

1 **Title**

2 **Human health effects of recycling and reusing plastic packaging in the food system:**
3 **a systematic review and meta-analysis of life cycle assessments.**

4
5 **Short Title**

6 Circular economies of plastic packaging and human health

7
8 **Authors**

9 Megan Deeney^{1*}, Rosemary Green^{1†}, Xiaoyu Yan^{2*†}, Claire Dooley^{1‡}, Joe Yates^{1‡},
10 Heike B Rolker^{3,4}, Suneetha Kadiyala¹.

11
12 **Affiliations**

13 ¹ London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine; London, United Kingdom.

14 ² University of Exeter; Exeter, United Kingdom.

15 ³ University of Bristol; Bristol, United Kingdom.

16 ⁴ Rothamsted Research, North Wyke, United Kingdom.

17 † These authors contributed equally to this work

18 ‡ These authors contributed equally to this work

19 *Corresponding author. Email: megan.deeney@lshtm.ac.uk, Xiaoyu.Yan@exeter.ac.uk

20
21 **Abstract**

22 Circular strategies, including recycling and reuse of food packaging, are critical
23 responses to the plastic pollution crisis and could provide co-benefits and trade-offs for
24 human health. Our meta-analysis of life cycle assessment (LCA) data quantifies possible
25 health effects using Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) mediated by climate
26 change, ozone, air pollution, toxicity, and water scarcity. We found strong evidence for
27 reduced health risks with both a higher percentage of recycled content and a greater end-
28 of-life recycling rate, resulting in around a day of healthy life saved per tonne of plastic
29 packaging recycled. On average, reusable packaging reduced the health impacts
30 associated with single use plastics after 30 uses, which is unlikely reflected in current
31 consumer behaviour. Data from low- and middle-income countries, and greater use of
32 health indicators in LCA, are urgently needed. LCA is a unique tool that could be
33 optimised for interdisciplinary public health research on circular economies.

34
35 **Teaser**

36
37 Life cycle assessment meta-analysis shows recycling and reusing plastic food packaging
38 could provide human health co-benefits, and some risks.

44 MAIN TEXT

45

46 Introduction

47

48 By 2050, the plastics sector could be responsible for 20% of oil consumption and 15% of
49 the annual global carbon budget (1), with single use packaging driving a cumulative 12
50 billion metric tonnes of plastic landfill and pollution (2). Food and beverage packaging
51 may account for 65% of the plastic packaging reaching consumers (3) and is a central
52 focus of circular economy initiatives promoting recycling and reuse. Whilst reducing
53 environmental burdens, these strategies may also present risks and opportunities for
54 human health(4).

55

56 Plastic offers an economic, versatile, and hygienic packaging solution for longer lasting
57 food and drink. Since mass production of plastic began in the 1950s, global consumption
58 has increased exponentially, outstripping that of any other manufactured material (2).
59 Over 90% of plastic is still derived from finite virgin fossil feedstocks and most plastic
60 packaging is discarded in the same year that it is produced (1, 2). Global average
61 recycling rates remain low at 18% of non-fibre plastic and the rest is incinerated,
62 landfilled, or accumulates in the environment(2). Plastic can take hundreds of years to
63 degrade(5), its durability a gross mismatch with its brief, single use by consumers. This
64 predominantly linear economy of plastic packaging is a resource-intensive and highly
65 wasteful ‘take-make-dispose’ model of material management, resulting in unsustainable
66 environmental damage and subsequent human health risks.

67

68 The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) put responsible management of resources
69 and waste reduction on the global agenda, highlighting recycling and reuse as key
70 alternatives to the linear economy (6). International targets for increasing recycling and
71 reuse have been rapidly adopted in response to the plastic pollution crisis. The New
72 Plastics Economy Global Commitment signatories, representing 20% of the plastic
73 packaging industry and 20 government bodies in five continents (7), have committed to
74 fully decoupling plastic production from finite resources and to recycling, reusing or
75 composting 100% of packaging (8). The European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular
76 Economy states that by 2030 all plastic packaging entering the European market should
77 be either recyclable or reusable(9). Countries across Africa have trailblazed single use
78 plastic bans (10, 11); the African Circular Economy Alliance calls for legislative changes
79 allowing recycled plastic to be used in food grade packaging and more efficient plastic
80 recycling trade between countries (12). The stage is set for a global break from single use
81 plastic packaging, with increasing recycling and reuse around the world, though
82 significant action across sectors will be required to realise these ambitions.

83

84 It is important that any trade-offs and co-benefits associated with actions to reduce plastic
85 waste are understood as we work towards the manifold economic, environmental and
86 health objectives of the SDGs. Identifying and quantifying these effects could help to
87 mitigate unintended consequences and provide additional incentives that could be used to
88 advocate and propel action on recycling and reuse targets. Research suggests that circular
89 economy strategies could provide co-benefits for reducing climate change and increasing

90 employment (13, 14). Yet, the potential opportunities and risks for human health remain
91 poorly understood; scientific evidence is scarce and health indicators are not integrated
92 into circular economy policy monitoring(4).

93
94 Opportunities to improve health outcomes may plausibly be derived from reducing the
95 impacts of a linear economy of plastics. For example, increased recycling and reuse
96 would reduce the need for raw material extraction required by virgin plastic production
97 and would circumvent incineration at the end of the packaging life cycle. These processes
98 cause air pollution linked to respiratory diseases, and lead to greenhouse gas emissions
99 which in turn increase heat related morbidity and mortality due to climate change(15).
100 Conversely, these circular strategies could also pose health risks associated with
101 occupational chemical and contaminant exposure during recycling and remanufacturing
102 processes (4). Direct consumer exposure to unintentionally added chemicals in recycled
103 plastics, or contaminants during reuse, may also be a concern, particularly in the absence
104 of strict regulation and careful hygiene management (4, 16). Whilst some evidence of
105 these health effects exists, it is often limited by challenges of attribution or restricted to
106 discrete stages of the packaging life cycle (15).

107
108 To gain a more comprehensive understanding of possible health co-benefits and trade-
109 offs of circular strategies, methods based on systems thinking are required. The European
110 Commission endorses Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) as the current most effective
111 framework for assessing environmental impacts associated with products (17). LCA can
112 also provide estimates of health effects, calculated in Disability-Adjusted Life Years
113 (DALYs). This estimate is the sum of human morbidity and mortality due to climate
114 change, ozone formation and depletion, ionising radiation, human toxicity, and water
115 scarcity (**Figure 1**), calculated by applying conversion factors based on the latest
116 scientific evidence to a complete inventory of the material and energy inputs and outputs
117 of a product and its life cycle processes (18). This unique assessment of the entire life
118 cycle allows circular versus linear economy health trade-offs to be analysed across plastic
119 packaging production, transport, consumer use and disposal.

120
121 LCAs are increasingly used to examine the relative effects of circular economy strategies
122 and have been conducted for a range of single use plastic and consumer-level packaging
123 formats, some of which report health-related impacts (19–21). These studies have been
124 reviewed to better understand the environmental performance of recycling and reuse
125 options and to support policy decisions (22–24) but not yet for their contribution to
126 understanding human health effects.

127
128 We systematically review and meta-analyse evidence from LCA studies to determine the
129 potential value of these methods for public health research on the circular economy of
130 plastic packaging, and to provide a quantitative analysis of possible human health risks
131 and opportunities associated with recycling and reuse across the packaging life cycle in
132 selected packaging types (**Figure 2**). The two primary objectives of this paper are:

133
134 Objective 1: To identify trends and gaps in the use of health-related indicators in life
135 cycle assessments of plastic primary food and drink packaging, food

136 service ware and grocery bags that compare virgin and single use plastic
137 packaging to recycling and reuse options

138 Objective 2: To quantitatively meta-analyse the possible human health effects of
139 circular economy scenarios according to LCA evidence, compared to a
140 linear economy of plastic primary food and drink packaging, food
141 service ware and grocery bags

142
143

144 Results

145
146

146 *Characteristics of included studies*

147
148

148 Our systematic literature search retrieved 10,499 unique records from scientific
149 databases. After screening by title and abstract we included 532 records for full text
150 screening, of which 30 were included in our review (**Figure 3**). Reasons for exclusion
151 were primarily related to study design and a lack of recycling or reuse comparison.
152 Searching reference lists of included studies and contact with the authors resulted in eight
153 additional studies for inclusion. The updated database search, on the 22nd of July 2021,
154 produced seven new eligible studies and grey literature searches returned four, resulting
155 in a total of 49 LCA studies included our review.

156
157

157 All included studies were published in the last 20 years, most since 2010, with the highest
158 number of annual publications in 2020-2021. Evidence from high-income countries in
159 Europe and the United States of America predominated (n=44 studies), the remaining
160 studies focused on product systems in Thailand (n=4) and China (n=1).

161
162

162 Within studies, comparisons focused predominantly on recycling (n=42), 15 of which
163 included a calculation of recycled content compared to virgin material and 36 studies
164 compared end-of-life recycling to incineration and/or landfill. Reusable products were
165 compared to single use products in 17 LCAs. Studies most frequently assessed drinks
166 bottles (n=15), followed by primary food packaging (n=11). Cups and service ware
167 featured equally (n=9 studies each) and fewer studies considered grocery bags (n=7), two
168 studies considered both bottles and packaging. These products were made of various
169 types of plastics, the most frequent being polyethylene terephthalate (n=27),
170 polypropylene (n=22) and polystyrene (n=16).

171
172

172 The impact assessments in each study was almost exclusively conducted at midpoint
173 level; only one study considered the endpoint area of protection, Human Health in
174 DALYs. All studies assessed Climate Change (n=49), but fewer calculated other
175 midpoint indicators, such as Cancer and Non-Cancer Effects (n=6 and n=4 respectively).
176 The frequencies of studies cross-referenced by circular economy strategy, product type
177 and LCA impact assessment categories are presented as a static map (**Figure 4**). The
178 [evidence map](#) is also available online and can be interactively filtered by type of plastic,
179 publication date and location. Complete data extraction and all meta-analysis calculations
180 are available in **Data S1-11**.

181

182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227

Reporting quality and suitability for meta-analysis

Our appraisal of included studies indicated that the majority of included LCAs modelled the packaging life cycle comprehensively (**Figure S1**), though the consumer use phase was rarely included in recycling comparisons: most studies stated that they assumed negligible or equal impacts during this phase in the context of their comparison. Two thirds of studies provided evidence of sufficient data for all modelled life cycle stages, either providing the actual data or detailing and referencing the sources.

None of the included studies explicitly set out to determine health impacts of recycling and reuse in their stated goals though many used impact categories such as Human Toxicity and Cancer Effects that only link to Human Health as the endpoint area of protection, rather than the environmental area of protection ‘Ecosystems’. Most studies provided a detailed description of the functional units with weight measurements (88%), though fewer were explicit about the method for accounting for recycling and reuse (71%), and 8% did not provide the specific impact assessment method used.

47 studies reported total life cycle impacts, the other two presented no overall impact data but instead provided results for each stage of the life cycle with multiple scenarios. Half the included studies presented disaggregated results for at least some of the life cycle stages modelled that were relevant to our review question.

Health effects of increasing recycled content of plastic packaging

We identified 15 LCAs that included recycled plastic content comparisons in food packaging (20, 25–38). In fixed scenarios of packaging made of 100% recycled plastic compared to 0% recycled plastic (**Figure 5**), ten comparisons from seven studies showed consistent reductions in health-related midpoint impacts including Climate Change, Photochemical Ozone Formation, Particulate Matter Formation, and Cancer Effects for 100% recycled plastic. Within each of these categories, the range of values was wide, with the median indicating average impacts a quarter to half the magnitude of those of virgin packaging. The median reduction for Ozone Depletion was the smallest at 7.22% (comparison points (cps)=4; IQR= -21.78% to -7.11%), and Human Toxicity was calculated only once, showing a 57.14% reduction in impacts relative to virgin packaging. Water Use was the only assessed impact where the direction of the relationship was unclear: the median showed a 7.03% increase in impact for 100% recycled plastic but one estimate indicated a 20% reduction (cps=3; Median=7.03%; IQR= -21.52% to 9.50%). There was a very small increase in Non-Cancer Effects from 100% recycled plastic, but this estimate came from a single study.

