

SECTION 10 – Part 1

EVIDENCE FOR BRAIN TUMORS AND ACOUSTIC NEUROMAS

Lennart Hardell, MD, PhD, Professor

Department of Oncology, Örebro University Hospital, Sweden

Kjell Hansson Mild, PhD, Professor

Department of Radiation Physics, Umeå University, Sweden

Michael Kundi, Ph.D., med.habil, Professor

Institute of Environmental Health, Center for Public Health,

Medical University of Vienna, Austria

Prepared for the BioInitiative Working Group

July 2007

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction
II.	Materials and Methods
III.	Results
	A. The first Swedish studies
	B. Studies from the USA
	C. Danish cohort study
	D. Finnish study
	E. The Interphone studies
	1. Acoustic neuroma
	2. Glioma, meningioma
	F. Meta-analysis
IV.	Discussion
V.	Conclusions
VI.	References

Table 1	Summary of 20 studies on the use of cellular telephones and brain tumor/acoustic neuroma risk
----------------	--

I. Introduction

During the recent decade potential health risks from microwave exposure during use of wireless phones has been discussed both in scientific settings but also by the layman. Especially the use of mobile phones has been of concern, to less extent use of cordless desktop phones (digital enhanced cordless telephone; DECT). The Nordic countries were among the first in the world to widely adopt use of such devices, probably due to the mobile phone companies like Ericsson in Sweden and Nokia in Finland.

These countries may be taken as models for the introduction of this new technology on the market. Thus, the analogue mobile phone system (Nordic Mobile Telephony, NMT) using 450 MHz started to operate in Sweden in 1981. First, it was used in cars with external antenna but from 1984 mobile (portable!) phones existed. This system is still used in Sweden but only to a minor extent. The 900 MHz NMT system operated in Sweden between 1986-2000. The GSM phone (Global System for Mobile communication) started in 1991 and is the most used phone type today, although the 3G phone (third generation mobile phone, UMTS) is increasingly used now.

The risk of brain tumors has been of special concern since the brain is the organ mainly exposed during such phone calls. Most studies on this topic have been of the case-control design and no results exist from prospective cohort studies. However, the results have been hampered by too short tumor-induction period in most studies or with limited number of long-term users, i.e. \geq 10 years latency time. As to carcinogenesis short latency period is of limited value to predict long-term health risks. Usually a latency period of at least 10 years is needed for more firm conclusions. It should be noted that for several carcinogens longer latency periods are often

required, such as smoking and lung cancer, asbestos and lung cancer, dioxins and certain cancer types etc.

By now a number of studies exist that give results for brain tumour risk and use of mobile phones for subjects with latency period ≥ 10 years. Most of these results are based on low numbers but nevertheless may together give a pattern of increased risk. In this review we discuss all studies on this topic that have been published so far. Moreover, we present a meta-analysis of results from studies with at least 10 years latency period. Only the Hardell group in Sweden has published results also for use of cordless phones. Recently the same group published an overview of long-term use of cellular phones and the risk for brain tumors, especially with use for 10 years or more (Hardell et al 2007). In the following a brief summary is given of these results with the addition of two more study published after that review (Klaeboe et al 2007, Schlehofer et al 2007). For further details see Hardell et al (2007).

II. Materials and Methods

The Pub Med database (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) was used for an up-dated search of published studies in this area using mobile/cellular/cordless telephone and brain tumour/neoplasm/acoustic neuroma/meningioma/glioma as searching terms. Personal knowledge of published studies was also used in order to get as comprehensive review as possible. Regarding several publication of the same study the most recent one with relevant data was used. We identified 20 studies to be included. Two were cohort studies (one study analysed twice) and 18 were case-control studies. No mortality studies were included. Three studies came from USA, four from Denmark, one from Finland, five from Sweden, two from Germany, one from the UK, one from Japan, one from Norway and two from study groups partly overlapping previously mentioned studies.

III. Results

A. The first Swedish studies

The first study by Hardell et al (1999, 2001) included cases and controls collected during 1994-96 in Sweden. Only living cases were included. Two controls were selected to each case from the Population Registry. The questionnaire was answered by 217 (93 %) cases and 439 (94 %) controls. Overall no association between mobile phone use and brain tumours was found, but when analysing ipsilateral phone use a somewhat increased risk was seen especially for tumours in the temporal, occipital or temporoparietal lobe yielding odds ratio (OR) = 2.4, 95 % confidence interval (CI) = 0.97-6.1 (Hardell et al 2001).

Hardell et al (2006a) made a pooled analysis for benign brain tumours from their two case-control studies. Cases were reported from Cancer Registries and controls were population based. The questionnaire was answered by 1,254 (88 %) cases and 2,162 (89 %) controls. Also use of cordless desktop phones was assessed. Use of cellular phones gave for acoustic neuroma OR = 1.7, 95 % CI 1.2-2.3 increasing to OR = 2.9, 95 % CI = 1.6-5.5 with > 10 year latency period. The corresponding results for cordless phones were OR = 1.5, 95 % CI = 1.04-2.0, and OR = 1.0, 95 % CI 0.3-2.9, respectively. Regarding meningioma cellular phones gave OR = 1.1, 95 % CI = 0.9-1.3, and cordless OR = 1.1, 95 % CI = 0.9-1.4. Using > 10 year latency period ORs increased, for cellular telephones OR = 1.5, 95 % CI = 0.98-2.4, and for cordless phones OR = 1.6, 95 % CI = 0.9-2.8.

The pooled analyses of the two case control studies of malignant brain tumours by Hardell et al (2006b) included 905 (90%) cases and the same control group as for benign tumours was used,

2,162 (89 %) subjects. Overall for low-grade astrocytoma cellular phones gave OR= 1.4, 95 % CI = 0.9-2.3 and cordless phones OR = 1.4, 95 % CI = 0.9-3.4. The corresponding results for high-grade astrocytoma were OR = 1.4, 95 % CI = 1.1-1.8, and OR = 1.5, 95 % CI = 1.1-1.9, respectively. Using > 10 year latency period gave for low-grade astrocytoma and use of cellular phones OR = 1.5, 95 % CI = 0.6-3.8 (ipsilateral OR = 1.2, 95 % CI = 0.5-5.8), and for cordless phones OR = 1.6, 95 % CI = 0.5-4.6 (ipsilateral OR = 3.2, 95 % CI = 0.6-16). For high-grade astrocytoma in the same latency period cellular phones gave OR = 3.1, 95 % CI = 2.0-4.6 (ipsilateral OR = 5.4, 95 % CI = 3.0-9.6), and cordless phones OR = 2.2, 95 % CI = 1.3-3.9 (ipsilateral OR = 4.7, 95 % CI = 1.8-13).

B. Studies from USA

Muscat et al (2000) studied patients with malignant brain tumours from five different hospitals in USA. Controls were hospital patients. Data from 469 (82 %) cases and 422 (90 %) controls were available. Overall no association was found, OR for handheld cellular phones was 0.9, 95 % CI = 0.6-1.2, but the mean duration of use was short, only 2.8 years for cases and 2.7 years for controls. For neuroepithelioma OR = 2.1, 95 % CI = 0.9-4.7, was reported. The study is inconclusive since no data were available on long-term users (≥ 10 years latency period). Some support of an association was obtained since of 41 evaluable tumours, 26 occurred at the side of the head mostly used during calls and 15 on the contralateral side.

Also the study by Inskip et al (2001) from USA had few long-term users of mobile phones, only 11 cases with glioma, 6 with meningioma and 5 with acoustic neuroma with ≥ 5 years regular use. No subjects had ≥ 10 years use. The study comprised 489 (92 %) hospital cases with malignant brain tumours, 197 with meningioma and 96 with acoustic neuroma, and 799 (86 %) hospital-based controls. Overall no significant associations were found. Regarding different

types of glioma OR = 1.8, 95 % CI = 0.7-5.1 was found for anaplastic astrocytoma. Duration of use ≥ 5 years gave for acoustic neuroma OR increased to 1.9, 95 % CI = 0.6-5.9.

In another study by Muscat et al (2002) presented results from a hospital based case-control study on acoustic neuroma on 90 (100 %) patients and 86 (100 %) controls. Cell phone use 1-2 years gave OR = 0.5, 95 % CI = 0.2-1.3 (n=7 cases), increasing to OR = 1.7, 95 % CI = 0.5-5.1 (n=11 cases), in the group with 3-6 years use. Average use among cases was 4.1 years and among controls 2.2 years.

C. Danish cohort study

A population based cohort study in Denmark of mobile phone users during 1982 to 1995 included over 700,000 users (Johansen et al 2001). About 200,000 individuals were excluded since they had company paid mobile phones. Of digital (GSM) subscribers only nine cases had used the phone for ≥ 3 years duration yielding standardised incidence ratio (SIR) of 1.2, 95 % CI = 0.6-2.3. No subjects with 10-year use were reported.

This cohort study was updated with follow-up through 2002 for cancer incidence (Schüz et al 2006). There was no truly unexposed group for comparison since a large part of the population uses wireless phones. Moreover the excluded company subscribers (> 200 000 or 32 %) were apparently included in the reference population. There was also a very skewed sex distribution with 85 % men and only 15 % women in the cohort. SIR was significantly decreased to 0.95, 95 % CI = 0.9-0.97 for all cancers indicating a “healthy worker” effect in the study. In the group with ≥ 10 years since first subscription significantly decreased SIR of 0.7, 95 % CI = 0.4-0.95 was found for brain and nervous system tumours indicating methodological problems in the study. No latency data were given or laterality of phone use in relation to tumour localisation in

the brain. This study was uninformative regarding long-term health effects from mobile phone use.

D. Finnish study

Auvinen et al (2002) did a register based case-control study on brain and salivary gland tumors in Finland. All cases aged 20-69 years diagnosed in 1996 were included; 398 brain tumour cases and 34 salivary gland tumour cases. The duration of use was short, for analogue users 2-3 years and for digital less than one year. No association was found for salivary gland tumours. For glioma OR = 2.1, 95 % CI = 1.3-3.4 was calculated for use of analogue phones, but no association was found for digital mobile phones. When duration of use of analogue phones was used as a continuous variable an increased risk was found for glioma with OR = 1.2, 95 % CI = 1.1-1.5 per year of use.

E. The Interphone studies

1. Acoustic neuroma

The Swedish part of the Interphone study on acoustic neuroma included exposure data from 148 (93 %) cases and 604 (72 %) population based controls (Lönn et al 2004). Use of digital phones with time ≥ 5 years since first use gave OR = 1.2, 95 % CI = 0.7-2.1. No subjects were reported with use of a digital phone ≥ 10 years. An association was found for use of analogue phones yielding for ≥ 10 years latency period OR = 1.8, 95 % CI = 0.8-4.3 increasing to OR = 3.9, 95 % CI = 1.6-9.5 for ipsilateral use.

In Denmark the Interphone study included 106 (82 %) interviewed cases with acoustic neuroma and 212 (64 %) population-based controls (Christensen et al 2004). Significantly larger tumours were found among cellular phone users, 1.66 cm^3 compared with 1.39 cm^3 among non-users, $p =$

0.03. However OR was not significantly increased but only two cases had use a mobile phone regularly ≥ 10 years.

Schoemaker et al (2005) presented results for acoustic neuroma as part of the Interphone study performed in 6 different regions in the Nordic countries and UK, as previously partly reported (Lönn et al 2004; Christensen et al 2004). The results were based on 678 (82 %) cases and 3,553 (42 %) controls. Lifetime use of mobile phone for ≥ 10 years gave for ipsilateral acoustic neuroma OR = 1.8, 95 % CI = 1.1-3.1, and for contralateral OR = 0.9, 95 % CI = 0.5-1.8.

The study from Japan by Takebayashi et al (2006) included 101 (84 %) acoustic neuroma cases aged 30-69 years and diagnosed during 2000-2004. Using random digit dialling 339 (52 %) controls were interview. No association was found, OR = 0.7, 95% CI = 0.4 – 1.2. No exposure related increase in the risk of acoustic neuroma was observed when the cumulative length of use (<4 years, 4-8 years, >8 years) or cumulative call time (<300 hours, 300-900 hours, >900 hours) was used as an exposure index. The OR was 1.1, 95% CI = 0.6 - 2.1, when the reference date was set to five years before the diagnosis. Further, laterality of mobile phone use was not associated with tumours. No cases with ≥ 10 years latency period were reported.

Use of mobile phones and risk of acoustic neuroma were published from Norway as part of the Interphone study (Klaeboe et al 2007). It included 45 (68 %) acoustic neuroma cases and 358 (69 %) controls. A decreased risk was found with OR = 0.5, 95 % CI = 0.2-1.0. Using different criteria such as duration of regular use, time since first regular use, cumulative use etc 22 additional ORs and CIs were calculated. Time since first regular use for < 6 years gave OR =

1.0, 95 % CI = 0.2-5.7. All 21 other ORs were < 1.0 indicating systematic bias in the study. No case had a latency period of 10 years.

Schlehofer et al (2007) reported results from the German part of the Interphone study on sporadic acoustic neuroma. The study was performed during October 2000 and October 2003. Four study areas were included and cases were aged 30-59 years, but from October 1, 2001 extended to include the age group 60-69 years. They were recruited from hospitals and included 97 (89 %) cases, however, three with trigeminus neuroma. Controls were randomly selected from population registries and in total 202 (55 %) agreed to participate. No association was found for regular mobile phone use, OR = 0.7, 95 % CI = 0.4-1.2. Most ORs were < 1.0 and a decreasing trend of the risk was found for time since first regular use, lifetime number of use and duration of calls. No case had a latency period > 10 years. However, increased OR was found for highly exposed in "specified occupational exposure" yielding OR = 1.5, 95 % CI = 0.5-4.2.

E. The Interphone studies

2. Glioma, meningioma

Lönn et al (2005) also studied glioma and meningioma. Data were obtained for 371 (74 %) glioma and 273 (85 %) meningioma cases. The control group consisted of 674 (71 %) subjects. No association was found although time since first regular phone use for ≥ 10 years gave for ipsilateral glioma OR = 1.6, 95 % CI = 0.8-3.4 and for contralateral glioma OR = 0.7, 95 % CI = 0.3-1.5.

