

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.

Contact details

Last name: *

Ray

First name: *

Professor Sumantra

E-mail: *

Sumantra.Ray@mrc-ewl.cam.ac.uk

Name of government/organization/association if applicable: *

NNEdPro Global Centre for Nutrition and Health

Position within organization *

NNEdPro Founding Chair and Executive Director

Address of organization

NNEdPro Global Centre for Nutrition and Health
St John's Innovation Centre
Cowley Road, Cambridge, CB4 0WS, UK

Country *

gbr

Are the responses approved or endorsed by your organization?

Yes

Comments on the "[Discussion paper](#)"

General comments : Please comment on the clarity and comprehensiveness of the approach

The discussion paper provides clear descriptions of the terminology to be used within the work packages, with clarity provided that whilst a potential conflict may exist this does not necessarily result in an actual material conflict. The paper clearly highlights the need to manage this concept, as removing key players from discussions could in itself actually skew, and therefore conflict, the outcome. For example, by not involving the food industry in the setting of nutrition policy, a significant amount of technical and logistical expertise would be lost. There is a need to 'declare' relevant interests including those relating to industry in any piece of work. However this may not constitute an actual 'conflict' of interest.

Specific comments

Comments on the "[Introductory paper](#)"

General comments : Please comment on the clarity and comprehensiveness of the introductory paper

The introductory paper provides a comprehensive overview of the rationale behind the proposals, providing a logical approach for limiting the potential for any bias or overt influence from the food industry. The document notes the research highlighting the likelihood that the risk of a Col is lower for food industry players linked with healthy produce than that with unhealthy produce. Consideration should be taken of the much wider food supply chain, incorporating everyone from the researcher to the seed producer and

grower; the hauliers, manufacturers and distributors through to the retailers, so that Col are considered at all stages of the food chain. Consideration should however be included for the equal strength that advocacy groups (be that health, religious or political) can also have on influencing the agenda.

Specific comments

Comments on the "[Tool](#)"

General comments : Please comment on the clarity and practical value of the tool

It is important to have all the key players 'around the table' if you want an initiative to be successful, particularly in nutrition. Therefore if anything is to be altered in the food chain, those responsible for providing the food we consume must be engaged in discussions. The tool provides a logical model for assessing and balancing potential risk with the securing of stakeholder engagement and 'buy-in' to ensure successful uptake of an initiative. Further guidance will be required on setting inclusion/exclusion criteria but this in itself will need to be flexible to enable adaptation to different situations. However this should always be transparent and equally applied to all parties, irrespective of whether they are industry, charity, political or religious, so as to not skew outputs with any bias.

Ultimately any project or initiative needs to be centered on population benefit and the key inputs that modulate population choices are largely via knowledge generation and translation from the research community, formulators and influencers of policy as well as advocacy by healthcare and public health professionals. The food and nutrition industry has inextricable interfaces with each of these sectors and therefore it is imperative to include inputs from industry whilst effectively mitigating both substantive and perceived conflicts in this process.

Specific comments