**Supplementary material**

**Table S1** Association between GHGE of diets and all-cause, cardiovascular disease or cancer mortality outcomes

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **(Authors and date) [reference]** | **Results – GHGE** | **Health outcome** | **Results – health outcomes** | **Lower GHGE associated with better health outcomes?** |
| (Biesbroek et al. 2014) [17] | *CO2 equivalent per day*1. **Low emissions: <3.26**
2. Med-low emissions: 3.26-3.87
3. Med-high emissions: 3.87-4.56
4. High emissions: >4.56
 | CVD incidence | *Adjusted risk*1. Low emissions: 1
2. Med-low emissions: 0.92
3. Med-high emissions: 0.83
4. High emissions: 0.9
 | 2. NO3. NO4. NO |
|  |  | Cancer incidence | *Adjusted risk*1. Low emissions: 1
2. Med-low emissions: 1.01
3. Med-high emissions: 0.93
4. High emissions: 1.01
 | 2. YES3.NO4.YES |
|  |  | All-cause mortality | *Adjusted risk*1. Low emissions: 1
2. Med-low emissions: 0.96
3. Med-high emissions: 0.87
4. High emissions: 0.95
 | 2.NO3. NO4. NO |
| (Briggs et al. 2013) [18] | *Reduction in ktCO2*1. Tax scenario A: 18683
2. Tax scenario B: 15228
 | CVD incidence | *Deaths averted*1. Tax scenario A: 5845
2. Tax scenario B: -1937
 | 1. YES2. NO |
| (Soret et al. 2014) [25] | *kg CO2 per day*1. **Nonvegetarian: 3.05**
2. Semivegetarian: 2.39
3. Vegetarian: 2.16
 | All-cause mortality | *Adjusted risk*1. Nonvegetarian: 1
2. Semivegetarian: 0.86
3. Vegetarian: 0.91
 | 2. YES3. YES |
| (Tilman and Clark 2014) [27] | *gCO2 per kcal*1. Mediterranean: 3.95
2. Pescetarian: 2.55
3. Vegetarian: 1.4
4. **Omnivorous: 5.1**
 | Cancer incidence | *Adjusted risk*1. Mediterranean: 0.86
2. Pescetarian: 0.86
3. Vegetarian: 0.92
4. Omnivorous: 1
 | 1. YES2. YES3. YES |
|  |  | All-cause mortality | *Adjusted risk*1. Mediterranean: 0.88
2. Pescetarian: 0.85
3. Vegetarian: 1
4. Omnivorous: 1
 | 1. YES2. YES3. NO |
| (Milner et al. 2015) [32] | *% GHG reduction*1. 10% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations)
2. 20% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations)
3. 30% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations)
4. 40% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations)
5. 50% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations)
 | Cancer | *Years of Life Lost (YLL) to cancer over 20 years*1. -516
2. 1468
3. 2728
4. 2444
5. 4897
6. -11992
 | 1. YES
2. NO
3. NO
4. NO
5. NO
6. YES
 |

**Table S2** Association between GHGE of diets and saturated fat, salt and sugar content of diet

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors and date** | **Results – GHGE** | **Nutrient outcome** | **Results – saturated fat, salt and sugar content of diet** | **Lower GHGE associated with better nutritional measure?** |
| (Berners-Lee, Hoolohan et al. 2012) [16] |  *kgCo2e per person per day*1. **Average per capita UK food supply: 7.4**
2. UK average diet with meat replaced by dairy: 5.79
3. US average vegetarian diet: 6.06
4. UK average diet with meat replaced by non-dairy 'healthy' alternatives: 5.54
5. UK average diet with meat and dairy replaced by plant foods: 5.14
6. US vegan diet: 5.68
7. UK average diet with meat and dairy replaced with 'healthy' plant foods: 5.55
 | Added sugar | *g per person per day*1. Average per capita UK food supply: 72
2. UK average diet with meat replaced by dairy: 76
3. US average vegetarian diet: 84
4. UK average diet with meat replaced by non-dairy 'healthy' alternatives: 73
5. UK average diet with meat and dairy replaced by plant foods: 104
6. US vegan diet: 79
7. UK average diet with meat and dairy replaced with 'healthy' plant foods: 67
 | 2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. YES |
|  |  | Total sodium | *g per person per day*1. Average per capita UK food supply: 2.63
2. UK average diet with meat replaced by dairy: 2.28
3. US average vegetarian diet: 2.35
4. UK average diet with meat replaced by non-dairy 'healthy' alternatives: 2.46
5. UK average diet with meat and dairy replaced by plant foods: 2.11
6. US vegan diet: 2.03
7. UK average diet with meat and dairy replaced with 'healthy' plant foods: 2.63
 | 2. YES3. YES4. YES5. YES6. YES7. NO |
| (Briggs et al. 2013) [18] | *Reduction in ktCO2*1. Tax scenario A: 18683
2. **Tax scenario B: 15228**
 | Saturated fat | *g per person per day*1. Tax scenario A: -0.9
2. Tax scenario B: -0.4
 | 1. YES2. YES |
|  |  | Salt | *g per person per day*1. Tax scenario A: +0.1
2. Tax scenario B: 0
 | 1. NO2. NO |
| (Hallström, Röös et al. 2014) [19] | *tonnes of CO2 per person per year*1. **REF - current average: 0.6**
2. NUTR1 - reduced meat intake: 0.4
3. NUTR2 - further reduced meat intake: 0.2
 | Saturated fat | *g per person per day*1. REF - current average: 9.6
2. NUTR1 - reduced meat intake: 3.9
3. NUTR2 - further reduced meat intake: 2.3
 | 2. YES3. YES |
| (Hendrie, Ridoutt et al. 2014) [20] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. **Average Australian diet (1995 NNS): 14.5**
