Teacher Answer Key

Case Study

1. Vague structure and function wording such as supports or resets makes no specific measurable promise, so there is nothing a viewer could test or disprove. It also avoids the regulatory line, since a claim to treat or prevent a disease would require evidence and authorization while a claim to support something does not.

2. She presented one food as a problem and one product as a cure, which no single food ever is. She was selling the solution she described, which is a direct conflict of interest. And she offered testimonials and before and after photos in place of trial evidence, which cannot separate the product from every other explanation.

Multiple Choice

1. A

2. D

3. A

Matching

1-C, 2-E, 3-A, 4-B, 5-D

Fill-in-the-Blank

1) Daily, 2) natural, 3) FDA

Short Answer (Sample Responses)

Q1: Reduced is a comparison claim requiring only that the product contain at least twenty five percent less than the regular version of that same food. If the original was very high in fat, cutting a quarter of it still leaves a high fat product, so the word describes a change rather than an amount.

Q2: Accurate nutrition advice is hedged, gradual, and boring, while misinformation is confident, simple, and dramatic, promising a single cause or a single cure. Platforms reward engagement, and confident simple claims generate far more of it than careful ones, so the structure of the system favors the wrong answer.

Q3: Nutrition guidance is built on accumulating evidence, so updating a recommendation means the source is tracking new research rather than defending an old position. Guidance on dietary cholesterol and fat changed because the evidence changed, and a source that never revises anything has stopped paying attention rather than being consistent.