

Karen Muir

From: Byers, Kate [Kate.Byers@edelman.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 4:55 PM
To: Mitch Kanter; Madell, Allison; Marcia Greenblum
Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

Mitch –

Does Monday work for you to discuss the Spence article? Marcia will be traveling to Chicago in the morning and I'll be in the INAP meeting from 10 am – 6 pm CT.

Monday looks pretty open at this point – how does your day look?

Thanks,
Kate

From: Mitch Kanter [mailto:mkanter@enc-online.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 10:00 AM
To: Madell, Allison; Marcia Greenblum
Cc: Byers, Kate
Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

Allison-

I'm in your camp on this. I feel that being quiet is often the best tact, and the article below supports this.

That said, I'm wondering if we should consider using the original article as an opportunity to craft a rebuttal that we can hold in our back pockets for future uses if necessary, or consider publishing elsewhere. In other words, should we send the article to some of our "friends" in the science community - Maria Luz Fernandez, David Katz, Richard Feinman--folks who will likely have strong perspectives that counter the statements made in the article? Having them provide some input on the record could have merit.

Thoughts?
Mitch

From: Madell, Allison [mailto:Allison.Madell@edelman.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 9:12 AM
To: Marcia Greenblum; Mitch Kanter
Cc: Byers, Kate
Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

Hi Marcia/Mitch – Kate and I both do not recommend jumping in on this food fight with a US statement at this time. We can hop on the phone to discuss if helpful.

From: Marcia Greenblum [mailto:mgreenblum@enc-online.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 9:08 AM
To: Mitch Kanter
Cc: Byers, Kate; Madell, Allison
Subject: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

I don't know if you've had a chance to read the article I attached to my last message but since Mitch will be reading it on his Blackberry I am embedding it in this message. It discusses the wisdom of making industry responses when the public knows there is a vested interested.

11/29/2010

Karen Muir

From: Madell, Allison [Allison.Madell@edelman.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 8:21 AM
To: Mitch Kanter
Subject: Re: Canadian journal article

Thanks!

----- Original Message -----

From: Mitch Kanter <mkanter@enc-online.org>
To: Byers, Kate; Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Marcia Greenblum <mgreenblum@enc-online.org>
Sent: Tue Nov 16 08:15:49 2010
Subject: FW: Canadian journal article

FYI.
Note I sent to David Katz this AM.
Mitch

-----Original Message-----

From: Mitch Kanter
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 8:12 AM
To: 'dk8@email.med.yale.edu'
Subject: RE: Canadian journal article

David-

Thanks for the feedback. I understand that your relationship with David might preclude you from saying a lot in response to his article, and that's okay. Frankly, I heard yesterday from Maria-Luz Fernandez at U of Ct. We have funded some of Maria's work in the past, and she was not happy with David's article. She said that she'd like to respond to the authors; so I think we've got our expert response. She said she'd be happy to share her response with me before submitting, and I'll be interested in hearing what she's got to say. So, thanks for your willingness to become involved, but I think we're covered on this one.

Having said that, another issue/opportunity has come our way and I thought I'd bounce it off of you. I'm not sure if you're aware that USDA recently did a nutritional analysis of eggs, and found that a large whole egg actually has about 185 mg of cholesterol, and not the 215 mg that is presently reported in USDA nutritional tables. As a result of this work, all of the government-developed nutrition tables will be changed to reflect this newer, lower cholesterol value in the egg. We have done some focus groups with health professionals and consumers and, somewhat surprisingly, few folks seemed to care. Most said that they were okay with eggs as they are, and knowing that there is about 12% less cholesterol in the egg would change their consumption patterns, or whether or not they'd recommend eggs to patients.

Nevertheless, the folks in charge of the American Egg Board would like to make a splash of this news, likely with some sort of media activity. When I showed folks the video you did for us at our recent board meeting they felt that you'd be the perfect spokesperson for this sort of a campaign. Frankly I have no idea at this point the form that the campaign will take; whether it will be one interview with a news outlet, something more or something less. But I do know that folks feel you'd be the right health authority to work with on the campaign.

I feel as if I've "gone to the well" with you a lot lately. I've

asked for your perspectives or participation on a number of things and you've been very gracious with your time. So if this is not something you'd like to be involved in I understand. But if you do feel that you'd like to learn more about this project, I'll gladly put some folks from Edelman, our PR agency, in touch with you to discuss further.

Please let me know if this is something that might be of interest to you. I don't suspect that it would take a lot of your time.

Thanks again for your input on the Jenkins article. Hope to hear from you soon.

Take care for now.
Mitch

-----Original Message-----

From: dk8@email.med.yale.edu [mailto:dk8@email.med.yale.edu]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 4:22 PM
To: Mitch Kanter
Subject: Re: Canadian journal article

Mitch-

sorry for the delay. My basic response to the paper is simply that the conclusion came first, the literature was reviewed (very selectively) and interpreted after. The authors did not even feign a balanced representation of what is in the literature. I couldn't help but notice that neither of my own directly relevant publications on the topic is cited.

As for responding: I think it is warranted, to point out that the authors have, indeed, cited the literature very selectively to support their position. There are papers that argue the other way, and that address directly the concerns the authors raise; our own work looks at immediate post-prandial responses, for instance.

The plot thickens a bit for me, however. David Jenkins is both friend and colleague, and an ONQI advisory board member. I certainly could not participate in an overtly antagonistic letter. However, I think a response could be drafted that takes the middle path.

