

15 years of research on biomedical effects of high-frequency mobile communication fields




A story of success or an endless story?

Extract from the Newsletter 3/2007 with additional information and bibliographical references

It is worthwhile to take a look back at the past 15 years of research on potential health effects of high-frequency fields in order to draw conclusions and perhaps define new tasks. However, many of the topics and hypotheses investigated over the last 15 years have been identified earlier, therefore a look at older publications is inevitable. Most problems in the meanwhile were scientifically investigated and solved as required. Yet gaps and unclarities are repeatedly pointed out, generating discussion and uncertainty in the public sphere. Even though the research on biomedical effects of high-frequency fields has not begun with the era of mobile phones³⁴, the annual number of publications in international scientific journals is distinctly increasing (fig. 1). In contrast, the number of publications on effects of alternate current low-frequency fields on biological systems is decreasing after a maximum in 1998.

by Roland Glaser

Fig. 1: Trend lines of the annual distribution of 960 publications on biological effects of EMF in the frequency range between 0.3 and 3 GHz (UHF) (red) and of 1446 investigations regarding the power frequency (50 and 60 Hz, respectively) (black) over the past 15 years.



Of course, this trend is mainly caused by the increasing relevance of the high-frequency issue as a consequence of the wide distribution of mobile phones and other forms of high-frequency data transfer. As a result, there was a corresponding reorientation of research funds.

This paper is not focused on the quantitative analysis of this situation but rather on the contents of research and the results that have become available over the past 15 years. This will be done exemplarily, related to the main trends of the development. One specific trait of this field are the extremely high requirements to interdisciplinary competence – beginning at the proper handling of elaborate field application technology and dosimetry, knowledgeable experience in animal care and cell biology, know-

ledge of biomolecular aspects, and finally resulting in medical evaluation of the observed biological effects. Special knowledge is required, associated with an urgent need of interdisciplinary cooperation. Research in earlier years often suffered from the fact that biologically oriented working groups used primitive electronics, whereas groups with technical background had a naive understanding of biological concepts. Although such dubious experiments are published even to day, the faulty results of them making a huge splash, a distinct trend to high-quality multidisciplinary research has been observed over the last decades, which, increasingly, is based also on multinational cooperation.

The development of application systems and dosimetry

While there is no difference regarding biomedical analysis techniques in investigations between low-frequency and high-frequency EMF, the technical requirements are much higher regarding the RF range. Biological experiments in the GHz range require considerable technical and thus also financial expenditure, beginning with generators, via amplifiers up to defined transmission systems in an anechoic environment. It is not sufficient to place a mobile phone near a Petri dish, as, unfortunately, is done sometimes even in recent publications (e.g. 25, 79, 80, 99). Experimental data can only be taken seriously in research today, if technically accurate application conditions and a corresponding dosimetry are used.

There are several cases in the reporting period, where there was no evidence anymore for originally found biological effects in repeat studies after correction of application conditions. As an example, we should mention the investigations on the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans*. There was no evidence anymore of the expression of a heat shock protein (Hsp16) (termed “non-thermal”) at SARs of 1 mW/kg¹⁷ after correction of the application system¹⁸. The – correctly measured – effect was caused by heating of the extremely temperature-sensitive animals. Also the spectacular findings regarding tumor promotion at exposure to 900-MHz fields in transgenic mice⁸⁴ had to be revised after the method of field application had been made more precise⁹³.

In both cases, the working groups themselves revised their results. Unfortunately, these are exceptions. Mostly the results of one laboratory are denied by repeat studies of others. This frequently is interpreted as a case of conflicting opinions by outsiders. At best, a philosophical thesis can be “refuted“. An experimental finding can raise doubts, if it is not reproducible, but it cannot be “refuted“. It is only the evidence of methodological errors, as far as they can be recognized at all from the publication of results, that can explain the fruitless attempts to replicate an experimental finding and enhance the probability that the result is wrong. In spite of that – and unfortunately, there are many examples for that – faulty measurements frequently are used argumentatively by some campaigners. The neglect of methodological diligence still is a major source of false conclusions⁴⁶. Unfounded concerns of citizens are repeatedly caused this way, intensified by corresponding press campaigns.

Accurate knowledge through the use of modern biomedical analysis techniques

Of course there is clear methodological progress not only regarding RF technology, but also concerning methods of biomedical analysis. While the former has to be seen mainly as the use of already existing technical knowledge for the development of applicators and dosimetric methods, bioelectromagnetic research directly profits from the rapid development of biomedical techniques in general.

Examples are the development of HTS technologies (High Throughput Screening Technologies), a group of methods in biomolecular analysis allowing to get a huge number

of biomolecular data from smallest samples⁶² in very short time. However, great diligence regarding the statistical verification of results is required here as well. Premature conclusions regarding the possible expression of stress proteins and their potential cancer risk⁶¹ had to be withdrawn later^{45, 48, 94}. Only precise knowledge about the physiological variability of these complex parameters, associated with the conduct of positive controls allow to correctly interpret possible alterations in the exposed system. The fast determination of a large amount of data alone is not sufficient.