Meta-regression analysing the effects of increasing recycled content, relative to baseline 0% recycled plastic, showed a linear relationship with decreasing Climate Change impacts and Total DALYs based on 41 packaging comparison points extracted from 13 studies (**Figure 6**). 21 comparison points were based on bottles, six on service ware, five

228 on cups, five on grocery bags and four on food packaging. On average, relative to virgin
229 plastic packaging, there was an additional 161kg decrease in Climate Change impacts (kg
230 CO₂ equivalents) for every 10% increase in recycled content in 1 metric tonne of food
231 and drink plastic packaging (Coefficient=-16.0978; 95% CI= -20.64423 to -11.55136;
232 p<0.0001). This equates to a 0.000149 decrease in DALYs as a result of climate change.
233

234 There was insufficient data on other midpoint impact categories to create separate
235 regression models. However, for each comparison point, all provided midpoint indicators
236 were converted to DALYs and summed to give a Total DALYs estimate for each
237 comparison. Estimates of Total DALYs were therefore based on different numbers of
238 midpoint impacts. All included the Climate Change pathway, and some included other
239 midpoint impacts such as Ozone Depletion, Photochemical Ozone Formation, Ionizing
240 Radiation, Particulate Matter Formation, and Human Toxicity impacts depending on the
241 study (**Data S3**). The trend for Total DALYs remained in favour of increasing recycled
242 content. On average, relative to virgin plastic packaging, there was an additional
243 0.000196 decrease in Total DALYs for every 10% increase in recycled content in 1
244 metric tonne of food and drink plastic packaging (Coefficient -0.0000196; 95% CI= -
245 0.0000269 to -0.0000124; p<0.0001). This equates to nearly a day of healthy life gained
246 for every tonne of packaging made from 100% recycled plastic as opposed to virgin
247 plastic (0.72 days).
248

249 Overall, reductions in Total DALYs were largely due to reductions in Climate Change
250 impacts, though in some cases Climate Change effects contributed to increasing DALYs
251 (**Figure S2**). Reductions in Particulate Matter Formation contributed to reductions in
252 Total DALYs more than the Climate Change effects in six packaging comparison points
253 and Human Toxicity appeared generally to support reductions in DALYs though
254 increased them in three comparison points.
255

256 Two studies could not be included in quantitative meta-analysis because the recycled
257 content comparison was part of a mixed strategy scenario, but both showed decreased
258 impacts relative to other scenarios (25, 28).
259

261 ***Health effects of increasing end-of-life recycling of plastic packaging***

262
263 End-of-life recycling was compared to incineration and/or landfill in 36 studies (19–21, 25–
264 29, 31, 33, 38–63). The only study to report on Human Health DALYs calculated a
265 reduction of 0.9 μ DALYs (-28%) for 100% recycling of 4 PET wine bottles compared to
266 a scenario of equal landfill and incineration (19).
267

268 In discrete scenarios, studies that modelled 100% recycling compared to a reference
269 100% incineration (n=19 studies, 92 comparison points) or 100% landfill (n=12 studies,
270 52 comparison points) showed mixed results for health-related midpoint impacts with
271 wide ranging values across studies (**Figure 7**). All studies that compared 100% recycling
272 to 100% landfill reported percent decreases in Climate Change, Ozone Depletion,
273 Ionizing Radiation, Particulate Matter Formation, Cancer Effects and Water Use, though

274 only Climate Change was based on more than four comparison points (cps=52; Median=
275 -40.53%; IQR= -54.83% to -22.09%). Effects were mixed for Photochemical Ozone
276 Formation (cps=22; Median= -15.68%; IQR= -53.98% to -5.80%), Human Toxicity
277 (cps=19; Median = -24.57%; IQR=-45.59% to -12.07%) and Non-Cancer Effects (cps=4;
278 Median= -58.50%; IQR= -71.00% to -28.00%) with some studies showing relative
279 increases in impacts, though the median presented an average reduction in each impact
280 category. Results were more variable in studies that compared 100% recycling to 100%
281 incineration. Whilst studies consistently showed reductions in Climate Change (cps=79;
282 Median= -56.59%; IQR= -68.78% to -36.89%) and Non-Cancer Effects (cps=3; Median=
283 -79.45%; IQR= -84.16% to -79.22%), increases in impacts were seen for Ionizing
284 Radiation (cps=10; Median=98.34%; IQR=31.91% to 183.33%) and all other indicators
285 showed both relative decreases and increases in impacts compared to incineration,
286 resulting in median percent increases in Ozone Depletion (cps=17; Median=27.27%;
287 IQR= 7.18% to 378.57%), Particulate Matter Formation (cps=11; Median=85.71%; IQR=
288 -29.38% to 90.91%) and Water Use (cps=17; Median=16.00%; IQR= -12.77% to
289 81.13%). Human Toxicity was the only indicator for which the median and mean were
290 not aligned on the direction of effect: the median showed decreased impacts and the mean
291 an increase.

292
293 We used mixed-effects linear regression to meta-analyse the effects of increasing end-of-
294 life recycling compared to a baseline 100% landfill and/or incineration. We included 179
295 comparison points from 27 studies; 65 comparison points were based on food packaging,
296 61 on bottles, 23 on service ware, 15 on cups and 15 on grocery bags. Relative to landfill
297 and/or incineration, there was an average additional 227kg decrease in Climate Change
298 impacts (kg CO₂ equivalents) for every 10% increase in end-of-life recycling rate of 1
299 metric tonne of food and drink plastic packaging (Coefficient=-22.69839 95% CI= -
300 27.22419 to -18.17259; p<0.0001) (**Figure 8**). This equates to 0.000210656 DALYs
301 mediated only by climate change.

302
303 Total DALYs based on all midpoint indicator estimates provided for each LCA
304 comparison point remained in favour of increasing recycling. On average, relative to 0%
305 recycling there was an additional 0.000211 decrease in Total DALYs for every 10%
306 increase in recycling of 1 metric tonne of food and drink plastic packaging (Coefficient -
307 0.0000211; 95% CI= -0.000026 to -0.0000163; p<0.0001). This equates to nearly a day
308 of healthy life gained for every tonne of packaging recycled instead of incinerated and
309 landfilled (0.77 days). Climate Change impacts consistently contributed to decreasing
310 DALYs though contributions from Human Toxicity measures, Particulate Matter
311 Formation and Water Use were mixed, and in some cases increased DALYs in recycling
312 scenarios (**Figure S3**).

313
314 Eight LCAs could not be included in meta-regression because of challenges with
315 comparability of data and scenarios. The specific reasons are listed in **Data S4**. However,
316 these studies also predominantly reflected that increasing recycling could reduce health-
317 related impacts relative to landfill and incineration.

318

319 Differences in impacts for recycled content and end-of-life recycling comparison points
320 were generated almost entirely from emitting processes and credits awarded for avoided
321 virgin material, at the production and waste management stages of the packaging life
322 cycle. Where studies provided disaggregated data, some calculated differences in
323 transport stages, as a result of different collection systems, but this only accounted for 1-
324 12% of the total difference in impacts.

325
326

327 *Health effects of reusable plastic packaging*

328

329 Reusable products were compared to single use products in 17 LCAs (21, 25, 28, 30, 35, 41,
330 43, 56–58, 64–70). Studies comparing packaging designed to be reused with packaging
331 designed for single use, based on both products being used just once (n=6 studies; 32
332 comparison points) demonstrated almost universal and often large relative increases in all
333 health-related impacts for reusable packaging (**Figure S4**). Relative to single use,
334 reusable packaging showed a median increase of 852.17% (cps=32; IQR=382.60% to
335 1260.93%) in Climate Change impacts, increased Ozone Depletion by 684.87% (cps=20;
336 IQR= 237.33% to 2610.98%), Photochemical Ozone Formation by 969.07% (cps=30;
337 IQR= 207.69% to 1690.54%), Human Toxicity by 447.59% (cps=12; IQR= 219.84% to
338 1196.52%) and Water Use by 4689.27% (cps=4, IQR=673.21% to 8780.39%).

339

340 The reuse mixed-effects regression model used percent change in impacts data from 13
341 studies with 97 packaging comparison points; 45 comparison points were based on
342 grocery bags, 32 on cups, 13 on bottles and 7 on service ware. Compared to the impact of
343 single-use packaging used once, the percent change in Climate Change emissions of
344 reusable packaging decreased on average by 15.05 percentage points for every additional
345 use (Coefficient=-0.1504829; 95% CI= -0.3118651 to -0.0108993; p=0.068). In brief,
346 whilst the impact of reusable packaging is initially relatively higher than single use
347 packaging, the relative difference becomes smaller with each additional use until
348 equivalent and eventually smaller impacts are generated. The break-even point for
349 Climate Change impacts, (where percent change=0) occurs at 29.94 uses, meaning that
350 on average reusable packaging must be used at least this many times to equal or reduce
351 Climate Change impacts and climate associated DALYs, compared to single use
352 packaging.

353

354 Due to the limited number of studies, formal sub-group analysis by product and material
355 type was not possible, though no visible patterns were identified in the scatter plot
356 (**Figure 9**). Other impact categories did not meet the threshold of ten studies needed for
357 formal regression analysis but scatter plots with a line of best fit are shown in **Figure S5**
358 and show linear relationships between increased reuse and reduced Ozone Depletion,
359 Ozone Formation, Human Toxicity and Water Use impacts relative to single use
360 packaging.

361

362 Five studies in this review were not included in the quantitative reuse meta-analysis; two
363 had no single-use baseline and three had no absolute impact data but provided their own

364 break-even points. For Climate Change impacts, these were 4 times for reusable plastic
365 cutlery (67), 2-4 times for takeaway food containers (68), <3-7 times for drinks cups (70).

366
367

368 **Discussion**

369
370 Circular economy strategies including recycling and reuse are primarily designed to
371 reduce waste and pollution. We found evidence for possible co-benefits to human health
372 as a result of these strategies in plastic food and drink packaging. This was supported by
373 strong evidence for a linear trend between both increasing percentage recycled content
374 and increasing end-of life recycling rate with decreasing DALYs relative to virgin plastic
375 and incineration or landfill waste management. Savings in DALYs were mainly a result
376 of reduced greenhouse gas emissions, which contribute to climate change and associated
377 morbidity and mortality, though other pathways also contributed. Scaling up our results,
378 for every 10% of the current annual global food and drink packaging waste (2, 3)
379 recycled instead of landfilled or incinerated, we could save around 10,400 DALYs,
380 though we identified critical gaps in this evidence. Despite overall improvements for
381 human health, some studies reported increased risks from Human Toxicity, Particulate
382 Matter Formation and Water Use, suggesting possible trade-offs that are currently under-
383 explored. We found that reusable plastic packaging can reduce health impacts associated
384 with single use plastics, but on average across packaging formats, these reductions only
385 occur with frequent reuse, not reflected in current consumer behaviour. Life cycle
386 assessments that compare circular versus linear economies of plastic primary food and
387 drink packaging represent an emerging body of literature. We identified opportunities for
388 future research to build on LCA methods towards a more robust and comprehensive
389 evidence base for assessing circular economy health risks and opportunities.

