


ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

2022

5G, 4G CELL TOWER RADIATION

A REGULATORY GAP

WWW.EHTRUST.ORG

CITIES AND TOWNS WITH STRONG ORDINANCES

SETBACKS FOR CELL ANTENNAS





Many communities have setbacks for cell towers and small cells.

Shelburne, MA: 3,000 feet for schools and 1,500 feet of homes; no new wireless antennas in residential zones
Copake, NY: 1,500 feet from homes, schools, churches, or other buildings containing dwelling units
Sallisaw, OK: No commercial wireless telecommunications towers within 1,500 of homes.
Calabasas, CA: No "Tier 2" wireless telecommunications facilities within 1,000 feet of homes and schools
Bedford, NH: 750 feet from residentially-zoned property
Scarsdale, NY: No wireless facilities within 500 feet from homes, schools, parks, and houses of worship
Walnut City, California: 1,500 feet
Stockbridge, Massachusetts: 1,000 feet
San Diego County California: 1,000 feet (small cells)
Bar Harbor Maine: 1500 setback for schools

School Boards
Palo Alto, California: School Board supports the City of Palo Alto immediately establishing local municipal zoning setback rules of 1500 feet or more from an operating wireless transmitter and a school site.
West Linn-Wilsonville Oregon School Board prohibits cell towers on school property.
Los Angeles California School District: Resolutions opposing cell towers on school property and a cautionary level" for radiofrequency radiation 10,000 times lower than FCC limits.

Bold blue on this PDF are hyperlinked. For more setbacks go to ehtrust.org

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

A REGULATORY GAP
No Federal Agency Ensuring Cell Tower Wireless Safety

There is no U.S. government agency with oversight for cell tower radiation health effects: no research reviews, no reports, no environmental monitoring, no risk mitigation and no post market health surveillance for the daily, full body radio-frequency (RF) radiation exposure from cell towers.

"The FDA does not regulate cell towers or cell tower radiation. Therefore, the FDA has no studies or information on cell towers to provide in response to your questions."
-Ellen Flannery, Director, FDA Policy Center for Devices and Radiological Health to a California mother with a cell tower on her street who asked the FDA about safety, July 11, 2022

"As a Federal research agency, the NCI is not involved in the regulation of radio frequency telecommunications infrastructure and devices, nor do we make recommendations for policies related to this technology"
-National Cancer Institute letter to Denise Ricciardi, member of the New Hampshire State Commission on 5G, July 30, 2020

The ACS does "not have any official position or statement on whether or not radiofrequency radiation from cell phones, cell phones towers, or other sources is a cause of cancer."
-American Cancer Society Website

"EPA's last review was in the 1984 document Biological Effects of Radiofrequency Radiation. The EPA does not currently have a funded mandate for radiofrequency matters."
-Lee Ann B. Veal Director, EPA Radiation Protection Division Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, July 8, 2020 Letter to Theodora Scarato

Fact: There are no scientific reports by the CDC on cell tower radiation safety, nor does the agency have staff with expertise monitoring the science and evaluating risk. Public information requests found that **several CDC website pages on radio frequency were found to be drafted with a wireless industry consultant.**

"The electromagnetic radiation standards used by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) continue to be based on thermal heating, a criterion now nearly 30 years out of date and inapplicable today." **- U.S. Department of Interior Letter to FCC, 2014**

Fact: The World Health Organization (WHO) EMF Project has not reviewed the science since 1993. The WHO webpages on cell phones and cell towers are not based on a published scientific review. The WHO EMF Project webpages were written by a scientist who **used wireless industry money** to start the WHO EMF Project and who is now a consultant to industry. **In contrast, the WHO International Agency for Research on Cancer (a separate WHO entity vetted for conflicts of interest) determined RF radiation to be a Class 2 B "possible" carcinogen in 2011.** Many scientists now state **the evidence showing cancer has increased.**

Blue text *is hyperlinked to source.*

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

EXPERT VOICES





"The National Toxicology Program studies clearly showed that non-ionizing cell phone radiofrequency radiation radiation can cause cancers and other adverse health effects. An important lesson that should be learned is that we cannot assume any current or future wireless technology such as 5G is safe without adequate testing."
-Ronald Melnick PhD 28 year scientist at National Institutes of Health

"I recommend public health organizations raise awareness and educate the public on why and how to reduce our daily exposure to wireless radio frequency radiation. Protective public health policy is needed now. It is time for regulatory bodies to fully evaluate the research and develop science based exposure limits that truly protect the public and the environment."
-Linda S. Birnbaum, PhD, Former Director, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and National Toxicology Program of the National Institutes of Health.

"Now we have 5G rolling out in massive quantities, without due diligence to determine are these sources of radiation safe not only for humans but for wildlife. And the answer is, no, they are not."
-Albert M. Manville II, Ph.D. Adjunct Professor, Johns Hopkins University, Wildlife Biologist (17 years), retired from Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service


"Given the human, animal and experimental evidence, I assert that, to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, the probability that RF exposure causes gliomas and neuromas is high."
-Christopher Portier PhD former Director of the United States National Center for Environmental Health at the CDC, former Director of the U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

"We should not wait to protect children's brains. The science is now clear and compelling indicating that wireless technology is harmful to health, especially to for children. Wireless radiation is repeating the history of lead, tobacco and DDT."
-Devra Davis PhD, MPH, President of Environmental Health Trust, founding director of the Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology of the U.S. National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, and a member of the team of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change scientists who were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2007

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

5G, CELL TOWERS AND WIRELESS

LEGAL & LIABILITY ISSUES





When a new cell tower or wireless network is proposed the first question to ask is "Do you have insurance for damages from long-term exposure to the radiofrequency radiation (RFR)?" Usually the answer is "No."

An Uninsurable Risk?

- Insurers rank wireless, cell tower, and 5G RFR non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation as a "high" risk, comparing the issue to lead and asbestos.
- Most insurance plans have "electromagnetic field exclusions" and do not insure for long-term RFR damages.
- Wireless RFR and non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation are defined as a type of "pollution" by wireless companies themselves.
- US mobile operators have been unable to get insurance to cover liabilities related to damages from long-term RFR exposure.
- Wireless companies warn their shareholders of RFR risk but do not warn users of their products, nor do the companies warn the people exposed to emissions from their infrastructure.

