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Reviewer's report:

In my initial (and very short) review I limited my comments to the suggestions that such a work should present not only the status quo of the (scientific) knowledge and regulations related to the transfer of FCC from FCM into our foodstuff but also some kind of proposal on steps to be followed in order to improve the actual situation at the level of the consumer protection laws. Now through Tables 1 and 2 the manuscript sets a possible "starting point" for a number of such actions. Let's hope that they will not be ignored by those (in most cases they are not scientists) who can decide to move from (pure) scientific knowledge to consumer protection legislation/s.

I was pleased to see that the other two reviewers did a detailed analysis of and comments to those presented in the manuscript. This helped increase the clarity and impact of this work.

I didn't dare to make such comments especially because my field of expertise is the quantification (mainly with theoretical methods) of mass transfer/migration of FCC's from FCM's into foods (and not the toxicology and/or exposure issues resulting from such processes). However from the view point of my expertise what I know for sure is that migration of FCC's from FCM's into our foods will always take place if we do want it or not. How far the FCC's we eat with food threaten indeed our health is a very complex problem. Therefore it would be nice to minimize not only the amount of FCC's the actual and next generations will eat with food by also to minimize the impact of this "minimum amount of FCC's" on our bodies. But this will be very difficult (if not even impossible) to achieve with the actual trends in technology, industry, society and politics. Looking at the long list of authors of this manuscript I realized that all of them (myself included) are living in societies with (very) high standards and quality of living. But this is not a self-evident result of some laws of nature but the result of human doings (developments over many centuries and millennia). To this doings belongs also the development (especially in the last century) of a world-wide industry for the production, infrastructure for the distribution and industry for the use of FCM. We owe to these developments some of our high standard and quality of living. For me at least it is clear that the implementation of strict measures/regulations to minimize as far as possible the amount and impact of FCC's on our health will not be possible without massive changes in how FCM will be produced, used and recycled in the future. However this will most likely cut corners in the high standard and quality of living we are enjoying today. Whether that will be accepted by the general public and especially by populist politicians (lawmakers) is an exciting question. I would like to invite the authors of this manuscript not only to present and defend their scientific findings (which are very important of
course) but also work on proposals (and take action) how to settle practically the problems arising from FCC's migrating from FCM's. This includes also the very difficult problem of convincing the public opinion and lawmakers that sometimes non-popular measures are the trade-off for gaining other advantages/goods than the material ones. And the general health of a population is such a good. Maybe a few words in this respect at the end of the present manuscript would not affect the quality of the overall-work, on the contrary.
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