



Principles and Validations of an Artificial Intelligence-Based Recommender System Suggesting Acceptable Food Changes

Jules Vandeputte, Pierrick Herold, Mykyt Kuslii, Paolo Viappiani, Laurent Muller, Christine Martin, Olga Davidenko, Fabien Delaere, Cristina Manfredotti, Antoine Cornuéjols, et al.

► To cite this version:

Jules Vandeputte, Pierrick Herold, Mykyt Kuslii, Paolo Viappiani, Laurent Muller, et al.. Principles and Validations of an Artificial Intelligence-Based Recommender System Suggesting Acceptable Food Changes. Journal of Nutrition, inPress, 10.1016/j.tjnut.2022.12.022 . hal-03975185

HAL Id: hal-03975185

<https://hal.science/hal-03975185>

Submitted on 17 Feb 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Principles and validations of an Artificial Intelligence-based recommender system suggesting acceptable food changes

Jules Vandeputte¹, Pierrick Herold², Mykyt Kuslii², Paolo Viappiani³, Laurent Muller⁴, Christine Martin¹, Olga Davidenko², Fabien Delaere⁵, Cristina Manfredotti¹, Antoine Cornuéjols¹, Nicolas Darcel^{2*}

¹ Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, AgroParisTech, UMR MIA Paris-Saclay, Palaiseau, 91120, FRANCE

² Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR PNCA, Palaiseau, 91120, FRANCE

³ Université Paris Dauphine, Université PSL, CNRS, LAMSADE, Paris, FRANCE

⁴ Université Grenoble Alpes Grenoble INP Institut d'Ingenierie et de Management, Univ. Grenoble Alpes, INRAE, CNRS, Grenoble INP, GAEL, Grenoble, 38000, FRANCE

⁵ Danone Nutricia Research, Centre Daniel Carasso, RD 128, Palaiseau, 91767, FRANCE

* corresponding author: nicolas.darcel@agroparistech.fr

Short Title: AI-based recommendations of food swaps

Abstract

Background: Along with the popularity of smartphones, Artificial Intelligence-based personalised suggestions can be seen as promising ways to change eating habits toward more desirable diets.

Objectives: Two issues raised by such technologies were addressed in this study.. The first hypothesis tested is that a recommender system based on automatically learning simple association rules between dishes of the same meal would make it possible to identify plausible substitutions for the consumer. The second hypothesis tested is that for an identical set of dietary swaps suggestions, the more the user is -or thinks to be- involved in the process of identifying the suggestion, the higher is their probability of accepting the suggestion. **Methods:** Three studies are presented in this article, firstly, we present the principles of an algorithm to mine plausible substitutions from a large food consumption database. Secondly we evaluate the plausibility of these automatically mined suggestions via online tests on a group of 255 adult participants. Afterwards, we investigated the persuasiveness of three suggestion methods of such recommendations in a population of 27 healthy adult volunteers, via a custom designed smartphone application. **Results:** The results firstly indicated that a method based on automatic learning of substitution rules between foods performed relatively well identifying plausible swaps suggestions. Regarding the form that should be used to suggest, we found that when users are involved in selecting the most appropriate recommendation for them, the resulting suggestions were more accepted (OR = 3.168 $p < 0.0004$). **Conclusion:** This work indicates that food recommendation algorithms can gain efficiency by taking into account the consumption context and user engagement in the recommendation process. Further work needs also to be done on identifying nutritionally relevant suggestions.

Keywords:

behaviour change; food recommendation algorithms; decision sciences

Introduction

Changing eating behaviors is critical to ensure food systems that are both healthy and environmentally sustainable (1). These changes are very difficult since eating habits are firmly rooted (2) and resistance to changes is often strong (3,4). The use of computer-based recommender systems appears to be a promising strategy to change consumption behaviour towards more desirable diets. Smartphones have become a personal assistant for many individuals, beyond simply allowing customers to search for product information, compare prices, and seek feedback, smartphone apps could use algorithms to provide users with personalised suggestions (5). Such algorithms would interact with humans (6) to propose a series of punctual substitutions (7) or new recipes or entire meals (8) and thus move individuals towards healthier diets through small iterative changes. Research in this field of application is still largely uncomplete and among the many research questions to be addressed in food recommendation technologies. The consumer acceptability of recommender systems relies on (i) the user's compliance with the machine and (ii) the relevance of its suggestions. Therefore two questions seem particularly salient: first, **what** should the artificial intelligence suggest? Second **how** should the artificial intelligence suggest? This question concerns the form of human-computer interaction that is most likely to ensure user compliance.

