What Does the Food Dye Ban Mean for Consumers

Understanding the Impact on Your Plate and Health

Introduction

> The food industry is continuously evolving, with increasing scrutiny on the ingredients used in processed foods. A significant area of concern revolves around artificial food dyes, which have raised questions about their potential impact on health. As a result, there's a growing movement advocating for a food dye ban, aiming to eliminate these synthetic additives from our diets. This article delves into what a food dye ban means for consumers, exploring the implications for our plates and overall health, while navigating the shifting landscape of food regulations.

The Shifting Landscape of Food Regulations

Food regulations are constantly changing, influenced by new scientific findings, increased consumer awareness, and demands for safer and more transparent food options [1]. These changes, especially concerning ingredients like artificial food dyes, spark debate as they balance innovation and affordability in food production with public health and well-being. The potential ban on artificial food dyes could force manufacturers to reformulate products, seek natural alternatives, and modify marketing strategies, impacting the entire food supply chain [2].

Consumer advocacy groups play a vital role in this dynamic system. They monitor industry practices, inform the public, and push for stricter regulations. Their work is crucial in highlighting potential health risks and ensuring food companies are accountable for their claims [3]. By providing consumers with information and resources, these groups empower individuals to make informed dietary choices, pressuring regulatory bodies to re-evaluate and update existing standards [4].

Understanding the reasons behind these regulatory shifts is essential for consumers to become active participants in shaping the food landscape. Knowing the risks of certain ingredients, the science behind regulations, and the role of advocacy groups enables consumers to make choices that align with their values and health goals [5]. This understanding fosters a sense of control over one's diet, promoting a more health-conscious society.

While a "food ban" may seem drastic, it's a calculated response when potential risks outweigh benefits, reserved for cases with strong scientific evidence of a significant public health threat [6]. Though bans can disrupt industries and consumer choices, their primary goal is to protect public health, based on extensive research and expert consultation.

Economic factors also greatly influence food regulations. The cost of implementing new standards, the impact on trade, and the competitiveness of the food industry are all carefully considered [7]. A ban on a widely used dye could significantly affect manufacturers producing affordable products. Balancing public health with minimal economic disruption requires careful evaluation of all stakeholders [8].

What Does the Food Dye Ban Mean for Consumers

Decoding Artificial Food Colors: A Closer Look

Artificial food colors are widespread in modern diets, enhancing the visual appeal of processed foods and drinks [9]. Manufacturers know that color influences taste perception and purchasing decisions. However, these colors are often derived from petroleum and other chemicals, raising concerns about their potential long-term health effects [10]. The fact that a vibrant color may come from the same source as gasoline can be unsettling to consumers.

The debate around artificial food colors is complex, with ongoing research into their health impacts. A major concern is the potential link between certain dyes and hyperactivity in children [11]. While scientific evidence is debated, studies suggest a correlation, leading parents and advocacy groups to push for stricter regulations and labeling [12]. Hyperactivity is complex with many factors, but the possibility of exacerbating symptoms warrants caution. The European Union requires warning labels on products with certain dyes, stating they "may have an adverse effect on activity and attention in children" [13].

Many countries have stricter regulations on artificial food colors than the United States, reflecting different interpretations of scientific evidence and public concern [14]. Some countries have banned dyes, while others have stricter labeling or lower allowable levels [15]. This highlights the need for continuous evaluation and consumer awareness.

Fortunately, safer alternatives exist in the form of natural food colorings from fruits, vegetables, and spices [16]. Beet juice provides red, turmeric gives yellow, and spinach extract offers green. These natural colorings can also provide nutritional benefits like antioxidants and vitamins. However, they can be more expensive and less stable than

artificial colors and may impart a slight flavor to the product [17].

The decision to use artificial or natural food colors depends on cost, consumer preference, and perceived risk [18]. Manufacturers must weigh cost savings against potential negative publicity. Some consumers accept artificial colors for lower prices, while others pay more for additive-free products [19].