2. Minimal non-core foods (e.g. snacks, processed meat, confectionary, etc): 11
3. Total diet (dietary pattern consistent with national guidelines): 11.1
4. Foundation diet (dietary pattern meeting minimum nutrient and energy needs): 10.9
 | Saturated fat | *Percentage of total energy*1. Average Australian diet (1995 NNS): 13
2. Minimal non-core foods (e.g. snacks, processed meat, confectionary, etc): 12
 | 2. YES |
| (Hoolohan, Berners-Lee et al. 2013) [21] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. **Average food consumption: 8.81**
2. Maximum action taken: 4.16
3. Eliminate waste: 7.79
4. Eliminate meat: 5.76
5. Eliminate ruminants: 7.26
6. Eliminate air-freight and hot-housing: 8.36
7. Eliminate packaging: 8.52
8. Eliminate meat and packaging: 6.73
9. All actions that do not require dietary change: 7.15
10. All actions that do not require sourcing change: 4.84
11. All actions that do not require waste reduction: 4.7
 | Added sugar | *g per person per day*1. Average food consumption: 72
2. Maximum action taken: 64
3. Eliminate waste: 63
4. Eliminate meat: 73
5. Eliminate ruminants: 72
6. Eliminate air-freight and hot-housing: 72
7. Eliminate packaging: 72
8. Eliminate meat and packaging: 68
9. All actions that do not require dietary change: 63
10. All actions that do not require sourcing change: 64
11. All actions that do not require waste reduction: 73
 | 2. YES3. YES4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. YES9. YES10.YES11. NO |
|  |  | Total sodium | *g per person per day*1. Average food consumption: 2.61
2. Maximum action taken: 2.16
3. Eliminate waste: 2.31
4. Eliminate meat: 2.44
5. Eliminate ruminants: 2.85
6. Eliminate air-freight and hot-housing: 2.61
7. Eliminate packaging: 2.61
8. Eliminate meat and packaging: 2.38
9. All actions that do not require dietary change: 2.31
10. All actions that do not require sourcing change: 2.16
 | 2. YES3. YES4. YES5. NO6. NO7. NO8. YES9. YES10. YES |
| (Scarborough, Appleby et al. 2014) [23] | *kg CO2 per 2000kcal*1. **High meat eaters: 7.19**
2. Medium meat eaters: 5.63
3. Low meat eaters: 4.67
4. Fish eaters: 3.91
5. Vegetarians: 3.81
6. Vegans: 2.89
 | Saturated fat | *Percentage of total energy*1. High meat eaters: 12.4
2. Medium meat eaters: 11.5
3. Low meat eaters: 10.9
4. Fish eaters: 10.6
5. Vegetarians: 10.6
6. Vegans: 6.5
 | 2. YES3. YES4. YES5. YES6. YES |
|  |  | Total sugar | *Percentage of total energy*1. High meat eaters: 22.5
2. Medium meat eaters: 24.4
3. Low meat eaters: 25.8
4. Fish eaters: 25.1
5. Vegetarians: 25.4
6. Vegans: 24.7
 | 2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO |
| (Temme et al. 2013) [26] | *Percentage change compared to reference value*1. Full replacement of meat/dairy foods: 50
2. Partial replacement of meat/dairy foods: 20
 | Saturated fat | *Percentage change compared to reference value*1. Full replacement of meat/dairy foods: -26
2. Partial replacement of meat/dairy foods: -9
 | 1. YES2. YES |
| (Tukker, Goldbohm et al. 2011) [28] | *kg CO2 equivalent per person per year (not including 1st and 2nd order effects)*1. **Status quo: 2590**
2. Recommendations: 2630
3. Recommendations including red meat reduction: 2400
4. Mediterranean: 2440
 | Saturated fat | *Percentage of total energy*1. Status quo: 11.4
2. Recommendations: 9.8
3. Recommendations including red meat reduction: 8.9
4. Mediterranean: 8.4
 | 2. YES3. YES4. YES |
| (van Dooren, Marinussen et al. 2014) [29] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. **Average Dutch consumption: 4.1**
2. Recommended Dutch Dietary Guideliens: 3.6
3. Semi-vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 3.4
4. Vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 3.2
5. Vegan based on dietary guidelines: 2.65
6. Mediterranean based on published dietary composition data: 3.4
 | Saturated fat | *Percentage of total energy*1. Average Dutch consumption: 8.3
2. Recommended Dutch Dietary Guideliens: 10.5
3. Semi-vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 10.9
4. Vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 11.4
5. Vegan based on dietary guidelines: 15.5
6. Mediterranean based on published dietary composition data: 13.1
 | 2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO |
|  |  | Free sugar | *Percentage of total energy*1. Average Dutch consumption: 4.6
2. Recommended Dutch Dietary Guideliens: 10.4
3. Semi-vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 10.4
4. Vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 10.4
5. Vegan based on dietary guidelines: 13.5
6. Mediterranean based on published dietary composition data: 12.4
 | 2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO |
|  |  | Salt | *g per person per day*1. Average Dutch consumption: 4.5
2. Recommended Dutch Dietary Guideliens: 5.1
3. Semi-vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 5.58
4. Vegetarian based on dietary guidelines: 7.2
5. Vegan based on dietary guidelines: 7.02
