

Electrosensitivity

Prepared by **Belgian BioElectroMagnetic Group** (BBEMG)

October 2008

1. What is electrosensitivity?

1.1 Definition and characteristics

Electrosensitivity covers symptoms attributed by a person who suffers from being in the vicinity or using electric equipment. It results in varied degrees of discomfort or poor health perceived.

In certain cases, people are so severely affected that they isolate themselves and are led to quit working and to change their lifestyle, while others report mild symptoms which bring about an avoidance of certain electromagnetic field sources.

The following terms can also be encountered :

- hypersensitivity to electricity (EHS)
- electromagnetic hypersensitivity
- environmental idiopathic intolerance with attribution to electromagnetic fields.

Disorders associated with environmental factors (here, electromagnetic fields) and sharing “similar non-specific medically unexplained symptoms that adversely affect people” are classified as environmental idiopathic intolerances. (Source: Fact sheet n°296, WHO).

Similarities exist with other environmental pathologies, such as multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS) or the sick building syndrome (SBS) (see the report¹ of the Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2005).

1.2 Definition and characteristics : symptoms

Various symptoms are reported, they include :

- ***dermatological symptoms*** : some electrosensitive individuals report redness of their face when working on a visual display unit, tingling or burning sensations in the vicinity of electric devices.
- ***neurasthenic and vegetative symptoms*** : the neurovegetative system controls the functioning of internal organs. This involves the regulation of digestion, metabolism, circulation, body temperature, secretions, reproduction, homeostasis, respiration and so on. The neurovegetative system is composed of ortho- and para- sympathetic systems. They have opposite effects on organs: they stimulate or inhibit the functioning of the latter, which lead to a precise regulation of the activities of organs.
Some electrosensitive individuals report fatigue, headaches, sleep disorders, anxiety, digestive disturbance (e.g. nausea), concentration and memory difficulties, dizziness ...

¹ http://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/publications/2005/87-7614-548-4/html/default_eng.htm

- **other symptoms** : some electrosensitive individuals report throat, nose and ear disorders, as for example ticklings in the throat. Other patients also report eye irritations.

A specific symptomatic profile does not exist, which means that symptoms can have similarities to other disorders or diseases. These symptoms are also frequently encountered in the general population.

Some authors analysed symptoms described by electrosensitive individuals. Here are some examples of the main results:

Hillert and coll., 2002

Classification in decreasing order of the most mentioned symptoms by 167 interviewed electrosensitive individuals (several answers possible)

45,5%	Fatigue
36,3%	Facial skin problems
24,6%	Sense of heaviness in head
23,2%	Eye irritation
17,0%	Runny and stuffy nose
16,8%	Headache
14,1%	Difficulties to concentrate

The authors didn't observe any differences between symptoms mentioned by women and men.

Röösli and coll., 2004

Classification in decreasing order of the most mentioned symptoms by 394 interviewed electrosensitive individuals (several answers possible)

58%	Sleep disorder
41%	Headache
19%	Nervousness/distress
18%	Fatigue
16%	Concentration difficulties
14%	Tinnitus
11%	Dizziness
11%	Limb pain

The authors didn't observe any differences between symptoms mentioned by women and men.

Schüz and coll., 2006

Classification in decreasing order of the most mentioned symptoms by 192 electrosensitive individuals who have completed an online questionnaire or sent an email (several answers possible)

87%	Tiredness
87%	Concentration difficulty
86%	Sleep disturbance
85%	Weariness
82%	Crankiness
80%	Obliviousness
76%	Headache

44% of respondents presented symptoms that they associated with EMF, but they didn't consider themselves as electrosensitive.

Symptom characteristics


- They quickly appear : from some minutes in 57% of cases to several hours in 21% of cases (see Rösli and coll, 2004)
- They are transitory and disappear with a distance from the source. Sometimes, delayed or extended reactions are noticed after exposure.

