One of the more interesting roles of the Honorary Strategic Communications Officer is to ‘edit’ the Nutrition Society’s Gazette. Of course, in practice, all the hard work is done by members of staff at Cambridge Court and our contributing writers. However, as the responsible Trustee, I get to influence the content of each issue which is a privilege and a lot of fun.

As a long-standing member of the Nutrition Society – since I was a PhD student at Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh – one of the things that greatly impresses me is the historical context. In essence, Society members have been involved at many of the key stages of the development of our discipline from its emergence at the fringes of medicine and biochemistry to the highly complex subject we see today.

In my new role, I look forward to developing this theme by tapping into our archives and the lived knowledge of members. In this issue, our new section on Nutrition Greats will focus on Sir Kenneth Blaxter, while our section celebrating key nutrition discoveries will tell the story of Denis Burkitt’s work on fibre. I will also ensure that we celebrate the here and now with conference highlights, debates and a regular focus on the myriad contributions that different members make to our Society such as publications, training and outreach.

I hope you enjoy this Gazette and play your own part by getting involved with Themes, Irish or Scottish Sections, registering for FENS, participating in the journal club, or downloading a webinar. With a new President coming on board, it’s a great time to be a nutritionist!
Tempus fugit
Professor Philip Calder, President

As I write this, my last Gazette piece as your President, I reflect on how quickly the last three years have passed. In fact, I still feel new to the role! Nevertheless, I believe that significant progress has been made in a number of areas over this period and that the Society is in even better shape now than it was in summer of 2016 when I became President. Our journals and conferences, which together form the heart of the Society, retain their high quality and are universally well regarded. Internationally, the Society is much valued for its strong structure, governance and leadership and our links with societies in Africa, Korea, and the US have been strengthened. It has been a true privilege to travel to meetings in those, and other, locations as your President and to represent the values of our Society on your behalf. I have been humbled by the high regard in which the Nutrition Society is held.

We have strengthened our links with other organisations including the Association for Nutrition with whom we now have regular “trustee-to-trustee” meetings; the British Association for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (BAPEN) whose meetings we now contribute to; the Royal Society of Medicine; and the Royal College of General Practitioners. I am delighted that our Winter Meeting this year is being co-organised with BAPEN and the British Society of Gastroenterology. This represents a new link and fits with my stated aim to work more closely with the medical community. Last year, the Society launched its Training Academy with exciting new developments, and it is already showing signs of significant success. Our recognition of, and service to, members at all career stages has been enhanced, for example with new Awards to recognise significant contributions, and with our support of a Daphne Jackson Fellowship, amongst other developments. I would also like to mention the Society’s archiving project which has brought to the surface important pieces of our history that have been remarkably well received wherever they have been shown.

In thinking over the last three years, there have been so many highlights for me. I would include our strengthened links with BAPEN, the launch of the Training Academy, and the success of the archiving project amongst these. Each of the last three Winter Conferences has been special, with the Society reception and the International Early Career Nutrition Research Championship (in 2017 and 2018) being important contributors to the success of those events. The Summer Conference of 2018 in Leeds was also really special I think. One real highlight for me has been awarding the Society’s Honorary Fellowships. To be in a position to honour those who have made significant and vital contributions to our discipline has been a real privilege. Attending the IUNS Congress in Buenos Aires in 2017 as Nutrition Society President was unique and a real honour. I should also mention the workshops I hosted on Scientific Publishing in Addis Ababa and Dubai as memorable highlights.

Right now I am really looking forward to the FENS Conference in Dublin in October. The programme is complete, abstract numbers are high and early indications of registrations are good. The Dublin venue will be wonderful and I am certain that FENS 2019 will be a scientific and social success. I really want to thank all those involved in putting this event together.

In closing, I wish to thank all Trustees and Council Members for their hard work on behalf of members and for their full support of me over the period of my Presidency. I also wish to thank all Society staff for their excellent work and dedication to the interests of our members. In addition, thank you to all Society members for their wonderful support over the last three years. Finally, I wish all the very best to my successor Professor Julie Lovegrove; I know that the Society will be in great hands and that the future is bright. Carpe diem ….
Sir Kenneth Blaxter, known to all as KB, may truly be described as a giant of nutrition; animal nutrition to be precise, but then we are all animals. Indeed, I doubt that we shall see his like again, not least because the golden days of farm animal nutrition science are over. At first sight this seems a pity, but it reflects the fact that we did a good job. Over 50 years (1945-1990) generously funded research in animal nutrition underpinned by fundamental studies of the physiology of digestion and metabolism, has given us the knowledge and understanding to feed our farm animals very well. We may not always manage this in practice but that’s another story.

Undoubtedly KB would have excelled at anything he turned his mind to. However, in the context of animal nutrition, he was lucky to have been born at the right time, since his career exactly spanned these 50 golden years. As a child, he was not a star pupil. Indeed, his father thought he was probably only fit for farming or the church. He elected for the former, took agriculture at Reading and entered the National Institute for Research in Dairying in 1939. He was drafted into the army for two years but it was decided that he could serve his country better by helping to increase food production on the home front. His first task was to study the effects of injecting dairy cows with thyroxine. He soon realised the fundamental flaw in this approach; i.e. you can’t get more without putting more in, and this led him to challenge conventional thinking as to nutrient requirements and nutritive value of feeds for ruminants, then based on the Starch Equivalent system. In 1946 he made a highly productive visit to the USA where Brody, Kleiber, Mitchell and others were developing new calorimetric techniques and pioneering new ideas in energy metabolism.

Shortly after his return from the USA, KB was appointed Head of the Nutrition Department at the Hannah Dairy Research Institute in Ayr, Scotland and at once set about construction of an energy metabolism unit based on closed-circuit respiration chambers able to measure energy exchanges with the high precision necessary to calculate the net (incremental) efficiency of utilisation of metabolizable energy (ME) for maintenance, growth and lactation. This work formed the basis for the ME System that has now become the internationally adopted standard for ruminant nutrition (The Americans feed their cows on the basis of NEI, Net Energy for Lactation, but it’s the same thing really). He also recognised that his calorimetric techniques were ideally suited to evaluation of the effects of cold stress on cattle and sheep and it was this that drew me first to work under KB at the Hannah in 1963. Incidentally, and as a topical aside, when I arrived four of the six calorimeters were being used to discover ways of reducing methane production in ruminants, the aim then being to increase the capture of digestible energy rather than to save the planet. Still, plus ca change.

