

From: Frazier, Tamara

Sent: 4/21/2016 1:31:48 PM

To: TTAB EFiling

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 86447383 - NUTRIVERUS - 1002.0006 - EXAMINER BRIEF

Attachment Information:

Count: 7

Files: evid1-1.jpg, evid1-2.jpg, evid1-3.jpg, evid1-4.jpg, evid1-5.jpg, evid1-6.jpg, 86447383.doc

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 86447383

MARK: NUTRIVERUS



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

SANFORD E WARREN JR

Warren Rhoades LLP

1212 Corporate Drive, Suite 250

Irving TX 75038

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp>

TTAB INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/index.jsp>

APPLICANT: Mannatech, Incorporated

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

1002.0006

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

ipdocketing@wriplaw.com

EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S APPEAL BRIEF

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Applicant has appealed the Trademark Examining Attorney's final refusal to register the trademark "NUTRIVERUS" on the ground of likelihood of confusion, mistake or deception under Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. Section 1052(d), with U.S. Registration No. 3774292 ("NUVERUS").

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Applicant filed this application on November 6, 2014, applying to register on the Principal Register, the mark “NUTRIVERUS” for “Dietary and nutritional supplements sold through a multi-level marketing program.”

In the initial Office Action dated December 31, 2014, the examining attorney issued a 2(d) refusal based on U.S. Registration No. 3774292.

On April 14, 2015, applicant argued against the 2(d) refusal. In response, on May 13, 2015 the examining attorney issued a final action based on 2(d) refusal citing U.S. Registration No. 3774292. On November 13, 2015, applicant submitted a Request for Reconsideration which the examining attorney subsequently denied on December 12, 2015. This appeal has since ensued.

ISSUE ON APPEAL

The issue on appeal is whether the mark, when used in connection with the identified goods in International Class 005, so resembles the mark in U.S. Registration No. 3774292 as to be likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive under Trademark Act Section 2(d).

LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION REFUSAL

BECAUSE THE MARKS CREATE A HIGHLY SIMILAR COMMERCIAL IMPRESSION AND WILL BE APPLIED TO RELATED GOODS, CONSUMER CONFUSION AS TO SOURCE IS LIKELY

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration where an applied-for mark so resembles a registered mark that it is likely, when applied to the goods, to cause confusion, mistake or to deceive the potential consumer as to the source of the goods. TMEP §1207.01. The Court in *In re E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563 (C.C.P.A. 1973), listed the principal factors to consider in determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion. Among these factors are the similarity of the marks as to appearance, sound, meaning and commercial

impression, and the relatedness of the goods. The overriding concern is to prevent buyer confusion as to the source of the goods. *Miss Universe, Inc. v. Miss Teen U.S.A., Inc.*, 209 USPQ 698 (N.D. Ga. 1980). Therefore, any doubt as to the existence of a likelihood of confusion must be resolved in favor of registrant. *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 6 USPQ2d 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION REFUSAL

(A) SIMILARITY OF THE MARKS: THE MARKS CREATE A HIGHLY SIMILAR COMMERCIAL IMPRESSION

1. THE PARTIES' MARKS ARE SIMILAR BECAUSE THEY CONTAIN THE IDENTICAL DOMINANT FEATURE "VERUS" PREFACED WITH THE SIMILAR TERMS "NU"/"NUTRI"

Marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar. *In re White Swan Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988); see *In re 1st USA Realty Prof'ls, Inc.*, 84 USPQ2d 1581, 1586 (TTAB 2007); TMEP §1207.01(b).

In the instant case, applicant's mark is "NUTRIVERUS" with design and registrant's mark is "NUVERUS" with design. Although marks are compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression. See *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d 1056, 1058, 224 USPQ 749, 751 (Fed. Cir. 1985); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). Greater weight is often given to this dominant feature when determining whether marks are confusingly similar. See *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d at

1058, 224 USPQ at 751. Here, the dominant feature of the applicant's mark is "VERUS" because "NUTRI" is the root of the word "nutrition" and merely describes the applicant's applied-for goods, namely, nutritional supplements. Furthermore, the registrant's mark contains the identical dominant feature "VERUS", prefaced only with the similar word "NU", which would likely be perceived as a shortened version of "NUTRI" and/or a new product within the same family of goods.

