



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/139211/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Reynolds, C.J., Horgan, G.W., Whybrow, S. et al. (2019) Healthy and sustainable diets that meet greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and are affordable for different income groups in the UK. *Public Health Nutrition*, 22 (8). pp. 1503-1517. ISSN: 1368-9800

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980018003774>

This article has been accepted for publication in a revised form in *Public Health Nutrition* [<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/public-health-nutrition>]. This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution, re-sale or use in derivative works. © The Authors 2019.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 Healthy and sustainable diets that meet GHGE reduction targets and are
2 affordable for different income groups in the UK.

3 C J Reynolds¹, G W Horgan², S Whybrow¹, J I Macdiarmid¹

4 ¹*The Rowett Institute, University of Aberdeen, AB25 2ZD,*

5 ²*Biomathematics & Statistics Scotland, Aberdeen, AB25 2ZD*

6 Corresponding author

7 Jennie I Macdiarmid, The Rowett Institute, University of Aberdeen, AB25 2ZD,

8 j.macdiarmid@abdn.ac.uk Phone +44 (0)1224 437125, Fax: +44 (0)1224 550925

9 A shortened version of the title: Healthy sustainable diets for UK incomes

10 At least four keywords or phrases (each containing up to three words).

11 Income

12 Greenhouse gas emissions

13 Affordable diets

14 Linear programming

15 Healthy sustainable diets

16 Acknowledgments

17 We thank Amandine Perrin and Hubert Ehlert for their help writing some of the early linear
18 programming code.

19 Financial Support

20 This study was funded by the Scottish Government's Rural and Environment Science and Analytical
21 Services Division (RESAS)

22 Conflict of Interest

23 There are no conflicts of interest.

24 Authorship

25 JM, GH formatted the research questions, CR, JM, SW, and GH contributed to the study design and
26 analysis. CR and JM drafted the manuscript. CR had primary responsibility for the final content. All
27 authors contributed to the final version and read and approved the final manuscript.

28 Ethical Standards Disclosure: NA

29 Accepted for publication: 26/11/2018

30 Journal: Public Health Nutrition

31 **THIS IS A PRE-PRINT OF THE ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT**

32

33 Abstract

34 Objective: To model dietary changes required to shift the UK population to diets that meet dietary
35 recommendations for health, have lower greenhouse gas emissions (GHGE) and are affordable for
36 different income groups.

37 Design: Linear programming was used to create diets that meet dietary requirements for health and
38 reduced GHGE (57% and 80% targets) by income quintile, taking into account food budgets and
39 foods currently purchased, thereby keeping dietary change to a minimum.

40 Subjects: Nutrient composition, GHGE and price data were mapped to 101 food groups in
41 household food purchase data (UK Living Cost and Food Survey (2013), n=5144 households).

42 Results: Current diets of all income quintiles had similar total GHGE, but the source of GHGE
43 differed by types of meat, and amount of fruit and vegetables. It was possible to create diets with a
44 57% reduction in GHGE that met dietary and cost restraints in all income groups. In the optimised
45 diets, the food sources of GHGE differed by income group due to the cost and keeping the level of
46 deviation from current diets to a minimum. Broadly, the changes needed were similar across all
47 groups; reducing animal-based products and increasing plant-based foods but varied by specific
48 foods.

49 Conclusions: Healthy and lower GHGE diets could be created in all income quintiles but tailoring
50 changes to income groups to minimise deviation may make dietary changes more achievable.

51 Specific attention must be given to interventions and policies to be appropriate for all income
52 groups.

53 Introduction

54 Dietary intakes in the UK vary by income and socio-economic group⁽¹⁻³⁾, yet the majority of the
55 current literature on dietary change towards healthy, low greenhouse gas emission (GHGE) diets
56 tends to focus on population level studies and solutions⁽⁴⁻⁷⁾ rather than exploring the differences
57 within the population⁽⁸⁾. Dietary intakes need to improve across all income groups in the population
58 since they are not meeting the dietary recommendations for health and are contributing significantly
59 to climate change. Dietary habits, however, vary across income group, therefore the changes needed
60 may differ from the general population level solutions that have been proposed. These changes
61 include, for example, increasing consumption of fruit, vegetables, and starchy foods and reducing
62 consumption of high-fat/high-sugar foods and animal products.

63 Dietary differences have been shown to be associated with the cost of food and the amount of
64 money available to purchase food^(2,9). In previous studies in the UK, low income groups have
65 reported consuming greater quantities of processed meat and sweet snacks or processed potato
66 products (e.g. chips, crisps), while higher income groups report consuming greater quantities of
67 fruits and vegetables, and high-fat dairy products (e.g. cheese)^(1,10-12). These dietary differences
68 across income groups have been associated with health inequalities such as obesity, type 2 diabetes
69 and cardiovascular disease⁽¹³⁻¹⁵⁾.

70 Cost is often perceived as a barrier to the uptake of healthy, low GHGE diets⁽¹⁶⁾. However, some
71 studies have shown that all income groups can afford a nutritionally adequate diet without
72 increasing cost, though this became difficult with lower food budgets⁽¹⁷⁾. While a UK study has
73 found that expensive, recommended 'healthy' diets (i.e. Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension
74 (DASH)) can have lower GHGE than cheaper, 'unhealthier' diets⁽¹⁸⁾ because they have larger
75 amounts of lower GHGE foods (e.g. fruit and vegetables). In contrast, an Australian study showed
76 that a typical diet actually eaten by high income groups tends to be associated with higher GHGE
77 than a typical diet consumed by low income groups⁽¹⁹⁾. This was because higher income groups
78 spent more on food, and on some higher environmental impact foods (e.g. meat, dairy and meals
79 out). This study, however, did not examine the nutrient composition of the diet for health and, as
80 previous studies have shown that while comparable, a healthy diet does not always have a lower
81 GHGE⁽²⁰⁻²⁴⁾. Van Dooren⁽²⁵⁾ examined GHGE and dietary requirements across Dutch sub-
82 populations, finding those with high income and social economic status (SES) had higher dietary
83 GHGEs than those on a low income and lower SES. Van Dooren concluded that these unsustainable
84 dietary practices of specific subgroups require dedicated transition strategies, and provided

85 examples for specific sub-groups (including replacing snacks with fruit, replacing cheese with
86 vegetables, partly replacing meat with fish, changing beverage consumption, and halving the daily
87 portion of meat).

88 Other barriers to dietary change include a resistance to reduce higher GHGE foods (e.g. animal
89 products)^(16,26), perceived time constraints for food preparation^(16,27) and a lack of knowledge about
90 what constitutes environmentally friendly diets^(16,26,28). To encourage a shift towards healthy, low
91 GHGE diets, these barriers could be mitigated by proposing healthy, low GHGE diets that align
92 more closely with current diets, that keep dietary change to a minimum.

93 It has been shown that across European populations, change at a national dietary level towards a
94 healthy low GHGE diets is feasible⁽²⁹⁾. Though the changes required in the consumption of animal-
95 based products across countries and genders are similar, other dietary changes differed (such as
96 consumption of fish, poultry, and non-liquid milk dairy). However, there is not one ideal diet or set
97 of policy advice to move towards a lower GHGE diet.

98 Change towards lower GHGE diets is necessary to meet the UK's GHGE reduction targets⁽³⁰⁾.
99 GHGE reductions are planned to be evenly distributed across the food system, which contributes an
100 estimated 20% of total UK GHGE^(5,31,32). Reductions in food system associated GHGE will need to
101 come from agriculture, processing, retail and waste management practices (supply side change), as
102 well as changes to diet to successfully transition to a lower GHGE economy^(33,34).

103 Household food budgets vary across the population, and this needs to be factored in to
104 recommended dietary changes. Through dietary modelling it has been shown that healthy,
105 affordable and low GHGE diets are feasible at the population level⁽³⁵⁻⁴³⁾. However, to shift to the
106 types of diets proposed, lower income groups would need to spend between 18% and 74% of their
107 total household income on food, while high income groups would only have to spend between 6%
108 and 10% to achieve a similar diet⁽⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶⁾.

109 The aim of this study was to model healthy, low GHGE diets that takes into account current dietary
110 habits and food budgets by income quintile. Using data from the Living Cost and Food Survey
111 (LCFS) this study compared current household purchases, used as a proxy for diets, with optimised
112 diets for different income groups.

113 Method

114 **Study design**

115 Linear programming was used to create low GHGE diets that met dietary requirements, and were no
116 more expensive than existing spend on diets, while keeping the deviation from current intakes to a
117 minimum. While linear programming has been previously used to calculate healthy, lower GHGE
118 and affordable diets at the population level ^(4,7,22,29,47–63), this study extends the research to optimised
119 diets for the different income quintiles and keeping dietary change to a minimum in each group. By
120 keeping the change to a minimum, multiple diets were generated that varied the minimum amount
121 of each food that made up the current diet. The UK's GHGE target at the time of this study, a 57%
122 reduction from 1990 values by 2032, was used⁽³²⁾. Income was based on gross income reported in
123 LCFS, the income quintile boundaries were taken from the Office for National Statistics, and
124 generated using weighted income data to represent the UK population ⁽⁶⁴⁾. In the manuscript current
125 diets are referred to '2013 diets', which provide the baseline for the optimised diets.

