

NMN at the Regulatory Threshold: When a ‘Longevity’ Ingredient Becomes a Novel Food - but Not an Anti-Ageing Claim

Europe’s draft authorisation of beta-nicotinamide mononucleotide exposes the widening gap between biochemical plausibility, supplement regulation and clinically proven benefit

José M. López, BSc, MD, PhD, LLD (C)

October 2026

Abstract

Beta-nicotinamide mononucleotide (beta-NMN) is approaching a decisive European regulatory milestone. EFSA concluded in 2026 that a chemically synthesised beta-NMN ingredient is safe at up to 300 mg/day for adults, excluding pregnant and lactating women, and is a bioavailable source of nicotinamide. In September, the European Commission submitted a draft implementing act to the Novel Food committee to authorise that ingredient under Regulation (EU) 2015/2283. Yet this is not an EU endorsement of NMN as an anti-ageing intervention. Human trials consistently show that oral NMN can alter NAD-related biomarkers, while evidence for broad metabolic, functional or longevity benefits remains limited, heterogeneous and short-term. The regulatory contrast is striking: the United States now treats NMN as eligible for dietary-supplement use subject to applicable NDI rules; Great Britain still has an application in risk assessment; Australia permits NMN in listed medicines under tightly specified conditions. This article argues that NMN is a model case for a new nutraceutical discipline under a new set of differentiated parameters, separating molecular mechanism, nutritional safety, clinical efficacy, legal market access and permissible claims before they are collapsed into a single marketing narrative.

Keywords: *beta-nicotinamide mononucleotide; NMN; NAD+; novel food; food supplements; longevity; niacin; regulatory science*

1. Why NMN Is the Right Test Case for Modern Nutraceutical Regulation

Few ingredients illustrate the collision between molecular biology, consumer enthusiasm and regulatory law as clearly as beta-nicotinamide mononucleotide (beta-NMN).

NMN is an endogenous nucleotide and a precursor in the biosynthesis of nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NAD⁺), a coenzyme central to redox metabolism and to multiple signalling systems involving sirtuins, PARPs and other NAD-consuming enzymes. Age-associated changes in NAD metabolism have made the NAD pathway a major target in geroscience. That biochemical rationale has generated a global consumer market in which NMN is frequently discussed using the vocabulary of “longevity”, “cellular energy”, “healthy ageing”, “metabolic rejuvenation” and NAD restoration. The regulatory evidence, however, is more restrained.

On 11 May 2026, EFSA published its scientific opinion on a specific chemically synthesised beta-NMN ingredient. The Panel concluded that the novel food is safe under the proposed conditions of use - up to 300 mg/day in food supplements for adults, excluding pregnant and lactating women - and that it constitutes a bioavailable source of nicotinamide, a form of niacin.

On 10 September 2026, the European Commission submitted a draft implementing act to the Standing Committee procedure proposing authorisation of beta-NMN and amendment of the Union list of novel foods. The relevant committee meeting was scheduled for 24 September. At the time of writing, the Commission’s public Comitology Register still identifies the measure as a draft implementing act submitted to committee rather than as a final published authorisation.

That procedural distinction is critical. EFSA performs scientific risk assessment; the Commission and Member States manage market authorisation. A positive EFSA opinion is not itself permission to place the ingredient on the EU market.

NMN therefore sits at an unusually revealing point: scientifically plausible, biologically active, commercially popular, increasingly supported by short-term human safety data, but still surrounded by much stronger efficacy narratives than the clinical evidence can presently sustain.

2. What EFSA Actually Concluded - and What It Did Not

The EFSA opinion is more interesting than the shorthand “NMN is safe”.

The assessed novel food consists of chemically synthesised beta-NMN. EFSA evaluated identity, manufacturing, composition, specifications, stability, toxicology, human evidence and nutritional implications. The intended maximum use was 300 mg/day in supplements for adults, excluding pregnant and lactating women. EFSA also addressed a second regulatory question: whether NMN can act as a source of niacin under the food-supplement framework. A human intervention study comparing beta-NMN and nicotinamide supported a conversion factor of 1 on an equimolar basis. At 300 mg NMN/day, the corresponding nicotinamide exposure was calculated at approximately 109.7 mg/day. EFSA considered that exposure below the established adult upper level for nicotinamide. This is a safety and bioavailability conclusion.

