

To be climate-friendly, food-based dietary guidelines must include limits on total meat consumption – modeling from the case of France

Emmanuelle Kesse-Guyot¹, Julia Baudry¹, Justine Berlivet¹, Elie Perraud¹, Chantal Julia^{1,2}, Mathilde Touvier¹, Benjamin Allès¹, Denis Lairon³, Serge Hercberg¹, Hélène Fouillet⁴, Philippe Pointereau⁵, François Mariotti⁴

¹ Université Sorbonne Paris Nord and Université Paris Cité, INSERM, INRAE, CNAM, Center of Research in Epidemiology and Statistics (CRESS), Nutritional Epidemiology Research Team (EREN), F-Sorbonne Paris Nord University, Inserm, INRAE, Cnam, Nutritional Epidemiology Research Team (EREN), Epidemiology and Statistics Research Center – University of Paris Cité (CRESS), 93017 Bobigny, France

² Public Health Department, Avicenne Hospital (Assistance Publique- Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Bobigny, France

³ AixMarseille Université, Inserm, INRAE, C2VN, 13005 Marseille, France

⁴ Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR PNCA, 91120, Palaiseau, France

⁵ Solagro, 75, Voie TOEC, CS 27608, F-31076 Toulouse Cedex 3, France

Correspondence: Email: emmanuelle.kesse-guyot@inrae.fr

Equipe de Recherche en Epidémiologie Nutritionnelle (EREN)

SMBH Université Sorbonne Paris Nord, 74 rue Marcel Cachin, 93017 Bobigny, France

Running title: GHGe and dietary guidelines

Number of tables: 2/Number of figures: 3

Supplemental material: 4 methods, 5 tables, 1 figure

Keywords: diet, optimization, mitigation, greenhouse gas emissions, dietary guidelines, healthy diet

Abbreviations:

FBDG: Food-based dietary guidelines

GBD: Global Burden of Diseases

GHGe: greenhouse gas emissions

P: percentile

TMREL: theoretical minimum-risk exposure level

Competing interests

The authors have no competing interest.

1 **Highlights**

- 2 * The average greenhouse gas emissions of the observed diets was 4.34 (SD=2.70)
3 kgCO₂eq/d with an energy intake of 2080 Kcal/d
4 * The diet that closely resembled the observed diet under the dietary guidelines, nutrient and
5 acceptability constraints (TD model) had emissions of 5.15 kgCO₂eq/d .
6 * Modeled diets that complied with dietary guidelines and nutrient and acceptability
7 constraints had emissions ranging from 1.16 kgCO₂eq/d (model MinGHGe) to 6.99
8 kgCO₂eq/d (model MaxGHGe).
9 * All modeled diets had higher consumption levels of fruit, vegetable oils, pulses, and
10 wholegrain products.
11 * The MinGHGe and MaxGHGe diets, and the range of identified models in between,
12 differed in their level of beef/lamb, refined cereals, fruit, pork, and snack products.
13 * The level of meat, especially beef/lamb, explained most of the difference (up to ~85%) in
14 GHGe across models.
15 * The level of total meat consumption varied progressively across models that imposed an
16 increase in GHGe.

17 **Abstract**

18 Although food-based dietary guidelines (FBDG) include guidelines for meat consumption, their
19 setting most often do not explicitly include environmental considerations. For instance, in France,
20 FBDG recommend consuming no more than 500 g of red meat and 150 g of processed meat per week.
21 This study uses modeling to investigate the range of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGe) that can be
22 achieved under FBDG compliance.

23 The study analyzed data collected in 2014 from 29,413 NutriNet-Santé participants to assess their
24 adherence to the French FBDG. GHGe, cumulative energy demand (CED), and land occupation (LO)
25 for organic and conventional foods were obtained from the DIALECTE database. Diets adequate in
26 nutrients, culturally acceptable, and consistent with FBDG were modeled under different GHGe
27 constraints. Environmental, nutritional, and health criteria were then calculated.

28 The average observed adequacy to FBDG was low (19%, SD=25%) and GHGe were 4.34 (SD=2.7%)
29 kgCO₂eq/d. The GHGe range of the diets varied from 1.16 to 6.99 kgCO₂eq/d, depending up to ~85%
30 on the level of meat consumption. Similar associations were observed for CED, LO and Health Risk
31 Score. At isoenergetic diets, the diet with the lowest emissions had a higher proportion of vegetables,
32 whole grains, and plant-based substitutes. This diet had a lower CED, LO, and a greater proportion of
33 organic foods when compared to the diet with the highest emissions.

34 While French dietary guidelines contribute, on average, to mitigating climate change and promoting
35 health, this study emphasizes levers in recommended food consumption to more efficiently reduce
36 diets' GHGe and points to total meat as the critical issue to better account for pressure on climate
37 change. Other environmental pressures should also be taken into account when designing dietary
38 guidelines.

39 **Introduction**

40 Our food systems are crippling the environment, pushing us beyond critical planetary boundaries and
41 accelerating environmental decline^{1,2}. Food production is a major driver, and six out of nine planetary
42 boundaries have already been breached³⁻⁵. For instance, food systems account for 34% of greenhouse
43 gas emissions (GHGe)⁶ and 70% of blue water usage⁷. Additionally, land overuse and reliance on
44 synthetic inputs (fertilizers and pesticides) are driving biodiversity loss at an alarming rate⁸.
45 Beyond environmental concerns, Diet significantly contributes to the burden of disease^{9,10}.

46 In that context, many countries have developed dietary guidelines in recent decades, with the aim to
47 guide populations towards healthier diets¹¹. However, these guidelines frequently partially account for
48 the profound influence of agriculture and dietary patterns on the environment, despite the intricate
49 interplay between these factors¹¹. Few dietary guidelines were designed while accounting for the goal
50 of minimizing environmental impact when setting consumption targets^{12,13}.

51 Although there is a wealth of research on the dietary environmental burden associated with adherence
52 to dietary guidelines, environmental impact estimates vary depending on methodological factors. It
53 remains unclear to what extent following dietary guidelines is aligned with reducing environmental
54 pressures. Recently, Springmann *et al.* reported that compliance with most of these official dietary
55 guidelines would yield only a modest 13% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions on average
56 (geographical range: -34% to +35%), as compared to the current situation¹⁴.

57 In France, the French High Council of Public Health (HCSP, Haut Conseil de la Santé Publique)
58 updated national dietary guidelines in 2017¹⁵. The consumption limits recommended by the HCSP
59 were based on scientific literature about the relationships between diet and long-term health and a
60 healthy eating patterns as modelled by The French Food Safety Agency (ANSES)¹⁶. This modeling
61 aimed to optimize diets by considering various factors, such as meeting nutrient reference intakes and
62 the established relations between consumption of food groups and long-term health, limiting exposure
63 to certain contaminants, and considering acceptable levels of consumption. Although French dietary
64 guidelines did not explicitly considered environmental pressures when they were implemented, we
65 previously showed that diets closely following these guidelines had an overall reduced environmental
66 footprint compared to non-compliant diets (comparing high versus low adherents: -46% GHGe)¹⁷.
67 However, because this result was based on observed data it does not mean that adherence to dietary
68 guidelines necessarily implies low-emission diets.

69 FAO and WHO have established a list of 16 principles for sustainable healthy diets¹⁸ covering health
70 (8 items), environmental (5 items), and sociocultural (3 items) aspects.

