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#### Abstract

The aim of the study was to assess the overall nutritional status of the 60 randomly selected patients in the selected hospital of Allahabad district. Nutritional status of these patients was assessed with anthropometric parameters, biochemical parameters, dietary parameters ( 3 day 24 hour recall method). It was observed that intake of food consumed by the respondents relating to cereals, Pulses is below the recommended ICMR Standards where as the amounts of vegetables, fruits, sugar \& milk consumed are above the ICMR standards in each group. This will influence the intake of the nutrients per day by the respondents. The respondents of above 60 years age group consume fruits, milk, fat, meat and fish in low amounts than the ICMR standards and in 10 to 20 years age group respondents consumed cereals, meat, sugar in high amounts than the ICMR Standard. The survey revealed that disease is more prevalent in women than in men. Among the female subjects suffering from Rheumatoid Arthritis 41.30\% were house wives and $28.26 \%$ were in service. only $4.34 \%$ were in business. Nutrition and health counseling is one of the most effective tool of changing the food habits of the people without affecting their sentiments.
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Rheumatoid arthritis is a chronic inflammatory anthropopathy of unknown cause that can affect most joints. The first convincing clinical descriptions of the disease are as recent as the early nineteenth century, and unlike gout, for example, it cannot be clearly identified in old art or literature. It may be a disease of modern origin. Rheumatoid arthritis comes under an autoimmune disorder, when our immune system mistakenly attacks our own body's tissues.
Criteria for the Diagnosis of Rheumatoid Arthritis -

1- Morning stiffness.
2- Pain on motion or tenderness in at least one joint.
3- Swelling of one joint representing soft tissue or fluid.
4- Swelling of at least one other joint.
5- Symmetric joint swelling.
6- Subcutaneous nodules.
7- Positive test for rheumatoid factor in serum.
8- Poor cumin precipitates from synovial fluid.
9- Characteristic histologic changes in synovial membrane.
10- Characteristic histopathology of rheumatoid nodules.

## PRAVALENCE

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) prevalence increases with age in both sexes and in most populations studied, is most common in the most elderly group studied (often 65 years and over or 70 years and over) In all populations studied,
women have a higher prevalence of disease than men, and in younger men, Rheumatoid arthritis is uncommon (ranging from 0 to $0.5 \%$ prevalence, depending on the population studied and criteria used). Rheumatoid arthritis occurs in all races and in all parts of the world. No differences in disease prevalence have been found across different latitudes, longitudes, or climates.

## Genetic Factors

Family studies of Rheumatoid arthritis patients suggest that first degree relatives have a three to four times higher risk of disease than unrelated individuals. Disease concordance among twins may be higher, however, in the most severe cases. These twin and family studies suggest a prominent inherited component of Rheumatoid arthritis, but most individuals closely related to someone with the disease do not get it. Therefore, the penetrance of disease is relatively low, and environmental factors may be important in disease expression.

## ARTHRITIS FOOD ALLERGY, DIETS AND NUTRITION

Rosenberg remarked that "it is almost universally acknowledged that Rheumatoid arthritis cannot be overcome by any dietary manipulations which have thus for been proposed. The Arthritis Foundation in its 1981 Publication", "The Truth About diet and Arthritis", Summarized as follows, "The possible relationship between diet and arthritis has been thoroughly and scientifically studied. The simple proven fact is no food has anything
to do with causing arthritis and no food is effective in treating or curing it."

## POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NUTRITION AND RHEUMATIC DISEASES

A relationship between nutrition and rheumatic disease could occur through two possible mechanisms. First, nutritional factors might alter immune or inflammatory responses or both, thus modifying rheumatic symptoms second, food antigens might provoke hypersensitivity responses leading to such symptoms. Keeping this in view the present investigation was planned and conducted to determine the nutritional status of selected respondent of Allahabad district with the following objectives.
i) To study the food and nutrient intake of the subjects.
ii) To compare the dietary intake of the subjects with the standards.