126 **Data Sources**

127 *The 2013 Family Food module of the Living Costs and Food Survey*

128 The 2013 Family Food Module of the LCFS includes purchase data of 5,144 households across the
129 UK. Households recorded all purchases of food and drink over two weeks, including those eaten in
130 the home and those out of the home⁽²⁾. The LCFS collected data on weights of all foods purchased
131 and the amount spent (£) on each food and drink item per person per week, which was reported at
132 the amount per individual, per week level by the LCFS.

133 Quintile household gross income boundaries range from less than £265.18 per household, per week
134 in the lowest income (Q1) to more than £1077.97 per household per week in the highest (Q5).

135 Individual incomes were not reported by the LCFS. Foods eaten in and outside the home were both
136 included in the linear programming, but the foods were kept as separate to allow for analysis of
137 these differing types of purchases and food budgets.

138 The 337 (eaten at home) and 316 (eaten out) LCFS food categories were matched to 101 food item
139 categories in a pre-existing dataset mapped to nutrient composition and GHGE data (see Table 1 for
140 list of the 101 food items used in the linear programming). Drinking water was excluded from this
141 mapping, and purchased drinking water was excluded from total spending. The nutrient
142 composition of the foods, associated GHGE data, and the purchase weights of the foods were
143 converted to represent the edible portions (g/day)⁽⁶⁵⁾. This included, for example, weight changes

144 with cooking (e.g. rice, meat) and unavoidable wastage (e.g. banana skins). Nutrient data were
145 taken from the National Diet and Nutrition Survey databank⁽⁶⁶⁾. Both the LCFS and nutrient data
146 were obtained from the UK Data Archive.

147 Composite meals in the LCFS were disaggregated into individual components, based on recipes
148 from UK food composition tables and portion sizes^(65,67) and cookbooks^(68–70). For food categories
149 with multiple composite dishes (e.g. takeaway and ready meals) a two-step disaggregation was
150 used. First, composite dishes were disaggregated into the Eatwell Plate food groups proportions⁽⁷¹⁾.
151 Second, within each of the Eatwell Plate food group, ingredients (in proportions based on the
152 frequency of purchasing (in Scotland between 2006 and 2012) recorded by Kantar Worldpanel
153 (www.kantarworldpanel.com/en)) were matched to one of the individual food items in the linear
154 programming dataset.

155 For example, for the category of takeaway meat based meals (e.g. curries, meat pies) it was
156 estimated that these dishes comprised 28% protein on the Eatwell plate. The protein category was
157 then disaggregated into the food groups of beef (14.34%), lamb (1.83%), pork (1.58%), chicken
158 (9.38%), and turkey (1.35%) based on the frequency of purchase of these types of meat. The
159 amount of each ingredient was then assigned to one of the food in the linear programming dataset.

160 *Price data*

161 The total spend per person was calculated by multiplying the weight of food consumed by a price
162 vector. The price vector (£ per 100g for all 101 food groups) was estimated using price and weight
163 data from the 2013 LCFS to create an average price for each food item. Six food categories (i.e.
164 pepper, sweetcorn, pumpkins, squash, kiwi, fried white fish and mayonnaise) did not have direct
165 price information, and so they were matched to similar products. The LCFS supplied no food item
166 level price data for foods eaten out of the home, and therefore in the absence of this information
167 these were set the same as food eaten at home. It is recognised that this has limitations as eating
168 food out can be more expensive.

169 *Greenhouse gas emissions data*

170 GHGE data (kgCO₂e/100g product) for each of the 101 food items were based on data published by
171 Audsley *et al.*⁽³¹⁾. These values are average emissions for the production of primary food commodities
172 up to the point of the regional distribution centre (RDC) in the UK (this excludes processing, retail,
173 household use and waste). The RDC is described as a nominal boundary of primary production to the
174 point of distribution for primary commodities in the UK. Audsley *et al.*⁽³¹⁾ estimates that 56% of

175 GHGEs are accounted for up to the RDC. For foods with multiple ingredients, such as cakes, biscuits,
176 bread, the GHGE were estimated based on the ingredients making up the food.

177 Audsley *et al.*⁽³¹⁾ estimated that in 1990 the GHGE of food supplied and consumed in the UK was
178 approximately 152 Mt CO₂e/year, or 7.38 kgCO₂e/person/day (based on the UK population by age
179 and sex in 1990⁽⁷²⁾), or 4.14 kgCO₂e/person/day to the point of the RDC. At the time of the study the
180 UK had targets to reduce GHGE by 57% from 1990 values by 2032, and an 80% reduction by 2050⁽³²⁾.
181 These GHGE reduction targets take account of population growth. Using the Audsley *et al.* 1990
182 value as a baseline, the 57% and 80% GHGE reduction targets are estimated to be equivalent to 1.78
183 and 0.83 kgCO₂e/person/day respectively (to the point of the RDC).

184 **Analysis: Linear programming and constraints**

185 Linear programming is a mathematical technique used to minimise or maximise a linear function,
186 subject to a series of constraints that defines a set of linear relationships between variables and
187 limiting resource, which has been used in other studies to optimise diets^(17,48,59,63,73–76)s. In this
188 study it was used to construct nutritionally complete diets while optimising another variable (e.g.
189 minimising GHGE), while being constrained by other factors (e.g. cost, energy, nutrients). The
190 constraints are expressed in terms of linear combinations, with minimum requirements, upper limits
191 or equality imposed on each item based on dietary recommendations (see Table 2 for constraints
192 included in the models)^(77–81). In this study constraints comprised meeting dietary
193 recommendations, not exceeding the budget spent on food (by quintile group) and limiting
194 deviation from current purchases. The amount spent on each food item is based on the item as
195 purchased, and is recorded at the household level but reported in the Family Food Report⁽²⁾ as
196 amount per person per week., The objective function was the associated GHGE of the diet, which
197 was minimised. An additional constraint for GHGE was used in later models to impose the UK
198 GHGE reduction targets (see Table 2). More details of linear programming is given in the
199 supplementary material (S1).

200 The energy and nutrient recommendations were weighted to reflect dietary recommendations for the
201 current UK population (by age and sex, excluding those younger than 1 year) using the same
202 methodology described in the LCFS⁽⁸²⁾. The price constraint was set at the maximum amount that
203 could be spent on food per day, which varied by income quintile based on their current spend.

204 This study used constraints of maximum upper and variable lower boundaries for all food items to
205 limit the deviation from the current dietary habits of each income quintile. This approach to

206 minimise the deviation from habitual diets was used by Horgan *et al*⁽⁸⁾ (who used fixed upper and
207 lower bounds).

208 The maximum upper boundary meant that the weight of any food item from the 2013 diet could
209 only double (200%), which was considered a reasonable and realistic increase, and in line with
210 previous studies^(7,22). Oily fish was the exception because 2013 amounts were less than half that
211 recommended. Alcoholic beverages could not exceed current household's purchase and an upper
212 limit was set at the average LCFS alcohol consumption per day of 8.9g/day. This is below the
213 national maximum recommendation for alcohol consumption⁽⁸³⁾. This meant that the amount of
214 alcohol could not increase.

215 A lower boundary was the minimum deviation per food item from the 2013 diet that could be found
216 for each modelling scenario, while meeting dietary recommendations, cost and GHGE constraints.
217 The lower boundary was set initially at 0% of the weight of all food items in the 2013 diet (i.e. 0%
218 is the greatest deviation from the diet), and the percentage increased over successive iterations of
219 linear programme runs (in steps of 1%), until no feasible diet could be found to meet the constraints
220 (i.e. dietary requirements, price, GHGE). For example, iteration with a lower boundary of 60%
221 meant that all food groups had at least 60%, by weight, of that food in the optimised diet. The
222 iteration that met the constraints with the highest percentage 'lower boundary' is referred to as the
223 'final optimised diet'. This is the diet that meets all the constraints, with the smallest change from
224 the 2013 diet that is possible using discrete linear constraints rather than an objective function, and
225 is the diet reported in the paper.

226 A population weighted minimum fruits and vegetable constraint of 380g/day was set, with 2 fruit
227 portions and 3 vegetable portions to ensure a mix of fruit and vegetables in the optimised diet⁽⁸⁰⁾.
228 Foods with no direct cost to the household (i.e. free school milk or free school fruit) were set at
229 fixed weights and included in the diet.

230 Three scenarios were run, the first only included the dietary constraints and minimum and
231 maximum boundaries (M1), and the second added the cost constraint (M2), while the final scenario
232 rejected any solutions where the GHGE minimum was not low enough (M3). In all the scenarios
233 GHGE were minimised.

234 Linear programming was carried out by using the GNU Linear Programming Kit as implemented in
235 the Rglpk (0.3–5) package of the R (3.20) statistical software environment⁽⁸⁴⁾.

