



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Human appropriation of land for food: The role of diet

Citation for published version:

Alexander, P, Brown, C, Arneith, A, Finnigan, J & Rounsevell, M 2016, 'Human appropriation of land for food: The role of diet', *Global Environmental Change*, vol. 41, pp. 88-98.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.09.005>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.09.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.09.005)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Global Environmental Change

Publisher Rights Statement:

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 **Human appropriation of land for food: the role of diet**

2 **Abstract**

3 Human appropriation of land for food production has fundamentally altered the Earth system, with
4 impacts on water, soil, air quality, and the climate system. Changes in population, dietary preferences,
5 technology and crop productivity have all played important roles in shaping today's land use. In this
6 paper, we explore how past and present developments in diets impact on global agricultural land use.
7 We introduce an index for the Human Appropriation of Land for Food (HALF), and use it to isolate the
8 effects of diets on agricultural land areas, including the potential consequences of shifts in consumer
9 food preferences. We find that if the global population adopted consumption patterns equivalent to
10 particular current national per capita rates, agricultural land use area requirements could vary over a 14-
11 fold range. Within these variations, the types of food commodities consumed are more important than
12 the quantity of per-capita consumption in determining the agricultural land requirement, largely due to
13 the impact of animal products and in particular ruminant species. Exploration of the average diets in the
14 USA and India (which lie towards but not at global consumption extremes) provides a framework for
15 understanding land use impacts arising from different food consumption habits. Hypothetically, if the
16 world were to adopt the average Indian diet, 55% less agricultural land would be needed to satisfy
17 demand, while global consumption of the average USA diet would necessitate 178% more land. Waste
18 and over-eating are also shown to be important. The area associated with food waste, including over-
19 consumption, given global adoption of the consumption patterns of the average person in the USA, was
20 found to be twice that required for all food production given an average Indian per capita consumption.
21 Therefore, measures to influence future diets and reduce food waste could substantially contribute
22 towards global food security, as well as providing climate change mitigation options.

23

24

25

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Human appropriation of global net primary production (NPP) of vegetation is increasing, and has
3 doubled since 1910 (Krausmann et al., 2013). This is due to rising populations, as well as changes in
4 diets. Diet is linked with wealth (Tilman et al., 2011), urbanisation (Huang and Bouis, 2001; Seto and
5 Ramankutty, 2016; Wu and Wu, 1997), and globalising food commodity markets (Pingali, 2007; Popkin,
6 2006; Yu et al., 2013). These changes, including rising incomes, have seen a concomitant increase in
7 food consumption and shift towards higher rates of consumption of commodities that are more land-
8 intensive to supply; in particular meat and milk (Godfray et al., 2010; Tilman and Clark, 2014;
9 Weinzettel et al., 2013).

10
11 Shifts in diets have become an increasingly important driver for land use change over time (Alexander
12 et al., 2015; Kastner et al., 2012), a process that is likely to continue even as the rate of population
13 growth slows (van Vuuren and Carter, 2014). Although increases in yields and production efficiencies
14 have offset additional demand for food commodities, agricultural land areas have been expanding
15 (FAOSTAT, 2015a). Environmental impacts can occur either through the expansion of agricultural
16 production and consequent loss of a previous land cover, or through the intensification of production,
17 e.g. eutrophication or biodiversity loss (Smith et al., 2013). Land use and the environmental impacts
18 associated with agricultural production are also increasingly displaced from the country of
19 consumption, through international trade of food commodities (Erb et al., 2009; Weinzettel et al., 2013;
20 Yu et al., 2013). Agriculture accounts for around a third of global anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG)
21 emissions, and land-use change alone presently accounts for 10% of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions (Le
22 Quéré et al., 2015). As well as causing environmental issues, dietary transitions have contributed to
23 rising global rates of obesity and increases in associated diseases, e.g. diabetes and heart disease (Hu,
24 2011; Tilman and Clark, 2014).

25
26 Animal products contribute disproportionately low amounts of energy and protein to human diets
27 (respectively 18 and 39 % globally in 2011), relative to their land-use footprint (pasture accounts for
28 approximately 68% of agricultural land, plus around one third of cropland is used for the production of
29 animal feeds (Alexander et al., 2015; FAO, 2006)). However, grassland is a broad category that covers a
30 diverse range of intensities, from intensively managed pasture to extensively used savannahs with little
31 or no inputs of fertiliser or other management, meaning that direct comparisons between different
32 land use areas are difficult. Nonetheless, the expansion of pasture (62% of the expansion in agricultural
33 area from 1961 to 2011 (FAOSTAT, 2015a)), as well as the increasing use of crops for feed,
34 demonstrates the critical importance of animal products as a driver of land use change. Animal
35 products also play a role in water consumption (Jalava et al., 2014), and agricultural GHG emissions not
36 associated with land use change (Tilman and Clark, 2014). The impacts from food production, both of
37 animal products and crops, are exacerbated by losses or inefficiencies that exist at each stage in the
38 production system, from harvesting, through transport and storage, to processing and finally at the
39 consumer (Gustavsson et al., 2011; Parfitt et al., 2010).

40
41 Future food requirements could be met through a combination of increasing production and reducing
42 demand. However, substantial attention has been given to supply-side responses, including expanding
43 land in agricultural use and increasing food yields, especially crops (e.g. closing the 'yield gap' or
44 'sustainable intensification') (Foley et al., 2011; Kastner et al., 2014; Mueller et al., 2012; West et al.,
45 2014); or the potential benefits and trade-offs associated with increasing livestock intensities (Davis et
46 al., 2015; Herrero et al., 2016). Such analyses tend to consider dietary change as an exogenous wealth-
47 based factor, and anticipate continuations of current dietary trends (Engström et al., 2016; Schmitz et
48 al., 2014). However, diets and the food preferences that shape them do not necessarily follow fixed

1 trends. Instead, they alter over time influenced by technology, policies and changes in social norms,
2 e.g. (Hollands et al., 2015). Modelling work has been done to project the impact of alternative
3 assumptions regarding future diets (Bajželj et al., 2014; Haberl et al., 2011; Popp et al., 2010; Stehfest
4 et al., 2009), and the ability of the agricultural system to supply the global population with a diet
5 containing adequate calories has also been considered (Cassidy et al., 2013; Davis et al., 2014). Further
6 studies in this area have taken a life-cycle analysis (LCA) approach that typically consider either GHG
7 emissions, energy or water requirements for individual commodities (Carlsson-Kanyama and González,
8 2009; González et al., 2011; Marlow et al., 2009; Pelletier et al., 2011). However, few studies have
9 quantified the impact of variations in existing diets. Erb *et al.* (2009) considered the impact of current
10 variations in food consumption patterns on agricultural land use, by quantifying trade in the embodied
11 human appropriation of biomass net primary production. But, despite the potential significance of
12 consumer behaviours on land use, no attempt appears to have been made to quantify the land use
13 impacts of existing diets, dissociated from the complicating effect of domestic production and
14 international trade.

15
16 Here, we address this gap by proposing a new index and using it to quantify the land use requirements
17 of diets by country and over time (from 1961 to 2011). The Human Appropriation of Land for Food
18 (HALF) index expresses the land area required for the global population to consume a particular diet, as
19 a percentage of the world land surface. HALF therefore provides a relative measure of the scale of the
20 impacts of alternative diets on land use. Diet here is assumed to include the quantities of commodities
21 lost and wasted after reaching the consumer. The index is calculated from global average production
22 intensities and yields from a baseline year, primarily 2011. HALF is accordingly not predictive, as
23 adaptive responses in production systems that may result from changes in demand are excluded.
24 Rather, the HALF index is a metric that characterises the land use impact of alternative scenarios of
25 dietary patterns. The results can be interpreted in terms of both methods and areas of production,
26 with a given increase in the HALF index implying the same increase in agricultural areas, an equivalent
27 increase in productive efficiency, or some combination of the two.