## METHODOLOGY

To accomplish the objectives of the study a total of 60 respondents of both sexes were selected randomly spread over in all the one selected nursing homes and pathological laboratories. They were personally interviewed and necessary information was collected using a pretested schedule.

## Nutritional Status

It may be defined as the condition of health as it is influenced by the intake and utilization of nutrients ${ }^{2}$. For assessment of nutritional status affords was made to calculate the nutrient intake of the selected respondents.

## Nutrient Intake

Food intake survey was conducted to assess the nutritional status. Information regarding the intake of food actually consumed by the individual was noted for three consecutive days by using 24 hours recall method. Their households would be visited in order to know the quantities of food consumed in ordinary serving.

Standard measure including Katories, spoons and glasses of standard sizes were shown to the respondents for estimating the amounts of food. Food intake would be recorded in terms of standard size utensils and detailed information about the ingredients used and the method of cooking would also be recorded. The amount of cooked food consumed was converted into raw ingredients and nutrient intake was calculated using food composition table ${ }^{1}$ and compared with recommended dietary allowance ${ }^{3}$. The per cent of recommended dietary allowances (RDA) was calculated using the following formula:

Percent RDA $=\frac{\text { Intake of nutrients }}{\text { RDA }} \times 100$
Nutrient intake of 3 consecutive days will be added and mean values of these were used for further analysis.

## Field Procedure and Data Collection

The data was collected using personal interview method by paying repeated visits to the study area. In the initial stage, friendly discussions were held to build up rapport with the respondents.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The test undertaking for interpreting the data were
a) Student t test
b) Chi-Square

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is clear from the table that the amounts of food consumed by the respondents relating to pulses, green leafy vegetables, fruits, \& Meat are above the recommended ICMR standards whereas the respondents of 10-40 year age group consumed cereals in more amount than the recommended values. The respondents belonging to 40-70 years age group have low intake of milk than the recommended amount.

Table-1 a: Food intake by male subjects

| Age <br> Grou <br> p in <br> yrs | No. of patient s | Tools | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cereal } \\ & \mathrm{s} \text { (gm) } \end{aligned}$ | Pul <br> ses <br> (gm ) | Green <br> Leafy <br> veg <br> (gm) | root \& tubers (gm) | Fruits <br> (gm) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { milk } \\ (\mathrm{ml}) \end{gathered}$ | fat \& oils (gm) | meat <br> fish <br> egg(g <br> m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sugar } \\ \& \\ \text { Jigger } \\ \text { y } \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peanu } \\ & \text { t (gm) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7-9 | 1 | Mean | 200 | 65 | 30 | 70 | 78 | 400 | 40 | 40 | 30 | - |
|  |  | RDA | 220 | 70 | 75 | 50 | 100 | 600 | 30 | 60 | 30 | - |
|  |  | Differ | -20 | -5 | -45 | +20 | 22 | -200 | 10 | -20 | - | - |
|  |  | ence | 90 | 60 | 150 | 200 | 100 | 500 | 50 | - | 40 | - |
| 10-20 | 01 | Mean | 420 | 70 | 100 | 175 | 100 | 600 | 40 | - | 30 | 50 |
|  |  | RDA | -70 | -10 | +50 | +25 | - | -100 | +10 | - | +10 | - |
|  |  | Differ | 450 | 75 | 200 | 80 | 70 | 400 | 40 | 60 | 30 | - |
|  |  | ence | 400 | 70 | 100 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 35 | 60 | 30 | - |
| 20-20 | 4 | Mean | +50 | +5 | +100 | +5 | +40 | -200 | +5 | - | - | - |


