Slashdof Stories Fireh	ose > All Popular Polls	/. Deals	Search	Q Login or Sign up
Topics				Follow us: 🔊 F 😵 室
66 Follow Slashdot blog				
Nickname: Password: 6-20 character Disconstruction Public Terminal				
Log In Forgot your pase				
Sign in with Google				
Facebook				
Twitter				
LinkedIn				
Close				
	n Digital Health ross The Chasm. VentureClash – Giv • O		■ iFix 64-Bit K 30% OF	lit
				WaveMaker

Leap Towards a Career in Ethical Hacking with 60+ Hours of Prep Toward CISM, CISA, & More Certification Exams at 95% off

Doubts Raised About Cellphone Cancer Study (vox.com)

Posted by EditorDavid on Sunday May 29, 2016 @06:30PM from the call-me-maybe dept.

Vox is strongly criticizing coverage of a supposed link between cellphones and cancer suggested by a new study, calling it "<u>a breathtaking example of irresponsible science hype</u>." An anonymous reader writes: A professor and research monitoring administrator at an American medical school reported that to get their results, the researchers "exposed pregnant rats to whole body CDMA- and GSM-modulated radiofrequency radiation, for 9 hours a day, 7 days a week," and the results were seen only with CDMA (but not GSM-modulated) radiofrequency. "[F]alse positives are very likely. The cancer difference was only seen in females, not males. The incidence of brain cancer in the exposed groups was well within the historical range. There's no clear dose response..."

An emeritus professor of applied statistics at the Open University in Britain also called the study "statistically underpowered..." according to Vox. "Not enough animals were used to allow the researchers to have a good chance of detecting a risk from radiofrequency radiation of the size one might plausibly expect."

health cellphones communications 🔖

50% less time , 42% less cost using

WaveMaker Professional Services

f ♥ in 8+ 🐨

<u>Systemd Starts Killing Your Background Processes By Default</u> <u>Cellphones Do Not Cause Brain Cancer, Says 29-Year Study</u>

Possible Cellphone Link To Cancer Found In Rat Study

Google Scholar Users Report Badly Malfunctioning Captcha **Doubts Raised About Cellphone Cancer Study More | Reply Login** Doubts Raised About Cellphone Cancer Study

Post Load All Comments

SoaFull 86 Abbneviated 22 Hiddente an Account

Exera ments	Filter:

- <u>**Sd</u>ore:</u></u>**
- **Ensightful**
- <u>Anformative</u>
- Bnteresting
- <u>Eunny</u>

0

0

0

The Fine Print: The following comments are owned by whoever posted them. We are not responsible for them in any way.

it was from Mother Jones (Score:3)

byotnerk Regulardeo (jih266624) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @06:39PM (#52207429) shoulda known

Nicknameis Paistwonde 6-20 characters long

Flagasi Inappropriate

Log In Forgot your password?

Arrow ColdWetDog (752185)

On go make a *really* long call on a cell phone.

• <u>Vox</u> (<u>Score:4</u>, Insightful)

by PopeRatzo (965947) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @06:44PM (#52207459) Journal

Vox is strongly criticizing coverage of a supposed link between cellphones and cancer

Vox is a highly-leveraged company that makes money with a news site that's designed for use on mobile devices. What the fuck you think they're gonna say?

Plus, Vox is the absolute ugliest news site every on the internet. I'm not joking. If you visit their page, be careful ow whiplash when you involuntarily turn your head away in horror. And their stock in trade are these hot-take "explainer cardstacks" which is some jargon bullshit for a web page with almost no information that prompts you to click on many other pages in order to read the whole story, which inevitably turns out to be disappointing, with mostly pictures and great big infographics without labels that make you come away feeling like you learned something when in fact you are stupider than when you started.

A bunch of refugees from other hipster publications started Vox, and they stand as a shining example of bad journalism, bad design and a bad business model.

Reply to This Share

twitter facebook linkedin 🞯

<u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>

• <u>2 hidden comments</u>

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:3</u>)

by <u>PopeRatzo</u> (965947)

OK, I just realized that there are some of you who may believe that I'm overdoing my criticism of vox.com, so I'm going to post a story from their *motherfucking front page* today. It's an "explainer cardstack" about a meme that I guarantee you have not heard of or seen if you are out of junior high school. A news story *about a meme*.