390
391

392 ***Meta-analysis results in the research context***

393
394 Our estimates of possible human health co-benefits of recycling plastic packaging were
395 smaller than those calculated for some other environmental strategies, for example the
396 health co-benefits estimated for more sustainable dietary choices (71). However, the
397 projected growth in plastic consumption means that health effects are important to
398 understand (72). An LCA of personal protective gear, made predominantly of single use
399 plastics, was conducted for the first six months of the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK
400 (73). Authors compared maximum recycling to baseline incineration and reported an
401 absolute reduction of 68 DALYs (73), which on a per tonne basis was aligned with our
402 findings for plastic food and drink packaging.

403
404 Meta-analysis results for midpoint health-related indicators broadly aligned with existing
405 studies evaluating the environmental impacts of packaging recycling and reuse. A review
406 by *Vendries et al.* of packaging and food service ware compared higher versus lower
407 levels of recycled content in packaging made of any plastic or other material (23). Our
408 findings were similar in that most comparisons showed reduced impacts with increased
409 recycled content. Some increased impacts were seen in three newer studies included in

410 our review but other studies from the same time-point did not. Reasons for these
411 differences are unclear and highlight possible trade-offs that remain critically
412 underexplored.

413
414 Our findings on the absolute reduction in Climate Change impacts as a result of end-of-
415 life recycling are largely in line with a broader study by *Lau et al.* on all plastic
416 packaging using stochastic modelling (72). This study reported a reduction of 1.9tCO₂
417 equivalents per metric tonne of packaging recycled, relative to virgin plastic production
418 (72). Using the ReCiPe 2016 conversion factor for Climate Change impacts, this would
419 equate to a reduction of 0.0017632 DALYs per tonne of packaging. Our meta-analysis
420 produced slightly higher estimates, showing average reductions of 2.3tCO₂ equivalents
421 per tonne and a 0.00208 decrease in Total DALYs relative to incineration or landfill.
422 Differences are likely because our meta-analysis is based on the distribution of material
423 types found in the literature, whereas this modelling study was based on market share. In
424 addition, our estimate of DALYs incorporated multiple health pathways using all
425 available indicator data from included studies.

426
427 For reusable packaging, our meta-analysis suggests a break-even point of 30 uses, higher
428 than reported in some other studies. Two other reviews of life cycle assessments
429 comparing reusable products to single use have been conducted (24, 74). One was not
430 restricted to plastic materials and included a broader range of packaging types, including
431 transport packaging, reporting break-even points between 2-20 uses(74). The other was
432 restricted to single use plastic carrier bags and their alternatives, the break-even point for
433 plastic reusable bags was between 5-20 uses (24). No formal quantitative meta-analysis
434 was conducted in either review, so figures represent a range of break-even points reported
435 in individual studies. Our results are higher than these figures, probably because we
436 specified single use plastic as the baseline for all our comparisons. Whilst highly
437 pollutive, single use plastic can perform relatively well in other environmental categories
438 so the break-even point for reusables will be higher. The second review did restrict
439 comparisons to those with a single use plastic baseline but the difference in weight and
440 production impacts between reusable and single use bags is likely to be less than for
441 some other packaging types. Our analysis reflects an average across packaging types and
442 plastic materials, this is likely to make the average reuse required higher because of the
443 inclusion of comparisons such as a single use polystyrene food saver with a reusable
444 Tupperware container, which have very different weights. We did not find enough studies
445 to conduct a formal subgroup analysis within the meta-regression, but our conclusions are
446 in accordance with these reviews in that the impacts of reusable products will reduce each
447 time they are used and the break-even point is relatively high. This means that products
448 need to be sufficiently durable, and that consumer awareness and behaviour reflects the
449 required level of reuse (24, 74).

450
451

452 *Meta-analysis results in practice*

453
454 Life cycle assessments often model impacts based on hypothetical scenarios rather than
455 real-life recycling and reuse systems. This is useful in indicating trends for increasing

456 circular economy activities but does not always align with technological and economic
457 possibilities or with current consumer behaviour.

458
459 Many of the studies we included modelled impacts of using 100% recycled plastic
460 content and 100% end-of-life recycling. However, each reprocessing degrades material
461 quality meaning that infinite recycling is not possible. Stochastic modelling suggests that
462 mechanical recycling could be scaled up by 2040 to process 33% of global total plastic
463 municipal solid waste but the remainder would not be possible due to capacity for waste
464 collection, the economics of recycling and material losses(72). These restrictions on
465 expanding recycling capacity will be acute in low- and middle-income countries,
466 particularly those where large distances and dispersed rural populations pose challenges
467 for infrastructure and where recycling may not be a political or economic priority. This
468 means that the reductions in health impacts that can be calculated through scenario
469 modelling may not be realisable due to real-world external constraints on the recycling
470 system. Further to this, recycling is modelled as if it took place in an industrial, high-
471 income setting, which does not account for the potentially higher health risks involved in
472 the informal recycling sector commonplace in LMICs (75) and the heavy reliance on
473 international waste trade that directs waste from HICs to LMICs (76). The UK for
474 example exports most of its recycling, often to countries that do not have the capacity to
475 process it, with increasing reports of resulting environmental and health damages (77,
476 78).

477
478 Nationally representative surveys in nine European countries, including the UK, indicated
479 that consumer reuse may be significantly lower than that required to break-even or reduce
480 impacts compared to single use packaging (79). Whilst a quarter of respondents reused
481 heavyweight plastic carrier bags more than 10 times, only 8% reused lightweight plastic
482 bags as much. 27% and 40% of respondents reused these bags just once or not at all (79).
483 Well-intentioned redesign for reuse and national policies may be having the unintended
484 effect of increasing environmental and health risks if consumer behaviour does not
485 correspond with the necessary level of reuse.

486
487 Both circular economy strategies have been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to
488 hygiene and safety concerns, reusable takeaway services have not been available and
489 recycling capacity has been restricted by lockdowns and worker illness (80). We cannot
490 ignore that these circular strategies are subject to external shocks that can limit
491 implementation and introduce new risks and opportunities for human health.

492 493 494 ***Evidence gaps in life cycle assessments***

495
496 The most important gaps in this body of literature are the small number of LCAs on this
497 topic and the narrow geographical coverage, the inconsistent use of available health-
498 related indicators and the current limitations of LCA methods for health research.

499
500 Given the surge of policy action to increase recycling and reuse, promoting the circular
501 economy over the linear, we found surprisingly few LCAs that assessed these actions in

502 primary food and drink packaging. This was particularly the case for recycled content and
503 reusable packaging; many of these assessments were conducted several years ago and
504 may be relying on data that has subsequently changed. The increased number of
505 publications during the last two years suggests a growing focus on the plastics circular
506 economy in LCAs. Endorsement by the European Commission and the rapid evolution of
507 policy may help to fuel a larger evidence base over the coming years. Investments should
508 be made to ensure this evidence is more inclusive of low- and middle-income countries,
509 which were almost entirely absent in the literature we identified and yet these are the
510 countries that will experience the greatest future growth in plastic consumption (81). This
511 underscores the existing call for the European Union and China to engage in greater
512 dialogue with low- and middle-income countries and to foster international sharing and
513 learning on the circular economy(12).

514
515 All included studies considered Climate Change impacts; based on the Intergovernmental
516 Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Global Warming Potentials, this is considered a
517 relatively robust impact category to model (82). Understanding this impact is critical in
518 the context of the climate crisis but restricting modelling to a single impact category
519 offers a one-dimensional view of the effects of circular economy actions, possibly
520 belying trade-offs in other impacts such as Particulate Matter Formation and Human
521 Toxicity, for which we found some evidence of increased risk (83). The lack of estimates
522 of DALYs may be due to the high level of uncertainty in endpoint calculations, resulting
523 from the complexity of impact mechanisms, the challenge of predicting population
524 adaptation and dynamics, and regional differences in impacts (82). However, this
525 represents an overlooked opportunity to consider the broader picture of links between
526 circular economies and health.

527
528 LCA is a holistic tool for assessing the health effects of circular economies. However,
529 emerging health concerns associated with specific life cycle stages are not yet captured
530 by LCA studies. For example, epigenetic health risks from direct consumer contact with
531 chemicals leaching from recycled plastics has been suggested (4) but the use phase in
532 LCAs of recycling was excluded from modelling. At the end of the life cycle,
533 industrialised recycling was compared to industrialised incineration and landfill, which
534 reflects the European and North American bias in this body of literature. This does not
535 account for the health effects of open burning of plastics that is commonplace in many
536 other countries, potentially reaching 144 million metric tonnes of plastic burned annually
537 by 2040 (72). Neither does this include the contamination risks of residing near open
538 rubbish dumps, occupational hazards of the informal recycling sector including waste
539 pickers, and the health effects of environmental plastic pollution. One report estimated
540 that diseases caused by plastic and other mismanaged waste cause 400,000 to 1 million
541 deaths every year in low- and middle-income countries(84) and so the health benefits of
542 recycling may be vastly underestimated.

543
544
545 ***Strengths and Limitations***

546

547 Our meta-analysis was designed to provide an illustrative overview of potential pathways
548 to human health risks and opportunities as a result of circular economy strategies as
549 identified in life cycle assessments, and an indication of the possible magnitude of effect
550 on DALYs under certain hypothetical scenarios. Results should not be interpreted as
551 predictive of health effects but used to support further investigation of these pathways.

552
553 Standardising impacts from studies based on different LCA methods, using ReCiPe
554 conversion factors, can result in estimates based on different assumptions. However, this
555 method is internationally recognised and where conversion from other methods was not
556 possible, we excluded these results from the meta-analysis to minimise the effect. ReCiPe
557 2008 factors likely result in lower estimates of DALYs than the 2016 updated conversion
558 factors. The older factors were only applied where necessary when Human Toxicity
559 impacts were not disaggregated by Cancer and Non-Cancer Effects. New LCAs in this
560 context using the updated 2016 midpoint impacts are required. We chose to sum all
561 health-related midpoint impacts within individual comparison points to provide a Total
562 DALY estimate. Different numbers of midpoint categories in this calculation, according
563 to data available, may explain some of the variability in total estimates.

564
565 The search strategy and literature selection process followed standardised procedures for
566 conducting systematic reviews. Conducting the literature search in English carries some
567 bias in that LCAs published only in other languages may not have been captured, though
568 we were able to review studies in French and Spanish where identified. We did not target
569 the search to capture industry LCA reports though it is likely that most of these would
570 focus on carbon emissions and not add more to our analysis in identifying health effects.

571
572 Included studies were peer-reviewed or been subject to critical review and were therefore
573 considered to be more robust, however not all reported explicitly on key elements of their
574 methodology. In addition, 12 studies had to be excluded because of a lack of data on the
575 impacts of our comparisons. In some cases, this was because studies were old and the
576 data were no longer available. This highlights the need for transparent and
577 comprehensive data reporting in published LCAs.

578
579 We found insufficient packaging comparisons to conduct formal subgroup analysis of
580 key attributes that would likely affect the results. Of particular interest might be sub-
581 group analyses by packaging format and plastic material types. Accounting for
582 differences in methodological choices in individual studies would also provide more
583 robust estimates as identified in a critical review of LCAs of cups(85). For example,
584 analyses based on the inclusion of specific life cycle stages in the system boundary, the
585 inclusion of secondary packaging in the inventory, whether credits are given for energy
586 recovery from incineration and landfill comparisons, the method of allocating benefits
587 from recycling and the specific impact assessment method used. As the field grows, it
588 would be useful to determine the influence of these factors on meta-analysis results.