|  |  | RDA | 500 | 60 | 200 | 80 | 100 | 500 | 40 | 90 | 30 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Differ | 400 | 70 | 100 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 35 | 60 | 30 | - |
|  |  | ence | 100 | -10 | +100 | +5 | +70 | +300 | +5 | +30 | - | - |
| 30-40 | 3 | Mean | 300 | 60 | 200 | 80 | 80 | 500 | 40 | - | 40 | - |
|  |  | RDA | 400 | 70 | 100 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 35 | - | 30 | - |
|  |  | Differ | -100 | -10 | +100 | +5 | +50 | +300 | +5 | - | +10 | - |
|  |  | ence | 200 | 80 | 200 | 70 | 50 | 100 | 25 | - | 35 | - |
| 40-60 | 2 | Mean | 400 | 70 | 100 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 35 | - | 30 | - |
|  |  | RDA | -200 | +10 | +100 | -5 | +20 | -100 | -10 | - | +5 | - |
|  |  | Differ ence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60-70 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | RDA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Differ ence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table-1 b: Food intake by female subjects

| Age Group in yrs | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { patien } \\ \text { ts } \end{gathered}$ | Tools | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cere } \\ & \text { als } \\ & (\mathrm{gm}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pulse } \\ \mathrm{s} \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | Green <br> Leafy <br> veg <br> (gm) | root \& tubers (gm) | Fruits (gm) | milk <br> (ml) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { fat \& } \\ \text { oils } \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | meat <br> fish $\operatorname{egg}(g$ m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sugar } \\ \& \\ \text { Jagga } \\ \text { ry } \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peanu } \\ & \mathrm{t} \text { (gm) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-10 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10-20 | 5 | Mean | 400 | 60 | 200 | 180 | 150 | 400 | 30 | 90 | 40 | 20 |
|  |  | Std | 320 | 50 | 150 | 150 | 100 | 600 | 30 | 80 | 30 | 30 |
|  |  | Differen | +80 | +10 | +50 | +30 | +50 | -200 | - | +10 | +10 | -10 |
|  |  | ce | 280 | 50 | 200 | 100 | 100 | 400 | 30 | - | 30 | - |
| 20-30 | 7 | Mean | 300 | 60 | 125 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 30 | 30 | 30 | - |
|  |  | Std | -20 | -10 | +75 | +25 | +70 | +200 | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | Differen | 300 | 90 | 100 | 100 | 80 | 250 | 45 | 40 | 40 | 20 |
|  |  |  | 300 | 60 | 125 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 30-40 | 3 | Mean | - | -10 | -25 | +25 | +50 | +50 | +5 | +10 | +10 | -10 |
|  |  | Std | 300 | 60 | 200 | 120 | 90 | 400 | 45 | 40 | 40 | 10 |
|  |  | Differen | 300 | 60 | 125 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  |  | ce | - | - | +75 | +45 | +69 | +200 | +15 | +10 | +10 | -20 |
| 40-60 | 20 | Mean | 290 | 55 | 200 | 70 | 25 | 150 | 25 | - | 25 | - |
|  |  | Std | 300 | 60 | 125 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  |  | Differen | -10 | -5 | +75 | +5 | +5 | +50 | -5 | - | -5 | - |
|  |  |  | 260 | 50 | 200 | 60 | 40 | 100 | 25 | - | 35 | - |
| 60-70 | 10 | Mean | 300 | 60 | 125 | 75 | 30 | 200 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  |  | Std | -20 | -10 | +75 | -15 | +10 | -100 | -5 | - | +5 | - |
|  |  | Differen ce |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70> | 1 | Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Std |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Differen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ce |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

It is clear from table $-1 b$ that the amount of food consumed by the respondents relating to cereals, Pulses is below the recommended ICMR standards whereas the amounts of vegetables, fruits, sugar \& milk consumed are above the ICMR std in each group. This will influence the intake of the nutrients per day by the respondents. The respondents of 60 to $>70$ years age group consume fruit, milk, fat, meat and fish in low amounts than the ICMR std. and in 10-20 years age group respondents consumed cereals, Meat, sugar in high amounts than the ICMR std.

On statistical analysis of tables 1 a and 1 b , applying student -t test it is seen that the null hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the amounts of cereals consumed by males and females per day". Stands selected as t calculated value - 2.24 at 5 d.f. and $5 \%$ level of significance is less than table value $=2.571$.