Imagine, these are people with advanced degrees in journalism who are writing this shit.

http://www.vox.com/2016/5/27/1... [vox.com]

<u>1 hidden comment</u>

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>drinkypoo (153816</u>)

It's an "explainer cardstack" about a meme that I guarantee you have not heard of or seen if you are out of junior high school.

Sorry, I get some of my best memes (one might say "dankest", if they were some kind of retard) from someone who talks like they're still in junior high school. So alas, I do know waddup. And this is one of the dumbest memes that evar happened.

<u>Re: (Score:2)</u>

by <u>PopeRatzo (965947)</u>

So alas, I do know waddup.

You show courage in admitting that. I salute you.

I like memes as much as the next Pepe, but damn, can you imagine the notion that a group of journalists believed that they needed to explain THIS ONE to people?

<u>Re:Vox</u> (<u>Score:5</u>, Insightful)

by <u>ArmoredDragon (3450605)</u> on Sunday May 29, 2016 @07:14PM (<u>#52207613</u>)

A bullshit study is a bullshit study, no matter who calls out the fact that it is bullshit. The fact that this only happens to the males and not the females is basically a dead ringer for it being a part of the rat's genome and that it's not being influenced by any environmental or other outside factors. I'm not even a scientist and that fact sticks out like a sore thumb to me. Then when you read deeper into the methodology used, and they didn't even use enough subjects to be able to come anywhere close to being able to meet statistical significance, that this is just another one of those bogus health related studies that come around every now and then because somebody is ideologically opposed to something everybody does or uses, and sets out to prove a point rather than to investigate. This is similar to studies that come around every now and then because that come around every now and then to attempt to prove that take your pick of any one of meat, GMO, vaccination, or aspartame is bad for you.

Reply to This Parent Share

<u>twitter facebook linkedin</u> <u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>

<u>Re: (Score:3)</u>

by <u>Dutch Gun (899105)</u>

I also find it slightly ironic that Slashdot first links to said bullshit study the other day (in which many people rightly call out that it's complete crap), and then posts this a few days later, as if they didn't contribute to the original study's publicity.

I mean, I get it, Slashdot is just a news aggregator, but I really wish they could find more reliable news sources to draw from in the first place, rather than having to post the same story twice: first sensationalizing, then debunking.

<u>Re:</u> (Score:3)

by Xenographic (557057)

> OK, I just realized that there are some of you who may believe that I'm overdoing my criticism of vox.com, so I'm going to post a story from their motherfucking front page today

That makes them better than Mother Jones (reporter of the original story) who has a "meme of the day" then, no?

http://www.motherjones.com/kev... [motherjones.com]

I'm curious as to how RF causes cancer only in *male* rats and why they live longer anyhow, or why the middle exposure group tended to have zero rats with cancer, rather than the low exp

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:3</u>)

by <u>PopeRatzo (965947</u>)

I'm curious as to how RF causes cancer only in *male* rats and why they live longer anyhow, or why the middle exposure group tended to have zero rats with cancer

Don't get me wrong, I'm not saying exposure to RF causes cancer. I'm saying exposure to Vox causes cancer.

However, that being said, if there's one thing that *should* cause cancer in a just universe, it's cell phone usage.

<u>1 hidden comment</u>

<u>Re:Vox</u> (<u>Score:4</u>, Informative)

by <u>Xenographic</u> (557057) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @09:40PM (#52208287) <u>Homepage Journal</u>

> I'm saying exposure to Vox causes cancer.

Even stopped clocks are right twice a day. I think the complaints about this study look legit here. I don't read Vox regularly and have no stake in arguing whether they're good or bad in general.

Reply to ThisParentShare

twitter facebook linkedin <u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>

<u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>PopeRatzo (965947)</u>
Vox is a garbage site, started by the same people who brought you Daily Kos.
No. It's a garbage site brought to you by Ezra Klein.
<u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/...</u> [wikipedia.org]
3 hidden comments

<u>Re: (Score:2)</u>

by Xenographic (557057)

Would you really feel better if people regularly made throwaway accounts for that nonsense instead? And it's not like you wouldn't see it anyway if you're reading score 0 posts...

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>Applehu Akbar (2968043)</u>

Would you really feel better if people regularly made throwaway accounts for that nonsense instead?

Yes, because every account has a posting history and throwaways are easy to detect.

