

Peer Review Plan

Title of Review: National Survey of WIC Participants III **Influential Scientific Information**

Agency: FNS **Highly Influential Scientific Assessment**

Agency Contact: Rich Lucas

Subject of Review: National Survey of WIC Participants III

Purpose of Review: FNS will seek scientific peer review for the subject study.

Type of Review: Panel Review Individual Reviewers

Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 2021 End: 2021 Completed: 2021

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

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: _____

There are three areas of expertise represented by these external reviewers: (1) WIC research expertise; (2) IPERIA experience; and (3) expertise in the WIC program.

Reviewers selected by: Agency

Designated Outside Organization

Organization's Name: The contracting firm conducting the study has identified the peer review panel

Opportunities for Public Comment? Yes No

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

How: _____

When: _____

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Comments? Yes No

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel? Yes No

Other: _____



The reviewers will be charged with two tasks as follows:

1. 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. Reviewers will be charged with evaluating the clarity of hypotheses, the robustness of the methods employed to address the hypotheses, 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 conclusions. 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 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 other FNS studies, 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 this 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).