

1 **DRAFT SCIENTIFIC OPINION**

2 **Guidance on the scientific requirements for health claims related to**
3 **physical performance¹**

4 **EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA)^{2,3}**

5 European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), Parma, Italy

6 **SUMMARY**

7 The Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA) was asked by the European Food
8 Safety Authority (EFSA) to draft guidance on scientific requirements for health claims related to
9 physical performance. This draft guidance has been drawn from scientific opinions of the NDA Panel
10 on such health claims. Thus, this guidance document represents the views of the NDA Panel based on
11 the experience gained to date with the evaluation of health claims in this area. It is not intended that
12 the document should include an exhaustive list of beneficial effects and studies/outcome measures
13 which are acceptable. Rather, it presents examples drawn from evaluations already carried out in
14 order to illustrate the approach of the Panel, as well as some examples which are currently under
15 consideration within ongoing evaluations. This draft guidance document was endorsed by the NDA
16 Panel on 24 November 2011, and is released for public consultation from 19 December 2011 to
17 09 March 2012.

18 **KEY WORDS**

19 Health claims, scientific requirements, physical performance.
20

¹ On request from EFSA, Question No EFSA-Q-2010-01186, endorsed for public consultation on 24 November 2011.

² Panel members: Carlo Agostoni, Jean-Louis Bresson, Susan Fairweather-Tait, Albert Flynn, Ines Golly, Hannu Korhonen, Pagona Lagiou, Martinus Løvik, Rosangela Marchelli, Ambroise Martin, Bevan Moseley, Monika Neuhäuser-Berthold, Hildegard Przyrembel, Seppo Salminen, Yolanda Sanz, Sean (J.J.) Strain, Stephan Strobel, Inge Tetens, Daniel Tomé, Hendrik van Loveren and Hans Verhagen. Correspondence: nda@efsa.europa.eu

³ Acknowledgement: The Panel wishes to thank for the preparatory work on this scientific opinion: The members of the Working Group on Claims: Carlo Agostoni, Jean-Louis Bresson, Susan Fairweather-Tait, Albert Flynn, Ines Golly, Marina Heinonen, Hannu Korhonen, Martinus Løvik, Ambroise Martin, Hildegard Przyrembel, Seppo Salminen, Yolanda Sanz, Sean (J.J.) Strain, Inge Tetens, Hendrik van Loveren and Hans Verhagen. The members of the Claims Sub-Working Group on Weight Management/Satiety/Glucose and Insulin Control/Physical Performance: Kees de Graaf, Joanne Harrold, Mette Hansen, Mette Kristensen, Anders Sjödin and Inge Tetens.

21 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

22	Summary	1
23	Table of contents	2
24	Background as provided by EFSA	3
25	Terms of reference as provided by EFSA	3
26	Assessment	4
27	1. Introduction	4
28	2. General considerations	5
29	2.1. Beneficial physiological effects	5
30	2.2. Studies/outcome measures appropriate for substantiation of claims	5
31	3. Claims on physical performance	6
32	4. Claims on endurance capacity	6
33	5. Claims on physiological effects which may lead to an improvement in physical performance or	
34	endurance capacity	7
35	Conclusions	7
36	Glossary and Abbreviations	8

37

38

39 BACKGROUND AS PROVIDED BY EFSA

40 Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006⁴ harmonises the provisions that relate to nutrition and health claims
41 and establishes rules governing the Community authorisation of health claims made on foods.
42 According to the Regulation, health claims should only be authorised for use in the Community after a
43 scientific assessment of the highest possible standard has been carried out by EFSA.

44 EFSA and its NDA Panel have been engaging in consultation with stakeholders and have published
45 guidance on scientific substantiation of health claims since 2007⁵. Most recently, a briefing document
46 on scientific evaluation of health claims was published for consultation in April 2010, followed by a
47 technical meeting with experts from the food industry, Member States and the European Commission
48 in Parma, in June 2010⁶.