Applicant argues that "the Examiner misapplied controlling law by improperly dissecting Applicant's Mark for comparison against NU VERUS & Design for likelihood of confusion. The Examiner has no right to dissect Applicant's Mark into two terms 'NUTRI' and 'VERUS' when the mark itself forms a single, fanciful, new word, 'nutriverus', and should be viewed as a whole."¹ Applicant further states that "the Examiner incorrectly concluded that the term 'NUTRI' is 'descriptive' or 'less significant' than the term 'VERUS'. To the contrary, the term 'NUTRIVERUS', when considered in its entirety, is suggestive and cannot be dissected into two terms."²

However, as previously mentioned, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression, especially in cases such as this where the less significant wording is descriptive. In the present case, the attached evidence shows that the wording "nutrition" is defined as "the act or process of nourishing or of being nourished."³ Thus, the prefix "NUTRI" as intended by applicant, is descriptive of applicant's nutritional supplements and is less significant in terms of affecting

1 See Appellant's Brief, pg. 3.

2 See Appellant's Brief, pg. 6.

3 See Dictionary.com Unabridged. Random House, Inc. <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/nutrition> (accessed: April 07, 2016). The Trademark Trial and Appeal Board may take judicial notice of definitions obtained from dictionaries that (1) are available in a printed format, (2) are the electronic equivalent of a print reference work, or (3) have regular fixed editions. TBMP §1208.04; *see* Fed. R. Evid. 201; 37 C.F.R. §2.122(a); *In re Dietrich*, 91 USPQ2d 1622, 1631 n.15 (TTAB 2009) (taking judicial notice of definition from Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary at www.merriam-webster.com); *In re Petroglyph Games Inc.*, 91 USPQ2d 1332, 1334 n.1 (TTAB 2009) (taking judicial notice of definition from Dictionary.com because it was from The Random House Unabridged Dictionary); *In re Red Bull GmbH*, 78 USPQ2d 1375, 1378 (TTAB 2006) (taking judicial notice of definition from Encarta Dictionary because it was readily available in specifically denoted editions via the Internet and CD-ROM); TMEP §710.01(c).

the mark's commercial impression. As such, the wording "VERUS" is the more dominant element of the mark.

Nonetheless, even when considering the marks as a whole, the overall commercial impression is similar and likely to cause confusion. Specifically, it is well established that marks may be confusingly similar in appearance where similar terms or phrases or similar parts of terms or phrases appear in the compared marks and create a similar overall commercial impression. *See Crocker Nat'l Bank v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, 228 USPQ 689, 690-91 (TTAB 1986), *aff'd sub nom. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l Ass'n*, 811 F.2d 1490, 1495, 1 USPQ2d 1813, 1817 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (finding COMMCASH and COMMUNICASH confusingly similar); *In re Corning Glass Works*, 229 USPQ 65, 66 (TTAB 1985) (finding CONFIRM and CONFIRMCELLS confusingly similar); *In re Pellerin Milnor Corp.*, 221 USPQ 558, 560 (TTAB 1983) (finding MILTRON and MILLTRONICS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(ii)-(iii). Here, the marks are confusingly similar because they both begin with "NU" and end with "VERUS". Indeed, analogous to *In re Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, the only difference between the marks is that applicant's mark contains "TRI" in the center.

It is also worth noting that in applicant's previous appeal for US Application No. 85558774, in which the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board affirmed the examining attorney's 2(d) refusal for the mark "NUTRIVERUS" in standard character, the Board stated that: *the first part of Applicant's mark NUTRIVERUS is the root of the word "nutrition" which, in the context of Applicant's goods, nutritional supplements, indicates nutrition and, as such, at a minimum is highly suggestive of the goods. By comparison, VERUS is arbitrary in connection with nutritional supplements and carries a stronger source-identifying significance.*⁴

⁴ See *In re Mannatech, Incorporated*, Serial No. 85558774, TTAB, October 22, 2014 [non-precedential].

Indeed, even though the prior mark (85558774) was a standard character mark, the Board referred to applicant's use of the stylized version of its mark on its specimen to show that NUTRI could be presented as a prefix and VERUS as distinct. Thus, given the fact that the dominant feature of the parties' marks (VERUS) is identical, the strong arbitrary nature of this dominant feature, and the fact that the marks are used for essentially identical goods, there is a likelihood of confusion.