This PDF is hyperlinked. For more on legal liability issues go to ehtrust.org

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

Cell Tower Companies Warn Shareholders of Risk From Cell Tower Radiation

Why Don't They Warn Families Living Near Cell Towers?

Verizon 10-K Report

"our wireless business also faces personal injury and wrongful death lawsuits relating to alleged health effects of wireless phones or radio frequency transmitters. We may incur significant expenses in defending these lawsuits. In addition, we may be required to pay significant awards or settlements."

Crown Castle 10-K Report

"We cannot guarantee that claims relating to radio frequency emissions will not arise in the future or that the results of such studies will not be adverse to us...If a connection between radio frequency emissions and possible negative health effects were established, our operations, costs, or revenues may be materially and adversely affected. We currently do not maintain any significant insurance with respect to these matters."

AT&T 10-K Report

"In the wireless area, we also face current and potential litigation relating to alleged adverse health effects on customers or employees who use such technologies including, for example, wireless devices. We may incur significant expenses defending such suits or government charges and may be required to pay amounts or otherwise change our operations in ways that could materially adversely affect our operations or financial results."

T- MOBILE 10-K Report

"Our business could be adversely affected by findings of product liability for health or safety risks from wireless devices and transmission equipment, as well as by changes to regulations or radio frequency emission standards."

This PDF is hyperlinked. For more on legal liability issues go to ehtrust.org

Cell Tower Companies Warn Shareholders of Risk From Cell Tower Radiation

Why Don't They Warn Families Living Near Cell Towers?

American Tower 10-K

"If a scientific study or court decision resulted in a finding that radio frequency emissions pose health risks to consumers, it could negatively impact our tenants and the market for wireless services, which could materially and adversely affect our business, results of operations or financial condition. We do not maintain any significant insurance with respect to these matters."

Nokia 10-K

"Although our products are designed to meet all relevant safety standards and other recommendations and regulatory requirements globally, we cannot guarantee we will not become subject to product liability claims or be held liable for such claims, which could have a material adverse effect on us."

Qualcomm 10-K

"If wireless handsets pose health and safety risks, we may be subject to new regulations, and demand for our products and those of our licensees and customers may decrease."

Ericsson Annual Report


"Any perceived risk or new scientific findings of adverse health effects from mobile communication devices and equipment could adversely affect us through a reduction in sales or through liability claims."

This PDF is hyperlinked. For more on legal liability issues go to ehtrust.org

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

5G, CELL TOWERS AND WIRELESS

LEGAL & LIABILITY ISSUES SHAREHOLDER WARNINGS



"Some research has shown biological effects from lower -level "non thermal" exposure and people exposed at lower levels have reported headaches, dizziness, nausea, mood disorders, mental slowing and memory loss." ***Business Insurance White Paper, The Next Asbestos: Five Emerging Risks That Could Shift the Liability Landscape***

Insurance Companies Have Electromagnetic Field Exclusions
Electromagnetic field exclusions" are clear and common in most insurance companies. It is applied as a market standard. This exclusion serves to exclude cover for illnesses caused by long-term EMF (non-ionizing radiation) exposure."
- Complete Markets

Wireless Companies rank EMF as a Risk with High Impact
"Electro-magnetic signals emitted by mobile devices and base stations may be found to pose health risks, with potential impacts including: changes to national legislation, a reduction in mobile phone usage or litigation."
-Vodaphone 2017 Report ranks EMF as a "Principal Risk with "High" impact.

Insurance Authorities Rate 5G as "High Risk."
5G mobile networks are classified as a "high," "off-the-leash" risk. "Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields (EMF) are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long-term consequence" and "[a]s the biological effects of EMF in general and 5G in particular are still being debated, potential claims for health impairments may come with a long latency."
-Swiss Re Institute (2019)

Insurance Plans Exclude Protecting Decision Makers Related To EMF Injury
"Exclusions: This insurance does not apply to: Bodily injury, personal injury, advertising injury, or property damage arising directly or indirectly out of, resulting from, caused or contributed to by electromagnetic radiation, provided that such loss, cost or expense results from or is contributed to by the hazardous properties of electromagnetic radiation."

Wireless Companies Warn Shareholder About Risk But Not People Living Near Their Wireless Infrastructure

Verizon says:
our wireless business also faces personal injury and wrongful death lawsuits relating to alleged health effects of wireless phones or radio frequency transmitters. We may incur significant expenses in defending these lawsuits. In addition, we may be required to pay significant awards or settlements."

Crown Castle says:
"We cannot guarantee that claims relating to radio frequency emissions will not arise in the future or that the results of such studies will not be adverse to us...If a connection between radio frequency emissions and possible negative health effects were established, our operations, costs, or revenues may be materially and adversely affected. We currently do not maintain any significant insurance with respect to these matters."

Wireless Companies Define Pollution in Their Own Policies as Including EMFs, Microwaves and Non-ionizing Radiation.

Verizons Total Mobile Protection Plan says: "Pollution" is defined as "any solid, liquid, gaseous, or thermal irritant or contaminant including smoke, vapor, soot, fumes, acid, alkalis, chemicals, artificially produced electric fields, magnetic field, electromagnetic field, sound waves, microwaves, and all artificially produced ionizing or non-ionizing radiation and/or waste."

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE COMMISSION

2020 REPORT: 5G HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

In 2020, the New Hampshire State Commission issued a Final Report with 15 recommendations to "to protect people, wildlife, and the environment from harmful levels of radiation" after a year-long investigation with numerous meetings and expert testimony.


State of New Hampshire

MEMORANDUM

"A likely explanation as to why regulatory agencies have opted to ignore the body of scientific evidence demonstrating the negative impact of cellphone radiation is that those agencies are "captured."'

Recommendations To Update RF Exposure Regulations With New Science

- A resolution to US Congress to require the FCC to commission an independent health study and review of safety limits.
- New measurement protocols needed to evaluate high data rate, signal characteristics associated with biological effects and summative effects of multiple radiation sources.