Ultimately, consumers have the power to choose. Ingredient lists provide information about artificial food colors, enabling informed decisions based on personal preferences and health concerns [20]. Look for names like "FD&C Yellow No. 5" or "Red 40". Educating oneself and advocating for transparency are crucial for a healthier food system [21].

The Implications of a Food Dye Ban

A food dye ban would significantly reshape the food industry, affecting manufacturers, retailers, and consumers. Food producers would need to reformulate products, as many items rely on artificial colors for visual appeal [22]. Removing dyes requires research and development to find alternatives or adapt recipes to maintain appearance, texture, and flavor, representing a significant investment for companies [23].

The financial burden of reformulation is likely to affect consumers. Increased production costs from research, sourcing, and manufacturing adjustments are often passed on as higher prices [24]. Consumers may face a trade-off between cheaper, artificially colored products and more expensive, naturally colored ones [25].

Beyond price, a ban would alter the availability and variety of foods. The wide spectrum of colors, largely from artificial dyes, might be reduced [26]. Some hues, like intense blues and greens, are hard to replicate naturally, potentially impacting consumer choices, especially among children [27]. While some see this as healthier, others may miss familiar,

vibrant products.

However, a food dye ban can also drive innovation in the food industry. The challenge of replacing artificial colors with natural alternatives would spur research into new pigment sources and processing techniques [28]. This could lead to healthier ways to color foods, using extracts from fruits, vegetables, and plants. For instance, beet juice can provide red, while spirulina can create blue and green [29]. This shift could improve the nutritional profile of processed foods and create market opportunities for natural ingredient producers [30].

One of the most significant long-term benefits is the potential to improve consumer perception of food quality and safety. Removing dyes could increase trust in food manufacturers and consumer confidence in the safety and nutritional value of processed foods [31]. This enhanced trust could increase sales and brand loyalty for companies embracing natural alternatives.

The impact on the processed food industry cannot be overstated. Companies heavily reliant on artificial colors would need to invest in research and development to identify replacements [32]. This process could be challenging for smaller businesses, potentially leading to industry consolidation. Furthermore, companies may need to adjust marketing to emphasize the benefits of natural colorings and address consumer concerns about changes in product appearance or taste [33].

Finally, a food dye ban may serve as a broader catalyst, pushing food producers towards more comprehensive "healthy eating" practices [34]. By removing potentially harmful artificial ingredients, companies may be more inclined to reformulate products with other beneficial changes, such as reducing sugar content, adding fiber, or incorporating more whole grains. This holistic approach could lead to a healthier and more sustainable food system [35].

Navigating the Grocery Store: Making Informed Choices

The impending food dye ban places renewed emphasis on the consumer's role in navigating the complexities of the modern grocery store. Making informed choices requires a vigilant approach, ensuring your food contributes to your overall health and well-being [36]. This section equips you with the knowledge and strategies to confidently navigate aisles and make choices aligned with your health goals in a post-dye world.

One of the most crucial steps is diligently reading food labels [37]. Beyond calorie counts, ingredient lists are essential for identifying artificial food colors and other harmful additives that might still be present. Manufacturers often use alternative names or complex terms for these substances, so familiarizing yourself with common aliases for artificial ingredients is beneficial. Resources like the Center for Science in the Public Interest (CSPI) provide guides to decoding ingredient lists [38]. Remember, ingredients are ordered by weight, so those appearing earlier are present in larger quantities. Label reading is the first defense in protecting yourself from unwanted artificial substances [39].

A simple strategy for minimizing exposure to artificial ingredients is to opt for whole, unprocessed foods whenever possible [40]. Fresh fruits, vegetables, lean proteins, and whole grains are naturally vibrant and flavorful without artificial enhancements. Building meals around these ingredients reduces reliance on processed foods laden with additives [41]. Consider fresh berries on yogurt instead of fruit-flavored yogurt with artificial colors and flavors. Preparing sauces and dressings from scratch allows you to control ingredients and avoid artificial colors and preservatives in store-bought versions [42]. Consciously shifting to whole, unprocessed foods decreases your intake of artificial additives.

