Sensory evaluations of a novel iron and zinc-enriched powder for the treatment and prevention of iron deficiency in women of reproductive age.

Clara H Miller[1], Hauna Sheyholislami[1], Jessie L Burns[1], Kristin L Connor[1,a]

[1]Department of Health Sciences, Carleton University
[a]kristin.connor@carleton.ca, Department of Health Sciences, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

Iron deficiency (ID) and iron deficiency with anaemia (IDA) are serious global health problems that disproportionately affect women aged 15-49 years. Although food fortification is one of the most effective and sustainable ways to combat nutritional deficiencies, iron remains one of the most difficult micronutrients to fortify, given its tendency to react strongly with food constituents. Therefore, it is important to assess the sensory properties of foods fortified with iron to determine the acceptability and palatability in target populations. We aimed to determine the palatability and acceptability of a novel iron and zinc enriched powder fortified in tap water by women of reproductive age. A 9-point hedonic scale was used to evaluate the colour, odour, and taste properties of samples containing different amounts of the mineral-enriched powder compared to placebo. We found significant differences between samples reconstituted at 1g/L, 2g/L, and 3g/L for sensory properties, including overall taste. Participants were more willing to drink the mineral-enriched powder when prepared at the lowest concentration (1g/L) compared to higher concentrations. Our results provide important insight on sensory qualities of a novel mineral-enriched powder for at-home fortification, and indicate consumer acceptability in women of reproductive age, a key group at risk for ID/IDA. If found to improve iron status, novel treatments like this product will contribute to global efforts to develop safe, acceptable, and sustainable interventions for ID and IDA.

Key words: Iron; iron deficiency; anaemia; women of reproductive age; sensory evaluation; hedonic scale; food fortification; nutritional deficiencies; micronutrients

Introduction

Iron and zinc are two of the most common mineral deficiencies worldwide[1,2]. These deficiencies are often caused by inadequate dietary intakes of these minerals and can result in serious adverse health problems if left untreated[3,4]. Both iron and zinc are important for proper immune function and disease resistance[5,6]. Iron and zinc deficiencies often occur simultaneously as they are found in many of the same foods and their absorption (thus, bioavailability) is affected by many of the same foods[7]. Notably, zinc also serves as an important catalyst in iron metabolism, meaning that low dietary intake of zinc can contribute to the development of iron deficiency (ID)[8,9].

ID affects 20-25% of the population and 52% of pregnant people[10-12]. Women of reproductive age (15-49 years) have an increased risk of developing ID due to their increased physiologic demand for iron as a result of menstruation and pregnancy[4,13]. ID results in fatigue, weakness, cognitive dysfunction, and decreased immunity, which ultimately affects quality of life[1,4,13,14]. If left untreated, ID can develop into iron deficiency anaemia (IDA), which is the most common form of anaemia globally[11]. IDA exacerbates the symptoms of ID while introducing additional health risks, such as cardiac complications[15] due to reduced erythropoiesis, which, in pregnant people, threatens maternal health and birth outcomes[14,16,17]. Currently, IDA is a serious public health problem affecting one in three women aged 15-49 worldwide, and 10% of women aged 15-49 in Canada[11,18,19]. Therefore, there is an need to ensure adequate iron status in women of reproductive age in order to prevent adverse health problems and ultimately promote healthy pregnancies.

According to the Canadian Clinical Guidelines for Family Medicine[20], the first-line treatment for ID and IDA in most patients is oral iron-replacement therapy, in addition to dietary modifications[20,21]. Current interventions include supplementation with iron salts (such as ferrous gluconate, ferrous fumarate, and ferrous sulphate) and other at-home fortification systems[22-24]. However, many of these interventions have only been moderately successful due to low long-term (more than 18-months) compliance (less than 50%), which decreases the overall effectiveness of the intervention[25-27].

Low compliance rates with current treatments are mainly attributed to unpleasant side effects, including nausea and constipation (associated with iron supplementation)[28-30]. Iron fortification is more gentle on the digestive system than supplementation with iron salts[28,31], resulting in fewer side effects (such as nausea, flatulence, abdominal pain, constipation, and black or tarry stools)[28,29,31,32]. However, fortification with iron has historically been known to affect various sensory modalities (taste, colour, odour) when reconstituted in food and drink, causing poor palatability, and ultimately resulting in low consumer compliance rates[26,33].

There is an urgent need to prevent and treat ID and IDA in women of reproductive age, and thus, a requirement to develop better interventions with improved consumer compliance. Doing so would enable sustainable solutions to address ID and IDA and improve the health of populations globally. To meet this need, we investigated the palatability and acceptability of a novel iron and zinc-enriched powder that can be reconstituted in tap water for at-home fortification. To establish regulatory guidelines for this product, it is important to demonstrate that fortification with the mineral-enriched powder is palatable to end-users when reconstituted in tap water. This powder has been designed to only minimally affect the sensory properties of the water (odour, colour, and taste) in order to circumvent the problem of poor palatability. An at-home fortification system for iron that is palatable would suggest good consumer acceptability and may ultimately contribute to higher compliance rates[22,33-37]. Therefore, the objectives of our study were to determine whether the mineral-enriched powder affects sensory perceptions (odour, colour, and taste) when reconstituted in tap water and if the reconstituted solution is palatable and acceptable to women of reproductive age.

