

Snacks Orchard: a small authored world worth choosing

The strongest present case is modest: make a distinctive moment of play understandable, responsive, optional and worth remembering. Existing research suggests useful questions about control and enjoyment, while also challenging the assumption that longer play means greater wellbeing.

Research by Education Angel Group. Last substantive review: September 19, 2026.

Education Angel Group is developing Snacks Orchard and has an interest in the proposed product. This review does not establish its effectiveness.

Prepared by Education Angel Group (EAG), with AI-assisted research and drafting. Research date: September 19, 2026. EAG is developing Snacks Orchard and has an interest in its success. This is a focused research and design-rationale report, not an independent evaluation or evidence that the game has produced benefits.

1. Proposition, audience and the value of one complete play moment

Snacks Orchard is a standalone, story-led, fruit-powered game world. Its locked tagline is: “Explore a fruit-powered world full of characters, surprises, and adventure.” The current proposition concerns authored characters, choices, exploration, consequences and a safe return. A satisfying encounter is the product being investigated. A gallery of attractive characters or a conventional website with game decoration would not establish it.

The immediate candidate journey is deliberately small: enter one clearing, invite one fruit companion to one nearby play object, travel, interact, notice an authored reaction, settle at a rest spot, leave and resume one remembered choice. This is a proposed design-review slice, not a completed game or an approved final mechanic. Who the player controls, the object, the action, the reaction and the precise memory remain unsettled. Snack and the wider fruit-world cast retain their existing identity authority; this report introduces no replacement character, anatomy or asset. Fruit travel and rest must preserve the specified absence of legs and feet. EAG product definition, A0

Student players are a named audience, but a precise intended age range has not been established. Returning players need truthful continuity. Parents and school adults need understandable information about content, effort, access and data before deciding whether the experience fits their setting. The operator needs an authored world that can be maintained without contradictory reactions or unreliable saves. Those are different needs, and satisfying an adult reviewer does not demonstrate that a child enjoys playing.

Snacks Orchard remains independent of Snacks After Class, which may provide orientation or a link. It does not inherit a curriculum, reward economy or obligation to participate. Where an account becomes necessary, Runstr supplies identity; that relationship does not automatically transfer progress, private saves, points, school resources or audience permissions.

Overview. The strongest present case is modest: make a distinctive moment of play understandable, responsive, optional and worth remembering. Existing research suggests useful questions about control and enjoyment, while also challenging the assumption that longer play means greater wellbeing. None of the retained sources evaluates Orchard. Developmental, educational, nutritional and therapeutic benefits remain unproven. The relevant first decision is whether the bounded encounter works as play, including for someone who chooses to stop.

2. Questions and the evidence each would require

This report addresses five questions. What makes this particular encounter worth choosing over another leisure activity? Can a child understand how a choice changes what happens? Can the experience support different inputs and circumstances without stripping away its authored meaning? Can departure and return be reliable without becoming an obligation? What additional evidence would justify any claim beyond immediate play quality?

These questions call for different forms of evidence. Original studies can inform hypotheses about player experience, but cannot decide Orchard's cast, story or artistic merit. First-party descriptions establish what alternative games say they offer. Accessibility guidance supplies practical considerations, not a certificate. The product definition defines intent, not observed success. Direct observation of an authorized prototype would eventually be needed to connect these evidence categories.

A useful distinction is between a player's report, a behavioral observation and an inferred outcome. "I liked the companion's reaction" would describe a response if actually collected. Selecting a rest action and exiting without help would show one usable route under those conditions. Neither would show improved emotional regulation outside the game. Even voluntary return would need interpretation: curiosity, confusion about unfinished business and fear of losing progress could produce similar logs.

No interviews, prototype sessions or child preferences were collected for this report. Questions about appeal should therefore remain open. A fruit world can be distinctive without being universally attractive, and a child who declines it provides relevant evidence rather than an inconvenient missing observation. The research purpose is to learn which intended experiences survive contact with real preferences, not to select a favorable psychological vocabulary for an already assumed success.

3. Context: play quality without a manufactured deficit

The proposition does not require a claim that children lack enough games, that all digital play is beneficial, or that a national wellbeing problem can be solved by a fruit companion. The immediate context is a choice among activities under limits of time, device access, permission, familiarity and interest. Orchard must earn that choice through its own experience. No population-level demand estimate or Arkansas-specific prevalence statistic was identified that would answer this question, so none is used as a market-size proxy.

