

Peer Review Plan

Preliminary Title: Providing Nutrition Incentives: What Can SNAP Learn from WIC?

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

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

Agency Contact: Ephraim Leibtag, eleibtag@ers.usda.gov

Subject of Review: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) have recently used two different strategies to promote fruit and vegetable consumption. A small-scale pilot in SNAP provided a price incentive that lowered the effective price of fruits and vegetables. WIC provides fruit and vegetable Cash Value Vouchers (CVVs) that participants redeem (at no charge to the participant) at food retailers for fruits and vegetables, up to the dollar value set on the CVV. Using an economic framework, this report compares two hypothetical interventions: one using a price incentive and the other a CVV. To improve comparability, we assume that both interventions cost the same. Because of cost neutrality, average consumption of fruits and vegetables increases by essentially identical amounts in both interventions. However, a price incentive and a CVV tend to channel fruits and vegetables to different types of consumers: those who increase consumption the most from a CVV are those who had consumed the least, while those who increase consumption the most from a price incentive are those who had consumed the most. Under diminishing returns of health to nutritional intake, those who initially consume the least fruits and vegetables are those who tend to benefit the most, nutritionally, from the additional consumption which a CVV provides. Thus, a CVV is more effective than a price incentive at prompting consumption among those who consume the least and at increasing overall health benefits for a low-income population.

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 Individual Reviewers

Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 10/01/15 End: 12/20/16 Completed: 12/20/16

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

Primary Disciplines/Types of Expertise Needed for Review: Economists

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

