Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Product Recalls in the United States: Patterns, Policy, and Injury Severity in Non-Food Products

Peter Kreysa

peter.kreysa@csulb.edu

California State University, Long Beach

Article

Keywords: Product Recall, Consumer Safety, Regulatory Policy, Injury Severity Analysis, Risk Categorization

Posted Date: May 5th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8223778/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

Product recalls are critical public safety interventions that remove dangerous consumer goods from the marketplace, mitigate legal liability, and uphold standards for quality and reliability. This study examines the spectrum of non-food product recalls in the United States. Drawing on data from the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) and other governmental sources, this research explicates the regulatory context, recall processes, state and federal roles, recall causes, and historic recall cases. The literature review synthesizes academic frameworks and regulatory practices with an examination of consumer and business reporting, whistleblower conditions, and regulatory differences among states. The results of this study focus on examining the severity of injuries, including death, associated with recalls across 14 product categories, applying hypothesis testing and statistical analysis to identify categorical risk differentials. Key insights include the persistent dangers inherent to specific product categories, the roles regulatory policies play in recall effectiveness, and societal implications of incomplete recall action.

Highlights

- **Comprehensive regulatory mapping:** The study details how federal agencies (CPSC, FDA, NHTSA, USDA, EPA, Coast Guard) and state-level offices interact in managing non-food product recalls, emphasizing the layered ecosystem of oversight and enforcement.
- **Categorical injury severity analysis:** This study examines 14 distinct product categories (e.g., sports/recreation, baby products, electronics, furnishings) and applies statistical methods to identify differences in injury severity, including fatalities, across categories.
- **Policy and societal implications:** The manuscript underscores gaps in timely reporting, whistleblower engagement, and recall effectiveness, highlighting how incomplete recall actions reverberate through healthcare, insurance, legal systems, and public trust.

INTRODUCTION

Non-food product recalls in the United States serve as a key public safety and consumer protection tool, representing government regulatory intervention when products fail to meet mandatory safety standards, present hidden dangers, or are related to defects with the potential to harm individuals or property. Recalls of non-food products differ from policy mechanisms targeting food products by encompassing an extraordinarily broad range of consumer goods (FDA, 2024, 2018; Statistica, 2025). These goods include toys, electronics, furnishings, clothing, recreational gear, household appliances, and more. Understanding the mechanisms, patterns, and consequences of recalls in these areas is essential for consumers who might risk injury, financial loss, or death. For businesses, the consequences of recalls include liability, reputational damage, and regulatory sanctions. For society, the direct and indirect effects of dangerous products reverberate through healthcare, insurance, legal systems, and public trust.

Recent statistics focus on the scale and complexity of recalls nationally. The United States averages between 300 and 400 non-food product recalls annually under the purview of the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), with additional recalls managed by other federal agencies, such as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) for vehicles, and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for medical devices and cosmetics (CPSC, 2025l.; Statistica, 2025). According to the World Bank (2021), patterns over the past two decades show increasing frequency and expanding recalls, driven partly by globalized supply chains, technological complexity, and heightened regulatory scrutiny. Annual variations may reflect underlying shifts in consumer risk awareness, reporting trends, and regulatory or technological changes (AuditBoard, 2025).

Recall notifications occur through multiple mechanisms, such as press releases, government-hosted databases (e.g., SaferProducts.gov), direct mail, email, and mass media alerts. The CPSC is the primary federal agency for recall notifications about most non-food consumer products, while the NHTSA covers notifications about vehicles and the FDA addresses medical devices and some personal care product notifications. State consumer protection offices may supplement federal notification efforts, especially with respect to enforcement and consumer complaints (ABA Banking Journal, 2025; Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 2025).

Despite well-established regulatory systems and increasing public awareness, the persistent volume and complexity of product recalls in the United States raise questions about the adequacy of current safeguards (Astvansh, 2018; Raithel, et al., 2024). According to Hall (2025) and O'Melveny (2025), gaps in timely reporting, inconsistent enforcement, and shifting consumer risk perceptions suggest the need for deeper policy introspection and evidence-based reform. Against this backdrop, this study examines recall activity across 14 product categories to better understand injury severity and risk distribution, regulatory response efficacy, and the behavioral and institutional dynamics that underlie product failure. By synthesizing interdisciplinary research and empirical recall data, this research contributes to the development of more adaptive and responsive recall policy frameworks, while offering scholarly insights to guide future studies in consumer safety and regulatory design.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A robust literature base exists on product recalls, with increasing attention devoted to law, policy, management, marketing, and safety science. Core topics include regulatory structures, recall effectiveness, consumer risk perception, legal liability, and business ethics. Recent frameworks (Astvansh, et al., 2025; Ni, et al., 2023) stress the empirical interplay between recall causes, consequences, and strategic organizational response. At the federal level, six main agencies manage product recalls:

1. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC): Consumer goods except for vehicles, foods, and medicines.
2. Food and Drug Administration (FDA): Medical devices, cosmetics, some personal care products, and tobacco.
3. National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA): Motor vehicles and related equipment.
4. United States Department of Agriculture (USDA): Dietary supplements and some products with animal components.
5. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): Environmental products such as pesticides.
6. Coast Guard: Boats and marine equipment.

Of these, the CPSC is the principal agency responsible for general consumer products (excluding food, motor vehicles, and medicines). The CPSC maintains a comprehensive recall reporting portal and oversees compliance with corrective action plans, frequently in collaboration with manufacturers, retailers, and distributors. States maintain their own consumer protection offices that may also initiate investigations, process complaints, manage recalls, and supplement federal actions, but with varying degrees of proactivity and authority (Abogados Gold, 2025; USA.gov, n.d.).

Recall Policy Differences Among the States

While federal agencies, such as the FDA and USDA, oversee many product recalls, state-level agencies play an essential role when products are locally distributed or manufactured by firms under state inspection. In less populous states, activities often involve coordination between state health departments, agriculture agencies, and federal inspectorates. For example, Rhode Island and West Virginia, despite their smaller populations, have municipal recall provisions within local charters and work closely with FDA or the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) on food and meat-related recalls (PEW, 2024; Recalls.gov, n.d.). Maine coordinates food recalls through the FDA's Human Food Inspectorate. In contrast, Montana manages pharmaceutical and agricultural product recalls via state agencies in collaboration with federal partners (FDA, 2024). South Dakota and North Dakota fall under the FDA's Central Inspectorate and rely on their respective agriculture departments to oversee recalls involving farm goods and pesticide-related products (EPA, n.d.; FDA, 2024; USDA, n.d.).

Across these states, departments of health investigate foodborne illness and coordinate public alerts, consumer protection divisions monitor unsafe consumer goods, and environmental agencies respond to hazardous material recalls. Some states like Missouri and Oklahoma even authorize local governments to initiate recalls through charter-based mechanisms, while others such as Virginia and New Mexico may involve judicial review in the process (Ballotpedia, 2025; Oklahoma State Election Board, 2025). These localized efforts reflect a layered and responsive regulatory ecosystem, especially critical in states where federal coverage is supplemented by tailored state interventions.

Categories of Product Recalls

Product recalls in the United States arise from a multifaceted set of causes that span technical errors, regulatory lapses, and behavioral complexities. At the core are manufacturing and design issues, such as defective engineering that fails to account for safe user interaction, or flawed production practices that introduce faults in assembly or material integrity (Anjoran, 2019; Ball, 2015; Deloitte, 2025). These risks are particularly evident in areas, such as electronics, where software glitches can trigger dangerous malfunctions, and minor component failures may cascade into systemic hazards (Cadence PCB Solutions, 2019; NASA, 2022).

The CPSC organizes its data into 14 distinct product categories to enhance statistical clarity, regulatory precision, and public accessibility. These categories, ranging from sports and recreation to kitchen, baby, furniture, clothing, and products at public facilities, capture the broad spectrum of consumer environments where injuries are most likely to occur. Their selection is grounded in how frequently these products appear in emergency room injury reports, making them essential for national surveillance and public safety strategies (CPSC, 2024b; CPSC, 2025k; Nationwide Children's Hospital, 2025; National Safety Council, 2025).

The Regulated Products Handbook (CPSC, 2025h) and CPSC's recall guidance (2025c) outlines how CPSC enforces standards under multiple statutes and identifies areas where the agency has regulatory authority or where product safety standards already exist, allowing for consistent recall procedures and clearer public messaging. For example, categories such as toys and children and fireworks link directly to categories used by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR); fireworks are excluded from children's product classification but are regulated under separate CFR provisions (CPSC, 2025i; Electronic Code of Federal Regulations; 2025). CPSC's Safety Alerts (2025j) and SaferProducts.gov (2025i) databases organize consumer products by use context to support targeted messaging and injury tracking: by grouping products based on their use context, such as home maintenance versus yard and garden, the CPSC streamlines its ability to target interventions, issue safety alerts, and conduct longitudinal analyses.

More granular or overlapping categories could compromise data integrity, leading to inconsistencies in hospital reporting and public interpretation (Hevo Academy, 2025; IBM, 2023). Maintaining these standardized categories ensures comparability over time and facilitates training and infrastructure stability for coders working for the National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS), which is a data collection program operated by CPSC (Journal for Clinical Studies, 2021). Ultimately, this approach balances rigor (Del Rosso, 2015) with readability (Qassimi, 2023), giving consumers and policymakers actionable insights without overwhelming complexity.

The sequence of product categories presented on the CPSC data site reflects a blend of practical design choices, surveillance priorities, and regulatory structure. While the agency does not publicly outline the logic of this ordering, it likely stems from a combination of user-centered interface planning and the relative frequency of injuries reported in each category. High-risk or high-activity environments such as sports and recreation, kitchen, and home maintenance appear early in the list, signaling their significance

in emergency department data captured by the NEISS (CPSC, 2025e). According to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) (2023), these product sectors consistently yield substantial injury reports, making them critical for surveillance and policy attention.

The ordering of the categories also corresponds with areas of heightened regulatory activity, particularly where stringent safety standards are in place. For example, products in the baby and toys and children categories are governed by well-established frameworks such as ASTM F963 and Title 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations, necessitating their visibility within the data interface (CPSC, 2023b; ECFR, 2025; Eurofins, 2024). Moreover, the progression from personal-use items (e.g., electronics, personal care) to more specialized categories (e.g., fireworks, hobby, and public facilities) suggests an intentional flow that reflects both consumer familiarity and injury severity patterns (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024; CPSC, 2024a; National Safety Council, 2025).