71 Assessment of the alignment of these principles with existing food-based dietary guidelines (FBDG)
72 has recently been investigated^{11,19,20}. A recent report covering dietary guidelines of 83 countries found
73 that no country addressed all 16 guiding principles across its documents and that FBDG of some
74 countries, such as France, did not fully align with the FAO principles¹¹. Only 45% of FBDG

75 documents mentioned environmental preservation and the vast majority lacked consistency with
76 sustainability.

77 Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the range of GHGe that could result from diets that follow
78 the French FBDG using optimization modeling. For diets complying with both nutrient and
79 acceptability constraints and with all FBDG individual recommendations, we identified the minimum
80 and maximum GHGe levels. Then, we examined which characteristics of the diets explained the
81 gradual variation in GHGe emissions.

82 **Materiel & method**

83 *Population*

84 This study was conducted on a sample of adults from the web-based prospective nutritional NutriNet-
85 Santé cohort²¹. The participants are volunteers recruited from the general French population. This
86 study is conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and all procedures were approved
87 by the Institutional Review Board of the French Institute for Health and Medical Research (IRB
88 Inserm 0000388FWA00005831) and the National Commission on Informatics and Liberty
89 (Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés, CNIL 908450 and 909216). Electronic
90 informed consent was obtained from all participants. The NutriNet-Santé study is registered in
91 ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03335644).

92 Sociodemographic characteristics, including age, education (<high school diploma, high school
93 diploma, and post-secondary graduate), lifestyles, i.e. smoking status (former, current, or never-
94 smoker) and physical activity level assessed using the International Physical Activity Questionnaire²²
95 as well as anthropometrics data²³, are collected using pre-validated questionnaires each year^{24,25}. The
96 participants were asked to report their total monthly income from different sources, such as salary,
97 rental income, family allowance, or social benefits. To determine the monthly household income, the
98 household unit was defined according to the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies
99 (INSEE) guidelines²⁶. The first adult in the household was allocated one household unit, while other
100 individuals aged 14 years or older were allocated 0.5 units, and children below 14 years were allocated
101 0.3 units. We reported data closest to the FFQ (Food Frequency Questionnaire, see below).

102 *Dietary data*

103 The dietary data were collected in 2014 via a self-administered semi-quantitative FFQ, aiming to
104 distinguish organic (under the official label) and conventional food consumption²⁷. This tool is based
105 on a previously validated 264-item food frequency questionnaire²⁸, improved by a five-point scale to
106 evaluate the mode of production of food²⁹. For each food item, participants reported the frequency of
107 food consumed (over the past 12 months) as organic by ticking the following modalities: “never”,
108 “rarely”, “half-of-time”, “often” or “always” in response to the question ‘How often was the product
109 of organic origin?’. Weight was allocated to each frequency modality, i.e., 0, 25, 50, 75, and 100%,
110 respectively. Nutrient intakes were calculated using a published food composition table³⁰.

111 ***French food-based dietary guidelines and PNNS-GS2***

112 In France, the High Council of Public Health published the revised version of the dietary guidelines
113 for adults in 2017¹⁵, including both specific food consumption targets and general guidelines such as:
114 “to promote dietary sustainability in the dietary guidelines: opt for raw (unprocessed), seasonal food
115 products, rely on short supply chains and low-input production methods, i.e. with a restriction in
116 inputs”.

117 To reflect the level of adherence to these dietary guidelines, a validated dietary score (sPNNS-GS2)
118 has been previously developed and validated³¹, and showed strong association with a wide range of
119 health outcomes³¹⁻³³.

120 The sPNNS-GS2 (theoretical range: $-\infty$ to 14.25), consists of 6 adequacy components and 7
121 moderation components. The components are weighted according to the level of epidemiological
122 evidence for the associations with health and a penalty on energy intake is also given. if it exceeds
123 nutritional needs. It includes components related to fruits and vegetables, pulses, whole grains, nuts,
124 fish, red meat, processed meat, sweet products, sweet drinks, added lipids, alcohol, dairy products, and
125 salt. Scoring and computation have been extensively described elsewhere³¹ and are presented in
126 **Supplemental Table 1** and **Supplemental Method 1**.

127 ***Environmental pressure data***

128 Environmental indicators assessment related to food production was computed using life cycle
129 analysis (LCA) using the DIALECTE database developed by Solagro³⁴. GHGe (kg of CO₂
130 equivalents (CO₂eq)), cumulative energy demand (MJ), and land occupation (m²) for organic and
131 conventional food production were calculated. Only the production stages have been considered due to
132 a lack of data regarding food production methods for other steps. The packaging, transport, treatment,
133 storage and recycling stages were not included in the scope of the LCA. Extensive details and raw data
134 have been provided elsewhere³⁵.

135 ***Food prices***

136 A database containing the price of each food item was created. The database considers where the food
137 was purchased and the farming method used (organic or conventional). It is based on the Kantar
138 Worldpanel® (40) purchase database, which includes information from 20,000 households and on
139 other data collected from short food-supply chains²⁷.

140 ***Diet modeling***

141 The optimized diets were identified using the procedure SAS/OR ® *optmodel* (version 9.4; SAS
142 Institute, Inc.). A non-linear optimization algorithm with multistart was used to select a solution that is
143 not only a local minimum. The solutions of the optimization procedure provided the consumption in
144 47 food groups and the % of organic for each of these groups (as the GHGe for a given food group
145 varies depending on the production method). The models' input parameters were the mean and 95th
146 percentile of the weighted (see below) observed consumption, and the nutrient content of the 47
147 groups (calculated by weighting the nutritional values of the items constituent of the group by the

148 population consumption of each item). Each group's GHGe (organic or conventional) were calculated
149 the same way.

150 *Optimization process and objectives*

151 - First, we identified the modeled diet as closest to the observed diet while complying with all the
152 nutritional, acceptability, and FBDG constraints. This model minimized the total departure (TD) from
153 the observed diet under all these constraints (TD model), according to the formula (1):

$$154 \quad (1) \text{ Min TD} = \sum_i^{47} \left[\frac{Opt_i - Obs_i}{SD_i} \right]^2$$

155 Where Opt_i and Obs_i respectively denote the optimized and observed daily consumptions of the food
156 group i , with SD_i being its standard deviation in the observed situation.

157 - Second, we identified the minimum and maximum GHGe values that are compatible with all the
158 nutritional, acceptability, and FBDG constraints, by minimizing or maximizing GHGe under all these
159 constraints, respectively (MinGHGe and MaxGHGe models).

160 - Finally, we identified a full spectrum of healthy modeled diets of increasing GHGe values (from 1.2
161 to 6.8 kgCO₂eq/d) complying with all the nutritional, acceptability, and FBDG constraints, by
162 minimizing the total departure (TD) from the observed diet under all these constraints and an
163 additional constraint on GHGe to cover its whole possible range from its minimum to maximum value,
164 using a grid search by 0.2 kgCO₂eq/d. GHGe increments.

