Shawe, R., (2025). J Pub Health Issue Pract, 9(2): 242
https://doi.org/10.33790/jphip1100242

Journal of Public Health Issues and Practices

Phthalates and Endocrine Disruptors: Implications for Public Health and Regulatory Challenges

Robb Shawe, Ph.D.,
Department of Sustainability, Capitol Technology University, Laurel, MD, United States.

Article Details
Article Type: Review Article
Received date: 24th July, 2025
Accepted date: 22nd August, 2025
Published date: 25th August, 2025
*Corresponding Author: Robb Shawe, Ph.D., Department of Sustainability, Capitol Technology University, Laurel, MD, United States.
Citation: Shawe, R., (2025). Phthalates and Endocrine Disruptors: Implications for Public Health and Regulatory Challenges. *J Pub Health Issue Pract* 9(2): 242. doi: https://doi.org/10.33790/jphip1100242

Abstract

Endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) are pervasive in consumer products, including plastics and personal care items. Phthalates, as a major subclass of EDCs, are especially concerning due to their widespread use and potential for adverse health effects. This paper examines the impacts of phthalates and other EDCs on developmental, reproductive, and neurological health. Epidemiological evidence is reviewed, highlighting heightened risks for vulnerable populations such as women and children. The analysis explores regulatory responses and public advocacy efforts, identifying both successes and ongoing challenges in minimizing exposure. Economic implications and the historical context of regulation are discussed, underscoring the complex interplay between public health, industry interests, and policy. The paper concludes by emphasizing the critical role of public advocacy in driving regulatory change and promoting safer alternatives. Recommendations are provided for future research, policy development, and community engagement to reduce risks associated with EDCs.

Keywords: Phthalates, Endocrine Disruptors, Public Advocacy, Regulation, Health Effects, Consumer Products, Policy, Exposure, Case Studies, Economic Implications

Introduction

Among the myriad chemicals encountered in modern life, endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) represent a specific threat due to their widespread use in everyday products. Phthalates, as a subclass of EDCs, are found in plastics, consumer goods, and personal care items. Awareness of their potential health risks is critical, as many of these compounds interact directly with hormonal systems, disrupting developmental and reproductive processes and impacting neurological health. Although regulations exist, economic and political interests perpetuate widespread use, complicating intervention. Public education, advocacy for safer alternatives, and transparency are vital in protecting public health.

Adverse Health Effects of Phthalates

Phthalates disrupt hormonal signaling, particularly within the female reproductive system, leading to infertility and pregnancy complications [1]. They also increase oxidative stress and disrupt intracellular signaling in reproductive tissues. Phthalates are prevalent in personal care products, increasing exposure particularly among women and children. Children face risks to growth and development with lifelong implications. Effective policies and regulations are necessary to minimize exposure.

Phthalates are prevalent in a diverse range of consumer products, including plastics, toys, and vinyl flooring. It plays a significant role in human exposure [2]. This group of chemicals is also present in personal care products, such as shampoos and deodorants, which increases exposure rates due to their daily application, particularly among women. Daily exposure from the contact is associated with endocrine dysfunction and reproductive health effects, including changes in fertility [2]. Phthalate exposure poses more harm to children as it may lead to growth and development disruption, resulting in lifetime health effects. Overall, there is a dire need for control measures to mitigate population exposure to these chemicals, primarily through effective policies that reduce such exposures during product manufacturing. While phthalates constitute a significant concern, it is also essential to consider other endocrine disruptors, which can have additional effects on hormonal and bodily systems, as discussed in the following section.

Adverse Health Effects of Endocrine Disruptors

Endocrine disruptors broadly impact developmental and reproductive health. They may increase susceptibility to breast cancer [3] and contribute to adverse outcomes such as obesity by altering hormonal pathways [4]. Neurotoxicity is also a concern, with studies showing impacts on neurotransmitter systems, synaptic plasticity, and neurogenesis, particularly during prenatal development.