236 Results

237 For all income quintiles, the linear program found a range of optimised diets with lower GHGE than
238 the 2013 diets that met dietary and cost constraints. However, it could not find any diet to meet the
239 80% GHGE reduction target with a 200% upper limit on food weights in place.

240 For the average UK diet the greater the lower boundary constraint achieved (i.e. keeping dietary
241 change to a minimum, the higher the associated GHGE of this diet (Figure 1a). Figure 1b shows
242 that the average optimized diets with (M1) and without (M2) a cost constraint are the same up to
243 until the cost constraint is met. Once the maximum cost is met the constrained diet 'flat lines' cost),
244 but increases in GHGE more quickly than the diet with no cost constraint .The cost and GHGE
245 impacts of the diets are identical in both up to the constraint being met (at 52%).

246 Income level affected the number of lower boundary iterations that could be completed by the linear
247 program, varying from 57% to 62% (quintile 1 to 5) when there was no cost constraint (M1), and
248 when cost constraint included, 53% to 60% (M2) (Table 3). This meant the higher income group
249 could retain more of the foods in the diet than lower income groups. When the additional GHGE
250 constraint was added (M3), all quintiles were reduced to similar lower boundaries (34%-35%).

251 These final optimised diets had an average saving of £0.21 per day (£0.23 to £0.47 quintile 1 and 5
252 respectively). The greatest GHGE reduction was in the highest income group (M3), this is due to
253 the highest income group having the highest 2013 GHGE and the largest capacity for reduction due
254 to their high income and high consumption of fruits and vegetables.

255 When there was no cost constraint, in order to meet the other constraints, the cost of the diets
256 increased and GHGE decreased marginally. As more constraints were applied the further the
257 optimised diets departed from the 2013 diets. At the lower boundary scenario, where the cost
258 constraint is reached (in Figure 1 this is 52%), the linear program begins to select cheaper but
259 higher GHGE intensity foods, to further increase the minimum amounts of the foods from the 2013
260 diet included in the optimised diet. These trade-offs lead to a divergence of the GHGE impacts for
261 diets with and without cost constraints (as shown in Figure 1a and 1b above the 52% lower
262 boundary). In Figure 1b this divergence can also be observed, with the daily price of the cost
263 constrained diet 'flat lining' at £4.47 from the lower bound of 51% (2.18 kgCO₂e/ day) to 57%
264 (2.55 kg CO₂e/day), while the diet without a price constraint continues to increase to lower bound
265 of 62% (£5.06 and 2.70 kg CO₂e/day). This illustrates a trade-off being made between higher cost
266 diets and healthy, lower GHGE diets. At greater the deviation from the current diet (ie at lower
267 bounds) the diets costs less than the current spending.

268 The variability of GHGE in 2013 and final optimised diets is due to the different dietary
269 composition and cost constraints of each quintile. For example, in 2013, the lowest income quintiles
270 purchased less fruit and vegetables and different types of red and processed meats, while higher
271 income quintiles purchased more dairy in the 2013 diets. These initial differences carried over to the
272 optimised diets because of the lower boundary constraint. Detailed diets for all lower boundaries are
273 provided in the online supplementary material (S2, Tables 2-7).

274 Substantial dietary change must occur in all income quintiles to meet the UK's 2032 57% GHGE
275 reduction target, with 58 of the 101 foods reduced to 34-35% of their 2013 diet weights, and 29
276 foods double their 2013 diet weights (Table 4). As shown in Table 1, there were specific food items
277 for all linear programme iterations, for all quintiles, that were maximised or minimised, i.e. oily fish
278 was quadrupled when compared to 2013 diets in all quintile groups. While differences were seen
279 between income groups with the amounts and types of individual foods that needed to change, the
280 overall direction of dietary change needed was similar in all income groups: increase fruit,
281 vegetables and starchy food, reduce animal products, non-alcoholic beverages and high-fat/high-
282 sugar foods. The food groups where the magnitude of change between quintile groups were highest
283 included a greater reduction in alcohol in higher quintile groups and in high-fat/high-sugar foods
284 and milk in lower quintile groups. A greater increase in fruit, vegetables and starchy foods was
285 observed in lower quintile groups. In optimised diets GHGE differences between quintile groups
286 mostly decreased as they shifted towards similar diets as a result of the optimisation. Some food
287 categories (e.g. cereals) had increases in differences in GHGE between quintiles due to changes in
288 the types/quantities of foods purchased (Table 4). Similarly, the difference between quintile groups
289 reduced for fruit and vegetables, and seafood because of differences in the original diets.

290 Results show that there is a greater than 20% difference in GHGE between the lowest and highest
291 GHGE quintiles for the food categories of rice, potatoes, fruits and vegetables, milk, beans, pulses,
292 nuts, seeds, alcoholic beverages, low calorie/sugar non-alcoholic beverages, and hot beverages in
293 2013 diets. GHGE differences are not specifically linked to income, with the highest and lowest
294 GHGE per category not mapping directly to income quintiles for all foods. Further information on
295 GHGE differences can be found in online supplementary materialS4, Tables 1 and 2.

296 Discussion

297 This study shows that all income quintiles' diets must change in broadly similar directions, with
298 some variation resulting from differences in the foods contributing to GHGE in the 2013 diets. The
299 degree of possible dietary change in each quintile was restricted by the amount of money available

300 to purchase food and the composition of the 2013 diet. The highest income quintile achieved an
301 optimised diet and retained greater amounts of its 2013 diet than did lower income quintiles, but
302 were also able to spend more on their diet. If the highest income quintile preserved the same amount
303 of its 2013 diet as lower income quintiles they achieved lower GHGE (Figure 1). This result
304 confirms the existence of trade-offs to balance healthy, low cost and low GHGE diets observed in
305 other studies⁽¹⁸⁾, and illustrates that the trade-offs shift with income, as higher incomes can buy their
306 way out of the trade-off until cost is a constraint (Table 3). The existence of trade-offs across
307 income implies that attention should be given to developing interventions and dietary policies that
308 can be achievable and effective for both lower and higher income quintiles.

309 The GHGE contribution of specific food categories differed across income quintiles in the 2013 and
310 optimised diets. This is due to the 2013 dietary habits of each income quintile differing (and thus
311 constraining the optimised diets). For example, although amounts of fruits and vegetables increased
312 in all optimised diets lower income quintiles consumed less fruit and vegetables in 2013 (in number
313 of types and absolute weight), and so were constrained in the types and quantities of fruit and
314 vegetables available in optimised diets. This is similar to the finding (at a sub-national level) that
315 low GHGE diets differed across European national diets due to current dietary habits⁽²⁹⁾.

316 Many of these differences between quintiles are passed through into the optimised diets. Retaining
317 these dietary differences in optimised diets illustrates that population level modelling studies have
318 missed the distinction that healthy sustainable diets will contain different foods in different
319 quantities at high and low incomes. This is particularly relevant as the food categories that have
320 variations between quintiles feature in current healthy and sustainable eating guidelines⁽⁸⁵⁻⁹⁰⁾ (i.e.
321 increasing fruits and vegetables or reducing animal products). Shifting to the more sustainable
322 healthy diet may result in different impacts for different income quintiles. This is significant when
323 discussing the types of foods eaten within each category with lower income groups eating a smaller
324 range of fruit and vegetables, and different types and weights of processed meats. If population
325 studies alone are used to design interventions this could mean only larger dietary changes are
326 advised, such as changing what is consumed to new, more sustainable, foods; trading in a portion of
327 meat for a portion of fish, for example ^(25,91). Introducing or trading to new foods may not prove as
328 effective as tailored advice that shifts amounts of what is already eaten, but may be seen as more
329 achievable as deviation from current diets is less.

330 Our results suggest that, at an aggregated food group level, population modelling in some cases is
331 sufficient, for some general food groups and categories. For example, the largest GHGE contributor

332 in all diets was the food group of red meat, the 2013 amount purchased by each quintile, and
333 reduction required in all diets is similar. Implying a population level (society wide) dietary change
334 is required, rather than a change at one specific quintile level. However, this study highlights that
335 the types of red (and processed) meat reduction is different for each quintile. For example, the
336 consumption (and associated GHGE) of beef, lamb and pork is highest in Q1, while Q2 has the
337 highest consumption of ham, and Q5 has the highest consumption of chicken and bacon. Shifting to
338 sustainable consumption patterns will involve different decisions for each quintile as well as
339 population level shifts of social norms and practices. Interventions and policy must recognise the
340 differences in diets throughout society, and provide advice for shifting towards realistic healthy low
341 GHGE diets for these different sectors of the population. The linear programme could not find a
342 diet that met the UK's 2050 80% GHGE reduction target with the constraints used. This is
343 consistent with previous population studies that show GHGE reductions above 74% were not
344 possible no matter the deviation from the diet⁽²²⁾, while up to 60% GHGE reductions were possible
345 only if some foods deviate from the current diet by up to 200%⁽⁷⁾. In this paper, GHGE reductions
346 were modelled from the demand-side, with no changes to the GHGE intensities of food products, or
347 the food system (supply-side) via new technologies or increases in efficiency. If the currently
348 unobtainable 2050 80% GHGE reduction target is to be met, change from both demand and supply
349 sides will be required^(33,34). However it is also unknown how diets may change over the next few
350 decades. This study used a low GHGE diet as a proxy for a sustainable diet, but it is recognised that
351 there are other indicators of sustainability such as water, waste, land, or energy use that could be
352 included. Further research could analyse the trade-offs between these different diets with different
353 income groups.

