

Plant to animal protein ratio in the diet: nutrient adequacy, long-term health and environmental pressure

Hélène Fouillet^{1*}, Alison Dussiot¹, Elie Perraud¹, Juhui Wang¹, Jean-François Huneau¹, Emmanuelle Kesse-Guyot², François Mariotti¹

¹Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR PNCA, 75005, Paris, France

²Sorbonne Paris Nord University, Inserm, Inrae, Cnam, Nutritional Epidemiology Research Team (EREN), Epidemiology and Statistics Research Center (CRESS) – University of Paris, 93017 Bobigny, France

*Address correspondence to Dr. Helene Fouillet, helene.fouillet@agroparistech.fr or Prof. François Mariotti, francois.mariotti@agroparistech.fr.

Sources of support: The authors report that no funding was received for this study.

Author disclosures: HF has received a research grant by INRAE from Roquette. FM has received research grants as PhD fellowships under his direction by AgroParisTech and INRAE from Terres Univia and Ecotone foundation, under the aegis of Fondation de France.

Availability Statement: Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will be made available upon request pending application and approval.

3 Figures, 2 Tables

16 Supplementary Data (2 Supplemental Methods, 8 Supplemental Tables, 6 Supplemental Figures)

Running title: Diet plant to animal protein ratio

Abbreviations used: ANSES, French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety; CIQUAL, French Information Centre on Food Quality; DALYs, Disability-adjusted life-years; *DD*, Diet departure criterion; GDB, Global Burden of Diseases; GHGe, greenhouse gas emissions; *HR*, Health risk criterion; INCA3, Third Individual and National Study on Food Consumption French Survey; %PP, Percentage of plant protein in the diet; TMREL, Theoretical minimum risk exposure level.

1 **Abstract**

2 Animal and plant protein sources have contrasting relationships with nutrient adequacy and long-term
3 health, and their adequate ratio is highly debated. Using reference values for nutrients and disease
4 burden risks for foods, we modeled diets with graded plant protein proportions (%PP) that ensure
5 nutrient adequacy, minimize long-term health risks and best preserve dietary habits in French adults.
6 We furthermore estimated the diets' related environmental impacts. We demonstrated that nutrient-
7 adequate diets must fall within the 15%-80% %PP range, and that fully healthy diets additionally
8 achieving the minimum-risk exposure levels for unhealthy/healthy foods must fall within the 25%-70%
9 %PP range. All healthy diets were very distant from current typical diet, and those with higher %PP
10 contributed less to climate change and land use. There is thus no single optimal %PP when
11 considering only nutrition and health, but high %PP diets are more sustainable. For %PP>80%,
12 nutrient fortification/supplementation and/or new foods are required.

13 **Keywords:** Plant-based diets; Healthy dietary patterns; Nutrient adequacy; Environmental footprints;
14 Diet optimization

15 Introduction

16 Historical and current nutritional transitions are coupled with changes in the relative contribution of
17 dietary animal and plant proteins. This has been studied from hunter-gatherers to post-agricultural
18 societies ¹, from traditional diets that enabled thriving civilizations to diets in post-industrialized
19 countries ^{2,3}, and more recently, in western countries with the emerging trend toward more plant-
20 predominant diets.

21 Changes in plant and animal protein intake raise classic nutritional questions. One in particular
22 concerns the possible risk of deficiency with diets too low in animal protein, since animal protein foods
23 contribute significantly to the intake of indispensable nutrients ⁴. However, plant proteins are also
24 important for the intake of some indispensable nutrients and fiber, and are also lower in saturated fats
25 ⁵. Beyond the relationship to nutrient adequacy, animal/plant proteins and their packages largely affect
26 the metabolome and the microbiota and physiological functions that are crucial for long-term health ⁵⁻
27 ⁸. Accordingly, there have been many contrasting associations reported recently between plant and
28 animal protein intake and mortality, especially regarding cardiovascular diseases ^{5,9,10}.

29 More globally, plant (such as legumes, nuts and whole grains) and animal (such as red and processed
30 meats) protein sources have heterogeneous relationships to nutrient adequacy ¹¹ and to long-term
31 health regarding cardiovascular diseases ^{7,12-14} and cancers ^{15,16}. There is indeed a challenge for food-
32 based dietary guidelines to point out what proportions of plant and animal protein foods should be
33 recommended ^{17,18}. However, the plant to animal protein ratio remains a poor, summarizing descriptor
34 of dietary patterns, since two diets with the same plant to animal protein ratio can actually be very
35 different ⁷. There is thus a need to analyze the overall proportion of plant protein in the diet in view of
36 the related dietary profiles and their nutritional adequacy and healthiness.

37 Furthermore, current interest in the proportions of plant and animal proteins in the diet also stems
38 from their differential association with environmental pressures, in particular greenhouse gas
39 emissions (GHGe) and land use ¹⁹⁻²². Altogether, the plant to animal protein ratio in the diet appears

40 central to the sustainability of the food systems^{19,23}. This has implications for dietary guidelines that
41 aim to encompass both human and planetary health²⁴⁻²⁶.

42 Here, using advanced diet modeling and optimization, we studied whether an optimal proportion of
43 plant protein in the diet (%PP, the percentage of plant protein in total protein intake) can be identified
44 when taking into account the reference values for nutrients and the disease burden risks for food
45 categories. We characterized modeled diets that departed as little as possible from prevailing diets at
46 all levels of adequate %PP values for nutrient adequacy and long-term health to identify nutritional
47 issues (i.e., limiting nutrients) and dietary levers (i.e., effective foods). We furthermore estimated the
48 environmental pressures associated with modeled diets along the whole range of adequate %PP
49 values.

50 **Results**

51 Range of adequate %PP values and identified tensions between %PP, nutrient adequacy and long- 52 term health

53 The adequate %PP range compatible with nutrient adequacy was 16%-82% in males and 16%-77%
54 in females, and only the 25%-70% %PP range was additionally compatible with a minimal health risk
55 for both sexes (**Table 1**). In this narrower range, a null *Health Risk* criterion (*HR*) value was attained
56 by the removal of unhealthy foods (red meat, processed meat and sweetened beverages) and an
57 increase in healthy foods (whole grain products, fruits, vegetables, legumes, nuts and seeds, and
58 milk) up to or above their theoretical minimum risk exposure levels (TMREL)²⁷.