For ipsilateral meningioma OR = 1.3, 95 % CI = 0.5-3.9 was calculated and for contralateral OR = 0.5, 95 % CI = 0.1-1.7 using $10 \geq$ years latency period.

The Danish part of the Interphone study on brain tumours (Christensen et al, 2005) included 252 (71 %) persons with glioma, 175 (74 %) with meningioma and 822 (64 %) controls. For meningioma OR = 0.8, 95 % CI = 0.5-1.3 was calculated and for low-grade glioma OR = 1.1, 95 % CI = 0.6-2.0, and for high-grade glioma OR = 0.6, 95 % CI = 0.4-0.9 were found. Use for \geq 10 years yielded for meningioma OR = 1.0, 95 % CI = 0.3-3.2, low-grade glioma OR = 1.6, 95 % CI = 0.4-6.1 and for high-grade glioma OR = 0.5, 95 % CI = 0.2-1.3. Regarding high-grade glioma 17 ORs were presented and all showed OR < 1.0.

Results from England were based on 966 (51 %) glioma cases and 1,716 (45 %) controls (Hepworth et al 2006). Cases were ascertained from multiple sources including hospital departments and cancer registries. The controls were randomly selected from general practitioners' lists. Regular phone use gave OR = 0.9, 95 % CI = 0.8-1.1, increasing to OR = 1.2, 95 % CI = 1.02-1.5 for ipsilateral use but OR = 0.8, 95 % CI = 0.6-0.9 for contralateral use. Ipsilateral use for \geq 10 years produced OR = 1.6, 95 % CI = 0.9-2.8, and contralateral OR = 0.8, 95 % CI = 0.4-1.4.

Schüz et al (2006) carried out a population-based case-control study in three regions of Germany, with incident cases of glioma and meningioma aged 30-69 years during 2000-2003. Controls were randomly drawn from population registries. In total, 366 (80 %) glioma cases, 381 (88 %) meningioma cases, and 1,494 (61 %) controls were interviewed. For glioma OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 0.7 - 1.3 and for meningioma OR = 0.8, 95% CI = 0.6 - 1.1 were obtained. However, among persons who had used cellular phones for \geq 10 years increased risk was found for glioma; OR = 2.2, 95% CI = 0.9 - 5.1 but not for meningioma; OR = 1.1, 95% CI = 0.4 - 3.4. Among women they found OR = 2.0, 95 % CI = 1.1-3.5 for high-grade glioma for "regular" cell-phone use.

Summary results for mobile phone use and risk of glioma in Denmark, and parts of Finland, Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom have been published (Lahkola et al 2007). Of the included Interphone studies results had already been published from Sweden (Lönn et al 2005), Denmark (Christensen et al 2005) and UK (Hepworth et al 2006). The results were based on 2,530 eligible cases but only 1,521 (60%) participated. Regular mobile phone use gave OR = 0.8, 95 % CI = 0.7-0.9, but cumulative hours of use yielded OR = 1.006, 95 % CI = 1.002-1.010 per 100 hours. Ipsilateral mobile phone use for ≥ 10 years gave OR = 1.4, 95 % CI = 1.01-1.9, p trend = 0.04 and contralateral use OR = 1.0, 95 % CI = 0.7-1.4.

Use of mobile phones and risk of glioma and meningioma were published from Norway as part of the Interphone study (Klaeboe et al 2007). It included 289 (71 %) glioma cases, 207 (69 %) meningioma cases and 358 (69 %) controls. Significantly decreased OR = 0.6, 95 % CI = 0.4-0.9 was found for glioma and decreased OR = 0.8, 95 % CI = 0.5-1.1 for meningioma. For glioma 22 additional ORs were calculated using different exposure criteria as discussed above and all calculations yielded OR < 1.0, seven significantly so. Also for meningioma most ORs were < 1.0. Again these results indicate systematic bias in the study.

F. Meta-analysis

A meta-analysis of the risk for acoustic neuroma, glioma and meningioma was performed for mobile phone use with a latency period of 10 years or more (Hardell et al 2007). For acoustic neuroma studies by Lönn et al (2004), Christensen et al (2004) Schoemaker et al (2005) and Hardell et al (2006a) were included, all giving results for at least 10 years latency period or

more. Overall OR = 1.3, 95 % CI = 0.6-2.8 was obtained increasing to OR = 2.4, 95 % CI = 1.1-5.3 for ipsilateral mobile phone use (Lönn et al 2004, Schoemaker et al 2005, Hardell et al 2006). For glioma OR = 1.2, 95 % CI = 0.8-1.9 was calculated (Lönn et al 2005, Christensen et al 2005, Hepworth et al 2006, Schüz et al 2006, Hardell et al 2006b, Lahkola et al 2007). Ipsilateral use yielded OR = 2.0, 95 % CI = 1.2-3.4 (Lönn et al 2005, Hepworth et al 2006, Hardell et al 2006b, Lahkola et al 2007). In total OR = 1.3, 95 % CI = 0.9-1.8 was found for meningioma (Lönn et al 2005, Christensen et al 2005, Schüz et al 2006, Hardell et al 2006a) increasing to OR = 1.7, 95 % CI = 0.99-3.1 for ipsilateral use (Lönn et al 2005, Hardell et al 2006b).

IV. Discussion

This review included 20 studies, two cohort studies and 18 case-control studies. We recently made a review on this topic and more details can be found in that publication (Hardell et al 2007). Only two studies have been published since then. Both were on acoustic neuroma (Klaeboe et al 2007, Schlehofer et al 2007). They were small with no cases with a latency period of at least 10 years. Furthermore, most ORs were < 1.0 indicating serious methodological problems in the studies.

So far most studies have had no or limited information on long-term users. No other studies than from the Hardell group has published results for use of cordless phones (Hardell et al 2006a,b). As we have discussed in our publications it is pertinent to include also such use in this type of studies. Cordless phones are an important source of exposure to microwaves and they are usually used for a longer time period on daily basis as compared with mobile phones. Thus, to exclude such use seems to underestimate the risk for brain tumors from use of wireless phones.

It should be noted that the Hardell group has included also use of cordless phones, and thus in the exposure assessment the “unexposed” cases and controls have not been exposed to either cordless or cellular phones. This is in contrast to the Interphone study where the “unexposed” may have been exposed to cordless phones of unknown amount.

Of the 18 case-control studies 11 gave results for ≥ 10 years use or latency period. However, most of the results were based on low numbers. Thus, it is necessary to get an overview if there is a consistent pattern of increased risk with longer latency period and to make a formal meta-analysis of these findings. Since brain tumours are a heterogenic group of tumours it is reasonable to separate the results for malignant and benign tumours, as has been done in the various studies.

The Danish cohort study (Johansen et al, 2001) is not very informative due to limits in study design, analysis and follow-up. Schüz et al. (2006) reported an update of this previous study on mobile phone subscribers in Denmark. Since this report has gained substantial media coverage as “proof” of no brain tumor risk from mobile phone use we will discuss the shortcomings of the study in more detail in the following.

The cohort was established for persons that some time during 1982–1995 were registered cellular telephone users and has now been followed against the Danish Cancer Registry until 2002, seven years more than in the previous study. Previously (Johansen et al, 2001) 9 persons with brain tumors had used GSM phones for > 3 years, and OR =1.2 was reported. Now, data were not provided for type of phone or years of use. Rather the calculation of latency was based on first year of registration.

During early 1980s almost all cellular telephones were used in cars with external antennae. These subjects were unexposed to electromagnetic fields (EMF). No information regarding such use is provided, and one may assume that such participants are now included as exposed although they were not. Over 200 000 (32 %) company subscribers were excluded from the cohort. These are the heaviest users and are billed 4.5 times more than the layman in Sweden. They started use the earliest, but were included in the “non-user” group, i.e., the general Danish population.

SIR among cellular telephone users was 1.21 for temporal glioma (Schüz et al 2006), a region most exposed to EMF, based on 54 persons and not on phone type or time of first use (latency period). No information regarding the ear used and correlation with tumor site was given. The expected numbers were based on the general population. Because a large part of the population uses mobile phones and/or cordless phones, and the latter use was not assessed at all in the study, there is no truly unexposed group for comparison. Risk of cancer was underestimated, e.g., in the group with first use ≥ 10 years, the associated risk for brain tumors was low (SIR = 0.7, 95 % CI = 0.4- 0.95). Relying on private cellular network subscription as measure of mobile phone use has been questioned (Ahlbom et al 2004, Funch et al 1996).

There seems to be a “healthy worker” effect in the study because of the decreased overall cancer risk (SIR= 0.9, 95 % CI = 0.9-0.95). Of the subscribers 85 % were men and 15 % women. Certainly early mobile phone users are not socioeconomically representative of the whole Danish population, used for comparison. The cohort only included people > 18 years of age. We reported (Hardell et al 2004, 2006a,b) that cellular telephone use beginning before age 20 is associated with a higher risk of brain tumours than use starting after age 20.

The authors do not acknowledge the contribution by the telecom industry as cited in the first publication (Johansen et al 2001), i.e., TelemarkDanmarkMobil and Sonofom. Two of the authors are affiliated with the private International Epidemiology Institute, Rockville, MD, USA, which has contributed financially to the study. Where the International Epidemiology Institute gets its money from is not declared. In the application to the Danish National Mobile Phone Program, which funded part of the study, no mention of the involvement or payment of these two consultants was made, a fact that is now being set under question.

Regarding the case-control studies there seems to be a consistent pattern of an increased risk for acoustic neuroma using a 10-year latency period and considering ipsilateral exposure. It might be a “signal” tumour type for increased brain tumour risk from microwave exposure, since it is located in an anatomical area with high exposure during calls with cellular or cordless phones (Hardell et al, 2003). Christensen et al (2004) found no association using a ≥ 10 year latency period, but the result was based on only 2 cases. Interestingly, the tumours were significantly larger in the total group of regular mobile phone users.

In our study we found an increased risk also with shorter latency period than 10 years (Hardell et al 2006a). However, it is not known at what stage in the carcinogenesis microwaves act. An effect might exist at different stages both of promoter and initiator type. We conclude that the results on acoustic neuroma are consistent with an association with use of cellular phones using a latency period of ≥ 10 years.

Regarding meningioma no consistent pattern of an association was found, although ipsilateral exposure in the ≥ 10 years latency group increased the risk in the meta-analysis. For a definite

conclusion longer follow-up studies are needed. We conclude that the results are not consistent with an association between use of mobile phones and meningioma.

Malignant brain tumours have been studied in 8 case-control studies. One study was register based and showed an increased risk associated with analogue phone use although the latency period seemed to be short (Auvinen et al 2002). The risk of glioma increased significantly per year of use. Five studies gave results for use of cell phone for 10 years or more. The pattern of an association was consistent in the different studies, except for the Danish study by Christensen et al (2005). In that study all 17 odds ratios for high-grade glioma were < 1.0 indicating systematic bias in assessment of exposure.

Our meta-analysis showed a significantly increased risk for ipsilateral use. We conclude that using ≥ 10 years latency period gives a consistent pattern of an association between use of mobile phones and glioma.

Regarding the Interphone studies the German part (Schüz et al 2006) was commented on by Morgan (2006) and these comments may also apply to the other Interphone studies. Morgan noted that the definition of a "regular" cell-phone user was so minimal that almost all "regular" cell-phone users would not be expected to be at risk, even if cell-phone use was found to create very high risks of glioma and meningioma. As for longer periods of "regular" cell-phone use, Schüz et al (2006) reported that only 14 percent of the glioma cases and 6 percent of the meningioma cases had used a cell phone for 5 years or more. For 10 years or more, the percentages were 3 percent and 1 percent, respectively. The authors replied that even long-term users in the study had barely more than 10 years of regular use and, in the beginning, were not heavy users; hence, they could not draw conclusions on heavy long-term use.

Methodological issues in the Interphone studies have been also discussed by Vrijhed et al (2006a,b). It was concluded that actual use of mobile phones was underestimated in light users and overestimated in heavy users. Random recall bias could lead to large underestimation in the risk of brain tumours associated with mobile phone use. According to the authors there was a selection bias in the Interphone study resulting in under selection of unexposed controls with decreasing risk at low to moderate exposure levels. Some of the Interphone studies had a low response rate, especially among controls giving potential selection bias.

A formal meta-analysis on mobile phone use and intracranial tumors was performed by Lahkola et al (2006). No data were given for ≥ 10 year latency period. Overall the risk increased for ipsilateral tumors, OR = 1.3, 95 % CI = 0.99-1.9 whereas no increased risk was found for contralateral tumors, OR = 1.0, 95 % CI = 0.8-1.4.

V. Conclusions

In summary we conclude that our review yielded a consistent pattern of an increased risk for acoustic neuroma and glioma after ≥ 10 years mobile phone use. We conclude that current standard for exposure to microwaves during mobile phone use is not safe for long-term brain tumor risk and needs to be revised.

VI. References

- Ahlbom A, Green A, Kheifets L, Savitz D, Swerdlow A. 2004. Epidemiology of health effects of radiofrequency exposure. ICNIRP (International Commission for Non-ionizing Radiation Protection) Standing Committee on Epidemiology. *Environ Health Perspect* 112:1741-1754.
- Auvinen A, Hietanen M, Luukonen R, Koskela RS. 2002. Brain tumors and salivary gland cancers among cellular telephone users. *Epidemiology* 13:356-359.
- Christensen HC, Schüz J, Kosteljanetz M, Poulsen HS, Thomsen J, Johansen C. 2004. Cellular telephone use and risk of acoustic neuroma. *Am J Epidemiol* 159:277-283.
- Christensen HC, Schüz J, Kosteljanetz M, *et al.* 2005. Cellular telephones and risk for brain tumors. A population-based, incident case-control study. *Neurology* 64:1189-1195.
- Funch DP, Rothman KJ, Loughlin JE, Dreyer NA. 1996. Utility of telephone company records for epidemiologic studies of cellular telephones. *Epidemiology* 7:299-302.
- Hardell L, Näsman Å, Pålsson A, Hallquist A, Hansson Mild K. 1999. Use of cellular telephones and the risk for brain tumours: A case-control study. *Int J Oncol* 15:113-116.
- Hardell L, Hansson Mild K, Pålsson A, Hallquist A. 2001. Ionizing radiation, cellular telephones and the risk for brain tumours. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 10:523-529.
- Hardell L, Hansson Mild K, Sandström M. 2003. Vestibular schwannoma, tinnitus and mobile telephones. *Neuroepidemiology* 22:124-129.
- Hardell L, Hansson Mild K, Carlberg M, Hallquist A. 2004. Cellular and cordless telephones and the association with brain tumours in different age groups. *Arch Environ Health* 59(3): 132-137.
- Hardell L, Carlberg M, Hansson Mild K. Pooled analysis of two case-control studies on the use of cellular and cordless telephones and the risk of benign tumours diagnosed during 1997-2003. *Int J Oncol* 28:509-518.
- Hardell L, Hansson Mild K, Carlberg M. 2006a. Pooled analysis of two case-control studies on use of cellular and cordless telephones and the risk for malignant brain tumours diagnosed in 1997-2003. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2006b, 79:630-639.

