Peptide Safety and Integrity

Understanding Quality, Verification, and Regulatory Boundaries

- Manufacturing and Global Supply Risks
- Analytical Verification and Mislabeling Concerns
- Clinical and Regulatory Safeguards

Millennium Health Centers, Inc.
Advancing Hormone and Peptide Therapies

Peptide Safety and Integrity: Understanding Quality, Verification, and Regulatory Boundaries

A White Paper on Origin, Verification, and Risk in Modern Peptide Use

Introduction

Peptides are increasingly employed across clinical medicine, integrative wellness, and biomedical research because of their remarkable biological specificity and therapeutic potential. As short chains of amino acids designed to interact with defined receptors, enzymes, and signaling pathways, peptides offer a level of molecular precision that is difficult to achieve with many conventional pharmaceuticals. This precision has fueled growing interest in their use for tissue repair, immune modulation, metabolic regulation, and neuroendocrine support.

At the same time, the rapid expansion of peptide availability has outpaced public and professional understanding of **manufacturing quality, analytical verification, and regulatory boundaries**. Unlike small-molecule supplements or traditional pharmaceuticals, peptides are inherently **sequence-dependent biological compounds**. Their structure and function are determined not only by their overall composition, but by the exact order, length, and chemical integrity of each amino acid in the chain. Minor variations, such as truncations, deletions, oxidation, or incomplete synthesis, can meaningfully alter receptor binding, signaling behavior, pharmacokinetics, and immunogenicity.

As a result, peptides occupy a unique position in modern therapeutics: they are neither simple chemical entities nor fully regulated biologics in many real-world applications. Their clinical impact is therefore inseparable from issues of **identity, purity, and manufacturing control**, making rigorous verification and appropriate oversight essential to ensuring both safety and predictability of biological effect.

This white paper explains:

- How peptide origin and global manufacturing affect quality
- The difference between Certificates of Analysis (CoAs) and analytical methods such as HPLC
- Why peptide fragments and mixed species raise safety concerns, especially for injectable use
- How U.S. federal regulations distinguish approved drugs, compounded peptides, and “research use only” materials
- Practical safety considerations for clinicians and consumers

The goal is not to discourage peptide research or clinical exploration, but to emphasize verification, oversight, and informed decision-making as essential components of responsible peptide use.

Why Peptide Quality Has Become a Frontline Safety Issue

Peptides derive their biological activity from highly precise amino acid sequences that govern how they interact with receptors, enzymes, and intracellular signaling pathways. Even minimal deviations, such as a single amino acid truncation, substitution, oxidation, or other chemical modification, can meaningfully alter receptor affinity, signaling bias, biological half-life, tissue distribution, or immunogenic potential. In peptide biology, structure is functional, and small molecular errors can translate into disproportionate clinical consequences.

As peptides move beyond tightly regulated pharmaceutical development pathways and into compounding environments and consumer-accessible markets, the central safety question has shifted. Increasingly, quality assurance, not theoretical mechanism of action or intended benefit, has become the primary

determinant of clinical safety and predictability. A peptide's name alone no longer guarantees its molecular identity or biological behavior.

Unlike FDA-approved drugs, many peptides currently in circulation do not undergo premarket review for identity, purity, sterility, or clinical effect. This regulatory reality has created a fragmented landscape in which two products bearing the same peptide designation may be chemically distinct, variably purified, or biologically non-equivalent, despite appearing interchangeable to the end user. In such an environment, assumptions of equivalence based on labeling or anecdotal experience can obscure meaningful differences in risk, efficacy, and safety.

Globalized Peptide Manufacturing and Points of Failure

Most peptide active pharmaceutical ingredients and peptide intermediates used within the United States are manufactured outside the country. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has repeatedly documented the extent to which the U.S. pharmaceutical supply chain depends on foreign manufacturing facilities, many of which operate under variable inspection schedules, differing regulatory frameworks, and heterogeneous quality control cultures. This globalized manufacturing model has increased access and scalability but has also introduced additional layers of complexity and risk that are not always visible to clinicians or end users.

A typical peptide manufacturing and distribution pathway often spans multiple geographic regions and operational stages. Raw amino acids may be sourced from one supplier, followed by solid-phase peptide synthesis at another facility, after which crude peptide products undergo cleavage and partial purification. The material may then be lyophilized for stability, repackaged or relabeled by an intermediary, and ultimately distributed through secondary or tertiary channels before reaching the point of clinical or consumer use. Each transition between facilities or handlers represents a potential disruption in continuity of quality oversight.

