ORIGINAL RESEARCH & COMPARATIVE REGULATORY ANALYSIS

Cadmium Has No Kill Step

The October 2026 Baby-Food Proposal, the Limits of End-Product Testing, and the Case for Source-Controlled Formulation

José M. López, BSc, MD, PhD, LLD (C)

INTABIOTECH KNOWLEDGE CENTER

EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

The US Food and Drug Administration's October 2026 draft action levels for cadmium in processed foods for children under two years of age mark a consequential shift from general concern about toxic elements to category-specific manufacturing decisions. The proposed concentrations range from 10 to 45 µg/kg, yet they are neither binding final limits nor interchangeable with the European Union's existing maximum levels. More importantly, cadmium is an elemental contaminant: ordinary cooking and microbial lethality steps do not destroy it, while peeling, fractionation, drying and ingredient substitution can redistribute its mass and change measured concentration. This article integrates the FDA's underlying exposure and achievability analysis with crop uptake science, analytical uncertainty, food-process mass balances, bioaccessibility research and comparative EU–Spain–UK–US law. It identifies where end-product testing is necessary but insufficient and develops a testable, source-to-serving qualification approach. The proposed framework is a research and industrial validation agenda, not a proven decontamination technology or a substitute for statutory controls.

KEYWORDS: *cadmium; infant food; chemical hazards; ingredient sourcing; food contaminants; mass balance; ICP-MS; comparative food law*

CATEGORY: Food Safety & Regulatory Affairs | Emerging Research

SEO SLUG: cadmium-no-kill-step-baby-food-2026-source-control

META DESCRIPTION: The FDA's 2026 cadmium proposal shows why baby-food safety needs verified sourcing, mass balance, validated testing and jurisdiction-specific controls.

INTERNAL TAGS: Cadmium; Infant Nutrition; Chemical Contaminants; Supplier Qualification; Food Processing; Regulatory Affairs; Mineral Technologies; Emerging Research

01 | A new regulatory signal, not a new universal legal limit

On 22 October 2026 the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) announced draft action levels for cadmium in specified packaged foods represented as suitable for babies and children younger than two years. A notice appeared in the Federal Register on 23 October. The proposal forms part of the agency's Closer to Zero programme, which seeks iterative reductions in exposure to toxic elements while preserving access to nutritionally important foods. In the same week FDA released draft Chapter 12 of its preventive-controls guidance, dealing with chemical hazards in human foods. Together, the documents create a stronger industrial signal than a numerical table alone: contaminant reduction is being connected explicitly to hazard analysis, procurement and the design of manufacturing controls. [1–4]

The legal status requires precision. The cadmium document is a draft guidance, marked "not for implementation"; even if finalised, an FDA guidance generally communicates the agency's thinking rather than imposing a new regulation. Under 21 CFR 109.6, action levels can inform decisions about whether a food may be considered adulterated, alongside the evidence in a particular case. It would be incorrect to tell a customer that the proposed 10 µg/kg value is already a universally binding American limit, or to assume that it applies to all products consumed by children. [1–3]

The publication also exposes a practical information-governance problem. The Federal Register notice and FDA's 22 October announcement specify 22 December 2026 as the deadline for comments on the cadmium draft, while the FDA guidance landing page, when checked on 30 October, displays 21 January 2027. The latter date is separately given for the chemical-hazards chapter. For the cadmium consultation, the published Federal Register notice is the more authoritative deadline record; prospective commenters should verify the live docket before filing. This inconsistency is a documentary observation, not evidence that the substantive proposal has changed. [1–4]

02 | The numbers are category-specific and the exclusions matter

FDA proposes 10 µg/kg (10 parts per billion, ppb) for processed fruits, vegetables other than single-ingredient carrots, and mixtures including grain- or meat-based mixtures; 25 µg/kg for single-ingredient carrots; 45 µg/kg for dry infant cereals; 20 µg/kg for yogurts, puddings and custards; and 25 µg/kg for single-ingredient meats. One microgram per kilogram equals one ppb for mass-based reporting. The proposed figures refer to the foods as sampled and sold within the draft's stated categories, not to a universal daily intake. [1,2]

The scope expressly excludes raw agricultural commodities, home-prepared foods, snacks (including grain-based and freeze-dried snacks), infant formula and beverages, including toddler drinks. Exclusion from this particular guidance does not imply absence of risk or immunity from general food-safety requirements. It means that a manufacturer cannot automatically use this table to declare a different product compliant. The exclusions are commercially material: a cereal marketed as a dry infant cereal and a grain-based finger-food snack may look technologically similar but occupy different regulatory categories. [2]

A product's age claim, presentation, processing state and intended use should therefore be established before applying a proposed concentration. A certificate with a single "cadmium pass" field conceals precisely the information needed to determine which benchmark is relevant.