In 1965, KB was appointed Director of the Rowett Research Institute in Aberdeen and I went off to study very cold cattle in Edmonton, Canada. He began at once to establish a new centre for calorimetric studies but accepted that (even) he could not run a large Institute (then over 300 staff) and a large research group at the same time. He invited me to return to run the latter and, in 1970, I did. Thus I had the great good fortune to know and work with KB both as a free-thinking, delightfully eccentric research scientist at the Hannah and as a more tightly reined-in leader and administrator of research at the Rowett. Undoubtedly, he found the former job more fun and, by his own admission, was not best suited to the role of Director. The problem, as I saw it, was that his brain operated at twice the speed of most of his staff. Discussions with KB were inclined to lead to a host of new ideas (from KB) that would arrive in writing the following morning on the desk of the alarmed researcher. More timid members of his staff (and staff in full-time research institutes, unused to the cut and thrust of life with University students, can be very timid) would take these notes as directives, rather than as ideas, and become confused and disgruntled. Personally, I thought they were great.

On his retirement from the Rowett, KB returned to his native Norfolk, where he painted the sky, whereas before he had painted mountains, reared sheep and goats, restored a moderately stately pile, Stradbroke Hall, supported his equally impressive wife Mildred (Micky) in her work on health in human society, and continued to produce some of his best writing. I cite, in particular, his magnum opus ‘Energy Metabolism in Animals and Man’. He continued to stimulate minds and challenge sloppy thinking until the day he died. His very last paper ‘Animal Production and Food; real problems and paranoia’ was an invited lecture that I gave in his place because he was too ill to attend. In this he used his statistical skills to challenge received thinking (at the time) as to the so-called causal relationship between intake of saturated fats and coronary heart disease. As always, he was ahead of the game.
The Society’s Parliamentary Profile – a record of success

Mark Hollingsworth, Chief Executive Officer

When this Gazette is published I will have passed my 5th anniversary of joining the Society as its Chief Executive – 1st July 2014. During my interview for the role I remember being asked by the panel how I could help the Society achieve a long-held ambition to be uniquely positioned to present strong evidence to Government and policy makers on the importance of nutritional science. Having just returned from 11 years living overseas, I had little current knowledge of the UK political environment, and could only offer a suggestion the answer might lie in developing a profile and network in the appropriate areas!

Now, in July 2019, I look back at just the past 3 years and note how dramatically the situation has changed. The Society co-hosted the annual Parliamentary Scientific Reception in the House of Commons (HoC) in December. It also supported STEM for Britain, an annual poster competition held in the HoC during which one of the Society’s members received a prize for her research and poster. I was also invited to deliver one of the keynote addresses. In addition, 6 of the Society’s student members participated in Voice of the Future, a unique occasion in which students question Government Ministers, MPs and officials on science-related issues. In March the Society were invited to host a debate on ‘Nutritional Challenges for an Ageing Population’ at the Parliamentary and Scientific Committee in the HoC. In May the Society attended the prestigious Speaker of the House of Commons Annual Lecture, held in the historic Speaker’s Apartment, where for the first time the lecture featured a scientific topic. In June the Society hosted a number of distinguished guests at the Parliamentary Links Day event held in both the House of Commons and the Speaker’s Apartment. The Society’s logo has featured prominently in the background of a range of promotional photographs from many of these events, and similar events, over the past three years, achieving what is commonly known as ‘brand recognition’. Opportunities now exist for Society members to attend a select number of All Party Parliamentary Groups covering a range of food, health and science issues. Moreover, members can now table questions to be asked at these events should they be unable to attend in person. Finally, at the policy level, I sit on the Parliamentary Scientific Advisory Committee – a group of representatives from the Biosciences community who meet to plan Parliamentary events, and to work with the HoC Select Committee for Science and Technology.

How did the Society achieve this positioning in just 3 years?

Firstly, the Trustees made a powerful commitment by adding the intention to the Strategic Plan they developed in 2015/2016. One of the objectives set is: Develop our ability to present strong evidence to Government and policy makers on the importance of nutritional science.

Next, over a period of time, Trustees, staff, members of Council, and other Society members have set out to build inter-society coalitions to promote the work of the Society and its members. Relationships have been built with key individuals inside and outside Government. In effect a new multilevel, interdependent, fluid network has been established, shaping outcomes by coordinating interests, pooling resources. It has driven change.

The Trustees, in setting the strategic objective, wished to clearly establish they were not setting out to ‘lobby’, but rather to ‘influence’ Government and policy makers. The results speak for themselves. The Society is now recognised within the political environment as a key component of the UK scientific network and has the infrastructure, policies and procedures in place to present, (as and when required), evidence-based nutrition science to Government and policy makers.

CEO OF THE YEAR AWARD

The Society is delighted to announce that Chief Executive Officer, Mark Hollingsworth MBA FInstLM, has been awarded the CEO of the Year Award by CEO Today magazine as part of their United Kingdom Awards 2018.

Dedicated to recognising strong and innovative leadership amongst business leaders operating in the United Kingdom, the CEO Today United Kingdom Awards recognises those who are leading in their respective sectors and beyond.

Congratulations to Mark for being awarded “CEO of the Year in the Life Sciences’ sector in the UK.

NUTRITIONAL SCIENCE RECOGNISED IN THE 2019 HONOURS LIST

Congratulations to Dr Steve Wootton, Associate Professor of Nutrition and Senior Lecturer in Human Nutrition within Medicine, University of Southampton, for being awarded an OBE in the 2019 New Year Honours list for ‘Services to Nutrition and Physical Education’.

Congratulations to Barbara Bray, Food Safety and Nutrition Consultant, for being awarded an MBE in the 2019 Birthday Honours list for ‘Services to Food Nutrition’.

FROM THE CEO
Someone once said to me, ‘I’m a taxpayer who is paying for your research. So what research do you do, how am I going to benefit from it, and does it represent value for my money?’ This is one reason why the REF was created, to provide accountability for public investment in research and evidence for the benefits of this investment. It’s also a tool to evaluate the quality of research in universities, by providing ‘benchmarking information’ and ‘reputational yardsticks’ for the higher education sector and general public.

Above all else, its main purpose is to inform the selective allocation of research funding to UK universities.