28

29 **2. Method**

30 FAO country-level panel data for crop areas, production quantities, commodity uses and nutrient values
31 were used to construct the HALF index (FAOSTAT, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2015d, 2015e, 2015f). Global
32 average production values and efficiencies for primary crops, processed commodities and livestock
33 products were used to calculate the agricultural areas needed to meet per capita consumption for each
34 country. The index is expressed as the percentage of the world's land surface required for the global
35 population to adopt each country's diet. All diets are evaluated using the global average production
36 system. Assessments of country average diet do not use production or international trade associated
37 with that country, except as they contribute to the world average. The calculations and assumptions
38 are described in more detail below, with a summary of assumptions available in Table S2.

39

40 *(a) Allocating areas for food commodities*

41 The areas associated with the production of 90 commodities (see Table S3), representing 99.4% of global
42 food consumption by calorific value, were each allocated between three categories of use: food for
43 human consumption, animal feed, and non-food related uses (primarily biofuels and fibre). The
44 commodities comprise 50 primary crops that are directly grown, 32 processed commodities derived from
45 them, and 8 livestock products. The FAO commodity balance data (FAOSTAT, 2015d) identifies the
46 quantities used for food, feed, processing, other non-food related uses (primarily, bioenergy and fibre),
47 seed and waste. To provide an assessment of the embedded areas required for delivering the consumed
48 commodities two adjustments were made. Firstly, for each primary crop, the quantities used as seed

1 and wasted (e.g. in storage and transport) were distributed across the remaining categories of use (i.e.
2 food, feed, processing and non-food). The second adjustment deals with the difference between the
3 total cropland area and the harvested areas (e.g. in 2011, respectively, 1556 Mha and 1378 Mha
4 (FAOSTAT, 2015a, 2015c)) due to set-aside, multiple-cropping, and failed or unharvested crops. To
5 account for these differences, the cropland area for each primary crop was adjusted by the ratio of these
6 areas (e.g. in 2011 areas they are increased by a factor of 1.129). After applying both the adjustments,
7 the cropland area for each primary crop was then allocated pro-rata between the categories of use (i.e.
8 food, feed, processing and non-food), by the mass used for each category. This approach removes the
9 areas used to produce commodities for bioenergy, fibre or other non-food uses. Example calculations
10 are given in the SI Methods.

11
12 The areas used to grow the primary crops for processing were further mapped to the commodities output
13 from the processing. Where multiple commodities are produced from a single crop, the areas used to
14 grow the primary crop were allocated on an approximate economic value basis (Table S4). For example,
15 processed oil crop areas were divided equally between the resulting oil (used primarily for food and
16 biofuel), and the seed meals or cakes (used primarily for livestock feed). In 2011, 224.1 Mt of soybeans,
17 which represent the single biggest vegetable oil crop (48% of the total), were processed globally into 41.6
18 Mt of oil and 174.7 Mt of meal (7.8 Mt is assumed lost during processing). This gives a similar total market
19 value for the oil and meal (45% of value is in the oil and 55% in meal), at 2011 market prices of \$1103/t
20 and \$321/t respectively (Index Mundi, 2016), suggesting that an equal division of input area is a
21 reasonable approximation. Alternative allocations would introduce additional biases. For example,
22 calculations on the basis of mass would be biased towards associating the area with the seed meals, while
23 conversely accounting for them as a by-product with no area allocated would implicitly and incorrectly
24 assume they can be freely produced and have no value.

25
26 *(b) Allocating areas for animal feed and pasture*
27 Animal nutrition derives from grassland and feed crops including forage crops. Data are available to
28 quantify the area of pasture and quantities of crops used as feed (FAOSTAT, 2015a, 2015d). However,
29 there are no empirical data to describe directly how these sources of nutrition are divided between
30 livestock species, and hence between commodity types such as meat, milk and eggs. Instead, feed
31 conversion ratios (FCRs), describing the efficiency of converting inputs into edible animal products, were
32 used to estimate animal feed requirements (Table 1). Commonly, FCRs are expressed in terms of dry
33 matter (DM) of feed per animal live weight (LW). To represent the production efficiency of meat
34 consumed by humans, these ratios were adjusted to express feeding requirements per unit edible weight
35 (EW), and also to account for the need to raise sire and dam animals (Smil, 2002).

36
37 The nutritional requirements of monogastric livestock (i.e. poultry and pigs) were assumed to be met
38 solely from feed, while nutrients for ruminant species (e.g. cattle and sheep) come from feed and
39 grazed pasture. Firstly, the produced masses from monogastric animals were multiplied by the feed
40 conversion factors (Table 1) to give estimates of the feed requirements. These feed amounts, and the
41 cropland areas needed to provide them, were allocated to the monogastric livestock products.
42 Secondly, the remaining feed (23% in 2011 using feed dry matter content (INRA et al., 2016)), and
43 associated cropland areas were allocated *pro rata* by the estimated feed requirements across the
44 ruminant products. The same *pro rata* allocation was used to associate the pasture area with products
45 derived from ruminant animals. See SI Methods for a worked example.

46

1 *Table 1. Global average feed conversion ratios and efficiencies for animal products. The feed*
 2 *conversion efficiencies and direct energy for housing are given for reference, and are not used in the*
 3 *analysis.*

Animal product	Feed conversion ratio (kg DM feed/kg EW)	Percentage edible (% EW of LW)	Energy feed conversion efficiency (%)	Protein feed conversion efficiency (%)	Direct energy for housing or processing (MJ / kg EW)	Data source
Poultry	3.3	70	13	19.6	4.5	(Macleod et al., 2013; Smil, 2013)
Pork	6.4	55	8.6	8.5	1.8	(Macleod et al., 2013; Smil, 2013)
Beef	25	40	1.9	3.8	0.08	(Opio et al., 2013; Smil, 2013)
Other meat *	15	55	4.4	6.3	0.09	(Opio et al., 2013; Smil, 2013)
Eggs	2.3	-	19	25	1.3	(Macleod et al., 2013; Smil, 2013)
Whole Milk	0.7	-	24	24	0.22	(Little, 2014; Opio et al., 2013)
Notes: * The 'other meats' category, which forms 6.6% of all meats produced in 2011, is based on sheep and goat meat (65% by mass of 'other meat' in 2011), but includes other sources of meats, e.g. horse, rabbit and camelids.						

4
 5 *(c) Assessing the land use impact of different diets*
 6 The average consumption per capita and per commodity were calculated globally and nationally
 7 (FAOSTAT, 2015b, 2015d). The area required to produce each commodity was determined from the
 8 global production system land use allocations (described above). The area needed to provide all the
 9 commodities for each country's diet if it were adopted by the global population could then be
 10 calculated (FAOSTAT, 2015g). This was expressed as a proportion of total global land area to obtain the
 11 Human Appropriation of Land for Food (HALF) value. HALF values were also calculated to quantify the
 12 land use impacts of changes in country-level diets over time. The values primarily used here were
 13 calculated with variable diet only, and a constant baseline population and production system (2011 was
 14 chosen as the most recent year with available values (FAOSTAT, 2015d)).

15
 16 National land footprints for food, i.e. an estimate of the actual agricultural land area used supply to
 17 each country's food, were also calculated based on domestic production and the land displaced
 18 through international trade. This used the same data as the HALF calculation, and accounted for
 19 imports and exports following the approach of previous studies (Alexander et al., 2015; Jalava et al.,
 20 2014). For each commodity, net exports were included using the domestic production yields, and net
 21 imports using the global mean yields of net exports (weighed by net export quantities). The country
 22 footprints were expressed as an area per capita using country populations (FAOSTAT, 2015g).
 23 Expressing as a fraction of global land area required for the global population, to match HALF values,
 24 could not be justified as the land footprints are country specific (e.g. in climate and soil).