03 | The evidence behind the proposal: what FDA actually measured

The FDA draft analysed 1,430 samples from its Toxic Elements Program and targeted surveys, alongside 689 Total Diet Study samples used as a complementary source. The agency did not simply average all observations into one proposed limit. It distinguished product categories, examined concentrations and high-end consumption, and considered whether lower concentrations appeared technically achievable in the existing supply. The Total Diet Study's composited samples were not used for the achievability calculation because composites cannot reproduce the distribution of individual-product concentrations in the same way. [2]

Among targeted programme and survey data, mean cadmium concentrations were 1.0 µg/kg in fruit products, 4.2 in mixtures, 4.4 in vegetables after separating single-ingredient carrots, 12.7 in those carrot products, and 15.0 in dry infant cereals. Yogurts/puddings/custards and single-ingredient meats averaged 0.9 and 0.5 µg/kg respectively. These are aggregate observations, not guaranteed values for a cultivar, brand or imported shipment. Sampling design, market composition and the age of the underlying observations all limit extrapolation. [2]

FDA estimated that the proposed thresholds would be met by 93% of samples in the combined fruit/vegetable/mixture category, 84% of carrot samples, 98% of dry infant cereals, and 100% of the two low-concentration categories. The different achievability percentages are important: the proposed 25-ppb carrot threshold is not a toxicological declaration that carrots are inherently less hazardous than other vegetables. It is a policy compromise informed by observed contamination, dietary exposure and the nutritional availability of that food. [2]

04 | The projected exposure benefit is uneven

Using the survey distribution and US consumption data, FDA estimated that excluding products above the proposed action levels would reduce 90th-percentile cadmium exposure attributable to the fruit/vegetable/mixture category by 28% and the single-ingredient carrot category by 32%. The corresponding estimated reduction for dry infant cereals was only 5%, while the two categories already exhibiting very low concentrations showed no modelled reduction. The agency reports these as scenario results, not as observed improvements following an implemented rule. [2]

The 5% cereal estimate merits attention. A numerical threshold can be administratively useful without being the strongest intervention for reducing population exposure. If most marketed cereals already fall below 45 µg/kg, eliminating the few higher results has limited leverage over the mean. A supplier strategy that reduces the whole distribution of cereal concentrations, rather than merely excluding the tail above 45, could produce a larger benefit, but that claim requires prospective evidence. [2]

Equally, the model assumes the removal of high-cadmium samples from the relevant datasets; it does not predict how manufacturers, growers or consumers would substitute products. If sourcing changes reduce cadmium but also displace iron-rich or otherwise valuable foods, the net nutritional consequences must be considered rather than presumed. This is one reason that a contaminant threshold and an optimal infant diet are different questions.

05 | Cadmium is an elemental hazard, not a microorganism

The central technological distinction is elementary but often neglected. Heat treatment can inactivate microorganisms when a validated process delivers sufficient lethality; it cannot destroy an element such as cadmium. Ordinary baking, pasteurisation, extrusion and sterilisation may change moisture, structure and chemical binding, but they do not eliminate the elemental mass merely because a temperature target has been met. A thermal step could even raise a reported concentration per kilogram through water loss. [2,5]

This does not mean that food processing is irrelevant. Washing and peeling can remove externally deposited contamination or discard tissues containing a disproportionate share of the metal. Leaching and separation can transfer some cadmium to a removed aqueous phase under particular conditions. Refining and fractionation may alter where the contaminant ends up. But a process is a removal technology only if cadmium mass is demonstrably exported into a rejected stream and the remaining food is safe and fit for use. A change in soluble or bioaccessible fraction alone is not proof of reduced total cadmium. [2,10–14]

For manufacturers, the strongest default hierarchy is prevention at source, followed by validated physical separation or processing where feasible, then representative verification. The presence of an antimicrobial intervention or a clean microbiological certificate should never be allowed to imply control of toxic elements.

06 | The field is the first factory: uptake, soils and cultivars

Cadmium enters crops through combinations of geogenic background, agricultural inputs, atmospheric deposition and contaminated water. Uptake depends on the species and cultivar, soil pH, redox conditions, organic matter, competing ions, mineral nutrition and plant transport systems. Two fields with similar total soil cadmium can produce different edible-tissue concentrations; equally, a supplier may change source geography without changing the commercial name of the ingredient. [2,11,12]

Rice provides a particularly instructive example because agronomic interventions can shift several contaminants at once. Soil amendments, nutrient management, irrigation and low-accumulating cultivars have established research precedents. However, reducing cadmium mobility under one soil-water regime may have implications for arsenic behaviour, which has different redox chemistry. A strategy designed around cadmium alone can therefore generate a multi-contaminant trade-off.