It is not a conclusion that 300 mg/day slows ageing, improves lifespan, prevents age-related disease, reverses mitochondrial dysfunction, enhances cognition or produces clinically meaningful metabolic rejuvenation. That boundary should be explicit in every scientifically responsible discussion of the ingredient. A molecule can be safe enough to consume without being clinically effective for the outcomes used to market it. It can raise a biomarker without improving a patient-centred endpoint. And it can be nutritionally bioavailable without qualifying for an anti-ageing health claim.

These are separate evidentiary questions.

3. The Most Important Regulatory Development Happened in September

The strongest current signal is not the May EFSA opinion itself but the movement from risk assessment into risk management. The European Commission's Comitology Register now contains a draft Commission Implementing Regulation authorising the placing on the market of beta-NMN as a novel food and amending Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2470. The draft was submitted to the competent committee on 10 September 2026 for the meeting of 24 September. This means the EU file has moved materially closer to market access.

However, until a final implementing regulation is adopted, published in the Official Journal and enters into force, companies should not describe beta-NMN as generally authorised for sale as a food supplement in the Union. The distinction matters commercially because products can circulate online before their legal status is settled. Market visibility is not legal authorisation.

The Commission's novel-food application register also shows multiple beta-NMN applications. That fact points toward a second issue: future market access may not be commercially symmetrical across suppliers, particularly where proprietary evidence and Article 26 data protection are involved. The proposed authorisation therefore should be read as a regulatory opening, not as the disappearance of regulatory barriers.

4. Five Questions That Marketing Commonly Collapses into One

The NMN debate becomes clearer if **five independent questions** are separated.

First: does NMN participate in NAD metabolism? Yes. That is established biochemistry.

Second: can oral NMN alter NAD-related biomarkers in humans? Human trials indicate that it can, although magnitude, kinetics and measured compartments vary.

Third: is short-term oral NMN reasonably tolerated at studied doses? The available randomised trials and the 2026 meta-analysis are broadly reassuring over short periods, but long-term evidence remains limited.

Fourth: does NMN produce clinically meaningful improvements in ageing, metabolic disease, muscle function or longevity? The evidence is not sufficient to make that general claim.

Fifth: may a company legally market a specific NMN product with a specific claim in a particular jurisdiction? That depends on ingredient status, manufacturing identity, notification or authorisation, labelling and claims law.

A scientifically weak marketing narrative often moves directly from Question 1 to Question 4: NAD is biologically important; NMN is a NAD precursor and therefore NMN slows ageing. That inference is not established by the available human evidence.

5. Human Evidence: Biomarker Success Is Not the Same as Clinical Success

Human intervention studies have provided a consistent signal that oral NMN can increase NAD-related measures.

A multicentre randomised trial in 80 middle-aged adults tested 300, 600 and 900 mg/day for 60 days and reported dose-related increases in blood NAD concentrations without identified safety problems during the study period.

A separate randomised trial in older men using 250 mg/day found increased blood NAD metabolites and some nominal functional signals, but did not establish a broad anti-ageing effect.

In 2025, a placebo-controlled trial of MIB-626, a beta-NMN formulation, administered 1 g twice daily for 14 days to hospitalised adults with COVID-19 and acute kidney injury. NMN substantially raised blood NAD⁺ and related metabolites, but changes in kidney-function markers, inflammatory markers and indices of disease severity did not differ significantly from placebo. That trial is especially instructive. It demonstrates pharmacodynamic activity while simultaneously showing why pharmacodynamic activity cannot be equated with clinical efficacy.

The most current synthesis is a 2026 systematic review and meta-analysis covering 15 randomised trials, with 10 contributing to safety analyses. Doses ranged from 250 to 2,000 mg/day and durations from 14 days to 24 weeks. The authors found no clear increase in overall or serious adverse events and no significant elevation of ALT or AST.

But broad metabolic benefits were not evident: body weight, BMI, fasting glucose, HbA1c, lipids and systolic blood pressure did not show significant overall improvement. A small reduction in diastolic blood pressure and a non-significant trend in HOMA-IR were considered preliminary signals requiring confirmation.