Hardell L, Carlberg M, Söderqvist F, Hansson Mild K, Morgan LL. Long-term use of cellular phones and brain tumours: increased risk associated with use for ≥ 10 years. *Occup Environ Med* 2007;64:626-632, doi:10.1136/oem.2006.029751.

Hepworth SJ, Schoemaker MJ, Muir KR, Swerdlow AJ, van Tongeren MJ, McKinney PA. 2006. Mobile phone use and risk of glioma in adults: case-control study. *BMJ* 15;332(7546):883-887. Epub 2006 Jan 20.

Inskip PD, Tarone RE, Hatch EE, *et al.* Cellular-telephone use and brain tumors. 2001. *New Engl J Med* 344:79-86.

Johansen C, Boice JD Jr, McLaughlin JK, Olsen JH 2001. Cellular telephones and cancer – a nationwide cohort study in Denmark. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 93:203-207.

Klaeboe L, Blaasaas KG, Tynes T. 2007. Use of mobile phones in Norway and risk of intracranial tumours. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 16:158-164.

Lahkola A, Tokola K, Auvinen A. 2006. Meta-analysis of mobile phone use and intracranial tumors. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 32(3):171-177.

Lahkola A, Auvinen A, Raitanen J, *et al.* 2007. Mobile phone use and risk of glioma in 5 North European countries. *Int J Cancer* 120:1769-1775.

Lönn S, Ahlbom A, Hall P, Feychting M. 2004. Mobile phone use and the risk of acoustic neuroma. *Epidemiology* 15: 653-659.

Lönn S, Ahlbom A, Hall P, Feychting M 2005. Swedish Interphone Study Group. Long-term mobile phone use and brain tumor risk. *Am J Epidemiol* 161:526-535.

Muscat JE, Malkin MG, Thompson S, *et al.* 2000. Handheld cellular telephone use and risk of brain cancer. *JAMA* 284:3001-3007.

Muscat JE, Malkin MG, Shore RE, *et al.* 2002. Handheld cellular telephones and risk of acoustic neuroma *Neurology* 58:1304-1306

Schoemaker MJ, Swerdlow AJ, Ahlbom A, *et al.* 2005. Mobile phone use and risk of acoustic neuroma: results of the Interphone case-control study in five North European countries. *Br J Cancer* doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6602764.

Schüz J, Böhler E, Berg G, Schlehofer B, *et al.* 2006. Cellular phones, cordless phones, and the risks of glioma and meningioma (Interphone Study Group, Germany). *Am J Epidemiology* 163(6):512-520. Epub 2006 Jan 27. Comment by Morgan in: *Am J Epidemiol* 2006;164:294-295. Author reply 295.

Schüz J, Jacobsen R, Olsen JH, *et al.* 2006. Cellular telephone use and cancer risks: An update of a nationwide Danish cohort. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 98:1707-1713.

Schlehofer B, Schlafer K, Blettner M, *et al.* 2007. Environmental risk factors for sporadic acoustic neuroma (Interphone Study Group, Germany). *Eur J Cancer* doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2007.05.008.

Takebayashi T, Akiba S, Kikuchi Y, *et al.* 2006. Mobile phone use and acoustic neuroma risk in Japan. *Occup Environ Med* 63:802-807.

Vrijheid M, Cardis E, Armstrong BK, *et al.* 2006a. Validation of short term recall of mobile phone use for the Interphone study. *Occup Environ Med* 63:237-243.

Vrijheid M, Deltour I, Krewski D, Sanchez M, Cardis E. 2006b. The effects of recall errors and selection bias in epidemiologic studies of mobile phone use and cancer risk. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol* doi:10.1038/sj.jes.7500509.

Table. Summary of 20 studies on the use of cellular telephones and brain tumour risk. For further details, see Hardell et al (2007). Odds ratio (OR), 95 % confidence interval (CI) and standardised incidence ratio (SIR) are given.

Study	Years Study Type	Age	Tumour type	No. of Cases	Odds ratio, 95 % confidence interval	Comments
Hardell et al 1999, 2001 Sweden	1994-1996 Case-control	20-80 years	Brain tumours	217	OR 1.0 (0.7-1.4)	Analogue and digital cell phone use
				34	OR 1.1 (0.6-1.8)	Ipsilateral
				16	OR 1.2 (0.6-2.6)	> 10 year latency, analogue cell phone
Muscat et al 2000 USA	1994-1998 Case-control	18-80 years	Brain tumours	17	OR 0.7 (0.4-1.4)	Mean duration of use, 2.8 years
			Neuorepithelioma	35	OR 2.1 (0.9-4.7)	
Johansen et al 2001 Denmark	1982-1995 Cohort	0 to > 65 years	Brain tumours	20	SIR 1.3 (0.8-2.1)	Analogue and digital cell phone use
				9	SIR 1.2 (0.6-2.3)	≥ 3 years duration of digital subscription
Inskip et al 2001 USA	1994-1998 Case-control	≥ 18 years	Acoustic neuroma	5	OR 1.9 (0.6-5.9)	≥ 5 years of cell phone use
			Glioma	11	OR 0.6 (0.3-1.3)	
			Meningioma	6	OR 0.9 (0.3-2.7)	
Muscat et al 2002 USA	1997-1999 Case-control	≥ 18 years	Acoustic neuroma	11	OR 1.7 (0.5-5.1)	3-6 years of cell phone use
Auvinen et al 2002 Finland	1996 Case-control, register based	20-69 years	Glioma	119	OR 1.5 (1.0-2.4)	Analogue and digital cell phone "ever" use
				40	OR 2.1 (1.3-3.4)	Analogue cell phone "ever" used
				11	OR 2.4 (1.2-5.1)	Analogue cell phone use 1-2 years
				11	OR 2.0 (1.0-4.1)	Analogue cell phone use, >2 years
Lönn et al 2004 Sweden Interphone	1999-2002 Case-control	20-69 years	Acoustic neuroma	12	OR 1.8 (0.8-4.3)	≥10 years of cell phone use, result for either side of head
				12	OR 3.9 (1.6-9.5)	≥10 years of cell phone use on same side of head as tumour

Study	Years Study Type	Age	Tumour type	No. of Cases	Odds ratio, 95 % confidence interval	Comments
Christensen et al 2004 Denmark Interphone	2000-2002 Case-control	20-69 years	Acoustic neuroma	45	OR 0.9 (0.5-1.6)	Regular use
				2	OR 0.2 (0.04-1.1)	≥ 10 years cell phone use on same side of head as tumour. Significantly larger tumours among cellular phone users 1.66 cm ³ versus 1.39 cm ³ , p=0.03.
Lönn et al 2005 Sweden Interphone	2000-2002 Case-control	20-69 years	Glioma	214	OR 0.8 (0.6-1.0)	Regular use
				15	OR 1.6 (0.8-3.4)	≥10 years since first "regular" cell phone use on same side of head as tumour
				11	OR 0.7 (0.3-1.5)	≥10 years since first "regular" cell phone use on opposite side of head as tumour.
			Meningioma	118	OR 0.7 (0.5-0.9)	Regular use
				5	OR 1.3 (0.5-3.9)	≥10 years since first "regular" cell phone use on same side of head as tumour
				3	OR 0.5 (0.1-1.7)	≥10 years since first "regular" cell phone use on opposite side of head as tumour.

Study	Years Study Type	Age	Tumour type	No. of Cases	Odds ratio, 95 % confidence interval	Comments
Schoemaker et al 2005 Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Scotland, England, Interphone	1999-2004 Case-control	18-69 years (variable)	Acoustic neuroma	360	OR 0.9 (0.7-1.1)	Regular use
				23	OR 1.8 (1.1-3.1)	≥ 10 lifetime years of cell phone use on same side of head as tumour
				12	OR 0.9 (0.5-1.8)	≥ 10 lifetime years of cell phone use on opposite side of head as tumour
Christensen et al 2005 Denmark Interphone	2000-2002 Case-control	20-69 years	Low-grade glioma	47	OR 1.1 (0.6-2.0)	Regular use
				9	OR 1.6 (0.4-6.1)	≥10 years since first regular use of cell phone
			High-grade glioma	59	OR 0.6 (0.4-0.9)	Regular use
				8	OR 0.5 (0.2-1.3)	≥10 years since first regular use of cell phone 17 odds ratios for high-grade glioma, all < 1.0, indicates systematic bias
			Meningioma	67	OR 0.8 (0.5-1.3)	Regular use
				6	OR 1.0 (0.3-3.2)	≥10 years since first regular use of cell phone
Hepworth et al 2006 UK Interphone	2000-2004 Case-control	18-69 years	Glioma	508	OR 0.9 (0.8-1.1)	Regular use
				NA	OR 1.6 (0.9-2.8)	≥10 years of cell phone use on same side of head as tumour.
				NA	OR 0.8 (0.4-1.4)	>10 years of cell phone use on opposite side of head as tumour.

Study	Years Study Type	Age	Tumour type	No. of Cases	Odds ratio, 95 % confidence interval	Comments
Schüz et al 2006 Germany Interphone	2000-2003 Case-control	30-59 years	Glioma	138	OR 1.0 (0.7-1.3)	Regular use
				12	OR 2.2 (0.9-5.1)	≥ 10 years since first regular use of cell phone
				30	OR 2.0 (1.1-3.5)	Female regular use of cell phone
			Meningioma	104	OR 0.8 (0.6-1.1)	Regular use
				5	OR 1.1 (0.4-3.4)	≥ 10 years since first regular use of cell phone

Study	Years Study Type	Age	Tumour type	No. of Cases	Odds ratio, 95 % confidence interval	Comments
Hardell et al 2006a Sweden	1997-2003 Case-control	20-80 years	Acoustic neuroma	130	OR 1.7 (1.2-2.3)	> 1 year latency of cell phone use
				20	OR 2.9 (1.6-5.5)	> 10 years latency of cell phone use
				10	OR 3.5 (1.5-7.8)	> 10 years of ipsilateral cell phone use
				4	OR 1.0 (0.3-2.9)	> 10 years latency of cordless phone use
				3	OR 3.1 (0.8-12)	> 10 years latency of ipsilateral cordless phone use
			Meningioma	347	OR 1.1 (0.9-1.3)	> 1 year latency of cell phone use
				38	OR 1.5 (0.98-2.4)	> 10 years latency of cell phone use
				15	OR 2.0 (0.98-3.9)	> 10 years latency of ipsilateral cell phone use
				23	OR 1.6 (0.9-2.8)	> 10 years latency of cordless phone use
				9	OR 3.2 (1.2-8.4)	> 10 years latency of ipsilateral cordless phone use
Hardell et al 2006b Sweden	1997-2003 Case-control	20-80 years	Glioma, high-grade	281	OR 1.4 (1.1-1.8)	> 1 year latency of cell phone use
				71	OR 3.1 (2.0-4.6)	> 10 years latency of cell phone use
				39	OR 5.4 (3.0-9.6)	> 10 years latency of ipsilateral cell phone use
				23	OR 2.2 (1.3-3.9)	> 10 years of cordless phone use
				10	OR 4.7 (1.8-13)	> 10 years latency of ipsilateral cordless phone use
			Glioma, low-grade	65	OR 1.4 (0.9-2.3)	> 1 year latency of cell phone use
				7	OR 1.5 (0.6-3.8)	> 10 years latency of cell phone use
				2	OR 1.2 (0.3-5.8)	> 10 years latency of ipsilateral cell phone use
				5	OR 1.6 (0.5-4.6)	> 10 years latency of cordless phone use
				3	OR 3.2 (0.6-16)	> 10 years latency of ipsilateral cordless phone use

Study	Years Study Type	Age	Tumour type	No. of Cases	Odds ratio, 95 % confidence interval	Comments
Takebayashi et al 2006 Tokyo Interphone	2000-2004 Case-control	30-69 years	Acoustic neuroma	51	OR 0.7 (0.4-1.2)	Regular use
				4	OR 0.8 (0.2-2.7)	Length of use > 8 years
				20	OR 0.9 (0.5-1.6)	Ipsilateral use
Schüz et al 2006 Denmark	1982-2002 Cohort	>18 years	Glioma	257	SIR 1.0 (0.9-1.1)	420 095 telephone subscribers
			Meningioma	68	SIR 0.9 (0.7-1.1)	
			Nerve sheat tumors	32	SIR 0.7 (0.5-1.0)	
			Brain and nervous system	28	SIR 0.7 (0.4-0.95)	Latency ≥ 10 years
Lahkola et al 2007 Denmark, Norway, Finland, Sweden, UK Interphone	September 2000- February 2004 (differed between countries) Case-control	20-69 years (Nordic countries), 18-59 years (UK)	Glioma	867	OR 0.8 (0.7-0.9)	Regular use
				77	OR 1.4 (1.01-1.9)	Ipsilateral mobile phone use, ≥ 10 years since first use, <i>p</i> for trend = 0.04
Klaeboe et al 2007 Norway Interphone	2001-2002 Case-control	19-69 years	Glioma	161	OR 0.6 (0.4-0.9)	Regular use
			Meningioma	111	OR 0.8 (0.5-1.1)	
Schlehofer et al 2007 Germany Interphone	2000-2003 Case-control	30-69 years	Acoustic neuroma	29	OR 0.7 (0.4-1.2)	Regular use