165 *Models constraints*

166 *-Nutrient constraints*

167 The nutrient constraints, which included daily intakes of energy and a set of nutrients, were based on
168 the lower and/or upper ANSES 2016 dietary reference intakes³⁶. A specific constraint imposed energy
169 intake to be between +8% and -8% of energy requirements. Lower bounds were defined as either
170 recommended dietary allowance (population reference intake), adequate intake, or lower bound of
171 reference range for the intake in the French population³⁶. Upper bounds were defined as the maximum
172 tolerable intakes for vitamins and minerals or the upper limit of the reference intake range. For zinc
173 and iron, bioavailability was considered using validated equations (**Supplemental Method 2 and**
174 **Supplemental Method 3**)^{37,38}. A minor acceptable lowest limit than nutritional references based on
175 deficiency intake has been defined for bioavailable zinc and iron as previously published³⁹. The lower
176 threshold values used in this context pertain to a deficiency prevalence of <5%. This approach offers
177 greater flexibility in identifying diets that are considered healthier overall despite the higher
178 prevalence of iron deficiency anemia³⁹. All reference values used are shown in **Supplemental Table**
179 **2**.

180 Of note, the French nutritional reference values for adults are based on the specific physiological
181 requirements of males and females, and established separately for each gender³⁶. Additionally, the
182 reference values are further differentiated for females based on their iron requirements, with a
183 distinction made between females with high and low/moderate iron requirements. To create new

184 nutritional reference values more representative of the average individual, we have derived a weighted
185 average of requirements for males, females with high iron requirements, and females with
186 low/moderate iron requirements. Therefore, the reference values for each nutrient for this average
187 individual are defined as the weighted average requirements of males and females (**Supplemental**
188 **Table 2**). For adequate intake, based on observed mean intake, the lower limit was set at the 5th
189 weighted percentile value of the overall population.

190 *-FGDB constraints*

191 To comply with official French dietary guidelines¹⁵, models were additionally constrained on the
192 consumption of different food groups using thresholds set by the official French FBDG quantitatively
193 translated as for the PNNS-GS computation (see **Supplemental Table 1**).

- 194 - Consumption of fruit and vegetables (including 100% fruit juice up to a maximum of one
195 portion) $\geq 400\text{g/d}$
- 196 - Consumption of 100%fruit juice $\leq 150\text{g/d}$
- 197 - Consumption of nuts $\geq 30\text{g/d}$
- 198 - Consumption of pulses $\geq 400\text{g/wk}$ (i.e. $\geq 57\text{g/d}$)
- 199 - Consumption of dairy products: 2 portions/d (with a portion for milk=150mL, cheese=30g,
200 yogurt=125g, “*Petits Suisses*”=120g, cottage cheese=100g)
- 201 - Consumption of wholegrain products $\geq 400\text{g/wk}$ (i.e. $\geq 57\text{g/d}$)
- 202 - Consumption of red meat $\leq 500\text{g/wk}$ (i.e. $\leq 71.4\text{g/d}$)
- 203 - Consumption of processed meat $\leq 150\text{g/wk}$ (i.e. $\leq 21.4\text{g/d}$)
- 204 - Consumption of total seafood 2 portions/wk (with a portion=100g, i.e. 28.57g/d)
- 205 - Consumption of fatty fish 2 portions/wk (with a portion=100g, i.e. 14.28g/d)
- 206 - Consumption of added fat (added lipids) $\leq 16\%$ of total energy intake
- 207 - Consumption of sweet drinks (including other fruit juice, sweet and artificially sweetened
208 beverages) = 0

209 Of note, no constraints were imposed on salt and sugary foods, as the limitations of sodium and sugar
210 were already considered by the nutrient-related constraints.

211 *-Acceptability constraints*

212 In order to prevent the models from giving aberrant values (i.e. excessive intakes for some food
213 groups), the maximum possible intake for each food group was set at the 99th percentile of observed
214 consumption distribution. For cereals (refined and wholegrain), a so-called "coupling" limit allowed
215 inter-group substitution so that each can exceed its 99th percentile while only the sum was constrained
216 to the 99th percentile. In addition, as pulses consumption is very low in the observed diet, no
217 acceptability constraint was used for this food group.

218 *-Sensitivity analyses*

219 Two sensitivity analyses were conducted. First, a sensitivity analysis was also conducted to compare
220 the results under different FBDG constraints to identify the changes in the maximum GHGe values
221 when further restricting the total meat consumption, from 500 (main scenario) to 400, 300, or
222 200g/wk. Then, the full spectrum of healthy modeled diets of increasing imposed GHGe values
223 complying with nutritional, acceptability, and FBDG constraints, by minimizing the total departure
224 (TD) was reanalyzed with the use of the 95th percentile of the food group consumption distribution as
225 acceptability criteria.

226 ***Descriptive statistics***

227 The observed situation was based on NutriNet-Santé participant data who had completed the FFQ
228 between June and December 2014 (N=37,685), with no missing covariates (N=37,305), who were not
229 under or over-energy reporters (N=35,196), living in mainland France (N=34,453), and with
230 information as regards the place of purchase for the computation of the dietary monetary cost (N=
231 29,413). Observed sociodemographic, and lifestyle characteristics of the sample were estimated as
232 mean (SD) or percentage according to sex-specific quintiles of the PNNS-GS2.

233 The modeled diets were described in terms of food group consumption (the 47 food groups used for
234 optimization were grouped into 25 groups for clarity purposes, see **Supplemental Table 4**), nutrient
235 intakes, potential health risk, assessed using the Health Risk Score (HRS), compared to the theoretical
236 maximal risk exposure level (TMREL) of the 2019 Global Burden of Diseases (GBD) study,
237 environmental pressures (GHGe, CED, and LO) as well as monetary cost of the diets. The HRS is
238 presented in **Supplementary Method 4**.

239 All statistical analyses were performed using SAS® (version 9.4; SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA)
240 and Figures were developed using R version 3.6.

241 **Results**

242 *Observed diets*

243 In the observed situation, the weighted mean (SD) age was 55 years (14), and sPNNS-GS2 was 2.28
244 (3.57). The average GHGe was 4.34 ± 2.70 kgCO₂eq/d (at the farm perimeter) (**Table 1**). The sample
245 characteristics by sPNNS-GS2 quintiles are presented in **Supplemental Table 3**. Better adherence to
246 dietary guidelines was associated with older age and higher levels of education, income, and physical
247 activity. A negative association was observed for smoking and living with a partner. Adherence was
248 negatively associated with daily energy intake, but positively associated with consumption of organic
249 foods and the proportion of plant protein in total protein intake.

250 Participants in the Q5 had higher or much higher consumption of plant products, especially fruits and
251 vegetables, oilseeds, pulses, whole grains, and plant substitutes, compared with individuals in Q1.
252 Higher adherence was associated with higher GHGe, even after adjusting for energy intake.

253 *Modeled diets*

254 When modeling a diet under nutritional constraints and PNNS guidelines, without constraints on
255 GHGe, emissions increased to 5.15 kgCO₂eq/d (model TD, i.e. as closely as possible to the observed

256 diet), i.e. +4%/1000 kcal compared to the observed diet (**Table 1**). Diets that complied with
257 nutritional, acceptability constraints, and dietary guidelines, had emissions ranging from 1.16
258 kgCO₂eq/d (model MinGHGe) to 6.99 kgCO₂eq/d (model MaxGHGe) (**Table 1**), i.e. -76.7 to
259 +34.8%/1000 kcal compared to the observed diet.

