

# CORA - Description of the BioInitiative Report 2012

## 1. About

Source
The BioInitiative Report, 2012
Link
<a href="http://www.bioinitiative.org/table-of-contents/">http://www.bioinitiative.org/table-of-contents/</a>
Supporting information
<a href="http://www.bioinitiative.org/">http://www.bioinitiative.org/</a>

## 2. Content and Mandate

Objectives
To give "a rationale for biologically-based exposure standards for low-intensity electromagnetic radiation". The report updates the 2007 report and includes additional topics.
EMF spectrum covered
0 Hz – 300 GHz
Status of report and authorship
(ad hoc) BioInitiative Working Group
Funding
Not indicated, but probably in part by the company of one of the two editors (Sage).
Accountability
None
Summary
Basic premise is not to provide a full risk assessment, but to prove a point. Not set up as an expert group to come to an objective assessment of science.

## 3. Authorship

Selection of Members
Not indicated: "A report by 29 independent scientists and health experts from around the world".
Composition (institutional)
Organizing committee/editors: 2; participants: 27.
Composition (expertise)
Relevant research expertise available.
Impartiality
No information provided on any procedures that are applied to get an impartial view. No information provided on criteria to check for vested interests.
Disclosure
Member's names and affiliations published. No information on vested interests.
Summary
No transparency on selection of group members. No declaration of interests. One of the editors (Sage) owns a company that provides EMF mitigation advice. The required expertise was available within the group. Unfortunately the expertise has not been used in a group process. Chapters have been written by one or several authors without apparent input from the other group members.

## 4. Assessment Process

<b>Literature search</b>
No information is provided about a literature search strategy. Authors of different chapters likely had their own strategies.
<b>Quality assurance</b>
No information is provided about how the scientific quality of the literature was assessed.
<b>Weighing of evidence</b>
A narrative weighing of evidence is done per chapter, without specific procedures. In the summary one of the coordinators (Sage) combines and weighs the evidence also, again only narrative and without specific procedures.
<b>Consultation activities</b>
No public consultation. 14 outside reviewers of the individual chapter (part of the total of 29 authors)
<b>Consensus finding</b>
None; the chapters are the responsibility of the authors; the summary, which is also an overall evaluation, is written by one of the coordinators (Sage).
<b>Summary</b>
Literature selection and evaluation are not described and therefore prone to bias. Overall risk assessment was mainly the work of one of the coordinators (Sage). Her personal influence was substantial.

## 5. Communication

<b>Differentiation between biological and health effects</b>
Biological effects are considered potentially adverse health effects.
<b>Unbiased descriptions</b>
The report is biased toward proving the existence of adverse health effects.
<b>Evidence-based conclusions</b>
The conclusions in the summary do not fully correspond to the evaluations made in the body of the report, but seek to overemphasize biological and adverse effects.
<b>Plain language summary</b>
Yes
<b>Unbiased summary</b>
The summary is unbalanced and biased, not discussing uncertainties, and aimed at proving the a priori point of view that current exposure limits are inadequate.
<b>Summary</b>
The evaluation is prone to bias, subjective and mainly reflects the opinion of one the two coordinators (Sage).