Deleted: ¶

¶
¶
¶

SECTION 10 – Part 2

EVIDENCE FOR BRAIN TUMORS

(EPIDEMIOLOGICAL)

**Michael Kundi, Ph.D. med. habil., Professor
Institute of Environmental Health, Center for Public Health, Medical
University of Vienna, Austria**

**Prepared for the BioInitiative Working Group
July 2007**

TABLE OF CONTENTS**I. INTRODUCTION****II. MATERIAL AND METHODS****III. EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES OF RF AND BRAIN TUMORS**

- A. Thomas et al. 1987
- B. Milham 1988
- C. Selvin et al. 1992
- D. Tynes et al., 1992
- E. Grayson 1996
- F. Szmigielski 1996
- G. Hocking et al., 1996
- H. Tynes et al., 1996
- I. Dolk et al., 1997a
- J. Dolk et al., 1997b
- K. Lagorio et al., 1997
- L. Finkelstein 1998
- M. Morgan et al., 2000
- N. Groves et al., 2002
- O. Berg et al., 2006

IV. EVALUATION OF BRAIN TUMOR EVIDENCE (RF EXPOSURE)**V. EVALUATION OF CANCER-RELATED ENDPOINTS (RF EXPOSURE)****A. Assessment of Epidemiological Evidence by IEEE (C95.1 Revision)****VI. CONCLUSIONS****VII. REFERENCES**

Figure 1: Estimates of relative risk (and 95% confidence intervals) of various RF exposures with respect to brain tumors

Table 1: Synopsis of epidemiologic studies of or including brain tumors (1987-2006)

Table 2: Synopsis of main results of brain tumor studies (1987 – 2006)

I. INTRODUCTION

Primary central nervous system (CNS) tumors are a heterogeneous group of benign and malignant neoplasms localized in the brain, the spinal cord and their coverings. They differ in histological type, tissue of origin, anatomic site, growth pattern, age distribution, sex ratio, clinical appearance and many other features including molecular neuropathological markers. These features are not independent but little is known about the etiology of these tumors and the reason for the observed epidemiological patterns. The rapidly developing field of molecular neuropathology may provide clues to solve these problems in the future.

Brain tumors, accounting for the majority of CNS tumors, are rare. Annually about 36,000 36000 new cases are diagnosed in the US and about 180,000 180000 world-wide. The age distribution has two peaks: incidence is about 35 cases per million per year below 10 years of age (which is mainly due to tumors originating from mesodermal and embryonic tissues, medulloblastoma and astrocytoma of the juvenile pilocytic type), and after age 15 there is a steady increase of incidence with increasing age reaching its second peak of about 200 cases per million per year at an age around 75 years. The burden of CNS cancers is distinctly higher in children making up around 20% of all childhood malignancies, while in adults less than 2% of all cancers are primary brain cancers.

There are some rare cases of inherited cancer syndromes (e.g. von Hippel-Lindau disease, Li-Fraumeni syndrome) that are related to brain tumor risk, accounting for a small fraction of cases. Except for therapeutic x-rays no environmental or lifestyle life-style factor has unequivocally been established as risk factor for brain tumors. Non-whites Non whites seem to have lower risk, and incidence tends to be higher with increasing socio-economic status. However, because of the rather advanced age of 75 of peak incidence, such differences may partly be due to differences in life-expectancy. During the last decades some types of brain tumors show a steady increase of a few percent per year, which might to some extent be related to the introduction of computed tomography and other high-resolution neuroimaging methods.

Since the report of Wertheimer and Leeper in 1979 of an increased incidence of brain tumors in children living in homes with an expected higher exposure to power-frequency electric and magnetic fields, exposure to electromagnetic fields have become an area of interest in the study of factors affecting brain tumor risk.

This review focuses on the radio frequency (RF) part of the electromagnetic spectrum (3 kHz to 300 GHz). However, because the epidemiology of mobile phone use is covered in another section, it will be restricted to RF exposure conditions other than microwaves from mobile phone use. Exposure to ELF magnetic fields and childhood brain tumors is covered in the chapter about childhood cancers.

II. Material and Methods

Published articles of relevant studies restricted to the last 20 years were obtained by searching PubMed using the following terms:

("radio frequency" OR electromagnetic* OR microwaves) AND ("brain cancer" OR brain tumor* OR "CNS cancer" OR CNS tumor* OR glioma* OR meningioma* OR neuroma*) NOT ("power frequency" OR "low frequency") AND epidemiology

The search resulted in 101 hits. After removing reviews and animal or in vitro studies as well as studies of mobile phone use, 8 articles remained. A hand search in review papers (Krewski et al. 2001; Elwood 2003; Ahlbom et al. 2004; Kundi et al. 2004) and reference lists of the articles found in PubMed revealed another 7 papers; hence the final body of evidence consists of 15 studies of exposure to various types of RF fields.

Of the 15 studies 8 were cohort studies, 3 case-control studies and 4 of an ecological type. The majority (11) were occupational studies, two studies investigated children, and one ecological study investigated adults and one study both, adults and children.

III. Epidemiological studies of RF fields and brain tumors

Table 1 gives an overview of the 15 studies obtained by the literature search with respect to study type, assessment of exposure and outcome, confounders considered and matching variables used, number of cases included and selection method of study participants. Results are summarized in Table 2.

In the following paragraphs each study is briefly discussed with respect to its strengths and weaknesses.

A. Thomas et al. 1987

This case-control study included 435 deaths from brain or CNS tumors and 386 deaths from other causes as controls. Only adult males were included. Basis of data collection on occupational history were interview with next-of-kin. Two methods of classification were used: one method assigned subjects to one of three categories (never exposed to RF/ever exposed to RF in an electrical or electronics job/ever exposed to RF but not in an electrical or electronics job), the other method consisted in a classification of each job by an industrial hygienist for presumed exposure to RF, soldering fumes, and lead. Both methods revealed significantly increased brain tumor risks of presumed occupational exposure to RF fields. This increase was due to an association in electronics and electrical jobs with astrocytic tumors as the predominant outcome associated with employment in these categories. In addition a significant increase of brain tumor risk was found for increasing duration of exposure.

Although relying on information of next-of-kin could be a source of misclassification, one strength of this study is its relying on occupational history only that could be assumed to be more accurate than recall of exposure to various agents. The two methods of classification led to almost the same results, which lends support to the hypothesis that indeed exposure in electrical and electronics jobs is associated with an increased brain tumor risk. Due to the strong relationship between RF exposure and exposure to lead, solvents or soldering fumes in these jobs, it is not possible to separate effects of these exposures. However, analysis of exposure to lead did not show a consistent relationship with brain tumor risk, indicating that it may not confound the relationship to RF exposure.

Because this study is of dead cases only it is likely over-representing high grade brain tumors that may not all be associated with exposure which leads to an effect dilution. Exposure misclassification, if it is non-differential in cases and controls, also tends to reduce effect estimates.

A weakness of this study is obviously its lack of an exposure indicator other than the occupational category. While there is no doubt that in these jobs some exposure to RF fields occur quite regularly, specific characteristics including frequency ranges, modulation, intensity, duration and distance from the source vary considerably. Overall the study (as well

as two earlier ones outside the search window: Lin et al. 1985 and Milham 1985) are sufficient to formulate a research hypothesis that can be tested in appropriately designed subsequent investigations. Unfortunately such studies have never been conducted.

B. Milham 1988

In this cohort study of 67,829 amateur radio operators holding a license within 1/1979 to 6/1984 in Washington and California 29 brain tumor deaths occurred during the follow up period with 21 expected.

It should be noted that there was a substantial and statistically significant lower number of overall deaths of less than three quarters of deaths expected from country mortality rates. This could be due to both a 'healthy-worker' effect as well as an effect of socio-economic status. In lieu of computing standardized mortality ratios (SMR) it may be instructive to look at the proportional mortality rates in the reference population and the amateur radio operators: 0.6% of all deaths are expected to be due to brain tumors in the reference population while in amateur radio operators twice as many occurred (1.2%). Whether or not this is an indication of an increased brain tumor risk due to RF exposure is difficult to assess. First of all this study is a register only investigation and no information on intensity, frequency and duration of engagement in amateur radio operations are available. In a later analysis the author reported about results using a proxy of intensity and duration of exposure: the license class. In this analysis indications of an increase of risk with increasing license class were obtained.

This study could and should have started off a thorough follow up of amateur radio operators and nested case-control studies to address the problem of potential confounders and to narrow down the conditions that may be responsible for the increased mortality from some cancers. It is another loose end that leaves us without a clear message.

Although no risk factor for brain cancer except therapeutic ionizing radiation is known, there are some indications that risk increases with social class. The reason for this association is unknown but life-style factors may play a role as well as concomitant causes of death that could lead to a spurious reduction of risk in lower class populations because brain tumors have their peak close to life-expectancy.

C. Selvin et al. 1992

The objective of this investigation was not primarily to study the relationship between RF exposure and childhood cancer but to address the general problem of how to assess disease incidence or mortality in relation to a point source. As the point source the Sutro Tower in San Francisco, the only microwaves emitting tower in this county, was chosen. A total of 35 brain tumor deaths occurred among 50,686 white individuals at risk aged less than 21 in the years 1973-88 in an area of approximately 6 km around the tower. The exact location of residence could not be obtained; therefore each case was located in the center of the census tract. Different methods of analysis were applied to assess a potential relationship between distance from the tower and brain tumor risk. Relative risk for brain tumors for a distance less than 3.5 km from Sutro Tower compared to more than 3.5 km was 1.162 and not significant. The study explored different methodological procedures and has its merits from a methodological point of view. However, it starts from the wrong assumption: that distance to a point source is a valid proxy for intensity of exposure. Under ideal conditions of spherical symmetry of an emission this assumption holds, however, there are almost no real life situations where this assumption is sufficiently close to actual exposure levels. And it is definitely not true for the Sutro Tower. Radiations from the antennae are directed towards the horizon and the complex pattern of emission with main and side lobes results in a complex pattern of RF exposure at ground level. Furthermore, the area is topographically structured with hills and valleys such that areas of high exposure at the vertices are in close proximity to areas of low exposure at the shadowed side downhill.

Studying the relationship between a point source and disease is not only difficult due to the complex relationship between distance and exposure but also because of the fact that humans are not stable at a certain location. This is of greater importance for adults who may commute from and to work places and have generally a greater radius of activity as compared to children. Nevertheless, there is at least a high chance of one long-lasting stable location that is when people sleep in their beds. Therefore, studies in relation to a point source should attempt to assess exposure at the location of the bed. Because the objective of this study was not the assessment of a potential brain tumor risk but the application of methods for the analysis of spatial data, no attempts were made to measure actual exposure.

D. Tynes et al. 1992

In this study information on occupations obtained for all Norwegians every 10 years was used to assess cancer incidence in relation to job titles. In 1960 37,945 male workers were identified that had jobs with possible exposure to EMFs and among these 3,017 with possible RF exposure. Overall 119 brain tumor cases were found in the cancer registry between 1961 and 1985. Of these cases 6 occurred in the subgroup of workers possibly exposed to RF fields. The overall expected number of brain tumor cases was 109 and 12 for the subgroup with possible RF exposure. Hence no increased brain tumor risk could be detected.

Despite the long follow-up period of 25 years with an accumulated number of 65,500 person-years the expected number of brain tumors diagnosed during that period is too low to detect a moderately elevated risk of 1.3 to 1.5.

As mentioned above, all studies solely relying on job titles lead to exposure misclassification and, therefore, to a dilution of risk. For dichotomous exposure variables (exposed/not exposed) and assuming a negligibly small proportion of exposed in the reference population standardized incidence ratios (SIR) are biased by a factor $(1+f*(SIR-1))/SIR$, if f denotes the fraction of true exposed and SIR is the true incidence ratio. Hence a true SIR of 2.0 is reduced to 1.5 if only 50% in the cohort are actually exposed. The observed SIR is further reduced if the assumption of a negligible fraction of exposed in the reference population is wrong. In this case the bias factor given above is further divided by $(1+g*(SIR-1))$, where g is the fraction of exposed in the general population.

While a cohort study that is based on registry data has the advantage of independence from recall errors and selection bias due to possible differential participation, it has the disadvantage that registry data are generally insufficient to provide reliable exposure indicators. While no association with brain tumors could be detected in this study it revealed an increased number of leukemia cases in occupations with possible RF exposure. This could be due to the higher incidence of leukemia or to a stronger association or to different latency periods and various other reasons including chance.

E. Grayson 1996

In this case-control study nested within approx. 880,000 US Air Force personnel with at least one years of service during the study period of 1970-89 primary malignant brain tumor cases were ascertained by screening hospital discharge records. The study included only males and only as long as they were on Air Force records. From 246 cases detected 16 were dropped due to incomplete or ambiguous data. For each case four controls were randomly selected from the case's risk set matching it exactly on year of birth and race. Controls who were diagnosed with diseases that may be associated with EMF exposure (leukemia, breast cancer, malignant melanoma) were excluded from the risk set.

One strength of this study is the detailed job history filed for each cohort member that could be used for retrospective exposure assessment. Furthermore, Air Force files contained detailed data from personal dosimetry on ionizing radiation for the different posts and jobs. Classification of RF field exposure was based on a detailed job exposure matrix with over 1,950 entries, indexing 552 different job titles. One source of classification was recorded events of exposure to RF fields above 100 W/m². By this method probable exposure was assigned if for a job such events were recorded in the past as well as for closely related jobs. Possible exposure was assigned for jobs that required operation of RF emitters but without recorded overexposure.

A further strength is the thorough consideration of possible confounders. Because of the possible relationship of brain tumor risk with socio-economic status (SES), military rank was used as a surrogate for SES and included in the analysis as well as ionizing radiation exposure that has previously been shown to increase brain tumor risk.

Exposure to RF fields was associated with a moderate but statistically significant increased risk of OR=1.39. Investigation of duration of exposure was compromised by an ambiguity introduced by the calculation of an exposure score as the product of exposure and months. Nevertheless, for those ever exposed there were indications of an increasing risk with increasing exposure duration.

