.
- Dasdag S, Akdag MZ, Kizil G, Kizil M, Cakir DU, Yokus B. 2012. Effect of 900 MHz radio frequency radiation on beta amyloid protein, protein carbonyl, and malondialdehyde in the brain. *Electromagn Biol Med.* 31: 67-74.
- Dasdag S, Akdag MZ, Erdal ME, Erdal N, Av OL, Ay ME, et al. 2015. Effects of 2.4 GHz radiofrequency radiation emitted from Wi-Fi equipment on microRNA expression in brain tissue. *Int J Radiat Biol* 91: 555-561.
- Davanipour Z, Sobel E. 2009. Long-term exposure to magnetic fields and the risks of Alzheimer's Disease and breast cancer. *Pathophysiology* 16: 149-156.
- De Luca C, Thai JC, Raskovic D, Cesareo E, Caccamo D, Trukhanov A, et al. 2014. Metabolic and genetic screening of electromagnetic hypersensitive subjects as a feasible tool for diagnostics and intervention. *Mediators Inflamm.* 2014: 924184.
- Deshmukh PS, Megha K, Banerjee BD, Ahmed RS, Chandna S, Abegaonkar MP, Tripathi AK. 2013. Detection of Low Level Microwave Radiation Induced Deoxyribonucleic Acid Damage Vis-a-vis Genotoxicity in Brain of Fischer Rats. *Toxicol Int* 20: 19-24.
- Deshmukh PS, Nasare N, Megha K, Banerjee BD, Ahmed RS, Singh D et al. 2015. Cognitive impairment and neurogenotoxic effects in rats exposed to low-intensity microwave radiation. *Int J Toxicol* 34: 284-90.
- Diem E, Schwarz C, Adlkofer F, Jahn O, Rüdiger H. 2005. Non-thermal DNA breakage by mobile-phone radiation (1800 MHz) in human fibroblasts and in transformed GFSH-R17 rat granulosa cells in vitro. *Mutat Res.* 583: 178-83.
- Dieudonné M. 2016. Does electromagnetic hypersensitivity originate from placebo responses? Indications from a qualitative study. *Bioelectromagnetics* 37: 14-24.
- Divan HA, Kheifets L, Obel C, Olsen J. 2008. Prenatal and postnatal exposure to cell phone use and behavioral problems in children. *Epidemiology* 19: 523-529.

- Divan HA, Kheifets L, Obel C, Olsen J. 2012. Cell phone use and behavioural problems in young children. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 66: 524-529.
- Dobes M, Khurana VG, Shadbolt B, Jain S, Smith SF, Smee R, et al. 2011. Increasing incidence of glioblastoma multiforme and meningioma, and decreasing incidence of Schwannoma (2000-2008): Findings of a multicentre Australian study. *Surg Neurol Int.* 2: 176.
- Dodge C.H. 1970. Clinical and hygienic aspects of exposure to electromagnetic fields. in *Biol. Effects and Health Implications of microwave Radiation*, "Symp. Proc, S.I. Cleary, Ed., USDHEW, Dept. BRH/DBE, 70-2, pp. 140-149.
- Duan Y, Zhang Z, Bu RF. 2011. Correlation between cellular phone use and epithelial parotid gland malignancies. *Int J Oral Maxillofac. Surg* doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2011.03.007.
- Eberhardt JL, Persson, BRR, Brun AE, Salfor LG, Malmgren LOG. 2008. Blood-brain barrier permeability and nerve cell damage in rat brain 14 and 28 days after exposure to microwaves for GSM mobile phones. *Electromag Bio Med* 27: 215-229.
- Eghlidospour M, Ghanbari A, Mortazavi SMJ, Azari H. 2017. Effects of radiofrequency exposure emitted from a GSM mobile phone on proliferation, differentiation, and apoptosis of neural stem cells. *Anat Cell Biol* 50: 115-123.
- Eltiti S, Wallace D, Russo R, Fox E. 2015. Aggregated data from two double-blind base station provocation studies comparing individuals with idiopathic environmental intolerance with attribution to electromagnetic fields and controls. *Bioelectromagnetics* 36: 96-107.
- Esmekaya MA, Ozer C, Seyhan N. 2011. 900 MHz pulse-modulated radiofrequency radiation induces oxidative stress on heart, lung, testis and liver tissues. *Gen Physiol Biophys* 30: 84-89.
- Etxeberrua H, San Roman E, Burgul R, Guevara M, Moreno-Iribas C, Urbina MJ, Ardanaz E. 2015. Brain and central nervous system cancer incidence in Navarre (Spain), 1973-2008 and projections for 2014. *J Cancer* 6: 177-183.
- Falcioni L, Bua L, Tibaldi M, Lauriola L, De Angelis F, Gnudi F et al. 2018. Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats

exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station. Environ Res <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.037>.

Falone S, Grossi MR, Cinque B, D'Angelo B, Tettamanti E, Cimini A et al. 2007. Fifty hertz extremely low-frequency electromagnetic field causes changes in redox and differentiative status in neuroblastoma cells. Int J Biochem Cell Biol. 39: 2093-2106.

Fojt L, Strasák L, Vetterl V, Smarda J. 2004. Comparison of the low-frequency magnetic field effects on bacteria *Escherichia coli*, *Leclercia adecarboxylata* and *Staphylococcus aureus*. Bioelectrochemistry. 63: 337-341.