59 Among the %PP equality constraint and the nutritional constraints, none were found limiting for *HR*
60 minimization over the 25%-70% %PP range (**Table 2**). The %PP equality constraint was limiting only
61 for %PP values lower than 25% (strongly) and higher than 70% (more moderately, due to the lower
62 *HR* impact of the milk decrease for the highest %PP values than of the red meat increase and whole
63 grain product decrease for the lowest %PP values). Nutrients identified as increasingly limiting as
64 %PP decreased below 25% were fiber, sugar (excluding lactose), saturated fatty acids and
65 atherogenic fatty acids (lauric, myristic and palmitic acids). As %PP decreased below 25%, it was
66 hence increasingly challenging to maintain sufficient intake of fiber and non-excessive intakes of
67 sugar and fatty acids (as shown by the opposite sign of their dual values), which resulted in dietary
68 solutions of increasingly degraded *HR* values. Nutrients that were identified as increasingly limiting
69 when %PP increased above 70% were iodine, sodium, vitamin B2, calcium, EPA+DHA, vitamin A
70 and α -linolenic acid in both sexes together with vitamin B12 in males and bioavailable iron in females.
71 As %PP increased above 70%, its was increasingly challenging to maintain sufficient intakes of these
72 nutrients and a non-excessive sodium intake. The other nutrients (n=20, those not shown in Table 2)
73 were never limiting over the adequate %PP range, including, of note, protein.

74 Sensitivity analysis showed that being more demanding for bioavailable iron and zinc (i.e.,
75 constraining their deficiency prevalence at $\leq 1\%$ rather than $\leq 5\%$ as in the main model) resulted in
76 slightly restricting the adequate %PP range on the right (16%-79% in males and 16%-70% in
77 females), and the %PP range ensuring a null *HR* value on both sides (30%-65% in males and 35%-
78 45% in females) (data not shown). Conversely, when suppressing all the food group consumption
79 limits (i.e., all the dietary and acceptability constraints) from the model (Supplemental Table 1), the
80 range of adequate %PP values was expanded on both sides (8%-94% in males and 8%-92% in
81 females), as was the %PP range ensuring a null *HR* value (16%-86% in males and 16%-84% in
82 females), but consistently with the same limiting nutrients as in the main model (in particular,
83 insufficient fiber intake for excessively low %PP values, or insufficient intakes of vitamin B12, iodine
84 and EPA+DHA for excessively high %PP values).

85 Modeled diets

86 All the modeled diets identified (**Figure 1** and Supplemental Figure 1) were very distant from the
87 current typical French diets, with *Diet Departure (DD)* values equal to or greater than twice the
88 standard deviation observed in the population. Furthermore, most of the modeled diets with a null *HR*
89 value (i.e., in the 25%-70% %PP range) were all about equally distant from the observed diets, with
90 close *DD* values (differing by less than 20%) in the 35%-65% %PP range and similar *DD* values
91 (differing by less than 5%) in the 45%-60% %PP range.

92 Although the energy intake remained relatively stable between modeled and observed diets (by
93 construction), the total intakes of both animal-based and plant-based foods were increased in the
94 25%-70% %PP range, notably owing to the important increases in milk, fruits and vegetables up to or
95 above their TMREL values (Supplemental Table 2 and Supplemental Figure 2). Regarding plant
96 products, all the modeled diets exhibited dramatic increases in fruits and vegetables, whole grain
97 products and legumes and nuts. Regarding animal products, red and processed meats were readily
98 removed as %PP increased. These meats were replaced by poultry and eggs, which transiently

99 increased, the modeled diets then being meat-free from PP%=60%. Dairy and seafood were the only
100 remaining animal products at the right end of the adequate %PP range (Supplemental Figure 2).

101 Over the entire adequate %PP range, including meat-free diets, the intakes of protein and of each
102 indispensable amino acid were always much higher than their 98% safe intake thresholds (**Figure 2**
103 and Supplemental Table 3 and Supplemental Figure 3).

104 Contributions of food groups to limiting nutrient intakes

105 Regardless of their %PP value, all the modeled diets were nutrient-adequate, in contrast with
106 observed diets (Supplemental Table 4).

107 As %PP increased, it was increasingly difficult to maintain sufficient intakes of bioavailable iron,
108 vitamins B12, B2 and A, and iodine and calcium, owing to the decreases in the animal products that
109 were their main contributors (red meat, dairy products and eggs) (Supplemental Figure 4). The
110 EPA+DHA and α -linolenic acid intakes, which are largely insufficient in the observed diets, were made
111 sufficient in all the modeled diets by increases in their main contributors, respectively, seafood and
112 added fats, with difficulties to maintain them sufficient for the highest %PP values (Supplemental
113 Figure 4). The sodium intake, which is dramatically excessive in the observed diets, was reduced to
114 its upper limit in all the modeled diets as a result of removing processed meat and reducing refined
115 grain products, with difficulties to maintain sodium not excessive for the highest %PP values, due to
116 increases in some starch and miscellaneous foods (Supplemental Figure 4). Conversely, as %PP
117 decreased, it was increasingly difficult to maintain a sufficient intake of fiber and non-excessive
118 intakes of sugar and saturated fatty acids, due to the meat and dairy increases (Supplemental Figure
119 5).

120 Environmental impacts of modeled diets

121 Across modeled diets, GHGe gradually decreased as %PP increased, with a stagnation from
122 %PP=70% onwards, from which the GHGe were 43% lower than with the observed diet (**Figure 3**).

123 Similar trends were observed for land use and, to a lesser extent, fossil resource use (Supplemental
124 Figure 6), with 43% and 12% decreases, respectively, from the observed to the modeled diet with
125 %PP=70%. In contrast, water use was similarly ~40% higher for all the modeled diets, regardless of
126 their %PP value, than for the observed diet, due to their very high levels of fruits and vegetables that
127 were by far the most water-demanding food groups (Supplemental Figure 6). Overall, at the level of
128 the single environmental footprint score that aggregated 16 indicators, the same trend was observed
129 as for GHGe, with a 34% decrease in this aggregated score from the observed to the modeled diet
130 with %PP=70% (Supplemental Figure 6).

131 **Discussion**

132 Gathering all nutritional information over a large spectrum that covered nutrient reference values and
133 long-term health risks, our study formally establishes ranges of plant protein proportion (%PP) for
134 nutrient-adequate and healthy diets. One major finding is that there is no optimal %PP value, as we
135 found a spectrum of similarly healthy diets over the 25%-70% range. However, diets in the upper end
136 were associated with substantially lower GHGe and overall environmental impact.