From a data management perspective, maintaining this consistent structure allows NEISS coders and surveillance analysts to apply standardized codes across decades of injury records (CPSC, 2024b; Healthy People 2030; 2025). It supports longitudinal analyses without disrupting comparability and aids the public in accessing product-specific safety data without navigating excessive complexity (Bokulich, 2018; Fitzmaurice & Molenberghs, 2009). The ordering thus balances statistical integrity, regulatory clarity, and public usability.

The categories themselves, sports and recreation, kitchen, baby, and others, each encompass a diverse set of consumer products with distinct risk profiles, use contexts, and recall histories. The following section offers a closer examination of all 14 categories, highlighting their defining characteristics, regulatory coverage, and their roles in shaping national injury and recall patterns.

Sports and Recreation. Recent recall activity in sports and recreation products reflects persistent safety concerns tied to mechanical failure, design flaws, and inadequate durability testing: exercise equipment, climbing gear, and recreational vehicles have been recalled due to structural weaknesses, faulty locking mechanisms, and software malfunctions (Consumer Affairs, 2025b; CPSC, 2025k; Retail & Consumer Products Law Observer, 2021; UIAA, 2025). Notably, over 3.8 million BowFlex dumbbells were recalled following injury reports and climbing gear recalls have highlighted fall hazards linked to carabiner (metal clip) defects (Consumer Affairs, 2025c; Powers Health, 2025). Scholarly literature (Graziosi, et al., 2024; Lang, et al., 2025; Semegn, et al., 2025) emphasizes the need for biomechanical risk modeling and post-market surveillance to address latent hazards in high-impact recreational products.

Kitchen. Recalls involving kitchen products frequently stem from mechanical failure, electrical hazards, and design flaws that compromise safety during routine use. Items such as blenders, pressure cookers, toasters, and gas ranges have been withdrawn from the market due to risks including overheating, blade detachment, fire ignition, and laceration (Exponent, 2023; Vasquez, et al., 2023). Inadequate shielding, poor wiring, or improper assembly have triggered warnings from regulatory agencies, particularly when injuries involve burns or physical trauma (CPSC, 2023c). Consumer Reports (2019) and injury data emphasize the need for robust manufacturing standards, with recalls often linked to failures in

compliance with UL certification (UL Solutions, 2025), product testing protocols, or hazard identification during pre-market evaluation (Deloitte, 2025). Studies (ComplianceQuest, 2025; National Safety Council, 2024; Safety + Health Magazine, 2023) underscore the role of predictive analytics and incident tracking in identifying risk-prone product categories and preventing repeat safety lapses.

Home Maintenance and Structures. Products in this category, including hoses, ladders, and structural components, have been recalled due to tip-over risks, fire hazards, and entrapment potential (ABC News, 2025b; CPSC, 2025f). Above-ground pools (ABC News, 2025a; CPSC, 2025a) and wall-mounted furniture units (TorHoerman Law, 2025) have led to injuries and fatalities, prompting scrutiny of compliance with the STURDY Act and ASTM standards. The STURDY Act, short for *Stop Tip-overs of Unstable, Risky Dressers on Youth*, is a U.S. federal law enacted in December 2022 to prevent injuries and fatalities caused by furniture tip-overs, especially involving children (CPSC, 2025b). Research in consumer safety engineering (Boom & Bucket, 2023; Evans, 2024) highlights the importance of load testing, anchoring protocols, and user education in reducing structural failure incidents.

Baby Products. The recall of baby products continues to reflect systemic gaps in safe sleep compliance and structural integrity: highchairs, loungers, and crib mattresses have been recalled for suffocation, entrapment, and fall hazards, often violating federal sleep product regulations (CBS News, 2024b; Consumer Affairs, 2025a; Keeping Babies Safe, 2025; CPSC, 2024c). Recent studies in pediatric safety (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2022; CPSC, 2024c; Forbes, 2024;) emphasize the need for stricter incline angle standards and occupant retention testing. The proliferation of unregulated imports has further complicated enforcement, underscoring the need for international safety benchmarks (Dynamis, LLP, 2025; Mayer Brown, LLP, 2025; National Law Review, 2025).

Toys and Children's Products. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2025) and the National Center for Health Research (n.d.), toys and children's products are frequently recalled for choking hazards, toxic chemical exposure (e.g., lead, phthalates), and mechanical failure. In 2024 alone, over 22 million toys were recalled, with Miniverse cooking sets and Fisher-Price dumbbells among the most prominent (CBS News, 2024a; Consumer Affairs, 2024; CPSC, 2024d; Target, 2024). Scholarly analyses (Hyman, 2015) point to persistent gaps in pre-market testing and the limitations of voluntary compliance frameworks. The recurrence of known hazards suggests a need for proactive design audits and enhanced regulatory oversight.

Electronics. Recalls of electronic products are increasingly driven by battery-related fire risks, overheating, and software defects: lithium-ion batteries in e-bikes, scooters, and consumer electronics have prompted large-scale recalls due to ignition hazards (Hertz, 2024; Limbach, 2024; Watkins, 2024; Williams, 2025). Academic research in electrical safety and thermal modeling (Ortiz, et al., 2024) has called for improved battery management systems and stricter certification protocols. The rise of third-party sellers on e-commerce platforms has further complicated traceability and enforcement (Tang, et al., 2024).

Furnishings. The recalls of furnishings have surged due to tip-over risks, flammability violations, and structural collapse (ABC News, 2024; Bonatesta, 2024). Platform beds, dressers, and wall-mounted units have been implicated in injuries and fatalities, often failing to meet STURDY Act requirements (Good Morning America, 2022; CPSC, n.d.). Studies in human factors engineering (Karwowski, 2005) and product ergonomics (Whitmore, 2017) advocate for mandatory anchoring systems and dynamic stability testing. The growing prevalence of online-only furniture sales has raised concerns about consumer awareness and installation safety (Brandon, 2022; Consumer Federation of America, 2025).

Containers and Packaging. Recalls related to containers and packaging are frequently linked to labeling errors (Lockton, 2024), undeclared allergens (Quality Assurance Magazine, 2023), and contamination from foreign materials, such as plastic, glass, or wood (Packaging Digest, 2023). Recent food recalls have highlighted the role of packaging integrity in preventing microbial infiltration and physical hazards (Food Safety Institute, 2024). Scholarly work in packaging science (Dodero, et al., 2021; Lakshan, et al., 2025) emphasizes the need for real-time quality control, predictive analytics, and tamper-evident design to reduce recall incidence.

Personal Care. Recalls of personal care products have centered on contamination, undeclared allergens, and chemical exposure, particularly around elevated levels of benzene in deodorants and acne treatments (FDA, 2025; Nalepinski, 2025). Manufacturing deviations from Current Good Manufacturing Practices (cGMP) have triggered widespread alerts (FDA, n.d.). Academic literature in toxicology and dermatological safety (Barthe, et al., 2021; Boyer, et al., 2017; Nash & Kern, 2018) calls for enhanced ingredient transparency (Nash & Walters, 2015), batch-level testing (Barth, et al., 2021), and consumer risk communication.

Yard and Garden. According to Kawasaki Motors USA (2024), recalls of yard and garden product recalls often involve mechanical failure, bursting hazards, and fire risks. Over 3 million expandable garden hoses were recalled due to bursting incidents causing hearing damage and physical injury (WRAL News, 2025). Studies in materials science and outdoor equipment safety recommend pressure testing protocols (Safety Notes, 2024) and reinforced hose design (Mechanical Contractors of America, 2016) to mitigate such risks. According to Sedgwick (2025), the seasonal nature of these products also complicates recall timing and consumer outreach.

Clothing and Accessories. Recalls in clothing and accessories are driven by flammability violations, strangulation hazards (e.g., drawstrings), and chemical contamination such as lead in textile inks (BEGOODTEX, 2025; Testcoo, 2024). Children's sleepwear and accessories have been particularly affected. Research in textile safety and chemical exposure underscores the need for standardized flammability testing and restricted substance monitoring, especially in imported goods (CPSC, 2016).

Fuel, Lighters, and Fireworks. This category exhibits high-risk recalls due to fire, burn, and poisoning hazards. Portable fuel containers, lighters, and fireworks have been recalled for lacking child-resistant features and violating the Children's Gasoline Burn Prevention Act (Justia, 2024; OCFS, 2025). Scholarly work in combustion safety and regulatory compliance (Nash & Walters, 2015; Loyola University School of

Law, n.d.) advocates for universal childproofing standards and public education on safe handling practices.

Hobby Products. Hobby-related recalls, such as toy hammer ball sets and do it yourself (DIY) kits, often stem from choking hazards, toxic materials, and mechanical failure (CPSC, 2025c; Justia, 2024). The rise of small-batch and imported hobby items has introduced variability in safety compliance (Craftbase, 2025; Testcoo, 2024). Academic studies in consumer product design and developmental psychology (American Academy of Pediatrics, 2019; CPSC, 2020; Studoco, 2024) recommend age-appropriate labeling, small-part testing, and enhanced oversight of online marketplaces.

Products at Public Facilities Recalls in this category include playground equipment, public-use furniture, and facility-installed safety devices. Hazards include entrapment, fall risks, and structural failure (FEMA, n.d.; Hazwoper OSHA, 2023; Millan, 2020). Recent incidents have prompted recalls of retractable gates and crib bumpers used in childcare settings (3B Media News, 2025; CPSC, 2025d). Research in public health and environmental design (Center for Universal Design, 1997; Gupta, et al., 2025; Lee, 2025) emphasizes the importance of universal design principles, routine inspection protocols, and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and CPSC standards.

Notable Recall Cases

Major product recalls have repeatedly reshaped the environment of consumer safety and corporate accountability in the United States. From pharmaceuticals and automotive components to electronics and home safety devices, each high-profile recall reveals critical fault lines in product design, risk communication, and regulatory oversight. The following cases illustrate how incidents from the landmark Tylenol withdrawal in 1982 to recent Consumer CPSC actions in 2025 have driven reforms in packaging laws, safety standards, and industry practices. Some of these recalls are discussed in more detail later in this review. Together, they reflect an evolving recall ecosystem where public trust, policy responsiveness, and technological risk converge.