6. Mediterranean based on published dietary composition data: 5.7
 | 2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO |
| (Vieux, Soler et al. 2013) [30] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. **High nutritional quality: 4.9**
2. **Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 4.9**
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 4.5
4. Low nutritional quality: 4.5
5. High nutritional quality: 3.9
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 3.8
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 3.4
8. Low nutritional quality: 3.3
 | Saturated fat | *Percentage of total energy*1. High nutritional quality: 12.7
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 14.4
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 15.1
4. Low nutritional quality: 16.9
5. High nutritional quality: 13.6
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 15.1
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 16.3
8. Low nutritional quality: 16.8
 | 3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Free sugar | *Percentage of total energy*1. High nutritional quality: 6.7
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 7.5
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 9.8
4. Low nutritional quality: 13.2
5. High nutritional quality: 8.2
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 8.5
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 11.1
8. Low nutritional quality: 14.6
 | 3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Salt | *mg per person per day*1. High nutritional quality: 3328.8
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 3381
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 3651
4. Low nutritional quality: 3206
5. High nutritional quality: 2447.3
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 2452.6
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 2636.5
8. Low nutritional quality: 2573.4
 | 3. NO4. YES5. YES6. YES7. YES8. YES |
| (Wilson, Nghiem et al. 2013) [31] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 2.72
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 2.64
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 2.2
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 4.33
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 1.67
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 1.31
7. G3 As G2 but including porridge: 1.56
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 1.9
9. MED Mediterranean version of C1: 4.03
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 3.29
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 4.68
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 2.17
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 5.25
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 4.54
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 4.24
16. **NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 5.98**
 | Saturated fat | *g per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 6
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 7
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 15
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 8
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 18
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 30
7. G3 As G2 but including porridge: 30
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 14
9. MED Mediterranean version of C1: 5
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 25
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 13
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 30
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 20
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 15
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 10
16. **NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 26**
 | 1. YES2. YES3. YES4. YES5. YES6. NO7. NO8. YES9. YES10. YES11. YES12. NO13. YES14. YES15. YES |
|  |  | Total sugar | *g per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 90
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 56
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 32
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 93
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 22
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 11
7. G3 As G2 but including porridge: 29
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 27
9. MED Mediterranean version of C1: 43
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 41
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 125
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 103
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 45
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 92
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 45
16. **NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 44**
 | 1. NO2. NO3. YES4. NO5. YES6. YES7. YES8. YES9. YES10. YES11. NO12. NO13. NO14. NO15. NO |
|  |  | Salt | *mg per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 1.21
