

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Health and Food Articles

Health and food articles present some particular difficulties for Wikipedia for some obvious reasons: Wikipedia cannot present as facts information that is questionable, fringe, or still in development. It is essential that the community around these articles is one of the most lively on Wikipedia. However, these editors often focus on these questions of reliability, notability, and verifiability. Thus, there is also a great need and significant openings for bold edits in the actual writing form of these articles.

This document is to help you work with a medicine and food related article.

Remember that there are no firm rules in Wikipedia. However, as per the notion of consensus, we have to work with what the community expresses. This is particularly important in this case as these need to be carefully checked and appropriately tailored.

Policy Pages

[WP:MOS/Medicine-related articles](#)

[WikiProject Medicine](#)

[WikiProject Food and Drink](#)

[Handling technical information](#)

Major Issues

Food and health articles may seem like an easy project when first looked at, but they tend to have a lot of complex issues happening that an editor might not be able to see until they start working on them.

1. Worked on by experienced editors

The first obstacle is not to be intimidated by the authority of other editors. These types of articles tend to have been created or heavily worked on by experienced Wikipedia editors who keep track of the things going on within these articles. These experiences vary, sometimes they can be helpful for the student to interact with someone who knows the article so well, and other times the experienced editor tends to police the edits made to the article.

Example: Coconut Milk -- ([Before](#) + [After](#) + [Talk Page](#))

The student encountered an editor policing their work on the article, and reached out to them to ask them to clarify their reasons for doing so.

Example: Basic Life Support -- ([Before](#) + [after](#) + [Talk Page](#))

An editor from the community came in to inform the student of the danger of adding all of their edits in a single upload. From here, the student took their advice graciously and asked for further advice on continuing edits on the article.

Example: Mushroom Hunting – ([Before](#) + [After](#) + [Talk Page](#))

Tons of subject matter experts float around on this talk page. This is an example of there being plenty of edit suggestions from the community to incorporate into a project.

2. Handling Fringe claims

Wikipedians are always on the lookout for fringe claims about health and food topics, to avoid claims of the sort like “A glass of wine lowers heart disease” or other open questions that are often made in food and health. You therefore need to be up to speed on the questions about verifiability and fringe claims and be careful to note and avoid these kinds of claims.

Sometimes these articles create significant underlying tone problems.

Example: [Fruitarianism](#) -- ([Before](#) + [After](#))

The [Fruitarianism](#) article has a lot of underlying Tone issues as well as problems with WP:V. Because it also falls under the WP:FRINGE category it has several editors who are policing it to keep vandals away which requires even more communication with the community.

An argument ensued on this talk page because of some editors preventing someone from making poor edits.

1) Unclear Organization and Content focus

[Zefr](#) Your intervention would have a lot more credibility if it was not accompanied by complete reversion of obviously beneficial contributions with such an insulting summary. By all means, respond to what I have pointed out about what the actual reference gives says. To be quite frank, I don't believe anyone else has actually read it in its entirety. So perhaps you are the one who should stop edit warring and add something of benefit to the topic instead.

As far as I can see, you have added nothing of any benefit whatsoever. Thank you. --[Danny Mamby \(talk\)](#) 19:49, 26 November 2021 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Psychologist Guy has presented a credible case and sources. You are defending a weak opinion with equally weak sources or blogs. The article before your edits was adequate to define this narrow fad diet. [Zefr \(talk\)](#) 19:58, 26 November 2021 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

That is an absolutely dishonest statement. I have not included one blog source whatsoever. I am referring to and using precisely the same reference that Psychologist Guy is. Have you actually read it? I think not because if you had, you'd recognize the quote I am using from it.--[Danny Mamby \(talk\)](#) 20:05, 26 November 2021 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

[@Zefr](#)., A gentle reminder not to use phrasing such as "poor writing" in edit summaries that could be construed as rude or uncivil. [Pyrrho the Skeptic \(talk\)](#) 20:14, 26 November 2021 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

Thank you. If you look closely at their reversions, you'll also see it is Zefr who is restoring incredibly poor quality blog references but yet accusing me for doing so in their summaries, when I actually removed them. I hope that is enough for others to see what is going on here. --[Danny Mamby \(talk\)](#) 20:43, 26 November 2021 (UTC) [[reply](#)]

It is often unclear what food articles should have in them and how they should be organized.

Example: [Iced Coffee](#) – This article seems a relatively easy undertaking, but requires a lot of organizational thought as well as making decisions regarding keeping a worldwide perspective.

Contents [hide]	
1	History
2	Serving
3	Variations by country
3.1	Australia
3.2	Canada
3.3	Chile
3.4	China
3.5	Czechia
3.6	Germany
3.7	Greece
3.8	India
3.9	Italy
3.10	Japan
3.11	Philippines
3.12	Slovenia
3.13	Sri Lanka
3.14	Thailand
3.15	United States
3.16	Vietnam
4	See also
5	References

Note: Fitness and health articles often have an unclear structure as editors work out what to include and how.

Example: Health information on the internet – ([Before](#) and [after](#))

This is a general health topic that has to synthesize a lot of interests while avoiding NPOV and OR. Examine the difference between the table of contents of each version here to witness the difficulty in deciding how to frame all of this information.

Example: Alice in Wonderland Syndrome -- ([before](#) + [after](#))

Again, you can see between these two tables that there is often difficulty in deciding what to place focus on in the article. Notice in the before that literary references are at the top of the page, but end up at the bottom after editing.

Before

After

Contents [hide]	Contents [hide]
1 Signs and symptoms	1 Signs and symptoms
1.1 <i>Alice in Wonderland</i>	1.1 Visual Distortions
1.2 <i>Gulliver's Travels</i>	1.2 Hallucinations
2 Etiology	1.3 Hearing and Time Distortions
2.1 Cerebral hypotheses	2 Causes
2.2 Migraines	2.1 Cerebral hypotheses
3 Diagnosis	2.2 Migraines
4 Prognosis	2.3 Genetic and Environmental Influence
5 Treatment	3 Diagnosis
6 Epidemiology	4 Prognosis
7 History	5 Treatment
8 See also	6 Epidemiology
9 References	7 History
10 External links	8 Society and Culture
	8.1 "Gulliver's Travels"
	8.2 "Alice in Wonderland"
	9 See also
	10 References
	11 External links

Example: Shavasana -- ([Before](#) and [After](#) + [much After](#))

Here is a great example of an article lacking bold edits until several years go by. Bold editing done by the student may have helped solve the lack of focus in the article, specifically in the "Benefits" section where the article derails. This is removed much later on in the article's development.