Symptoms appear for exposure levels that do not lead to reaction from the majority of other people, frequency and intensity levels at which people are exposed and largely under international recommendations.


1.3 Definition and characteristics : sources

Incriminate sources are always more widespread in our modern society.

A real specificity of symptoms according to the source does not exist.



Rösli and coll (2004) analysed the suspected reasons of the symptoms. Results of this study are listed below:



Schreier and coll (2006) noticed that concerns are more often expressed with regard to mobile phone masts or high voltage powerlines compared to mobile phones, electric devices and wireless phones. Similar results were obtained in another study (Siegrist and coll., 2005) and in Austria (Hutter and coll., 2004).

1.4 Definition and characteristics : consequences

In some people, a progression from electrosensitivity to chronicity is observed. Consequences are varied:

- physical and psychological suffering (worry, anxiety, depressive states, stress...)
- behaviors of avoidance to exposure
- the organisation of a patient's life around this concern
- absenteeism, working incapacity
- social isolation
- financial problems due to moving and changing the electrical wiring of a house ...

Sometimes, a misunderstanding of professional and familial entourage and the medical world's failure to recognize the condition worsen the isolation of an electrosensitive individual.

Several authors speak of a vicious circle (see figure 1) where symptoms, their association with one (some) electromagnetic sources and avoidance behaviors follow one after the other, then amplify and keep themselves up.




Figure 1

2. Prevalence of electrosensitivity

Characteristics of electrosensitive individuals

- People of all ages can become electrosensitive. However, studies show that a larger proportion of middle aged women are prone to this.
- Some studies put forward various proportions of electrosensitive individuals depending on educational and/or socio-economic levels, but results are contradictory (Hillert et coll., 2002; Institut für Angewandte Sozialwissenschaft, 2003).

Geographical variations (see figure 2)

- A European study (Bergqvist and coll., 1997) described more cases in Sweden, Denmark and Germany and fewer cases in France, Austria and the United-Kingdom (North-South gradient)
- In the same study, exposure sources were indoors (e.g. visual display units) in Scandinavia and outdoors (e.g. high voltage powerlines and mobile phone masts) in our regions.




Figure 2

Caption	
1	<p>California (Levallois and coll, 2002) : Telephone survey among 2,072 Californians over 18 years (response rate=84.1%) To the question: “Are you allergic or very sensitive to getting near electric appliances, computers or power lines?, 3.2% of the respondents defined themselves as electrosensitive.</p> <p>23.1% of the respondents reported chemical sensitivity (1.3% reported electrosensitivity without any chemical sensitivity)</p>
2	<p>Sweden Stockholm (Hillert and coll., 2002) : Questionnaire survey among 15,000 men and</p>

	<p>women between 19 and 80 years (response rate=73%) To the question: "Are you allergic or hypersensitive to electric or magnetic fields?", 1.5% of the respondents defined themselves as electrosensitive. Scania (Carlsson and coll., 2005) Postal questionnaire survey among 24,922 people between 22 and 84 years (response rate=59%) To the question: "During the past 14 days, did you experience annoyance that you associate with [chemical or electrical factors]?", 30.2% of the respondents quoted at least one factor, of whom 40% an electrical factor.</p>
3	<p>Germany (Schroeder, 2002) Phone survey among 2,406 individuals over 14 years (response rate=61.4%) With the help of predetermined criteria, authors conclude that 6% of the German population is electrosensitive. (Institut für angewandte Sozial-wissenschaft, infas, 2003) 8 % of the German population is electrosensitive.</p>
4	<p>Austria (<i>Schröttner & Leitgeb, 2008</i>) Phone survey among 460 people between 15 and 80 years (response rate=88%) To the question: "Do you feel disturbed from electromagnetic pollution?", 3.5% of the respondents defined themselves as electrosensitive. (<i>Leitgeb & Schröttner, 2003</i>) Study on 708 adults, between 17 and 60 years of age (response rate= 55.1%) These authors distinguished: -"electromagnetic sensibility" (ability to perceive electric and electromagnetic exposure) and -"electromagnetic hypersensitivity" (developing health symptoms due to exposure to environmental electromagnetic fields). In the population studied, 4.2% of women and 1.7% of men were "electromagnetic sensible". This sensibility is characterized by a current perception threshold</p>
5	<p>Switzerland (Schreier and coll., 2006) Phone survey among 2,048 individuals over 14 years (response rate=55.1%) 2.7% of all respondents reported adverse health effects attributed to electric and magnetic fields. 2.2% reported having had such effects in the past.</p>
	<p>The European Commission Survey (Bergqvist and coll, 1997) Questionnaires were sent to 138 centers for occupational medicine and 15 self-aid groups (response rate respectively 49 and 67%). It was an exploratory study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Frequency : From several people out of a million (in the UK, Italy and France, with respect to centers for occupational medicine) to a few tenths of a percent (in Denmark, Ireland and Sweden, with regard to self-aid groups). - symptoms and sources varied depending on the country.