Methods

Study Design and Population

This study aimed to determine the palatability and acceptability of an iron and zinc micronutrient-enriched powder compared to a placebo powder. The study was conducted as a single-blinded study, where only the researcher knew which samples contained the intervention and which samples contained the placebo, and their concentrations, between November 2021 and March 2022 in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Participants were biologically female women of reproductive age (18-35 years), a target consumer population for this intervention. All participants were recruited locally from a university campus. This study was approved by Office of Research Ethics at Carleton University (CUREB-B Protocol #116204).

Interested participants met virtually with a member of the research team for a 5-minute phone or Zoom call to discuss the objectives of the study and review the screening criteria. Eligible participants were those who were: women of the biological female sex (assigned at birth), between 18-35 years old, and not currently taking any mineral supplements. Only participants who were not taking any mineral supplements were included in this study because some vitamins contain iron, chromium, calcium, and zinc which can cause temporary changes in taste perception[38,39].

Fifty-two participants were screened for this study. Of these, 35 were deemed eligible and agreed to participate in the study (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Participant recruitment and enrolment flow-chart.

Study Products

This study sought to evaluate the palatability and acceptability of three different concentrations of a mineral-enriched powder dissolved in water, compared to a placebo. Participants evaluated a total of six samples, three samples containing the intervention and three containing a placebo. The three samples containing the intervention were grouped as the "active samples". These samples were labelled S1, S2, S3 and contained 1g/L, 2g/L, and 3g/L of the mineral-enriched powder, respectively. The three placebo samples were labelled S4, S5, S6 and contained 1g/L, 2g/L, and 3g/L of the placebo powder, respectively.

The iron and zinc enriched powder has been developed using a fine-grade electrolytic iron powder. The zinc is derived from zinc sulphate monohydrate. These minerals are included in a proprietary mixture of food stabilisers (primarily vegetable-derived gums) and a milled vinegar, adapted by the manufacturer (Gum Products International [GPI] Inc.). All constituents of the mixture are designated by Health Canada as safe for human consumption and meet the international Food Codex standards for food additives[40]. The levels of iron and zinc in the formulation are at levels similar to those used for routine fortification of staple products such as flour, corn flakes and other cereals, and well below the levels where toxicity would be a concern.

Evaluation of Palatability and Acceptability of Study Products

Eligible individuals were invited to individually participate in a 20-30-minute sensory evaluation session conducted in-person. Only one participant and one member of the research team were present during each session. During the study, participants were presented with a total of six samples to evaluate: three samples containing the intervention and three samples containing a placebo. Each sample was prepared by dissolving different amount of either the mineral-enriched powder or the placebo powder in 1L of water.

Participants were presented the six samples in a random order, given a score card, and provided with instructions on how to perform the sensory tests (for odour, colour, and taste). The score cards were used to capture information about the palatability of the active and placebo preparations, using a 9-point hedonic scale[41].

The 9-point hedonic scale measures how much an individual likes or dislikes a food product[41]. The scale ranges from 1-9, with a score of 9 meaning "like extremely" and a score of 1 meaning "dislike extremely". A score of 5 indicates a neutral response, meaning "neither like nor dislike". These hedonic scores are interpreted to understand the palatability of the samples: A score of 5 indicates that the sensory property is palatable, a hedonic score of 7 or greater indicates that the sensory property is well liked (good acceptability by the consumer[41-43]) and a hedonic score of 4 or less indicates that the sensory property is disliked (and not acceptable to the consumer[41-43]).

Participants were asked to use the 9-point hedonic scale to evaluate the sensory properties of colour, odour, overall taste, and the 5 organoleptic properties of taste (sour, sweet, bitter, salty, and umami) for each sample by recording their answers on the provided score card. Participants were also asked "*would you be willing to drink this sample daily?*" to determine the acceptability of the samples.

Statistical Analysis

Within groups (active and placebo), hedonic scores for each sensory property (odour, colour, salty, sweet, bitter, sour, and umami) and overall taste were compared between concentrations (1 g/L, 2 g/L, and 3 g/L) using the Kruskal-Wallis test for non-parametric data with a Steel Dwass post-hoc analysis. Hedonic scores were also compared between groups (active vs placebo) at each concentration using the Mann-Whitney U test and visualized in polar plots. Responses to the question "*would you be willing to drink this sample daily?*" (yes/no) was analysed (chi-square test) to determine if participants would be likely to say "yes" to drinking a sample or not. Within active and placebo groups, participant willingness to say "yes" to drinking one sample over the other was determined (chi-square test with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons). Data were analysed using RStudio Statistical Software (v2022.02.1+461). Hedonic scores for the five organoleptic properties of taste are reported as medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) and visualized using polar plots (RStudio version 2022.02.1+461). All values were considered to be statistically significant at $p<0.05$.

Results

Mineral-enriched samples score higher than placebo samples on the hedonic scale

Overall, with increasing concentration of the active and placebo powders, hedonic scores decreased (Figure 2). Additionally, at the lowest concentration (1g/L), there were significant differences between the active intervention and placebo samples for the sensory properties of "colour" ($p<0.001$), "salty" ($p=0.01$), and "sour" ($p=0.02$) (Figure 2). Participants also indicated that the "overall taste" of the active powder at 1g/L (S1) was better than the placebo at 1g/L (S4) ($p=0.004$, Figure 2). On average, the active powder reconstituted at 1g/L (S4) received higher median hedonic scores than the placebo at 1g/L (S4) in every sensory category, other than "odour" (Supplementary Table 1).