137 A wide dietary %PP range, from ~15% to 80%, was found compatible with providing all nutrients in
138 adequate amounts. As shown by sensitivity analysis, this %PP range was slightly restrained by the
139 considered constraints for food acceptability, whereas the nutritional issues identified remained
140 broadly the same with or without these constraints. From a nutritional viewpoint, no diet with %PP <
141 ~15% was able to provide enough fiber and non-excessive amounts of saturated fatty acids, while
142 also satisfying all constraints for nutrient intakes and food acceptability. More interestingly, given the
143 ongoing dietary transition, we could not find diets with %PP > ~80% that would provide sufficient
144 amounts of a large set of nutrients, particularly iodine, vitamin B12 (in males), bioavailable iron (in
145 females), calcium and EPA+DHA. These nutrients are considered to be at issue in vegetarian diets
146 (except calcium and iodine in lacto-ovo-vegetarian), notably calcium and B12 in predominantly plant-
147 based diets ^{28,29}. From a dietary viewpoint, as shown when approaching the critical value of
148 %PP=80%, dairy appeared to be key to preventing iodine and calcium shortages. Seafood,
149 meanwhile, appeared critical to providing EPA+DHA (with oily fishes as the main source) as well as
150 iodine and B12. Milk and seafood were the last remaining animal products at the highest %PP values,
151 confirming their importance as healthy, nutrient-dense protein sources ³⁰. Healthy plant protein
152 sources such as legumes and nuts apparently could not replace milk or seafood. This is because they
153 actually reached their upper allowed intake very early (as soon as %PP=25% for legumes), which
154 indicates that they constitute an effective dietary lever. However, even when removing all food intake
155 limits (in sensitivity analysis), it remained impossible to obtain 100% plant-based diets because of the
156 same nutritional issues (insufficient intakes of vitamin B12, iodine and EPA+DHA). Our findings do

157 not indicate that vegetarian (without seafood) or vegan diets (without seafood and dairy) cannot be
158 nutritionally adequate. It means that solutions for diets that are entirely or almost entirely plant-based
159 should rely on additional food products than those presently consumed by the general population,
160 including fortified foods ³¹⁻³³. This warrants further studies about the potential of new foods to extend
161 the limit of the %PP range identified as adequate here.

162 Within the wide range of nutrient-adequate %PP values, we did not find a single optimal diet, but a
163 large range of diets with %PP from 25% to 70%. These diets were all optimal when considering their
164 health value, because their food consumptions complied with minimum-risk exposure levels. These
165 consisted of no red meat and high levels of fruits and vegetables, whole grains, legumes, nuts and
166 milk, in line with dietary guidelines ³⁴. Modeled healthy diets were variations of this pattern, which
167 explains why they were also similarly distant from current diets. Within this healthy pattern spectrum,
168 the increase in %PP was predominantly related to the decrease in total and animal proteins. This
169 occurred mostly in poultry and eggs and, to a lesser extent, dairy. This finding aligns well with the
170 current spectrum of observed diets, with plant-based diets being higher in plant protein but especially
171 low in total and animal protein ^{35,36}. This could simply be ascribed to the higher protein density in
172 animal protein sources compared to plant protein sources. Also, the nutrients identified as limiting at
173 the borders of the healthy %PP range appear to be related to the nutrient density of animal vs plant
174 protein sources when expressed relative to protein density. However, the dietary protein amount was
175 never limiting, even at the highest %PP levels. There is a growing consensus that the protein package
176 and not the protein per se are important to the question of plant to animal protein ratio in the diet ^{5,7}.
177 Likewise, indispensable amino acid amounts were well above reference values based on
178 requirements. In real diets, composed of a mix of different types of proteins that complement each
179 other, sufficient amounts of protein appear to guarantee sufficient amounts of amino acids ^{20,36,37}.

180 Distance from the prevailing diets is often used in diet modeling to take into account so-called cultural
181 acceptability ³⁸⁻⁴⁰, also referred to as dietary inertia ⁴¹. In this study, healthy diets in the 35-65% %PP
182 range departed rather similarly from the prevailing diets, which are still at ~35% %PP. This confirms

183 that the plant to animal protein ratio is, by itself, a poor descriptor of diet characteristics, and so blanket
184 statements about the right %PP are not warranted. Given that modeled healthy diets ranging from
185 35% %PP (the level of the current diets in western countries) to 65% %PP were all very distant from
186 current diets, our study also shows that overcoming dietary inertia is required for healthy diets,
187 irrespective of the plant to animal protein target ratio ⁴².

188 The GHGe and overall composite score for environmental pressures were lower for healthy modeled
189 diets than observed diets, and all the more as %PP increased. A large body of literature has reported
190 that diets which are more plant-based are associated with lower environmental pressure, and vice
191 versa, whether diets were modeled ^{29,40,43,44}, observed ⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷ or composite ²³. However, until our study,
192 this relationship had not yet been demonstrated using %PP in healthy diets; our results indicate that
193 %PP is strongly associated with the environmental impact of healthy diets. As compared to the
194 prevailing diets, lower GHGe and composite score are firstly explained by the removal of total red
195 meat in all healthy diets, red meat accounting for ~1/3 of the pressure in prevailing diets. This is in
196 line with the literature that points to red meat and associated sustainability concerns ^{44,48}. Finally, we
197 found that other environmental pressures (land use and fossil resource use), except water use, had
198 similar patterns of change, in line with the literature ^{19,29}. The strong general relationship between
199 %PP and environmental pressure can mostly be ascribed to the fact that animal sources are rich in
200 protein, and that livestock breeding is associated with higher resource use, higher land use, and
201 higher GHGe ^{21,49-51}.

202 This study has some limitations. We modeled diets according to changes in intakes of food groups,
203 based on the present food repertoire and current intake levels in the population. Food grouping is
204 critical in diet modeling ⁵², and food diversity and composition can change rapidly in western countries,
205 as seen by recent changes ⁵³. A similar limitation applies to the assessment of a diet's environmental
206 impacts, for which also we did not consider variations related to food production systems ^{54,55}.
207 Nevertheless, we used a classical food grouping, which helps represent dietary patterns at an
208 appropriately high level of detail. We also believe that using standard/traditional foods in modeling

209 provides a good starting point to evaluate the situation before considering changes in the food offer
210 or food composition. Our study uses sources of information as background parameters, including
211 references/targets for nutrients and food categories. Clearly, there are many uncertainties in this
212 regard ⁵². Nonetheless, we believe that a strength of our study is our use of a conceptual framework
213 that aggregates most of the state of the art knowledge in nutrition.

214 To conclude, we identified that the range of equally optimal %PP values for nutrition and health is
215 wide (25%-70%), and that all of these healthy diets deviate greatly from prevailing diets. From a public
216 health perspective, there is no unique, optimal %PP value when considering nutrition and health
217 alone. However, significant changes in current eating habits are nonetheless required to achieve
218 healthier diets. Moreover, in the higher end of the plant protein percentage range, modeled healthy
219 diets have a lower environmental impact and are thus more sustainable than other healthy diets. At
220 %PP > ~80%, changes in food repertoire diversity, food composition, nutrient enrichment or nutrient
221 supplementation are required for fully nutrient-adequate diets.

222 **Methods**

223 Input of dietary data

224 The data used for this study were extracted from the French Individual and National Study on Food
225 Consumption Survey 3 (INCA3) conducted in 2014-2015. The INCA3 survey is a representative cross-
226 sectional survey of the French population; its method and design have been fully described elsewhere
227 ⁵⁶. Males aged 18-64 y ($n=564$) and pre-menopausal females aged 18-54 y ($n=561$), not identified as
228 under-reporters, were included in the present study; the final sample contained 1125 adults.