Fragopoulou AF, Samara A, Antonelou MH, Xanthopoulou A, Papadopoulou A, Vougas K, et al. 2011. Brain proteome response following whole body exposure of mice to mobile phone or wireless DECT base radiation. Electromag Biol Med 31: 250-274.

Frey AH. 1993. Electromagnetic field interactions with biological systems. FASEB J. 7: 272-281.

Friedman JI, Kraus S, Hauptman Y, Schiff Y, Seger R. 2007. Mechanism of short-term ERK activation by electromagnetic fields at mobile phone frequencies. Biochem J 405: 559-568.

Furtado-Filho OV, Borba JB, Maraschin T, Souza LM, Henriques JA, Moreira JC, Saffi J. 2015. Effects of chronic exposure to 950 MHz ultra-high-frequency electromagnetic radiation on reactive oxygen species metabolism in the right and left cerebral cortex of young rats of different ages. Int J Radiat Biol 91: 891-897.

Gandhi OP, Lazzi G, Furse CM. 1996. Electromagnetic absorption in the human head and neck for mobile telephones at 835 and 1900 MHz. IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory Tech 44(10): 1884-1897.

Gandhi OP, Morgan LL, de Salles AA, Han YY, Herberman RF, Davis DL. 2012. Exposure limits: the underestimation of absorbed cell phone radiation, especially in children. Electromagn Biol Med. 31: 34-51.

Gapeev AB, Iakushina VS, Chemeris NK, Fesenko EE. 1999a. Modulated extremely high frequency electromagnetic radiation of low intensity activates or

- inhibits respiratory burst in neutrophils depending on modulation frequency (in Russian). *Biofizika* 42: 1125-1134.
- Gapeev AB, Iakushina VS, Chemeris NK, Fesenko EE. 1999b. Dependence of EHF EMF effects on the value of the static magnetic field. *Dokl Akad Nauk* 369: 404-407.
- García AM, Sisternas A, Hoyos SP. 2008. Occupational exposure to extremely low frequency electric and magnetic fields and Alzheimer disease: a meta-analysis. *Int J Epidemiol.* 37: 329-340.
- Geoffroy-Siraudin C, Loundou AD, Romain F, Achard V, Courbiere B, Perrad MH, et al. 2012. Decline of semen quality among 10932 males consulting for couple infertility over a 20-year period in Marseille, France. *Asian J Andol.* 14: 584-490.
- Goodman R, Lin-Ye A, Geddis MS, Wickramaratne PJ, Hodge SE, Pantazatos SP, et al. 2009. Extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields activate the ERK cascade, increase hsp70 protein levels and promote regeneration in *Planaria*. *Int J Radiat Biol* 85: 851-859.
- Grasso CM, D'Ascenzo M, Torsello A, Martinotti G, Wolf F, Cittadini A et al. 2004. Effects of 50 Hz electromagnetic fields on voltage-gated Ca^{2+} channels and their role in modulation of neuroendocrine cell proliferation and death. *Cell Calcium* 35: 307-315.
- Greenland S, Sheppard AR, Kaune WT, Poole C, Kelsh MA for the Childhood Leukemia-EMF Study Group. 2000. A pooled analysis of magnetic fields, wire codes, and childhood leukemia. *Epidemiology* 11: 624-634.
- Grell K, Frederiksen K, Schüz J, Cardis E, Armstrong B, Siemiatycki J et al. 2016. The intracranial distribution of gliomas in relation to exposure from mobile phones: Analyses from the INTERPHONE study. *Am J Epidemiol* 184: 818-828.
- Grigoriev YG, Grigoriev OA, Ivanov AA, Lyaginskaya AM, Merkulov AV, Stepanov VS, et al. 2010. Autoimmune process after long-term low-level exposure to electromagnetic field (experimental results). Part 1. Mobile communications and changes in electromagnetic conditions for the population: Need for additional substantiation of existing hygienic standards. *Biophysics* 55: 1041-1045.

- Ha M, Im H, Lee M, Kim HJ, Kim B-C, Kim B-C, Gimm Y-M and Pack J-K. 2007. Radio-frequency radiation exposure from AM radio transmitters and childhood leukemia and brain cancer. *Am J Epidemiol* 168: 270-279.
- Hallberg O, Oberfeld G. 2006. Letter to the editor: will we all become electrosensitive? *Electromagn Biol Med* 25: 189–191.
- Hardell L. 2017. World Health Organization, radiofrequency radiation and health – a hard nut to crack (Review). *Int J Oncol*.51: 405-413.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M, Söderqvist F, Hansson Mild K. 2013. Pooled analysis of case-control studies on acoustic neuroma diagnosed 1997-2003 and 2007-2009 and use of mobile and cordless phones. *Int J Oncol*. 43: 1036-1044.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M. 2014. Long-term mobile phone use and acoustic neuroma, *Epidemiology* 25: 778.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M. 2015. Mobile phone and cordless phone use and the risk for glioma – Analysis of pooled case-control studies in Sweden, 1997-2003 and 2007-2009. *Pathophysiology*. 22: 1-13.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M. 2017. Mobile phones, cordless phones and rates of brain tumors in different age groups in the Swedish National Inpatient Register and the Swedish Cancer Register during 1998-2015. *PLOS ONE* 2017;12(10):e0185461, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185461>.
- Hardell L, Näsman Å, Pålsson A, Hallquist A, Hansson Mild K. 1990. Use of cellular telephones and the risk for brain tumours: A case-control study. *Int J Oncol*. 15: 113-116.
- Hansson Mild K, Repacholi M, van Deventer E, Ravazzani P, eds. 2006. *Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity: Proceedings, International Workshop on EMF Hypersensitivity, Prague, Czech Republic, October 25-27, 2004. Geneva (Switzerland): WHO Press. p. 16.*
- Havas M. 2013. Radiation from wireless technology affects the blood, the heart, and the autonomic nervous system. *Rev Environ Health*. 28: 75-84.
- Hedendahl L, Carlberg M, Hardell L. 2015. Electromagnetic hypersensitivity - an increasing challenge to the medical profession. *Rev Environ Health* 30: 209-215.