There is a polite way to say that there was, for years, a conviction that eggs/cholesterol were harmful, and then research accumulated to refute this position. From this point on, to avoid shuttling between one misconception and another, we should proceed based on evidence, not personal conviction. There are studies that demonstrate no harmful effects of egg intake in the post-prandial period, as well as over time. The anthropology literature suggests that dietary cholesterol is long part of the 'native' human diet, and thus likely to be well tolerated as such.

Studies of egg intake and diverse effects are warranted in healthy individuals, those with risk factors for heart disease, and those with heart disease- for whom egg intake might be substantially 'safer' and more prudent than the intake of many popular items, such as donuts and bagels. The ENC is committed, along with other funding sources, to advance just such an agenda.

The final arbiter here should be well done studies, not strident voices...

Something like that. If we are diplomatic enough, I could potentially sign on with you- otherwise, I think you would do a fine job flying solo. You obviously have a bias along for the ride- but so does Dr. Jenkins, who is vegan. David

The authors voice a concern. Concerns call out for hypothesis testing, not premature conclusions. Studies of

Quoting Mitch Kanter <mkanter@enc-online.org>:

>
> David-
> I'm not sure if you've seen the attached article that was
> recently published in the Canadian Journal of Cardiology. It is
> extremely negative about eggs, and about the cholesterol/CVD
relationship in general.
>
> If you have a few minutes to review I'd be very interested in
> your thoughts. I am contemplating whether or not to send a letter to
> the editor of the journal to refute some of the statements made. If I
> do that (and depending on your perspective), I'm wondering if you'd be

> amenable to co-authoring a response with me, or authoring a response
> yourself. If you do so, we'll certainly compensate you for your time.
>
> I'm just weighing a) whether it makes sense to comment at all; b)

> if we do, does it make sense to have an objective, external source
> author the response; or c) would co-authorship between someone from
> within the industry and outside of the industry make sense.
>
> I'm open to any thoughts you might have about an appropriate tact

> to take, and I'm extremely interested in your thoughts about the paper
itself.
>
> Any input you can provide would be much appreciated.
>
> Hope all is well.
>
> Regards,
> Mitch
>

Mitch Kanter

From: Byers, Kate [Kate.Byers@edelman.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 9:16 AM
To: Mitch Kanter; Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Marcia Greenblum
Cc: Jensen, Elizabeth (Schreiber)
Subject: RE: Canadian journal article

Hi Mitch -

Thanks for reaching out to David on this. Keep us posted.

We'll talk with you soon,
Kate

-----Original Message-----

From: Mitch Kanter [mailto:mkanter@enc-online.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 8:16 AM
To: Byers, Kate; Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Marcia Greenblum
Subject: FW: Canadian journal article

FYI.
Note I sent to David Katz this AM.
Mitch

-----Original Message-----

From: Mitch Kanter
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2010 8:12 AM
To: 'dk8@email.med.yale.edu'
Subject: RE: Canadian journal article

David-

Thanks for the feedback. I understand that your relationship with David might preclude you from saying a lot in response to his article, and that's okay. Frankly, I heard yesterday from Maria-Luz Fernandez at U of Ct. We have funded some of Maria's work in the past, and she was not happy with David's article. She said that she'd like to respond to the authors; so I think we've got our expert response. She said she'd be happy to share her response with me before submitting, and I'll be interested in hearing what she's got to say. So, thanks for your willingness to become involved, but I think we're covered on this one.

Having said that, another issue/opportunity has come our way and I thought I'd bounce it off of you. I'm not sure if you're aware that USDA recently did a nutritional analysis of eggs, and found that a large whole egg actually has about 185 mg of cholesterol, and not the 215 mg that is presently reported in USDA nutritional tables. As a result of this work, all of the government-developed nutrition tables will be changed to reflect this newer, lower cholesterol value in the egg. We have done some focus groups with health professionals and consumers and, somewhat surprisingly, few folks seemed to care. Most said that they were okay with eggs as they are, and knowing that there is about 12% less cholesterol in the egg would to change their consumption patterns, or whether or not they'd recommend eggs to patients.

Nevertheless, the folks in charge of the American Egg Board would like to make a splash of this news, likely with some sort of media activity. When I showed folks the video you did for us at our recent board meeting they felt that you'd be the perfect spokesperson for this sort of a campaign. Frankly I have no idea at this point the form that

the campaign will take; whether it will be one interview with a news outlet, something more or something less. But I do know that folks feel you'd be the right health authority to work with on the campaign.

I feel as if I've "gone to the well" with you a lot lately. I've asked for your perspectives or participation on a number of things and you've been very gracious with your time. So if this is not something you'd like to be involved in I understand. But if you do feel that you'd like to learn more about this project, I'll gladly put some folks from Edelman, our PR agency, in touch with you to discuss further.

Please let me know if this is something that might be of interest to you. I don't suspect that it would take a lot of your time.

Thanks again for your input on the Jenkins article. Hope to hear from you soon.

Take care for now.
Mitch

-----Original Message-----

From: dk8@email.med.yale.edu [mailto:dk8@email.med.yale.edu]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 4:22 PM
To: Mitch Kanter
Subject: Re: Canadian journal article

Mitch-

sorry for the delay. My basic response to the paper is simply that the conclusion came first, the literature was reviewed (very selectively) and interpreted after. The authors did not even feign a balanced representation of what is in the literature. I couldn't help but notice that neither of my own directly relevant publications on the topic is cited.

As for responding: I think it is warranted, to point out that the authors have, indeed, cited the literature very selectively to support their position. There are papers that argue the other way, and that address directly the concerns the authors raise; our own work looks at immediate post-prandial responses, for instance.

The plot thickens a bit for me, however. David Jenkins is both friend and colleague, and an ONQI advisory board member. I certainly could not participate in an overtly antagonistic letter. However, I think a response could be drafted that takes the middle path.