The agronomic literature is substantial; neither soil amendment nor selection of low-accumulating varieties is a newly discovered technology. [11,12]

Root crops raise another distinction: contamination adhering to surfaces can be reduced by cleaning, whereas cadmium absorbed into edible tissue may not respond to washing. FDA specifically discusses peeling and washing as possible mitigations and recommends selecting ingredient sources with lower concentrations. A processor should test the actual before/after effect in its supply, not infer that a general recommendation delivers a fixed percentage reduction. [2]

07 | Mineral technologies: plausible chemistry is not demonstrated food safety

Mineral chemistry can influence cadmium availability in soil and the partitioning of dissolved metal ions in a treatment stream. Changes in pH, ionic strength, sorbent composition and competing calcium, magnesium, iron or zinc can alter sorption, precipitation and complexation. These mechanisms justify experimental investigation; they do not justify a marketing assertion that a particular alkaline water, mineral powder or bicarbonate preparation removes cadmium from finished baby food. [11–14]

A successful soil amendment may immobilise cadmium without removing it from the field. A successful aqueous precipitation experiment may reduce dissolved cadmium but generate a contaminated sludge that requires proper management. A food-processing treatment might lower measured total cadmium while changing micronutrient content, taste, texture or ingredient identity. Each claim demands a different validation design and legal analysis.

The relevant INTABIOTECH opportunity, if pursued, would be an independently tested mineral–process platform for selected raw-material or wash-water streams, not an assumed efficacy claim for an existing product. Food-contact legality, processing-aid status, residual chemicals, mineral additions and waste disposal would have to be resolved before industrial use. No product-specific cadmium-removal performance is established in this article.

08 | Mass balance before marketing: where the metal actually goes

Consider a deliberately hypothetical batch of 1,000 kg of vegetable material containing 20 µg/kg cadmium. Its apparent cadmium inventory is 20 mg. If 200 kg of peel or other rejected tissue carries 8 mg and the retained 800 kg carries 12 mg, the retained fraction contains 15 µg/kg. The concentration falls by 25%, but the true removal is 40% of the incoming cadmium mass. Both quantities are useful, and neither can be substituted for the other.

Now imagine that the retained 800 kg is dried to 160 kg without cadmium loss. The resulting powder contains 75 µg/kg, although the cadmium mass remains 12 mg. If that powder is reconstituted with clean water to 800 kg, the concentration returns to 15 µg/kg. These numbers are arithmetic illustrations, not processing data or compliance advice. They demonstrate why wet-weight and dry-weight specifications, yields and product-as-marketed rules must be stated explicitly.

The practical balance is: cadmium entering with each ingredient and process input equals cadmium leaving in edible product, removed fractions, water, residues and any measured losses, within analytical uncertainty. Where a manufacturer reports 60% “detoxification” without quantifying the removed cadmium or the treatment residues, the claim is incomplete. A credible process dossier includes both mass recovery and quality consequences.

09 | Concentration is not the same as dietary dose

For a single food, dietary cadmium intake is the measured concentration multiplied by the mass eaten. If an 8-kg child hypothetically consumes 100 g of a product containing 10 µg/kg cadmium, that serving supplies 1 µg, or 0.125 µg/kg body weight for that day. At 40 µg/kg, the same serving supplies 4 µg. These are exposure calculations, not predictions of absorbed dose or adverse health outcomes.

A dry infant cereal at 45 µg/kg and a wet puree at 10 µg/kg should not be compared solely by their numerical concentrations. Twenty grams of the dry cereal would contain 0.9 µg before preparation, whereas 100 g of the puree would contain 1 µg. Frequency, reconstitution, body weight and exposure from the rest of the diet determine the relevant comparison. A low concentration in a frequently eaten food may contribute more total exposure than a higher concentration in a rarely consumed ingredient.