A first difficulty is that eating decisions are complex processes (9) influenced by numerous and intricate factors, such as individual preferences, social influences or contextual effects (10–14) and they all display a strong variability across individuals (15) or groups (16). Identifying acceptable recommendations will therefore require an understanding of how one or several of these factors shape acceptability (17,18). While the literature on how acceptability is driven (19), either by individual preferences, food variability and dynamics, or by the effects of the social context is rather extensive, few studies have focused on the rules governing the meal composition. A meal or a menu is not just a random arrangement of foods, it is a complex assembly that often complies with very strict rules of associations or exclusions between food items. Since the deduction of such rules by a human observer would be very limited, machine learning algorithms could be used to explore large volumes of

consumption data to come up with relevant suggestions. The first hypothesis tested is that a recommender system based on automatically learning simple association rules between dishes of the same meal would make it possible to identify plausible and acceptable substitutions from a consumer standpoint.

Finally, considering that the acceptability of a suggestion varies depending on how it is presented to users, identifying the most persuasive recommendation method is an essential issue. Several directions have so far been explored, such as personalization (20), gamification (21) but also the engagement of the user in the selection process (22). The question of the effect of user engagement on acceptability is an open question. Indeed, two opposite hypotheses can be formulated. It can be argued that receiving a recommendation without much effort can be perceived as comfortable and attractive to the user, thus favoring his or her future acceptability. Conversely, it can be assumed that if the user feels that he or she has control over the suggestions, he or she will be more inclined to accept them in the end. The second hypothesis tested is that for an identical set of dietary swaps suggestions, the more the user is -or the more the user thinks to be- involved in the process of identifying the suggestion, the higher their probability of accepting the suggestion.

In this article we present three studies related to testing these hypotheses. The first two studies are related to our first hypothesis about the validity of automatic identification of food recommendation the last work focused on the hypothesis formulated above on the most effective form of the recommendation. Firstly, we present the principles of a method to reveal relevant substitutions from a large food consumption database. Secondly we evaluate the plausibility of these automatically mined suggestions via online tests. Afterwards, we investigate the persuasiveness of three suggestion methods of such recommendations in a population of healthy volunteers.

87

88 **Methods**

89 Design and implementation of an algorithm able to identify relevant substitutions

90 Problem statement and objectives

91 Our first objective was to develop an algorithm able to mine substitutable foods. Given a database of
92 consumed meals, we aimed to extract substitutability relationships based on the implicit rules applied by
93 consumers when they compose their meals. The hypothesis on which we based our mining method of
94 relevant substitutions was that “two food items are substitutable if they are consumed in a similar dietary
95 context but rarely together”. A detailed description of this algorithm has been realised and was the
96 subject of a previous publication (23).

97 Defining context

98 The dietary context of a food item x is the set of food items C with which x is consumed. For instance, in
99 the meal (*coffee, bread, jam, juice*), the dietary context of (*coffee*) is: (*bread, jam, juice*)

100 Computing a substitutability score

101 Substitutability is not a binary relationship because foods can be substitutable to various extents. For
102 instance, it is plausible to replace potatoes with rice, less plausible to replace them with bread, but much
103 less plausible to replace those same potatoes with ice cream. Moreover, if two items are consumed
104 together, they are less substitutable because they might be associated. Therefore, we designed a function
105 to quantify the relationship of substitutability that incorporates the possibility of associativity. Detailed
106 computing of the substitutability score are presented in supplementary methods