25

1 *(d) Decomposing dietary changes into quantities consumed and commodity profiles*


2 The impacts of potential shifts in diets from the 2011 global baseline to that of a particular country was
3 decomposed into two parts. The first part represents a shift in the total quantity of nutrients consumed
4 while holding the proportional contribution of each commodity constant. The second part represents a
5 shift in the ratio or profile of commodities consumed, while holding the total nutrient level constant.
6 These two parts were expressed both in protein and energy terms, with nutritional values by mass for
7 each commodity derived from global FAO food supply data (FAOSTAT, 2015e, 2015f). For example, the
8 average energy consumed per capita globally is 11.9 MJ/person/day, while in the USA the average is
9 16.6 MJ/person/day, i.e. 40% more. Therefore, if the current global profile commodities remained
10 unchanged, but the energy consumed increased to that of the USA, 40% more land would be required
11 for production, in the absence of production intensification. This is reflected in a 40% increase in HALF.
12 However, consumption in the USA also differs in the relative profile of the different commodities
13 consumed. These differences also have an effect on the land required, evaluated without the influence
14 of the quantity differences in the 'profile' type.
15

16 **3. Results**

17 *(a) Global and country-level HALF*

18 The total agricultural area used for human food production was 4484 Mha in 2011, of which 871 Mha
19 was used for cropland for human consumption, and 3700 Mha for animal products (497 Mha of
20 cropland for feed and 3203 Mha of pasture). The remaining cropland was used for biofuels (140 Mha),
21 fibre (33 Mha), feed for non-food uses of animal products (9 Mha), and net variations in stock levels (7
22 Mha). Expressed as a percentage of the global land surface (13,009 Mha (FAOSTAT, 2015a)) the Human
23 Appropriation of Land for Food (HALF) index is 35.1, or an average area per person of 0.65 ha.
24 Expressing HALF as a percentage of global land surface includes land that is unlikely to be suitable for
25 agriculture, e.g. ice-covered or desert areas. However, the use of an estimate of suitable land suffers
26 from difficulty in definition and measurement, and also would vary with climate change. Consequently,
27 the clarity of comparing to the global land surface was preferred.
28

29 There are large differences in HALF values between country-level average diets. For example, the
30 global adoption of the diet in the USA would require over 6 times the agricultural area that adoption of
31 the diet in India, with a HALF index of 97.7 compared to India's 15.8. Figure 1 shows the HALF index at
32 2011 for the average diets of 170 countries for which sufficient data were available (Table S5). The
33 highest HALF values are for diets in New Zealand, Argentina and Australia at 135.8, 114.9 and 112.2
34 respectively, due to the high levels of animal products – particularly beef - consumed. At the other
35 extreme are Mozambique, Liberia, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka all with a HALF index below 11.5, i.e. less
36 than a third of the global average.
37




1
 2 *Figure 1. Map of HALF index for average country-level diets in 2011. Countries where the index could*
 3 *not be calculated due to no commodity consumption data being available (FAOSTAT, 2015d), e.g. Libya,*
 4 *Somalia and Greenland, are shown in light grey.*

5
 6 The HALF results use global mean production efficiencies, and so no specific account is taken of
 7 domestic (national) production except as it contributes to the world average. The national food
 8 footprints (Figure S1) include aspects of diet and production within them, whereas HALF (Figure 1) only
 9 includes variations in diet. The distribution of these national footprints differ from the distribution of
 10 HALF values as a result (e.g. Mongolia has a per capita footprint 3 times greater than any other country
 11 (39 ha/person), due to the use of extensive grazing). Many developed countries have a lower land use
 12 footprint than implied by the HALF index, due to the high agricultural yields in these countries. For
 13 example, the USA was found to have a national food footprint of 1.0 ha/person, but a HALF of 1.8
 14 ha/person. The first value addresses, “how much land is used to produce the food consumed in the
 15 USA?”, and the second “how much land would be used if the global population adopted the average
 16 diet in the USA”. The inclusion of production systems within the land footprint to some degree
 17 obscures the understanding of the role of diet in the global food system. HALF, therefore, provides
 18 both a clearer comparative metric between countries of the land requirements of different diets, and
 19 also a way to consider the impacts from changes in dietary patterns.

20
 21 *(b) Temporal trends*
 22 Calculating the time-dependent HALF index for dietary variations only, i.e. assuming a constant 2011
 23 population and production systems, demonstrates the impacts of changes in food consumption
 24 patterns (solid lines in Figure 2). The global agricultural land required has increased by 8.7% due to
 25 dietary changes, from a HALF value of 32.3 in 1961 to 35.1 in 2011. For country-level average diets,
 26 results for Brazil and China show particularly substantial increases, due to the transitions in diets that
 27 are associated with increasing per capita wealth (Godfray et al., 2010), as well as the influence of
 28 urbanisation (Dong and Fuller, 2010; Huang and David, 1993; Popkin et al., 1999; Seto and Ramankutty,
 29 2016) and globalisation of food markets (Meyfroidt et al., 2013; Popkin, 2006). The land required for
 30 the diet in Brazil more than doubled between 1961 and 2011, from 43.5 to 88.2, making it the eleventh
 31 highest ranked country globally in 2011. However, the Chinese diet’s HALF increased nearly 5-times,
 32 from 6.0 in 1961 (the lowest at that period), to 28.6 (but still below the global average). The gap

1 between the USA and Indian diets has reduced slightly, from the USA value being 7.5 times the Indian
 2 value in 1961 to 6.2 times in 2011, with an 8% reduction in the USA and a 11% increase for the Indian
 3 diet.
 4



5
 6 *Figure 2. HALF index from 1961 to 2011, globally and for selected counties. Solid lines show variable*
 7 *diets, but constant population and agricultural production systems (at 2011 values). Dashed lines show*
 8 *variable diet, population and agricultural production systems over time.*


9
 10 When the time-dependent HALF indices are re-calculated to take account of changing production
 11 efficiencies and population sizes (Figure 2, dashed lines), they show a high degree of similarity to the
 12 diet-only case (Figure 2, solid lines). This is because increasing agricultural efficiencies and population
 13 growth in the past have acted in opposite directions on land requirements, largely offsetting one
 14 another. If production efficiencies from 2011 had been available and used in 1961, less than half of the
 15 agricultural land used at the time would have been required to feed the population at the time (Figure
 16 S2, dot-dashed line). However, populations have more than doubled since 1961, and therefore the
 17 2011 population would have required more than twice the land for food production based on 1961
 18 production systems (Figure S2, dotted line). The net effect is that if the mean global diet of 1961 had
 19 been consumed by the 2011 population, using 2011 production systems, agricultural land area would
 20 have remained largely unchanged from 1961 (just 5 Mha less land is estimated to have been needed
 21 than was used in 1961). When HALF values including variation in the production system and population
 22 (dashed lines in Figure 2) are lower than the HALF values for dietary changes only (solid lines), then
 23 cumulative improvements in agricultural efficiencies achieved by 2011 have not fully offset the rise in
 24 population. However, diets have also been changing. Dietary changes alone between 1961 and 2011
 25 has caused the agricultural area for food to increase by 368 Mha or 2.8% of the land surface. HALF has
 26 increased less than the 464 Mha expansion of global agricultural land since 1961 (FAOSTAT, 2015a), as

1 an increasing proportion of land is used for non-food uses of agricultural commodities, i.e. feedstocks
2 for biofuels.