Ryan, Rigby and Przybylski's 2006 studies associated perceived competence and autonomy with enjoyment and game preferences, and examined intuitive controls. Their samples included university students and an online gaming community. Short laboratory sessions and self-reported experience limit transfer to children in ordinary leisure. Relatedness in their multiplayer work concerned other players; it does not establish that an authored companion substitutes for human relationships. Ryan, Rigby and Przybylski, S1

EAG's inference is to investigate whether the player can act intentionally and recognize a consequence. This does not imply that more selectable objects are better. One consequential invitation may be easier to understand than many nominal choices, but that is an Orchard hypothesis. Nor does effortless interaction necessarily make good play: an encounter might be comprehensible yet dull. Challenge, surprise and familiarity need to be judged together, with the intended age and reading level specified before evaluation.

UNICEF's RITEC project offers child-specific context through afterschool, home and laboratory research. Its official summary describes different age ranges and settings and emphasizes variation among children and games. The afterschool component concerns ages 8-12; the home work ages 6-12; the physiological component ages 7-13. This is not a single uniform population or a validation of all games. The project was co-founded with the LEGO Group and funded by the LEGO Foundation. UNICEF Innocenti, S3

The implication for Orchard is to establish its own audience rather than borrowing the broadest age envelope. A child who can read a location list independently and a child who needs spoken guidance may encounter different games in practice. The relevant context includes who explains the rules, whether an adult is present, and whether another activity is available. A school-led session also differs from freely chosen play at home. Those distinctions should be recorded in later observations instead of being collapsed into a single engagement rate.

4. Alternatives and the narrower gap Orchard could fill

A Short Hike describes mountain exploration with a destination, optional routes, encounters with hikers and discoveries. Alba: A Wildlife Adventure describes a character-led island visit, wildlife exploration and activity at the player's pace. These first-party accounts demonstrate existing, legible leisure propositions. They do not establish child suitability, accessibility, comparative satisfaction or health effects, and this report did not play-test either game. Prices, transactions and current device compatibility were not verified.

A Short Hike, S5; Alba, S6

Orchard cannot claim an empty category merely because its cast consists of fruit. Its narrower possible contribution is an intimate, responsive encounter in which the companion's behavior makes a choice memorable and the next return understandable. That distinction is a proposal, not demonstrated competitive advantage. The relevant comparison is not the number of environments or collectables in a mature game; it is whether Orchard's small space supports a complete experience with an identifiable beginning, consequence and stopping point.

Non-digital options also matter. Drawing a character, inventing a story with an adult, playing outdoors, or choosing quiet time are plausible alternatives in a future choice task. This report makes no comparative outcome claims for them. They matter because evaluation should not assume that opening another screen is the desired result. A child could prefer the characters as a story or toy rather than as a digital interaction. That finding would challenge the proposed medium without invalidating the creative identity.

Figure 1

Different reasons to choose play

A Short Hike

Mountain destination

Developer describes routes, discoveries and fellow hikers. No comparative test here.

Alba

Island and wildlife

Developer describes a character-led visit and player-paced activity. No comparative test here.

Snacks Orchard

One companion encounter

Proposed choice, authored reaction and remembered continuation. Preference is untested.

First-party alternatives beside the proposed Orchard slice; no ranking, efficacy or suitability claim.

Different reasons to choose play

First-party alternatives beside the proposed Orchard slice; no ranking, efficacy or suitability claim.

- A0. EAG product definition
- S5
- S6

These equivalents accompany the reader figures. Source IDs refer to the report references. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Figure 1. Different reasons to choose play

First-party alternatives beside the proposed Orchard slice; no ranking, efficacy or suitability claim.

A Short Hike: Mountain destination. Developer describes routes, discoveries and fellow hikers. No comparative test here.

Alba: Island and wildlife. Developer describes a character-led visit and player-paced activity. No comparative test here.

Snacks Orchard: One companion encounter. Proposed choice, authored reaction and remembered continuation. Preference is untested.

Sources: A0, S5, S6.

Figure 1. Developer-described alternatives are compared with an unevaluated Orchard proposal. This is a qualitative scope comparison, not a ranking, purchase recommendation or measured preference. Text and data alternative.