49 Based on experiences gained with the evaluation of health claims, and to further assist applicants in
50 preparing and submitting their applications for the authorisation of health claims, the NDA Panel is
51 asked to develop guidance documents on the scientific requirements for the substantiation of health
52 claims in selected areas, in addition to the guidance for the scientific substantiation of health claims
53 related to gut and immune function (EFSA-Q-2010-01139).

54 TERMS OF REFERENCE AS PROVIDED BY EFSA

55 The NDA Panel is requested by EFSA to develop guidance documents on the scientific requirements
56 for health claims in the following areas:

- 57 • Post-prandial blood glucose responses/blood glucose control
- 58 • Weight management, energy intake and satiety
- 59 • Protection against oxidative damage
- 60 • Cardiovascular health
- 61 • Bone, joints, and oral health
- 62 • Neurological and psychological functions
- 63 • Physical performance

64 Specific issues to be addressed in these guidance documents include:

- 65 • which claimed effects are considered to be beneficial physiological effects?
- 66 • which studies/outcome measures are appropriate for the substantiation of function claims and
67 disease risk reduction claims?

68 Each guidance document should be subject to public consultation, and may be followed up as
69 appropriate by scientific meetings with experts in the field.

70 Before the adoption of each guidance document by the NDA Panel the draft guidance shall be revised,
71 taking into account the comments received during the public consultation. A report on the outcome of
72 the public consultation shall be published for each guidance document. All guidance documents
73 should be finalised by July 2012.

74

⁴ Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods. OJ L 404, 30.12.2006, p. 9–25.

⁵ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/nda/ndaclaims.htm>

⁶ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/ndameetings/docs/nda100601-ax01.pdf>

75 ASSESSMENT

76 1. Introduction

77 To assist applicants in preparing and submitting their applications for the authorisation of health
78 claims, EFSA and in particular its Scientific Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies
79 (NDA) has ongoing consultations with stakeholders, and has published guidance on the scientific
80 substantiation of health claims since 2007⁷. In April 2010, a draft briefing document on the scientific
81 evaluation of health claims was published for consultation, and was followed by a technical meeting
82 with experts from the food industry, Member States and the European Commission in Parma, in
83 June 2010. The draft briefing document has been transformed into a Panel output, taking into account
84 the questions/comments received. This document constitutes the general guidance for stakeholders on
85 the evaluation of Article 13.1, 13.5 and 14 health claims, and outlines the approach of the NDA Panel
86 to the evaluation of health claims in general. In response to requests from industry, EFSA is engaged
87 in further consultation with stakeholders, and is developing additional guidance on specific types of
88 claims.

89 The objective of the present public consultation is to discuss with scientific experts in the field the
90 scientific requirements for the substantiation of health claims related to physical performance. This
91 consultation document will be revised to take into account the comments received, in order to provide
92 additional guidance to applicants for the substantiation of health claims in this area.

93 The consultation document focuses on two key issues regarding the substantiation of health claims
94 related to physical performance:

- 95 • claimed effects which are considered to be beneficial physiological effects.
- 96 • studies/outcome measures which are considered to be appropriate for the substantiation of
97 health claims.

98 Issues which are related to substantiation and are common to health claims in general (e.g.
99 characterisation of the food/constituent) are addressed in the general guidance for stakeholders on the
100 evaluation of Article 13.1, 13.5 and 14 health claims⁸.

101 This document has been drawn from scientific opinions of the NDA Panel on health claims related to
102 physical performance. Thus, it represents the views of the NDA Panel based on the experience gained
103 to date with the evaluation of health claims in this area. The document should be read in conjunction
104 with the general guidance for stakeholders on the evaluation of Article 13.1, 13.5 and 14 health
105 claims.

106 It is not intended that the document should include an exhaustive list of beneficial effects and
107 studies/outcome measures which are acceptable. Rather, it presents examples drawn from evaluations
108 already carried out in order to illustrate the approach of the Panel, as well as some examples which
109 are currently under consideration within ongoing evaluations.

⁷ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/ndaclaims/ndaguidelines.htm>

⁸ EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), 2011. General guidance for stakeholders on the evaluation of Article 13.1, 13.5 and 14 health claims. EFSA Journal, 9(4):2135, 24 pp.