At a concentration of 2g/L, there were significant differences between the active intervention (S2) and the placebo sample (S5) for the sensory properties of "odour" ($p=0.04$), "colour" ($p<0.001$), "salty" ($p=0.03$), "sweet" ($p=0.05$), "bitter" ($p=0.007$), and "sour" ($p=0.002$) (Figure 2) and in the "overall taste" ($p=0.003$, Figure 2 and Supplemtary Table 1). On average, the median hedonic scores for the active powder at 2g/L (S2) were higher than the placebo sample at 2g/L (S5) in every sensory category (Supplementary Table 1).

At a concentration of 3g/L, there were significant differences between the active intervention (S3) and placebo sample (S6) for the sensory properties of "colour" ($p<0.001$), "odour" ($p=0.03$), "salty" ($p<0.001$), and "sour" ($p=0.02$), and in the "overall taste" ($p=0.02$, Figure 2). On average, the median hedonic scores for the active sample at 3g/L (S3) were higher than the median hedonic scores for the placebo sample at 3g/L (S6) across each sample property (Supplementary Table 1).



Figure 2. Participant evaluations for seven sensory properties (colour, odour, salty, sweet, bitter, sour, umami) and overall taste for active and placebo solutions at three concentrations. Sensory evaluations were reported using a numeric 9-point hedonic scale. A. Hedonic ratings of 1g/L active and placebo solutions B. Hedonic ratings of 2g/L active and placebo solutions C. Hedonic ratings of 3g/L active and placebo solutions. A hedonic score of 7 or greater indicates the sample will likely have good consumer acceptability. A score of 5 or greater indicates the overall taste of the sample (or sensory property) is palatable. S1, S2, S3 (blue) = active solutions containing the mineral-enriched powder at concentrations of 1g/L, 2g/L, and 3g/L, respectively. S4, S5, S6 (pink) = placebo solutions containing the control powder at concentrations of 1g/L, 2g/L, and 3g/L, respectively. * indicates a significant difference between a sensory property in the active vs placebo solution (Mann-Whitney U-test, $p<0.05$).

Favourable sensory perceptions decrease with increasing concentration of mineral-enriched samples and placebo samples

To determine which concentrations of the active and placebo preparations were more palatable and liked, sensory properties were evaluated across the concentrations within each group (active vs placebo). For the active preparations (S1, S2, S3), there were significant differences across concentrations in participants' reporting of four out of the seven sensory properties ("colour", "salty", "bitter", and "sour", $p<0.001$, Supplementary Table 1). There were no differences in the

odour, sweetness, and umami scores across active sample concentrations (Supplementary Table 1).

Additionally, the 1g/L (S1) active sample received the highest hedonic scores for each sensory property, aside from "odour", as well as for "overall taste", compared to samples at 2g/L or 3g/L (Supplementary Table 1). The median hedonic score for the "overall taste" of the active sample at 1g/L (S1) was significantly higher than the median hedonic scores for both the active sample at 2g/L (S2) and the active sample at 3g/L (S3) ($p<0.05$, Figure 3). To better understand the distribution of scores from participants, the proportion of participants who disliked (hedonic scores 1-4), were neutral towards (hedonic score of 5), or liked (hedonic scores of 7-9) the "overall taste" of each active sample were determined (Supplementary Table 2). In total, 82% of participants indicated that they liked the overall taste of sample S1, 57% indicated that they liked sample S2, and only 6% indicated that they liked sample S3 (Supplementary Table 2).

For the placebo preparations (S4, S5, S6), there were significant differences across concentrations in participants' reporting of five out of the seven sensory properties ("odour", "colour", "salty", "bitter" and "sour", $p<0.001$, Supplementary Table 1). There were no differences in the sweetness or umami scores across placebo concentrations (Supplementary Table 1).

The placebo sample at 1g/L (S4) received the highest hedonic scores for each sensory property, as well as for "overall taste" compared to samples at 2g/L or 3g/L (Supplementary Table 1). The median hedonic score for the "overall taste" of the placebo sample at 1g/L (S4) was significantly higher than the median hedonic score for both the placebo sample at 2g/L (S5) and at 3g/L (S6) ($p<0.05$, Figure 3). The proportion of participants who disliked, were neutral towards, or liked the "overall" taste of each placebo sample was also determined (Supplementary Table 2). In total, 60% of participants indicated that they liked the overall taste of S1, 23% indicated that they liked S2, and only 6% indicated that they liked S3 (Supplementary Table 2).



Figure 3. Participant evaluation of the overall taste for active and placebo solutions. S1, S2, S3 (blue) = active solutions containing the mineral-enriched powder at concentrations of 1g/L, 2g/L, and 3g/L, respectively. S4, S5, S6 (pink) = placebo solutions containing the control powder at concentrations of 1g/L, 2g/L, and 3g/L, respectively. Data are median and IQR. Within panels, groups with different letters are significantly different (Kruskal-Wallis test with Steel-Dwaas post-hoc for multiple comparisons, $p<0.05$).

