

Not in?
scope?

31 May

SNAG Mtg - Re: Nano in IF.

External

- 1) Intro (Thurs)
- 2) CoI on record
- 3) Purpose (Thurs)
Gill - Context.

2nd stage

Key questions

Q Significance of the study.

Q Methods valid

Q Does indicate "intentionally engineered"

④ Questions

Nobhetha NICNAC

Maxine CSIRO

Brian P.

Meeting Notes

- Introductions

- 2 papers circulated

- Purpose seek feedback on FoE report

→ FSANZ conducted internal review

Now your thoughts on report

{ - methodology

{ - intentionally engineered assertion.

→ CoI any reason to declare further?

Brian no but approached by

Nobhetha no

Science Media center
No comment

Maxine no but FoE contacted

some time ago. declined to comment

Trevor - if asked, ok to make public statement
but please let FSANZ know.

Brian wary of his view being perceived
as view of regulator.

Trevor - yes we would have to manage
if respond on behalf of FSANZ.

Q 1: ~~Does info~~ Views on info provided

[Brian] 2 issues:

1) presence nano demonstrated
cant comment on method

Are they engineered intentionally?

2) health risk?

are they bio persistent

No - their study shows
dissolve.

1) Can't tell but suspect naturally
occurring

[Maxine] Q Does it matter if engineered?
yes, does if added intentionally
matter.

requires pre market
if occur through processing or
naturally occurring then
no or not necessarily

And
Needs to be
considered in
context of food material
this is
why
not qualitative

info does not allow to discern
above.

there are ways to determine
isotope ratios
but not in this paper

dissolutions study:
depends on how you do this.

Not
Simple

dissolution
sample prep

dissolution
in gut.

Q2: Methodology

Sample prep.

30 min sonication.

XRD - fair amount of sample to get good spectrum.

Some are v. weak intensity.

∴ cannot eliminate presence of HA in some samples

#4-7 May be present but small amount

? ~~Can't~~ only look at evidence

#1 - Calcite also present

~~#2~~ #2 & 5 diffraction pattern says there might be other ~~info~~ substances.

(TW) How sensitive are XRD results?

When is a blip not just noise?

(MM) Spectrum good. A blip is real.

eg. #7 ~~is~~

Nobheetha

Methodology - solubility in water vs. acid.

IF temp. also a factor. Usually IF heated to dissolve.

HA can be manufactured in nano form

Any risk from how IF prepared.
What % dissolve in gut?
~~Can~~ significant ~~can~~ quantity
of nanoparticles.

didn't
follow
this

Q2 does study show
what proportion are nano vs not
nano.

Brian

claim 100% of particles
but cannot work out.

Maxine: need to know other ingredients
cannot say what % of CaPO₄
is present as nano particles

Noblethe



Q3. Standard approach for methodology.
Maxine. - yes.

Brian

Comments talk to Mike Roberts

Maxine is it imp that it is intentionally
added or not? Yes.

if in IF, then % contribution is
critical question. See SCCS opinion
on toothpastes etc (2016)
HA xstals taken up in oral epithelial cells.

but HA¹ could not be linked to food grade HA.
Samples investigated Can't say if same form.

iffy bits

Rosalind = read SCCS paper.

nuanced statement about solubility.

Sim physico - solubility.

Researchers gastric fluid.

but infants don't have acidic gut fluid?

Due diligence

- contacted manufacturers

- contact ~~SNAG~~ SNAG

- what is motivation - nonsensical

➡ Next contact Mike Roberts. Cost of nonneed

Final points

- 1) Nanoparticles detected.
- 2) Methodology ok.
- 3) do not know how much, as proportion of IF
- 4) do not know if intentionally added.
- 5) No PH risk or unlikely