2. THE DESIGN ELEMENTS OF THE PARTIES' MARKS DO NOT OBVIATE LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

The applicant argues that "the pictorial representation as a whole of NU VERUS & Design is so highly stylized, both in color and design, that it would not readily evoke in a purchaser's mind the word 'NUVERUS'. The word 'NU' clearly stands out in bold lettering and is attached to a large, distinctive design of a mortar and pestle, whereas the word 'VERUS' is independent and in ... smaller lettering."⁵ However, for a composite mark containing both words and a design, the word portion may be more likely to be impressed upon a purchaser's memory and to be used when requesting the goods. *Joel Gott Wines, LLC v. Rehoboth Von Gott, Inc.*, 107 USPQ2d 1424, 1431 (TTAB 2013) (citing *In re Dakin's Miniatures, Inc.*, 59 USPQ2d 1593, 1596 (TTAB 1999)); TMEP §1207.01(c)(ii); see *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908, 1911 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (citing *CBS Inc. v. Morrow*, 708 F. 2d 1579, 1581-82, 218 USPQ 198, 200 (Fed. Cir 1983)). Therefore, the fact that the cited mark and the applicant's mark contain a design component/stylization does not overcome a likelihood of confusion based on the similarity of the literal elements. Indeed, with regard to applicant's stylization, the design of the "V" in "NUTRIVERUS" is minimal at best and does not create a commercial impression different from the cited mark, but rather sets the dominant feature "VERUS" apart in such a way that it is likely to cause confusion with the registrant's mark "NU VERUS", which also sets the "VERUS" portion apart.

⁵ See Appellant's Brief, pg. 8.

Additionally, the applicant argues that “the color black of the [registrant’s] mark’s background is also a dominant feature of the mark, as the ‘background’ is the largest portion of the mark and has not been limited to size ... Thus, the black background is prominent and dominant in comparison to the words ‘NU’ and ‘VERUS.’”⁶ However, as previously discussed, the applicant’s mark is presented in very little stylization with no color claim. Therefore, it can be presented in any color and background including that which appears in the cited registration.

Applicant also argues that “[t]he words in neither NU VERUS & Design nor Applicant’s Mark are pronounced the same when compared in their entireties. The Examiner gave the term ‘TRI’ no meaningful legal weight in its similarity analysis. The term ‘TRI’ in Applicant’s Mark adds a syllable when spoken allowed, making the marks considerably different in sound.”⁷ However, slight differences in the sound of similar marks will not avoid a likelihood of confusion. *In re Energy Telecomm. & Elec. Ass’n*, 222 USPQ 350, 351 (TTAB 1983); see *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1367, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1912 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Nonetheless, as previously mentioned and affirmed by the Board, the marks are confusingly similar because they both begin with “NU” and end with “VERUS”.

Applicant references TMEP 1207.01(b)(i), which states “[s]imilarity of the marks in one respect – sight, sound, or meaning – will not automatically result in a determination that confusion is likely even if the goods are identical or closely related; rather, taking into account all of the relevant facts of a particular case...”⁸ However, the pertinent TMEP section continues “similarity as to one factor alone may be sufficient to support a holding that the marks are confusingly similar.” Therefore, based on the identical arbitrary wording “VERUS”, as well as the very similar prefix NU/NUTRI, the marks are so

6 See Appellant’s Brief, pg. 9.

7 See Appellant’s Brief, pg. 9.

8 See Appellant’s Brief, pgs. 11-12.

similar in their appearance, sound, connotation and commercial impression that there is a likelihood of confusion.

Lastly, where the goods of an applicant and registrant are “similar in kind and/or closely related,” the degree of similarity between the marks required to support a finding of likelihood of confusion is not as great as in the case of diverse goods and/or services. *In re J.M. Originals Inc.*, 6 USPQ2d 1393, 1394 (TTAB 1987); *see Shen Mfg. Co. v. Ritz Hotel Ltd.*, 393 F.3d 1238, 1242, 73 USPQ2d 1350, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004); TMEP §1207.01(b). Since the parties’ goods are identical in part, and the evidence illustrates that they are used in the same multi-marketing trade channels, the degree of similarity between the marks required to support a finding of likelihood of confusion is not as great as in the case of diverse goods.

Based on the above arguments, the marks are so similar in their appearance, sound, connotation and commercial impression that there is a likelihood of confusion.

