MEDICAL LETTER

Review Article
Volume: 3
Issue: 1

Micronutrient Fortification: Evidence, Implementation Challenges and Public Health Priorities

Dr. Amit Sachdeva[1*], Mr Nasim Ahmed[2], Mrs. Tamanna Rahman[3], Dr. Anju Sachdeva[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Indira Gandhi Medical College, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh
[2]Independent Researcher, Guwahati Assam, India Email: nasim@iarcon.org
[3]MSc in Herbal Science and Technology, Anandaram Dhekial Phookan College under Guwahati University, Assam
[4]Physiotherapist, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

Received: Mar. 13, 2026; Revised: Apr. 11, 2026; Accepted: May. 13, 2026; Published: June. 30, 2026

Under a Creative Commons license *Doi: 10.47310/medlet.2026.v03i01.015*

Abstract: Micronutrient fortification is the deliberate addition of vitamins or minerals to foods to improve their nutritional quality and reduce population-level deficiencies. Large-scale fortification of widely consumed staples and condiments—including salt, flour, rice, edible oil and milk—can reach broad populations without requiring sustained individual behaviour change. Established examples include salt iodization, folic acid fortification of cereal grains, vitamin A fortification of oils and iron fortification of flour or rice. Evidence indicates that well-designed programmes can improve micronutrient status and reduce outcomes such as iodine-deficiency disorders, iron-deficiency anaemia and neural tube defects. Nevertheless, effects vary according to the selected food vehicle, fortificant bioavailability, baseline deficiency, consumption patterns, industrial coverage and regulatory compliance. Fortification cannot address every cause of anaemia or malnutrition, and indiscriminate implementation may create risks of inadequate delivery, excessive intake, inequitable coverage or diversion of attention from dietary diversity and health-system interventions. India has established standards for fortified salt, rice, wheat flour, milk and edible oil, including iron, folic acid, vitamin B12, iodine and vitamins A and D. The expansion of fortified rice through public food programmes provides substantial potential reach but has generated debate regarding evidence, quality assurance, informed communication and safety monitoring. Micronutrient fortification should be treated as one component of an integrated nutrition strategy that includes diverse diets, supplementation for high-risk groups, infection control, sanitation and clinical management. Future programmes require biomarker-based needs assessment, independent quality surveillance, monitoring of total micronutrient exposure and transparent evaluation of health outcomes.

Keywords: food fortification; micronutrients; hidden hunger; fortified rice; anaemia; public health nutrition

INTRODUCTION

Micronutrients are vitamins and minerals required in small quantities but essential for growth, immune function, cognition, metabolism, reproduction and healthy ageing. Deficiencies of iron, iodine, vitamin A, folate, zinc, vitamin B12 and vitamin D remain important public health concerns, particularly among children, adolescents, women of reproductive age and populations with restricted dietary diversity. WHO identifies deficiencies of iron, vitamin A and iodine among the most common micronutrient deficiencies worldwide.[1]

Micronutrient fortification is the deliberate increase of one or more vitamins or minerals in a food or condiment to improve the nutritional quality of the food supply and provide a public health benefit with minimal risk.[1] It can also restore nutrients lost during processing. Fortification differs from supplementation, which delivers nutrients in concentrated forms such as tablets or syrups to individuals or target groups. It also differs from biofortification, which increases the nutrient content of crops through conventional breeding, agronomic practices or biotechnology.

The attraction of fortification is its potential to reach large populations through foods they already consume. Once integrated into milling, refining or food-distribution systems, fortification requires little active participation from consumers. However, its apparent simplicity can be misleading. Programme effectiveness depends on whether the selected food is regularly consumed by the intended population, whether nutrient levels remain stable during storage and cooking, and whether manufacturers consistently meet standards.

In 2023, the World Health Assembly adopted a resolution urging countries to accelerate safe and effective food fortification and strengthen financing, monitoring and implementation.[2] This renewed global emphasis reflects both the persistence of micronutrient deficiencies and the incomplete performance of many existing programmes.

Forms of Micronutrient Fortification

Mass or large-scale fortification

Mass fortification adds nutrients to foods consumed by most of the population. Examples include iodized salt, fortified wheat flour, rice and edible oil. It is most appropriate when a micronutrient deficiency is widespread and a centrally processed food reaches a large proportion of households.

