

OBJECTIVE: To assess the performance of the IST in Arabic bread made from white wheat flour.

METHODS: Bread samples were collected from 1,737 households during a national micronutrient survey in Jordan. A subsample of Arabic bread (n = 44) was systematically selected for testing by both the IST and spectrophotometry (criterion reference). Performance measures (sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative predictive values) were calculated using five cutoffs to define the presence of added iron, including ≥ 15.0 ppm (approximate level of natural iron in Arabic bread) and four additional cutoffs based on test performance.

RESULTS: The iron contents of samples testing negative by IST ranged from 10.4 to 18.4 ppm, with one outlier at 41.0 ppm, which was excluded from subsequent analyses. The iron contents of samples testing positive by IST ranged from 16.1 to 38.4 ppm. With the exception of negative predictive values for the two lowest cutoffs (≥ 15.0 and ≥ 16.1 ppm), all performance measures exceeded 83.3%.

CONCLUSIONS: These results show promise for the IST as an inexpensive, field-friendly method for testing bread that could have a useful role in the monitoring and evaluation process for flour fortification programs.

3. Title:

Dietary components influencing zinc (Zn) bioavailability were implicated in the first cases of human Zn deficiency in the Middle East in the 1960s. It was not until the 1980s that isotope tracer studies in humans quantified the effects of the type and/or quantity of Zn, protein, iron, and phytate (myo-inositol hexaphosphate) on Zn absorption in humans and confirmed the dose-dependent inhibitory effect of phytate on Zn absorption. This led to further analysis of the Zn and phytate content of foods. The use of phytate-to-Zn molar ratios as likely estimates of absorbable dietary Zn followed together with an assessment of their relationship with Zn biomarkers in low-income countries (LIC). In the 1990s, increasing knowledge of factors governing Zn-absorption led to refinements of Zn requirements and algorithms to estimate dietary Zn bioavailability. Their use highlighted that inadequate Zn intake from plant-based diets were a major etiological factor in morbidity and stunting in LIC, prompting the need to identify indicators of the population's Zn status. Major advances in analyses of dietary data pioneered by Beaton in 1980s led to the endorsement in 2007 of a dietary Zn indicator based on the prevalence of the population with usual Zn intake below the estimated average requirement for Zn. Risk of Zn deficiency is a public health concern when the prevalence of inadequate Zn intake is $>25\%$. Recent findings that Zn bioavailability from high-phytate, whole-day diets is lower than previous estimates suggest that revision of Zn estimated average requirement for LIC may be warranted.

Writing style and content

1. Never use –ing, especially “using”.
2. Never use “respectively” especially with lists of numerical data.
3. Never use an abbreviation without defining it.
4. Never mix up USA spelling (e.g. center) and UK spelling (e.g. centre).
5. Never have differences in the aims, conclusions or data (including statistical results) between the abstract, main text and tables or figures.

Professional publication practice and strategy

1. Take time to choose the most appropriate journal. Consult Researchers / Advice for Authors / Choosing the journal at <http://www.authoraide.com/>.
2. Always follow the journal’s Instructions to Authors or Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Editors are offended by noncompliance with the journal’s rules.
3. Check all references and quotations carefully. Avoid suspicions of plagiarism.
 - Spell all researchers’ names correctly. Check the original publication.
 - Use “quotation marks” for literal (verbatim, word-for-word) quotations.
 - Provide the bibliographic reference for i) word-for-word quotations, ii) paraphrased quotations and iii) references to any information or ideas published before (even your own).
4. If there is something that you don’t understand or that is not clear, ask the editor before you submit your manuscript.

EXERCISE 2: Clear writing

<http://jn.nutrition.org/content/141/6/1140.full?sid=072fb672-3677-4654-a15f-b8f9ba6d5ef6>

Schröder H, Fitó M, Estruch R, Martínez-González MA, Corella D, Salas-Salvadó J, Lamuela-Raventós R, Ros E, Salaverría I, Fiol M, Lapetra J, Vinyoles E, Gómez-Gracia E, Lahoz C, Serra-Majem L, Pintó X, Ruiz-Gutierrez V, Covas MI. A Short Screener Is Valid for Assessing Mediterranean Diet Adherence among Older Spanish Men and Women J. Nutr. 2011; 141(6): 1140-1145

Impact Factor (2010): 4.3

In the top 12% of all journals ranked by ISI in 2009

Ranked no. 3 among peer-reviewed research journals in ISI’s Nutrition and Dietetic category

1. “Using” misused

Using Bland Altman’s analysis, the average MEDAS Mediterranean diet score estimate was 105% of the FFQ PREDIMED score estimate.

According to Bland Altman’s analysis, the average MEDAS Mediterranean diet score estimate was 105% of the FFQ PREDIMED score estimate.

2. CHD risk was estimated **using** the Registre Gironí del Cor function adapted from the original Framingham function and validated for the Spanish population (12).

CHD risk was estimated **with** the Registre Gironí del Cor function adapted from the original Framingham function and validated for the Spanish population (12).

The abbreviation as the first word of the sentence is not helpful to readers.

3. -ing forms

This screener might also be used to assess dietary compliance in large epidemiological settings **incorporating** a broad spectrum of measurements with limited resources.

Who – or what – incorporates what?

This screener, **which** incorporates a broad spectrum of measurements with limited resources, might also be used to assess dietary compliance in large epidemiological settings.

“measurements with limited resources”?

4. Participle (-ing form) as a noun

Of course, **evaluating** how well the new method measures what it is intended to measure is of paramount importance.

This is acceptable but there is a better alternative:

Of course, it is of paramount importance **to evaluate** how well the new method measures what it is intended to measure.

5. “Respectively”

Which of these five examples are hard to understand? Which are easy to understand?

5.1. Weight and height were measured with calibrated scales and a wall-mounted stadiometer, **respectively**.

5.2. Specifically, glucose, total cholesterol, and TG were analyzed by hexokinase, esterase-oxidase-peroxidase, and glicerol-phosphate oxidase-peroxidase methodology, **respectively**.

5.3. Poor ($\kappa < 0.21$), fair ($\kappa = 0.21-0.40$), moderate ($\kappa = 0.41-0.60$), good ($\kappa = 0.61-0.80$), and excellent ($\kappa = 0.81-1.00$) concordance was found for 21.4, 28.6, 28.6, 14.3, and 7.1% of the components of the PREDIMED score, **respectively**.

Alternative:

Concordance for the components of the PREDIMED score was poor ($\kappa < 0.21$) for 21.4%, fair ($\kappa = 0.21-0.40$) for 28.6%, moderate ($\kappa = 0.41-0.60$) for 28.6%, good ($\kappa = 0.61-0.80$) for 14.3% and excellent ($\kappa = 0.81-1.00$) for 7.1%.

