

Why is it so difficult to figure out if coffee, wine, eggs and other foods are good for us or not?

Do you know whether eggs are good for you? What about coffee, red wine, or chocolate? Most people probably have a yes-or-no impulse about each of these things, thanks to the amount of media coverage given to studies looking for health benefits or detriments of individual foods. And no matter what you say, you're probably right, according to at least some of that science—findings often reverse or contradict one another over time, even if the conflicting studies are all methodologically sound.

“Nutritional studies are extremely difficult to do, and it’s very hard to figure out what people are actually eating, even if you try your best,” said the journalist Christie Aschwanden, speaking on a panel at the Aspen Ideas Festival... .

When studies try to set a diet or even provide food themselves, studying nutrition can still be distressingly inexact for a very relatable reason: Study participants aren’t any better at sticking to a diet than anyone else.

...

Eating a variety of fresh, minimally processed foods and plenty of fruits and vegetables is one of the simplest ways humans can bolster their health, even if that reality isn’t as new or exciting as many journalists writing about nutrition might wish it were. (Sorry.)

Read full, original post: [Why Science Can Be So Indecisive About Nutrition](#)