Mandatory fortification can achieve wider and more equitable coverage than voluntary fortification because all regulated producers are required to comply. Its success, however, depends on the proportion of food processed through formal industrial channels. Populations relying on home-produced, locally milled or unpackaged foods may be missed.

Targeted fortification

Targeted fortification adds nutrients to foods distributed to groups with specific nutritional needs. Examples include fortified complementary foods, school meals, maternal foods and emergency rations. Targeting permits formulation according to age or physiological requirements but requires reliable identification and delivery systems.

Market-driven fortification

Manufacturers may voluntarily add vitamins or minerals to commercial foods and beverages. This can increase nutrient availability but may primarily reach wealthier consumers. It can also create misleading health halos around products high in sugar, sodium or saturated fat. Public health fortification should be distinguished from promotional nutrient addition designed mainly to support marketing claims.

or point-of-use fortification

Micronutrient powders or small-quantity lipid-based nutrient supplements are added to food immediately before consumption. These approaches can help young children or other vulnerable groups but require repeated caregiver action, correct dosing and reliable distribution. They function more like targeted supplementation than conventional mass fortification.

Selecting an Appropriate Food Vehicle

A suitable food vehicle should be consumed regularly and predictably by the intended population. It should be centrally processed through a limited number of facilities, allowing effective regulation and quality control. Fortification should not significantly alter taste, colour, smell, texture or cooking characteristics.

Salt is a strong vehicle for iodine because consumption is widespread and relatively stable. However, salt-fortification policy must remain consistent with population sodium-reduction goals. The principle is to iodize the smaller quantity of salt that people should consume, not to encourage increased salt intake.

Wheat and maize flour are suitable where industrial milling is common. Rice presents a different technological challenge because vitamins and minerals cannot simply be applied to polished grains without substantial losses. Rice fortification generally uses extruded fortified rice kernels that resemble ordinary rice and are blended at a defined ratio.

Edible oils are useful vehicles for fat-soluble vitamins A and D. WHO's 2025 guideline supports fortification of edible oils and fats with vitamins A and D when justified by population need and accompanied by appropriate programme monitoring.[3] Milk can also deliver these vitamins but may have limited reach among populations with low milk consumption or lactose intolerance.

The vehicle should be selected using current food-consumption data rather than assumptions. National averages may conceal lower consumption among remote, tribal, poor or culturally distinct populations.

Determining the Fortification Level

The amount of nutrient added must balance expected benefit against potential harm. A fortification standard should consider:

- prevalence and severity of deficiency;
- usual intake from natural foods;
- use of supplements and other fortified products;
- average and high consumption of the food vehicle;
- bioavailability of the fortificant;
- processing and storage losses;
- upper intake levels and vulnerable clinical groups.

The compound used is as important as the quantity. Highly bioavailable iron compounds may cause undesirable sensory changes, whereas more stable compounds may be poorly absorbed. Phytate in cereal-based diets can reduce iron and zinc absorption. Encapsulation and extrusion technologies may improve stability but increase cost.

Fortification levels should therefore be derived through dietary modelling and adjusted using programme data. Copying standards from another country without considering local consumption can result in inadequate or excessive delivery.

Evidence of Effectiveness

Large-scale fortification

A systematic review of real-world programmes in low- and middle-income countries found that large-scale fortification improved several micronutrient and functional outcomes. Across the included studies, fortification was associated with reductions in anaemia, goitre and neural tube defects, although programme quality and implementation varied.[4]

These findings demonstrate population-level potential, but results from successful programmes should not be generalized automatically. Fortification has little effect when industry compliance is weak, target populations do not consume the vehicle, the nutrient compound has low bioavailability or deficiency has causes unrelated to dietary intake.

Multiple-micronutrient fortification

A Cochrane review concluded that foods fortified with multiple micronutrients may reduce anaemia, iron deficiency, iron-deficiency anaemia and selected vitamin deficiencies compared with unfortified foods.[5] However, much of the evidence was rated low or very low certainty because of small studies, heterogeneity and imprecision. Effects on growth were modest, and information on morbidity and adverse events was limited.

This distinction is important. Improvement in biochemical status does not always translate immediately into measurable gains in growth, cognition or mortality. Functional outcomes may require longer follow-up and concurrent improvements in infection control, diet and caregiving.