3

4 The central role of the types of foods consumed in determining the agricultural land requirements of
5 different diets, compared to the overall quantity of nutrients consumed, can be seen from the calculated
6 energy intake and the percentage derived from animal products (Figure 3). Variation in total food energy
7 consumed between countries and over time is substantially smaller than the variations in the land
8 needed (Figure 3 & Figure S2). In 2011, the per capita land required to sustain a USA diet was 635% of
9 that required for an Indian diet, even though the energy content of the food was only 65% greater (or
10 99% greater in terms of protein; see Figure S3). This disparity stems from the profile of commodities
11 consumed, with 30% of energy derived from animal products in the USA and 9% in India (65% and 19%
12 respectively for protein). This greater proportion of animal products increases the land requirements in
13 comparison to a predominantly vegetarian diet, e.g. as in India.

14



15

16 *Figure 3. Mean energy per capita, a), and percentage energy derived from animal products, b), in foods*
17 *consumed from 1961 to 2011 globally, and for selected countries, using global average nutritional*
18 *values (FAOSTAT, 2015e, 2015f). This includes commodities wasted after reaching the consumer, but*
19 *not in the food supply chain.*


20

21 In developed countries such as the USA and the UK, per capita dietary land requirements have been
22 falling (Figure 2) even while energy and protein consumption continue to rise (Figure 3a & Figure S3a).
23 This apparent discrepancy is explained by the fall in the proportion of nutrients from animal products
24 (Figure 3b & Figure S3b), and a shift in the mix of animal products consumed (Figure 4). The drop in the
25 proportion of nutrients from animal products is in large part due to the increased consumption of vegetal
26 products, particularly vegetal oil, e.g. soybean oil. For example, in the USA vegetal oils provided 9.6% of
27 calories in 1961, but this expanded to 19.2% by 2011 (14.5% from soya bean oil alone). Consumption of
28 these oils accounts for over half (55%) of the 3.2 MJ/person/day increase in energy consumed in the USA,
29 with other sweeteners (i.e. corn syrup) and poultry meat respectively accounting for 26% and 18% of the
30 rise.

31

32 The relative quantities of different animal products consumed changes over time, influencing the HALF
33 results. The effects of this are evident in the results for China, where since 1961 the proportion of

1 nutrients derived from animal products has increased towards that found in developed countries (Figure
 2 3), but the HALF values have converged more slowly (Figure 2). The energy and protein intake and the
 3 percentages derived from animals are all higher than the global averages in China in 2011 (Figure 3 &
 4 Figure S3). Nonetheless, the HALF is lower in China compared to its global value (Figure 2). This is due
 5 to the high rates of consumption of the commodities derived from monogastric animals (Figure 4), which
 6 have lower feed conversion ratios and lower land requirements in comparison to ruminants, although
 7 direct energy inputs are higher (Table 1). For example, the average diet in China contained around half
 8 the global average amount of beef (53%), but more than twice that of pork (239%). The rise in global
 9 HALF (8.5%) is also modest (Figure 2), given the rise in nutrients (28% rise in energy and protein) and the
 10 proportions derived from animals (increased by 11% for energy and 25% for protein). Again this can be
 11 understood by reference to the changes in the relative quantities of meats consumed (Figure 4). Global
 12 consumption per capita of bovine meat has been broadly constant, while poultry and pig meat have seen
 13 substantial rises, with 399% and 91% increases respectively from 1961 to 2011. Global average per capita
 14 consumption of beef is now less than pork and poultry in mass, energy and protein.
 15



16
 17 *Figure 4. Per capita daily rates of bovine, pig and poultry meat consumption from 1961 to 2011. Data*
 18 *source: (FAOSTAT, 2015e).*

19
 20 *(c) Alternative diet scenarios*


21 Changes in diets and dietary impacts on land use are uncertain and are influenced by multiple factors,
 22 both economic and environmental. Two contrasting alternative scenario were used as exemplars to
 23 analyse the impacts of diet on global agricultural land use; the global adoption of the current diets of
 24 India and the USA. Although these countries are not the most extreme cases, they are major
 25 economies, with large populations, in which diets lie close to the lowest and highest land use
 26 requirements respectively (of the 170 countries included, India has the 13th lowest HALF value and the
 27 USA has the 6th highest, Table S5). Consideration of the adoption of these diets by the global
 28 population therefore provides a broad envelope within which human appropriation of land for food is
 29 likely to vary, but these are intended to be illustrative rather than represent equally plausible
 30 alternative futures. The net change in land use from a shift in global diet was decomposed into two
 31 parts; one considering a change in the quantity of nutrients consumed, and a second the profile of
 32 commodities consumed. The profile of commodities (i.e. the sources from which nutrients are derived)
 33 was found to have a greater impact on land use than the quantities of nutrients consumed, in the
 34 dietary transitions considered (

1
 2 Table 2). For both dietary scenarios, changes in quantities and profiles act in the same direction,
 3 intensifying the overall impact.
 4

5 *Table 2. Changes in HALF from transitions of average global diet to that of India or the USA in 2011,*
 6 *divided into the impact from quantity of consumption ('quantity') and the types of commodities*
 7 *consumed ('profile'). For the quantity and profile cases, the change in areas are calculated based on*
 8 *providing the same energy and protein as current consumption. The overall type includes changes in*
 9 *quantities and profile of foods consumed, and by definition $(1+\text{overall change rate}) = (1+\text{profile change}$*
 10 *rate) * $(1+\text{quantity change rate})$, in terms of energy or protein. A single "overall" row is given for each*
 11 *dietary scenario, as this is equal in both nutrient terms.*

Dietary scenario country	Type and nutrient basis	Cropland area for food change (%)	Total cropland area change (%)	Livestock (feed & pasture) area change (%)	Agricultural area change (%)
India	Profile: Energy	+13	-22	-61	-47
India	Profile: Protein	+27	-12	-56	-40
India	Quantity: Energy	-16			
India	Quantity: Protein	-25			
India	Overall	-5	-34	-67	-55
USA	Profile: Energy	-11	+21	+122	+97
USA	Profile: Protein	-17	+13	+109	+85
USA	Quantity: Energy	+41			
USA	Quantity: Protein	+50			
USA	Overall	+25	+71	+214	+178

12
 13 The impact of contrasting diets is much larger for the livestock area compared to cropland area used for
 14 food for human consumption. A more than 3-fold increase is required in livestock area (pasture and
 15 cropland for feed) under the USA diet scenario, increasing HALF by 178%. This area is needed both to
 16 support the increased quantities of nutrients consumed and the changes in dietary profile towards a
 17 greater proportion of animal products. Conversely, the lower overall consumption and the lower
 18 proportion from animal products in India suggests the livestock area would drop to less than a third of
 19 the current area, and reduce the overall HALF by 55%. The changes in cropland required to produce
 20 food for human consumption are comparatively modest with both the Indian and USA diets, with a 4%
 21 fall and a 21% rise respectively. The profile of the Indian diet is weighted towards vegetal crops, but
 22 the impact of this is offset by the lower level of nutrient intake overall. The opposite is the case for the
 23 average diet in America, with lower emphasis on crops, but higher overall consumption. Figure 5 shows
 24 the 2011 HALF index values for these scenarios, with cropland (for food and feed) and pasture
 25 identified separately.
 26



1
 2 *Figure 5. Cropland and pasture required to produce food under alternative dietary scenarios, expressed*
 3 *as required percentage of world land, or HALF index, using global 2011 population and production*
 4 *systems. For each scenario (from*

5
 6 *Table 2) the case are shown that provides at least equal amounts of both energy and protein, e.g. the*
 7 *protein case is shown for the Indian diet profile, as the energy case provides insufficient protein.*

