



**HAL**  
open science

## The nature of protein intake as a discriminating factor of diet sustainability: a multi-criteria approach

Hafsa Toujgani, Joséphine Brunin, Elie Perraud, Benjamin Allès, Mathilde Touvier, Denis Lairon, François Mariotti, Philippe Pointereau, Julia Baudry, Emmanuelle Kesse- Guyot

### ► To cite this version:

Hafsa Toujgani, Joséphine Brunin, Elie Perraud, Benjamin Allès, Mathilde Touvier, et al.. The nature of protein intake as a discriminating factor of diet sustainability: a multi-criteria approach. Scientific Reports, 2023, 13 (1), pp.17850. 10.1038/s41598-023-44872-3 . hal-04350853

**HAL Id: hal-04350853**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04350853>**

Submitted on 18 Dec 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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

## **The nature of protein intake as a discriminating factor of diet sustainability: a multi-criteria approach**

**Hafsa Toujgani\*<sup>1</sup>, Joséphine Brunin<sup>1-2</sup>, Elie Perraud<sup>3</sup>, Benjamin Allès<sup>1</sup>, Mathilde Touvier<sup>1</sup>, Denis Lairon<sup>4</sup>, François Mariotti<sup>3</sup>, Philippe Pointereau<sup>5</sup>, Julia Baudry<sup>1</sup>, Emmanuelle Kesse-Guyot<sup>1</sup>**

### **Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup> Université Sorbonne Paris Nord and Université Paris Cité, Inserm, INRAE, CNAM, Center of Research in Epidemiology and Statistics (CRESS), Nutritional Epidemiology Research Team (EREN), F-93017 Bobigny, France

<sup>2</sup> ADEME, (Agence de l'Environnement et de la Maîtrise de l'Energie), 49004 Angers, France

<sup>3</sup> Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR PNCA, 91120, Palaiseau, France

<sup>4</sup> Aix Marseille Université, Inserm, INRAE, C2VN, 13005 Marseille, France

<sup>5</sup> Solagro, 75, Voie TOEC, CS 27608, F-31076 Toulouse Cedex 3, France

### **Corresponding author**

Hafsa Toujgani

Equipe de Recherche en Epidémiologie Nutritionnelle (EREN)

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

[h.toujgani@eren.smbh.univ-paris13.fr](mailto:h.toujgani@eren.smbh.univ-paris13.fr)

**Running title: Sustainability of protein profiles**

**Number of tables/ figures:** 2 tables /3 figures

**Supplemental material:** 4 methods, 5 tables and 2 figures

**Abbreviations:**

IPCC: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change  
GBD: Global Burden of Diseases  
INSEE: National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies  
Org-FFQ: Organic Food Frequency Questionnaire  
GHG: greenhouse gas  
CED: Cumulative energy demand  
pReCiPe: partial ReCiPe  
PANDiet: Diet Quality Index based on the Probability of Adequate Nutrient Intake  
PNNS: Programme National Nutrition Santé  
PNNS-GS2: Program National Nutrition Health Guidelines Score  
cDQI: Comprehensive Diet Quality Index  
AS: Adequation sub-score of PANDiet  
MS: Moderation sub-score of PANDiet  
TMREL: Theoretical Minimum-Risk Exposure Level  
HRS: Health Risk Score  
SD: Standard Deviation  
SEM: Standard Error of the Mean  
AHC: Ascending Hierarchical Classification  
PCA: Principal Component Analysis  
SFF: sweetened and fatty foods

## 1 **Abstract**

2 Animal production is responsible for 56-58% of the GHG emissions and limiting meat consumption  
3 would strongly contribute to reducing human health risks in Western countries. This study aimed to  
4 investigate the nature of protein intake as a discriminating factor for diets' sustainability.

5 Using data from 29,210 French adults involved in the NutriNet-Santé cohort, we identified clusters  
6 according to 23 protein sources. A multicriteria (environmental, economic, nutritional and health)  
7 sustainability analysis was then conducted on the identified clusters. The economic analysis focused  
8 on both food and protein expenditure structures, using a budget coefficient approach. Relative  
9 values of clusters compared to the whole sample were calculated.

10 We identified five clusters: milk-based, meat-based, fast food-based, healthy-fish-based, and  
11 healthy-plant-based. We found that the healthy-plant-based and healthy-fish-based clusters were  
12 the most sustainable, conciliating the compromise between human health (0.25 and 0.53  
13 respectively for the Health Risk Score) and the protection of the environment (-62% and -19%  
14 respectively for the pReCiPe indicator). Conversely, the highest environmental impacts (+33% for the  
15 pReCiPe indicator) and the highest health risk (0.95 for the HRS) were observed for the meat-based  
16 cluster, which was associated with the lowest nutritional scores (-61% for the PNNS-GS2 score). The  
17 economic analysis showed that the healthy-plant-based cluster was the one with the highest food  
18 budget coefficient (+46%), followed by the healthy-fish-based cluster (+8%), partly explained by a  
19 strong share of organic food in the diet. However, the meat-based cluster spent more of their food  
20 budget on their protein intake (+13%), while the healthy-plant-based cluster exhibited the lowest  
21 expenditure for this intake (-41%).

22 Our results demonstrate that the nature of protein intake is a discriminating factor in diet  
23 sustainability. Also, reducing animal protein consumption would generate co-benefits beyond  
24 environmental impacts, by being favorable for health, while reducing the monetary cost associated  
25 with protein intake.

## 26 **Keywords**

27 Sustainable, dietary patterns, protein sources, environmental pressures, health risk, food  
28 expenditure, protein expenditure.

### 29 **Highlights Results**

30 Five clusters were extracted based on the contributions of protein sources: milk-based,  
31 meat-based, fast-food-based, healthy-fish-based, and healthy-plant-based.

32 **Sustainability assessment of the identified diets:** the healthy-plant-based and healthy-fish-  
33 based clusters were the most sustainable with the lowest environmental impacts, the  
34 highest nutritional quality and the best adherence to the French dietary guidelines, and the  
35 lowest health risk score. In contrast, the meat-based cluster displayed the highest  
36 environmental impacts and health risk score. The fast-food-based cluster was associated  
37 with the lowest nutritional scores.

38 **Economic analysis:** we put a specific emphasis on the economic dimensions: the healthy-  
39 plant-based cluster showed the largest share of income allocated to food, followed by the  
40 healthy-fish-based cluster. In addition, the meat-based cluster had the largest share of food  
41 budget allocated to protein intake while the healthy-plant-based cluster had the lowest.

42

## 43 **Introduction**

44 Some planetary boundaries being officially crossed (1–3), recent efforts to limit global warming to  
45 1.5°C, as stipulated in the Paris Climate Agreement, remain insufficient according to the 2021  
46 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report (4). Moreover, The 2023 Sustainable  
47 Development Goals Report not only confirms this assessment but also sounds the alarm, urgently  
48 calling for a doubling of efforts to get these objectives back on track (5). Actually, current food  
49 systems are responsible for one third of global GHG emissions (6), one third to 80% of which  
50 originates from the production stage (6,7). Besides, as populations become more urbanized and  
51 affluent, their dietary patterns are shifting towards calorie-rich diets with more animal-based and  
52 protein-dense foods (8). These dietary patterns have been largely influenced by the “protein”  
53 debate, which has been evolving for decades. It was in the 1930s that particular attention was paid  
54 to this nutrient, with the widespread incidence of kwashiorkor, and its association with protein  
55 deficiency (9). A special Protein Advisory Group was then created by the United Nations, whose  
56 mission was to “fight to close the protein gap”, while dietary guidelines encouraged the consumption  
57 of protein-rich foods, namely meat and milk (10). Furthermore, the “protein” debate has been largely  
58 influenced by animal production industry, given the great market opportunities offered by this  
59 sector, whose trade balance reached 28 billion euros in 2018 in the EU (11). However, the debate has  
60 gone off in another direction, and it is now beyond doubt that the reduction of meat consumption  
61 would contribute to strongly reducing human health risks in Western countries according to the  
62 Global Burden of Diseases (GBD) analysis (12). Moreover, animal food production is responsible for  
63 56-58% of the emissions generated by food production while providing only 37% of the protein  
64 supply (13). In that regard, the IPCC has strongly recommended to reduce meat consumption by two-  
65 thirds (4), as red meat and processed meat production have been shown to have the highest impact  
66 on all dimensions (GHG emissions, land use, water use, acidification and eutrophication) (13,14).  
67 Note that these emissions are double those generated by plant-based foods (15). Although it has  
68 been proven that there is no longer protein gap in Western countries, as protein intake exceeding

69 needs (16), the protein debate persists and has shifted towards new trends of “protein transitions”.  
70 The new markets of plant-based meat and dairy substitutes are growing exponentially (17),  
71 contributing to collapse the global dietary issues into a single nutrient. That being said, the  
72 individuals’ dietary patterns seem to be strongly influenced by this debate. Indeed, it has been  
73 shown that the overall diet of meat eaters is less healthy than the one of plant-based foods eaters  
74 (18–20).