Recommendations To Address Impacts to Wildlife And Environment

- Engage agencies with ecological knowledge to develop RF-radiation safety limits that will protect the trees, plants, birds, insects, and pollinators.
- Under the National Environmental Policy Act, FCC should do an environmental impact statement as to the effect on New Hampshire and the country as a whole from 5G and the expansion of RF wireless technologies.

Recommendations To Reduce Public Exposure

- Require setbacks for new wireless antennas from residences, businesses, and schools.
- Cell phones and wireless devices should be equipped with updated software that stops cell phones from radiating when positioned against the body.
- Establish RF-radiation free zones in commercial and public buildings
- New Hampshire health agencies should educate the public on minimizing RF exposure with public service announcements on radio, television, print.

Recommendations To Utilize Safer Alternatives

- New Hampshire schools and libraries should replace Wi-Fi with hardwired connections.
- Support statewide deployment of fiber optic cable connectivity with wired connections inside homes.

Recommendations To Increase Transparency

- State should measure RFR and post maps with RF measurements..
- Require 5G structures to be labeled for RFR at eye level and readable from nine feet away.
- RFR signal strength measurements for cell sites should be done by independent contractors.
- NH professional licensure to offer RF measurement education for home inspectors.
- Warning signs posted in commercial and public buildings.

5G, Small Cells & Cell Towers Can Drop Property Values

Would you buy a home with cell antennas outside the bedroom window?



Legal filings by cities and municipalities to the FCC highlight how small cell deployment could impact aesthetics and property values.

"many deployments of small cells could affect property values, with significant potential effect…"

- Reply Comments of Smart Communities Siting Coalition (local governments and associations representing 1,854 communities) 4/7/2017,Docket No. 16-421, April 7, 2017

"**Considering that the Smart Communities' prior filings show that the addition of facilities of this size diminish property values, it is strange for the Commission to assume that approval can be granted in the regulatory blink of an eye…."**

"**…allowing poles to go up in areas where poles have been taken down has significant impacts on aesthetics (not to mention property values)."**

--Ex Parte Submission of Smart Communities CLetter to Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission September 19, 2018

5G, CELL TOWERS AND WIRELESS

DECREASED PROPERTY VALUE



"An overwhelming 94 percent of home buyers and renters surveyed by the National Institute for Science, Law & Public Policy (NISLAPP) say they are less interested and would pay less for a property located near a cell tower or antenna."

"of the 1,000 survey respondents, 79 % said that under no circumstances would they ever purchase or rent a property within a few blocks of a cell tower or antennas, and almost 90% said they were concerned about the increasing number of cell towers and antennas in their residential neighborhood."

"**Cell Towers, Antennas Problematic for Buyers" Realtor Magazine**

"...cell towers are concerning to many people and drop property values."

"While most states do not require disclosure of neighborhood nuisances, such as cell towers or noisy neighbors, a few states do, and more are likely to in the future."
-Real Estate Attorney, South Florida Sun Sentinel, 2021

The California Association of Realtors' Property Sellers Questionnaire specifically lists "cell towers" on the disclosure form for sellers of real estate.
-Click to go to the California Association of Realtors' Property Sellers Questionnaire
(p. 3-4 under K. Neighborhood)

"While the magnitude of the impact varies, the studies uniformly indicate that there is a significant impact on residential property values from installation of cell phone towers..."
-David E. Burgoyne, ASA, SR/WA Certified General Real Estate Appraiser

"In some areas with new towers, property values have decreased by up to 20%."

-"Your new neighbor, a cell tower, may impact the value of your home" National Business Post 2022

PDF is hyperlinked. More on property values at ehtrust.org

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

THE URGENT NEED FOR SAFER TECHNOLOGY

EXPERT VOICES

"I am calling on my industry to bring safer technology to market. The current implementation of technology is not safe. Take a good look at the science. This is about our children's future. Do not be lulled into believing that 25-year-old standards can protect the youngest and most vulnerable. They simply cannot."
- Frank Clegg, Former President of Microsoft Canada, CEO of Canadians for Safe Technology

"A moratorium is urgently needed on the implementation of 5G for wireless communication."
-Lennart Hardell, MD, PhD , advisory to World Health Organization international Agency for Research on Cancer, Department of Oncology, University Hospital, Örebro, Sweden (retired) , leads the Environment and Cancer Research Foundation

"The evidence indicating wireless is carcinogenic has increased and can no longer be ignored. If the World Health Organization International Agency for Research on Cancer were to meet to review all of the evidence, we believe the weight of evidence supports a new determination- that wireless radiofrequency radiation is a human carcinogen."
-Anthony B. Miller MD, Professor Emeritus, Dalla Lana School of Public Health of the University of Toronto. Former Senior Epidemiologist for the International Agency for Research on Cancer and former Director of the Epidemiology Unit of the National Cancer Institute of Canada

"Most parents believe that cellphones were safety-tested before they came on the market. We assume that our federal health and environmental agencies regularly review the latest research and ensure that these incredible devices are safe. They do not. Children are not little adults. As we sadly learned with early childhood lead exposures leaving long-lasting impairments, the developing brain is particularly susceptible."
-Jerome Paulson, MD , Professor Emeritus, George Washington University, Milliken School of Public Health, former Chair of American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Environmental Health

"The exposure levels of the Federal Communications Commission are totally outdated and do not protect the health of the public, especially of children. I urge you to take strong and active steps to reduce exposure of children and staff to excessive levels of radiofrequency EMFS within your schools."
-David O. Carpenter, M.D. Director, Institute for Health and the Environment University at Albany





ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

FCC EXPOSURE LIMITS DO NOT PROTECT

OUTDATED FCC REGULATIONS FOR RF RADIATION



FCC human exposure limits were adopted in 1996 after the EPA was defunded from creating safety limits. They have not been properly reviewed these limits since 1996.

FCC's human exposure limits for the RF microwaves emitted by 5G, 4G, cell towers, cell phones, Wi-Fi, Bluetooth, smart devices and wireless networks are based on outdated science and faulty assumptions.