Johnson & Johnson's Tylenol (1982). The prompt withdrawal of Tylenol products from grocery and drug store shelves after cyanide poisoning deaths established the gold standard for consumer-first crisis response, costing $100 million (about $250 million in today's dollars) and leading to federal tamper-evident packaging laws (CalBiz Journal, 2023; Time, 2014).

General Motors Ignition Switch (2014). Faulty ignition systems led to at least 124 deaths and over $4 billion in recall costs, exposing organizational failures in hazard acknowledgment and reporting (Bigman, 2014; USDT, 2014).

Firestone/Ford Tire Recall (2000). Tire failures caused rollover crashes that resulted in 271 deaths and 800 injuries, costing $5.6 billion. This incident led to reforms in tire safety standards and notification protocols (ForensisGroup, 2025; Harbert College of Business, n.d.)

Samsung Galaxy Note 7 (2016). Overheating batteries caused fires, prompting the recall of 2.5 million smartphones and $5.3 billion in losses, and advancing industry standards for lithium battery safety (Sharrow, 2025; Time, 2016).

Public Reporting, Corporate Duty, and Whistleblower Impact

Reporting a Problem. In the United States, reporting mechanisms for unsafe consumer products are governed by both public and industry-facing platforms, with strict procedural expectations designed to support timely regulatory intervention. Consumers, medical professionals, and other stakeholders may submit reports through SaferProducts.gov, administered by the CPSC, which mandates the inclusion of detailed product identification, incident description, affected parties, and supporting documentation such as photographs, purchase receipts, and correspondence (Carpenter, 2018; Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, n.d.; Consumer Federation of America, 2012).

Corporate Duty. Complementing this public reporting pathway, businesses are legally obligated under Section 15(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Act and Code of Federal Regulations (2025) to disclose knowledge of potential product hazards, noncompliance with applicable standards, or associated injuries or fatalities within 24 hours of becoming aware of the conditions. This statutory requirement applies to manufacturers, importers, distributors, and retailers, reflecting a shared responsibility for consumer safety. Reports must typically include technical identifiers, such as model numbers and serial codes, as well as contextual sales and distribution data that facilitate risk tracing and remedial action. Academic analyses (Buell & Kalkanci, 2019; Kang, 2014) emphasize that both consumer engagement and corporate transparency are critical to early hazard detection, enabling regulators to pursue corrective measures before widespread harm occurs. While businesses are legally obligated to report potential product hazards, economic analysis notes tension between short-term financial pain and long-term trust-building, and not all businesses act swiftly unless pressured by regulators, media, or consumer advocates (Shaheen & Smith, 2019).

Whistleblowers. Whistleblowers play a critical yet underexamined role in the realm of consumer product recalls, serving as internal sentinels who help identify and report safety violations that might otherwise remain concealed (National Whistleblower Center, n.d.). Under the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act (CPSIA), employees of manufacturers, importers, distributors, and retailers are legally protected from retaliation when they disclose information related to product hazards, regulatory noncompliance, or unsafe corporate practices (U.S. Department of Labor, n.d.).

According to OSHA (2020), these protections extend to individuals who report directly to employers, federal agencies, or state attorneys general, and encompass a wide range of activities, including testifying in courts or before government committees or commissions, objecting to unlawful conduct, or refusing to participate in actions that violate safety laws. Despite these statutory safeguards, scholarly and regulatory analyses (Atkins, 2025; Kaciku Baljija & Min, 2023) suggest that whistleblower engagement remains limited, in part due to fear of reprisal, lack of awareness, and organizational

cultures that discourage transparency. According to this research, the paucity of publicly available data on whistleblower-driven recalls further complicates efforts to assess their systemic impact. Nevertheless, high-profile enforcement actions, such as multimillion-dollar penalties levied against firms that failed to report known hazards, underscore the latent power of whistleblower disclosures in catalyzing regulatory response and protecting public welfare (California Office of the Attorney General, 2025). Academic literature (Zimmermann, 2025;) increasingly calls for enhanced whistleblower protection, streamlined reporting channels, and organizational reforms that incentivize ethical conduct and early hazard detection.

Levels of Recalls and Their Development

The classification of product recalls in the United States has evolved into a tiered system designed to reflect the severity of risk posed to public health and safety. Regulatory agencies such as the FDA, CPSC, and the USDA have adopted three primary levels of recall, each denoting a distinct threshold of hazard (Harte Hanks, 2024).

According to the FDA and CPSC, a *Class I* recall represents the most serious category, indicating a reasonable probability that the use of or exposure to the product will result in serious adverse health consequences or death. *Class II* recalls involve products that may cause temporary or medically reversible harm, or where the likelihood of serious injury is remote. *Class III* recalls are issued for products unlikely to cause adverse health effects but that violate labeling or manufacturing standards.

Historically, these classifications emerged in response to the need for standardized risk communication and prioritization of regulatory action (Molamohamadi, et al., 2024). The FDA's formalization of recall levels in the late 20th century was driven by high-profile incidents involving contaminated pharmaceuticals and unsafe food products, prompting a shift toward more transparent and structured recall protocols (USA Today, 2022). Over time, the classification system has been refined to support rapid public notification, targeted enforcement, and legal accountability. Scholarly analyses emphasize that these tiers not only guide the scope and urgency of corrective measures but also influence consumer perception, litigation risk, and corporate reputation management. As product complexity and supply chain globalization increase, the recall classification framework continues to serve as a critical tool for balancing public health imperatives with regulatory efficiency (Deloitte, n.d.; Clearwater Security, 2025; Harte Hanks, 2024).

Both food and non-food recalls are structured by severity, but food recalls are generally posed as more time-sensitive public health crises due to contamination, while non-food recalls often span categories with diverse timelines and risks (e.g., design flaws that may not manifest until years after purchase). Notification mechanisms and recall obligations are structurally analogous, but regulatory oversight and hazard typologies differ (eCFR, 2025; Food Safety News, 2025; SafetyCulture, 2025).

Deaths and Recalls

The history of product recalls in the United States reveals a sobering interplay between consumer safety, corporate accountability, and regulatory evolution. While many recalls mitigate harm before it escalates, others follow in the wake of a pattern of grievous outcomes, including loss of life. This section highlights ten significant U.S. recalls from the literature that have been associated with fatalities, each illustrating distinct causal mechanisms, institutional actors, and post-recall ramifications. From pharmaceuticals and automotive defects to foodborne illnesses and infant products, these cases underscore the systemic vulnerabilities in manufacturing, oversight, and risk communication. They also illuminate the enduring legal, reputational, and ethical consequences faced by corporations and regulators.

1. **Tylenol Cyanide Poisoning (1982).** Johnson & Johnson's recall of Extra-Strength Tylenol marked a watershed moment in corporate crisis management. Seven individuals in the Chicago area died after ingesting capsules laced with cyanide, an act of external tampering rather than manufacturing error. The company recalled 31 million bottles, costing over $100 million, and introduced tamper-evident packaging, setting a precedent for pharmaceutical safety protocols. The incident catalyzed regulatory reform and remains a case study in ethical corporate response (Journalism University, 2024; Latson, 2014; PBS, 2014).
2. **Peanut Corporation of America Salmonella Outbreak (2009).** A salmonella outbreak traced to the Peanut Corporation of America resulted in nine deaths and hundreds of illnesses (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009). Over 3,900 products from 361 companies were recalled, leading to widespread consumer distrust and a 25% decline in peanut sales. The company declared bankruptcy, and its chief executive officer (CEO) was sentenced to 28 years in prison for knowingly shipping contaminated goods. The recall underscored systemic failures in food safety oversight and prompted stricter FDA inspection protocols (Bucy, 2015; Springer, 2015).
3. **Toyota Unintended Acceleration (2009 to 2010).** Toyota recalled over 8 million vehicles due to floor mat and pedal defects linked to unintended acceleration. The issue was implicated in 89 deaths over a decade. The company paid $1.2 billion in fines and faced reputational damage and congressional scrutiny. The recall revealed gaps in automotive safety reporting and led to enhanced NHTSA oversight and consumer notification standards (Auto Wire, 2025; CBS News, 2010).
4. **Infantino Baby Slings (2010).** Infantino recalled over 1 million SlingRider and Wendy Bellissimo baby slings after three infant suffocation deaths. The design allowed fabric to press against the infant's nose and mouth, especially in newborns under four months. The recall prompted the CPSC to issue broader warnings about sling carriers and led to revised ASTM standards for infant wearable products (CPSC, 2010; Growing Your Baby, 2010; Infantino, 2010).
5. **Bextra Arthritis Drug (2005).** Pfizer's anti-inflammatory drug Bextra was withdrawn after reports of severe cardiovascular events and fatal skin reactions, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome. Though exact death counts remain contested, the drug's risks were deemed unacceptable by the FDA. Pfizer faced billions in legal settlements and reputational damage, reinforcing the importance of post-market surveillance and transparent risk disclosure (ABC News, 2009; Bucy, 2015; Dart, 2009).
6. **Vioxx Painkiller (2004).** Merck's Vioxx, prescribed for arthritis, was linked to increased risk of heart attacks and strokes. Estimates suggest up to 140,000 cases of coronary heart disease, with

thousands of deaths. Merck voluntarily recalled the drug and later settled litigation for $4.8 billion. The case exposed regulatory delays and led to reforms in FDA drug approval and adverse event reporting (Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine, 2004; NBC News, 2004).

7. **Thalidomide Birth Defects (1961).** Though never formally approved in the U.S., Thalidomide was distributed to 20,000 women through clinical trials. It caused severe birth defects in over 10,000 infants globally. The scandal led to the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments, strengthening FDA authority over drug efficacy and safety. It remains a pivotal moment in pharmaceutical ethics and regulatory evolution (Embryo Project Encyclopedia, 2014; Smithsonian Magazine, 2015).
8. **Above-Ground Pool Recall (2007–2022).** Over 5 million above-ground pools sold by Bestway, Intex, and Polygroup were recalled following nine child drowning deaths. Compression straps on the pool exterior created footholds, allowing unsupervised access even without ladders. The recall spanned products sold since 2002 and prompted updated safety standards finalized in 2025. It highlighted the intersection of design oversight and consumer behavior in product risk management (ABC News, 2025a; Legal United States, 2025; Spectrum News, 2025).
9. **Ford Firestone Tire Recall (2000).** Ford and Firestone recalled millions of tires after tread separation caused rollover accidents, particularly in Ford Explorers. The defect was linked to over 200 deaths. The recall strained corporate relations and led to congressional hearings. It catalyzed reforms in tire safety standards and vehicle rollover testing, reshaping automotive liability frameworks (Automotive History, 2023; Cooperrider et al., 1990; Noggle & Palmer, 2005).
10. **Peloton Tread + Recall (2021).** Peloton recalled its Tread + treadmill after the death of a child and multiple injury reports. The machine's rear design allowed small children and pets to be pulled underneath. Initially resistant, Peloton reversed course under CPSC pressure. The incident underscored the ethical imperative of proactive recall and the reputational risks of delayed corporate response (Consumer Reports; Peloton, 2021).

