



**Request for Information (RFI):  
Facilitating Evidence Synthesis to Improve Decision  
Making on Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals**

April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2026

**Request for Information for The Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew)**

RFI No.: 2026-SCP-01  
RFI Issue Date: April 13, 2026  
RFI Title: Facilitating Evidence Synthesis to Improve Decision Making on Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals  
Point of Contact (POC): Troy Wise, Contracts and Procurement Services, Pew\_RFP\_SCP@pewtrusts.org

Key Dates:

Deadline for requests for clarifications	April 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2026
Anticipated release of Pew’s responses to requests for clarifications	May 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2026
<b>Deadline for submission of responses</b>	<b>June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2026</b>

If you need assistance or accommodation to participate in the RFI process, please reach out to the Pew Point of Contact as soon as possible.

\*All responses must be valid for at least one hundred and twenty (120) calendar days from the date of submission.

**BACKGROUND ON PEW**

Pew is a United States (U.S.) nonprofit organization and Section 501(c)(3) public charity. Pew is driven by the power of knowledge to solve today’s most challenging problems in the U.S. and globally. Pew applies a rigorous, analytical approach to improving public policy, informing the public and invigorating civic life. Pew partners with a diverse range of donors, public and private organizations and concerned citizens who share its commitment to practical, fact-based solutions and goal-driven investments to improve society. For more information about Pew, please see [www.pewtrusts.org](http://www.pewtrusts.org).

**RFI OVERVIEW**

Over the past thirty years, there will have been three large-scale syntheses of the latest science on endocrine disruption, in 2002, 2012 and soon-to-be published in 2026. In parallel, the biomedical profession commonly publishes multiple systematic reviews on relevant endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDC) each year, often from different academic research groups assessing the literature independently. As a result, “best available science” for policy and decision-making is a constantly moving target, and the fragmentation of evidence has contributed to an uneven policy landscape. Even when global syntheses are undertaken, they are multi-year efforts that require substantial investment of time and resources by those involved. These challenges all contribute to a disconnect between a rapidly evolving understanding of EDCs and active policy discussions.

Pew would like to address these challenges by funding a research project to assess the feasibility of novel and alternative approaches to evidence synthesis that could contribute to more effective use of limited scientific funding and time, support a common knowledge base on the latest science, strengthen the link between science and policy allowing for more rapid assessment of new chemicals, and increase the speed at which regulatory agencies can respond to changes in scientific understanding. Depending on the feasibility of the approaches identified, Pew may support a pilot initiative to inform a longer-term strategy for implementation at scale.

- **Purpose**

The purpose of this RFI is for Pew to gather information that will inform possible future Pew-funded research – such as through a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) or Request for Proposals (RFP) – on the topic described herein. To most effectively gather that information, Pew may send this RFI to individuals or organizations that Pew does not expect to ultimately submit responses to a future RFQ or RFP.

- **Intended Audiences**

The audiences of this research project are scientists (who undertake or rely on systematic reviews to underpin new regulatory decisions relevant to EDCs). Secondary audience would be advocates, private sector leaders, and others engaged in EDC-related communications and decision-making.

- **Research Questions**

This research project would seek to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What are existing approaches to gathering evidence that seek to increase the efficiency and efficacy of syntheses to support field-wide understanding of scientific issues? Where have these been applied to more directly target policy-relevant science questions?
- 2) What are examples of emerging technologies (e.g., AI and LLMs) that are enabling novel approaches to evidence synthesis? What are potential challenges associated with broader application of these technologies?
- 3) What are the levels of resources (funding, staffing, etc.) necessary to effectively implement the approaches to evidence synthesis identified? How does this differ between start-up and maintenance?
- 4) How could the findings from #1 and #2 be applied to endocrine disrupting chemicals? What are some unique challenges that would need to be addressed given their complexities?
- 5) How could an effort focused on increasing efficiencies of evidence synthesis ensure relevance and uptake by the audiences identified? What are the aspects of evidence synthesis that are most relevant to those audiences?
- 6) What barriers exist for implementation and uptake of a novel approach to evidence synthesis? What are incentives that would be important for improving the utility and relevance of such an approach for state or federal scientists, academics, and/or policymakers?

- **Resources Identified**

Here is a selection of resources we have identified related to evidence synthesis and/or EDCs that Pew may use to inform future work related to this topic.

