

Recueillir une journée alimentaire

Un parcours simple,
des limites explicites.

**Un relevé confirmé reste
une déclaration de l'utilisateur.**

Méthodes de recueil, omissions, portions et charge de saisie : revue ciblée et proposition de parcours pour une période alimentaire définie.

Rapport scientifique v1.0 · 11 octobre 2026

Présentation publique · 14 octobre 2026

Synthèse en français · dossier scientifique en anglais

Propulsé par MedLab

L'essentiel

Ce que cette recherche permet de retenir

01 Un relevé éditable pour 24 heures

Le rapport propose de réunir les saisies faites au fil de la journée, plus tard ou lors d'un rappel du lendemain, dans un même relevé. Ce parcours combiné est une hypothèse de conception. [1-8, 10-12]

02 Une revue de clôture facultative

Une courte relecture peut rechercher les occasions oubliées, boissons et ajouts, puis demander une confirmation de couverture. Ni pesée ni photographie systématique n'est imposée. [Dossier 2-3]

03 La confirmation ne mesure pas l'exactitude

Quantités, omissions, composition des aliments et réactivité au recueil gardent leurs incertitudes. Les valeurs inconnues doivent pouvoir rester inconnues. [Dossier 4-10]

04 Le parcours reste à évaluer

La séquence exacte, la charge de saisie et la performance du parcours Nutrikom ne sont pas validées. Les cas proposés sont des critères de vérification à réaliser. [Dossier 11-16]

Portée et méthode

Revue critique ciblée, non exhaustive. Certaines sources ne sont accessibles que partiellement. La recherche documentaire et les conclusions n'ont pas été actualisées pour cette édition. Les propositions du dossier ne constituent ni une validation clinique de Nutrikom ni une recommandation personnelle.

Parcourir le rapport

Le dossier scientifique conserve sa pagination de référence : 01 à 16.
Les renvois internes désignent cette pagination, affichée en pied de page.

01-03 Méthodes et parcours proposé

04-06 Études, erreurs et charge de saisie

07-10 Données, états et calculs

11-13 Formulations et cas proposés

14-16 Méthode, références et décision

Édition publique

Cette édition ajoute une synthèse française et une navigation au dossier v1.0. La présentation est harmonisée ; les mentions d'outils et d'opérations internes sont retirées. Les données, références, niveaux d'accès aux sources et réserves scientifiques sont conservés. Les propositions décrivent l'état de la recherche à la date du dossier.

Dietary collection for one recorded period

The smallest defensible Nutrikom workflow

Question ID: REC01

Date: 11 October 2026 | **Version:** 1.0

Population: generally healthy adults using a self-administered nutrition app.

Disposition: ADOPT FOR DESIGN. Add an optional structured closure review to existing meal entries, with a retrospective recall route when no entries exist. Investigate the exact prompt sequence and burden before describing this Nutrikom workflow as validated.

Recommendation

Use one editable intake ledger for a defined 24-hour interval. Let adults enter foods near consumption, later, or during a next-day recall. After the interval ends, offer a short structured review for missed occasions, drinks and additions, then ask the user to confirm coverage. Do not require weighing, photographs, fixed meal names or several scheduled submissions. This combined approach fits Nutrikom's current meal-based input; its superiority over a full retrospective recall is a design hypothesis, not an established trial result. [1–8, 10–12]

Decision	Scientific boundary
One recorded period	Describe estimated intake for that stated period and the foods entered. Coverage confirmation is self-report, not objective verification.
Repeated records	Describe the sampled days. No universal number of days unlocks usual intake or personal adequacy; sampling and nutrient-specific uncertainty still matter. [DAY01]
Unavailable details	Allow explicit unknown states. Show a qualitative record or partial nutrient estimate when quantitative inputs are insufficient.
Clinical claims	Do not infer deficiency, diagnose glycaemic responses, or prescribe supplements from this collection.

Status and scope

Evidence review plus a proposed future collection contract; no repository implementation or deployment. The current meal workflow is taken from the supplied Nutrikom context. DAY01 v1.0 supplies the inference boundaries. This targeted review is not a systematic review or a certification of Nutrikom accuracy. The English prompts and verification cases are proposals.

