# IMPROVING FDA'S POST-MARKET REVIEW OF CHEMICALS:

## Summary of Key Themes from Comments on FDA's Proposed Framework

*June 2025*

**Authors:** Lauren Limbach and Emily Broad Leib, Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic

In August 2024, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) introduced a proposed framework for its post-market review of chemicals in the food supply, and[1] Comment letters were due in January 2025, and commenters were asked to respond to FDA's discussion paper and answer several key questions.[2] The opportunity for comment followed a public meeting in September 2024 during which FDA officials, consumer advocacy groups, and industry representatives presented their top priorities for a reimagined post-market safety assessment system for food chemicals. The new commitment to create a clearer process for post-market review is part of an overall effort by FDA to increase the comprehensiveness of its food ingredient safety.

FDA is in the process of reviewing the comment letters. Given the broad national conversation that is currently taking place with respect to chemical and additive safety, including recent state legislation that takes a more aggressive approach to food chemical safety than currently exists at the federal level,[3] this report aims to summarize overarching themes from the comment letters to facilitate ongoing discussion. This is especially important in light of the consensus we observed across various interest groups that FDA's approach to food chemical safety is overdue for reform.

It is important to note that even while FDA has not yet responded to the comment period, the agency has made several key announcements in 2025 related to pre- or post-market review of chemicals in food. In March 2025, Secretary of Health and Human Services Robert F. Kennedy issued a directive to FDA to explore rulemaking to eliminate the ability for companies to determine that a substance is "generally recognized as safe" without notification to FDA (this process is discussed in more detail below).[4] In April, FDA Commissioner Marty Makary announced that FDA planned to phase out eight petroleum based food dyes by the end of 2026.[5] In May 2025, FDA announced a series of steps it plans to take in the coming months, including developing a prioritization scheme for chemical review, finalizing the full post-market review of chemicals, and an updated list of chemicals under review.[6] The draft prioritization scheme was published for public comment in June 2025, and while it was not reviewed in detail for this current report, it appears to broadly address the concern raised in public comments about the need for clearer prioritization.[7]

The first section of this memo provides a summary of the reassessment process outlined by FDA in its discussion paper, followed by an overview of the comments that FDA received in response. The following sections detail five key themes that we identified from across the comment letters. These key themes are: need for a holistic overhaul of FDA's approach to food chemical safety, need for clear prioritization of chemicals for review, request for firm commitments from FDA with respect to their anticipated progress in reviewing chemicals, recommendation of the use of rigorous scientific methods, and need for maximum transparency from FDA towards the public. Finally, the memo concludes with key points that stakeholders working on food chemical safety should take from the comment letter submissions.

## OVERVIEW: FDA'S PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR POST-MARKET ASSESSMENT AND KEY FINDINGS

FDA's 2024 discussion paper outlines a proposed procedure for assessing food chemicals that are already on the market.[8] Under this proposed framework, a post-market safety assessment would proceed in three stages: 1) identification of a safety signal, 2) triage to determine if the safety signal warrants a post-market assessment, and 3) assignment to either a "Focused" or "Comprehensive" Assessment.[9] The decision as to whether a chemical should undergo a Focused or a Comprehensive Assessment would be based on a variety of factors including the nature and severity of the potential safety signal, the prior body of knowledge on the chemical, and the anticipated resources required to conduct the assessment.[10] Under both types of assessments the agency would examine the relevant safety questions and, in the event that the assessment indicates a safety issue, would result in the implementation of appropriate risk management actions.[11] However, the Comprehensive Assessments would have a number of additional components including the consideration of a broader body of information and an opportunity for formal public comment.[12]

While organizations welcomed the effort by FDA to address the issue of chemical safety in food, most organizations found FDA's discussion paper lacking in detail and poised to have little practical impact.[13] Indeed, several overall themes emerge from the comment letters submitted by key organizations that engage in food chemical safety work. The comment letters almost universally addressed concerns regarding the overall state of food chemical safety, rather than limiting their comment letters to the specific issue of post-market safety assessments. Most were critical of food chemical safety in the U.S., with multiple organizations characterizing the current system as "broken."[14]

A central concern shared by many commenters is the large role that the Generally Recognized as Safe (GRAS) pathway plays in permitting chemicals to come to market without oversight by FDA, and in making it difficult for FDA to know about and thus address challenges with these substances post-market.[15] The GRAS pathway stems from a carveout to the definition of "food additive" that exempts a substance from the statutory requirements to which food additives must adhere if it is "generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training and experience ... to be safe under the conditions of its intended use."[16] As a result of FDA's rulemaking regarding the GRAS pathway, food chemical manufacturers are able to self-determine that their products fall within the definition of "generally recognized as safe" and place them on the market without notifying FDA.[17]