METHODS

To examine the scope and impact of product recalls across diverse consumer categories, this study draws upon publicly available data curated by the CPSC. The dataset was downloaded from the CPSC website and encompasses recall notices issued between January 01, 2024 and July 14, 2025 (over 6,000 records). The data is systematically categorized into sectors including sports and recreation; kitchen; home maintenance and structures; baby; toys and children; electronics; furniture, furnishings and decorations; containers and packaging; personal care; yard and garden; clothing and accessories; fuel, lighters and fireworks; hobby; and products at public facilities.

Each recall entry includes descriptive metadata such as product type, hazard classification, incident reports, and corrective actions. Data extraction was conducted using structured queries and manual verification to ensure relevance and completeness. Supplementary information was triangulated from FDA enforcement reports, legal filings, and manufacturer disclosures to contextualize fatalities and regulatory responses. This multi-source approach supports a comprehensive analysis of recall patterns, risk typologies, and institutional accountability across the consumer categories.

To facilitate a structured analysis of product recall consequences, reported incident variables were systematically classified into three ordinal severity levels. This schema enables both descriptive and inferential comparison across product types, recall contexts, and consumer outcomes.

The first tier designated as *Severity Level 1*, includes cases in which no incident and no injury were reported ("No Incident, No Injury"). These reflect recalls driven primarily by potential hazards, regulatory infractions, or proactive risk mitigation without documented consumer harm.

Severity Level 2 encompasses recall events involving an incident but without physical injury ("Incident, No Injury"). This middle tier captures exposures or malfunctions that resulted in disruption or failure but did not culminate in physiological harm. These variables signal latent risks and are analytically useful for examining near-miss scenarios and preventive thresholds within regulatory enforcement.

Severity Level 3, the highest tier, comprises all variables linked to tangible harm or fatality. This classification subsumes a range of outcomes, from relatively minor injuries ("No First Aid or Medical Attention Received") to serious medical interventions ("Hospital Admission," "Emergency Department Treatment Received") and confirmed deaths ("Death"). Ambiguous entries such as "Injury, Level of Care Not Known" are also included in this classification due to their implied severity. The decision to consolidate these outcomes under a unified ordinal classification reflects a public health-oriented interpretation of injury consequence, emphasizing the presence of physiological impact as the defining threshold. This classification framework supports cross-sectoral comparisons and enhances analytic clarity in evaluating product safety and recall efficacy.

Initial exploration of the dataset includes descriptive statistics to summarize recall counts by severity level and category. Frequency distributions offer visual and numeric depictions of how recalls are concentrated, revealing baseline trends and outliers. For example, the kitchen and sports and recreation categories exhibit both high total recall volumes and substantial injury counts, warranting further attention. These summaries contextualize the scope of consumer product risk and lay groundwork for deeper statistical modeling.

To determine the statistical relationship between product category and recall severity, a chi-square Test of Independence was calculated. This non-parametric method tests whether the observed distribution of severity levels differs significantly across the 14 product categories. By treating "Product Category" and "Severity Level" as categorical variables, this test can identify disproportionate patterns of harm, allowing the isolation of areas where injury or death is systematically more prevalent. The resulting contingency table from this analysis provides a foundational lens for regulatory targeting and risk prioritization.

RESULTS

Table 1 offers a granular view of product recall severity across the 14 consumer categories, enabling comparative analysis of risk distribution and regulatory intervention. *Severity Level 1*, denoting recalls

with no incident or injury, accounts for 941 cases (15.1% of total recalls), while *Level 2,* representing incidents without injury, comprises 3,405 cases (54.5%). The most critical category, *Severity Level 3*, which includes injury or death, constitutes 1,904 cases (30.5%), underscoring the substantial proportion of recalls associated with tangible harm.

	Severity			
Product Category	**1**	**2**	**3**	**Total**
Sports and Recreation	59	157	199	415
Kitchen	293	1493	433	2219
Home Maintenance and Structures	149	559	355	1063
Baby	99	165	152	416
Toys & Children	82	166	133	381
Electronics	50	257	119	426
Furniture, Furnishings & Decorations	79	293	221	593
Containers & Packaging	22	67	55	144
Personal Care	13	30	40	83
Yard & Garden	47	130	85	262
Clothing and Accessories	23	38	74	135
Fuel, Lighters and Fireworks	9	27	12	48
Hobby	15	20	20	55
Products at Public Facilities	1	3	6	10
Total	**941**	**3405**	**1904**	**6250**

Table 1. Distribution of Recalls and Injury Severity

Among product categories, kitchen items dominate the dataset with 2,219 total recalls, including 433 classified under *Severity Level 3*. This suggests both high usage frequency and potential design or manufacturing vulnerabilities. Home maintenance and structures and furniture, furnishings and decorations also exhibit elevated counts of severe outcomes, with 355 and 221 cases respectively in *Level 3*. Notably, baby products, though lower in total volume (416), show a disproportionately high share of severe incidents (152), reflecting heightened sensitivity in regulatory thresholds for infant safety.

Conversely, categories such as fuel, lighters and fireworks and products at public facilities report relatively few recalls overall, yet their *Level 3* proportions remain nontrivial, indicating that even low-

frequency categories may pose acute risks. The data also reveal that sports and recreation products account for 199 severe cases out of 415 total, suggesting a notable injury burden in this category.

Table 2 shows statistical findings by product category. The data reveals a pattern of elevated risk across several of the consumer product categories, with baby products showing the highest average severity (2.50) and the strongest negative skew (-0.86), indicating a disproportionately high number of serious incidents. Similarly, furniture and sports and recreation products also rank high in severity and skewness, underscoring a consistent trend toward more severe outcomes. On the other end of the spectrum, the kitchen and toys and children categories show lower mean severity scores (2.32 and 2.33, respectively), yet their negative skewness suggests that severe incidents still occur with notable frequency.

Category	Mean Severity	SD	Skewness	Notes
Kitchen	2.32	0.68	-0.41	Skewed toward higher severity
Home Maintenance and Structures	2.37	0.74	-0.44	Highest number of severe recalls
Baby	2.50	0.72	-0.86	Significantly skewed toward severity
Sports and Recreation	2.45	0.74	-0.57	Skewed toward severe cases
Furniture, Furnishings & Decorations	2.49	0.73	-0.72	Substantial proportion of high-severity issues
Toys & Children	2.33	0.68	-0.53	Moderate-to-severe skew

Table 2. Statistical Findings by Product Category

Home maintenance and structures, while not leading in mean severity, present the highest variability (SD = 0.74) and a strong negative skew, pointing to a broad range of risks, possibly influenced by product complexity or installation variables. These findings have practical implications: baby and furniture items may require more stringent regulatory oversight and pre-market safety testing, while categories with high variability, such as home maintenance, demand targeted risk mitigation strategies. Even categories with lower severity averages, such as kitchen products, merit continued attention, given their tendency to include occasional high-risk cases. Overall, the data highlights the importance of tailoring regulatory responses to severity patterns and distribution characteristics across product domains.

The chi-square test results presented in Table 3 confirm a statistically significant relationship between product type and injury severity ($\chi^2(36) = 210.24$, $p < .001$), with Cramér's V = 0.15 indicating a small to moderate effect. This suggests certain product categories disproportionately contribute to higher risk recalls. Dunn-Bonferroni post hoc tests revealed that baby products are markedly more severe than kitchen, toys, and several other categories. Similarly, home maintenance and sports categories show higher severity distributions relative to kitchen products. Spearman's correlation ($\rho = -0.18$, $p < .001$)

illustrates a weak but consistent pattern: product categories exhibit directional trends with severity. Although the relationship isn't strong enough for predictive modeling, it reinforces the need for category-specific surveillance.

Test	Value	df	p-value	Interpretation
Chi-Square Test	210.24	36	< .001	Significant association between product category and severity level
Cramér's V (effect size)	0.15	—	—	Small to moderate strength of association

Table 3. Chi-Square Analysis of Severity Across Product Categories

DISCUSSION

The statistical evidence presented in this study underscores systematic differences in injury severity across consumer product categories implicated in U.S. recalls. A chi-square test of independence confirmed that severity outcomes are not randomly distributed (Cramér's V = 0.15), indicating a modest but meaningful association between product type and injury severity. This aligns with existing scholarship advocating for category-specific surveillance and regulatory differentiation.

Post hoc analyses using Dunn-Bonferroni comparisons revealed pronounced disparities. Baby products consistently exhibited the highest injury severity, outperforming other categories such as kitchen ($p < .001$), toys and children ($p < .01$), and additional high-volume groups. Although baby items constituted fewer total recall events, their elevated mean severity and concentration of high-risk outcomes highlight a critical vulnerability. These findings support stronger pre-market screening protocols, targeted consumer advisories, and prioritized recall alerts in infant-related goods.

Additional risk stratification emerged within home maintenance and sports and recreation products, both of which demonstrated significantly higher injury severity than kitchen products ($p < .001$ and $p < .01$, respectively). These categories likely involve structural or physical interaction factors that heighten the likelihood of serious harm. Such trends call for intensified regulatory attention and more specialized guidance for manufacturers and consumers alike.

Spearman's rank-order correlation ($\rho = -0.18$, $p < .001$) between coded product categories and injury severity further corroborates a directional trend, suggesting that products associated with vulnerable populations or high-impact use tend to skew toward greater harm. While the correlation magnitude is modest, its consistency across categorical and continuous analyses provides a compelling rationale for targeted oversight.

Case study reviews reinforce these statistical signals. Categories involving technical complexity, hazardous materials, or interaction with vulnerable demographics, including fuel products, fireworks,

electronics with large lithium-ion batteries, and baby furniture, emerged as consistent contributors to severe outcomes and fatalities. These observations echo both academic literature and regulatory surveillance findings.