At every stage of this process, specific vulnerabilities can emerge. Errors in synthesis may lead to sequence truncations or incorrect amino acid incorporation. Incomplete purification can allow residual synthesis byproducts, deletion sequences, or chemically modified fragments to persist in the final product. Shared manufacturing equipment or inadequate cleaning procedures increase the risk of cross-contamination with other peptides. Extended transport and improper storage conditions may contribute to chemical degradation, oxidation, or loss of biological activity. Finally, repackaging and relabeling steps introduce opportunities for substitution, mislabeling, or document inconsistencies that can obscure the true origin and composition of the peptide.

While foreign manufacturing does not inherently imply poor quality, the length and complexity of the modern peptide supply chain substantially amplify the importance of downstream analytical verification. In the absence of transparent, methodologically sound testing and clear chain-of-custody documentation, assumptions regarding peptide identity and purity become increasingly unreliable, even when products appear equivalent by name or labeling.

Global sourcing is not inherently unsafe, but it requires stronger downstream verification. Quality failures rarely arise from a single step; they emerge from cumulative, unverified assumptions across the supply chain.

Certificates of Analysis vs Analytical Testing: What Actually Proves Purity

Certificate of Analysis (CoA)

A Certificate of Analysis (CoA) is a batch-specific quality document that summarizes reported test results for a particular lot of material. It typically identifies the lot or batch number, reports an assay or purity percentage, includes statements regarding identity confirmation, and provides basic information related to

storage conditions and testing dates. In practice, the CoA functions as a snapshot of quality claims associated with a specific production batch.

It is critical to understand, however, that a CoA is **not itself an analytical test**. Rather, it is a report that compiles results generated elsewhere using one or more analytical methods. The scientific and clinical value of a CoA therefore depends entirely on factors that are often not immediately visible to the end user. These include the competence and independence of the laboratory performing the testing, the appropriateness and rigor of the analytical methods employed, whether those methods have been properly validated, and the degree to which testing methodologies and acceptance criteria are transparently disclosed.

Without clear documentation of how identity and purity were assessed, a CoA provides only limited assurance of actual peptide integrity. In such cases, the document may function more as a compliance artifact than as a reliable indicator of molecular identity or biological consistency. For peptides, where small structural deviations can result in significant functional differences, this distinction becomes especially important when products are intended for clinical or injectable use.

A CoA without accompanying methodological detail or raw data provides **limited assurance** of true peptide identity or purity.

High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)

High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) is a foundational analytical technique used to separate the components of a chemical or biological mixture and to estimate relative purity based on chromatographic peak area under defined experimental conditions. It is one of the most commonly employed tools in pharmaceutical and peptide analysis and is widely referenced in pharmacopeial standards, including those maintained by the United States Pharmacopeia.

When appropriately designed and executed, HPLC can identify the presence of multiple components within a peptide preparation, detect gross impurities arising from synthesis or degradation, and provide an estimate of relative purity for the dominant molecular species. For this reason, HPLC is frequently cited in quality documentation and is often used to support purity claims associated with peptide products.

However, HPLC has important and frequently misunderstood limitations. On its own, HPLC cannot confirm the amino acid sequence or molecular identity of a peptide. Structurally similar peptides, truncated variants, or deletion sequences may co-elute under certain chromatographic conditions, appearing as a single peak despite representing multiple distinct molecular species. In addition, impurities that share similar physicochemical properties with the target peptide may not be reliably resolved without highly optimized or orthogonal methods.

As a result, a peptide may legitimately be reported as “99% pure by HPLC” while still being biologically incorrect, structurally altered, or functionally unpredictable. HPLC purity values must therefore be interpreted as method-dependent estimates rather than definitive proof of peptide identity. In clinical or injectable contexts, HPLC data are most meaningful when paired with complementary identity-confirming techniques, such as mass spectrometry, and supported by transparent method validation and disclosure.

Best-Practice Verification

Meaningful peptide verification requires a multidimensional analytical approach that extends beyond any single test or reported purity value. In practice, robust verification typically involves the use of High-Performance Liquid Chromatography, often employing more than one chromatographic method, to assess relative purity and detect gross impurities under different separation conditions. While HPLC provides important information regarding compositional complexity, it does not, by itself, establish molecular identity.