354 The optimised diets save between 18p and 47p a day across income quintiles. However, studies
355 have shown that reducing dietary cost can result in rebound effects, where money saved in one part
356 of the household budget (e.g. food) is spent on more GHGE intensive items elsewhere (e.g. travel,
357 entertainment)⁽⁹²⁻⁹⁵⁾. To reduce rebound effects, dietary change must be accompanied by broader
358 transitions in consumption to a healthier, lower GHGE lifestyle.

359 The monetary savings of the diet represent changes in energy to cost density, and energy to weight
360 density, with all increasing the energy from the 2013 levels to 9250 kJ. It is well recognised that
361 self-reported dietary records tend to be lower than actual consumption, or even requirements⁽⁹⁶⁾.
362 Purchase data may be similarly under-reported⁽⁹⁷⁻⁹⁹⁾. This increase in energy is a direct result of the
363 constraints used, with the 2013 diets having lower energy values than estimated requirements.
364 Additional linear program runs were carried out with energy constraints matched to 2013 energy

365 values, and the results of these were that similar dietary shifts were required as in optimised diets.
366 However, the cost of the final optimised diet decreased (to between £3.99 (Q1) and £4.10 (Q5) –
367 see cells J41 to N41 in the online supplementary material S3 Energy Comparison), and the lower
368 boundary reached increased (40%-42%). Furthermore, quintiles 3 and 5 did not meet their cost
369 constraint for any diet, with health constraints taking effect first. This implies that the fixed energy
370 constraint forced the LP to purchase more healthy and sustainable foods that cost more.

371 This study adds to the growing evidence that income quintiles have diets that are associated with
372 differing amounts of GHGE emissions. Previously Reynolds *et al.*⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ and Van Dooren *et al.*⁽²⁵⁾
373 have found 66% and 9% GHGE differences, respectively between high and low income diet related
374 GHGE emissions. The baseline difference of 3% in this study is smaller than previous studies,
375 possibly because of a greater similarity of diets across the UK population. The larger GHGE
376 impacts of Dutch and Australian diets can be explained by the differences in household diet
377 composition between countries, such as higher consumptions of meat, poultry, fruit and
378 discretionary foods^(25,91,101,102). All studies however agree that moving towards sustainable diets will
379 impact income quintiles in different ways due to the different income based dietary habits. A recent
380 US study has also looked at different households and GHGE emissions finding higher GHGE diets
381 correlated with higher spending patterns⁽¹⁰³⁾. However the paper analysed GHGE quintiles not
382 income quintiles and did not perform any optimised diet modelling.

383 The types of foods selected for increase and reduction are consistent to previous population level
384 linear programming studies^(7,22,49,52), with starchy food, fish, fruit and vegetable consumption
385 increasing to replace the decreases in animal products and high-fat/high-sugar foods. This is in part
386 driven by food based guidelines, such as for fruit, vegetables, fish and red meat. However, this is
387 not consistent with current dietary trends where purchases of starchy foods have been decreasing
388 since 2010⁽²⁾, while the consumption of fish, fruits and vegetables is static⁽²⁾. Encouraging increased
389 consumption of these foods will pose its own set of challenges. Current dietary trends indicate
390 reductions in meat consumption, particularly red meat,⁽²⁾ which are consistent with the
391 recommended direction of travel, but to meet GHGE targets, reduction needs to be accelerated.

392 The data used in this study have some limitations. Firstly, the LCFS is a purchase based survey at
393 the household level, with no adjustment for avoidable food waste, or account of which household
394 member consumes the food⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. Future research could incorporate average avoidable waste (i.e.
395 food waste that would be edible) fractions into the linear programme as per WRAP or Food
396 Standards Scotland data^(105,106).

397 Second, the disaggregation of composite dishes into raw ingredients means that the edible weights
398 presented in Table 3 are in total 1.1kg per week (~9%) higher than the purchased weights in the
399 LCFS. Furthermore, though our composite dishes were disaggregated to component food items
400 using standardised recipes, this may not represent the full range of dishes purchased. Both these
401 factors could affect the energy density and processed/fresh food composition of the optimised diets.

402 Third, the prices used are an average price for each food item, calculated using average price paid
403 price and average weight purchased for each food item from the 2013 LCFS. Though commonly
404 used in dietary modelling ^(52,107,108), different income quintiles may purchase similar foods at
405 different price points. This can lead to underestimating diet cost in high incomes quintiles and
406 overestimating in low income quintiles. The former was supplied as raw data from the LCFS, while
407 the latter is calculated by multiplying the average prices of food items by the weights from the
408 LCFS. As shown in Figure 1 and Table 3, cost constraints did not take effect until the 47%(Q1) to
409 54% (Q5) lower boundary scenario. Changes to food prices would result in this constraint coming
410 into effect earlier and further modifying the optimised diet. Future research could use individual
411 prices, and optimise each diet per quintile's average price paid, rather than at a population average.

412 Fourth, due to insufficient information regarding the price of food eaten out of the home, prices for
413 foods eaten in the home were used throughout. The result of this was that the absolute spend per
414 household was lower than in the LCFS, but the ratio of spending (and prices) were kept constant.
415 Although the proportion of food purchased outside the home is not large (only 10% of total energy
416 and 11% of the associated GHGE), this is important to note as foods eaten out of the home are
417 typically higher cost, and the types and quantity of foods eaten outside the home changed with
418 income (higher income households purchasing greater amounts of food outside the house than
419 lower income households), the average UK household spending 30% of its food and drink spending
420 outside the home in 2013. The models were run excluding eating out of home, with similar results
421 (see supplementary material S3 Tables 1 and 2). Eat out costs results should be taken as minimum
422 cost, and could be higher for the reasons stated above. Further research is needed into the
423 sustainability and health implications of food eaten away from home.

424 Fifth, the method used to keep dietary change to a minimum is a slightly crude percentage deviation
425 to the current diet. To achieve a closer match to the current diet, a modified objective function
426 focused on keeping dietary change to a minimum could be used in future research.

427 In addition, the optimised diets found this study are based on population level food purchase data,
428 and so are not suggested as diets on an individual, daily basis. To create individual diets that could

429 be realistically followed, individual diets from the LCFS could be modelled in a similar method to
430 Horgan *et al.*⁽⁸⁾. In this study, gross income was used rather than equivalised income due to data
431 availability, however equivalised income quintiles can be calculated⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. It is recognised that
432 equivalised income quintiles may alter the finding slightly because this takes into account the
433 composition of the household. Future research could investigate the differences in results between
434 gross and equivalised income quintiles.

435 Finally, there is no statistical comparison of the optimised dietary results. Though not common in
436 the optimised dietary literature to date, this limitation could be addressed in future studies using
437 Monte Carlo and sensitivity analysis. It is also acknowledged that there are limitations due to the
438 precision of the GHGE data, and using the Audsley *et al.*⁽³¹⁾ data as the baseline in this study against
439 the percent reduction targets may not give the exact reduction required. However, in the absence of
440 other data these were used as the baseline for the UK diets. Future research might use Monte Carlo
441 methods to incorporate the wider UK and global⁽¹¹⁰⁾ variability of GHGE estimations into the linear
442 programme.

443 Conclusion

444 In conclusion, this study has modelled healthy, low GHGE diets in each income quintile that did not
445 exceed the current household food budget by altering the amounts of different foods (but not
446 eliminating foods) currently consumed. The more of the foods from the current (2013) diet retained
447 in the optimised diet, the higher the GHGE associated with the optimised diet. It was found that
448 although all incomes had similar total GHGE impacts, there were differences in the foods within
449 categories consumed in both 2013, and optimised diets. The results highlight that different dietary
450 trade-offs are needed by different income quintiles, but these are generally in the same direction to
451 be shifts towards healthy sustainable diets. This implies that though population dietary targets are
452 sufficient, population level sustainable dietary advice or interventions may not produce the same
453 effects in high or lower income groups. Tailored dietary advice or interventions that keep dietary
454 change to a minimum may be more effective to shift income groups to healthy and sustainable diets

455 References

- 456 1. Maguire ER & Monsivais P (2014) Socio-economic dietary inequalities in UK adults: an
457 updated picture of key food groups and nutrients from national surveillance data. *Br. J. Nutr.*
458 **113**, 1–9. Cambridge University Press.
- 459 2. DEFRA (2014) *Family Food 2013*. London, England: .