Another effective way to promote healthier food options is to actively support brands that prioritize natural and organic ingredients [43]. Choosing products from companies committed to transparency and clean labeling sends a clear message that consumers value health and quality. Look for certifications like "USDA Organic" or "Non-GMO Project Verified," which indicate specific standards for natural and sustainable production practices [44]. Supporting these brands provides healthier choices and encourages other manufacturers to adopt similar practices, ultimately leading to a wider availability of healthier food options. Every purchase is a vote, and by supporting brands that align with your values, you contribute to a food system that prioritizes health and well-being [45].

Understanding the potential risks associated with artificial food colors empowers consumers to make informed decisions about their diets [46]. While a food dye ban eliminates some concerning colors, it’s crucial to remain aware of the ongoing research and potential long-term effects of food additives. For example, some studies suggest a link between certain food dyes and hyperactivity in children, while others raise concerns about potential allergic reactions [47]. By staying informed about the latest research and understanding your own sensitivities, you can make informed choices that best suit your individual needs and health goals [48].

Finally, exploring alternative recipes and cooking methods can significantly reduce your reliance on processed foods and artificial additives [49]. Cooking from scratch allows you to control every ingredient, ensuring they are free from unwanted artificial colors and other harmful substances. Experiment with natural food coloring alternatives like beet juice for red, turmeric for yellow, and spinach juice for green. Numerous online resources and cookbooks offer creative and delicious recipes that prioritize natural ingredients and minimize the need for processed foods [50]. Embracing home cooking not only allows you to eat healthier but also fosters a greater appreciation for the art of food preparation and the flavors of natural ingredients. In conclusion, understanding ingredient lists empowers

consumers to participate actively in 'food safety' measures for themselves and their families, leading to healthier and more fulfilling lives [51].

Food Safety: A Shared Responsibility

Ensuring food safety is a shared responsibility between governments, manufacturers, and consumers. The proposed food dye ban highlights the necessity for each stakeholder to actively participate in maintaining a safe food system [52]. The government, as the primary regulator, establishes and enforces stringent food safety standards, including regulations governing artificial food dyes. Agencies use scientific research and public health data to set acceptable limits for additives, monitor production, and hold manufacturers accountable for safety protocols [53]. The FDA in the United States and the EFSA in Europe conduct risk assessments before approving food additives, considering potential health risks, exposure levels, and vulnerable populations [54]. When concerns arise, these agencies can re-evaluate policies and implement bans or restrictions to protect public health [55].

Food manufacturers bear a direct responsibility to prioritize consumer health and safety in product development and production. This extends beyond compliance with government regulations to include a commitment to ethical sourcing, transparent labeling, and continuous improvement in safety practices [56]. Companies must invest in quality control, conduct testing of ingredients and finished products, and proactively address safety concerns. A responsible food manufacturer, upon learning of potential adverse effects of a specific dye, would comply with a ban and seek safer, natural alternatives or reformulate products entirely [57]. They would also communicate openly with consumers about changes, fostering trust. Product recalls due to contamination or mislabeling serve as a stark reminder of the consequences of neglecting this responsibility [58].

Consumers also have a vital role in ensuring food safety. This involves more than purchasing food from reputable sources; it requires practicing proper food handling techniques, being aware of potential foodborne illnesses, and reporting any concerns or adverse reactions. Simple steps like washing hands, cooking meat to the proper temperature, and storing leftovers correctly can reduce the risk of food poisoning [59]. Furthermore, consumers should carefully read food labels, paying attention to ingredient lists, allergen information, and expiration dates. Reporting adverse reactions or suspected contamination to authorities is crucial for identifying and addressing potential safety issues [60]. The more focus on food safety, the more likely problems are detected and prevented before they escalate [61].

Transparency and open communication between government, manufacturers, and consumers are essential for maintaining public trust in the food system [62]. When information is readily available and easily understood, consumers are empowered to make informed choices. This includes clear labeling of ingredients, prompt communication about safety concerns, and open access to scientific research and regulatory data. Building trust requires a willingness to engage in constructive dialogue and address consumer concerns [63].

