

Journal Pre-proof



Magnetic stimulation and the control of electromagnetic fields at work act (2016): An update

Stuart Goodall, Paul Ansdell, Kevin Thomas, Glyn Howatson

PII: S1935-861X(23)01812-0

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2023.06.016>

Reference: BRS 2415

To appear in: *Brain Stimulation*

Received Date: 17 June 2023

Accepted Date: 25 June 2023

Please cite this article as: Goodall S, Ansdell P, Thomas K, Howatson G, Magnetic stimulation and the control of electromagnetic fields at work act (2016): An update, *Brain Stimulation* (2023), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2023.06.016>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2023 Published by Elsevier Inc.

Magnetic stimulation and the Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Act (2016): an update.

Stuart Goodall, Paul Ansdell, Kevin Thomas, & Glyn Howatson

Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

Word Count: 996

Journal Pre-proof

Correspondence:

Dr Stuart Goodall
Faculty of Health and Life Sciences
Department of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation
Northumbria University
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 8ST
UK
Email: stuart.goodall@northumbria.ac.uk

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor, the Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Regulations (CEMFAW) came into effect within the UK in 2016, with the purpose of implementing the European Union Physical Agents (Electromagnetic Fields [EMF]) Directive (2013/35/EU). Two Volumes of a Guide to Good Practice for implementing the EMF directive have been published, where magnetic stimulation is acknowledged as an “*important and widely used technique*” [1, p 4]. However, in Volume 2 [2], a case study reports how being in close proximity of a discharged stimulating coil, exceeds the conservative EMF exposure limit value [ELV, internal electric field strength of $1.1 \text{ V}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}$, Table ELV2; 3]. Such data, obtained via modelling, was carried out whilst a stimulator discharged a maximum, single stimulation (1 ms) with a ‘body’ placed two distances (30 & 15 cm) from a circular coil. The data show how the health effect ELV is exceeded by 24,100% at 30 cm and 35,700% at 15 cm from the coil. Such a breach of the ELV is concerning to read from a health and safety perspective, especially for those who are not experienced with using the technique.

The ELVs are set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection [ICNIRP; 4] and it is likely that many countries use ELVs within EMF legislation. As such, this will have significant implications to the way in which researchers around the world use magnetic stimulation. Due to the focal nature of the discharged magnetic field, it is common practice for stimulating coils to be held manually over sites in the peripheral (i.e., femoral and phrenic nerves) and central nervous systems, to elicit desired responses in patients or research volunteers. Holding the coil means that operators will very likely exceed the ELV, something which is an inevitable consequence when using the technique. For occupational settings, there are few well-established acute effects of exposure to low-frequency, sinusoidal EMFs on the nervous system: the direct stimulation of nerve and muscle tissue and the induction of retinal phosphenes, which form the basis for the ELVs. There is also indirect scientific evidence that brain functions such as visual processing and motor coordination, can be transiently affected by induced electrical fields. However, evidence from other neurobehavioral research is not sufficiently reliable to provide a basis for human exposure limits [4]. Guidelines for exposure to EMF and the associated acute and chronic health effects, are regularly reviewed by the ICNIRP, however, the quality of such reviews has recently been questioned. Nordhagen & Flydal [5] suggest a wider pool of experts need to be consulted to appropriately determine exposure limits for human health. Additionally, long-term epidemiological evidence recently confirmed no association between occupational exposure to EMF and lymphoma risk [6].

Engineering-based literature demonstrate how discharged currents can spread into *models* of a human body. Recently, D’Agostino et al. [7] evaluated the risk of occupational exposure from administering magnetic stimulation, however, using the word ‘*risk*’ suggests there is an adverse

35 effect to the operator. The paper does not state what hazard exists to a user and none have been
36 documented. Whilst merits of the work are appreciated, as a standalone paper, it has the
37 unfortunate effect of being prohibitive for the use of magnetic stimulation in research and clinical
38 contexts. One method of quantifying responses evoked by an EMF in human tissue is the recording
39 of muscle activity in the form of electromyography (EMG), along with perceptual responses. Figure 1
40 shows EMG data measured in an operator's hand holding a stimulating coil, whilst eliciting stimuli in
41 a participant; when stimuli are given, a clear dose-response relationship is visible in the participant,
42 but no detectable activity was elicited or felt, in the operator's hand. If such an E- field was being
43 produced in a part of the body, "*rich in peripheral nerve innervation*" [7, p 3417], researchers would
44 likely feel a twitch like contraction in their hand, but this does not occur in practice. The present data
45 suggest that the EMF released from the stimulating coil is not sufficient to evoke a response in an
46 operator, corroborating previous literature [8], whilst refuting the stance of D'Agostino et al. [7].