For this reason, mass spectrometry, most commonly liquid chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (LC–MS), is essential for confirming peptide identity. LC–MS allows direct verification of molecular weight and structural consistency, helping to distinguish the intended peptide from truncated sequences, deletion variants, or structurally similar impurities that may not be resolved chromatographically. Identity confirmation is particularly critical for peptides, where small sequence differences can translate into substantial biological and immunologic consequences.

When peptides are intended for injectable use, verification must extend beyond chemical composition to include safety-critical assessments. Endotoxin testing is necessary to evaluate the presence of pyrogenic contaminants that can provoke inflammatory or systemic reactions even at very low concentrations. Where applicable, sterility or bioburden testing is also required to reduce the risk of microbial contamination associated with parenteral administration.

Taken together, these complementary analyses form the foundation of responsible peptide verification. Purity claims that are not supported by molecular identity confirmation and appropriate safety testing are scientifically incomplete and insufficient to ensure predictable biological behavior, particularly in clinical or injectable contexts.

Fragment Peptides and Mixed Species: Why Injection Raises Risk

Peptides produced without rigorous purification frequently contain a heterogeneous mixture of molecular species rather than a single, uniform compound. These mixtures may include truncated peptide sequences, deletion or insertion variants, oxidized amino acid residues, and residual synthesis byproducts that arise during solid-phase peptide synthesis and incomplete downstream purification. Although these variants may be present in relatively small proportions, their biological impact can be disproportionate, particularly when peptides are administered parenterally.

When peptides are taken orally, some degree of molecular degradation or inactivation may be mitigated by digestive enzymes and first-pass metabolism, which can reduce systemic exposure to structurally altered or unintended peptide species. Injection bypasses these protective barriers entirely, delivering the peptide mixture directly into systemic circulation or local tissue compartments. As a result, any impurities, fragments, or chemically modified variants present in the preparation gain immediate biological access, increasing the potential for unpredictable pharmacologic behavior, immune activation, or adverse reactions.

This distinction is especially important in the context of injectable peptide use, where assumptions of molecular uniformity based on labeling or reported purity may obscure the presence of biologically active fragments. In such cases, the route of administration transforms what might otherwise be a theoretical quality concern into a clinically relevant safety issue.

Immunologic Risk

Fragmented or chemically altered peptides may introduce novel antigenic structures that are not present in the intended parent sequence. These structural changes can increase the likelihood of immune recognition, leading to antibody formation, hypersensitivity reactions, or immune-mediated neutralization of biological activity. In some cases, antibody development may reduce or eliminate therapeutic effect over time, while in others it may provoke inflammatory or allergic responses that are difficult to predict or monitor. Because peptides interact directly with immune surveillance mechanisms, even small sequence deviations can shift a compound from biologically tolerated to immunologically reactive.

Pharmacologic Uncertainty

Minor changes in peptide sequence or chemical structure can significantly alter pharmacologic behavior. Variations such as truncations, substitutions, or post-synthetic modifications may change receptor affinity, modify signaling bias toward agonist or antagonist activity, and alter tissue distribution patterns. These changes can also influence duration of action, metabolic stability, and clearance rates, resulting in biological

effects that differ substantially from those expected based on the intended peptide design. In addition, structurally related but unintended peptide species may engage off-target receptors or signaling pathways, further increasing unpredictability of clinical response.

Contamination Amplification

Injectable administration magnifies the clinical consequences of contamination that might otherwise be less consequential with non-parenteral routes. Endotoxin contamination can provoke acute inflammatory or pyrogenic reactions even at very low concentrations. Microbial contamination introduces the risk of localized or systemic infection, while particulate matter can trigger inflammatory responses or tissue irritation. Improper excipients, incorrect pH, or osmolarity mismatches may further exacerbate local or systemic adverse effects. When peptides are injected, these factors bypass normal physiological barriers, transforming quality lapses into immediate safety concerns.

Taken together, these risks underscore an important principle: peptide fragmentation and contamination are not cosmetic quality defects. They function as biological and clinical risk multipliers, particularly in injectable contexts, where molecular precision and manufacturing control are essential to predictable and safe use.