References should inform questions, not supply protected expression. A clear destination can prompt examination of orientation without importing another game's map. Player-paced exploration can prompt scrutiny of time pressure without reproducing distinctive interactions. Orchard's characters, reactions, movement and setting need their own coherence. If their appeal depends on looking like another title, the evidence has not supplied a defensible gap.

5. Evidence, counterevidence and what does not transfer

The most relevant counterweight to an engagement-based benefit story is Vuorre and colleagues' 2022 study. The published abstract reports six weeks of logged play and three wellbeing survey waves from 38,935 players across seven games, with little evidence of meaningful average effects of time played. Oxford's author-written announcement confirms that participants were aged 18 or older.

Oxford Internet Institute, S2a Attempts to retrieve the full article during report drafting were blocked. The numerical description here is limited to the published abstract, and no effect estimate is reproduced. Vuorre et al., S2

This result does not show that a particular child cannot enjoy a particular moment. It does weaken a proposed shortcut from more minutes to more wellbeing. It also does not establish that every game or every pattern of use is harmless. EAG's practical inference is to avoid treating longer sessions or more frequent returns as sufficient success criteria. A concise encounter that ends satisfactorily could meet the proposed purpose; a long session spent lost or retrying could fail it.

The RITEC investigators' April 2024 account reports improvement in overall wellbeing in the South African digital-play group and more conditional findings in the United States and Chile. It describes comparison children continuing usual afterschool activities. Social interaction accompanied the tablet program. Random allocation, effect sizes, uncertainty and subgroup specifications could not be verified from this account. It is an investigators' summary, not an independently appraised full trial report.

Homer, Plass and Froehlich, S4

Two limitations must remain visible. The investigators describe a ten-week program, while UNICEF's methods summary says six to twelve weeks. The underlying phase-two PDF was inaccessible in the retrieval routes used, so the difference cannot be resolved here. The accounts should not be treated as two independent replications. They concern overlapping research, and neither isolates Orchard's proposed companion reaction or remembered choice. UNICEF, S3; Investigators, S4

Figure 2

What the research can and cannot answer

Motivation studies

Questions about control

S1: associations in student and gaming samples; not child or Orchard validation.

Child play research

Context-dependent findings

S3-S4: overlapping program and observational evidence; full report inaccessible and duration descriptions differ.

Playtime panel

A counterweight to more hours

S2: little evidence of meaningful average wellbeing effects; adult recruitment confirmed by Oxford. No Orchard effect.

Study contexts are not interchangeable. Evidence does not support an Orchard efficacy chart.

What the research can and cannot answer

Study contexts are not interchangeable. Evidence does not support an Orchard efficacy chart.

- S1
 - S2
 - S3
 - S4
 - S2a
-

Figure 2. What the research can and cannot answer

Study contexts are not interchangeable. Evidence does not support an Orchard efficacy chart.

Motivation studies: Questions about control. S1: associations in student and gaming samples; not child or Orchard validation.

Child play research: Context-dependent findings. S3-S4: overlapping program and observational evidence; full report inaccessible and duration descriptions differ.

Playtime panel: A counterweight to more hours. S2: little evidence of meaningful average wellbeing effects; adult recruitment confirmed by Oxford. No Orchard effect.

Sources: S1, S2, S3, S4, S2a.

Figure 2. Motivational associations, child program summaries and adult playtime findings answer different questions. None estimates an Orchard effect. Full-report access limits prevent an efficacy comparison. Text and data alternative.

The combined interpretation is deliberately conditional. Research provides a reason to examine the experience a game affords, but not a formula for assigning benefits to a theme. Fruit imagery is not evidence of nutrition learning. An apparent rest animation is not evidence of relaxation. Liking a companion is not evidence of reduced loneliness. A remembered preference is not evidence of improved memory. These distinctions protect the game's creative proposition from claims it has not been designed or evaluated to support.

6. Proposed mechanism: action, recognition and honest continuity

The proposed mechanism begins with orientation. A player should be able to identify a reachable object, understand an available invitation and recognize who or what will move. The current product definition leaves player-versus-companion control open; the two arrangements should not be conflated. Directly moving a character and directing a companion may produce different expectations about responsibility, feedback and failure.