8
 9 **4. Discussion**

10 *(a) Comparisons to previous studies*

11 The results show that global adoption of diets already consumed by hundreds of millions of people
 12 could lead to a magnitude of change greater than a doubling or halving of current agricultural land area.
 13 There have been few previous studies that have quantified the impact of such substantial shifts in diets
 14 on agricultural land areas. Stehfest *et al.* (2009) is one example, where dietary scenarios for 2050 are
 15 considered, including a ‘healthy diet’ (low rates of ruminant meat and pork and moderate poultry and
 16 consumption) and a no-meat diet. The current diet in India falls between these scenarios (i.e. rates of
 17 animal product consumption are lower than the Stehfest *et al.* ‘healthy diet’, but higher than the no-
 18 meat diet), and likewise the land use results found here lie between those of Stehfest *et al.* (2009). The
 19 impact of a ‘healthy diet’ was also considered in Bajželj *et al.* (2014), and showed a somewhat lower
 20 drop of 32% in pasture areas in 2050 compared to the authors’ business-as-usual scenario. The few
 21 studies published to date have shown that shifts in dietary preferences have a substantial impact not
 22 only on agricultural land use, but also on externalities such as GHG emissions and bioenergy potential
 23 (Haberl *et al.*, 2011; Popp *et al.*, 2010). Further studies that do not include land use change have also
 24 shown substantial GHG emissions implications from alternative diets, e.g. a 55% reduction from a
 25 vegetarian diet (Tilman and Clark, 2014). Considering the trade-offs between land for bioenergy
 26 production or afforestation (Williamson, 2016), reducing agricultural GHG emissions and meeting the
 27 food requirements of a growing population, a greater focus is justified in examining demand side
 28 measures, including waste reduction (Smith and Gregory, 2013).

29

1 The impact of global dietary changes since 1961 found here (Figure 2) is lower than that previously
2 published (Alexander et al., 2015). The differences arise primarily from the alternative approaches to
3 allocating areas of monogastrics livestock. In Alexander *et al.* (2015) poultry and pigs were allocated a
4 proportion of pasture area, which increases the land use associated with these products, and conversely
5 reduces the ruminant products' footprint. However, monogastrics' nutrient requirements are met from
6 feed, while ruminants can also consume grass-based forage (Bellarby et al., 2013; Schader et al., 2015).
7 Therefore, in this study a more accurate assumption was made where only ruminants are allocated a
8 proportion of pasture area. As dietary changes have included larger increases in monogastrics (than
9 ruminant) derived productions (Figure 4) the resulting bias in Alexander *et al.* (2015) associates dietary
10 change with a greater land use impact than that found here. In 2011, 37.8% of the world surface was
11 used for agricultural purposes (FAOSTAT, 2015a), and here 34.5% was found to be associated with food
12 production. The difference between these rates is due to the other non-food uses of agricultural
13 commodities, such as bioenergy and fibre (Alexander et al., 2015; Rulli et al., 2016).

14

15 *(b) Uncertainties in the analysis*

16 The results presented are derived under a set of assumptions with related uncertainties. Domestic
17 consumption is assumed to be supplied from the global production system. For example, countries
18 where grass-fed beef production systems predominate are treated identically to countries where
19 housed or feed-based systems are more common, as all use global average values. The distribution of
20 high HALF index values (Figure 1), appear to be associated with countries with substantial grassland
21 areas and high levels of beef production. This is not due directly to the production system, but to
22 these countries having high levels of beef consumption. The same effect occurs with vegetal
23 commodities, where countries with high production intensities and yields are assigned the same global
24 average as lower-yielding countries. Consequently, in countries with above-average yields, the HALF
25 areas associated with growing that crop would be higher than domestic production implies. The
26 national agricultural land footprints (Figure S1), gives the results of a similar calculation, but based on
27 domestic production and accounting for international trade (rather than a global average). Given the
28 research aims, we believe the approach of using a global average production systems is reasonable
29 because of the global scale of the analysis (considering global adoption of alternative diets), and also
30 because of the levels of international trade in agricultural commodities and the associated globalised
31 markets (D'Odorico et al., 2014; Fader et al., 2013; Meyfroidt et al., 2013). Most importantly, the
32 approach allows the impact of variations in diets to be quantified without the obscuring influence of
33 differences in the production system.

34

35 The disaggregation of feed by animal products uses the feed requirements calculated from feed
36 conversion ratios (FCR; Table 1). FCR are difficult to estimate, and have been the subject of
37 misrepresentation by both sides of the sustainability - meat consumption debate (Fairlie, 2010). The FCRs
38 used here are for the global average production, derived in FAO studies (Macleod et al., 2013; Opio et
39 al., 2013). While some uncertainty in FCRs remains, changes in the ratios only affect the disaggregation
40 of the global pasture and feed areas between animal products. Biases introduced by inaccurate FCRs will
41 cancel out in the baseline case. When alternative consumption profiles are considered they may not
42 perfectly cancel out, and result in a residual bias in the required land areas calculated. This is likely to be
43 small relative to the scale of the overall effects shown, due in part to the offsetting between animal
44 products. As a check on the accuracy of the FCRs used, the allocation of feed between monogastric animal
45 and ruminants was compared against the results of a survey of the feed use from 134 countries (Alltech,
46 2013). This survey showed that 26% of total feed use was for ruminants in 2012, while 23% of feed was
47 calculated as used for ruminants in 2011 in the results presented here. The level of agreement between
48 these values gives additional confidence in the FCR rates used.

49

1 (c) *Obesity, malnutrition and waste*

2 The findings presented here are based on the average food reaching consumers rather than human
3 nutritional requirements, and it is important to consider the extent to which these differ within a
4 population. Distinctions arise due to over-eating and, conversely, malnutrition, through waste of food
5 by consumers (Eshel and Martin, 2006), and also inequalities in distribution (Porkka et al., 2013). Losses
6 and waste occur at each stage of the food supply chain, with overall food waste, accounting for losses in
7 production and at the consumer, estimated to be around 25-40% of total food production (Godfray et
8 al., 2010; Kummu et al., 2012). HALF values include losses both in the production system (e.g.
9 unharvested crops and losses in storage, transportation, and processing) and at the consumer.
10 Production system losses are derived from the global production efficiencies, and therefore are
11 considered only as a global average. By contrast, food waste by consumers are included at a country
12 specific level, as this is included in the FAO commodity balance data used (FAOSTAT, 2015d).
13 Consequentially, the HALF index includes (but does not separately identify) the variations in the rates of
14 per capita food waste by consumers. 95-115 kg/year of food has been estimated to be wasted per capita
15 after reaching the consumer in Europe and North-America, while in sub-Saharan Africa and
16 South/Southeast Asia this is only 6-11 kg/year (Gustavsson et al., 2011), which equates to 9-12% and 1-
17 3% of food delivered to consumers respectively. Applying the mean values of these rates for USA and
18 India suggests that the HALF values for consumer wastes alone is 10.3 and 0.3, respectively.

19
20 The protein requirement of adult men and women depends on body weight. For an average body weight
21 of 60kg, 50 g/day of protein is the minimum safe limit (WHO et al., 2007). No country with a population
22 of more than 20 million currently falls below this limit, although several smaller countries consume 40-
23 50 g/person/day, i.e. Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Zambia and
24 Zimbabwe. The energy requirements also vary by sex, weight and the level of physical activity. For
25 instance, average energy requirements for the population of UK adult females and males, are respectively
26 8.7 MJ/day (2079 kcal/day) and 10.9 MJ/day (2605 kcal/day) (SACN, 2011). To compare with the
27 calculated energy in-takes, we assume the mean energy requirement value is 9.8 MJ/person/day (2342
28 kcal/person/day). This value is somewhat higher than the 2100 kcal/person/day energy intake used in
29 some previous studies (Eshel and Martin, 2006; Kummu et al., 2012), and likely to exceed the in-take
30 needed to avoid hunger or malnutrition (WFP, 2016). The average Indian consumption appears close to
31 the population's energy requirements, given the relatively low levels of consumer waste in South &
32 Southeast Asia (Gustavsson et al., 2011), just 1% more, assuming 2% food is discarded.