U.S. Regulatory Framework: Understanding Legal Categories

Peptides in the United States are regulated under different legal frameworks depending on their intended use, manufacturing pathway, and method of distribution. Unlike conventional pharmaceuticals, peptides do not exist within a single, uniform regulatory category. Their legal status is determined by how they are produced, labeled, and supplied, rather than by their molecular structure or proposed biological effect alone. Understanding these distinctions is essential for evaluating both safety and compliance.

FDA-Approved Drugs

Peptides that are approved as drugs undergo formal premarket review by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for safety, efficacy, and manufacturing quality. This process includes rigorous evaluation of clinical trial data, validation of analytical methods, and inspection of manufacturing facilities to ensure adherence to current Good Manufacturing Practices. FDA-approved peptide drugs are therefore subject to standardized quality controls, post-marketing surveillance, and defined labeling requirements intended to ensure consistency and patient safety.

Compounded Peptides

Compounded peptides occupy a distinct regulatory space and are not FDA-approved drugs. Instead, they may be legally prepared under specific statutory conditions outlined in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Traditional compounding pharmacies operating under Section 503A prepare peptide formulations pursuant to patient-specific prescriptions and are primarily overseen by state pharmacy boards, with certain federal exemptions applying when statutory requirements are met. In contrast, outsourcing facilities registered under Section 503B are permitted to compound sterile drugs without patient-specific prescriptions, provided they comply with federal current Good Manufacturing Practices and are subject to direct FDA oversight.

In clinical and commercial discussions, the term “502B-certified” is frequently used but is legally inaccurate. Section 502 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act addresses issues of misbranding and labeling, not compounding authorization or manufacturing standards. The operative federal designation for large-scale sterile compounding is Section 503B, which defines both the privileges and regulatory obligations of outsourcing facilities. Confusion between these statutory sections can obscure meaningful differences in oversight, manufacturing requirements, and quality assurance expectations.

Understanding where a peptide product falls within this regulatory framework is essential for assessing both its legal status and the degree of quality control applied during its production. Without this context,

assumptions about safety or equivalence based solely on peptide name or marketing claims may be misleading.

"Research Use Only" Peptides vs Compounded Products

Peptides labeled "Research Use Only" (RUO) are legally and functionally distinct from compounded or FDA-approved medical products. This distinction is not semantic; it reflects fundamental differences in intended use, manufacturing standards, regulatory oversight, and permissible distribution. RUO labeling signifies that a peptide is intended solely for laboratory, analytical, or preclinical research purposes and **not for human administration**.

RUO peptides are not manufactured under clinical-use standards and are not required to meet the safety and quality controls associated with products intended for patient use. As a result, they are not subject to requirements for sterility assurance, endotoxin limits, validated dosing accuracy, or clinical-grade excipient compatibility. Their labeling, documentation, and distribution pathways are structured around experimental research contexts rather than patient safety considerations. Importantly, RUO designation does not imply inferiority of scientific intent, but rather a clear regulatory boundary regarding how and where such materials may be used.

Compounded peptides, by contrast, are prepared by licensed pharmacies or registered outsourcing facilities operating under defined state and federal frameworks. These products are subject to oversight requirements that are specifically intended to support human use, including controls related to formulation, labeling, and, in the case of sterile preparations, manufacturing environment and quality systems. While compounded peptides are not FDA-approved drugs, they exist within a regulatory structure designed to mitigate risk when products are administered to patients.

Using RUO-labeled peptides for human administration collapses this legal and regulatory distinction. Regardless of a peptide's theoretical mechanism of action or reported purity, such use bypasses safeguards intended to protect patients and exposes clinicians, suppliers, and end users to both safety risks and regulatory consequences. From a risk management perspective, the issue is not whether a peptide could work biologically, but whether it was manufactured, labeled, and supplied under conditions appropriate for human exposure.

Understanding and respecting the boundary between RUO materials and compounded medical products is therefore essential for responsible peptide use and for maintaining clarity around both safety expectations and legal accountability.

The Millennium's Stance on Peptides

Millennium Health Centers, Inc. has promoted the thoughtful and clinically responsible use of peptides since 2019 as part of an integrative approach to addressing a wide range of complex medical presentations. Our position has consistently been grounded in the belief that peptides, when properly manufactured, verified, and clinically overseen, represent valuable biological tools capable of supporting repair, regulation, and recovery across multiple physiological systems.