107 Mining of relevant substitutions

108 The French dataset INCA2 (25) was used for the mining of relevant substitutions. This dataset is the
109 result of a survey conducted during 2006-2007 on individual food consumption. Individual 7-day food
110 diaries were reported for 2624 adults and 1455 children over several months accounting possible

seasonality in eating habits. It should be noted that since the start of this study, which was the subject of an initial communication, another more recent survey has become available (26). Since the results of the search for substitutability differed little over this period of time, we prefer to maintain consistency with the initial study. A typical day was composed of three main meals: breakfast, lunch and dinner. The moments in between were denoted as snacking. For the main meals, the location (home, work, school, outdoor) and the companion (family, friends, co-workers, alone) were registered. The 1280 food entries were organised in 110 groups of food items. We chose to consider this “subgroup” level of hierarchy to capture substitution relationships inter-groups and intra-groups. Indeed, it would have been possible to choose a finer categorisation (more groups) but this would have led to the identification of only substitutions between very similar sub-groups. On the other hand, we could have chosen a coarser categorisation (fewer groups), but this would have greatly constrained the algorithm's searches. The level of grouping chosen was hence determined in order to obtain the best compromise between very relevant but closely related changes and important but not very relevant changes. Only adults are considered in this work. The meal database was split according to contextual (type of meal) information in order to get better results. We compared the results of our methodology on three sub-datasets corresponding to (breakfast, lunch and dinner) as well as (breakfast and lunch and dinner).

Evaluation of the plausibility of the substitutions mined by the recommendation algorithm

To evaluate the extent to which the algorithm was able to generate plausible substitutions suggestions, an online task was designed in the manner of a “Turing test” (27) in which participants were asked to guess whether the proposed food substitutions were issued by an artificial intelligence or by a human being.

Participants

Volunteers were invited to participate in an online experiment via a public mailing list run by the French National Centre for Scientific Research (Information Relay in Cognitive Sciences, Paris, France, www.risc.cnrs.fr). The inclusion criteria were to be over 18 years of age and to be able read and understand French language properly. Participants could not participate more than once. Upon

completion of the experiment, participants could enter in a draw to win 15 €. A total of 255 participants participated in the study, none of them reported to have guessed the objective of the study.

Online task

The experimental task consisted of three presentations of a series of 12 meals for which a proposal for change was made. Proposals were made either by a professional dietician, or by the substitution mining algorithm. In the latter case, to test the relevance of the substitutability scoring system, algorithm suggestions either reflected substitutions with the highest substitutability score (expert algorithm), or substitutions with a low substitutability score (clumsy algorithm). All these suggestions concerned the same items of the 12 same meals. For each pair of meal + modified meal, participants had to answer ('yes' or 'no') to the following question: "*some of these suggestions are made by an artificial intelligence, others by a dietician, do you think this substitution was made by an artificial intelligence?*". The supporting software was developed using the PC IBEX platform (28).

Data analysis

The dependant variable is the binary answer to the question on the emitter of the substitution recommendation (human / non-human). Binary logistic regressions and resulting odds ratio were used to evaluate whether the answer was influenced by the actual type of emitter.

Acceptability of identified recommendation on a group of volunteers

This work examined whether the extent of the user involvement in the suggestion process substitutions by the AI-based recommender system affects the acceptability of that suggestion. For this purpose, a food coaching interface based on the plausible substitution mining algorithm presented earlier was tested on participants. Participants were different from the volunteers of the previously described online study.

Ethics approval

The study was conducted according to the Helsinki declaration guidelines and all procedures were approved by the Ethics Committee of Université Paris-Saclay (decision CER-Paris-Saclay-2021-055). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Access to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is permanently available from the application interface. The participation in the experiment was compensated by a gift voucher worth 50€.

Participants

Based on similar studies (18, 23–25), we estimated that 30 volunteers were needed for this study. Considering a dropout and non-completion rate of the experiment of 50%, to obtain approximately 30 complete and exploitable responses, 60 candidates were recruited. The recruitment was done via an online form distributed via a public mailing list run by the French National Centre for Scientific Research (Information Relay in Cognitive Sciences, Paris, France, www.risc.cnrs.fr). The inclusion criteria were being over 18 years old, not being on a diet, and owning a smartphone. To avoid possible effects of the order of presentation, the participants received the different modalities in a random way.