75 Thus, as we assume that the nature of protein intake might be indicative of the overall dietary  
76 patterns of individuals, we hypothesized that it could be a discriminating factor for diet sustainability,  
77 as defined by FAO in 2012 (21). We identified a previous study comparing diets defined by protein  
78 sources in relation to sustainability (22) but the economic dimension was not assessed. However, we  
79 believe that this aspect holds considerable importance regarding individual dietary choices,  
80 particularly given the established literature linking healthier and acceptable diets to increased  
81 expenses (23). Our objective was to identify clusters in the population of French adults participating  
82 in the NutriNet-Santé cohort, according to the sources of protein intake, and then to characterize, in  
83 a multi-criteria approach, the level of sustainability of these clusters according to environmental,  
84 economic, nutritional and health aspects. We specifically conducted an economic analysis to  
85 investigate the expenditure structure of both food and protein intake across the identified clusters as  
86 this dimension of diets’ sustainability is often omitted.

## 87 **Methods and Data**

### 88 **Study population**

89 The present study used observational data from the NutriNet-Santé study. The NutriNet-Santé study  
90 is an Internet-based cohort launched in May 2009 (24). Its purpose is to study the determinants of  
91 diets, nutritional status, and physical activity as well as their associations with health. The  
92 participants, recruited on a voluntary basis, are adults living in France with an access to internet.  
93 Participants have to complete annual or biannual questionnaires on socioeconomic status, lifestyle,  
94 anthropometry, dietary intake and physical activity. Regularly, specific questionnaires are proposed.

95 Gender, occupational status, income, place of residence, physical activity, and smoking habits are  
96 self-reported using validated questionnaires (25). The NutriNet- Santé study is in line with the  
97 principles of the Helsinki Declaration (26) and validated by both the INSERM Ethical Evaluation  
98 Committee (CEEI) (no. 0000388FWA00005831) and the National Committee for Information  
99 Technology and Freedom (CNIL) (nos. 908450 and 909216). The study is registered in  
100 ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03335644).

### 101 **Assessment of food consumption and protein intake in total and by food groups**

102 Food consumption data were collected via an Organic Food Frequency Questionnaire (Org-FFQ)  
103 developed in 2014, including 264 organic and conventional food items (27). In the present study, a  
104 total of 23 food groups were defined based on their protein content as follows: meat (including red  
105 meat and pork), processed meat, poultry, seafood, eggs, milk, dairy (including all dairy products  
106 except for milk), fast food, sweetened and fatty foods (SFF), fat (including animal fat and margarine),  
107 dressing, potatoes, legumes, whole-grain products, cereals (including all cereals products), nuts,  
108 soya-based products (including also substitutes), vegetables, fruits, fruit juice, beverages (including  
109 non-alcoholic beverages), oil (including vegetable oils) and alcohol (including all alcoholic beverages).  
110 Nutrient values were derived from the food composition table developed for the NutriNet-Santé  
111 study (28). Detailed information on the composition of the food groups is provided in the legend of  
112 Figure 1.

### 113 **Environmental data**

114 Environmental pressures, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>-eq), Cumulative Energy Demand  
115 (MJ), Land use (m<sup>2</sup>), were assessed using the DIALECTE tool (29). Developed by Solagro, this French  
116 diagnostic tool aims to evaluate the environmental performance of French farms using a  
117 comprehensive approach. The Life Cycle Assessment method was used on 60 raw agricultural  
118 products. The scope of the analysis was limited to the agricultural production stage but organic and  
119 conventional products were distinguished. Details are provided in **Supplemental Material 1**. In  
120 addition, the pReCiPe score, a synthetic impact indicator including the three indicators above, has



121 been calculated (30). To balance conflicting environmental indicators, the ReCiPe method considers  
 122 both midpoint and endpoint measures. Developed in the Netherlands, this LCA method aligns the  
 123 indicators to provide a comprehensive view (30). It focuses on 18 indicators, three of which are  
 124 oriented towards final impacts, including resource availability, human health and ecosystem  
 125 diversity. In practice, some authors have found that the environmental impact of food products and  
 126 diets can be assessed by measuring greenhouse gas emissions, primary energy consumption, and  
 127 land occupation. These factors make up about 90% of the total environmental dimension of the  
 128 ReCiPe model. To calculate the environmental impact of a food product or diet, one can use the  
 129 partial ReCiPe score (pReCiPe), with normalization and weighting factors (31).

130 The pReCiPe score is computed as follows:

$$pReCiPe = 0.0459 \times GHGe + 0.0025 \times CED + 0.0439 \times LO$$

131  
 132 with GHGe, in kg of CO<sub>2</sub>eq/d, CED, in MJ/d and LO, in m<sup>2</sup>/d. The highest the pReCiPe, the highest the  
 133 environmental impact.

#### 134 **Nutritional quality data**

135 Three dietary indexes were computed. The PANDiet (Diet Quality Index based on the Probability of  
 136 Adequate Nutrient Intake) is a nutritional adequacy score based on the nutritional references values  
 137 (32,33). The PNNS-GS2 (Program National Nutrition Health Guidelines Score) measures the  
 138 adherence of individuals to the French dietary guidelines established by the High Council of Public  
 139 Health in 2017 (34). The cDQI (Comprehensive Diet Quality Index) aims to assess the quality of plant  
 140 and animal foods consumed (35). Further details are provided in **Supplemental Material 2**.

#### 141 **Health risk data**

142 Health risk was assessed using a “*Health Risk Score*” (HRS) of the diet, computed using the distance  
 143 to the Theoretical Minimum-Risk Exposure Level (TMREL), provided in the GBD study in 2019 (12). It  
 144 reflects the overall risk of death associated with the individual dietary pattern, resulted from a

145 suboptimal consumption of each food group. The computation of the HRS, ranging from 0 to 1, is  
146 provided in the **Supplemental Material 3**.

#### 147 **Economic data**

148 The economic data used were participants' monthly income, and their estimated food expenditures  
149 for their whole diet and each food group.

150 Participants' income was collected as part of the socio-economic status questionnaire, where each  
151 participant provided the income class corresponding to his/her monthly income. Income per  
152 consumption unit (C.U) were estimated using household composition and age of family members  
153 according to the INSEE procedure (36). In the NutriNet-Santé study, the monetary cost of the diet  
154 (€/d) was calculated for each participant using prices (€/g) from several databases. Further details  
155 are provided in **Supplemental Material 4**.

#### 156 **Statistical Analysis**

157 Among the participants in the cohort NutriNet-Santé, 29, 210 individuals were selected for this study,  
158 with Org-FFQ data, no missing data for sociodemographic aspects (except for monthly income which  
159 is a non-mandatory question) and with available information on place of purchase. Those considered  
160 as under- or over-reporters for energy intake were excluded as previously published (27). A flowchart  
161 is provided in **Supplemental Figure 1**.

#### 162 **Construction of the protein-source-typology and description of clusters**

163 The contribution (in %) to total protein intake of the 23 food groups was calculated for each  
164 individual, to focus on the sources independently of the total intake. The typology aiming to identify  
165 groups of individuals with similar protein sources was built using a two-step procedure. First, a  
166 Principal Component Analysis (37) was applied on the 23 protein contributing food groups (the list is  
167 available on **Figure 1**). This multivariate data analysis method allowed to reduce the initial range of  
168 information by maximizing the variance. Nine dimensions were retained according to Kaiser criterion  
169 (eigenvalues >1). Then, on the basis of the retained dimensions, an Ascending Hierarchical  
170 Classification (AHC) was performed with data preprocessing using the K-means algorithm reiterated

171 100 times. As this study used a large database, the complementary use of the k-means and AHC  
 172 methods allowed to stabilize the solution. Further details are provided in **Supplemental Material 5**.

### 173 **Description and comparison of clusters**

174 The clusters were named according to the food groups contributing the most to the protein intake of  
 175 each cluster compared to the whole sample. First, means (SD) of protein contribution of each food  
 176 group were computed (%/day) for the whole sample. Then, as cluster potentially exhibits a different  
 177 energy intake than the whole sample, energy-adjusted means of protein contributions of the 23 food  
 178 groups (SEM) were calculated for each cluster, using ANCOVA models.

179 The identified clusters were described according to the socio-demographic characteristics reporting  
 180 mean (SD) or % for continuous and categorical variables respectively. Means comparison across  
 181 clusters was performed using Pearson's Chi-square test for categorical variables and ANOVA test for  
 182 continuous variables. For food groups consumption, mean (SD) were presented for the whole  
 183 sample, and for each cluster, energy-adjusted mean of food group intakes (g/day) and standard error  
 184 of the mean (SEM) were calculated, using ANCOVA models.

