

Dimitris J. Panagopoulos, and Andreas Karabarbounis: Comments on “Diverse Radiofrequency Sensitivity and Radiofrequency Effects of Mobile or Cordless Phone near Fields Exposure in *Drosophila melanogaster*”, *Advances in Environmental Studies* 4(1):271-276.

The paper by Geronikolou et al (2014) “Diverse Radiofrequency Sensitivity and Radiofrequency Effects of Mobile or Cordless Phone near Fields Exposure in *Drosophila melanogaster*” [1] published in Plos One supposedly presents original work on the effects of mobile and cordless phones electromagnetic fields (EMFs) on *Drosophila melanogaster* reproduction. The paper reports that two of its authors “conceived and designed the experiments”. This is not the case. The paper is a replication of the experimental procedures introduced by Panagopoulos et al (2004) “Effect of GSM 900-MHz Mobile Phone Radiation on the Reproductive Capacity of *Drosophila melanogaster*” [*Electromagn Biol Med*, 23(1), 29-43] [2], and applied since then in many publications (Panagopoulos et al 2007a; b; 2010; 2013; Panagopoulos 2016; 2017; 2019). Geronikolou et al (2014) followed the same experimental methodology without reporting replication or even citing the original study. Then, they differentiated on secondary points - employing a different statistical method, calculating theoretically the near-field instead of measuring it, not sham-exposing the control groups, and including experiments with cordless phones based on the same procedures - which led them to serious flaws and misleading conclusions. They claimed they “overcame systematic errors” in previous studies including another study of ours [3] which was based on the same methods as [2]. Thus, not only they replicated our experiments without reporting that, but in addition they tried to downgrade certain parts of our methodology. Plos One issued a “Correction” and included the reference to our study [2] after we sent a letter, but responded that they do not publish comments.

Our present commentary is a necessary action to protect authorship and restore science in regards to experiments with mobile and cordless phones.

A basic principle in scientific (and any) publications is acknowledgement of previous findings, and proper citation of the corresponding studies. This is why all science journals proclaim that they check for plagiarism. Replicating previous studies is important and justifies publication when this is clearly reported. Unfortunately that was not the case with the Geronikolou et al (2014) [1] paper.

The editor of the Plos One journal who handled the Geronikolou et al (2014) [1] paper bears great responsibility and should insist that its authors report replication and provide proper citations, especially when the reviewers had noted the issue (personal communication). Moreover should have recognized the many flaws of the paper and ask for extensive revisions. Finally, the Plos One journal should publish Comments on its published papers alike every other journal, providing the scientific community with the opportunity of challenging a peer-reviewed published paper by a peer-reviewed commentary.

Dr Dimitris J. Panagopoulos, Dr Andreas Karabarbounis

[1] Geronikolou S, Zimeras S, Davos CH, Michalopoulos I, Tsitomeneas S, (2014): Diverse Radiofrequency Sensitivity and Radiofrequency Effects of Mobile or Cordless Phone near Fields Exposure in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS One* 9(11): e112139. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0112139.

[2] Panagopoulos DJ, Karabarbounis A, and Margaritis LH, (2004): Effect of GSM 900-MHz Mobile Phone Radiation on the Reproductive Capacity of *Drosophila melanogaster*, *Electromagn Biol Med*, 23(1), 29-43.