

Introduction to the first issue of World Nutrition for 2020

In public health nutrition's corner of the world, we see clearly the corruption and exploitation of the nutrition profession by Big Food, and especially, Big Snack.

As entire populations shift to consuming many, even a majority of their calories from ultra-processed foods, alarmed and bold governments around the world are beginning to take "baby steps," for example, stopping or limiting junk food advertising aimed at children, taxing sugar, and mandating front of the pack warning labels for unhealthy foods. The food industry and the right-wing political parties in bed with it continue to intone their mantra that everything is the responsibility of the consumer, who ought to be given free choice, uninterfered with by the "nanny state."

How can we do our part in this epic and still early battle? First, join the only association of professional nutritionists that stands by you in this battle—the World Public Health Nutrition Association (<https://wphna.org/membership>). Second, read and contribute to the independent journal it sponsors—this one. If you browse through past issues back to 2010, you'll see that WN has, for a full decade now, contributed to the debate and empowered actors on this issue.

In the current issue we continue our tradition of naming names. The premier international congress in the nutrition field, the International Union of Nutritional Sciences, has been in bed with the junk food industry since its inception. Our first research article, by [Piaggio and Solans](#), documents in detail industry involvement in and corruption of the latest IUNS meeting. The industry's methods to place health halos around their ultra-processed foods are subtle; so are our researchers'.

Our second research article, by [Oroniran et al.](#), is a concrete example of the progress Big Snack has made in taking over diets, even among university students in Nigeria. This is a critical age because during our first years of independence from our parents is when many of us form the dietary patterns that will continue throughout adulthood. In the third research article, [Tselengidis et al.](#) find that 87% of ready to eat cereals on sale in Cyprus would not be allowed to advertise if the country followed WHO Europe guidance, because they are too high in sugar or salt. Cyprus has the highest obesity rate in the region, so we hope its government is listening!

The next article, by [Leeds et al.](#), explores how low mood is linked to unhealthy eating and improved mood to healthier eating among an ethnically diverse sample of women in London. In another paper on a similar topic from London, [Adegboye et al.](#) present the protocol for a study of the influence of attitudinal factors on diet and lifestyle among African and Caribbean women. This paper does not present the results of the study. Because this publishing approach may be new to WN readers, I cite the authors' explanation to me (which I agree with) for doing it this way: "publishing study protocols/designs helps to improve the quality of public health research by reducing publication bias and improving reproducibility."

The next article, by [Ansari et al.](#), examines the links between diversity of mothers' and their children's diets in the slums of Delhi, India. In Ibadan, Nigeria, [Samuel et al.](#) also look at dietary diversity, assessing the relationship between household food insecurity and diversity in the diets of young children and their

mothers. Next, [Saaka and Oladele](#) evaluate the adequacy of nutrient intakes of pregnant women resident in northern Ghana.

After this record number of research articles for a single issue of WN, we present two literature reviews. The first is a comprehensive review by [Rana et al.](#) of the effectiveness of various nutrition interventions that have been implemented in low- and middle-income countries on the WHO global nutrition target for stunting. [Iddrisu and Chikwere](#) review the possible value of several plants and mushrooms in the management of type 2 diabetes, largely based on animal research.

The issue concludes with a review by [Goldberg](#) of the 2019 Right to Food and Nutrition Watch issue Women's Power in Food Struggles. Goldberg was the winner of a contest--an innovative teaching approach used by Prof Anne Bellows--whereby students were asked to read and review the book, with the winning entry (chosen among the three best by a panel of WN-appointed judges) to be published in WN.

As always, this issue kicks off with George Kent's [Good Question](#). This time he asks what should be done about the absence of immune factors in infant formula.

Ted Greiner, Editor-in-Chief