3. Diagnosis

Establishing a diagnosis of electrosensitivity is difficult in the absence of objective specific clinical signs or specific / sensitive pathophysiological markers capable of characterizing this intolerance. No plausible biophysical mechanism is known.

It is important to emphasize that these symptoms are real and that the individual's suffering cannot be questioned. However, they objectively cannot be attributed to electromagnetic fields. Indeed, so far:

- *epidemiological studies* cannot clearly determine the effective cause of reported symptoms (effects linked to field exposure or linked to risk perception and worries generated?)
- *provocation studies* have not allowed us to establish a direct causal link between the appearance of symptoms and the exposure to electric, magnetic or electromagnetic fields, regardless of their frequency: exposure to these fields doesn't always lead to symptoms and inversely the latter also appear in the absence of fields.

Remarks :

Epidemiological studies analyse the frequency of symptoms in a long term exposed population to certain kinds of fields, due to, for instance, the presence of a high voltage powerline or mobile phone base station in the vicinity of their home.

In provocation studies, volunteers are exposed in laboratory to electric and or magnetic fields. They have to determine if they have been exposed (field detection) and to report potential symptoms. They also can be submitted to various tests of memory or attention.

With regard to the frequency studied, equipment differs: on the right, an helmet used to analyse reactions during exposure to extremely low frequency fields (50Hz).

In order to validate the experiment, neither the volunteer nor the researcher know whether the exposure is real or sham. This is called double-blind studies.



Magnetic helmet developed in the framework of the research contract of BBEMG by technical teams (see teams of V.Beauvois and Prof.JL.Lilien)

According to the expert group of the European Commission (Bergqvist et al, 1997) and the working group of WHO (see factsheet n°296), the word “electrosensitivity” doesn't imply an established relationship between electromagnetic fields and health symptoms because provocation studies have not shown a clear relation between subjective feelings and exposure to electromagnetic fields.

However, provocation studies testing immediate and acute effects of exposure have their limits. For example, these studies:

- do not take into account the latency in symptom appearance because of a relatively short exposure period.
- only present a single EMF source or harmonics artificially generated
- lead to additional stress (effect of anticipation)

We would like to emphasize that symptoms can be a manifestation of organic pathology. An extensive medical evaluation must allow to exclude all known pathologies.

4. Treatment

In the absence of the demonstration of causal relationships and defined diagnosis criteria, the first step consists of rejecting all known medical pathology that may be responsible for symptoms. From the identification of the environmental, psychosocial and medical conditions of electrosensitive individuals, individualized, multidisciplinary and overall taking in charge of patients should be privileged.

The choice of a therapy should be based on clinical presentation, as well as reponse to treatment. Numerous therapeutic technique have been the object of publications and among these **cognitive behavioral therapies** prove to be the most effective (Rubin et coll., 2006; Irvine, 2005; Hillert et coll., 2002).