In this context also the discussion about the experiments should be mentioned, where it was concluded that DNA damages in human fibroblasts²⁰ were caused by RF fields near the upper limit. The authors of this paper referred to results obtained by the so-called comet assay, an electrophoretic test routinely used for the detection of DNA strand breaks. This test, especially if the evaluation is made manually and not automatically as in these experiments, is not per se sufficient for drawing far-reaching conclusions. It also indicates aberrations in the regular cell cycle⁹⁵. Conclusions could only be legitimized by evidence of other consequences of this process. Attempts to reproduce the results by means of an improved technique had no result⁸⁹.

The investigation of possible effects of high-frequency electromagnetic fields on the cognitive performance of humans, their reaction time, but also their sleep behavior, profited a lot from the general development of neurophysiology and its methods. On one hand, this concerns EEG measurements, but also the possibility to make blood flow alterations visible by means of Positron Resonance Tomography (PET)^{51, 52}. Unfortunately, by technical reason, many of those methods can not be used during RF exposure¹⁴. Surprisingly, many of such investigations show unreproducible effects. In some cases, the research groups failed to reproduce their own results (e.g. Röschke⁸⁵ versus Wagner⁹⁷; Eulitz^{24, 39} versus Hamblin⁴⁰). In contrast to the examples above mentioned however, in most cases this does not seem to be a result of technical lacks or of lacking diligence of the experimenters, but are caused by the system behavior itself. The conclusion was that not the exposure of a mobile phone base station near by, but sometimes the fields of a mobile phone at the ear can affect the brain. This influence however, obviously depends on the physiological state of the volunteer and keeps within neurophysiological day-to-day variations. Initial allegations that such measurements would show adverse health effects⁵⁶ are untenable, though. Nevertheless the mechanisms leading to such effects should be checked. Krause et al.⁵⁸ assume that responses to a slight cortical heating were behind this effect, indicated also by local changes in blood flow, as measured by PET⁵¹. Obviously, the sensitivity of the system of physiological thermoreception is still underestimated³³.

The road of epidemiological research

There has been a distinct increase in the number of epidemiological studies on possible effects of mobile radio fields over the last years, which, of course, is also due to the rapidly increasing use of corresponding devices. At the same time, there is also a clear trend to concretize results and eliminate wrong decisions.

Epidemiological studies on possible health consequences of high-frequency field exposure began by observation of occupationally exposed persons, like workers for broadcasting stations, radar and flight staff, especially in the military sector. So the study of Szmigielski⁹² on alleged cancer cases in the Polish military due to field exposure, which was discussed very intensely and controversially. Surveys on occupational exposure to RF fields however did not show a clear association, mainly due to the lacking dosimetry as well as the different and, in part, very strong confounders, i.e. the influence of other specific occupational agents^{11, 22, 23, 55}.

It was only in the nineties that studies on the possible consequences of high-frequency exposure of the population were published. For example, a possible association between child leukemia and the vicinity of radio and television towers was investigated^{21, 49, 69, 70}. Rothman et al.⁸⁶ for the first time stressed the need for epidemiological investigations of a possible link between RF exposure and brain tumors, at the same time pointing out the methodological problems of this endeavor.

It was only at the end of the nineties that epidemiological research directly focused on potential effects of mobile phones. The first case-control study on a possible association with the occurrence of brain tumors probably is that of Hardell et al.⁴³ from 1999. In the subsequent years some other case-control studies were published, but they did not allow to draw distinct conclusions^{42, 43, 54, 72, 74, 75, 100}. Moreover there were publications addressing the lack of physical well-being and other general symptoms related to living in the vicinity of mobile phone base stations^{7, 76}. These studies, however, often had serious methodological flaws.

A comprehensive summary of the situation was compiled by five members of the ICNIRP Standing Committee on Epidemiology⁵. They concluded that, until 2004, epidemiological findings did not provide conclusive and convincing evidence for a causal association between exposure to high-frequency fields and any serious health damage. At the same time, possible sources of error were pointed out both regarding statistics and dosimetry. Repeatedly, there is the problem of small numbers. If only about an average of 10-15 persons out of 100,000 per year get a brain tumor, this, naturally, is not sufficient for a statistically verified survey. Another problem are the so-called “confounders“, the wealth of mostly not detected and often not detectable causes of health disturbances our modern environment is known for.

All this critique has led to a clear improvement of new epidemiological surveys, partially using the data of cancer registries^{13, 59, 67, 68}. The investigations of recent years are remarkable insofar as the international cooperation led to an increase in case numbers. An example is the INTERPHONE study involving 13 countries.

Though none of the studies so far has been able to give evidence of an influence of mobile communication base stations or mobile phones on well-being or health, nearly all of these publications end by stating that “further investigations are necessary“. This may be due to the principal uncertainty of all findings, but also the concerns still existing over longterm effects, although we are better able today to identify faults and give recommendations on the type of research to be done^{77, 87, 96}.

Models and hypotheses on possible biophysical interaction mechanisms of high-frequency electromagnetic fields

Others already reported in depth on primary processes of high-frequency electromagnetic field effects³⁴. Here, the developments of the last two decades shall be outlined and tendencies shall be made visible.

“*Hypotheses non fingo*“ – (I don't invent hypotheses) Newton said, thereby pointing out the relation between experiment and theory. In EMF research, this relation is obvious: Alleged field effects repeatedly encouraged biophysicians to think about mechanisms. On the other hand, new experiments were stimulated by theoretical models. This interaction between theory and experiment results either in a spiral, asymptotically approaching the point of reality or, if objective reality does not support the theory, an endless cycle, which gradually peters out.

