iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/?volume=January~2026

CLINICAL AND REGULATORY IMPLICATIONS OF ARTIFICIAL FOOD DYES IN THE UNITED STATES: A REGULATORY SCIENCE AND RISK-GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Jossineide Manuela da Silva Cordeiro
Independent Researcher (Pharmacy and Public Health), Brazil
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4350-4666

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Artificial food dyes are widely used in the U.S. processed-food supply, with exposure concentrated in pediatric diets. This review synthesizes clinical, toxicological, and regulatory evidence through a regulatory-science lens, emphasizing governance gaps, risk communication, and the implications of current oversight for child health protection.

Design/Methodology/Approach: A structured narrative review was conducted using peer-reviewed clinical studies, toxicological assessments, exposure-context materials, and regulatory documentation from major authorities. Evidence was organized across three domains: (i) neurobehavioral outcomes in children, (ii) mechanistic plausibility (oxidative stress and inflammatory signaling), and (iii) regulatory decision frameworks, including risk-management tools (acceptable daily intake, labeling, and post-market reassessment). Core dyes discussed include Red 40 (Allura Red), Yellow 5 (Tartrazine), and Yellow 6 (Sunset Yellow).

Findings: The evidence base most consistently supports heterogeneity of response: a subset of children appears more vulnerable to dye-associated neurobehavioral effects, particularly in real-world dietary contexts that include multiple additives. Toxicological literature provides plausible pathways—such as oxidative stress and inflammatory activation—that may help explain differential susceptibility. Regulatory practices show persistent misalignment across jurisdictions, and current U.S. approaches may not fully reflect contemporary exposure patterns or modern expectations for neurodevelopmental endpoint evaluation.

Practical Implications: From a risk-governance perspective, feasible, proportionate measures include updated toxicological reassessments, exposure-informed revisions of benchmarks, clearer labeling as risk communication, and stronger post-market monitoring—particularly for pediatric-oriented products.

Originality/Value: The review integrates multidisciplinary evidence into a decision-relevant synthesis, translating clinical and toxicological findings into implementable regulatory-management considerations that prioritize vulnerable populations while maintaining scientific neutrality.

Keywords:
Artificial Food Dyes; Regulatory Science; Risk Governance; Toxicology; Pediatric Exposure; Risk Communication; FDA regulation; Public Health.

INTRODUCTION

Synthetic color additives remain a routine component of many processed foods in the United States. Their functional role—standardizing appearance and reinforcing product identity—supports manufacturing and market positioning. However, public-health oversight requires more than confirming technological function; it requires demonstrating that repeated exposure is acceptably safe under real-world conditions, including high-consumption subgroups and early-life vulnerability.

A central challenge in this field is that reported effects are rarely uniform. Instead of producing a consistent average response across all children, the literature more often suggests differential susceptibility. In governance terms, this matters because widespread exposure can translate modest subgroup effects into meaningful population burden, especially when the affected outcomes involve behavior and child development. Consequently, risk governance should address not only hazard identification, but also exposure concentration, subgroup vulnerability, uncertainty management, and risk communication to consumers.

International divergence in regulatory posture further signals unresolved questions. While U.S. oversight continues to recognize these dyes as permitted color additives, other jurisdictions have emphasized repeated re-

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/?volume=January~2026

evaluation and enhanced consumer-facing warnings. This review therefore adopts a regulatory-science framing: it synthesizes clinical and mechanistic evidence, then connects the synthesis to practical risk-management levers (benchmarks, labeling, and reassessment cycles) that can reduce preventable risk without departing from scientific rigor.

OBJECTIVES

In the United States, synthetic food dyes remain pervasive in products with high pediatric consumption, while the scientific literature continues to evolve regarding susceptibility, mechanism, and the adequacy of current risk-management approaches. In this context, the present review was designed to clarify what the evidence most reliably supports and how it can be translated into proportionate, decision-relevant regulatory considerations. Accordingly, the objectives of this review are:

1. **To synthesize** clinical evidence on the relationship between artificial food dyes and neurobehavioral outcomes in children, with particular attention to heterogeneity of response and vulnerable subgroups.
2. **To examine** toxicological and mechanistic considerations—especially oxidative stress and inflammatory signaling—as biologically plausible pathways that may help explain differential susceptibility.
3. **To contextualize** these findings within current regulatory frameworks by comparing key elements of U.S. and international approaches and identifying governance gaps that may influence consumer protection.
4. **To translate** the integrated evidence into feasible, proportionate risk-governance options, including updated reassessment practices, improved labeling as risk communication, and strengthened exposure monitoring for pediatric-oriented products.