The evidence hierarchy therefore looks different from the marketing hierarchy. The strongest human proposition is currently that NMN can modify NAD-related biochemistry and appears reasonably tolerated in short-duration studies. The weakest proposition is that oral NMN has been demonstrated to extend human lifespan or reverse biological ageing. It has not.

6. Safety: Reassuring Short-Term Data Do Not Close the File

The current safety evidence is encouraging but should not be overinterpreted. Short-term trials have generally reported good tolerability across a wide dose range. EFSA was satisfied with the evidence package for the proposed 300 mg/day adult use of the specific novel food it assessed. The 2026 meta-analysis did not detect a clear adverse-event or hepatic-biochemistry signal. But three limitations remain.

The first is duration. Most human trials are measured in weeks or a few months. A product marketed conceptually around “longevity” is, by implication, a candidate for chronic use over years. Short-term tolerability cannot establish multi-year safety.

The second is population selection. Healthy or relatively selected trial participants do not represent all consumers, particularly people with polypharmacy, cancer histories, renal or hepatic impairment, or other chronic disease.

The third is mechanistic uncertainty. NAD metabolism is not a simple fuel gauge in which more is necessarily better. NAD-dependent pathways intersect with metabolism, DNA repair, inflammation and cell proliferation. This does not demonstrate a specific long-term hazard from NMN, but it is sufficient reason to reject simplistic “natural therefore indefinitely safe” reasoning.

The appropriate position is neither alarmism nor promotional certainty: the short-term human safety database is increasingly reassuring; the long-term database remains incomplete.

7. The EU Is Regulating NMN as a Novel Food and a Niacin Source - Not as a Longevity Drug

This distinction has major consequences for product development. Under Regulation (EU) 2015/2283, novel foods require pre-market authorisation and inclusion in the Union list before lawful placing on the EU market. EFSA’s role is risk assessment; the European Commission and Member States complete the authorisation process.

The EFSA opinion additionally evaluated NMN in the context of Directive 2002/46/EC because the applicant sought recognition of beta-NMN as a bioavailable source of niacin for food supplements. This legal architecture does not convert the ingredient into an authorised anti-ageing intervention. Any health-related communication must still comply with applicable EU food-information and nutrition/health-claims law. A novel-food authorisation answers whether the specified ingredient may be marketed under defined conditions. It does not automatically authorise claims that the ingredient slows ageing, increases longevity or prevents disease.

For manufacturers, this creates a practical rule: the regulatory dossier for market access and the evidence dossier for claims are related but distinct assets. A company can possess one and lack the other.

8. Data Protection Could Shape the First European Market

The EU Novel Food Regulation permits protection of proprietary scientific evidence under defined conditions. EFSA’s opinion records that the applicant requested data protection, and the Commission draft concerns a defined ingredient and applicant.

If the final act grants protected market access on the proposed basis, the first commercial phase may not function as a generic opening for every chemically similar NMN supplier. This is strategically important for distributors.

The relevant question is not simply “is NMN authorised?” but “does our exact material fall within the authorisation, specifications and commercial rights that permit us to rely on that authorisation?” Novel-food compliance is ingredient-specific. Manufacturing route, purity, specifications and protected evidence can matter. This resembles a recurring pattern in modern food biotechnology: molecular identity alone does not always establish regulatory interchangeability.

9. United States: Lawful Supplement Status Does Not Mean FDA Approval

The US history of NMN is unusually complex. Let’s see:

FDA previously took the position that NMN was excluded from the dietary-supplement definition because of the statutory drug-exclusion provision. In September 2025, the agency reversed that interpretation and concluded that NMN is not excluded from the dietary-supplement definition, based on evidence of prior supplement marketing. The practical result is that NMN can participate in the dietary-supplement framework rather than being categorically excluded by the drug-preclusion rule. But **three** qualifications are essential.

First, this does not make NMN an FDA-approved drug.

Second, dietary supplements are not pre-approved for efficacy in the manner of pharmaceuticals.