There is a polite way to say that there was, for years, a conviction that eggs/cholesterol were harmful, and then research accumulated to refute this position. From this point on, to avoid shuttling between one misconception and another, we should proceed based on evidence, not personal conviction. There are studies that demonstrate no harmful effects of egg intake in the post-prandial period, as well as over time. The anthropology literature suggests that dietary cholesterol is long part of the 'native' human diet, and thus likely to be well tolerated as such.

Studies of egg intake and diverse effects are warranted in healthy individuals, those with risk factors for heart disease, and those with heart disease- for whom egg intake might be substantially 'safer' and more prudent than the intake of many popular items, such as donuts and bagels. The ENC is committed, along with other funding sources, to advance just such an agenda.

The final arbiter here should be well done studies, not strident voices...

Something like that. If we are diplomatic enough, I could potentially sign on with you- otherwise, I think you would do a fine job flying solo. You obviously have a bias along for the ride- but so does Dr. Jenkins, who is vegan. David

The authors voice a concern. Concerns call out for hypothesis testing, not premature conclusions. Studies of

Quoting Mitch Kanter <mkanter@enc-online.org>:

>
> David-
> I'm not sure if you've seen the attached article that was
> recently published in the Canadian Journal of Cardiology. It is
> extremely negative about eggs, and about the cholesterol/CVD
relationship in general.
>
> If you have a few minutes to review I'd be very interested in
> your thoughts. I am contemplating whether or not to send a letter to
> the editor of the journal to refute some of the statements made. If I
> do that (and depending on your perspective), I'm wondering if you'd be

> amenable to co-authoring a response with me, or authoring a response
> yourself. If you do so, we'll certainly compensate you for your time.
>
> I'm just weighing a) whether it makes sense to comment at all; b)

> if we do, does it make sense to have an objective, external source
> author the response; or c) would co-authorship between someone from
> within the industry and outside of the industry make sense.
>
> I'm open to any thoughts you might have about an appropriate tact

> to take, and I'm extremely interested in your thoughts about the paper
itself.
>
> Any input you can provide would be much appreciated.
>
> Hope all is well.
>
> Regards,
> Mitch
>

To: RDAs

Subject: Research FYI: Negative Canadian Review on Dietary Cholesterol

Attachments: Original Journal Article; Canadian response; ENC talking points

Hello Registered Dietitian Advisors –

We wanted to flag a review published in the November issue of the *Canadian Journal of Cardiology* that I know some of you are aware of. The report examines the association between dietary cholesterol and indicators of cardiovascular disease risk such as increased fasting LDL levels, endothelial dysfunction and atherosclerosis. Among other inaccuracies in the report, the authors incorrectly state that “a single large egg yolk contains approximately 275 mg of cholesterol.”

There was significant media interest in this report in Canada and much of it focused on a sensationalized quote that compared the amount of cholesterol in popular fast food sandwiches to the amount in an egg yolk. We did not see significant media coverage in the US, but wanted to share some resources with you should you receive questions in the future. Attached you will find the full-text of the journal article, the press release issued by the Egg Farmers of Canada in response and some talking points we drafted for your use should any questions arise from consumers or media. If you do receive questions about this report, please let us know.

Should you wish to rebut this article in your blog or other social media outlets, please let us know what responses you receive.

Please let me know if you have any questions,

Marcia

Marcia D. Greenblum MS, RD
Senior Director, Nutrition Education
Egg Nutrition Center
1460 Renaissance Drive Suite #314
Park Ridge, IL 60068
Fax: 847-768-7973
Phone: 847-296-7055
Cell: [REDACTED]

BG

To: SAP members

Subject: Research FYI: Negative Canadian Review on Dietary Cholesterol

Attachments: Original Journal Article, Canadian response; ENC key messages

Good Morning –

We wanted to flag a review published in the November issue of the *Canadian Journal of Cardiology* that some of you may already be aware of. The report examines the association between dietary cholesterol and indicators of cardiovascular disease risk such as increased fasting LDL levels, endothelial dysfunction

and atherosclerosis. Among other inaccuracies in the report, the authors incorrectly state that “a single large egg yolk contains approximately 275 mg of cholesterol.”

I have attached the full-text of the report and we’d appreciate your thoughts on the review if you have a moment. As you can imagine, this report generated much more media attention in Canada than in the US, so our sister organization, the Egg Farmers of Canada, issued the press release I have attached for your reference. We at ENC also drafted the attached talking points in case anyone within our network receives questions about this information.

We look forward to your feedback,

Mitch

Mitch Kanter
Executive Director
Egg Nutrition Center

To: Nutrition Committee members and select other producers

Subject: Update from ENC re: Negative Canadian Review on Dietary Cholesterol

Attachments: Original Journal Article, ENC key messages

Good Morning –

We wanted to let you know about a few steps ENC has taken in response to the negative research review published in the November issue of the *Canadian Journal of Cardiology* (attached). The report received significant media attention in Canada, but very little media attention in the US. Regardless, we wanted to make sure that our expert networks were well informed in case they receive any questions about this report in the future. Activities completed to date include:

- Reviewed the research report and created ENC talking points (attached) for the team’s communication needs as well as to share with our expert network.
- Distributed the report to respected researchers and asked for their POV. Currently coordinating with one researcher who is drafting a letter to the journal editor. Once submitted, the journal will evaluate the letter and possibly publish it in a future issue of the journal.
- Communicated with the Registered Dietitian Advisors (RDAs) and shared materials including the original journal review, Egg Farmers of Canada response press release and ENC talking points.
- Communicated with our Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) to share the original journal review and request their feedback and insights and also shared the ENC key messages, as an FYI.