229 Dietary data were collected by professional investigators assisted by a dietary software from three
230 unplanned, non-consecutive, 24h dietary recalls spread over a three-week period. Portion sizes were
231 estimated using validated photographs ⁵⁶, and the nutrient contents of different food items came from
232 the 2016 food composition database operated by the French Information Centre on Food Quality
233 (CIQUAL) ⁵⁷. Mixed foods were broken down into ingredients and then gathered into 45 food groups
234 (Supplemental Table 5). For each sex, the nutrient content of each food group was calculated as the
235 mean nutrient content of food items constituting the food group weighted by their mean intake by the
236 sex considered, as previously described ⁵⁸.

237 Multi-criteria diet optimization under constraints

238 Using multi-criteria optimization, we identified modeled diets (i.e., modeled consumptions of the 45
239 food groups) with a minimal long-term health risk and a minimal departure from the observed diet
240 (taking into account cultural acceptability and inertia), under constraints that would ensure adequate
241 nutrient intakes and remain within current consumption limits. In this context, we investigated the role
242 of %PP to identify its adequate range of variations and to characterize the dietary, nutritional and
243 environmental consequences of these variations.

244 This non-linear optimization problem was performed using the NLP solver of the OPTMODEL
245 procedure of SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA.). Optimization was

246 implemented at the population level but in males and females, separately. The optimized diets of
247 males and females were then averaged to derive optimized diets for the adult population.

248 Constraints

249 During diet optimization, the total energy intake was constrained to stay within $\pm 5\%$ of its observed
250 value. Thirty-five nutritional constraints were applied to ensure adequate nutrient intake in the male
251 and female populations (Supplemental Table 6), based on the most recent reference values from the
252 French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES) ⁵⁹. We did not
253 consider any constraints for vitamin D, because its reference value is known to be much too high to
254 be reached by a non-fortified diet alone ^{52,58}. As the absorption of iron and zinc is dependent on dietary
255 factors, the requirements were based on bioavailable iron and zinc calculated from the dietary intake
256 using equations that predict their absorption ⁶⁰⁻⁶³, as detailed in a previous study by our group ⁵⁸. This
257 previous study had demonstrated that current recommendations regarding bioavailable iron and zinc
258 are very constraining when trying to model healthier diets, these recommendations being much higher
259 than current intakes (e.g., there is a current iron-deficiency anemia prevalence of 4.1% in French
260 women) ⁵⁸. Therefore, like in this previous study, we used threshold values lower than current
261 reference values. They correspond to a deficiency prevalence of 5%, because such flexibility enables
262 the identification of diets that are apparently healthier overall, with a better balance in disability-
263 adjusted life-years (DALYs) due to less cardiometabolic disease, despite a higher prevalence of iron-
264 deficiency anemia ⁵⁸. In addition, to take into account the slightly lower digestibility of plant vs animal
265 proteins regarding the nutritional constraint on protein requirement, a 5% penalty was applied to
266 protein intake from plant protein food items, as previously described ⁶⁴. As the intake of individual
267 amino acids is generally adequate when the protein intake is sufficient in a varied diet ⁶⁵, only protein
268 requirements were considered in the model constraints, but we have *a posteriori* verified that modeled
269 diets also contained adequate intakes of indispensable amino acids by using a database of the amino
270 acid composition of food groups (Supplemental Method 1).

271 Moreover, some acceptability constraints were applied to the food group consumption (Supplemental
272 Table 7). Acceptability constraints aimed to keep the food group intakes within the range of observed
273 intakes, by bounding each food group intake between its 5th and 95th percentile of observed
274 consumption in males and females separately. We did not do this for the unhealthy food groups or
275 categories (red meat, processed meat and sweetened beverages), for which a dietary constraint with
276 an upper limit was already defined according to the French dietary guidelines. Another exception was
277 made for some healthy food groups (legumes and milk) that had 95th percentile values slightly lower
278 than TMREL values, and for which the upper limit has thus been raised to their TMREL values.

279 Objectives

280 The main optimization objective was to minimize the long-term health risk of the modeled diet, as
281 assessed by the *HR* criterion. The *HR* criterion was set to target the dietary recommendations from
282 the GDB based on epidemiological studies about the associations between consumption of different
283 food groups and risk of chronic diseases ²⁷. The *HR* criterion thus aimed to limit the consumption of
284 three unhealthy food groups or categories (red meat, processed meat and sweetened beverages),
285 while promoting that of six healthy food groups or categories (whole grain products, fruits, vegetables,
286 legumes, nuts and seeds, and milk) until their TMREL values were reached. According to the most
287 recent (2019) estimates from the Global Burden of Diseases (GBD), TMREL values were 0 g/d for
288 red meat, processed meat and sweetened beverages, and 150, 325, 300, 95, 14.5 and 430 g/d,
289 respectively, for whole grain products, fruits, vegetables, legumes, nuts and seeds, and milk ²⁷. In our
290 study, the *HR* criterion was thus expressed and minimized as:

$$291 \quad \text{Min } HR = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\text{Opt}(i)}{\text{Max}(i)} \times \frac{\text{DALYs}(i)}{\text{DALYs}(\text{all})} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^6 \left(\max \left[\frac{\text{TMREL}(j) - \text{Opt}(j)}{\text{TMREL}(j)}; 0 \right] \times \frac{\text{DALYs}(j)}{\text{DALYs}(\text{all})} \right)$$

292 Where *i* denotes the food groups to be decreased (red meat, processed meat and sweetened
293 beverages), *j* denotes the food groups to be increased (whole grain products, fruits, vegetables,
294 legumes, nuts and seeds, and milk), *Opt*(*i*) and *Opt*(*j*) are the optimized consumptions of food groups

295 i and j, respectively (in g/d), $Max(i)$ is the upper limit of consumption of food group i (in g/d), $TMREL(j)$
296 is the TMREL value of food group j (in g/d), $DALYs(i)$ and $DALYs(j)$ are the disability-adjusted life-
297 years associated with excessive or insufficient consumptions of food groups i and j, respectively (in
298 y), and $DALYs(all)$ is the sum of all $DALYs(i)$ and $DALYs(j)$. The Max values used were the maximal
299 recommended consumption of unhealthy foods in line with the French dietary guidelines ⁵²: 71g/d for
300 red meat, 25g/d for processed meat and 263 g/d (corresponding to the average portion size) for
301 sweetened beverages intake. The TMREL and DALYs values used were issued from the most recent
302 (2019) estimates from the GBD ²⁷ adapted to our study context (by using sex-specific and French
303 DALYs values, Supplemental Table 8).