So how does REF work? Universities submit a portfolio of research into one of 34 Units of Assessment (UoAs), which best suits the nature of their research. The qualitative assessment of research is based on the evaluation of three elements: ‘Outputs’, ‘Impact’ and ‘Environment’, which carry a respective weighting of 60%, 25% and 15% in the overall score. These elements are assessed by expert panels, made up of senior academics from competing universities, who give sub-profile scores for each element, which are combined to produce an overall score on which the final outcome is based. The types of output, produced between 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2020, can vary considerably between academic disciplines. In scientific subjects, including nutritional science, outputs are chiefly confined to publications of original, peer reviewed research, preferably in journals with a high number of citations or impact factor, which I’ll come back to. The quality of the research in these publications is given a star rating on the basis of its ‘Originality’ (novelty, being first of its kind, not confirmatory), ‘Significance’ (importance in terms of its transformative potential and impact in advancing concepts and changing practice), and ‘Rigour’ (statistical robustness; scale, study design, power, controls, randomisation, and quality of methods and techniques). These three research criteria are judged as being either ‘World-leading’ (4*), ‘Internationally excellent’ (3*), ‘Recognised internationally’ (2*), ‘Recognised nationally’ (1*) or ‘Unclassified’. The number of papers from each institution must be 2.5 times the number of staff, with an individual submission allowance of a minimum of one or maximum of five papers. Impact factor (IF) is a measure of the frequency with which the average paper in a journal has been cited in a particular year. Its purpose, to measure the importance or rank of a journal by the number of times its papers are cited. However, IF has been commonly misused as a metric of research quality, which can be at odds with the quality of the journal in which it is published. This undoubtedly introduces conscious bias towards the quality of papers in journals at either end of the IF spectrum, even before they’ve been reviewed!

In contrast to the misuse of ‘IF’, ‘impact’ represents a true measure of research quality. In the REF, research ‘impact’ is measured by the quality of submitted Impact Case Studies, which consist of a portfolio of research gathered over an extended period of time, for which there is evidence of a substantive contribution from a single researcher or research unit. The quality of impact case studies is assessed in terms of their ‘reach and significance’ on the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, which is judged to be either ‘Outstanding’ (4*), ‘Very considerable’ (3*), ‘Considerable’ (2*), ‘Recognised’ (1*) or ‘Unclassified’.

The types of impact, and the extent to which they can be measured objectively, vary enormously across disciplines. This inevitably brings disparity to the comparative judgement of impacts within a single UoA, and, some believe, tactics in choosing the most appropriate UoA. For example, case studies within the same UoA may describe bodies of research that underpin the development of a drug therapy that reduces mortality from a disease, or the formulation of new dietary guideline. Both case studies are impactful, but one is measured in hard clinical endpoint of human survival, while the other is more difficult to measure and relatively nebulous. It has also been suggested that overemphasis on impact, is undermining the quality of research by driving a ‘claims inflation’ that over develops the breadth, but compromises the depth of our knowledge. Real advances in research are built in small, reproducible stages that may not transform the world, but may eventually
lead to something that does. The final element under assessment in REF is the research ‘Environment’ which is subdivided into parts. The first evaluates research income and number of postgraduate research degrees, while the second is based on a statement from the institution that summarises the extent of its research facilities, referring to quantitative indices wherever possible1.

The principles and standard operating procedures of REF have been planned and laid out with scientific precision and rigour. Nevertheless, the review process relies upon the highly subjective interpretation of descriptive criteria to assess research quality, and the judgement of academics from competing institutions. More sinister sides of the REF include its use as a metric to weed-out ‘unREFable’ academic staff, and its inevitable consequence of concentrating resources for research into a relatively smaller numbers of institutions, so the rich, get richer and the poor, get poorer. In this respect, a disproportionately large amount of total Government funding for research (>50%) already goes to a small number of incredibly wealthy universities in the UK (~5%). In this context, REF is an exercise for managing the competition for what’s left. REF has become ingrained in the fabric of academic life. It has infiltrated our vocabulary, consumed human resources, and changed the very way we do research. It is a constant reminder and re-enforcer of performance indicators that are already ingrained in the mind of researchers as goals required to achieve success. The process of being made accountable is time consuming and uncomfortable, but it is a necessary set of hoops to jump through to keep us on our toes.

1. REF Guidance on submissions: https://www.ref.ac.uk/media/1092/ref-2019_01-guidance-on-submissions.pdf
**Vision for Public Health Nutrition**

Dr Allison Hodge, Editor in Chief

As a nutritional epidemiologist, *Public Health Nutrition (PHN)* has been the natural home for several papers I have contributed to, going back to 2003. It is also the sort of journal, that back in the days when we had hard copies on display in the office, you could always be assured would contain something interesting to read over lunch. The beauty of PHN is that although all the readers and authors are passionate about public health nutrition, they cover a broad range of subjects from policy development to workforce development, behavioural nutrition to economics and so much more as well. This diversity has led me over years of being a reviewer, Associate Editor, Deputy Editor, and now Editor-in-Chief, to read papers on topics I might otherwise never have thought about. For example, the article by Shen et al1, compares results from Nutrition Environment Measures Survey in Stores (NEMSS), an objective and rigorous assessments of the consumer nutrition environment, with information retrieved from Yelp (www.yelp.com), a social media site that provides a platform for consumers to post reviews of local businesses and services. This study suggests that Yelp might provide useful information on consumer food environment without requiring researchers to visit and assess individual stores. A completely different paper by Reynolds et al2, uses linear modelling to identify diets that meet nutrition and green house gas emissions guidelines for different income groups in the UK, demonstrating that it is possible to achieve with minimal changes to diets required.

Recent discussion with John Mathers, the new Editor-in-Chief of British Journal of Nutrition (BJN), regarding the papers that we should consider for PHN or recommend for transfer to BJN and vice versa, has prompted me to consider what sort of papers I would like to publish in PHN. I have also noticed during the selection of manuscripts for each issue, that although we have 12 categories, submitted manuscripts are predominantly in the nutritional epidemiology category, with few choices in the other categories which are i) monitoring and surveillance of nutritional status or nutritional environments, ii) assessment and methodology related to any of the other categories, iii) nutritional status and body composition, iv) nutrition communication, v) behavioural nutrition, vi) nutritional epidemiology, vii) economics and environment as they impact on nutritional status and health, viii) community nutrition, ix) interventions, x) public policies, xi) workforce development and xii) sustainability of the environment and food systems. Papers from all these categories are welcome as they together contribute to the goal of promoting good health through nutrition. I don’t know whether the mix of papers we receive reflects the mix of research that is conducted in public health nutrition, or whether there is a bias among researchers that results in manuscripts in other categories being submitted elsewhere. However, what we can do is promote the broad scope of PHN and highlight the range of different papers published, for example through our Paper of the Month, which is shared across the five Nutrition Society journals, and the PHN Editorial Highlights.