A weakness of this investigation is its incomplete follow-up of cohort members. This could have resulted in an underestimation of the true risk. Leaving the Air Force could have been

more likely in those exposed to RF fields and developing a brain tumor. Some malignant brain tumors have early signs that could be incompatible with the Air Force job especially if involving operation of RF equipment (like seizures, severe headaches, somnolence, and absences). Because the study did not involve personal contact it is free of other selection biases.

F. Szmigielski 1996

In this military cohort study of cancer morbidity Polish military career personnel was assessed for occupational exposure to RF fields based on service records. The study covered 15 years (1971-85) including approx. 128,000 persons per year. Expected rates for 12 cancer types were calculated based on the age specific morbidity in those classified as unexposed.

For brain and nervous system tumors a significantly increased ratio of observed to expected (OER=1.91) was found. Other malignancies with significantly increased incidence in exposed were: esophageal and stomach cancers, colorectal cancers, melanoma, and leukemia/lymphoma.

One strength of this study is its substantial size with almost 2 million person-years of follow-up. Furthermore, accurate military records on job assignment and on exposure from military safety groups gives a unique opportunity to assess long-term exposure effects based on already filed data.

Some important data are missing because they were military classified information that could not be provided in the paper. This includes the exact number of cases of the different neoplasms. However, from the data presented an observed number of brain tumors of about 46 can be calculated.

The study has been criticized for an alleged bias because more information on risk factors was available for cancer cases. It is true that military medical boards collected data for cases such as life style factors and exposure to possible carcinogens during service, however, at no stage this information entered the analysis. Therefore, this criticism is unfounded. Such information could have been utilized within a nested case-control study applying the same methods of assessment of risk factors for controls as has been done for cases. Because some findings, such as the increased risk for esophagus/stomach cancer, that are rarely reported in relation to

RF exposure warrant further study, such a nested case-control approach is recommended. It could, albeit with some difficulties, even be successfully conducted retrospectively.

G. Hocking et al. 1996

In an ecological study cancer incidence and mortality in nine municipalities of northern Sydney during 1972-90 three of which surround three TV towers were assessed. Population size in the three municipalities located within a radius of approximately approx. 4 km around the TV towers amounts to 135,000 while population size in the six municipalities further away was 450,000. High-power transmission commenced in 1956, an additional 100 kW transmission started in 1965 and another 300 kW broadcast in 1980. Carrier frequencies varied between 63 and 533 MHz for TV broadcasting and was around 100 MHz for FM radio broadcast.

During the study period 740 primary malignant brain tumors were diagnosed in adults and 64 in children, 606 deaths due to brain cancer occurred in adults and 30 in children. While incidence of lymphatic leukemia was significantly higher in adults as well as in children inhabiting the three municipalities surrounding the transmission towers compared to the six districts further away, brain tumor incidence was not significantly elevated (RR=0.89 in adults and 1.10 in children).

As has been stated above, distance from a transmitter is a poor proxy for exposure. Some measurements done in the study area obtained levels much lower than those calculated from the emission power and antenna gain. Several factors are responsible for this effect: multiple reflections, attenuation by buildings and vegetation, ground undulations, non-coincidence of maxima for the different signals as well as complex radiation characteristics of the broadcast antennae.

The exact location of the residence of cases could not be provided which reduces the potential of the study to relate incidences to measurements or calculations of RF fields. Authors discussed some potential sources of bias such as migration and other exposures in the different regions. However, the most important disadvantage in such studies is that individual risk factors cannot be adjusted for. Both spurious positive as well as false negative results can be obtained by disregarding such individual variables.

H. Tynes et al. 1996

In a historical cohort study 2,619 Norwegian female radio and telegraph operators certified between 1920 and 1980 were followed from 1961 through 1991 for entries in the cancer registry. During this period a total of 140 cases of cancer occurred which are about 20% more than expected from the Norwegian population. Among these were 5 brain tumor cases closely matching the number expected.

An excess for breast cancer was found in this study that may be related to a combination of RF field exposure and night work. For other cancers including brain cancer numbers of cases were too low to address exposure risk.

In this very thoroughly conducted study including a nested case-control approach for breast cancer, measurements at historical transmitters on ships, comparison with women at other jobs on sea, brain tumors were not distinctly higher than expected from the reference population. However, because of the limited cohort size a moderately increased risk cannot be excluded.

I. Dolk et al. 1997a

This ecological small area study of cancer incidence 1974-86 near the Sutton Coldfield TV/radio transmitter at the northern edge of the city of Birmingham (England) was initiated by an unconfirmed report of a 'cluster' of leukemias and lymphomas. The transmitter came into service in 1949. Transmission at 1 megawatt (effective radiated power erp) began in 1964, at 3 MW in 1969, and at 4 MW in 1982. The tower has a height of 240 m with no big hills in the surrounding area. The study area was defined by a circle of 10 km radius centered at the transmitter. The population within this area was about 408,000. All cancers, excluding non-melanoma skin cancer, were considered focusing on hematopoietic and lymphatic cancers, brain and nervous system cancers, eye cancer, and male breast cancer. Childhood cancers were restricted to all cancers and all leukemias.

In the study area a small but significant excess of all cancers was observed in adults. All leukemias and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma were particularly elevated and incidence within 2 to

4 km from the tower was about 30% higher than expected. Brain tumors were only analyzed for distances of within 2 km and the whole study area. Within 2 km an increased OER of 1.29 for all brain tumors and 1.31 for malignant brain tumors was calculated based on 17 and 12 cases, respectively.

Also this investigation suffers from using distance from the tower as proxy for intensity of exposure. The wrong assumption that exposure decreases with increasing distance invalidates the statistical trend test applied. Measurements conducted in the study area revealed the poor relationship with distance but without consequences on the evaluation of the data. Overall the study is consistent with a moderately increased risk of hematopoietic and lymphatic cancers as well as some other cancers including brain cancer in the vicinity of high-power transmitters that, if related to RF fields, must be substantially higher for actual exposure.

The Sutton Coldfield study was later continued (Cooper & Saunders 2001) to cover the period 1987-94. The study revealed, compared to the earlier period, an almost unchanged increase of leukemias and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma in adults and a slight increase in children.

J. Dolk et al. 1997b

Because the Sutton Coldfield study was triggered by a cluster report and to provide independent test of hypotheses arising from that study, similar methods as applied in the previous study were used to study all high-power TV/radio transmitters (≥ 500 kW ERP) in Great Britain. In adults leukemias, bladder cancer, and skin melanoma, and in children, leukemias and brain tumors were studied. The study period was 1974-86 for England and somewhat shorter in Wales and Scotland.

Although population density around transmitters was not always as high as in the case of the Sutton Coldfield tower, with an average population density of only about one third of that around Sutton Coldfield tower within 2 km from the towers, in the most important range of 2 to 4 km from the transmitters, where in many cases the maximum of radiated RF at ground level is reached, population density was similar. The study of all high-power transmitters essentially corroborated the findings for adult leukemias with an increase of incidence between 10 and 50% in the distance band of 2 to 4 km from the transmitters for the different transmitter types. Most of these increased incidences were statistically significant.

For children only the incidence in the whole study area and within a distance of 2 km was calculated, which is unfortunate because the area close to the towers is sparsely populated and exposure is low. Number of brain tumors in children was slightly above expectation (244 observed and 231 expected).

In contrast to the interpretation by the authors, the study of all high power transmitters essentially replicated and supported the findings of an excess incidence of leukemias in relation to RF emission from TV/radio towers. Because the different heights and radiation characteristics of the transmitters result in different exposure patterns at ground level, the consistent increase in an area that is likely close to the maximum of exposure supports the hypothesis of an association.

K. Lagorio et al. 1997

A mortality study of a cohort of 481 female plastic-ware workers employed between 1962-92 in an Italian plant, 302 of which were engaged in the sealing department with exposure to RF fields, was reported by Lagorio et al. (1997). For RF-sealers 6,772 person-years of follow-up were accumulated and overall 9 deaths occurred, 6 of which were from malignant neoplasms (which are twice as many as expected from comparison with the local reference population). In the 31 years only one brain cancer occurred but only 0.1 were expected.

Although the small size of the cohort and the potential exposure to other agents except RF fields such as solvents and vinyl chloride prohibit far reaching conclusion, much more of such thorough follow-up studies of exposed cohorts are needed to accumulate a body of evidence that can provide a useful basis for analysis.

L. Finkelstein 1998

A preliminary study intended to form the basis for an assessment of cancer risks associated with handheld radar devices was conducted among a cohort of 20,601 male Ontario police officers. The retrospective follow up covered the period of 1964-95. By linkage with the cancer registry and mortality database 650 cases of cancer were detected.

Testicular cancer and melanoma showed an excess incidence while overall cancer incidence was reduced as expected from a working cohort. Overall 16 cases of primary malignant brain tumors occurred which are slightly less than expected.

The author had difficulties to build up a proper cohort because some departments refused to participate and others couldn't spare the time to provide lists of all officers employed during the target period. Furthermore, while cancer sites of primary interest showed actually an increased incidence calling for a nested case-control approach, this study was never conducted due to lack of interest and support of the authorities.

M. Morgan et al. 2000

In an occupational cohort study all US Motorola employees with at least 6 months cumulative employment and at least 1 day of employment in the period 1976-96 were included. A total of 195,775 workers contributing about 2.7 million person-years were available for the study. The cohort was compared to the SSA Master Mortality File and the National Death Index to obtain vital status. Death certificates were obtained by states' vital statistics offices and company records. Exposure was assessed by expert opinion. Four RF exposure groups were defined with increasing level of estimated RF exposure. Only about 5% of the total cohort was classified as highly exposed and more than 70% with only background exposure. Neither private nor occupational mobile phone use was included.

Overall 6,296 deaths occurred in the cohort in 21 years, which were only two thirds of deaths expected from mortality data of the four countries where most Motorola facilities are located. This reduction is too pronounced to be solely due to a healthy worker effect, other factors such as higher SES must have contributed, an interpretation supported by the substantial reduction of mortality from all life-style associated causes of death. Internal comparisons were done for mortality from brain cancer and hematopoietic and lymphatic cancers. Brain tumor mortality was slightly but insignificantly elevated in high and moderately high exposed workers as compared to those with no or low RF exposure.

This study of a huge cohort demonstrates the limitations of such a study design. The majority of the cohort (58%) consisted of retired or terminated workers that may or may not accumulate further RF exposure at other companies. Furthermore, it can be assumed that

Motorola employees were among the first that used mobile phones at the workplace and privately. Neglecting mobile phone use may diminish the gradient of exposures between occupational groups studied. It would have been better to conduct nested case-control studies instead of using internal comparison that may be compromised by mobility bias, exposure misclassification and other sources of bias.

N. Groves et al. 2002

In this military cohort study of 40,581 men followed from the year of graduation (1950-1954) from Navy technical schools through 1997, known as the Korean War Veterans study, groups of sailors with imputed difference in likelihood and amount of exposure to radar waves were compared with respect to mortality. The original study, with a follow up through 1974, (Robinette et al. 1980) reported increased risks of cancer of the hematopoietic and lymphatic system, of the lung and digestive system for the high exposure group but was handicapped by the lack of information on date of birth of the cohort members. For the extended follow up study many missing birth dates were found in the Veterans Administration Master Index. Nevertheless, birth date remained unknown for over 8% of the cohort. Based on expert opinion low RF exposure was assigned to job classifications of radioman, radarman, and aviation electrician's mate, high exposure stratum included men with job classifications of electronics technician, aviation electronics technician, and fire control technician.

By matching against the Social Security Administration's Death Master File and the National Death Index 8,393 deceased subjects were identified through 1997. This number is substantially and significantly lower as expected from the male white US population. A healthy soldier effect may have been responsible for a lower mortality rate in the 1950ies but cannot explain the reduced mortality after 40 years. It has not been reported how long the cohort members stayed in service nor were life-style factors investigated; however, of more than 40% of the cohort no social security number could be obtained suggesting possible under-estimation of deaths.

Comparison of high- with low-exposure groups revealed significantly lower mortality from life-style associated causes of death (lung cancer, vascular diseases, diabetes mellitus, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, liver cirrhosis) and significantly higher mortality from all leukemias and external causes of death. Increased mortality from leukemias was found in all high exposure groups but the most pronounced increase was observed in aviation electronics

technicians. Brain cancer was less frequent in all high exposure groups compared to the low exposure category.

The long period of follow up of this large cohort with start of follow up almost at the same time (1950-54) and at a time when exposure commenced is a great advantage of this investigation. However, there are a number of shortcomings: follow up was possibly incomplete by unknown social security number of a substantial proportion of the cohort; almost half of all deaths in the first 20 years were from external causes which could have obscured an effect of exposure; duration and intensity of exposure is unknown as well as potential exposure after leaving the Navy; classification into low and high exposure groups may introduce substantial misclassification. In the earlier report, inspection of Navy records for a sample from the high exposure group revealed that 24% had no exposure to radar waves at all.

Concerning brain tumors, assuming an effect of radar exposure on growth rate, exposure during the Korean War and no exposure afterwards would be expected to result in only a slightly increased risk during a period of about 10 years after the war. Sailors were about 20 to 25 years at that time. The fraction with an already initiated brain tumor during this age range is estimated to be less than 3 in 100,000 per year. Increase of growth rate even if substantial cannot result in an effect observable in a cohort of that size. If radar exposure increases the likelihood of malignant transformation this could increase the incidence during a time window of 10 to 20 years after the exposure period. Results of the Israeli study of x-ray treated tinea capitis (Sadetzki et al. 2005) suggest an even longer latency, however, risk decreased with increasing age at first exposure to x-rays. In addition, for malignant brain tumors there is a less pronounced relationship to ionizing radiation, and a higher risk was observed for meningioma that were not investigated in the Korean War Veterans study. Taking the data on ionizing radiation as a guiding principle for brain tumor initiation, radar exposure of sailors during their twenties might result in an increase of brain tumor mortality of about 10 to 15%, i.e. a maximum of 8 additional cases among 20,000. Considering the biases of the study such a low risk is easily obscured. Hence neither tumor promotion nor initiation may be detected in this study even if there is an increased risk. Because of the mentioned limitation to a certain time window with possibly increased incidence due to exposures during service in the Korean War, it would have been instructive to compute Kaplan-Meier estimates for cumulative brain tumor mortality.