47 Placing coils in holders and delivering stimuli remotely can ensure that operators do not
48 exceed ELVs, such approaches are used when sub-threshold stimuli are delivered at rest. However, it
49 is not possible to use coil holders for all sites of stimulation and many testing regimes involve
50 stimulations above motor threshold delivered during muscle contraction. When delivering stimuli in
51 this way, it is important to manually hold the coil in place to adjust for any participant movement
52 and ensure the correct site is stimulated. Magnetic stimulation users should be aware that short-
53 term exposure to EMFs is contraindicated for certain populations and individuals with metal
54 implants. As such, these groups should not operate or be in the vicinity of stimulation, as it is not
55 reasonably practicable to screen the EMF. Responsible users of magnetic stimulation follow risk-
56 assessments covering the above and it seems unfair for users of the technique to be seen as 'law
57 breakers' giving license for health and safety teams to prevent such use. Furthermore, if use of
58 magnetic stimulation is prevented, it should also be noted that commonly used university library
59 gates likely breach ELVs [9]. One would be exposed for a longer duration when passing through
60 library gates, compared to magnetic stimulation, and there could be multiple gates in one vicinity
61 where users are not risk assessed.

62 For operators who hold or are in very close proximity to a stimulating coil, the legislation is
63 in place to protect against involuntary stimulation of nerve and muscle tissue. However, these
64 responses do not occur in practice and the adverse effects (e.g., muscle/nerve stimulation and
65 development of phosphenes), upon which the health effect ELV is based, are not reported, or
66 observed in operators using magnetic stimulation. Accordingly, the technique is set to be made
67 exempt from relevant UK legislation, like MRI [10], and using magnetic stimulation should not be
68 considered a '*risk*' to operator(s).

69

Figure Legend

70 **Figure 1.** Responses to magnetic stimulation in FDI at 25 (A), 50 (B), 75 (C), and 100% (D) stimulator
71 output in the participant (solid trace) and the operator (dashed trace). Note the absence of any
72 electromyographic response in FDI in the operator holding the flat figure of 8 coil. All responses
73 shown are the average trace of two single stimuli.

74

Conflict of interest statement


76 No conflicts of interest exist with any of the authors that could inappropriately influence this work.

Journal Pre-proof

77

References

- 78 1. Commission EU. Non-binding guide to good practice for implementing Directive 2013/35/EU
79 Electromagnetic Fields, Volume 1. 2013;1.
- 80 2. Commission EU. Non-binding guide to good practice for implementing Directive 2013/35/EU
81 Electromagnetic Fields, Volume 2. 2013;2.
- 82 3. HSE. The Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Regulations. 2016.
- 83 4. ICNIRP. Guidelines for limiting exposure to time-varying electric and magnetic fields (1 Hz to
84 100 kHz). *Health Phys.* 2010;99(6):818-36.
- 85 5. Nordhagen EK, Flydal E. Self-referencing authorships behind the ICNIRP 2020 radiation
86 protection guidelines. *Rev Environ Health.* 2022.
- 87 6. Jalilian H, Guxens M, Heikkinen S, Pukkala E, Huss A, Eshagh Hossaini SK, et al. Malignant
88 lymphoma and occupational exposure to extremely low frequency magnetic fields and electrical
89 shocks: a nested case-control study in a cohort of four Nordic countries. *Occup Environ Med.* 2022.
- 90 7. D'Agostino S, Colella M, Liberti M, Falsaperla R, Apollonio F. Systematic numerical
91 assessment of occupational exposure to electromagnetic fields of transcranial magnetic stimulation.
92 *Med Phys.* 2022;49(5):3416-31.
- 93 8. Rossi S, Antal A, Bestmann S, Bikson M, Brewer C, Brockmoller J, et al. Safety and
94 recommendations for TMS use in healthy subjects and patient populations, with updates on training,
95 ethical and regulatory issues: Expert Guidelines. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2021;132(1):269-306.
- 96 9. Ikuyo M, Esaki K, Aimoto A, Wake K, Yamaguchi-Sekino S, Kojimahara N, et al. Measurement
97 and Exposure Assessment of Intermediate Frequency Magnetic Fields From Electronic Article
98 Surveillance (EAS) Gates in Libraries. *Front Public Health.* 2022;10:871134.
- 99 10. Keevil SF, Lomas DJ. The Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Regulations 2016 and
100 medical MRI. *Br J Radiol.* 2017;90(1070):20160813.



Declarations of Interest

Declarations of interest: none.

S Goodall on behalf of all authors.

Journal Pre-proof