Comparison of collection methods

Dimension	Prospective record	Retrospective 24-hour recall	Combined ledger + review
Omissions / memory	Less delay if recorded promptly; a missed entry can remain invisible. Snacks, drinks and additions are still easily missed.	Depends on memory; structured passes provide retrieval cues. Forgotten foods and invented recollections remain possible.	Earlier entries act as cues; review targets gaps. Extra prompts can also elicit intrusions. Never auto-add suggested foods.
Amounts / preparation	A scale, packet or recipe can be available. Estimated servings and served-versus-eaten errors persist.	Portion aids help but do not recover an unknowable amount or recipe. Food matching remains necessary.	Reuse amounts and details; ask only for relevant gaps. More detail is not necessarily more accurate.
Behaviour change	Planning to record, especially weigh, may change food choices, amounts or eating out.	An unannounced recall limits anticipatory change; planned app tracking does not share this advantage fully.	Inherits prospective reactivity. A closure review cannot undo altered consumption.
Burden / completion	Many interruptions; weighing adds effort. Convenience depends on routine and access.	One session can be easier, but food search and detailed passes can take considerable time.	Avoid duplicating a complete recall and a complete diary. Save/resume and an optional entry rhythm are proposed.
Accessibility	Typing, numeracy, scales and internet may exclude users; household measures can help.	Requires memory, language, search skills and digital access; an interviewer can assist.	Offer plain language and assistance; test screen-reader, low-bandwidth and culturally appropriate portion support.
Best use here	Useful existing meal input, not proof of full-day coverage.	Strongest direct precedent for a structured self-administered review.	Recommended product fit, with the compact variant still requiring evaluation.

The trade-offs are supported by observed-intake, biomarker and usability evidence plus institutional methods guidance; the specific combined Nutrikom interface is an extrapolation. No study below establishes a universally best consumer workflow. [1-12]

Structured recall and the minimum workflow

What multi-pass evidence supports

Validated recall systems collect an initial food list, use forgotten-food cues, organize occasions, obtain food and amount details, and review the record. AMPM and ASA24 provide precedents for this structure. Their validation applies to the tested instrument, database, population and administration; a shorter Nutrikom review does not inherit those results automatically. Studies do not isolate the causal contribution of a single final review prompt. [1, 4, 12]

Five compact actions in one ledger — proposed design

Action	Minimum behaviour
1. Define the interval	Show start, end and time zone. Default to the previous calendar day when it is a 24-hour interval. Reuse existing entries after confirming their consumption period.
2. List occasions	Ask for eating or drinking occasions in the interval, including between meals and overnight. Accept user labels and an unknown time within the interval.
3. Check omissions	Prompt briefly for drinks, snacks, cooking fats, sauces, additions, alcohol and supplements. Include late intake and meals away from home. All suggestions need confirmation.
4. Resolve needed details	For each consumed item, capture food identity and amount or an explicit unknown. Request preparation, recipe, brand or serving fraction only when relevant to the estimate.
5. Review and close	Show the ledger, resolve likely duplicates and ask whether the entire interval has been covered. Allow complete-as-recalled, partial and unsure; publish the appropriate scope.

End-of-day review is a completion aid, not a validity guarantee

A bedtime review may miss later snacks or drinks. Keep it provisional until the selected interval has ended; offer a next-morning final check. Progressive recall evidence suggests some memory benefits but poorer convenience for many users, without an independent intake criterion. It supports flexibility, not compulsory repeated daily prompts. [7]

Smallest default: existing meal capture + one optional closure session. Empty-ledger users can perform the same structured session retrospectively. Record the mode per item (near-consumption entry / later entry / recall / import), because a mixed ledger should not be labelled an unannounced retrospective recall. Prompt count, timing and completion targets are UX hypotheses.

Primary evidence against observed intake

Observed meals with unobtrusive weighing and plate-waste measurement provide a stronger criterion for item and portion error on those meals than agreement between two questionnaires. They remain controlled snapshots, and nutrient estimates still depend on composition tables. A participant-kept weighed record improves amount measurement when used correctly, but is still self-report: omissions, reactivity and shared database errors can remain. [1–3, 10]

Study / access	Population and comparator	Findings: group vs individual	Limits / applicability
[1] Kirkpatrick 2014 Abstract	81 adults; 3 buffet meals unobtrusively weighed, including plate waste; randomized next-day ASA24 or interviewer AMPM.	ASA24 captured 80% of consumed items vs 83% for AMPM (P=.07). ASA24 had more intrusions. Additions/ingredients were omitted more often than main foods. Few mode differences in nutrient and portion discrepancies.	Similar modes does not mean perfect individual records. Small controlled feeding study; no all-day free-living, usual-intake or deficiency validation.
[2] Whitton 2024 Abstract and indexed primary full-text results; publisher access blocked	152 Australian adults, mean age 32, 55% women; randomized crossover feeding, 3 study days. Observed meals vs ASA24-Australia, Intake24-Australia, trained-analyst mobile record and image-assisted interviewer recall.	Mean energy percent errors: +5.4%, +1.7%, +1.3% and +15.0%, respectively. For carbohydrate/protein, small mean errors with ASA24/Intake24 coexisted with broad individual agreement limits exceeding $\pm 50\%$.	Controlled meals and trained support do not validate a consumer automatic image tool. Imaging plus interview was not uniformly best; more features need not improve accuracy.
[3] Mun 2025 Indexed abstract Index metadata	119 Korean adults aged ≥ 60 , mean 72.2; 3 self-served meals discreetly weighed, next-day interviewer recall in person or video.	71.4% of foods recalled; mean reported/actual portion ratio 1.34. No significant mean energy or macronutrient differences. Item omissions and portion overestimation can compensate at group level.	Older adults, some with chronic disease; indirect for healthy younger app users and self-administration. Local mixed dishes and side dishes limit simple transfer from Western validation.