The limits are irrelevant to modern day technologies and do not reflect the way people are exposed to RF and actually use technology in the 21st century.

Reasons Why FCC's 1996 Limit Do Not Protect

Heating Based Only

FCC limits are heat based "thermal" limits. This means they primarily protect against the over heating of tissue from RF. FCC's limits are not based on protecting against non-heating biological effects such as cancer, oxidative stress, headaches, behavioral problems, memory damage, disrupting bee behavior or tree damage etc.

Short Term Impacts Only

FCC limits are based on protecting against acute effects. No federal report or research review exists regarding safety from chronic, long term, RF exposures from cell towers, Wi-Fi and wireless networks in the home, school and workplace. The FDA nominated the National Toxicology Program (NTP) to perform animal studies designed to mimic a lifetime of human cell phone exposure. Cancer and DNA damage was found. Another large scale animal study used cell tower level exposures and found the same tumors as the NTP. However, the FDA rejected these findings.

Children Are Not Protected

FCC limits are misleadingly presented as being "designed to protect children. When safety thresholds were developed decades ago, the science investigating RF impacts to children's developing brains simply did not exist. Current research concludes the limits should be hundreds of times more protective for children because they are more vulnerable.

FCC EXPOSURE LIMITS DO NOT PROTECT

OUTDATED FCC REGULATIONS FOR RF RADIATION

No Risk Analysis or Review of Totality of Science
No agency has reviewed all of the latest science. Usually the EPA and FDA use risk assessment to characterize the nature and magnitude of risks to human health for various populations such as children and pregnant women. The EPA also estimates ecological risks, including plants, birds, other wildlife, and aquatic life. When groundbreaking studies are published, a quantitative risk analysis of the data is performed. This has never been done for RF.

"The FCC and FDA have failed in their obligation to prescribe safe RFR guidelines produced from wireless communication devices to protect the public health and safety. Devices are becoming more sophisticated, and their usage is as common to daily life as brushing your teeth."
- Pittsburgh Law Review "The FCC Keeps Letting Me Be: Why Radiofrequency Radiation Standards Have Failed to Keep Up With Technology" by Hala Mouzaffar

"**The wireless industry reaction features stonewalling public relations and hyper aggressive legal action. It can also involve undermining the credibility and cutting off the funding for researchers who do not endorse cellular safety. It is these hardball tactics that look a lot like 20th century Big Tobacco tactics. It is these hardball tactics—along with consistently supportive FCC policies—that heighten suspicion the wireless industry does indeed have something to hide."**

-Norm Alster in the Harvard Press Book "Captured Agency: How the Federal Communications Commission is Dominated by the Industries it Presumably Regulates"





ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH TRUST

The 2022 study "**Measurements of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields, including 5G, in the city of Columbia, South Carolina, USA**" published in World Academy of Sciences Journal authored by Tarmo Koppel and Lennart Hardell MD of the Environment and Cancer Research Foundation found the highest RF exposure readings were registered close to cell phone base station antennas mounted on top of utility poles, street lamps or traffic lights.



WORLD ACADEMY OF SCIENCES JOURNAL 4: 23, 2022

Measurements of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields, including 5G, in the city of Columbia, SC, USA

TARMO KOPPEL[1,3] and LENNART HARDELL[2]

Figure 7. Gervais Street: Cell phone base station antenna placed close to street level and causing high exposure to pedestrians and nearby café visitors (exposure scenario illustration). The antenna appears camouflaged and seemingly part of a utility pole. The measurer only discovered the antenna due to the high radiofrequency levels in the vicinity.



WORLD ACADEMY OF SCIENCES JOURNAL 4: 23, 2022

Measurements of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields, including 5G, in the city of Columbia, SC, USA

TARMO KOPPEL[1,3] and LENNART HARDELL[2]

Figure 8. Gervais Street: Another cell phone base station antenna close to street level and causing high exposure to pedestrians (exposure scenario illustration). Note the antenna appears undistinguishable from the utility pole an unnoticeable between the trees.

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™

healthychildren.org
Powered by pediatricians. Trusted by parents.
from the American Academy of Pediatrics

American Academy of Pediatrics Webpage Excerpts

Electromagnetic Fields: A Hazard to Your Health?

In recent years, concern has increased about exposure to radio frequency electromagnetic radiation emitted from cell phones and phone station antennae. An Egyptian study confirmed concerns that living nearby mobile phone base stations increased the risk for developing:

- Headaches
- Memory problems
- Dizziness
- Depression
- Sleep problems

Short-term exposure to these fields in experimental studies have not always shown negative effects, but this does not rule out cumulative damage from these fields, so larger studies over longer periods are needed to help understand who is at risk. In large studies, an association has been observed between symptoms and exposure to these fields in the everyday environment.

Last Updated 12/28/2012
Source American Academy of Pediatrics (Copyright © 2012)

ELSEVIER

Environmental Pollution

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/envpol

Thermal and non-thermal health effects of low intensity non-ionizing radiation: An international perspective☆

Dominique Belpomme [a, b, 1], Lennart Hardell [a, c, 1, 2], Igor Belyaev [a, d, e, 1], Ernesto Burgio [a, f], David O. Carpenter [a, g, h, *, 1]

[a] European Cancer Environment Research Institute, Brussels, Belgium
[b] Paris V University Hospital, Paris, France
[c] Department of Oncology, Orebro University Hospital, Faculty of Medicine, Orebro, Sweden
[d] Department of Radiobiology, Cancer Research Institute, Biomedical Research Center, Slovak Academy of Science, Bratislava, Slovak Republic
[e] Laboratory of Radiobiology, Institute of General Physics, Russian Academy of Science, Moscow, Russian Federation
[f] Instituto Scientifico Biomedico Euro Mediterraneo, Mesagne, Italy
[g] Institute for Health and the Environment, University at Albany, Albany, NY, USA
[h] Child Health Research Centre, The University of Queensland, Faculty of Medicine, Brisbane, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 6 April 2018
Received in revised form
31 May 2018
Accepted 4 July 2018
Available online 6 July 2018