Rice fortification

A Cochrane review of rice fortified with vitamins and minerals found that it probably improves iron status and may reduce anaemia, but the certainty of evidence varied across outcomes.[6] A subsequent systematic review focusing on iron-fortified rice reported a modest increase in haemoglobin and greater benefit among populations with a high baseline prevalence of anaemia.[7]

Rice fortification should therefore be described as a potentially useful complementary strategy rather than a stand-alone solution to anaemia. Anaemia can result from iron deficiency, folate or vitamin B12 deficiency, haemoglobinopathies, malaria, helminth infection, chronic inflammation and other causes. An intervention directed primarily at iron intake cannot eliminate these pathways.

Table 1. Major food vehicles for micronutrient fortification

Food vehicle	Common fortificants	Principal public health objective	Major strengths	Key limitations and monitoring needs
Salt	Iodine; iodine plus iron	Prevention of iodine-deficiency disorders and improvement of iron status	Nearly universal consumption; relatively centralized production	Must align with sodium reduction; iodine losses during storage; colour and stability concerns with double fortification
Wheat flour, atta and maida	Iron, folic acid and vitamin B12	Reduction of iron and folate deficiencies and prevention of neural tube defects	Suitable where industrial milling and wheat consumption are widespread	Variable flour intake; informal milling; reduced mineral bioavailability in high-phytate diets
Rice	Iron, folic acid and vitamin B12	Improvement of iron status among rice-consuming populations	Can use large public-distribution and school-meal systems	Requires high-quality fortified kernels and uniform blending; breakage, storage, cooking losses and acceptance require monitoring
Edible oil	Vitamins A and D	Improvement of fat-soluble vitamin intake	Centralized refining; good technical vehicle for fat-soluble vitamins	Consumption differs across households; oxidation and light exposure; risk of overlap with supplements
Milk	Vitamins A and D	Prevention of vitamin A and D inadequacy	Familiar food and relatively centralized processing in formal markets	Limited reach among people who consume little milk; informal milk markets; cold-chain and light-related losses
Commercial complementary foods	Iron, zinc, vitamins A, B12, D and others	Prevention of deficiencies during infancy and early childhood	Can be formulated for age-specific needs	Cost, displacement of breastfeeding or local foods, marketing practices and unequal access
School or institutional foods	Single or multiple micronutrients	Targeting children, adolescents or other programme beneficiaries	Predictable delivery through public programmes	Misses non-attendees; intake and adherence vary; requires menu and supply-chain quality control
Market-driven packaged foods	Variable vitamins and minerals	Product differentiation and possible intake improvement	Broad retail availability	May fortify nutritionally poor foods; health-halo marketing; exposure concentrated among wealthier consumers
Biofortified crops	Iron, zinc, vitamin A or other traits	Increasing nutrient density through agriculture	Reaches rural consumers and integrates nutrition with farming	Variety acceptance, seed access, nutrient retention and lower precision of delivered dose

Double-fortified salt

Double-fortified salt combines iodine and iron. A Cochrane review found that compared with iodized salt alone, double-fortified salt may improve haemoglobin and iron-related outcomes, but evidence for anaemia reduction and some functional outcomes remained uncertain.[8] Technical challenges include maintaining iodine stability, preventing colour changes and ensuring consumer acceptability.

Public Health Significance

Fortification can reduce deficiency without requiring individuals to purchase supplements, recognize symptoms or attend health facilities. It is therefore potentially equitable and cost-effective, especially when delivered through universal staples or public food programmes.

Its strongest public health applications have clear biological and delivery pathways. Salt iodization reduces inadequate iodine intake; folic acid fortification increases folate exposure before and during early pregnancy; and vitamin A fortification can improve intake where deficiency is common and oil consumption is widespread.

Fortification also has limitations that supplementation may overcome. Pregnant women with high iron requirements or children with severe deficiency may require therapeutic or preventive supplementation even when staple foods are fortified. Similarly, people with clinical anaemia need diagnosis and treatment rather than reliance on population fortification.

Fortification should be considered part of a wider food-system strategy. Dietary diversity supplies protein, essential fatty acids, fibre and multiple bioactive compounds that cannot be reproduced by adding isolated micronutrients to staple foods. Safe water, sanitation, deworming, malaria control and maternal healthcare also influence micronutrient status.

The Indian Context

India carries a substantial burden of anaemia and other micronutrient deficiencies across children, adolescents and women. At the same time, deficiency patterns vary by state, age, diet, infection exposure and socioeconomic position. Haemoglobin alone cannot identify the nutritional cause of anaemia, making biomarker surveillance essential.