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 5.55
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 0.849
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 1.41
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 0.606
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 1.29
7. G3 As G2 but including porrodge: 2.08
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 4.83
9. MED Mediterranean version of C1: 3.9
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 3.4
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 4.27
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 3.58
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 5.88
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 5.86
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 5.88
16. **NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 5.88**
 | 1. YES2. YES3. YES4. YES5. YES6. YES7. YES8. YES9. YES10. YES11. YES12. YES13. NO14. YES15. NO |
| (Milner et al. 2015) [32] | *% GHG reduction*1. 10% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
2. 20% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
3. 30% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
4. 40% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
5. 50% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
6. 60% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
7. 10% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
8. 20% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
9. 30% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
10. 40% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
11. 50% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
12. 60% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
 | Salt | *Change in g sodium*1. -0.2
2. -0.2
3. -0.2
4. -0.2
5. -0.2
6. -0.2
7. 0.1
8. 0.1
9. 0
10. 0
11. 0
 | 1. YES
2. YES
3. YES
4. YES
5. YES
6. YES
7. NO
8. NO
9. NO
10. NO
11. NO
12. NO
 |
| (Meier and Christen 2012) [33] | *Tons of CO2 per person per year*1. D-A-CH (official recommendations of the German Nutrition Society) : 1.82
2. UGB (recommendations by the Federation for Independent Health Consultation): 1.81
3. Ovo-lacto-vegetarian: 1.56
4. Vegan: 0.96
5. Intake 1985-9: 2.28
6. Intake 2006 (men only): 2.13
7. Intake 2006 (women only): 1.98
 | Sugar | *G per person per day*1. 32
2. 32
3. 32
4. 32
5. 54
6. 70
7. 71
8. 69
 | 1. NO
2. NO
3. NO
4. NO
5. YES
6. YES
7. YES
8. YES
 |

**Table S3** Association between GHGE of diets and micronutrient content of diet

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Authors and date** | **Results – GHGE** | **Nutrient outcome** | **Results – Micronutrient content of diet** | **Lower GHGE associated with better nutritional measure?** |
| (Briggs et al. 2013) [18] | *Reduction in ktCO2*1. Tax scenario A: 18683
2. **Tax scenario B: 15228**
 | Iron | *mg per day*1. Tax scenario A: 10.4
2. Tax scenario B: 10.6
 | 1. NO |
|  |  | Zinc | *mg per day*1. Tax scenario A: 8
2. Tax scenario B: 8.2
 | 1. NO |
|  |  | Vitamin A | *µg per day*1. Tax scenario A: 778.4
2. Tax scenario B: 793.7
 | 1. NO |
|  |  | Calcium | *mg per day*1. Tax scenario A: 884.3
2. Tax scenario B: 915.1
 | 1. NO |
|  |  | Vitamin B12 | *µg per day*1. Tax scenario A: 5.6
2. Tax scenario B: 5.8
 | 1. NO |
| (Hallström, Röös et al. 2014) [15] | *tonnes of CO2 per person per year*1. **REF - current average: 0.6**
2. NUTR1 - reduced meat intake: 0.4
3. NUTR2 - further reduced meat intake: 0.2
 | Iron | *mg per person per day*1. REF - current average: 3.8
2. NUTR1 - reduced meat intake: 1.8
3. NUTR2 - further reduced meat intake: 1.4
 | 2. NO3. NO |
|  |  | Zinc | *mg per person per day*1. REF - current average: 5.2
2. NUTR1 - reduced meat intake: 3
3. NUTR2 - further reduced meat intake: 2.3
 | 2. NO3. NO |
| (Hendrie, Ridoutt et al. 2014) [20] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. **Average Australian diet (1995 NNS): 14.5**
2. Minimal non-core foods (e.g. snacks, processed meat, confectionary, etc): 11
3. Total diet (dietary pattern consistent with national guidelines): 11.1
4. Foundation diet (dietary pattern meeting minimum nutrient and energy needs): 10.9
 | Zinc | *Percentage RDI (Recommended Daily Intake)* 1. Average Australian diet (1995 NNS): 113
2. Minimal non-core foods (e.g. snacks, processed meat, confectionary, etc): 94
 | 2. NO |
|  |  | Vitamin A | *Percentage RDI (Recommended Daily Intake)*1. Average Australian diet (1995 NNS): 79
2. Minimal non-core foods (e.g. snacks, processed meat, confectionary, etc): 61
 | 2. NO |
|  |  | Calcium | *Percentage RDI (Recommended Daily Intake)*1. Average Australian diet (1995 NNS): 76
2. Minimal non-core foods (e.g. snacks, processed meat, confectionary, etc): 63
 | 2. NO |
| (Vieux, Soler et al. 2013) [30] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. **High nutritional quality: 4.9**
2. **Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 4.9**
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 4.5