•

• <u>Re: (Score:3)</u>

by <u>quantaman</u> (517394)

Vox is strongly criticizing coverage of a supposed link between cellphones and cancer

Vox is a highly-leveraged company that makes money with a news site that's designed for use on mobile devices. What the fuck you think they're gonna say?

That strikes me as a bit of a stretch as far as conflicts of interest go.

Plus, Vox is the absolute ugliest news site every on the internet. I'm not joking. If you visit their page, be careful ow whiplash when you involuntarily turn your head away in horror. And their stock in trade are these hot-take "explainer cardstacks" which is some jargon bullshit for a web page with almost no information that prompts you to click on many other pages in order to read the whole story, which inevitably turns out to be disappointing, with mostly pictures and great big infographics without labels that make you come away feeling like you learned something when in fact you are stupider than when you started.

A bunch of refugees from other hipster publications started Vox, and they stand as a shining example of bad journalism, bad design and a bad business model.

You think they have an ugly website and therefore their reporting on the cellphone study is wrong??

Honestly I read a fair bit of Vox. I haven't looked at the card stacks but I think they're intended as a very high level basic overview (in case you're completely ignorant of the subject) but the stories, aside from their annoying click baity design, are generally pretty solid. They essentially come at things with a wonky left-leaning per

<u>Re:</u> (Score:2)

by PopeRatzo (965947)

You think they have an ugly website and therefore their reporting on the cellphone study is wrong??

No, those are two separate conditions. The first is true and the second is false. My wanting cell phones to cause cancer is not going to make it so. However, that Vox is an ugly website is not a matter of opinion.

If anyone doesn't believe me, here, go look for yourself. I want someone here to come back and tell us that it's not an ugly website. If one person (not an AC) believes that this is a well-designed

<u>Re: (Score:2)</u>

by <u>quantaman</u> (517394)

You think they have an ugly website and therefore their reporting on the cellphone study is wrong??

No, those are two separate conditions. The first is true and the second is false. My wanting cell phones to cause cancer is not going to make it so.

Well your claim that they did bad journalism seemed predicated on the idea their design was poor.

However, that Vox is an ugly website is not a matter of opinion.

If anyone doesn't believe me, here, go look for yourself. I want someone here to come back and tell us that it's not an ugly website. If one person (not an AC) believes that this is a well-designed and attractive website, I will retract my words and refund your money.

http://www.vox.com/ [vox.com]

Fine, I think it's good.

Structurally the main page is a bit of a mess conflating their big current stories and topics but every site does that. If I click on one of the stories it's fairly clean text and all on one page, I'd say that's well above average.

The cards are a new idea, I don't know if they're a good one, but they seem well executed.

The only issue I can see is they've gone away from the traditional new

■ <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>PopeRatzo</u> (965947)

Yeah, no, sorry, I don't buy the cellphone-cancer study.

No, of course I don't buy it either, no matter how much I'd like it to be true.

I just aim to point out the toxic waste dump that is Vox, and I do so every chance I get. No Slashdot story should cite a Vox article, under any circumstances.

<u>1 hidden comment</u>

Here's why I rarely come to /. anymore. First comment is nothing but an ad hominem attack, yet gets an 'insightful' rating.

Re: (Score:2)

by <u>PopeRatzo (965947</u>) Here's why I rarely come to /. anymore.

I know I speak for everyone when I say how much you've been missed.

• <u>1 hidden comment</u>

• <u>Funny, I thought (Score:4</u>, Insightful)

by John Smith (4340437) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @07:11PM (#52207599)

That 1, it was the male rats affected, and two, those rats actually lived longer. So we should see headlines like this: Constant Cell Phone Use Lengthens Lifespan (in men)

Reply to This Share

<u>twitter facebook linkedin</u> <u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>houghi (78078)</u>

Next on Tublr: Cellphone invented by CIS males to kill off women earlier.

• <u>Emotional involvement</u> (<u>Score:4</u>, Insightful)

by <u>Okian Warrior (537106</u>) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @07:15PM (<u>#52207623</u>) <u>Homepage Journal</u>

One problem with media reporting today is the perceived need to get emotional involvement.

In it's economic zeal to get eyeballs on articles, the media has resorted to sensationalizing and emotionalism. They compete for the most outrageous, most shocking headlines in an attempt to lure readers.

...and because of this the media has lost all credibility. The readers have wised up, and most don't seem to fall for these tricks any more.