33
34 Even if there is sufficient food to avoid malnutrition within a country or region, this does not mean that
35 these foods are distributed equitably. Globally, 37% of men and 38% of women were overweight in 2014
36 (Ng et al., 2014), while approximately 12% of people were undernourished between 2010 and 2012 (FAO
37 et al., 2015). The populations living in countries with critically low food supply (<2000 kcal/cap/d) has
38 also been dropping over time, from 52% in 1965 to 3% in 2005 (Porkka et al., 2013). In India (ranked 25th
39 worst in the 2015 Global Hunger Index Report (Grebmer et al., 2015)) 20% of the population are over-
40 weight (including nearly 5% obese) and 15% undernourished (FAO et al., 2015; Ng et al., 2014), while the
41 for adults in the USA 66% are over-weight, including 33% obese (Ng et al., 2014). Given there are three-
42 times more overweight people than undernourished, and that levels of malnutrition have been declining
43 over recent years, better national and international distribution of food is more relevant to achieving
44 global food security than additional production.

45
46 The USA per capita energy consumption is 16.6 MJ/day, which suggests that 41% of food (in energy terms)
47 is either due to overeating or consumer waste (34% of energy intake is in excess of requirements,
48 assuming 10.5% food waste (Gustavsson et al., 2011)). This is in line with a previous finding, showing
49 that in the USA, overeating and food discarded by consumers accounted for 44% of food distributed to

1 consumers (Eshel and Martin, 2006). The results suggest that under the global adoption of USA consumer
2 behaviours the land required to produce the food wasted by consumers (including over-consumption),
3 would be sufficient to provide more than twice the entire food requirements assuming adoption of Indian
4 consumption patterns.

6 *(d) Plausibility of dietary scenarios*

7 Two contrasting scenarios were used to examine how changes in food consumption preferences and
8 behaviours might affect agricultural commodity demand and land use. These scenarios explore the
9 consequences of a wide range of consumption patterns, but do not represent equally plausible future
10 states. The first scenario considers the average global diet transitioning to the current average USA diet.
11 Although this (time-independent) scenario is unlikely in the short term, consumption patterns have been
12 shifting in this direction, due to increases in per capita incomes in developing countries (e.g. China and
13 Brazil), rural-urban migration and globalisation, leading to more overall per capita food consumption, and
14 a greater percentage consumption of animal products (Lambin and Meyfroidt, 2011; Seto and
15 Ramankutty, 2016; Tilman et al., 2011). However, a substantial gap in consumption patterns remains
16 between countries, with the US diet requiring 2.8 times the land area of the global average diet, and 3.4
17 times that of the Chinese diet. Consequently, given current yields and production systems, it would
18 clearly not be possible for the world's population to consume food as in the US; indeed, this would require
19 98% of all land, including snow-cover and deserts. Apart from being physically impossible, changes to
20 approach this level of consumption would also generate strong market signals that would act to increase
21 the price of food, suppress demand and intensify production practices (additional inputs, e.g. irrigation
22 water, fertiliser or labour, leading to higher yield). Conversely, if more land were to be used for
23 agriculture, suitable land would become more scarce, and the additional land would tend to be of lower
24 quality and produce lower yields, leading to a greater area requirements (Lambin and Meyfroidt, 2011).
25 Price signals may be particularly large for the less efficient and potentially costlier commodities, e.g. beef.
26 Arguably, these impacts are already evident, with a shift towards chicken and away from beef (Figure 4)
27 supported by intensification of chicken production and the associated efficiency increases (Havenstein,
28 2006).

29
30 The contrasting scenario considers the global diet becoming equivalent to the average diet of India. This
31 is more plausible from an environmental and agricultural system viewpoint. However, it implies shifts in
32 consumption that are the opposite of the global consumption trends that have occurred over previous
33 decades, as per capita incomes have increased in developing countries. A reversal of these trends would
34 either require a substantial shift in consumer preferences (towards the consumption of vegetal crops,
35 e.g. higher rates of vegetarianism), or a catastrophic global economic collapse reducing per capita
36 incomes, particularly in wealthier countries. Changes in food preferences may be achievable through
37 either behavioural or economic approaches. For example, less food is consumed when people are
38 offered smaller-sized portions, packages or tableware than when offered larger-sized versions, leading
39 to the possibility of policies to reduce consumption (Hollands et al., 2015). Economic approaches such
40 as taxes (e.g. a fat tax or a tax on sugar-sweetened beverages) and subsidies (e.g. on fruit and vegetables)
41 could be used to provide fiscal incentives to change behaviours (Thow et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2012).
42 However, the effectiveness of taxation and subsidies alone to alter diets, without other policies that
43 target a number of different levels within society, has been questioned (Tiffin and Arnoult, 2011).

45 **5. Conclusions**

46 Dramatically different requirements for land for food production could arise depending on the course of
47 dietary change – both in terms of quantity of food consumed per person, but more importantly in terms
48 of the mix of food commodities. A wide range of human appropriation of land for food was found based

1 on global adoption of current country-level average diets, far wider than the divergence in energy or
2 protein in-takes, with the difference due to the types of commodities in each diet, and in particular the
3 level of ruminant animal products. For example, if the diets of India or the USA were adopted globally
4 the impact from the change in the mix of commodities would be about twice that from the quantities
5 consumed. What we individually eat (or even waste), rather than how much, appears to be more
6 important for agricultural land requirements. However, waste and over-eating are still important issues,
7 with the results suggesting that the land required to produce the food wasted by consumers (including
8 over-consumption) given USA consumption, could provide more than twice the food required under
9 adoption of Indian consumption patterns.

10
11 Shifts toward diets of Western countries, exemplified here by the average diet in the USA, for the global
12 population are not sustainable or desirable for environmental and health reasons (Tilman and Clark,
13 2014). Given the possibility that intensification alone may be insufficient to satisfy changes in dietary
14 preferences and population growth, other methods of avoiding increases in agricultural areas are
15 needed to target consumer behaviours or preferences. Behavioural and economic mechanisms need to
16 be better understood to establish how more equitable, healthy and environmentally benign food
17 consumption can be achieved.

18 19 **6. References**

- 20 Alexander, P., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Dislich, C., Dodson, J.R., et al., 2015. Drivers for global agricultural
21 land use change: The nexus of diet, population, yield and bioenergy. *Global Environmental Change*
22 35, 138–147. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.08.011
- 23 Alltech, 2013. *Global Feed Summary*. Alltech, Nicholasville, Kentucky, USA.
- 24 Bajželj, B., Richards, K.S., Allwood, J.M., Smith, P., et al., 2014. Importance of food-demand
25 management for climate mitigation. *Nature Climate Change* 4, 924–929.
26 doi:10.1038/nclimate2353
- 27 Bellarby, J., Tirado, R., Leip, A., Weiss, F., et al., 2013. Livestock greenhouse gas emissions and
28 mitigation potential in Europe. *Global Change Biology* 19, 3–18. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
29 2486.2012.02786.x
- 30 Carlsson-Kanyama, A., González, A.D., 2009. Potential contributions of food consumption patterns to
31 climate change. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 89, 1704S–1709S.
32 doi:10.3945/ajcn.2009.26736AA.1704S
- 33 Cassidy, E.S., West, P.C., Gerber, J.S., Foley, J. a, 2013. Redefining agricultural yields: from tonnes to
34 people nourished per hectare. *Environmental Research Letters* 8, 34015. doi:10.1088/1748-
35 9326/8/3/034015
- 36 D’Odorico, P., Carr, J. a., Laio, F., Ridolfi, L., Vandoni, S., 2014. Feeding humanity through global food
37 trade. *Earth’s Future* 2, 458–469. doi:10.1002/2014EF000250
- 38 Davis, K.F., Odorico, P.D., Rulli, M.C., 2014. Moderating diets to feed the future. *Earth’s Future* 2, 559–
39 565. doi:10.1002/2014EF000254.Received
- 40 Davis, K.F., Yu, K., Herrero, M., Havlik, P., et al., 2015. Historical trade-offs of livestock’s environmental
41 impacts. *Environmental Research Letters* 10, 125013. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/12/125013
- 42 Dong, F., Fuller, F., 2010. Dietary structural change in China’s cities: Empirical fact or urban legend?
43 *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 58, 73–91. doi:10.1111/j.1744-7976.2009.01159.x
- 44 Engström, K., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Murray-Rust, D., Hardacre, C., et al., 2016. Applying Occam’s Razor to
45 global agricultural land use change. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 75, 212–229.
46 doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.10.015
- 47 Erb, K.-H., Krausmann, F., Lucht, W., Haberl, H., 2009. Embodied HANPP: Mapping the spatial
48 disconnect between global biomass production and consumption. *Ecological Economics* 69, 328–
49 334. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.06.025
- 50 Eshel, G., Martin, P.A., 2006. Diet , Energy , and Global Warming. *Earth Interactions* 10, 1–17.