In the case of dielectrophoresis and electrorotation there was a spiral of success: experiment and theory led to insights that have their firm place today in biotechnology^{31, 35}. These two non-thermal processes of polarization caused by high-frequency

fields however require field strengths, several magnitudes above the legally prescribed limits, and therefore are without relevance for the topic of this contribution. Unfortunately, the research on lower-intensity RF fields points in the other direction at present. This may be illustrated by two examples.

The first example is connected with the “cyclotron resonance” hypothesis of A. R. Liboff, first referring to the interaction of the static magnetic field and low-frequency EMF⁶³, later also to low-frequency modulated RF fields. The experiments of the laboratory of Ross Adey, due to which high-frequency fields (147 MHz) affected the calcium metabolism of the brain, if they were modulated with 16 Hz^{8, 10}, were especially spectacular. Already in 1982 however, Merritt and Shelton⁷¹ had denied the findings of this group as being methodologically flawed and unreproducible. The impact of modulated high-frequency fields on the calcium signaling pathway in lymphocytes postulated by Bawin and Blackman could not be reproduced¹⁵. The hypothesis in the meantime was shown to be unrealistic, not only in experiment, but also physically¹. Independent of this, it became clear that low-frequency cannot be the result of a demodulation of high-frequency fields by the biological system²⁸. So this approach, promoted by many publications, petered out. The Bawin publication is still sometimes cited uncritically by certain outsider groups, if them seems useful.

The second example relates to the theory of coherent excitation of H. Fröhlich, to whom a special symposium was devoted in 1982 in Bad Neuenahr.³⁰ This theory and their predicted sharp resonance windows in the GHz range could neither be verified in experiment nor theoretically^{36, 37}, despite initial experimental evidence³⁸.

Related to these concepts are also the tests of T. Litovitz, who postulated a „coherence time“, a short time that was needed to adapt the low-frequency coherence at HF-modulations in the biological system⁶⁶. He still insisted on his concept of the impact of low-frequency window effects^{73, 81} on ornithine decarboxylase (ODC), even after all attempts of other laboratories to reproduce this had failed [e.g.⁶] (especially on this controversy see^{32, 65}).

Decisive progress made in the past decade is reflected in the statement – which was experimentally and theoretically confirmed – that there can be no resonant energy accumulation of high-frequency oscillations due to the strong viscosity reducing effects in the watery milieu^{2, 3, 12, 26, 82, 83}. Thus the arguments for the existence of sharp frequency windows of high-frequency effects do not apply anymore either.

Neither the originally suspected induction of calcium signals nor the ODC findings^{19, 45, 50}, nor the initially alleged changes in the melatonin metabolism^{44, 90, 101} could be confirmed. Many of these findings were based on the methods of fluorescent microscopy. It is often overlooked that the cells are sometimes exposed to UV radiation here, producing clearer effects than high-frequency fields⁵³.

In recent years, an influence of high-frequency EMF on the complicated system of the elimination of reactive oxygen species (ROS) of the cellular metabolism, suspected already in 1985⁶⁴, has been controversially discussed again^{25, 29, 57, 60, 78, 88, 102}. There is no plausible biophysical mechanism supporting this hypothesis. The future will show whether the measurements can be verified or whether those will be right who see the biological variability of this system and the uncertainty of the analysis technique as the cause of to-date findings.

Summing up this paragraph, the conclusion must be that the 15 years of this reporting period were a time of clearing up unrealistic hypotheses. Recalling Newton’s “*Hypotheses non fingo*“, the question is allowed: What undeniable experimental effects do still require a biophysical explanation today?

“Non-thermal“ or “subtle thermal“ effects?

When looking at the neurological measurements initially listed, including their variability, as well as the repeatedly published results on the occurrence of heat shock proteins^{16, 91}, one comes back to thermal effects of high-frequency fields, even if they are not always measurable as a temperature increase. It seems very clear regarding heat shock proteins, as many recent findings show, that this cellular response in fact can be expected only when thermal stress occurs^{47, 88, 98}.

The term „non-thermal effect“ has a populist undertone, as it suggests that there were secretive, still undiscovered adverse health effects of electromagnetic fields, not having been considered in the setting of limits. Laypersons can be easily convinced that electrical oscillations may attack all kinds of charges, thereby causing unimaginable damage in the biological system. But the problem are not these effects per se, which undeniably exist, but rather the dosimetry and the question whether these oscillations disappear to the noise and unspecifically dissipate to heat, i.e. eventually are “thermal“, or whether these smallest amounts of energy could have specific biological effects before their dissipation.

This question is as old as the research on the impact of electromagnetic fields itself, going back to the end of the 19th century³⁴. The past years have greatly contributed to clarification through scientific publications and, especially, through discussion during special conferences.

Initially we reported that some “non-thermal“ effects disappear after correction of the application system, because they were just the results of uncontrolled heating. But even when neglecting the results of publications providing evidence of heating effects or at least corresponding suspicions, a number of findings remain which are not as easily explained by measurable heating. Progress made in the field of thermosensitive ion channels and so-called “riboswitches“ however has shown in the past decade that, in many cells, these molecular thermometers respond so sensitively in certain temperature ranges, possibly releasing biochemical signal chains, that macroscopically changes in temperature are not measurable^{27, 33}. The result of such responses can be both special protein expressions, as well as local changes in blood flow, which could lead to measurable alterations in the EEG. As these responses however are also dependent of different other physiological parameters, the difficulty to reproduce these neurological effects becomes clear.

