

**ASN Advisory Committee on Ensuring Trust in Nutrition Science  
CALL NOTES  
Wednesday, August 24, 2016**

Bert Garza, Chair  
Vinita Bali  
Catherine Bertini  
Eric Campbell  
Sylvia Rowe  
Patrick Stover, ex officio  
John Courtney, ex officio  
Sarah Ohlhorst, staff  
Judith Alonzo

Chair Bert Garza welcomed the committee. There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

Review of 7/20/16 call summary

Chair Bert Garza reviewed the July 20<sup>th</sup> call summary notes. The Advisory Committee approved the summary notes as is.

Literature review status update

Stage 1 of the literature review is now complete. Bert Garza and Patrick Stover reviewed all abstracts found during literature searches for each of the bins, and loosely used the culling criteria to reduce the references found to fewer than 100 for each bin. They culled approximately 75% of the references that the search yielded. Culling criteria served as loose guardrails as some references are of an authoritative nature and contain useful information, even if they do not meet the agreed upon criteria. All committee members on the call felt comfortable with the strategy used to cull references. There are less than 40 abstracts in each bin currently, with two exceptions – the scientific rigor and public trust\* bins; the former has over one hundred references and the latter a few less than a hundred. The scientific rigor bin has already been shared with Dr. Cathie Woteki (via EndNote) since it has the largest number of abstracts requiring review.

\*This a correction from the call. In checking subsequent to the call, the public trust bin was found to have more than 40 abstracts.

Stage 2 will now commence. The spreadsheet shared previously identified the bins committee members have been assigned to. This information is also included in the notes below. Two reviewers are assigned to each bin. Each is asked to independently review all abstracts in their respective bin. Once both reviewers have independently reviewed all abstracts in their assigned bin, the two reviewers should compare their findings to identify disagreements, discuss specific references to be included/ excluded, and reach consensus on the best path forward.

<b>BIN</b>	<b>REVIEWERS</b>
Public Benefit:	Bert Garza; Catherine Bertini

Scientific Rigor:	Catherine Woteki; Patrick Stover
Conflict of Interest:	Vinita Bali; Michael McGinnis
Communication:	Ed Cooney; Sylvia Rowe
Accountability:	Eric Campbell; Robert Steinbrook
Public Trust:	Bert Garza; Carol Tucker-Foreman

Committee members are being asked to review the remaining abstracts using the culling criteria agreed to earlier for Stage 1:

- 1) Clear statement of goal/hypothesis, or equivalent;
- 2) Literature review with sense of strategy/rationale for selection of relevant material; and,
- 3) Clear description of methodologies, design, and analyses.

Two additional criteria also are to be used for the Stage 2 formal review of abstracts:

- Is the manuscript grounded in research or opinion? If opinion-based, are the opinions from authoritative sources? If research-based, is the research relevant to public trust (or other relevant “bin”)? (Abstract review is sufficient for decision making)
- Is the manuscript germane to the section in the draft report outline associated with the search? If not, is it relevant to another section and should it be transferred to that review group? Or is the work likely relevant to the Committee’s work but doesn’t appear to fit the present draft report outline? If that is the case, propose a new section and its placement in the draft report outline. (Abstract review is sufficient for decision making)

Again in Stage 2, culling criteria should serve as loose guideposts. Committee members should also determine if there are additional references in the bibliographies or references that were tagged for Stage 3 review that the committee should also evaluate.

Stage 3 will require reading all remaining abstracts/papers thoroughly. Committee members are not expected to actively participate in this portion of the review. However, no one who wishes to participate will be excluded.

**ACTION:** Please let Sarah Ohlhorst know if you would like to participate as a reviewer during Stage 3 of the literature review process.

**ACTION:** Sarah Ohlhorst will email the references from each bin to the assigned Advisory Committee member for Stage 2 review in the near future and committee members should start the review as soon as possible after they have received the references.

Other business/ Next steps

The next call will be held on **Tuesday, October 18<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM Eastern Daylight Savings**. Stage 2 abstract reviews should be complete by this date and Stage 3 review will have commenced. We will discuss how soon reviews of initial drafts will start on the October call.

The call adjourned at 10:32am.