1 Fader, M., Gerten, D., Krause, M., Lucht, W., Cramer, W., 2013. Spatial decoupling of agricultural
2 production and consumption: quantifying dependences of countries on food imports due to
3 domestic land and water constraints. *Environmental Research Letters* 8, 14046. doi:10.1088/1748-
4 9326/8/1/014046

5 Fairlie, S., 2010. *Meat: A benign extravagance*. Permanent Publications, East Meon, Hampshire, UK.

6 FAO, 2006. *Livestock's long shadow - environmental issues and options*. Food and Agriculture
7 Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy. doi:10.1007/s10666-008-9149-3

8 FAO, IFAD, WFP, 2015. *The State of Food Insecurity in the World: Meeting the 2015 international
9 hunger targets: taking stock of uneven progress*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
10 Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy. doi:14646E/1/05.15

11 FAOSTAT, 2015a. *Resources/Land (2015-12-16)*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
12 Nations, Rome, Italy.

13 FAOSTAT, 2015b. *Commodity Balances/Livestock and Fish Primary Equivalent (2015-12-16)*. Food and
14 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.

15 FAOSTAT, 2015c. *Production/Crops (2015-12-16)*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
16 Nations, Rome, Italy.

17 FAOSTAT, 2015d. *Commodity Balances/Crops Primary Equivalent (2015-12-16)*. Food and Agriculture
18 Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.

19 FAOSTAT, 2015e. *Food Supply - Livestock and Fish Primary Equivalent (2015-12-16)*. Food and
20 Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.

21 FAOSTAT, 2015f. *Food Supply - Crops Primary Equivalent (2015-12-16)*. Food and Agriculture
22 Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.

23 FAOSTAT, 2015g. *Population/Annual time series (2015-12-16)*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the
24 United Nations, Rome, Italy.

25 FAOSTAT, 2015h. *Production/Livestock Primary (2015-12-16)*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the
26 United Nations, Rome, Italy.

27 Foley, J.A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K.A., Cassidy, E.S., et al., 2011. Solutions for a cultivated planet.
28 *Nature* 478, 337–42. doi:10.1038/nature10452

29 Godfray, H.C.J., Beddington, J.R., Crute, I.R., Haddad, L., et al., 2010. Food security: the challenge of
30 feeding 9 billion people. *Science (New York, NY)* 327, 812–8. doi:10.1126/science.1185383

31 González, A.D., Frostell, B., Carlsson-Kanyama, A., 2011. Protein efficiency per unit energy and per unit
32 greenhouse gas emissions: Potential contribution of diet choices to climate change mitigation.
33 *Food Policy* 36, 562–570. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2011.07.003

34 Grebmer, K. von, Bernstein, J., Prasai, N., Yin, S., Yohannes, Y., 2015. *2015 Global Hunger Index*.
35 International Food Policy Research Institute, Bonn, Washington, DC, and Dublin.

36 Gustavsson, J., Cederberg, C., Sonesson, U., Otterdijk, R. van, Meybeck, A., 2011. *Global food losses and
37 food waste—Extent, causes and prevention*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
38 Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy.

39 Haberl, H., Erb, K.H., Krausmann, F., Bondeau, A., et al., 2011. Global bioenergy potentials from
40 agricultural land in 2050: Sensitivity to climate change, diets and yields. *Biomass and Bioenergy*
41 35, 4753–4769. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2011.04.035

42 Havenstein, G.B., 2006. Performance changes in poultry and livestock following 50 years of genetic
43 selection. *Lohmann Information* 41, 30–37.

44 Herrero, M., Conant, R., Havlik, P., Hristov, A.N., et al., 2016. Greenhouse gas mitigation potentials in
45 the livestock sector. *Nature Climate Change*. doi:10.1038/nclimate2925

46 Hollands, G., Shemilt, I., Marteau, T., Jebb, S., et al., 2015. Portion , package or tableware size for
47 changing selection and consumption of food , alcohol and tobacco. *Cochrane Database of
48 Systematic Reviews*. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011045.pub2.Copyright

49 Hu, F.B., 2011. Globalization of Diabetes: The role of diet, lifestyle, and genes. *Diabetes Care* 34, 1249–
50 1257. doi:10.2337/dc11-0442

51 Huang, J., Bouis, H., 2001. Structural changes in the demand for food in Asia: Empirical evidence from
52 Taiwan. *Agricultural Economics* 26, 57–69. doi:10.1016/S0169-5150(00)00100-6

1 Huang, J., David, C.C., 1993. Demand for cereal grains in Asia: The effect of urbanization. *Agricultural*
2 *Economics* 8, 107–124. doi:10.1016/0169-5150(92)90025-T

3 Index Mundi, 2016. Commodity Prices Indices: Vegetable Oil and Protein Meal [WWW Document]. URL
4 <http://www.indexmundi.com/commodities/?commodity=soybean-oil> (accessed 1.7.16).

5 INRA, CIRAD, AFZ, FAO, 2016. Animal feed resources information system, Feedipedia.

6 Jalava, M., Kummu, M., Porkka, M., Siebert, S., Varis, O., 2014. Diet change—a solution to reduce water
7 use? *Environmental Research Letters* 9, 74016. doi:074016 10.1088/1748-9326/9/7/074016

8 Kastner, T., Erb, K.-H., Haberl, H., 2014. Rapid growth in agricultural trade: effects on global area
9 efficiency and the role of management. *Environmental Research Letters* 9, 34015.
10 doi:10.1088/1748-9326/9/3/034015

11 Kastner, T., Rivas, M.J.I., Koch, W., Nonhebel, S., 2012. Global changes in diets and the consequences
12 for land requirements for food. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
13 *States of America* 109, 6868–6872. doi:10.1073/pnas.1117054109

14 Krausmann, F., Erb, K.-H., Gingrich, S., Haberl, H., et al., 2013. Global human appropriation of net
15 primary production doubled in the 20th century. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
16 110, 10324–10329. doi:10.1073/pnas.1211349110

17 Kummu, M., de Moel, H., Porkka, M., Siebert, S., et al., 2012. Lost food, wasted resources: Global food
18 supply chain losses and their impacts on freshwater, cropland, and fertiliser use. *Science of the*
19 *Total Environment* 438, 477–489. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.08.092

20 Lambin, E.F., Meyfroidt, P., 2011. Global land use change , economic globalization , and the looming
21 land scarcity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
22 108, 3465–3472. doi:10.1073/pnas.1100480108

23 Le Quéré, C., Moriarty, R., Andrew, R.M., Peters, G.P., et al., 2015. Global carbon budget 2014 47–85.
24 doi:10.5194/essd-7-47-2015

25 Little, S., 2014. Feed Conversion Efficiency: A key measure of feeding system performance on your
26 farm. Dairy Australia, Victoria, Australia.