Furthermore, the effects of endocrine disruptors on the neurological system raise concerns as they impact critical brain processes. A recent study revealed that these widely used chemicals disrupt the balance of our neurotransmitter systems, potentially leading to dysfunctions in mood and cognitive performance. Two well-studied endocrine disruptor chemicals were shown to significantly decrease synaptic plasticity, which is responsible for memory and learning processes [3]. Additionally, critical exposure to endocrine-disrupting chemicals

can dysregulate neurogenesis, leading to dysfunction in brain regions and pathways associated with neurodevelopmental disorders, particularly during the prenatal period [3]. Consequently, the neurotoxicity associated with long-term exposure to this class of chemicals warrants further studies and precautionary measures to safeguard a vital and priceless gift: brain health, given its permanence in the environment. To further illustrate these impacts, the following section presents case studies that demonstrate the significant effects of these chemicals on various populations.

Epidemiological Evidence on Health Effects

Epidemiological studies demonstrate risks associated with phthalate and EDC exposure. Ortho-phthalates, for example, affect reproductive and developmental health [5]. Existing reference doses (toxicological thresholds set by regulatory agencies) are intended to protect populations but may require reevaluation. Significantly, regulations minimize but do not eliminate risk, underscoring the role of risk management. Studies link daily use of personal care products to disrupted hormonal signaling and reduced fertility in women [1].

Public and Regulatory Responses

Phthalates and endocrine disruptors are a public health concern that draws considerable attention from both the public and regulatory bodies. Public health advocacy has a significant impact on the concern, where greater public awareness calls for reforms in regulation, as well as the development of safer products. Similarly, regulatory agencies have responded through programs aimed at exposure mitigation and redefining a comprehensive regulatory framework to screen and test applicable exposures. In the US, the current regulatory program only applies to estrogenic endocrine disruptors and supports a risk management approach to exposure limit management [6]. Additionally, an expert review recommends that regulatory applications beyond risk-based evaluations consider non-linear and cumulative exposure to endocrine disruptors, as well as include them in broader health and environmental concern programs [7]. An integrated approach aims to show concern not only regarding public health but also the other environmental consequences accentuated through exposure to endocrine disruptors. Despite various measures in place to address concerns about the challenges posed by endocrine disruptors, a significant deficit remains in adapting and reforming new regulatory paradigms.

Moreover, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have proposed various regulations to manage the use of phthalates and endocrine disruptors in household products. The Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program, developed by the EPA, is a crucial regulatory program that assesses the impact of endocrine disruptor chemicals on the environment and human health, particularly the effects of hormone perturbation [7]. On the other hand, the FDA is monitoring the use of phthalates in food contact substances to protect public health as part of a general plan to reduce exposure. Although current regulations and policies have been introduced, many challenges still face the regulatory programs. Particularly, policies on phthalates and endocrine disruptors must account for non-linear exposure effects and cumulative exposure effects [7]. The complexity of these problems necessitates updates to policy actions that incorporate current scientific knowledge and assess the extent to which it is possible to protect human health from continued environmental exposure.

Public advocacy and regulatory measures are fundamental to reducing exposures. Agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have established programs to monitor and regulate phthalates and other Endocrine-Disrupting Chemicals (EDCs) [7]. While policies have achieved some success, challenges continue in addressing non-linear and cumulative exposures. Specific policy interventions have also demonstrated positive outcomes, as evidenced by a scoping review indicating that over 80% of the assessed interventions, encompassing both policy and non-policy-related strategies, resulted in decreased exposure to bisphenol and phthalates [8]. *Policy interventions* refer to formal legislative or regulatory actions, whereas *non-policy interventions* include voluntary industry reforms, changes in consumer behavior, and initiatives led by non-governmental organizations. Both approaches have contributed to reductions in exposure [8]. Advocacy efforts have motivated the public to adopt behavioral modifications, leading to lower exposure levels, such as increased use of personal care products formulated with higher natural ingredient content [8].