(B) SIMILARITY OF THE GOODS: APPLICANT’S IDENTIFIED GOODS ARE RELATED, AND CAN BE EXPECTED TO EMANATE FROM THE SAME SOURCE AS REGISTRANT’S GOODS

The goods of the parties need not be identical or even competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. *See On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Recot, Inc. v. Becton*, 214 F.3d 1322, 1329, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1898 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“[E]ven if the goods in question are different from, and thus not related to, one another in kind, the same goods can be related in the mind of the consuming public as to the origin of the goods.”); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

The respective goods need only be “related in some manner and/or if the circumstances surrounding their marketing [be] such that they could give rise to the mistaken belief that [the

goods and/or services] emanate from the same source.” *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler*, 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1724 (TTAB 2007)); *Gen. Mills Inc. v. Fage Dairy Processing Indus. SA*, 100 USPQ2d 1584, 1597 (TTAB 2011); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

In present case, the applicant’s identified goods are “Dietary and nutritional supplements sold through a multi-level marketing program” in Class 005. The registrant’s goods are (in part) “Liquid nutritional supplement; Nutritional supplements; Vitamin and mineral supplements” in Class 005. As such, both parties provide nutritional supplements.

Applicant argues that its “application specifically limits its channels of trade to dietary and nutritional supplements sold through a multilevel marketing program.”⁹ The applicant further argues that “independent distributors and company sponsors specifically educate and market the products to consumers, making the avoidance of any confusion inherent. Therefore, consumers would not assume that the goods [emanate] from a common source as they could not be marketed and sold together and/or in the same channels of trade.”¹⁰

However, likelihood of confusion is determined on the basis of the goods identified in the application and registration. If the application or registration describes the goods broadly and there are no limitations as to their nature, type, channels of trade or classes of purchasers, it is presumed that the application and registration encompasses all goods of the type described, that they move in all normal channels of trade, and that they are available to all potential customers. *See In re Melville Corp.*, 18 USPQ2d 1386, 1388 (TTAB 1991) (“With reference to the channels of trade, applicant’s argument that its goods are sold only in its own retail stores is not persuasive ... There

⁹ See Appellant’s Brief, pg. 12.

¹⁰ See Appellant’s Brief, pg. 12.

is no restriction [in its identification of goods] as to the channels of trade in which the goods are sold”); TMEP §1207.01(a)(iii). Here, the registrant’s goods are listed as “Liquid nutritional supplement; Nutritional supplements; Vitamin and mineral supplements” with no limitation. Therefore, it is presumed that the registration encompasses all goods of the type described, including those in the applicant’s identification, that they move in all normal channels of trade, and that they are available to all potential customers.

Furthermore, the presumption under Trademark Act Section 7(b), 15 U.S.C. §1057(b), is that the registrant is the owner of the mark and that use of the mark extends to all goods identified in the registration. The presumption also implies that the registrant operates in all normal channels of trade and reaches all classes of purchasers of the identified goods. *In re Melville Corp.*, 18 USPQ2d 1386, 1389 (TTAB 1991); *McDonald’s Corp. v. McKinley*, 13 USPQ2d 1895, 1899 (TTAB 1989); *RE/MAX of Am., Inc. v. Realty Mart, Inc.*, 207 USPQ 960, 964-65 (TTAB 1980); *see* TMEP §1207.01(a)(iii). In the case at issue, it is quite plausible that the registrant’s supplements are sold in the same channels of trade as the applicant’s supplements. Indeed, in the Request for Reconsideration denial, the examining attorney attached an article which discusses 7 multilevel marketing companies and states with regard to such companies that “*there are probably close to 100 or more companies with vitamins and/or health and wellness products...*”¹¹ In the same Office action, the examining attorney provided evidence illustrating multi-level marketing supplements such as Herbalife often appear among other supplements in popular trade channels such as Amazon.¹² And perhaps most compelling, the evidence also includes the cited registrant’s website which appears to discuss multi-level marketing opportunities related to its supplements as

11 See Request for Reconsideration Denial dated December 12, 2015, pgs. 2-3.

12 See Request for Reconsideration Denial dated December 12, 2015, pgs. 9-14.

well.¹³ Indeed, by applicant's own admission, the "Registrant's website also suggests that Registrant is a multi-level marketing program..."¹⁴ Based on the registrant's identification of goods and referenced evidence, it is highly probable the goods travel in the same channels of trade.

Therefore, contrary to applicant's argument that its goods are unrelated to the cited registrant's goods due to the former's limitation to multi-level marketing channels of trade, the aforementioned evidence actually further indicates that the parties provide very similar marks (NUVERUS/NUTRIVERUS) for essentially identical goods (nutritional supplements provided through multi-level marketing).

