



**Australian Centre for
Radiofrequency Bioeffects Research (ACRBR)**

**Rodney Croft, Michael Abramson, Irena Cosic
John Finnie, Ray McKenzie, Andrew Wood**

**“ACRBR Position Statement on
BioInitiative Report”**



Régie de l'énergie
DOSSIER 12-3770-2011
DÉPOSÉE EN AUDIENCE
Date 18/05/2012
Pièces n° 3-0152

December 18, 2008

undergone, merely mentioning that “*another dozen outside reviewers have looked at and refined the Report*” (Section 1, page 4). This is particularly important since many of the statements and conclusions in the Report are contrary to scientific consensus. Thus rigorous scientific evaluation would need to be performed to determine whether the inconsistencies are due to errors in the report, or errors in the scientific consensus. While such independent peer review would normally be undertaken prior to publication (to avoid misleading conclusions should problems be identified), some informal independent peer review has now occurred *in response to* publication of the BioInitiative Report. For example, the Health Council of the Netherlands (HCN) recently published a report that noted a number of inadequacies in the BioInitiative Report, inadequacies that would normally be addressed during the peer review process².

Of particular note is that the BioInitiative Report does not appear to apply principles consistently, which biases its conclusions. For example, in arguing for a link between 50/60 Hz power lines and breast cancer, the Report does not consider some of the evidence that argues against such an association. It also provides an argument for excluding other evidence (poor exposure assessment) that is not employed for studies arguing for an association between 50/60 Hz power lines and childhood leukemia (even though they are subject to the same exposure assessment limitations; see Section 12 of the Report). Another issue is that there are statements that do not accord with the standard view of science, and the Report does not provide a reasonable account of why we should reject the standard view in favour of the views espoused in the Report.

Should we be convinced by the BioInitiative Report?

Overall we think that the BioInitiative Report does not progress science, and would agree with the Health Council of the Netherlands² that the BioInitiative Report is “not an objective and balanced reflection of the current state of scientific knowledge” (page 4). As it stands it merely provides a set of views that are not consistent with the consensus of science, and it does not provide an analysis that is rigorous-enough to raise doubts about the scientific consensus.

It is worth noting that the state of science in this area is continually being debated and updated by a number of expert bodies comprised of the leading experts in this field. For example, the World Health Organisation (WHO) Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) project³, the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP)⁴, the UK Mobile Telecommunications and Health Research (MTHR) programme⁵, and here in Australia the Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Science Agency (ARPANSA)⁶ have all provided authoritative analyses of the electromagnetic radiation bioeffects research. The WHO Environment Health Criteria 238 also provides a thorough analysis of the literature to date in relation to extremely low frequency (ELF, or powerline electromagnetic fields)⁷. We have provided some web links to these below, and would strongly urge the interested reader to consult these for a balanced perspective on this fascinating research domain.

¹ BioInitiative Report: A Rationale for a Biologically-based Public Exposure Standard for Electromagnetic Fields (ELF and RF), August 31, 2007 <http://www.bioinitiative.org/report/index.htm>.

² Health Council of the Netherlands. BioInitiative report. The Hague: Health Council of the Netherlands, 2008; publication no. 2008/17E. <http://www.gr.nl/pdf.php?ID=1743&p=1>

³ <http://www.who.int/peh-emf/en/>

⁴ <http://www.icnirp.de/>

⁵ http://www.mthr.org.uk/documents/MTHR_report_2007.pdf

⁶ <http://www.arpansa.gov.au/mobilephones/index.cfm>

⁷ http://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/Comple DEC_2007.pdf