

ASN Advisory Committee on Ensuring Trust in Nutrition Science
CALL NOTES
Monday, June 20, 2016

Bert Garza, Chair
Carol Tucker-Foreman
Vinita Bali
Catherine Bertini
Eric Campbell
Sylvia Rowe
Ed Cooney
Judith Alonzo
Patrick Stover, ex officio
Sarah Ohlhorst, staff

Review of last call's summary

Chair Bert Garza welcomed the committee and reviewed the May 25th call summary notes. The Advisory Committee approved the summary notes as is.

Update of literature review

Judith Alonzo provided an update on the literature reviews for each of the domains. Cornell librarians recommended using the snowball method –Judith will identify ten key articles for each of the domains and then review the references for each paper to gather additional references. *Judith will upload all references to Endnote to be shared with Committee members.* She is currently in the process of gathering references for the domains, and will be done with this portion of the literature reviews soon.

To Bert, it seems that she will find lots of opinion pieces but very few evaluations with an independent assessment. The literature review for the scientific rigor domain may fare better than the other domains. Judith confirmed this and noted that she is also including gray literature, like press releases, in her literature reviews. It was noted that areas outside of nutrition research, such as political science/ public policy literature will include conflict of interest reviews, etc., so *it is very important to be sure to include other areas of research in the searches. It may help to search methodologies as well as keywords*, such as meta-analyses, systematic reviews, randomized trials, clinical trials/experiments, etc. to ensure material beyond opinion pieces is gathered. Judith has included biological sciences literature in her searches. Reviewing the lay versions of papers on these domains may also be important to translate recommendations into public trust.

It was suggested that an additional domain to consider is dependability, which may be imbedded into public trust. Integrity, competence, and dependability were included in an article, and dependability seems to be the only one not completely covered by an existing domain. Committee members suggested that dependability is problematic however, since science builds and evolves. The public sees a lack of dependability, but it is really the evolving nature of science, as well as the active nature of science communication.

People don't understand the dynamic nature of science – *this should be included in report prologue*. Consumers want simple messages and do not like it when scientists change their minds. It is important to design Advisory Committee communications carefully for this very reason.

Present iteration of draft report

The report outline is still far from final, as it will be influenced by the literature reviews.

ACTION ITEM: Please send all corrections to the most recent version of the draft report outline to Sarah Ohlhorst to ensure we are covering all items in literature reviews that require the attention of the Advisory Committee.

Review of case study status

Case studies would be provided as examples of trust eroded or made better. Commentary on why each case study is instructive would be included in the final report. It may be difficult to provide in-depth thinking on case studies now, until the report is further developed.

An additional case study example suggested is the nutrition guidelines for the national school lunch program – what is the role of private industry, as it relates to the appropriations process in the school lunch program.

All case study examples are from the United States – committee members felt it would be helpful to have international case studies included. There is also a lack of case study examples from academia, which would be good to include.

ACTION ITEM: Committee members were asked to think of additional case studies (both negative and positive), specifically international and academic case study examples, and provide these suggestions to Sarah Ohlhorst.

The American Diabetes Association example mentions the public – The Public has commented this is “medically absurd.” Who is the public in this example? Consumer research could be showed to show “public perception” but *this should be clarified. We should also differentiate between type 1 and type 2 diabetes if this example is to be used.*

Other business/Next steps

Sarah Ohlhorst will bold all action items in future call/meeting summaries to call attention to them for Committee members.

The next calls will be held on Wednesday, July 20th; 1:00-2:00pm Eastern, and Wednesday, August 24th; 10:00-11:00am Eastern. The next call will largely be an update on the literature reviews and how the search characteristics suggested on this call have been implemented.

The call adjourned at 1:47pm.