260 Similar results were observed for LO and CED. The TD model contained no organic food (as by
261 construction, no constraints depending on the mode of production were introduced to the model),
262 while from Min to MaxGHGE models, %organic food products varied from 24%(Max) to 76%(Min) .
263 In the TD model (Table 1), certain food items such as alcoholic beverages, animal fats, milk, other
264 fats, pork, potatoes, snack foods, and soft drinks were excluded compared to the observed diet due to
265 the nutritional and FBDG constraints. Of note, the total meat intake (beef/lamb, poultry) in the TD
266 model was high, 97g/d, far above the target value of the FBDG (500g/wk).

267 The same foods were also eliminated in both the MinGHGe and MaxGHGe models. For all three
268 models (i.e. TD, MinGHGe and MaxGHGe), there was a systematic increase, compared to the
269 observed diet, of the consumption of fruits, fruit juices, vegetable oil, pulses, vegetable oils, and
270 wholegrain products. Conversely, consumptions of eggs, fish, dairy products, and fatty and sweet
271 products were reduced. The MinGHGe and MaxGHGe models differed in their level of beef/lamb,
272 refined cereals, fruit, pork, and snack products, for which we saw an increase in consumption in the
273 MaxGHGe model, while pulses, wholegrain products, and plant-based substitutes (especially soya-
274 based products) experienced a decrease. Notably, there was a progressive shift towards plant-based
275 diets from the MaxGHGe to MinGHGe models, as expressed by the higher % of protein derived from
276 plant sources from 43% to 82%.

277 **Figure 1** describes various indicators for the GHGe-imposed diets. Specifically, higher GHGe
278 correlated with increases in other environmental indicators such as LO and CED. Similarly, the price
279 of the modeled diets and their HRS increased with GHGe. Conversely, the proportion of organic food
280 in the diet increased non-linearly and then fell drastically. Additionally, the distance from the observed
281 diet exhibited a U-shaped curve, with the levels furthest from the observed diet found at low and high
282 GHGe extremes.

283 The composition of the GHGe-imposed modeled diets is shown in **Figure 2** and **Supplemental Table**
284 **4**. A gradual increase in GHGe was associated with progressive variations in most types of
285 consumption. Notably, the increase in GHGe was associated with beef/lamb consumption increase,
286 along with a reduction of fruit juices and poultry while pulses and plant-based substitutes. In addition,
287 a slight decrease in the consumption of wholegrain cereals and an increase in refined cereals were
288 observed. Vegetable consumption remained stable, as did fish consumption. Some foods, such as dairy
289 products, offals, and sweet and fatty foods, exhibited a bell-shaped distribution. Finally, vegetables,
290 fish, and oilseeds were found at the upper or lower limits defined in the models. Certain foods like
291 animal fats, eggs, and potatoes were excluded from the modeled diets. Pork consumption did not
292 display a discernible pattern but was most prevalent in the diet with the highest emissions.

293 The **Figure 3** details the contribution of food groups to total GHGe for the GHGe-imposed diets. The
294 gradual increase in GHGe translated into a higher increase in the contribution of meat (beef/lamb,
295 poultry, pork) and dairy products, from ~30% (in M0) up to ~85% (in M28).

296 **Supplemental Figure 1** shows, for illustrative purposes, the contributions of food groups to nutrient
297 intakes across different modeled diets.

298 In the sensitivity analyses, decreasing the upper limit for total meat consumption from 500 to 200g/wk
299 when identifying the healthy diets induced a decrease in their maximum total diet-related GHGe value,
300 from 6.44 (M500) to 4.38 kgCO₂eq/d (M200) **Table 2**). There were concomitant decreases in land
301 occupation, energy demand, and HRS, while the percentage of plant protein and the percentage of
302 organic food increased. The optimized diets were similar, except for a decrease in cereals, substitutes,
303 and meat (regardless of type), and an increase in pulses and whole grains. To comply with nutritional
304 references, beef/lamb was selected while poultry and pork were excluded. Additionally, lowering the
305 maximum amount of food that could be consumed from the 99th to the 95th percentile in the
306 acceptability constraints had only a slight impact on the results (**Supplemental Table 5**). The
307 differences were minor, mostly affecting the diets with high GHGe. For example, the amount of
308 vegetables decreased, and there was a shift towards more pulses, and the amount of poultry decreased,
309 resulting in no solution beyond 5.6 kgCO₂eq/d.

310 **Discussion**

311 *GHG of French FBDG as compared to others*

312 In the present study, we observed that it was possible to obtain diets nutritionally adequate and
313 adhering to all recommendations of the French FBDG with associated GHGe ranging from 1.6 to 6.8
314 kgCO₂eq/d. This large GHGe range can be explained by the fact that the French FBDG do not have a
315 low specific target for total meat but only recommends upper limits for red and processed meats that
316 are relatively high (e.g. 500g/wk) compared to other FBDGs, especially in countries where a strong
317 emphasis already exists to promote environmental sustainability alongside health. For instance, in the
318 Netherlands, it is recommended that individuals limit their consumption of all types of meat (i.e.
319 including poultry) to 500 grams per week¹². Although the production of meat from poultry generates
320 less GHG than ruminant meat, their emissions per kilogram are still significant and much higher than
321 those of plant-based foods^{3,6,40}.

322 Our results are consistent with the large body of literature showing that consumption of animal
323 products, especially meat is associated with very high GHGe⁴¹⁻⁴³. This is the case even for diets
324 following FBDG. For example, a study conducted in the Netherlands, based on the recommendations
325 before they were updated, found that following dietary guidelines could reduce the environmental
326 impact of males aged 31-50y by up to 13%, while it might increase it by up to 5% for women aged 19-
327 30y. Conversely, adopting a meat-free version of the same diet according to the Dutch guidelines
328 could reduce the environmental impact by 28% to 46%⁴⁴. Likewise, following the Dietary Guidelines
329 for Americans for an omnivore diet does not necessarily result in lower GHGe, mostly because of the

330 high levels of total meat, in sharp contrast to the vegetarian version of the Dietary Guidelines for
331 Americans⁴⁵.
332 Our results, along with others, underscore that following the French FBDG can result in a large range
333 of environmental pressures. For this reason, some countries have directly (i.e. included in diet
334 modeling) considered the environmental criteria when assessing FBDG¹¹, particularly GHGe, when
335 developing their dietary guidelines, unlike France. For instance, recently the Netherlands has based its
336 guidelines on optimization models that establish maximum consumption levels for foods that emit
337 high levels of greenhouse gases¹². The United States has developed guidelines for broad food groups,
338 such as the Protein Foods Group, which includes lean meat and poultry, eggs, seafood, beans, peas,
339 and lentils, nuts, seeds, and soy-based products. This has resulted in vastly different environmental
340 footprints for the set of diets that comply with the guidelines for the “Protein Foods Group” depending
341 on the type of food in that group⁴⁶.

342 ***Levers of the FBDG on GHG and healthiness***

343 Here, we found that complying with FBDG while departing as less as possible from the usual diet led
344 to a ~4%/1000Kcal GHGe increase compared to the observed diet. Thus, people wanting to increase
345 their adherence to FBDG with a minimal effort from the current French diet may slightly increase
346 climate pressure. This result is consistent with the extensive scientific literature reporting that all the
347 healthy diets are not necessarily low-emission diets^{14,47,48} and that there are large variations in GHGe
348 across FBDGs^{14,49}.