N. Berg et al. 2006

In the German part of the Interphone study special attention was paid to occupational history and exposure to RF fields at workplaces. Incident meningioma (n=381, response rate 88%) and glioma cases (n=366, response rate 80%) aged 30-69 years were selected from four neurological clinics. Overall 1,535 (participation rate 63%) were randomly selected from population registries matched to the cases by sex, age, and region. Most cases were interviewed during their stay in hospitals, controls were interviewed at home. The interview contained several screening questions about occupations that are probably associated with RF exposure. If any of these screening questions were marked additional questions were asked about the job. Based on the literature and the evaluation by two industrial hygienists a classification into the following categories was performed: no RF exposure/not probably RF exposed/probably ER exposed/highly RF exposed. In total about 13% (299 cases and controls) were classified with at least possible RF exposure at the workplace. Analyses were adjusted for region, sex, age, SES, urban/rural residence, ionizing radiation exposure in the head/neck region. Mobile phone use was not considered as a confounder.

While overall RF exposure at workplaces showed no increased odds-ratios, high exposure and especially for durations of 10 years or more resulted in elevated risk estimates that were, however, not significant. This result was similar for meningioma (OR=1.55 for high exposure for 10 years or more) and glioma (OR=1.39).

The study tried to assess potential workplace exposure as precisely as possible in a personal interview, but still misclassification may have occurred especially in the probable and not probable categories while the high exposure group is likely to have had at least occasionally above average RF exposure. Odds ratios are in the range expected if exposure results in a substantial increase of growth rate. The small number of highly and long-term exposed cases (13 glioma and 6 meningioma) prohibit, however, far reaching conclusions.

IV. Evaluation of Evidence

Due to the varying endpoints, methods used and populations included and the small number of studies a formal meta-analysis is not possible. The following figure shows the results detailed in Table 2 in an easily comprehensible way.

Only few studies found clear indications of an association between RF exposure and brain tumors: one cohort study (Szmigielski 1996) and two case-control studies (Thomas et al. 1987, Grayson 1996). None of the ecological studies demonstrated a tendency for an increased risk in the vicinity of RF transmitters.

The discussion of the 15 published investigations revealed shortcomings in all studies. The greatest problem was encountered in the difficulties to reliably assess actual exposure. Even if we don't know the relevant aspect of the exposure, if any, that is responsible for an increased risk, the type, duration and amount of exposure must be determined in order to use the studies in derivations of exposure standards. None of the studies included a useful quantitative indicator of intensity of exposure and even duration of exposure was rarely addressed. Concerning type of exposure only quite crude and broad categories were used.




Fig. 1: Estimates of relative risk (and 95% confidence intervals) of various RF exposures with respect to brain tumors (B+NS...brain and nervous system tumors, BT...brain tumors, M...meningioma, G...glioma; all others primary malignant brain tumors)

In ecological studies, although for the studied population the exposure - despite considerable variations in time - is similar with respect to carrier frequency, modulation etc. it is quite different between various types of transmitters and hence results are not easily generalized.

Considering the discussion of the different investigations and the fact that most biases encountered tend to dilute a potential risk, the compiled evidence from occupational cohorts is compatible with a moderately increased risk of RF exposure. Because of the lack of actual measurements but observing that exposure above guideline levels must have been a rare event a precautionary approach must result in a reduction of occupational exposure levels and organizational measures to avoid over-exposure. Although brain tumors are rare and the population attributable risk is low (assuming 13% of adults being occupationally exposed to RF fields as inferred from Berg et al. 2006, and assuming a relative risk of 1.3, about 4% of brain tumors can be attributed to RF exposure, i.e. 1,350 cases per years in the US).

V. EVALUATION OF CANCER-RELATED ENDPOINTS (RF EXPOSURE)

A. Assessment of Epidemiological Evidence by IEEE (C95.1 Revision)

In their 2006 revision of the standard C95.1 IEEE has assessed the evidence from epidemiology for cancer related endpoints in chapter B.7.3. The assessment relies mainly on the reviews of Bergqvist (1997), Moulder et al. (1999) and Elwood (2003). These reviews and the IEEE overview share the same deficiencies. The main lines of argumentation would be impossible in any other field of environmental health and closely resemble the strategy used to dismiss a power frequency exposure/childhood leukemia association. In the following paragraphs the assessment by IEEE will be briefly discussed.

Cluster studies, such as the one performed in Sutton Coldfield in the U.K. in response to a cluster of leukemia and lymphoma in adults living close to an RF broadcasting transmitter (Dolk et al. [R624]), are inherently difficult to interpret because of the impossibility of assessing all of the effects that chance variation might have contributed to the cluster. In the initial Sutton Coldfield study, the authors correctly concluded that no causal association could be drawn between the presence of the cluster and RF exposure from broadcasting towers (Dolk et al. [R625]) (Cooper et al. [R760]). (IEEE C 95.1 – 2005, p.75)

First of all the Sutton Coldfield study was no cluster study but an ecological investigation. It is true that it was initiated by an unconfirmed report of a cluster of leukemia and lymphoma in the vicinity of a broadcasting transmitter but it proceeded independently of this initial report and used registry data on the population living within a radius of 10 km around the transmitter. The statement that such studies are “inherently difficult to interpret because of the

impossibility of assessing all of the effects that chance variation might have contributed to the cluster” is ridiculous not only because the study is no cluster study but because it is impossible for any study to “assess all effects that chance variation might have contributed” to the endpoint under investigation. It is not mentioned that the study was supplemented by a larger investigation of another 20 high-power transmitters in Great Britain. The difficulties of interpreting ecological studies is related to the fact that potential confounders can only be related to a segment of the population but not to individuals and that in general duration and intensity of exposure are not known for individual members of the different strata. While evidence for an effect on brain tumor incidence from both studies (Dolk et al. 1997a, 1997b) is weak, there is consistent evidence for a relation to hematopoietic cancers. This evidence has been overlooked by the authors due their wrong assumption about the relation between proximity to the transmitter and exposure.

Inconsistent effects have been reported between residential proximity to other RF broadcast towers and adverse health endpoints (Bielski [R267]) (Maskarinec et al. [R579]) (Selvin and Merrill [R823]) (Michelozzi et al. [R858]) (Altpeter et al. [R977]) (Hallberg and Johansson [R995], [R996]) (Boscolo [R1012]), although many of these studies have significant flaws in their study design (making them difficult to interpret). (IEEE C 95.1 – 2005, p.75)

Although it is not stated what these “inconsistent effects” might be, the statement is flawed in more than this respect. First of all the study by Bielski (1994) is an occupational investigation and not about residential proximity to RF broadcast towers, second three of these investigations (Selvin et al. 1992; Maskarinec et al. 1994; Michelozzi et al. 2002) included leukemia as an endpoint with indications of an increased incidence consistent with the studies from Great Britain (Dolk et al. 1997a, 1997b) and Australia (Hocking et al. 1996). Note that the study by Selvin et al. (1992), as stated previously, intended to compare different methods to assess the relationship between a point source and diseases and did erroneously assume a monotonous relationship between exposure and distance from a transmitter. Correcting this error there seems to be an increased probability of childhood leukemia in areas receiving the highest exposure from the Sutro tower. The other three investigations (Altpeter et al. 1995; Boscolo 2001; Hallberg & Johansson 2002) have nothing in common and hence cannot be inconsistent.

An increased incidence and mortality rate of childhood leukemia was reported in Australia with residential proximity to a specific RF broadcasting tower (Hocking et al. [R633]), although subsequent reanalysis of the data showed the results may have

been influenced by other confounding variables within the study location (McKenzie et al. [R669]). (IEEE C 95.1 – 2005, p.75)

This is another example how carelessly and sloppy the evidence is dealt with by the IEEE committee. The study of Hocking et al. (1996) was not about “proximity to a specific RF broadcasting tower” but about an area where three broadcasting towers are located. While there is always the possibility of confounders influencing results of an epidemiologic investigation, the ‘reanalysis’ of McKenzie et al. (1998) is seriously flawed and cannot support the cited statement. Hocking et al. (1996) combined the districts near the broadcasting area and those further away based on homogeneity analyses, while McKenzie et al. (1998) omitted one area with high incidence (and highest exposure) based on inspection of data. Any statistical analysis subsequent to such data picking is useless.

While scattered reports of adverse health effects associated with occupational exposure to RF do exist (Demers et al. [R36]) (Kurt and Milham [R68]) (Pearce [R110]) (Speers et al. [R125]) (Thomas et al. [R128]) (Pearce et al. [R199], [R211]) (Hayes et al. [R207]) (Cantor et al. [R268]) (Davis and Mostofi [R563]) (Tynes et al. [R570], [R605]) (Grayson [R592]) (Richter et al. [R747]) (Holly et al. [R838]) these studies are largely inconsistent with each other in terms of the adverse health endpoints affected, and often show no clear dose response with RF exposure. Many have serious flaws in their study design, contain limited or insufficient RF exposure assessment, and are generally inconsistent with the absence of findings of an association from other occupational studies (Tornqvist et al. [R131]) (Coleman [R142]) (Lilienfeld et al. [R146]) (Robinette and Silverman [R147], [R148]) (Siekierzynski et al. [R151], [R152]) (Wright et al. [R213]) (Coleman et al. [R214]) (Muhm [R506]) (Czerski et al. [R542]) (Hill [R568]) (Lagorio et al. [R616]) (Kaplan et al. [R647]) (Morgan et al. [R701]) (Gallagher et al. [R822]) (Groves et al. [R853]) (Wiklund [R1013]) (Armstrong et al. [R1014]). (IEEE C 95.1 – 2005, p.75)

Even allowing for restrictions of space for a discussion of the evidence, greater nonsense has not been produced so far in this field as condensed in these two sentences. Putting higgledy-piggledy all sorts of studies together and then wondering about endpoints being inconsistent is an intellectual masterpiece. Of the occupational studies mentioned, three (Thomas et al. 1987; Speers et al. 1988; Grayson 1996) were about brain cancer, three about hematopoietic cancers (Pearce et al. 1985; Kurt & Milham 1988; Pearce 1988), two about testicular cancer (Hayes et al. 1990; Davis & Mostofi 1993), one about male (Demers et al. 1991) and two about female breast cancer (Cantor et al. 1995, Tynes et al. 1996) the latter including other cancers as well, and one about intraocular melanoma (Holly et al. 1996). Three further studies (Pearce et al. 1989; Tynes et al. 1992; Richter et al. 2000) investigated several or all malignancies. These studies differ not only in endpoints, study type (cohort, case-control, and cluster) but also in

the methods of exposure assessment. Ignorance of the IEEE reviewers is underlined by the compilation of studies characterized by an “absence of findings of an association”. Not only did several of these studies indeed indicate an association of cancer risk with EMF exposure (Lilienfeld et al. 1978; Robinette et al. 1980; Tornqvist et al. 1991; Armstrong et al. 1994; Lagorio et al. 1997; Groves et al. 2002) but two were no epidemiologic studies at all (Siekierzynski et al. 1974; Czerski et al. 1974) and several were rather addressing ELF exposure (Tornqvist et al. 1991; Wright et al. 1982; Coleman et al. 1983; Gallagher et al. 1991) and one (Wiklund 1981) was a cluster study in the telecommunication administration with uncertain type of exposure. Simply confronting studies finding an effect with others that were ‘negative’ is scientifically flawed and permits neither the conclusion that there is nor that there is no association between exposure and cancer risk. Even if all studies would have applied the same method, assessed the same endpoint and used the same exposure metric, studies reporting a significantly increased cancer risk are not outweighed by others that did not.

While micronuclei formation in workers occupationally exposed from broadcast antennas has been reported (Garaj-Vrhovac [R757]) (Lalic et al. [R791]), these findings were not verified in a larger study of more than 40 Australian linemen exposed under similar conditions (Garson et al. [R186]). (IEEE C 95.1 – 2005, pp.75-76)

It goes without saying that also this statement is wrong. Garson et al. (1991) did not investigate micronuclei formation, their workers were considerably shorter exposed and it were not more than 40 linemen but 38 radio-lineman.

No clear association could be established between occupational exposures of parents to a number of agents, including RF, and effects (neuroblastoma) in their offspring (Spitz and Johnson [R289]) (De Roos et al. [R798]). (IEEE C 95.1 – 2005, p.76)

What is meant by ‘no clear association’ is obscure. Spitz and Johnson (1985) found a significantly increased risk for paternal occupational exposure to electromagnetic fields, and also De Roos et al. (2001) found several jobs with paternal as well as maternal exposure to EMFs associated with an elevated risk for neuroblastoma in their children. However, broad groupings of occupations with ELF, RF EMF, as well as ionizing radiation (!) exposure did not reveal an increased risk.

One study reported a slight excess in brain tumors associated with combined exposure to RF and other exposures associated with electrical or electronic jobs, but not with RF alone (Thomas et al. [R128]). A study of a Polish military cohort reported a substantial excess of total cancer and several cancer sub-types with jobs associated

with RF exposure (Szmigielski [R578]), (Szmigielski and Kubacki [R982]), although questions have been raised about severe bias in the exposure assessment of this study (Elwood [R665]) (Bergqvist [R1015]) (Stewart [R1133]). Studies by Milham of U.S. amateur radio operators reported an excess in one of nine types of leukemia assessed (see [R101], [R102], [R209], [R215], and [R569]), but not for total tumors, total leukemia, or brain tumors, and potential confounding factors might have included exposure to soldering fumes, degreasing agents and over-representation of a particular social class. (IEEE C 95.1 – 2005, p.76)

Again the evidence is incorrectly summarized for all cited investigations. Thomas et al. (1987) found a significantly elevated risk for brain tumors among all men exposed to RF fields and in particular in those exposed for 20 or more years. There were indications that this elevated risk is due to a subgroup with electrical or electronics jobs. The group of those exposed in other jobs is heterogeneous and may contain subjects with low or no exposure (e.g. some groups of welders) and therefore lack of an association could be due to a dilution effect from exposure misclassification.