Acceptability was highest at lowest sample concentrations

Acceptability of the samples was assessed by comparing participant responses within active and placebo groups to the question "*would you be willing to drink this sample daily?*". Among the active samples, the proportion of participants who were willing to drink the active sample with the lowest concentration at 1g/L (S1) daily was 97%, which was significantly higher than the proportion of participants willing to drink the sample at 2g/L (S2, 74%) and at 3g/L (S3, 46%) ($p<0.05$, Figure 4). Moreover, only 3% of participants indicated they would not be willing to drink S1 daily, which was significantly lower than the proportion of participants who were unwilling to drink samples S2 (26%) and S3 (54%) daily ($p<0.05$, Figure 4). Participants were also more likely to say they were willing to drink sample S1 over S2 and S3 ($p<0.01$, Figure 4), and more willing to drink sample S2 over S3 ($p<0.05$, Figure 4).

Among the placebo samples, the proportion of participants willing to drink the sample with the lowest concentration at 1g/L (S4) daily was 69%, which was significantly higher than the proportion of participants willing to drink the placebo sample at 2g/L (S5, 40%) and the placebo sample at 3g/L (S6, 14%) daily ($p<0.05$, Figure 4). The proportion of participants who indicated they would not be willing to drink the sample S4 daily was only 31%, which was significantly lower than proportion of participants who were unwilling to drink samples S5 (60%) and S6 (86%) daily ($p<0.05$, Figure 4). Participants were also more likely to say they were willing to drink S4 over S5 or over S6, and more willing to drink sample S5 over S6 ($p<0.05$, Figure 4).



Figure 4. Proportion of participant responses to the question of "*would you be willing to drink this sample daily*?" for each sample (S1-S6). A. Active samples (S1, S2, S3), containing the mineral-enriched powder. B. Placebo samples (S4, S5, S6), containing the placebo powder. * indicates significant differences ($p<0.005$) between responses "yes" (green bars) and "no" (grey bars) at each concentration (chi-square. In plot A, ** indicates significant differences ($p<0.02$) between S1 and S2 ($p<0.001$), S1 and S3 ($p<0.001$), S2 and S3 ($p=0.014$). In plot B, ** indicates significant differences between S4 and S5 ($p=0.016$), S4 and S6 ($p<0.001$), and S5 and S6 ($p=0.015$) (chi-squared with Bonferroni correction, $p<0.02$).

Discussion

ID and IDA remain serious global health concerns and current interventions, including iron fortification and supplementation, vary in their effectiveness as treatments for these conditions, in part due to unpleasant sensory changes or adverse side effects[44]. Here we conducted a palatability and acceptability study to analyse sensory properties of fortified beverages containing different concentrations of either a mineral-enriched or a placebo powder. We found that the addition of either powder to tap water resulted in sensory changes, and that both the mineral-enriched powder and placebo were most palatable and acceptable to participants when reconstituted at a concentration of 1g/L (compared to 2g/L or 3g/L). Our study suggests that interventional products to combat ID and IDA can be formulated with improved consumer acceptability, which may help increase adherence when treating these conditions in women of reproductive age.

We demonstrate that fortification with a mineral-enriched powder containing electrolytic iron did not result in unpleasant sensory changes when reconstituted in tap water at the lowest concentration (1g/L). An inverse relationship was observed between the concentration of iron and hedonic scores for almost every sensory category, in both treatment and placebo groups. Specifically, the "odour", "colour", and "overall taste" (and thus, palatability) were the sensory properties most significantly affected by increased concentration. While to our knowledge there are no other studies that specifically investigate sensory changes to tap water fortified with electrolytic iron, our finding is consistent with results from similar studies involving other iron fortification systems[45-49]. A series of studies that assessed the use of water fortified with ferrous sulphate for the prevention of IDA in children in Brazil found that 20 mg doses of iron were associated with more unfavourable sensory changes in the colour and taste of tap water; however, this was not observed when the water was fortified with lower amounts (10 mg) of iron[46,50,51]. These findings suggest that fortification of tap water with lower iron dosages will be more favourable and palatable. Similarly, an investigation of the sensory properties (colour, odour, and taste) in cheese fortified with different amounts of ferrous sulphate (either 0.016 mg, 0.822 mg, or 0.932 mg of Fe/g of cheese) reported that the samples with the lowest amount of iron (0.016 mg) had the most favourable sensory properties across every category[49]. Together, these findings demonstrate that fortification with lower doses of iron is consistently associated with improved palatability and favourability is important to consider in terms of consumer uptake and adherence, as the acceptability of commercial iron fortification programs can be negatively affected by unfavourable sensory changes to food vehicles, leading to poor adherence[22,36,46,52].

To investigate the acceptability of this mineral-enriched powder, we assessed the willingness of participants to drink the samples daily and found an inverse relationship between acceptability and sample concentration. In general, participants reported they would be less willing to drink the samples as the concentration of the active or placebo powder increased. This further suggests that our mineral-enriched powder will be more acceptable to the target population when reconstituted at lower concentrations, which may thus increase adherence to a treatment regimen using an iron fortified beverage[53]. Although there are very few studies that investigate the acceptability of iron fortification systems in women of reproductive age, there have been several efficacy studies conducted in different populations that have reported participant adherence and acceptability as part of their secondary outcomes[46,47,50,54]. Two research groups conducted randomised controlled trials in different paediatric populations to investigate the efficacy of food fortification using a micronutrient powder ("*Sprinkles*") containing either 12.5, 20, or 30 mg of ferrous fumarate compared to supplementation with oral iron drops ("*DROPS*") containing either 12.5[54] or 20[50] mg of ferrous sulphate[50,54]. Both studies found that the serum ferritin levels in all participants increased after eight weeks of treatment, with no significant differences between groups; however, they did report that participant adherence to the consumption regimen varied significantly between treatment groups. Specifically, both studies found that participants randomised to low dose *Sprinkles* (12.5 mg of ferrous fumarate) had significantly better adherence rates than participants randomised to higher dose *Sprinkles* (20 or 30 mg of ferrous fumarate) or *DROPS* [50,54]. These findings demonstrate that food fortification with low doses of iron can be both effective and acceptable to consumers, further supporting our results.