If you have any questions about these materials or our outreach to the network, please let me know.

Mitch

Mitch Kanter
Executive Director
Egg Nutrition Center

Spence JD, Jenkins DJA, Davignon J. Dietary cholesterol and egg yolks: Not for patients at risk of vascular disease. *Can J Cardiol* 2010; 26: e336-9.

Key Messages on Study Limitations & Media Coverage

- The article, published in *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, is a narrative review and not a systematic, objective research study. Therefore it does not show cause and effect. There is no new science presented and no discussion on the impact of dietary cholesterol on the ratio of LDL to HDL cholesterol, an important consideration in determining risk for heart disease.
 - Research shows that egg consumption does not significantly impact the LDL:HDL ratio. A 2008 review of more than 30 studies published in the *Journal of the American College of Nutrition* argued that the LDL:HDL ratio is a much better indicator of heart disease than either indicator alone.
- The article also inaccurately states that the yolk of a large egg contains 275 milligrams (mg) of cholesterol. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) recently reviewed egg nutrient data to update the USDA National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference. The results show that the average amount of cholesterol in a Grade A large egg is 186 mg, 12 percent lower than the 212 mg previously reported in the United States.
- An announcement issued by the University of Western Ontario perpetuated the false information regarding the cholesterol content of a large egg and went on to give examples of the amount of cholesterol in popular fast food sandwiches and the inaccurate amount in an egg yolk without also commenting on total calories, fat and saturated fat in these same sandwiches.

Key Messages on Egg Benefits

- Research consistently shows that the vast majority of people may eat eggs without concern.
 - More than 40 years of research have demonstrated that healthy adults can enjoy eggs without significantly impacting their risk of heart disease.
 - The 2010 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee reported that research shows only moderate evidence linking dietary cholesterol to cardiovascular disease and further concluded that consumption of one egg per day is not associated with risk of coronary heart disease or stroke in healthy adults. The Committee also reported that among individuals with type 2 diabetes increased dietary cholesterol intake is associated with cardiovascular disease risk. Further research is anticipated in this area.
- Dietary recommendations should be based on a food's complete nutritional profile and total health benefits:
 - Eggs are all-natural and packed with a number of nutrients. One egg has 13 essential vitamins and minerals in varying amounts, high-quality protein and antioxidants, all for 70 calories.
 - Eggs are an excellent source of choline, which plays an important role in breaking down homocysteine, an amino acid associated with an increased risk of heart disease. The Double Down with grilled filet has 25 grams of fat and 480 calories, and the Double Down with original filet has 32 grams of fat and 540 calories. A large egg on the other hand, has 5 grams of fat, only 1.5 grams of saturated fat and only 70 calories.

American Egg Board

Mitch Kanter

From: Byers, Kate [Kate.Byers@edelman.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 11:06 AM
To: Mitch Kanter; Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Roggi, Rachel
Cc: Joanne Ivy; Marcia Greenblum
Subject: RE: Canadian journal article

Fantastic – thanks for making the introduction. I will reach out to him this week.

Thanks,
Kate

From: Mitch Kanter [mailto:mkanter@enc-online.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 10:58 AM
To: Byers, Kate; Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Roggi, Rachel
Cc: Joanne Ivy; Marcia Greenblum
Subject: FW: Canadian journal article

David Katz expressed interest in learning more about the low cholesterol egg media campaign. So the door is opened for us to discuss further with him. I mentioned to him that someone from Edelman would be in touch with him if he was interested.

So you've got the green light from David to get in touch with him.
Mitch

From: dk8@email.med.yale.edu [mailto:dk8@email.med.yale.edu]
Sent: Wed 11/17/2010 9:36 AM
To: Mitch Kanter
Subject: RE: Canadian journal article

Mitch-

certainly of interest. I would need more details before committing, but happy to move to next steps with you.

Best,
David

Quoting Mitch Kanter <mkanter@enc-online.org>:

>
>
> David-
> Thanks for the feedback. I understand that your relationship with
> David might preclude you from saying a lot in response to his article,
> and that's okay. Frankly, I heard yesterday from Maria-Luz Fernandez at
> U of Ct. We have funded some of Maria's work in the past, and she was
> not happy with David's article. She somewhat ironically said that she'd
> like to respond to the authors; so a potential rebuttal fell in our lap.
> She said she'd be happy to share her response with me before submitting,
> and I'll be interested in hearing what she's got to say. So, thanks for
> your willingness to become involved, but I think we're covered on this
> one.

11/30/2010

>
> Having said that, another issue/opportunity has come our way and I
> thought I'd bounce it off of you. I'm not sure if you're aware that USDA
> recently did a nutritional analysis of eggs, and found that a large
> whole egg actually has about 185 mg of cholesterol, and not the 215 mg
> that is presently reported in USDA nutritional tables. As a result of
> this work, all of the government-developed nutrition tables will be
> changed to reflect this newer, lower cholesterol value in the egg. We
> have done some focus groups with health professionals and consumers and,
> somewhat surprisingly, few folks seemed to care. Most said that they
> were okay with eggs as they are, and knowing that there is about 12%
> less cholesterol in the egg would to change their consumption patterns,
> or whether or not they'd recommend eggs to patients.

>
> Nevertheless, the folks in charge of the American Egg Board would
> like to make a splash of this news, likely with some sort of media
> activity. When I showed folks the video you did for us at our recent
> board meeting they felt that you'd be the perfect spokesperson for this
> sort of a campaign. Frankly I have no idea at this point the form that
> this campaign will take; whether it will be one interview with a news
> outlet, something more or something less. But I do know that folks feel
> you'd be the right health authority to work with on the campaign.