- [Living Interactive Systematic Reviews](#)
- [Australian Living Evidence Collaboration](#)
- [Elliot et al. \(2021\). Decision makers need constantly updated evidence synthesis](#)
- [Holder et al. \(2023\). Systematic evidence mapping of potential exposure pathways for PFAS](#)
- [Wolfe et al. \(2020\). A Survey of Systematic Evidence Mapping Practice and the Case for Knowledge Graphs in Environmental Health and Toxicology](#)
- [The Comparative Toxicogenomics Database](#) and [Mattingly Lab](#)
- [Nevill et al. \(2025\). Capturing the influx of living systematic reviews: a systematic methodological survey](#)
- [Evidence Synthesis Infrastructure Collaborative \(ESIC\)](#)
- [Cochrane Living Evidence Gap Maps](#)

**INFORMATION PEW IS SEEKING:**

- 1) Are there any substantial changes to the research concept you'd recommend Pew to consider?
- 2) Would you and/or your team, if applicable, have sufficient capacity between now and early-2027 to commit to a co-development process with Pew to refine this concept into an achievable research project? We'd anticipate co-development to require roughly 4-6 hours per week for 3 months.
- 3) What previous experience do you have with evidence synthesis, and how would that inform your recommendations for how Pew should tackle this topic and potential research project?
- 4) What previous experience do you have with endocrine disrupting chemicals and/or chemicals policy, and how would that inform your recommendations for how Pew should tackle this topic and potential research project?
- 5) Are there existing initiatives that you can disclose that are already seeking to improve evidence synthesis related to endocrine disrupting chemicals?
- 6) What new approaches to evidence synthesis and application do you anticipate being applicable and/or relevant to this project?
- 7) What form or format could you envision innovative evidence synthesis for endocrine disrupting chemicals taking? Where would this be stored and/or housed, if necessary, for long-term maintenance and updating?
- 8) What other considerations would you suggest Pew consider in assessing the feasibility and potential implementation of improved evidence synthesis related to endocrine disrupting chemicals?

**INSTRUCTIONS**

**All** communications related to this RFI must be conducted via email with the Pew Point of Contact (POC) and by the Key Dates listed on Page 1 of this RFI. Questions must be submitted in writing via email; **phone calls will not be accepted**. Phone calls not initiated by Pew to discuss the RFI or ask questions **are not** permitted. **Pew reserves the right to modify or cancel this RFI, including Key Dates, at any time and to make all decisions respecting this RFI, and any possible future solicitation, in its sole discretion.**

**Requests for clarifications.** All questions, and the responses thereto, that Pew believes may be of interest to other potential Respondents will be circulated to all Respondents who have submitted an EOI. Only written responses issued by Pew will be considered official. Any verbal information received from employees of Pew or any other entity should not be considered an official response to any requests for clarifications regarding this RFI.

**Submission Instructions:**

1. Responses must be submitted via email to the POC by the date listed on the first page. Please reference the RFI number in the subject line of any response to this RFI. Pew reserves the right to accept or reject, without consideration, responses that are received late or obtain responses from, and negotiate with, respondents and third parties outside of this RFI at any time.
2. Pew will endeavor to confirm receipt of all properly submitted responses. If Pew does not confirm receipt, Respondent should assume its response has not been received and resubmit before the deadline.

**Disclaimers**

By submitting a response, each Respondent grants to Pew and its designees the right to duplicate, use, disclose, and distribute all materials (and information contained therein) submitted for purposes of evaluation, review, and/or research. In addition, each Respondent guarantees that (1) it has full and complete rights to all information and materials included in the response and (2) all such materials are not defamatory and do not infringe upon or violate the privacy rights, copyrights, or other proprietary rights of any third party. Additionally, each Respondent agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless Pew with respect to any claims or losses arising from the aforementioned guarantees. Each Respondent further agrees that in addition to this RFI, which is owned by Pew, any submission to Pew (including, without limitation, all materials and information contained therein) will become the property of Pew (not including any of Respondent's preexisting intellectual property rights contained in such submission), and Pew is not required to return the response, including any submitted materials, to any Respondent.

Following review of the RFI responses, Pew may or may not release a full RFQ or RFP to collect more detailed proposals and budgets. Participation in this RFI is not required to be eligible to participate in the RFQ or RFP. Further details regarding the contracting process and Pew's standard terms and conditions would be included in the RFQ or RFP at that time.

This is a request for information only. Issuance of this RFI does not in any way obligate Pew to issue any award or follow-up RFQ or RFP. Pew is not financially or otherwise liable for any costs associated with the preparation, submission, or presentation of any information in response to this RFI. Pew also retains the right to modify or cancel this RFI at any time at its sole discretion.