Hence “non-thermal“ effects really are to be termed „subtle thermal“, i.e. minimal thermal day-to-day effects. They even occur when a man is sweating on a summer day, enjoying the relaxing warm water of a shower, or his thermoregulation is otherwise activated. Of course, the biophysicist is interested in each effect of high-frequency fields on the biological system for which there is clear evidence, the radiation protection scientist on his part must notice only influences which are health-relevant. The statement of Bernhardt published already in 1999 was corroborated⁹: “A possible pathological relevance of to-date available reports on so-called non-thermal effects is purely speculative at present.“

Conclusions

It seems obvious to come to the following statement: “The problem is solved. Science has proved that there are no adverse health effects of mobile communication fields within legal limits.“ – Unfortunately, this is true only to a certain extent: science cannot prove the non-existence of a process or phenomenon. So, the conclusion would have to be: “Last decade’s research, could clear up many errors regarding effects of high-frequency fields, and despite global efforts to date no reproducible evidence could be found for a health risk from these fields within valid limits.“

As EMF is no agent which concerns only a minor percentage of the population, but each citizen of the civilized world is exposed to nowadays to a different degree qualitatively and quantitatively, we cannot be content with this conclusion.

The following activities in this field seem of future relevance to the author:

- The technical application of high-frequency fields is developing rapidly, thus qualitatively und quantitatively increasing the general exposure. Although narrow window effects for special frequencies and intensities of high-frequency fields could not be found until now, certainly different interaction mechanisms can be expected for the broad frequency range of 0.1 to 10 GHz at greater intensities. This results in the obligation to reassess all technological innovations regarding health consequences of applied intensities, frequencies and modulations and, possibly, initiate new research projects in order to exclude potential health-relevant effects.
- The quantitative increase in the number of scientific publications shown in fig. 1 requires greater attention. As repeatedly experiments are published, which were performed without reliable dosimetry, double-blind evaluations and positive control, i.e. which are of lacking quality regarding modern technology and therefore are often faulty, attentive quality control is required. Unfortunately, there are many examples for results of superficial experiments or flawed performance of experiments that, accentuated by the press, led to spectacular reactions in the public. Research projects worth millions were needed, eventually failing to disqualify these results, even if they were not confirmed and sources of error were pointed out. Permanent control and instruction are needed to prevent this. Diligent observation of research activities and a well-coordinated international cooperation are a means to this end.
- It is an important and continuing task to counter unfounded concerns of citizens over possible dangers of high-frequency fields by objective information. In this respect it is even important to check the above-mentioned effects, which really are within day-to-day alterations without any health-relevance. Only by knowing the mechanism of such day-to-day effects a scientific extrapolation and assessment of exposures in general can be done.

References

1. Adair RK: A physical analysis of the ion parametric resonance model. *Bioelectromagnetics* 19 (1998) 181-191.
2. Adair RK: Vibrational Resonances in biological systems at microwave frequencies. *Biophys. J.* 82 (2002) 1147-1152.
3. Adair RK: Comment on the comment by Dr. Marino and Dr. Frilot on "proposed test for detection of nonlinear response in biological preparations exposed to RF energy". *Bioelectromagnetics* 24 (2003) 440-441.
4. Adair RK: Comment on "thermal noise limit on the sensitivity of cellular membranes to power frequency electric and magnetic fields". *Bioelectromagnetics* 24 (2003) 444-445.
5. Ahlbom A, Green A, Kheifets L, Savitz D, and Swerdlow A: Epidemiology of health effects of radiofrequency exposure. *Environ. Health Persp.* 112 (2004) 1741-1754.
6. Azadniv M, Klinge CM, Gelein R, Carstensen EL, Cox C, Brayman AA, Miller MW: A test of the hypothesis that a 60-hz magnetic field affects ornithine decarboxylase activity in mouse L929 cells in vitro. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 214 (1995) 627-631.