The EU's established tolerable weekly intake for cadmium is 2.5 µg/kg body weight per week. It is a health-based guidance value for long-term exposure, not a product limit or a threshold at which a single meal becomes unsafe. The FDA draft uses a toxicological reference-value range of 0.21–0.36 µg/kg body weight per day, derived through its own analysis and modelling. Comparing these figures requires attention to the endpoints, assumptions and averaging periods; the values should not be treated as interchangeable legal standards. [2,7,8]

10 | Total cadmium and bioaccessibility answer different questions

Acid digestion followed by elemental analysis quantifies cadmium in a food sample; it does not by itself establish how much will be absorbed through the intestine. In-vitro gastrointestinal extraction and cell-based models have long been used to investigate bioaccessibility and transport, including in infant-food matrices. A 2003 study evaluated digested infant foods using Caco-2 cells, while a 2019 study examined the bioaccessible fraction in organic weaning foods and the influence of dietary components. These are prior studies, not a new field created by the 2026 proposal. [9,10]

The distinction matters scientifically because food structure, phytate, fibre and mineral composition can affect cadmium solubilisation and uptake. Nevertheless, laboratory bioaccessibility does not directly equal human bioavailability, and a lower in-vitro soluble fraction does not demonstrate lower lifetime renal burden. Nor does it permit a food exceeding an applicable legal total-cadmium maximum to be sold on the theory that its cadmium is poorly absorbed.

For regulatory release, total cadmium and the relevant legal category remain primary. Bioaccessibility can be a complementary research endpoint for evaluating processing and formulation hypotheses, provided it is not used to obscure the total concentration or make unapproved health and safety claims.

11 | Analytical evidence at microgram-per-kilogram concentrations

FDA describes inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) as its method for determining cadmium in the relevant monitoring programme. At the proposed concentrations, the analytical challenge is not simply instrument sensitivity. It is obtaining representative samples from heterogeneous ingredient lots, controlling contamination during sampling and digestion, calibrating against appropriate materials, and quantifying uncertainty near the decision level. [2]

An industrial laboratory report should identify the food matrix, batch and sampling protocol; preparation and digestion method; quality-control blanks and recoveries; measurement uncertainty; limit of detection and limit of quantification; and the treatment of values below quantification. Accreditation and validated method scope are important, but a generic claim of "ICP-MS tested" does not prove suitability for every matrix. An oil-rich ingredient, a high-mineral powder and a fruit puree can pose different preparation challenges.

When a result lies near a threshold, the operator should avoid converting a single number into absolute certainty. Repeatability, representativeness and the relevant official-control rules matter. Retesting a different grab sample may help investigate heterogeneity but does not automatically invalidate the first finding. A supplier's certificate of analysis is evidence within a control system, not the system itself.

12 | The hidden statistical problem in lot qualification

Contaminant distributions are rarely uniform across farms, harvests or bulk consignments. A mean result can be acceptable while a substantial fraction of sublots is high; conversely, an isolated elevated subsample can reflect a genuinely localised source. The choice of composite sampling, stratified sampling and retained samples changes the probability of detecting that pattern. A sampling plan should therefore be tied to the decision being made: characterising a supplier, accepting a lot, investigating a process or verifying corrective action.

FDA's own analysis illustrates the distinction between market averages and individual-product achievability. It treated composited Total Diet Study samples differently from individual targeted survey observations. Industry should do likewise when building supplier dashboards: a moving average of annual supplier results is not proof that the next delivered lot satisfies a maximum. [2]

A defensible protocol can use risk-ranked frequencies, defined acceptance criteria, independent verification and escalation after excursions. Statistical process control may identify drift, but it cannot repair biased sampling or a laboratory method

that lacks matrix validation. Artificial-intelligence models may help rank likely risk factors only after the underlying lot genealogy, analytical data and source changes are reliable and auditable.

13 | The European Union already has binding cadmium maximum levels

The EU does not need to wait for FDA to establish legal controls. Regulation (EU) 2023/915, as amended, sets directly applicable maximum levels for specified contaminants and foods. Annex I, section 3.2.20, specifies 0.040 mg/kg (40 µg/kg) cadmium for baby food and processed cereal-based food for infants and young children, applied to the product as placed on the market. Separate limits exist for infant formula, particular vegetables, grains, cocoa and other categories. The correct annex entry must be selected for the actual product, not borrowed from a convenient neighbouring category. [5]

Article 2 of Regulation 2023/915 prohibits placing food on the market or using it as an ingredient when it exceeds an applicable maximum level. It also prohibits mixing compliant food with food that exceeds the applicable maximum. Article 3 addresses dried, diluted, processed and compound products, including the relevant concentration or dilution factors. Thus a mass-balance model is necessary for legitimate processing calculations, but cannot be repurposed into a strategy for laundering a non-compliant lot by blending. [5]

The difference between the EU's 40 µg/kg baby-food category and the US draft's 10 µg/kg for many wet mixtures is commercially significant, but it does not establish that one entire jurisdiction is "four times stricter". The US draft contains 45 µg/kg for dry infant cereals, has explicit exclusions and is not final; the EU text contains multiple binding category-specific limits. Product scope, product-as-sold basis and enforcement status must be compared before drawing conclusions.