With increasing specialisation of journals for example, the *Journal of Tryptophan Research* is devoted to a single nutrient, the broad scope of PHN is something we should nurture. With increasing numbers of papers being submitted, the job of our reviewers, Associate and Deputy Editors is difficult and we remain committed to minimising the time authors wait for a decision. On the other hand, the large number of submissions means we can be more selective and publish high quality work to help with our goal of increasing the journal impact factor.

It is an honour for me to have been given the opportunity to be Editor-in-Chief for PHN. I am still learning a lot about how things work and would like to take the opportunity to thank all the staff at PHN and the Nutrition Society who are helping with this, as well as the editors and reviewers who give their time so generously to ensure we make the right selections and provide authors with useful feedback.

---


2 Reynolds CJ, Horgan GW, Whybrow S, Macdiarmid J. Healthy and sustainable diets that meet greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and are affordable for different income groups in the UK. Public Health Nutr 2019;22:1503-17.

Access PHN or subscribe: https://www.nutritionsociety.org/publications/public-health-nutrition
The Society was thrilled to receive a portrait of Sir Frederick Gowland Hopkins (as seen on the front cover) in March of this year, a gift from MRC Elsie Widdowson Laboratory after its closure. As one of the founders of the Nutrition Society, Sir Frederick’s achievements are commemorated with the Gowland Hopkins award which honours senior scientists working within the area of Cellular and Molecular Nutrition. 2019 will be the first time the Gowland-Hopkins has been awarded, with the inaugural ceremony planned for the Annual Charity Meeting on 9 September 2019. But, what do we know about the life and work of the man himself?

Sir Frederick’s vital research over the years shone a light on the ‘accessory food factors’, later named vitamins, which had an enormous impact on growth and function in living things, despite being present in tiny amounts in the diet.

He was born in Eastbourne in 1861 where he was raised by his mother and uncle; his bookseller father having died when Sir Frederick was a baby. Ten years later, the family moved to Enfield in North London, where he excelled in science, particularly chemistry.

The first big break came in 1883, when Sir Frederick was offered a post at the Home Office to work on poisons alongside Sir Thomas Stevenson. This led him to complete a BSc in chemistry followed by a medical degree at Guy’s Hospital, London. After graduating, he continued at Guy’s teaching physiology and toxicology, during which time he developed research into what would become the new discipline of biochemistry. His early experiments revealed the workings of lactic acid and muscle contraction, before Sir Frederick’s attention switched to nutrition.

A move to Cambridge University in 1898 began a period of intense research, culminating in the work that made his name. Sir Frederick’s first success was to isolate the amino acid, tryptophan, from protein and prove that certain amino acids could not be manufactured by the body. This led to the concept of ‘essential’ amino acids. Further research on laboratory animals revealed that the prevalent view of a balanced diet – one that contained sufficient proteins, fats, carbohydrates, minerals and water – was lacking something vital. His papers in 1906 and 1912 are acknowledged as the first to develop the theory on the importance of vitamins.

Subsequently building on research by Christiaan Eijkman, Sir Frederick discovered that thiamin in unprocessed rice could reverse the deficiency disease beriberi. For this work, he and Eijkman were awarded the 1929 Nobel Prize. Honours rapidly followed: the Royal Medal of the Royal Society of London in 1918; a knighthood in 1925; and the Order of Merit in 1935. Until his death, Sir Frederick continued to influence his peers and oversaw the flourishing of the two disciplines that he had nurtured during his lifetime.

Extract adapted from 30-Second Nutrition, Edited by Julie Lovegrove and written by Carrie Ruxton. Published by Ivy Press.
Conference overview: Optimal diet and lifestyle strategies for the management of cardio-metabolic risk

The Nutrition Society’s Winter Conference on 4 and 5 December in association with the Royal Society of Medicine (RSM), examined the very topical subject of diet and lifestyle strategies for the management of cardio-metabolic risk. The topic was of significant interest to healthcare professionals given that metabolic risk factors increase the risk of developing cardiovascular disease, a condition that remains the leading cause of death globally.

Four symposia examined the impact of both individual nutrients and wider dietary patterns on cardio-metabolic risk and prevention over the course of the two days, with lively panel debate and audience questions following each symposium. Day one examined the impact of dietary fatty acids on cardio-metabolic diseases and key metabolic tissues, with day two focussing on dietary sugars, resistant starch and fibres. The conference finished by considering lifestyle factors and their role in prevention, with Dr Alison Tedstone bringing the conference to a close with an overview of the UK’s current dietary policies aiming to improve metabolic health at a population level.

The two excellent keynote speakers provided engaging talks and plenty of food for thought, taking a broader view of the role of diet and body weight in cardio-metabolic risk. Dr Jean-Pierre Després from Université Laval gave the first plenary, and urged delegates to become ‘waist watchers’ rather than ‘weight watchers’, recommending clinical practitioners use waist circumference to aid identification of overweight and obese individuals with the highest cardio-metabolic risk. The second keynote speaker was Dr Amanda Moore from the University of Navarra, who presented some of the findings of their HEAL-D study, especially amongst such a distinguished field of nutritional scientists. The whole conference was really informative, and presenting our work gave me the opportunity to meet and talk to lots of delegates I may not otherwise have had the chance to meet.”

Amanda Moore, doctoral researcher, winner of the best Oral Communication
Congratulations to Amanda Moore, King’s College London, for the best oral communication

The overall event and exceptionally high quality of presentations more than fulfilled my expectations; to highlight the prevalence and clinical relevance of cardio-metabolic risk, and impact of diet and lifestyle factors in reducing this risk.”

Professor Bruce Griffin, Scientific Organiser

keynote lecture by Professor Eric Rimm, Professor of Epidemiology and Nutrition at Harvard Medical School, was entitled “The optimal diet – so many pieces to that pie!” Highlighting the dangers of looking to individual nutrients – such as blueberry polyphenols – for reducing CVD risk, Professor Rimm advocated for a ‘Mediterranean-style’ dietary pattern adaptable to individual countries.