- Heuser G, Heuser SA. 2017. Functional brain MRI in patients complaining of electrohypersensitivity after long term exposure to electromagnetic fields. *Rev Environ Health*. 32: 291-299.
- Ho VKY, Reijneveld JC, Enting RHBienfait HP, Robe P, Baumert BG, Visser O, on behalf of the Dutch Society of Neuro-Oncology. 2014. Changing incidence and improved survival of gliomas. *Eur J Cancer* 50: 2309-2318.
- Holmstrom KM, Finkel T. 2014. Cellular mechanisms and physiological consequences of redox-dependent signaling. *Nature Rev Mol Cell Biol*. 15: 411-421.
- Huang PC, Cheng MT, Guo HR. 2018. Representative survey on idiopathic environmental intolerance attributed to electromagnetic fields in Taiwan and comparison with the international literature. *Environ Health* 17: 5-12.
- Huber R, Treyer V, Schuderer J, Berthold T, Buck A, Kuster N, et al. 2005. Exposure to pulse-modulated radio frequency electromagnetic fields affects regional cerebral blood flow. *Eur J Neurosci*. 21: 1000-1006.
- Huber R, Treyer V, Borbély AA, Schuderer J, Gottselig JM, Landolt HP, et al. 2002. Electromagnetic fields, such as those from mobile phones, alter regional cerebral blood flow and sleep and waking EEG. *J Sleep Res*. 11: 289-295.
- Huss A, Peters S, Vermeulen R. 2018. Occupational exposure to extremely low-frequency magnetic fields and the risk of ALS: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bioelectromagnetics* 39: 156-163.
- IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). 2002. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans: Volume 80: *Non-ionizing radiation, Part 1: Static and extremely low-frequency (ELF) electric and magnetic fields*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. 341pp.
- IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer). 2013. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans: Volume 102: *Non-ionization radiation, Part 2: Radiofrequency electromagnetic fields*. IARC Press, Lyon, France 406 pp.

- IEG (Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones). 2000. Report of the group (the Stewart Report). Available at: www.iegmp.org.uk/report/index.htm.
- Interphone Study Group. 2011. Acoustic neuroma risk in relation to mobile telephone use: results of the INTERPHONE international case-control study. *Cancer Epidemiol* 35: 453-64.
- Interphone Study Group. 2010. Brain tumour risk in relation to mobile telephone use: results of the INTERPHONE international case-control study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 39: 675-694.
- Irigaray P, Garrel C, Houssay C, Mantello P, Belpomme D. 2018a. Beneficial effects of a fermented papaya preparation for the treatment of electrohypersensitivity self-reporting patients: results of a phase I-II clinical trial with special reference to cerebral pulsation measurement and oxidative stress analysis. *Funct Foods Health Dis* 8: 122-144.
- ISD (International Scientific Declaration on EHS & MCS). 2015. Brussels International Scientific Declaration on Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity and Multiple Chemical Sensitivity Following the 5th Paris Appeal Congress that took place on the 18th of May, 2015 at the Royal Academy of Medicine, Brussels, Belgium. Available from: http://eceri-institute.org/fichiers/1441982737_Statment_FR_DEFINITIF.pdf
- Jaffe LF, Nuccitelli R. 1977. Electrical controls of development. *Annu Rev Biophys Bioeng*. 6: 445-213.
- Jakovljevic M. 2014. The placebo-nocebo response: controversies and challenges from clinical and research perspective. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 24: 333-341.
- Ji Y, He Q, Sun Y, Tong J, Cao Y. 2016. Adaptive response in mouse bone-marrow stromal cells exposed to 900-MHz radiofrequency fields: Gamma-radiation-induce DNA strand breaks and repair. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 79: 419-426.
- Johansen C, Boice J Jr, McLaughlin J, Olsen J. 2001. Cellular telephones and cancer – a nationwide cohort study in Denmark. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 93: 203-207.
- Johansson A, Nordin S, Heiden M, Sandström M. 2010. Symptoms, personality traits, and stress in people with mobile phone-related symptoms and electromagnetic hypersensitivity. *J Psychosom Res*. 68: 37-45.