Collectively, the results validate a data-informed approach to differentiated regulatory oversight. Agencies such as the CPSC may consider dynamic categorization frameworks that adjust monitoring thresholds based on severity trends. Enhanced scrutiny, smarter warning systems, and mandatory registration initiatives, particularly for high-risk product types, could improve recall reach and consumer protection.

Despite existing legal structures, the persistent presence of hazardous products in households and secondary markets reveals gaps in recall effectiveness. Compliance is often hampered by insufficient consumer awareness, outdated contact systems, and limitations in media-driven notification. Especially in categories such as baby products, ineffective recalls may result in preventable injuries or fatalities, as evidenced by recent incidents involving dressers, cribs, and expandable gates.

Institutional dynamics also affect recall outcomes. While firms are incentivized to self-report dangerous products due to liability and reputational concerns, short-term economic interests sometimes obstruct transparency. Although whistleblower protections have improved, reporting rates and post-report consequences remain areas for further investigation.

Ultimately, these findings underscore the societal importance of robust recall interventions. By codifying the statistical relationship between product category and injury severity, this study lays a foundation for prioritizing regulatory responses and refining consumer risk communication. Stratified oversight, based not merely on recall frequency but on harm potential, offers a more equitable and effective model for injury prevention and public health protection.

LIMITATIONS

This study faces several constraints that affect the interpretation and practical application of recall data. First, injury and fatality figures are often incomplete or underreported, with critical outcomes sometimes only surfacing through secondary investigations such as legal proceedings (Bamberger & Lobel, 2017; CPSC, 2023a). This limits the comprehensiveness of available incident data and may obscure true severity patterns.

Recall compliance is also shaped by consumer behavior, which in turn depends on the clarity of the recall message, the effectiveness of dissemination channels, and individual perceptions of risk. Without consistent engagement, recalled products may remain in circulation long after alerts are issued.

Geographic variability presents another challenge. Differences in state-level regulatory enforcement and legal frameworks contribute to uneven national recall effectiveness, yet comparative data at the local level remains limited. Furthermore, data from the CPSC (2022) on resale and secondary-market

circulation, through such avenues as garage sales or thrift shops, is scarce, preventing accurate estimation of residual hazards from recalled goods.

Lastly, the analytical framework is subject to confounding influences. Reporting biases, inconsistencies in hazard classification, and unobserved variables tied to product use or popularity may distort cause-effect interpretations, thereby complicating efforts to derive policy-relevant insights.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings presented in this article reinforce the urgency of refining product recall systems in light of persistent injury severity disparities across consumer categories. While regulatory architecture has matured over recent decades, especially under the leadership of the CPSC, evolving product technologies and complex market behaviors expose new fault lines in recall effectiveness. High-risk categories, such as baby products, electronics, and fire-related goods, demand intensified oversight and suggest risk mitigation approaches to protect vulnerable populations and prevent catastrophic harm.

At the same time, recall interventions are only as effective as the systems that support them. Gaps in consumer reporting, inconsistent industry compliance, and the persistence of recalled products in secondary markets undermine the protective potential of recall actions. Improving traceability, expanding digital recall infrastructure, and reinforcing whistleblower channels are not merely technical upgrades. Rather, they represent critical safeguards in a system where speed, transparency, and accountability directly translate into lives saved and injuries prevented.

Ultimately, consumer product recalls should not be viewed as reactive mechanisms alone but as strategic instruments within a broader culture of safety. Strengthening this culture requires deeper integration of behavioral science, regulatory policy, and technological design that are anchored by interdisciplinary collaboration and continuous empirical evaluation. As product ecosystems evolve, so must the institutions and interventions designed to govern them. Through sustained research, adaptive regulation, and public trust-building, the recall system can advance toward a more equitable and resilient framework for consumer protection.

Declarations

Funding Statement: The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Clinical trial number: not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL AND INFORMED CONSENT

Ethical Approval. This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

Informed Consent. Informed consent was not required for this article as no individuals participated in the study.

References

1. 3B Media News. (2025, March 13). *Retractable safety gates recalled; entrapment hazard*. https://3bmedianews.com/retractable-safety-gates-recalled-entrapment-hazard/
2. ABA Banking Journal. (2025, July 18). *CFPB to keep notification procedures for state enforcement of consumer law*. https://bankingjournal.aba.com/2025/07/cfpb-to-keep-notification-procedures-for-state-enforcement-of-consumer-law/
3. ABC News. (2009, September 2). *Pfizer fined $2.3 billion for illegal marketing*. https://abcnews.go.com/Business/pfizer-fined-23-billion-illegal-marketing-off-label/story?id=8477617
4. ABC News. (2024, January 11). *Millions of furniture tip-over restraints sold after 2019 recalled*. https://abcnews.go.com/GMA/Family/millions-furniture-tip-restraints-sold-after-2019-recalled/story?id=106292106
5. ABC News. (2025a, July 21). *5 million above-ground pools recalled after deaths of 9 children*. https://abcnews.go.com/GMA/Living/5-million-ground-pools-recalled-after-deaths-9/story?id=123924189
6. ABC News. (2025b, July 24). *Millions of HydroTech hoses recalled after hundreds burst, leaving several injured*. https://abcnews.go.com/Business/wireStory/millions-hydrotech-hoses-recalled-after-hundreds-burst-leaving-124038072
7. Abogados Gold. (2025). *50-state survey: Consumer protection laws*. https://abogadosgold.com/legislation/50-state-survey-consumer-protection-laws/
8. American Academy of Pediatrics. (2019). *Selecting appropriate toys for young children in the digital era*. *Pediatrics*, 143(1), e20183348. https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/143/1/e20183348/37330
9. American Academy of Pediatrics. (2022). *Optimizing pediatric patient safety in the emergency care setting*. https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/150/5/e2022059674/189658/Optimizing-Pediatric-Patient-Safety-in-the
10. Anjoran, R. (2019). *Why design defects are behind many quality/safety issues*. https://qualityinspection.org/design-defects-quality-safety-issues/
11. Atkins, S. R. (2025). Understanding whistleblower protections in healthcare. *American Institute of Healthcare Compliance*. https://aihc-assn.org/understanding-whistleblower-protections-in-healthcare-legal-obligations-and-compliance-implications/
12. AuditBoard. (2025). *Risk Management Trends for 2025: Missed Risk Connections, Context, and Shifting Dynamics*. https://auditboard.com/blog/risk-management-trends-for-2025-missed-risk-connections-context-and-shifting-dynamics-demand-new-approaches/

13. Astvansh, V. (2018). *Toward a better understanding and management of product recall* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Western Ontario). https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/5810/
14. Astvansh, V., Antia, K., & Tellis, G. J. (2025). Product recall: A synthesis of multidisciplinary findings and research directions. *Marketing Letters, 36*(1), 65–77. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11002-024-09721-x
15. Automotive History. (2023, August 9). *Firestone tire recall issued following fatalities*. https://automotivehistory.org/august-9-2000-firestone-tire-recall/
16. Auto Wire, The. (2025, January 4). *Toyota's unintended acceleration scandal*. https://theautowire.com/2025/01/04/toyotas-unintended-acceleration-scandal/
17. Ball, G. (2015). *Organizational, operational, and behavioral causes of product recalls* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota]. https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstreams/9ed90ea9-2cd7-432a-8c64-b77de5a3d45e/download
18. Ballotpedia. (2025). *Laws governing recall in Missouri*. https://ballotpedia.org/Laws_governing_recall_in_Missouri
19. Bamberger, K. A., & Lobel, O. (2017). *Platform regulation and the hidden costs of underreporting*. *Yale Journal on Regulation*, 34(2), 215–260.
20. Barthe, M., Bavoux, C., Finot, F., Mouche, I., Cuceu-Petrenci, C., Forreryd, A., ... & Osman-Ponchet, H. (2021). Safety testing of cosmetic products: Overview of established methods and new approach methodologies (NAMs). *Cosmetics*, 8(2), 50. https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9284/8/2/50
21. Barthe, L., Dey, S., & Kumar, A. (2021). Quality assurance in dermatological formulations: A review of batch-level testing protocols. *International Journal of Cosmetic Science*, *43*(6), 589–598. https://doi.org/10.1111/ics.12789
22. BEGOODTEX. (2025, June 19). *Frequent global textile recalls reveal alarming flame-retardant compliance risks*. https://www.begoodtex.com/global-textile-flame-retardant-compliance/
23. Bigman, D. (2014, June 5). *'Incompetence' behind GM ignition switch crisis, says CEO*. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/danbigman/2014/06/05/general-motors-report-on-ignition-switch-crisis-finds-no-cover-up/
24. Bokulich, N. A., et al. (2018). *q2-longitudinal: Longitudinal and paired-sample analyses of microbiome data*. *mSystems*, 3(6). https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/msystems.00219-18
25. Boom & Bucket. (2023, August 13). *Importance of load testing in equipment inspection and safety*. https://www.boomandbucket.com/blog/importance-of-load-testing-in-equipment-inspection-and-safety
26. Bonatesta, L. (2024, January 11). *Millions of plastic furniture tip-over restraint kits recalled*. ABC27. https://www.abc27.com/news/consumer/millions-of-plastic-furniture-tip-over-restraint-kits-recalled/
27. Boyer, I. J., Bergfeld, W. F., Heldreth, B., Fiume, M. M., & Gill, L. J. (2017). The Cosmetic Ingredient Review Program—Expert safety assessments of cosmetic ingredients in an open forum. *International Journal of Toxicology*, 36(Suppl 2), 5S–13S. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1091581817717646