Design consequence

Capture both item identity and amount uncertainty. A group nutrient mean can appear satisfactory while the food list or individual amounts are wrong. Do not display “accurate day” from completion alone or correct every user’s totals with a study’s average bias.

Primary evidence using recovery biomarkers

Doubly labelled water (DLW) estimates energy expenditure over a multi-day period; under approximately stable energy stores it informs average energy intake. It does not measure the exact foods or energy consumed on one day. Urinary recovery measures have nutrient-specific collection and recovery assumptions. Concentration biomarkers are not equivalent intake measures. [4–6, 10]

Study / access	Population / comparator	Group findings	Individual limits / disagreement
[4] Moshfegh 2008 Primary abstract and indexed publisher text	524 US volunteers aged 30–69, equal men/women; 3 interviewer AMPM recalls vs DLW over about 2 weeks.	Mean energy under-reporting 11%; less than 3% in normal-weight participants. Supports structured recall as useful but not unbiased in all groups.	Mean bias varies with BMI. Not a self-administered compact-review trial; cannot identify a missing snack or validate the exact recorded day.
[5] Park 2018, IDATA Abstract	1,075 US adults aged 50–74; 6 ASA24 recalls, two unweighed 4-day records and FFQs over 12 months; DLW and 24-hour urinary protein, K and Na measures.	Mean energy underestimation 15–17% for ASA24 and 18–21% for records. Both outperformed FFQs for several measures; neither removed bias.	Group bias is not each user's error. Selected older cohort and repeated protocols; unequal sampling schedules do not answer which one-day closure interface is best.
[6] Biltoft-Jensen 2023 Publisher full text / PDF; 2024 correction checked	120 Danish volunteers aged 18–60 (52 men/68 women); randomized starting order of interviewer 2×24-hour recalls and web 7-day diary; DLW comparator.	Mean energy 11.5 MJ/day for recalls and DLW, 9.5 for diary. Diary had greater average under-reporting; raw diary agreement limits were narrower.	Substantial individual error: diary and model-adjusted recalls had limits around $\pm 50\%$ (± 5 MJ/day). Motivation/education selection and model assumptions matter. Correction concerned author affiliations, not findings.

How to read the conflicting findings

A lower mean bias can coexist with wider individual error. Results also change with setting, respondent age, portion aids, prompt design, study duration and comparator. The studies support preserving uncertainty and testing locally; they do not rank every prospective record below every recall. Do not import population-model shrinkage as personal accuracy or use a two-recall survey protocol as a universal day-count gate. [5, 6; DAY01]

Burden, completion and cultural transfer

Primary study / access	Population and methods	Finding and limit
[7] Osadchiy 2020 Open publisher full text	UK university recruitment; adults 18–64, English speakers with a common UK diet. 50 recruited; balanced analysis of 33, interviews with 23. Intake24 progressive vs previous-day recalls, weekday crossover.	Progressive recalls shortened retention by 15.2 hours and reported more evening-meal foods. 65% of interviewees found standard recall more convenient; 65% felt progressive capture aided memory. Shared self-report; more foods is not proven truer intake. Weekday-only, selected sample.
[8] Thompson 2015 Abstract	1,081 US adults across 3 integrated health systems; diversity quotas; randomized sequences of ASA24 and interviewer AMPM recalls.	87% of 20 nutrient/food-group estimates met group equivalence within a 20% bound; 70% preferred ASA24. Attrition favoured ASA24 groups. Comparator is another self-report: equivalence cannot establish food-level truth or individual accuracy.
[9] Kupis 2019 Abstract and indexed open primary excerpts	Low-income adults in a Canadian nutrition coupon programme; 85% women, mean age 48.2. Mixed-methods ASA24 usability, including moderated observation.	Usability issues and incomplete sessions occurred; reported completion was about 27 minutes. Observed usability is not a validation against consumed intake. Assistance and study setting limit estimates of unattended consumer completion.