To identify key trends in stakeholder comment letters, we analyzed 15 comment letters from both consumer advocacy and industry-affiliated organizations. The letters were collected primarily through outreach to organizations that participated in FDA's public meeting or that are involved in issues related to food chemical safety. Several letters also were found through a review of the public docket in the Federal Register related to the discussion paper.[18]

While it would be impossible to comprehensively summarize all the various positions taken and recommendations made by organizations in response to FDA's call for public comment to its discussion paper, this document summarizes five key themes that arose across the comment letters submitted by stakeholders.

## DISCUSSION OF KEY THEMES

### 1. FDA should implement a holistic approach to food chemical safety, including by reforming the GRAS process.

Many organizations used FDA's request for comment letters on the post-market safety assessment discussion paper as an opportunity to voice larger concerns that FDA is not fulfilling its broader role of ensuring that Americans have access to a safe and wholesome food supply.[19] Chief among the issues identified by comment letters was the GRAS pathway to allowing substances in food. Commenters pointed out that the reason a well-functioning post-market safety assessment system is so vital to ensuring the safety of food chemicals is because the GRAS pathway permits companies to place ingredients on the market without FDA's knowledge or approval.[20] Even more importantly, as many commenters noted, efforts to improve food chemical safety through the proposed changes to post-market safety alone are unlikely to be effective so long as companies retain the ability to enter the market while staying off FDA's radar.[21] Accordingly, many commenters called for FDA to fundamentally reimagine GRAS.[22] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic (FLPC) recommended that FDA use its existing authority to require companies to notify the agency prior to placing a GRAS ingredient on the market.[23] The Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) suggested that FDA request the data relied on by companies for their GRAS determination and declare the ingredient not GRAS if the company fails to provide the data.[24] The Environmental Working Group (EWG) clarified that GRAS should not be considered an appropriate path to market for "novel" ingredients.[25] Other commenters in industry suggested that FDA should reiterate to the public the wide regulatory powers it has with respect to GRAS ingredients.[26]

In addition to overarching structural concerns with respect to how FDA handles food chemical safety, commenters also called on FDA to take into consideration consumers' cumulative chemical exposures when assessing the safety of individual ingredients.[27] The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) included a detailed analysis of the various requirements that impose a duty on FDA to consider the impacts of chemicals cumulatively, rather than on an isolated basis.[28] Other commenters pointed out that cumulative exposure is not limited to food consumption, but also includes a variety of potential sources of chemical exposure such as packaging, environmental contaminants, etc.[29]

In response to concerns that FDA is not taking a sufficiently widespread approach to safety assessments of chemicals, commenters proposed a number of discrete actions that FDA could take to remedy the problem. Numerous commenters recommended that FDA establish an advisory committee dedicated to the issue of food chemical safety, [30] in part because implementing an advisory committee that is responsible for synthesizing numerous dimensions of food additive safety would allow FDA to take a broader approach to the issue.[31] One commenter proposed specific changes to FDA's protocols for toxicity analysis, namely that they be modified to consider a wider variety of outcomes associated with chronic diseases.[32]

Overall, commenters demonstrated a strong desire for FDA to zoom out to consider the issue of post-market safety assessments in the context of FDA's broader responsibility to ensure that the American food system supports public health and wellbeing.

**Key Quotes on a Holistic Approach:**

*"Even as the FDA works to improve its post-market assessment activities, many new food chemicals are coming to market without FDA oversight due to the GRAS exemption and the FDA-designed voluntary GRAS notification procedure… It creates situations where the FDA only acts after consumers have been harmed and then deprives the agency of information necessary for conducting post-market surveillance and safety assessments."*[33]

- Center for Science in the Public Interest

*"For efficiency and effectiveness, and to maximize limited resources, priorities should then be informed by potential risk, accounting for not only the hazard potential but also the exposure potential (both described further below)."*[34]

- American Beverage Association

*"The process FDA proposes for the post-market assessment of food chemicals is flawed since it appears to be reactive rather than proactive."*[35]