Over this period of clinical engagement, however, we have observed a growing and concerning pattern within the peptide marketplace. Specifically, some companies have represented their peptide products as being "made in the USA" when, in reality, the active peptide ingredients were synthesized in foreign facilities and only aliquoted, freeze-dried, labeled, or packaged domestically. While such downstream handling may occur within the United States, it does not equate to domestic manufacturing of the peptide itself. This distinction is rarely disclosed with sufficient clarity and, in many cases, is presented in a manner that may mislead clinicians and consumers regarding the true origin of the active compound.

This level of misrepresentation introduces a meaningful risk to patient safety. When the origin, synthesis conditions, and upstream quality controls of a peptide are undocumented or obscured, neither clinicians nor

patients can reliably assess identity, purity, or consistency. In the context of injectable or long-term peptide use, such uncertainty is incompatible with responsible medical practice and undermines trust in otherwise promising therapeutic tools.

Millennium Health Centers recognizes that regulatory frameworks have not yet fully evolved to reflect the expanding role of peptides in health, longevity, and systems-based medicine. At the same time, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has appropriately emphasized the importance of purity, manufacturing standards, and truthful labeling as foundational elements of public safety. While scientific exploration of peptide applications continues to advance, regulatory efforts aimed at ensuring analytical integrity and manufacturing transparency ultimately serve to protect patients, clinicians, and the credibility of peptide-based therapies.

For these reasons, Millennium Health Centers maintains a clear and consistent stance: peptides should only be recommended or utilized when their origin is accurately represented, their identity and purity are verifiable through appropriate analytical methods, and their production aligns with applicable regulatory standards for human use. Anything less places patients at unnecessary risk and compromises the ethical application of peptide science.

This position reflects not opposition to peptide innovation, but a commitment to ensuring that peptide therapies are advanced responsibly, transparently, and in a manner consistent with patient safety and clinical integrity.

Safety Considerations Across the Peptide Lifecycle

Safety considerations surrounding peptide use extend across the entire lifecycle of a product, from manufacturing and verification through administration, patient response, and clinical oversight. Unlike conventional pharmaceuticals, peptide safety cannot be assessed at a single point in time or through a single metric. Instead, it reflects the cumulative integrity of multiple interconnected processes.

At the product level, risks may arise from incorrect peptide sequencing, incomplete synthesis, or the presence of undisclosed impurities and fragmented molecular species. Inaccurate concentration, whether due to formulation error or degradation over time, can further compromise predictable dosing. Compounding these issues, counterfeit documentation or recycled Certificates of Analysis may obscure the true origin, identity, or quality of the peptide, undermining confidence in reported specifications and analytical claims.

Risks associated with administration are particularly pronounced when peptides are delivered parenterally. Non-sterile injection practices or inadequately controlled manufacturing environments increase the potential for microbial contamination. Endotoxin exposure, even at low levels, can provoke significant inflammatory or pyrogenic responses. Improper storage, handling, or reconstitution may accelerate degradation or alter peptide stability, while incompatible excipients, incorrect pH, or osmolarity mismatches can contribute to local tissue irritation or systemic adverse effects.

Patient-specific factors introduce an additional layer of complexity. Individuals with underlying autoimmune susceptibility may be more prone to immune activation or antibody formation in response to altered or impure peptides. Drug-peptide interactions, particularly in patients receiving immunomodulatory, anticoagulant, or endocrine therapies, may produce unintended physiological effects. Disruption of endocrine feedback loops is a particular concern with signaling peptides, and the absence of structured clinical monitoring can delay recognition of adverse responses or loss of efficacy.

Beyond biochemical and clinical considerations, governance-related risks play a critical role in overall peptide safety. Inadequate informed consent may leave patients unaware of uncertainties related to non-approved or compounded therapies. Off-label use without appropriate documentation can complicate clinical accountability and regulatory compliance. The lack of systematic adverse event tracking further

limits the ability to identify emerging safety signals or to distinguish individual reactions from broader quality-related issues.

Taken together, these factors underscore a central principle: peptide safety is not determined solely by molecular design or theoretical mechanism of action. It is procedural, analytical, and clinical in nature, requiring discipline oversight at every stage of the peptide lifecycle to ensure predictable and responsible use.