Over the course of the conference, 45 original communication sessions covered a diverse range of topics from vitamin D and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, to results from the recent EPIC-Oxford study finding that vegetarian, pescatarian and vegan diets may have a protective effect against diabetes compared to meat-eaters.

Following the annual drinks reception at the Royal Society the proceeding evening, the first day of the conference closed with an informal evening drinks reception in the festive RSM atrium. Food stations were themed around dietary patterns linked to the management of cardiometabolic risk, with the Nordic Diet station (serving salmon and barley) and the Mediterranean diet station (tomato peperonata) proving particularly popular.

Invited speaker reviews and Original Communications will all be published in Proceedings of the Nutrition Society. Log into the members area for full access.
New Theme Leader for Whole Body Metabolism

Dr Wendy Hall, Kings College London

I am delighted to have this opportunity to introduce myself as Theme Leader for Whole Body Metabolism (WBM). I would like to thank Professor Bruce Griffin for all his contributions as the previous Theme Leader and I look forward to continuing his hard work in promoting and supporting the Society’s scientific activities. In my role as Reader in Nutritional Sciences at King’s College London, I teach BSc and MSc Nutrition & Dietetics students, and also carry out nutrition research. I have been conducting human dietary intervention studies in the field of cardio-metabolic health for over 20 years, and I have been a member of the Nutrition Society for a similar length of time. The procedures involved in conducting nutrition trials have transformed over this period with the introduction of greater controls for data protection, human tissue storage, ethical committee review, and standards for clinical trial reporting. These important changes have evolved in response to deficiencies that existed previously and are generally beneficial, but they also present nutritional scientists who conduct whole body metabolism studies with even greater challenges in terms of staffing, expertise, time and resources. My experiences conducting human metabolic studies during my research career at the Universities of Surrey, Reading and King’s College London mean that I have a deep understanding of the highs and lows of conducting this type of research, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of applying pharmaceutical research paradigms to dietary interventions. Sometimes the methodological approaches taken to address important nutritional questions in the prevention of chronic diseases can provoke intense debates about lack of reproducibility between studies, non-significant effects on clinical outcomes despite effects on risk biomarkers, and often results in polarised opinions in the wider community about current dietary guidelines. I am keen to facilitate debate on these issues and other hot topics in WBM, and importantly I would also welcome any suggestions from Society Members for research subjects relevant to the Theme that deserve consideration as topics for future conferences, workshops and seminars. Finally, I would like to send out a call for anyone who would be interested in being part of the Theme Leader team. Being part of the WBM team would provide the opportunity to contribute to Theme activities such as conference and meeting planning and Society responses to consultation papers. If you are interested, please contact me at wendy.hall@kcl.ac.uk and I would be happy to provide more information.

Cellular and Molecular

Dr Ruan Elliott, University of Surrey

The Nutrition Society’s Spring conference at Abertay University, Dundee (April 1-2, 2019) addressed the subject of “Inter-individual differences in the nutrition response: from research to recommendations”. This is an issue that anyone who has tried to analyse data from a human study undoubtedly will be familiar with. Nonetheless, it is an issue that has never been adequately resolved. Consequently, I found it extremely useful to have the opportunity to learn more about current approaches and to discuss how we can best take forward future research to address this specific scientific challenge.

The genomic revolution has already led to a substantial amount of research into the genetic basis for inter-individual variation. Moreover, the application of functional genomic techniques, such as metabolomics, shows great promise for developing phenotypic classification methods that may help predict individual responses to dietary interventions. It seems to me that the missing piece of the puzzle is an understanding of the mechanistic basis for this inter-individual variation in response. Both the structural and functional genomic techniques are likely to give us pointers to the underlying mechanisms and these surely represent a fantastic opportunity for cellular and molecular nutritionists to work on.

My personal experience suggests that it is often difficult to detect the effects of moderate nutritional interventions in humans at the cellular mechanistic level, largely because normal inter-individual variation often dwarfs the acute nutritional effects. Therefore, investigating the molecular basis for the inter-individual variation in response to nutrients may well represent a pragmatic approach. For example, it should be possible to identify individuals who are at phenotypic extremes to help unravel the underlying mechanisms and, from there, perhaps we can work towards a mechanistic understanding for the full spectrum of individuals. Thus, while currently these is a major focus on the use of big data, I would like to take this opportunity to make the case for the importance of focused mechanistic research to be done in parallel.
Last November I spent a week in Westminster as part of the Royal Society Pairing Scheme. This scheme aims to build bridges between parliamentarians, civil servants and scientists of all disciplines from around UK.

During the week there were opportunities to tour the Palace of Westminster, attend lectures on how parliament works, how research can inform policy, and question Sir Patrick Vallance, the Government Chief Scientific Advisor, on how scientists can engage with government.

A reception in the Houses of Parliament on the topic of ‘Science: Thinking globally, delivering locally’ provided a chance to network with some of the organisations that the Royal Society represent and hear speeches from Norman Lamb MP, Chair of the Commons Science and Technology Committee, Chi Onwurah MP, Shadow Minister for Industrial Strategy Science and Innovation, and Professor Brian Foster, Vice President of the Royal Society.

I was fortunate enough to be paired with Baroness Jenkin of Kennington who despite an incredibly busy schedule allowed me to shadow and work alongside her. During this time I was able to observe Questions in the House of Lords and several select committee meetings including the Select Committee on Intergenerational Fairness and Provision. We also attended a drop in session with The Obesity Health Alliance who were in Portcullis House to discuss the impact of unhealthy food promotions and advertising, and policies that could be implemented to help reduce childhood obesity.

All participants were invited to take part in a Mock Select Committee to answer the question ‘Should the UK have an Office of Scientific Responsibility?’ Where we were able to ask questions of expert witnesses including Lord Patel, Chair of the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee.

The Royal Society Pairing Scheme allowed me to gain a wealth of knowledge and insight into how to engage with policy makers and how research is used to make evidence based decisions. I would whole heartedly recommend the scheme to anyone with an interest in politics and policy.