By establishing links between public advocacy outreach initiatives and implementable policy legislation, concerns regarding the safety of chemical products will be effectively addressed and enforced, thereby contributing to the promotion of safer consumer practices. These continuous advocacy and policy efforts lay the groundwork for comprehending the ongoing challenges in regulation examined in the subsequent section. Public advocacy organizations are principally focused on mitigating exposure to phthalates and other endocrine disruptors through legislative measures that endorse the adoption of approved, safer alternative products. This endeavor has garnered support from non-governmental organizations and various community groups advocating for comprehensive regulatory reforms.

Challenges in Regulation

The challenges in regulating phthalates and EDCs are predominantly economically driven, and the complexities of establishing reliable testing methods for these substances. Significant challenges include the economic impacts of testing and regulation on the industries that use or are reliant on specific phthalates and EDCs, as outlined in various industries. The risk-based assessment models used today fail to adequately account for the unique non-linear and synergistic exposures to EDCs when setting exposure limits. This has led to a current failure of effective regulation and risk assessment [6]. Attempts to formally define EDCs have been hindered by their complexity and shifting, non-monotonic dose-response relationships, which necessitate new paradigms for testing that account for real-life exposure levels [7]. Overall, these factors lead to challenging regulatory environments, where effective international collaboration is necessary to develop strategies for impact assessments that reduce the adverse health consequences posed by widespread chemicals.

The fundamental question regarding the regulation of phthalates and endocrine disruptors is the balance between public health and economic interests. On an industrial level, harmful chemicals such as phthalates and endocrine disruptors remain crucial elements of production processes, which is why most businesses remain resistant to policies aimed at eliminating or reducing their use. This adverse resistance only serves to exacerbate human exposure. Regulatory procedures must consider the impact of a ban or restriction on a substance essential to a production process, as well as whether such bans will harm human health [6]. There are also significant differences in the approaches taken by various nations and regulators worldwide. While the European Union prioritizes human health and demands stricter measures, such as identifying endocrine disruptors as substances of very high concern, the United States predominantly follows a risk-based approach centered on a handful of categories, including the subset of estrogenic disruptors [6]. It, therefore, follows that a consensus highlights the need for compromise on measures that seem unnecessary and those that strain public health. The compromise needs to be heavily informed by scientific evidence and robust defenses to ensure its cohesiveness and stability, while also minimizing disruptions to economic interests and industrial innovation. While compromise remains a possibility, the challenges outlined above continue to influence the extent to which regulatory measures for exposure to endocrine disruptors and phthalates become strict or robust. Acknowledging these problems facilitates a deeper

understanding of how specific narratives unfold over time, particularly in terms of the evolution of understanding regarding regulations and policies, as outlined in the following sections.

Historical Context of Regulatory Efforts

The historical context of regulation for phthalates and endocrine disruptors exhibits a significant progression over time, accentuated by increasing awareness and research findings. One discernible advancement is the establishment of the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP) under the auspices of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which sought to conduct monitoring assessments for specific chemicals with endocrine-disruptive capabilities [7]. The initiation of EDSP was motivated by statutory requirements, which necessitated the assessment of the potential impacts of certain chemicals on hormonal activities using a tiered approach. Likewise, associated efforts portrayed amendments within Safe Drinking Water Act regulations intended to alleviate the intrusion of certain chemicals labeled as endocrine disruptors into the drinking water supply. Notably, several historical attempts have failed to achieve practical outcomes, as the progression of scientific evidence has indicated the inability of conventional risk assessments to account for diverse exposures and cumulative impacts associated with realistic environments [7]. This accounts for a re-emphasis on the importance of historical records of regulatory actions adaptable to current scientific evidence in the regulation of chemicals purported to have endocrine-disrupting characteristics.

