



Letter to the Editor

Authors' response to the letter entitled 'Concerns about the "corporate capture" of The Academy article'

We write in response to the letter entitled 'Concerns about the corporate capture of The Academy' published online on 16 March 2023⁽¹⁾. It was written in response to our original research article published in *Public Health Nutrition* on 24 October 2022 about the corporate capture of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (AND)⁽²⁾.

Our research article provides evidence of AND's relationships with food, pharmaceutical and agri-business companies^(3–6). We analysed publicly available information accessible to anyone who wants to repeat the exercise⁽⁷⁾. We analysed the data using standard scientific methods.

Butler et al. claim that our article 'has minimum standards of design or research methodology'. The authors are concerned about the contextualisation of the research, accuracy of our reflexivity process, validity and replicability of our study and its rigour. Our research article is written for a public health audience and contextualised under this perspective. Moreover, our original research article provides details on our analysis and data sources, which are comprehensively described in the paper that was peer-reviewed before publication. We undertook an inductive analysis, a well-established qualitative research approach to data analysis, with regular team meetings to discuss analyses and findings. Using documents obtained from freedom of information requests as primary data is a valid data collection technique used in qualitative research⁽⁸⁾. We triangulated such data with other publicly accessible documents, including archival AND policies. With the details provided in our article, we are confident that other researchers can replicate our study.

In their letter, Butler et al. point to an author of the original study working for the U.S. Right To Know as having connections to specific organisations. This information is disclosed in our publication and is consistent with the journal's guidelines. Contrary to what the authors of the letter claim, in scientific articles, it is not a mandatory practice to include information on 'lived experience, training or roles'. Even if it were, this still would not have changed the substance of our findings.

Butler et al. claimed that our article will have 'negative implications for the field'. These negative implications are

related to our findings: that AND has ties with corporations. We only use the words 'may' or 'might' when those ties may have influenced the decisions of the AND. In our study, we added evidence to what has been discussed elsewhere and what appears on AND's website. AND's members may already be aware of those ties, and some have previously questioned them⁽⁹⁾.

It is unclear why the authors of the letter ask the journal to write 'a statement or position paper on the importance of balancing rigour and ethics in research' for our article. Every article published in *Public Health Nutrition* follows principles of rigour and ethics in research. These principles are part of the journal's policies that all authors, including us, adhere to.

In conclusion, we welcome a rigorous scientific debate on our findings. However, calling for the revocation of our article threatens scientific integrity because rigorous scientific standards and processes were followed. We stand by our research and reject any allegations of inaccuracy or other unsupported claims.

Financial support

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authorship

AC drafted the letter and all authors contributed to revisions for important intellectual content.

Ethics of human subject participation

Not applicable.





Angela Carriedo^{1,*}, Ilana Pinsky², Eric Crosbie^{3,4}, Gary Ruskin⁵ and Melissa Mialon⁶

¹World Public Health Nutrition Association,
Peacehaven, UK

²Urban Food Policy Institute, Graduate School of Public
Health and Health Policy, City University of New York,
New York, USA

³School of Community Health Sciences, University of
Nevada Reno,
Reno, NV, USA

⁴Ozmen Institute for Global Studies, University of Nevada
Reno,
Reno, NV, USA

⁵US Right to Know, Oakland, CA, USA

⁶Trinity Business School, Trinity College Dublin,
Dublin, Ireland

*Corresponding author: Email angela_carriedo@yahoo.com

References

1. Butler JL, Downs L, Johnson CM *et al.* (2023) Concerns about the 'corporate capture' of The Academy article. *Public Health Nutr* 1–2. doi: 10.1017/S1368980023000551.
2. Carriedo A, Pinsky I, Crosbie E *et al.* (2022) The corporate capture of the nutrition profession in the USA: the case of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. *Public Health Nutr* **25**, 1–15.
3. Nestle M (2015) Dietitians Put Seal on Kraft Singles (You Can't Make This Stuff Up). https://www.foodpolitics.com/page/177/?SPH_PRACTICE=NUVIVA (accessed April 2023).
4. Nestle M (2018) Nutrition Education and Dietetics Societies: Industry Influence. *Unsavoury Truth: How Food Companies Skew the Science of What We Eat*: Basic Books. pp. 141–151.
5. Simon M (2015) Nutrition Scientists on the Take from Big Food.
6. Simon M (2013) And Now a Word from Our Sponsors: are America's Nutrition Professionals in the Pocket of Big Food. http://www.eatdrinkpolitics.com/wp-content/uploads/AND_Corporate_Sponsorship_Report.pdf (accessed April 2023).
7. U.S. Right to Know (2022) Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics documents. <https://usrtk.org/ultra-processed-foods/academy-of-nutrition-and-dietetics-documents/> (accessed April 2023).
8. Mitchell G & McCambridge J (2023) Interactions between the U.S. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the alcohol industry: evidence from email correspondence 2013–2020. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* **84**, 11–26.
9. Strom S (2013) A Dismissal Raises Questions About Objectivity on Food Policy. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/11/business/a-dismissal-raises-questions-about-objectivity-on-food-policy.html> (accessed April 2013).