Brief Clinician Safety Checklist

Before recommending or overseeing peptide use, clinicians should systematically evaluate several core considerations to ensure patient safety, regulatory alignment, and clinical accountability. The source of the peptide should be verified to confirm that it is obtained from a licensed compounding pharmacy or a properly registered outsourcing facility operating within applicable state and federal frameworks. Reliance on undocumented suppliers or non-clinical distribution channels introduces avoidable quality and compliance risks.

Clinicians should also confirm that molecular identity is supported by appropriate analytical methods, such as mass spectrometry or equivalent techniques capable of verifying peptide structure. Purity assessment should extend beyond a reported percentage and include disclosure of HPLC methods that are suitable for detecting relevant impurities and variants. For peptides intended for injectable use, documentation of sterility and endotoxin controls is essential, as these factors directly affect patient safety and cannot be inferred from purity data alone.

Regulatory alignment must also be assessed, including confirmation that the product is labeled and supplied for human administration rather than designated for research use only. Clinical oversight should include a defined plan for monitoring patient outcomes, tracking adverse events, and reassessing therapy based on response or emerging concerns. Finally, informed consent should be obtained and documented, with clear disclosure of known risks, uncertainties, regulatory status, and the limitations of available clinical evidence.

Approaching peptide use through this structured framework helps ensure that clinical decisions are grounded not only in theoretical benefit, but in verifiable quality, appropriate oversight, and responsible patient care.

Conclusion

A Certificate of Analysis is a document, and High-Performance Liquid Chromatography is an analytical method. Neither, in isolation, guarantees safety, identity, or predictable biological behavior. When interpreted without methodological context, identity confirmation, or appropriate safety testing, both can create a false sense of assurance rather than a reliable foundation for clinical decision-making.

Peptides are powerful biological tools whose potential benefits are inseparable from the rigor with which they are manufactured, verified, and overseen. When supported by transparent analytical verification, appropriate regulatory sourcing, and disciplined clinical judgment, peptides may offer meaningful opportunities for research, innovation, and patient care. When these safeguards are absent, peptides cease to function as precision instruments and instead become uncontrolled biological variables with unpredictable pharmacologic and immunologic consequences.

Responsible peptide use therefore begins not with enthusiasm or theoretical promise, but with evidence, transparency, and governance. In an evolving therapeutic landscape, these principles remain essential to ensuring that peptide-based interventions advance safety and science rather than compromise them.

Dr. Mark L. Gordon

Author of the ***Peptides for Health*** (2026) Medical and Consumer Edition Vol. 1
https://millenniumhealthstore.com/collections/educational-products

References

1. Fosgerau, K., & Hoffmann, T. (2015). Peptide therapeutics: Current status and future directions. *Drug Discovery Today*, 20(1), 122–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2014.10.003
2. Lau, J. L., & Dunn, M. K. (2018). Therapeutic peptides: Historical perspectives, current development trends, and future directions. *Bioorganic & Medicinal Chemistry*, 26(10), 2700–2707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bmc.2017.06.052
3. Wang, L., (2022). Therapeutic peptides: Current applications and future directions. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy*, 7(1), 48. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-022-00904-4
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2019). *Safeguarding pharmaceutical supply chains in a global economy* (Congressional testimony, Oct 30, 2019). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/congressional-testimony/safeguarding-pharmaceutical-supply-chains-global-economy-10302019
5. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2019). *Securing the U.S. drug supply chain: Oversight of FDA's foreign inspection program* (Congressional testimony, Dec 10, 2019). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/congressional-testimony/securing-us-drug-supply-chain-oversight-fdas-foreign-inspection-program-12102019
6. Congressional Research Service. (2020). *FDA's role in the medical product supply chain and shortages: Background and policy issues* (R46507). CRS. https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46507
7. International Council for Harmonisation. (2000). *ICH Q7: Good manufacturing practice guidance for active pharmaceutical ingredients*. ICH. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-q7-good-manufacturing-practice-active-pharmaceutical-ingredients-scientific-guideline
8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2016). *Q7 good manufacturing practice guidance for active pharmaceutical ingredients: Guidance for industry* (PDF). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/files/drugs/published/Q7-Good-Manufacturing-Practice-Guidance-for-Active-Pharmaceutical-Ingredients-Guidance-for-Industry.pdf
9. United States Pharmacopeia. (2021). *USP General Chapter <621> Chromatography* (harmonized chapter PDF). USP. https://www.usp.org/sites/default/files/usp/document/harmonization/gen-chapter/harmonization-november-2021-m99380.pdf
10. Gleerup, K. (2023). What the new USP Chapter <621> guidelines mean for your HPLC analysis. *LCGC / Chromatography Online*. https://www.chromatographyonline.com/view/what-the-new-usp-chapter-621-guidelines-mean-for-your-hplc-analysis
11. GMP-Verlag / GMP Compliance. (2024). *Certificate of Analysis (CoA) guide* (PDF). GMP Compliance. https://www.gmp-compliance.org/files/guidemgr/2024-coa-guide-f-1720781885.pdf
12. Achilleos, K., et al., (2025). Beyond efficacy: Ensuring safety in peptide therapeutics by addressing immunogenicity. *Peptide Science*, e70016. https://doi.org/10.1002/psc.70016
13. Puig, M., et al. (2025). Immunogenicity of therapeutic peptide products: Bridging translation and clinical risk. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 16, 1608401. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2025.1608401
14. European Medicines Agency. (2017). *Guideline on immunogenicity assessment of therapeutic proteins (Revision 1)* (EMA/CHMP/BMWP/14327/2006 Rev.1). EMA. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-immunogenicity-assessment-therapeutic-proteins-revision-1_en.pdf
15. Real-Fernández, F., et al. (2023). Therapeutic proteins immunogenicity: A peptide point of view. *Exploration of Drug Science*, 3, 100825. https://www.explorationpub.com/Journals/eds/Article/100825
16. Guzmán, F. (2023). Peptides, solid-phase synthesis and characterization. *Electronic Journal of Biotechnology*, 62, 1–10. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0717345823000143
17. Insuasty Cepeda, et al., (2019). Synthetic peptide purification via solid-phase extraction with gradient elution: A simple, economical, fast and efficient methodology. *Molecules*, 24(7), 1215. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules24071215
18. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2018). *Section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act* (statutory text and overview). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/human-drug-compounding/section-503a-federal-food-drug-and-cosmetic-act

19. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2016). *Pharmacy compounding of human drug products under Section 503A of the FD&C Act: Guidance* (PDF). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/files/drugs/published/Pharmacy-Compounding-of-Human-Drug-Products-Under-Section-503A-of-the-Federal-Food--Drug--and-Cosmetic-Act-Guidance.pdf
20. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2022). *Information for outsourcing facilities* (503B overview). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/human-drug-compounding/information-outsourcing-facilities
21. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). *Current good manufacturing practice—Guidance for human drug compounding outsourcing facilities under Section 503B of the FD&C Act* . FDA. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/current-good-manufacturing-practice-guidance-human-drug-compounding-outsourcing-facilities-under
22. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2014). *Registration of human drug compounding outsourcing facilities under Section 503B of the FD&C Act: Guidance* (PDF). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/media/87570/download
23. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2018). *Pharmacy compounding of human drug products under Section 503A of the FD&C Act*. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/pharmacy-compounding-human-drug-products-under-section-503a-federal-food-drug-and-cosmetic-act
24. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2025). USApeptide.com—**Warning letter** (MARCS-CMS 696885). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/inspections-compliance-enforcement-and-criminal-investigations/warning-letters/usapeptidecom-696885-02262025
25. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2022). *Labeling requirements and misbranding*. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/general-device-labeling-requirements/labeling-requirements-misbranding
26. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024). *Intended use: How FDA evaluates product claims and marketing context* (regulatory concept; enforcement applied across product types). FDA. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents
27. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2012; updated). *Guidance for industry: Pyrogen and endotoxins testing—Questions and answers*. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/guidance-industry-pyrogen-and-endotoxins-testing-questions-and-answers
28. Robinson, S. A., et al (2023). Bacterial endotoxin testing of drugs and biologics in the U.S. *Regulatory Focus* (RAPS), 2023(Aug), 1–8. https://rapsprod.blob.core.windows.net/rapsk13/raps/media/news-images/23-8_robinson-et-al_rev-2.pdf
29. Tidswell, E. C. (2023). A nontrivial analysis of patient safety risk from parenteral drug- and medical device-borne endotoxin. *Drugs in R&D*, 23(1), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40268-023-00412-y
30. United States Pharmacopeia. (2012). *USP General Chapter <788> Particulate matter in injections*. USP. https://www.uspnf.com/sites/default/files/usp_pdf/EN/USPNF/revisions/788_particulate_matter_in_injections.pdf