7. Balmori A: Possible effects of electromagnetic fields from phone masts on a population of white stork (*Ciconia ciconia*). *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 24 (2005) 109-119.
8. Bawin SM, Adey WR, Sabbot IM: Ionic factors in release of $^{45}\text{Ca}^{2+}$ from chicken cerebral tissue by electromagnetic fields. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 75 (1978) 6314-6318.
9. Bernhardt JH: Gesundheitliche Aspekte des Mobilfunks. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt* 96 (1999) 845-851.
10. Blackman CF, Benane SG, Elder JA, House DE, Lampe JA, Faulk JM: Induction of calcium-ion efflux from brain tissue by radiofrequency radiation: Effect of sample number and modulation frequency on the power density-window. *Bioelectromagnetics* 1 (1980) 35-43.
11. Blettner M; Schlehofer B: Gibt es ein erhöhtes Risiko für Leukämien, Hirntumoren oder Brustkrebs nach Exposition gegenüber Hochfrequenzstrahlung? *Med. Klin.* 94 (1999) 150-158.
12. Challis LJ.: Mechanisms for interaction between RF fields and biological tissue. *Bioelectromagnetics Supplement* 26 (2005) S98 - S106.
13. Christensen HC, Schüz J, Kosteljanetz M, Poulsen HS, Thomsen J, and Johansen C: Cellular telephone use and risk of acoustic neuroma. *Am. J. Epidem.* 159 (2004) 277-283.
14. Cook CM, Saucier, DM, Thomas AW, and Prato FS: Exposure to ELF magnetic and ELF-modulated radiofrequency fields: The time course of physiological and cognitive effects observed in recent studies (2001-2005). *Bioelectromagnetics* 27 (2006) 613-627.
15. Cranfield CG, Wood AW, Anderson V, and Menezes KG: Effects of mobile phone type signals on calcium levels within human leukaemic T-cells (Jurkat cells). *Intern. J. Radiat. Biol.* 77 (2001) 1207-1217.
16. Czyz J, Guan K, Zeng Q, Nikolova T, Meister A, Schönborn F, Schuderer J, Kuster N, Wobus AM: High frequency electromagnetic fields (GSM signals) affect gene expression levels in tumor suppressor p53-deficient embryonic stem cells. *Bioelectromagnetics* 25 (2004) 296-307.
17. de Pomerai D, Daniells C, David H, Allan J, Duce I, Mutwakil, Thomas D., Sewell P., Tattersall J., Jones D, Candidos P: Non-thermal heat-shock response to microwaves. *Nature* 405 (2000) 417-418.
18. de Pomerai DI, Smith B, Dawe A., North K, Smith T, Archer DB, Duce IR, Jones D, and Candido PM: Microwave radiation can alter protein conformation without bulk heating. *FEBS Letters* 543 (2003) 93-97.
19. Desta AB, Owen RD, and Cress LW: Non-thermal exposure to radiofrequency energy from digital wireless phones does not affect ornithine decarboxylase activity in L929 cells. *Radiat. Res.* 160 (2003) 488-491.
20. Diem E, Schwarz C, Adlkofer F, Jahn O and Rüdiger H.: 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. - Gen. Toxicol. Environ. Mutag.* 583 (2005) 178-183.
21. Dolk H, Elliott P, Shaddick G, Walls P, Thakrar B: Cancer incidence near radio and television transmitters in Great Britain. 2. All high power transmitters. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 145 (1997) 10-17.
22. Elwood JM: A critical review of epidemiologic studies of radiofrequency exposure and human cancers. *Environ. Health Persp.* 107 (1999) 155-168.
23. Elwood, JM: Epidemiological studies of radio frequency exposures and human cancer. *Bioelectromagnetics Suppl.* 6 (2003) S63-S73.

24. Eulitz C, Ullsperger P, Freude G, Elbert T: Mobile phones modulate response patterns of human brain activity. *Neuroreport* 9 (1998) 3229-3232.
25. Ferreira AR, Bonatto F, Pasquali MAD, Polydoro M, Dal-Pizzoi F, Fernandez C, De Salles AAA, and Moreira JCF: Oxidative stress effects on the central nervous system of rats after acute exposure to ultra high frequency electromagnetic fields. *Bioelectromagnetics* 27 (2006) 487-493.
26. Foster KR, Baish JW: Viscous damping of vibrations in microtubules. *J. Biol. Phys.* 26 (2000) 255-260.
27. Foster KR, Glaser R: Thermal mechanisms of interaction of radiofrequency energy with biological systems with relevance to exposure guidelines. *Health Physics* 92 (2007) 609-620.
28. Foster KR, Repacholi MH: Biological effects of radiofrequency fields: does modulation matter? *Radiat. Res.* 162 (2004) 219-225.
29. Friedman J, Kraus S, Hauptman Y, Schiff Y, and Seger R: Mechanism of a short-term ERK activation by electromagnetic fields at mobile phone frequency. *Biochem. J.* published on 25 Apr 2007 as manuscript BJ20061653 (2007)
30. Fröhlich H, Kremer F (eds.): *Coherent Excitations in Biological Systems.* - Springer Verlag, Berlin (1983)
31. Fuhr G, Hagedorn R: Cell Electrorotation. In: Lynch, PT., M R Davey (eds.): *Electrical Manipulation of Cells.* Chapman & Hall, New York (1996) 38-70.
32. Glaser R: Do electromagnetic fields really increase the ornithin-decarboxylase (ODC) activity of cells? What happens with the 'coherence time' effect - A comment to the papers of T.A. Litovitz et al. *Bioelectrochem. Bioenerg.* 46 (1998) 301-302.
33. Glaser R: Are thermoreceptors responsible for „non-thermal“ effects of RF fields? *Edition Wissenschaft* 21 (2005) 3-13.
34. Glaser R: Biophysikalische Primärreaktionen hochfrequenter elektromagnetischer Felder. *News Letter FGF* (2006) 10-21.
35. Glaser R, Fuhr G: Electrorotation – The spin of cells in rotating high frequency electric fields. In: M. Blank and E. Findl (eds.); *Mechanistic Approaches to Interactions of Electric and Electromagnetic Fields with Living Systems;* Plenum Press, New York (1987) 271-289.
36. Gos P, Eicher B, Kohli J, Heyer WD: Extremely high frequency electromagnetic fields at low power density do not affect the division of exponential phase *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* cells. *Bioelectromagnetics* 18 (1997) 142-155.
37. Gos P, Eicher B, Kohli J, and Heyer WD: No mutagenic or recombinogenic effects of mobile phone fields at 900 MHz detected in the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Bioelectromagnetics* 21 (2000) 515-523.
38. Grundler W, Keilmann F: Resonant microwave effects on locally fixed yeast microcolonies. *Z. f. Naturf.* 44c (1989) 863-866.
39. Hamblin DL and Wood AW: Effects of mobile phone emissions on human brain activity and sleep variables. *Int. J. Radiat. Biol.* 78 (2002) 659-669.
40. Hamblin DL, Wood AW, Croft, RJ, and Stough C: Examining the effects of electromagnetic fields emitted by GSM mobile phones on human event-related potentials and performance during an auditory task. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 115 (2004) 171-178.
41. Hardell L, Hallquist A, Mild KH, Carlberg M, Pålsson A, Lilja A: Cellular and cordless telephones and the risk for brain tumors. *Europ. J. Cancer Prevention* 11 (2002) 377-386.
42. Hardell L, Mild KH, and Carlberg M: Further aspects on cellular and cordless telephones and brain tumours. *Intern. J. Oncology* 22 (2003) 399-407.