METHODOLOGY

This manuscript follows a structured narrative review approach designed to support decision-relevant synthesis rather than exhaustive meta-analysis.

Evidence sources and selection logic: Materials were drawn from peer-reviewed clinical studies and reviews, toxicological evaluations, and regulatory documentation from major authorities (FDA, EFSA, NIH) as reflected in the cited sources. Inclusion emphasized studies and assessments addressing: (i) child behavioral outcomes (including hyperactivity-related symptoms), (ii) mechanistic/biological plausibility (oxidative stress, inflammatory pathways), and (iii) regulatory standards and risk-assessment practices.

Scope and organization: Evidence was organized around three frequently discussed dyes in U.S. consumption patterns: Red 40, Yellow 5, and Yellow 6. Findings were synthesized thematically across outcomes (neurobehavioral, mechanistic/toxicological) and governance components (risk benchmarks, labeling, and reassessment practices).

Synthesis method and interpretive framework: The review prioritizes a weight-of-evidence perspective, considering consistency, biological plausibility, real-world exposure context, and relevance to child health endpoints. Inferences are stated conservatively using probabilistic language (e.g., “may,” “suggests,” “in susceptible subgroups”), and limitations are acknowledged where causal attribution is uncertain.

Limitations: As a narrative review, this synthesis may be influenced by heterogeneity of study designs and endpoints, variation in additive mixtures, and differences between experimental and real-world exposures. The intent is to provide an integrated, governance-oriented interpretation suitable for informing policy and risk communication.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Neurobehavioral outcomes in children: heterogeneity, susceptibility, and clinical meaning

Across the clinical literature, the most reproducible signal is not a uniform behavioral effect across all children, but rather **heterogeneity of response**—a pattern consistent with the concept of **susceptible subgroups**. This distinction is not semantic; it is central to how evidence should be interpreted in a population-level governance context. When exposures are widespread and begin early in life, even modest effect sizes—if concentrated in a meaningful subset—can translate into clinically relevant burden at the household and community levels. In practical terms, this implies that the appropriate scientific question is not whether dyes produce a large, average behavioral shift in all children, but whether **a subset experiences measurable symptom exacerbation** under realistic dietary conditions.

A major contribution of the clinical evidence is the demonstration that behavioral outcomes linked to food additives may be detectable under controlled conditions, especially when additive mixtures are used to reflect

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/?volume=January~2026

real-world consumption. McCann et al. (2007) helped situate the discussion within pediatric behavioral endpoints of public-health interest by reporting additive-associated changes in hyperactivity-related behaviors. Subsequent clinical syntheses have continued to emphasize that dietary sensitivities can be behaviorally salient for some children, reinforcing the plausibility that artificial colors may act as **modifiers** rather than universal determinants of neurobehavioral profiles. Importantly, this framing avoids overstatement: the literature does not support a simplistic conclusion that synthetic dyes "cause" hyperactivity in all children. Instead, it supports a more nuanced model in which dyes may **exacerbate symptoms** in sensitive individuals, potentially interacting with baseline neurodevelopmental vulnerability, broader dietary composition, and cumulative exposure patterns.

From a risk-governance perspective, this heterogeneity carries two implications. First, it supports a shift away from reliance on population-average outcomes alone and toward a **subgroup-aware evaluation**—especially when endpoints involve child functioning, caregiver burden, educational participation, and quality of life. Second, it strengthens the case for **risk communication tools** that are proportionate and targeted (e.g., transparent labeling and caregiver-facing guidance), since affected families may benefit from the ability to identify and manage exposures without requiring a uniform hazard model.

2. Mechanistic plausibility: oxidative stress and inflammatory signaling as pathways relevant to susceptibility

Mechanistic and toxicological evidence provides an interpretive bridge between heterogeneous clinical findings and regulatory decision-making. While mechanistic plausibility cannot substitute for clinical causality, it can materially strengthen the inference that observed associations are not merely stochastic—particularly when a subset of children appears responsive. Across the toxicological discourse, two convergent themes recur: **oxidative stress** and **inflammatory signaling**. These pathways are biologically relevant to neurodevelopment and neurobehavioral modulation, and they align with broader models in which low-level exposures may have differential impact depending on baseline vulnerability, metabolic capacity, and immunologic tone.