>
> I feel as if I've "gone to the well" with you a lot lately. I've
> asked for your perspectives or participation on a number of things and
> you've been very gracious with your time. So if this is not something
> you'd like to be involved in I understand. But if you do feel that you'd
> like to learn more about this project, I'll gladly put some folks from
> Edelman, our PR agency, in touch with you to discuss further.

>
> Please let me know if this is something that might be of interest
> to you. I don't suspect that it would take a lot of your time.

>
> Thanks again for your input on the Jenkins article. Hope to hear
> from you soon.

>
> Take care for now.

> Mitch

>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: dk8@email.med.yale.edu [<mailto:dk8@email.med.yale.edu>]

> Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 4:22 PM

> To: Mitch Kanter

> Subject: Re: Canadian journal article

>
> Mitch-

>
> sorry for the delay. My basic response to the paper is simply that the
> conclusion came first, the literature was reviewed (very selectively)
> and interpreted after. The authors did not even feign a balanced
> representation of what is in the literature. I couldn't help but notice
> that neither of my own directly relevant publications on the topic is
> cited.

>
> As for responding: I think it is warranted, to point out that the
> authors have, indeed, cited the literature very selectively to support
> their position. There are papers that argue the other way, and that
> address directly the concerns the authors raise; our own work looks at
> immediate post-prandial responses, for instance.

>
> The plot thickens a bit for me, however. David Jenkins is both friend

> and colleague, and an ONQI advisory board member. I certainly could not
> participate in an overtly antagonistic letter. However, I think a
> response could be drafted that takes the middle path.

>
> There is a polite way to say that there was, for years, a conviction
> that eggs/cholesterol were harmful, and then research accumulated to
> refute this position. From this point on, to avoid shuttling between
> one misconception and another, we should proceed based on evidence, not
> personal conviction. There are studies that demonstrate no harmful
> effects of egg intake in the post-prandial period, as well as over time.
> The anthropology literature suggests that dietary cholesterol is long
> part of the 'native' human diet, and thus likely to be well tolerated as
> such.

>
> Studies of egg intake and diverse effects are warranted in healthy
> individuals, those with risk factors for heart disease, and those with
> heart disease- for whom egg intake might be substantially 'safer' and
> more prudent than the intake of many popular items, such as donuts and
> bagels. The ENC is committed, along with other funding sources, to
> advance just such an agenda.

>
> The final arbiter here should be well done studies, not strident
> voices...

>
> Something like that. If we are diplomatic enough, I could potentially
> sign on with you- otherwise, I think you would do a fine job flying
> solo. You obviously have a bias along for the ride- but so does Dr.
> Jenkins, who is vegan. David

>
> The authors voice a concern. Concerns call out for hypothesis testing,
> not premature conclusions. Studies of

>
> Quoting Mitch Kanter <mkanter@enc-online.org>:

>>
>> David-

>> I'm not sure if you've seen the attached article that was
>> recently published in the Canadian Journal of Cardiology. It is
>> extremely negative about eggs, and about the cholesterol/CVD
> relationship in general.

>>
>> If you have a few minutes to review I'd be very interested in
>> your thoughts. I am contemplating whether or not to send a letter to
>> the editor of the journal to refute some of the statements made. If I
>> do that (and depending on your perspective), I'm wondering if you'd be

>>
>> amenable to co-authoring a response with me, or authoring a response
>> yourself. If you do so, we'll certainly compensate you for your time.

>> I'm just weighing a) whether it makes sense to comment at all; b)

>>
>> if we do, does it make sense to have an objective, external source
>> author the response; or c) would co-authorship between someone from
>> within the industry and outside of the industry make sense.

>> I'm open to any thoughts you might have about an appropriate tact

> > to take, and I'm extremely interested in your thoughts about the paper
> itself.
> >
> > Any input you can provide would be much appreciated.
> >
> > Hope all is well.
> >
> > Regards,
> > Mitch
> >
>
>
>

Karen Muir

From: Roggi, Rachel [Rachel.Roggi@edelman.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 03, 2010 1:54 PM
To: Mitch Kanter; Marcia Greenblum; Michelle Leistiko; Don Layman; Joanne Ivy; Kevin Burkum; Kristin Livermore
Cc: Madell, Allison; Byers, Kate; Borra, Susan; Jensen, Elizabeth (Schreiber); Schaffner, Serena; Ores, Colleen; Hattis, Joel; Torvik, Erika
Subject: Research FYI: Negative Canadian Review on Dietary Cholesterol

Hi Everyone –

We wanted to flag a review published in the November issue of the *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*. The paper examines the association between dietary cholesterol and indicators of cardiovascular disease risk such as increased fasting LDL levels, endothelial dysfunction and atherosclerosis. The authors incorrectly state that “a single large egg yolk contains approximately 275 mg of cholesterol,” and that dietary cholesterol, including egg yolks, is harmful to the arteries.

Aside from minor coverage by outlets such as ScienceDaily.com, redOrbit.com and examiner.com, this story has not yet gained much traction in the United States. Internationally, there has been significant coverage from major media outlets including: [The Independent \(UK\)](http://TheIndependent(UK)), [The Toronto Star](http://TheTorontoStar), [The Montreal Gazette](http://TheMontrealGazette) and [The Globe and Mail \(Canada\)](http://TheGlobeandMail(Canada)). To note, this story comes two weeks after the launch of the KFC Double Down in Canada and some coverage draws the comparison that an egg has more cholesterol than the Double Down sandwich.