- 460 3. Darmon N & Drewnowski A (2008) Does social class predict diet quality? *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*
461 **87**, 1107–1117.
- 462 4. Macdiarmid J, Kyle J, Horgan G, et al. (2012) Sustainable diets for the future: can we
463 contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by eating a healthy diet? *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.*
464 **93**, 632–639.
- 465 5. Garnett T (2011) Where are the best opportunities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in
466 the food system (including the food chain)? *Food Policy* **36**, S23–S32.
- 467 6. Scarborough P, Appleby PN, Mizdrak A, et al. (2014) Dietary greenhouse gas emissions of
468 meat-eaters, fish-eaters, vegetarians and vegans in the UK. *Clim. Change*, 179–192.
- 469 7. Green R, Milner J, Dangour AD, et al. (2015) The potential to reduce greenhouse gas
470 emissions in the UK through healthy and realistic dietary change. *Clim. Change*, 15–17.
- 471 8. Horgan GW, Perrin A, Whybrow S, et al. (2016) Achieving dietary recommendations and
472 reducing greenhouse gas emissions: modelling diets to minimise the change from current
473 intakes. *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.* **13**, 46.
- 474 9. Wiggins S & Alberto J (2015) *The rising cost of a healthy diet*. London, England: .
- 475 10. Pechey R, Jebb S a, Kelly MP, et al. (2013) Socioeconomic differences in purchases of more
476 vs. less healthy foods and beverages: analysis of over 25,000 British households in 2010.
477 *Soc. Sci. Med.* **92**, 22–6. Elsevier Ltd.
- 478 11. Barton KL, Wrieden WL, Sherriff A, et al. (2015) Trends in socio-economic inequalities in
479 the Scottish diet: 2001–2009. *Public Health Nutr.*, 1–12.
- 480 12. Mackenbach JD, Brage S, Forouhi NG, et al. (2015) Does the importance of dietary costs for
481 fruit and vegetable intake vary by socioeconomic position? *Br. J. Nutr.* **114**, 1464–70.
482 Cambridge University Press.
- 483 13. Turrell G & Vandevijvere S (2015) Socio-economic inequalities in diet and body weight:
484 evidence, causes and intervention options. *Public Health Nutr.* **18**, 759–63. Cambridge
485 University Press.
- 486 14. James WP, Nelson M, Ralph a, et al. (1997) Socioeconomic determinants of health. The
487 contribution of nutrition to inequalities in health. *BMJ* **314**, 1545–1549.
- 488 15. Drewnowski A (2007) The real contribution of added sugars and fats to obesity. *Epidemiol.*

- 489 *Rev.* **29**, 160–71.
- 490 16. Dixon J & Isaacs B (2013) Why sustainable and ‘nutritionally correct’ food is not on the
491 agenda: Western Sydney, the moral arts of everyday life and public policy. *Food Policy* **43**,
492 67–76.
- 493 17. Maillot M, Vieux F, Delaere F, et al. (2017) Dietary changes needed to reach nutritional
494 adequacy without increasing diet cost according to income: An analysis among French
495 adults. *PLoS One* **12**, 1–20.
- 496 18. Monsivais P, Scarborough P, Lloyd T, et al. (2015) Greater accordance with the Dietary
497 Approaches to Stop Hypertension dietary pattern is associated with lower diet-related
498 greenhouse gas production but higher dietary costs in the United Kingdom 1 , 2. *Am. J. Clin.*
499 *Nutr.* **102**, 138–145.
- 500 19. Reynolds CJ, Buckley JD, Weinstein P, et al. (2014) Are the dietary guidelines for meat, fat,
501 fruit and vegetable consumption appropriate for environmental sustainability? A review of
502 the literature. *Nutrients* **6**, 2251–65.
- 503 20. Vieux F, Soler L-G, Touazi D, et al. (2012) High nutritional quality is not associated with
504 low greenhouse gas emissions in self-selected diets of French adults. In *8th Int. Conf. Life*
505 *Cycle Assess. Agri-Food Sect. Towar. Sustain. Food Syst.* [Corson MS, Werf HMG van der,
506 editors]. Saint-Malo, France: .
- 507 21. Vieux F, Soler L-G, Touazi D, et al. (2013) High nutritional quality is not associated with
508 low greenhouse gas emissions in self-selected diets of French adults. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **97**,
509 569–583.
- 510 22. Perignon M, Masset G, Ferrari G, et al. (2016) How low can dietary greenhouse gas
511 emissions be reduced without impairing nutritional adequacy, affordability and acceptability
512 of the diet? A modelling study to guide sustainable food choices. *Public Health Nutr.*, 1–13.
513 Cambridge University Press.
- 514 23. Masset G, Vieux F, Verger EO, et al. (2014) Reducing energy intake and energy density for a
515 sustainable diet: A study based on self-selected diets in French adults. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **99**,
516 1460–1469.
- 517 24. Vieux F, Darmon N, Touazi D, et al. (2012) Greenhouse gas emissions of self-selected
518 individual diets in France: Changing the diet structure or consuming less? *Ecol. Econ.* **75**,

- 519 91–101.
- 520 25. van Dooren C (2018) *Simultaneous optimisation of the nutritional quality and environmental*
521 *sustainability of diets*. Thesis. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Vrije Universiteit.
- 522 26. Macdiarmid JI, Douglas F & Campbell J (2015) Eating like there's no tomorrow: public
523 awareness of the environmental impact of food and reluctance to eating less meat as part of a
524 sustainable diet. *Appetite* **96**, 487–493.
- 525 27. Jabs J & Devine CM (2006) Time scarcity and food choices: an overview. *Appetite* **47**, 196–
526 204.
- 527 28. Lea E & Worsley A (2008) Australian consumers' food-related environmental beliefs and
528 behaviours. *Appetite* **50**, 207–214.
- 529 29. Vieux F, Perignon M, Gazan R, et al. (2018) Dietary changes needed to improve diet
530 sustainability: are they similar across Europe? *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.*
- 531 30. UK Government. (2008) *Climate Change Act 2008*. London, England: Statute Law Database.
- 532 31. Audsley E, Brander M, Chatterton J, et al. (2009) *How low can we go? An assessment of*
533 *greenhouse gas emissions from the UK food system and the scope to reduce them by 2050*.
534 WWF-UK.
- 535 32. Committee on Climate Change (2015) *The fifth carbon budget – The next step towards a*
536 *low-carbon economy* | Committee on Climate Change. London: .
- 537 33. Bajželj B, Richards KS, Allwood JM, et al. (2014) Importance of food-demand management
538 for climate mitigation. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **4**, 924–929. Nature Publishing Group.
- 539 34. Bryngelsson D, Wirsenius S, Hedenus F, et al. (2016) How can the EU climate targets be
540 met? A combined analysis of technological and demand-side changes in food and
541 agriculture. *Food Policy* **59**, 152–164.
- 542 35. Perignon M, Vieux F, Soler LG, et al. (2017) Improving diet sustainability through evolution
543 of food choices: Review of epidemiological studies on the environmental impact of diets.
544 *Nutr. Rev.* **75**, 2–17.
- 545 36. Ridoutt BG, Hendrie GA & Noakes M (2017) Dietary Strategies to Reduce Environmental
546 Impact: A Critical Review of the Evidence Base. *Adv. Nutr.* **8**, 933–946.

- 547 37. Nelson ME, Hamm MW, Hu FB, et al. (2016) Alignment of Healthy Dietary Patterns and
548 Environmental Sustainability: A Systematic Review. *Adv. Nutr. An Int. Rev. J.* **7**, 1005–1025.
- 549 38. Mertens E, Van’T Veer P, Hiddink GJ, et al. (2017) Operationalising the health aspects of
550 sustainable diets: A review. *Public Health Nutr.* **20**, 739–757.
- 551 39. Khatri P & Jain S (2017) Environmental life cycle assessment of edible oils: A review of
552 current knowledge and future research challenges. *J. Clean. Prod.* **152**, 63–76. Elsevier Ltd.
- 553 40. Jones AD, Hoey L, Blesh J, et al. (2016) A Systematic Review of the Measurement of
554 Sustainable Diets. *Adv. Nutr. An Int. Rev. J.* **7**, 641–664.
- 555 41. Auestad N & Fulgoni VL (2015) What Current Literature Tells Us about Sustainable Diets :
556 Emerging Research Linking Dietary Patterns , Environmental. *Adv. Nutr. An Int. Rev. J.* **6**,
557 19–36.
- 558 42. Aleksandrowicz L, Green R, Joy EJM, et al. (2016) The Impacts of Dietary Change on
559 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use, Water Use, and Health: A Systematic Review. *PLoS*
560 *One* **11**, e0165797 [Wiley AS, editor].
- 561 43. Hallström E, Carlsson-Kanyama a. & Börjesson P (2015) Environmental impact of dietary
562 change: a systematic review. *J. Clean. Prod.* **91**, 1–11.
- 563 44. Barosh L, Friel S, Engelhardt K, et al. (2014) The cost of a healthy and sustainable diet--who
564 can afford it? *Aust. N. Z. J. Public Health* **38**, 7–12.
- 565 45. Food Standards Agency (2015) *The cost of a healthy food basket.* .
- 566 46. Scott C, Sutherland J & Taylor A (2018) *Affordability of the UK’s Eatwell Guide.* .
- 567 47. Wilson N, Nghiem N & Foster RH (2013) The Feasibility of Achieving Low-Sodium Intake
568 in Diets That Are Also Nutritious, Low-Cost, and Have Familiar Meal Components. *PLoS*
569 *One* **8**, e58539.
- 570 48. Ward JD, Ward PJ, Mantzioris E, et al. (2014) Optimising diet decisions and urban
571 agriculture using linear programming. *Food Secur.* **6**, 701–718.
- 572 49. van Dooren C, Tyszler M, Kramer G, et al. (2015) Combining Low Price, Low Climate
573 Impact and High Nutritional Value in One Shopping Basket through Diet Optimization by
574 Linear Programming. *Sustainability* **7**, 12837–12855.