Also the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the amounts of Pulses consumed by males and female per day" stands selected as $t$ calculated value 2.14 at 5 d.f. and $5 \%$ level of significance is less than table value $=$ 2.571 .

Also the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the amounts of green leafy vegetables, root and tubers, fruits, milk, fats and oil, meat and fish and egg and sugar and Jiggery consumed by males and females as t
calculated values $2.10,2.24,2.17,2.19,2.23$, $2.35,2.41$ at 5 d.f. and $5 \%$ level of significance are less than table values.

Table - 2 a: Nutrient intake by male subjects

| Age <br> Grou <br> p in <br> yrs | No. of pati ents | Tools | Calori <br> e (k <br> cal) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Protei } \\ \mathrm{n} \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Fats \& } \\ \text { oil } \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ca} \\ (\mathrm{mg}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Fe} \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | B Caroten e (micro gm) | Thia <br> mine (mg) | Ribofla vin (micro gm) | Niacin <br> (micro gm) | Ascorbi c acid (mg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7-9 | 01 | Mean | 2000 | 50 | 30 | 600 | 30 | 3000 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 14 | 400 |
|  |  | Std | 1950 | 41 | 25 | 400 | 26 | 2400 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 13 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | 50 | +2 | +5 | +200 | +4 | +600 | +. 1 | - | +1 | +360 |
| 10-20 | 01 | Mean | 2000 | 58 | 35 | 800 | 32 | 2500 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 14 | 600 |
|  |  | Std | 2190 | 54 | 22 | 600 | 34 | 2400 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 15 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | +190 | +4 | +13 | +200 | +2 | +100 | -. 1 | -. 1 | -1 | -560 |
| 20-30 | 3 | Mean | 2430 | 70 | 40 | 900 | 20 | 2600 | . 1 | 1.2 | 18 | 500 |
|  |  | Std | 2425 | 60 | 20 | 400 | 28 | 2400 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 16 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | +5 | +10 | +20 | +500 | -8 | +200 | -1.1 | -. 2 | +2 | +460 |
| 30-40 | 3 | Mean | 3000 | 60 | 40 | 600 | 25 | 2500 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 13 | 700 |
|  |  | Std | 2875 | 60 | 20 | 400 | 28 | 2400 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 18 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | +125 | - | +20 | +200 | -3 | +100 | -4 | -. 2 | -5 | +660 |
| 40-60 | 2 | Mean | 2500 | 50 | 30 | 500 | 20 | 2600 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 12 | 700 |
|  |  | Std | 2425 | 60 | 20 | 400 | 28 | 2400 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 16 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | -75 | -10 | +10 | +100 | -8 | +200 | -. 2 | -. 2 | -4 | +660 |
| 60-70 | 3 | Mean | 2100 | 50 | 30 | 700 | 25 | 2600 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 14 | 400 |
|  |  | Std | $2425$ | $60$ | $20$ | $400$ | 28 | 2400 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 16 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | -325 | -10 | -10 | +300 | -3 | +200 | -. 1 | -. 2 | -2 | -360 |
| 70> |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

It is clear from the table-2a that the amount of nutrients intake by the respondents relating to calorie, fat, calcium and ascorbic acid are above the recommended ICMR standards where as the amounts of Iron, Thiamine intake are below the ICMR standard. The intake of the
respondent of 40-70 years age group with reference to Protein, Niacin and Iron is lower than the ICMR stds. In 7-9 years age group and $10-20$ years age groups the intake of Iron and Niacin is more than RDA.