Operation of the algorithm:

A smartphone application (virtual nutrition coach) was specifically designed for this study. The principle was as follows: 1- the participant declares the meal they intend to eat the next day to the virtual coach. 2- the virtual coach makes a substitution suggestion targeting one of the items of the meal according to three modes of suggestion (detailed below). 3- The participant can accept or refuse the suggestion(s). 4- If they accept, they commit to implement the recommendation and to certify it by sending a picture of their meal via the mobile application. For 1 declared meal made by the user, 4 suggestions were identified by the virtual nutrition coach via an online query to the substitution mining algorithm (described above), the list of these possible substitutions was based on the 4 most substitutable items presenting a better nutritional profile (according to their Rayner's score (32)). The three modalities were:

- (A) all 4 options were presented simultaneously, and the user could choose either one or nothing

- (B) identified options were presented one by one and each time the user could refuse (in which case they must justify their refusal) until the list of proposals is exhausted, if the last proposal is not accepted then no option is chosen.
- (C) the coach asked the user for their preferences and proposed a single dish, which best matched the announced criteria. The user could either accept or refuse.

Measured parameters

At the beginning of the experiment, the volunteers filled out a questionnaire indicating their age, sex and BMI. For each recommendation session, the acceptance or refusal data were recorded, as well as the constituents of the meals filled in by the volunteers and the elements suggested by the coach.

Data collection procedure

The study used a within-subject design to test two meal conditions. The experiment lasted 3 weeks, spanning June and July 2021. During the sessions, the recruited volunteers had 6 recommendation sessions every Tuesday and Thursday, during which they received a suggestion that they could accept to implement the next day. These 6 sessions were divided into 2 sessions for each of the recommendation methods.

Statistical analysis

In order to explain the influence of the mode by which the recommendation is given on the probability of acceptance, a binary logistic regression analysis has been implemented. The statistical model used is therefore described as follows:

$$p(\text{accept}) \sim \text{sex} + \text{method} + \text{sessionnumber} + \text{age} + \text{BMI}$$

All statistical analyses were performed using R (version 3.6.3) and R-Studio (RStudio 2021.09.1+372 "Ghost Orchid" Release). To represent the probabilities of acceptance, odds ratios were computed from the logistic regression model.

Results

Identification of substitutions

Applied to the three meals datasets (breakfast, breakfast and lunch, lunch), the algorithm retrieved a series of substitutable items for all considered items in the database. Substitutable items for each element of a list of items for breakfast are represented in figure 1. If substitutions across food categories turned out to be proposed by the algorithm, the most frequent substitutable items were intra-category substitutions. When considering all foods listed in the consumption database, on average 6 % of all retrieved substitutions were within the same food category, this proportion increased to 20 % when only considering the three most substitutable items for each food. The substitutions proposed were also consistent with regards to eating practices: substitutes of drinks were also drinks: 54 % if considering all substitutions; 100 % when considering three most substitutable items (e.g.: the substitutes of coffee are tea, cocoa and chicory) or the substitutes for butter for breakfast are spreadable items (26 % vs 100 %). Detailed description of the results obtained by this algorithm and in particular of the comparisons between substitutability scores according to the meals was carried out and was the subject of a previous publication of our team (23).

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Plausibility of mined substitutions retrieved by the algorithm

A total of 255 participants participated in the study, none of them reported to have guessed the objective of the study. When comparing human and artificial intelligence recommenders, we found that the probability that participants judge recommendations made by a human to be "made by non-humans" was low (0.26 ± 0.01), while the probability that participants judge recommendations made by an artificial intelligence (clumsy and expert) to be "made by non-humans" (0.67 ± 0.01) this difference appeared as highly statistically significant ($p < 10^{-16}$). When comparing the two artificial intelligence-based emitters (clumsy vs expert), we observed that a recommendation made by the "clumsy" artificial intelligence had a significantly higher chance of being judged as not emitted by a human (0.71 ± 0.01)

than a recommendation made by the "expert" (0.64 ± 0.01), here again this difference appeared as highly statistically significant ($p < 10^{-10}$).

Real life acceptability of identified suggestions and effect of recommendation methods

Of the 60 candidates initially enrolled in the experiment, the results of 27 of them were complete and exploitable for analysis (yielding a total of 162 meals). The final sample was composed of 20 women and 7 men. The average age was 37.5 ± 15.2 years. The average BMI was 22.2 ± 4.1 with two overweight individuals and two others moderately obese. Of the 162 interaction outcomes between the participants and the coach we observed that 74 of them resulted in the acceptance of a recommendation, reflecting an overall average acceptability of 46%.

