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Meals served in Danish nursing homes and to meals-on-wheels clients may not offer nutritionally adequate choices

Underweight is a significant problem among older Danish nursing home residents and home-care clients. The aim of this study was to evaluate the nutritional composition of the meals prepared for older adults in nursing homes and receiving Meals-on-Wheels deliveries, focusing on the menus most commonly served, including the standard menu (most commonly prepared), the energy and protein dense menu, and two types of texture modified menus (chopped and blended). Also, one portion of a homemade energy and protein dense drink was collected and analyzed. For each of the participating kitchens (N = 10), extra portions of different menus were made (3 days in a row). The meal samples (total n = 389) were analyzed for content of energy, protein, fat and carbohydrate. The findings were compared with recommendations regarding the foods to be served in Danish institutions. The nutrient content of the meals-on-wheels and nursing home meals, as well as that of the homemade energy and protein dense drink, varied considerably. The nursing home menus seldom or never fulfilled the recommendations. Our findings support the conclusion that meals served in Danish nursing homes and to meals-on-wheels clients do not consistently offer adequate nutritional intakes.

General information
State: Published
Organisations: Division of Nutrition, National Food Institute
Authors: Beck, A. M. (Intern), Hansen, K. S. (Ekstern)
Pages: 100-109
Publication date: 2010
Main Research Area: Technical/natural sciences

Publication information
Journal: Journal of Nutrition for the Elderly
Volume: 29
Issue number: 1
ISSN (Print): 0163-9366
Ratings:
BFI (2018): BFI-level 1
Web of Science (2018): Indexed yes
BFI (2017): BFI-level 1
BFI (2016): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2016): SJR 0.443 SNIP 0.534 CiteScore 1.15
BFI (2015): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2015): SJR 0.903 SNIP 0.935 CiteScore 2.26
BFI (2014): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2014): SJR 0.832 SNIP 0.858 CiteScore 1.84
BFI (2013): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2013): SJR 0.513 SNIP 0.79 CiteScore 1.76
ISI indexed (2013): ISI indexed no
BFI (2012): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2012): SJR 0.256 SNIP 0.423 CiteScore 0.63
ISI indexed (2012): ISI indexed no
BFI (2011): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2011): SJR 0.403 SNIP 0.878
ISI indexed (2011): ISI indexed no
BFI (2010): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2010): SJR 0.319 SNIP 0.445
BFI (2009): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2009): SJR 0.335 SNIP 0.623
BFI (2008): BFI-level 1
Scopus rating (2008): SJR 0.206 SNIP 0.265
Scopus rating (2007): SJR 0.248 SNIP 0.399
Scopus rating (2006): SJR 0.295 SNIP 1.563
Scopus rating (2005): SJR 0.168 SNIP 0.031
Scopus rating (2004): SJR 0.235
Scopus rating (1999): SJR 0.216