Public Comment: Mechanism-Resolved RF/EMF Research Priorities

Docket HHS-OASH-2026-0397 | October 21, 2026 | Independent researcher

Purpose

I recommend a federal research program designed to distinguish reproducible biological responses to radiofrequency electromagnetic field (RF/EMF) exposure from confounding physical stimuli and to test competing causal mechanisms. Exposure, response, and mechanism are distinct evidentiary claims. This proposal sets out testable research priorities; it does not assert that RF/EMF causes neurovascular injury or that combined acoustic/RF effects have been demonstrated.

Experimental design

Use a randomized factorial design with four core conditions: sham, acoustic exposure only, RF exposure only, and combined acoustic plus RF exposure. Incorporate independent controls for heating, mechanical vibration, equipment emissions, handling, and observer bias. Where appropriate, use dose and pulse-timing gradients. Prespecify the statistical interaction contrast so that an effect in the combined condition is not mistaken for synergy without evidence that it exceeds the expected additive response.

Exposure characterization

For RF exposures, document carrier frequency, calibrated field strength, power density or specific absorption rate as appropriate, pulse shape, modulation, repetition frequency, duty cycle, geometry, duration, and spatial distribution. For acoustic exposures, document pressure or intensity, spectrum, timing, geometry, and vibration coupling. Record thermal changes and instrument uncertainty. Publish sufficient waveform and calibration data to enable independent replication.

Biological outcomes and mechanistic tests

Prespecify primary endpoints such as endothelial barrier permeability and viability, with secondary endpoints potentially including calcium signaling, inflammatory responses, barrier-protein localization, and measures of neurovascular function. Mechanosensitive ion channels, integrin-associated signaling, and endothelial regulatory pathways are candidates for investigation, not established mediators of RF-induced injury. Use pharmacological or genetic interventions where feasible, while accounting for off-target effects.

Validity and falsification

Require allocation concealment, blinded assessment, suitable positive and negative controls, power calculations, preregistered analyses, and independent replication. A proposed interaction mechanism would be weakened if effects fail to reproduce, disappear with adequate artifact controls, lack a coherent exposure-response pattern, or persist despite disruption of its hypothesized pathway. Null findings should be made public.

Coordination and data infrastructure

HHS and relevant federal research agencies should establish interoperable reporting standards and an open reference dataset connecting exposure records, instrument calibration, biological outcomes, and protocol metadata. Mechanistic laboratory studies, human observational research, and clinical attribution should be evaluated as different evidentiary levels. NIH, FDA, and CDC expertise could be coordinated according to their respective research

and public-health roles.

Conclusion

The desired outcome is neither blanket reassurance nor predetermined hazard attribution. It is a reproducible research infrastructure capable of identifying which exposure-associated effects exist, under what conditions, through which mechanisms, and with what relevance to human health.