43. Hardell L, Näsman Å, Pålsson A, Hallquist A, Mild KH: Use of cellular telephones and the risk for brain tumours: A case-control study. *Intern. J. Oncology* 15 (1999) 113-116.
44. Hata K, Yamaguchi H, Tsurita G, Watanabe S, Wake K, Taki M, Ueno S, and Nagawa H: Short term exposure to 1439 MHz pulsed TDMA field does not alter melatonin synthesis in rats. *Bioelectromagnetics* 26 (2005) 49-53.
45. Heikkinen P, Kosma VM, Alhonen L, Huuskonen H, Komulainen H, Kumlin T, Laitinen JT, Lang S, Puranen L, and Juutilainen J: Effects of mobile phone radiation on UV-induced skin tumorigenesis in ornithine decarboxylase transgenic and non-transgenic mice. *Intern. J. Radiat. Biol.* 79 (2003) 221-233.
46. Heynick LN, Johnston SA, and Mason PA: Radio frequency electromagnetic fields: Cancer, mutagenesis, and genotoxicity. *Bioelectromagnetics Suppl.* 6 (2003) S74-S100.
47. Hirose H, Sakuma N, Kaji N, Nakayama K, Inoue K, Sekijima M, Nojima T, Miyakoshi J: Mobile phone base station-emitted radiation does not induce phosphorylation of Hsp27. *Bioelectromagnetics* 28 (2007) 99-108.
48. Hirose H, Sakuma N, Kaji N, Suhara T, Sekijima M, Nojima T, and Miyakoshi J: Phosphorylation and gene expression of p53 are not affected in human cells exposed to 2.1425 GHz band CW or W-CDMA modulated radiation allocated to mobile radio base stations. *Bioelectromagnetics* 27 (2006) 494-504.
49. Hocking B, Gordon IR, Grain HL, Hartfield GH: Cancer incidence and mortality and proximity to TV towers. *Med. J. Aust.* 165 (1996) 601-605.
50. Hoytö A, Sihvonen AP, Alhonen A, Juutilainen J, and Naarala J: Modest increase in temperature affects ODC activity in L929 cells: low-level radiofrequency radiation does not. *Radiat. Environ. Biophys.* 45 (2006) 231-235.
51. Huber R, Treyer V, Borbely AA, Schuderer J, Gottselig JM, Landolt HP, Werth E, Berthold T, Kuster N, Buck A, and Achermann P: Electromagnetic fields, such as those from mobile phones, alter regional cerebral blood flow and sleep and waking EEG. *J. Sleep Res.* 11 (2002) 289-295.
52. Huber R, Treyer V, Schuderer J, Berthold T, Buck A, Kuster N, Landolt HP, and Achermann P: Exposure to pulse-modulated radio frequency electromagnetic fields affects regional cerebral blood flow. *Europ. J. Neurosci.* 21 (2005) 1000-1006.
53. Ihrig I, Heese C, Glaser R: Alterations of intracellular calcium concentration in mice neuroblastoma cells by electrical field and UVA. *Bioelectromagnetics* 18 (1997) 595-597.
54. Inskip PD, Tarone RE, Hatch EE, Wilcosky TC, Shapiro, W.R., Selker RG, Fine HA, Black PM, Loeffler JS, Linet MS: Cellular-telephone use and brain tumors. *N-Engl. J. Med.* 344 (2001) 79-86.
55. Kheifets, LI: Electric and magnetic field exposure and brain cancer: A review. *Bioelectromagnetics* S5 (2001) S120-S131.
56. von Klitzing L: Low frequency pulsed electromagnetic fields influence EEG of man. *Physica Medica* 11 (1995) 77-80.
57. Koyu A, Cesur G, Ozguner F, Akdogan M, Mollaoglu F, and Ozen S: Effects of 900 MHz electromagnetic field on TSH and thyroid hormones in rats. *Toxicology Letters* 157 (2005) 257-262.
58. Krause CM, Bjornberg CH, Pesonen M, Hulten A, Liesivuori T, Koivisto M, Revonsuo A, Laine M, and Hamalainen H: Mobile phone effects on children's event-related oscillatory EEG during an auditory memory task. *Intern. J. Radiat. Biol.* 82 (2006) 443-450.