Analysis of the odds ratios corresponding to the different factors of influence of the acceptability revealed that modality B only, (*i.e.* when the user is participating to the selection of the suggestions, OR: 3.168; CI 95%: 1.688, 6.061; $p < 0.0004$) was associated with an odds ratio exceeding the significance threshold. A tendency was noted for the effect of age ($p = 0.08$) indicating that younger participants had a higher propensity to accept recommendations. Sex ($p = 0.14$), and BMI ($p = 0.32$) did not have a significant effect on acceptability.

Discussion

This work presents an artificial intelligence-based food recommendation system designed to make suggestions of food substitutions to its users. Two critical issues raised by such a recommendation technology were addressed in this study: first, the method to identify relevant substitutions suggestions and, second, the most efficient form that should be used to ensure acceptability from users. To identify acceptable substitutions, we hypothesised that two foods consumed with the same other foods can be replaced by each other with a relatively high probability of acceptance. Our results indicated that such a method, based on the analysis of a large-scale food consumption database and without any prior information of the considered dishes, showed overall coherence as the suggested swaps were often

within similar food types. We also found that such mining of relevant substitutions based solely on the analysis of the meal context, allowed to produce plausible suggestions from a human perspective. Regarding the form that should be used to suggest a substitution, our results obtained from a group of 27 volunteers over a period of 3 weeks suggest that, when users are involved in the selection of the suggestion, the resulting suggestions are more likely to be accepted.

The substitutability score presented in this study was based on the estimation, for two foods to be substituted, to what extent these items are consumed in similar meals (i.e., with the same other foods). While no semantic information describing ingredients or usual positioning of foods in meals was available for the recommender system, substitutions between food items of the same nutritional food groups were found. Such contextual information appears to be relevant to derive food substitutions. To our knowledge, this is the first study showing the richness of the information contained not in what we eat but in what we combine with what we eat. A substantial amount of research has already been performed in the area of recommendations to induce behaviour changes (7,8,18,33), most existing approaches focused on recommending similar foods (with similar taste for instance) to consumers without considering any additional contextual information. By showing that such information may matter in the acceptability decision, we believe that we are opening a promising field of research for automated dietary recommendations. The main strength of this study is that it links fundamental algorithmic considerations related to dietary decisions with studies on healthy volunteers in online or real-life consumption conditions.

Nevertheless, this work has focused on identifying solutions that are acceptable to the consumer. In this context, we have chosen to study the plausibility of the identified solutions only from the consumer's point of view, without trying to identify changes leading to a better nutritional quality diet. But it is obvious that such technologies, in order to be really effective on improving the quality of diets, will have to integrate additional filtering rules allowing to select, among the plausible suggestions, only the foods improving the quality of the diet. For this purpose, scores taking into account past food consumption history could be used (34).

Additional limitations are that food swaps recommendations issued by this work cannot be generalised as the data set was collected in France and may not be relevant for other countries. Also as the dataset was obtained in 2006-7, the substitution relationships are likely to have changed along with the modification of the food offer, for example, an increase in plant-based meat substitutes would require new data on their consumption relationships. Future work will need to address these limitations.

In a second step, using a task in which participants were invited to judge if the emitter of a given suggestion was a human or a machine, we observed that recommendations made by an artificial intelligence were often recognized as originating from a non-human recommender. This indicates that there is a margin of progress in our ability to derive substitutability information from food consumption databases. Interestingly, we observed that depending on the substitutability scores chosen by the artificial intelligence for selecting the recommendation (best scores or weaker scores), the participants estimated differently the plausibility of the resulting suggestions, as the higher the score was the lower the probability of judging the emitter as a non-human. This substitutability score is thus a promising but perfectible proxy of the acceptability of substitutions. To gain predictive capacity, it could be useful to extend the concept of “contextual information” to include other information that is known to influence eating decisions such as the consumptions made at the preceding meals, the time and/or the location (9,35) of the meal, or the company of others (36,37).