The next link is recognizable consequence. After the invitation, travel should result in meaningful arrival and interaction, followed by a response that reflects the first action. This is more demanding than playing a generic animation on tap. The player must be able to infer why the response happened. A surprising reaction can be enjoyable while remaining causally legible; a random flourish may be visually attractive but fail that purpose. This is an authored-design hypothesis, not a validated learning mechanism.

Rest then supplies a possible conclusion or pause. It need not be framed as self-care or recovery. A clear rest state may help communicate that the interaction has finished, but a child should also be able to stop earlier. If the design only permits departure after completing a sequence, its invitation is less voluntary than its language suggests. Repeated input and interruption should not corrupt the consequence or leave the companion apparently stranded.

Finally, return should reveal exactly the bounded choice that was promised. Save behavior has a factual obligation independent of emotional response. A game that says a choice is remembered must either recover that choice or explain that it cannot. Recreating a generic scene while implying personal continuity would undermine the proposed value. The memory should remain within the approved local save boundary rather than silently becoming a school profile or a reason to create an account.

Figure 3

A proposed encounter with a voluntary exit

Conceptual only. Every link is proposed.

Authored play

1. Orient in the clearing
↓ proposed link
2. Invite companion to object
↓ proposed link
3. Notice contextual reaction
↓ proposed link
4. Choose rest or leave

Proposed sequence; reaction, control and object remain undecided.

Honest continuity

1. Leave at a chosen point
↓ proposed link
2. Retain only promised choice
↓ proposed link
3. Resume or explain recovery failure

No guilt, decay or obligation to return.

Equivalent participation

1. Choose a named action
↓ proposed link
2. Receive readable response
↓ proposed link
3. Use the same useful state route

The non-3D route must preserve meaningful choice.

EAG conceptual model, not an evaluated causal chain. Immediate play quality is distinct from developmental benefit.

A proposed encounter with a voluntary exit

EAG conceptual model, not an evaluated causal chain. Immediate play quality is distinct from developmental benefit.

- A0. EAG product definition

Figure 3. A proposed encounter with a voluntary exit

EAG conceptual model, not an evaluated causal chain. Immediate play quality is distinct from developmental benefit.

Authored play. Orient in the clearing → Invite companion to object → Notice contextual reaction → Choose rest or leave.
Proposed sequence; reaction, control and object remain undecided.

Honest continuity. Leave at a chosen point → Retain only promised choice → Resume or explain recovery failure. No guilt, decay or obligation to return.

Equivalent participation. Choose a named action → Receive readable response → Use the same useful state route. The non-3D route must preserve meaningful choice.

Sources: AO.

Figure 3. EAG conceptual model derived from the product definition. Every link is proposed. The usable exit and recovery routes matter even when a player declines the full encounter. No developmental outcome is implied. Text and data alternative.

7. Design concepts to test without deciding the finished game

Three questions can structure a later authorized concept comparison. First, does a single visible invitation make the next action understandable? Second, does the companion's contextual reaction make that action feel consequential? Third, does returning to the remembered choice feel like continuing one's own encounter? These are criteria for comparing proposals, not authorization for an engine, camera, object, animation or cast revision.

A candidate presentation could pair visible destinations with named actions and readable response text. The EAG product definition also calls for a location/action list that drives the same useful state route without 3D. This should be evaluated as an equivalent way to play: the choice, response, stopping point and memory still need to make sense. A text alternative that only describes an inaccessible scene would not prove equivalent interaction.

Microsoft's Xbox Accessibility Guideline 116 recommends giving players adequate time to perceive and act on interface information and avoiding or adapting unnecessary UI timing. It distinguishes UI limits from core gameplay timing. The guidance informs examination of cues and messages; it does not certify Orchard's accessibility or dictate every gameplay rhythm. Microsoft, S7

For Orchard, a reaction that disappears before a player can interpret it would be a concrete design problem. So would a motion-only instruction, mandatory camera orbiting, or an interaction that is understandable only through sound. The EAG product definition's proposed keyboard and named-action routes offer candidates

for investigation. Actual accessibility remains unverified until people can use those routes in the relevant device, input and reading contexts.