185 Percentages of total energy intake were calculated for macronutrients. For vitamins, minerals and  
 186 fiber, each nutrient energy-adjusted intake was calculated based on the "residual method" (38).

187 Prevalence of adequate protein intake is computed as defined in the PANDiet score (33).

188 To allow comparison of clusters to the whole sample in relative values for all indicators, standardized  
 189 means were computed for the whole sample, corresponding to the mean that the whole sample  
 190 would have if its energy intake was that of the cluster (*overall<sub>i</sub>*). Relative values as regards energy-  
 191 adjusted indicator, were then calculated with the following formula:

$$\text{Relative value of indicator } i(\%) = \frac{\text{Energy adjusted mean}_i - \text{Standardized mean}_{\text{overall}_i}}{\text{Standardized mean}_{\text{overall}_i}} \times 100$$

192 Where i denotes clusters.

### 193 **Multicriteria analysis**

194 For each sustainability indicator considered, we calculated the mean (SD), and for each cluster,  
 195 energy-adjusted means (SEM) were calculated via ANCOVA models. Comparison between clusters

196 was based on relative values computed as defined above. A comparison of means across clusters was  
 197 performed using ANCOVA models.

### 198 **Economic analysis**

199 The objective was to analyze both food and protein expenditure structure across clusters. The  
 200 economic analysis included 27,244 of the 29,210 participants, for whom there were no missing  
 201 income data (since the question was optional). The monthly income variable, modelled, as category  
 202 was transformed into a numeric variable by considering the class center of the daily income category  
 203 for each individual as previously done (39) and converted as euros per day.

204 The expenditure structure analysis across clusters was conducted using a budget coefficient  
 205 approach (40). This approach makes comparable the share of food expenditure between individuals  
 206 with different incomes and different diets (40).

207 To do so, we first computed for each participant, the budget coefficients of both the overall diet and  
 208 the food groups, using the following formulas:

$$\text{Budget coefficient of the overall diet}_i = \frac{\text{Overall diet expenditure}_i}{\text{Income}_i} \times 100$$

$$\text{Budget coefficient of food group}_{i,j} = \frac{\text{Food group expenditure}_{i,j}}{\text{Overall diet expenditure}_i} \times 100$$

209 *Where i denotes individuals and j denotes food groups.*

210 Insofar as we assume that the production mode (organic/conventional) affects food expenditure, the  
 211 analysis was detailed by distinguishing expenditures allocated to organic products from those  
 212 allocated to conventional products. To do so, budget coefficients of organic and conventional foods,  
 213 for the overall diet and for each food group were computed for each individual. For the overall diet,  
 214 budget coefficients of the overall diet by production mode were computed with respect to the  
 215 overall diet budget. The budget coefficients of the food groups by production mode were calculated  
 216 in relation to the overall diet budget allocated to foods from the corresponding production mode.

217 We defined the protein expenditure as the share of the food group expenditure allocated to the daily  
 218 protein intake. It was calculated, for each food group and for each participant, using the following  
 219 formula:

$$\text{Protein expenditure}_{i,j} (\text{€}) = \frac{\text{Food expenditure}_{i,j} (\text{€}) \times \text{Protein intake}_{i,j} (\text{g})}{\text{Quantity consumed}_{i,j} (\text{g})}$$

220 Where  $i$  denotes individuals and  $j$  denotes food groups.

221 Then, the “**Total protein expenditure**” was calculated for each participant by summing the protein  
222 expenditures for all food groups.

223 The budget coefficients of protein intake were then computed, using the following formulas:

$$\text{Budget coefficient of protein intake per food group}_{i,j} = \frac{\text{Protein expenditure}_{i,j}}{\text{Overall diet expenditure}_i} \times 100$$

$$\text{Budget coefficient of the total protein intake}_i = \frac{\text{Total Protein expenditure}_i}{\text{Overall diet expenditure}_i} \times 100$$

224 Where  $i$  denotes individuals and  $j$  denotes food groups.

225 Afterwards, non-adjusted means (SD) were computed for all the calculated budget coefficients for  
226 the whole sample, and for each cluster, means and standard error of the mean (SEM) adjusted for  
227 energy intake were estimated using ANCOVA models. Comparison between clusters was based on  
228 relative percentage values computed using standardized means as defined above. Comparison of  
229 means across clusters was performed using the ANCOVA test.

230 Data management and statistical analyses were performed using RStudio software (RStudio, Version  
231 1.4.1717, © 2009-2021 RStudio, PBC).

## 232 **Results**

233 The study population was predominantly female (75%), with a mean age of 54 (SD=14) years  
234 **(Supplemental Table 1).**

### 235 **Description of the protein-source typology**

236 Based on food group contribution to protein intake, we identified 5 clusters (**Figure 1 and Table 1**):  
237 **Milk-based** cluster (17% of the population), characterized by high contributions of milk (+336%  
238 higher than the whole sample) and beverages (coffee, tea (including with milk), all sweetened  
239 beverages except fruit juice 100% ; **Meat-based** cluster (26% of the population) with high  
240 contributions of red meat to proteins (+54%) , poultry and processed meat; **Fast-food-based** cluster  
241 (29% of the population) showing a higher protein intake derived from fast food to proteins (+37%) ,

242 refined or wholegrain cereals, fatty and sweet products; **Healthy-fish-based** cluster (25% of the  
243 population), characterized by high protein intake from seafood (+49%), wholegrain cereal products,  
244 fruit and vegetables; and finally the **Healthy-plant-based** cluster (3% of the population) for which the  
245 most of protein intake is derived from the consumption of soy (+909%), legumes, nuts, fruit and  
246 vegetables. The detailed values are presented in **Table 1**, and **figure 1**.

247 The characteristics of the participants in the 5 clusters are shown in **Supplemental Table 1**. Food  
248 group consumptions across clusters are presented in **Supplemental figure 2**, and computed nutrient  
249 intakes across clusters are presented in **Supplemental Table 2**. Total Protein intakes range from  
250 67g/d in the healthy-plant-based cluster to 99g/d in the meat-based cluster, while plant-based  
251 protein intakes vary from 25g/d in the meat-based cluster to 53g/d in the healthy-plant-based  
252 cluster.

### 253 **Multi-criteria analysis of clusters**

254 Results of the multicriteria analysis of clusters are presented in **Table 2** and **figure 2**.

### 255 **Nutritional quality**

256 **Table 2** shows that the healthy-plant-based had the highest PNNS-GS2 score (+144% compared to  
257 the whole sample), reflecting a better adherence to the PNNS guidelines and the highest PANDiet  
258 score (+12% compared to the whole sample) based on nutritional reference values, followed by the  
259 healthy-fish-based cluster. This latter cluster, though, showed the highest cDQI score (+15%  
260 compared to the whole sample), indicating the highest quality of both animal and plant foods  
261 consumed. Inversely, the meat-based cluster had the lowest nutritional scores for all computed  
262 indicators (-61%, -5% and -8% respectively for the PNNS-GS2, the PANDiet, and the cDQI indicators).

### 263 **Health risk score**

264 The health risk analysis (**Table 2**) showed that the structure of the healthy-plant-based cluster was  
265 the most beneficial compared to the other clusters (0.25 for the HRS score), followed by the healthy-  
266 fish-based cluster (0.53 for the HRS score). Yet, the health risk score associated with the meat-based  
267 cluster was the highest among the five clusters (0.95 for the HRS score). Furthermore, the analysis of

268 the contribution of food groups to the health risk score shows that for all clusters, a low consumption  
269 of wholegrain products and legumes and a high consumption of red meat contribute the most to the  
270 value of the HRS.

### 271 **Environmental impacts**

272 **Table 2** shows that for all observed indicators, the healthy-plant-based cluster had the least impact  
273 on the environment (pReCIpe: - 62% compared to the whole sample), while the meat-based cluster  
274 showed the highest impact (pReCIpe: + 33% compared to the whole sample) among the five  
275 identified diets. The environmental impacts of healthy-fish-based and fast-food-based clusters were  
276 lower than the whole sample means for all indicators. The milk-based diet showed similar  
277 environmental impacts to the whole sample means.

### 278 **Organic food consumption across clusters**

279 **Table 2** shows that participants of the healthy-plant-based cluster had the highest share of organic  
280 consumption (+127% compared to the whole sample), followed by the participants of the healthy-  
281 fish-based cluster showing a 40% higher share than the average of the population. However, the  
282 participants of the meat-based and milk-based clusters showed the lowest share of organic food (-  
283 30% compared to the whole sample) among the five identified clusters.