Cultural and accessibility conditions

Do not assume that US, UK, Australian or Danish food lists, meal labels and portion images fit all Nutrikom users. Local dishes, shared bowls, condiments, recipes, fortification and household measures can materially affect food matching. The Korean study illustrates why satisfactory nutrient means can mask item and amount errors. Translation alone does not validate a database or portion aid. [1–3, 7–10]

Use flexible occasion labels, locally recognizable foods and units, recipe alternatives and “not found” paths. Test mixed dishes, common serving vessels and eating outside the home with intended language/cultural groups. Screen-reader support, keyboard access, clear units, resume support, low-bandwidth capture and optional human help are accessibility design requirements to evaluate, not outcomes already demonstrated for Nutrikom.

Completion is an endpoint of its own: report starts, submitted reviews, time, edits and abandonment with denominators. Submission, user satisfaction and high nutrient totals are not proxies for intake accuracy.

Field contract — interval, occasions and amounts

R = required state/value; C = conditional detail; O = optional. “Required” never forces an invented quantity. Unknown is an allowed state; quantitative output requires the inputs on which it depends. This is a proposed product contract derived from the error sources, not a field list experimentally proven minimal.

Field	Class	Minimum rule
Dates and interval	R	period_id; start/end with offsets; time-zone ID; actual duration; interval type. Use [start,end): an event at the end belongs to the next period. Show the dates, not only “today”.
Collection and provenance	R	Capture method per item; created/updated times distinct from consumption time; source entry ID; ledger revision; review status and confirmation tied to that revision.
Eating/drinking occasions	R	Group every reported item into an occasion, including snacks and drink-only occasions; accept a custom or unknown label. Do not require breakfast/lunch/dinner consumption.
Exact occasion clock time	O / C	Optional for daily nutrient aggregation. Conditional when needed to assign an ambiguous midnight/boundary event. Allow approximate time or known-within-period / unresolved membership.
Foods and drinks	R	User food description, item kind, consumption status, and food-match status. Include water and non-caloric drinks in intake coverage; exclude non-consumed choices from nutrient calculation.
Edible amount and unit	R state; C value	known / estimated / range / unknown. Positive edible amount consumed + unit and conversion are conditional for quantity-based nutrient estimates. Keep original unit and any converted grams/mL.
Amount method	C	For a calculated item: weighed / package fraction / household measure / visual estimate / generic serving / other; record assumptions. Optional confidence note must not become a probability of accuracy.
Raw/cooked state	C	Ask when identity or unit conversion depends on it (rice, pasta, meat etc.). Otherwise inherit an explicit matched-food state. Unknown preparation keeps dependent outputs uncertain.
Coverage confirmation	R for full-period wording	After the interval ends: complete_as_recalled / partial / unsure, with confirmed_at and revision. Before then, review may be saved but full-period confirmation remains pending.

A partial period and an item with unknown amount remain useful qualitative records. Partial records must not receive the same daily-total wording as a user-confirmed interval with calculable inputs.

Field contract — recipes, additions and products

Field / intake	Class	Minimum rule
Recipes / mixed dishes	C	If calculated from ingredients: ingredient identities and amounts, whole-recipe edible yield or serving allocation, user portion, preparation basis and relevant loss/retention assumptions. Otherwise a disclosed generic-dish match is allowed; never imply the exact recipe was known.
Shared portions	C	Capture the user's consumed fraction or edible amount, not the whole pot or table serving. An unknown share makes the person's quantitative estimate unavailable.
Oils and cooking fats	R review; C detail	Review possible use; explicitly record present / none recalled / not sure. If relevant, include oil absorbed/consumed or a disclosed dish estimate. Do not allocate all pan oil to one person automatically.
Sauces, dressings and additions	R review; C detail	Include sugar/milk in drinks, spreads, toppings, dressings and condiments when consumed. Preserve amount unknown. Check whether a recipe or matched dish already includes them.
Snacks / tastes / bites	R review; C detail	Capture when consumed; no minimum calorie cutoff. A blank snack list is not confirmed absence.
Leftovers / inedible parts	C	Amounts mean eaten edible amount. If the user enters served amount, ask about leftovers and bones/peels as relevant. Store served and leftover amounts separately; do not subtract twice.
Brands / product variants	O / C	Conditional when fortification, formulation, label or serving basis matters materially. Generic matches are permissible with provenance. Barcode scanning is optional; unmatched product descriptions remain in the ledger.
Alcohol	R review; C detail	When consumed: beverage and volume or explicit unknown; strength/product if needed for ethanol/energy calculation. "One glass" without a defined size is an estimate, not a universal unit.
Supplements	R review; C detail	none recalled / taken / not reported / unsure. For total nutrient exposure: product/formulation, actual dose, unit and amount taken within this interval. Unknown dose keeps supplement contributions incomplete; do not assume habitual daily use.
Photos, place, reason, diet change	O	May aid recall or future interpretation. No photo requirement. An atypical-day note is useful context, not a correction coefficient or a representativeness score.