589
590
591
592

593 ***Recommendations***

594
595 Circular economy strategies, including recycling and reuse, can offer co-benefits for
596 human health through small reductions to the DALYs associated with a linear economy
597 of plastic food and drink packaging. There is also some evidence of increased health risks
598 though these remain critically underexplored in the literature. LCAs are a unique tool that
599 can be used to examine multiple health indicators using a systems approach. However,
600 many potential health pathways are not accounted for in LCAs, so results may
601 underestimate the human health opportunities in circular economies. Building on LCA
602 methodological capacity to support interdisciplinary research on health outcomes would
603 facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of possible co-benefits and trade-offs
604 associated with sustainable initiatives.

605
606 To develop the LCA evidence base for supporting understanding of health co-benefits
607 and trade-offs associated with circular economy strategies to reduce food packaging
608 waste:

- 609 • Conduct LCAs of food and drink packaging with circular economy comparisons,
610 based on current technologies, systems, data and conversion factors
- 611 • Conduct international studies and foster capacity development for conducting LCAs
612 in LMICs that will yield more representative evidence facilitating understanding of
613 global systems and impacts
- 614 • Encourage greater methodological reporting transparency and provision of data inputs
- 615 • Encourage greater use of health-related impact categories, particularly Particulate
616 Matter Formation, Human Toxicity, and Human Health DALYs in LCAs
- 617 • Develop LCA data pools and methodological capacity for modelling health impacts
618 from consumer use and end-of-life open burning, landfill, and pollution
- 619 • Consider hybrid approaches, using LCA methods combined with other forms of
620 modelling, allowing for the inclusion of more diverse evidence such as qualitative
621 data

622
623 To aid future meta-analyses of LCA data:

- 624 • Develop guidance for conducting meta-analyses of LCAs, including tools and advice
625 for harmonising differences in LCA methodological choices
- 626 • Develop a quality appraisal tool that can be used by non-specialists to evaluate
627 evidence from LCAs to support accurate interpretation of results

628
629 Sensitising policy to health risks and opportunities:

- 630 • Interdisciplinary design of health-sensitive circular economy policies, informed by
631 LCA evidence
- 632 • Policy monitoring of relevant health indicators to mitigate unintended harms and to
633 iteratively inform research

634
635
636
637
638

639 **Materials and Methods**

640
641 Our review is conducted according to the standardised technique for assessing and
642 reporting reviews of life cycle assessments (STARR-LCA) checklist (86), based closely
643 on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
644 reporting guidelines(87). A PRISMA checklist is available in **Table S1**. A study protocol
645 was registered with Prospero international prospective register of systematic reviews
646 (88).

647 648 649 ***Search strategy***

650
651 We systematically searched Web of Science, Scopus, Medline, EMBASE, Global Health
652 and GreenFile databases using key search terms for life cycle assessments and packaging
653 types, combined with more specific terminology to identify assessments of food and
654 drink packaging, particular plastic materials and recycling and reuse comparisons.
655 Database searches were run on 29th July 2020 and updated on 22nd July 2021 with no
656 limits on geographical location, language or publication date. An example search string
657 for Scopus is provided in full and was adapted only where necessary for the functionality
658 of other databases. All search strings are provided in **Tables S2-S7**.

659
660 *TITLE-ABS-KEY ((lca OR lcas OR lcia OR lcias OR {life cycle} OR {life-cycle})*
661 *AND (packag* OR pack OR packs OR packet OR packets OR container* OR*
662 *casing OR casings OR pouch OR pouches OR pot OR pots OR punnet OR*
663 *punnets OR carton OR cartons OR box OR boxes OR tray* OR film OR films*
664 *OR wrap OR wraps OR wrapping OR wrappings OR wrapper OR wrappers OR*
665 *bottle* OR cup OR cups OR bag OR bags OR cap OR caps OR clamshell* OR*
666 *tableware OR {food service ware} OR cutlery OR crockery OR spoon OR spoons*
667 *OR fork OR forks OR knife OR knives) AND (food* OR beverage* OR drink**
668 *OR water OR waste OR plastic OR plastics OR polyolefin OR polyolefins OR*
669 *polyethylene OR polythene OR pe OR pet OR hdpe OR mdpe OR ldpe OR lldpe*
670 *OR {polyvinyl chloride} OR pvc OR polypropylene OR pp OR polystyrene OR ps*
671 *OR acrylic OR polycarbonate OR pc OR polylactide OR {polylactic acid} OR pla*
672 *OR styrofoam OR styrene OR {acrylonitrile butadiene} OR nylon OR pa OR*
673 *fibreglass OR fiberglass OR tetrapak OR {tetra pak} OR {single-use} OR {single*
674 *use} OR {one-way} OR {one way} OR disposable OR vacuum OR aseptic OR*
675 *multilayer* OR recycl* OR reuse OR reusing OR reused OR reusable OR multi-*
676 *use OR multiuse))*

677
678 Websites of relevant organisations and select government agencies were searched for
679 grey literature including: the United Nations Environment Programme Life Cycle
680 Initiative, the European Platform on Life Cycle Assessment, the European Environment
681 Agency, Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP), the United Kingdom
682 government website, EThOs database for doctoral research and a Google search for
683 additional government agency studies. Reference lists of included LCAs were searched
684 and authors were contacted where necessary to retrieve additional or related studies.

685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730

Eligibility criteria

We included peer-reviewed, process-based, comparative life cycle impact assessments of plastic food and drink primary packaging, food service ware and grocery bags that compare virgin and single use plastics with recycling and reuse options. Eligible functional units included those based on a specific number of packaging items (e.g. 1000 cups), a measure of packaging weight (e.g. 1000kg of plastic food packaging) or the provision of a service (e.g. the bags required for 1000 shopping trips).

The Resin Identification Codes for the most common plastics were used to inform the search string: Polyethylene Terephthalate, High-Density Polyethylene, Polyvinyl chloride, Low-Density Polyethylene, Polypropylene and Polystyrene, Polycarbonate, Acrylic, Fiberglass, Nylon, Acrylonitrile Styrene and Polylactic Acid (89). Other types of plastic, including bio-based plastics were included where identified in the literature. Primary packaging was defined as consumer-level food or drink contact packaging, service ware included any items such as crockery or cutlery for takeaway food and drink consumption and bags were included if specified for groceries. These items were collectively referred to as ‘packaging’ in this review.

Including only comparative LCAs, focusing on internal differences in impacts, reduces confounding by varying methodological choices and assumptions between studies(86).

Three groups of internal comparisons were eligible:

- 1) Recycled content of plastic packaging: LCAs that compare a unit of packaging made entirely of virgin plastic, or lower recycled content, compared to the same made of any higher level of recycled plastic content. For example, a virgin polyethylene terephthalate (PET) bottle compared with a 20% recycled content PET bottle
- 2) Recycling as an end-of-life plastic packaging scenario: LCAs that compare incineration and/or landfill of plastic packaging at the end of its lifespan with any higher rates of recycling. For example, a PET bottle with 100% incineration at the end of its lifespan compared to 100% recycling
- 3) Reusable plastic packaging: LCAs that compare plastic packaging designed for single use compared to packaging designed to be reused and for the same purpose. These studies may compare any number of uses of the reusable product. For example, a PET bottle designed for single use, and used once, compared with a PET bottle that is designed to be reused, and is used 20 times

Eligible studies considered the whole packaging life cycle, at a minimum including both plastic production and end-of-life stages in the scope of the study.

LCA methodology offers a range of impact categories, from which individual studies may select any number to model. To be eligible for our review, each LCA was required to model at least one of the available health-related impact categories including: the

731 endpoint area of protection category "Human health" (calculated in Disability-Adjusted
732 Life Years) and/or the predefined contributing "Human health" midpoint impact
733 categories including "Climate change", "Stratospheric ozone depletion", "Particulate
734 matter formation", "Photochemical ozone formation", "Ionizing radiation", "Human
735 toxicity" and "Water Use" (18). This terminology is taken from the ReCiPe 2016 LCA
736 impact assessment method (90); the specific health effects encapsulated by each category
737 are detailed in **Figure 1** and relate mainly to morbidity and mortality from respiratory
738 diseases and cancers, and malnutrition, malaria, diarrhoea, and flooding. Various
739 terminologies for these impact categories exist in different LCA impact assessment
740 methods; all were eligible for our review and are conceptually comparable to those listed.

741
742 Studies that only reported life-cycle inventory data, purely economic input-output or
743 social LCAs and all other study designs were excluded. LCAs that only compared plastic
744 packaging with another type of material (e.g., glass or paper) and those in which the
745 packaging was a composite of plastic and other materials such as paperboard were
746 excluded. Packaging used in other parts of the food system (e.g., in agriculture or
747 secondary and tertiary packaging for bulk transport) was excluded, as were studies in
748 which packaging was only part of the inventory list for a food product functional unit.
749 Studies that only reported environmental, non-health related impact indicators according
750 to LCA methods were excluded, for example Resource Depletion and Eutrophication(18).

751

752

753 *Data screening and extraction*

754

755 Records were exported from database searches into Eppi Reviewer software. Screening
756 was conducted in two stages by MD, first on title and abstract and then by full text, with
757 10% checks completed by HR and JY at both stages. Agreement rates were 98% at title
758 and abstract stage and 94% on full text, discrepancies were discussed and resolved by
759 consensus.

760

761 The data extraction form was developed in Eppi Reviewer to capture publication date and
762 geographical focus, compliance with the International Organization for Standardization
763 (ISO) or other LCA standards, the LCA goal and scope, functional unit, specific
764 packaging function and material composition, the system boundaries, specific recycling
765 and/or reuse comparison, the life cycle inventory data sources, key assumptions,
766 recycling and reuse allocation methods, impact assessment software and methods, impact
767 categories and indicators and the absolute impact values or relative differences from
768 study comparisons. Data extraction was carried out by MD with 10% checks completed
769 by XY. Study authors were contacted directly to request additional information and data
770 where necessary.

771

772

773 *Reporting Quality and Suitability for Meta-analysis*

774

775 We only included LCAs that were peer-reviewed or subject to critical review, as
776 specified in the ISO LCA standards for comparative life cycle assessments (91, 92), to

777 ensure quality evidence with the lowest risk of bias. In addition to this selection criterion,
778 we adapted a tool proposed by Price and Kendall (93) to assess the reporting transparency
779 of included articles and their suitability for the purpose of our meta-analysis. This is not
780 an appraisal of overall study quality, and it should be noted that lower scores may
781 indicate that individual studies, whilst relevant, are designed to meet different objectives
782 from those of our review. This assessment was carried out on all studies by MD with
783 10% checks completed by XY. The full tool is provided in **Figure S6**.

784
785 This tool considers three domains of reporting quality and suitability for meta-analysis:
786 1) Completeness of life-cycle modelling: LCAs were graded on a ten-point scale
787 according to their consideration of the complete life cycle of packaging, including
788 raw material extraction, product manufacturing, transport and distribution,
789 consumer use and end-of-life scenarios, and whether evidence of use of sufficient
790 data was provided for each of these stages
791 2) Methodological focus and transparency: Focus was defined as the alignment of
792 individual LCA objectives with those of our review, in terms of assessing health
793 outcomes. Transparency was graded on a three-point scale, based on the provision
794 of a clear description of the functional unit with specific material weights, the
795 method of accounting and crediting systems for recycling and reuse, and the
796 impact assessment methodology used
797 3) The granularity of presented results: LCAs were graded on a six-point scale based
798 on their reporting of overall life cycle impacts, and whether results were
799 disaggregated by life cycle stages

800
801 Given the limited number of studies, the resulting scores were not used to exclude studies
802 from meta-analysis but to give an overall indication of quality and to aid discussion of
803 discrepancies in results.

