

ASN Advisory Committee on Ensuring Trust in Nutrition Science
CALL NOTES
Tuesday, October 18, 2016

Bert Garza, Chair
Catherine Bertini
Cathie Woteki
Ed Cooney
Robert Steinbrook
Eric Campbell
Sylvia Rowe
Carol Tucker-Foreman
Sarah Ohlhorst, staff
Judith Alonzo
Martha Field

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

Review of 8/24/16 call summary

Chair Bert Garza reviewed the August 24th call summary notes. The Advisory Committee approved the summary notes as is.

Review of 9/12 ASN Board meeting discussion

At the 9/12 ASN Board meeting, Dr. Patrick Stover provided an overview of the goals of the ASN Advisory Committee and where the Committee currently is in the process, conducting a comprehensive literature review. The only discussion surrounded whether to share the draft report with stakeholders, including CEOs of major food companies, prior to publishing the final report. While some Board members could see value in this step, others questioned sharing the report. There were no other questions or comments from the Board. This is an agenda item later in today's call for the Committee to discuss.

Stage 2 abstract review results

Culling is now complete and the number of documents remaining in each bin has been drastically reduced. Sarah reported on the number of documents left in each bin following the Stage 2 abstract review.

Rigor/ reproducibility: 22
Public benefit: 8
Accountability: 1
Communications: 9
Public trust: 27

We are still waiting on the conflict of interest abstract review to be completed. There are currently approximately 67 total documents to read for the Stage 3 review.

ADDENDUM: 16 abstracts have been identified for Stage 3 review from the Conflict of Interest bin, bringing the total number of manuscripts to read and carefully review to 83.

Next Steps

Chair Bert Garza asked if the Committee should consider human subject research for this report. While the Committee members agreed that there are certain elements related to human subject research that come up within public trust, they are tangential to the Committee's charge. The Committee decided not to include human subject research at this time, and to reconsider it if necessary once the report draft is underway. It was suggested that the report clearly explain why human subject research isn't being covered, if that is the Committee's final decision.

Stage 3 review

The publications that survived the Stage 2 review will be reviewed in greater detail now during Stage 3. The reviewers will also look at publically available survey data as they conduct the Stage 3 review to ensure the literature is an accurate reflection of publically available data. No major discrepancies between the two are anticipated.

Drafting process

Drs. Patrick Stover and Bert Garza will lead the drafting team. The Committee members noted a preference to receive major sections of the report outline once they are drafted and ready for review. It was suggested that it will be easier to review sections at a time, and to better understand the full context of each section within the report. It will likely be 4-6 weeks before sections of the outline are drafted and ready to go out to Committee members for review.

Convening Key Stakeholders

Committee member Vinita Bali had suggested to Patrick Stover on a phone call the idea of convening stakeholders to review the draft report. Bert Garza mentioned that he would be most comfortable if stakeholders are not limited to any sector, but as many stakeholders as wish to participate are allowed to do so. He suggested that stakeholders could be convened via an online format (webcast) or at an in-person meeting in the DC area.

All Committee members agreed that a broad spectrum of stakeholders is necessary, rather than any limited subgroups identified by either the committee or ASN. A group on the call expressed a clear preference to involve as many stakeholders as possible in this process. It was suggested that a stakeholder consultation could be conducted in one or more ways:

- 1) Earlier in the drafting process when we have key questions to seek input on,
- 2) When we are close to having a final report, we could conduct a report briefing and ask targeted questions to seek feedback for final report conclusions, or
- 3) Once the final report is complete, we would inform constituencies so they are not surprised although we would not seek further input.

Committee members thought that the first stakeholder consultation suggested would most likely allow the report to be recognized as unbiased and credible. Stakeholders should be involved early and not once the drafting process has started.

Committee members noted that an in-person meeting would result in a richer dialogue and would therefore be preferable to an online consultation, but noted that this type of meeting requires cost and time, and could possibly add months to the process. It was suggested that the Committee utilize the ASN website as a means to seek comments from ASN members and others by a certain date. We would provide specific questions that we seek input on and other general guidance to help gather information that will be of the most value to the Committee.

Other Business

It was suggested that the final report should have its own press conference. It could be held at the National Press Club in DC to brief press and allow them to ask questions – the final report would be released as a news story at the same time and would be posted online. Committee members suggested that this happen a week or two before ASN's 2017 Scientific Sessions and Annual Meeting, and that a roll-out should also be held at that meeting. Anyone who attends the ASN Annual Meeting would be asked to attend this session if they wish.

The next ASN Advisory Committee call will be held on **Wednesday, November 30th at 10:00am Eastern**. Sarah will send this information around soon.

The call adjourned at 10:50 AM.