Supplement review does not require supplement analysis. If excluded, label the output "foods and drinks only; supplements not included." A confirmed interval can have complete food coverage while total nutrient exposure remains incomplete. [10, 11]

State contract — preserve different kinds of missingness

Object / state	Allowed states	Meaning / invariant
Consumption	consumed / confirmed_not_consumed / uncertain	Confirmed non-consumption is an explicit response, not a missing food row. Uncertain presence is not counted as certain intake; keep a note or unresolved candidate.
Intake coverage	unreviewed / pending_interval_end / complete_as_recalled / partial / unsure	User confirmation concerns the whole interval. Known unreported intake or unresolved membership prevents unqualified full-period coverage. Unreviewed never defaults to fasting.
Amount	known / estimated / range / unknown	Consumed but unknown amount is distinct from no consumption. A range is a bounded user estimate, not a statistical confidence interval. No unknown-to-zero coercion.
Food matching	exact / generic / recipe / proxy / unmatched	Retain original description and source/version. Proxy selection is explicit and traceable. Unmatched does not remove consumed intake from coverage.
Nutrient value, per item	available / estimated_or_imputed / trace / known_zero / unavailable	Unknown composition is distinct from unknown quantity. A true database zero requires provenance. Trace is retained as qualified; blank fields cannot become zero.
Nutrient coverage, per period	calculable_for_reported_items / partial / unavailable	Derived separately for each nutrient from quantity, conversion, matching and composition availability. Distinguish unresolved food coverage from missing nutrient values.
Sampling context	single_period / sampled_period; selection metadata optional	Keep recorded dates, interval durations and known changes. User-selected days do not become representative because coverage is confirmed. No count-based usual-intake state.
Review and revisions	draft / reviewed; current revision ID	Any intake, quantity, interval or composition change recomputes outputs. Intake changes invalidate the old coverage confirmation; preserve it in history, require review of the revised ledger.

Three separate messages

Intake: “You confirmed this covers the whole period as you remember it.”

Nutrient data: “Calcium estimate is partial: 2 consumed items lack usable calcium data.”

Sampling: “This describes one recorded day. It does not establish your usual intake.”

Do not combine these into a “95% complete” or “reliable diet” badge. Field-population percentages are not the probability that a personal total is correct.

Calculation, interrupted records and time boundaries

Situation	Contract behaviour
Uncertain amounts	Keep point estimates labelled estimated. Preserve ranges without substituting a midpoint silently. If supported, show a scenario range from entered bounds; otherwise withhold that item's point estimate. Do not claim a true-intake confidence interval.
Unmatched food / missing nutrient	Keep the food in the reported ledger. Request a match or offer a disclosed proxy. For each affected nutrient, show partial estimate and omitted contribution count; never zero-fill or declare the known subtotal a strict lower bound.
Interrupted recording	Save as draft or partial; retain gaps and resume position. No silent completion after timeout. A user may later reconstruct the interval, while entry timing/provenance remains visible.
Midnight / travel / daylight saving	Assign by consumption interval, not entry date or app opening. Pin the interval's time zone; preserve original offsets when travelling. Calendar days spanning daylight-saving changes last 23/25 hours: label actual duration or let the user choose an explicit 24-hour elapsed interval.
Duplicate entry / import	Use stable item IDs and idempotent import IDs. Flag similarity for user review; two coffees may be real. Do not silently deduplicate by food name or double count the same meal entered prospectively and recalled later.
True fasting / no intake	An empty ledger means unreported until reviewed. Ask separately about foods, drinks and supplements. Explicit no-food/no-energy intake can coexist with water or supplements. Only confirmed absence gives a corresponding reported zero; no physiological or benefit inference.
Later edits	Permit corrections. Preserve revision history and calculation/database version. Recompute totals, source contributions and generated wording; invalidate confirmation when intake changes. Never continue showing cached prose from an earlier ledger.
Repeated periods	Keep one day's unknowns out of false zero averages. Report nutrient-specific included periods and denominator. Consecutive days can be described; no universal gate or extrapolation to unrecorded days.

