

## Peer Review Plan

Preliminary Title: Examining an “Experimental” Food Security Status Classification Method for Households with Children

Type of Report  
(ERR, EIB, EB, TB,  
SOR,)

TB

Agency: Economic Research Service [X] Influential Scientific Information  
USDA [ ] Highly Influential Scientific Assessment

Agency Contact: Cindy Nickerson, [cnickerson@ers.usda.gov](mailto:cnickerson@ers.usda.gov)

Subject of Review: Food insecurity, which the USDA has been measuring and tracking since 1995, has become a key national measure of well-being: this being the case, it is important that the measure is accurate. A review of USDA food security measurement methods by the National Academies Committee on National Statistics suggested that USDA address certain biases in the measurement methods when assessing food insecurity between households with and without children. In response to this suggestion, researchers have developed an alternative approach—an “experimental” classification method—for classifying food insecurity in households with children (Nord and Coleman-Jensen, 2014). This alternative approach reduces biases inherent in the current standard food security measurement approach and improves the internal validity of the food security measure. However, the external validity of the two food security status classifications approaches has not been previously evaluated. We examine whether the “experimental” food security classification or the current classification is more consistent with alternative measures of food inadequacy including food insufficiency, reporting needing to spend more money on food to meet food needs, and using a food pantry. We also examine the association between food security and dietary quality comparing the two classification methods.

Purpose of Review: The purpose of the review is to ensure the high-quality of the economic analysis, transparent explanation of methods, objective interpretation of results, and effective communication to the intended audience.

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

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 03/27/17 Completed: 06/05/17 Withdrawn: X/X/X

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

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: Economists

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