- Consumer Reports

## 2. FDA should implement a clear prioritization system for reviewing chemicals in the market.

A common theme across many of the comment letters was that FDA should develop a plan for which chemicals it is going to reassess first. The need for clear prioritization is particularly salient given the high volume of food chemicals that are currently on the U.S. market due to the existence of the GRAS pathway[36] and the relative lack of post-market assessment previously conducted by FDA.[37] FDA's proposed approach to prioritization is to use a similar process to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA), which numerically sorts chemicals for review based on the chemical's score on a range of factors.[38]

Use of an approach similar to the MCDA garnered some support amongst commenting organizations, though there was recognition that FDA would have to extensively modify the framework currently used by EPA.[39] For example, FLPC pointed out that use of a prioritization system such as MCDA is unlikely to be effective without simultaneously establishing a pipeline for systematically identifying food chemicals and flagging them for review to ensure that all food chemicals are eventually reviewed.[40] Additionally, EDF pointed out that FDA should conduct prioritization of chemicals for review early in the post-market assessment analysis, rather than doing so after extensively gathering and reviewing relevant safety information.[41]

Organizations varied in terms of what criteria they suggested should serve as the basis for prioritization. EWG recommended that FDA target chemicals that have been linked to especially adverse health outcomes including cancer, reproductive harm, and neurological damage.[42] EDF also highlighted the potential dangers posed by carcinogens and called on FDA to use the Delaney Clause, which prohibits carcinogenic food additives, to identify and expedite the review of potentially carcinogenic chemicals, allowing FDA to "bypass[] redundant evaluation steps."[43] The American Beverage Association highlighted a wide variety of factors for consideration ranging from the findings of international regulatory agencies to ingredients that are viewed skeptically by the public.[44] With respect to identifying the riskiest chemicals, commenters requested that FDA look beyond immediate health concerns and consider the risk that chemicals carry for causing chronic health conditions over the course of an individual's lifetime.[45]

As mentioned above, FDA has recently released a proposed tool for the prioritization of chemicals for post-market review, with comments due in July 2025.[46]

**Key Quotes on Prioritization:**

*"The FDA's process for prioritization should be based on hazard, emphasizing chemicals linked to the most significant outcomes including carcinogens, concern for children's health like reproductive or developmental effects, immunotoxicants, endocrine disruptors, neurotoxicants, obesogens, chemicals causing irreversible organ toxicity, and chemicals linked to chronic disease."*[47]

- Environmental Working Group

*"Given the large number of chemicals of concern used in food and food packaging (more than 1600), and the vast data gaps associated with most known food contact chemicals, their prioritization based on existing information is key."*[48]

- Food Packaging Forum

*"The FDA's post-market framework should begin with risk-based prioritization of chemicals using the existing body of evidence, including human, animal, and mechanistic evidence."*[49]

- Center for Science in the Public Interest

### 3. FDA should make transparent commitments regarding regulatory actions and their timelines that the public can use to hold the agency accountable.

A seemingly universal critique of FDA's post-market safety assessment proposal was that the proposal was lacking in detail.[50] Topics from the discussion paper that were highlighted as areas needing more explanation included determining when a focused versus comprehensive assessment will take place,[51] assessing when a safety signal will be considered of sufficient quality to warrant consideration,[52] and explaining how FDA's "decision tree" will be applied to determine when the agency will make a safety reassessment.[53]

Commenters' requests for additional information on FDA's proposal appeared to serve more than just a clarifying function – organizations also wanted FDA to share information on its proposed approach so that the public could hold FDA accountable in the event that it failed to meet its established milestones. For example, FLPC proposed that FDA adopt a process similar to the EPA's implementation of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and commit to reviewing a certain number of chemicals of concern each year.[54] Echoing similar concerns, other commenters pointed out that strict deadlines for the completion of food chemical safety reviews would play an important role in ensuring that safety assessments happen fast enough to protect the public from ongoing harmful exposure.[55] Industry organizations such as the Consumer Brands Association supported the implementation of timelines throughout the assessment process and argued that doing so was essential for cultivating public trust.[56]

In addition to seeking a greater ability to hold FDA accountable for the timeline of its assessments, commenters also called for greater clarity on the prioritization process. Commenters stated that it was important for the public to understand what considerations will go into FDA's analysis as to which chemicals will be subject to a post-market safety assessment.[57] Specifically, the Food Industry Association argued that if FDA planned on implementing a modified version of EPA's MCDA analysis, which assigns a prioritization value for review by assessing and scoring a variety of criteria relevant to safety,[58] FDA should publish its process for doing so.[59]

From these comment letters, it is clear that stakeholders seek additional information from FDA, not only for understanding the agency's approach, but also so that they can identify when the process is not working as anticipated and advertised and hold FDA accountable.