For more details about this annual scheme and to find out how to apply visit: https://royalsociety.org/grants-schemes-awards/pairing-scheme/
You belong to a premier learned society, regarded as one of the best nutrition societies in the world. This Society advances the scientific study of nutrition and its application to the maintenance of human and animal health, and members are represented in all key areas of nutrition – generating, communicating and practise science. The Society has some similarities to an English Premiership football team (bear with me non-football fans). The Premiership teams, so wealthy because of TV rights, sponsorship and other deals, could arguably play in front of an empty stadium without significantly affecting their wealth. But what would a football match be without fans in the stands? The Nutrition Society secures around eighty per cent of its income from the publication of its five peer-reviewed, highly regarded journals. Membership fees count for a small percentage of our income. Could the Society survive without members – possibly, at the current level of income from our journals, but what would be the point of a membership organisation having no members!

The income from journals results in members like you and I paying a relatively small membership fee, and ensures much of our member benefits are subsidised by the success of the journals. However, the level of income from our journals that we have been accustomed to is under threat as a result of ‘Plan S’, the essence of which is that all publicly funded research in Europe will be open access, possibly as early as January 2020. Open access is an admirable goal (excuse the soccer punt!), but one that could impact substantially on all learned societies. Therefore, we should all take interest in the ‘Plan S’ debate.

The Nutrition Society needs its members, it values and needs YOU. If you would like to find out more about the work of the Membership Committee, please email membership@nutritionsociety.org.

We are focussing on representation from the several interests and career paths that our 2600 members have. Through the monthly email newsletter, and, where there was no expression of interest a more direct approach, we now have representation from animal nutrition, sport and exercise nutrition, academia, international (high and low income countries), Policy, and students. Students are the largest proportion of the Society’s members, and, 33 percent of members are from over 80 countries. Together with our Membership Manager, and Membership and Database Officer, we held the inaugural meeting of the Membership Committee in March 2019, at which we scoped our thoughts on a wide variety of issues for action over the next year or so. We are starting by focussing particularly on developing a range of membership types and member benefits to suit different career paths and career stages. After all, The Nutrition Society needs its members, it values and needs YOU.

Members are at the heart of the Society, and in 2018 the Trustees decided on the need to establish a Membership Committee. As a Trustee and Chair of the Membership Committee, it is a pleasure to be able to update on the progress being made. The process of forming a committee began in the Autumn and the idea is to not create a juggernaut of a committee, despite the many interests we would like the committee to represent. For this reason, it has been decided not to include representatives of the Scottish and Irish sections, as they already have a regional committee, and report to the Advisory Council. We incorporated into the Membership Committee Terms of Reference the aim of recruiting around eight members, who are not serving on other Society committees, in order to widen member engagement. Prudence in expenditure is also a consideration in these choppy financial times.

If you would like to find out more about the work of the Membership Committee, please email membership@nutritionsociety.org.
Continuing Professional Development: time to dispel some myths

Professor Geraldine McNeill MB ChB, MSc, PhD, RNutr, FAfN, AfN Registration Chair

Continuing professional development, or CPD, is often seen as a chore or an obligation needed by employers or professional regulatory bodies. It is also widely believed to be costly and therefore only open to those with employers willing to pay registration fees and travel costs. As the Association for Nutrition (AfN) prepares to launch a CPD scheme for Registered Nutritionists from this autumn, it is a good time to examine some aspects of these views.

First, why should you do CPD? The primary function is to maintain, update and extend your work-related skills in a way that enhances your performance, which should lead to improved efficiency and job satisfaction. It should ensure that your relevant knowledge and skills are up to date, so that others such as students, clients and the wider public can have confidence in your work and your views. The direction the CPD takes may be partly defined by your employer or professional regulatory body but should also allow some opportunity for you to identify areas of your role in which you need training or in which you would like to increase your skills in future.

Second, what can CPD consist of? Formal scientific conferences are usually the first thing that come to mind, particularly for academics, but just attending a scientific meeting may not be particularly valuable in itself. There are many other more flexible ways of developing skills are available, often at low or no cost. Webinars, on-line training modules, work shadowing, directed reading, seminars, professional support groups and many other activities can all be used to develop knowledge and skills. The most important thing is to select carefully to make sure that the content will be useful for your own particular role or career aspirations. If there is nothing available, perhaps you can organise a workshop for colleagues with similar interests?

Third, how should you record CPD? Some employers or regulatory bodies have specific templates, but in essence you should record the date(s) and duration, a description of the activity, and some reflective comments stating what you gained and how this will be useful to you in future or what you intend to do differently as a result. It is useful to have a folder to keep your records of the different activities, along with any accompanying evidence e.g. certificate of attendance, feedback from a workshop or a blogpost you wrote after researching an issue. AfN aims to allow on-line recording in the near future, but paper-based records can have practical advantages too.

Fourth, how much CPD should you aim to do? Rules vary: the AfN scheme will ask all Registered Nutritionists to record an average of 30 hours of CPD each year, with 90 hours required over 3 years. This is considered the minimum to ensure knowledge and skills are kept up-to-date so the requirement is the same for those working part-time as full-time. Many of you will in fact be doing more than this already without noticing, so that all that will be needed is recognition of the activities which can count as CPD and getting in the habit of recording them.

Finally, who needs to do CPD? The AfN scheme will apply to all Registered Nutritionists and to Registered Associate Nutritionists who have been on the register for four or more years. Registered Associate Nutritionists will be encouraged to do use the scheme voluntarily as part of their professional development and the preparation of a portfolio to support their transfer to full registration after 3 years and thereby support their long-term professional development.

Nutrition Society CPD endorsed activities:
Sign up for the Nutrition Society Journal Club by logging into ‘My Membership’ on the website.
View the webinar programme for 2019: www.nutritionsociety.org/events/training
View the upcoming conferences: www.nutritionsociety.org/events/conferences
Having been a Student, and now a Graduate Member, I have been a supporter of everything that The Nutrition Society has to offer for students and early career professionals. The conferences, the monthly Journal Club (I highly recommend members of all levels attend) and other related activities within the Nutrition Society Training Academy, are just some fantastic ways members can stay up-to-date with the latest nutritional science, external to traditional classrooms learning and teaching.

Reflecting back to when I first started university, my undergraduate degree introduced me to the vast topic areas within nutrition science. It was impossible to know what aspect of nutrition I wanted to focus on without having the opportunity to constantly ask many questions throughout my academic career. Whilst that is the beauty of becoming an aspiring scientist, nutrition is such a vast discipline and most of the time, we can only have ‘snapshots’ throughout undergraduate education.

I was first introduced to the Society by a student in the upper year sharing their experiences during my induction week, and I joined almost immediately. When I joined I was amazed by the amount of information available to students. I particularly enjoyed the regular email communications and the Gazette articles written by other members which I found inspiring and informative.