As mentioned previously criticism of the Polish military cohort study about exposure assessment is unfounded. Bergqvist (1997), Elwood (1999) and Stewart (2000) criticized that the military health board assessed a number of potential risk factors only for cancer cases. However, they overlooked that the study was a cohort and not a case-control study and that at no stage information about these factors entered the analysis and therefore couldn't affect the results in any way.

The study by Milham (1988a, 1988b) of radio amateur operators revealed a significantly increased standardized mortality ratio (SMR) for acute myeloid leukemia while the overall mortality and cancer mortality was significantly reduced relative to the country mortality rates. As mentioned previously this points to a 'healthy worker' effect as well as to an influence of life-style factors (mortality related to smoking and overweight were reduced). From the mentioned nine types of leukemia three with expectancies below one and no case observed couldn't be assessed, from the six remaining types five had elevated SMRs with AML, the most frequent type in adults, being significantly elevated.

The last portion of the IEEE review of epidemiology studies is dedicated to mobile phone investigations that are discussed in another contribution.

The following citation presents the IEEE summary in its full length:

The epidemiological evidence to date does not show clear or consistent evidence to indicate a causal role of RF exposures in connection with human cancer or other disease endpoints. Many of the relevant studies, however, are weak in terms of their design, their lack of detailed exposure assessment, and have potential biases in the data. While the available results do not indicate a strong causal association, they cannot establish the absence of a hazard. They do indicate that for commonly encountered RF exposures, any health effects, if they exist, must be small. Even though epidemiological evidence cannot rule out a causal relationship, the overall weight-of-evidence is consistent with the results of the long term animal studies showing no evidence of physiological, pathological or disease-specific effects. (IEEE C95.1 - 2005; pp.76-77)

As already pointed out earlier (Kundi 2006) there is an intolerable tendency in the past years that confronted with an undeniable epidemiologic evidence of an association between an agent and adverse health effects such as cancer, interested parties take their resort to the concept of causality based on the wrong assumption evidence to “indicate a causal role” is a lot more difficult to provide. Unprecedented, however, is the notion of “a strong causal association”. Whatever the meaning of this exceptional statement, the conclusion that, if health effects of commonly encountered RF exposures exist, they must be small, is wrong. To the contrary: considering the “lack of detailed exposure assessment” and other potential biases that predominantly lead to an underestimation of the risk, the evidence points to a quite substantial hazard. While the animal studies reviewed in another section of the IEEE standard document cannot be discussed here it should be underlined that they are generally insufficient to support either an increased risk or the lack of health relevant effects. Therefore they cannot be used in a weight-of-evidence statement as has been made by IEEE, that there is no evidence for adverse health effects of RF exposure.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

- Only few studies of long-term exposure to low levels of RF fields and brain tumors exist, all of which have methodological shortcomings including lack of quantitative exposure assessment. Given the crude exposure categories and the likelihood of a bias towards the null hypothesis of no association the body of evidence is consistent with a moderately elevated risk.
- Occupational studies indicate that long term exposure at workplaces may be associated with an elevated brain tumor risk.
- Although in some occupations and especially in military jobs current exposure guidelines may have sometimes been reached or exceeded, overall the evidence suggest that long-term exposure to levels generally lying below current guideline levels still carry the risk of increasing the incidence of brain tumors.
- Although the population attributable risk is low (likely below 4%), still more than 1,000 cases per year in the US can be attributed to RF exposure at workplaces alone. Due to the lack of conclusive studies of environmental RF exposure and brain tumors the potential of these exposures to increase the risk cannot be estimated.
- Epidemiological studies as reviewed in the IEEE C95.1 revision (2006) are deficient to the extent that the entire analysis is professionally unsupportable. IEEE's dismissal of epidemiological studies that link RF exposure to cancer endpoints should be disregarded, as well as any IEEE conclusions drawn from this flawed analysis of epidemiological studies.

VII. REFERENCES

References for Brain Tumor Epidemiological Studies

- Ahlbom A, Green A, Kheifets L, Savitz D, Swerdlow A. 2004. Epidemiology of health effects of radiofrequency exposure. *Environ Health Perspect* 112: 1741–1754.
- Altpeter ES, Krebs TT, Pfluger DH, von Kanel J, Blattmann R. 1995. Study on health effects of the short-wave transmitter station at Schwarzenburg, Berne, Switzerland,” BEW Publication Series No. 55, University of Berne, Inst. for Social & Preventive Medicine.
- Armstrong B, Theriault G, Guenel P, Deadman J, Goldberg M, Heroux P. 1994. Association between exposure to pulsed electromagnetic fields and cancer in electric utility workers in Quebec, Canada, and France. *Am J Epidemiol* 140: 805 – 820.
- Berg G, Spallek J, Schüz J, Schlehofer B, Böhler E, Schlaefer K, Hettinger I, Kunna-Grass K, Wahrendorf J, Blettner M. 2006. Occupational exposure to radio frequency/microwave radiation and the risk of brain tumors: Interphone Study Group, Germany. *Am J Epidemiol*.
- Bergqvist U. 1997. Review of epidemiological studies. In: Kuster N, Balzano Q, Lin JC (eds.), *Mobile Communications Safety*, London: Chapman & Hall, pp. 147 – 170
- Bielski J. 1994. Bioelectrical brain activity in workers exposed to electromagnetic fields,” *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 724: 435 – 437
- Boscolo P. 2001. Effects of electromagnetic fields produced by radiotelevision broadcasting stations on the immune system of women. *Sci Total Environ* 273: 1 – 10
- Cantor K, Stewart P, Brinton L, Dosemeci M. 1995. Occupational exposure and female breast cancer mortality in the United States. *J Occup Environ Med* 37: 336-348
- Coleman M, Bell J, Skeet R. 1983. Leukaemia incidence in electrical workers. *Lancet* 1:982 – 983
- Coleman M. 1985. Leukaemia mortality in amateur radio operators. *Lancet* 2: 106 – 107
- Cooper DK, Hemmings K, Saunders P 2001. Cancer incidence near radio and television transmitters in Great Britain. I. Sutton Coldfield transmitter; II. All high power transmitters. *Am J Epidemiol* 153: 202 – 204
- Czerski P, Siekierzynski M, Gidynski A. 1974. Health surveillance of personnel occupationally exposed to microwaves. I. Theoretical considerations and practical aspects. *Aerospace Med* 45: 1137 – 1142
- Davis RL, Mostofi FK. 1993. Cluster of testicular cancer in police officers exposed to hand-held radar. *Am J Ind Med* 24: 231-233
- De Roos AJ, Teschke K, Savitz DA, Poole C, Grufferman BH, Pollock BH. 2001. Parental occupational exposures to electromagnetic fields and radiation and the incidence of neuroblastoma in offspring. *Epidemiol* 12: 508 – 517
- Demers PA, Thomas DB, Rosenblatt KA, Jimenez LM, McTiernan A, et al. 1991. Occupational exposure to electromagnetic fields and breast cancer in men. *Am J Epidemiol* 134: 340 – 347

- Dolk H, Shaddick G, Walls P, Grundy C, Thakrar B, Kleinschmidt I, Elliott P. 1997a. Cancer incidence near radio and television transmitters in Great Britain, Part I. Sutton Coldfield Transmitter. *Am J Epidemiol* 145: 1-9.
- Dolk H, Elliot P, Shaddick G, Walls P, Thakrar B. 1997b. Cancer incidence near radio television and transmitters in Great Britain, Part II. All high-power transmitters. *Am J Epidemiol* 145: 10-17.
- Elwood MJ. 2003. Epidemiological studies of radiofrequency exposures and human cancer. *Bioelectromagnetics Suppl* 6: S63 - S73.
- Finkelstein MM. 1998. Cancer incidence among Ontario police officers. *Am J Ind Med* 34: 157-162.
- Gallagher RP, Band PR, Spinelli JJ, Threlfall WJ, Tamaro S. 1991. Brain cancer and exposure to electromagnetic fields. *J Occup Med* 33: 944 – 945
- Garaj-Vrhovac V. 1999. Micronucleus assay and lymphocyte mitotic activity in risk assessment of occupational exposure to microwave radiation. *Chemosphere* 39: 2301 – 2312
- Garson OM, McRobert TL, Campbell LJ, Hocking BA, Gordon I. 1991. A chromosomal study of workers with long-term exposure to radio-frequency radiation. *Med J Australia* 155: 289 – 292.
- Grayson JK. 1996. Radiation exposure socioeconomic status and brain tumor risk in the US Air Force: a nested case-control study. *Am J Epidemiol* 143: 480-486.
- Groves FD, Page WF, Gridley G, Lisimaque L, Stewart PA, Tarone RE et al. 2002. Cancer in Korean war navy technicians: mortality survey after 40 years. *Am J Epidemiol* 155: 810-818.
- Hallberg O, Johansson O. 2002a. Melanoma incidence and frequency modulation (FM) broadcasting. *Arch Environ Health* 57: 32 – 40
- Hallberg O, Johansson O. 2002b. Cancer trends during the 20th century. *J Australian College Nutrtr Environ Med.* 21: 3 – 8
- Hayes RB, Brown LM, Pottern LM, Gomez M, Kardaun JWPF, Hoover RN, O’Connell KJ, Sutzman RE, Javadpour N. 1990. Occupation and risk of testicular cancer: a case-control study. *Int J Epidemiol* 19: 825-831
- Hill DG. 1988. A longitudinal study of a cohort with past exposure to radar: the MIT Radiation Laboratory follow-up study. [Dissertation Manuscript], Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, UMI Dissertation Services, Ann Arbor, MI
- Hocking B, Gordon IR, Grain ML, Hatfield GE. 1996. Cancer incidence and mortality and proximity to TV towers. *Med J Aust* 165: 601-605
- Holly EA, Aston DA, Ahn DK, Smith AH. 1996. Intraocular melanoma linked to occupations and chemical exposures. *Epidemiology* 7: 55-61
- Kaplan S, Etlin S, Novikov I, Modan B. 1997. Occupational risks for the development of brain tumors. *Am J Ind Med* 31: 15 – 20.
- Krewski D, Byus CV, Glickman BW, Lotz WG, Mandeville R, McBride ML, Prato FS, Weaver DF. 2001. Potential health risks of radiofrequency fields from wireless telecommunication devices. *J Tox Env Health Part B* 4: 1-143.
- Kundi M, Hansen Mild K, Hardell L, Mattsson MO. 2004. Mobile telephones and cancer - a review of epidemiological evidence. *J Toxicol Environ Health Part B* 7: 351-384.

- Kundi M. 2006. Causality and the interpretation of epidemiologic evidence. *Environ Health Perspect* 114: 969 – 974
- Kurt TL, Milham S. 1988. Re: Increased mortality in amateur radio operators due to lymphatic and hematopoietic malignancies. [Letter and Reply] *Am J Epidemiol* 128: 1384–1385
- Lagorio S, Rossi S, Vecchia P, De Santis M, Bastianini L, Fusilli M, Ferrucci A, Desideri E, Comba P. 1997. Mortality of plastic-ware workers exposed to radiofrequencies. *Bioelectromagnetics* 18: 418-421
- Lalic H, Lekic A, Radosevic-Stasic B. 2001. Comparison of chromosome aberrations in peripheral blood lymphocytes from people occupationally exposed to ionizing and radiofrequency radiation. *Acta Medica Okayama* 55: 117 – 127
- Lilienfeld AM, Tonascia J, Tonascia S, Libauer CH, Cauthen GM, et al. 1978. Foreign Service Health Status Study: Evaluation of Status of Foreign Service and other Employees From Selected Eastern European Posts. NTIS Document No. PB-28B 163/9GA Dept. of State, Washington DC, Final Report, Dept. of Epidemiology, School of Hygiene Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD
- Maskarinec G, Cooper J, Swygert L. 1994. Investigation of increased incidence in childhood leukemia near radio towers in Hawaii: preliminary observations. *J Environ Pathol Toxicol Oncol* 13: 33-37
- McKenzie DR, Yin Y, Morrell S. 1998. Childhood incidence and acute lymphoblastic leukaemia and exposure to broadcast radiation in Sydney – a second look. *Aust NZ J Public Health* 22: 360-367
- Michelozzi P, Capon A, Kirchmayer U, Forastiere F, Biggeri A, Barca A, Perucci CA. 2002. Adult and childhood leukemia near a high-power radio station in Rome, Italy. *Am J Epidemiol* 155: 1096-1103
- Milham S. 1982. Mortality from leukemia in workers exposed to electrical and magnetic fields. [Letter] *New England J Med* 307: 249 – 249
- Milham S. 1983. Occupational mortality in Washington State: 1950-1979. DHHS (NIOSH) Publication 83-116, October 1983, Contract No. 210-80-0088, U.S. Depart. of Health and Human Services, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Cincinnati, OH
- Milham S. 1985. Mortality in workers exposed to electromagnetic fields. *Environ Health Perspect* 62: 297 – 300
- Milham S. 1988a. Increased mortality in amateur radio operators due to lymphatic and hematopoietic malignancies. *Am J Epidemiol* 127: 50-54
- Milham S. 1988b. Mortality by license class in amateur radio operators. *Am J Epidemiol* 128: 1175 – 1176
- Morgan RW, Kelsh MA, Zhao K, Exuzides KA, Heringer S, Negrete W. 2000. Radiofrequency exposure and mortality from cancer of the brain and lymphatic/hematopoietic systems. *Epidemiology* 11: 118-127
- Moulder JE, Erdreich LS, Malyapa RS, Merritt JH, Pickard WF, Vijayalaxmi. 1999. Cell phones and cancer: what is the evidence for a connection? *Radiat Res* 151: 513 – 531
- Muhm JM. 1992. Mortality investigation of workers in an electromagnetic pulse test program. *J Occup Med* 34: 287-292

Pearce N, Reif J, Fraser J. 1989. Case-control studies of cancer in New Zealand electrical workers. *Int J Epidemiol* 18: 55 – 59

Pearce NE, Sheppard RA, Howard JK, Fraser J, Lilley BM. 1985. Leukaemia in electrical workers in New Zealand. [Letter] *Lancet* 1: 811 – 812

Pearce NE. 1988. Leukemia in electrical workers in new Zealand: a correction. [Letter] *Lancet* 2: 48
Richter ED, Berman T, Ben-Michael E, Laster R, Westin JB. 2000. Cancer in radar technicians exposed to radiofrequency/microwave radiation: Sentinel episodes. *Int J Occup Environ Health* 6: 187 – 193

Robinette CD, Silverman C, Jablon S. 1980. Effects upon health of occupational exposure to microwave radiation radar. *Am J Epidemiol* 112: 39 – 53

Robinette CD, Silverman C. 1977. Causes of death following occupational exposure to microwave radiation (radar) 1950-1974. In Hazzard (ed), *Symposium on Biological Effects and Measurement of radiofrequency Microwaves*, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, DC, HEW Publication No. (FDA) 77-8026: 338 – 344

Selvin S, Schulman J, Merrill DW. 1992. Distance and risk measures for the analysis of spatial data: a study of childhood cancers. *Soc Sci Med* 34: 769-777

Siekierzynski M, Czernski P, Milczarek H, Gidynski A, Czarnecki C, Dziuk E, Jedrzejczak W. 1974a. Health surveillance of personnel occupationally exposed to microwaves. II. Functional disturbances. *Aerospace Med* 45: 1143 – 1145

Siekierzynski M, Czernski P, Milczarek H, Gidynski A, Czarnecki C, Dziuk E, Jedrzejczak W. 1974b. Health surveillance of personnel occupationally exposed to microwaves. III. Lens translucency. *Aerospace Med* 45: 1146 – 1148

Speers MA, Dobbins JG, Miller VS. 1988. Occupational exposures and brain cancer mortality: a preliminary study of East Texas residents. *Am J Ind Med* 13: 629 – 638

Spitz MR, Johnson CC. 1985. Neuroblastoma and paternal occupation. A case-control analysis. *Am J Epidemiol* 121: 924 – 929

Stewart, Sir W. 2000. *Mobile Phones and Health*. Report by the UK Independent Expert Group on Mobile Phones. c/o UK National Radiological Protection Board, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0RQ pp. 1 – 160.