59. Lahkola A, Auvinen A, Raitanen J, Schoemaker M, Christensen HC, Feychting M, Johansen Ch, Kjaerboe L, Lönn St, Swerdlow AJ, Tynes T, and Salminen T: Mobile phone use and risk of glioma in 5 North European countries. *Int. J. Cancer* 120 (2007) 1769-1775.
60. Lantow M, Schuderer J, Hartwig C, and Simko M: Free radical release and HSP70 expression in two human immune-relevant cell lines after exposure to 1800 MHz radiofrequency radiation. *Radiat. Res.* 165 (2006) 88-94.
61. Leszczynski D, Joenvaara S, Reivinen J, and Kuokka R: Non-thermal activation of the hsp27/p38MAPK stress pathway by mobile phone radiation in human endothelial cells: Molecular mechanism for cancer- and blood-brain barrier-related effects. *Differentiation* 70 (2002) 120-129.
62. Leszczynski D and Metz ML: Questions and answers concerning applicability of proteomics and transcriptomics in EMF research. *Proteomics* 6 (2006) 4674-4677.
63. Liboff AR: Cyclotron resonance in membrane transport. In: A. Chiabrera et al. (eds.), *Interactions between Electromagnetic Fields and Cells*; Plenum, London (1985) 281-296.
64. Liburdy RP, Vanek PF: Microwave and cell membranes. II. Temperature, plasma and oxygen mediate microwave-induced membrane permeability in erythrocyte. *Radiat. Res.* 102 (1985) 190-205.
65. Litovitz TA: Can electromagnetic fields modify the activity of ornithine decarboxylase (ODC)? What happens with the 'coherence time' effect? A reply to the comment by R. Glaser. *Bioelectrochem. Bioenerg.* 46 (1998) 303-306.
66. Litovitz TA, Krause D, Penafiel M, Elson EC, Mullins JM: The role of coherence time in the effect of microwaves on ornithine decarboxylase activity. *Bioelectromagnetics* 14 (1993) 395-403.
67. Lonn S, Ahlbom A, Christensen HC, Johansen C, Schüz J, Edstrom S, Henriksson G, Lundgren J, Wennerberg J, and Feychting M: Mobile phone use and risk of parotid gland tumor. *Am. J. Epidem.* 164 (2006) 637-643.
68. Lönn S, Forssen U, Vecchia P, Ahlbom A, and Feychting M.: Output power levels from mobile phones in different geographical areas; implications for exposure assessment. *Occup Environ Med* 61 (2004) 769-722.
69. Mascarinec G, Cooper J, Swygert L: Investigation of increased incidence in childhood leukemia near radio tower in Hawaii: preliminary observations. *J. Environ. Pathol. Toxicol. Oncol.* 13 (1994) 33-37.
70. McKenzie DR, Yin Y, Morrell S: Childhood incidence of acute lymphoblastic leukemia and exposure to broadcast radiation in Sydney - second look. *Austral. New Zealand J. Pub. Health* 22 (1998) 360-367.
71. Merritt JH; Shelton, Chamness AF: Attempts to alter $^{45}\text{Ca}^{2+}$ binding to brain tissue with pulse-modulated microwave energy. *Bioelectromagnetics* 3 (1982) 475-478.
72. Morgan RW, Kelsh MA, Zhao K, Exuzides KA, Heringer S, and Negrete W: Radiofrequency exposure and mortality from cancer of the brain and lymphatic/hematopoietic systems. *Epidemiology* 11 (2000) 118-127.
73. Mullins JM, Litovitz TA, Penafiel M, Desta A, Krause D: Intermittent noise affects EMF-induced ODC activity. *Bioelectrochem. Bioenerg.* 44 (1998)
74. Muscat JE, Malkin MG, Shore RE et al.: Handheld cellular telephones and risk of acoustic neuroma. *Neurology* 58 (2002) 1304-1306.
75. Muscat JE, Malkin MG, Thompson S, Shore RE, Stellman SD, McRee, Neugut AI, Wynder EL: Handheld cellular telephone use and risk of brain cancer. *JAMA* 284 (2000) 3001-3007.