Marcia, have you heard anything from Bonnie/EFC regarding this publication and media coverage? Do you know if their team is handling a letter to the journal editor and/or media response? We're happy to be involved, but want to make sure we coordinate since this originated in Canada.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Rachel

Rachel A. Roggi, RD

Edelman | 200 E. Randolph Dr., 65th Floor | Chicago, IL 60601
Ph: 312.240.2736 | F: 312.240.2903



Edelman kindly reminds you to please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

11/30/2010

Mitch Kanter

From: Byers, Kate [Kate.Byers@edelman.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 4:55 PM
To: Mitch Kanter; Madell, Allison; Marcia Greenblum
Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

Mitch –

Does Monday work for you to discuss the Spence article? Marcia will be traveling to Chicago in the morning and I'll be in the INAP meeting from 10 am – 6 pm CT.

Monday looks pretty open at this point – how does your day look?

Thanks,
Kate

From: Mitch Kanter [mailto:mkanter@enc-online.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 10:00 AM
To: Madell, Allison; Marcia Greenblum
Cc: Byers, Kate
Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

Allison-

I'm in your camp on this. I feel that being quiet is often the best tact, and the article below supports this.

That said, I'm wondering if we should consider using the original article as an opportunity to craft a rebuttal that we can hold in our back pockets for future uses if necessary, or consider publishing elsewhere. In other words, should we send the article to some of our "friends" in the science community - Maria Luz Fernandez, David Katz, Richard Feinman--folks who will likely have strong perspectives that counter the statements made in the article? Having them provide some input on the record could have merit.

Thoughts?
Mitch

From: Madell, Allison [mailto:Allison.Madell@edelman.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 9:12 AM
To: Marcia Greenblum; Mitch Kanter
Cc: Byers, Kate
Subject: RE: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

Hi Marcia/Mitch – Kate and I both do not recommend jumping in on this food fight with a US statement at this time. We can hop on the phone to discuss if helpful.

From: Marcia Greenblum [mailto:mgreenblum@enc-online.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 9:08 AM
To: Mitch Kanter
Cc: Byers, Kate; Madell, Allison
Subject: PRESS RELEASE CRITICISM

11/30/2010

I don't know if you've had a chance to read the article I attached to my last message but since Mitch will be reading it on his Blackberry I am embedding it in this message. It discusses the wisdom of making industry responses when the public knows there is a vested interest.

Please respond after you read this:

Farmers left with egg on faces after fatty food fight

By: Laura Rance

Posted: 6/11/2010 10:18 AM | Comments: 1

WATCHING the egg versus KFC Double Down Sandwich debate unfold last week was like watching a football game in which the guy with the ball has forgotten which way to run, and gets tackled by his own team.

In the end, Canada's egg farmers wound up off side.

And three doctors who wanted us to pay more attention to dietary cholesterol wound up vindicating those of us inclined to consume fast-food abominations such as the Double Down -- strips of bacon sandwiched between two breaded chicken breasts loaded with cheese and special sauce. Yum.

We can now argue with authority, after all, that such a sandwich is lower in cholesterol than an egg yolk. Never mind that it has 540 calories, 30 grams of fat and 1,740 of sodium (more than the total recommended daily intake) in a few greasy bites.

It started with three University of Western Ontario cardiologists out to reverse a growing public perception that dietary cholesterol is benign, a perception they say is fuelled by a "sustained propaganda campaign from the egg producers' lobby."

While eating eggs isn't so bad if you are not at risk of heart disease, the problem is, there are woefully few of us in that category these days. "The consequences of high cholesterol intake in those at increased risk of cardiovascular disease who are sedentary and not losing weight -- especially when already consuming relatively high levels of saturated fat -- give reason for concern," the study said.

In short, the majority of the population would find limiting consumption of cholesterol-rich foods beneficial.

The original study, published in the November Canadian Journal of Cardiology, doesn't even mention the Double Down. It compared egg yolks to a Hardee's Monster Thickburger, although it reached the same conclusion. It was the university's communicators that pulled in the KFC Double Down, probably because it had more headline-grabbing cachet.

One egg yolk contains about 195 mg cholesterol, five grams of fat and 70 calories. Daily recommended cholesterol intake is around 200 mg.

The Hardee Monster contains 210 mg of cholesterol while the Double Down contains 150 mg.

Out came the headlines: "Eggs far from sunny up, doctors warn," or "Eggs versus the Double Down: Guess who wins?"

Then the spit hit the pan. Egg producers rose to defend the egg's nutritional reputation -- and their livelihoods -- by tackling the medical professionals.

"With obesity increasing in North America at an alarming rate, medical professionals should be encouraging the consumption of nutrient-dense, low-calorie foods, such as eggs, rather than suggesting that high-fat, fast food is better for health," Bonnie Cohen, a registered dietitian with Egg Farmers of Canada, sputtered in a release.

"Comments made by these same researchers that a popular high-fat, high-calorie sandwich is more nutritious than eggs are quite simply irresponsible."

For the record, the journal article didn't say the Double Down was more nutritious. What the researchers said was, egg yolks contain more cholesterol.

And they didn't promote the fast-food concoctions as healthy.

There is debate in the research community around the relevance of dietary cholesterol. But even if these

doctors are dead wrong, egg producers still wouldn't have won this fight.

It comes down to the relative scale of credibility. Egg farmers have a vested interest in convincing people to eat eggs.

If heart doctors were only looking after their own interests, they'd be telling people to eat all the eggs and Double Downs they could stomach -- because it might bring more customers through their door.

Had egg producers paused to think this one through a little, they might have realized that they could sit this one out on the sidelines. A scan of the online comments that rolled in after the original story published shows the general public and independent dietitians were quick to pounce on the idiocy of such comparisons.