- Juutilainen J, Matilainen P, Saankoski S, Laara E, Suonio S. 1993. Early pregnancy loss and exposure to 50-Hz magnetic fields. *Bioelectromagnetics* 14: 229-236.
- Kabali HK, Irigoyen MM, Nunez-Davis R, Budacki JG, Mohanty SH, Leister KP, Bonner RL Jr. 2015. Exposure and use of mobile media devices by young children. *Pediatrics* 136: 1044-50.
- Kesari KK, Kumar S, Behari J. 2011. 900-MHz microwave radiation promotes oxidation in rat brain. *Electromagn Biol Med.* 30: 219-234.
- Kesari KK, Meena R, Nirala J, Kumaar J, Verma HN. 2014. Effect of 3G cell phone exposure with computer controlled 2-D stepper motor on non-thermal activation of the hsp27/p38MAPK stress pathway in rat brain. *Cell Biochem Biophys* 68: 347-358.
- Kheifets L, Repacholi M, Saunders R, van Deventer E. 2005. The sensitivity of children to electromagnetic fields. *Pediatrics.* 116: e303-313.
- Koivisto M, Revonsuo A, Krause C, Laarala C, Sillanmaki L et al. 2000. Effects of 902 MHz electromagnetic field emitted by cellular telephones on response times in humans. *Cog Neurosci Neuropsychol* 11: 413-415.
- Koyu A, Cesur G, Ozguner F, Akdogan M, Mollaoglu H, Ozen S. 2005. Effects of 900 MHz electromagnetic field on TSH and thyroid hormones in rats. *Toxicol Lett* 137: 257-262.
- Kumari K, Kolviato H, Viluksela M, Paidanius KMA, Maritinen M, Hilitunen M et al. 2017. Behavioral testing of mice exposed to intermediate frequency magnetic fields indicates mild memory impairment. *PLOS One* 12: e188880.
- Lai H, Singh NP. 1997. Melatonin and a spin-trap compound block radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation-induced DNA strand breaks in rat brain cells. *Bioelectromagnetics* 18: 446-454.
- Lai H, Singh N. 2004. Magnetic field-induced DNA strand breaks in brain cells of the rat. *Environ Health Perspect* 112: 687-694.

- Ledoigt G, Belpomme D. 2013. Cancer induction molecular pathways and HF-EMF irradiation. *Adv Biol Chem* 3: 177-186.
- Lee TMC, Ho SMY, Tsang LYH, Yang SYC, Li LSW, Chan CCH. 2001. Effect on human attention of exposure to the electromagnetic field emitted by mobile phones. *Cog Neurosci Neuropsychol* 12: 729-731.
- Lenhart A. 2015. Teens, social media & technology overview. Pew Research Center. Retrived from <http://pewinternet.org/2015/04/09/teens-social-media-technology.2015>.
- Leone L, Fusco S, Mastrodonato A, Piacentini R, Barbati SA, et al. 2014. Epigenetic modulation of adult hippocampal neurogenesis by extremely low-frequency electromagnetic fields. *Mol Neurobiol*. 49: 1472-1486.
- Lerchl A, Klose M, Grote K, Wilhelm AF, Spathmann O, Fiedler T, *et al.* 2015. Tumor promotion by exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields below exposure limits for humans. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun*.459: 585-590.
- Levin M. 2003. Bioelectromagnetics in morphogenesis. *Bioelectromagnetics* 24: 295–315.
- Levine H, Jorgensen N, Martino-Andrade A, Mendiola J, Weksler-Derri D, Mindlis I, et al. 2017. Temporal trends in sperm count: a systematic review and meta-regression analysis. *Human Reprod Update* 23: 646-659.
- Li DK, Chen H, Ferber JR, Odouli R, Quesenberry C. 2017. Exposure to magnetic field non-ionizing radiation and the risk of miscarriage: A prospective cohort study. *Sci Rep*. 7: 17541.
- Liburdy RP, Vanek PF, Jr. 1987. Microwaves and the cell membrane. III. Protein shedding is oxygen and temperature dependent: evidence for cation bridge involvement. *Radiat Res* 109: 382-395.
- Lin H, Blank M, Goodman R. 1999. A magnetic field-responsive domain in the human HSP70 promoter. *J Cell Biochem* 75: 170-6.
- Lin H, Blank M, Rossol-Haseroth K, Goodman R. 2001. Regulating genes with electromagnetic response elements. *J Cell Biochem* 81: 143-148.

- Luo Q, Jiang Y, Jin M, Xu J, Huang HF. 2013. Proteomic analysis on the alteration of protein expression in the early-stage placental villous tissue of electromagnetic fields associated with cell phone exposure. *Reprod Sci* 20: 1055-1061.
- Lyle DB, Schecher P, Adey WR, Lundak RL. 1983. Suppression of T-lymphocyte cytotoxicity following exposure to sinusoidally amplitude-modulated fields. *Bioelectromagnetics* 4: 281-292.
- Ma Q, Deng P, Zhu G, Liu C, Zhang L, Zhou Z, et al. 2014. Extremely low-frequency electromagnetic fields affect transcript levels of neuronal differentiation-related genes in embryonic neural stem cells. *PLoS One*. 9: e90041.
- Maffei ME. 2014. Magnetic field effects on plant growth, development, and evolution. *Front Plant Sci*. 5: 445. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2014.00445.
- Mahmoudabadi FS, Ziaei S, Firoozabadi M, Kazemnejad A. 2015. Use of mobile phone during pregnancy and the risk of spontaneous abortion. *J Environ Health Sci Eng*. 13:34. doi: 10.1186/s40201-015-0193-z.
- Maisch D. 2006. Conflict of interest & bias in health advisory committees: A case study of the WHO's Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Task Group. *J Aust Coll Nutr & Env Med*. 25: 15-17.
- Markov M, Grigoriev Y. 2015. Protect children from EMF. *Electromagn Biol Med* 34: 251-256.
- Markova E, Hillert L, Malmgren L, Persson BR, Belyaev Y. 2005. Microwaves from GSM mobile telephones affect 53BP1 and gamma-H2AX foci in human lymphocytes from hypersensitive and healthy persons. *Environ Health Perspect*. 113: 1172-1176.
- Markova E, Malmgren L, Belyaev I. 2010. Microwaves from mobile phones inhibit 53BP1 focus formation in human stem cells stronger than in differentiated cells: Possible mechanistic link to cancer risk. *Environ Health Perspect* 118: 394-399.
- Mashevich M. 2003. Exposure of human peripheral blood lymphocytes to electromagnetic fields associated with cellular phones leads to chromosomal instability. *Bioelectromagnetics* 24: 82-90.