804 805 806 *Analysis*

807 808 1) *Evidence Map*

809
810 Using Eppi Reviewer Software, an interactive evidence and gap map was created
811 to visualise the frequencies of LCAs according to the three circular economy comparison
812 domains: 1) Recycled content, 2) End-of-life recycling and 3) Reuse. This was cross
813 tabulated with the frequencies of LCA impact categories modelled in the literature. The
814 map is segmented by product type and can be further filtered by plastic material types. A
815 static version of this map was created using Excel.

816 817 2) *Average percent change in impacts for recycled content, recycling, and reusable 818 packaging*

819
820 Results from individual studies were tabulated and analysed in Excel. Where studies
821 reported multiple relevant comparisons, all were extracted and used as individual
822 comparisons in the analysis. These are referred to as ‘comparison points’ throughout our

823 review. For recycled content and end-of-life scenarios, comparisons were restricted to
824 those looking at the same type of plastic material to avoid confounding of the effects by
825 different resource requirements and emissions related to different types of plastic. For
826 reuse comparisons however, different types of material comparisons were permitted to
827 account for the predominantly different design, often in terms of material type and
828 weight, of reusable products.

829
830 For each impact category assessed, we tabulated the absolute value for the reference
831 product or scenario, the absolute value for the comparison product or scenario, the
832 absolute difference and the relative percent change between the two. Where studies
833 reported only the absolute values for each of the products or scenarios, we calculated the
834 absolute difference and relative percent change using the following formulas:

$$835 \text{ Absolute difference} = AVI_R - AVI_{VS}$$

$$836 \text{ Relative percent change} = \frac{AVI_R - AVI_{VS}}{AVI_{VS}}$$

837
838
839
840 Where:

841
842
843 AVI_{VS} = The absolute impact category value for the reference virgin plastic or
844 single use plastic product or scenario

845 AVI_R = The absolute impact category value for the recycling or reuse comparison
846

847 Some LCAs result in negative impacts, this is where environmental credits awarded to
848 the system outweigh environmental burdens and the product is perceived to provide a
849 net-benefit. For example, if the burdens of packaging production are less than the energy
850 recovery from incineration credits awarded for electricity generation. Percent change
851 comparison points where one of the starting values was negative were excluded from this
852 meta-analysis because these values were not meaningful (94). Where absolute values
853 were both negative, the relative percent change was included. Excluded calculations are
854 provided in the Supplementary Data File and highlighted in red.

855
856 Impact categories resulting from different LCA impact assessment methods were grouped
857 based on similarity. For consistency, we retain the terminology used in ReCiPe 2016
858 impact assessments though the resulting groups may contain indicators such as the
859 following:

- 860
861 • **Climate Change (kg CO₂ equivalents):** Global Warming Potential (kg CO₂
862 equivalents), Carbon Footprint (kg CO₂)
- 863 • **Stratospheric Ozone Depletion (kg CFC-11 equivalents):** Ozone Depletion
864 Potential (kg R11 equivalents)
- 865 • **Photochemical Ozone Formation (kg NO_x equivalents):** Ozone Creation
866 Potential, Photochemical Oxidant Formation (kg NMVOC equivalents),

- 867 Respiratory Organics (kg C₂H₄ equivalents, Summer Smog (kg ethene
868 equivalents)
869 • **Ionizing Radiation (kBq Co-60 to air eq/kBq):** Ionizing Radiation (kBq U235-
870 equivalents)
871 • **Fine Particulate Matter Formation (kg PM_{2.5} equivalents):** Respiratory
872 Inorganics (kg PM_{2.5} equivalents)
873 • **Human Toxicity (ReCiPe 2008) (kg 1,4-DCB equivalents):** Human Toxicity
874 Potential (kg DCB equivalents)
875 • **Human Toxicity Cancer Effects (ReCiPe 2016) (kg 1,4-DCB equivalents):**
876 Human Carcinogenic Toxicity (kg 1,4 DCB), Carcinogens (kg C₂H₃Cl
877 equivalents), Carcinogenic risk (mg As equivalents)
878 • **Human Toxicity Non-Cancer Effects (ReCiPe 2016) (kg 1,4-DCB
879 equivalents):** Non-carcinogens (kg C₂H₃Cl equivalents)
880 • **Water Use (m³):** Resource Depletion Water (m³ equivalents), Water
881 Consumption (L), Water Depletion (gal), Water Scarcity Indicator (m³)
882

883 Relative measures are useful for their robustness to differences between studies in terms
884 of the functional unit and specific impact indicators. They also reflect the greater strength
885 of LCAs in comparing products and scenarios rather than accurately assessing absolute
886 emissions(91, 92). For this reason, we first summarised the relative percent change within
887 restricted scenarios that were most frequently assessed in the literature:
888

- 889 1) Recycled content: Virgin plastic (0% recycled content) vs 100% recycled content
890 2) End-of-life recycling:
891 a. 100% landfill vs 100% recycling
892 b. 100% incineration vs 100% recycling
893 3) Reuse: Products designed for reuse vs products designed for single use based on a
894 one-time use
895

896 The impacts of these scenarios were summarised using the median and interquartile range
897 of the relative percent change values calculated from individual comparisons within
898 studies. This reflects the average relative change in specific emission categories across
899 food packaging types under scenarios of switching entirely from virgin plastic to recycled
900 plastic, from landfill and incineration to complete recycling and from single-use design to
901 reusable design based on one use. The mean and standard deviations are available in
902 **Figures S7-S10.**
903
904

905 ***Meta-analysis using mixed-effects linear regression***

906

907 We used mixed-effects linear regression, specifying individual studies as the random
908 effects to account for multiple comparison points from each study, and using the range of
909 values found in the literature for percentage recycled content, end-of-life recycling rates
910 and number of uses for reusable products as predictor variables.
911

912 Including only studies that used 0% recycled content, 0% recycling or a single use item
913 used once respectively as the reference baseline allowed the response variable to be
914 meaningful as the absolute or relative difference in LCA health-related impacts. In line
915 with Cochrane advice, we also limited meta-regressions to LCA impact categories for
916 which there was minimum of 10 studies (95), and that had at least 5 variations in the
917 predictor variable. For example, at least 10 studies that considered Climate Change
918 impacts of increasing recycled content of plastic packaging, relative to virgin packaging,
919 with at least 5 variations in the percentage of recycled content across available
920 comparison points.

921
922 For both recycled content comparisons and end-of-life recycling comparisons, we were
923 able to calculate meaningful absolute differences in impacts because internal study
924 comparisons were restricted to those considering the same type of plastic with the same
925 weight for the virgin plastic product and the recycled content product. To make the
926 absolute differences comparable across studies we standardised functional units to 1
927 metric tonne of plastic packaging using the material weights provided by each study.

928
929 All midpoint impacts were standardised to ReCiPe 2016 Hierarchic perspective midpoint
930 indicators, and subsequently converted to DALYs using the same method (90). The only
931 exceptions were for some midpoint Human Toxicity indicators for which 2016
932 conversions were not available. We converted Comparative Toxic Units for human
933 toxicity (CTUh) to DALYs using factors for Cancer Effects and Non-Cancer Effects from
934 the International Resource Panel (96). Where “Human Toxicity” was not disaggregated
935 by Cancer and Non-Cancer Effects, it was necessary to use the ReCiPe 2008 conversion
936 factor(97). This is likely to underestimate DALYs and was highlighted in the limitations.
937 Where converting impact indicators was not possible or meaningful, these data were
938 excluded from the meta-analysis, these data are highlighted in the Supplementary File.

939
940 Studies reported different numbers of health-related midpoint indicators. The Total
941 DALYs is based on the sum of DALYs from all provided midpoint indicators in each
942 study. This means that for some studies, DALY estimates are based on one pathway only
943 e.g. health effects of Climate Change, whereas estimates from other studies will be based
944 on multiple pathways e.g. health effects of Climate Change, Particulate Matter Formation
945 and Human Toxicity combined, depending on what data was provided in the study. A
946 detailed description of all conversions and the number of midpoint indicators contributing
947 to each DALY estimate is provided in the Supplementary file.

948
949 For comparisons of reuse, only the relative percent change was used in regressions
950 because the differences in material composition and weight between single-use and
951 reusable products within studies, and the different definitions of functional units between
952 studies meant that standardising to calculate the absolute difference was not possible.
953 Instead, the number of uses required to ensure the reusable product had lower or equal
954 health related impacts compared to the single use product was estimated using the
955 regression formula to calculate x (number of uses) when $y=0$ (relative percent change in
956 impacts). This is referred to as the ‘break-even point’.

957

958 All regressions were run in Stata 17.0 using the *xtmixed* command with random effects
959 for study name. Regressions for recycled content and end-of-life recycling included a
960 fixed intercept at zero. This is because the only explanatory variable was percentage
961 recycled content or percentage end-of-life recycling and the response variable was the
962 absolute difference in impacts with a fixed reference point of 0% recycled content and
963 0% recycling respectively. Therefore, given that comparison points were based on the
964 same products, with the same weight and material type, when $x=0$ for these regressions,
965 the absolute difference (y) must also equal zero and fixing the intercept permits the co-
966 efficient for the change in absolute difference to be meaningfully interpreted. Random
967 effects from multiple comparison points in individual studies were applied to the slope.
968 This was not done for the reuse model because the same inclusion criteria for comparison
969 points of equal material type and weight do not apply in this analysis. The Stata do file is
970 available in **Data S12** and all Stata regression outputs are available in **Figures S11-S13**.

971
972

973 References

- 974
- 975 1. World Economic Forum, Ellen MacArthur Foundation and McKinsey & Company, “The New Plastics
976 Economy - Rethinking the Future of Plastics” (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2016), (available at
977 <http://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/publications>).
 - 978 2. R. Geyer, J. R. Jambeck, K. L. Law, Production, use and fate of all plastics ever made. *Science Advances*. **3**,
979 19–24 (2017).
 - 980 3. C. Cimpan, E. L. Bjelle, A. H. Strømman, Plastic packaging flows in Europe: A hybrid input-output
981 approach. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 1–16 (2021).
 - 982 4. World Health Organization, “Circular economy and health: opportunities and risks” (World Health
983 Organization, Regional Office for Europe, 2018), (available at
984 [https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/374917/Circular-Economy_EN_WHO_web_august-](https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/374917/Circular-Economy_EN_WHO_web_august-2018.pdf)
985 [2018.pdf](https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/374917/Circular-Economy_EN_WHO_web_august-2018.pdf)).
 - 986 5. Statistica, NOAA, Woods Hole Sea Grant, Plastic Can Take 500 Years To Bio-Degrade In The Ocean
987 (2018), (available at [https://www.statista.com/chart/15905/the-estimated-number-of-years-for-selected-](https://www.statista.com/chart/15905/the-estimated-number-of-years-for-selected-items-to-bio-degrade/)
988 [items-to-bio-degrade/](https://www.statista.com/chart/15905/the-estimated-number-of-years-for-selected-items-to-bio-degrade/)).
 - 989 6. United Nations, “Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development” (A/RES/70/1,
990 United Nations, 2015), (available at <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld>).
 - 991 7. Ellen MacArthur Foundation, “The Global Commitment 2020 Progress Report” (Ellen MacArthur
992 Foundation, 2020), (available at <https://emf.thirdlight.com/link/il0mcm1dqjtn-knjubr/@/preview/1?o>).
 - 993 8. Ellen MacArthur Foundation, “New Plastics Economy Global Commitment” (Ellen MacArthur Foundation,
994 2020), (available at <https://emf.thirdlight.com/link/pq2algvgnv1n-uitck8/@/preview/1?o>).
 - 995 9. European Commission, “A European Strategy for Plastics in a Circular Economy” (European Commission,
996 2018), (available at [https://www.europarc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Eu-plastics-strategy-](https://www.europarc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Eu-plastics-strategy-brochure.pdf)
997 [brochure.pdf](https://www.europarc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Eu-plastics-strategy-brochure.pdf)).
 - 998 10. J. Jambeck, B. D. Hardesty, A. L. Brooks, T. Friend, K. Teleki, J. Fabres, Y. Beaudoin, A. Bamba, J.
999 Francis, A. J. Ribbink, T. Baleta, H. Bouwman, J. Knox, C. Wilcox, Challenges and emerging solutions to
1000 the land-based plastic waste issue in Africa. *Marine Policy*. **96**, 256–263 (2018).
 - 1001 11. J. Carlos Bezerra, T. R. Walker, C. A. Clayton, I. Adam, Single-use plastic bag policies in the Southern
1002 African development community. *Environmental Challenges*. **3**, 100029 (2021).
 - 1003 12. F. Preston, J. Lehne, L. Wellesley, “An Inclusive Circular Economy: Priorities for Developing Countries”
1004 (Chatham House, 2019), (available at
1005 <https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/publications/research/2019-05-22-Circular-Economy.pdf>).
 - 1006 13. Material Economics, “The Circular Economy: A powerful force for climate mitigation” (Material
1007 Economics, 2016), (available at [https://materialeconomics.com/publications/the-circular-economy-a-](https://materialeconomics.com/publications/the-circular-economy-a-powerful-force-for-climate-mitigation-1)
1008 [powerful-force-for-climate-mitigation-1](https://materialeconomics.com/publications/the-circular-economy-a-powerful-force-for-climate-mitigation-1)).