304 We also evaluated how the modeled diets deviated from current diets (*DD* criterion), in order to
305 consider inertia to changes in food consumption, which is one way to account for social/cultural
306 acceptability. The *DD* criterion was defined as the sum of the squares of the differences between
307 observed and optimized food group consumption, standardized by their observed standard
308 deviations, as previously explained ⁵⁸. *DD* was thus expressed and minimized as:

309

$$\text{Min } DD = \sum_{k=1}^n \left[\frac{\text{Obs}(k) - \text{Opt}(k)}{SD(k)} \right]^2$$

310 Where k is the number of food groups (n=45), $Obs(k)$ and $Opt(k)$ are respectively the observed and
311 optimized consumption of food group k (in g/d) and $SD(k)$ is the current standard deviation of the
312 consumption of food group k.

313 Optimization strategy

314 We firstly aimed to determine the range of adequate %PP values in the diet that would ensure nutrient
315 adequacy with a minimal long-term health risk. This first problem of identifying the adequate %PP
316 range was addressed by optimizing the *HR* criterion under all the nutritional and acceptability
317 constraints, with an additional constraint on %PP that was iteratively parameterized according to a
318 grid search. This grid search constraint forced the %PP value to be equal to x%, with x% varying from

319 0% to 100% by steps of 5% (or even 1% at the edges of the adequate %PP range). As this problem
320 was often non-uniquely identifiable, leading to different solutions with slightly distinct dietary patterns
321 but similar *HR* values (especially for the intermediate %PP values that allowed for a variety of food
322 group combinations with a similarly null *HR* value), we choose to systematically select the dietary
323 solution that was the most acceptable *a priori*, based on the lowest departure from the current diet.
324 According to the hierarchical method in multi-criteria optimization ⁶⁶, this second problem of diet
325 selection was addressed in a second stage. This time it was done by optimizing the *DD* criterion under
326 the constraint that *HR* was equal to its previously identified minimal value, always under all the
327 nutritional and acceptability constraints, and the grid search constraint on %PP covering its previously
328 identified adequate range.

329 Limiting nutrients and contribution of food groups to their intake

330 We conducted a dual value analysis to better characterize the tensions between %PP, nutrient
331 adequacy and long-term health. We reported the dual values associated with the %PP equality
332 constraint and the nutritional constraints during *HR* optimization (obtained during the first problem
333 solving, as explained above), which represent the potential *HR* gain if the limiting bound (lower or
334 upper) of the considered constraint was relaxed by one unit. In order to compare the relative influence
335 of nutrients, their dual values were standardized to represent the potential *HR* gain if the limiting bound
336 was relaxed by 10%, to classify nutrients from the most limiting (higher absolute standardized dual
337 value) to the least limiting (lowest absolute standardized dual value).

338 For the most limiting nutrients in the different modeled diets (i.e., nutrients with the most active
339 constraints), we studied contributions of different food groups to intake of that particular nutrient in
340 each modeled diet identified for each adequate %PP value (i.e., in the modeled diets resulting from
341 the second problem solving, as explained above).

342 Sensitivity analysis

343 We also conducted a sensitivity analysis to assess the influence of some constraints of particular
344 interest. We thus compared the results obtained when requiring the deficiency prevalence to be $\leq 1\%$
345 rather than $\leq 5\%$ (main model) in the nutritional constraints for bioavailable iron and zinc (their
346 alternative threshold values are given in Supplemental Table 6), and when removing or not (main
347 model) all the dietary and acceptability constraints on food group intakes.

348 Diet environmental impacts

349 Finally, to assess environmental pressures related to the observed and modeled diets, we used the
350 French agricultural life cycle inventory database AGRIBALYSE®; its methodological approach
351 (summarized in Supplemental Method 2) has been described elsewhere ⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹. In particular, we
352 evaluated the food-related GHGe (in kg CO₂eq, with the non-CO₂ GHGe included and weighted
353 according to their relative impact on warming), land use (referring to the use and transformation of
354 land, dimensionless), water use (relating to the local scarcity of water, in m³ water deprivation) and
355 fossil resource use (use of non-renewable fossil resources such as coal, oil, and gas, in MJ), together
356 with a single environmental footprint score (dimensionless) that aggregated 16 indicators ⁷⁰.

357 **Acknowledgments and statement of authors' contributions to the manuscript**

358 The authors thank Vincent Colomb and Mélissa Cornélius (Ademe) for their important support in the
359 use of the Agribalyse database.

360 HF and FM designed the research; HF conducted the research and analyzed the data; AD, EP, FM,
361 JW, J-FH and EK-G provided methodological support and help with interpretation of the results; HF
362 and FM wrote the first draft of the manuscript; and all authors provided critical comments on the
363 manuscript. HF and FM had primary responsibility for the final content, and all authors have read and
364 approved the final manuscript.