Historical awareness and regulatory responses, such as the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP) and amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act, have led to a current understanding that enables the drafting of more comprehensive evaluations of phthalates and endocrine disruptors in consumer and government products [7]. These historic programs have underscored the importance for chemical practitioners and policymakers to recognize and comprehend the potential for chemical substances to interfere with endocrine systems, employing increasingly sophisticated stepwise testing methods [7]. Despite these historic movements and approaches to current policy frameworks, controversy persists regarding the validity of relying on traditional risk-based processes through old mechanisms [7]. These approaches often fail to evaluate the complexities by which chemicals can be absorbed. Current practices attempt to incorporate net evaluations of the complexity of exposures, their non-linear effects, and potential for cumulative interactions within program framework evaluation assessments [7]. This reiterates the complexity of new chemical approaches, encapsulated in their new paradigms, which are informed by historic norms and past regulations, creating a perceived clarity of environmental and societal impacts. However, this highlights the need to refine current policy frameworks to create a realistic and achievable approach that allows humans and the environment to coexist. This slow evolution in policy regarding chemicals as agents in exposure frameworks and their societal and environmental implications shows the need for practices to focus on a more engaged public, through education and movements. This focused engagement is discussed in the next element.

Need for Public Education and Advocacy

Awareness-raising is an important means of advocacy for safer products and environments, supported by evidence from policy interventions [8]. Public education empowers individuals to make safer choices and supports legislative advocacy for chemical safety. Awareness campaigns at schools and community levels further amplify these effects. As studies have shown, education makes people more informed and less likely to use chemicals that expose them to phthalates and other endocrine disruptors. Legislative advocacy, which aims to reshape existing policies and enact new ones, can be furthered by raising awareness and promoting informed decision-making.

The success of policy advocacy in reducing exposure to common phthalate and bisphenol sources [8] demonstrates that legislation can be a powerful tool for influencing change. Raising awareness at various societal levels, such as in schools and community organizations, can help inform people about the risks these chemicals pose to their health and the health of others. Consequently, this awareness will help raise informed citizens who will continue to pressure industries for transparency in their product formulas, the reformulation of commonly used products, and the development of safer alternatives to these products and materials. Awareness-raising continues the advocacy efforts for safer products and environments, supporting various communities and industries in protecting the health and well-being of present and future generations.

Certainly, effective advocacy and policy interventions for raising public awareness serve as a vital means of driving the purported path forward for phthalates and endocrine disruptors. Policy implications through effective advocacy campaigns play a crucial role in disseminating relevant information about the effects of chemicals and their connection to synthetic additives in consumer products. Such campaigns help change consumer behavior by promoting the use of products with reduced synthetic additives. An informed public, achieved through effective advocacy, also places pressure on key stakeholders, particularly policymakers, whose decisions have proven to have significant impacts on controlling chemical exposure in both animal and human populations [8].

Key stakeholders include communities, academics, professionals, organizations, and institutions that collaborate to amplify the impact of these advocacy campaigns. Together with the emergence of technologies like social media, the constituency can raise awareness campaigns that relay vital information. Furthermore, continuous advocacy and public awareness can also promote the interests of various sectors by facilitating the necessary changes in chemical centers and industries to align with an establishment that prioritizes public health [8]. To showcase the impact of these policy implications on public health and its advocacy campaigns, the next section is segregated to showcase applicable case studies on the control of phthalates and endocrine disruptors.

Case Studies on Regulatory and Advocacy Efforts

In particular case studies, it can be shown that regulatory action and advocacy can continue to significantly reduce exposure to chemicals, such as phthalates and endocrine disruptors. One specific case of advocacy relates to the policies aimed at changing industry practices to lower the level of endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs). The implementation of such policies has been a success, particularly when manufacturers are taken into account when creating policies with mechanisms that apply to all sectors. This means that the impact of these policies on public health focuses more on changes in practices and processes during production than on personal choices [2]. Therefore, the findings of these policies demonstrate how attention to lobbying can reduce chemical concentrations in personal care items and food sources, as opposed to the individual choices of their users. Consequently, those advocacy cases have shown that promising advocacy, combined with the implementation of the relevant policies in the industry and business environment, minimizes the production of unsafe products; thereby, lobbying for the promising chemicals can define a significant reduction in general population exposure to phthalates and EDCs [2].