ABSTRACT

Exposure to low frequency and radiofrequency electromagnetic fields at low intensities poses a significant health hazard that has not been adequately addressed by national and international organizations such as the World Health Organization. There is strong evidence that excessive exposure to mobile phone-frequencies over long periods of time increases the risk of brain cancer both in humans and animals. The mechanism(s) responsible include induction of reactive oxygen species, gene expression alteration and DNA damage through both epigenetic and genetic processes. *In vivo* and *in vitro* studies demonstrate adverse effects on male and female reproduction, almost certainly due to generation of reactive oxygen species. There is increasing evidence the exposures can result in neurobehavioral decrements and that some individuals develop a syndrome of "electro-hypersensitivity" or "microwave illness", which is one of several syndromes commonly categorized as "idiopathic environmental intolerance". While the symptoms are non-specific, new biochemical indicators and imaging techniques allow diagnosis that excludes the symptoms as being only psychosomatic. Unfortunately standards set by most national and international bodies are not protective of human health. This is a particular concern in children, given the rapid expansion of use of wireless technologies, the greater susceptibility of the developing nervous system, the hyperconductivity of their brain tissue, the greater penetration of radiofrequency radiation relative to head size and their potential for a longer lifetime exposure.

© 2018 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

European Parliament

Health impact of 5G

STUDY

Panel for the Future of Science and Technology

EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service

Scientific Foresight Unit (STOA)

PE 690.012 – July 2021

Health impact of 5G

Current state of knowledge of 5G-related carcinogenic and reproductive/developmental hazards as they emerge from epidemiological studies and in vivo experimental studies

The upcoming deployment of 5G mobile networks will allow for significantly faster mobile broadband speeds and increasingly extensive mobile data usage. Technical innovations include a different transmission system (MIMO: use of multiple-input and multiple-output antennas), directional signal transmission or reception (beamforming), and the use of other frequency ranges. At the same time, a change is expected in the exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMF) of humans and the environment. In addition to those used to date, the 5G pioneer bands identified at EU level have frequencies of 700 MHz, 3.6 GHz (3.4 to 3.8 GHz) and 26 GHz (24.25 to 27.5 GHz). The first two frequencies (FR1) are similar to those used for 2G to 4G technologies and have been investigated in both epidemiological and experimental studies for different end points (including carcinogenicity and reproductive/developmental effects), while 26 GHz (FR2) and higher frequencies have not been adequately studied for the same end points.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified radiofrequency (RF) EMF as 'possibly carcinogenic to humans' (Group 2B) and recently recommended RF exposure for re-evaluation 'with high priority' (IARC, 2019). Since 2011 a great number of studies have been performed, both epidemiological and experimental. The present review addresses the current knowledge regarding both carcinogenic and reproductive/developmental hazards of RF as exploited by 5G. There are various *in vivo* experimental and epidemiological studies on RF at a lower frequency range (450 to 6000 MHz), which also includes the frequencies used in previous generations' broadband cellular networks, but very few (and inadequate) on the higher frequency range (24 to 100 GHz, centimetre/MMW).

The review shows: 1) 5G lower frequencies (700 and 3 600 MHz): a) limited evidence of carcinogenicity in epidemiological studies; b) sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity in experimental bioassays; c) sufficient evidence of reproductive/developmental adverse effects in humans; d) sufficient evidence of reproductive/developmental adverse effects in experimental animals; 2) 5G higher frequencies (24.25-27.5 GHz): the systematic review found no adequate studies either in humans or in experimental animals.

Conclusions: 1) cancer: FR1 (450 to 6 000 MHz): EMF are probably carcinogenic for humans, in particular related to gliomas and acoustic neuromas; FR2 (24 to 100 GHz): no adequate studies were performed on the higher frequencies; 2) reproductive developmental effects: FR1 (450 to 6 000 MHz): these frequencies clearly affect male fertility and possibly female fertility too. They may have possible adverse effects on the development of embryos, foetuses and newborns; FR2 (24 to 100 GHz): no adequate studies were performed on non-thermal effects of the higher frequencies.

Environmental Research 208 (2022) 112627

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Environmental Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/envres

Very high radiofrequency radiation at Skeppsbron in Stockholm, Sweden from mobile phone base station antennas positioned close to pedestrians' heads

Tarmo Koppel [a], Mikko Ahonen [b], Michael Carlberg [c], Lennart Hardell [c,*]

[a] Tallinn University of Technology, SOC353 Ehitajate tee 5, 19086, Tallinn, Estonia
[b] Päivölä Institute, Päivölantie 52, Tarttila, 37770, Finland
[c] The Environment and Cancer Research Foundation, Studievägen 35, SE 702 17, Örebro, Sweden



Fig. 3. Street view on the Skeppsbron street with some of the mobile phone base station antennas pointed out with a circle; note the low placement of the antennas, where microwaves irradiate the pedestrian at close range.

A B S T R A C T

In urban environment there is a constant increase of public exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields from mobile phone base stations. With the placement of mobile phone base station antennas radiofrequency hotspots emerge. This study investigates an area at Skeppsbron street in Stockholm, Sweden with an aggregation of base station antennas placed at low level close to pedestrians' heads. Detailed spatial distribution measurements were performed with 1) a radiofrequency broadband analyzer and 2) a portable exposimeter. The results display a greatly uneven distribution of the radiofrequency field with hotspots. The highest spatial average across all quadrat cells was 12.1 V m^{-1} (388 mW m^{-2}), whereas the maximum recorded reading from the entire area was 31.6 V m^{-1} (2648 mW m^{-2}). Exposimeter measurements show that the majority of exposure is due to mobile phone downlink bands. Most dominant are 2600 and 2100 MHz bands used by 4G and 3G mobile phone services, respectively. The average radiofrequency radiation values from the earlier studies show that the level of ambient RF radiation exposure in Stockholm is increasing. This study concluded that mobile phone base station antennas at Skeppsbron, Stockholm are examples of poor radiofrequency infrastructure design which brings upon highly elevated exposure levels to popular seaside promenade and a busy traffic street.