Cognitive behavioral therapies are based on observable behaviors, thoughts and ensuing emotions. By joint work with the therapist, the patient strives to become aware of his/her thoughts, and the possible gap between them and reality, and thereafter gradually replaces negative or mistaken thoughts by the learning of new behaviors.

Hillert and coll (2002) indicated that prognosis was better when the care plan was precociously carried out and when symptoms were associated with work on visual display units (figure 3).




Figure 3

A spontaneous remission is noticed in a certain number of cases.

Röösli et coll. (2004) analysed the means that are carried out to avoid symptoms. The results of that study are shown in figure 4.




Figure 4

Reducing exposure is often considered as a temporarily or partially effective means in the improvement of symptomatology by people who complain about this. Reducing exposure seems to lead an electrosensitive individual to a spiral of avoidance and arrangements that sometimes have important consequences in term of costs, social and professional isolation and quality of life.

Because reported complaints mainly concerned usual exposure level encountered in our everyday life, this solution should be first deeply thought about in light of exposure evaluations and scientific data in this field.


Overall, it is recommended to be wary of gadgets that are supposed to reduce or cancel magnetic fields.

5. Prospects for research : paths to explore

At this time, researchers agree on a multifactorial origin of electrosensitivity.

On the right, the figure illustrates factors that could be analysed and taken into account in future studies.

We emphasize the fact that some factors, such as chemical factors, are often evoked even though we do not have any scientific plausible data to justify their intervention.



Examples of organisational and psychosocial factors

- work organisation and stress
- family problems, life events, social isolation
- role of media and communication
- cultural context
- risk management
- risk perception

Examples of physical factors :

- electric and/or magnetic fields
- electrostatic fields, dusts
- contact currents
- neon lights
- weak humidity in the air
- high ambient temperature

Examples of internal factors

- psychological and cognitive (personality, anxiety, negative affect, past experiences, expectancy effects...)
- biological and physiological (age, feminine sex, allergic status, psychophysiological reactivity...)

Examples of chemical factors : exposure or sensitization to toxic substances, heavy metals (example: mercury of dental fillings), moisture, mycotoxins...

Hypothesis of a hyper reactivity of the central nervous system

Electrosensitive individuals could have a higher reactivity of the central nervous system (Wang et coll., 1994; Sandström, 1997; Lyskov et coll., 2001). It could be a physiological predisposition that could lead to higher sensitivity to environmental stressors.

Research in process in Liege (Belgium)

More research is needed in order to better understand reasons and other aspects of symptomatology, as well as to test the effectiveness of therapeutic methods targeted at better helping individuals who complain of electrosensitivity.

Our team is involved in a study with the aims of

- evaluating health status of people with complaints related to electricity, characterizing this disorder and better understanding what is called «electrosensitivity» in the Belgian population ;
- assessing the effects of 50Hz magnetic field exposure on cognitive performance (as attention, memory...) and the reporting of symptoms;

- looking for biological markers of this electrosensitivity by genetic analysis.

References (by alphabetical order)