- 1009 14. Green Alliance, WRAP, “Employment and the circular economy: Job creation in a more resource efficient
1010 Britain” (Green Alliance, 2015), (available at [http://www.green-alliance.org.uk/resources/Employment and
1011 the circular economy.pdf](http://www.green-alliance.org.uk/resources/Employment%20and%20the%20circular%20economy.pdf)).
- 1012 15. D. Azoulay, P. Villa, Y. Arellano, M. Gordon, D. Moon, K. Miller, K. Thompson, “Plastic & Climate: The
1013 hidden costs of a plastic planet” (CIEL, 2019), (available at [https://www.ciel.org/wp-
1014 content/uploads/2019/05/Plastic-and-Climate-FINAL-2019.pdf](https://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Plastic-and-Climate-FINAL-2019.pdf)).
- 1015 16. B. Geueke, K. Groh, J. Muncke, Food packaging in the circular economy: Overview of chemical safety
1016 aspects for commonly used materials. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **193**, 491–505 (2018).
- 1017 17. European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament:
1018 Integrated Product Policy Building on Environmental Life-Cycle Thinking” (COM(2003) 302 final,
1019 European Commission, 2003), (available at [https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-
1020 /publication/5d40b176-ecf4-4da1-8d5f-f9fd47762e13/language-en](https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/5d40b176-ecf4-4da1-8d5f-f9fd47762e13/language-en)).
- 1021 18. F. Veronesi, J. Bare, C. Bulle, R. Frischknecht, M. Hauschild, S. Hellweg, A. Henderson, O. Jolliet, A.
1022 Laurent, X. Liao, J. P. Lindner, D. Maia de Souza, O. Michelsen, L. Patouillard, S. Pfister, L. Posthuma, V.
1023 Prado, B. Ridoutt, R. K. Rosenbaum, S. Sala, C. Ugaya, M. Vieira, P. Fantke, LCIA framework and cross-
1024 cutting issues guidance within the UNEP-SETAC Life Cycle Initiative. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **161**,
1025 957–967 (2017).
- 1026 19. C. Ferrara, G. de Feo, Comparative life cycle assessment of alternative systems for wine packaging in Italy.
1027 *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **259**, 120888 (2020).
- 1028 20. WRAP, “Life cycle assessment of example packaging systems for milk” (WRAP, 2010), (available at
1029 [https://kidv.nl/media/engelse_rapporten/life-cycle-assessment-of-example-packaging-systems-for-
1030 milk.pdf?1.2.2](https://kidv.nl/media/engelse_rapporten/life-cycle-assessment-of-example-packaging-systems-for-milk.pdf?1.2.2)).
- 1031 21. Environment Agency, “Life cycle assessment of supermarket carrier bags: a review of the bags available in
1032 2006” (SC030148, Environment Agency, Bristol, 2011), (available at
1033 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/291023/sc
1034 ho0711buan-e-e.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/291023/sc-ho0711buan-e-e.pdf)).
- 1035 22. WRAP, “Environmental benefits of recycling - 2010 update” (WRAP, 2010), (available at
1036 <https://wrap.org.uk/resources/report/environmental-benefits-recycling-2010-update>).
- 1037 23. J. Vendries, B. Sauer, T. R. Hawkins, D. Allaway, P. Canepa, J. Rivin, M. Mistry, The Significance of
1038 Environmental Attributes as Indicators of the Life Cycle Environmental Impacts of Packaging and Food
1039 Service Ware. *Environmental Science and Technology*. **54**, 5356–5364 (2020).
- 1040 24. United Nations Environment Programme, “Single-use plastic bags and their alternatives - Recommendations
1041 from Life Cycle Assessments” (United Nations Environment Programme, 2020), (available at
1042 <https://wedocs.unep.org/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/31932/SUPB.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>)
1043 .
- 1044 25. L. Camps-Posino, L. Batlle-Bayer, A. Bala, G. Song, H. Qian, R. Aldaco, R. Xifré, P. Fullana-i-Palmer,
1045 Potential climate benefits of reusable packaging in food delivery services. A Chinese case study. *Science of
1046 the Total Environment*. **794**, 148570 (2021).
- 1047 26. K. Changwichan, S. H. Gheewala, Choice of materials for takeaway beverage cups towards a circular
1048 economy. *Sustainable Consumption and Production*. **22**, 34–44 (2020).
- 1049 27. A. Dormer, D. P. Finn, P. Ward, J. Cullen, Carbon footprint analysis in plastics manufacturing. *Journal of
1050 Cleaner Production*. **51**, 133–141 (2013).
- 1051 28. M. P. Hekkert, L. A. J. Joosten, E. Worrell, W. C. Turkenburg, Reduction of CO₂ emissions by improved
1052 management of material and product use: The case of primary packaging. *Resources, Conservation and
1053 Recycling*. **29**, 33–64 (2000).
- 1054 29. N. Horowitz, J. Frago, D. Mu, Life cycle assessment of bottled water: a case study of Green2O products.
1055 *Waste Management*. **76**, 734–743 (2018).
- 1056 30. R. M. Kimmel, “Life Cycle Assessment of grocery bags in common use in the United States” (Clemson
1057 University Press, Clemson, 2014), (available at
1058 https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=cudp_environment).
- 1059 31. V. Kouloumpis, R. S. Pell, M. E. Correa-Cano, X. Yan, Potential trade-offs between eliminating plastics and
1060 mitigating climate change: An LCA perspective on Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) bottles in Cornwall.
1061 *Science of the Total Environment*. **727**, 138681 (2020).
- 1062 32. M. Kruger, B. Kauertz, A. Detzel, “Life Cycle Assessment of food packaging made of Ingeo biopolymer
1063 and (r)PET. Final report.” (Institut für Energie- und Umweltforschung Heidelberg GmbH Life, 2009),

- 1064 (available at <https://www.natureworksllc.com/~media/Files/NatureWorks/What-is-Ingeo/Why-it->
1065 [Matters/LCA/IFEU_LCA_Ingeo_Full_Report_012709_FINAL_pdf.pdf?la=en](https://www.natureworksllc.com/~media/Files/NatureWorks/What-is-Ingeo/Why-it-Matters/LCA/IFEU_LCA_Ingeo_Full_Report_012709_FINAL_pdf.pdf?la=en)).
- 1066 33. D. Maga, M. Hiebel, V. Aryan, A Comparative Life Cycle Assessment of Meat Trays Made of Various
1067 Packaging Materials. *Sustainability*. **11**, 5324 (2019).
- 1068 34. T. Mattila, M. Kujanpaa, H. Dahlbo, R. Soukka, T. Myllymaa, Uncertainty and Sensitivity in the Carbon
1069 Footprint of Shopping Bags. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*. **15**, 217–227 (2011).
- 1070 35. S. Nessi, L. Rigamonti, M. Grosso, LCA of waste prevention activities: A case study for drinking water in
1071 Italy. *Journal of Environmental Management*. **108**, 73–83 (2012).
- 1072 36. M. Rybaczevska-Blazejowska, A. Mena-Nieto, Circular economy: Comparative life cycle assessment of
1073 fossil polyethylene terephthalate (PET) and its recycled and bio-based counterparts. *Management and*
1074 *Production Engineering Review*. **11**, 121–128 (2020).
- 1075 37. R. Stefanini, G. Borghesi, A. Ronzano, G. Vignali, Plastic or glass: a new environmental assessment with a
1076 marine litter indicator for the comparison of pasteurized milk bottles. *International Journal of Life Cycle*
1077 *Assessment*. **26**, 767–784 (2021).
- 1078 38. E. van der Harst, J. Potting, C. Kroeze, Comparison of different methods to include recycling in LCAs of
1079 aluminium cans and disposable polystyrene cups. *Waste Management*. **48**, 565–583 (2016).
- 1080 39. D. Amienyo, H. Gujba, H. Stichnothe, A. Azapagic, Life cycle environmental impacts of carbonated soft
1081 drinks. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*. **18**, 77–92 (2013).
- 1082 40. K. Changwichan, T. Silalertruksa, S. H. Gheewala, Eco-Efficiency Assessment of Bioplastics Production
1083 Systems and End-of-Life Options. *Sustainability*. **10**, 952 (2018).
- 1084 41. D. Cottafava, M. Costamagna, M. Baricco, L. Corazza, D. Miceli, L. E. Riccardo, Assessment of the
1085 environmental break-even point for deposit return systems through an LCA analysis of single-use and
1086 reusable cups. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*. **27**, 228–241 (2021).
- 1087 42. K. Fangmongkol, S. H. Gheewala, Life cycle assessment of biodegradable food container from bagasse in
1088 Thailand. *Journal of Sustainable Energy & Environment*. **11**, 61–69 (2020).
- 1089 43. A. Gallego-Schmid, J. M. F. Mendoza, A. Azapagic, Environmental impacts of takeaway food containers.
1090 *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **211**, 417–427 (2019).
- 1091 44. C. Ghenai, Life cycle assessment of Packaging Materials for Milk and Dairy Products. *Int. J. of Thermal &*
1092 *Environmental Engineering*. **4**, 117–128 (2012).
- 1093 45. T. Herberz, C. Y. Barlow, M. Finkbeiner, Sustainability Assessment of a Single-Use Plastics Ban.
1094 *Sustainability*. **12**, 3746 (2020).
- 1095 46. F. Hermansson, M. Janssen, F. Gellerstedt, Environmental evaluation of Durapulp bio-composite using LCA
1096 - Comparison of two different applications. *J-FOR The Journal of Science and Technology for Forest*
1097 *Products and Processes*. **5**, 68–76 (2016).
- 1098 47. G. Ingarao, S. Licata, M. Sciortino, D. Planeta, R. di Lorenzo, L. Fratini, Life cycle energy and CO2
1099 emissions analysis of food packaging: an insight into the methodology from an Italian perspective.
1100 *International Journal of Sustainable Engineering*. **10**, 31–43 (2017).
- 1101 48. B. Kuczenski, R. Geyer, PET bottle reverse logistics-environmental performance of California’s CRV
1102 program. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*. **18**, 456–471 (2013).
- 1103 49. S. Madival, R. Auras, S. P. Singh, R. Narayan, Assessment of the environmental profile of PLA, PET and
1104 PS clamshell containers using LCA methodology. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **17**, 1183–1194 (2009).
- 1105 50. M. Meneses, J. Pasqualino, F. Castells, Environmental assessment of the milk life cycle: The effect of
1106 packaging selection and the variability of milk production data. *Journal of Environmental Management*.
1107 **107**, 76–83 (2012).
- 1108 51. C. Moretti, L. Hamelin, L. G. Jakobsen, M. H. Junginger, M. M. Steingrimsdottir, L. Høibye, L. Shen,
1109 Cradle-to-grave life cycle assessment of single-use cups made from PLA, PP and PET. *Resources,*
1110 *Conservation & Recycling*. **169**, 105508 (2021).
- 1111 52. J. Pasqualino, M. Meneses, F. Castells, The carbon footprint and energy consumption of beverage packaging
1112 selection and disposal. *Journal of Food Engineering*. **103**, 357–365 (2011).
- 1113 53. S. Rattana, S. H. Gheewala, Environment impacts assessment of petroleum plastic and bioplastic carrier
1114 bags in Thailand. *Journal of Sustainable Energy & Environment*. **10**, 9–17 (2019).
- 1115 54. V. Rossi, N. Clevee-Edwards, L. Lundquist, U. Schenker, C. Dubois, S. Humbert, O. Jolliet, Life cycle
1116 assessment of end-of-life options for two biodegradable packaging materials: Sound application of the
1117 European waste hierarchy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **86**, 132–145 (2015).
- 1118 55. M. Šerešová, V. Kočí, Proposal of Package-to-Product Indicator for Carbon Footprint Assessment with
1119 Focus on the Czech Republic. *Sustainability*. **12**, 3034 (2020).