A strength of our study includes that the tested home-beverage fortification system used a mineral-enriched powder containing electrolytic iron, a relatively inert form of iron known to have sensory-related advantages over other common iron fortificants (such as ferrous sulphate)[9,23,49,55,56]. The World Health Organization also regards food fortification as one of the safest, most effective, and most affordable ways to administer dietary iron in deficient populations[54,57]. However, iron is one of the most difficult micronutrients with which to fortify the diet, as it is known to interact strongly with many food constituents, resulting in unfavourable sensory changes to the colour, odour, and taste of fortified foods[33,34,58]. Water soluble forms of iron (such as ferrous sulphate, ferrous gluconate, and ferrous fumarate) are most commonly used for oral iron replacement therapy given their high bioavailability; however, fortification with these iron compounds is frequently limited by their strong interactions with many foods[35,55,58]. In contrast, fortification with electrolytic iron has been widely studied in many foods and has been consistently associated with significantly fewer organoleptic changes compared to water-soluble forms of iron fortified in the same foods[45,48,59,60]. Researchers have even recommended that cereal staples be fortified with electrolytic iron when other water-soluble forms of iron result in unfavourable sensory changes[44,55,61]. Given that the sensory perceptions of food can influence the likelihood of consumption[38,49], fortification with electrolytic iron can overcome the sensory barriers faced by treatment interventions involving water-soluble iron compounds, thus contributing to greater palatability and long-term consumer adherence[33,44,56,57]. Further, electrolytic iron is more cost-effective than ferrous sulphate (the current leading compound in oral iron replacement therapy[44]) which is advantageous, as economic feasibility is an important feature of sustainable treatments for micronutrient deficiencies[44,62].

An additional strength of our study includes that we are one of the first to report on the palatability and acceptability of a fortification system involving electrolytic iron in women of reproductive age. Women are one of the most vulnerable populations at risk for ID and IDA[11,14,17,63], and thus there is a great need for palatable interventions that are accepted by this population for regular consumption of this product to effectively treat these conditions[53].

The generalizability of our results is limited by the small sample size and the subjective nature of the data collected. However, our approach used the 9-point hedonic scale, a validated methodological tool that has been used to assess the acceptability of foods and beverages for over 40 years[64-67]. Further, the known organoleptic changes to food and beverages due to iron make the application of this scale an appropriate methodologic approach for our study[33,57,62,68,69].

We found that electrolytic iron fortification in tap water is palatable, acceptable, and favourable to women of reproductive age. These findings provide important preliminary data on the sensory perceptions of this preparation in one of the most vulnerable populations at risk for ID and IDA. Successful fortification systems consist of food or beverages that are already common in the diet and can thus be effectively incorporated into an individual's daily routine[57,70]. Evaluating consumer preferences for fortified foods and beverages, including palatability and acceptability, is also critical to inform the formulation or consumption regimen of these products[43,71,72], which will influence intervention success. Our findings suggest that electrolytic iron fortification of tap water could improve consumption of this intervention, and if efficacious in improving iron status, may ultimately help to strengthen global efforts to combat ID and IDA among women of reproductive age.

Funding statement
This study was funded by Lucky Iron Fish Enterprises (LIFe) and the National Research Council of Canada Industrial Research Assistance Program (NRC IRAP).

Acknowledgements
We would also like to acknowledge and thank the individuals who generously volunteered their time and data for the purposes of this study. Gum Products International Inc. (GPI) provided the proprietary food stabilizer in the mineral-enriched powder.