- 575 50. Darmon N, Ferguson E & Briend A (2003) Do economic constraints encourage the selection
576 of energy dense diets? *Appetite* **41**, 315–322.
- 577 51. Darmon N, Ferguson EL & Briend A (2006) Impact of a cost constraint on nutritionally
578 adequate food choices for French women: an analysis by linear programming. *J. Nutr. Educ.*
579 *Behav.* **38**, 82–90.
- 580 52. Donati M, Menozzi D, Zighetti C, et al. (2016) Towards a sustainable diet combining
581 economic, environmental and nutritional objectives. *Appetite* **In Press**. Elsevier Ltd.
- 582 53. Perignon M, Masset G, Ferrari G, et al. (2016) How low can dietary greenhouse gas
583 emissions be reduced without impairing nutritional adequacy, affordability and acceptability
584 of the diet? A modelling study to guide sustainable food choices. *Public Health Nutr.* **19**,
585 2662–2674.
- 586 54. Tyszler M, Kramer G & Blonk H (2016) Just eating healthier is not enough: studying the
587 environmental impact of different diet scenarios for Dutch women (31–50 years old) by
588 linear programming. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **21**, 701–709.
- 589 55. Van Mierlo K, Rohmer S & Gerdessen JC (2017) A model for composing meat replacers:
590 Reducing the environmental impact of our food consumption pattern while retaining its
591 nutritional value. *J. Clean. Prod.* **165**, 930–950. Elsevier Ltd.
- 592 56. Gephart JA, Davis KF, Emery KA, et al. (2016) The environmental cost of subsistence:
593 Optimizing diets to minimize footprints. *Sci. Total Environ.* **553**, 120–127. Elsevier B.V.
- 594 57. Scarborough P, Kaur A, Cobiac L, et al. (2016) Eatwell Guide: Modelling the dietary and
595 cost implications of incorporating new sugar and fibre guidelines. *BMJ Open* **6**.
- 596 58. Tyszler M, Kramer G & Blonk H (2016) Just eating healthier is not enough: studying the
597 environmental impact of different diet scenarios for Dutch women (31–50 years old) by
598 linear programming. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **21**, 701–709.
- 599 59. Buttriss JL, Briend A, Darmon N, et al. (2014) Diet modelling: How it can inform the
600 development of dietary recommendations and public health policy. *Nutr. Bull.* **39**, 115–125.
- 601 60. Drewnowski A (2014) Healthy diets for a healthy planet. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **99**, 1284–5.
- 602 61. Berners-Lee M, Hoolohan C, Cammack H, et al. (2012) The relative greenhouse gas impacts
603 of realistic dietary choices. *Energy Policy* **43**, 184–190.

- 604 62. Wilson N, Nghiem N, Ni Mhurchu C, et al. (2013) Foods and Dietary Patterns That Are
605 Healthy, Low-Cost, and Environmentally Sustainable: A Case Study of Optimization
606 Modeling for New Zealand. *PLoS One* **8**, e59648. Public Library of Science.
- 607 63. Milner J, Green R, Dangour AD, et al. (2015) Health effects of adopting low greenhouse gas
608 emission diets in the UK. *BMJ Open* **5**, e007364–e007364.
- 609 64. Jo Bulman (2017) Household expenditure by gross income decile group, UK: Table A4. *Off.*
610 *Natl. Stat.*
611 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/exp](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/expenditure/datasets/householdexpenditurebygrossincomedecilegroupuktablea4)
612 [enditure/datasets/householdexpenditurebygrossincomedecilegroupuktablea4](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/expenditure/datasets/householdexpenditurebygrossincomedecilegroupuktablea4) (accessed
613 August 2017).
- 614 65. Food Standard Agency (2002) *McCance and Widdowson's The Composition of Foods*. 6th
615 ed. Royal Society of Chemistry.
- 616 66. Bates B, Lennox A, Prentice A, et al. (2014) National Diet and Nutrition Survey : Results
617 from Years 1-4 (combined) of the Rolling Programme. Executive Summary. *Public Heal.*
618 *Engl.* **4**, 1–24.
- 619 67. Crawley H, Mills A & Patel S (2002) *Food portion sizes*,. 3rd ed. London: Food Standards
620 Agency.
- 621 68. McGovern K (2011) *The Takeaway Secret: How to cook your favourite fast-food at home*.
622 Little, Brown Book Group.
- 623 69. Dhillon K (1989) *The Curry Secret Indian Restaurant Cookery at Home*. Elliot Right Way
624 Books.
- 625 70. Hsiung D-T (2000) *Chinese Cookery Secrets: How to Cook Chinese Restaurant Food at*
626 *Home*. Elliot Right Way Books.
- 627 71. Whybrow S, Macdiarmid JI, Craig LC a., et al. (2016) Using food intake records to estimate
628 compliance with the Eatwell Plate dietary guidelines. *J. Hum. Nutr. Diet.* **29**, 262–268.
- 629 72. Office for National Statistics (2003) *Mid-1982 to 1990 Population Estimates: United*
630 *Kingdom; estimated resident population by single year of age and sex*. London, England: .
- 631 73. Dantzig G (1990) The diet problem. *Interfaces (Providence)*. **20**, 43–47.
- 632 74. Stigler G (1945) The cost of subsistence. *J. Farm Econ.* **27**, 303.

- 633 75. Hobbs D. A, Lovegrove J. A & Givens D. I (2015) The role of dairy products in sustainable
634 diets: modelling nutritional adequacy, financial and environmental impacts. In *Futur. Anim.*
635 *Prod. Hum. Diet Heal. Environ. Concerns, Nutr. Soc.*, vol. 74, p. E310.
- 636 76. Darmon N & Drewnowski A (2015) Contribution of food prices and diet cost to
637 socioeconomic disparities in diet quality and health: a systematic review and analysis. *Nutr.*
638 *Rev.* **73**, 643–660. The Oxford University Press.
- 639 77. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (2011) *SACN Dietary Reference Values for*
640 *Energy*. .
- 641 78. Department of Health (1991) *Dietary reference values for food energy and nutrients for the*
642 *United Kingdom (DRV)*. London, United Kingdom: HMSO.
- 643 79. Wyness LA, Buttriss JL & Stanner SA (2012) Reducing the population's sodium intake: the
644 UK Food Standards Agency's salt reduction programme. *Public Health Nutr.* **15**, 254–61.
645 Cambridge University Press.
- 646 80. Public Health England (2014) *A Quick Guide to the Government's Healthy Eating*
647 *Recommendations*. London: Public Health England.
- 648 81. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN) and & Committee on Toxicity (CoT)
649 (2004) *Advice on fish consumption: benefits & risks 2004. Advice fish Consum. benefits*
650 *risks*.
- 651 82. DEFRA (2014) *Nutrient Intakes - Family food methodology*. London: .
- 652 83. Drinkaware (2016) Alcohol Unit Guidelines. [https://www.drinkaware.co.uk/check-the-](https://www.drinkaware.co.uk/check-the-facts/what-is-alcohol/daily-guidelines)
653 [facts/what-is-alcohol/daily-guidelines](https://www.drinkaware.co.uk/check-the-facts/what-is-alcohol/daily-guidelines) (accessed March 2016).
- 654 84. R Core Team (2015) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna,
655 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 656 85. Fischer CG & Garnett T (2016) *Plates, pyramids and planets, Developments in national*
657 *healthy and sustainable dietary guidelines: a state of play assessment*. Oxford: .
- 658 86. Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Moubarac J-C, et al. (2015) Dietary guidelines to nourish humanity
659 and the planet in the twenty-first century. A blueprint from Brazil. *Public Health Nutr.* **18**,
660 2311–2322. Cambridge University Press.
- 661 87. Ministers NC of (2014) *Nordic Nutrition Recommendations 2012*. Copenhagen: .