References

- 1 Styring, A. K. *et al.* Refining human palaeodietary reconstruction using amino acid $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values of plants, animals and humans. *J Archaeol Sci* **53**, 504-515, doi:10.1016/j.jas.2014.11.009 (2015).
- 2 WHO. Diet, nutrition and the prevention of chronic diseases. 3. Global and regional food consumption patterns and trends. Report No. 0512-3054, 1-149 (2003).
- 3 Winnie Gerbens-Leenes, P. in *Vegetarian and Plant-Based Diets in Health and Disease Prevention* (ed François Mariotti) 117-134 (Academic Press, 2017).
- 4 Phillips, S. M. *et al.* Commonly consumed protein foods contribute to nutrient intake, diet quality, and nutrient adequacy. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, doi:10.3945/ajcn.114.084079 (2015).
- 5 Mariotti, F. Animal and Plant Protein Sources and Cardiometabolic Health. *Adv Nutr* **10**, S351-S366, doi:10.1093/advances/nmy110 (2019).
- 6 Lepine, G. *et al.* A Scoping Review: Metabolomics Signatures Associated with Animal and Plant Protein Intake and Their Potential Relation with Cardiometabolic Risk. *Adv Nutr* **12**, 2112-2131, doi:10.1093/advances/nmab073 (2021).
- 7 Richter, C. K., Skulas-Ray, A. C., Champagne, C. M. & Kris-Etherton, P. M. Plant Protein and Animal Proteins: Do They Differentially Affect Cardiovascular Disease Risk? *Adv Nutr* **6**, 712-728, doi:10.3945/an.115.009654 (2015).
- 8 Dietrich, S. *et al.* Amino acid intake and plasma concentrations and their interplay with gut microbiota in vegans and omnivores in Germany. *Eur J Nutr*, doi:10.1007/s00394-021-02790-y (2022).
- 9 Naghshi, S., Sadeghi, O., Willett, W. C. & Esmailzadeh, A. Dietary intake of total, animal, and plant proteins and risk of all cause, cardiovascular, and cancer mortality: systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *BMJ* **370**, m2412, doi:10.1136/bmj.m2412 (2020).
- 10 Zhong, V. W. *et al.* Protein foods from animal sources, incident cardiovascular disease and all-cause mortality: a substitution analysis. *Int J Epidemiol*, doi:10.1093/ije/dyaa205 (2021).
- 11 Salomé, M. *et al.* Plant-Protein Diversity Is Critical to Ensuring the Nutritional Adequacy of Diets When Replacing Animal With Plant Protein: Observed and Modeled Diets of French Adults (INCA3). *J Nutr* **150**, 536-545, doi:10.1093/jn/nxz252 (2020).
- 12 Malik, V. S., Li, Y., Tobias, D. K., Pan, A. & Hu, F. B. Dietary Protein Intake and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes in US Men and Women. *American journal of epidemiology* **183**, 715-728, doi:10.1093/aje/kwv268 (2016).
- 13 Tharrey, M. *et al.* Patterns of plant and animal protein intake are strongly associated with cardiovascular mortality: the Adventist Health Study-2 cohort. *Int J Epidemiol*, doi:10.1093/ije/dyy030 (2018).
- 14 Guasch-Ferre, M. *et al.* Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials of Red Meat Consumption in Comparison With Various Comparison Diets on Cardiovascular Risk Factors. *Circulation* **139**, 1828-1845, doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.118.035225 (2019).
- 15 Farvid, M. S. *et al.* Consumption of red meat and processed meat and cancer incidence: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Eur J Epidemiol* **36**, 937-951, doi:10.1007/s10654-021-00741-9 (2021).
- 16 Huang, Y. *et al.* Red and processed meat consumption and cancer outcomes: Umbrella review. *Food Chem* **356**, 129697, doi:10.1016/j.foodchem.2021.129697 (2021).
- 17 Havemeier, S., Erickson, J. & Slavin, J. Dietary guidance for pulses: the challenge and opportunity to be part of both the vegetable and protein food groups. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **1392**, 58-66, doi:10.1111/nyas.13308 (2017).

- 18 Comerford, K. B., Miller, G. D., Reinhardt Kapsak, W. & Brown, K. A. The Complementary Roles for Plant-Source and Animal-Source Foods in Sustainable Healthy Diets. *Nutrients* **13**, 3469, doi:10.3390/nu13103469 (2021).
- 19 Clark, M. A., Springmann, M., Hill, J. & Tilman, D. Multiple health and environmental impacts of foods. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, doi:10.1073/pnas.1906908116 (2019).
- 20 Katz, D. L., Doughty, K. N., Geagan, K., Jenkins, D. A. & Gardner, C. D. Perspective: The Public Health Case for Modernizing the Definition of Protein Quality. *Adv Nutr* **10**, 755-764, doi:10.1093/advances/nmz023 (2019).
- 21 Xu, X. M. *et al.* Global greenhouse gas emissions from animal-based foods are twice those of plant-based foods. *Nat Food* **2**, 724+, doi:10.1038/s43016-021-00358-x (2021).
- 22 Jarmul, S. *et al.* Climate change mitigation through dietary change: a systematic review of empirical and modelling studies on the environmental footprints and health effects of 'sustainable diets'. *Envir Res Lett* **15**, 123014, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/abc2f7 (2020).
- 23 Reinhardt, S. L. *et al.* Systematic Review of Dietary Patterns and Sustainability in the United States. *Adv Nutr*, doi:10.1093/advances/nmaa026 (2020).
- 24 Kesse-Guyot, E. *et al.* Environmental and nutritional analysis of the EAT-Lancet diet at the individual level: insights from the NutriNet-Sante study. *J Clean Prod* **296**, 10, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126555 (2021).
- 25 Willett, W. *et al.* Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* **393**, 447-492, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4 (2019).
- 26 Tuomisto, H. L. Importance of considering environmental sustainability in dietary guidelines. *Lancet Planet Health* **2**, e331-e332, doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(18)30174-8 (2018).
- 27 GBD Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet* **396**, 1223-1249, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-2 (2020).
- 28 Bakaloudi, D. R. *et al.* Intake and adequacy of the vegan diet. A systematic review of the evidence. *Clin Nutr* **40**, 3503-3521, doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2020.11.035 (2021).
- 29 Springmann, M. *et al.* Health and nutritional aspects of sustainable diet strategies and their association with environmental impacts: a global modelling analysis with country-level detail. *Lancet Planet Health* **2**, e451-e461, doi:10.1016/S2542-5196(18)30206-7 (2018).
- 30 Cifelli, C. J., Houchins, J. A., Demmer, E. & Fulgoni, V. L. Increasing Plant Based Foods or Dairy Foods Differentially Affects Nutrient Intakes: Dietary Scenarios Using NHANES 2007-2010. *Nutrients* **8**, doi:10.3390/nu8070422 (2016).
- 31 Mangano, K. M. & Tucker, K. L. in *Vegetarian and Plant-Based Diets in Health and Disease Prevention* (ed François Mariotti) 315-331 (Academic Press, 2017).
- 32 Thorpe, D. L., Beeson, W. L., Knutsen, R., Fraser, G. E. & Knutsen, S. F. Dietary patterns and hip fracture in the Adventist Health Study 2: combined vitamin D and calcium supplementation mitigate increased hip fracture risk among vegans. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqab095 (2021).
- 33 Craig, W. J. *et al.* The Safe and Effective Use of Plant-Based Diets with Guidelines for Health Professionals. *Nutrients* **13**, doi:10.3390/nu13114144 (2021).
- 34 Herforth, A. *et al.* A Global Review of Food-Based Dietary Guidelines. *Adv Nutr*, doi:10.1093/advances/nmy130 (2019).
- 35 Halkjaer, J. *et al.* Intake of total, animal and plant proteins, and their food sources in 10 countries in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition. *European journal of clinical nutrition* **63 Suppl 4**, S16-36, doi:10.1038/ejcn.2009.73 (2009).