- McCarty DE, Carrubba S, Chesson AL, Frilot C, Gonzalez-Toledo E, Marino AA. 2011. Electromagnetic hypersensitivity: evidence for a novel neurological syndrome. *Int J Neurosci*. 121: 670-676.
- McGill JJ and Agarwal A. 2014. The impact of cell phone, laptop computer, and microwave oven usage on male fertility. In: *Male Infertility: A Complete Guide to Lifestyle and Environmental Factors*. S.S. du Plessis et al., eds Springer Science + Business Media, New York. DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-1040-3_11.
- Medeiros LN, Sanchez TG. 2016. Tinnitus and cell phones: the role of electromagnetic radiofrequency radiation. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol*. 82: 97-104.
- Megha K, Deshmukh PS, Banerjee BD, Tripathi AK, Ahmed R, Abegaonkar MP. 2015. Low intensity microwave radiation induced oxidative stress, inflammatory response and DNA damage in rat brain. *Neurotoxicology* 51: 158-165.
- Michelozzi P, Capon A, Kirchmayer U, Forastiere F, Biggeri A, Barca A and Perucci CA. 2002. Adult and childhood leukemia near a high-power radio station in Rome. *Am J Epidemiol* 155: 1096-1103.
- Momoli F, Siemiatycki J, McBride ML, Parent ME, Richardson L, Bedard D, Platt R, et al. 2017. Probabilistic multiple-bias modelling applied to the Canadian data from the INTERPHONE study of mobile phone use and risk of glioma, meningioma, acoustic neuroma, and parotid gland tumors. *Am J Epidemiol*. 186: 885-893.
- Moon IS, Kim BG, Kim J, Lee JD, Lee WS. 2014. Association between vestibular schwannomas and mobile phone use. *Tumour Biol*. 35: 581-587.
- Mortavazi S, Habib A, Ganj-Karami A, Samimi-Doost R, Pour-Abedi A, Babaie A. 2009. Alterations in TSH and Thyroid Hormones following Mobile Phone Use. *Oman Med J*. 24: 274-278.
- Mousavy SJ, Riazzi GH, Kamarel M, Aliakbarian H, Sattarahmady N, Sharifzadeh A, et al. 2009. Effects of mobile phone radiofrequency on the structure and function of normal human haemoglobin. *Int J Biol Macromol*. 44: 278-285.
- Muehsam D, Lalezari P, Lekhraj R, Abruzzo P, Boiotta A, Marini M, et al. 2013. Non-thermal radio frequency and static magnetic fields increase rate of haemoglobin deoxygenation in a cell-free preparation. *PLOS ONE* 8: e61752.

- Nazıroğlu M, Yüksel M, Köse SA, Özkaya MO. 2013. Recent reports of Wi-Fi and mobile phone-induced radiation on oxidative stress and reproductive signaling pathways in females and males. *J Membr Biol*. 246: 869-875.
- Needleman HL, Gunnoe CG, Leviton A, Reed RR, Peresie H, Maher C, Barrett P. 1979. Deficits in psychologic and classroom performance of children with elevated dentine lead levels. *N Engl J Med* 300: 684-695.
- Nordal RA, Wong CS. 2005. Molecular targets in radiation-induced blood-brain barrier disruption. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 62: 279-287.
- Nordenson I, Mild KH, Andersson G, Sandström M. 1994. Chromosomal aberrations in human amniotic cells after intermittent exposure to fifty hertz magnetic fields. *Bioelectromagnetics*. 15: 293-301.
- Nordin S, Neely G, Olsson D, Sandström M. 2014. Odor and noise intolerance in persons with self-reported electromagnetic hypersensitivity. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 11: 8794-8805.
- Novoselova EG, Glushkova OV, Khrenov MO, Novoselova TV, Lunin SM, et al. 2017. Extremely low-level microwaves attenuate immune imbalance induced by inhalation exposure to low-level toluene in mice. *Int J Rad Bio* 93: 535-543.
- Odaci E, Hanci H, Okinci A, Fikret O, Sonmez F, Aslan A, et al. 2016. Maternal exposure to a continuous 900-MHz electromagnetic field provokes neuronal loss and pathological changes in cerebellum of 32-day female rat offspring. *J Clin Neuroanat*. 75: 105-110.
- Ohgaki H, Kleihues P. 2005. Population-based studies on incidence, survival rates, and genetic alterations in astocytic and oligodendroglial gliomas. *J Neuropath Exp Neurol*. 64: 479-489.
- Oscar KJ, Hawkins TD. 1977. Microwave alteration of the blood-brain barrier system of rats. *Brain Res*. 126: 281-293.
- Ostrom QT, Gittleman H, Fulo0 J, Liu M, Blanda R, Kromer C et al. 2015. CBTRUS statistical report: Primary brain and central nervous system tumors diagnosed in the United States in 2008-2012. *Neuro-Oncology* 17: iv1-iv62.

