



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Environmental Research

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/envres](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/envres)

## Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102)<sup>☆</sup>

Anthony B. Miller<sup>a,\*</sup>, L. Lloyd Morgan<sup>b</sup>, Iris Udasin<sup>c</sup>, Devra Lee Davis<sup>d,e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Canada

<sup>b</sup> Environmental Health Trust, Berkeley, CA, United States

<sup>c</sup> Rutgers University School of Public Health, United States

<sup>d</sup> Environmental Health Trust, Teton Village, WY, United States

<sup>e</sup> Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Brain cancer  
Vestibular schwannoma  
Salivary gland tumor  
Electric hypersensitivity  
Glioma  
Meningioma  
Radio frequency fields  
Cell phones  
Mobile phones

### ABSTRACT

Epidemiology studies (case-control, cohort, time trend and case studies) published since the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) 2011 categorization of radiofrequency radiation (RFR) from mobile phones and other wireless devices as a possible human carcinogen (Group 2B) are reviewed and summarized. Glioma is an important human cancer found to be associated with RFR in 9 case-control studies conducted in Sweden and France, as well as in some other countries. Increasing glioma incidence trends have been reported in the UK and other countries. Non-malignant endpoints linked include acoustic neuroma (vestibular Schwannoma) and meningioma. Because they allow more detailed consideration of exposure, case-control studies can be superior to cohort studies or other methods in evaluating potential risks for brain cancer. When considered with recent animal experimental evidence, the recent epidemiological studies strengthen and support the conclusion that RFR should be categorized as carcinogenic to humans (IARC Group 1). Opportunistic epidemiological studies are proposed that can be carried out through cross-sectional analyses of high, medium, and low mobile phone users with respect to hearing, vision, memory, reaction time, and other indicators that can easily be assessed through standardized computer-based tests. As exposure data are not uniformly available, billing records should be used whenever available to corroborate reported exposures.

### 1. Introduction

With rapidly increasing applications for wireless devices targeting populations of all ages, exposures to the associated radiofrequency radiation (RFR) are increasing in number and diversity. Radiation sources include communications devices such as mobile (cell) or cordless phones, laptops and tablets, baby monitors, wearable devices and associated infrastructure (e.g. routers, antennae on towers, and distributed antennae systems (DAS) that can employ directional couplers or wireless amplifiers to enhance accessibility). Thus, the technology entails direct and growing personal exposures to an expanding array of wireless transmitting devices (WTDs).

In 2011, a Working Group of the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified RFR as a

possible human carcinogen (Group 2B) (IARC, 2013). In this paper we review the human epidemiology and some other relevant studies published since the IARC Working Group meeting.

#### 1.1. Wireless phone types

The principal sources of exposure of humans to RFR are cell and cordless phones. The radiated power and technologies for cell phones have evolved over the years, as summarized in Table 1 (Hardell and Carlberg, 2015).

### 2. Case-control studies; glioma

Aydin et al. (2011) reported the results of CEFALO, a multicenter

<sup>☆</sup> This paper was prepared for and revised with the Epidemiology Working Group of the Expert Forum: Wireless Radiation and Human Health at the Hebrew University, January 23–26, 2017. sponsored by the Israel Institute for Advanced Study and Environmental Health Trust, with support from the U.S. National Institutes of Health/ National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and Dr. Lucy R. Willetzky.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [ab.miller@utoronto.ca](mailto:ab.miller@utoronto.ca) (A.B. Miller), [lloyd.l.morgan@gmail.com](mailto:lloyd.l.morgan@gmail.com) (L.L. Morgan), [iu22@ehsi.rutgers.edu](mailto:iu22@ehsi.rutgers.edu) (I. Udasin), [ddavis@ehtrust.org](mailto:ddavis@ehtrust.org) (D.L. Davis).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043>

Received 5 September 2017; Received in revised form 14 June 2018; Accepted 20 June 2018  
0013-9351/ © 2018 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.