- 36 Mariotti, F. & Gardner, C. D. Dietary Protein and Amino Acids in Vegetarian Diets-A Review. *Nutrients* **11**, doi:10.3390/nu11112661 (2019).
- 37 Young, V. R. & Pellett, P. L. Plant proteins in relation to human protein and amino acid nutrition. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* **59**, 1203S-1212S, doi:10.1093/ajcn/59.5.1203S (1994).
- 38 Gazan, R. *et al.* Mathematical Optimization to Explore Tomorrow's Sustainable Diets: A Narrative Review. *Adv Nutr* **9**, 602-616, doi:10.1093/advances/nmy049 (2018).
- 39 Macdiarmid, J. I. *et al.* Sustainable diets for the future: Can we contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by eating a healthy diet? *The American journal of clinical nutrition* **96**, 632-639, doi:10.3945/ajcn.112.038729 (2012).
- 40 Seconda, L. *et al.* Conservative to disruptive diets for optimizing nutrition, environmental impacts and cost in French adults from the NutriNet-Sante cohort. *Nat Food* **2**, 174-182, doi:10.1038/s43016-021-00227-7 (2021).
- 41 Webb, D. & Byrd-Bredbenner, C. Overcoming Consumer Inertia to Dietary Guidance. *Adv Nutr* **6**, 391-396, doi:10.3945/an.115.008441 (2015).
- 42 Petersen, K. S. *et al.* Healthy Dietary Patterns for Preventing Cardiometabolic Disease: The Role of Plant-Based Foods and Animal Products. *Curr Dev Nutr* **1**, cdn.117.001289-cdn.001117.001289, doi:10.3945/cdn.117.001289 (2017).
- 43 Springmann, M., Godfray, H. C., Rayner, M. & Scarborough, P. Analysis and valuation of the health and climate change cobenefits of dietary change. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **113**, 4146-4151, doi:10.1073/pnas.1523119113 (2016).
- 44 Wilson, N., Cleghorn, C. L., Cobiac, L. J., Mizdrak, A. & Nghiem, N. Achieving Healthy and Sustainable Diets: A Review of the Results of Recent Mathematical Optimization Studies. *Adv Nutr* **10**, S389-S403, doi:10.1093/advances/nmz037 (2019).
- 45 Kesse-Guyot, E. *et al.* Sustainability analysis of French dietary guidelines using multiple criteria. *Nat Sustain* **3**, 377-385, doi:10.1038/s41893-020-0495-8 (2020).
- 46 Segovia-Siapco, G. & Sabate, J. Health and sustainability outcomes of vegetarian dietary patterns: a revisit of the EPIC-Oxford and the Adventist Health Study-2 cohorts. *European journal of clinical nutrition*, doi:10.1038/s41430-018-0310-z (2018).
- 47 Baudry, J. *et al.* Improvement of diet sustainability with increased level of organic food in the diet: findings from the BioNutriNet cohort. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* **109**, 1173-1188, doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqy361 (2019).
- 48 Nelson, M. E., Hamm, M. W., Hu, F. B., Abrams, S. A. & Griffin, T. S. Alignment of Healthy Dietary Patterns and Environmental Sustainability: A Systematic Review. *Adv Nutr* **7**, 1005-1025, doi:10.3945/an.116.012567 (2016).
- 49 Crippa, M. *et al.* Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions. *Nat Food* **2**, 198-209, doi:10.1038/s43016-021-00225-9 (2021).
- 50 Poore, J. & Nemecek, T. Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. *Science* **360**, 987-992, doi:10.1126/science.aaq0216 (2018).
- 51 Godfray, H. C. J. *et al.* Meat consumption, health, and the environment. *Science* **361**, doi:10.1126/science.aam5324 (2018).
- 52 Mariotti, F. *et al.* Perspective: Modeling Healthy Eating Patterns for Food-Based Dietary Guidelines-Scientific Concepts, Methodological Processes, Limitations, and Lessons. *Adv Nutr* **12**, 590-599, doi:10.1093/advances/nmaa176 (2021).
- 53 Wickramasinghe, K. *et al.* The shift to plant-based diets: are we missing the point? *Global Food Security* **29**, 100530, doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2021.100530 (2021).

- 54 Reganold, J. P. & Wachter, J. M. Organic agriculture in the twenty-first century. *Nat Plants* **2**, doi:10.1038/NPLANTS.2015.221 (2016).
- 55 Nijdam, D., Rood, T. & Westhoek, H. The price of protein: Review of land use and carbon footprints from life cycle assessments of animal food products and their substitutes. *Food Policy* **37**, 760-770, doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2012.08.002 (2012).
- 56 Dubuisson, C. *et al.* The Third French Individual and National Food Consumption (INCA3) Survey 2014-2015: method, design and participation rate in the framework of a European harmonization process. *Public health nutrition* **22**, 584-600, doi:10.1017/S1368980018002896 (2019).
- 57 The French Agency for Food Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES). *ANSES-CIQUAL French food composition table* (version 2016); <https://ciqual.anses.fr/>.
- 58 Dussiot, A. *et al.* Modeled healthy eating patterns are largely constrained by currently estimated requirements for bioavailable iron and zinc - a diet optimization study in French Adults. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqab373 (2021).
- 59 The French Agency for Food Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES). *Avis de l'Agence nationale de sécurité sanitaire de l'alimentation, de l'environnement et du travail relatif à « Actualisation des références nutritionnelles françaises en vitamines et minéraux »* (saisine n°2018-SA-0238, saisine liée n°2012-SA-0103, 2021); <http://www.anses.fr/fr/system/files/NUT2018SA0238Ra.pdf>.
- 60 Armah, S. M., Carriquiry, A., Sullivan, D., Cook, J. D. & Reddy, M. B. A complete diet-based algorithm for predicting nonheme iron absorption in adults. *J Nutr* **143**, 1136-1140, doi:10.3945/jn.112.169904 (2013).
- 61 EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, N. & Allergies. Scientific Opinion on Dietary Reference Values for zinc. *EFSA J* **12**, 76, doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3844 (2014).
- 62 Hallberg, L. & Hulthen, L. Prediction of dietary iron absorption: an algorithm for calculating absorption and bioavailability of dietary iron. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* **71**, 1147-1160, doi:10.1093/ajcn/71.5.1147 (2000).
- 63 Miller, L. V., Krebs, N. F. & Hambidge, K. M. A mathematical model of zinc absorption in humans as a function of dietary zinc and phytate. *J Nutr* **137**, 135-141, doi:10.1093/jn/137.1.135 (2007).
- 64 Gavelle, E., Huneau, J. F. & Mariotti, F. Patterns of Protein Food Intake Are Associated with Nutrient Adequacy in the General French Adult Population. *Nutrients* **10**, doi:10.3390/nu10020226 (2018).
- 65 de Gavelle, E., Huneau, J. F., Bianchi, C. M., Verger, E. O. & Mariotti, F. Protein Adequacy Is Primarily a Matter of Protein Quantity, Not Quality: Modeling an Increase in Plant:Animal Protein Ratio in French Adults. *Nutrients* **9**, doi:10.3390/nu9121333 (2017).
- 66 Mausser, H., Grodzewich, O. & Romanko, O. in *Proceedings of the Fields-MITACS Industrial Problems Workshop*. 89-101.
- 67 *Agribalyse data v3.0* (ADEME, 2020); <https://doc.agribalyse.fr/documentation-en/>.
- 68 Colomb, V. *et al.* AGRIBALYSE (R), the French LCI Database for agricultural products: high quality data for producers and environmental labelling. *Ocl-Oilseeds and Fats Crops and Lipids* **22**, doi:10.1051/ocl/20140047 (2015).
- 69 Koch, P. & Salou, T. *AGRIBALYSE®: Rapport Méthodologique - Volet Agriculture - Version 3.0* (ADEME, 2020); Available from: www.ademe.fr/agribalyse-en.
- 70 European Commission. *Guidance for the development of Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules (PEFCRs)* (version 6.3, 2018); https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eusssd/smgp/pdf/PEFCR_guidance_v6.3.pdf.