- Andersson, B., Berg, M., Arnetz, BB., Melin, L., Langlet, I., & Liden, S. (1996). A cognitive-behavioral treatment of patients suffering from "electric hypersensitivity". Subjective effects and reactions in a double-blind provocation study. *J Occup Environ Med*, 38(8):752-8.
- Bergqvist, U., Vogel, E., Aringer, L., Cunningham, J., Gobba, F., Leitgeb, N., Miro, L., Neubauer, G., Ruppe, I., Vecchia, P. & Wadman, C. (1997). Possible health implications of subjective symptoms and electromagnetic fields. A report prepared by a European group of experts for the European Commission, DG V.
- Carlsson, F., Karlson, B., Orbaek, P., Osterberg, K., & Ostergren, PO. (2005). Prevalence of annoyance attributed to electrical equipment and smells in a Swedish population, and relationship with subjective health and daily functioning. *Public Health*, 119(7):568-77.
- Hillert, L., Berglind, N., Arnetz, BB., Bellander, T. (2002). Prevalence of self-reported hypersensitivity to electric or magnetic fields in a population-based questionnaire survey. *Scand J Work Environ Health*, 28(1):33-41.
- Institut für Angewandte Sozialwissenschaft, infas (2003). Ermittlungen der Befürchtungen und Ängste der breiten Öffentlichkeit hinsichtlich möglicher Gefahren der hochfrequenten elektromagnetischen Felder des Mobilfunks-jährliche Umfragen. B. f. Strahlenschutz. Bonn, Institut für Angewandte Sozialwissenschaft GmbH: 1-34.
- Irvine, N. (2005). Definition, epidemiology and management of electrical sensitivity. Report for the Radiation Protection Division of the UK Health Protection Agency, HPA-RPD-010.
- Leitgeb, N. & Schrottner, J. (2003). Electrosensibility and electromagnetic hypersensitivity. *Bioelectromagnetics*, 24(6):387-94.
- Levallois, P., Neutra, R., Lee, G., & Hristova, L. (2002). Study of self-reported hypersensitivity to electromagnetic fields in California. *Environ Health Perspect*, 110 Suppl 4:619-23.
- Lyskov, E., Sandstrom, M., Mild, KH. (2001). Provocation study of persons with perceived electrical hypersensitivity and controls using magnetic field exposure and recording of electrophysiological characteristics. *Bioelectromagnetics*, 22(7):457-62.
- Röösli, M., Moser, M., Baldinini, Y., Meier, M., & Braun-Fahrländer, C. (2004). Symptoms of ill health ascribed to electromagnetic field exposure - a questionnaire survey. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health*, 207:141-150.
- Rubin, GJ., Das Munshi, J., Wessely, S. (2005). Electromagnetic hypersensitivity: a systematic review of provocation studies. *Psychosom Med*, 67(2):224-32.
- Rubin, GJ., Das Munshi, J., Wessely, S. (2006). A systematic review of treatments for electromagnetic hypersensitivity. *Psychother Psychosom*, 75(1):12-8.

Sandström, M., Lyskov, E., Berglund, A., Medvedev, S., & Hansson Mild, K. (1997). Neurophysiological effects of flickering light in patients with perceived electrical hypersensitivity. *J Occup Environ Med*, 39:15-21.

Schreier, N., Huss, A., & Rössli, M. (2006). The prevalence of symptoms attributed to electromagnetic field exposure: a cross-sectional representative survey in Switzerland. *Soz Präventiv Med*, 51:202-209.

Schroeder, E. (2002). Stakeholder-Perspektiven zur Novellierung der 26.BImSchV. Ergebnisse der bundesweiten Telefonumfrage im Auftrag des Bundesamtes für Strahlenschutz (BfS).

Schröttner, J., & Leitgeb, N. (2008). Sensitivity to electricity - Temporal changes in Austria. *BMC Public Health*, 8:310.

Schuz, J., Petters, C., Egle, UT., Jansen, B., Kimbel, R., Letzel, S., Nix, W., Schmidt, LG., & Vollrath, L. (2006). The "Mainzer EMF-Wachhund": results from a watchdog project on self-reported health complaints attributed to exposure to electromagnetic fields. *Bioelectromagnetics*, 27(4):280-7.

Siegrist, M., Siegrist, M., Earle, TC., Gutscher, H., & Keller, C. (2005). Perception of mobile phone and base station risks. *Risk Anal*, 25(5):1253-64.

Silny, J. (1999). Electrical hypersensitivity in humans--fact or fiction? *Zentralbl Hyg Umweltmed*, 202(2-4):219-33.

Wang, T., Hawkins, LH., & Rea, WJ. (1994). Effects of ELF magnetic fields on patients with chemical sensitivities. COST 244: Biomedical effects of electromagnetic fields, September 27-29; Graz, Austria. 123-132.