27 Macleod, M., Gerber, P., Mottet, A., Tempio, G., et al., 2013. Greenhouse gas emissions from pig and
28 chicken supply chains - A global life cycle assessment. Food and Agriculture Organization of the
29 United Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy.

30 Marlow, H.J., Hayes, W.K., Soret, S., Carter, R.L., et al., 2009. Diet and the environment: does what you
31 eat matter? *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 89, 1699S–1703S.
32 doi:10.3945/ajcn.2009.26736Z

33 Meyfroidt, P., Lambin, E.F., Erb, K.-H., Hertel, T.W., 2013. Globalization of land use: distant drivers of
34 land change and geographic displacement of land use. *Current Opinion in Environmental*
35 *Sustainability* 5, 438–444. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2013.04.003

36 Mueller, N.D., Gerber, J.S., Johnston, M., Ray, D.K., et al., 2012. Closing yield gaps through nutrient and
37 water management. *Nature* 490, 254–7. doi:10.1038/nature11420

38 Ng, M., Fleming, T., Robinson, M., Thomson, B., et al., 2014. Global, regional, and national prevalence of
39 overweight and obesity in children and adults during 1980–2013: a systematic analysis for the
40 Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *The Lancet* 384, 766–781. doi:10.1016/S0140-
41 6736(14)60460-8

42 Opio, C., Gerber, P., Mottet, A., Falculli, A., et al., 2013. Greenhouse gas emissions from ruminant
43 supply chains- A global life cycle assessment. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
44 Nations (FAO), Rome, Italy.

45 Parfitt, J., Barthel, M., Macnaughton, S., 2010. Food waste within food supply chains: quantification and
46 potential for change to 2050. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
47 365, 3065–3081. doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0126

48 Pelletier, N., Audsley, E., Brodt, S., Garnett, T., et al., 2011. Energy Intensity of Agriculture and Food
49 Systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 36, 223–246. doi:10.1146/annurev-
50 environ-081710-161014

51 Pingali, P., 2007. Westernization of Asian diets and the transformation of food systems: Implications for
52 research and policy. *Food Policy* 32, 281–298. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2006.08.001

- 1 Popkin, B.M., 2006. Technology, transport, globalization and the nutrition transition food policy. *Food*
2 *Policy* 31, 554–569. doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2006.02.008
- 3 Popkin, B.M., Carolina, N., Hill, C., 1999. Popkin(1999) Urbanization, Lifestyle Changes and the Nutrition
4 27, 1905–1916.
- 5 Popp, A., Lotze-Campen, H., Bodirsky, B., 2010. Food consumption, diet shifts and associated non-CO2
6 greenhouse gases from agricultural production. *Global Environmental Change* 20, 451–462.
7 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.02.001
- 8 Porkka, M., Kummu, M., Siebert, S., Varis, O., 2013. From food insufficiency towards trade dependency:
9 A historical analysis of global food availability. *PLoS ONE* 8. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0082714
- 10 Rulli, M.C., Bellomi, D., Cazzoli, A., Carolis, G. De, Odorico, P.D., 2016. The water-land-food nexus of
11 first- generation biofuels. *Nature Publishing Group* 1–10. doi:10.1038/srep22521
- 12 SACN, 2011. Dietary Reference Values for Energy 2011. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition,
13 London, UK.
- 14 Schader, C., Muller, A., Scialabba, N.E.-H., Hecht, J., et al., 2015. Impacts of feeding less food-competing
15 feedstuffs to livestock on global food system sustainability. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*
16 12, 20150891. doi:10.1098/rsif.2015.0891
- 17 Schmitz, C., van Meijl, H., Kyle, P., Nelson, G.C., et al., 2014. Land-use change trajectories up to 2050:
18 insights from a global agro-economic model comparison. *Agricultural Economics* 45, 69–84.
19 doi:10.1111/agec.12090
- 20 Seto, K.C., Ramankutty, N., 2016. Hidden linkages between urbanization and food systems. *Science* 352,
21 943–945.
- 22 Smil, V., 2013. *Should We Eat Meat? Evolution and Consequences of Modern Carnivory*. Wiley, New
23 York, USA.
- 24 Smil, V., 2002. Worldwide transformation of diets, burdens of meat production and opportunities for
25 novel food proteins. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology* 30, 305–311. doi:10.1016/S0141-
26 0229(01)00504-X
- 27 Smith, P., Gregory, P.J., 2013. Climate change and sustainable food production. *The Proceedings of the*
28 *Nutrition Society* 72, 21–8. doi:10.1017/S0029665112002832
- 29 Smith, P., Haberl, H., Popp, A., Erb, K.-H., et al., 2013. How much land-based greenhouse gas mitigation
30 can be achieved without compromising food security and environmental goals? *Global change*
31 *biology* 19, 2285–302. doi:10.1111/gcb.12160
- 32 Stehfest, E., Bouwman, L., Van Vuuren, D.P., Den Elzen, M.G.J., et al., 2009. Climate benefits of changing
33 diet. *Climatic Change* 95, 83–102. doi:10.1007/s10584-008-9534-6
- 34 Thow, A.M., Jan, S., Leeder, S., Swinburn, B., 2010. The effect of fiscal policy on diet, obesity and
35 chronic disease: a systematic review. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 88, 609–614.
36 doi:10.2471/BLT.09.070987
- 37 Tiffin, R., Arnoult, M., 2011. The public health impacts of a fat tax. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*
38 65, 427–433. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2010.281
- 39 Tilman, D., Balzer, C., Hill, J., Befort, B.L., 2011. Global food demand and the sustainable intensification
40 of agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
41 108, 20260–4. doi:10.1073/pnas.1116437108
- 42 Tilman, D., Clark, M., 2014. Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health. *Nature*
43 515, 518–522. doi:10.1038/nature13959
- 44 van Vuuren, D.P., Carter, T.R., 2014. Climate and socio-economic scenarios for climate change research
45 and assessment: Reconciling the new with the old. *Climatic Change* 122, 415–429.
46 doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0974-2
- 47 Wang, Y.C., Coxson, P., Shen, Y., Goldman, L., 2012. A Penny-Per-Ounce Tax On Sugar-Sweetened
48 Beverages Would Cut Health And Cost Burdens Of Diabetes. *Health Affairs* 31, 199–207.
49 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2011.0410
- 50 Weinzettel, J., Hertwich, E.G., Peters, G.P., Steen-Olsen, K., Galli, A., 2013. Affluence drives the global
51 displacement of land use. *Global Environmental Change* 23, 433–438.
52 doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.12.010

1 West, P.C., Gerber, J.S., Engstrom, P.M., Mueller, N.D., et al., 2014. Leverage points for improving global
2 food security and the environment. *Science* 345, 325–328. doi:10.1126/science.1246067
3 WFP, 2016. What is hunger? World Food Programme (WFP), Rome, Italy.
4 WHO, FAO, UNU, 2007. Protein and amino acid requirements in human nutrition. World Health
5 Organization technical report series 935.
6 Williamson, P., 2016. Scrutinize CO 2 removal methods. *Nature* 530, 5–7.
7 Wu, Y., Wu, H.X., 1997. Household Grain Consumption in China : Effects of Income , Price and
8 Urbanization * Yanrui Wu. *Asian Economic Journal* 11, 325–342.
9 Yu, Y., Feng, K., Hubacek, K., 2013. Tele-connecting local consumption to global land use. *Global*
10 *Environmental Change* 23, 1178–1186. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.04.006
11
12