The companion must also remain a fruit character in motion, contact and rest. The design should not solve an animation problem by adding human legs or substituting an unapproved humanoid movement. Nor should provisional geometry become evidence of finished character craft. The needed question is whether the approved character can carry this interaction expressively and coherently, with the same meaning surviving reduced motion and rendering failure. That is a creative and technical question that this literature cannot settle.

8. Risks, unequal access and the work behind a gentle experience

A gentle presentation can conceal demanding requirements. A small scene may still load slowly, drain a phone, make a camera hard to follow or rely on precise touch. The proposed device evidence therefore includes cold loading, usable readiness, sustained interaction and background/resume behavior on named phones. No frame-rate, payload or latency result has been measured for this report. A high-end desktop demonstration would not resolve those questions.

Reading, language and sensory access can change the apparent simplicity of the encounter. The response text must be understandable without adult interpretation if independent play is intended. If adult help is expected, that should be declared and its effort observed. Requiring an adult to recover a save or translate every instruction is a product cost, even if it does not appear in a software budget. People who cannot use the preferred input should not disappear from evaluation because they never reach the first reaction.

Emotional framing is another risk. A companion should not imply distress when the child leaves or suggest that absence harms it. The EAG product definition excludes guilt, artificial waiting and decaying needs. That boundary should extend to return language, visual reactions and reminders. Counting a successful departure as a failure would create an incentive to weaken the very freedom the proposition promises.

Privacy and identity need equally concrete boundaries. Anonymous play need not create an account. A remembered preference should not become inferred wellbeing data, a psychological label or a school record. Later research can ask about enjoyment without collecting unnecessary personal histories. No multiplayer, public social world or voice service is approved by this report. Those additions would materially change moderation, data and safety demands.

There is also an opportunity cost to world breadth. Every extra character or object increases the number of authored combinations and recovery cases that must remain coherent. More content may be valuable later, but a broad world cannot compensate for an unclear first interaction. Maintenance includes keeping reactions consistent, explaining save changes and preserving access when assets fail. These are obligations created by the proposed experience, not evidence against making a small game.

9. Evaluation and decisions that could change the proposition

An initial evaluation should ask whether the encounter is understandable, enjoyable to its intended audience and recoverable. It should be planned only after age range, consent arrangements, approved slice and data boundaries are settled. This report specifies questions and decision logic, not an implemented study, approved sample size or instrument. Observation should include people who need alternative inputs and those who decline or stop, not just confident completers.

For orientation, observe what a player thinks is available and what actually happens after an action. Record assistance separately from independent success. For authorship, ask the player to explain the reaction in their own words without first supplying the intended explanation. For choice, distinguish deliberate repetition from confusion. For departure, ask whether the child can leave at a chosen point and understands what will be retained. For return, compare the promised remembered choice with the recovered state.

A later preference comparison could offer the approved encounter alongside a credible alternative under similar access conditions, including an option to do something else. The purpose would be to understand preference and burden, not establish that Orchard treats a condition. Adult prompting, researcher enthusiasm and novelty should be recorded because they can affect participation. A repeated encounter would help reveal whether the initial surprise becomes tiresome, but return frequency alone would still not explain why someone came back.

Figure 4

Observations that should change the design

Action is misunderstood

Revise control and response

Observe who players think they control and how they explain the consequence.

Exit feels obligatory

Remove pressure

Treat chosen departure as valid; inspect worry, unclear saving and companion language.

Return loses the choice

Repair the promise

Compare recovered state with what was promised. Benefit claims need a separate study.

Proposed decision logic, not completed evaluation. No invented thresholds or results.

Observations that should change the design

Proposed decision logic, not completed evaluation. No invented thresholds or results.

- A0. EAG product definition
 - S1
 - S2
 - S3
 - S4
-

Figure 4. Observations that should change the design

Proposed decision logic, not completed evaluation. No invented thresholds or results.

Action is misunderstood: Revise control and response. Observe who players think they control and how they explain the consequence.

Exit feels obligatory: Remove pressure. Treat chosen departure as valid; inspect worry, unclear saving and companion language.

Return loses the choice: Repair the promise. Compare recovered state with what was promised. Benefit claims need a separate study.

Sources: AO, S1, S2, S3, S4.

Figure 4. Proposed observations and corresponding decisions. No thresholds, samples or results have been fabricated; acceptance criteria must be set before a later study. Text and data alternative.

