**Agenda items for 10/25/19 :**

Intervention into the literature

1. Patterns in nutritional shortfalls; compare to existing work

(1a) Calculating other commonly used metrics:

BMI

HDDS

Intake + activity level (sedentary, moderate, active)

Intake + energy expenditure (fancy equations?)

* 1. Demonstrate correlations across measures.
  2. These are different outcome measures related? What one should we use when?

1. How to capture the shortfall for women / kids?
   1. Raw percentage from benchmark? Difference in percentages from benchmark for different household members? Weighting by severity?
   2. Empowerment matter?
2. We also care about the tails –
3. Machine Learning around certain outcomes?
4. Weighting
   1. **Erin:** Here is a smattering of language that seems clear and then confusing: The BIHS sample is statistically representative at the following levels: (1) nationally representative of rural Bangladesh; (2) representative of rural areas of each of the seven administrative divisions of the country: Barisal, Chittagong, Dhaka, Khulna, Rajshahi, Rangpur, and Sylhet; and, (3) representative of the FTF zone of influence. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) provided the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) the list of FTF locations (districts and upazilas [i.e., subdistricts]). Using this list, a consultant statistician sampled the FTF zone separately for its statistical representativeness.  …. Later, sampling weights were adjusted on the basis of the latest population census of 2011.  … Since the sampling frame of the BIHS has the FTF stratum and the seven strata representing the seven divisions, the use of the additional BIHS sample from the three divisional strata required estimation of appropriate sampling weights to obtain results that are statistically representative of the FTF zone of influence. The consultant statistician calculated the sampling weights and trained IFPRI- PRSSP research analysts on the use of the weights in analyzing the expanded sample of the FTF data set. The final sample frame of the FTF zone includes 2,040 households (1,000 households in the original FTF sample and 1,040 additional sample households) in 102 PSUs belonging to 73 upazilas.
   2. **Lila:** After restricting the sample to non-polygamous households with male married heads with present spouses and no pregnant or lactating women in the household, and then excluding individuals with missing consumption data,  the sample yields: Feed the Future Original (634), FTF additional (610), and National Representative (2449). According to Table 1 of D’Souza and Tandon, their sample size is 3060, which is almost equal to National Representative + FTF additional = 3059 . Does it make sense that they selected those two groups? Also, in note 9 on page 631, it reads “The data are representative with the use of sample weights; weights were adjusted using the 2011 population census sampling frame.” Do you think they reweighted to the 2011 census after restricting the sample?
5. Data Sources
   1. Household consumption and expenditure surveys (HES)
      1. Often food consumption and/or acquisition over 7-14 days
   2. 24 hour recall surveys
6. Adult equivalents

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Calculation | Comments |
| OECD |  |  |
| D&T |  |  |
| Per capita |  |  |
| Adult Male Equivalent (AME) |  |  |

1. Nutritional Benchmarks

See excel document

1. Data decisions/issues
   1. Choice of nutrition data (Golapan vs Govt of Bangladesh)
   2. Secondary sources for Nutrition data and how to adapt
   3. Categorize employment into three categories
   4. Determine weighting scheme
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