Egg producers might also have realized that they could have positioned themselves on the same side as the highly credible doctors. They could have seized the opportunity to promote their own Healthy Choices Cholesterol Kit, which is available online and stresses many of the same points the doctors made.

One of Nature's own "fast-foods," eggs -- when consumed in moderation -- are a nifty, low-cal, low-fat nutritional package that complements a healthy lifestyle.

You simply can't make that argument about a Double Down.

That the doctors are questioning egg marketing campaigns should be cause for sober second thought, not sabre rattling.

Instead, Canada's egg farmers went charging into a box-end canyon from which there was no escape.

When this is written up in the food war chronicles, the chapter could aptly be called: Custard's Last Stand.

Laura Rance is editor of the Manitoba Co-operator. She can be reached at 792--4382 or by email:

laura@fbcpublishing.com.

Marcia D. Greenblum MS, RD
Senior Director, Nutrition Education
Egg Nutrition Center
1460 Renaissance Drive Suite #314
Park Ridge, IL 60068
Fax: 847-768-7973
Phone: 847-296-7055
Cell: [REDACTED]

B6

Mitch Kanter

From: Byers, Kate [Kate.Byers@edelman.com]
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2010 1:53 PM
To: Mitch Kanter; Marcia Greenblum
Cc: Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Roggi, Rachel
Subject: For MK & MG Review: Spence messages & e-mails
Attachments: CanJCard_Review_DietaryCholandEggYolk_11.19.10.docx; Spence et al_DietaryCholEggAndCVDRisk_CanJCardiol_2010.pdf; EFC Press Release-ENG-final.docx; Emails to RDA_SAP_Producers.doc

Mitch and Marcia –

The attached Word doc titled “CanJCard_Review...” is the key messages we drafted regarding the Spence article in the *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*. Please review these messages and track any edits or suggestions you’d like us to address.

Once these are buttoned-up, we have also drafted three e-mails that are included in the attached doc titled “E-mails to RDA_SAP...”:

- To RDAs from Marcia
- To SAP from Mitch
- To Nutrition Committee and select producers from Mitch

The other attached items are to include in the e-mails to each group.

If you have any questions about these materials, please let us know.

Thanks,
Kate

Kate G. Byers, MS, RD
Edelman, Food & Nutrition
200 East Randolph Drive, Floor 65
Chicago, IL 60601
Ph: (312) 240-2606
F: (312) 240-9381



Edelman kindly reminds you to consider the environment before printing this email or attachments.

Karen Muir

From: Byers, Kate [Kate.Byers@edelman.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 11:06 AM
To: Mitch Kanter; Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Roggi, Rachel
Cc: Joanne Ivy; Marcia Greenblum
Subject: RE: Canadian journal article

Fantastic – thanks for making the introduction. I will reach out to him this week.

Thanks,
Kate

From: Mitch Kanter [mailto:mkanter@enc-online.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 10:58 AM
To: Byers, Kate; Madell, Allison; Ores, Colleen; Roggi, Rachel
Cc: Joanne Ivy; Marcia Greenblum
Subject: FW: Canadian journal article

David Katz expressed interest in learning more about the low cholesterol egg media campaign. So the door is opened for us to discuss further with him. I mentioned to him that someone from Edelman would be in touch with him if he was interested.

So you've got the green light from David to get in touch with him.
Mitch

From: dk8@email.med.yale.edu [mailto:dk8@email.med.yale.edu]
Sent: Wed 11/17/2010 9:36 AM
To: Mitch Kanter
Subject: RE: Canadian journal article

Mitch-

certainly of interest. I would need more details before committing, but happy to move to next steps with you.

Best,
David

Quoting Mitch Kanter <mkanter@enc-online.org>:

>
>
> David-
> Thanks for the feedback. I understand that your relationship with
> David might preclude you from saying a lot in response to his article,
> and that's okay. Frankly, I heard yesterday from Maria-Luz Fernandez at
> U of Ct. We have funded some of Maria's work in the past, and she was
> not happy with David's article. She somewhat ironically said that she'd
> like to respond to the authors; so a potential rebuttal fell in our lap.
> She said she'd be happy to share her response with me before submitting,
> and I'll be interested in hearing what she's got to say. So, thanks for
> your willingness to become involved, but I think we're covered on this
> one.
>
> Having said that, another issue/opportunity has come our way and I
> thought I'd bounce it off of you. I'm not sure if you're aware that USDA

11/29/2010

> recently did a nutritional analysis of eggs, and found that a large
> whole egg actually has about 185 mg of cholesterol, and not the 215 mg
> that is presently reported in USDA nutritional tables. As a result of
> this work, all of the government-developed nutrition tables will be
> changed to reflect this newer, lower cholesterol value in the egg. We
> have done some focus groups with health professionals and consumers and,
> somewhat surprisingly, few folks seemed to care. Most said that they
> were okay with eggs as they are, and knowing that there is about 12%
> less cholesterol in the egg would to change their consumption patterns,
> or whether or not they'd recommend eggs to patients.

>
> Nevertheless, the folks in charge of the American Egg Board would
> like to make a splash of this news, likely with some sort of media
> activity. When I showed folks the video you did for us at our recent
> board meeting they felt that you'd be the perfect spokesperson for this
> sort of a campaign. Frankly I have no idea at this point the form that
> this campaign will take; whether it will be one interview with a news
> outlet, something more or something less. But I do know that folks feel
> you'd be the right health authority to work with on the campaign.

>
> I feel as if I've "gone to the well" with you a lot lately. I've
> asked for your perspectives or participation on a number of things and
> you've been very gracious with your time. So if this is not something
> you'd like to be involved in I understand. But if you do feel that you'd
> like to learn more about this project, I'll gladly put some folks from
> Edelman, our PR agency, in touch with you to discuss further.

