

The bias of SCENIHR

The problem: the SCENIHR is composed of an internal committee and the working group. Most SCENIHR internal committee members are not experts on non ionizing radiation, which is the subject they review. Only two people in the SCENIHR internal committee are from the non ionizing radiation field: one member and the Chair. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The working group declared conflicts of interests, too. Generally, people would expect from the European Union to have a strictly professional attitude without external influence and with the proper expertise. This is not the case here.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Independent scientists criticized SCENIHR report for:

- "biased in favor of negative studies and negative interpretations" (negative – no harm)
- "general bias of this report in favor of negative finding" (negative-no harm).
- Papers on an association between mobile phone use and glioma and acoustic neuroma were "systematically disregarded", referring to studies published in 2012-2013.
- "Entire bodies of relevant evidence are ignored, or key papers are not quoted....an explanation is needed".
- "misread evidence of effects"
- many of the genetic effects reported in 65% radiofrequency radiation studies (74 of 114) and 83% extremely low frequency studies (49 of 59) were "overlooked".
- "It is quite stunning that the preliminary Opinion simply does not evaluate many key papers on radiofrequency radiation impacts to sperm and male fertility **that it clearly knows to exist**, because it lists them in Section 7 as "Literature Identified but Not Cited", **and still has the temerity to conclude** that the evidence for potential effects of RF fields on male fertility is weak. It would not be weak if these papers were properly included in the review" (emphasis added).
- "unreliable for judging possible health risk"

- SCENIHR preliminary Opinion argued about a study that found important adverse effects as low as SAR= 1.0 W/kg (which is half of the European ICNIRP safety limit of 2 W/kg), that it's not relevant to cell phone users, although the study's researchers "point directly to a threat from cell phone use but the preliminary opinion misquotes the authors...it directly misrepresents both data and conclusions of this important paper".

- "Consistent Failure to Identify the Potential for Health Effects (Opinion-wide)".

- "It is unfortunate that SCENIHR has disregarded these findings and instead relies heavily on the much criticized Danish cohort study on mobile phone users with poor exposure data."

- "The preliminary SCENIHR conclusion that glioma risk is weaker now is not scientifically justified. The only way that conclusion could be reached by SCENIHR is to exclude critical studies that present evidence to the contrary".

"Sections on brain tumors are flawed. The report consistently ignores or dismisses published scientific studies that report positive findings at exposure levels below ICNIRP standards".

- "Critical evidence is misquoted"

- "overlooked studies of extremely-low frequency radiation that are reported to cause nervous system effects in 90% of the 105 studies"

- "Because key studies are omitted, and because the standard for judging possible health effects....the Preliminary Opinion wrongly concludes that no risks are established."

- "The involvement of oxidative stress on neurological/behavioral effects of ELF EMF was not carefully considered"

- "It does not include studies of the natural protective mechanisms in virtually all cells that protect against the immediate changes that lead to the long term health effects"

- "Extremely low frequencies carcinogenicity (ELF): Page 131 of SCENIHR provides misleading and flawed conclusions on ELF and neoplastic diseases".

- "The main flaw of the preliminary Opinion is in neglecting the mechanistic data on non-thermal effects of microwaves"

- "Another fundamental flaw is in neglecting many studies showing dependence of the non-thermal microwaves effects on exposure duration or dose"

Source:

<http://www.bioinitiative.org/potential-health-effects-emf/>