349 When GHGe was also constrained, results showed that plant-based diets led to lower emissions than
350 those containing more or less substantial amounts of animal products, especially ruminant meat, in line
351 with the scientific literature^{41–43}. This is also consistent with recent work focusing on protein, showing
352 that a healthy diet (in terms of both nutritional adequacy and long-term health) richer in plant protein
353 led to lower environmental pressures⁵⁰. In addition, our long-term health indicator (reflecting
354 adherence to the 2019 Global Burden of Diseases’s TMRELS) showed that, within the limits of the
355 FBDGs, a more plant-based diet, rich in fruit and vegetables, pulses, and wholegrains, was associated
356 with a lower health risk. This is in line with the literature documenting the health value of more plant-
357 based diets^{40,51,52}. It also highlights the fact that diets following dietary recommendations exhibit a
358 wide range of health risks.

359 ***Other issues remaining unresolved and implications***

360 GHGe is generally considered a good marker of global environmental pressures⁵³. However, the
361 climate mitigation approach should not overlook other equally important indicators for achieving
362 sustainable food systems, particularly water use, biodiversity conservation, and fisheries resources.
363 Indeed, we recently showed in an analysis of the trade-offs between reducing water use and reducing
364 GHGe that there are some discrepancies between modeled diets depending on whether the modeling is
365 guided by one parameter or the other⁵⁴. Indeed, plant-based diets are generally better for both health
366 and the environment, but there are still possible conflicts between certain environmental criteria,

367 particularly water use⁵⁵. Then, as diets rich in plant-based food may increase some exposure to
368 chemicals⁵⁶, such as synthetic pesticide residues, other factors, such as pollutants, could also be
369 included in models to limit health risks¹⁶. Finally, modeled healthy low-GHGe diets, which are rich in
370 plant foods, were characterized by selecting organic foods in preference to conventional foods, as they
371 exhibit lower GHGe, as previously documented⁵⁷. Thus, in the context of climate mitigation, it is
372 important to consider not only dietary patterns but also production methods and possible
373 improvements in agricultural practices. Also, optimized diets, which prioritize lower emissions and
374 increased levels of plant products as organic, often come at a higher cost²⁷. Even though it would
375 reduce their exposure to synthetic pesticides, this raises concerns about affordability for consumers.

376 ***Assessment of FBDG in relation to the FAO principles***

377 Beyond addressing environmental impacts, the FAO principles establish a list of targets to promote
378 food sustainability¹⁸. In that context, several studies have recently evaluated the sustainability of
379 official FBDG across different countries^{11,14,19,20}. In the study conducted by James-Martin et al.¹¹,
380 evaluating compliance with the 16 FAO principles for a sustainable healthy diet¹⁸, France scored
381 poorly because it did not numerically consider environmental criteria while setting their dietary
382 guidelines and omitted other principles. On the other hand, the Belgian guidelines received the best
383 score for the consumer official document.

384 In another report, a climate change score was assigned to the guidelines from 93 countries¹⁹. Here
385 again, Belgian dietary guidelines received the best score (84/100), while the French ones were rated
386 lower (51/100). The latter score was mostly undermined by the absence of any reference to animal
387 product substitution. Finally, the guidelines on animal products, and therefore the scope for
388 consumption of these food groups, appear to be a key lever for ensuring the sustainability of
389 appropriate diets, particularly in environmental terms.

390 ***Strengths and Limitations***

391 Our study has a few limitations. Because the people who participated in the study were all volunteers
392 who were presumably more interested in nutritional matters, their initial diet before optimization was
393 already quite rich in plant-based foods compared to what is typically observed in the general
394 population. This has probably led to higher 99th percentile values than in a representative sample. The
395 LCA only considered the production stage as data for the entire system (from farm to fork) was not
396 accessible for organic systems. However, whether for organic or standard/conventional farming
397 systems for LCA, which has rarely been considered before, the production phase has the highest
398 emissions⁵⁸.

399 Additionally, it has been established that the LCA may inaccurately represent some ecosystem
400 services, particularly for agroecological practices⁵⁹. It would be also valuable to consider other
401 environmental indicators, as discussed above, and consequential LCA. Here, the consequences in
402 terms of reshaping agricultural practices and mitigation associated with lower production of animal
403 products are not considered.

404 Our study has many strengths. When modeling diets, we considered many nutrient reference values,
405 including bioavailability for iron and zinc and cultural “acceptability,” which corresponds to the
406 apparent feasibility of the solutions. We also used recent and reliable data from the GBD as a proxy
407 for the potential impact of the diet on health.

408 **Conclusion**

409 In conclusion, this study highlights specific dietary adjustments that can significantly reduce the
410 environmental footprint of diets while also providing health benefits. According to scientific literature,
411 dietary changes alone could reduce environmental impact by up to 80%. A key adjustment involves
412 redefining the role of meat in dietary guidelines, including the introduction of thresholds for different
413 types of meat, with a particular focus on ruminant meat. To achieve truly sustainable diets, a
414 multidisciplinary approach is essential. This approach should consider a range of factors beyond
415 greenhouse gas emissions, addressing various environmental, health, and socio-economic issues.

416 **Acknowledgements**

417 We thank Cédric Agaesse, Alexandre De Sa, Rebecca Lutchia (dietitians); Selim Aloui (IT manager),
418 Thi Hong Van Duong, Selim Aloui (IT manager), Régis Gatibelza, Jagatjit Mohinder and Aladi
419 Timera (computer scientists); Julien Allegre, Nathalie Arnault, Laurent Bourhis, Nicolas Dechamp,
420 and Fabien Szabo de Edelenyi, PhD (supervisor) (data-manager/statisticians), Maria Gomes, Mirette
421 Foham (participants’ support), Paola Yvroud, MD (health event validator), Marine Ricau (operational
422 coordination), Nadia Khemache (HR and finance manager), Marie Ajanohun, Souad Hadji
423 (administrative support) for their technical contribution to the NutriNet-Santé study and Marine Ricau
424 (operational coordination). We warmly thank all the volunteers of the NutriNet-Santé cohort.

425 **The authors’ contributions are as follows:**

426 EKG, MT, and SH conducted the cohort study.

427 EKG, SH, DL, PP and JB implemented databases.

428 EKG, JB, HF, and FM, conducted the research.

429 EKG performed statistical analyses and drafted the manuscript.

430 All authors critically helped interpret results, revised the manuscript and provided relevant intellectual
431 input. They all read and approved the final manuscript.

432 EKG had primary responsibility for the final content; she is the guarantor.

433 **Transparency statement**

434 Dr Kesse-Guyot (the guarantor) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent
435 account of the study being reported, that no important aspects of the study have been omitted and that
436 any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

437 **Code availability statement**

438 Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code will be made available upon request
439 pending application and approval. Researchers from public institutions can submit a collaboration

440 request including information on the institution and a brief description of the project to
441 collaboration@etude-nutrinet-sante.fr. All requests will be reviewed by the steering committee of the
442 NutriNet-Santé study. If the collaboration is accepted, a data access agreement will be necessary and
443 appropriate authorizations from the competent administrative authorities may be needed. In
444 accordance with existing regulations, no personal data will be accessible.