The Food Safety and Standards Authority of India has established fortification standards for five major staple-food categories. Rice and wheat flour may be fortified with iron, folic acid and vitamin B12; milk and edible oil with vitamins A and D; and salt with iodine or both iodine and iron. Fortified foods are identified through the "+F" logo.[9]

India's use of fortified rice through the Targeted Public Distribution System, school meals and other welfare programmes creates the potential to reach large numbers of people. The approach uses fortified rice kernels blended with ordinary rice. Implementation research from several districts found good awareness among delivery stakeholders, continuous supply in assessed locations and general consumer acceptance, while emphasizing the importance of quality assurance and communication.[10]

The Indian rollout has also generated controversy. Concerns include the strength of outcome evidence, variation in the causes of anaemia, quality of fortified kernels, uniformity of blending, informed communication and the possibility of cumulative iron exposure from multiple interventions. These concerns should be addressed through independent monitoring rather than polarized claims that fortification is either universally safe and effective or intrinsically harmful.

Special attention is often raised for people with haemoglobin disorders or conditions involving iron overload. Population programmes should use appropriate fortification levels rather than therapeutic doses, but surveillance and clinical guidance remain necessary. Public distribution should be accompanied by clear packaging, beneficiary information and mechanisms for reporting adverse concerns.

Programme Design and Quality Assurance

Fortification programmes fail most commonly through implementation rather than biological theory. A complete quality system should include:

- premix and fortified-kernel certification;
- internal quality assurance by manufacturers;
- independent external testing;
- inspection of blending and processing facilities;
- nutrient testing at production, distribution and retail points;

- monitoring of storage and cooking losses;
- traceability, recall and corrective-action procedures;
- population biomarker surveillance.

Testing only the premix is insufficient. Nutrient content must be verified in the final food as consumed. For rice, uneven blending can produce some samples with too few fortified kernels and others with excess concentrations. Sampling protocols must account for this heterogeneity.
Compliance data should be publicly reported in aggregated form. Transparency can strengthen consumer confidence and allow programme managers to identify weak points in the supply chain.

Recent Advances

Improved fortification technologies

Extruded rice kernels, encapsulated iron compounds and more stable vitamin premixes have improved the sensory acceptability and nutrient retention of fortified foods. Technology must nevertheless be assessed under real conditions of heat, humidity, prolonged storage and household cooking.

Biofortification–fortification combinations

Biofortified crops can raise the intrinsic nutrient content of foods, while industrial fortification provides a more controlled dose. Combining the approaches may improve coverage, especially where industrially processed foods do not reach rural populations. Total exposure must still be considered to avoid duplication.

Digital supply-chain monitoring

Barcode systems, electronic procurement, laboratory information systems and geospatial dashboards can track premixes and fortified products. Digital monitoring is valuable only when data lead to inspections and corrective action.

Precision in population assessment

Recent dietary-modelling approaches estimate micronutrient inadequacy using detailed consumption data and account for fortification and supplementation. Such analyses can help determine which nutrients, foods and population groups should be prioritized rather than applying identical fortification nationally.

Updated global guidance

The 2023 World Health Assembly resolution and WHO's 2025 edible-oil guideline signal a shift towards stronger large-scale fortification programmes combined with equity, safety and rights-based monitoring.[2,3]

Challenges and Limitations

Fortification depends on stable consumption of the selected vehicle. People who consume very little of the staple may receive inadequate nutrient doses, while high consumers receive more. Programmes should therefore model the intake distribution, not only average intake.
Informal food markets can reduce coverage. Small local mills and unpackaged products may operate outside fortification systems, particularly in remote or poor communities. Mandatory policy can therefore remain inequitable despite universal legal wording.
Another challenge is overlapping interventions. Individuals may receive fortified staples, fortified commercial foods, school supplements and clinical tablets simultaneously. Without total-intake monitoring, programme planners cannot assess cumulative exposure.
Micronutrient biomarkers can be affected by inflammation, infection and physiological state. Ferritin, for example, rises during inflammation and may conceal iron deficiency. Evaluation should use appropriate biomarker panels and adjustment methods rather than relying on haemoglobin alone.
Commercial conflicts also require attention. Voluntary fortification may encourage companies to market sugary cereals, beverages or snacks as healthy because they contain added vitamins. Nutrition claims should not override assessment of the product's overall nutrient profile.

