

Table 1

Comparison of Sample Size from Double-Blind Provocation Studies Using Mobile Phones or Base Stations

Mobile phone Studies	Sample	Base Station Studies	Sample
Barth et al. [2000] ^a	1 IEI-EMF ^b	Augner et al. [2009]	8 IEI-EMF, 49 controls
Hietanen et al. [2002]	20 IEI-EMF	Eltiti et al. [2007a]	44 IEI-EMF, 114 controls (Power = .75)
Hillert et al. [2008]	38 IEI-EMF, 33 controls	Furubayashi et al. [2009]	11 IEI-EMF, 43 controls
Johansson [1995] ^c	7 IEI-EMF	Regel et al. [2006]	33 IEI-EMF, 84 controls
Johansson, [2003] ^c	70 IEI-EMF	Wallace et al. [2010]	48 IEI-EMF, 132 controls
unpublished data			(66 participants needed for within comparison power = 0.90)
Kwon et al. [2012]	17 IEI-EMF, 20 controls	Zwamborn et al. [2003]	36 IEI-EMF, 36 healthy controls (Power = .80)
Nam et al. [2009]	18 IEI-EMF, 19 controls		
Nieto-Hernandez et al. [2011]	60 IEI-EMF. 60 controls (Power = 0.90)		

Oftedal et al. [2007]	17 IEI-EMF (Power = 0.96) ^d
Raczek et al. [2000] ^a	16 IEI-EMF
Radon & Maschke [1998] ^a	11 IEI-EMF
Rubin et al. [2006]	60 IEI-EMF, 60 controls (Power = .80)
Wilén et al. [2006]	20 IEI-EMF, 20 controls

^a Original study not found, but cited in both Rubin et al. [2005] and AGNR [2012] report.

^b Single IEI-EMF participant was tested 15 times with a real and 16 times with a sham exposure.

^c Original study not found, but cited in Rubin et al. [2005] review.

^d Power calculation based on 15 IEI-EMF participants tested under two real and two sham exposure for a total of 60 pairs.