If players repeatedly misidentify who they control, revise the control proposition before adding content. If they cannot connect action and reaction, revise the authored response. If they like the cast but prefer watching, investigate whether interaction contributes enough to justify the game format. If the alternate route loses meaningful choice, repair equivalence rather than classifying its users as unsuccessful. If exit causes worry, remove the source of pressure. If resume is unreliable, stop making the continuity promise until recovery is demonstrable.

Any broader benefit claim requires a separate evaluation. Transferable learning needs a specified skill and an appropriate measure outside the practiced game action. Wellbeing claims need a defined outcome, age-appropriate measurement, suitable comparison, adequate follow-up and attention to harms and unequal effects. A positive enjoyment response cannot substitute for that work. Orchard can remain worthwhile entertainment if those broader effects are absent, provided its actual proposition is delivered honestly.

10. Methods, limitations, references and corrections

This was a focused, question-led review conducted on September 19, 2026, using the EAG product definition, the entity research brief and original or institutional sources. It is not a systematic review or meta-analysis. Searches concerned game motivation, child digital play, wellbeing, accessible timing and first-party exploration games. Sources were selected for their relevance to the bounded encounter and ability to expose limits, rather than for a favorable conclusion. No evidence was pooled across ages, settings or outcome types.

Access was uneven. The motivation paper was available as an author-hosted full PDF, with methods and relevant results inspected. UNICEF's project page and the investigators' account were readable, but the phase-two PDF could not be retrieved through the routes used. For the 2022 playtime paper, full-text retrieval was blocked during drafting. Numerical findings are limited to the published abstract; the age restriction is confirmed separately by Oxford's author-written institutional announcement. No table reanalysis or independent replication was performed. The UNICEF duration discrepancy remains unresolved.

The report excludes unsourced game-benefit marketing, derivative news treated as independent replication, and clinical studies of unrelated treatments as evidence for Orchard. No current price, market-size, clinical, nutrition or educational-effect claim is made. Developer descriptions are not product tests. The qualitative figures contain no estimated effect sizes, probabilities or audience counts. Conceptual links are labeled as proposals, and their text alternatives preserve the same limits.

Correction checks were bounded: source identity, publication year, accessible notices and a targeted title/correction search for the playtime study were checked. Search results exposed older preprint counts that differ from the published abstract; only the published 38,935-player description is retained. This is not an exhaustive retraction search. Later full-report access, corrected source data or direct Orchard evidence should trigger revision of the relevant claim rather than a silent strengthening of the conclusion.

References and source locators:

- **A0.** Education Angel Group, Snacks Orchard product definition, reviewed September 19, 2026 for this report. Defines intended scope, not implementation or effectiveness.
- **S1. Ryan, Rigby and Przybylski (2006).** The Motivational Pull of Video Games: A Self-Determination Theory Approach. Abstract, study methods/results and discussion. Original PDF.
- **S2. Vuorre et al. (2022).** Time spent playing video games is unlikely to impact well-being. Published abstract; full-text retrieval during drafting blocked. Article.
- **S2a. Oxford Internet Institute (July 27, 2022).** Major new study finds little evidence for causal connection between well-being and video game playing. Author-written institutional announcement; recruitment paragraph confirms ages 18+. Announcement.
- **S3. UNICEF Innocenti (2024 research).** Responsible Innovation in Technology for Children. Official project Methods, Findings and partner disclosure; full phase-two PDF inaccessible. Project.
- **S4. Homer, Plass and Froehlich (April 30, 2024).** Can Digital Games Enhance Children's Well-being? Intervention paragraphs and results bullets; investigators' summary. Account.
- **S5. Adam Robinson-Yu.** A Short Hike. Undated developer description, accessed September 19, 2026. Official site.
- **S6. ustwo games.** Alba: A Wildlife Adventure. Undated About and Features descriptions, accessed September 19, 2026. Official site.
- **S7. Microsoft.** Xbox Accessibility Guideline 116: Time limits. Goal, overview and implementation guidance, accessed September 19, 2026. Official guideline.

Figure text and data alternatives

Complete semantic alternatives accompany each figure in this reader and its text download. Source IDs refer to the references in this report. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Corrections and entity context

Readers identifying an error can contact EAG with the section, disputed statement and supporting source. Snacks Orchard provides the public entity context, not an external citation for EAG's product claims.