Studies from recent decades have shown elevated health risk under long term exposure to such highly elevated radiofrequency fields.

A review by Khurana et al. (2010) found in 80% of the available studies neurobehavioral symptoms or cancer in populations living at distances <500 m from base stations (Khurana et al., 2010). In another review exposure from base stations and other antenna arrays showed changes in immunological and reproductive systems as well as DNA double strand breaks, influence on calcium movement in the heart and increased proliferation rates in human astrocytoma cancer cells (Levitt and Lai, 2010).

When a GSM 900 MHz base station was installed in the village Rimbach in Germany it had an influence on the neurotransmitters adrenaline, noradrenaline, dopamine and phenyletylamine (Buchner and Eger, 2011). Influence on cortisol and thyroid hormones in people living near base stations was shown in other studies (Augner et al., 2010; Eskander et al., 2012).

Dode et al. (2011 compared base station (BS) clusters and cases of deaths by neoplasia in the Belo Horizonte municipality, Minas Gerais state, Brazil, from 1996 to 2006. In their study largest electric field was 12.4 V m^{-1} and the smallest was 0.4 V m^{-1}. They found cancer-related death rates be higher close to base stations. This finding confirmed earlier findings by Eger (Eger et al., 2004).

In a study from India, genetic damage using the single cell gel electrophoresis (comet) assay was assessed in peripheral blood leukocytes of individuals residing in the vicinity of a mobile phone base station and comparing it to that in healthy controls. Genetic damage parameters of DNA migration length, damage frequency, and damage index were significantly ($p < 0.001$) elevated in the sample group compared to respective values in healthy controls (Gandhi et al., 2014).

The effect of RF radiation among 20 subjects living close to mobile phone base station compared with 20 subjects living with a distance of about 1 km was studied (Singh et al., 2016). The authors concluded that: "*It was unveiled that a majority of the subjects who were residing near the mobile base station complained of sleep disturbances, headache, dizziness, irritability, concentration difficulties, and hypertension. A majority of the study subjects had significantly lesser stimulated salivary secretion ($p < 0.01$) as compared to the control subjects.*"

Zothansiama et al. (2017) in India inspected DNA damage a antioxidant status in cultured human peripheral blood lymphocy (HPBLs) of individuals residing in the vicinity of mobile phone b stations and compared it with healthy controls living further away. analyses of data from the exposed group (n = 40), residing withi perimeter of 80 m of mobile base stations, showed statistically sign cantly ($p < 0.0001$) higher frequency of micronuclei when compare the control group, residing 300 m away from the mobile base statio

The Ramazzini Institute findings (Falcioni et al., 2018) are suppor by the results in the USNTP study on rats and mice exposed to RF diation (National Toxicology Program, 2018a, 2018b). A clear evide of increased incidence of heart Schwannoma and some evidence glioma and tumours in the adreanal medulla in male rats was fo according to the expert panel, for further discussion see Hardell a Carlberg (2019).

The study concluded that Skeppsbron street mobile phone base station antennas are examples of a poor radiofrequency infrastructure design with mobile phone base station antennas positioned into close range to the general public which brings upon high exposure levels. Given the low placement of the antennas (height from the street floor), the highest exposure was often registered at pedestrian head level. Given that head is one of most vulnerable parts of the body, these placements by mobile telephony service providers put pedestrians into unnecessary risk. Position of these antennas, can pose a health risk to people at close range. This is especially critical for people at particular risk, including persons with medical implants, pregnant women or chronically ill persons.

Based on the latest scientific literature regarding RF exposure and adverse health effects, this study recommends repositioning such base station antennas to areas away from the nearby inhabitants, workers and the general public. Alternatively, very low power antennas may also be considered to reduce the exposure. Occupational exposure of people

Environ. Rev. **18**: 369–395 (2010) doi:10.1139/A10-018 Published by NRC Research Press

Biological effects from exposure to electromagnetic radiation emitted by cell tower base stations and other antenna arrays

B. Blake Levitt and Henry Lai

Abstract: The siting of cellular phone base stations and other cellular infrastructure such as roof-mounted antenna arrays, especially in residential neighborhoods, is a contentious subject in land-use regulation. Local resistance from nearby residents and landowners is often based on fears of adverse health effects despite reassurances from telecommunications service providers that international exposure standards will be followed. Both anecdotal reports and some epidemiology studies have found headaches, skin rashes, sleep disturbances, depression, decreased libido, increased rates of suicide, concentration problems, dizziness, memory changes, increased risk of cancer, tremors, and other neurophysiological effects in populations near base stations. The objective of this paper is to review the existing studies of people living or working near cellular infrastructure and other pertinent studies that could apply to long-term, low-level radiofrequency radiation (RFR) exposures. While specific epidemiological research in this area is sparse and contradictory, and such exposures are difficult to quantify given the increasing background levels of RFR from myriad personal consumer products, some research does exist to warrant caution in infrastructure siting. Further epidemiology research that takes total ambient RFR exposures into consideration is warranted. Symptoms reported today may be classic microwave sickness, first described in 1978. Nonionizing electromagnetic fields are among the fastest growing forms of environmental pollution. Some extrapolations can be made from research other than epidemiology regarding biological effects from exposures at levels far below current exposure guidelines.



Clinical Biochemistry
Volume 45, Issues 1–2, January 2012, Pages 157-161



Case Report

How does long term exposure to base stations and mobile phones affect human hormone profiles?

Emad F. Eskander, Selim F. Estefan, Ahmed A. Abd-Rabou

Objectives

This study is concerned with assessing the role of exposure to radio frequency radiation (RFR) emitted either from mobiles or base stations and its relations v human's hormone profiles.

Results

This study showed significant decrease in volunteers' ACTH, cortisol, thyroid hormones, prolactin for young females, and testosterone levels.