14 | Spain: EU law, official controls and the evidential burden

Spain applies the EU contaminant framework directly. Food business operators remain responsible for safe food under Regulation (EC) 178/2002, and competent authorities exercise official controls under Regulation (EU) 2017/625 and the relevant national and autonomous-community arrangements. The official-control framework governs matters such as sampling, analysis, procedural safeguards and enforcement; a private certificate does not replace an official finding. [5,6]

For a Spanish manufacturer supplying infant cereals, purées or specialised ingredients, a legally sound dossier should contain the product-category assessment, ingredient origin, traceability, sampling plan, laboratory validation, risk analysis and corrective-action rules. Where ingredients come from outside the EU, the supplier's local legal compliance does not displace the requirements applicable to the finished product placed on the EU market.

A disagreement about a result should begin with evidence preservation: sample identity, chain of custody, chromatographic or instrumental records where available, method scope, uncertainty, retained samples and the genealogy of affected batches. The aim is not to find a second number that happens to be lower; it is to determine whether the original result is representative, technically sound and legally consequential.

15 | Great Britain and Northern Ireland: do not assume one UK rulebook

Great Britain has a distinct domestic legal route for food contaminants and enforcement, while Northern Ireland must be assessed separately under the applicable EU-linked arrangements. The UK Committee on Toxicity has examined cadmium exposure in infant and young-child diets, finding that contributions from commercial infant foods and other foods vary markedly by age and consumption pattern. Its analyses are useful scientific context but do not themselves create new statutory product limits. [15,16]

The UK government's March 2026 description of the intended UK–EU sanitary and phytosanitary alignment indicates that the regulatory relationship may change. An announced alignment objective, however, is not proof that a specific EU amendment is already operative in Great Britain. Importers should verify the currently applicable domestic contaminant instrument and any relevant amendments at the date of shipment, rather than copy an EU 2026 annex into a British certificate. [17]

Northern Ireland requires its own destination analysis, including the applicable EU rules and any movement-scheme exceptions. A UK-wide label or customer specification should not collapse these territorial distinctions into one undifferentiated "UK compliant" assertion.

16 | United States: action levels, adulteration and preventive controls

The US approach combines the general prohibition on adulterated food in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with preventive-controls obligations where applicable. The proposed cadmium action levels would inform FDA's enforcement discretion under 21 CFR 109.6; they are not a stand-alone permission to market a food containing cadmium below the proposed number. Nor do they displace an operator's responsibility to assess reasonably foreseeable chemical hazards. [1–4]

Draft Chapter 12 of FDA's Hazard Analysis and Risk-Based Preventive Controls guidance explicitly identifies toxic elements, including cadmium, among potential environmental chemical hazards. It discusses preventive measures that may include supply-chain controls, process controls and verification. The chapter is a draft guidance; the underlying obligations in 21 CFR Part 117 must be distinguished from the non-binding illustrative recommendations. [4]

A manufacturer should therefore ask two questions in sequence. First, what legal obligations apply today to this facility and food? Second, how do the proposed action levels change prudent sourcing targets, customer specifications and future regulatory planning? Treating a draft concentration as a substitute for hazard analysis would answer neither question.

17 | Cocoa, grains and botanicals: adjacent markets with real implications

The FDA baby-food proposal is not a cocoa regulation. Yet it has implications for ingredient companies that supply cocoa preparations, grain-derived powders, botanical carriers and mineral-enriched formulations to customers developing infant or toddler products. The relevant question is whether an ingredient's contaminant contribution is controlled at the actual use rate, with attention to the finished-food category. Cocoa can present origin-dependent cadmium exposure, and rice or other cereals can exhibit agronomic variation; none of these facts supports a universal contamination claim about a named supplier. [11–14]

A 2025 Food Chemistry study examined water soaking after cacao fermentation and reported pilot-scale reductions in nib cadmium concentrations, with performance dependent on cacao variety. It also reported stronger removal in powdered material and under some salt conditions. Those observations are evidence of a technically plausible transfer mechanism, not proof of universal industrial performance, unchanged sensory quality, regulatory approval or suitability for infant food. [13]

The industrial lesson is to distinguish ingredient concentration, formulation contribution and product category. A botanical extract at a low addition rate can still warrant scrutiny if its cadmium concentration is high or variable; a bulk cereal ingredient may dominate exposure simply because it is consumed in larger quantities. Any INTABIOTECH qualification programme should prioritise relevant matrices and documented customer uses, without inventing performance claims for existing product families.