Case studies show that regulatory reforms and advocacy can successfully reduce exposures. For example, Taiwan's Toxic Chemical Substances Control Act reduced phthalates in products [9]. By integrating thorough public education with local advocacy, the project targeted local personal care producers with evidence demonstrating both the toxicity of phthalates—particularly concerning the male reproductive system—and other potentially grave effects identified in epidemiological research [5]. The results

of the intervention uncovered a notable discrepancy between established reference doses for these chemicals and their impact on public health. Consequently, local businesses responded by reformulating their products. The success of this initiative exemplifies that even in small communities and amidst seemingly insufficient regulatory measures, community-level strategies—such as grassroots efforts to influence local enterprises—illustrate the efficacy of public education combined with targeted lobbying [5]. These efforts exemplify how coordinated advocacy and legislative action can effectively reduce public exposure.

Likewise, the assessment of Taiwan's achievement in regulation serves as an ideal case demonstrating that coherent legislation can effectively minimize public exposure to endocrine disruptors. Taiwan has implemented national-level regulations through the Toxic Chemical Substances Control Act, aiming to restrict the use of toxic chemical substances in industrial processes [9]. Taiwanese enterprises recorded a significant drop in endocrine-disrupting agents, particularly phthalates, in commercial products, indicating the success of coherent legislation in improving safety during the manufacturing process [9]. The success was also strengthened through widespread public awareness programs and product transparency, allowing consumers to be aware of the materials present in their purchases. Overall, such examples suggest that an integrated legislative strategy, combined with public awareness programs, can reduce public exposure to toxic chemicals, providing other states with a model to follow in safeguarding public health.

Economic Implications of Regulation

Imposing regulations on phthalates and endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) entails costs for manufacturers; however, it also confers economic advantages, including decreased healthcare expenditures and the promotion of safer markets. Although industries contend that such regulations increase operational costs, the long-term benefits encompass fostering innovation, developing safer alternatives, and achieving public health savings [6]. A key point addressed in the article pertains to the economic ramifications of regulating phthalates and endocrine disruptors. Manufacturers dependent on these substances for their production processes may argue that regulatory limits threaten their competitiveness. Industries reliant on these substances assert that integrating regulatory constraints into traditional manufacturing methods will substantially elevate primary production costs, thereby affecting their competitiveness and profitability within the market [6]. Such economic implications may also serve to dissuade manufacturers from pursuing adaptation efforts.

Regulatory policies frequently entail substantial costs, which may further dissuade certain enterprises from pursuing alternative options that do not jeopardize consumer health. Furthermore, the economic ramifications of regulatory initiatives are apparent in the differing strength of policies implemented across various regions. For example, the European Union has proactively identified endocrine disruptors as substances of particular concern. In contrast, regulatory efforts in the United States generally adopt a risk-based approach, focusing on specific categories of products [6].

On the other hand, regulating phthalates and endocrine disruptors can yield economic benefits through reduced public health expenditures and foster the development of safer markets. Reducing healthcare expenditures is a direct benefit of regulating exposure to harmful chemicals associated with reproductive and developmental dysfunction. Focusing on reducing the prevalence of certain health conditions inevitably impacts the cost of healthcare systems' expenditures [6]. The emergence of a safer product market, encouraging new innovations to meet consumer demands for transparency and safety, can contribute to economic growth and job creation. These benefits are an indication of how regulation can potentially create economic impact through public health measures, which can counter initial economic opposition with long-term benefits and product innovation. As the economy adapts over time, managing phthalates and endocrine disruptors alike will require delineating future plans and recommendations, which are addressed in the following section.