- 662 88. Health Council of the Netherlands (2011) *Guidelines for a healthy diet: the ecological*
663 *perspective*. vol. Publicatio. The Hague: Health Council of the Netherlands.
- 664 89. Freidberg S (2016) Wicked Nutrition : The Controversial Greening of Official Dietary
665 Guidance. *Gastron. J. Crit. Food Stud.* **16**, 69–80. University of California Press Journals.
- 666 90. van 't Veer P, Poppe KJ & Fresco LO (2017) *Towards a European Food and Nutrition*
667 *Policy*. .
- 668 91. van Dooren C, Keuchenius C, De Vries J, et al. (2017) Actual unsustainable diets practices of
669 specific subgroups require dedicated transition strategies: case study in the Netherlands. *Food*
670 *Policy Submitted*.
- 671 92. Chitnis M, Sorrell S, Druckman A, et al. (2013) Turning lights into flights: Estimating direct
672 and indirect rebound effects for UK households. *Energy Policy* **55**, 234–250. Elsevier.
- 673 93. Grabs J (2015) The rebound effects of switching to vegetarianism. A microeconomic analysis
674 of Swedish consumption behavior. *Ecol. Econ.* **116**, 270–279. Elsevier B.V.
- 675 94. Chitnis M, Sorrell S, Druckman A, et al. (2014) Who rebounds most? Estimating direct and
676 indirect rebound effects for different UK socioeconomic groups. *Ecol. Econ.* **106**, 12–32.
677 Elsevier B.V.
- 678 95. Sorrell S & Dimitropoulos J (2008) The rebound effect: Microeconomic definitions,
679 limitations and extensions. *Ecol. Econ.* **65**, 636–649.
- 680 96. Stubbs RJ, O'Reilly LM, Whybrow S, et al. (2014) Measuring the difference between actual
681 and reported food intakes in the context of energy balance under laboratory conditions. *Br. J.*
682 *Nutr.* **111**, 2032–2043.
- 683 97. Harper H & Hallsworth M (2016) *Counting Calories: How under-reporting can explain the*
684 *apparent fall in calorie intake*. .
- 685 98. Woolford J (2016) *A Government Statistical Service perspective on official estimates of*
686 *calorie consumption*. .
- 687 99. Data Science Campus (2018) Evaluating Calorie Intake.
688 <https://datasciencecampus.ons.gov.uk/2018/02/15/eclipse/> (accessed February 2018).
- 689 100. Reynolds CJ, Piantadosi J, Buckley JD, et al. (2015) Evaluation of the environmental impact
690 of weekly food consumption in different socio-economic households in Australia using

- 691 environmentally extended input–output analysis. *Ecol. Econ.* **111**, 58–64.
- 692 101. Hadjikakou M (2017) Trimming the excess: environmental impacts of discretionary food
693 consumption in Australia. *Ecol. Econ.* **131**, 119–128.
- 694 102. Hendrie G, Baird D, Ridoutt B, et al. (2016) Overconsumption of Energy and Excessive
695 Discretionary Food Intake Inflates Dietary Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Australia. *Nutrients*
696 **8**, 690. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- 697 103. Boehm R, Wilde PE, Ver M, et al. (2018) A Comprehensive Life Cycle Assessment of
698 Greenhouse Gas Emissions from U . S . Household Food Choices. *Food Policy*, 1–10.
699 Elsevier.
- 700 104. Burgon C (2009) Family Food - an introduction to data sources and uses. *Nutr. Bull.* **34**,
701 220–224.
- 702 105. Barton KL, Masson LF & Wrieden WL (2018) *Estimation of Food and Nutrient Intakes from*
703 *Food Purchase Data in Scotland 2001-2015 (FS424018)*. .
- 704 106. WRAP (2018) *Household food waste : restated data for 2007-2015*. Banbury, UK: .
- 705 107. Darmon N, Ferguson EL & Briend A (2002) A cost constraint alone has adverse effects on
706 food selection and nutrient density: an analysis of human diets by linear programming. *J.*
707 *Nutr.* **132**, 3764.
- 708 108. Timmins K a, Morris MA, Hulme C, et al. (2013) Comparability of methods assigning
709 monetary costs to diets: derivation from household till receipts versus cost database
710 estimation using 4-day food diaries. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* **67**, 1072–6. Nature Publishing Group.
- 711 109. Barton KL, Chambers S, Anderson AS, et al. (2018) Time to address the double inequality of
712 differences in dietary intake between Scotland and England. *Br. J. Nutr.* **120**, 220–226.
- 713 110. Clune S, Crossin E & Verghese K (2017) Systematic review of greenhouse gas emissions for
714 different fresh food categories. *J. Clean. Prod.* **140**, 766–783.
- 715 111. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (2003) *Salt and health*. .
- 716 112. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (2010) *Iron and Health*. .
- 717





Figure 1. Impact on GHGE and cost associated with lower boundaries of the different diets. A) GHGE associated with different lower boundary iteration optimised diets. B) Cost associated with different lower boundary iteration optimised diets

Table 1 Food groups used in the linear programme, indicating if they were selected at the maximum weight limit, varied weight or at the minimum lower boundary for all linear programme iterations, for all quintiles.

Food category	Food selected at their maximum weight limit (200%), in all linear programme iterations.	Food that varies depending on linear programme iteration.	Food selected at their minimum lower boundary, in all linear programme iterations.
Starchy foods	Brown, granary, rye bread Pasta, noodles, couscous Wholegrain and high fibre breakfast cereals Muesli Potato products grilled or oven baked (not fried) Potato (boiled, baked, no fat)	White bread Wholegrain bread Other breads Other breakfast cereals Porridge oats Rice	
Fruit and Vegetables	Apples, pears Grapes, cherries Kiwi Peaches, nectarines, apricots Plums Peas Onions Sweetcorn	Citrus fruit Bananas Melons, pineapple, watermelon, mangoes Raspberries, strawberries Dried fruits Carrots/ turnips Tomatoes Cabbages, brussel s, other brassicas Cucumbers Lettuce Mushrooms Pumpkins, squash	Fruit juice Tinned fruit Free Fruit† Green beans Cauliflowers, broccoli, spinach Pepper
Milk and dairy foods	None	Whole milk Semi-skimmed milk Skimmed milk Yoghurt / fromage frais (full fat)	Cottage cheese Cheese (full fat) Cheese (reduced fat) Yoghurt / fromage frais (low fat) Free milk†
Non-dairy protein sources	Mixed nuts Mixed seeds Beans e.g. kidney, chickpeas Lentils Oily fish*	White fish (coated, fried) White fish (not fried) Shellfish Tinned tuna Eggs Soya milk Quorn	Beef Lamb Pork Bacon Ham Sausages (pork) Baked beans Soya mince
High fat/ high sugar foods	Fried, roast potatoes and fried potato products (incl. chips)	Biscuits Soft margarine (not low fat) Reduced or low fat margarine Crisps & savoury snacks Sugar Preserves (jam, honey etc.) Sweets	Buns, cakes and pastries Milk & dairy puddings Sponge & cereal based puddings Cream Ice-creams Butter Spreadable butter

		Chocolate Mayonnaise Oil	Reduced or low fat spreadable butter Bottled sauces (e.g. ketchup, brown sauce) French dressing
Non Alcoholic beverages §	None	None	Carbonated soft drinks Non-carbonated soft drink Carbonated soft drinks (low calorie/sugar) Non-carbonated soft drink (low calorie/sugar)
Alcoholic beverages		Beer‡ Wine‡ Spirits‡	
Hot beverages	None	Hot chocolate	Tea (no milk) Coffee (no milk)

* Oily fish had a minimum consumption of 19g per day, this is a minimum increase of 400% of 2013 consumption rates.

† These foods were fixed at 100% of their 2013 weights as they were 'free' foods and not purchased.

‡ Alcoholic beverages had an upper limit set at the average LCFS alcohol consumption (8.9g/day), this means there was some alcohol reduction in some diets.

Table 2 Dietary constraints based on population weighted dietary recommendations used in the linear programming compared with energy and nutrients reported in the 2013 diet by income quintile.

		2013 Diets					Population Average UK
		Low income 1 (n= 1014 households)	2 (n= 1085 households)	3 (n= 1058 households)	4 (n= 1015 households)	High income 5 (n= 972 households)	(n=5144 households)
Income boundaries (£, per week, per household)		< 265.18	265.18 - 461.89	461.9 - 695.5	695.51 - 1077.97	>1077.97	—
Average income (£, per week, per household)		170.06	362.02	572.56	864.27	1739.27	726.83
% of gross normal weekly household income spent on food & drink		28.32%	20.41%	17.27%	14.59%	10.17%	23.01%
Population weighted dietary recommendations (per day)	Constraints						
Energy (MJ)	=9.25 (a)	8.95	8.88	8.74	8.58	8.70	8.74
Fat (g)*	≤ 82.50 (b)	92.81	91.40	89.98	87.92	88.92	89.81
Carbohydrate (g)†	≥ 272.10 (b)	252.56	250.15	244.15	237.40	237.55	242.90
Protein (g)‡	≥ 46.20 (b)	75.60	75.45	74.36	73.86	76.19	75.06
Nonstarch polysaccharides (g)	≥ 16.90 (d)	13.22	13.22	12.94	13.01	13.56	13.20
Non milk extrinsic sugars (g)‡	≤ 54.40 (b)	82.41	82.09	80.38	75.92	75.05	78.47
Saturated fat (g)§	≤ 25.00 (b)	34.73	33.47	32.75	32.04	32.59	32.91
Sodium (mg)	≤ 2115.00 (c)	2292.55	2275.05	2218.55	2238.99	2276.66	2257.46
Potassium (mg)	≥ 3.20 (b)	2.79	2.82	2.73	2.70	2.81	2.77
Calcium (mg)	≥ 693.30 (b)	923.84	914.98	874.61	845.44	868.64	879.17
Iron (mg)	≥ 10.90 (b)	11.79	11.67	11.52	11.66	12.10	11.77
Zinc (mg)	≥ 8.00 (b)	9.39	9.32	9.13	9.10	9.50	9.29
B12 (ug)	≥ 1.40 (b)	6.20	6.34	6.12	6.08	6.23	6.19
Folate (ug)	≥ 190.10 (b)	248.04	247.75	242.07	243.45	251.93	246.69
Vitamin A (ug)	≥ 624.90 (b)	1492.70	1551.80	1523.61	1494.10	1518.19	1516.18

