

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<sup>1\*</sup>, Rosemary Green<sup>1†</sup>, Xiaoyu Yan<sup>2\*†</sup>, Claire Dooley<sup>1‡</sup>, Joe Yates<sup>1‡</sup>,  
10 Heike B Rolker<sup>3,4</sup>, Suneetha Kadiyala<sup>1</sup>.

11  
12 **Affiliations**

13 <sup>1</sup> London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine; London, United Kingdom.

14 <sup>2</sup> University of Exeter; Exeter, United Kingdom.

15 <sup>3</sup> University of Bristol; Bristol, United Kingdom.

16 <sup>4</sup> 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](mailto:megan.deeney@lshtm.ac.uk), [Xiaoyu.Yan@exeter.ac.uk](mailto: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 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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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 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 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 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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  $\mu$ 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 1.9tCO<sub>2</sub>  
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 2.3tCO<sub>2</sub> 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 29<sup>th</sup> July 2020 and updated on 22<sup>nd</sup> 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

### 808 *1) Evidence Map*

809  
810

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

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

819  
820

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 CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents):** Global Warming Potential (kg CO<sub>2</sub>  
862 equivalents), Carbon Footprint (kg CO<sub>2</sub>)
- 863 • **Stratospheric Ozone Depletion (kg CFC-11 equivalents):** Ozone Depletion  
864 Potential (kg R11 equivalents)
- 865 • **Photochemical Ozone Formation (kg NO<sub>x</sub> equivalents):** Ozone Creation  
866 Potential, Photochemical Oxidant Formation (kg NMVOC equivalents),

- 867 Respiratory Organics (kg C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub> 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<sub>2.5</sub> equivalents):** Respiratory  
872 Inorganics (kg PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>3</sub>Cl  
877 equivalents), Carcinogenic risk (mg As equivalents)  
878 • **Human Toxicity Non-Cancer Effects (ReCiPe 2016) (kg 1,4-DCB  
879 equivalents):** Non-carcinogens (kg C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>3</sub>Cl equivalents)  
880 • **Water Use (m<sup>3</sup>):** Resource Depletion Water (m<sup>3</sup> equivalents), Water  
881 Consumption (L), Water Depletion (gal), Water Scarcity Indicator (m<sup>3</sup>)  
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  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008

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


### 1263 **Author contributions:**

1264 Conceptualization: MD, JY, SK, RG, XY  
1265 Methodology: RG, XY, MD, CD, SK  
1266 Investigation: MD, XY, CD, JY, HR, RG  
1267 Visualization: MD, RG, CD  
1268 Funding acquisition: SK, JY  
1269 Project administration: SK, JY  
1270 Supervision: SK, RG  
1271 Writing – original draft: MD  
1272 Writing – review & editing: MD, SK, RG, CD, JY, HR

1273  
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

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

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
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16*</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7*</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6*</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	
	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	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>37*</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16*</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10*</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>		
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>		

\* 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






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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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

1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365

Polyethylene (LDPE), Multiple components made of different plastics (Mix), Polybutylene Succinate (PBS), Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET), Polyhydroxyalkanoates (PHA), Polylactic Acid (PLA), Polypropylene (PP), Polystyrene (PS), Thermoplastic starch (TPS).



1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372

**Fig. 9. Meta-regression of increasing reuse compared to single use.** Scatter plot for mixed-effects linear regression with number of uses of the reusable plastic packaging as the predictor variable and the percent change in Climate Change impacts relative to the single use counterpart packaging. The specific plastic material type of the reusable product is written over corresponding data points, a

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)