

Chairs Remarks

September 17, 2014

Barbara Millen

Chair, 2015 DGAC

2015 DGAC Themes

Core to the DGAC

Food, nutrient, and health-related recommendations

Themes

- Focus on **dietary patterns** related to
 - Meeting nutrient recommendations
 - Health outcomes
 - Sustainability
- “**What works**” to meet recommendations (best practices)
- “**Systems**” approach

Review of Agendas

Tuesday, September 16th

- Review of subcommittee process
- Subcommittees 1, 2, and 5

Wednesday, September 17th

- Subcommittees 3 and 4
- Cross-cutting topics
- Next Steps

2015 DGAC Subcommittees

Science Review Subcommittee

SC 1

Food and Nutrient Intakes, and Health: Current Status and Trends

Nutrients of concern
Food group intakes
Food sources
Eating behaviors
Dietary patterns
Health concerns
Food pattern modeling

SC 2

Dietary Patterns, Foods and Nutrients, and Health Outcomes

Dietary patterns and health outcomes

Foods and nutrients and health outcomes

SC 3

Diet and Physical Activity Behavior Change

Self-monitoring
Eating out
Household food insecurity
Food/menu label use
Mobile health
Acculturation
Screen time/sedentary behavior
Sleep patterns

SC 4

Food and Physical Activity Environments

Settings:
Schools/afterschool
Childcare
Post-secondary
Worksites

Food access
Food marketing

SC 5

Food Sustainability and Safety

Food safety:
Preventing foodborne illness
Caffeine
Non-caloric sweeteners

Dietary patterns and sustainability

Cross-cutting Topics

Examples

- Sodium
- Added Sugars
- Physical Activity
- Saturated Fat
- “What Works”
 - Health impact of and modes/methods/settings for helping Americans meet diet and physical activity recommendations to promote health

2015 DGAC Systematic Reviews

- Materials presented today may include:
 - Analytical framework for the systematic review(s)
 - Inclusion/exclusion criteria
 - Literature search results
 - Description of the evidence reviewed, key findings
 - Conclusion statements, grades, implications statements with recommendations (*Draft*)

Conclusion Statements and Grading the Evidence

- **Conclusion statements:** Overall summary statement worded as an answer to the question; tightly associated with the evidence
- **Grading the evidence:** Considers risk of bias, quantity, consistency, impact, and generalizability of the body of evidence

Grading the Evidence

<p>Strong</p>	<p>The conclusion statement is substantiated by a large, high quality, and/or consistent body of evidence that directly addresses the question. There is a high level of certainty that the conclusion is generalizable to the population of interest, and it is unlikely to change if new evidence emerges.</p>
<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The conclusion statement is substantiated by sufficient evidence, but the level of certainty is restricted by limitations in the evidence, such as the amount of evidence available, inconsistencies in findings, or methodological or generalizability concerns. If new evidence emerges, there could be modifications to the conclusion statement.</p>
<p>Limited</p>	<p>The conclusion statement is substantiated by insufficient evidence, and the level of certainty is seriously restricted by limitations in the evidence, such as the amount of evidence available, inconsistencies in findings, or methodological or generalizability concerns. If new evidence emerges, there could likely be modifications to the conclusion statement.</p>
<p>Grade not assignable</p>	<p>A conclusion statement cannot be drawn due to a lack of evidence, or the availability of evidence that has serious methodological concerns.</p>

Chairs Remarks

Implications Statements

- Builds on the conclusion statement to provide needed context
- Makes conclusion statement (*the answer to the question*) actionable
- Describes what the Committee advises the government to recommend

Chairs Remarks

September 17, 2014

Barbara Millen

Chair, 2015 DGAC