Environment International 82 (2015) 1–9

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Environment International

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/envint

The effect of wind turbine noise on sleep and quality of life: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies

Igho J. Onakpoya [a,*], Jack O'Sullivan [b], Matthew J. Thompson [c], Carl J. Heneghan [a]

[a] University of Oxford, Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, New Radcliffe House, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Oxford OX2 6GG, United Kingdom

[b] Department of Health Sciences and Medicine, Bond University, Gold Coast, Queensland 4229, Australia

[c] Department of Family Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-4696, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 16 September 2014
Received in revised form 27 April 2015
Accepted 30 April 2015
Available online 16 May 2015

Keywords:
Wind turbines
Annoyance
Sleep
Quality of life
Systematic review
meta-analysis

ABSTRACT

Noise generated by wind turbines has been reported to affect sleep and quality of life (QOL), but the relationship is unclear. Our objective was to explore the association between wind turbine noise, sleep disturbance and quality of life, using data from published observational studies. We searched Medline, Embase, Global Health and Google Scholar databases. No language restrictions were imposed. Hand searches of bibliography of retrieved full texts were also conducted. The reporting quality of included studies was assessed using the STROBE guidelines. Two reviewers independently determined the eligibility of studies, assessed the quality of included studies, and extracted the data. We included eight studies with a total of 2433 participants. All studies were cross-sectional, and the overall reporting quality was moderate. Meta-analysis of six studies (n = 2364) revealed that the odds of being annoyed is significantly increased by wind turbine noise (OR: 4.08; 95% CI: 2.37 to 7.04; $p < 0.00001$). The odds of sleep disturbance was also significantly increased with greater exposure to wind turbine noise (OR: 2.94; 95% CI: 1.98 to 4.37; $p < 0.00001$). Four studies reported that wind turbine noise significantly interfered with QOL. Further, visual perception of wind turbine generators was associated with greater frequency of reported negative health effects. In conclusion, there is some evidence that exposure to wind turbine noise is associated with increased odds of annoyance and sleep problems. Individual attitudes could influence the type of response to noise from wind turbines. Experimental and observational studies investigating the relationship between wind turbine noise and health are warranted.

1. Introduction

The last few decades have seen governments attempting to decrease greenhouse gas emissions (Olander et al., 2012). This response – to changes in the earth's temperature – has seen the rise of wind power (Leithead, 2007). This alternative energy source, generated by wind turbines, is one tool being employed to generate cleaner energy.

Wind turbine generators (WTGs) are devices that convert wind power into kinetic energy, and are regarded as one of the most important renewable sources of power (Leithead, 2007). Energy generated from WTGs can be used to produce electricity and drive machinery (Caduff et al., 2012; Chang Chien et al., 2011; Li and Chen, 2008). It is thought that large scale utilization of these devices can improve global climate by extracting energy from the atmosphere and altering the pattern of gaseous flow in the earth's atmosphere (Keith et al., 2004).

More recently, exposure to noise from WTGs has been reported to have negative effects on human health (Jeffery et al., 2013). People living near WTGs have reportedly experienced sleep disturbances and a reduction in the quality of life; it has been suggested that a combination of turbine noise, infrasound (sounds with frequency <20 Hz) and ground currents (stray current from electrical equipment which passes through the earth) could be responsible for these symptoms (Havas and Colling, 2011). Cases of litigation because of the unwanted health effects allegedly caused by the noise from WTGs have been reported both in the UK (Daily Mail, 2011) and the US (Oregon Herald, 2013). Very recently, the UK parliament passed a bill restricting the number, height and location of WTGs in England (UK House of Commons Library, 2015).

Studies investigating the effects of wind turbines on sleep and quality of life in individuals living in their proximity have been conducted. While the findings from a pooled meta-analyses of three studies suggested a relationship between exposure to WTG noise and annoyance (Janssen et al., 2011), a more recent review concluded that there was no evidence of a consistent relationship between WTG noise and adverse health effects (Merlin et al., 2013). Therefore, the objective of this systematic review was to explore the association between wind turbine noise, annoyance, sleep and quality of life, and also explore

Abbreviations: WTG, wind turbine generator; ESS, Epworth Sleepiness Scale; PSQI, Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: igho.onakpoya@phc.ox.ac.uk (I.J. Onakpoya).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.04.014
0160-4120/

the influence of other moderating factors on these outcomes, using data from published observational studies.

2. Methods

We conducted electronic searches in the following databases: Medline, Embase and Global health. Each database was searched from inception till June 2014. MeSH terms used included wind turbine, wind energy, clean energy, annoyance, sleep, and quality of life (a MEDLINE search strategy is included as a web Appendix 1). We also searched Google Scholar for relevant conference proceedings, and hand searched the bibliography of retrieved full texts. An updated search of the databases was conducted on November 28, 2014. Case–control, cross-sectional, and cohort studies were considered for inclusion. To be included in the review, studies had to report annoyance, sleep or quality of life as outcomes in subjects living in proximity with wind turbines. Studies not comparing participants based on the proximity of their homes to WTGs were excluded. No age, language or time restrictions were imposed. Where necessary, contact with study investigators was made to request additional data.

The reporting quality of included studies was evaluated using a checklist adapted from the STROBE (Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) guidelines (von Elm et al., 2007). Data was systematically extracted by two reviewers [IJO and JOS] using a piloted spreadsheet of pertinent variables including baseline demographics, study location, distances of homes from wind turbines, SPLs, assessment of exposure and outcome. These were independently cross-checked by two other reviewers [MJT and CJH]. Disagreements were resolved through consensus. Our main outcomes were annoyance, sleep disturbance and quality of life (QOL). We also examined the influence of other background noise, visual perception and socio-economic factors on reported outcomes.

