Supplementary Table 3: Stratified analysis of association of SNAP^a participation with self-reported frequency of consumption of selected food and beverage items for adult respondents with incomes below 130% of the Federal Poverty Line by presence or absence of a small grocery store within ¹/₂ mile. Cross-sectional data collected from four New Jersey cities in 2009-10 and 2014.

Food and		SNAP Par	Interaction ^c			
beverage	Small Grocery Absent		Small Grocery Present		(n=983)	
items	(n=590)		(n=393)			
	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value
	difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)	
	(95% CI) ^{d,e}		(95% CI) ^{d,e}		(95% CI) ^{d,e}	
Fruit - all	0.83	0.09	0.93	0.59	1.22	0.20
	(0.67, 1.03)		(0.73, 1.20)		(0.90, 1.66)	
Vegetables	0.94	0.36	0.99	0.89	1.00	0.98
- all	(0.82, 1.08)		(0.85, 1.15)		(0.82, 1.22)	
Salad	0.90	0.35	0.92	0.57	1.00	0.99
	(0.72, 1.13)		(0.70, 1.22)		(0.72, 1.4)	
SSB ^f -	1.13	0.29	1.46	0.01	1.24	0.21
Total	(0.90, 1.42)		(1.09, 1.96)		(0.89, 1.73)	
Soda	0.91	0.60	1.47	0.07	1.38	0.19
	(0.64, 1.29)		(0.97, 2.23)		(0.85, 2.24)	
Fruit	1.28	0.07	1.42	0.05	1.08	0.72

Drinks	(0.98, 1.68)	(1.00, 2.02)	(0.71, 1.63)	

^b Association of SNAP participation and reported frequency of consumption stratified by presence or

absence of a small grocery store within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile, using gamma regression adjusting for age, sex,

race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation, and income

^c Independent model including interaction between SNAP participation and small grocery presence,

also controlling for age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation,

and income

 $^{d} e^{b}$ = antilogarithm of regression coefficient, represents the proportional differences in the outcome associated with a 1-unit increase in the independent variable

^e 95% CI=95% Confidence Interval

^fSSB=Sugar sweetened beverage

Supplementary Table 4: Stratified analysis of association of SNAP^a participation with self-reported frequency of consumption of selected food and beverage items for adult respondents with incomes below 130% of the Federal Poverty Line by presence or absence of a supermarket within ½ mile. Cross-sectional data collected from four New Jersey cities in 2009-10 and 2014.

Food and		SNAP Par	Interaction ^c			
beverage	Supermarket Absent Sup		Supermarket	Present	(n=983)	
items	(n=647)	(n=336)			
	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value
	difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)	
	(95% CI) ^{d.,e}		(95% CI) ^{d.,e}		(95% CI) ^{d.,e}	
Fruit - all	0.80	0.03	1.07	0.61	1.41	0.03
	(0.65, 0.98)		(0.83, 1.37)		(1.04, 1.91)	
Vegetables	0.99	0.84	0.89	0.15	0.97	0.80
- all	(0.86, 1.13)		(0.76, 1.04)		(0.79, 1.19)	
Salad	0.99	0.95	0.77	0.06	0.91	0.58
	(0.79, 1.24)		(0.59, 1.02)		(0.64, 1.28)	
SSB ^f -	1.13	0.25	1.42	0.02	1.13	0.47
Total	(0.92, 1.40)		(1.05, 1.90)		(0.81, 1.59)	
Soda	0.95	0.74	1.24	0.35	1.33	0.25
	(0.68, 1.31)		(0.79, 1.93)		(0.82, 2.14)	
Fruit	1.25	0.09	1.45	0.05	1.01	0.95

Drinks	(0.97, 1.61)	(1.00, 2.08)	(0.66, 1.55)	

^b Association of SNAP participation and reported frequency of consumption stratified by presence or absence of a supermarket within ½ mile, using gamma regression adjusting for age, sex,

race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation, and income

^c Independent model including interaction between SNAP participation and supermarket presence,

also controlling for age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation,

and income

 $^{d} e^{b}$ = antilogarithm of regression coefficient, represents the proportional differences in the outcome associated with a 1-unit increase in the independent variable

^e 95% CI=95% Confidence Interval

^eSSB=Sugar sweetened beverage

Supplementary Table 5: Stratified analysis of association of SNAP^a participation with self-reported frequency of consumption of selected food and beverage items for adult respondents with incomes below 130% of the Federal Poverty Line by presence or absence of a convenience store within ¹/₄ mile. Cross-sectional data collected from four New Jersey cities in 2009-10 and 2014.