18 | Why blending is not a universal compliance solution

A manufacturer can legitimately design a compliant multi-ingredient formulation using ingredients that satisfy their applicable legal requirements. But arithmetic alone does not cure the unlawful use of a raw material that already exceeds a binding maximum. Under the EU's Article 2(2) anti-mixing rule, compliant food must not be mixed with food exceeding an applicable maximum level. Where the law sets a limit for an ingredient or commodity, the operator must respect that limit independently of the calculated finished-product average. [5]

In the United States, a proposed FDA action level is not a formal recipe-averaging authorisation either. The finished product remains subject to general safety law, and any relevant ingredient-specific requirements continue to matter. A commercial specification that permits deliberate dilution of a known high-cadmium lot can create substantial legal, reputational and scientific risk even where a simplistic weighted average appears favourable.

The appropriate engineering use of a formulation mass balance is predictive and preventive: estimate the contributions of independently qualified ingredients, set internal targets below the applicable finished-product benchmark, and verify the finished batch. It is not a mechanism for concealing non-compliant inputs.

19 | Procurement must move from a certificate to a controlled source

An effective supplier qualification programme begins with the food's intended market, product category and expected use level. It then identifies ingredients likely to dominate cadmium exposure, including those whose origin or agricultural conditions vary substantially. Contracts should require disclosure of source changes, defined sampling and analytical methods, retention of representative samples and cooperation in root-cause investigations. [2,4,5]

The programme should distinguish a source baseline from a lot-release test. Baselines may include harvest, geography, cultivar, soil or irrigation characteristics where available, processing history and historic results. Lot-release evidence establishes whether the specific delivered material meets the agreed specification. Periodic independent verification tests the supplier's analytical claims and checks for systematic bias.

A supplier's performance should be judged on both concentration and variability. A slightly lower mean with frequent excursions may be commercially inferior to a stable source with a marginally higher mean that remains well below the applicable limit. These are decisions for statistical quality management, not for a single "natural" or "premium" marketing adjective.

20 | Processing validation must include nutritional and environmental costs

Where a reduction step is proposed, success should be defined before testing. The protocol should measure total cadmium entering and leaving the process, contaminant transfer to rejected streams, recovery of saleable food, change in nutrient profile, sensory quality, microbial safety, energy and water demand, and disposal requirements. It should also test worst-case starting concentrations and normal industrial variability. [10–14]

An aggressive aqueous extraction may reduce cadmium while removing minerals, phenolics or other valuable constituents. A high-water washing process may increase wastewater treatment costs and microbial risk. An agronomic intervention may improve one metal while worsening another. A low-cadmium raw material from a distant origin may have higher logistics costs or lower traceability than a well-managed regional source. None of these trade-offs can be resolved by measuring cadmium alone.

Life-cycle and commercial analyses should use a functional unit, such as kilograms of compliant, nutritionally acceptable ingredient delivered at specified performance. Claims of "sustainable detoxification" require data on the removed cadmium, treatment chemicals, residues and environmental burden. A laboratory demonstration without these elements is an early feasibility signal, not a validated industrial solution.

21 | Research & Innovation Opportunity

Unresolved problem. Food companies can measure cadmium, assess suppliers and model recipes, while researchers have investigated soil amendments, crop genetics, leaching and bioaccessibility. What remains insufficiently standardised is a cross-matrix industrial framework that predicts finished-product cadmium from source attributes, processing mass transfer and real formulation use, and quantifies whether those predictions reduce costly rejections without compromising safety. [2,9–14]

What is already known. ICP-MS analysis, source selection, peeling, food-processing mass balance and cadmium uptake science are established. Published studies and patent disclosures already describe postharvest leaching and cadmium-removal approaches, including Chinese patent CN115316594B for treatment of rice flour slurries. This article does not claim that chemical removal, a mineral treatment or a "passport" concept has been invented for the first time. A patent publication demonstrates prior technical disclosure, not independently validated safety or freedom to operate. [10–14,18]

Proposed hypothesis—not established fact. A Source-to-Serving Cadmium Qualification Model combining (i) source and harvest metadata, (ii) validated total-cadmium measurements, (iii) process-stage material and contaminant balances, (iv) recipe-level exposure modelling and (v) uncertainty-aware lot-release rules will predict finished-product results more reliably than a conventional supplier certificate plus a single final-product test. Its value should be assessed against the cost and error rate of existing systems, not presumed from digital sophistication.