Future Directions and Recommendations

Future efforts should emphasize coordinated policy frameworks that address mixture and cumulative exposures, harmonize international approaches, and encourage safer alternatives through innovation. Public advocacy must remain central to driving change, alongside continued scientific research.

Conclusion

Conclusively, the health impacts of phthalates, as a subclass of endocrine disruptors, and other EDCs are pressing concerns that demand sustained scientific investigation and responsive regulatory frameworks. Effective policies must account for non-linear dose–response relationships and cumulative exposures, while ensuring that international strategies are harmonized to provide coherent protection for public health. Equally important, public advocacy remains a powerful driver of transparency, safer alternatives, and accountability. By mobilizing grassroots campaigns, professional networks, and community coalitions, advocacy can amplify awareness and influence both regulatory reforms and industry practices. Reducing risks requires collective action. Scientists contribute evidence to inform policy; policymakers craft and enforce regulations; industry must innovate safer substitutes; and the public, through informed participation, ensures that decision-making reflects real community concerns.

Together, these collaborative efforts can accelerate the transition toward safer products and healthier environments, protecting present and future generations from the harms of phthalates and endocrine disruptors.

Conflicts of Interest: According to the writers, there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Weng, X., Zhu, Q., Liao, C., & Jiang, G. (2023). Cumulative exposure to phthalates and their alternatives and associated female reproductive health: body burdens, adverse outcomes, and underlying mechanisms. *Environmental Science & Technology, 57*(22), 8189–8212. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.3c00823
2. Yang, T. C., Jovanovic, N., Chong, F., Worcester, M., Sakhi, A. K., Thomsen, C., Garlantézec, R., Chevrier, C., Jensen, G., Cingotti, N., Casas, M., McEachan, R. R., Vrijheid, M., & Philippat, C. (2023). Interventions to reduce exposure to synthetic phenols and phthalates from dietary intake and personal care products: a scoping review. *Current Environmental Health Reports, 10*, 184–214. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-023-00394-8
3. Wan, M. L. Y., Co, V. A., & El-Nezami, H. (2021). Endocrine-disrupting chemicals and breast cancer: a systematic review of epidemiological studies. *Taylor & Francis, 62*(24), 6549–6576. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2021.1903382
4. Dalamaga, M., Kounatidis, D., Tsilingiris, D., Vallianou, N. G., Karampela, I., Psallida, S., & Papavassiliou, A. G. (2024). The role of endocrine disruptors, bisphenols, and phthalates in obesity: current evidence, perspectives, and controversies. *MDPI. com, 25*(1), 675. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms25010675
5. Maffini, M. V., Geueke, B., Groh, K., Carney Almroth, B., & Muncke, J. (2021). Role of epidemiology in risk assessment: a case study of five ortho-phthalates. *Environmental Health, 20*(114). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-021-00799-8

6. Kassotis, C. D., Vandenberg, L. N., Demeneix, B. A., Porta, M., Slama, R., & Trasande, L. (2020). Endocrine-disrupting chemicals: economic, regulatory, and policy implications. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology, 8*(8), 719–730. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(20)30128-5

7. Duh-Leong, C., Maffini, M. V., Kassotis, C. D., Vandenberg, L. N., & Trasande, L. (2023). The regulation of endocrine-disrupting chemicals to minimize their impact on health. *Nature.Com, 19*, 600–614. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41574-023-00872-x

8. Sieck, N. E., Bruening, M., van Woerden, I., Whisner, C., & Payne-Sturges, D. C. (2024). Effects of behavioral, clinical, and policy interventions in reducing human exposure to bisphenols and phthalates: a scoping review. *Ehp.Niehs.Nih.Gov, 132*(3), 036001. https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP11760

9. Wu, W., Cao, L., Zheng, T., Feng, S., Ma, G., He, Y., & Wu, P. (2021). Prenatal phthalate exposure reduction through an integrated intervention strategy. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 28*, 57183–57191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14613-y