Third, New Dietary Ingredient requirements remain relevant. FDA’s public NDIN register shows post-reversal NMN-related notifications, including a reduced beta-NMN calcium salt notification in 2026. A notification and FDA response are not equivalent to drug approval.

The US and EU therefore reach market access through structurally different systems. The United States can permit supplement marketing through the dietary-supplement framework, subject to NDI and other requirements, while the EU requires novel-food authorisation before placing a novel ingredient on the food market. Neither system, however, turns legal supplement status into proof of longevity efficacy.

10. Great Britain: Still in Risk Assessment

Great Britain provides a useful third regulatory state.

The Food Standards Agency’s regulated-product register lists EffePharm’s beta-NMN novel-food application, RP-2116, as in progress and currently in the risk-assessment phase. That means a positive EU EFSA opinion does not automatically create GB authorisation after Brexit. Companies planning parallel EU and GB launches therefore need separate regulatory timelines. The scientific dossier may overlap substantially, but the legal decision pathway does not.

This is precisely the type of divergence that can be missed when regulatory teams use “Europe” as a single commercial category.

11. Australia: A Different Category, a Different Dose and a Different Claims Logic

Australia illustrates how dramatically the same molecule can be regulated when placed in another legal category.

The Therapeutic Goods Administration included NMN in the Therapeutic Goods (Permissible Ingredients) Determination from 10 December 2025 for use in listed medicines, subject to specific conditions. These include oral administration, a maximum recommended daily dose of 500 mg, a recommended duration of use no longer than 12 weeks, use in adults only, and exclusion of pregnant or lactating women. Sponsor-specific conditions apply until December 2027.

TGA guidance published in August 2026 is equally revealing about claims. It states that there are currently no permitted indications that directly reference NAD, NAD⁺, NADH or NMN, and it gives examples of presentations that could improperly imply anti-ageing or longevity uses.

Australia therefore permits NMN under a therapeutic-goods framework while simultaneously constraining how the ingredient can be presented. This is a powerful reminder that dose, category, claims and market access are jurisdiction-specific variables. A “global NMN product” is not a single regulatory object.

12. The Claims Problem: ‘Raises NAD’ Is Not ‘Extends Life’

The most important commercial risk may ultimately be language. A biomarker claim can sound like a clinical outcome to consumers. “Supports NAD⁺” or “raises NAD⁺” may be interpreted within a wider narrative of rejuvenation, mitochondrial restoration or lifespan extension even where the evidence supports only a biochemical change. This is not merely a legal drafting problem. It is an epistemic problem.

NAD⁺ is a mechanistically important molecule, but ageing is a multi-system biological process. Changing one intermediate biomarker does not establish a net effect on morbidity, disability or lifespan. The history of nutrition and pharmacology contains many examples in which favourable movement in a surrogate endpoint did not translate into the expected clinical benefit. Responsible NMN communication should therefore distinguish at least four levels:

- mechanism: NMN is a precursor in NAD biosynthesis;
- pharmacodynamic effect: oral NMN can alter NAD-related biomarkers;
- functional effect: some small trials report selected physiological signals;
- clinical outcome: robust evidence for disease prevention, lifespan extension or reversal of ageing is not established.

Collapsing these levels is scientifically practically indefensible and commercially fragile.

13. Product Quality May Become the Next Major Issue

As regulatory access improves, attention will move from “can NMN be sold?” to “what exactly is being sold?”

NMN is chemically sensitive enough that identity, stereochemistry, purity, water content, degradation, storage and impurity control matter. Different manufacturing routes can generate different impurity profiles. Australia’s TGA compositional guideline provides a useful example of how detailed this can become. It specifies identity tests, assay limits, residual solvents, elemental impurities, related substances and microbiological criteria for the permitted ingredient.

The EU novel-food approach similarly ties authorisation to defined specifications.

For industry, the lesson is clear: high-purity headline claims are insufficient. A defensible NMN raw-material programme should address identity, beta-anomer specificity, assay, related compounds, elemental impurities, residual solvents, microbiology, stability and batch-to-batch consistency. If the European market opens, supplier qualification will become a differentiator rather than an administrative exercise.

