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Dear Editor,

In clinical scenarios, patient engagement via the use of smartphone application technology has positively impacted upon a range of quality of life measures by improving adherence to weight loss treatments [1] and clinical dietetic practices [2]. However, despite use as a tool by sports dieticians [3], the success of nutrition application technology within athletic populations remains unclear.

In sports where the nutritionist is employed on a part-time or consultancy basis, the provision of nutrition education primarily occurs at live-in training camps that take place on fewer than 10 times annually. Thus, players experience prolonged periods of time whereby the athlete/practitioner contact is limited; a factor which may influence the efficacy of interventions or educational programmes administered.

The use of smartphone food picture applications is becoming increasingly prevalent for nutrition practitioners to inform dietary intake [4]. Given improved adherence and intervention engagement following nutrition application usage in clinical populations, we provide data comparing nutrition application usage to habitual practice (limited contact with a performance nutritionist) in young International female Rugby Union players in the time separating consecutive training camps (8 weeks).

After gaining institutional ethics approval, two 19-year-old female Rugby Union players, playing in the highest tier of women’s rugby in England (English Premiership), participated in this study and were allocated to one of two conditions. In the 8-weeks separating consecutive training camps, one player maintained their usual practices (which acted as the control; CONT) whereas the other athlete used a nutrition application (APP) to increase the frequency of athlete-practitioner
interactions. Both players provided written informed consent before study involvement.

Energy and macronutrient intake were assessed before and after the 8-week between-camp period using a three-day food diary. Diaries required quantification of portion size using household measures (as per reference: [5]) encompassing two training days and one match day. Food diaries were analysed retrospectively using dietary analysis software (Nutritics v3.06, Ireland). Nutrition knowledge of both athletes was tested using the General Knowledge Nutrition Questionnaire (GKNQ). Anthropometric data including height (Stadiometer, Seca, UK), body mass (Seca, UK) and body composition (using sum of 8 skinfolds; Harpenden Skinfold Callipers, UK) were collected in accordance with published protocols (International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry Level 1).

Following familiarisation, the player in APP photographed and provided a description of foods and drinks consumed in the 8 weeks between training camps. These images and descriptions were then uploaded to the applications database and were available to view remotely by the first author (MealLogger, New York, United States). The player received the on-going nutrition support via the application. Information and feedback was provided by the first author on the suitability, composition and timing of the uploaded meals/snacks in relation to the player’s daily lifestyle and training/competition schedule.

As part of the nutrition support provided to CONT, current practices of email correspondence and face-to-face contact with the first author during International training camps remained in place. For context, this included an email every 2-weeks and a 30-min one-to-one session per training camp.
A total of 161 meals (~3 meals/day) and 117 drinks were photographed and logged by the player in APP during the 8-week intervention. Follow-up questioning confirmed that >85% of meals consumed were captured. In APP, total energy intake increased by 9% (mean pre, mean post: 2029 kcal d⁻¹, 2213 kcal d⁻¹; Figure 1) over the 8 weeks. Carbohydrate intake increased by 7% (mean pre, mean post: 258 g d⁻¹, 277 g d⁻¹) whereas average protein intake increased by 29% (mean pre, mean post: 99 g d⁻¹, 128 g d⁻¹). There was no change in fat intake between baseline and post-intervention; being, 74 g d⁻¹ (Figure 2) Examples of daily food intake from baseline and post-intervention can be seen in Table 1 for APP. Conversely, total average energy intake increased by 3% in CONT (mean pre, mean post: 2251 kcal d⁻¹, 2325 kcal d⁻¹) over the 8 week period. In CONT carbohydrate intake decreased by 9% (mean pre, mean post: 278.1 g d⁻¹, 254 g d⁻¹) whereas protein intake decreased by 6% (mean pre, mean post: 135.6 g d⁻¹, 127.8 g d⁻¹). Average fat intake increased by 23% (mean pre, mean post: 73.2 g d⁻¹, 95.1 g d⁻¹). Scores observed in the GKNQ increased more so in APP (+8%; 61% - 69%) versus CONT (+6%; 49% - 54%) between baseline and post-intervention, respectively. Body mass in APP decreased by 2% (78.3 kg to 76.7 kg, -1.6 kg) whereas in CONT body mass increased by 0.2% (75.3 kg to 75.5 kg). The total sum of 8 skinfolds in APP reduced by 16% (133 mm to 111.7 mm, -21.3 mm; Figure 3) whereas in CONT skinfolds increased by 0.3% (93.1 mm to 93.4 mm, +0.3 mm). In APP, subjective comments supported the efficacy of the technology during the intervention period. More specifically, the player strongly agreed that they found using the nutrition application technology helpful, that the support helped improve their nutrition knowledge, aided their thoughts around their nutrition for performance and that they found the application easy to use.
In high-level competitive female rugby players, this data provides applied evidence supporting the efficacy of nutrition application usage alongside typical support for improving general nutrition knowledge, dietary practices and body composition in the time between consecutive training camps. Notably, as this study took place during times of the season where interactions between athletes and practitioners may be limited, the nutrition application technology facilitated a greater level of interaction between practitioner and player. It is likely that the effect of regular information and feedback on meal/snack suitability improved adherence to the existing nutritional support provided during training camps.