It is however important to be cautious when interpreting these results. We indeed assumed that the criteria on which participants based their response was the plausibility of the suggestion (e.g. “*if I think it is a non-sense, it must have been issued by a machine*”). However, it cannot be excluded that participants' responses were based on other criteria. The reasoning that they would attribute to the machine (e.g., “*the recommender is expected to make recommendations being of higher nutritional quality, if it is not the case it must be a machine*”) could strongly influence the results. It would thus be interesting to combine these approaches with qualitative measures in which explanations of the reasons for the choices indicated in the task would be recorded.

In a third step, we showed on a cohort of 27 participants that among three modalities of suggestion presentation, the one that seemed to have the highest efficiency was the one that involved the user in repeated exchanges, and even if the suggested options were the same as what would have been offered by the other modalities, the impression of dialogue and thus of control over the production of the recommendation yielded the greater acceptability from the consumer. In the field of recommender systems, such an approach is called critiquing-based recommendation as it relies on users' feedback (critiques) to iteratively improve the recommendation's acceptability. The advantage of such an approach can be explained by the illusion of control that individuals may have in the case of a critiquing-based system. Indeed, studies in psychology or behavioural economics on the endowment effect (38) (popularly known as the IKEA effect, (39)) have established that the more we engage in a task (in this case, finding a consumption suggestion), the more we are attached to the result, and the greater the value of this result is for us.

The critiquing-based recommendation modality system has emerged as the most acceptable, it is interesting to note that this performed even better than modality C which registered preferences before making a recommendation. This advantage could be explained by the fact that when user's preferences-based recommender systems have little information about the users they often fail to establish a meaningful profile (cold start problem (40)). Conversely, it is likely that if virtual coaches had access to large amounts of data on user preferences, they would be more effective than critiquing-based coaching modalities.

Such results should however not be generalised, as the profile of the participants remains not representative, being constituted mainly by young women. The number of participants and the design of the study did not allow to identify different profiles, but, if the modality based on "critiquing" seems to be more effective, we cannot exclude that another modality would be more effective in inducing behavioural changes for some subgroups.

Conclusion

While computerised recommender technologies may be a promising tool for changing eating behaviours, several questions remain open. First, concerning the methods for selecting acceptable alternatives, we proposed a substitutability score based on a limited amount of contextual information (i.e., foods eaten with the food to be substituted) and showed that it can be used to identify plausible and acceptable alternatives. This is a promising approach, but it is highly perfectible and will gain in quality if we consider other contextual elements in the substitution retrieval method. Second, the interactions between the recommendation technologies and the users are another facet determining the acceptability that it is necessary to consider. We have highlighted that approaches involving the users seem to have an advantage, but this work remains to be refined by putting into perspective the individual profiles and the most effective suggestion modalities. Future research should therefore focus on understanding the dynamics of consumption (recent food history, for example) and on the effects of the diversity of consumer profiles on the types of human-machine interactions to consider. Finally, additional work will also have to take into account the nutritional quality of the suggested swaps to improve overall diet quality.

347 **Acknowledgements:**

348 The authors of this article are thankful to the "PennController for IBEX" team for providing us with this
349 user-friendly virtual experimentation domain: Florian Schwarz and specially Jeremy Zehr who answered
350 all our questions regarding the programming and coding parts of the online experiment. **Author**
351 **contributions:** J.V: methodology, investigation, formal analysis, visualization, writing – original draft;
352 P.H: methodology, investigation; M.K: methodology, investigation; P.V: conceptualization,
353 methodology, validation; L.M: conceptualization, methodology, validation; Ch.M: conceptualization,
354 methodology, validation; O.D: methodology, conceptualization; Cr.M: conceptualization, methodology,
355 validation; A.C: supervision, conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, writing – original draft.
356 N.D: supervision, project administration, funding acquisition, conceptualization, methodology, formal
357 analysis, writing – original draft. All the authors participated in writing – reviewing and editing.
358 **Declaration of interest:** the authors declare no conflict of interest. **Funding:** This study was funded by
359 the French National Agency for Research (ANR) [[ANR-18-CE21-0008](#)]. **Sources of Support**
360 **statement:** Support to this study is exclusively from governmental entities.