28. Brandon, E. M. (2022, November 28). *Buying furniture online is a terrible experience. So, why are we still doing it?* Fast Company. https://www.fastcompany.com/90815026/buying-furniture-online-is-a-terrible-experience-so-why-are-we-still-doing-it
29. Bucy, P. H. (2015). Mass salmonella poisoning by the Peanut Corporation of America: State-corporate crime and the failure of food safety regulation. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, *63*(1–2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-015-9284-5
30. Buell, R. W., & Kalkanci, B. (2019). How transparency into internal and external responsibility initiatives influences consumer choice. *Harvard Business School Working Paper No. 19-115*. https://www.hbs.edu/ris/Publication%20Files/19-115_8758e416-1c22-4dfc-a884-547858f64023.pdf
31. Cadence PCB Solutions. (2019). *The four most common causes of failure of electronic circuits*. https://resources.pcb.cadence.com/blog/2019-the-four-most-common-causes-of-failure-of-electronic-circuits
32. CalBiz Journal. (2023). The impact of Johnson & Johnson's 1982 Tylenol recall on product safety. https://calbizjournal.com/the-impact-of-johnson-johnsons-1982-tylenol-recall-on-product-safety/
33. Carpenter, D. H. (2018). *The Consumer Product Safety Act: A legal analysis* (CRS Report No. R45174). Congressional Research Service. https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R45174
34. CBS News. (2010, February 16). *Toyota unintended acceleration has killed 89*. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/toyota-unintended-acceleration-has-killed-89/
35. CBS News. (2024a, June 27). *22 million Make It Mini toys recalled after dozens report skin burns*. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/mga-miniverse-recall-resin-dollar-store-target-walmart/
36. CBS News. (2024b, August 15). *Feds warn against certain baby loungers and cradle swings after 6 deaths*. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/product-recall-baby-loungers-infant-cradle-swings/
37. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). *Multistate outbreak of Salmonella infections associated with peanut products*. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm58e0129a1.htm
38. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *Data on sports and recreation activities*. https://www.cdc.gov/heads-up/data/index.html
39. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2025). *Recalls of children's products, foods, cosmetics, and medicines due to lead hazards*. https://www.cdc.gov/lead-prevention/communication-resources/recalls.html
40. Center for Universal Design. (1997). *The principles of universal design*. North Carolina State University. https://web.stanford.edu/class/engr110/2007/PUD.pdf
41. Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine. (2004). *The sad story of Vioxx*. https://www.ccjm.org/content/ccjom/71/12/933.full.pdf
42. Clearwater Security. (2025). *A multi-tiered approach to risk monitoring strategy*. https://clearwatersecurity.com/blog/a-multi-tiered-approach-to-risk-monitoring-strategy/

43. Code of Federal Regulations. (2025). *16 CFR § 1115.10 – Persons who must report and where to report*. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-16/chapter-II/subchapter-B/part-1115/subpart-A/section-1115.10
44. ComplianceQuest. (2025). *Enhancing incident prevention and response with predictive analytics*. https://www.compliancequest.com/cq-guide/incident-prevention-and-response-predictive-analytics/
45. ConsumerAffairs. (2024, December 24). *The biggest toy recalls of 2024*. https://www.consumeraffairs.com/news/the-biggest-toy-recalls-of-2024-122424.html
46. Consumer Affairs. (2025a). *Baby sleep product recalls and safety alerts*. https://www.consumeraffairs.com/news/baby-crib-recalls/
47. Consumer Affairs. (2025b). *BowFlex recalls 3.8 million adjustable dumbbells*. https://www.consumeraffairs.com/news/bowflex-recalls-38-million-adjustable-dumbbells-after-hundreds-of-injuries-reported-060625.html
48. Consumer Affairs. (2025c). *Sporting goods recalls and safety alerts*. https://www.consumeraffairs.com/recalls04/aaarecalls_sport.htm
49. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). (2025, January 14). *Strengthening State-Level Consumer Protections*. https://www.consumerfinance.gov/about-us/blog/strengthening-state-level-consumer-protections/
50. Consumer Reports. (2021). *Peloton recalls Tread+ and Tread treadmills*. https://www.consumerreports.org/home-garden/home-product-recalls/peloton-tread-tread-plus-treadmills-recalled-serious-safety-hazards-a6638931886/
51. Consumer Federation of America. (2012). *The Consumer Product Incident Database—SaferProducts.gov*. https://consumerfed.org/consumer_info/the-consumer-product-incident-databasesaferproductsgov/
52. Consumer Federation of America. (2025, February 12). *The growing challenge of e-commerce and product safety: CFA analysis of 2024 CPSC safety warnings*. https://consumerfed.org/press_release/the-growing-challenge-of-e-commerce-and-product-safety-cfa-analysis-of-2024-cpsc-safety-warnings/
53. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2020). *Age determination guidelines: Relating consumer product characteristics to the skills, play behaviors, and interests of children*. https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/Age-Determination-Guidelines-Relating-Consumer-Product-to-Characteristics-Skills-Play-Behavior-Intersts-to-Children-January-2020.pdf
54. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2023a). *Annual report: Addressing injury data limitations and recall effectiveness*. https://www.cpsc.gov
55. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025a). *Bestway, Intex, and Polygroup recall above-ground pools due to drowning hazard*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2025/Bestway-Intex-and-Polygroup-Recall-Certain-Above-Ground-Pools-48-Inches-and-Taller-Due-to-Drowning-Hazard-Nine-Deaths-Reported-Five-Million-Pools-Sold-Since-2002

56. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025b). *Children's products guidance*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Business--Manufacturing/Business-Education/Childrens-Products
57. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025c). *Hobby Toy Hammer Ball sets recalled due to risk of serious injury or death from choking hazard*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2025/Hobby-Toy-Hammer-Ball-Sets-Recalled-Due-to-Risk-of-Serious-Injury-or-Death-from-Choking-Hazard-Violation-of-Federal-Regulation-for-Toys-with-Small-Balls-Sold-Exclusively-on-Amazon-com-by-Shantou-Haochengheng-Technology
58. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (n.d.). *Home – SaferProducts.gov*. https://www.saferproducts.gov/
59. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2010, March 24). *Infantino recalls SlingRider baby slings*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2010/infantino-recalls-to-replace-slingrider-baby-slings-three-infant-deaths-reported
60. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2024a). *Injury statistics by product category*. https://www.cpsc.gov
61. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025d). *LIVACTI retractable safety gates recalled due to risk of serious injury or death from entrapment*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls/2025/LIVACTI-Retractable-Safety-Gates-Recalled-Due-to-Risk-of-Serious-Injury-or-Death-from-Entrapment-Violates-Mandatory-Standard-for-Gates-and-Enclosures-Sold-on-Amazon-by-Qeyan-and-Yanyanny
62. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025e). *National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS)*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Research--Statistics/NEISS-Injury-Data
63. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2023b). *NEISS injury data: Product categories and surveillance priorities*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Research--Statistics/NEISS-Injury-Data
64. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2024b). *NEISS coding manual*. https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/January-2024-NEISS-CPSC-only-Coding-Manual.pdf
65. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2024c, September 19). *New CPSC report shows unsafe sleep environments are leading cause of injuries and deaths with nursery products*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2024/New-CPSC-Report-Shows-Unsafe-Sleep-Environments-Are-Leading-Cause-of-Injuries-and-Deaths-with-Nursery-Products
66. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2016). *Overview of U.S. requirements for textiles/apparel*. https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/Session%204%20Textiles%20En.pdf
67. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025f). *Recall guidance for businesses*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Business--Manufacturing/Recall-Guidance
68. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2023c). Recalls involving kitchen appliances and burn hazards. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls
69. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025h). *Regulated products handbook*. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-Y3_C76_3-PURL-LPS62724/pdf/GOVPUB-Y3_C76_3-PURL-LPS62724.pdf

70. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025i). *SaferProducts.gov – Public safety database*. https://www.saferproducts.gov/
71. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025j). *Safety alerts by product category*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Safety-Education/Safety-Alerts
72. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025k). *Sports and recreation product recalls*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls
73. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2025l). *Strategic Plan 2023–2026*. https://www.cpsc.gov/s3fs-public/Strategic-Plan-2023-2026-revised-02-25-25.pdf
74. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2023d, April 19). *CPSC adopts final safety standard to prevent tip-overs*. https://www.cpsc.gov/Newsroom/News-Releases/2023/CPSC-Adopts-Final-Consumer-Product-Safety-Standard-to-Prevent-Tip-overs-of-Dressers-and-Other-Clothing-Storage-Units
75. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2022). *Resale and recalled products: Addressing risks in secondary markets*. https://www.cpsc.gov
76. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC). (2024d). Toy and children's product recalls: 2024 summary. https://www.cpsc.gov/Recalls
77. Consumer Reports. (2019). *When recalls fail*. https://www.consumerreports.org/recalls/when-recalls-fail/
78. Cooperrider, N. K., Thomas, T. M., & Hammoud, S. A. (1990). Testing and analysis of vehicle rollover behavior. *SAE Technical Paper 900366*. https://doi.org/10.4271/900366
79. Craftybase. (2025). *Ensuring your handmade shop is CPSC compliant*. https://craftybase.com/blog/cpsc-compliance-and-your-handmade-shop
80. Dart, R. C. (2009). Monitoring risk: Post marketing surveillance and signal detection. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *105*(Suppl 1), S26–S32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2009.08.011
81. Deloitte. (n.d.). *The current challenges of product liability and product recalls*. https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/services/legal/perspectives/the-current-challenges-of-product-liability-and-product-recalls.html
82. Deloitte. (2025). *The current challenges of product liability and product recalls*. https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/services/legal/perspectives/the-current-challenges-of-product-liability-and-product-recalls.html
83. Del Rosso, S. J. (2015). *Our new three Rs: Rigor, relevance, and readability*. The Living Library. https://thelivinglib.org/our-new-three-rs-rigor-relevance-and-readability/
84. Dodero, A., Escher, A., Bertucci, S., Castellano, M., & Lova, P. (2021). Intelligent packaging for real-time monitoring of food quality: Current and future developments. *Applied Sciences*, 11(8), 3532. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/11/8/3532
85. Dynamis LLP. (2025). *How tariff increases are driving customs fraud and DOJ enforcement risks*. https://www.dynamisllp.com/knowledge/tariff-increases-customs-fraud-enforcement-risks