110 2. General considerations

111 2.1. Beneficial physiological effects

112 According to Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006, the use of health claims shall only be permitted if the
113 food/constituent, for which the claim is made, has been shown to have a beneficial physiological
114 effect. In assessing each claim, the NDA Panel makes a scientific judgement on whether the claimed
115 effect is considered to be a beneficial physiological effect in the context of the specific claim, as
116 described in the information provided and taking into account the population group for whom the
117 claim is intended. For function claims, a beneficial effect may relate to the maintenance or
118 improvement of a function.

119 The NDA Panel considers that the population group for which health claims are intended is the
120 general (healthy) population or specific subgroups thereof, for example, elderly people, physically
121 active subjects, or pregnant women. Applications for claims which specify target groups other than
122 the general (healthy) population are the subject of ongoing discussions with the Commission and
123 Member States with regard to their admissibility.

124 The NDA Panel also considers whether the claimed effect is sufficiently defined to establish that the
125 studies identified for substantiation of the claim were performed with (an) appropriate outcome
126 measure(s) of that claimed effect. Reference to general, non-specific benefits of the nutrient or food
127 for overall good health or health-related well-being may only be made if accompanied by a specific
128 health claim.

129 2.2. Studies/outcome measures appropriate for substantiation of claims

130 As human studies are central for the substantiation of health claims, this document focuses in
131 particular on such studies. In considering whether the studies provided are pertinent (i.e. studies from
132 which conclusions can be drawn for the scientific substantiation of the claim), the NDA Panel
133 addresses a number of questions, including:

- 134 • Whether the studies have been carried out with the food/constituent for which the claim is
135 made. This requirement means that there should be sufficient definition of the
136 food/constituent for which the claim is made, and of the food/constituent which has been
137 investigated in the studies which have been provided for substantiation of the claim. The
138 evaluation also considers how the conditions under which the human studies were performed
139 relate to the conditions of use (e.g. quantity and pattern of consumption of the
140 food/constituent) proposed for the claim.
- 141 • Whether the design and quality of the studies allow conclusions to be drawn for the scientific
142 substantiation of the claim. The evaluation takes into account the hierarchy of evidence as
143 described in the scientific and technical guidance of the EFSA NDA Panel⁹, for example,
144 intervention studies generally provide stronger evidence than observational studies.
145 Intervention studies should be appropriately conducted so as to minimise bias. In
146 observational studies adequate control for factors other than the food/constituent known to
147 have an impact on the claimed effect is important. Each health claim is assessed separately
148 and there is no pre-established formula as to how many or what type of studies are needed to
149 substantiate a claim. In this regard, the reproducibility of the effect of the food/constituent as
150 indicated by consistency between studies is an important consideration.

⁹ EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), 2011. Scientific and technical guidance for the preparation and presentation of an application for authorisation of a health claim (revision 1). EFSA Journal,9(5):2170, 36 pp.

- 151
- 152
- 153
- 154
- 155
- 156
- Whether the studies have been carried out in a study group representative of the population group for which the claim is intended. Can the results obtained in the studied population be extrapolated to the target population? For studies in groups (e.g. subjects with a disease) other than the target group for a claim (e.g. the general population), the NDA Panel considers on a case-by-case basis the extent to which it is established that extrapolation from the study group to the target group is biologically plausible.
- 157
- Whether the studies used (an) appropriate outcome measure(s) of the claimed effect. For this, the NDA Panel considers what is generally accepted in the relevant research fields (e.g. guidelines published by scientific societies based on rigorous methodological approaches), and consults experts from various disciplines, as appropriate.
- 158
- 159
- 160

161 3. Claims on physical performance

162 Physical performance relates to the ability to complete certain physical tasks with higher intensity,
163 faster, or with a higher power output. An improved physical performance may be a beneficial
164 physiological effect for individuals performing physical exercise for different reasons (e.g. athletes
165 preparing for a competition or during a competition, individuals engaged in physical work or
166 recreational activities). Claims should refer to the direct effects of the food on performance.