Szmigielski S, Kubacki R. 1999. Analysis of cancer morbidity in Polish career military personnel exposed occupationally to RF and MW radiation. In: F. Bersani (ed.), *Electricity and Magnetism in Biology and Medicine*, Kluwer Academic/ Plenum, pp. 809 – 812.

Szmigielski S. 1996. Cancer morbidity in subjects occupationally exposed to high frequency (radiofrequency and microwave) electromagnetic radiation. *Sci Total Environ* 180: 9-17.

Thomas TL, Stolley PD, Stemhagen A, Fonham ETH, Bleeker ML, Stewart PA et al. 1987. Brain tumour mortality risk among men with electrical and electronic jobs: a case-control study. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 79: 233-238

Tornqvist S, Knave B, Ahlbom A, Persson T. 1991. Incidence of leukaemia and brain tumours in some 'electrical occupations'. *Brit J Indust Med* 48: 597 – 603

Tynes T, Andersen A, Langmark F. 1992. Incidence of cancer in Norwegian workers potentially exposed to electromagnetic fields. *Am J Epidemiol* 136: 81-88

Tynes T, Hannevik M, Andersen A, Vistnes AI, Haldorsen T. 1996. Incidence of breast cancer in Norwegian female radio and telegraph operators. *Cancer Causes Control* 7: 197-204

Wiklund K. 1981. An application of the Swedish cancer-environment registry: leukaemia among Telephone operators at the telecommunications administration in Sweden. *Int J Epidemiol* 10: 373 – 376

Wright WE, Peters JM, Mack TM. 1982. Leukaemia in workers exposed to electrical and magnetic fields. *Lancet* 307: 1160 – 1161

Table 1: Synopsis of epidemiologic studies of or including brain tumors (1987 – 2006)

Study	Country/Period/Study Type	Exposure assessment	Outcome assessment	Confounders considered & matching variables(m)	Number of cases/controls or cases (cohort studies)	Selection of participants
Thomas et al. 1987	Northern New Jersey, Philadelphia, gulf coast of Louisiana/1979-1981/Case-control	Interviews with next-of-kin about occupational history – response rates: cases 74%, controls 63%; JEM (2 methods)	Death certificates verified through review of hospital records	age(m), (only males), year of death(m), area of residence(m), educational level, (lead, soldering fumes)	435/386	Cases: deaths of brain tumor or CNS tumors of white males (age>30) from death certificates Controls: deaths from other causes than brain tumors, epilepsy, etc.
Milham 1988	Washington, California/1979-1984/Cohort	Amateur radio operator license within 1/1979 to 6/1984	Mortality records	age, (only males), race, year of death	29	67829 operators, search of deaths in state registry through 1984
Selvin et al. 1992	San Francisco/1973-1988/Spatial cluster	Distance of center of census tract to microwave tower (Sutro tower)	SEER records	-	35	Search of cancer deaths of white individuals (age<21)
Tynes et al. 1992	Norway/1961-1985 /Occupational cohort	Job title in 1960 and 1970 censuses and expert categorization	Cancer registry	age, (only males)	119 overall, 6 in subgroup with possible RF exposure	Cohort of 37945 male workers identified that had jobs in 1960 with possible EMF exposure. among these 3017 with possible RF exposure
Grayson 1996	US Air Force/1970-1989/Nested case-control	Detailed job history and classification based on JEM (RF/MW exposure	Screening of hospital discharge records	age(m), race(m), military rank, (ELF and ionizing radiation	230/920	Cohort of ~880000 US Air Force members with at least one completed year of service within

Brain Tumors and RF Fields

Study	Country/Period/Study Type	Exposure assessment	Outcome assessment	Confounders considered & matching variables(m)	Number of cases/controls or cases (cohort studies)	Selection of participants
		from frequent measurements)		exposure)		the study period, no follow up after subjects left service
Szmigielski 1996	Poland (military)/1971 - 1985/Occupational cohort	Allocation to RF/MW exposure group based on service records, documented measurements of military safety groups	Incident cases from central and regional military hospitals and military health departments	age, (only males)	~46	Annual number of ~127800 military career personnel, ~3720 RF/MW exposed per year
Hocking et al. 1996	Sydney (Australia)/ 1972-1990/Ecological	Municipalities within ~4 km of 3 TV broadcasting towers considered higher exposed as compared to 6 further away	Incident and death cases from cancer registry	age, sex, calendar period	740 (incident) 606 (mortality) 64 age<15 (incident) 30 age<15 (mortality)	Study population: inner area ~135000, outer area ~450000
Tynes et al. 1996	Norway/1961-1991/ Occupational cohort	Certified radio and telegraph operators 1920-1980 (98% worked on merchant ships); spot measurements on ships with old-	Cancer registry	age, (only females)	5	2619 women certified as radio or telegraph operators by Norwegian Telecom

Brain Tumors and RF Fields

Study	Country/Period/Study Type	Exposure assessment	Outcome assessment	Confounders considered & matching variables(m)	Number of cases/controls or cases (cohort studies)	Selection of participants
		fashioned equipment				
Dolk et al. 1997a	Birmingham (GB)/ 1974-1986/Ecological	Living near a TV/FM radio transmitter (Sutton Coldfield)	Cancer registry	age, sex, calendar year, SES	332	Population (age \geq 15) ~408000 within 10 km of the transmitter
Dolk et al. 1997b	GB/1974-1986/ Ecological	Living near a high power (\geq 500 kW erp) transmitter (overall 21)	Cancer registry	age, sex, calendar year, SES	244	Population (age $<$ 15) within 10 km of one of 20 high power transmitters
Lagorio et al. 1997	Italy/1962-1992/ Occupational cohort	Working as RF heat-sealer operator	Cancer deaths from registry	age, (only females), calendar period, region	1	302 women employed 1962-1992 in a plastic-ware manufacturing plant as RF sealers
Finkelstein 1998	Ontario (Canada)/ 1964-1995/ Occupational cohort	Working as a police officer (possible handheld radar exposure)	Cancer registry	age, (only males), calendar year	16	20601 male officers of Ontario Police
Morgan et al. 2000	USA/1976-1996/ Occupational cohort	Jobs classified according to work with RF emitting devices with different output power	Death certificates from states' statistics offices	age, sex, period of hire	51	All U.S. Motorola employees with at least 1 day employment 1976-1996 (195775 workers, 2,7 million person-years)

Brain Tumors and RF Fields

Study	Country/Period/Study Type	Exposure assessment	Outcome assessment	Confounders considered & matching variables(m)	Number of cases/controls or cases (cohort studies)	Selection of participants
Groves et al. 2002	USA/1950-1997/ Occupational cohort	6 occupational groups 3 with assumed low radar exposure (radar-, radio operator, aviation electrician's mate) and 3 with assumed high exposure (aviation electronics -, electronics -, fire control technician)	Death certificate from a state vital statistics office or National Death Index Plus	age at entry, (only males), attained age	88	40581 Navy Korean War veterans graduated 1950-54 from Navy technical schools; follow-up from graduation through 1997
Berg et al. 2006	Germany/2000-2003/ Case-control	JEM from occupational history collected in interview	Histological verified cases of glioma and meningioma	age(m), sex(m), region(m), SES, urban/rural, smoking, ionizing rad. exposure	Glioma 366/732 Meningioma 381/762	All histological confirmed cases of glioma and meningioma from 4 neurosurgical clinics (age: 30-69) (part.rate 84%); frequency matched controls from population registry (part.rate 63%)

SES...socio-economic status, JEM...job exposure matrix, erp...equivalent radiation power, RF/MW...radio frequency/microwaves, CNS...central nervous system, ELF...extremely low frequency

Table 2: Synopsis of main results of brain tumor studies (1987 – 2006)

Study	Endpoint	Exposure category	Meas.	Outcome [95% CI]
Thomas et al. 1987	Brain tumor deaths (ICD not specified)	Ever exposed to RF	OR	1.6 [1.0 – 2.4]
		Electrical/electronics job	OR	2.3 [1.3 – 4.2]
		Unexposed*		
		Ever exposed < 5 y	OR	1.0
		5-19 y	OR	2.3
		20+ y	OR	2.0
Milham 1988	Brain cancer deaths (ICD-8: 191)	All	SMR	1.39 [0.93 – 2.00]
		Novice ^a	SMR	0.34
		Technician	SMR	1.12
		General	SMR	1.75
		Advanced	SMR	1.74
		Extra	SMR	1.14
Selvin et al. 1992	Brain cancer deaths (ICD-O: 191.2)	> 3.5 km distance from tower*	RR	1.16 [0.60 – 2.26]
	≤ 3.5 km ^b			
Tynes et al. 1992	Incident brain cancer (ICD-7: 193)	All with possible EMF exposure	SIR	1.09 [0.90 – 1.41]
		Subgroup possible RF exposure ^c	SIR	0.49 [0.18 – 1.06]
Grayson 1996	Incident brain cancer (ICD-9: 191)	Never RF/MW exposed*		
		Ever exposed	OR	1.39 [1.01 – 1.90]
Szmigielski 1996	Incident nervous system & brain tumors	RF/MW exposed	OER	1.91 [1.08 – 3.47]
Hocking et al. 1996	Brain cancer (ICD-9: 191)	Outer area*		
		Inner area (incident, overall)	RR	0.89 [0.71 – 1.11]
		Inner area (mortality, overall)	RR	0.82 [0.63 – 1.07]
		Inner area (incident, age<15)	RR	1.10 [0.59 – 2.06]
		Inner area (mortality, age<15)	RR	0.73 [0.26 – 2.10]
Tynes et al. 1996	Incident brain cancer (ICD-7: 193)	All	SIR	1.0 [0.3 – 2.3]
Dolk et al. 1997a	Incident brain tumors (ICD-8/9: 191, 192)	0-2 km from transmitter	OER	1.29 [0.80 – 2.06]
		0-10 km from transmitter	OER	1.04 [0.94 – 1.16]
Dolk et al. 1997b	Incident brain tumors (ICD-8/9: 191, 192)	0-2 km from transmitter	OER	0.62 [0.17 – 1.59]
		0-10 km from transmitter	OER	1.06 [0.93 – 1.20]
Lagorio et al. 1997	Brain cancer deaths (ICD-9: 191)	RF sealer operator	OER	1 : 0.1
Finkelstein 1998	Incident brain cancer (ICD-9: 191)	All police officers	SIR	0.84 [0.48 – 1.36]
Morgan et al. 2000	Incident brain cancer (ICD-9: 191)	No RF exposure*		
		Low ^d	RR	0.92 [0.43 – 1.77]

Study	Endpoint	Exposure category	Meas.	Outcome [95% CI]	
		Moderate	RR	1.18 [0.36 – 2.92]	
		High	RR	1.07 [0.32 – 2.66]	
Groves et al. 2002	Brain cancer deaths (ICD-9: 191)	Low radar exposure*			
		High radar exposure	RR	0.65 [0.43 – 1.01]	
Berg et al. 2006	Incident glioma (ICD-O3: C71)	No occup. RF/MW exposure*			
		Probably no exposure	OR	0.84 [0.48 – 1.46]	
		Probable exposure	OR	0.84 [0.46 – 1.56]	
		High exposure	OR	1.22 [0.69 – 2.15]	
		No high exposure*			
		Incident meningioma (ICD-O3: C70.0)	High exposure <10 y	OR	1.11 [0.48 – 2.56]
			High exposure ≥ 10 y	OR	1.39 [0.67 – 2.88]
			No occup. RF/MW exposure*		
			Probably no exposure	OR	1.11 [0.57 – 2.15]
			Probable exposure	OR	1.01 [0.52 – 1.93]
		High exposure	OR	1.34 [0.61 – 2.96]	
		No high exposure*			
		High exposure <10 y	OR	1.15 [0.37 – 3.48]	
		High exposure ≥ 10 y	OR	1.55 [0.52 – 4.62]	

^a From Milham 1988b, license classes as proxy for exposure duration

^b Based on the assumption that exposure is higher near the microwave tower

^c Computed based on Table 5 in Tynes et al. 1992

^d Classification according to power output of equipment used for longest period of employment

OR...odds-ratio, SIR...standardized incidence ratio, SMR...standardized mortality ratio, RR...relative risk (rate ratio), OER...observed/expected ratio