A valuable part of my membership was the opportunity to be a part of the Society’s Student Section. Being a part of this enabled me to champion the student voice and enhance student engagement. Student engagement soon became my other strong passion at university, alongside nutrition. As part of my role with the Student Section, I was heavily involved in organising the annual ‘Nutrition Futures’ conference (previously the Student Conference). Nutrition Futures provides students with the chance to engage with other students, share experiences, and encourage each other through our ups and downs. It is a good way for like-minded students from across the UK to come together, extending their knowledge within nutrition outside the classroom by developing transferrable skills and exploring potential careers within nutritional science. Being part of the organising team gave me an insight into conference management and allowed me to develop important social media skills as I was responsible for conference promotion.

Attending conferences, such as those organised by the Society, and participating in available activities is a good way to identify your research interest. It is via these opportunities that I discovered what ignited my passion, which informed which direction I would like my career to take, and I have been motivated by those who have inspired me on my professional journey.

The next Nutrition Futures Conference will be held at the University of Nottingham, 4-5 September. [www.nutritionsociety.org/events/nutrition-futures-2019](http://www.nutritionsociety.org/events/nutrition-futures-2019)
Update from the Irish Section

Professor Lorraine Brennan, Secretary, Irish Section

This year started very well with the Irish Postgraduate meeting hosted by Ulster University. It was yet another successful Irish Postgraduate meeting with a good mixture of scientific and career development talks. As the popularity of this meeting grows, we as a Section have to think of new ways to accommodate all the delegates who wish to present at it. We will engage with the student body to work out some feasible options.

Over the past two years we have worked with the Irish Nutrition and Dietetic Institute (INDI) to provide a joint voice in the area of evidence based nutrition. Following on from the success of our combined symposium last year, we organised a second one centred on Maternal Health. The event took place on May 7th in Dublin and it re-enforced the importance of working with our dietetic colleagues to raise the profile of evidence-based dietary advice. We had an excellent range of speakers from both professions who covered a range of topics all related to maternal health and nutrition. Following the success of this second event, the Irish Section Committee will continue to engage with the INDI to develop ideas on how to collaborate further.

As many of you know, Professor Jayne Woodside from Queens University Belfast, has taken up the role as Honorary Publications Officer for the Nutrition Society. We wish Jayne all the best in this new role and look forward to working with her.

The big event in our calendar this year is FENS 2019 which will take place in Dublin in October. The programme looks very exciting and I encourage you all to register and attend. There are many people from the Irish Section involved in the organisation of this large meeting and I would like to thank them all for their commitment to making this event a success. It will be the Nutrition meeting of the year!

The Irish Section committee has worked hard at increasing our engagement with more research institutions across Ireland. As a result of this work we are delighted that the 2020 Irish Section Annual Meeting will be held in the University of Limerick. In the coming years, we look forward to welcoming colleagues from around Ireland to our annual meetings and to increasing the membership of the Irish Section.

Visit the FENS 2019 website to find out more: www.fens2019.org

Update from the Scottish Section

Dr Derek Ball, Secretary, Scottish Section

The Scottish section welcomed over 100 delegates from both academia and industry to Dundee for the Spring Conference. The meeting focussed on a range of factors implicated in the inter-individual variation in nutrient response, ranging from sex/gender, race through to genetics and age. The meeting was supported by invited speakers from the UK, Europe and North America who discussed the latest research on examining the effects of individual variation on nutrient response.

The meeting concluded with a lively discussion on how these factors should be addressed and considered as we continue to work on nutrition into the future. The meeting organisers received positive feedback for the overall organisation and the quality of the scientific programme. Special thanks go to Dr Karen Barton (Abertay University), Dr Jo Cecil (University of St Andrews) and Dr Spiridoula Athanasiadou (SRUC) for their hard work in pulling together the programme, and to the speakers and the conference organisers for delivering a great meeting!

As the new secretary for the Scottish Section, I extend my thanks to Spiridoula for the hard work and commitment she has provided to the Scottish Section and Nutrition Society in her tenure as Secretary. I also extend a warm welcome to the new members of the Scottish Section committee, Dr Janet Kyle (University of Aberdeen) and Dr James Dick (University of Stirling) who will undoubtedly make a valuable contribution to the smooth running of the committee.

We are always looking to engage with our membership: if you are keen to join the committee or you have ideas for future symposia topics get in touch at www.nutritionsociety.org/membership/sections/scottish-section.
The Fibre Man: Celebrating 50 years since the discovery of the link between fibre and bowel disease

Rebecca Tobi, Science Communication Officer

This year marks 50 years since Denis Burkitt’s seminal paper ‘Related Disease – Related Cause?’ was published in The Lancet, where Burkitt hypothesised that a diet low in fibre played a major role in the incidence of lesions in the large bowel.

Suggesting that a ‘low residue diet’ could be an aetiological cause of both benign and malignant bowel tumours, Burkitt drew on epidemiological observations to argue convincingly for the role played by the food environment in the development of bowel disorders. Although polyps and colorectal cancers are not viewed as fibre deficiency diseases, there is now broad agreement that fibre exerts a protective influence on a number of chronic diseases, including colorectal cancer.2

An engineer by training, Burkitt (1911-1993) switched to medicine believing it was his evangelical calling, and subsequently spent close to twenty years living and working in Uganda. It was on his return to Britain that he began to more formally compare the differing bowel disease patterns he had observed while in Africa, noting that ‘many large-bowel diseases which are universally prevalent in the so-called civilised world are almost or totally unknown throughout rural Africa’. Using data from African and English hospitals Burkitt was able to illustrate the differing disease patterns between the two. At the time, over 12% of cancerous tumours in England were due to colorectal cancer, compared with just 1.1-4.3% of all cancers in East Africa.

Noting, however, the similar incidence of bowel disease between Caucasian and African-American populations in North America, Burkitt highlighted the key role played by the food environment, observing that ‘stool bulk and content, bacterial flora, total transit time and intra-lumen pressures can be profoundly altered by changes in diet…and in particular by the removal of fibre…as in much modern food processing.’

Although Burkitt did not identify other components of diet that increase the risk of colorectal cancer, his observation that the changes in dietary patterns seen when individuals migrate from rural to urban or higher income areas may have associated health implications was a prescient one, with the nutrition transition continuing to impact on diet and disease patterns globally.