For a point estimate, sum only eligible item contributions on the stated edible basis, including recipe allocation and preparation conversions. Show the unit, scope and rounding appropriate to uncertainty. Do not calculate energy or nutrient "deficits" by treating an incomplete period as a complete day. No personal anthropometrics are required for a descriptive intake ledger; reference comparisons, if offered, need a named framework and appropriate personal reference group. [DAY01; 10, 11]

English prompts and output wording

These are proposed prompts for testing. They paraphrase the intent of structured recall; they are not a validated questionnaire. Keep prompts neutral, allow “not sure”, and avoid suggesting that a low total should be repaired by inventing foods.

Moment	Proposed English wording
Interval	“Let’s review everything you ate or drank from [start] to [end], in [time zone]. Is this the period you want to describe?”
Occasions	“What eating or drinking occasions do you remember during this period? Include anything between meals or overnight.”
Omissions	“Anything else: drinks, snacks, bites, cooking oil, sauces, spreads, toppings, sugar or milk added to drinks, or alcohol?”
Amount	“How much did you actually eat or drink? You can enter a weight, a familiar measure, an estimate, a range, or ‘amount unknown’.”
Preparation / sharing	“Was that amount raw or cooked?” / “How much of the shared dish did you eat?” / “Was any left uneaten?”
Unknown dish	“Can’t find this food? Keep its name in your record. We can leave its nutrients unavailable or use an identified approximate match.”
Supplements	“Did you take any vitamin, mineral or other dietary supplements in this period? None / Yes / Not sure / Prefer not to report.”
Review / fasting	“Does this include everything you remember eating and drinking in the whole period? Yes / Some intake is missing / I’m not sure.” An empty list: “Was there no food or drink, or has intake not been entered? Water and supplements can be recorded separately.”
Interrupted / edit	“Your record is saved as partial. You can finish the review later.” / “Your intake record changed. Review coverage again before using a full-period summary.”

Allowed educational outputs

“Estimated intake for the recorded period: [amount]. Based on the foods and portions you reported; supplements [included/not included].”

“This is a partial estimate. [Nutrient] data are unavailable for [items].”

“Across [n] recorded periods with usable [nutrient] data, the recorded average was [value]. These periods may not represent your usual intake.”

Conclusions to prohibit

“Your diet is complete/accurate”; “you are deficient”; “your needs are met”; “you need this supplement”; “this meal caused a glucose spike”; “you ate nothing” from an empty ledger; “you never consume X” from absent entries; “usual intake unlocked after N days.”

Verification cases — coverage and calculation

Proposed acceptance cases for implementation; not executed against Nutrikom. The expected results test the contract rather than study-level accuracy.

ID	Input / trigger	Expected result
REC01-01	Three meal entries; no closure review.	Keep unreviewed. Display recorded items only; no “complete day”.
02	User confirms all intake; one dish amount unknown.	Intake can be complete-as-recalled; dependent nutrient estimate partial. Preserve amount unknown.
03	Known quantity, unmatched local dish.	Food remains consumed and recorded; matching unresolved, nutrient contributions unavailable; no forced Western proxy.
04	Known food and amount; calcium field blank.	Calcium partial, other usable nutrients calculable. Blank is not calcium zero.
05	Known-zero and trace database values.	Retain provenance and distinction from unavailable; report trace with appropriate qualification.
06	Served 200 g edible food; 50 g uneaten.	Calculate 150 g consumed; do not use served amount or subtract leftovers twice.
07	Dry rice amount entered; cooked-rice match.	Request/correct basis or explicit conversion. Do not multiply dry grams by cooked composition silently.
08	Whole recipe 4 portions; user ate half of one.	Allocate one-eighth only if portions equivalent; otherwise request consumed weight/share. Unknown allocation stays unknown.
09	Cooking oil in recipe and separately entered.	Flag potential overlap. User determines inclusion; no double count or automatic deletion.
10	“One bowl” has no defined conversion.	Keep original measure and amount estimate state. Request a local bowl size/weight or retain quantity unknown.
11	Alcohol “one glass”, strength unknown.	Do not assign a universal volume/ABV. Preserve relevant uncertainty and conditional calculation.
12	Weekly supplement habit; none taken this interval.	No interval dose inferred from habitual frequency; preserve confirmed interval non-consumption.
13	Supplement taken, dose unknown / declined.	Food-only estimate possible with explicit scope; total exposure incomplete, no prescription.