We only have to look at the Trump campaign to see how this happened. Taking one single issue as an example, we read all about how he hates and has a war against latinos. In reality, he said nothing of the sort, which is 'kinda why he's got such a huge support base right now.

The media is astonished that his supporters aren't leaving him in droves... he *is* the next Hitler, didn't you know?

Everything is a crisis, everything is a war on something, everything is a conflict.

(Note: You can learn how to get around this using this <u>one weird trick!</u> [google.com])

Reply to This Share

<u>twitter facebook linkedin</u>
 <u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>
 <u>2 hidden comments</u>

<u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:3</u>)

by <u>ancientt (569920)</u>

Nice wording. By phrasing it so that a link needs to quote him specifically saying something you specify, you narrow legitimate potential replies, but lets take a look at what the interwebs are saying:

9 Outrageous Things Donald Trump Has Said About Latinos [huffingtonpost.com]

The Mexican government is much smarter, much sharper, much more cunning. And they send the bad ones over because tehy don't want to pay for them, they don't want to take care of them."

• "Sadly, the overwhelming amount of violent crime in our major cities i

<u>1 hidden comment</u>

<u>Re: (Score:2)</u>

by <u>careysub</u> (976506)

Nice wording. By phrasing it so that a link needs to quote him specifically saying something you specify, you narrow legitimate potential replies... Interestingly enough, this is a very popular tactic used by Neo-Nazis to deny that Hitler had anything to do with the Holocaust or other atrocities. Many years after WWII the German files have been exhaustively searched and analyzed, and so we know exactly what the record shows of the Holocaust's planning and execution. So the tactic is to make up some seemingly reasonable sounding "requirement" that the Hitler-defender knows does not exist e.g. Hitler *must* have signed a formal order for the Holocaust - an

• <u>Re: (Score:2</u>)

by <u>quantaman (517394)</u>

One problem with media reporting today is the perceived need to get emotional involvement.

In it's economic zeal to get eyeballs on articles, the media has resorted to sensationalizing and emotionalism. They compete for the most outrageous, most shocking headlines in an attempt to lure readers.

...and because of this the media has lost all credibility. The readers have wised up, and most don't seem to fall for these tricks any more.

The reason republicans have lost faith in the media is they were watching Fox News and finally realized the media was messing with them.

We only have to look at the Trump campaign to see how this happened. Taking one single issue as an example, we read all about how he hates and has a war against latinos. In reality, he said nothing of the sort, which is 'kinda why he's got such a huge support base right now.

The media is astonished that his supporters aren't leaving him in droves... he *is* the next Hitler, didn't you know?

What's Trump's health care policy? What's his education policy? What's his energy policy? The only time he mentions these is scripted readings of a teleprompter. He doesn't care about them and neither do his supporters.

There's only two policy areas he ever talks about. Mexicans and Muslims and all the things he'll do to keep them out of the country. And a weird mishmash of

• <u>The journalism..</u> (<u>Score:5</u>, Insightful)

by <u>TechyImmigrant (175943</u>) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @07:20PM (<u>#52207647</u>) <u>Homepage Journal</u>

was facepalm worthy from the get go.

But it continues to be facepalm worthy in criticizing the study.

The study was not worthless. It failed to show a statistically significant link. But it might have. The study was big enough that a real effect would have stuck out like a sore thumb. That it didn't, but some weird weak relationships were seen in fact puts a bound on the maximum size of the problem : I.E. In some contexts (gender, ludicrously powered phone, being a mouse) the effect of cell phone radiation doesn't cause excess tumors over the expected rate with a pretty good confidence.

The press started out all "OMG! Cell phones cause cancer!!!!". Then after the criticism of the hyperbole they went all "OMG!!! That study was shite!!!". The problem is with the press, not the study.

Reply to This Share

<u>twitter facebook linkedin</u> <u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:1</u>)

by Anonymous Coward

The study was big enough that a real effect would have stuck out like a sore thumb.

A real effect would stick out like a sore thumb in society in general, now that people have spent 20 years with cell phones glued to their ears.

No symptoms = no effect. Seems simple enough.

<u>Re:</u> (Score:3)

by Pseudonym (62607)

A real effect would stick out like a sore thumb in society in general, now that people have spent 20 years with cell phones glued to their ears. You'd think so, but cancer is actually pretty tricky to pin down and the technology and usage patterns of mobile phone usage hasn't remained constant

over those 20 years.

