

fields.¹⁸ Claims that voltage and frequency irregularities in household alternating currents (what some refer to as “dirty electricity”) create a wide, non-specific swath of medical problems—from ADHD to rashes to diabetes to cancer—are completely unsubstantiated, and also have no plausible biologic mechanisms.¹⁹

A few words about peer review. Peer review is quite simple, contrary to the mystique it has acquired among wind developers (most of whom probably have a fanciful idea of what it is). Peer review *consists of sending a scholarly manuscript to experts in that particular field of knowledge, who are asked to judge whether it merits publication*. Simple as that. The identity of reviewers (also called “referees”) can be either known to the author (with book manuscripts, authors are routinely asked by editors to submit a list of recommended referees) or kept confidential.

If the referees (usually consisting of two or three) manage to convince the editor that the manuscript is not worthy of publication, the editor contacts the author and rejects the manuscript. If, on the other hand, the referees feel the manuscript merits publication subject to certain revisions and perhaps additions, the editor will forward their reports to the author and ask for a response. “Are you willing to make these changes? Do you agree with these criticisms? If not, give me compelling reasons why not.”

The author then revises the manuscript accordingly, except where she feels her referees are wrong—and manages to convince the

¹⁸Johansen 2004.

¹⁹ I have asked Prof. Magda Havas, Environmental and Resource Studies, Trent University, Ontario, Canada, to remove references to Wind Turbine Syndrome from her PowerPoint presentation on hypothesized wind turbine health effects, because these references are inaccurate.

editor. Once the editor feels the author has addressed criticisms and suggestions adequately, he (she) proceeds with publication.

Lastly, referees do not have to agree with the author's arguments or conclusions. This is worth emphasizing. Their purpose is merely to certify that a) the manuscript conforms to conventional standards of scholarly or clinical research appropriate to the discipline, and, perhaps most important, b) the manuscript is a significant contribution to knowledge.

In the case of this book, a variety of scientists and physicians, all professors at medical schools or university departments of biology, read and commented on the manuscript and recommended it as an important contribution to knowledge and conforming to the canons of clinical and scientific research. Moreover, they did in fact suggest revisions, even substantial revisions and additions, all of which I made. Some gave me written reports to include in the book itself. See REFEREE REPORTS. Others offered to review the book after it was published.

That said, the litmus test of scientific validity is not peer review, which, after all, is not infallible, as the history of science amply demonstrates. Peer review is an important first step in judging scientific or scholarly merit. Still, the ultimate test is whether other scientists can follow the author's research protocol and get the same results, or if different lines of research point to the same conclusions.

That, of course, remains to be seen with this report.

I thank Dr. Joel Lehrer in particular for providing me with new information regarding vestibular function, contributions echoed by Drs. Owen Black and Abraham Shulman (all in otolaryngology/neurotology). I thank Professors Ralph Katz (epidemiology) and