### 284 **Economic analysis**

285 The healthy-plant-based cluster had the largest share of income allocated to food (+46% compared  
286 to the whole sample) (**Figure 3**). On the opposite, consumers of milk-based and fast-food-based  
287 clusters spent the smallest share of their income for food (-10% and -6% compared to the whole  
288 sample), while the food budget coefficient of the meat-based cluster is similar to the mean of the  
289 population studied. Comparison of clusters by food groups revealed that budget coefficients  
290 followed the same trend as food intake across the clusters. Furthermore, analysis of food  
291 expenditure structure by cluster showed that vegetables are the food group for which all clusters  
292 spent the largest share of their overall diet expenditure, with the exception of the meat-based  
293 cluster, who spent the most for meat.

294 After vegetables, the milk-based cluster spent more for meat and non-alcoholic beverages, the fast-  
295 food-based cluster for dairy products, the healthy-fish-based cluster for fruit and seafood, and the  
296 healthy-plant-based cluster for fruits and soy-based foods. The detailed values are presented in  
297 **Supplemental table 3.**

298 Analysis of the overall diet budget coefficients according to the production mode (**Supplemental**  
299 **Table 4**) showed that 70% of the food expenditure of the healthy-plant-based cluster was allocated  
300 to organic products, which contributes to the higher diet expenditure. Conversely, the meat-based  
301 cluster had the lowest share of the budget allocated to organic food (20%).

302 In terms of budget coefficients of protein intake (**Figure 3**), meat-based cluster participants were  
303 those spending the most of their overall diet expenditure for their protein intake (+13% compared to  
304 the whole sample). The healthy-plant-based cluster exhibited  
305 the lowest protein expenditure (-41% compared to the whole sample), followed by the fast-food-  
306 based and milk-based clusters (-5% and -3% respectively, compared to the whole sample). Analysis of  
307 protein expenditure structure by cluster showed that meat-based, milk-based and fast-food-based  
308 clusters spent the largest share of their overall diet expenditure on meat proteins. The healthy-fish-  
309 based cluster allocated the largest share of their overall diet expenditure to seafood proteins, while  
310 the healthy-plant-based cluster spent more on nuts proteins.

311 The detailed values are presented in **Supplemental Table 5.**

## 312 **Discussion**

313 We extracted five clusters based according to food-group contribution to protein intake (all analyses  
314 are adjusted for energy intake). The healthy-plant-based cluster (3%) and the healthy-fish-based  
315 cluster (25%) were the most sustainable for the environmental, nutritional and health dimensions.  
316 Conversely, the meat-based cluster (26%) exhibited the highest environmental pressures, the lowest  
317 nutritional scores and a high health risk. Furthermore, based on an economic analysis, we observed  
318 that although the healthy-plant-based cluster had the highest food budget coefficient, its  
319 expenditure for protein intake was the lowest. Conversely, expenditure on protein intake was high



320 for the meat-based cluster eaters. This study therefore argues that the protein sources of a diet are a  
321 good factor in the sustainability of diets.

### 322 **Nutritional quality and health risk across diets**

323 The healthy-plant-based cluster exhibited the highest PANDiet score, and a better adherence to the  
324 PNNS guidelines. In fact, while the choice of protein sources in individuals' diets often raises the  
325 question of protein adequacy (including protein and amino acid intakes) (16), previous studies  
326 documented that balanced diets in accordance with public health goals and with low meat intake,  
327 provide an adequate intake for most nutrients (41). Indeed, the amounts and quality of plant-based  
328 proteins are frequently underestimated or misunderstood (42). Moreover, maintaining protein  
329 adequacy in spite of the decrease in the consumed quantity of animal protein could be explained by  
330 the great excess above the needs in terms of protein intake in Western countries (16). But this issue  
331 is still being debated and for example, a Canadian cohort study stated that the transition to plant-  
332 based protein might be nutritionally challenging since animal protein contributes overwhelmingly to  
333 total protein intake, particularly for the elderly (43).

334 The health risk analysis showed that the dietary structure of the healthy-plant-based cluster eaters is  
335 the most protective in terms of health benefits, as reflected using the HRS, while the health risk  
336 associated with the meat-based cluster is much higher. Similar results were found using another  
337 health risk estimator, the HiDiet score, aiming to evaluate the effect of diet on long-term morbidity  
338 and mortality (22). Thus, plant-based protein consumption was proven to be associated with nutrient  
339 intakes and dietary profiles that are supportive of cardiometabolic health (44). Moreover, the  
340 reduction in premature mortality associated with the adoption of balanced low-meat diets, was  
341 estimated at 19% for the flexitarian diet and 22% for the vegan diet (41). Furthermore, the  
342 association between animal sourced food consumption and the risk of chronic diseases has been  
343 established by literature (45–47). For instance, it has been demonstrated that a 5% substitution of  
344 animal protein with plant protein would reduce the risk of incidence of type 2 diabetes by 23% (48).

345 Indeed, red and processed meat were proved to be risk factors for type 2 diabetes, while soy and  
346 dairy products provide protection (49).

### 347 **Environmental impacts across the diets**

348 As the literature on the environmental impacts of protein consumption has not been sufficiently  
349 developed, we situated our results in relation to existing studies comparing predominantly animal-  
350 based diets to more plant-based diets. In our study, the healthy plant-based cluster had less  
351 environmental impact than the meat-based cluster, which exhibited the highest environmental  
352 pressures. This is in accordance with the available literature regarding the lowest impact of plant-  
353 based dietary patterns (8,22,50,51). Moreover, it has been demonstrated, in a comprehensive review  
354 (52), that the decrease of the environmental footprint is generally proportional to the extent to  
355 which animal-based food consumption is restricted (41). Furthermore, we reported that belonging to  
356 the healthy-plant-based cluster was concomitant with a higher consumption of organic products, as  
357 shown before (53), which could contribute to the lower environmental impacts, especially for energy  
358 demand. A previous study also based on the NutriNet-Santé cohort (54), showed that organic food  
359 consumption could partly explain the inverse link between plant-based diet and some environmental  
360 impacts (GHG emissions and energy demand), specifying that this link is only established for  
361 individuals with diets rich in plant-based foods.

### 362 **Economic analysis**

363 We showed that, at constant energy intake, the overall diet expenditure of the healthy-plant-based  
364 cluster was the highest among the five clusters, followed by the healthy-fish-based cluster, and to a  
365 lesser extent the meat-based cluster. In that regard, a previous study based on a representative  
366 sample of 1,719 French adults (INCA2), showed that meeting with nutritional reference values  
367 systematically increased the cost of food (55), which is consistent with our previous findings  
368 regarding the superiority of the nutritional quality of healthy-plant-based and healthy-fish-based  
369 clusters. Nevertheless, improving diet quality by optimization on nutritional constraints without  
370 increasing food expenditure, regardless of the initially observed cost, has been shown to be possible

371 (55). However, for food budgets below 3.85€/day, significant diet changes were needed.  
372 Furthermore, the high food budget coefficients associated with the healthy-plant-based and healthy-  
373 fish-based clusters might also be explained by the much higher share of organic food consumption of  
374 these two clusters. Similarly, another study also based on the NutriNet-Santé cohort (56)  
375 demonstrated that high consumers of organic food displayed a high consumption of plant-based  
376 foods and a healthier diet. Thus, the monetary cost of their diet was higher (+26%) compared to that  
377 of low consumers due to the higher prices of organic products as shown by a decomposition model  
378 of the effects. This dual choice seems a best option by resulting in a markedly reduced exposure to  
379 pesticides from diet (56).

380 Interestingly, the protein budget coefficient of the meat-based cluster was higher than that of other  
381 clusters, which could be explained by both the higher prices of protein foods characteristic of the diet  
382 adopted by this cluster's participants (meat, poultry and processed meat) and their higher protein  
383 intake (+6% compared to the whole sample). Inversely, both the lower protein intake of the healthy-  
384 plant-based cluster eaters (-27% compared to the whole sample) and the lower prices of their diet's  
385 proteins sources (soya-based foods, legumes and nuts), might explain the lower protein budget  
386 coefficient. Indeed, it has been previously demonstrated in a meta-analysis assessing the nutritional  
387 status of meat-based diets compared to plant-based diets, that the protein intake of meat eaters was  
388 higher than that of people adopting a plant-based diet, although it was still within the recommended  
389 levels (57).

#### 390 **Multicriteria analysis of diets' sustainability according to protein intake**

391 The scarcity of studies on sustainability in its entirety is inherent to its multidimensionality, which  
392 makes it complex to conduct research in this sense. Indeed, while a multi-criteria analysis of protein  
393 profiles (22) close to our study only addressed 2 of the 4 dimensions of diets sustainability  
394 (environment, nutrition and health) according to the FAO definition (21), we also focused on the  
395 economic aspect since this dimension has rarely been accounted for in multi-criteria studies on  
396 sustainability. The economic analysis we carried out aimed to provide an initial overview of the

397 aspect of economic affordability. However, cultural acceptability, which is a significant obstacle to  
398 achieving changes in dietary behaviour, haven't been sufficiently addressed neither in our work nor  
399 in that of Perraud et al. (22). On the other hand, the multiplicity of aspects making up these  
400 dimensions prevent from covering them entirely. Indeed, although we assessed the environmental  
401 pressures and impacts on 3 aspects, the above-mentioned study (22) evaluated other impacts by  
402 mobilizing more indicators, but without distinguishing organic and conventional foods as we did. The  
403 results of this study (22) remain consistent with ours, showing that protein profiles associated with  
404 low meat consumption tend to be more sustainable on the two dimensions analysed, namely  
405 environment, nutrition and health. Moreover, due to the difference in dietary behaviours of the  
406 different populations considered in these two studies, discrepancies with our results are identified,  
407 notably in the identification of clusters (distinction between ruminant and monogastric meat in the  
408 protein profiles (22), identification of more plant-based protein profiles in our work).