Conflicts of interest statement
The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References
1. Miller JL. Iron deficiency anemia: a common and curable disease. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med*. Jul 01 2013;3(7)doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a011866
2. Wirth JP, Rajabov T, Petry N, et al. Micronutrient Deficiencies, Over- and Undernutrition, and Their Contribution to Anemia in Azerbaijani Preschool Children and Non-Pregnant Women of Reproductive Age. *Nutrients*. Oct 11 2018;10(10)doi:10.3390/nu10101483
3. Institute IFPR. *International Food Policy Research Institute. Global Nutrition Report 2016: From Promise to Impact: Ending Malnutrition by 2030*. 2016:182. https://www.ifpri.org/publication/global-nutrition-report-2016-promise-impact-ending-malnutrition-2030
4. Benson CS, Shah A, Stanworth SJ, et al. The effect of iron deficiency and anaemia on women's health. *Anaesthesia*. Apr 2021;76 Suppl 4:84-95. doi:10.1111/anae.15405
5. Wessels I, Maywald M, Rink L. Zinc as a Gatekeeper of Immune Function. *Nutrients*. Nov 25 2017;9(12)doi:10.3390/nu9121286
6. Cherayil BJ. Iron and immunity: immunological consequences of iron deficiency and overload. *Arch Immunol Ther Exp (Warsz)*. Dec 2010;58(6):407-15. doi:10.1007/s00005-010-0095-9
7. Sandstead HH. Causes of Iron and Zinc Deficiencies and Their Effects on Brain. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2000;130(2):347S-349S. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/130.2.347S
8. Abdo JS, Amer AY, Abdo Soliman JS. Association of Zinc Deficiency with Iron Deficiency Anemia and its Symptoms: Results from a Case-control Study. *Cuureus*. 2019;11(4)doi:10.7759/cureus.c20
9. Kondaiah P, Yaduvanshi PS, Sharp PA, Pullakhandam R. Iron and Zinc Homeostasis and Interactions: Does Enteric Zinc Excretion Cross-Talk with Intestinal Iron Absorption? *Nutrients*. Aug 13 2019;11(8)doi:10.3390/nu11081885
10. Whitney R, Centrone WA, Mamani HS, et al. Impact of a collaborative childhood anaemia intervention programme in Peru. *Trop Med Int Health*. Jun 2021;26(6):680-686. doi:10.1111/tmi.13564
11. Turawa E, Awotiwon O, Dhansay MA, et al. Prevalence of Anaemia, Iron Deficiency, and Iron Deficiency Anaemia in Women of Reproductive Age and Children under 5 Years of Age in South Africa (1997-2021): A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 12 04 2021;18(23)doi:10.3390/ijerph182312799
12. Petry N, Olofin I, Hurrell RF, et al. The Proportion of Anemia Associated with Iron Deficiency in Low, Medium, and High Human Development Index Countries: A Systematic Analysis of National Surveys. *Nutrients*. Nov 2 2016;8(11)doi:10.3390/nu8110693
13. Lu J, Cai J, Ren T, et al. Physiological requirements for iron in women of reproductive age assessed by the stable isotope tracer technique. *Nutr Metab (Lond)*. 2019;16:55. doi:10.1186/s12986-019-0384-1
14. Mirza FG, Abdul-Kadir R, Breymann C, Fraser IS, Taher A. Impact and management of iron deficiency and iron deficiency anemia in women's health. *Expert Rev Hematol*. Sep 2018;11(9):727-736. doi:10.1080/17474086.2018.1502081
15. Abu-Ouf NM, Jan MM. The impact of maternal iron deficiency and iron deficiency anemia on child's health. *Saudi Med J*. Feb 2015;36(2):146-9. doi:10.15537/smj.2015.2.10289
16. Means RT. Iron Deficiency and Iron Deficiency Anemia: Implications and Impact in Pregnancy, Fetal Development, and Early Childhood Parameters. *Nutrients*. Feb 11 2020;12(2)doi:10.3390/nu12020447

