method appropriate to reduce the likelihood for false positive or false negative results 📃 studies completely fulfilling the requirements 📃 studies partly fulfilling the requirements method considered a source of high risk of bias method considered a source of imprecision key question not applicable

🕂 high risk of bias in favour of an effect of exposure 🗧 high risk of bias in favour of a null result 🚦 high risk of bias with uncertain direction on study outcome

SELECTION BI	AS	0	5	Number 10	of studies 15	20	25
Were individuals excluded whose EMF-attributed symptoms may be	based on examination for somatic diseases						
	based on examination for mental disorders						
explained by somatic	based on medical interview						
diseases or mental disorders?	based on self-report of medical conditions						
	not sufficiently considered/not reported						
Was the contrast in the	based on open provocation						
severity of symptoms	based on blinded pre-tests						
with/without exposure	based on self-report						
verified?	not reported						
(type of exposure source,	based on open provocation						
frequency range and exposure level) applied							
that individuals associate with their symptoms?	not reported						-
Were exposure durations	based on open provocation						
and assessment times applied that matched	based on blinded pre-tests						
the time scales for the symptoms to appear?	based on self-report						
	not reported						
Were the intervals	based on open provocation						
between exposure sessions sufficiently long	based on self-report of usual recovery times or next exposure						
to allow for recovery and to avoid carry-over effects?	interval of at least 1 week between exposure sessions						
	interval of at least 1 day between exposure sessions						
	not reported 📩						
vere the symptoms recorded in the trials	based on symptoms reported in open provocation						
matched with those experienced in everyday	using a comprehensive list of symptoms for registration in the						
exposure situations?	not reported						

PERFORMANCE BIAS

Was the level and method of blinding appropriate?	blinding of participants during sessions	
	blinding of research personal during sessions	
	blinding of research personal during data analysis	
	removal of any clues that could reveal exposure status and/or tests done to control blinding	
	no blinding of research personal during sessions 🕇	
	insufficient removal of any clues that could reveal exposure status and no tests done to control blinding	
Were biases related to	randomized exposure sequence	
sequence and period of the exposure conditions	counterbalanced exposure sequence	
minimized (for studies with cross-over design)?	use of a habituation session	
	effect of sequence tested and/or controlled for in analysis (relevant if not counterbalanced)	
	same sequence and period of the exposure conditions for all participants or for all participants of a group	
	not reported	
	N/A	

CONFOUNDING BIAS

		Number of studies					
		0	5	10	15	20	25
Were biases related to confounders and cofac- tors minimized (for studies	randomized allocation to EMF exposure or sham						
	confounding adjusted for in analysis						
comparing parallel groups	not randomized 茸						
with different exposure conditions)?	N/A						
,-							
Were other co-variates	use of an adaptation period						
appropriately controlled?	sessions scheduled for the same time of day						
	inclusion of pre-trial symptom levels in analysis						
	control for pre-trial EMF exposure						
	control for intake of drugs						
	control for relevant factors of the physical environment of the exposure room, e.g., humidity, temperature, light						
	refrain from e.g. caffeine and alcohol consumption, cigarettes, stress, strenuous exercise						
	control for other potential sources of bias						
	none considered						

EXPOSURE BIAS

Was the background exposure level controlled and minimized?	based on provided background field levels or effectiveness of the shielding of the exposure room use of shielded/rewired room or remote location without providing exposure/shielding data reduction of exposure-unrelated EMF	
	based on open provocation with sham condition	
	not reported	
Was the exposure level controlled?	control of emission level from source	
	recording or estimation of exposure level	
	not reported	

ATTRITION BIAS

Were biases minimized that are related to attrition and to incom- plete data included in the analysis?	no dropout or exclusion of participants or low dropout/exclusion rate
	all data included in analysis for the reported outcomes or few missing outcome data
	high attrition/exclusion rate or incomplete data in analysis

SELECTIVE REPORTING BIAS

Was bias related to selective outcome reporting minimized?	all relevant outcomes reported	
	selective outcome reporting	

IMPRECISION

Was the statistical power sufficient to detect participants whose symptoms are caused by a physical effect of EMF exposure ?	analysis based on individual data with sufficient number of repetitions to ensure statistical power statistics based on group data and with sufficient number of participants/trials to ensure statistical power analysis based on individual data for repeated trials or on group data without demonstration of sufficient statistical power descriptive statistics only	
Were measures applied to control for the increased chance for false positive findings due to multiple comparisons?	by adjusting for multiple comparisons	
	by retesting individuals with positive findings	•
	not considered/not reported	
	N/A	