4. Low nutritional quality: 4.5
5. High nutritional quality: 3.9
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 3.8
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 3.4
8. Low nutritional quality: 3.3
 | Iron | *mg per person per day*1. High nutritional quality: 14.9
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 14.9
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 15.3
4. Low nutritional quality: 14
5. High nutritional quality: 12.6
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 11.2
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 11.8
8. Low nutritional quality: 10.4
 | 3. YES4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Zinc | *mg per person per day*1. High nutritional quality: 12
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 11.9
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 13.2
4. Low nutritional quality: 12.3
5. High nutritional quality: 19.4
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 8.8
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 9.4
8. Low nutritional quality: 8.8
 | 3. YES4. YES5. YES6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Vitamin A (retinol equivalent) | *ug per person per day* 1. High nutritional quality: 1536.4
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 1440.2
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 1297.4
4. Low nutritional quality: 937.5
5. High nutritional quality: 1298.4
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 1343.8
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 1127.1
8. Low nutritional quality: 898.4
 | 3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Calcium | *mg per person per day*1. High nutritional quality: 1033.9
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 945.5
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 1031.1
4. Low nutritional quality: 916.5
5. High nutritional quality: 948.5
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 850.5
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 838.5
8. Low nutritional quality: 770.1
 | 3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Vitamin B12 | *ug per person per day* 1. High nutritional quality: 6.7
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 6.6
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 6.8
4. Low nutritional quality: 5.6
5. High nutritional quality: 5.2
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 5.4
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 5.2
8. Low nutritional quality: 4.3
 | 3. YES4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Iodine | *mg per person per day*1. High nutritional quality: 142.2
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 130.9
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 142.2
4. Low nutritional quality: 126.8
5. High nutritional quality: 131.5
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 119.9
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 115.3
8. Low nutritional quality: 98.7
 | 3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
|  |  | Riboflavin | *mg per person per day*1. High nutritional quality: 2.1
2. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 2
3. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 2.1
4. Low nutritional quality: 1.9
5. High nutritional quality: 1.9
6. Intermediate+ nutritional quality: 1.7
7. Intermediate- nutritional quality: 1.7
8. Low nutritional quality: 1.5
 | 3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO |
| (Wilson, Nghiem et al. 2013) [31] | *kg CO2 per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 2.72
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 2.64
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 2.2
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 4.33
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 1.67
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 1.31
7. G3 As G2 but including porrodge: 1.56
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 1.9
9. MED Medietrranean version of C1: 4.03
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 3.29
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 4.68
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 2.17
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 5.25
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 4.54
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 4.24
16. **NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 5.98**
 | Iron | *mg per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 23
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 25
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 23
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 25
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 33
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 26
7. G3 As G2 but including porrodge: 21
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 34
9. MED Medietrranean version of C1: 19