17. Milman NT. Dietary Iron Intake in Women of Reproductive Age in Europe: A Review of 49 Studies from 29 Countries in the Period 1993-2015. *J Nutr Metab*. 2019;2019:7631306. doi:10.1155/2019/7631306
18. Ltd DIPR. *2021 Global Nutrition Report: The state of global nutrition*. 2021. https://globalnutritionreport.org/reports/2021-global-nutrition-report/
19. Cooper M, Greene-Finestone L, Lowell H, Levesque J, Robinson S. Iron sufficiency of Canadians. *Health Rep*. Dec 2012;23(4):41-8.
20. Committee CGaPA. *Iron Deficiency - Diagnosis and Management*. 2019:1-17. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/health/practitioner-pro/bc-guidelines/full_guideline_-_iron_deficiency.pdfhttps://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/health/practitioner-professional-resources/bc-guidelines/iron-deficiency
21. Baird-Gunning J, Bromley J. Correcting iron deficiency. *Aust Prescr*. Dec 2016;39(6):193-199. doi:10.18773/austprescr.2016.069
22. Waller AW, Andrade JE, Mejia LA. Performance Factors Influencing Efficacy and Effectiveness of Iron Fortification Programs of Condiments for Improving Anemia Prevalence and Iron Status in Populations: A Systematic Review. *Nutrients*. Jan 21 2020;12(2)doi:10.3390/nu12020275
23. Stoffel NU, von Siebenthal HK, Moretti D, Zimmermann MB. Oral iron supplementation in iron-deficient women: how much and how often? *Mol Aspects Med*. 2020;doi:10.1016/j.mam.2020.100865
24. Mansour D, Hofmann A, Gemzell-Danielsson K. A Review of Clinical Guidelines on the Management of Iron Deficiency and Iron-Deficiency Anemia in Women with Heavy Menstrual Bleeding. *Adv Ther*. Jan 2021;38(1):201-225. doi:10.1007/s12325-020-01564-y
25. Ranganathan P, Pramesh CS, Aggarwal R. Common pitfalls in statistical analysis: Intention-to-treat versus per-protocol analysis. *Perspect Clin Res*. Jul-Sep 2016;7(3):144-6. doi:10.4103/2229-3485.184823
26. DeMaeyer EM, Dallman P, Gurney JM, Hallberg L, Sood SK. *Preventing and controlling iron deficiency anaemia through primary health care : a guide for health administrators and programme managers*. 1989.
27. Mirkovic KR, Perrine CG, Subedi GR, et al. Predictors of micronutrient powder intake adherence in a pilot programme in Nepal. *Public Health Nutr*. 07 2016;19(10):1768-76. doi:10.1017/S1368980015003572
28. Pereira DI, Couto Irving SS, Lomer MC, Powell JJ. A rapid, simple questionnaire to assess gastrointestinal symptoms after oral ferrous sulphate supplementation. *BMC Gastroenterol*. Jun 04 2014;14:103. doi:10.1186/1471-230X-14-103
29. Peña-Rosas JP, De-Regil LM, Garcia-Casal MN, Dowswell T. Daily oral iron supplementation during pregnancy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jul 22 2015;(7):CD004736. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004736.pub5
30. Souza AI, Batista Filho M, Bresani CC, Ferreira LO, Figueiroa JN. Adherence and side effects of three ferrous sulfate treatment regimens on anemic pregnant women in clinical trials. *Cad Saude Publica*. Jun 2009;25(6):1225-33. doi:10.1590/s0102-311x2009000600005
31. Cancelo-Hidalgo MJ, Castelo-Branco C, Palacios S, et al. Tolerability of different oral iron supplements: a systematic review. *Curr Med Res Opin*. Apr 2013;29(4):291-303. doi:10.1185/03007995.2012.761599
32. Ojukwu JU, Okebe JU, Yahav D, Paul M. Oral iron supplementation for preventing or treating anaemia among children in malaria-endemic areas. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jul 08 2009;(3):CD006589. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006589.pub2
33. Hurrell RF. Iron Fortification Practices and Implications for Iron Addition to Salt. *J Nutr*. Feb 15 2021;151(Suppl 1):3S-14S. doi:10.1093/jn/nxaa175
34. Hurrell RF. Venkatesh Mannar M, Hurrell R, eds. *Efficacy and Safety of Iron Fortification*. 1st ed. Academic Press; 2018:pp. 196-212.
35. Hurrell RF. Preventing iron deficiency through food fortification. *Nutr Rev*. Jun 1997;55(6):210-22. doi:10.1111/j.1753-4887.1997.tb01608.x
36. Asibey-Berko E, Zlotkin SH, Yeung GS, et al. Dual fortification of salt with iron and iodine in women and children in rural Ghana. *East Afr Med J*. Oct 2007;84(10):473-80. doi:10.4314/eamj.v84i10.9565
37. Lester S, Kleijn M, Cornacchia L, Hewson L, Taylor MA, Fisk I. Factors Affecting Adherence, Intake, and Perceived Palatability of Oral Nutritional Supplements: A Literature Review. *The journal of nutrition, health & aging*. 2022;26:663-674.
38. Delompré T, Guichard E, Briand L, Salles C. Taste Perception of Nutrients Found in Nutritional Supplements: A Review. *Nutrients*. Sep 02 2019;11(9)doi:10.3390/nu11092050
39. Nguyen M, Tadi P. *Iron Supplementation*. 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK557376/
40. CODEX. *General standards for food additives*. 1995-2021. *CODEX Alimentarius International Food Standards*. https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FStandards%252FCXS%2B192-1995%252FCXS_192e.pdf
41. Wichchukit S, O'Mahony M. The 9-point hedonic scale and hedonic ranking in food science: some reappraisals and alternatives. *J Sci Food Agric*. Aug 30 2015;95(11):2167-78. doi:10.1002/jsfa.6993
42. Singh-Ackbarali D, Maharaj R. Sensory Evaluation as a Tool in Determining Acceptability of Innovative Products Developed by Undergraduate Students in Food Science and Technology at The University of Trinidad and Tobago. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*. 2014;3(1):10-18. doi:10.5430/jct.v3n1p10
43. Everitt M. *Chapter 8 - Consumer-Targeted Sensory Quality*. Global Issues in Food Science and Technology. 2009.
44. Hurrell R, Bothwell T, Cook JD, et al. The usefulness of elemental iron for cereal flour fortification: a SUSTAIN Task Force report. Sharing United States Technology to Aid in the Improvement of Nutrition. *Nutr Rev*. Dec 2002;60(12):391-406. doi:10.1301/002966402320964061
45. Theuer RC. Iron-Fortified Infant Cereals. *Food Reviews Internations*. 2008;24(3):277-310. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/87559120801926260