445 **Funding**

446 The NutriNet-Santé study is funded by the French Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, Santé
447 Publique France, Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale, Institut national de
448 recherche pour l'agriculture, l'alimentation et l'environnement, and Sorbonne Paris Nord University.
449 The BioNutriNet project was supported by the French National Research Agency (Agence Nationale
450 de la Recherche) in the context of the 2013 Programme de Recherche Systèmes Alimentaires Durables
451 (ANR-13-ALID-0001). The funders had no role in the study design, data collection, analysis,
452 interpretation of data, preparation of the manuscript, and the decision to submit the paper.
453

454 **References**

- 455 1. Springmann, M. *et al.* Options for keeping the food system within environmental limits. *Nature*
456 **562**, 519–525 (2018).
- 457 2. Willett, W. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from
458 sustainable food systems. *The Lancet* **393**, 447–492 (2019).
- 459 3. Poore, J. & Nemecek, T. Reducing food’s environmental impacts through producers and
460 consumers. *Science* **360**, 987–992 (2018).
- 461 4. Campbell, B. *et al.* Agriculture production as a major driver of the Earth system exceeding
462 planetary boundaries. *Ecology and Society* **22**, (2017).
- 463 5. Eyhorn, F. *et al.* Sustainability in global agriculture driven by organic farming. *Nature*
464 *Sustainability* **2**, 253–255 (2019).
- 465 6. Crippa, M. *et al.* Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG
466 emissions. *Nat Food* **2**, 198–209 (2021).
- 467 7. The United Nations, F. A. A. O. *The State of the World’s Land and Water Resources for Food and*
468 *Agriculture*. (Routledge, 2013). doi:10.4324/9780203142837.
- 469 8. IPBES. *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services of the*
470 *Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*.
471 <https://zenodo.org/record/5517154> (2019) doi:10.5281/zenodo.5517154.
- 472 9. GBD 2019 Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and
473 territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*
474 **396**, 1223–1249 (2020).
- 475 10. GBD 2021 Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden and strength of evidence for 88 risk factors
476 in 204 countries and 811 subnational locations, 1990–2021: a systematic analysis for the Global
477 Burden of Disease Study 2021. *Lancet* **403**, 2162–2203 (2024).
- 478 11. James-Martin, G. *et al.* Environmental sustainability in national food-based dietary guidelines: a
479 global review. *The Lancet Planetary Health* **6**, e977–e986 (2022).
- 480 12. Brink, E. *et al.* Development of healthy and sustainable food-based dietary guidelines for the
481 Netherlands. *Public Health Nutr.* **22**, 2419–2435 (2019).

- 482 13. Schäfer, A. *et al.* Deriving Sustainable Food-Based Dietary Guidelines for Germany via
483 Multidimensional Optimization: Insights to Operationalise the Diet-Health Dimension. *Current*
484 *Developments in Nutrition* **5**, 881 (2021).
- 485 14. Springmann, M. *et al.* The healthiness and sustainability of national and global food based dietary
486 guidelines: modelling study. *BMJ* **370**, m2322 (2020).
- 487 15. High Council of Public Health. *Statement related to the revision of the 2017-2021 French*
488 *Nutrition and Health Programme's dietary guidelines for adults.*
489 <https://www.hcsp.fr/explore.cgi/avisrapportsdomaine?clefr=653> (2017).
- 490 16. Mariotti, F. *et al.* Perspective: Modeling Healthy Eating Patterns for Food-Based Dietary
491 Guidelines-Scientific Concepts, Methodological Processes, Limitations, and Lessons. *Adv Nutr*
492 **12**, 590–599 (2021).
- 493 17. Kesse-Guyot, E. *et al.* Sustainability analysis of French dietary guidelines using multiple criteria.
494 *Nature Sustainability* 1–9 (2020) doi:10.1038/s41893-020-0495-8.
- 495 18. FAO & WHO. *Sustainable Healthy Diets: Guiding Principles.* (Food and Agriculture
496 Organization of the United Nations: World Health Organization, Rome, 2019).
- 497 19. Aguirre-Sánchez, L., Teschner, R., Lalchandani, N. K., El Maohub, Y. & Suggs, L. S. Climate
498 Change Mitigation Potential in Dietary Guidelines: A Global Review. *Sustainable Production and*
499 *Consumption* **40**, 558–570 (2023).
- 500 20. Kovacs, B., Miller, L., Heller, M. C. & Rose, D. The carbon footprint of dietary guidelines around
501 the world: a seven country modeling study. *Nutrition Journal* **20**, 15 (2021).
- 502 21. Hercberg, S. *et al.* The Nutrinet-Sante Study: a web-based prospective study on the relationship
503 between nutrition and health and determinants of dietary patterns and nutritional status. *BMC*
504 *Public Health* **10**, 242 (2010).
- 505 22. Hagströmer, M., Oja, P. & Sjöström, M. The International Physical Activity Questionnaire
506 (IPAQ): a study of concurrent and construct validity. *Public Health Nutrition* **9**, (2006).
- 507 23. Lassale, C. *et al.* Validity of web-based self-reported weight and height: results of the Nutrinet-
508 Santé study. *J. Med. Internet Res.* **15**, e152 (2013).

- 509 24. Vergnaud, A.-C. *et al.* Agreement between web-based and paper versions of a socio-demographic
510 questionnaire in the NutriNet-Santé study. *Int J Public Health* **56**, 407–417 (2011).
- 511 25. Touvier, M. *et al.* Comparison between web-based and paper versions of a self-administered
512 anthropometric questionnaire. *Eur.J.Epidemiol.* **25**, 287–296 (2010).
- 513 26. INSEE. Definitions and methods. (2009).
- 514 27. Baudry, J. *et al.* Improvement of diet sustainability with increased level of organic food in the
515 diet: findings from the BioNutriNet cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr* **109**, 1173–1188 (2019).
- 516 28. Kesse-Guyot, E., Castetbon, K., Touvier, M., Hercberg, S. & Galan, P. Relative validity and
517 reproducibility of a food frequency questionnaire designed for French adults. *Ann. Nutr. Metab.*
518 **57**, 153–162 (2010).
- 519 29. Baudry, J. *et al.* Contribution of Organic Food to the Diet in a Large Sample of French Adults (the
520 NutriNet-Santé Cohort Study). *Nutrients* **7**, 8615–8632 (2015).
- 521 30. Etude Nutrinet-Santé. Table de composition des aliments de l'étude Nutrinet-Santé (Nutrinet-
522 Santé Study Food Composition Database). Paris: Economica. (2013).
- 523 31. Chaltiel, D. *et al.* Prospective association between adherence to the 2017 French dietary
524 guidelines and risk of death, CVD and cancer in the NutriNet-Santé cohort. *British Journal of*
525 *Nutrition* 1–11 (2021) doi:10.1017/S0007114521001367.
- 526 32. Chaltiel, D. *et al.* Adherence to the 2017 French dietary guidelines and adult weight gain: A
527 cohort study. *PLoS Med.* **16**, e1003007 (2019).
- 528 33. Kesse-Guyot, E. *et al.* Association between adherence to the French dietary guidelines and the
529 risk of type 2 diabetes. *Nutrition* **84**, 111107 (2021).
- 530 34. Pointereau, P., Langevin, B. & Gimaret, M. DIALECTE, a comprehensive and quick tool to
531 assess the agro-environmental performance of farms. in (2012).
- 532 35. Seconda, L. *et al.* Comparing nutritional, economic, and environmental performances of diets
533 according to their levels of greenhouse gas emissions. *Clim. Change* **148**, 155–172 (2018).
- 534 36. French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health Safety (Anses). *Actualisation*
535 *Des Repères Du PNNS*: *Élaboration Des Références Nutritionnelles*. Available from:
536 <https://www.anses.fr/fr/system/files/NUT2012SA0103Ra-2.pdf> (2016).