14. Research & Innovation Opportunity

From NAD Biomarkers to a Clinically Meaningful Response Map

Unresolved problem. NMN studies demonstrate biochemical activity more consistently than clinically meaningful benefit. The field lacks a validated map connecting dose, exposure, NAD-related biomarker change, tissue response and patient-relevant outcomes.

Why it matters. Without that map, product development risks optimising for an easily measurable biomarker rather than a meaningful physiological effect.

What is already known. Oral NMN can increase NAD-related measures in humans; short-term tolerability is broadly reassuring; several small trials report selected functional or metabolic signals.

What remains unknown. It remains unclear which populations, if any, derive reproducible clinically meaningful benefit; what biomarker magnitude is necessary; whether effects plateau; how tissue-specific responses differ; and what happens during long-term exposure.

Proposed hypothesis. NMN benefit, if clinically meaningful, is unlikely to be uniform across healthy consumers. It may depend on baseline NAD metabolism, age, metabolic phenotype, renal function, inflammatory state, diet and microbiome-associated metabolism.

Development pathway. A stratified programme should combine pharmacokinetics, NAD metabolomics, clinical phenotyping and pre-specified functional endpoints. Participants should be stratified by baseline metabolic and NAD-related status rather than analysed only as a single heterogeneous population.

Key validation steps. Standardise NAD metabolite measurement; establish inter-laboratory reproducibility; define minimally meaningful changes in functional endpoints; extend follow-up beyond current trial durations; investigate dose-response and discontinuation; and prospectively register clinically relevant outcomes.

Regulatory constraints. A research programme showing efficacy would not automatically create an authorised food health claim. In the EU, claims would require separate compliance with the applicable claims framework. Disease-treatment claims could shift the product toward medicinal-product law.

Industrial relevance. The result could move NMN development away from generic “anti-ageing” positioning toward evidence-defined subpopulations and measurable functions.

This is a proposed research agenda, not an established clinical use.

15. Research & Innovation Opportunity: Regulatory-Grade NMN Fingerprinting

A second white space concerns material equivalence. The global NMN market includes chemically synthesised and enzymatically produced materials, multiple suppliers and increasingly sophisticated formulations. Yet regulatory decisions attach to defined ingredients and specifications.

A useful industrial platform would create a regulatory-grade fingerprint combining stereochemical identity, quantitative purity, related-substance profile, residual processing markers, elemental impurities, water activity, stability kinetics and degradation products. The purpose would be to answer a practical question: when are two commercial NMN materials genuinely equivalent for safety, stability and regulatory purposes?

High-resolution LC-MS, NMR, ion chromatography and stability modelling could be integrated with chemometric batch comparison. A digital change-control layer could then flag drift from the authorised or notified reference profile. Such a platform would be especially valuable for distributors sourcing across jurisdictions, because “NMN 99%” does not by itself demonstrate equivalence to an authorised novel-food specification or an NDI-notified material. Again, this is a proposed quality and regulatory-science framework, not a current legal requirement.

16. Practical Implications for the Nutraceutical Industry

The emerging NMN market should be approached with more discipline than the first wave of longevity marketing often displayed. Ingredient suppliers should maintain jurisdiction-specific regulatory files rather than rely on a global status statement.

Finished-product manufacturers should verify that the exact raw material is covered by the relevant authorisation, notification or sponsor arrangement. Quality teams should establish stability-indicating specifications, not merely incoming purity tests.

Marketing teams should separate mechanism, biomarker evidence and clinical outcomes, and Regulatory teams should review anti-ageing, longevity, disease-risk and NAD-related wording before launch rather than after advertising is developed.

Commercial teams should recognise that the EU's potential opening may initially be applicant- and data-specific. R&D teams should prioritise long-duration human evidence and clinically meaningful endpoints over additional small trials designed primarily to show that NAD biomarkers rise.

17. Implications for INTABIOTECH

For INTABIOTECH, the most relevant opportunity is not necessarily immediate entry into NMN manufacturing and distribution. The more durable opportunity lies in the **regulatory and technical architecture surrounding next-generation nutraceutical ingredients**.

NMN exemplifies a category in which value depends on four linked capabilities: sourcing a chemically well-defined ingredient; proving regulatory eligibility in the target jurisdiction; building quality evidence around the actual commercial material; and communicating benefits without exceeding the evidence. That same architecture applies to many emerging functional ingredients, fermentation-derived actives, botanical compounds and metabolic precursors.

