

Peer Review Plan

Title of Review: What We Eat in America Survey, part of National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) Database Update **Influential Scientific Information**

Agency: Agricultural Research Service **Highly Influential Scientific Assessment**

Agency Contact: Dr. Joseph Spence, Director Beltsville Area, ARS 10300 Baltimore Avenue, Room 223, Beltsville, MD 20705 Phone: 301-504-6078

Subject of Review: The Food Surveys Research Group of the Beltsville Human Nutrition Research Center is also part of the National Nutrition Monitoring System. It collects data on dietary intake of Americans in conjunction with the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), a continuous survey under the Department of Health and Human Services, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. This is a continuing survey released every two years as the What We Eat in America Survey, as part of the NHANES. The products provide information on food and nutrient intakes of Americans and as well as tools developed for use in assessing dietary intakes based on My Pyramid servings as well as nutrients. Their products are accessible via the following www.ars.usda.gov/ba/bhnrc/fsrg. All non-journal publications of scientific interest are formally peer-reviewed by external experts. Comments are also solicited depending on content from stakeholders, industry commodity groups/trade associations, and other federal agencies.

Purpose of Review: We anticipate that the external peer reviewers will possess an in-depth knowledge of research conducted. Reviewers will be expected to focus on areas such as:

1. The evidence provided and whether the conclusions and inferences are correctly supported by the evidence.
2. Evaluate the methodology. Is the approach and process appropriate for the analysis?
3. Are there data or other evidence complete? Have any important data or considerations been omitted?
4. Are all important assumptions identified and uncertainties clearly stated?
5. Identify any relevant data or evidence not contained in the report.
6. Evaluate the quality and completeness of the individual components of the analysis.
7. Comment on whether/where the document is difficult to read or understand.

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