Despite 50 years of outcome improvements, the mortality rate of cancer has remained relatively static. The reason may simply be that people are dying of cancer because they aren't dying of other things, and hence getting old enough to die from cancers that are hard to treat. Moreover, mobile phones were originally mostly car-mounted, and in

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by JoeMerchant (803320)

In a world of 7 billion people, a 0.01% problem has the potential to adversely affect seven hundred thousand people.

No doubt, cell phones aren't killing a great number of people, but...

<u>1 hidden comment</u>

• **<u>Re:The journalism.</u>** (Score:4, Interesting)

by <u>Pseudonym (62607</u>) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @08:10PM (<u>#52207895</u>)

You know the worst part, though? The headline of very Slashdot story implies that doubts were raised about the *study* rather than *how it was reported*. The mistake is being compounded every time the story is retold.

(Incidentally, the "statistically underpowered" comment is accurate but irrelevant. The whole point of a small-scale study is to decide whether or not it's worth spending resources on a larger-scale study. Science journalists should know this.)

<u>Reply to This</u> <u>Parent</u> <u>Share</u>

<u>twitter facebook linkedin</u> <u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>

• <u>Re: The journalism..</u> (<u>Score:1</u>)

by Anonymous Coward Burden of proof is on them. "But maybe" fucking nothing.

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>Rei (128717)</u>

I immediately thought of that when I heard of the original report.

•

• <u>Obey the Cellpone Lobby!</u> (Score:2)

by <u>BrendaEM (871664</u>) You must obey the makers of cellphones and wireless carriers! Do not question anything they state as fact. Do not think for yourself! Give up your rational mind. Obey!

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>dcw3 (649211</u>)

You must obey the makers of cellphones and wireless carriers! Do not question anything they state as fact. Do not think for yourself! Give up your rational mind. Obey! Forget your meds this morning?

• <u>Did anyone read the whole thing?</u> (<u>Score:5</u>, Informative)

by <u>Solandri (704621</u>) on Sunday May 29, 2016 @11:24PM (<u>#52208685</u>) I didn't. :) But just reading <u>the first dozen pages</u> [biorxiv.org]...

It looks like they broke the test rats into groups with 1.5, 3, and 6 W/kg exposure, CDMA and GSM, male and female. That's 3*2*2 = 12 groups. For the brain section, they looked for two types of tumors. So now they've got 24 groupings that they're searching for possible correlations.

The statistical significance of the one correlation they found (male, CDMA, 6 W/kg, malignant glioma) was p < 0.05. In other words, due to their limited sample size, just by random chance alone you'd expect such a blip to occur about 1 in 20 times even when there is no real correlation. Well they tried 24 times and got one blip.

Same thing with the heart results. 24 groupings, one blip with p < 0.05, one blip with p = 0.052. Again, almost exactly what you'd expect by pure chance alone.

Reply to This Share

twitter facebook linkedin Flag as Inappropriate

С

0

<u>Re:Did anyone read the whole thing?</u> (Score:4, Funny) by <u>Solandri (704621)</u> on Sunday May 29, 2016 @11:31PM (<u>#52208721</u>) Forgot to link the <u>relevant XKCD cartoon</u> [xkcd.com].

<u>Reply to This</u> <u>Parent</u> <u>Share</u>

<u>twitter facebook linkedin</u> <u>Flag as Inappropriate</u>

• <u>Rats vs Humans</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>MrKaos (858439)</u>

I think the big thing to remember is that humans are walking around making calls with a 1-3W microwave transmitter attached to the side of their head, rats don't. This may not be a lot of power however combined with human habit (left or right side exposure) it is certain to deliver a constant rate of microwave energy almost directly to the brain.

I've seen someone die from brain cancer and it's bad, so I think it's worth sharing a few things that make it simple to take personal responsibility for your own

• <u>Re: (Score:2</u>)

by <u>Hylandr (813770)</u>

First, it's your brain

Damn right it is, and I will do what I want with it.

Second, don't trust any information from any source that sponsored from an interest in ... industry behave to protect their business model and revenue

stream.

This follows for Vaccines, Climatology, Alcoholism, Dairy and Eggs, etc.

it is simple to make minor changes to usage patterns that can also increase the usefullness of the device.

Cancer is obviously caused by holding it wrong.

