

I would like to respond to the Draft Carbohydrates and Health Report, as author of four papers included in the report:

-

1. **Drummond-S** & Kirk-T (1998) - The effect of different types of dietary advice on body composition in a group of Scottish men. - *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics* **11**, -473-485
2. **Drummond-S**, Kirk-T, Jackson-J, Hendry-J, Panton-S & Grey-F (2003) - Effectiveness of dietary advice given by community dietitians to men with elevated blood cholesterol in a clinical setting: a pilot study. - *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics* **16**, -81-83
3. Kirkwood-L, Aldujaili-E & **Drummond-S** (2007) - Effects of advice on dietary intake and/or physical activity on body composition, blood lipids and insulin resistance following a lowfat sucrose-containing high-CHO, energy-restricted diet. - *Int Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition* **58**, -383-397
4. Zaveri-S & **Drummond-S** (2009) - The effect of including a conventional snack (cereal bar) and a non-conventional snack (almonds) on hunger, eating frequency, dietary intake and body weight. - *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics* **22**, -461-468

-

Specifically I would like to query the data selected from my papers listed 1 & 2 above, referred to in paragraph 6.18, 6.19 of the report and in Figure 1, page 202: 'The relationship in randomised controlled trials between daily energy intake and the percentage of total energy intake consumed as sugars'.

-

From both my papers you have selected the end-point data from two independent groups for sugar intake and energy intake without taking into account differences in energy intake between these groups at baseline—which I think is significant particularly in the 2003 paper.

-

From Reference 2 (2003 paper) Table 1 p83:

-

	<u>Baseline</u>	<u>8Weeks</u>
<b>EI (MJ/D)</b>		
-----Group-1-----	9.70	9.39
-----Group-2-----	8.49	8.39
<b>%NMES</b>		
-----Group-1-----	10.0	10.5
-----Group-2-----	11.4	9.0

-

I think the way the data has been selected (by focussing on the endpoint data) is misleading. In fact, if you had selected the baseline values for Group 1 & 2 the relationship would have been the other way round—

i.e. at Baseline:-

Group-1-NMES=10.0%-----EI=9.7MJ

Group-2-NMES=11.4%-----EI=8.49MJ

-

-

From-Reference-1-(1998-paper)-Table-5-p479

-

-----Baseline-----6weeks--6months

**EI-(kcal/d)**

-----Group-1-----2566-----2141-----2253

-----Group-2-----2639-----2280-----2455

-

**%total-sugar**

-----Group-1-----17.0-----15.9-----16.5

-----Group-2-----16.5-----19.9-----19.6

-

Here-you-can-see-that-as-Group-2-increased-%total-sugar-from-16.5-to-19.9-to-19.6%, -  
their-intakes-decreased-from-2639-to-2280-to-2455kcal/d.-There-was-no-significant-change-  
in--%total-sugar-in-Group-1.-In-addition,-Group-2-significantly-reduced-EI-whilst-increasing-  
%energy-from-sugar--particularly-at-6-weeks,-which-lead-to-significant-weight-loss-  
(2.5kg),-which-an-important-outcome-since-weight-control-is-the-key-issue-after-all.-(NB:-  
the-reduction-in-total-energy-intake-was-the-result-of-reducing-intakes-of-dietary-fat)

-

I-also-think-it-is-misleading-to-connect-the-data-points-with-a-line-on-Figure-1.-This-makes-  
it-look-like-the-2-data-points-are-from-a-single-group-repeated-measures-over-time,-  
whereas-they-are-from-two-different-groups-at-one-single-time-point.-

-

I-would-be-delighted-if-my-studies-continued-to-be-included-in-this-report-but-to-  
acknowledge-that-there-is-no-evidence-from-my-studies-that-with-increasing-sugar-intake-  
there-is-an-increase-in-energy.

-

-

Yours-sincerely,  
Sandra-Drummond

-

Dr-Sandra-Drummond-RPHNutr  
Senior-Lecturer-in-Nutrition  
School-of-Health-Sciences  
Queen-Margaret-University