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 18
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 24
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 19
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 31
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 21
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 28
16. NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 25
 | 1. NO2. NO3. NO4. NO5. YES6. YES7. NO8. YES9. NO10. NO11. NO12. NO13. YES14. NO15. YES |
|  |  | Zinc | *mg per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 18
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 19
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 15
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 18
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 21
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 21
7. G3 As G2 but including porrodge: 19
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 21
9. MED Medietrranean version of C1: 15
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 15
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 15
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 15
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 24
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 15
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 19
16. NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 21
 | 1. NO2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO9. NO10. NO11. NO12. NO13. YES14. NO15. NO |
|  |  | Vitamin A (retinol equivalent) | *ug per person per day* 1. C1 Minimizing cost: 625
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 625
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 625
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 625
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 625
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 625
7. G3 As G2 but including porrodge: 625
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 625
9. MED Medietrranean version of C1: 1700
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 808
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 625
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 2149
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 625
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 1385
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 625
16. NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 625
 | 1. NO2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO9. YES10. YES11. NO12. YES13. NO14. YES15. NO |
|  |  | Calcium | *mg per person per day*1. C1 Minimizing cost: 840
2. C2 Minimizing cost, and including porridge and rotis: 840
3. C3 Minimizing cost and cooking skills: 840
4. C4 Minimizing cost and adding extra fruit and vegetables: 840
5. G1 Minimizing GHGEs at low cost: 840
6. G2 Minimising GHGEs at a higher cost: 840
7. G3 As G2 but including porrodge: 840
8. G4 As G2 but fully vegan: 840
9. MED Medietrranean version of C1: 840
10. MED-G As MED, but minimising GHGEs: 840
11. ASIAN Asian version of C1: 840
12. ASIAN-G As ASIAN, but minimising GHGEs: 840
13. NZ-M NZ version of C1 (with mince): 840
14. NZ-S NZ version of C1 (with sausages): 840
15. NZ-F NZ version of C1 (with fish): 840
16. NZ-P NZ version of C1 (with Pacific foods): 840
 | 1. NO2. NO3. NO4. NO5. NO6. NO7. NO8. NO9. NO10. NO11. NO12. NO13. NO14. NO15. NO |
| (Milner et al. 2015) [32] | *% GHG reduction*1. 10% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
2. 20% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
3. 30% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
4. 40% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
5. 50% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
6. 60% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, men only)
7. 10% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
8. 20% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
9. 30% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
10. 40% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)
11. 50% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only)

60% reduction (& meeting WHO recommendations, women only) | Iron | *Change in mg per day*1. 1
2. 0.9
3. 1
4. 1
5. 1
6. 1.9
7. 3.9
8. 0.6
9. 0.7
10. 0.7
11. 0.8
12. 1.2
13. 1.4
14. 2.6
 | 1. YES
2. YES
3. YES
4. YES
5. YES
6. YES
7. YES
8. YES
9. YES
10. YES
11. YES
12. YES
13. YES
14. YES
 |
|  |  | Calcium | *Change in mg per day*1. -110.1
2. -95.8
3. -112.1
4. -115.3
5. -141.4
6. -187.3
7. -155.4
8. -76.2
9. -72.1
10. -66.6
11. -59.7
12. -97.6
13. -161.6
14. -133.9
 | 1. NO
2. NO
3. NO
4. NO
5. NO
6. NO
7. NO
8. NO
9. NO
10. NO
11. NO
12. NO
13. NO
14. NO
 |
|  |  | B12 | *Change in ug per day*1. -1.1
2. -1.1
3. -1.1
4. -1.2
5. -1.5
6. -2.2
7. -2.8
8. -0.6
9. -0.5
10. -0.6
11. -0.7
12. -1.1
13. -1.9
14. -2.
 | 1. NO
2. NO
3. NO
4. NO
5. NO
6. NO
7. NO
8. NO
9. NO
10. NO
11. NO
12. NO
13. NO
14. NO
 |
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