Table-2 b: Nutrient intake by female subjects

| Age Group in yrs | No. of patient s | Tools | Calorie (k cal) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Protei } \\ \mathrm{n} \\ (\mathrm{gm}) \end{gathered}$ | Fats <br> \& oil <br> (gm) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Ca} \\ (\mathrm{mg}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Fe} \\ & (\mathrm{gm}) \end{aligned}$ | B Caroten e (micro gm) | Thia <br> mine <br> (mg) | Ribofl avin (micro gm) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Niaci } \\ \text { n } \\ (\mathrm{micr} \\ \mathrm{ogm}) \end{gathered}$ | Asco <br> rbic <br> acid <br> (mg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10-20 | 5 | Mean | 2000 | 65 | 25 | 450 | 31 | 2200 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 14 | 400 |
|  |  | Std | 2060 | 63 | 22 | 500 | 30 | 2400 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 14 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | -60 | +2 | +3 | +50 | +1 | -200 | -5 | -0.1 | - | +360 |
| 20-30 | 7 | Mean | 1870 | 60 | 20 | 720 | 33 | 2000 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 10 | 200 |
|  |  | Std | 1875 | 50 | 20 | 400 | 30 | 2400 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 12 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | -5 | +10 | - | +320 | +2 | -400 | -. 1 | -0.1 | -2 | -160 |
| 30-40 | 3 | Mean | 2000 | 78 | 26.5 | 600 | 29 | 2300 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 10 | 500 |
|  |  | Std | 1875 | 50 | 22.0 | 400 | 30 | 2400 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 12 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | +125 | +28 | +6.5 | +200 | -1 | -100 | +0.4 | -. 1 | -2 | -460 |
| 40-60 | 2 | Mean | 1900 | 55 | 21.0 | 530 | 22 | 2500 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 11 | 400 |
|  |  | Std | 1875 | 50 | 22 | 400 | 30 | 2400 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 12 | 40 |
|  |  | Difference | +25 | +5 | -1 | +130 | -8 | +100 | +0.2 | +2 | -1 | +360 |
| 60-70 | 10 | Mean | 1895 | 56 | 21.0 | 560 | 28 | $2600$ | $1.1$ | 1.0 | 21 | 400 |
|  |  | Std | 1875 | 50 | 21.0 | 400 | 30 | 2400 | . 9 | 1.1 | 12 | 40 |
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|  |  | Difference | +20 | +6 | -1 | +160 | -2 | +200 | -.2 | -.1 | +9 | +360 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $70>$ | 1 | Mean | 1925 | 70 | 25.0 | 600 | 25 | 2700 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 14 | 800 |
|  |  | Std | 1875 | 50 | 25.0 | 400 | 30 | 2400 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 12 | 400 |
|  |  | Difference | +50 | +20 | +3 | +200 | +5 | +300 | +2 | -0.1 | +2 | +400 |

It is clear from table-2b that the amount of nutrients intake by the respondents relating to calorie, protein, fat, calcium and Ascorbic acid are above the recommended ICMR standards whereas the amounts of iron, B carotene intake are below the ICMR Standard. The intake of B Carotene and Thiamine in the respondents of 30 to $>70$ yrs age group is in high amounts than the ICMR stds. In (10-20) yrs, ( $20-30$ yrs and (30-40) yrs age groups the intake of Niacin, Iron, Riboflavin is lower than the ICMR stds. In 10 to 20 yrs age group the intake of Thiamine is lower than the ICMR standards. On statistical analysis of table 2 a and table 2 b i.e. on applying Student test it is seen that the null hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the amounts of caloric consumed by males and female per day" stands selected as $t$ calculated value -2.51 at 5 d.f. and $5 \%$ level of significance is less than table value $=$ 2.571 .

Null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the amounts of protein and fat consumed by males and females per day stands selected as t calculated value 2.21 and 2.35 at 5 d.f. and $5 \%$ level of significance is less than table value 2.57 . There is no significant difference in the amounts of Calcium, Iron, B Carotene, Thiamine, Riboflavin, Niacin and Ascorbic acid intake by males and females per day stands selected as $t$ calculated values $2.45,2.51,2.14$, $2.23,2.15,2.43$, and 2.25 at 5 d.f. and $5 \%$ level of significance is less than table values.

## CONCLUSION

From the finding it is concluded that no significant difference in food intake of patient on the basis of sex. People in higher income groups and those consuming rich purine non vegetarian diets were more susceptible to Rheumatoid Arthritis as has been observed after during various appropriate significance test. It was further revealed the nutrition education was responsible for fall in the serum uric acid levels in majority of the cases.
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