76. Navarro EA, Segura J, Portoles M, and GomezPerretta C: The microwave syndrome: A preliminary study in Spain. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 22 (2003) 161-169.
77. Neubauer G, Feychting M, Hamnerius Y, Kheifets L, Kuster N, Ruiz I, Schüz J, Uberbacher R, Wiart J, and Rösli M: Feasibility of future epidemiological studies on possible health effects of mobile phone base stations. *Bioelectromagnetics* 28 (2007) 224-230.
78. Oktem F, Ozguner F, Mollaoglu H, Koyu A, and Uz E: Oxidative damage in the kidney induced by 900-MHz-emitted mobile phone: Protection by melatonin. *Arch. Med. Res.* 36 (2005) 350-355.
79. Ozguner F, Bardak Y, and Comlekci S: Protective effects of melatonin and caffeic acid phenethyl ester against retinal oxidative stress in long-term use of mobile phone: A comparative study. *Mol. Cell. Biochem.* 282 (2006) 83-88.
80. Panagopoulos DJ, Chavdoula ED, Nezis IP, and Margaritis LH: Cell death induced by GSM 900-MHz and DCS 1800-MHz mobile telephony radiation. *Mutat. Res.-Genetic Toxicol. Environ. Mutag.* 626 (2007) 69-78.
81. Penafiel LM, Litovitz T, Krause D, Desta A, Mullins JM: Role of modulation on the effect of microwaves on ornithine decarboxylase activity in L929 cells. *Bioelectromagnetics* 18 (1997) 132-141.
82. Pickard WF and Moros EG: Energy deposition processes in biological tissue: Nonthermal biohazards seem unlikely in the ultra-high frequency range. *Bioelectromagnetics* 22 (2001) 97-105.
83. Prohovsky EW: RF absorption involving biological macromolecules. *Bioelectromagnetics* 25 (2004) 441-451.
84. Repacholi MH, Basten A, Gebiski V, Noonan D, Finnie J, Harris AW: Lymphomas in *Em̄-Pim1* transgenic mice exposed to pulsed 900 MHz electromagnetic fields. *Radiat. Res.* 147 (1997) 631-640.
85. Rösche J, Mann K: No short-term effects of digital mobile radio telephone on the awake human electroencephalogram. *Bioelectromagnetics* 18 (1997) 172-176.
86. Rothman KJ, Chou CK, Morgan R, Balzano Q, Guy AW, Funch DP, Preston-Martin S, Mandel J, Steffens R, Carlo G: Assessment of cellular telephone and other radio frequency exposure for epidemiologic research. *Epidemiology* 7 (1996) 291-298.
87. Schüz J, Johansen Ch.: A comparison of self-reported cellular telephone use with subscriber data: agreement between the two methods and implications for risk estimation. *Bioelectromagnetics* 28 (2007) 130-136.
88. Simko A, Hartwig C, Lantow A, Lupke A, Mattsson MO, Rahman Q, and Rollwitz J: Hsp70 expression and free radical release after exposure to non-thermal radio-frequency electromagnetic fields and ultrafine particles in human Mono Mac 6 cells. *Toxicology Letters* 161 (2006) 73-82.
89. Speit G, Schuetz P, and Hoffmann H: Genotoxic effects of exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF) in cultured mammalian cells are not independently reproducible. *Mutat. Res.-Genetic Toxicol. Environ. Mutag.* 626 (2007) 42-47.
90. Sukhotina I, Streckert JR, Bitz, AK, Hansen VW, and Lerchl A: 1800 MHz electromagnetic field effects on melatonin release from isolated pineal glands. *J. Pineal Res.* 40 (2006) 86-91.
91. Sun LX, Yao K, Wang KJ, Lu DQ, Hu HJ, Gao XW, Wang BH, Zheng W, Lou JL, and Wu W: Effects of 1.8 GHz radiofrequency field on DNA damage and expression of heat shock protein 70 in human lens epithelial cells. *Mutat. Res.-Fund. Mol. Mech. Mutag.* 602 (2006) 135-142.

92. Szmigielski S: Cancer morbidity in subjects occupationally exposed to high-frequency (radiofrequency and microwave) electromagnetic radiation. *Sci. Total Environ.* 180 (1996) 9-17.
93. Utteridge TD, GebSKI V, Finnie JW, Vernon-Roberts B, Kuchel TR: Long-term exposure of E: δ -*Pim1* transgenic mice to 898,4 MHz microwaves does not increase lymphoma incidence . *Radiat. Res.* 158 (2002) 000.
94. Vanderwaal RP, Cha B, Moros EG, and Roti JLR.: Hsp27 phosphorylation increases after 45 degrees C or 41 degrees C heat shocks but not after non-thermal TDMA or GSM exposures. *Intern. J. Hyperthermia* 22 (2006) 507-519.
95. Vijayalaxmi: Cytogenetic studies in human blood lymphocytes exposed in vitro to 2.45 GHz or 8.2 GHz radiofrequency radiation. *Radiat. Res.* 166 (2006) 532-538.
96. Vrijheid M, Deltour I, Krewski D, Sanchez M, and Cardis E: The effects of recall errors and of selection bias in epidemiologic studies of mobile phone use and cancer risk . *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* (2006)
97. Wagner P, Röschke J, Mann K, Hiller W, Frank C: Human sleep under the influence of pulsed radiofrequency electromagnetic fields: A polysomnographic study using standardized conditions. *Bioelectromagnetics* 19 (1998) 199-202.
98. Wang J, Koyama S, Komatsubara Y, Suzuki Y, Taki M, and Miyakoshi J: Effects of a 2450 MHz high-frequency electromagnetic field with a wide range of SARs on the induction of heat-shock proteins in A172 cells. *Bioelectromagnetics* 27 (2006) 479-486.
99. Weisbrot D, Lin H, Ye L, Blank M, and Goodman R: Effects of mobile phone radiation on reproduction and development in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Cell. Biochem.* 89 (2003) 48-55.
100. Wilén J, Sandström M, and Mild KH: Subjective symptoms among mobile phone users - A consequence of absorption of radiofrequency fields? *Bioelectromagnetics* 24 (2003) 152-159.
101. Wood AW: How dangerous are mobile phones, transmission masts, and electricity pylons? *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 91 (2006) 361-366.
102. Zmyslony M, Palus J, Dziubaltowska E, Politanski P, Mamrot P, Rajkowska E, and Kamedula M: Effects of in vitro exposure to power frequency magnetic fields on UV-induced DNA damage of rat lymphocytes. *Bioelectromagnetics* 25 (2004) 560-562.



Prof. em. Dr. rer nat. habil. Roland Glaser was Chair of Biophysics at the Humboldt University of Berlin. Prof. Glaser is a member of the working group „high-frequency micro-dosimetry“ of the German Commission for Radiation Protection.