- 1120 56. B. Simon, M. ben Amor, R. Foldenyi, Life cycle impact assessment of beverage packaging systems: focus
1121 on the collection of post-consumer bottles. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. **112**, 238–248 (2016).
- 1122 57. The Danish Environmental Protection Agency, “Life Cycle Assessment of grocery carrier bags” (The
1123 Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2018), (available at
1124 <https://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/publications/2018/02/978-87-93614-73-4.pdf>).
- 1125 58. Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research (TNO), “Single use Cups or Reusable (coffee)
1126 Drinking Systems: An Environmental Comparison” (TNO, 2007), (available at
1127 <https://www.tno.nl/media/2915/summary-research-drinking-systems.pdf>).
- 1128 59. S. Toniolo, A. Mazzi, M. Niero, F. Zuliani, A. Scipioni, Comparative LCA to evaluate how much recycling
1129 is environmentally favourable for food packaging. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*. **77**, 61–68
1130 (2013).
- 1131 60. E. van der Harst, J. Potting, Variation in LCA results for disposable polystyrene beverage cups due to
1132 multiple data sets and modelling choices. *Environmental Modelling and Software*. **51**, 123–135 (2014).
- 1133 61. E. van der Harst, J. Potting, C. Kroeze, Multiple data sets and modelling choices in a comparative LCA of
1134 disposable beverage cups. *Science of the Total Environment*. **494–495**, 129–143 (2014).
- 1135 62. F. Wikstrom, H. Williams, K. Verghese, S. Clune, The influence of packaging attributes on consumer
1136 behaviour in food-packaging life cycle assessment studies - a neglected topic. *Journal of Cleaner
1137 Production*. **73**, 100–108 (2014).
- 1138 63. F. Wikstrom, H. Williams, G. Venkatesh, The influence of packaging attributes on recycling and food waste
1139 behaviour - An environmental comparison of two packaging alternatives. *Journal of Cleaner Production*.
1140 **137**, 895–902 (2016).
- 1141 64. D. Civancik-Uslu, R. Puig, M. Hauschild, P. Fullana-i-Palmer, Life cycle assessment of carrier bags and
1142 development of a littering indicator. *Science of the Total Environment*. **685**, 621–630 (2019).
- 1143 65. A. M. Copeland, A. A. Ormsby, A. M. Willingham, Assessment and Comparative Analysis of a Reusable
1144 Versus Disposable To-Go System. *Sustainability: The Journal of Record*. **6**, 353–358 (2013).
- 1145 66. Ecobilan, “Évaluation des impacts environnementaux des sacs de caisse Carrefour: Analyse du cycle de vie
1146 de sacs de caisse en plastique, papier et matériau biodégradable” (Carrefour, 2004), (available at
1147 https://www.ademe.fr/sites/default/files/assets/documents/28300_acv_sacs_carrefour_2004.pdf).
- 1148 67. H. Fetner, S. A. Miller, Environmental payback periods of reusable alternatives to single-use plastic
1149 kitchenware products. *International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*. **26**, 1521–1537 (2021).
- 1150 68. S. C. Greenwood, S. Walker, H. M. Baird, R. Parsons, S. Mehl, T. L. Webb, A. T. Slark, A. J. Ryan, R. H.
1151 Rothman, Many Happy Returns: Combining insights from the environmental and behavioural sciences to
1152 understand what is required to make reusable packaging mainstream. *Sustainable Production and
1153 Consumption*. **27**, 1688–1702 (2021).
- 1154 69. P. Hutner, C. Helbig, D. Stindt, A. Thorenz, A. Tuma, Transdisciplinary Development of a Life Cycle-
1155 Based Approach to Measure and Communicate Waste Prevention Effects in Local Authorities. *Journal of
1156 Industrial Ecology*. **22**, 1050–1065 (2018).
- 1157 70. C. Pladerer, M. Meissner, F. Dinkel, M. Zschokke, G. Dehoust, D. Schöler, “Comparative Life Cycle
1158 Assessment of various Cup Systems for the Selling of Drinks at Events” (Österreichisches Ökologie-Institut,
1159 Carbotech AG, Öko-Institut, 2008), (available at http://www.meucopoeco.com.br/environmental_study.pdf).
- 1160 71. K. S. Stylianou, V. L. Fulgoni III, O. Jolliet, Small targeted dietary changes can yield substantial gains for
1161 human health and the environment. *Nature Food*. **2**, 616–627 (2021).
- 1162 72. PEW Charitable Trusts, SYSTEMIQ, “Breaking the Plastic Wave: A Comprehensive Assessment of
1163 Pathways Towards Stopping Ocean Plastic Pollution” (PEW Charitable Trusts, SYSTEMIQ, 2020),
1164 (available at <https://www.systemiq.earth/breakingtheplasticwave/>).
- 1165 73. C. Rizan, M. Reed, M. F. Bhutta, Environmental impact of personal protective equipment distributed for use
1166 by health and social care services in England in the first six months of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of
1167 the Royal Society of Medicine*. **114**, 250–263 (2021).
- 1168 74. Zero Waste Europe: Reloop, “Reusable vs single-use packaging: A review of environmental impacts”
1169 (Reloop, 2020), (available at <https://zerowasteurope.eu/library/reusable-vs-single-use-packaging-a-review-of-environmental-impact/>).
- 1170
1171 75. C. Y. Wright, L. Godfrey, G. Armiento, L. K. Haywood, R. Inglesi-Lotz, K. Lyne, P. N. Schwerdtle,
1172 Circular economy and environmental health in low- and middle-income countries. *Globalization and
1173 Health*. **15**, 1–5 (2019).
- 1174 76. A. L. Brooks, S. Wang, J. R. Jambeck, The Chinese import ban and its impact on global plastic waste trade.
1175 *Science Advances*. **4**, eaat0131 (2018).

- 1176 77. Greenpeace UK, “Trashed: How the uk is still dumping plastic waste on the rest of the world” (Greenpeace
1177 UK, 2021), (available at [https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Trashed-Greenpeace-
1178 plastics-report-final.pdf](https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Trashed-Greenpeace-plastics-report-final.pdf)).
- 1179 78. B. Cotta, What goes around, comes around? Access and allocation problems in Global North–South waste
1180 trade. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*. **20**, 255–269 (2020).
- 1181 79. J. Tame, “European Packaging Preferences 2020. A European study of consumer preferences, perceptions,
1182 and attitudes towards packaging.” (Two Sides, 2020), (available at
1183 [https://www.twosides.info/documents/research/2020/packaging/European-Packaging-Preferences-
1184 2020_EN.pdf](https://www.twosides.info/documents/research/2020/packaging/European-Packaging-Preferences-2020_EN.pdf)).
- 1185 80. J. Duer, The plastic pandemic is only getting worse during COVID-19. *World Economic Forum* (2020),
1186 (available at <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/07/plastic-waste-management-covid19-ppc/>).
- 1187 81. L. Lebreton, A. Andrady, Future scenarios of global plastic waste generation and disposal. *Palgrave
1188 Communications*. **5**, 1–11 (2019).
- 1189 82. M. Z. Hauschild, M. A. J. Huijbregts, Eds., *Life cycle impact assessment. LCA Compendium - The Complete
1190 World of Life Cycle Assessment* (Springer, Dordrecht, 2015).
- 1191 83. J.-P. Schweitzer, F. Petsinaris, C. Gionfra, “Justifying plastic pollution: how Life Cycle Assessments are
1192 misused in food packaging policy” (Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP), Brussels. A study
1193 by Zero Waste Europe and Friends of the Earth Europe for the Rethink Plastic Alliance, 2018), (available at
1194 [http://zerowasteurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Justifying-plastic-pollution_The-shortcomings-of-
1195 LCAs-in-food-packaging-policy_FoEE-ZWE-April-2018.pdf](http://zerowasteurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Justifying-plastic-pollution_The-shortcomings-of-LCAs-in-food-packaging-policy_FoEE-ZWE-April-2018.pdf)).
- 1196 84. Tearfund, Flora & Fauna International, WasteAid, The Institute of Development Studies, “No time to waste:
1197 Tackling the plastic pollution crisis before it’s too late” (Tearfund, 2019), (available at
1198 [https://learn.tearfund.org/-/media/learn/resources/reports/2019-tearfund-consortium-no-time-to-waste-
1199 en.pdf](https://learn.tearfund.org/-/media/learn/resources/reports/2019-tearfund-consortium-no-time-to-waste-en.pdf)).
- 1200 85. E. van der Harst, J. Potting, A critical comparison of ten disposable cup LCAs. *Environmental Impact
1201 Assessment Review*. **43**, 86–96 (2013).
- 1202 86. J. M. Zumsteg, J. S. Cooper, M. S. Noon, Systematic Review Checklist: A Standardized Technique for
1203 Assessing and Reporting Reviews of Life Cycle Assessment Data. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*. **16**, S12–
1204 S21 (2012).
- 1205 87. D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D. G. Altman, The PRISMA Group, Preferred reporting items for
1206 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*. **6**, e1000097 (2009).
- 1207 88. M. Deeney, R. Green, X. Yan, H. Rolker, J. Yates, S. Kadiyala, Using life-cycle assessments to assess the
1208 direct and indirect human health effects of recycling and reusing plastic packaging in the food system: a
1209 systematic review. *PROSPERO*. **CRD4202019**, 1–6 (2020).
- 1210 89. ASTM International, “ASTM D7611/D7611M-20 Standard Practice for Coding Plastic Manufactured
1211 Articles for Resin Identification” (ASTM International, 2020), (available at
1212 <https://www.astm.org/Standards/D7611.htm>).
- 1213 90. M. A. J. Huijbregts, Z. J. N. Steinmann, P. M. F. Eishout, G. Stam, F. Verones, M. D. M. Vieira, A.
1214 Hollander, M. Zijp, R. van Zelm, “ReCiPe 2016 v1.1. A harmonized life cycle impact assessment method at
1215 midpoint and endpoint level. Report I: Characterization” (RIVM Report 2016-0104a, National Institute for
1216 Public Health and the Environment, The Netherlands, 2017), (available at
1217 <https://www.rivm.nl/bibliotheek/rapporten/2016-0104.html>).
- 1218 91. International Organization for Standardization, “Environmental Management - Life Cycle Assessment -
1219 Principles and Framework (ISO 14040:2006)” (BS EN ISO 14040:2006, International Organization for
1220 Standardization, 2006).
- 1221 92. International Organization for Standardization, “International Standard ISO 14044: Environmental
1222 management - Life cycle assessment - Requirements and guidelines” (ISO 14044:2006(E), International
1223 Organization for Standardization, 2006).
- 1224 93. L. Price, A. Kendall, Wind Power as a Case Study: Improving Life Cycle Assessment Reporting to Better
1225 Enable Meta-analyses. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*. **16**, S22–S27 (2012).
- 1226 94. Wall Street Journal, WSJ.com -- HELP: Digest of Earnings (2001), (available at
1227 <http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/doe-help.htm>).
- 1228 95. Deeks J. J., Higgins J. P. T., Altman D. G., in *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
1229 version 6.2*, J. Higgins, J. Thomas, J. Chandler, M. Cumpston, T. Li, M. Page, V. Welch, Eds. (Cochrane,
1230 2021; www.training.cochrane.org/handbook).