- Parini M, Lepetit JM, Dumas M, Tapie P, Lemoine J. 1984. Ultrasonic cerebral tomography. Application in 143 healthy subjects. *Aggressologie*. 25: 585-589.
- Park JE, Seo YK, Yoon HH, Kim CW, Park JK, Jeon S. 2014. Electromagnetic fields induce neural differentiation of human bone marrow derived mesenchymal stem cells via ROS mediated EGFR activation. *Neurochem Int* 62: 418-424.
- Pawlak K, Seehman B, Nieckarz Z. 2014. Plasma thyroid hormones and corticosterone levels in blood of chicken embryos and post-hatch chickens exposed during incubation to 1800 MHz electromagnetic fields. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health* 27: 114-122.
- Paz de la Puente M, Balmori A. 2007. Addiction to cell phones: are there neurophysiological mechanisms involved? *Proyecto* 61: 8-12, s. 8.
- Persson BRR, Salford LG, Brun A. 1997. Blood-brain barrier permeability in rats exposed to electromagnetic fields used in wireless communication. *Wireless Networks* 3: 455-461.
- Pettersson D, Mathiesen T, Prochazka M, Bergenheim T, Florentzon R, Harder H, et al. 2014. Long-term mobile phone use and acoustic neuroma risk. *Epidemiology* 25: 233-241.
- Philips A, Henshaw DL, Lamburn G, O'Carroll MJ. 2018. Brain tumours: rise in glioblastoma multiforme incidence in England 1995-2015 suggests an adverse environmental or lifestyle factor. *J Environ Public Health*, In press.
- Purlauastja S, Sorond P. 2012. Transcranial Doppler ultrasound: Technique and application. *Semin Neurol*. 32: 411-420.
- Qiu C, Fratiglioni L, Karp A, Winblad B, Bellander T. 2004. Occupational exposure to electromagnetic fields and risk of Alzheimer's disease. *Epidemiology* 15: 687-94.
- Rea WJ, Pan Y, Fenyves EF, Sujisawa I, Suyama H, et al, 1991. Electromagnetic field sensitivity. *J Bioelectricity* 10: 214-256.
- RNCNIRP (Russian National Committee on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection). 2011. Resolution: Electromagnetic Fields from Mobile Phones: Health Effect on

- Children and Teenagers. 19th April 2011. Available at:
http://iemfa.org/images/pdf/RNCNIRP_Resolution_2011.pdf.
- Roberts JA, Yaya LH, Manolis C. 2014. The invisible addiction: cell-phone activities and addiction among male and female college students. *J Behav Addict* 3: 254-65.
- Rodrequez-De la Fuente AO, Alcocer-Gonzalez JM, Heredia-Rojas JA, Rodriquez-Padilla C, Rodriquez-Flores LE et al. 2010. Effect of 60 Hz electromagnetic fields on the activity of hsp70 promotoer: an *in vivo* study. *Cell Biol Int Rep*. 19: e00014.
- Rolland M, Le Moal J, Wagner V, Royere D, and De Mouzon J. 2013. Decline in semen concentration and morphology in a sample of 26,609 men close to general population between 1989 and 2005 in Europe. *Human Reprod* 28: 462-270.
- Röösli M. 2008. Radiofrequency electromagnetic field exposure and non-specific symptoms of ill health: a systematic review. *Environ Res*. 107: 277-287.
- Roshangar L, Hamdi BA, Khaki AA, Rad JS, Soleimani-Rad S. 2014. Effect of low-frequency electromagnetic field exposure on oocyte differentiation and follicular development. *Adv Biomed Res* 3: 76.
- Roux D, Vian A, Girard S, Bonnet P, Paladian F, Davies E, et al. 2008. High frequency (900 MHz) low amplitude (5 V m⁻¹) electromagnetic field: a genuine environmental stimulus that affects transcription, translation, calcium and energy charge in tomato. *Planta*. 227: 883–891.
- Rubin GJ, Hillert L, Nieto-Hernandez R, van Rongen E, Oftedal G. 2011. Do people with idiopathic environmental intolerance attributed to electromagnetic fields display physiological effects when exposed to electromagnetic fields? A systematic review of provocation studies. *Bioelectromagnetics* 32: 593-609.
- Sadetzki S, Chetrit A, Jarus-Hakak A, Cardis E, Deutch Y, Duvdevani Sh, et al., 2007. Cellular phone use and risk of benign and malignant parotid gland tumors – A nationwide case-control study. *Am J Epidemiol* 167: 457-467.
- Sage C, Burgio E. 2017. Electromagnetic fields, pulsed radiofrequency radiation, and epigenetics: How wireless technologies may affect childhood development. *Child Develop* doi:10.1111/cdev.12824.