Odds ratios (ORs) were used to measure associations between wind turbine noise and annoyance or sleep disturbance. Using the random-effects model of the software for meta-analyses (Review Manager, Version 5.3 (2011)), we calculated the ORs and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the studies which had sufficient data for statistical pooling. We used sound pressure level (SPL) reference ranges of $<$40 dB for lower exposure and $>$40 dB for higher exposure to wind turbine noise in the analyses; these limits correspond to the World Health Organisation (WHO) guideline recommendations for indoor community noise levels suitable for night-time sleep (Berglund et al., 1999). Where SPLs were not available, we used the reported near ("near group") and far ("far group") distances from WTGs for high and low SPLs respectively. Subgroup analyses by SPLs or distances from WTGs were used to test the robustness of overall analyses. Sensitivity analyses by meta-analysing studies with larger sample sizes or with higher respondent rates (≥50%) were used to investigate heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic; values of 25%, 50%, and 75% indicated low, medium, and high statistical heterogeneity respectively. Where statistical combination of reported data was considered inappropriate, such data was reported narratively.

2.1. Definitions

For the purpose of this review, annoyance was defined as a constellation of psychosocial and/or psychological symptoms — "feelings of being bothered, exasperation at being interrupted by noise, and symptoms such as headache, fatigue and irritability" (Anonymous, 1977). Sleep disturbance was defined as any interruption of an individual's normal sleep–wake pattern (Cormier, 1990). A change in an individual's quality of life was measured based on their own perceptions, with regard to their own goals, expectations, standards and concerns (WHO, 1997).

3. Results

Our electronic searches returned 148 non-duplicate citations, out of which 18 potentially eligible articles were identified (Fig. 1). One article (Ambrose et al., 2012) was excluded because the study was conducted in only one residential apartment and another two (Maffei et al., 2013; Van Renterghem et al., 2013) because they were virtual experimental studies conducted in subjects not residing within the vicinity of WTGs. Two articles (Verheijen et al., 2011; Pedersen and Larsman, 2008) were excluded because they were modelling studies, the latter of which used results from two studies already included in the review. One article was excluded because it explored the effects of road traffic noise using data from a study included in the review (Pedersen et al., 2010) and another two because they did not distinguish subjects by distance from WTGs or SPLs (Harry, 2007; Morris, 2012). Two articles (Nissenbaum et al., 2011; Pedersen et al., 2009) were excluded because more complete versions of their reports were included in the review. Thus eight studies (Bakker et al., 2012; Krogh et al., 2011; Magari et al., 2014; Nissenbaum et al., 2012; Pawlaczyk-Łuszczyńska et al., 2014; Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004, 2007; Shepherd et al., 2011) with a total of 2433 participants were included in the review. The key details of the studies are shown in Tables 1, 2a and 2b.

All included studies were of cross-sectional design (Table 1). Seven studies reported appropriate recruitment and sampling strategies, and all used objective and validated measures to compute outcome variables. The studies also used appropriate statistical methods to compare groups, but only half (50%) adequately reported sample size calculations. All studies reported adequate statistical analysis, and baseline demographics for participants in the high and low exposure groups were generally similar. The response rate for questionnaires ranged from 37% to 93%.

Annoyance was measured on a 5-point scale (ranging from did not notice to very annoyed) using questionnaires that enquired about attitudes towards wind turbines; one study (Pawlaczyk-Łuszczyńska et al., 2014) used a 6-point scale that included "extremely annoyed" variable after "very annoyed". In all the studies, annoyance from exposure to WTG noise implied being rather annoyed, very annoyed or extremely annoyed. Sleep disturbance (defined in the studies as interruption of normal sleep patterns) was assessed from the general questionnaire administered in seven studies (Bakker et al., 2012; Krogh et al., 2011; Magari et al., 2014; Pawlaczyk-Łuszczyńska et al., 2014; Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004, 2007; Shepherd et al., 2011), and measured by Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) in the eighth (Nissenbaum et al., 2012) — this same study assessed daytime sleepiness using the Epworth Sleepiness Scale (ESS). Quality of life was measured in three studies by general health questionnaire (GHQ) (Bakker et al., 2012; Pawlaczyk-Łuszczyńska et al., 2014), short form 36 (SF-36v2) (Nissenbaum et al., 2012), and health-related quality of life (HRQOL) (Shepherd et al., 2011). Two studies used unspecified masked questionnaires that addressed health and general well-being (Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004, 2007); these questionnaires were described as validated. One study (Krogh et al., 2011) did not use a validated questionnaire to assess quality of life and another (Magari et al., 2014) did not report quality of life as an outcome.

The study locations ranged from rural to semi-rural and metropolitan built-up areas (Table 2a), with varying population densities and terrain. The distance of homes from WTGs varied between 0 and 8 km, and the number of WTGs in the individual studies ranged from 16 to 1846. The emission levels for the WTGs in the studies were measured using A-weighted scales (a filtering method aimed at mimicking responses to sound by the human ear) with 8 m/s downwind, and power generated from the turbines ranged between 0.15 and 2300 kW.

The mean age of the respondents across all the studies was 46 to 58 years (Table 2b). One study (Krogh et al., 2011) did not report the socio-economic status of respondents, while another (Bakker et al.,