46. Dutra-de-Oliveira JE, Marchini JS, Lamounier J, Almeida CA. Iron-Fortified Drinking Water Studies for the Prevention of Children's Anemia in Developing Countries. *Anemia*. 2011;2011:815194. doi:10.1155/2011/815194
47. Dutra-de-Oliveira JE, de Almeida CA. Domestic drinking water--an effective way to prevent anemia among low socioeconomic families in Brazil. *Food Nutr Bull*. Sep 2002;23(3 Suppl):213-6.
48. Kisinski A, Kapsokefalou M, Yanniotis S, Mandala I. Effect of Iron Fortification on Physical and Sensory Quality of Gluten-Free Bread. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*. 2011;5:385-390. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-011-0651-2
49. Siddique A, Park YW. Effect of iron fortification on microstructural, textural,
and sensory characteristics of caprine milk Cheddar cheeses under different storage treatments. *Journal of Dairy Science*. 2019;102(4):2890-2902. doi:https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15427
50. Hirve S, Bhave S, Bavdekar A, et al. Low dose 'Sprinkles'-- an innovative approach to treat iron deficiency anemia in infants and young children. *Indian Pediatr*. Feb 2007;44(2):91-100.
51. Galloway R, McGuire J. Determinants of compliance with iron supplementation: supplies, side effects, or psychology? *Soc Sci Med*. Aug 1994;39(3):381-90. doi:10.1016/0277-9536(94)90135-x
52. Preedy VR, Srirajaskanthan R, Patel VB. Preedy VRS, Rajaventhan, Patel VB, eds. *Handbook of food fortification and health*. 1 ed. Human Press
Springer Science+Business Media New York 2013; 2013:400. https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-1-4614-7076-2#bibliographic-information
53. Vecchiato D, Torquati B, Venanzi S, Tempesta T. The Role of Sensory Perception in Consumer Demand for Tinned Meat: A Contingent Valuation Study. *Foods*. Sep 15 2021;10(9)doi:10.3390/foods10092185
54. Christofides A, Asante KP, Schauer C, Sharieff W, Owusu-Agyei S, Zlotkin S. Multi-micronutrient Sprinkles including a low dose of iron provided as microencapsulated ferrous fumarate improves haematologic indices in anaemic children: a randomized clinical trial. *Matern Child Nutr*. Jul 2006;2(3):169-80. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8709.2006.00060.x
55. SUSTAIN. *Guidelines for iron fortification of cereal food staples*. 2001. https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/13268018/sustain-guidelines-for-iron-fortification-of-cereal-food-idpasorg/2
56. Vatandoust A, Diosady L. Iron compounds and their organoleptic properties in salt fortification with iron and iodine: an overview. *Current Opinion in Food Science*. 2022;43:232-236.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2021.12.007
57. Allen L, de-Benoist B, Dary O, Hurrell R. Allen Ld-B, B, Dary O, Hurrell R, eds. *Guidelines on food fortification with micronutrients*. The World Health Organization; 2006:331.
https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/43412/9241594012_eng.pdf
58. WHO. Organization WH, ed. *PART III - Fortificants: physical characteristics, selection and use with specific food vehicles*. World Health Organization; 2006:42. https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/micronutrients/gff-part-3-en.pdf?sfvrsn=620a179c_2
59. Hackl LS, Abizari AR, Speich C, et al. Micronutrient-fortified rice can be a significant source of dietary bioavailable iron in schoolchildren from rural Ghana. *Sci Adv*. 03 2019;5(3):eaau0790. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aau0790
60. Ziegler EE, Fomon SJ, Nelson SE, Jeter JM, Theuer RC. Dry cereals fortified with electrolytic iron or ferrous fumarate are equally effective in breast-fed infants. *J Nutr*. Feb 2011;141(2):243-8. doi:10.3945/jn.110.127266
61. Richins AT, Burton KE, Pahulu HF, Jefferies L, Dunn ML. Effect of Iron Source on Color and Appearance of Micronutrient-Fortified Corn Flour Tortillas. *Cereal Chemistry*. 2008;85(4):561-565. doi:https://doi.org/10.1094/CCHEM-85-4-0561
62. Swain JH, Johnson LK, Hunt JR. Electrolytic Iron or Ferrous Sulfate Increase Body Iron in Women with Moderate to Low Iron Stores. *Journal of Nutrition*. 2007;137(3):620-627. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/137.3.620
63. Swareldhab ESE, Al-Jawaldeh A, Qureshi AB, et al. Assessment of Micronutrient Situation among Reproductive-Age Women (15-49) and Under-Five Children in Sudan. *Nutrients*. Aug 13 2021;13(8)doi:10.3390/nu13082784
64. Munoz AM, King SC, eds. *International consumer product testing across cultures and countries*. ASTM MNL 55 International; 2007.
65. Johnson M. The 9-point hedonic scale. The Society of Sensory Professionals. https://www.sensorysociety.org/knowledge/sspwiki/Pages/The%209-point%20Hedonic%20Scale.aspx
66. Gambaro A, McSweeney MB. Probiotic and Prebiotics in Foods: Challenges, Innovations and Advances, Chapter 8. *Advances in Food and Nutrition Research*. 2020;94:295-337.
67. Wang G, Chen Y, Xia Y, Song X, Ai L. Characteristics of Probiotic Preparations and Their Applications. *MDPI*. 2022;11:2-17.
68. Bovell-Benjamin A, Guinard J. Novel Approaches and Application of Contemporary Sensory Evaluation Practices in Iron Fortification Programs. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*. 2010;43(4)doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10408690390826563
69. Huma N, Rehman SU, Anjum FM, Murtaza MA, Sheikh MA. Food Fortification Strategy—Preventing Iron Deficiency Anemia: A Review. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*. 2007:269-265. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10408390600698262
70. Olson R, Gavin-Smith B, Ferraboschi C, Kraemer K. Food Fortification: The Advantages, Disadvantages and Lessons from. *Nutrients*. Mar 29 2021;13(4)doi:10.3390/nu13041118
71. Sutrisna A, Vossenaar M, Izwardy D, Tumilowicz A. Sensory Evaluation of Foods with Added Micronutrient Powder (MNP) " Taburia " to Assess Acceptability among Children Aged 6–24 Months and Their Caregivers in Indonesia. *Nutrients*. 2017;9(9)doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/nu9090979
72. Bovell-Benjamin AC, Guinard JX. Novel approaches and application of contemporary sensory evaluation practices in iron fortification programs. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr*. 2003;43(4):379-400. doi:10.1080/10408690390826563