A strong position would therefore be to develop an internal “evidence-to-market” framework that scores candidate nutraceuticals across regulatory maturity, analytical controllability, human evidence, claims latitude, supply-chain defensibility and intellectual-property/data-protection constraints.

This would allow commercial attractiveness to be evaluated before investment rather than after a product has already been selected. NMN is a useful prototype because it demonstrates that a scientifically fashionable ingredient can be simultaneously promising, legally complex and clinically over-narrated.

18. A Proposed Evidence-to-Market Matrix

A practical decision matrix for emerging nutraceutical ingredients should contain at least six axes.

Regulatory maturity. Is the ingredient authorised, notified, under assessment or prohibited in the target market?

Material definition. Is the commercial material demonstrably equivalent to the material assessed by the authority?

Safety maturity. Are data limited to short-term tolerability or do they include chronic exposure and vulnerable populations?

Efficacy maturity. Is the evidence mechanistic, biomarker-based, functional or clinical?

Claims latitude. What can legally be said on-pack, online and in professional communication?

Commercial defensibility. Is market access protected by proprietary data, patents, sponsor arrangements or supplier-specific specifications?

An ingredient with excellent mechanistic science but poor claims latitude and uncertain regulatory status may be commercially weaker than a less fashionable ingredient with robust human evidence and clear legal positioning. This is the kind of distinction that separates trend-following from technical product strategy.

19. What Industry Should Not Say

Several formulations should be treated with caution unless a jurisdiction-specific legal and evidentiary review supports them.

“EFSA approved NMN for anti-ageing” is incorrect. EFSA issued a safety opinion; it did not authorise an anti-ageing indication.

“NMN is now authorised throughout Europe” is premature while the EU implementing act remains at draft/comitology stage and Great Britain continues its separate assessment.

“NMN reverses ageing” is not supported by human outcome evidence.

“NMN is proven to extend lifespan” is not supported by human trials.

“FDA approved NMN” is misleading. FDA’s dietary-supplement position is not drug approval.

“500 mg is the safe global dose” is incorrect. Australia’s 500 mg listed-medicine limit, the EU applicant’s 300 mg/day proposed use and doses used in clinical research arise from different legal and scientific contexts.

Precision in language is not conservative marketing. It is durable marketing.

20. Conclusions

NMN is approaching a regulatory inflection point in Europe. EFSA has concluded that a specific chemically synthesised beta-NMN is safe at up to 300 mg/day for adults excluding pregnant and lactating women and is a bioavailable source of nicotinamide. The European Commission has advanced a draft implementing act toward novel-food authorisation.

That is important, but it is not the scientific conclusion most commonly implied by the longevity market. The strongest human evidence shows biochemical activity: oral NMN can alter NAD-related biomarkers. Short-term tolerability is increasingly supported. Evidence for broad metabolic benefit is inconsistent, and evidence that NMN extends human lifespan or reverses ageing is absent.

The regulatory comparison is equally instructive. The EU is moving through novel-food authorisation; Great Britain remains in risk assessment; the United States permits NMN within the dietary-supplement framework subject to applicable requirements; Australia permits defined NMN use in listed medicines with dose, duration, population and sponsor restrictions.

The same molecule therefore occupies different legal identities in different markets. The broader lesson reaches well beyond NMN. The next generation of nutraceutical innovation will require companies to keep five propositions separate: mechanistic plausibility, material quality, safety, clinical efficacy and legal claims.

When those propositions are collapsed into one, **science becomes marketing**. When they are kept distinct and then deliberately connected by evidence, **nutraceutical development becomes regulatory science**.

Related Knowledge Areas

Nutrition & Nutraceuticals - NAD metabolism, metabolic precursors and evidence-based supplement development. Regulatory Affairs - novel-food authorisation, NDI requirements, claims and cross-jurisdictional market access. Biotechnology - manufacturing-route identity and analytical comparability of high-purity bioactive ingredients. AI & Food - evidence surveillance and regulatory-status monitoring for fast-moving nutraceutical ingredients. Functional Ingredients - translation from molecular mechanism to validated consumer benefit. Emerging Research - stratified NAD biology, long-term safety and clinically meaningful response phenotyping.