#### 409 **Action levers for greater sustainability**

410 Insofar as we concluded that the nature of protein intake is a discriminating factor in the  
411 sustainability of diets, it is relevant to consider this factor for the development of action plans for  
412 changing dietary patterns towards greater sustainability. As previously mentioned, meat  
413 consumption is associated with socio-cultural values, making transitions to plant-based diets more  
414 complex to manage in practice (58,59). To this end, some suggestions have been developed in the  
415 literature. First, at the production stage, some environmental impacts could be reduced by  
416 integrating crops and livestock (60) and promoting grazing systems. This could improve efficiency of  
417 animal feeding and nutrient cycling, besides crop rotation through temporary grasslands. Also, non-  
418 food biomass would serve as feed for animals, which provide organic fertilizer (60). Then, at the  
419 consumption stage, an intrinsic change in diet at the food group level could be operated. As we  
420 demonstrated that beef, pork and poultry consumption are correlated for the meat-based cluster,  
421 replacing ruminant meat by poultry (13,61) could contribute to reduce some environmental  
422 pressures, especially GHG emissions (13) and to lower the health risk compared to red meat (13).

423 However, this raises the question of the individualized nature of dietary pattern, which conditions  
424 the feasibility of the effective transition from potential pathways to action plans for sustainable  
425 dietary changes. Acceptability is thus enhanced by considering personalized and targeted  
426 recommendations.

#### 427 **Strengths and limitation**

428 First of all, it is important to note that the participants in the NutriNet-Santé cohort are volunteers,  
429 who may have a greater interest in nutrition and health compared to the general population. As a  
430 result, this sample exhibits certain characteristics such as a higher proportion of women, older  
431 individuals, those with higher education and healthier dietary habits (62). However, the large sample  
432 size allows access to a wide variety of dietary profiles and probably a higher representation of diets  
433 rich in plant-based foods. However, our sample is not representative of the French population and  
434 these results cannot be directly generalized. Secondly, the environmental data mobilized are limited  
435 to the production stage. However, this stage represents the major part of the environmental impacts  
436 of the food system. And, as mentioned above, the socio-cultural dimension associated with the  
437 choice of protein sources in diets was not considered in this study. However, our study is the first to  
438 provide a multi-criteria analysis of sustainability according to protein profiles, while including an  
439 economic analysis. It covers a large French population, with various dietary patterns, including plant-  
440 based diets. Moreover, our study considers production modes (organic, conventional), and the data  
441 on food expenditures are quite accurate by considering consumers' places of purchase.

#### 442 **Conclusion**

443 In conclusion, the nature of protein intake is a good discriminating factor of diets sustainability. The  
444 healthy-plant-based and healthy-fish-based clusters were the most sustainable, allowing to conciliate  
445 the trade-off between individual and environmental health. Conversely, the meat-based cluster  
446 exhibited the highest environmental pressures, the lowest nutritional scores and a higher health risk  
447 score. Additionally, although the healthy-plant-based cluster had the highest food budget coefficient,  
448 their expenditure on protein intake was the lowest. However, this same expenditure was high for the

449 meat-based cluster, which is explained by both higher prices of the protein sources consumed and  
450 their higher protein intake. These results could be useful for the development of food transition  
451 strategies aimed at reducing animal protein consumption.

452

453 **Data Availability**

454 Analytic code will be made available upon request pending. Researchers from public institutions can  
455 submit a collaboration request including information on the institution and a brief description of the  
456 project to [collaboration@etude-nutrinet-sante.fr](mailto:collaboration@etude-nutrinet-sante.fr). All requests will be reviewed by the steering  
457 committee of the NutriNet-Santé study. If the collaboration is accepted, a data access agreement will  
458 be necessary and appropriate authorizations from the competent administrative authorities may be  
459 needed. In accordance with existing regulations, no personal data will be accessible

460 **Bibliography**

- 461 1. Campbell BM, Beare DJ, Bennett EM, Hall-Spencer JM, Ingram JSI, Jaramillo F, et al. Agriculture  
462 production as a major driver of the Earth system exceeding planetary boundaries. *E&S*.  
463 2017;22(4):art8.
- 464 2. Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K, Persson Å, Chapin FS, Lambin EF, et al. A safe operating space  
465 for humanity. *Nature*. 2009 Sep;461(7263):472–5.
- 466 3. Steffen W, Richardson K, Rockström J, Cornell SE, Fetzer I, Bennett EM, et al. Planetary  
467 boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*. 2015 Feb  
468 13;347(6223):1259855.
- 469 4. Masson-Delmotte V, Zhai P, Pirani A. Climate change 2021: the physical science basis : summary  
470 for policymakers : working group I contribution to the sixth Assessment report of the  
471 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC; 2021.
- 472 5. The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2023.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2023 Sep 21]. Available  
473 from: [https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-](https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2023.pdf)  
474 [2023.pdf](https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2023.pdf)
- 475 6. Crippa M, Solazzo E, Guizzardi D, Monforti-Ferrario F, Tubiello FN, Leip A. Food systems are  
476 responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions. *Nat Food*. 2021 Mar 8;2(3):198–  
477 209.
- 478 7. Clune S, Crossin E, Verghese K. Systematic review of greenhouse gas emissions for different fresh  
479 food categories. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2017 Jan;140:766–83.
- 480 8. Clark M, Hill J, Tilman D. The Diet, Health, and Environment Trilemma. *Annual Review of*  
481 *Environment and Resources*. 2018;
- 482 9. Nott J. “No one may starve in the British Empire”: Kwashiorkor, Protein and the Politics of  
483 Nutrition Between Britain and Africa. *Social History of Medicine*. 2021 May 28;34(2):553–76.
- 484 10. IPES-Food. The politics of protein: examining claims about livestock, fish, ‘alternative proteins’  
485 and sustainability. 2022.
- 486 11. Chatellier V, Dupraz P. Les performances économiques de l’élevage européen : de la  
487 “compétitivité coût” à la “compétitivité hors coût.” *INRAE Productions Animales*. 2019 Apr  
488 25;32(2):171–88.
- 489 12. Murray CJL, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, Abbafati C, Abbas KM, Abbasi-Kangevari M, et al. Global burden  
490 of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global  
491 Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020 Oct;396(10258):1223–49.
- 492 13. Poore J, Nemecek T. Reducing food’s environmental impacts through producers and consumers.  
493 *Science*. 2018 Jun;360(6392):987–92.
- 494 14. Clark MA, Springmann M, Hill J, Tilman D. Multiple health and environmental impacts of foods.  
495 *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2019 Nov 12;116(46):23357–62.
- 496 15. Xu X, Sharma P, Shu S, Lin TS, Ciais P, Tubiello FN, et al. Global greenhouse gas emissions from  
497 animal-based foods are twice those of plant-based foods. *Nat Food*. 2021 Sep 13;2(9):724–32.