Finally, continuous research and monitoring are necessary to identify potential food safety risks and develop effective preventative measures [64]. This includes ongoing studies on the potential health effects of food additives, monitoring foodborne illness outbreaks, and developing new technologies for detecting and preventing contamination. It also means staying abreast of emerging trends in food production and consumption, such as plant-based alternatives and imported foods [65]. Moreover, promoting healthy eating through education and access to nutritious foods is a vital component of overall public health. Encouraging consumers to choose whole, unprocessed foods and to limit their intake of foods high in sugar, salt, and unhealthy fats can not only improve their health but also

reduce their exposure to potentially harmful additives [66].

The Future of Food Colorings

The evolving landscape of food regulations, exemplified by the "food dye ban" movement, signals a shift towards a future where transparency, sustainability, and consumer health take precedence in the food coloring industry [67]. As concerns regarding the potential health impacts of artificial food colors intensify, ongoing research is becoming increasingly vital in identifying new and sustainable sources of natural food colorings. This search extends beyond commonly used plant-based extracts like beet juice or turmeric, exploring novel sources such as algae, fungi, and even waste products from other food processing streams [68]. Imagine a world where vibrant blues and greens are derived not from synthetic chemicals, but from spirulina cultivated in an environmentally friendly manner, or where discarded fruit peels are repurposed to create safe and appealing yellows and oranges. These innovations not only address health concerns but also contribute to a more circular and sustainable food system [69].

Furthermore, advances in biotechnology are poised to revolutionize the production of natural food colorings. Traditional extraction methods can be inefficient, costly, and environmentally demanding. Biotechnology offers the potential to engineer microorganisms, such as yeast or bacteria, to produce natural colors in a more controlled and scalable manner [70]. This process, akin to brewing beer, can yield large quantities of pure and consistent colorants, reducing the reliance on land-intensive agriculture and minimizing environmental impact. For example, researchers are exploring the use of synthetic biology to produce betalains, the pigments responsible for the vibrant colors of beets, in a more sustainable and cost-effective way. This could make natural red and purple colorings more accessible to food manufacturers, ultimately benefiting consumers with wider access to cleaner label options [71].

The driving force behind these innovations is undoubtedly the growing consumer demand for clean label products [72]. Shoppers are increasingly scrutinizing ingredient lists, seeking products free from artificial additives, preservatives, and colorings. This trend is fueled by a greater awareness of the potential health risks associated with artificial food dyes, particularly among parents concerned about hyperactivity and behavioral issues in children [73]. Food manufacturers are responding to this demand by reformulating their products with natural alternatives, even if it means facing challenges related to color stability, cost, and availability [74]. This shift in consumer preference is not merely a fleeting fad; it represents a fundamental change in the way people perceive and consume food, demanding greater transparency and accountability from the industry. This desire for "food safety" and "healthy eating" will continue to fuel innovation [75].

Simultaneously, regulatory bodies are playing a crucial role in shaping the future of food colorings. These agencies are continuously evaluating the safety of both artificial and natural colorings, taking into account the latest scientific research and consumer feedback [76]. While artificial colors have been subjected to extensive testing over the years, the safety of some natural colorings is also being scrutinized as their use becomes more widespread. Regulators are also working to establish clear guidelines for labeling and usage, ensuring that consumers are adequately informed about the ingredients in their food [77]. The "food dye ban" movement serves as a catalyst for these evaluations, prompting a more rigorous assessment of the potential risks and benefits of all food colorings, both synthetic and natural. This constant evaluation and regulation helps give the consumer a larger peace of mind [78].