Table 1. Range of adequate values of the percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) and corresponding minimal values of long-term health risk (*HR*) in French males and females.

%PP	Males							Females					
	Observed diet	Modeled diets						Observed diet	Modeled diets				
	33%	16%	20%	25%-70%	75%	80%	82%	34%	16%	20%	25%-70%	75%	77%
<i>HR</i> value	0.983	0.602	0.180	0.000	0.004	0.024	0.049	0.736	0.516	0.065	0.000	0.039	0.052
<i>HR</i> components:													
<i>Risk of excessive intake of unhealthy foods:</i>													
Red meat	0.236	0.211	0.065	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.023	0.207	0.347	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Processed meat	0.213	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.126	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Sweetened beverages	0.026	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.024	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.013
<i>Risk of insufficient intake of healthy foods:</i>													
Whole grain products	0.213	0.195	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.157	0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Legumes	0.111	0.127	0.067	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.056	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.000
Fruits	0.091	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.093	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Vegetables	0.033	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nuts & seeds	0.039	0.048	0.048	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.023	0.023	0.000	0.000	0.000
Milk	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.024	0.026	0.037	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.037	0.039

Values of the *HR* criterion and its individual components when optimizing *HR* under all the nutritional, dietary and acceptability constraints and an additional constraint imposing the %PP value according to an iterative grid search. Results are reported for the %PP values allowing model convergence (i.e., nutrient-adequate diets) for each sex (16%-82% and 16%-77% %PP ranges in males and females, respectively). Within these %PP values, those outside the 25%-70% range have non-null *HR* values because of excessive intake of unhealthy foods and/or insufficient intake of healthy foods.

Table 2. Dual values of the active constraints identified during minimization of the long-term health risk (*HR*) in French males and females¹.

%PP	Males						Females				
	Modeled diets						Modeled diets				
	16%	20%	25%-70%	75%	80%	82%	16%	20%	25%-70%	75%	77%
%PP constraint²	-0.246	-0.081	NS	0.003	0.004	0.037	-0.166	-0.042	NS	0.004	0.017
Nutrients that are more limiting as %PP increase³											
Iodine	NS	NS	NS	0,002	0,005	0,058	NS	NS	NS	0.006	0.043
Sodium	NS	-0.023	NS	-0,002	-0,005	-0,041	NS	NS	NS	-0.006	-0.027
Bioavailable iron	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.096	NS	0.014	0.027
Vitamin B12	NS	NS	NS	0.002	0.004	0.035	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Vitamin B2	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.001	0.006	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.021
Calcium	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.001	0.009	NS	NS	NS	0.001	0.013
EPA+DHA	NS	NS	NS	0.001	0.001	0.007	NS	NS	NS	0.002	0.009
Vitamin A	NS	NS	NS	0.001	0.002	0.009	NS	NS	NS	0.004	0.001
α-linolenic acid	NS	NS	NS	0.001	0.001	0.001	NS	NS	NS	0.001	0.004
Nutrients that are more limiting as %PP decrease³											
Fiber	0.435	0.136	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.332	0.077	NS	NS	NS
Sugar excluding lactose	-0.125	-0.044	NS	NS	NS	-0.012	-0.106	-0.030	NS	NS	-0.002
Saturated fatty acids	-0.095	-0.074	NS	NS	NS	NS	-0.085	-0.036	NS	NS	NS
Atherogenic fatty acids	-0.083	-0.001	NS	NS	NS	NS	-0.094	-0.006	NS	NS	NS

¹Dual values when optimizing *HR* under all the nutritional, dietary and acceptability constraints and an equality constraint imposing the percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) value according to an iterative grid search. Results are reported for the %PP values allowing nutrient-adequate diets (16%-82% and 16%-77% %PP ranges in males and females, respectively), which includes those also allowing a null *HR* value (25%-70% %PP range in both sexes). NS, not significant (<0.0001).

²For the %PP equality constraint, dual values represent the potential effect on *HR* of the relaxation by one unit of the limiting bound, with positive (negative) values if the lower (upper) bound is limiting (e.g., for %PP=82% in males, the dual value indicates that there would be a potential *HR* gain of 0.037 if %PP was decreased from 82% to 81%).

³For nutritional constraints, dual values have been standardized to represent the potential effect on *HR* of the relaxation by 10% of the limiting bound, to classify the nutrients from the most limiting (higher absolute value) to the least limiting (lowest absolute value). Limiting nutrients have a positive (negative) dual value if their lower (upper) bound is limiting (e.g., for %PP=82% in males, the dual value for iodine indicates that there would be a potential *HR* gain of 0.058 if the lower bound for iodine intake was decreased by 10%, from 150 to 135 μ g/d). Only nutrients with an active constraint (i.e., with a non-null dual value) for at least one %PP value are presented here. For nutrients not presented in this table, dual values were always equal to zero, meaning that compliance with these constraints was not limiting. Atherogenic fatty acids, lauric and myristic and palmitic acids; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Daily food category consumption in the observed diets (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure (*DD*) minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy (16%-77%), which includes those also ensuring a null *HR* value (25%-70%). The bar charts represent the cumulative consumptions of food categories (black axis on the left) and the curves represent the *HR* and *DD* values (blue and pink axes on the right, respectively). For clarity, the 45 modeled food groups are not represented here but grouped into broader categories that are included in *HR* (such as red and processed meats) or represent other protein sources (such as poultry and seafood). Consumption of water, hot beverages, alcohol and miscellaneous foods are not shown for clarity. Details about food grouping and consumptions of food categories not shown here are given in Supplemental Tables 5 and 2, respectively.

Figure 2. Contribution of food categories to protein intake in the observed diets (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy (16%-77%), which includes those ensuring also a null *HR* value (25%-70%). Sections inside the bars represent the contributions of food categories to protein intake (in g of protein/kg of BW/d). See Supplemental Table 5 for the detailed composition of food categories.

Figure 3. Greenhouse gas emissions (GHGe) associated with the observed (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy (16%-77%), which includes those ensuring also a null *HR* value (25%-70%). Sections inside the bars represent the contributions of food categories to GHGe (in kg CO₂ eq), and values above the bars represent the relative deviation in GHGe from its observed value (in %). See Supplemental Table 5 for the detailed composition of food categories.

Figure 1




Figure 3

