

Peer Review Plan

Title of Review: Review of SNDA-IV Final Report [X] **Influential Scientific Information**

Agency: FNS [] **Highly Influential Scientific Assessment**

Agency Contact: Rich Lucas

Subject of Review: School Nutrition Dietary Assessment Study IV Final Report

Purpose of Review: Subject the information to formal, independent, external peer review to ensure its objectivity.

Type of Review: [] Panel Review [X] Individual Reviewers
[] Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 6/2010 End: 9/2010 Completed: _____

Number of Reviewers: [] 3 or fewer [X] 4 to 10 [] More than 10

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: _____
There are three areas of expertise needed: (1) research methodology and statistical analysis; (2) knowledge; of the operation of the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs in elementary and secondary schools and (3) nutritional characteristics of school meals.

Reviewers selected by: [X] Agency [] Designated Outside Organization
Organization's Name: _____

Opportunities for Public Comment? [] Yes [X] No

If yes, briefly state how and when these opportunities will be provided:
How: _____
When: _____

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Comments? [] Yes [X] No

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel? [] Yes [X] No

Other: See next page.



The SNDA final reports are large, complex documents. Conceptually, the report is comprised of four distinct components and FNS plans to have separate peer reviews of each of these components. Each component will have two independent peer reviewers. The components and charges to the reviewers are as follows:

1. **Research questions, study design and analysis methods.** Reviewers will be requested to determine if (i) the data collection as implemented was appropriate, (ii) whether the analyses as carried out reflect the original plans and (iii) whether the analyses are appropriate given the actual implementation of sampling and data collection.
2. **School operations and environment, factors affecting student participation in school meals, and characteristics of participants and nonparticipants.** Reviewers will be charged with evaluating the clarity of hypotheses, the robustness of the methods employed on this component, the appropriateness of the methods for the hypotheses being tested, the extent to which the conclusions follow from the analysis, and the strengths and limitations of the overall component. The peer reviewers will be requested, as appropriate, to suggest ways to clarify assumptions, findings, and conclusions; identify oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies; and, if needed, encourage authors to more fully acknowledge limitations and uncertainties.
3. **Competitive foods.** Reviewers will be charged with evaluating the clarity of hypotheses, the robustness of the methods employed on this component, the appropriateness of the methods for the hypotheses being tested, the extent to which the conclusions follow from the analysis, and the strengths and limitations of the overall component. The peer reviewers will be requested, as appropriate, to suggest ways to clarify assumptions, findings, and conclusions; identify oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies; and, if needed, encourage authors to more fully acknowledge limitations and uncertainties.
4. **Characteristics of reimbursable meals and the nutrient content of school lunches and breakfasts.** Reviewers will be charged with evaluating the clarity of hypotheses, the robustness of the methods employed on this component, the appropriateness of the methods for the hypotheses being tested, the extent to which the conclusions follow from the analysis, and the strengths and limitations of the overall component. The peer reviewers will be requested, as appropriate, to suggest ways to clarify assumptions, findings, and conclusions; identify oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies; and, if needed, encourage authors to more fully acknowledge limitations and uncertainties.

All 8 peer reviewers will be informed that the Agency does not have funds to make changes that require additional data collection, reconsideration of the research design, or significant modifications to data collection and analysis methods. The reviewers will be informed that the Agency, while it will welcome recommendations that may improve the design of the next SNDA study, requires an evaluation of the current product that is cognizant of the funding constraints.

Each reviewer will be instructed to supply the results of their review in written form. Because the SNDA study is considered influential scientific information, reviewers will be informed that the Agency is required to make available to the public the written charge to the peer reviewers, the peer reviewers' names, the peer reviewers' report(s), and the agency's response to the peer reviewers' report(s).