(C) SOPHISTICATION OF PURCHASERS DOES NOT OVERCOME A LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Applicant argues that "each party sells their respective goods through distributors/sponsors via a multi-level marketing program, consumers are well educated in the source of the goods as well as the product lines prior to making a purchase. The decision to purchase these goods is not made in haste, thus greatly reducing the likelihood of confusion."¹⁵ However, the fact that purchasers are sophisticated or knowledgeable in a particular field does not necessarily mean that they are sophisticated or knowledgeable in the field of trademarks or immune from source confusion. TMEP §1207.01(d)(vii); *see, e.g., Imagineering Inc. v. Van Klassens Inc.*, 53 F.3d 1260, 1265, 34 USPQ2d 1526, 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *Top Tobacco LP v. N. Atl. Operating Co.*, 101 USPQ2d 1163, 1170 (TTAB 2011). Here, there is nothing to indicate that the parties' consumers have some form of specialized knowledge or expertise. As such, upon the average consumer encountering the similar terms "NUTRIVERUS" and "NUVERUS",

13 See Request for Reconsideration Denial dated December 12, 2015, pgs. 15-21.

14 See Appellant's Brief, pg. 13.

15 See Appellant's Brief, pgs. 13.

both for supplements provided within a multi-level marketing capacity, there will be a likelihood of confusion.

**(D) THIRD PARTY REGISTRATIONS ARE NOT BINDING AND DO NOT OBVIATE LIKELIHOOD OF
CONFUSION**

Lastly, applicant references third-party registrations for marks containing the wording “NU” vs “NUTRI” combined with identical wording to support the argument that the applicant’s and registrant’s marks can co-exist. However, prior decisions and actions of other trademark examining attorneys in registering other marks have little evidentiary value and are not binding upon the USPTO or the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. TMEP §1207.01(d)(vi); *see In re Midwest Gaming & Entm’t LLC*, 106 USPQ2d 1163, 1165 n.3 (TTAB 2013) (citing *In re Nett Designs, Inc.*, 236 F.3d 1339, 1342, 57 USPQ2d 1564, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 2001)). Each case is decided on its own facts, and each mark stands on its own merits. *See AMF Inc. v. Am. Leisure Prods., Inc.*, 474 F.2d 1403, 1406, 177 USPQ 268, 269 (C.C.P.A. 1973); *In re Binion*, 93 USPQ2d 1531, 1536 (TTAB 2009).

Nonetheless, the majority of the examples referenced by the applicant contain the term “NU”/“NUTRI” and are combined with highly suggestive/descriptive wording. However, the marks at issue share the very similar wording “NU”/“NUTRI” combined with the common identical arbitrary wording “VERUS”.

CONCLUSION

Applicant’s mark NUTRIVERUS is likely to be confused with registrant’s mark NUVERUS because applicant’s mark creates a highly similar commercial impression and the marks are used on goods that are essentially identical in part, and otherwise closely related. For the foregoing reasons, it is

respectfully submitted that the refusal of registration under Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. Section 1052(d), be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

/tfrazier/

Tamara Frazier

Trademark Attorney

Law Office 116

(571) 272-8256

tamara.frazier@uspto.gov

Christine Cooper

Managing Attorney

Law Office 116

- Dictionary.com
 - Word of the Day
 - Translate
 - Games
 - Blog
- Thesaurus.com
- Apps
- Favorites
- Log Out
- Log In

Follow Dictionary.com

Dictionary.com Thesaurus.com

Word of the Day Translate Games Blog

nutrition

definitions

nutrition

[noo-trish-uh n, nyoo-] /nuˈtriʃən, nyu-/

[Spell](#) [Syllables](#)
Examples Word Origin
[See more synonyms on Thesaurus.com](#)

- noun**
1. the act or process of nourishing or of being nourished.
 2. the science or study of, or a course of study in, nutrition, especially of humans.
 3. the process by which organisms take in and utilize food material.
 4. food: nutriment.

4. food; nutriment.
5. the pursuit of this science as an occupation or profession.

Origin of nutrition



1375-1425; late Middle English < Late Latin *nutritiōn-* (stem of *nutrītus*) a feeding, equivalent to Latin *nutrī(us)* (past participle of *nutrīre* to feed, nourish) + *-iōn-* *-iōn*

Related forms

nutritional, **nutritional**, adjective

nutritionally, adverb

hypernutrition, noun

supernutrition, noun

Dictionary.com Unabridged

Based on the Random House Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2016.