- 537 37. Armah, S. M., Carriquiry, A., Sullivan, D., Cook, J. D. & Reddy, M. B. A complete diet-based
538 algorithm for predicting nonheme iron absorption in adults. *J. Nutr.* **143**, 1136–1140 (2013).
- 539 38. Miller, L. V., Krebs, N. F. & Hambidge, K. M. Mathematical model of zinc absorption: effects of
540 dietary calcium, protein and iron on zinc absorption. *Br J Nutr* **109**, 695–700 (2013).
- 541 39. Dussiot, A. *et al.* Modeled healthy eating patterns are largely constrained by currently estimated
542 requirements for bioavailable iron and zinc—a diet optimization study in French adults. *The*
543 *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* nqab373 (2021) doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqab373.
- 544 40. Clark, M. A., Springmann, M., Hill, J. & Tilman, D. Multiple health and environmental impacts
545 of foods. *PNAS* **116**, 23357–23362 (2019).
- 546 41. Chai, B. C. *et al.* Which Diet Has the Least Environmental Impact on Our Planet? A Systematic
547 Review of Vegan, Vegetarian and Omnivorous Diets. *Sustainability* **11**, 4110 (2019).
- 548 42. Wilson, N., Cleghorn, C. L., Cobiac, L. J., Mizdrak, A. & Nghiem, N. Achieving Healthy and
549 Sustainable Diets: A Review of the Results of Recent Mathematical Optimization Studies. *Adv*
550 *Nutr* **10**, S389–S403 (2019).
- 551 43. Jarmul, S. *et al.* Climate change mitigation through dietary change: a systematic review of
552 empirical and modelling studies on the environmental footprints and health effects of ‘sustainable
553 diets’. *Environ Res Lett* **15**, 123014 (2020).
- 554 44. van de Kamp, M. E. *et al.* Healthy diets with reduced environmental impact? - The greenhouse
555 gas emissions of various diets adhering to the Dutch food based dietary guidelines. *Food Res. Int.*
556 **104**, 14–24 (2018).
- 557 45. Hitaj, C., Rehkamp, S., Canning, P. & Peters, C. J. Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the United
558 States Food System: Current and Healthy Diet Scenarios. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* (2019)
559 doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b06828.
- 560 46. Blackstone, N. T. Linking sustainability to the healthy eating patterns of the Dietary Guidelines
561 for Americans: a modelling study. *The lancet. Planetary Health* **2**, 344–352 (2018).
- 562 47. Aleksandrowicz, L., Green, R., Joy, E. J. M., Smith, P. & Haines, A. The Impacts of Dietary
563 Change on Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use, Water Use, and Health: A Systematic Review.
564 *PLoS ONE* **11**, e0165797 (2016).

- 565 48. Perignon, M., Vieux, F., Soler, L.-G., Masset, G. & Darmon, N. Improving diet sustainability
566 through evolution of food choices: review of epidemiological studies on the environmental impact
567 of diets. *Nutr Rev* **75**, 2–17 (2017).
- 568 49. Leydon, C. L., Leonard, U. M., McCarthy, S. N. & Harrington, J. M. Aligning Environmental
569 Sustainability, Health Outcomes and Affordability in Diet Quality: A Systematic Review.
570 *Advances in Nutrition* **0**, (2023).
- 571 50. Fouillet, H. *et al.* Plant to animal protein ratio in the diet: nutrient adequacy, long-term health and
572 environmental pressure. *Front Nutr* **10**, 1178121 (2023).
- 573 51. Willett, W. *et al.* Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy diets from
574 sustainable food systems. *Lancet* **393**, 447–492 (2019).
- 575 52. Medawar, E., Huhn, S., Villringer, A. & Veronica Witte, A. The effects of plant-based diets on the
576 body and the brain: a systematic review. *Translational Psychiatry* **9**, 1–17 (2019).
- 577 53. Kramer, G. F., Tyszler, M., Veer, P. V. & Blonk, H. Decreasing the overall environmental impact
578 of the Dutch diet: how to find healthy and sustainable diets with limited changes. *Public Health*
579 *Nutr* **20**, 1699–1709 (2017).
- 580 54. Kesse-Guyot, E. *et al.* Trade-offs between blue water use and greenhouse gas emissions related to
581 food systems: An optimization study for French adults. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*
582 **42**, 33–43 (2023).
- 583 55. Carey, C. N. *et al.* The Environmental Sustainability of Plant-Based Dietary Patterns: A Scoping
584 Review. *The Journal of Nutrition* (2023) doi:10.1016/j.tjnut.2023.02.001.
- 585 56. Baudry, J. *et al.* Estimated dietary exposure to pesticide residues based on organic and
586 conventional data in omnivores, pesco-vegetarians, vegetarians and vegans. *Food Chem Toxicol*
587 **153**, 112179 (2021).
- 588 57. Kesse-Guyot, E. *et al.* Halving food-related greenhouse gas emissions can be achieved by
589 redistributing meat consumption: Progressive optimization results of the NutriNet-Santé cohort.
590 *Sci Total Environ* **789**, 147901 (2021).
- 591 58. Kesse-Guyot, E. *et al.* Environmental impacts along the value chain from the consumption of
592 ultra-processed foods. *Nature Sustainability* (2022) doi:10.1038/s41893-022-01013-4.

- 593 59. van der Werf, H. M. G., Knudsen, M. T. & Cederberg, C. Towards better representation of
594 organic agriculture in life cycle assessment. *Nature Sustainability* **3**, 419–425 (2020).
595

596 **Table 1: Characteristics of observed diets and main modeled diets**

	Obs	min TD ¹	min GHGe ²	max GHGe ³
GHGe (kgCO ₂ eq/d)	4.34 (2.70)	5.15	1.16	6.99
GHGe (kgCO ₂ eq/d)/1000kcal ⁴	2.09	2.17 (+4%)	0.49 (-77%)	2.82 (+35%)
Land occupation (m ² /d)	11.36 (7.35)	12.93	4.43	20.09
Cumulative energy demand (MJ/d)	18.45 (7.98)	25.14	10.61	33.52
Energy intake (Kcal/d)	2080 (661)	2373	2373	2482
% organic food in the diet	28 (27)	0	76	24
HRS ⁵	0.75 (0.30)	0.39	0.09	0.38
Plant protein (% of total protein)	33 (14)	56	82	43
Consumption (g/d)				
Alcoholic beverages	128 (180)	1	1	1
Animal fat	6 (7)	0	0	0
Beef	44 (43)	69	0	71
Refined cereals	140 (99)	254	266	325
Dairy products	185 (139)	96	67	63
Eggs	11 (12)	3	0	0
Fish	48 (46)	29	29	29
Fruit	283 (252)	446	369	666
Fruit juice	85 (118)	101	150	150
Milk	59 (135)	0	0	0
Nuts	8 (16)	15	15	15
Offal	2 (7)	2	0	0
Mixed dishes ⁶	29 (36)	0	0	0
Other fat	7 (9)	0	0	0
Pork	51 (4)	0	0	14
Potatoes	24 (25)	0	0	0
Poultry	24 (26)	26	0	106
Pulses	17 (32)	57	143	57
SFF ⁷	73 (58)	66	42	0
Snack	11 (16)	0	0	49
Sweet drinks ⁸	47 (111)	0	0	0
Substitutes	40 (138)	3	157	5
Vegetable fat	23 (16)	46	50	49
Vegetables	355 (236)	930	930	930
Wholegrain products	58 (75)	191	255	196