- Saili L, Hanini A, Smirani C, Azzouz I, Azzouz A, Sakly M, et al. 2015. Effects of acute exposure to WiFi signals (2.45GHz) on heart variability and blood pressure in albino rabbits. *Environ Toxicol Pharmacol*. 40: 600-605.
- Sannino A, Zeni O, Sarti M, Romeo S, Reddy SB, et al. 2011. Induction of adaptive response in human blood lymphocytes exposed to 900 MHz radiofrequency fields: influence of cell cycle. *Int J Radiat Biol* 87: 993-999.
- Sannino A, Zeni O, Romeo S, Massa R, Gialanella G, Grossi G, Manti L, Vijayalaxmi, Scarfi MR. 2014. Adaptive response in human blood lymphocytes exposed to non-ionizing radiofrequency fields: resistance to ionizing radiation-induced damage. *J Radiat Res* 55: 210-217.
- Santini R, Seigne M, Bonhomme-Faivre L, Bouffet S, Defrasme E, Sage M. 2001. Symptoms experienced by users of digital cellular phones: a study of a French engineering school. *Electromagn Biol Med*. 21: 81-88.
- Santini R, Santini P, Le Ruz P, Danze JM, Seigne M. 2003. Survey study of people living in the vicinity of cellular phone base. *Electromagn Biol Med*. 22: 41-49.
- Sato Y, Akiba S, Kubo O, Yamaguchi N. 2011. A case-case study of mobile phone use and acoustic neuroma risk in Japan. *Bioelectromagnetics* 32: 85-93.
- SCENIHR (Scientific Committee on Emerging Newly Identified Health Risk). 2009. Health effects of exposure to EMF. European Commission, Directorate-General for Health & Consumers. 19 January 2009.
- Schwartz C, Kratochvil E, Pilger A, Kuster N, Adlkofer F, Rudiger HW. 2008. Radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (UMTS, 1,950 MHz) induce genotoxic effects *in vitro* in human fibroblasts but not in lymphocytes. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 81: 755-767.
- Schüz J, Jacobsen R, Olsen JH, Boice JD Jr, McLaughlin JK, et al. 2006. Cellular telephone use and cancer risk: update of a nationwide Danish cohort. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 98: 1707-1713.
- Semin I A. 1995. Changes in secondary structure of DNA under the influence of electromagnetic fields. *Radiats Biol Radioecol*. 35: 36-41.

- Shahin S, Banerjee S, Swarup V, Singh SP, Chaturvedi CM. 2017. 2.45 GHz microwave radiation impairs hippocampal learning and spatial memory: Involvement of local stress mechanism induced suppression of iGluR/ERK/CREB signaling. *Toxicol Sci* 161: 349-374.
- Sirav B, Seyhan N. 2009. Blood-brain barrier disruption by continuous-wave radio frequency radiation. *Electromagnetic Bio Med* 28: 213-222.
- Sirav B, Seyhan N. 2016. Effects of GSM modulated radio-frequency electromagnetic radiation on permeability of blood-brain barrier in male & female rats. *J Chem Neuroanat* 75: 123-127.
- Sly JL, Carpenter DO. 2012. Special vulnerability of children to environmental exposures. *Rev Environ Health* 27: 151-157.
- Smith-Roe SL, Wyde ME, Stout MD, Winters JW, Hobbs CA, Shepard KG, et al. 2017. Evaluation of the genotoxicity of cell phone radiofrequency radiation in male and female rats and mice following subchronic exposure. Environmental Mutagenesis and Genomics Society, Annual Meeting, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA September 9-13.
- Sobel E, Dunn M, Davanipour Z, Qian Z, Chui HC. 1996. Elevated risk of Alzheimer's disease among workers with likely electromagnetic field exposure. *Neurology* 47:1477-1481.
- Söderqvist F, Carlberg M, Hardell L. 2012a. Review of four publications on the Danish cohort study on mobile phone subscribers and risk of brain tumors. *Rev Env Health*. 27: 51-58.
- Söderqvist F, Carlberg M, Hardell L. 2012b. Use of wireless phones and risk of salivary gland tumours: a case-control study. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 21: 576-579.
- Sonmez OF, Odaci E, Bas O, Kaplan S. 2010. Purkinje cell number decreases in the adult female rat cerebellum following exposure to 90 MHz electromagnetic fields. *Brain Res* 1356: 95-101.
- Spadaro JA, Bergstrom WH. 2002. *In vivo* and *in vitro* effects of a pulsed electromagnetic field on net calcium flux in rat clavicular bone. *Calcif Tissue Int*. 70: 496-502.