- 498 16. Mariotti, Gardner. Dietary Protein and Amino Acids in Vegetarian Diets—A Review. *Nutrients*.  
499 2019 Nov 4;11(11):2661.
- 500 17. Bloomberg Intelligence. Bloomberg Intelligence. Plant-Based Foods Poised for Explosive Growth.  
501 Bloomberg Professional Services, August, 2021. [https://www.bloomberg.com/professional/bi-](https://www.bloomberg.com/professional/bi-research/?dyn=plant-based-food)  
502 [Research/?Dyn=plant-Based-Food,](https://www.bloomberg.com/professional/bi-research/?dyn=plant-based-food) 2021. 2021.
- 503 18. Sobiecki JG, Appleby PN, Bradbury KE, Key TJ. High compliance with dietary recommendations in  
504 a cohort of meat eaters, fish eaters, vegetarians, and vegans: results from the European  
505 Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition—Oxford study. *Nutrition Research*. 2016  
506 May;36(5):464–77.
- 507 19. Vergnaud AC, Norat T, Romaguera D, Mouw T, May AM, Travier N, et al. Meat consumption and  
508 prospective weight change in participants of the EPIC-PANACEA study. *The American Journal of*  
509 *Clinical Nutrition*. 2010 Aug;92(2):398–407.
- 510 20. Fogelholm M, Kanerva N, Männistö S. Association between red and processed meat  
511 consumption and chronic diseases: the confounding role of other dietary factors. *Eur J Clin Nutr*.  
512 2015 Sep;69(9):1060–5.
- 513 21. Burlingame B, Dernini S. Sustainable diets and biodiversity: directions and solutions for policy,  
514 research and action: proceedings of the international scientific symposium Biodiversity and  
515 sustainable diets united against hunger, 3-5 november 2010, FAO headquarters, Rome. Rome:  
516 FAO; 2012.
- 517 22. Perraud E, Wang J, Salomé M, Mariotti F, Kesse-Guyot E. Dietary protein consumption profiles  
518 show contrasting impacts on environmental and health indicators [Internet]. *Nutrition*; 2022 Jul  
519 [cited 2023 Mar 14]. Available from:  
520 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2022.07.07.22277350>
- 521 23. Darmon N, Drewnowski A. Contribution of food prices and diet cost to socioeconomic disparities  
522 in diet quality and health: a systematic review and analysis. *Nutr Rev*. 2015 Oct;73(10):643–60.
- 523 24. Hercberg S, Castetbon K, Czernichow S, Malon A, Mejean C, Kesse E, et al. The Nutrinet-Santé  
524 Study: a web-based prospective study on the relationship between nutrition and health and  
525 determinants of dietary patterns and nutritional status. *BMC Public Health*. 2010 Dec;10(1):242.
- 526 25. Vergnaud AC, Touvier M, Méjean C, Kesse-Guyot E, Pollet C, Malon A, et al. Agreement between  
527 web-based and paper versions of a socio-demographic questionnaire in the NutriNet-Santé  
528 study. *Int J Public Health*. 2011 Aug 1;56(4):407–17.
- 529 26. General Assembly of the World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of  
530 Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *J Am Coll Dent*.  
531 2014;81(3):14–8.
- 532 27. Baudry J, Méjean C, Allès B, Péneau S, Touvier M, Hercberg S, et al. Contribution of Organic Food  
533 to the Diet in a Large Sample of French Adults (the NutriNet-Santé Cohort Study). *Nutrients*.  
534 2015 Oct 21;7(10):8615–32.
- 535 28. NutriNet-Santé. Table de Composition Des Aliments ETUDE NUTRINET SANTE - Economica.  
536 [https://www.economica.fr/livre-table-de-composition-des-aliments-etude-nutrinet-sante-](https://www.economica.fr/livre-table-de-composition-des-aliments-etude-nutrinet-sante-c2x32211075)  
537 [c2x32211075](https://www.economica.fr/livre-table-de-composition-des-aliments-etude-nutrinet-sante-c2x32211075). 2013.



- 538 29. Pointereau P, Langevin B, Gimaret M. DIALECTE, a comprehensive and quick tool to assess the  
 539 agro-environmental performance of farms. Producing and reproducing farming systems New  
 540 modes of organisation for sustainable food systems of tomorrow 10th European IFSA  
 541 Symposium, Aarhus, Denmark, 1-4 July 2012 [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2023 Mar 14]; Available  
 542 from: <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20133410218>
- 543 30. Goedkoop M, Heijungs R, Huijbregts M. ReCiPE 2008: A life cycle impact assessment method  
 544 which comprises harmonised category indicators at the midpoint and the endpoint level. 2013;
- 545 31. Kramer GF, Tyszler M, Veer P van't, Blonk H. Decreasing the overall environmental impact of the  
 546 Dutch diet: how to find healthy and sustainable diets with limited changes. *Public Health Nutr.*  
 547 2017 Jun;20(9):1699–709.
- 548 32. de Gavelle E, Huneau JF, Fouillet H, Mariotti F. The Initial Dietary Pattern Should Be Considered  
 549 when Changing Protein Food Portion Sizes to Increase Nutrient Adequacy in French Adults. *The*  
 550 *Journal of Nutrition.* 2019 Mar;149(3):488–96.
- 551 33. Verger EO, Mariotti F, Holmes BA, Paineau D, Huneau JF. Evaluation of a Diet Quality Index Based  
 552 on the Probability of Adequate Nutrient Intake (PANDiet) Using National French and US Dietary  
 553 Surveys. Cameron DW, editor. *PLoS ONE.* 2012 Aug 3;7(8):e42155.
- 554 34. Kesse-Guyot E, Chaltiel D, Fezeu LK, Baudry J, Druesne-Pecollo N, Galan P, et al. Association  
 555 between adherence to the French dietary guidelines and the risk of type 2 diabetes. *Nutrition.*  
 556 2021 Apr;84:111107.
- 557 35. Keaver L, Ruan M, Chen F, Du M, Ding C, Wang J, et al. Plant- and animal-based diet quality and  
 558 mortality among US adults: a cohort study. *Br J Nutr.* 2021 Jun 28;125(12):1405–15.
- 559 36. INSEE. Définition - Nombre d'unités de Consommation Du Ménage Fiscal | Insee.  
 560 <https://www.insee.fr/fr/metadonnees/definition/c1001>. 2009.
- 561 37. O'Rourke N, Hatcher L, Stepanski EJ, Hatcher L. A step-by-step approach to using SAS for  
 562 univariate & multivariate statistics. 2nd ed. New York : Cary, NC : SAS: Wiley-Interscience; 2005.  
 563 514 p.
- 564 38. Willett W, Stampfer MJ. TOTAL ENERGY INTAKE: IMPLICATIONS FOR EPIDEMIOLOGIC ANALYSES.  
 565 *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 1986 Jul;124(1):17–27.
- 566 39. Seconda L, Baudry J, Allès B, Hamza O, Boizot-Szantai C, Soler LG, et al. Assessment of the  
 567 Sustainability of the Mediterranean Diet Combined with Organic Food Consumption: An  
 568 Individual Behaviour Approach. *Nutrients.* 2017 Jan 12;9(1):61.
- 569 40. Ferrant C, Plessz M. Structure des budgets alimentaires dans l'enquête Budget de famille 2011.  
 570 hal-01247408. 2015;
- 571 41. Springmann M, Wiebe K, Mason-D'Croz D, Sulser TB, Rayner M, Scarborough P. Health and  
 572 nutritional aspects of sustainable diet strategies and their association with environmental  
 573 impacts: a global modelling analysis with country-level detail. *The Lancet Planetary Health.* 2018  
 574 Oct 1;2(10):e451–61.
- 575 42. Katz DL, Doughty KN, Geagan K, Jenkins DA, Gardner CD. Perspective: The Public Health Case for  
 576 Modernizing the Definition of Protein Quality. *Advances in Nutrition.* 2019 Sep;10(5):755–64.

- 577 43. Auclair O, Burgos SA. Protein consumption in Canadian habitual diets: usual intake, inadequacy,  
578 and the contribution of animal- and plant-based foods to nutrient intakes. *Appl Physiol Nutr*  
579 *Metab.* 2021 May;46(5):501–10.
- 580 44. Mariotti F. Protéines animales et végétales : quels effets sur la santé cardio-métabolique ?  
581 *Médecine des Maladies Métaboliques.* 2019 May;13(3):245–51.
- 582 45. Giromini C, Givens DI. Benefits and Risks Associated with Meat Consumption during Key Life  
583 Processes and in Relation to the Risk of Chronic Diseases. *Foods.* 2022 Jul 12;11(14):2063.
- 584 46. Daniel CR, Cross AJ, Koebnick C, Sinha R. Trends in meat consumption in the USA. *Public Health*  
585 *Nutr.* 2011 Apr;14(4):575–83.
- 586 47. Salter AM. The effects of meat consumption on global health: -EN- -FR- Les effets de la  
587 consommation de viande sur la santé dans le monde -ES- Efectos del consumo de carne en la  
588 salud mundial. *Rev Sci Tech OIE.* 2018 Apr 1;37(1):47–55.
- 589 48. Malik VS, Li Y, Tobias DK, Pan A, Hu FB. Dietary Protein Intake and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes in US  
590 Men and Women. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2016 Apr 15;183(8):715–28.
- 591 49. Tian S, Xu Q, Jiang R, Han T, Sun C, Na L. Dietary Protein Consumption and the Risk of Type 2  
592 Diabetes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cohort Studies. *Nutrients.* 2017 Sep  
593 6;9(9):982.
- 594 50. Weindl I, Ost M, Wiedmer P, Schreiner M, Neugart S, Klopsch R, et al. Sustainable food protein  
595 supply reconciling human and ecosystem health: A Leibniz Position. *Global Food Security.* 2020  
596 Jun;25:100367.
- 597 51. Auestad N, Fulgoni VL. What Current Literature Tells Us about Sustainable Diets: Emerging  
598 Research Linking Dietary Patterns, Environmental Sustainability, and Economics. *Advances in*  
599 *Nutrition.* 2015 Jan;6(1):19–36.
- 600 52. Aleksandrowicz L, Green R, Joy EJM, Smith P, Haines A. The Impacts of Dietary Change on  
601 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use, Water Use, and Health: A Systematic Review. Wiley AS,  
602 editor. *PLoS ONE.* 2016 Nov 3;11(11):e0165797.
- 603 53. Baudry J, Touvier M, Allès B, Péneau S, Méjean C, Galan P, et al. Typology of eaters based on  
604 conventional and organic food consumption: results from the NutriNet-Santé cohort study. *Br J*  
605 *Nutr.* 2016 Aug 28;116(4):700–9.
- 606 54. Lacour C, Seconda L, Allès B, Hercberg S, Langevin B, Pointereau P, et al. Environmental Impacts  
607 of Plant-Based Diets: How Does Organic Food Consumption Contribute to Environmental  
608 Sustainability? *Front Nutr.* 2018 Feb 9;5:8.
- 609 55. Maillot M, Vieux F, Delaere F, Lluch A, Darmon N. Dietary changes needed to reach nutritional  
610 adequacy without increasing diet cost according to income: An analysis among French adults.  
611 Adams J, editor. *PLoS ONE.* 2017 Mar 30;12(3):e0174679.
- 612 56. Baudry J, Pointereau P, Seconda L, Vidal R, Taupier-Letage B, Langevin B, et al. Improvement of  
613 diet sustainability with increased level of organic food in the diet: findings from the BioNutriNet  
614 cohort. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition.* 2019 Apr;109(4):1173–88.