>
> Please let me know if this is something that might be of interest
> to you. I don't suspect that it would take a lot of your time.

>
> Thanks again for your input on the Jenkins article. Hope to hear
> from you soon.

>
> Take care for now.

> Mitch

>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: dk8@email.med.yale.edu [mailto:dk8@email.med.yale.edu]

> Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 4:22 PM

> To: Mitch Kanter

> Subject: Re: Canadian journal article

>
> Mitch-

>
> sorry for the delay. My basic response to the paper is simply that the
> conclusion came first, the literature was reviewed (very selectively)
> and interpreted after. The authors did not even feign a balanced
> representation of what is in the literature. I couldn't help but notice
> that neither of my own directly relevant publications on the topic is
> cited.

>
> As for responding: I think it is warranted, to point out that the
> authors have, indeed, cited the literature very selectively to support
> their position. There are papers that argue the other way, and that
> address directly the concerns the authors raise; our own work looks at
> immediate post-prandial responses, for instance.

>
> The plot thickens a bit for me, however. David Jenkins is both friend
> and colleague, and an ONQI advisory board member. I certainly could not
> participate in an overtly antagonistic letter. However, I think a
> response could be drafted that takes the middle path.

>
> There is a polite way to say that there was, for years, a conviction
> that eggs/cholesterol were harmful, and then research accumulated to
> refute this position. From this point on, to avoid shuttling between

11/29/2010

> one misconception and another, we should proceed based on evidence, not
> personal conviction. There are studies that demonstrate no harmful
> effects of egg intake in the post-prandial period, as well as over time.
> The anthropology literature suggests that dietary cholesterol is long
> part of the 'native' human diet, and thus likely to be well tolerated as
> such.
>
> Studies of egg intake and diverse effects are warranted in healthy
> individuals, those with risk factors for heart disease, and those with
> heart disease- for whom egg intake might be substantially 'safer' and
> more prudent than the intake of many popular items, such as donuts and
> bagels. The ENC is committed, along with other funding sources, to
> advance just such an agenda.
>
> The final arbiter here should be well done studies, not strident
> voices...
>
>
>
> Something like that. If we are diplomatic enough, I could potentially
> sign on with you- otherwise, I think you would do a fine job flying
> solo. You obviously have a bias along for the ride- but so does Dr.
> Jenkins, who is vegan. David
>
>
> The authors voice a concern. Concerns call out for hypothesis testing,
> not premature conclusions. Studies of
>
>
> Quoting Mitch Kanter <mkanter@enc-online.org>:
>
>>
>> David-
>> I'm not sure if you've seen the attached article that was
>> recently published in the Canadian Journal of Cardiology. It is
>> extremely negative about eggs, and about the cholesterol/CVD
> relationship in general.
>>
>> If you have a few minutes to review I'd be very interested in
>> your thoughts. I am contemplating whether or not to send a letter to
>> the editor of the journal to refute some of the statements made. If I
>> do that (and depending on your perspective), I'm wondering if you'd be
>
>> amenable to co-authoring a response with me, or authoring a response
>> yourself. If you do so, we'll certainly compensate you for your time.
>>
>> I'm just weighing a) whether it makes sense to comment at all; b)
>
>> if we do, does it make sense to have an objective, external source
>> author the response; or c) would co-authorship between someone from
>> within the industry and outside of the industry make sense.
>>
>> I'm open to any thoughts you might have about an appropriate tact
>
>> to take, and I'm extremely interested in your thoughts about the paper
> itself.
>>
>> Any input you can provide would be much appreciated.
>>
>> Hope all is well.
>>
>> Regards,
>> Mitch
>>
>

11/29/2010

Comparing eggs to high-fat, fast-food is irresponsible, inaccurate: Egg Farmers of Canada refute misleading scientific report

OTTAWA—November 2, 2010: Egg Farmers of Canada today responded to a report issued by the University of Western Ontario, calling it irresponsible and inaccurate. Egg Farmers of Canada wants to reassure Canadians that eggs are a nutritious choice and that they can confidently consume eggs as part of a well-balanced diet.

“With obesity increasing in North America at an alarming rate, medical professionals should be encouraging the consumption of nutrient-dense, low-calorie foods, such as eggs, rather than suggesting that high-fat, fast food is better for health,” Bonnie Cohen, a registered dietitian with Egg Farmers of Canada, said.

“While individuals with heart or other health issues should always consult with their doctors or dietitians about their diet, research consistently shows that the vast majority of people may eat eggs without concern,” she added. “Furthermore, comments made by these same researchers that a popular high-fat, high-calorie sandwich is more nutritious than eggs are quite simply irresponsible.”

Laurent Souligny, chair of Egg Farmers of Canada, says egg farmers take a great deal of pride in providing Canadians with a convenient, nutritious and affordable meal choice. He adds that the report issued by the University of Western Ontario inaccurately cites the cholesterol level of eggs. “If the researchers get this number wrong, we must question the accuracy of the complete report,” Souligny said.

A large Canadian egg has 195 milligrams of cholesterol and the Double Down, according to the nutritional information posted at kfc.ca, has 150 milligrams of cholesterol. The Double Down also has 30 grams of fat and 540 calories. A large egg, on the other hand, has 5 grams of fat and only 70 calories.

“It is important that Canadians balance their diets by choosing a variety of foods from each of the food groups in Canada’s Food Guide,” Cohen said.

Canada’s Food Guide recognizes two eggs as a serving in the Meat and Alternatives group.

-30-

For more information please contact:

Bernadette Cox
613 238 2514 extension 2235