At approximately 2.4 Ghz the wavelength is roughly 13cm, which is about the width of a human head, so if you are within one wavelength your head will absorb a portion of the energy from the phone. At 60-180 degrees of the fresnel of transmission into the head, it can vary between >0% to 50% of the power output

Did Shatner whisper that in your ear when he came in your ass?

or to use the same headphone you are using for music to take the call

BlueTooth ~~ More RF. Not just microwave. Cook it right !!!

increasing its signal output to overcome the effects of the capacitance from the water in your brain to maintain the call connection.

Tinfoil works better.

>>>

All in all a great post of genuine concern by someone completely clueless and legitimately thinking they are helping by making shit up. It's a disease, seek help and don't post anymore ple

<u>Re: (Score:2)</u>

by <u>MrKaos (858439</u>)

Climate change will exist so long as there's money to be made from it.

Interesting.

All in all a great post of genuine concern by someone completely clueless and legitimately thinking they are helping by making shit up.

Is there anything specific you are referring too, or are you speaking to your assumptions?

<u>Re: (Score:2)</u>

by <u>Hylandr (813770)</u>

Just because you don't like it doesn't mean it isn't true.

People *Are* making money off this and it runs through every industry, Tell me, who is *selling* carbon credits and what programs are funded by that money?

Crickets

Although I have been considering changing my signature to the following:

It's getting to the point that I instantly interpret ad-hominem attacks as a vocal acceptance of my victory.

Re: (Score:2)

by <u>MrKaos (858439</u>)

Do you have anything specific to say about this information:

At approximately 2.4 Ghz the wavelength is roughly 13cm, which is about the width of a human head, so if you are within one wavelength your head will absorb a portion of the energy from the phone. At 60-180 degrees of the fresnel of transmission into the head, it can vary between >0% to 50% of the power output

other than:

Did Shatner whisper that in your ear when he came in your ass?

because it's getting to the point that I instantly interpret ad-hominem attacks as a vocal acceptance of my victory.

• <u>Re:</u> (<u>Score:2</u>)

by <u>dcw3 (649211)</u>

Let's just stop the speculation, and look at facts. The number of cases of brain cancer per 100,000 population simply has NOT increased since the introduction of cell phones. In fact, citing the site below...Using statistical models for analysis, rates for new brain and other nervous system cancer cases have been falling on average 0.2% each year over the last 10 years. Do you have statistical evidence to the contrary? If not, then you should stop spreading FUD.

http://seer.cancer.gov/statfac... [cancer.gov]

• <u>It's in your feed.</u> (Score:2)

by <u>Hylandr (813770)</u> "a breathtaking example of irresponsible science hype."

Welcome to Facebook.

• <u>Outcome of reasearch (Score:2</u>)

by <u>houghi (78078)</u>

The consensus is that research causes cancer in mice. News at 11.

<u>Related Links</u> Top of the: <u>day</u>, <u>week</u>, <u>month</u>.

- 599 comments <u>Windows 10 Now Showing Full Screen Ads On Lock Screen</u>
- 588 comments<u>Massachusetts Boarding School Sued Over Wi-Fi Sickness</u>
 529 commentaThe Terre That Data Automatic
- 529 comments
 502 comments
 Final State S
- 503 comments<u>Mother Blames Wi-Fi Allergy For Daughter's Suicide</u>

 456 comments<u>French Woman Gets €800/month For Electromagnetic-Field 'Disability'</u> <u>next</u>

Google

Google Scholar Users Report Badly Malfunctioning Captcha 87 comments previous



Systemd Starts Killing Your Background Processes By Default 560 comments

- Studying in the US? Be Prepared with These 4 Tips (ShareAmerica)
- Read Ebooks? Here's The Worst Kept Secret Among Book Lovers (BookBub)
- Young Germans Stop Paying For Their TV Because Of This New Website (cinapalace.com)
- New "Limitless Brain Exercise" Gives Surprising Results! (NeuroNation)
- Find out why more than 14 million people can't stop playing this game (Sparta Online Game)



<u>Slashdot</u>

<u>Post</u>

<u>Get more comments</u>

67 of 67 loaded Submit Story "...a most excellent barbarian ... Genghis Kahn!" -- _Bill And Ted's Excellent Adventure_ FAQ Story Archive Hall of Fame Advertising Terms Privacy Cookie Preferences Opt Out Choices About Feedback Mobile View Blog

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2016 SlashdotMedia. All Rights Reserved. <u>Close</u>

<u>Slashdot</u>

Working...

Sponsored Links by Taboola 🕟