Future Directions and Policy Priorities

India and other countries should base fortification decisions on nationally representative data covering dietary intake, biochemical deficiency and food-vehicle consumption. Programmes should be periodically revised when dietary patterns or deficiency prevalence change.
Fortification policies should establish explicit objectives and measurable outcomes. These may include reduction in iodine deficiency, improvement in ferritin or folate status, or prevention of neural tube defects. Anaemia alone is too nonspecific to evaluate iron-fortification impact.
Independent implementation studies are required across different states, supply chains and population groups. Evaluation should include nutrient content, coverage, consumption, biomarkers, functional outcomes, safety and cost-effectiveness.
Coordination is needed among food regulators, public-distribution agencies, nutrition programmes, agriculture, laboratories and health services. Fragmented responsibility can result in technically compliant products without measurable population benefit.
Fortification literacy should be improved among healthcare workers and consumers. Communication should explain why nutrients are added, what the programme can and cannot achieve and why diverse diets remain essential.

CONCLUSION

Micronutrient fortification is an established public health strategy capable of improving nutrient intake and reducing selected deficiency-related outcomes. Its major strength is population reach through routinely consumed foods, without requiring repeated clinical contact or substantial behavioural change.
The evidence is strongest when a prevalent deficiency, an appropriate food vehicle, a bioavailable fortificant and an effective regulatory system are aligned. Fortification is less successful when it is implemented without current consumption data, quality control or attention to the multiple causes of nutritional disorders.
India's standards for fortified salt, flour, rice, milk and oil provide a broad policy framework. Fortified rice distributed through public programmes offers major potential reach, but its long-term credibility will depend on independent quality monitoring, transparent evaluation and integration with other anaemia-control measures.
Fortification should neither be dismissed as a technological shortcut nor promoted as a complete solution to hidden hunger. It is most effective as one component of a comprehensive nutrition strategy that protects dietary diversity, treats clinical deficiency, controls infection and improves the social conditions that determine access to nutritious food.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *Guidelines on food fortification with micronutrients* [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2006 [cited 2026 Aug 7]. Available from: WHO publication.
2. World Health Assembly. *Accelerating efforts for preventing micronutrient deficiencies and their consequences, including spina bifida and other neural tube defects, through safe and effective food fortification*. Resolution WHA76.19 [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2023 May 30 [cited 2026 Aug 7]. Available from: WHO Resolution WHA76.19.
3. World Health Organization. *WHO guideline on fortification of edible oils and fats with vitamins A and D for public health* [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2025 [cited 2026 Aug 7]. Available from: WHO guideline.
4. Keats EC, Neufeld LM, Garrett GS, Mbuya MNN, Bhutta ZA. Improved micronutrient status and health outcomes in low- and middle-income countries following large-scale fortification: evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Clin Nutr. 2019;109(6):1696-1708. doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqz023.
5. Das JK, Salam RA, Mahmood SB, Moin A, Kumar R, Mukhtar K, et al. Food fortification with multiple micronutrients: impact on health outcomes in general population. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2019;12(12):CD011400. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011400.pub2.
6. Peña-Rosas JP, Mithra P, Unnikrishnan B, Kumar N, De-Regil LM, Nair NS, et al. Fortification of rice with vitamins and minerals for addressing micronutrient malnutrition. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2019;2019(10):CD009902. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD009902.pub2.

7. Ramaswamy G, Agarwal N, Dutta M, Kaur M, Kumar R, Krishnan A. Effect of iron-fortified rice on haemoglobin concentration and anaemia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Glob Health Rep. 2023;7:e2023010.
8. Baxter JAB, Carducci B, Kamali M, Zlotkin SH, Bhutta ZA. Fortification of salt with iron and iodine versus fortification of salt with iodine alone for improving iron and iodine status. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2022;4(4):CD013463. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013463.pub2.
9. Food Safety and Standards Authority of India. *Food Safety and Standards (Fortification of Foods) Regulations, 2018* [Internet]. New Delhi: Food Safety and Standards Authority of India; 2018 [updated 2021 Sep 22; cited 2026 Aug 7]. Available from: FSSAI. The regulations were originally notified on 2 August 2018 and were subsequently amended, including on 22 September 2021.
10. Nandeep ER, Mahajan H, Mummadi MK, Sairam C, Venkatesh K, Kadiyam J, et al. Implementation, delivery, and utilization of iron fortified rice supplied through public distribution system across different states in India: an exploratory mixed-method study. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2024;4(8):e0003533. doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0003533.

MEDICAL LETTER

Review Article
Volume: 3
Issue: 1