References

1. Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B, Springmann M, Lang T, Vermeulen S, Garnett T, Tilman D, DeClerck F, Wood A, et al. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *The Lancet* 2019;393:447–92.
2. Jastran MM, Bisogni CA, Sobal J, Blake C, Devine CM. Eating routines. Embedded, value based, modifiable, and reflective. *Appetite* 2009;52:127–36.
3. Bouton ME. Why behavior change is difficult to sustain. *Prev Med* 2014;68:29–36.
4. John LK, Loewenstein G, Troxel AB, Norton L, Fassbender JE, Volpp KG. Financial incentives for extended weight loss: a randomized, controlled trial. *J Gen Intern Med* 2011;26:621–6.
5. Piotrowicz W, Cuthbertson R. Introduction to the Special Issue Information Technology in Retail: Toward Omnichannel Retailing. *Int J Electron Commer* 2014;18:5–16.
6. Oh YJ, Zhang J, Fang M-L, Fukuoka Y. A systematic review of artificial intelligence chatbots for promoting physical activity, healthy diet, and weight loss. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2021;18:160.
7. Ge M, Elahi M, Fernández-Tobías I, Ricci F, Massimo D. Using Tags and Latent Factors in a Food Recommender System. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Digital Health* 2015. [Internet] New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2015. p. 105–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2750511.2750528>
8. Freyne J, Berkovsky S. Intelligent food planning: personalized recipe recommendation. *Proceedings of the 15th international conference on Intelligent user interfaces*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2010. p. 321–4. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1719970.1720021>
9. Köster EP. Diversity in the determinants of food choice: A psychological perspective. *Food Qual Prefer* 2009;20:70–82.
10. Sobal J, Bisogni CA. Constructing Food Choice Decisions. *Ann Behav Med* 2009;38:37–46.
11. Rozin P. The socio-cultural context of eating and food choice. In: Meiselman HL, MacFie HJH, editors. *Food Choice, Acceptance and Consumption*. Boston, MA: Springer US; 1996. p. 83–104.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-1221-5_2

12. Higgs S, Ruddock H, Darcel N. People in context—The social perspective. In Meiselman HL editor. Context: the effects of environment on product design and evaluation. Duxford, United Kingdom: Woohhead Publishing; 2019. p. 19–38.
13. Robinson E, Higgs S. Liking food less: the impact of social influence on food liking evaluations in female students. *PloS One* 2012;7:e48858.
14. Cruwys T, Bevelander KE, Hermans RCJ. Social modeling of eating: A review of when and why social influence affects food intake and choice. *Appetite* 2015;86:3–18.
15. Schüz B, Schüz N, Ferguson SG. It's the power of food: individual differences in food cue responsiveness and snacking in everyday life. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2015;12:149.
16. Bennett G, Bardon LA, Gibney ER. A Comparison of Dietary Patterns and Factors Influencing Food Choice among Ethnic Groups Living in One Locality: A Systematic Review. *Nutrients* 2022;14:941.
17. McAuley J, Pandey R, Leskovec J. Inferring Networks of Substitutable and Complementary Products. *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. [Internet] New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2015. p. 785–94. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2783258.2783381>
18. Zheng J, Wu X, Niu J, Bolivar A. Substitutes or complements: another step forward in recommendations. *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*. [Internet] New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2009. p. 139–46. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1566374.1566394>
19. Symmank C, Mai R, Hoffmann S, Stok FM, Renner B, Lien N, Rohm H. Predictors of food decision making: A systematic interdisciplinary mapping (SIM) review. *Appetite* 2017;110:25–35.
20. Aldenaini N, Orji R, Sampalli S. How Effective is Personalization in Persuasive Interventions for Reducing Sedentary Behavior and Promoting Physical Activity: A Systematic Review. *Adjunct proceedings of the 15th int. conference on Persuasive Technology*. Persuasive. 2020.

