I. Introduction

As an individual consumer and parent, I am submitting this comment to urge regulatory authorities to adopt a strict precautionary framework regarding human exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMF), radiofrequency radiation (RFR), and extremely low-frequency magnetic fields (ELF-MF). While public communications often claim there is "no evidence" of harm from non-ionizing radiation, a rigorous evaluation of the published literature reveals a substantial body of pooled epidemiological and experimental data.

To support the need for updated, biology-based safety limits, this submission highlights the quantitative findings of multiple peer-reviewed meta-analyses spanning brain tumors, childhood leukemia, general carcinogenesis, reproductive health, and neurodegenerative decline.

II. Summary of Evidence from Peer-Reviewed Meta-Analyses

1. Mobile Phone Radiation & Brain Tumors (Gliomas and Neuromas)

Pooled data demonstrates a statistically significant increase in brain tumor risks correlated with long-term or ipsilateral (same-side) mobile phone usage:

- **Yang et al. (*PLoS One*, 2017; PMID: 28472042):** Found that mobile phone use extending to 10 years or more is associated with an elevated risk of glioma (**OR 1.44**; 95% CI: 1.08–1.91). This risk increases for same-side (ipsilateral) use (**OR 1.46**; 95% CI: 1.12–1.92) and low-grade glioma (**OR 2.22**; 95% CI: 1.69–2.92).
- **Hardell et al. (*Int J Oncol*, 2008; PMID: 18425337):** Reported that 10+ years of same-side mobile phone use doubled the risk for glioma (**OR 2.0**; 95% CI: 1.2–3.4) and more than doubled the risk for acoustic neuroma (**OR 2.4**; 95% CI: 1.1–5.3).
- **Myung et al. (*J Clin Oncol*, 2009; PMID: 19826127):** Identified an overall tumor risk increase for 10+ years of use (**OR 1.18**; 95% CI: 1.04–1.34). Notably, the authors found that methodologically superior, blinded studies clearly identified harm, whereas unblinded studies showed a false "protective" effect.
- **Wang et al. (*World Neurosurg*, 2018; PMID: 29709736):** Noted that while ever-use was not statistically significant, the data indicated an increased risk trajectory specifically for long-term users.

2. Childhood Leukemia & Magnetic Fields

The vulnerability of developing children to ambient magnetic fields is documented in high-scale pooled controls:

- **Zhao et al. (*Leuk Res*, 2014; PMID: 24388073):** Analyzing 11,699 cases and 13,194 controls, researchers found that exposure to magnetic fields of 0.4 microtesla (\(\mu\text{T}\)) or greater (compared to <0.1 \(\mu\text{T}\)) yielded a significant risk elevation for leukemia (**OR 1.57**; 95% CI: 1.03–2.40). The risk escalated sharply for acute lymphocytic leukemia (**OR 2.43**; 95% CI: 1.30–4.55).
- **Wartenberg (*Bioelectromagnetics*, 2001; PMID: 11170120):** Calculated that if an association exists, approximately 175 to 240 childhood leukemia cases per year in the United States could be directly attributed to magnetic field exposure.

3. General Cancer Risks & ELF Fields

- **Zhang et al. (*Environ Int*, 2016; PMID: 26703095):** Aggregated 42 studies (13,259 cases, 100,882 controls) and found a positive association overall (**OR 1.08**; 95% CI: 1.01–1.15). The risk was higher in United States cohorts (**OR 1.10**) and notably elevated for residential exposures (**OR 1.18**; 95% CI: 1.02–1.37).

4. Breast Cancer Risk Elevation

- **Chen et al. (*PLoS One*, 2013; PMID: 23869239):** Identified an elevated risk of breast cancer associated with exposure (**OR 1.07**; 95% CI: 1.02–1.13), which rose slightly higher for estrogen-receptor-positive configurations (**OR 1.11**).
- **Zhao et al. (*Eur J Gynaecol Oncol*, 2014; PMID: 244984538):** Found a pooled **OR of 1.10** (95% CI: 1.01–1.20) for breast cancer, which increased significantly among premenopausal women (**OR 1.25**; 95% CI: 1.05–1.49).

5. Reproductive Health & Sperm Quality

- **Adams et al. (*Environ Int*, 2014; PMID: 24927498):** Meta-analysis of 1,492 samples demonstrated that mobile phone exposure is significantly associated with a decrease in sperm motility by **-8.1%** (95% CI: -13.1 to -3.2) and viability by **-9.1%** (95% CI: -18.4 to 0.2). This effect was consistent across both *in vitro* experimental setups and *in vivo* observational studies.
- **Liu et al. (*Andrology*, 2014; PMID: 24700791):** Confirmed clear biological harm and degradation in *in vitro* and animal models, though human observational data in their pooled subset remained null.

6. Neurodegenerative Diseases & Occupational ELF-MF Exposure

- **Jalilian et al. (*Neurotoxicology*, 2018; PMID: 29278690):** Found a substantial relative risk increase for Alzheimer's disease (**RR 1.63**; 95% CI: 1.35–1.96) among workers with high occupational ELF-MF exposure.

- **Huss et al. (*Bioelectromagnetics*, 2018; PMID: 29350413):** Found an elevated risk for Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) overall (**sRR 1.14**; 95% CI: 1.00–1.30), which jumped sharply for individuals working within electrical occupations (**sRR 1.41**; 95% CI: 1.05–1.92).

III. Conclusion & Regulatory Recommendation

The argument that there is "no evidence" of biological harm from ambient electromagnetic and magnetic fields is contradicted by the extensive epidemiological data compiled above. Regulatory agencies cannot rely solely on short-term thermal absorption models (like SAR) to determine human safety.

Because these meta-analyses demonstrate clear patterns of increased risk—particularly regarding chronic, long-term exposure, residential proximity, and early-childhood vulnerabilities—I request that the agency:

1. Implement the **Precautionary Principle** across all updated safety regulations.
2. Establish lower, biology-based exposure limits that account for non-thermal, chronic biological mechanisms (e.g., oxidative stress, DNA transcription changes).
3. Incentivize and prioritize wired telecommunications and localized power mitigation infrastructure over widespread, high-density ambient wireless radiation.

Thank you for reviewing this empirical data and incorporating independent public health research into your regulatory decision-making process.

Respectfully submitted,

Nina Martin

Winter Garden, FL – wife and mother of two young adult children