167 Information on the characteristics (e.g. type, duration and intensity) of the exercise for which the
168 claim is made may be important for the definition of the claimed effect (e.g. physical performance
169 during short-term, high intensity exercise *vs.* longer-term, endurance performance; single exercise
170 bout *vs.* repetitive bouts) and of the target population for the claim. Outcome measures of physical
171 performance which may be appropriate for the assessment of the claimed effect in humans in the
172 context of a particular type of exercise should be indicated (e.g. time spent to run a certain distance,
173 distance cycled during a time-trial, throwing distance in javelin or shot put, one repetition maximum
174 weight lifted, jumping height). Some of the outcomes proposed (e.g. muscle glycogen stores,
175 maximum oxygen consumption (VO₂max), muscle fatigue, muscle damage and muscle repair) are not
176 direct measures of performance but could be used in support of a mechanism by which the
177 food/constituent could exert the claimed effect on physical performance.

178 The studies provided for the scientific substantiation of the claim should reflect the conditions of use
179 for the claim. For example, the moment when the food/constituent is consumed relative to the
180 physical performance may be of importance (e.g. before or during exercise).

181 4. Claims on endurance capacity

182 Endurance capacity refers to the exercise time to self reported fatigue when exercising at a constant
183 workload or speed, generally at intensity <80 % VO₂max. An increased endurance capacity may be a
184 beneficial physiological effect for individuals performing physical exercise which is not limited by
185 time (e.g. recreational running, walking, swimming or cycling, fitness training). Claims should refer
186 to the direct effects of the food on endurance capacity.

187 The particular type of exercise (e.g. cycling, running, swimming) and the conditions (e.g. distance,
188 power output, single *vs.* repeated bouts) in which endurance capacity is tested should be specified.
189 Endurance capacity is measured as the exercise time to self reported fatigue under defined conditions.
190 Some of the outcomes proposed (e.g. muscle glycogen stores, muscle fatigue, muscle damage and
191 muscle repair) are not direct measures of endurance capacity but could be used in support of a
192 mechanism by which the food/constituent could exert the claimed effect.

193 **5. Claims on physiological effects which may lead to an improvement in physical**
194 **performance or endurance capacity**

195 Claims on specific physiological effects which may lead to an improvement in physical performance
196 have been proposed. These include, for example, reduction in perceived exertion/effort during
197 exercise, increase in muscle strength, or enhancement of water absorption during exercise. Such
198 effects may be considered beneficial depending on the context of the claim, and on the target
199 population for which the claim is intended. Claims should refer to the direct effects of the food.

200 Outcome measures which may be appropriate for the assessment of the claimed effects in humans
201 should be indicated. For example, validated questionnaires could be used for the assessment of
202 perceived exertion/effort during exercise. For self-reported outcome measures, adequate blinding of
203 subjects is particularly important. Appropriate outcome measures for claims on muscle strength
204 include, for example, one repetition maximum weight lifted, isokinetic knee extension torque and
205 isometric handgrip strength. Some of the outcomes proposed (e.g. lean body mass, muscle mass,
206 muscle fatigue, muscle damage and muscle repair) are not direct measures of muscle strength but
207 could be used in support of a mechanism by which the food/constituent could exert an effect on
208 muscle strength.

209 Claims related to changes in body composition have been addressed in the “Guidance on the scientific
210 requirements for health claims related to appetite ratings, weight management, and blood glucose
211 concentration”¹⁰.

212 **CONCLUSIONS**

213 The draft guidance document focuses on two key issues regarding the substantiation of health claims
214 related to physical performance:

- 215
- claimed effects which are considered to be beneficial physiological effects.
 - studies/outcome measures which are considered to be appropriate for the substantiation of health claims.
- 216
217

218 The document has been drawn from scientific opinions of the NDA Panel on health claims related to
219 physical performance. Thus, it represents the views of the NDA Panel based on the experience gained
220 to date with the evaluation of health claims in this area.

221

¹⁰ EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA); Draft guidance on the scientific requirements for health claims related to appetite ratings, weight management, and blood glucose concentrations released for public consultation.

222 **GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS**

223 VO₂max Maximum oxygen consumption