- 615 57. Neufingerl N, Eilander A. Nutrient Intake and Status in Adults Consuming Plant-Based Diets  
616 Compared to Meat-Eaters: A Systematic Review. *Nutrients*. 2021 Dec 23;14(1):29.
- 617 58. Niva M, Vainio A, Jallinoja P. Barriers to Increasing Plant Protein Consumption in Western  
618 Populations. In: *Vegetarian and Plant-Based Diets in Health and Disease Prevention* [Internet].  
619 Elsevier; 2017 [cited 2023 Mar 14]. p. 157–71. Available from:  
620 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/B9780128039687000101>
- 621 59. Graça J, Godinho CA, Truninger M. Reducing meat consumption and following plant-based diets:  
622 Current evidence and future directions to inform integrated transitions. *Trends in Food Science  
623 & Technology*. 2019 Sep;91:380–90.
- 624 60. Smith P, Haberl H, Popp A, Erb K heinz, Lauk C, Harper R, et al. How much land-based greenhouse  
625 gas mitigation can be achieved without compromising food security and environmental goals?  
626 *Glob Change Biol*. 2013 Aug;19(8):2285–302.
- 627 61. Clark M, Tilman D. Comparative analysis of environmental impacts of agricultural production  
628 systems, agricultural input efficiency, and food choice. *Environ Res Lett*. 2017 Jun  
629 1;12(6):064016.
- 630 62. Kesse-Guyot E, Assmann K, Andreeva V, Castetbon K, Méjean C, Touvier M, et al. Lessons  
631 Learned From Methodological Validation Research in E-Epidemiology. *JMIR Public Health  
632 Surveill*. 2016 Oct 18;2(2):e160.
- 633

634 **Acknowledgements**

635 We thank Cédric Agaësse, Alexandre De-Sa and Rebecca Lutchia (dietitians) (dietitian); Thi Hong Van  
636 Duong, Younes Esseddik (IT manager), Régis Gatibelza, Jagatjit Mohinder and Aladi Timera (computer  
637 scientists); Julien Allegre, Nathalie Arnault, Laurent Bourhis, Nicolas Dechamp and Fabien Szabo de  
638 Edelenyi, PhD (supervisor) (data-manager/statisticians) for their technical contribution to the  
639 NutriNet-Santé study, ); Merveille Kouam (health event validator), Maria Gomes (Nutrinaute  
640 support) and Nathalie Druesne-Pecollo, PhD (operational coordination). We thank all the volunteers  
641 of the NutriNet-Santé cohort. Nicolas Dechamp (data-manager/statisticians); Merveille Kouam  
642 (health event validator); Maria Gomes (participant support)  
643 Alexandre De Sa (dietitian), Rebecca Lutchia (dietitian)

644 **The authors' contributions are as follows:**

645 EKG, BA, DL, PP and JB, led the BioNutriNet project on which the data used.

646 HT conducted the analysis supervised by EKG.

647 HT wrote the statistical script, conducted analyses and drafted the manuscript.

648 All authors critically helped in the interpretation of results, revised the manuscript and provided  
649 relevant intellectual input. They all read and approved the final manuscript.

650 EKG had primary responsibility for the final content, she is the guarantor.

651 **Funding**


652 The NutriNet-Santé study is funded by French Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, Santé Publique  
653 France, Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale, National Research Institute for  
654 Agriculture, Food and the Environment, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, and Sorbonne  
655 Paris Nord University. The BioNutriNet project (PI EKG) was supported by the French National  
656 Research Agency (Agence Nationale de la Recherche) in the context of the 2013 Programme de  
657 Recherche Systèmes Alimentaires Durables (ANR-13-ALID-0001). The funders had no role in the study  
658 design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of data, preparation of the manuscript, and decision

659 to submit the paper. JBr was supported by a Doctoral Funding from National Research Institute for  
660 Agriculture, Food and the Environment (INRAE) and ADEME - Galilée Doctoral School.

661 **Additional Information**


662 No author declared conflict of interest.

663 **Figure 1: Protein contributions per food group across clusters<sup>1</sup>**



664 <sup>1</sup> Values are energy-adjusted means of protein contributions of food groups (%/day) computed using ANCOVA model. Food groups are formed as follows: Vegetables include all vegetables and  
 665 soups, fruit include fresh fruit, fruit in syrup and compote, dried fruit and seeds, beverages include fruit nectar, syrup, soda (with or without sugar), plant-based beverages (except soy-based),  
 666 milk consumed with tea/coffee, Seafood, dairy products include yogurts, fresh cheese and cheese, potatoes include other tubers, cereals include breakfast cereal low in sugar, bread semolina,  
 667 rice and pasta, SFF (sweet and fat foods) include croissants, pastries, chocolate, biscuits, milky dessert, ice cream, honey and marmalade, cakes, chips, salted oilseeds, salted biscuits, fast-food  
 668 include sandwich, prepared foods such as pizza, hamburger, ravioli, panini, salted pancake, etc., soy includes soy-based food that are tofu, soy-based meat substitute and vegetable patties,  
 669 soy-based yogurt, soy-based milk, animal fat (butter and lards) and dressing (ready-to-use salad dressing, mayonnaise or cream-based sauces) include sour cream and butter and all fat-based  
 670 sauces, oil include plant-based oils, meat includes beef and pork.


672 **Figure 2: Sustainability indicators across clusters<sup>1</sup>**



673  
 674 Abbreviations: HRS, Heath Risk Score; GHG, Greenhouse Gas (kg CO2 eq/d); CED, Cumulative Energy Demand (MJ/d); Land  
 675 Use (m<sup>2</sup>/d); pRecipe, partial Recipe; PANDiet, Diet Quality Index based on the Probability of Adequate Nutrient Intake; cDQI,  
 676 Comprehensive Diet Quality Index; PNNS-GS2, Program National Nutrition Health Guidelines Score.

677 <sup>1</sup> The energy-adjusted means of indicators, computed using ANCOVA model, were rescaled to the same scale by equalizing  
 678 the maximum value to 1 and the minimum value to 0 for each indicator. For the environmental indicators and the HRS,  
 679 higher values denote higher impacts/risk. For nutritional quality indicators, higher values denote higher nutritional quality.  
 680

681 **Figure 3 : Food budget coefficients across clusters according to production mode (A); Protein budget coefficients across clusters (B)<sup>1</sup>.**



700 <sup>1</sup> Values are energy-adjusted means of budget coefficients computed using ANCOVA model.

701 Panel A refers to food budget coefficients across clusters according to production mode (organic/conventional). Panel B refers to protein budget coefficients across clusters.