Cite This Source

Examples from the Web for nutrition

Contemporary Examples

- The lightly caffeinated beverage tapered my appetite while ensuring I had some *nutrition*.
- Can You Live on a 220-Calorie-a-Day Diet? Gregory Ferenstein June 1, 2014
- This has been a theme in *nutrition* policy since the beginning.
- Everything You Know About Fat Is Wrong Daniela Drake May 6, 2014
- I would like to reexamine what Salinger has to say about health and *nutrition*.
- Salinger's Final Mystery Nathaniel Rich January 28, 2010
- They learn about makeup application, photo shoots, *nutrition* and the nature of the modeling beast.
- Camp Fashion Design Draws Budding Designers To New York Robin Givhan July 12, 2012
- He is a consultant for Foodminds, which specializes "in food, beverage, *nutrition*, health and wellness."
- The Heart Association's Junk Science Diet Dr. Barbara H. Roberts May 21, 2014

Historical Examples

- The mode of *nutrition* of the ovum may be very instructively studied in this type.
- The Works of Francis Maitland Balfour, Volume II (of 4) Francis Maitland Balfour
- The chief requisite is a firm soil that contains plenty of *nutrition*.
- Commercial Geography Jacques W. Redway
- The mineral constituents of milk have many important functions to perform in the building up and *nutrition* of the bodily organism.
- The *Bacillus* of Long Life Loudon Douglas
- The faculties of *nutrition* and imagination have neither virtues nor vices.
- A History of Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy Isaac Husik
- They approach the proteids in composition, but unlike them they cannot form flesh or fulfil the same purpose in *nutrition*.
- The Chemistry of Food and Nutrition A. W. Duncan

British Dictionary definitions for nutrition

nutrition

njuːˈtrɪʃən

noun

process in animals and plants involving the intake of nutrient materials and their subsequent assimilation into the tissues *related adjectives* alimentary trophic

2. the act or process of nourishing

- the study of nutrition, esp in humans

Derived Forms

nutritional, (rare) **nutrionary**, **adjective**
nutritionally, **adverb**

Word Origin

C16: from Late Latin *nutritio*, from *nutrire* to nourish

Collins English Dictionary - Complete & Unabridged 2012 Digital Edition
© William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd. 1979, 1986 © HarperCollins
Publishers 1998, 2000, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2012

[Cite This Source](#)



Word Origin and History for nutrition

n.



early 15c., from Old French *nutrition* (14c.) and directly from Latin *nutritionem* (nominative *nutritio*) "a nourishing," noun of action from past participle stem of *nutrire* "to nourish, suckle" (see *nourish*).

Online Etymology Dictionary, © 2010 Douglas Harper

[Cite This Source](#)

nutrition in Medicine

nutrition nu-tri-shən (nôo-trish'an, nyôo-)

n.

- The process by which a living organism assimilates food and uses it for growth, liberation of energy, and replacement of tissues; its successive stages include digestion, absorption, assimilation, and excretion.
- The science or study that deals with food and nourishment, especially in humans.

nutrition *adj.*

The American Heritage® Stedman's Medical Dictionary

Copyright © 2002, 2001, 1995 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company.

[Cite This Source](#)

nutrition in Science

nutrition

(nôo-trish'an)



LINK TO DEFINITION

1. The process by which living organisms obtain food and use it for growth, metabolism, and repair. The stages of nutrition include ingestion, digestion, absorption, transport, assimilation, and excretion.
2. The scientific study of food and nourishment, including food composition, dietary guidelines, and the roles that various nutrients have in maintaining health.

The American Heritage® Science Dictionary
Copyright © 2002. Published by Houghton Mifflin. All rights reserved.
[Cite This Source](#)

Word of the Day

 
Difficulty index for nutrition
Most English speakers likely know this word

Word Value for nutrition

9
12
Scrabble Words With Friends

Related Words

- nutritive
- recommended dietary allowance
- US RDA

- -trophy
- additive
- agrobiolology



Nearby words for nutrition

nutrigenetics
nutrigenomics
nutrilite
nutriment
nutrimental
nutrition
nutritional
nutritional genomics
nutritionist
nutritionist's calorie
nutritious

- About
- Terms
- Privacy
- Careers
- Apps
- Contact Us