**Key Quotes on Details and Accountability:**

*"Equally important in defining the scope of each comprehensive review is to set a realistic completion date with timeframes for specific deliverables and reporting requirements for the agency to track the progress of the assessment."*[60]

- National Consumers League

*"We believe as well that FDA needs to establish a reasonable expectation for the volume and throughput annually and timeframes for its post-market assessments to ensure an efficient program, accountability, and timely reviews."*[61]

- Consumer Brands Association

*"By using such a systematic approach, FDA would provide all stakeholders with the factors considered, clear criteria, data used, rankings and a prioritized list of candidate chemicals for assessment."*[62]

- Environmental Defense Fund

### 4. FDA should ensure that it is using methods informed by high quality science.

Another common approach by the commenting organizations was urging FDA to use robust scientific methods to ensure that its safety assessments reflect the highest scientific standards. While a wide variety of procedural recommendations were made across the comment letters, a few suggestions repeatedly emerged. First, the comment letters contained a recommendation that FDA separate the processes of risk assessment and risk management so that the team involved in identifying potential health risks from the available data is separate from the team that implements the mitigating solution.[63] They also recommended that post-market risk re-assessment be organizationally separate from the original pre-market risk assessments to minimize the potential for bias toward prior work.[64] Accordingly, there appears to be a desire amongst stakeholders for clear and separate suborganizations within FDA that address each stage of the safety assessment process in isolation.

Additionally, many of the letters sought to ensure that FDA retained the proper individuals for conducting the reassessment analyses. For example, multiple letters pointed to a need for scientists involved in the reassessment process to have no conflicts of interest[65] or to ensure that all conflicts of interest were fully disclosed,[66] to combat the potential for industry or other biased actors from taking an outsized role in the reassessment process.[67] Other commenters suggested that FDA should establish an advisory committee to ensure that it is receiving high quality scientific advice and that "minimum requirements" should be instituted for scientists involved in the safety reassessments.[68] The advisory committee was also suggested as a peer-reviewing body,[69] which was another commonly-requested procedural safeguard.[70] Thus, an advisory committee could provide FDA with a stable body of experts with which to conduct the reassessments, in addition to ensuring the FDA takes a sufficiently broad approach food additive safety reassessments.

In addition to ensuring that FDA has the proper personnel and organizational structure to manage the reassessment process, several of the letters also sought to make sure that FDA had adequate underlying facts with which to conduct the analysis. CSPI voiced concern that FDA's proposal did not devote sufficient attention to describing how it will procure high quality data and provided recommendations for how they think the agency should do so.[71] Namely, CSPI recommended that FDA revise its procedures for calculating exposure to chemicals by more completely considering exposure sources and that FDA should require companies submitting data to collect the data in accordance with certain standards.[72] Additionally, several of the comment letters stressed that the FDA should place the vast majority of its emphasis on human health when making decisions related to reassessment and that other factors such as costs to industry or agency resources should be given less weight.[73]

In sum, organizational stakeholders agree that the success of FDA's reassessment abilities will be partially dependent on its ability to conduct high quality science.

**Key Quotes on High Quality Science:**

*"If the [proposed] advisory committee [for conducting Comprehensive Assessments] does not already include scientific experts in the specific substance under review, as well as experts in the relevant health outcomes, IFAC strongly recommends that the FDA require the committee to obtain testimony from at least four qualified experts."*[74]

- International Food Additives Council

*"The outcome of the risk assessment informs the risk management decision. These two activities should be separate so that neither improperly influences each other."*[75]

- Environmental Defense Fund

*"For transparency purposes, the process of risk assessment and risk management should be strictly separated from each other. In addition, risk assessment should only be concerned with protecting public health, not taking into account factors such as impact or cost to industry."*[76]

- Consumer Reports

### 5. FDA should be transparent with the public through maximizing communication across the reassessment process.

Perhaps the most universal request from the organizational comment letters was that FDA be transparent with respect to the status and progress of food chemical safety reassessments. For many of the commenters, particularly industry stakeholders, transparency on behalf of FDA is seen as essential for maintaining public trust in the food supply.[77] The International Food Additives Council provided FDA with a list of additional suggestions for increasing transparency including establishing an online resource dedicated to providing consumers with information on food chemical safety and producing communications that are digestible to the general public.[78] Additionally, it was suggested that FDA's overall approach to food chemical reassessments should be driven – at least in part – by public opinion, as a recognition of the integral role that public trust plays in the food system.[79]

