

Peer Review Plan

Title of Review

Agency

Influential Scientific Information

Agency Contact

Highly Influential Scientific Assessment

Subject of Review

Purpose of Review

Type of Review

Panel Review

Individual Reviewers

Alternative Process (briefly explain:)

Timing of Review
(estimated):

Start

End

Completed

Number of
Reviewers:

3 or fewer

4 to 10

More than 10

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review:

Reviewers selected by:

Agency

Designated Outside Organization

Organization's Name:

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 acknowledge limitations and uncertainties more fully.

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).