Current Alzheimer Research, 2022, *19*, 119-132

MINI-REVIEW ARTICLE



Low Intensity Electromagnetic Fields Act *via* Voltage-Gated Calcium Channel (VGCC) Activation to Cause Very Early Onset Alzheimer's Disease: 18 Distinct Types of Evidence



Martin L. Pall[1,*]

[1]*Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry & Basic Medical Sciences, Washington State University, Current Address: 638 NE 41st Ave., Portland, OR 97232, USA*

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: October 04, 2021
Revised: December 22, 2021
Accepted: December 31, 2021

DOI:
10.2174/1567205019666220202114510



This is an Open Access article published under CC BY 4.0
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by /4.0/legalcode

Abstract: Electronically generated electromagnetic fields (EMFs), including those used in wireless communication such as cell phones, Wi-Fi and smart meters, are coherent, producing very high electric and magnetic forces, which act on the voltage sensor of voltage-gated calcium channels to produce increases in intracellular calcium $[Ca^{2+}]i$. The calcium hypothesis of Alzheimer's disease (AD) has shown that each of the important AD-specific and nonspecific causal elements is produced by excessive $[Ca^{2+}]i$. $[Ca^{2+}]i$ acts in AD *via* excessive calcium signaling and the peroxynitrite/oxidative stress/inflammation pathway, which are each elevated by EMFs.An apparent vicious cycle in AD involves amyloid-beta protein (Aβ) and $[Ca^{2+}]i$. Three types of epidemiology suggest EMF causation of AD, including early onset AD. Extensive animal model studies show that low intensity EMFs cause neurodegeneration, including AD, with AD animals having elevated levels of Aβ, amyloid precursor protein and BACE1. Rats exposed to pulsed EMFs every day are reported to develop universal or near universal very early onset neurodegeneration, including AD; these findings are superficially similar to humans with digital dementia. EMFs producing modest increases in $[Ca^{2+}]i$ can also produce protective, therapeutic effects. The therapeutic pathway and peroxynitrite pathway inhibit each other. A summary of 18 different findings is provided, which collectively provide powerful evidence for EMF causation of AD. The author is concerned that smarter, more highly pulsed "smart" wireless communication may cause widespread very, very early onset AD in human populations.

ELECTROMAGNETIC BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE
2022, VOL. 41, NO. 2, 230–255
https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2022.2065683





The roles of intensity, exposure duration, and modulation on the biological effects of radiofrequency radiation and exposure guidelines

Henry Lai[a] and B. Blake Levitt[b]

[a]Department of Bioengineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA; [b]New Preston, CT, USA

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we review the literature on three important exposure metrics that are inadequately represented in most major radiofrequency radiation (RFR) exposure guidelines today: intensity, exposure duration, and signal modulation. Exposure intensity produces unpredictable effects as demonstrated by nonlinear effects. This is most likely caused by the biological system's ability to adjust and compensate but could lead to eventual biomic breakdown after prolonged exposure. A review of 112 low-intensity studies reveals that biological effects of RFR could occur at a median specific absorption rate of 0.0165 W/kg. Intensity and exposure duration interact since the dose of energy absorbed is the product of intensity and time. The result is that RFR behaves like a biological "stressor" capable of affecting numerous living systems. In addition to intensity and duration, man-made RFR is generally modulated to allow information to be encrypted. The effects of modulation on biological functions are not well understood. Four types of modulation outcomes are discussed. In addition, it is invalid to make direct comparisons between thermal energy and radiofrequency electromagnetic energy. Research data indicate that electromagnetic energy is more biologically potent in causing effects than thermal changes. The two likely functionthrough different mechanisms. As such, any current RFR exposure guidelines based on acute continuous-wave exposure are inadequate for health protection.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 15 February 2022
Accepted 1 April 2022

KEYWORDS
Radiofrequency radiation (RFR); intensity; duration of exposure; modulation; specific absorption rate (SAR); biological effects

Current Alzheimer Research, 2022, *19*, 119-132

MINI-REVIEW ARTICLE



Low Intensity Electromagnetic Fields Act *via* Voltage-Gated Calcium Channel (VGCC) Activation to Cause Very Early Onset Alzheimer's Disease: 18 Distinct Types of Evidence



Martin L. Pall[1,*]

[1]*Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry & Basic Medical Sciences, Washington State University, Current Address: 638 NE 41st Ave., Portland, OR 97232, USA*

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: October 04, 2021
Revised: December 22, 2021
Accepted: December 31, 2021

DOI:
10.2174/1567205019666220202114510



This is an Open Access article published under CC BY 4.0
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by /4.0/legalcode

Abstract: Electronically generated electromagnetic fields (EMFs), including those used in wireless communication such as cell phones, Wi-Fi and smart meters, are coherent, producing very high electric and magnetic forces, which act on the voltage sensor of voltage-gated calcium channels to produce increases in intracellular calcium $[Ca^{2+}]i$. The calcium hypothesis of Alzheimer's disease (AD) has shown that each of the important AD-specific and nonspecific causal elements is produced by excessive $[Ca^{2+}]i$. $[Ca^{2+}]i$ acts in AD *via* excessive calcium signaling and the peroxynitrite/oxidative stress/inflammation pathway, which are each elevated by EMFs.An apparent vicious cycle in AD involves amyloid-beta protein (Aβ) and $[Ca^{2+}]i$. Three types of epidemiology suggest EMF causation of AD, including early onset AD. Extensive animal model studies show that low intensity EMFs cause neurodegeneration, including AD, with AD animals having elevated levels of Aβ, amyloid precursor protein and BACE1. Rats exposed to pulsed EMFs every day are reported to develop universal or near universal very early onset neurodegeneration, including AD; these findings are superficially similar to humans with digital dementia. EMFs producing modest increases in $[Ca^{2+}]i$ can also produce protective, therapeutic effects. The therapeutic pathway and peroxynitrite pathway inhibit each other. A summary of 18 different findings is provided, which collectively provide powerful evidence for EMF causation of AD. The author is concerned that smarter, more highly pulsed "smart" wireless communication may cause widespread very, very early onset AD in human populations.