In addition to providing consumers with information, stakeholders' desire for transparency also included repeated requests for the public to be involved in the decision-making process. For example, commenters recommended that public input be incorporated into the less formal focused assessment process, as FDA says it plans to do during the comprehensive assessments.[80] Commenters also called for the public to be able to provide input on the prioritization of chemicals for assessment,[81] the institution of risk management measures,[82] and the process of gathering data for reassessments.[83] These suggestions indicate an appetite for a collective approach to reassessment that aims to capitalize on as many resources as possible while providing the general public with a means by which to gauge whether the reassessment process is working as they think it should.

**Key Quotes on Transparency:**

*"Clear and consistent communication to the public about any Post-Market Assessment action taken by FDA such as, the reasons for that action and what it signifies, is necessary to effectively convey potential risks and to reassure consumers of the safety of our food supply."*[84]

- The Food Industry Association

*"The discussion paper does not specify if or how the public will be notified of the outcome of the agency's prioritization process, and it does not indicate that the public will have an opportunity to provide input on the prioritization process."*[85]

- Center for Science in the Public Interest

*"The public should also have the opportunity to weigh in on chemicals that the FDA should add to the prioritization list and which chemicals the FDA should select for review."*[86]

- Environmental Working Group

## CONCLUSION

The comment opportunity provided by FDA in response to its proposed post-market safety assessment framework revealed numerous consensus points across stakeholders. As highlighted in this summary, these trends include a desire for FDA to approach food chemical safety with a holistic viewpoint that includes better pre-market processes, develop rigorous systems for prioritizing large numbers of chemicals for review, set clear expectations through which the agency can be held accountable, engage in high quality scientific inquiry, and maintain transparent communication with consumers. Most importantly, the comment letters echoed a shared sentiment that FDA's approach to food chemical safety is in need of radical reform that goes beyond merely a small revision to its post-market assessment protocol. Accordingly, stakeholders in the food chemical space are well-positioned to capitalize on these points of agreement and public energy to work with FDA and generate meaningful reform.

**Acknowledgments:** Thank you to Grace Huddleston for support with background research that informed this report.

# ENDNOTES

[1] *See FDA to Hold Public Meeting on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food*, U.S. Food & Drug Admin., https://www.fda.gov/food/hfp-constituent-updates/fda-hold-public-meeting-development-enhanced-systematic-process-fdas-post-market-assessment (Nov. 20, 2024).
[2] *Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food; Public Meeting; Request for Comments,* 89 Fed. Reg. 65633 (August 12, 2024), https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/08/12/2024-17791/development-of-an-enhanced-systematic-process-for-the-food-and-drug-administrations-post-market.
[3] *See, e.g.,* A.B. 2316, 2023-2024 Leg. Sess. (CA. 2024); H.B. 2354, 2025 Reg. Sess. (WV. 2025); Tex. S.B. 25, 89th Leg., R.S. (Tx. 2025).
[4] *See HHS Secretary Kennedy Directs FDA to Explore Rulemaking to Eliminate Pathway for Companies to Self-Affirm Food Ingredients Are Safe*, U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Services https://www.hhs.gov/press-room/revising-gras-pathway.html
[5] *HHS, FDA to Phase Out Petroleum-Based Synthetic Dyes in Nation's Food Supply,* U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Services, https://www.hhs.gov/press-room/hhs-fda-food-dyes-food.html (April 22, 2025).
[6] *FDA Advances Robust, Transparent Post-Market Chemical Review Program to Keep Food Supply Safe and Healthy*, U.S. Food & Drug Admin., https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-advances-robust-transparent-post-market-chemical-review-program-keep-food-supply-safe-and (May 15, 2025).
[7] *Tool for the Prioritization of Food Chemicals for Post-Market Assessment*, U.S. Food & Drug Admin., FDA-2025-N-1733, https://www.regulations.gov/docket/FDA-2025-N-1733 (June 18, 2025).
[8] *See generally* U.S. Food & Drug Admin., Discussion Paper Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food (2024).
[9] *Id* at 3-4.
[10] *Id* at 6-7.
[11] *Id* at 4-5.
[12] *Id*.
[13] *See* Food Packaging Forum, *Comment on Food Additive Petition FDA-2024-N-3609* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-60019; Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-62482; Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-63222.
[14] *See, e.g.,* Consumer Reports, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025); Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 1 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-64018.
[15] *See* Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025); Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 12 (Jan. 21, 2025); Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 12 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[16] 21 U.S.C. § 321(s).
[17] *See About the GRAS Notification Program*, U.S. Food & Drug Admin., https://www.fda.gov/food/generally-recognized-safe-gras/about-gras-notification-program (last visited Apr. 12, 2025).
[18] Docket FDA-2024-N-3609-0001, Regulations.gov, https://www.regulations.gov/document/FDA-2024-N-3609-0001 (last visited Apr. 13, 2025).
[19] *See* Consumer Reports, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025); Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 1 (Jan. 21, 2025); Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[20] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 12 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[21] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3-4 (Jan. 21, 2025),