Development pathway. Select three contrasting product matrices: a root-vegetable puree, a dry infant cereal and a cocoa- or botanical-containing formulation. Recruit multiple suppliers across harvests. Pre-register input specifications and sampling frequencies; measure total cadmium at intake and after defined operations; quantify separated streams; and run blinded

holdout batches. Record ingredient mass, moisture, recovery, finished-product cadmium and legally relevant category. Bioaccessibility may be investigated as a separate exploratory endpoint, not as a replacement for total-cadmium compliance.

Validation and falsification. Primary endpoints should include absolute prediction error, frequency of false lot acceptance and false lot rejection, interlaboratory reproducibility, mass-balance closure, time to decision and cost per compliant kilogram. Challenge the model with unannounced source changes, high-cadmium sublots, alternative drying yields and missing data. A credible model must be able to return “insufficient evidence” rather than a fabricated confidence score. Independent laboratories and external manufacturing sites are essential for generalisability.

Regulatory constraints and industrial relevance. The model would not authorise the use of non-compliant ingredients, replace official-control procedures or justify unapproved claims about contaminant removal. Any physical treatment would require separate food-safety and regulatory assessment, including residuals and waste management. If validated, the approach could support procurement, contract manufacturing, mineral-processing research, product reformulation and cross-border customer qualification. Its benefits remain hypotheses until demonstrated in prospective industrial trials.

22 | Evidence status: five claims that must remain distinct

Established regulatory fact: the EU already applies binding category-specific cadmium maximum levels, including 40 µg/kg for the specified baby-food and processed-cereal category; the FDA’s October 2026 numbers are a draft guidance proposal. The US consultation deadline stated in the Federal Register is 22 December 2026. [1–5]

Established scientific evidence: cadmium is a persistent element that enters crops through environmental pathways; its concentration can change through removal of contaminated fractions, moisture changes and mass transfer. Chronic exposure and renal effects underpin major health-based assessments. [2,7,8,11]

Emerging or context-dependent evidence: particular washing, leaching, soil-management and formulation interventions can reduce cadmium in some matrices, but performance and side effects vary with conditions. Published cacao and rice research should not be extrapolated without validation. [11–14]

Expert interpretation: the best default industrial strategy is source-controlled procurement supported by process mass balance and risk-based analytical verification. This is a reasoned recommendation, not a new regulatory mandate.

Hypothesis and research agenda: an integrated Source-to-Serving qualification model may improve decisions and reduce exposure more efficiently than isolated end-product testing. Prospective multisite validation is required before claims of predictive superiority, safety benefit or cost advantage.

23 | Conclusions: a compliant number is the end of a chain of evidence

The FDA’s October 2026 initiative is important not because cadmium is a newly discovered contaminant, but because it places category-specific targets beside a renewed emphasis on chemical-hazard controls. The agency’s own analysis shows that projected exposure reductions differ substantially by food category and that numerical achievability does not automatically equal maximal public-health benefit. [1–4]

The scientifically defensible response is to treat cadmium as a source-and-mass-transfer problem. Manufacturers should verify where the element enters, how processing redistributes it, what is actually measured in a representative lot and how the finished food contributes to dietary exposure. They should not confuse heat treatment with elemental removal, a laboratory bioaccessibility assay with legal compliance, or a draft US action level with a binding EU maximum.

For ingredient suppliers serving Spain, the EU, Great Britain and the United States, regulatory classification must precede any comparative claim. A reliable certificate is useful; a qualified source, validated process and auditable evidence chain are stronger. The research opportunity is not to rename existing removal chemistry, but to test whether integrated evidence can make contamination prevention more predictable, proportionate and economically practical.

RELATED KNOWLEDGE AREAS

Food Safety; Regulatory Affairs; Nutrition; Mineral Technologies; Processing Technologies; Biotechnology; AI & Food; Emerging Research.