ELECTROMAGNETIC BIOLOGY AND MEDICINE
https://doi.org/10.1080/15368378.2021.1881866

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

REVIEW

Check for updates

Genetic effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields

Henry Lai

Department of Bioengineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

ABSTRACT

This is a review of the research on the genetic effects of non-ionizing electromagnetic field (EMF), mainly on radiofrequency radiation (RFR) and static and extremely low frequency EMF (ELF-EMF). The majority of the studies are on genotoxicity (e.g., DNA damage, chromatin conformation changes, etc.) and gene expression. Genetic effects of EMF depend on various factors, including field parameters and characteristics (frequency, intensity, wave-shape), cell type, and exposure duration. The types of gene expression affected (e.g., genes involved in cell cycle arrest, apoptosis and stress responses, heat-shock proteins) are consistent with the findings that EMF causes genetic damages. Many studies reported effects in cells and animals after exposure to EMF at intensities similar to those in the public and occupational environments. The mechanisms by which effects are induced by EMF are basically unknown. Involvement of free radicals is a likely possibility. EMF also interacts synergistically with different entities on genetic functions. Interactions, particularly with chemotherapeutic compounds, raise the possibility of using EMF as an adjuvant for cancer treatment to increase the efficacy and decrease side effects of traditional chemotherapeutic drugs. Other data, such as adaptive effects and mitotic spindle aberrations after EMF exposure, further support the notion that EMF causes genetic effects in living organisms.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 22 September 2020
Accepted 13 December 2020

KEYWORDS
Radiofrequency radiation; static/extremely low frequency EMF; genetic effects; genotoxicity; gene expression

International Journal of
Environmental Research and Public Health

MDPI

Article

The Effect of Continuous Low-Intensity Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields from Radio Base Stations to Cancer Mortality in Brazil

Nádia Cristina Pinheiro Rodrigues [1,2,*], Adilza Condessa Dode [3], Mônica Kramer de Noronha Andrade [1], Gisele O'Dwyer [1], Denise Leite Maia Monteiro [4], Inês Nascimento Carvalho Reis [1], Roberto Pinheiro Rodrigues [5,6], Vera Cecília Frossard [1] and Valéria Teresa Saraiva Lino [1]

Abstract: Background: this study aims to estimate the rate of death by cancer as a result of Radio Base Station (RBS) radiofrequency exposure, especially for breast, cervix, lung, and esophagus cancers. Methods: we collected information on the number of deaths by cancer, gender, age group, gross domestic product per capita, death year, and the amount of exposure over a lifetime. We investigated all cancer types and some specific types (breast, cervix, lung, and esophagus cancers). Results: in capitals where RBS radiofrequency exposure was higher than 2000/antennas-year, the average mortality rate was 112/100,000 for all cancers. The adjusted analysis showed that, the higher the exposure to RBS radiofrequency, the higher cancer mortality was. The highest adjusted risk was observed for cervix cancer (rate ratio = 2.18). The spatial analysis showed that the highest RBS radiofrequency exposure was observed in a city in southern Brazil that also showed the highest mortality rate for all types of cancer and specifically for lung and breast cancer. Conclusion: the balance of our results indicates that exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields from RBS increases the rate of death for all types of cancer.

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Environmental Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/envres

Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission

A B S T R A C T

Background: In 2011, IARC classified radiofrequency radiation (RFR) as possible human carcinogen (Group 2B). According to IARC, animals studies, as well as epidemiological ones, showed limited evidence of carcinogenicity. In 2016, the NTP published the first results of its long-term bioassays on near field RFR, reporting increased incidence of malignant glial tumors of the brain and heart Schwannoma in rats exposed to GSM – and CDMA – modulated cell phone RFR. The tumors observed in the NTP study are of the type similar to the ones observed in some epidemiological studies of cell phone users.

Objectives: The Ramazzini Institute (RI) performed a life-span carcinogenic study on Sprague-Dawley rats to evaluate the carcinogenic effects of RFR in the situation of far field, reproducing the environmental exposure to RFR generated by 1.8 GHz GSM antenna of the radio base stations of mobile phone. This is the largest long-term study ever performed in rats on the health effects of RFR, including 2448 animals. In this article, we reported the final results regarding brain and heart tumors.

Methods: Male and female Sprague-Dawley rats were exposed from prenatal life until natural death to a 1.8 GHz GSM far field of 0, 5, 25, 50 V/m with a whole-body exposure for 19 h/day.

Results: A statistically significant increase in the incidence of heart Schwannomas was observed in treated male rats at the highest dose (50 V/m). Furthermore, an increase in the incidence of heart Schwann cells hyperplasia was observed in treated male and female rats at the highest dose (50 V/m), although this was not statistically significant. An increase in the incidence of malignant glial tumors was observed in treated female rats at the highest dose (50 V/m), although not statistically significant.

Conclusions: The RI findings on far field exposure to RFR are consistent with and reinforce the results of the NTP study on near field exposure, as both reported an increase in the incidence of tumors of the brain and heart in RFR-exposed Sprague-Dawley rats. These tumors are of the same histotype of those observed in some epidemiological studies on cell phone users. These experimental studies provide sufficient evidence to call for the re-evaluation of IARC conclusions regarding the carcinogenic potential of RFR in humans.


Government Accountability Office Reports

These GAO reports confirm zero review of the totality of the science and bust the industry myth that 5G will bridge the digital divide.




2020: 5G Wireless: Capabilities and Challenges for an Evolving Network

"The FCC relies on the FDA as well as other organizations—principally IEEE and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP)—to review scientific research and provide recommendations for setting RF safety standards. **However, each of these organizations has only reviewed a subset of the relevant research…"**



2020 5G DEPLOYMENT: FCC Needs Comprehensive Strategic Planning to Guide Its Efforts

"The experts GAO convened also stated that 5G deployment would likely exacerbate disparities in access to telecommunications services, known as the "digital divide."



2012 TELECOMMUNICATIONS: Exposure and Testing Requirements for Mobile Phones Should Be Reassessed

"By not formally reassessing its current limit, FCC cannot ensure it is using a limit that reflects the latest research on RF energy exposure…"

"Some consumers may use mobile phones against the body, which FCC does not currently test, and could result in RF energy exposure higher than the FCC limit."

This PDF is hyperlinked.