**Table 1: Protein contributions of food groups across clusters<sup>1,2,3</sup>**

Food groups	Whole sample n = 29,210	Milk-based n = 4,966 (17%)	Meat-based n = 7,569 (26%)	Fast-food-based n = 8,469 (29%)	Healthy-fish-based n = 7,189 (25%)	Healthy-plant-based n = 1,017 (3%)	p
<b>Legumes</b>	1.41 (2.49)	0.86 (0.03)	0.95 (0.02)	1.06 (0.02)	1.71 (0.02)	8.49 (0.07)	< 0.0001
<b>Soya-based foods</b>	1.62 (4.72)	0.43 (0.05)	0.42 (0.04)	0.83 (0.04)	2.56 (0.04)	16.33 (0.12)	< 0.0001
<b>Cereals</b>	8.9 (6.38)	8.83 (0.09)	9.39 (0.07)	10.84 (0.07)	5.91 (0.07)	10.68 (0.19)	< 0.0001
<b>Nuts</b>	2.39 (4.37)	1.23 (0.05)	1.00 (0.04)	1.60 (0.04)	4.37 (0.04)	11.00 (0.12)	< 0.0001
<b>Wholegrain products</b>	5.59 (7.06)	4.26 (0.09)	2.74 (0.07)	4.91 (0.07)	9.73 (0.08)	9.93 (0.20)	< 0.0001
<b>Fruits</b>	2.41 (2.69)	1.83 (0.04)	1.98 (0.03)	2.07 (0.03)	3.35 (0.03)	4.81 (0.08)	< 0.0001
<b>Fruit juice</b>	0.61 (0.91)	0.59 (0.01)	0.44 (0.01)	0.89 (0.01)	0.42 (0.01)	1.07 (0.03)	< 0.0001
<b>Vegetables</b>	5.21 (3.63)	4.00 (0.05)	4.45 (0.04)	4.61 (0.04)	6.69 (0.04)	11.55 (0.10)	< 0.0001
<b>Potatoes</b>	0.46 (0.49)	0.39 (0.01)	0.59 (0.01)	0.42 (0.01)	0.41 (0.01)	0.60 (0.01)	< 0.0001
<b>Alcohol</b>	0.22 (0.53)	0.16 (0.01)	0.29 (0.01)	0.22 (0.01)	0.21 (0.01)	0.20 (0.01)	< 0.0001
<b>Dressing</b>	0.23 (0.28)	0.18 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.31 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.31 (0.01)	< 0.0001
<b>Beverages</b>	3.19 (4.24)	8.46 (0.05)	1.99 (0.04)	2.38 (0.04)	1.95 (0.04)	2.13 (0.11)	< 0.0001
<b>Oil</b>	0 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	< 0.0001
<b>Meat</b>	15.26 (10.16)	14.86 (0.12)	23.94 (0.10)	12.36 (0.10)	11.8 (0.10)	1.35 (0.26)	< 0.0001
<b>Processed meat</b>	4.55 (3.88)	4.22 (0.05)	5.99 (0.04)	4.84 (0.04)	3.50 (0.04)	0.55 (0.12)	< 0.0001
<b>Eggs</b>	1.6 (1.66)	1.34 (0.02)	1.36 (0.02)	1.47 (0.02)	2.25 (0.02)	1.23 (0.05)	< 0.0001
<b>Fast food</b>	3.64 (3.24)	3.22 (0.04)	3.31 (0.04)	4.94 (0.03)	2.73 (0.04)	3.81 (0.10)	< 0.0001
<b>Fat</b>	0.08 (0.13)	0.07 (0.00)	0.07 (0.00)	0.12 (0.00)	0.08 (0.00)	0.12 (0.00)	< 0.0001
<b>Poultry</b>	6.03 (5.14)	5.38 (0.07)	8.76 (0.05)	5.03 (0.05)	5.52 (0.06)	0.83 (0.15)	< 0.0001
<b>Dairy</b>	17.28 (10.06)	15.14 (0.13)	15.05 (0.11)	23.16 (0.10)	15.73 (0.11)	6.29 (0.29)	< 0.0001
<b>Seafood</b>	10.55 (7.84)	8.51 (0.10)	9.90 (0.08)	9.09 (0.08)	15.42 (0.08)	3.14 (0.23)	< 0.0001
<b>Milk</b>	2.19 (5.06)	9.68 (0.05)	0.57 (0.04)	0.87 (0.04)	0.57 (0.04)	0.31 (0.12)	< 0.0001
<b>SFF</b>	4.24 (3.42)	4.20 (0.05)	3.81 (0.04)	5.52 (0.04)	3.21 (0.04)	4.53 (0.10)	< 0.0001

Abbreviations: SFF, Sweetened and Fatty Foods.

<sup>1</sup> Values are mean (SD) contribution (%) for the whole sample, and energy-adjusted means of protein contributions (SEM) across clusters (ANCOVA model).

<sup>2</sup> P values were calculated using ANCOVA.

<sup>3</sup> Other food groups with minor contribution to protein intake are not represented

**Table 2: Sustainability indicators across clusters<sup>1,2</sup>**

Indicators	Whole sample	Milk-based	Meat-based	Fast-food-based	Healthy-fish-based	Healthy-plant-based	p
<b><i>Nutritional quality</i></b>							
PANDiet	64.97 (7.86)	65.17 (0.09)	63.01 (0.07)	62.65 (0.07)	68.53 (0.07)	72.68 (0.21)	< 0.0001
AS	78.86 (12.74)	78.43 (0.13)	78.11 (0.1)	75.73 (0.1)	83.79 (0.1)	77.64 (0.29)	< 0.0001
MS	51.08 (18.49)	51.9 (0.15)	47.9 (0.12)	49.57 (0.12)	53.27 (0.13)	67.72 (0.35)	< 0.0001
cDQI	51.48 (9.18)	49.57 (0.11)	48.56 (0.09)	49.33 (0.08)	58.21 (0.09)	52.97 (0.25)	< 0.0001
aDQI	15.86 (3.9)	16.84 (0.05)	14.59 (0.04)	15.73 (0.04)	17.05 (0.04)	13.16 (0.11)	< 0.0001
pDQI	35.62 (7.47)	32.72 (0.09)	33.96 (0.07)	33.6 (0.07)	41.16 (0.07)	39.81 (0.2)	< 0.0001
PNNS-GS2	2.51 (3.56)	1.96 (0.03)	1.01 (0.03)	2.34 (0.02)	4.15 (0.03)	6.13 (0.08)	< 0.0001
<b><i>Environmental impacts</i></b>							
GHG emissions (kg CO <sub>2</sub> eq/d)	4.05 (2.48)	4.13 (0.02)	5.47 (0.02)	3.61 (0.01)	3.4 (0.02)	1.31 (0.05)	< 0.0001
Cumulative Energy Demand (MJ/d)	17.62 (7.56)	17.08 (0.06)	21.14 (0.05)	16.18 (0.04)	17.09 (0.05)	9.85 (0.14)	< 0.0001
Land Use (m <sup>2</sup> /d)	10.6 (6.75)	10.57 (0.07)	14.24 (0.05)	9.33 (0.05)	9.15 (0.05)	4.52 (0.15)	< 0.0001
pRecipe	0.28 (0.16)	0.28 (0.00)	0.39 (0.00)	0.26 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)	0.11 (0.00)	< 0.0001
Organic food share	0.29 (0.27)	0.21 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.26 (0.00)	0.41 (0.00)	0.67 (0.01)	< 0.0001
<b><i>Health risk</i></b>							
RR (%) Whole grain	19.51 (12.35)	20.59 (0.16)	17.45 (0.13)	21.17 (0.12)	17.1 (0.14)	32.9 (0.37)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Fruits	6.98 (7.59)	7.8 (0.10)	5.17 (0.08)	8.26 (0.08)	5.8 (0.08)	14.07 (0.23)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Vegetables	2.19 (2.58)	2.87 (0.03)	1.54 (0.02)	2.77 (0.02)	1.69 (0.02)	2.4 (0.07)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Nuts/Seeds	3.82 (3.17)	3.84 (0.04)	2.95 (0.03)	3.88 (0.03)	4.1 (0.03)	7.56 (0.09)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Legumes	10.24 (6.47)	10.29 (0.08)	7.63 (0.07)	10.63 (0.06)	12.21 (0.07)	12.14 (0.19)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Milk	6.65 (5.86)	3.03 (0.06)	4.41 (0.05)	6.95 (0.05)	9.15 (0.05)	20.65 (0.14)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Processed meat	16.87 (10.22)	16.58 (0.14)	18.26 (0.11)	17.73 (0.1)	16.47 (0.11)	3.75 (0.3)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Red meat	32.97 (16.75)	34.08 (0.21)	41.97 (0.17)	27.67 (0.16)	32.89 (0.17)	5.19 (0.46)	< 0.0001
RR (%) Sweetened beverages	0.73 (1.96)	0.86 (0.02)	0.58 (0.02)	0.88 (0.02)	0.53 (0.02)	1.29 (0.06)	< 0.0001
HRS	0.69 (0.29)	0.7 (0.00)	0.95 (0.00)	0.65 (0.00)	0.53 (0.00)	0.25 (0.00)	< 0.0001

Abbreviations: AS, Adequation sub-score of PANDiet; MS, Moderation sub-score of PANDiet; HRS: Health Risk Score; RR: relative risk

<sup>1</sup> Values are mean (SD) for the whole sample, and adjusted means of indicators on total energy intake (SEM) across clusters (ANCOVA model).

<sup>2</sup> P values were calculated using ANCOVA.