Food and		SNAP Par	Intera	action ^c			
beverage	Convenience	e Store	Convenience	Convenience Store		(n=983)	
items	Absent		Present	Present			
	(n=188)		(n=814)				
	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value	
	difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)		
	(95% CI) ^{d,e}		(95% CI) ^{d,e}		(95% CI) ^{d,e}		
Fruit - all	1.08	0.32	1.04	0.73	1.07	0.72	
	(0.93, 1.27)		(0.83, 1.31)		(0.73, 1.59)		
Vegetables	1.05	0.32	1.03	0.66	1.03	0.82	
- all	(0.95, 1.16)		(0.90, 1.19)		(0.79, 1.34)		
Salad	1.12	0.17	1.13	0.28	1.18	0.47	
	(0.95, 1.33)		(0.91, 1.41)		(0.76, 1.83)		
SSB ^f -	0.79	0.01	0.96	0.78	0.88	0.56	
Total	(0.66, 0.95)		(0.73, 1.27)		(0.57, 1.35)		
Soda	0.68	0.01	0.98	0.94	0.73	0.30	
	(0.51, 0.90)		(0.66, 1.48)		(0.39, 1.33)		
Fruit	0.91	0.45	0.91	0.58	1.00	0.98	

1

Drinks	(0.73, 1.15)	(0.65, 1.28)	(0.58, 1.70)	

^bAssociation of SNAP participation and reported frequency of consumption stratified by presence or absence of a convenience store within ¼ mile, using gamma regression adjusting for age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation, and income

^c Independent model including interaction between SNAP participation and convenience store presence, also controlling for age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation, and income

 $^{d} e^{b}$ = antilogarithm of regression coefficient, represents the proportional differences in the outcome associated with a 1-unit increase in the independent variable

^e 95% CI=95% Confidence Interval

^fSSB=Sugar sweetened beverage

Supplementary Table 6: Stratified analysis of association of SNAP^a participation with reported frequency of consumption of selected food and beverage items for adult respondents with incomes below 130% of the Federal Poverty Line by presence or absence of a limited service restaurant within ¹/₄ mile. Cross-sectional data collected from four New Jersey cities in 2009-10 and 2014.

Food and		SNAP Par	Interaction ^c			
beverage	LSR ^d Abs	sent	LSR Pres	LSR Present		983)
items	(n=310)	(n=673)			
	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value	proportional	p-value
	difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)		difference (e ^b)	
	(95% CI) ^{e,f}		(95% CI) ^{e,f}		(95% CI) ^{e,f}	
Fruit - all	1.14	0.41	0.83	0.06	0.78	0.14
	(0.84, 1.54)		(0.69, 1.01)		(0.56, 1.08)	
Vegetables	1.06	0.53	0.94	0.31	0.90	0.32
- all	(0.88, 1.27)		(0.82, 1.06)		(0.73, 1.11)	
Salad	1.10	0.52	0.86	0.18	0.83	0.32
	(0.82, 1.46)		(0.69, 1.07)		(0.59, 1.19)	
SSB ^g -	1.07	0.67	1.27	0.03	1.31	0.14
Total	(0.78, 1.47)		(1.02, 1.58)		(0.92, 1.87)	
Soda	0.84	0.45	1.16	0.36	1.59	0.07
	(0.53, 1.33)		(0.84, 1.60)		(0.96, 2.63)	
Fruit	1.27	0.21	1.28	0.08	1.05	0.82
Drinks	(0.88, 1.85)		(0.97, 1.69)		(0.74, 1.48)	

1

^bAssociation of SNAP participation and reported frequency of consumption stratified by presence or absence of a limited service restaurant within ¼ mile, using gamma regression adjusting for age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation, and income

^c Independent model including interaction between SNAP participation and limited service restaurant presence, also controlling for age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, city of residence, panel, WIC participation, and income

^dLSR=Limited service restaurant

 $e^{b} =$ antilogarithm of regression coefficient, represents the proportional differences in the outcome associated with a 1-unit increase in the independent variable

^f 95% CI=95% Confidence Interval

^gSSB=Sugar sweetened beverage