Verification cases — time, revision and interpretation

ID	Input / trigger	Expected result
REC01-14	Session abandoned before review.	Persist draft/partial; no automatic coverage confirmation.
15	Bedtime review at 22:00; snack at 23:30.	Period not closed before end. Add snack and complete review afterward; avoid a premature whole-day label.
16	00:10 intake entered next afternoon.	Assign by consumption time to the correct interval, not by entry time.
17	Event exactly at interval end.	Half-open interval assigns once to next period. Uncertain boundary time remains unresolved.
18	Spring-forward / fall-back calendar day.	Show 23/25-hour duration or explicit elapsed 24-hour interval. No hidden normalization to 24 hours.
19	Same imported meal retry; two genuinely separate coffees.	Import retry idempotent. Distinct coffees retained; similarity merely prompts review.
20	Empty ledger; user has not answered review.	Unreported intake, not fasting or zero energy.
21	User reports no food, water consumed, no supplements.	Explicit no-food interval with water recorded. No diagnosis, fasting advice or implied health benefit.
22	User confirms coverage then remembers a snack.	New revision invalidates prior confirmation and prose; recompute then offer renewed review.
23	Composition database corrected, intake unchanged.	Recompute nutrient outputs and retain versions; intake confirmation can remain valid if intake did not change.
24	Four completed weekdays selected by user.	Describe four recorded days; no representative-week badge or automatic usual-intake gate.
25	Low nutrient estimate / high carbohydrate meal.	No deficiency label, supplement recommendation or glycaemic-response diagnosis.
26	Two of four periods have unusable calcium data.	Report denominator and exclusions for calcium; do not count unknown days as zero or mix partial and complete totals silently.

Reproducible search and evidence limitations

Search date: 11 October 2026. Sources: Scholarly academic retrieval, web-indexed PubMed, original publisher/PMC records and NCI/FAO guidance. English query terms; no publication-date filter. Targeted evidence review, not a registered systematic search. Re-running ranked searches may return different records.

Executed discovery queries — core set

Source	Query string
Index	self administered 24 hour dietary recall prospective food record multiple pass observed intake validation adults omissions portions reactivity
Web / PubMed	site.pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov dietary recall ASA24 observed intake Kirkpatrick 2014 81 omissions
Web / PubMed	site.pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov 24 hour recall food diary Danish adults doubly labelled water 2023
Web / PubMed	site.pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov dietary food record end of day review combined recall adults validation
Web	"end-of-day" "food record" dietary validation adults
Web	"progressive 24-hour recall" feasibility acceptability short retention intervals
Web	Whitton Healy 2024 2025 accuracy ASA24 Intake24 image assisted mobile food record observed intake randomized crossover results
Web	"Comparison of self-reported dietary intakes" "recovery biomarkers" ASA24 4-d food records
Web	ASA24 low income adults usability literacy completion Kirkpatrick study
Web	Accuracy of 24 hour dietary recalls older Korean adults Mun 2025 119 DOI

Selection and verification

Relevant bibliographic records included Kirkpatrick 2014, Park 2018, Thompson 2015 and Mun 2025. Follow-up title/DOI searches located primary records, individual-error results, usability reports and the Danish corrigendum. The Whitton 2021 protocol was excluded as outcome evidence; its 2024 results were included. Reviews, unrelated hits and child-only retention-interval studies did not establish adult workflow effectiveness. NCI methods pages were read through their institutional links.

Included adult criterion-validation studies, direct comparisons, and primary usability evidence relevant to self-administration; interviewer studies are labelled indirect. Access varied: some publisher pages were blocked, PMC returned access checks, and indexed excerpts/abstracts were used where necessary. No inaccessible table was treated as fully reviewed. No formal risk-of-bias scoring or exhaustive duplicate-screening was performed. Exact wording and minimum field burden remain evidence gaps.