- 413 21. Radhakrishnan K, Toprac P, O’Hair M, Bias R, Kim MT, Bradley P, Mackert M. Interactive
414 Digital e-Health Game for Heart Failure Self-Management: A Feasibility Study. *Games Health J*
415 2016;5:366–74.
- 416 22. Reilly J, McCarthy K, McGinty L, Smyth B. Dynamic Critiquing. In: Funk P, González Calero PA,
417 editors. *Advances in Case-Based Reasoning*. [Internet] Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin
418 Heidelberg; 2004. p. 763–77. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-540-28631-8_55
- 419 23. Akkoyunlu S, Manfredotti C, Cornuéjols A, Darcel N, Delaere F. Investigating substitutability of
420 food items in consumption data. *Second International Workshop on Health Recommender Systems*
421 *co-located with ACM RecSys*. 2017. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02482142>
- 422 24. Jaccard P. The Distribution of the Flora in the Alpine Zone.1. *New Phytol* 1912;11:37–50.
- 423 25. ANSES. Données de consommations et habitudes alimentaires de l’étude INCA 2 - data.gouv.fr.
424 [https://www.data.gouv.fr/fr/datasets/donnees-de-consommations-et-habitudes-alimentaires-de-](https://www.data.gouv.fr/fr/datasets/donnees-de-consommations-et-habitudes-alimentaires-de-letude-inca-2-3/)
425 [letude-inca-2-3/](https://www.data.gouv.fr/fr/datasets/donnees-de-consommations-et-habitudes-alimentaires-de-letude-inca-2-3/)
- 426 26. Dubuisson C, Dufour A, Carrillo S, Drouillet-Pinard P, Havard S, Volatier J-L. The Third French
427 Individual and National Food Consumption (INCA3) Survey 2014-2015: method, design and
428 participation rate in the framework of a European harmonization process. *Public Health Nutr*
429 2019;22:584–600.
- 430 27. Turing AM. Computing Machinery And Intelligence. *Mind* 1950;LIX:433–60.
- 431 28. Schwarz F, Zehr J. PennController for Internet Based Experiments (IBEX). *Open Science*
432 *Framework*; 2018; <https://osf.io/md832/>
- 433 29. Ipjian ML, Johnston CS. Smartphone technology facilitates dietary change in healthy adults.
434 *Nutrition* 2017;33:343–7.
- 435 30. Lee J-E, Song S, Ahn JS, Kim Y, Lee JE. Use of a Mobile Application for Self-Monitoring Dietary
436 Intake: Feasibility Test and an Intervention Study. *Nutrients* 2017;9:E748.
- 437 31. Ahn Y, Bae J, Kim H-S. The development of a mobile u-Health program and evaluation for self-
438 diet management for diabetic patients. *Nutr Res Pract* 2016;10:342–51.

32. Rayner M, Scarborough P, Boxer A, Stockley L. Nutrient profiles: Development of Final Model Final Report. 2005; <http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/npreportsept05.pdf>
33. Vandeputte J, Cornuéjols A, Darcel N, Delaere F, Martin C. Coaching Agent: Making Recommendations for Behavior Change. A Case Study on Improving Eating Habits. 2022;9. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3535850.3535994>
34. Chaltiel D, Adjibade M, Deschamps V, Touvier M, Hercberg S, Julia C, Kesse-Guyot E. Programme National Nutrition Santé – guidelines score 2 (PNNS-GS2): development and validation of a diet quality score reflecting the 2017 French dietary guidelines. *Br J Nutr* 2019;122:331–42.
35. Bisogni CA, Connors M, Devine CM, Sobal J. Who we are and how we eat: a qualitative study of identities in food choice. *J Nutr Educ Behav* 2002;34:128–39.
36. Higgs S. Social norms and their influence on eating behaviours. *Appetite* 2015;86:38–44.
37. Vartanian LR, Spanos S, Herman CP, Polivy J. Modeling of food intake: a meta-analytic review. *Soc Influ* 2015;10:119–36.
38. Morewedge CK, Huh YE, Vosgerau J. Thought for Food: Imagined Consumption Reduces Actual Consumption. *Science* 2010;330:1530–3.
39. Norton MI, Mochon D, Ariely D. The IKEA effect: When labor leads to love. *J Consum Psychol* 2012;22:453–60.
40. Lika B, Kolomvatsos K, Hadjiefthymiades S. Facing the cold start problem in recommender systems. *Expert Syst Appl* 2014;41:2065–73.

460 **FIGURE 1: Substitutability scores computed between most frequent breakfast items:** The breakfast
461 sub-dataset was extracted from the French dataset INCA2 (25) gathering individual 7-day food diaries
462 for 2624 adults and 1455 children.