Thiamin (mg)	≥ 0.85	(b)	1.65	1.65	1.61	1.61	1.63	1.63
Riboflavin (mg)	≥ 1.15	(b)	1.88	1.88	1.81	1.77	1.78	1.81
Niacin (mg)	≥ 14.10	(b)	14.60	14.65	14.96	15.15	15.18	14.97
Vitamin C (mg)	≥ 38.50	(b)	76.37	78.64	80.75	83.11	90.02	82.83
Magnesium (mg)	≥ 267.90	(b)	255.67	258.68	253.14	254.25	266.85	258.26
Alcohol (g)	≤ 8.90	(d)	6.55	7.17	8.21	9.25	10.82	8.76
Red & processed meat (g)	≤ 66.60	(e)	65.89	63.13	62.15	62.56	64.02	63.37
Fruit and vegetables (g)	≥ 380.50	(f)	269.47	273.61	282.70	289.77	330.94	293.82
Total Fish	≥ 38.05	(g)	14.01	14.58	13.90	14.45	15.72	14.64
(of which oily fish)	≥ (19.03)		4.56)	(4.28)	(4.17)	(5.21)	(5.21)	(4.79)
Total cost (£)	≤ current spend	(h)	4.24	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.76	4.47
Cost eat in (£)	≤ current spend	(h)	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.12	3.99
Cost eat out (£)	≤ current spend	(h)	0.27	0.38	0.41	0.51	0.64	0.47
GHGE (kg CO ₂ e/day) ⁱⁱⁱ	≤ 1.78 kg	(i)	2.80	2.76	2.76	2.74	2.88	
	CO ₂ e/person /day							

Source a= Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition 2011⁽⁷⁷⁾, b= Department of Health 1991⁽⁷⁸⁾, c= Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition 2003⁽¹¹¹⁾, d= Intake of alcohol in average UK household, not to be increased DEFRA 2014⁽²⁾, e= Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition 2010⁽¹¹²⁾, f= Public Health England 2014⁽⁸⁰⁾ g= Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition and Committee on Toxicity 2004, and Public Health England 2014^(80,81), h= DEFRA 2014⁽²⁾ (i)= Audsley et al. and UK GHGE reduction targets ⁽³¹⁾⁽³²⁾

*based on ≤ 33% fat of total energy, † based on ≥50% CHO of total energy, ‡ based on ≤10% NMES of total energy, § based on ≤10% saturated fat of total energy

^{||}cost constraints calculated by multiplying an average price for each food by the weight of each food purchased.ⁱⁱⁱ this constraint was not used in every model.

1 Table 3. The estimated GHGE and cost of the diet by household income quintiles for 2013 diets and
 2 optimised diets for health

	Low income 1 (n= 1014)	2 (n= 1085)	3 (n= 1058)	4 (n= 1015)	High income 5 (n= 972)
2013 diets					
GHGE, (kgCO ₂ e/ day)	2.80	2.76	2.76	2.74	2.88
Energy (kJ/day)	8951	8876	8739	8576	8701
Cost (£/day)	4.24	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.76
Weight (g/day)	1979	1964	1919	1873	1939
M1 Optimised diet for health, with no cost constraint*					
<i>Final optimised diet</i>					
Lower boundary for any food group	57%	60%	62%	62%	62%
GHGE (kgCO ₂ e/day)	2.46	2.68	2.57	2.61	2.79
Cost (£/day)	4.61	4.87	4.83	5.00	5.25
Weight (g/day)	1870	1973	1927	1903	1963
M2 Optimised diet for health, with cost constraint					
<i>Final optimised diet</i>					
Lower boundary for any food group	53%	54%	57%	56%	60%
GHGE (kg CO ₂ e/day)	2.43	2.49	2.52	2.58	2.56
Cost, £/day	4.24	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.76
Weight (g/day)	1836	1908	1847	1886	1852
Lower boundary where cost constraint takes effect					
Food groups retained	47%	47%	52%	48%	54%
GHGE (kg CO ₂ e/day)	2.11	2.09	2.20	2.10	2.29
M3 Optimised diet for health, with cost constraint and maximum GHGE1.78 kg CO₂e/person /day target					
<i>Final optimised diet.</i>					
Lower boundary for any food group	34%	35%	35%	35%	35%
GHGE (kg CO ₂ e/day)	1.78	1.78	1.78	1.78	1.78
Cost (£/day)	4.01	4.03	4.20	4.25	4.29
Weight (g/day)	1599	1627	1617	1591	1570

Note: the lower boundary iteration refers to the minimum percentage of any food item (g/day) from the 2013 diet to be included in the optimised diet. The 'final optimised diet' is the iteration with the highest limit found by the linear programme to have a feasible diet. *the energy constraint for all the optimised diets was 9200kJ/day.

Table 4 Food purchases by household by income quintile for the 2013 diet and optimised diet with cost constraint and 1.78 GHGE kg CO₂e /day target.

Food purchases per day	2013 diet						Optimised diet, with cost constraint GHGE of 1.78 kg CO ₂ e/day.							
	Low Income		3	High Income		Population Average UK	Maximum difference in % GHGE between quintile groups	Low Income		High Income		Population Average UK	Maximum difference in % GHGE between quintile groups	
	1	2		4	5			1	2	3	4			5
Starchy foods (g)	269	264	254	251	248	255	4%	481	485	478	458	452	463	7%
<i>Bread</i> (g)	118	113	107	107	105	109	11%	205	204	215	201	195	197	9%
<i>Cereals (pasta, breakfast)</i> (g)	45	44	43	48	52	47	15%	68	66	68	76	85	74	21%
<i>Rice</i> (g)	23	21	27	25	24	24	21%	41	41	43	38	37	41	13%
<i>Potatoes</i> (g)	84	87	76	72	67	76	22%	168	173	152	143	135	151	22%
Fruit and vegetables (g)	269	274	283	290	331	294	22%	393	395	395	399	402	397	2%
<i>Fruit</i> (g)	115	122	125	131	153	132	25%	165	167	167	170	173	169	5%
<i>Vegetables</i> (g)	154	152	157	159	178	162	19%	228	228	228	228	228	228	0%
Dairy products (g)	304	305	273	250	254	272	8%	104	107	96	88	89	96	18%
<i>Milk</i> (ml)	258	258	222	197	199	221	24%	89	91	78	69	70	78	24%
<i>Other dairy products</i> (g)	46	46	51	53	55	51	17%	16	16	18	19	19	18	18%
Non-dairy proteins (g)	162	162	164	163	173	166	5%	105	107	117	106	116	110	10%
<i>Total meat</i> (g)*	101	101	103	104	106	103	4%	34	35	36	36	37	36	7%
<i>Red meat</i> (g)	42	39	39	38	39	39	9%	14	14	13	13	14	14	6%
<i>White meat</i> (g)	35	38	40	41	42	40	17%	12	13	14	14	15	14	18%
<i>Processed meat</i> (g)	21	21	20	21	22	21	6%	7	7	7	7	8	7	7%
<i>Seafood</i> (g)	16	17	16	17	19	17	16%	39	39	39	39	39	39	1%
<i>Eggs</i> (g)	16	14	15	14	17	15	14%	5	5	5	5	6	5	14%

<i>Beans, pulses, nuts, seeds (g)</i>	29	30	31	28	31	30	23%	26	28	37	26	34	30	30%
High fat/ high sugar foods (g)	240	242	233	225	217	229	9%	203	205	195	206	199	205	5%
Alcoholic beverages (ml)	96	118	134	155	175	142	48%	96	118	134	145	122	142	34%
Non-alcoholic beverages (ml)	212	226	256	262	258	247	19%	72	79	90	92	90	87	21%
<i>Not low calorie/sugar (ml)</i>	132	134	149	142	136	139	17%	45	47	52	50	48	49	14%
<i>Low calorie/sugar (ml)</i>	80	91	108	120	122	108	41%	27	32	38	42	43	38	36%
Hot beverages (ml)	426	374	322	278	283	323	21%	145	131	113	97	99	113	33%

* Total meat also includes red meat, white meat, processed meat and liver † The weights (g) of these food categories is similar however there is difference in the GHGE between quintiles due to the differing composition of each quintiles diet.