- Starkey SJ. 2016. Inaccurate official assessment of radiofrequency safety by the Advisory Group on Non-ionizing radiation. *Rev Environ Health* 31: 493-501.
- State of California. 2017. How to reduce exposure to radiofrequency energy from cell phones. Division of Environmental and Occupational Disease Control, California Department of Public Health, December, 2017.
- Sun ZC, Ge JL, Guo B, Guo J, Hao M, Wu YC et al. 2016. Extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields facilitate vesicle endocytosis by increasing presynaptic calcium channel expression at a central synapse. *Sci Rep* 6: 21774
- Tice RR, Hook GG, Donner M, McRee DI, Guy AW. 2002. Genotoxicity of radiofrequency signals. 1. Investigation of DNA damage and micronuclei induction in cultured human blood cells. *Bioelectromagnetics* 23: 113-128.
- Tillmann T, Ernst H, Streckert J, Zhou, Y, Taugner F, Hansen V, et al. 2010. Indication of cocarcinogenic potential of chronic UMTS-modulated radiofrequency exposure in an ethylnitrosourea mouse model. *Int J Radiat Biol.* 86: 529-541.
- Vijayalaxmi, Pridoda TJ. 2009. Genetic damage in mammalian somatic cells exposed to extremely low frequency electro-magnetic fields: A meta-analysis of data from 87 publications (1990-2007). *Int J Radiat Biol.* 85: 196-213.
- Vijayalaxmi, Reddy AB, McKenzie RJ, McIntosh RL, Prihoda TJ, Wood AW. 2013. Incidence of micronuclei in human peripheral blood lymphocytes exposed to modulated and unmodulated 2450 MHz radiofrequency fields. *Bioelectromagnetics* 34: 542-548.
- Vojisavljevic V, Pirogova E, Cosic I. 2010. Review of studies on modulating enzyme activity by low intensity electromagnetic radiation. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 835-838.
- Volkow ND, Tomasi D, Wang GF, Vaska P, Fowler JS, Teland F, et al. 2011. Effects of cell phone radiofrequency signal exposure on brain glucose metabolism. *J Amer Med Assoc* 305: 808-814.
- Wang J, Su H, Xie W, Yu S. 2017. Mobile phone use and the risk of headache: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional studies. *Sci Rep* 7: 12595.

- Wei J, Sun J, Xu H, Shi L, Sun L, Zhang J. 2015. Effects of extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields on intracellular calcium transients in cardiomyocytes. *Electromagn Biol Med* 34: 77-84.
- Wei LX, Goodman R, Henderson A. 1990. Changes in levels of c-myc and histone H2B following exposure of cells to low frequency sinusoidal electromagnetic fields: Evidence for a window effect. *Bioelectromagnetics* 11: 269-272.
- West JG, Kopoor NS, Liao S-Y, Chen JW, Bailey L, Nagourney RA. 2013. Multifocal breast cancer in young women with prolonged contact between their breast and their cellular phones. *Case Report Med* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/354682>.
- WHO (World Health Organization) 2005. WHO Fact Sheet No. 296. Electromagnetic Fields and Public Health, Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity. Available from: <http://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/fs296/en/>
- WHO (World Health Organization) 2014. Electromagnetic fields and public health: mobile phones. Fact sheet No. 193, reviewed October, 2014
- Wolf FI, Torsello A, Tedesco B, Fasanella S, Boninsegna A, D'Ascenzo M. et al. 2007. 50-Hz extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields enhance cell proliferation and DNA damage: possible involvement of a redox mechanism. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1743: 120-129.
- Wyde M, Cesta M, Blystone C, Elmore S, Foster P, Hooth M, *et al.* 2016. Report of Partial Findings from the National Toxicology Program Carcinogenesis Studies of Cell Phone Radiofrequency Radiation in Hsd: Sprague Dawley® SD rats (Whole Body Exposures). Draft 5-19-2016. US National Toxicology Program (NTP). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/055699>. Available online: <http://biorxiv.org/content/biorxiv/early/2016/05/26/055699.full.pdf> (accessed on 30 July, 2017).
- Yan HG, Agresti M, Zhang LL, Yan Y, Mathoul HS. 2008. Upregulation of specific mRNA levels in rat brain after cell phone exposure. *Electromag Biol Med*. 27: 147-154.
- Yang XS, He GL, Hao YT, Xiao Y, Chen CH, Zhang GB, et al. 2012. Exposure to 2.45 GHz electromagnetic fields elicits an HSP-related stress response in rat hippocampus. *Brain Res Bull* 88: 371-278.

- 2155
2156 Yang Y, Jin X, Yn C, Tian Y, Tang J, Shen X. 2008. Case-only study of
2157 interactions between DNA repair genes (hMLH1, APEX1, MGMT, XRCC1 and
2158 XPD) and low-frequency electromagnetic fields in childhood acute leukemia.
2159 Leuk Lymph 49: 2344-2350.
2160
2161 Zhang X, Liu X, Pan L, Lee I. 2010. Magnetic fields at extremely low-frequency
2162 (50 Hz, 0.8 mT) can induce the uptake of intracellular calcium levels in
2163 osteoblasts. Biochem Biophy Res Comm. 396: 662-666.
2164
2165 Zhang Y, Li Z, Gao Y, Zhang C. 2015. Effects of fetal microwave radiation
2166 exposure on offspring behavior in mice. J Radiat Res 56: 261-268.
2167
2168
2169

Highlights:

Exposure to electromagnetic fields at low intensities that do not cause tissue heating has increased dramatically over the past several decades.

Electromagnetic fields at low and non-thermal intensities increase risk of cancer in animals and humans.

Some individuals are particularly sensitive to exposure to electromagnetic fields and develop a syndrome of electrohypersensitivity.

There is an urgent need to recognize hazards associated with excessive exposure to low intensity, non-thermal levels of electromagnetic fields.

Capsule:

Excessive exposure to electromagnetic fields at low intensities that do not cause tissue heating is associated with increased risk of cancer, electrohypersensitivity and other diseases.