Bibliography — primary studies

- [1] Kirkpatrick SI, Subar AF, Douglass D, et al. (2014). Performance of the Automated Self-Administered 24-hour Recall relative to a measure of true intakes and to an interviewer-administered 24-h recall. *Am J Clin Nutr* 100:233–240. DOI: [10.3945/ajcn.114.083238](https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.114.083238) | PMID: [24787491](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24787491/)
- [2] Whitton C, et al. (2024). Accuracy of energy and nutrient intake estimation versus observed intake using 4 technology-assisted dietary assessment methods: a randomized crossover feeding study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 120:196–210. DOI: [10.1016/j.ajcnut.2024.04.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajcnut.2024.04.030) | PMID: [38710447](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38710447/)
- [3] Mun J, Kim S, Kim K, Nam C, Kim S, Park CY (2025). Accuracy of 24-Hour Dietary Recalls among Free-Living Older Korean Adults: Validation against Weighed Intakes. *Journal of Nutrition*. DOI: [10.1016/j.tjn.2025.10.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjn.2025.10.038) | PMID: [41173375](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41173375/)
- [4] Moshfegh AJ, Rhodes DG, Baer DJ, et al. (2008). The US Department of Agriculture Automated Multiple-Pass Method reduces bias in the collection of energy intakes. *Am J Clin Nutr* 88:324–332. DOI: [10.1093/ajcn/88.2.324](https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/88.2.324) | PMID: [18689367](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18689367/)
- [5] Park Y, Dodd KW, Kipnis V, et al. (2018). Comparison of self-reported dietary intakes from the Automated Self-Administered 24-h recall, 4-d food records, and food-frequency questionnaires against recovery biomarkers. *Am J Clin Nutr* 107:80–93. DOI: [10.1093/ajcn/nqx002](https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/nqx002) | PMID: [29381789](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29381789/)
- [6] Biloft-Jensen A, Ygil KH, Knudsen L, et al. (2023). Validation of the 2 × 24 h recall method and a 7-d web-based food diary against doubly labelled water in Danish adults. *Br J Nutr* 130:1444–1457. DOI: [10.1017/S0007114523000454](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114523000454) | PMID: [36805853](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36805853/)
- [7] Osadchiy T, Poliakov I, Olivier P, Rowland M, Foster E (2020). Progressive 24-Hour Recall: Usability Study of Short Retention Intervals in Web-Based Dietary Assessment Surveys. *J Med Internet Res* 22:e13266. DOI: [10.2196/13266](https://doi.org/10.2196/13266) | PMID: [32012055](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32012055/)
- [8] Thompson FE, Dixit-Joshi S, Potischman N, et al. (2015). Comparison of Interviewer-Administered and Automated Self-Administered 24-Hour Dietary Recalls in 3 Diverse Integrated Health Systems. *Am J Epidemiol* 181:970–978. DOI: [10.1093/aje/kwu467](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwu467) | PMID: [25964261](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25964261/)
- [9] Kupis J, Johnson S, Hallihan G, Olstad DL (2019). Assessing the Usability of the Automated Self-Administered Dietary Assessment Tool (ASA24) among Low-Income Adults. *Nutrients* 11:132. DOI: [10.3390/nu11010132](https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11010132) | PMID: [30634581](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30634581/)
- [6a] Corrigendum (2024). Author-affiliation correction. DOI: [10.1017/S0007114524001156](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114524001156) | PMID: [38832516](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38832516/).

Institutional sources and final disposition

Original methods guidance below is publicly accessible and was consulted on 11 October 2026. It supplies terminology and design rationale; it does not validate Nutrikom.

[10] US National Cancer Institute — Dietary Assessment Primer

Food record profile — <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/dietary-assessment-primer/profiles/record/>

24-hour recall profile — <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/dietary-assessment-primer/profiles/recall/>

Reactivity — <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/dietary-assessment-primer/learn/reactivity.html>

Food composition databases — <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/dietary-assessment-primer/learn/recall-record.html>

Supplements and total nutrient intake — <https://epi.grants.cancer.gov/dietary-assessment-primer/learn/intake.html>

Framework primarily intended for research requiring group intake estimates. Its record/recall trade-offs and measurement-error principles inform this design; population recommendations must not become personal accuracy guarantees.

[11] FAO — Food Composition Data

Greenfield H, Southgate DAT. Food Composition Data: Production, Management and Use, 2nd ed. (2003), Chapter 9, use of composition data. [Institutional chapter](#). Public full chapter; supports edible basis, food matching, uncertainty and retaining missing values separately from zeros. No consumer workflow trial.

[12] NCI — ASA24 respondent methodology

[Methodology and structured passes](#). Public full methods page; a protocol precedent rather than evidence that a compact substitute is equivalent.

[DAY01] Nutrikom evidence review (11 October 2026), v1.0. DAY01 — Dietary observation evidence and Nutrikom contract. User-provided full report read for continuity; establishes the one-day scope and absence of a universal recording-day gate. It is a prior synthesis, not new primary validation evidence.

Decision, remaining work and deferred claims

Disposition	What to do
ADOPT FOR DESIGN	One ledger, a defined interval, optional near-consumption entries, a structured retrospective closure, explicit missingness and three separate coverage constructs. Permit partial outputs with transparent scope.
INVESTIGATE FURTHER	Pilot exact prompts, timing and conditional details across languages, food cultures and accessibility needs. Measure burden and omissions; validate amounts and individual error against observed/weighed consumption, rather than only another self-report tool.
DEFER	Any claim that this compact workflow is validated, clinically diagnostic, universally superior, or sufficient for personal usual intake after a fixed number of days.

Suggested evaluation: compare the compact closure with current meal-only entry and a structured full recall in a planned adult study. Predefine item omissions/intrusions, portion error, group bias, individual agreement, completion and accessibility endpoints. Observed-meal studies test collection details; free-living recovery-biomarker work can address average energy/protein reporting but cannot certify each recorded day. [1–10]