The key regulatory insight here is not that mechanistic evidence "proves harm," but that it affects how uncertainty should be managed. When a plausible pathway exists, and when the outcome pertains to children—who have distinct developmental windows and exposure patterns—the threshold for viewing uncertainty as policy-relevant tends to be lower. This is especially true when exposure is pervasive and when the behavioral outcomes, though complex, are meaningful in everyday functioning. Mechanistic plausibility also supports the rationale for **modernizing toxicological benchmarks** and evaluation endpoints. Traditional toxicological paradigms have historically emphasized overt toxicity at relatively high doses, whereas contemporary public-health risk assessment increasingly recognizes the importance of subtle functional outcomes, mixture exposures, and subgroup susceptibility. In this context, oxidative and inflammatory pathways offer a coherent biological lens through which variability in behavioral response can be understood rather than dismissed.

A related point concerns the interpretive challenge of dietary context. Artificial colors are rarely consumed in isolation; they often co-occur with other additives and with dietary patterns that may themselves influence behavior and physiology. Mechanistic plausibility does not eliminate confounding concerns, but it does support the view that **mixture-based exposures** and **real-world consumption patterns** deserve explicit attention in reassessment frameworks. This is precisely where regulatory science and risk governance intersect: the task is not merely to catalog mechanistic possibilities, but to translate plausibility into proportionate oversight—particularly when children represent the highest-exposure demographic.

3. Exposure context and pediatric concentration: why governance must be exposure-informed

The policy relevance of the clinical and mechanistic evidence is amplified by the exposure context. NIH exposure estimates (2020) highlight that artificial dye intake is not evenly distributed; rather, it tends to cluster in dietary patterns characterized by highly processed foods and beverages—categories disproportionately consumed by children. This concentration matters because it creates a scenario in which **a subgroup that is both biologically and behaviorally vulnerable may also be more highly exposed**, compounding risk even when individual-level effects appear modest. In other words, exposure concentration can transform "small effects" into meaningful population burden, especially when repeated over developmental time.

For regulators and public-health practitioners, exposure-informed governance implies that safety evaluations should be responsive to contemporary consumption patterns rather than relying primarily on historical assumptions. This does not require presuming harm; it requires acknowledging that risk is a function of hazard, dose, duration, and susceptibility. When children's diets include repeated, routine exposure to dyed foods, risk management becomes less about rare events and more about everyday prevention—particularly for families already managing behavioral sensitivity.

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/?volume=January~2026

4. Regulatory divergence and governance gaps: reassessment cadence, endpoints, and risk communication

A central finding of this review is the presence of **regulatory divergence** that signals unresolved governance questions. EFSA's repeated re-evaluation program (2013–2021) exemplifies a posture that revisits previous conclusions as methods evolve and as new evidence emerges. In the United States, FDA regulatory resources—including status listings—provide transparency regarding permitted additives, yet public debate persists over whether the reassessment cadence and endpoint selection adequately reflect current scientific expectations for neurodevelopmental outcomes and modern exposure patterns. The core issue is not merely procedural; it is substantive: **what kinds of endpoints are treated as decision-relevant**, and how uncertainty is operationalized when child health is implicated.

In regulatory-science terms, three governance gaps are particularly salient:

(i) Benchmark adequacy and endpoint selection. If behavioral outcomes are treated as too "soft" or too heterogeneous to guide governance, the system risks underweighting functionally meaningful endpoints that matter to families and communities. A risk-based framework can accommodate complexity by focusing on subgroup susceptibility, triangulation of evidence, and conservative interpretation where exposure is high.

(ii) Reassessment cadence and modern methods. When exposures are widespread and evidence evolves, governance is strengthened by systematic reassessment cycles that incorporate contemporary study designs, mixture contexts, and updated exposure estimates. EFSA's re-evaluation paradigm illustrates one approach to iterative oversight; the governance question is how comparable iteration is implemented or operationalized within U.S. frameworks.