Making a convincing case for the importance of using observational evidence in nutritional research to show changes in time and space, Burkitt went on to write the international bestseller “Don’t Forget Fibre in Your Diet” (1979), and was affectionately nicknamed ‘The Fibre Man’ in later accounts of his research discoveries.


Professor Derek J. Oddy
BSc (econ), PhD, FSNR
1931-2018

Professor Catherine Geissler,
Professor Emerita of Human Nutrition, King’s College London

Derick Oddy, a pioneer in the development of business history in the United Kingdom, and a major contributor and editor on the history of food, nutrition, diet and health in Britain and in Europe, sadly passed away on 26 December 2018.

As a graduate and post graduate of the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), Derek completed his PhD in 1971 on 'The working-class diet, 1886-1914'. In 1966 he was appointed research sociologist in the Social Nutrition Research Unit in the Department of Nutrition at Queen Elizabeth College, Campden Hill, London. His interest in diet and nutrition then spanned four decades. Derek was a key figure in the Historians and Nutritionists Symposium started by Professor Yudkin in the early 1960s and composed of Economic Historians and Nutritionists which met regularly at Queen Elizabeth College. The proceedings of many of these symposia were published as books, including Changing Food Habits, John Yudkin and JC McKenzie (eds), MacGibbon & Kee, 1964; Our Changing Fare – Two hundred years of British Food Habits TC Barker, JC McKenzie and John Yudkin (eds), MacGibbon & Kee, 1966; The Dietary Surveys of Dr Edward Smith 1862-3 by TC Barker, Derek J Oddy and John Yudkin. Staples Press, 1970; The Making of the Modern British Diet Derek J Oddy and Derek S Miller (eds), Croom Helm, 1976; Diet and Health in Modern Britain Derek J Oddy and Derek S Miller (eds), Croom Helm, 1985; and Food, Diet and Economic Change, Catherine Geissler and Derek J Oddy (eds). Leicester University Press, 1993.

Derek was born and went to school in Birmingham and after National Service in the Royal Airforce he received a teaching certificate from Loughborough College in 1953. Following several teaching posts he was appointed lecturer at Ealing Technical College in 1970 and later senior lecturer in economic history at the Polytechnic of Central London (PCL) which became the University of Westminster in 1992. There Professor Oddy ran a successful part-time MA in Twentieth Century History. He retired in 1996 and was awarded the title of Emeritus Professor of Economic and Social History.

Derek served on the Social Sciences Research Council’s Economics and Social History Council from 1975 to 1979, and from 1984 to 1987 on its Social Affairs Committee where he devised the ESRC’s ‘The Nation’s Diet Programme’.

From 1989 Derek was a member of the International Commission for Research into European Food History. On retirement, he co-edited numerous essay collections of the European Food History Group, the last with Alain Drouard, The Food Industries of Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (2013). In 2003, Derek wrote the monograph, From Plain Fare to Fusion Food. British Diet from the 1890s to the 1990s (Woodbridge, 2003).

In 1974 Derek founded and chaired an annual Business History Seminar (BHS) and on the foundation of the Association of Business Historians in 1990, his contribution to the discipline was acknowledged by his election as its first President.

Derek was highly energetic not only in academic matters but also in sport. He represented Warwickshire, the RAF Bomber Command and Loughborough College in either swimming, water polo or rugby union. He was also a keen sailor. In 2005 he was invited to the Editorial Board of Mariner’s Mirror, retiring in December 2018 and in 2008-2009, he wrote with Hugh Murphy, The mirror of the seas: a centenary history of the Society for Nautical Research, (London 2010).

Derek’s wife, Judy, a psychologist, predeceased him in February 2018. He is survived by two sons, one daughter, five grandchildren, and one great-grandchild.
The Nutrition Society’s Journal Club

Critical appraisal skills, keeping up to date with the latest evidence-based research, and the interpretation and communication of such findings are key skills for nutrition professionals. With nutrition receiving an increasing amount of interest from policy-makers, the press, and the public, there is a need to advance nutrition science through evidence-based practice and research that meets rigorous scientific standards. For this reason, the Nutrition Society Journal Club (NSJC) was launched by the Nutrition Society Training Academy in January. The club aims to promote discussion and engagement with the latest research, in addition to supporting the development of critical appraisal skills.

The NSJC is a member only benefit, hosted online monthly, providing an opportunity for the membership to engage irrespective of location, field of interest or career stage. Each month the club is led by lead facilitator Dr Bernard Corfe, or one of the team; Dr John Brameld, Dr Ruan Elliot, Dr Wendy Hall and Dr James Thorne. With a wide range of expertise and the ability for the facilitator to choose either the Society’s Journals Paper of the Month, or an open-access paper of their choice, the club covers a variety of topics.

To find out more and register for your place on next month’s NSJC, visit the Society’s membership section to log in and book. The link to subscribe can then be found under the ‘my benefits’ tab.

Dr Bernard Corfe:
“The Journal Club aims to both support the process of keeping up-to-date with the latest research in nutrition, and at the same time foster and develop the critical appraisal skills that are central to understanding the strengths and limitations of statements and claims in published research. Reading in this critical way also improves that quality of science that we undertake ourselves, enriching the design and interpretation of our own work.”

Save the Date: 2-4 December 2019

Diet and Digestive Disease: The Winter Conference this year will be in collaboration with the British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) and the British Association for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (BAPEN).

Interaction between diets, nutrients and the host in the promotion of systemic health is wholly dependent upon effective digestive function. Perturbation of digestive function associates with a range of pathobiologies, but dysfunction may have systemic sequelae. The gut is exquisitely sensitive and senses the nutritional status of the lumen, however the full extent of sensing is still being discovered and its functions remain opaque.

This conference will explore the relationships between diet, gut function, gut pathologies and systemic health, taking as its focus recent developments in the field and areas of continued debate.

Further details are available on the events section of the website.

Events Calendar 2019

4-5 September: Nutrition Futures: Student Conference, University of Nottingham

9 September: The Nutrition Society ACM and Gowland Hopkins Award, Royal College of Nursing, London

15-18 October: European Nutrition Conference, FENS 2019, Dublin

2-4 December: Winter Conference: Diet and Digestive Disease, Royal Society of Medicine, London

Plus: regular webinars through the Nutrition Society Training Academy: www.nutritionssociety.org/events/training

All registration fees and early bird deadlines can be found at: www.nutritionssociety.org/events