597 Abbreviations: GHGe, greenhouse gas emissions; HRS, Health Risk Score; Obs, observed diet (mean, SD); SFF,

598 Sweet and fat foods

599 sPNNS-GS2, simplified *Programme National Nutrition Santé*-Guidelines Score 2, SFF, Sweet and fat foods

600 ¹Min TD is the model under nutritional, dietary guidelines and acceptability constraints minimizing the total
601 departure from the observed diet

602 ²Min GHGe is the model under nutritional, dietary guidelines and acceptability constraints minimizing the
603 GHGe

604 ³Max GHGe is the model under nutritional, dietary guidelines and acceptability constraints maximizing the
605 GHGe

606 ⁴ Values in parentheses are relative difference to the observed situation

607 ⁵HRS (%) is the normalized distance to the theoretical minimum-risk exposure levels (TMREL) from the Global
608 Burden of Diseases, expressed in % (i.e., HRS = 0% when the diet is at minimal risk by meeting all the TMREL
609 and HRS=100% when the diet is at maximal risk by deviating from them at most)
610 ⁶Mixed dishes include sandwiches, dishes such as pizza, hamburger, ravioli, panini, salted pancake
611 ⁷Sweet and fat foods (SFF) include croissants, pastries, chocolate, biscuits, milky desserts, ice cream, honey and
612 marmalade, cakes, chips, salted oilseeds, salted biscuits
613 ⁸Sweet drinks include fruit nectar, syrup, soda (with or without sugar)

614 **Table 2: Description of the diet models, maximizing GHGe constrained for different**
 615 **levels of total meat ¹**

	M500	M400	M300	M200
GHGe (kgCO ₂ eq/d)	6.44	5.75	5.07	4.38
Land occupation (m ² /d)	18.47	16.25	14.02	11.81
Cumulative energy demand (MJ/d)	29.15	27.81	26.44	25.06
Energy intake (kcal/d)	2433.69	2405.18	2375.69	2373.86
% organic food in the diet	24	24	24	27
HRS ²	0.39	0.34	0.30	0.20
Plant protein (% of total protein)	53.27	54.96	56.80	60.16
Consumption (g/d)				
Alcoholic beverages	1	1	1	1
Animal fat	0	0	0	0
Beef	71	57	43	29
Cereals	306	295	282	247
Dairy products	102	102	102	102
Eggs	0	0	0	0
Fish	29	29	29	29
Fruit	637	637	637	634
Fruit juice	150	150	150	150
Milk	0	0	0	0
Nuts	15	15	15	15
Offal	0	0	0	0
Mixed dishes ³	76	82	88	92
Other fat	0	0	0	0
Pork	0	0	0	0
Potatoes	0	0	0	0
Poultry	0	0	0	0
Pulses	57	57	57	99
SFF ⁴	0	0	0	0
Snack	49	49	49	49
Sweet drinks ⁵	0	0	0	0
Substitutes	41	37	33	28
Vegetable fat	45	44	44	44
Vegetables	930	930	930	930
Wholegrain products	215	226	239	274

616 Abbreviations: GHGe, greenhouse gas emissions; HRS, health risk score; SFF, Sweet and fat foods

617 ¹ All models maximized GHGe under nutritional, dietary guidelines, and acceptability constraints. M500 to
 618 M200 referred to a maximum of 500 to 200 g of meat per week


619 ²HRS (%) is the normalized distance to the theoretical minimum-risk exposure levels (TMREL) from the Global
 620 Burden of Diseases, expressed in % (i.e., HRS = 0% when the diet is at minimal risk by meeting all the TMREL
 621 and HRS=100% when the diet is at maximal risk by deviating from them at most)

622 ³Mixed dishes include sandwiches, dishes such as pizza, hamburger, ravioli, panini, salted pancake

623 ⁴Sweet and fat foods (SFF) including croissants, pastries, chocolate, biscuits, milky desserts, ice cream, honey
 624 and marmalade, cakes, chips, salted oilseeds, salted biscuits

625 ⁵Sweet drinks include fruit nectar, syrup, soda (with or without sugar)


626 **Figure 1: Characteristics of modeled diets adhering to dietary guidelines with minimal**
 627 **deviation from observed diets at different levels of GHGe¹⁻²**



628

629 Abbreviations and units: CED, cumulative energy demand (MJ/d); GHGe, greenhouse gas emissions (kg CO₂
 630 eq/d); HRS, health risk score (a lower value is healthier); LO, land occupation (m²/d); Organic Food, proportion
 631 of organic food in the diet; TD, total departure of observed diet. Cost is in euros/d, SFF, Sweet and fat foods
 632 ¹M0 to M28 denote models imposing GHGe of 1.2 to 6.8 kgCO₂eq/d by increments of 0.2.
 633 ²HRS (%) is the normalized distance to the theoretical minimum-risk exposure levels from the Global Burden of
 634 Diseases, expressed in % (i.e., HRS = 0% when the diet is at minimal risk because meeting all the TMREL and
 635 HRS=100% when the diet is at maximal risk by deviating from them at most)

636 **Figure 2: Food group consumptions (g/d) in modeled diets adhering to dietary guidelines**
 637 **of graded GHGE values^{1,2}**



638


639 Abbreviations: GHGe, greenhouse gas emissions; M: model; SFF, Sweet and fat foods

640 The 47 food groups are pooled into 25 broader food categories for clarity.

641 ¹Mixed dishes include sandwiches, dishes such as pizza, hamburger, ravioli, panini, salted pancake, sweet and fat
 642 foods (SFF) including croissants, pastries, chocolate, biscuits, milky desserts, ice cream, honey and marmalade,
 643 cakes, chips, salted oilseeds, salted biscuits, and sweet drinks include fruit nectar, syrup, soda (with or without
 644 sugar)

645 ²M0 to M28 denote models imposing GHGe of 1.2 to 6.8 kgCO₂e/d by increments of 0.2.

646 **Figure 3: Contribution of food group to GHGe in GHG-imposed scenarios^{1,2}**



Abbreviations: GHGe, greenhouse gas emissions, M: model; SFF, Sweet and fat foods

The 47 food groups are pooled into 25 broader food categories for clarity.

¹Mixed dishes include sandwiches, dishes such as pizza, hamburger, ravioli, panini, salted pancake, sweet and fat foods (SFF) including croissants, pastries, chocolate, biscuits, milky desserts, ice cream, honey and marmalade, cakes, chips, salted oilseeds, salted biscuits, and sweet drinks include fruit nectar, syrup, soda (with or without sugar)

²M0 to M28 denote models imposing GHGe of 1.2 to 6.8 kgCO₂eq/d by increments of 0.2.