- 1231 96. B. Oberle, S. Bringezu, S. Hatfield-Dodds, S. Hellweg, H. Schandl, J. Clement, L. Cabernard, N. Che, D.
1232 Chen, H. Droz-Georget, P. Ekins, M. Fischer-Kowalski, M. Floerke, S. Frank, A. Froemelt, A. Geschke, M.
1233 Haupt, P. Havlik, R. Hüfner, M. Lenzen, M. Lieber, B. Liu, Y. Lu, S. F. Lutter, J. Mehr, A. Miatto, D.
1234 Newth, C. Oberschelp, M. Obersteiner, S. Pfister, E. Piccoli, R. Schaldach, J. Schüngel, T. Sonderegger, A.
1235 Sudheshwar, H. Tanikawa, E. van der Voet, C. Walker, J. West, Z. Wang, B. Zhu, “Global Resources
1236 Outlook 2019: Natural Resources for the Future We Want. METHODS ANNEX” (International Resource
1237 Panel (IRP) of the United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment), 2019), (available at
1238 www.resourcepanel.org/reports/global-resources-outlook).
- 1239 97. M. Goedkoop, R. Heijungs, M. Huijbregts, A. de Schryver, J. Struijs, R. van Zelm, “ReCiPe 2008 - A life
1240 cycle impact assessment method which comprises harmonised category indicators at the midpoint and the
1241 endpoint level” (Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, The Netherlands, 2008),
1242 (available at https://www.leidenuniv.nl/cml/ssp/publications/recipe_characterisation.pdf).
- 1243
1244
1245
1246

1247 Acknowledgments

1248
1249 We would like to thank R. Burke at LSHTM for advising on the search strategy, E.
1250 Hutchinson from LSHTM for consulting on the analysis of health outcomes and M.
1251 Huijbregts for advising on ReCiPe 2016 conversion factors and the analysis strategy.
1252 With thanks also to M. E. Correa Cano at Exeter University, and A. Gasparrini and D.
1253 Macleod at LSHTM for advice on statistical queries. We would like to acknowledge the
1254 EPPI Reviewer team at the University College London, which includes J. Brunton, Z.
1255 Grouze, S. Graziosi and M. Bond.

1256
1257 **Funding:** This work is funded through the Innovative Methods and Metrics for
1258 Agriculture and Nutrition Action (IMMANA) programme, led by the London School of
1259 Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM). IMMANA is co-funded by:
1260 UK Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) grant 300654 (SK, JY,
1261 MD)
1262 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation INV-002962 / OPP1211308 (SK, JY, MD)


1264 Author contributions:

1265 Conceptualization: MD, JY, SK, RG, XY
1266 Methodology: RG, XY, MD, CD, SK
1267 Investigation: MD, XY, CD, JY, HR, RG
1268 Visualization: MD, RG, CD
1269 Funding acquisition: SK, JY
1270 Project administration: SK, JY
1271 Supervision: SK, RG
1272 Writing – original draft: MD
1273 Writing – review & editing: MD, SK, RG, CD, JY, HR

1274
1275 **Competing interests:** Authors declare that they have no competing interests.
1276

1277 **Data and materials availability:** All data are available in the main text or the
1278 supplementary materials.

1279 **Figures and Tables**
1280




1281
1282 **Fig. 1. Modelling human health effects in life cycle assessments.** Life cycle assessment
1283 conceptual modelling process of health impact pathways from midpoint health-
1284 related categories to endpoint Human Health Disability-Adjusted Life Years
1285 (DALYs), according to ReCiPe 2016 life cycle impact assessment method.
1286 Authors' own: Adapted from ReCiPe 2016 v1.1 Report 1: Characterization. 2017
1287 (90).
1288

Systematic review and meta-analysis of life cycle assessments	
Products:	Consumer food and drink packaging and single use plastics <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Primary food and drink packaging (food contact, consumer-level packaging)● Drinks bottles and cups● Food service ware● Grocery bags
Materials:	Plastics <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET)● High-Density Polyethylene (HDPE)● Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)● Low-Density Polyethylene (LDPE)● Polypropylene (PP)● Polystyrene (PS)● Polycarbonate, Acrylic, Fiberglass, Nylon, Acrylonitrile Styrene and Polylactic Acid● Other (as identified in LCAs)
Comparisons:	Circular vs linear economy <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Increased recycled content vs virgin plastic● Increased end-of-life recycling vs landfill and incineration● Reusable vs single-use plastic
Types of study:	Peer-reviewed, process-based, comparative life cycle impact assessments
Outcomes:	Health-related midpoint and endpoint LCA impact categories <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Human Health (Disability Adjusted Life Years)● Climate Change● Stratospheric Ozone Depletion● Photochemical Ozone Formation● Ionizing Radiation● Fine Particulate Matter Formation● Human Toxicity● Cancer Effects● Non-Cancer Effects● Water Use
	Synthesis and meta-analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Evidence map● Median percent change and interquartile range● Meta-regression of absolute and relative differences using mixed-effects linear regression

1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296

Fig. 2. Summary of systematic review inclusion criteria and meta-analysis. Life cycle assessment (LCA) studies were systematically screened against pre-defined eligibility criteria. Studies were required to meet at least one of the inclusion criteria under each of the sub-headings. Strategy for synthesis and meta-analysis of data extracted from LCAs included an evidence map, summary statistics and regression.

1297



1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

Fig. 3. PRISMA flow chart. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow chart showing the study selection process for inclusion of life cycle assessments in the systematic review according to pre-defined eligibility criteria.

CIRCULAR ECONOMY STRATEGIES		LCA ENDPOINT		LCA MIDPOINT HEALTH - RELATED IMPACT CATEGORIES								
		Human Health	Climate Change	Stratospheric Ozone Depletion	Photo-chemical Ozone Formation	Ionizing Radiation	Fine Particulate Matter Formation	Human Toxicity	Human Toxicity Cancer Effects	Human Toxicity Non-Cancer Effects	Water Use	
RECYCLING	Recycled vs virgin material content	Bottles	0	7	3	3	0	2	3	2	1	1
		Cups	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
		Primary packaging	0	3	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	1
		Grocery bags	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
		Service ware	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
	Total	0	16*	4	7*	1	4	6*	3	1	3	
	End-of-life recycling vs landfill or incineration	Bottles	1	12	2	4	0	2	2	1	1	0
		Cups	0	7	5	5	1	4	4	0	0	2
		Primary packaging	0	11	4	4	3	3	2	1	1	3
		Grocery bags	0	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Service ware		0	5	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	
Total	1	37*	13	16*	5	7	10*	4	4	6		
REUSE	Reusable vs single-use by design and number of uses	Bottles	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Cups	0	4	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	2
		Primary packaging	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Grocery bags	0	5	1	5	1	1	2	1	1	4
		Service ware	0	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Total	0	17	4	8	1	1	5	1	1	8		

* Total across packaging types exceeds total number of studies as two studies included multiple product categories

1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316

Fig. 4. Static map of LCAs on plastic food and drink packaging recycling and reuse.

Frequency of life cycle assessment (LCA) studies included in the systematic review, cross tabulated by: (A) the specific circular economy comparison categories considered in each study: recycled vs virgin material content, end-of-life recycling vs landfill or incineration, reusable vs single-use by design and number or uses; (B) the product type: bottles, cups, primary food packaging, grocery bags or service ware and (C) the health-related LCA impact categories calculated in each study.





Fig. 5. Relative health-related impacts of 100% recycled plastic content. Percent change in health-related impacts, comparing 100% recycled plastic content products to virgin plastic products. Values calculated for each comparison found within LCA studies are represented with dots and summarised using box plots of the median and interquartile range across data points for Climate Change, Ozone Depletion, Photochemical Ozone Formation, Ionizing Radiation, Particulate Matter Formation, Human Toxicity, Cancer Effects, Non-Cancer Effects and Water Use.


1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326




1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332

Fig. 6. Meta-regression of the effects of increasing recycled plastic content on Climate Change and Total DALYs. Scatter plot for mixed-effects linear regression with percentage recycled content as the predictor variable and the response variables: **(A)** absolute difference in Climate Change impacts (kg CO₂ equivalents) relative to virgin plastic packaging and **(B)** absolute difference in

1333 Total Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) based on multiple LCA health
1334 pathways, relative to virgin plastic. The key shows the colour coding of
1335 comparison points by plastic material type: High-density Polyethylene (HDPE),
1336 Low-density Polyethylene (LDPE), Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET), Polylactic
1337 Acid (PLA), Polypropylene (PP), Polystyrene (PS).
1338
1339
1340



1341
1342 **Fig. 7. Relative health-related impacts of 100% end-of-life plastic recycling.** Percent
1343 change in health-related impacts, comparing 100% recycling to (A) 100% landfill
1344 and (B) 100% incineration. Values calculated for each comparison found within
1345 LCA studies are represented with dots and summarised using box plots of the
1346 median and interquartile range across data points for Climate Change, Ozone
1347 Depletion, Photochemical Ozone Formation, Ionizing Radiation, Particulate
1348 Matter Formation, Human Toxicity, Cancer Effects, Non-Cancer Effects and
1349 Water Use.
1350



1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359

Fig. 8. Meta-regression of the effects of increasing end-of-life recycling on Climate Change and Total DALYs. Scatter plot for mixed-effects linear regression with end-of-life recycling rate as the predictor variable and the response variables: **(A)** absolute difference in Climate Change impacts (kg CO₂ equivalents) relative to 0% recycling and **(B)** absolute difference in Total Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) based on multiple LCA health pathways, relative to 0% recycling. The key shows the colour coding of comparison points by plastic material type: Compound plastics (Blend), High-density Polyethylene (HDPE), Low-density

1373 full list is provided in **Data S11**. Data points are colour coded on product type:
1374 Blue=bottles, yellow=cups, green=grocery bags, purple=service ware. A full list
1375 of material and product types are available in Data S11. For ease of viewing the y
1376 axis has been capped at 1500% but there are six data points above this point, all
1377 are based on one use, 5 of which refer to PLA cups had between 1631% and
1378 7450% higher Climate Change impacts and one PET cup which had 2238%
1379 higher Climate Change impacts than the respective single use comparison.
1380 Abbreviations: Low-density Polyethylene (LDPE), Non-woven Polypropylene
1381 (NWPP), Polyethylene (PE), Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET), Polypropylene
1382 (PP).
1383
1384

1385 **Supplementary Materials**

1386 **Supplementary Materials File**

1387 Figs. S1 to S13

1388 Tables S1 to S7

1389 References (1 to 1)

1390

1391
1392 **Other Supplementary Materials for this manuscript include the following:**

1393 **Data S1-S11** (separate file)

1394 **Data S12** (separate file)