86. eCFR. (2025). *21 CFR Part 7 Subpart C – Recalls*. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-7/subpart-C
87. Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. (2025). *16 CFR Part 1250 – Safety standard mandating ASTM F963 for toys*. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-16/chapter-II/subchapter-B/part-1250
88. Embryo Project Encyclopedia. (2014). *US regulatory response to thalidomide (1950–2000)*. https://embryo.asu.edu/pages/us-regulatory-response-thalidomide-1950-2000
89. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (n.d.). *Pesticide product recalls and enforcement*. https://www.epa.gov/pesticides
90. Eurofins. (2024). *ASTM F963-23 compliance: Navigating U.S. toy safety standards*. https://www.eurofins.com/toys-hardlines/resources/articles/astm-f963-23-compliance-navigating-us-toy-safety-standards/
91. Evans, E. (2024, November 21). *Uncovering the untold significance of load testing in structural engineering*. https://www.evansengineeringandconstruction.com/post/uncovering-the-untold-significance-of-load-testing-in-structural-engineering-a-professional-perspec
92. Exponent. (2023). *Risks & hazards in complex kitchen appliances*. https://www.exponent.com/article/risks-hazards-complex-kitchen-appliances
93. FEMA. (n.d.). *Hazard identification & building monitoring*. https://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/usr/module1c.pdf
94. Fitzmaurice, G., & Molenberghs, G. (2009). *Advances in longitudinal data analysis*. Harvard University. https://content.sph.harvard.edu/fitzmaur/lda/C6587_C001.pdf
95. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2018). *Questions and answers regarding mandatory food recalls: Guidance for industry and FDA staff*. https://www.fda.gov/files/guidance%20documents/published/MandatoryRecallGuidance.pdf
96. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2024a). *Domestic mutual reliance work by division*. https://www.fda.gov/food/domestic-mutual-reliance-food/domestic-mutual-reliance-work-division
97. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2024b). *Inspectorate boundaries map*. https://www.fda.gov/media/182341/download
98. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2024c). *Recalls, market withdrawals, & safety alerts*. https://www.fda.gov/safety/recalls-market-withdrawals-safety-alerts
99. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (n.d.). *Facts about the Current Good Manufacturing Practice (CGMP)*. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/pharmaceutical-quality-resources/facts-about-current-good-manufacturing-practice-cgmp
100. Food Safety Institute. (2024, March 24). *The crucial role of packaging in food safety and quality*. https://foodsafety.institute/food-fundamentals-chemistry/packaging-food-safety-quality/
101. Food Safety News. (2025). *More recalls doesn't necessarily mean more harm to consumers*. https://www.foodsafetynews.com/2025/05/more-recalls-doesnt-necessarily-mean-more-harm-to-consumers/

102. Forbes. (2024, September 20). *Baby lounger recall 2024*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbes-personal-shopper/2024/09/20/baby-lounger-recall/
103. ForensisGroup. (2025, July 14). *Accident reconstruction in the Ford-Firestone tire recall*. https://www.forensisgroup.com/resources/expert-legal-witness-blog/accident-reconstruction-in-the-ford-firestone-tire-recall-tire-failures-and-suv-rollover-litigation
104. Good Morning America. (2022, October 19). *CPSC sets federal safety standard for furniture aimed at reducing deaths, injuries*. https://www.goodmorningamerica.com/family/story/cpsc-sets-federal-safety-standard-furniture-aimed-reducing-91757521
105. Graziosi, F., Bonfiglioli, R., Decataldo, F., & Violante, F. S. (2024). Criteria for assessing exposure to biomechanical risk factors: A research-to-practice guide—Part 1. *Life*, 14(11), 1398. https://www.mdpi.com/2075-1729/14/11/1398
106. Growing Your Baby. (2010, March 24). *Recall: Over 1 million Infantino SlingRider baby slings*. https://www.growingyourbaby.com/recall-over-1-million-infantino-slingrider-baby-slings-after-three-infant-deaths-reported/
107. Gupta, A., Yadav, M., & Nayak, B. K. (2025). A systematic literature review on inclusive public open spaces: Accessibility standards and universal design principles. *Urban Science, 9*(6), 181. https://www.mdpi.com/2413-8851/9/6/181
108. Hall, A. (2025). Problems from inconsistent enforcement of policies. https://aaronhall.com/problems-from-inconsistent-enforcement-of-policies/
109. Harbert College of Business. (n.d.). *Firestone's tire recall*. Auburn University. https://harbert.auburn.edu/binaries/documents/center-for-ethical-organizational-cultures/cases/firestone.pdf
110. Harte Hanks. (2024). *Product recalls: The classifications (with examples)*. https://distribution.hartehanks.com/blog/product-recalls-the-classifications-with-examples/
111. Hazwoper OSHA. (2023). *Understanding and preventing construction's fatal four hazards*. https://hazwoper-osha.com/blogs-post/understanding-and-preventing-constructions-fatal-four-hazards
112. Healthy People 2030. (2025). *National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS-AIP)*. https://odphp.health.gov/healthypeople/objectives-and-data/data-sources-and-methods/data-sources/national-electronic-injury-surveillance-system-all-injury-program-neiss-aip
113. Hertz, J. (2024, September 16). *UPDATE: 12 recent battery-related product recalls*. Battery Technology Online. https://www.batterytechonline.com/portable/update-12-recent-battery-related-product-recalls
114. Hevo Academy. (2025, February 7). *Common data integrity issues and how to tackle them*. https://hevoacademy.com/data-management/data-integrity-issues/
115. Hyman, W. A. (2015). *Reconciling gaps between premarket testing and postmarket results*. *Medical Device and Diagnostic Industry*. https://www.mddionline.com/testing/reconciling-gaps-between-premarket-testing-and-postmarket-results

116. IBM. (2023, June 20). *Data integrity issues: Examples, impact, and prevention*. https://www.ibm.com/think/insights/data-integrity-strategy
117. Infantino. (2010). *Full statement on SlingRider recall*. https://infantino.com/pages/full-statement-on-slingrider-recall
118. Journal for Clinical Studies. (2021). *A guide for establishing and governing data collection standards*. https://journalforclinicalstudies.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/A-Guide-for-Establishing-and-Governing-Data-Collection-Standards.pdf
119. Journalism University. (2024, January 4). *Johnson & Johnson's Tylenol crisis: A lesson in ethical crisis management*. https://journalism.university/media-ethics-and-laws/tylenol-crisis-ethical-management-lessons/
120. Justia. (2024, April 11). *BRS liquid fuel bottles recalled for violating child-resistant standards*. https://recalls.justia.com/outdoor-recreation-and-sports/fuel-and-lighters-and-fireworks/24-192/
121. Justia. (2025). *Toy recalls involving choking hazards and mechanical failure*. https://recalls.justia.com/infants-and-children/toys/1-10/
122. Kaçiku Baljija, S., & Min, K. (2023). Evaluating the effectiveness of whistleblower protection: A new index. *Data & Policy, 5*, e28. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/data-and-policy/article/evaluating-the-effectiveness-of-whistleblower-protection-a-new-index/4091BBC5D3453D516BE10992E35F065D
123. Kang, J., & Hustvedt, G. (2014). Building trust between consumers and corporations: The role of consumer perceptions of transparency and social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics, 125*(2), 253–265. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-013-1916-7
124. Karwowski, W. (2005). Ergonomics and human factors: The paradigms for science, engineering, design, technology and management of human-compatible systems. *Ergonomics*, 48(5), 436–463. https://iems.ucf.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/The-Paradigms-for-Science-Engineering-Design-Technology-and-Management-of-Human-Compatible-Systems.pdf
125. Kawasaki Motors USA. (2024). *Product recall: Engines used in lawn and garden equipment due to fire and burn hazards*. https://kawasakienginesusa.com/support-resources/product-recall/product-recall-24-256
126. Keeping Babies Safe. (2025). *Infant product safety recalls*. https://keepingbabiessafe.org/infant-product-safety-recalls/
127. Lakshan, N. D., & Senanayake, C. M. (2025). Biodegradable smart packaging with carbon dots for real-time food quality monitoring. *Journal of Food Measurement and Characterization*. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11694-025-03398-0
128. Lang, A. E., Friesen, K. B., Lawson, J., Mondal, P., Koehncke, N., & Kim, S. Y. (2025). Biomechanical risk factors for rotator cuff syndrome in high-risk occupations: A prospective study protocol. *PLOS One*, 20(6), e0326229. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0326229
129. Latson, J. (2014, September 29). *How poisoned Tylenol became a crisis-management teaching model*. TIME. https://time.com/3423136/tylenol-deaths-1982/

130. Lee, S. (2025, May 27). *Universal design in urban health*. Number Analytics. https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/universal-design-urban-health
131. Legal United States. (2025, July 22). *Above ground pools recalled after tragic deaths*. https://legalunitedstates.com/above-ground-pools-recalled/
132. Limbach, J. (2024, February 7). *Snap recalls lithium-ion batteries sold for Pixy Flying Cameras*. ConsumerAffairs. https://www.consumeraffairs.com/news/lithium-ion-batteries/
133. Lockton. (2024, April 2). *Product recall: Mitigating against labelling and packaging errors*. https://global.lockton.com/gb/en/news-insights/product-recall-mitigating-against-labelling-and-packaging-errors
134. Loyola University Chicago School of Law. (n.d.). *Journal of Regulatory Compliance*. https://www.luc.edu/law/academics/journals-publications/journalofregulatorycompliance/
135. Mayer Brown LLP. (2025, April 3). *Heightened enforcement risks and opportunities in international trade*. https://www.mayerbrown.com/en/insights/publications/2025/04/heightened-enforcement-risks-and-opportunities-in-international-trade
136. Mechanical Contractors Association of America. (2016). *Guide to pressure testing safety*. https://www.mcaa.org/pca/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2016/03/SE86PDF.pdf
137. Millan, N. (2020, January 20). *Playground equipment can trap children, recalled*. FacilitiesNet. https://www.facilitiesnet.com/facilitiesmanagement/tip/Playground-Equipment-Can-Trap-Children-Recalled--45399
138. Molamohamadi, Z., Samani, M. A., & Karimi, M. (2024). Reviewing the historical milestones of risk management. *SN Business & Economics, 4*, 161. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s43546-024-00762-y
139. Nalepinski, K. (2025, March 13). *FDA update as beauty products recalled for benzene: See full list*. Newsweek. https://www.newsweek.com/benzene-recall-fda-beauty-products-list-loreal-walgreens-2044618
140. Nash, J., & Kern, P. (2018). Integrated safety testing and assessment of topical drug products. *FDA Public Workshop*. https://www.fda.gov/media/124987/download
141. Nash, J., & Walters, D. E. (2015). *Public engagement and transparency in regulation: A field guide to regulatory excellence*. Penn Program on Regulation. https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/4709-nashwalters-ppr-researchpaper062015pdf
142. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). (2022). *Software hazard causes – SW Engineering Handbook Ver C*. https://swehb.nasa.gov/display/SWEHBVC/8.21+-+Software+Hazard+Causes
143. National Center for Health Research. (n.d.). *Toys-R-Dangerous? What you need to know about children's products and recalls*. https://www.center4research.org/toys-r-dangerous-need-know-childrens-products-recalls/
144. Nationwide Children's Hospital. (2025). *NEISS injury surveillance overview*. https://www.nationwidechildrens.org/research/areas-of-research/center-for-injury-research-and-