REFERENCES

[1] US Food and Drug Administration. FDA Advances Closer to Zero Initiative to Safeguard Food for Children. Constituent Update, 22 October 2026. https://www.fda.gov/food/hfp-constituent-updates/fda-advances-closer-zero-initiative-safeguard-food-children

[2] US FDA. Action Levels for Cadmium in Processed Food Intended for Babies and Young Children: Draft Guidance for Industry. October 2026; 19 pages; FDA-2025-D-4023. https://www.fda.gov/media/195793/download

[3] Federal Register. Action Levels for Cadmium in Processed Food Intended for Babies and Young Children; Draft Guidance; Availability. 91 FR 66796–66797, 23 October 2026. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2026-10-23/pdf/2026-21670.pdf

[4] US FDA. Chapter 12: Control of Chemical Hazards. Hazard Analysis and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food: Draft Guidance for Industry. October 2026. https://www.fda.gov/media/195791/download

[5] European Commission. Regulation (EU) 2023/915 on maximum levels for certain contaminants in food, as amended; Annex I, section 3.2 (cadmium), notably 3.2.20; Articles 2–3. Verify the latest consolidated version and OJ amendments. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2023/915/2026-08-19/eng

[6] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2017/625 on official controls; Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 laying down general principles of food law. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2017/625/oj

[7] EFSA CONTAM Panel. Cadmium in food. EFSA Journal. 2009;7(3):980. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2009.980. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2009.980

[8] EFSA. EFSA sets lower tolerable intake level for cadmium in food. 20 March 2009; TWI 2.5 µg/kg body weight/week. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/news/efsa-sets-lower-tolerable-intake-level-cadmium-food

[9] Eklund G, Lindén A, Tallkvist J, Oskarsson A. Bioavailability of cadmium from in vitro digested infant food studied in Caco-2 cells. J Agric Food Chem. 2003;51:4168–4174. DOI: 10.1021/jf0343884. https://doi.org/10.1021/jf0343884

[10] Cámara-Martos F et al. Selenium and cadmium in bioaccessible fraction of organic weaning food: risk assessment and influence of dietary components. J Trace Elem Med Biol. 2019;56:116–123. DOI: 10.1016/j.jtemb.2019.08.004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtemb.2019.08.004

[11] Xia W et al. Rice and heavy metals: a review of cadmium impact and potential remediation techniques. Sci Total Environ. 2024;957:177403. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.177403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2024.177403

[12] Mabagala FS et al. A review of amendments for simultaneously reducing Cd and As availability in paddy soils and rice grain based on meta-analysis. J Environ Manage. 2024;366:121661. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.121661. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.121661

[13] Dekeyrel J et al. Soaking cacao beans in water after fermentation can reduce the concentrations of cadmium and nickel in cacao products. Food Chem. 2025;493:145789. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2025.145789. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2025.145789

[14] Hajeb P et al. Toxic elements in food: occurrence, binding, and reduction approaches. Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf. 2014;13:457–472. DOI: 10.1111/1541-4337.12068. https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12068

[15] UK Committee on Toxicity. Statement on potential risks from cadmium in the diet of infants aged 0–12 months and children aged 1–5 years. https://cot.food.gov.uk/Statement%20on%20potential%20risks%20from%20cadmium%20in%20the%20diet%20of%20infants%20aged%200%20to%2012%20months%20and%20children%20aged%201%20to%205%20years

[16] UK Committee on Toxicity. Cadmium exposures in maternal health; discussion of UK dietary exposure and EFSA TWI. https://cot.food.gov.uk/Cadmium%20exposures%20in%20maternal%20health

[17] UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. UK–EU SPS Agreement: Legislation in Scope. 9 March 2026. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-eu-sps-agreement-legislation-in-scope

[18] China patent CN115316594B. Rice cadmium removing method; prior art date 24 January 2022; published 12 March 2024. Patent disclosure, not efficacy validation or freedom-to-operate opinion. https://patents.google.com/patent/CN115316594B/en

[19] US FDA. Closer to Zero: Reducing Childhood Exposure to Heavy Metals from Foods. Programme status updated October 2026. https://www.fda.gov/food/environmental-contaminants-food/closer-zero-reducing-childhood-exposure-heavy-metals-foods

[20] US FDA. Guidance for Industry: Action Levels for Lead in Processed Food Intended for Babies and Young Children. Final, January 2025; separate from the cadmium proposal. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/guidance-industry-action-levels-lead-processed-food-intended-babies-and-young-children

[21] US FDA. 21 CFR Part 117: Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-B/part-117

[22] US FDA. 21 CFR 109.6: Tolerances for unavoidable contaminants in food and food-packaging materials. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-B/part-109/section-109.6

[23] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 178/2002; food safety, operator responsibility, traceability and withdrawal. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2002/178/oj

[24] US FDA. Action Levels for Cadmium in Processed Food Intended for Babies and Young Children: Draft Guidance landing page (noting a date inconsistency with Federal Register as checked 30 October 2026). https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/action-levels-cadmium-processed-food-intended-babies-and-young-children-draft-guidance-industry

© 2026 José M. López · All rights reserved.