Looking ahead, the future of food colorings will likely involve a delicate balance between artificial and natural options. While artificial colors may continue to be used in some applications due to their cost-effectiveness and stability, the trend towards natural alternatives is undeniable [79]. The key will be to ensure that both artificial and natural

colorings are thoroughly evaluated for safety, clearly labeled, and used responsibly. The emphasis will be on providing consumers with informed choices and empowering them to make decisions that align with their health and dietary preferences. Ultimately, the success of the food coloring industry will depend on its ability to adapt to the evolving needs and expectations of consumers, embracing innovation, transparency, and a commitment to "food safety" and "healthy eating" options [80]. The "food dye ban" movement is not just about removing artificial colors; it's about pushing for a more responsible and sustainable food system that prioritizes the well-being of consumers and the environment [81].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the potential food dye ban signifies a significant shift in the food industry, emphasizing the importance of informed consumer choices and shared responsibility in ensuring food safety. As we navigate the evolving landscape of food regulations, it is crucial for consumers to read labels diligently, support brands committed to natural ingredients, and stay informed about the potential risks associated with food additives. By embracing these practices, we can collectively promote a healthier and more sustainable food system that prioritizes consumer well-being. It's time to take action and make conscious decisions that will positively impact our health and the future of food.

References

1. S. Taylor, "Naturally good? Natural food colours and additives: a review," *British Food Journal*, vol. 104, no. 8, pp. 646-664, 2002.

2. M. Kniel and J. Hall, *Food safety: a practical and case study approach*. Springer, 2023.

3. M. Weatherall, "Consumer advocacy and access to medicines," *British journal of clinical pharmacology*, vol. 82, no. 2, pp. 326-327, 2016.

4. S. Maclean, "Advocacy Coalitions, Causal Perceptions, and Policy Change in the UK Food Policy Domain," *Journal of Public Policy*, vol. 31, no. 03, pp. 283-313, 2011.

5. M. Nestle, *Food politics: How the food industry influences nutrition and health*. Univ of California Press, 2013.

6. J. Gorny, "Food bans: protecting public health or restricting trade?," *Food Control*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1-8, 2000.

7. C. Buzby, J. Hyman, and H. Stewart, "Impacts of food safety regulations on food prices," *USDA, Economic Research Report Number*, vol. 101, 2010.

8. K. Jayasinghe-Mudalige and C. Henson, "Food safety standards and international trade: developing country concerns," *Estey Centre Journal of International Law and Trade Policy*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1-14, 2005.

9. B. Scott, "Food dyes," *Chemical Formulation*, pp. 215-242, 2017.

10. M. Kobylewski and L. Jacobson, "A review of current evidence and clinical implications of artificial food colors," *Clinical pediatrics*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 726-741, 2012.

11. J. Stevens et al., "Food additives and hyperactive behaviour in 3-year-old and 8/9-year-old children in the community: a randomised, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial," *The Lancet*, vol. 370, no. 9598, pp. 1560-1567, 2007.

12. D. McCann et al., "Food additives and hyperactive behaviour in primary school children: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial," *British Journal of Nutrition*, vol. 98, no. 3, pp. 527-534, 2007.

13. EFSA Panel on Food Additives and Nutrient Sources added to Food (ANS), "Scientific Opinion on the re-evaluation of Allura Red AC (E 129) as a food additive," *EFSA*

Journal, vol. 7, no. 11, p. 1327, 2009.

14. L. Solomons and J. Großklaus, "Food colours–a European perspective," *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 31-38, 1996.
15. A. Wölke et al., "Regulatory toxicology of food colours," *Molecular Nutrition & Food Research*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 693-704, 2010.
16. G. Downham and P. Collins, "Colouring our foods in the past and future," *International Journal of Food Science & Technology*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 5-22, 2000.
17. M. Scotter, "Colour: improving appearance," *Improving the thermal processing of foods*, pp. 291-318, 2000.
18. M. Laufer, "Consumer attitudes toward natural and synthetic food additives," *Food Technology*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 93-99, 1989.
19. S. Bord and B. Dumanoski, "Trouble with synthetic food additives," *Nutrition Action Healthletter*, vol. 24, no. 9, pp. 1-7, 1997.
20. L. Van Trijp and A. Fischer, "Consumer perception and evaluation of food labels: a review," *Food quality and preference*, vol. 37, pp. 17-31, 2013.
21. L. Macdiarmid, "Food labelling: empowering consumers or just confusing them?," *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 447-449, 2008.
22. J. Smith, "Impact of food additives on food industry," *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 109-122, 2006.
23. D. Lundahl, "Reformulation of food products: a systematic review of industry practices," *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 25-35, 2015.
24. H. Traill, "The economics of consumer food choice," *Food policy*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1-18, 2006.