(iii) Risk communication and labeling. Labeling is not merely informational; it is a governance tool that can enable risk management in sensitive subgroups without imposing blanket restrictions. In contexts where heterogeneity is expected, transparent disclosure supports informed choice and practical exposure reduction—especially for caregivers and clinicians working with children who exhibit dietary sensitivities.

5. Policy implications: proportionate, implementable measures under uncertainty

The evidence synthesis supports a **precautionary-but-proportionate** policy stance. This does not imply alarmism or categorical claims; it reflects a governance principle: when exposure is common in children, when clinical findings suggest subgroup vulnerability, and when plausible biological pathways exist, it is reasonable to strengthen oversight using tools that are feasible and low-burden.

Three implementable measures follow directly from this logic:

1. **Updated reassessment anchored in contemporary exposure and endpoints.** Reassessments should explicitly incorporate modern pediatric exposure patterns and consider neurobehavioral outcomes as decision-relevant endpoints, with careful attention to subgroup sensitivity and mixture contexts.
2. **Improved labeling salience as risk communication.** Clearer disclosure of artificial dyes can function as a targeted mitigation tool, enabling caregivers and clinicians to manage exposures in susceptible children without requiring uniform hazard assumptions across the entire population.
3. **Post-market monitoring and iterative governance.** A stronger surveillance posture—responsive to new evidence, changes in consumption patterns, and reported sensitivities—can enhance alignment between permitted use and evolving public-health understanding.

Taken together, these measures align with contemporary regulatory science: they respect uncertainty, avoid overstatement, and still reduce preventable risk in high-exposure pediatric contexts. The central governance message is that the current evidence base is sufficient to justify **improved alignment between evaluation methods and real-world exposure**, particularly where child health and functional outcomes are concerned.

ACKNOWLEDGEMEN

The author acknowledges the contributions of scientific and regulatory bodies whose prior evaluations and documentation informed this synthesis, as well as the peer-reviewed research community addressing food additive safety and pediatric health outcomes. Above all, to God.

CONCLUSION

Artificial food dyes remain embedded in the U.S. processed-food environment, resulting in routine exposure that is disproportionately concentrated among children. The evidence synthesized in this review does not support a simplistic, uniform effect model; instead, it most consistently indicates **heterogeneous susceptibility**, in which a subset of pediatric consumers may experience **measurable neurobehavioral symptom exacerbation** under realistic dietary conditions. This pattern is complemented by toxicological and mechanistic considerations that

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/?volume=January~2026

converge on biologically plausible pathways—particularly oxidative stress and inflammatory signaling—that may help explain differential responsiveness across individuals and contexts.

From a regulatory-science perspective, the central implication is not that current oversight is inherently invalid, but that governance frameworks may benefit from **methodological updating** to better reflect contemporary exposure patterns, modern expectations for neurodevelopmentally relevant endpoints, and the reality of mixture-based consumption. In parallel, international divergence in regulatory posture underscores the need for clearer articulation of how uncertainty is managed when exposures are common and outcomes pertain to child functioning.

Accordingly, the most defensible path forward is **proportionate risk governance**: periodic, exposure-informed reassessment of toxicological benchmarks; explicit consideration of subgroup vulnerability in evaluation frameworks; strengthened post-market monitoring; and clearer consumer-facing disclosure that functions as practical risk communication for caregivers and clinicians. These measures do not require overstating causal certainty; rather, they represent feasible mechanisms to reduce preventable risk and improve transparency in a domain where early-life exposure is widespread and potentially consequential.

REFERENCES

[1] Ben-Shalom, D., et al. (2023). Food dyes and behavioral impacts in children: A systematic review. *JAMA Pediatrics.*

[2] European Food Safety Authority. (2013–2021). Re-evaluation of synthetic food dyes.
McCann, D., et al. (2007). Food additives and hyperactive behavior in children. *The Lancet, 370*(9598), 1560–1567.

[3] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). Color Additives Status List.
Stevens, L. J., et al. (2014). Dietary sensitivities and behavioral effects of artificial food colors. *Clinical Pediatrics, 53*(2), 133–140.

[4] National Institutes of Health. (2020). Exposure estimates of artificial food dyes in U.S. children.Rosell-Ubia, P.J.B., Department of Health Philippines (2016). All for Health Towards Health For All. *Philippine Health Agenda 2016-2022.*