This data is offered as an example for performance nutrition practitioners looking to implement effective nutrition strategies to improve general nutrition knowledge and body composition in other team sport players in applied contexts. However, we identify some limitations to our findings; notably, although this intervention worked for the athlete in APP, it is difficult to state whether this intervention would suit all athletes and their lifestyles. Further research is therefore required to assess the use of nutrition application technology in larger numbers of athletic cohorts to substantiate our findings.
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Figure 1: Average energy intake (kcal) of both APP and Control at baseline and post-intervention
Figure 2: Average macronutrient intake (g) of APP and Control at baseline and post-intervention
Figure 3: Changes in body composition (body mass (kg) and skinfold sum (mm)) of APP and Control from baseline to post-intervention
### Table 1: One-day dietary intake of APP at baseline and post-intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item/s</th>
<th>Amount (g)</th>
<th>Item/s</th>
<th>Amount (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakfast (0800)</strong></td>
<td>Black Americano Coffee</td>
<td>300 ml</td>
<td>Baked Beans</td>
<td>205 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toasted Bagel</td>
<td>76 g</td>
<td>Scrambled Egg</td>
<td>120 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pork Sausages</td>
<td>105 g</td>
<td>Wholemeal Bread</td>
<td>40 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Morning Snack (11:00)</strong></td>
<td>x2 Boiled Eggs Mars bar</td>
<td>110 g</td>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>100 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lunch (1300)</strong></td>
<td>Grilled Chicken Breast</td>
<td>160 g</td>
<td>Grilled Chicken</td>
<td>120 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacket Potato</td>
<td>174 g</td>
<td>Mixed Beans</td>
<td>200 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salad Leaves</td>
<td>100 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olive Oil Dressing</td>
<td>20 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afternoon</strong></td>
<td>Frozen Ice Lolly</td>
<td>50 g</td>
<td>Coffee – Latte</td>
<td>300 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dinner (1900)</strong></td>
<td>Homemade Shepherd’s Pie</td>
<td>300 g</td>
<td>Homemade Beef Lasagne</td>
<td>320 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frozen Peas</td>
<td>80 g</td>
<td>Mixed Salad Leaves</td>
<td>100 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedtime Snack (2200)</strong></td>
<td>Semi-skimmed Milk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Daily Fluid Intake</strong></td>
<td>Mixed Fruit Squash with Water</td>
<td>1928 ml</td>
<td>Mixed Fruit Squash with Water</td>
<td>2250 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy Intake</strong></td>
<td>Energy (Kcal)</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHO (g)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>CHO</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRO (g)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAT (g)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>FAT</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>