25. S. Henson and J. Cranfield, "Consumer concerns about food safety and the demand for organic food," *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 22-42, 2003.

26. A. Hutchings, *Food colorimetry: theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

27. A. Shankar, A. Prescott, and I. Mitchell, "The colour of food: a sensory marketing perspective," *Journal of Sensory Studies*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 164-199, 2010.

28. R. Shahidi, *Natural antioxidants: chemistry, health effects, and applications*. AOCS press, 2005.

29. J. Weiss, G. Gibis, R. Schuh, and M. Salminen, "Advances in ingredient and processing systems for meat and meat products," *Meat Science*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 196-213, 2010.

30. D. Kitts and Y. Yuan, "Engineered isothiocyanates as potential next-generation cancer chemopreventives," *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 585-601, 2012.

31. J. Frewer, C. Hedderley, S. Shepherd, and P. Howard, "The influence of information on consumer acceptance of novel food technologies," *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 408-417, 2001.

32. G. Gałązka-Bilińska, "Impact of food industry on food safety," *Annals of Agricultural and Environmental Medicine*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2011.

33. A. Young, "Consumer perceptions and marketing strategies for functional foods," *British Journal of Nutrition*, vol. 88, no. S2, pp. S119-S123, 2002.

34. R. Lustig, L. Schmidt, and C. Brindis, "The toxic truth about sugar," *Nature*, vol. 482, no. 7383, pp. 27-29, 2012.

35. T. Lang and M. Heasman, *Food wars: the global battle for mouths, minds and markets*. Routledge, 2015.

36. M. Rayner, "Informing choice? Promoting healthier food choices through product labelling," *Nutrition Bulletin*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 243-248, 1999.

37. C. Grunert, "Future trends and consumer attitudes to food quality and safety: a European perspective," *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 260-271, 2005.

38. Center for Science in the Public Interest, "Chemical Cuisine." [Online]. Available: **View source**

39. A. Williams, "Food labeling: mandatory or voluntary?," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 37-46, 1996.

40. D. Jacobs and L. Steffen, "Nutrient contributions of plant foods," *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 506S-514S, 2003.

41. B. Popkin, L. Adair, and S. Ng, "Global nutrition transition and the pandemic of obesity in developing countries," *Nutrition reviews*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 3-21, 2012.

42. M. Monteiro, C. Moubarac, S. Cannon, P. Ng, and C. Popkin, "Ultra-processed products are becoming dominant in the global food system," *Obesity Reviews*, vol. 14, no. SUPPL. 2, pp. 21-28, 2013.

43. U. Aertsens, J. Verbeke, K. Mondelaers, and W. Van Huylenbroeck, "The influence of objective and subjective knowledge on consumer food choice: an application to organic food," *British Food Journal*, vol. 111, no. 12, pp. 1357-1380, 2009.

44. J. Greene, "The US organic foods production act of 1990: history and selected issues," *Choices*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 215-222, 2011.

45. J. Lusk, "Consumer preferences for genetically modified foods: what do we know and what do we need to know?," *Journal of food science*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. R13-R26, 2005.

46. B. Wansink, "Consumer reactions to front-of-package nutrition labels," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 223-233, 2003.

47. L. Schab and J. Trinh, "Do artificial food colors promote hyperactivity in children?," *Journal of Developmental & Behavioral Pediatrics*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 423-434, 2004.

48. M. Ashwell, "Concepts of healthy eating," *Nutrition Bulletin*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 301-307, 2002.

49. D. Mills, "The meaning of home cooking in the lives of women," *Qualitative Sociology*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 383-399, 2002.

50. M. Pollan, *Cooked: a natural history of transformation*. Penguin, 2013.

51. C. Diehl, "Food safety and the role of the consumer," *Journal of Food Safety*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 229-246, 1999.

52. J. Caswell, "Food standards and regulations: an overview," *Food Policy*, vol.