References

1. EFSA Panel on Nutrition, Novel Foods and Food Allergens (NDA). Safety of beta-nicotinamide mononucleotide (beta-NMN) pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 and the bioavailability of nicotinamide from this source in the context of Directive 2002/46/EC. *EFSA Journal*. 2026;24(5):e10007. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2026.10007. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2026.10007>
2. European Commission. Draft Commission Implementing Regulation authorising the placing on the market of beta-nicotinamide mononucleotide (beta-NMN) as a novel food and amending Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2470. Comitology document D118035/01, submitted 10 September 2026. <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/comitology-register/screen/documents/118035/1>
3. European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 on novel foods. *Official Journal of the European Union*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2015/2283/oj>
4. European Commission. Summary of applications and notifications under the Novel Food Regulation. 2026. https://food.ec.europa.eu/food-safety/novel-food/authorisations/summary-applications-and-notifications_en
5. European Commission. Consultation process on novel food status - Nicotinamide mononucleotide. 2026. https://food.ec.europa.eu/food-safety/novel-food/consultation-process-novel-food-status_en
6. Food Standards Agency. Regulated product application RP-2116: beta-Nicotinamide Mononucleotide. Application in progress, risk assessment. 2026. <https://data.food.gov.uk/regulated-product-applications/products-list/RP-2116>
7. Therapeutic Goods Administration. NAD, NAD+, NADH or NMN medicines sold in Australia. Updated 3 February 2026. <https://www.tga.gov.au/safety/about-market-actions/product-alert-market-actions/nad-nad-nadh-or-nmn-medicines-sold-australia>
8. Therapeutic Goods Administration. Making NAD, NAD+, NADH or NMN representations for listed medicines. Published 12 August 2026. <https://www.tga.gov.au/resources/guidance/making-nad-nad-nadh-or-nmn-representations-listed-medicines>
9. Therapeutic Goods Administration. Nicotinamide mononucleotide - compositional guideline. 2026. <https://www.tga.gov.au/resources/resources/compositional-guidelines/nicotinamide-monomonucleotide>
10. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Submitted 75-Day Premarket Notifications for New Dietary Ingredients. Updated 2026. <https://www.fda.gov/food/new-dietary-ingredient-ndi-notification-process/submitted-75-day-premarket-notifications-new-dietary-ingredients>
11. Yi L, Maier AB, Tao R, et al. The efficacy and safety of beta-nicotinamide mononucleotide (NMN) supplementation in healthy middle-aged adults: a randomized, multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, dose-dependent clinical trial. *GeroScience*. 2023;45:29-43. doi:10.1007/s11357-022-00705-1.
12. Igarashi M, Miura M, Williams E, et al. Chronic nicotinamide mononucleotide supplementation elevates blood nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide levels and alters muscle function in healthy older men. *npj Aging*. 2022;8:5. doi:10.1038/s41514-022-00084-z.
13. Pencina KM, Leaf DE, et al. Oral MIB-626 (beta Nicotinamide Mononucleotide) Safely Raises Blood Nicotinamide Adenine Dinucleotide Levels in Hospitalized Patients With COVID-19 and Acute Kidney Injury: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *FASEB BioAdvances*. 2025;7:e70011. doi:10.1096/fba.2025-00014.
14. Safety and Metabolism-Related Outcomes of Oral Nicotinamide Mononucleotide Supplementation in Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Nutrients*. 2026;18(14):2251. <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6643/18/14/2251>
15. Prokopidis K, et al. The Effect of Nicotinamide Mononucleotide and Riboside on Skeletal Muscle Mass and Function: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle*. 2025;16:e13799. doi:10.1002/jcsm.13799.

16. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Dietary Supplements - New Dietary Ingredient Notification Process.

<https://www.fda.gov/food/dietary-supplements/new-dietary-ingredient-ndi-notification-process>

17. European Parliament and Council. Directive 2002/46/EC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to food supplements. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2002/46/oj>

© 2026 José M. López · All rights reserved.