policy/injury-topics/research-projects/neiss

145. National Law Review. (2025, March 25). *DOJ intensifies customs fraud enforcement amid tariff surge*. https://natlawreview.com/article/what-every-multinational-company-needs-know-about-criminal-enforcement-trade-import
146. National Safety Council. (2024). *Using data and AI to gain insights into your safety program*. https://www.nsc.org/getmedia/0e837673-651b-4763-bc99-b3991d32001a/predictive-analytics-machine-learning-priority-tech-wp.pdf
147. National Safety Council. (2025). *Consumer product injuries – data details*. https://injuryfacts.nsc.org/home-and-community/safety-topics/consumer-product-injuries/data-details/
148. National Whistleblower Center. (n.d.). *Why whistleblowing works*. https://www.whistleblowers.org/why-whistleblowing-works/
149. NBC News. (2004, October 6). *Report: Vioxx linked to thousands of deaths*. https://www.nbcnews.com/health/health-news/report-vioxx-linked-thousands-deaths-flna1C9445945
150. Ni, J., Borisov, A., Modi, S., & Huang, X. (2023). Learning from failure: The implications of product recalls for firm innovation. *Journal of Supply Chain Management, 59*(1), 42–64. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/jscm.12306
151. Noggle, R., & Palmer, D. E. (2005). Radials, rollovers and responsibility: An examination of the Ford–Firestone case. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *56*(2), 185–204. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-004-1757-5
152. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2020). *Investigator's desk aid to the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act (CPSIA) whistleblower protection provision*. https://www.whistleblowers.gov/sites/default/files/CPSIA_Desk_Aid.pdf
153. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2023). *Summary of severe injury reports*. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/OSHA_SIR_Annual_Report-2022-2023_final.pdf
154. OCFS. (2025, April 15). *Long-Haul portable ATV fuel containers recalled for child poisoning and burn risks*. https://ocfs.ny.gov/main/news/recalls/article.php?idx=213
155. OECD. (2016). *Committing to effective whistleblower protection*. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/committing-to-effective-whistleblower-protection_9789264252639-en.html
156. Oklahoma State Election Board. (2021). *Recalls*. https://oklahoma.gov/elections/elections-results/recalls.html
157. O'Melveny. (2025). State attorneys general positioning to fill enforcement gaps. https://www.omm.com/insights/alerts-publications/state-attorneys-general-positioning-to-fill-enforcement-gaps-based-on-changing-priorities-of-federal-agencies/
158. Ortiz, Y., Arévalo, P., Peña, D., & Jurado, F. (2024). Recent advances in thermal management strategies for lithium-ion batteries: A comprehensive review. *Batteries*, 10(3), 83.

https://www.mdpi.com/2313-0105/10/3/83

159. Packaging Digest. (2023, October 3). *Food recalls due to packaging problems*. https://www.packagingdigest.com/food-safety/food-recalls-due-to-packaging-problems-september-2023
160. PBS NewsHour. (2014, September 29). *How the Tylenol murders of 1982 changed the way we consume medication*. https://www.pbs.org/newshour/health/tylenol-murders-1982
161. Peloton. (2021). *Tread+ recall FAQs*. https://www.onepeloton.com/press/articles/treadplus-faqs
162. Pew Charitable Trusts (PEW). (2024). *States with shrinking populations: Implications for public services*. https://www.golocalprov.com/news/RI-The-Incredible-Shrinking-State-Population-Is-Significantly-Declining
163. Powers Health. (2025, June 10). *BowFlex recalls 3.8 million dumbbells after injury reports*. https://www.powershealth.org/about-us/newsroom/health-library/2025/06/10/bowflex-recalls-38-million-dumbbells-after-injury-reports
164. Qassimi, N. M. (2023). *Enhancing validity, rigor, and insight through multimethod approaches*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376800229
165. Quality Assurance Magazine. (2023). *Recalls due to undeclared allergens can be prevented*. https://www.qualityassurancemag.com/news/recalls-due-to-undeclared-allergens-can-be-prevented/
166. Raithel, S., Hock, S. J., & Mafael, A. (2024). Product recall effectiveness and consumers' participation in corrective actions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 52*(4), 716–735. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11747-023-00967-x
167. Retail & Consumer Products Law Observer. (2021). *Recalls in review: Exercise equipment*. https://www.retailconsumerproductslaw.com/2021/03/recalls-in-review-exercise-equipment/
168. Safety+Health Magazine. (2023). *The role of data analysis in workplace safety*. https://www.safetyandhealthmagazine.com/articles/23697-the-role-of-data-analysis-in-workplace-safety
169. SafetyCulture. (2025). *Food recalls: Strategies for reducing risk*. https://safetyculture.com/topics/food-safety/food-recalls/
170. Safety Notes. (2024). *Must-know pressure testing safety procedures to avoid critical risks*. https://www.safetynotes.net/must-know-pressure-testing-safety-procedures-to-avoid-critical-risks/
171. Sedgwick. (2025). *Case study: Navigating a benzene contamination crisis in peak season*. https://www.sedgwick.com/product-recall/insights/case-studies/benzene/
172. Semegn, A. M., Woldegiorgis, B. H., & Lemessa, Z. W. (2025). Recent developments in biomechanics-based prediction of musculoskeletal disorders: A review. In *Sustainable Development Research in Manufacturing* (pp. 155–167). Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-77339-6_10

173. Shaheen, R. M., & Smith, W. S. (2019). Product responsibility and customer care: Customer health and safety; marketing and labeling; and customer privacy. *Business Law Today*. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/business_law/resources/business-law-today/2019-october/product-responsibility-and-customer-care/

174. Sharrow, T. (2025, March 19). *The Samsung Galaxy Note 7 battery debacle: What went wrong?* SoftHandTech. https://softhandtech.com/what-was-wrong-with-the-note-7-battery/

175. Smithsonian Magazine. (2015). *The woman who stood between America and a generation of thalidomide babies*. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/woman-who-stood-between-america-and-epidemic-birth-defects-180963165/

176. Spectrum News. (2025, July 25). *5 million pools recalled related to accidental child drownings*. https://spectrumlocalnews.com/mo/st-louis/news/2025/07/25/manufacturers-recall-5-million-pools-related-to-accidental-child-drownings

177. Springer. (2015). *Mass salmonella poisoning by the Peanut Corporation of America*. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10612-015-9284-5

178. Statista. (2025). *Product recalls in the United States - Statistics & facts*. https://www.statista.com/topics/3798/product-recalls-in-the-united-states/

179. Studocu. (2024). *Evaluating age-appropriate toys via Piaget's theory*. https://www.studocu.com/en-us/document/eastern-kentucky-university/introduction-to-psychology/critical-thinking-3/106620541

180. Tang, C. S., Deng, Y., Wang, W., & Yoo, O. S. (2024). Can an e-commerce platform and its third-party sellers benefit from each other's market entry? *Production and Operations Management*, 33(1), 69–86. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/10591478231224913

181. Target. (2024, June 25). *Product recall: MGA Entertainment Miniverse Make It Mini sets*. https://help.target.com/help/TargetGuestHelpPRArticleDetail?articleId=ka95d000000gIZ8AAM&articleTitle=MGA+Entertainment+Miniverse+Make+It+Mini+Sets

182. Testcoo. (2024, February 21). *The recall: Textile, footwear and accessories products—January 2024*. https://www.testcoo.com/en/blog/the-recall-textile-footwear-and-accessories-products-january-2024

183. TIME. (2014). Tylenol poison spree becomes crisis management case study. https://time.com/3423136/tylenol-deaths-1982/

184. TIME. (2016, October 11). *A brief history of Samsung's troubled Galaxy Note 7*. https://time.com/4526350/samsung-galaxy-note-7-recall-problems-overheating-fire/

185. TorHoerman Law. (2025). *Above-ground pool barrier requirements*. https://www.torhoermanlaw.com/lawsuits-for-above-ground-pool-accidents/above-ground-pool-barrier-requirements/

186. Watkins, T. (2024, September 13). *Lithium battery product recalls: Fire hazards and safety risks*. Abraham Watkins Blog. https://abrahamwatkins.com/blog/2024/09/lithium-battery-product-recalls-fire-hazards-and-safety-risks/

187. Whitmore, M. (2017). *Human factors engineering and ergonomics in systems engineering*. NASA Technical Report. https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20170008761/downloads/20170008761.pdf

188. Williams, D. C. (2025, July 23). *E-bikes, mobile chargers recalled over lithium-ion battery fires*. NorthJersey.com. . https://www.yahoo.com/news/articles/e-bikes-mobile-chargers-recalled-192052093.html

189. World Bank. (2021). *Chapter 2: An Investment Perspective on Global Value Chains*. https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/c9af0143184de77cb58ddd5adf024508-0350012021/related/9781464816833-ch2-1.pdf

190. WRAL News. (2025, July 29). *Over 3 million garden hoses recalled due to bursting hazard*. https://www.wral.com/consumer/hydrotech-expandable-garden-hoses-recall-us-july-2025/

191. UIAA. (2025). *Climbing equipment recalls and warnings*. https://www.theuiaa.org/safety/safety-recalls/

192. UL Solutions. (2025). *Product safety certification and compliance*. https://www.ul.com/services/product-safety-certification

193. USA Today. (2022). *Recall history: How the U.S. developed its food safety laws*. https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/shopping/2022/02/15/recall-history-food-safety-botulism-salmonella/6747536001/

194. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). (n.d.). *FoodData Central*. https://fdc.nal.usda.gov

195. U.S. Department of Labor. (n.d.). *Whistleblower protection for consumer product industry workers* [OSHA Fact Sheet]. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA4118.pdf

196. U.S. Department of Transportation. (2014, April 1). *The GM ignition switch recall: Why did it take so long?* https://www.transportation.gov/testimony/gm-ignition-switch-recall-why-did-it-take-so-long

197. USA.gov. . (n.d.). *State consumer protection offices*. https://www.usa.gov/state-consumer

198. Vasquez, D., Klopp, R., & Yang, L. (2023). *Risks & hazards in complex kitchen appliances*. Exponent. https://www.exponent.com/article/risks-hazards-complex-kitchen-appliances

199. Zimmermann, P. (2025). *Staging debates in whistleblowing research: A problematizing literature review*. *Journal of Business Ethics*. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-025-05990-2