

ASN Advisory Committee on Ensuring Trust in Nutrition Science
CALL NOTES
Tuesday, October 24, 2017

Bert Garza, Chair
Sylvia Rowe
Ed Cooney
Patrick Stover
Cathie Woteki
Robert Steinbrook

Sarah Ohlhorst, staff

Dr. Bert Garza welcomed the committee and provided an update.

Committee Review of Edited Report

Most changes made to the report to date have been editorial. The report is still longer than was originally anticipated. ASN is open to publishing the report (or versions of it) in multiple ASN journals. There will likely be one or more edited versions, such as a longer, full version and a briefer version. ASN plans to publish the full version of the report in an ASN journal, such as *Advances in Nutrition*. An executive summary of the report, as well as an abstract, are still planned – perhaps one for a broader audience and one for a professional audience.

Committee members were asked to review the report and send all edits, using the track changes function, to Sarah Ohlhorst by Wednesday, November 8th. Any substantive changes will be discussed on future calls.

Recommendation rankings

Dr. Catherine Bertini was unable to join the call, so Dr. Garza shared her feedback. She found it difficult to rank the recommendations, as they seem to fit into two broad categories: 1) how does ASN enhance its credibility with the public by enhancing how it operates in terms of public trust, and 2) educational goals with a much more external focus, aimed at the public, perhaps also enhancing public trust.

It was suggested that the recommendations be grouped as best practices ASN can take on itself and other, more broad best practices that ASN can implement with other potential partners/ food and nutrition stakeholders. Some of the recommendations may be outside the scope and mission of ASN, but would not preclude ASN from partnering with others to implement them. For example, it would be natural for ASN to reach out to universities to partner on recommendation 7, developing guidelines for managing and conducting research funded by “for profit” entities with a financial stake in the funded works’ outcomes. It was also noted that the report could include some suggestions for how ASN might implement each recommendation, which may include initiating efforts with others. It is important for the committee to think of who the audience is for each recommendation – ASN or the entire nutrition community. Language explaining the differences can easily be added to the introduction.

It was also suggested that the report address additional gaps not covered by recommendations, but found in the landscape analysis.

The committee felt that the top ranked recommendations (7, 4, 1AB, 9, 6, and 8) are reasonable and the other recommendations could be jettisoned.

Revised Recommendation 1 A and B

Committee members felt that the listing of pros and cons for both recommendation 1A and B make the recommendations confusing. It was also noted that some of the cons listed under 1A may be perceived as pros by some individuals. Originally the committee had discussed forwarding both recommendation 1A and B to the ASN Board, as each have their own strengths and weaknesses. It was felt that consensus around 1A or B may be unachievable through a series of telephone conversations. However, committee members expressed concern with not deciding on either 1A or B. There is not a lack of willingness to reach consensus. The writing group will take a second attempt at formatting how recommendation 1A and B are presented and nuancing the language to provide more clarity and to reflect the committee discussion. A revised Recommendation 1A and B will be sent to the entire committee for review prior to the next call.

It was questioned if industry funds should only be used for certain activities or types of support, or is industry funds should just not be accepted. This is the main difference between 1A and B. There is conflict of interest and the appearance of conflict of interest with industry funds. Many committee members resonated around the need for a more rigorous approach with regards to accepting industry support with more transparency – which is in line with the current recommendation 7, guidelines on industry funded research for the wider nutrition community. While 1A provides maximum credibility, a thoughtful 1B can also provide credibility and give structure and clear barriers to acceptance and use of industry support.

Next Steps

Committee members were asked to review the edited report and send any further suggested edits, using the track changes function to [Sarah Ohlhorst](#) by Wednesday, November 8th. The edited report will be sent to the committee prior to the next call for final approval on the call.

The writing group will revise recommendation 1A and B and send to the entire committee for review prior to the next call. The writing team will also craft introductory material for the report.

Sarah will resend the top ranked recommendations to the committee.

The next call will be held on **Thursday, December 14th at 2:00pm Eastern**. The chair will make an effort to get all committee members on the December call for final report approval. An email reminder and additional materials will be sent prior to the call.

The call adjourned at 12:00 PM.