[22] *See, e.g. id.* at 6-9; Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 12-13 (Jan. 21, 2025), Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 9-10 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[23] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6-7 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[24] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 13 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[25] Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 10 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[26] The Food Industry Association, *Comment Letter on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6-7 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-60689.

[27] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 12 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[28] *Id.* at 12-14.

[29] Center for Environmental Health, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-61520.

[30] *See* Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 21, 2025); Institute of Food Technologists, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-59863; Consumer Brands Association, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-59493.

[31] *See* Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5-6 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[32] Food Packaging Forum, *Comment on Food Additive Petition FDA-2024-N-3609* 1 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[33] Center for Science in the Public Interest*, Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 12 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[34] American Beverage Association, *Public Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 4 (Dec. 2, 2024).

[35] Consumer Reports, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-62795.

[36] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[37] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[38] U.S. FOOD & DRUG ADMIN., DISCUSSION PAPER DEVELOPMENT OF AN ENHANCED SYSTEMATIC PROCESS FOR THE FDA'S POST-MARKET ASSESSMENT OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD 7 (2024).

[39] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 16-17 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[40] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3-4 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[41] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[42] Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[43] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* (Jan. 21, 2025).

[44] American Beverage Association, *Public Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 4 (Dec. 2, 2024).

[45] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 9 (Jan. 21, 2025); Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).

[46] U.S. Food and Drug Admin., *Tool for the Prioritization of Food Chemicals for Post-Market Assessment*, FDA-2025-N-1733, https://www.regulations.gov/docket/FDA-2025-N-1733 (June 18, 2025).
[47] Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[48] Food Packaging Forum, *Comment on Food Additive Petition FDA-2024-N-3609* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[49] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[50] *See* Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025); International Food Additives Council, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 15, 2025).
[51] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[52] Consumer Brands Association, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[53] International Food Additives Council, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 15, 2025).
[54] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 4-5 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[55] Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025); National Consumers League, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Dec. 19, 2024).
[56] Consumer Brands Association, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[57] *See* Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[58] *See Prioritization of Existing Chemicals Under TSCA*, U.S. ENV'T. PROT. AGENCY, https://www.epa.gov/assessing-and-managing-chemicals-under-tsca/prioritization-existing-chemicals-under-tsca (Aug. 28, 2024).
[59] The Food Industry Association, *Comment Letter on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[60] National Consumers League, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Dec. 19, 2024).
[61] Consumer Brands Association, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[62] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[63] *Id.* at 14.
[64] Consumer Reports, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 2 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[65] *Id.* at 3.
[66] Center for Environmental Health, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[67] *See* Silent Spring Institute, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 7 (Jan. 18, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-53549.
[68] International Food Additives Council, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 15, 2025), https://www.regulations.gov/comment/FDA-2024-N-3609-46896.
[69] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 9 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[70] Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[71] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 8-11 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[72] *Id.*

[73] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 4 (Jan. 21, 2025); Consumer Reports, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[74] International Food Additives Council, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 15, 2025).
[75] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 14 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[76] Consumer Reports, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for FDA's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[77] The Food Industry Association, *Comment Letter on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[78] International Food Additives Council, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 15, 2025).
[79] The Food Industry Association, *Comment Letter on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[80] Harvard Law School Food Law and Policy Clinic, *Comments on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 10 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[81] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[82] The Food Industry Association, *Comment Letter on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[83] Environmental Defense Fund, *Comments on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 7 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[84] The Food Industry Association, *Comment Letter on the Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 5 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[85] Center for Science in the Public Interest, *Comment Letter on Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 6 (Jan. 21, 2025).
[86] Environmental Working Group, *Environmental Working Group Comment on FDA's Development of an Enhanced Systematic Process for the Food and Drug Administration's Post-Market Assessment of Chemicals in Food* 3 (Jan. 21, 2025).