International Journal of Agriculture and Plant Science
www.agriculturejournal.in
Online ISSN: 2664-7664
Received: 22-11-2025, Accepted: 21-12-2025, Published: 05-01-2026
Volume 8, Issue 1, 2026, Page No. 276-282

Sustainable Diets and their role in Sustainable Agriculture, Global Food Security, and Environmental Health

Ankita Ganguly
Assistant Professor in Dietetics and Community Nutrition Management, Vidyasagar University, Paschim Medinipur, West Bengal, India

Abstract
The global food system faces an unprecedented paradox: while it has successfully increased caloric production over the last half-century, it has simultaneously degraded environmental systems and failed to ensure nutritional equity for all. This research paper explores the concept of sustainable diets as a pivotal nexus connecting agricultural practices, environmental preservation, and global food security. By analyzing the environmental footprint of current dietary patterns—specifically the high consumption of animal-based foods—this paper evaluates the ecological necessity of dietary transitions. It examines how sustainable diets, characterized by low environmental impact and nutritional adequacy, can drive changes in agricultural production systems, thereby promoting regenerative practices and biodiversity. Furthermore, the paper investigates the socio-economic dimensions of food security, arguing that shifting towards plant-forward diets is essential for feeding a projected global population of 9.7 billion by 2050 without exceeding planetary boundaries. The research synthesizes data from life cycle assessments (LCA), agricultural economics, and nutritional epidemiology to propose a multi-scalar framework for policy intervention. The findings suggest that sustainable diets are not merely a consumer choice but a structural imperative for the resilience of global food systems.

Keywords: Sustainable Diets, Food Security, Sustainable Agriculture, Environmental Health, Planetary Boundaries, Climate Change, Food Systems

Introduction

The twenty-first century is characterized by a convergence of crises: escalating climate change, rapid biodiversity loss, and persistent malnutrition. At the heart of these interconnected challenges lies the global food system. Since the mid-20th century, the Green Revolution has exponentially increased agricultural yields, averting widespread famine in many regions. However, this industrial intensification has come at a profound cost to environmental health and long-term food security (Stoate *et al*., 2001) [42]. The current food system is responsible for approximately one-third of global anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, utilizes 50% of habitable land, and accounts for 70% of global freshwater withdrawals (Poore & Nemecek, 2018) [33].

Simultaneously, the global population is projected to reach 9.7 billion by 2050, necessitating a projected 50–70% increase in food production (United Nations, 2019) [10]. However, the expansion of agricultural land is increasingly constrained by finite resources and ecological tipping points. This creates a critical dilemma: how to nourish a growing population while restoring, rather than depleting, the ecological systems upon which agriculture depends.

The concept of "sustainable diets" has emerged as a central solution to this dilemma. Defined by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) as "diets with low environmental impacts which contribute to food and nutrition security and to healthy life for present and future generations," sustainable diets are protective and respectful of biodiversity and ecosystems, culturally acceptable, accessible, economically fair, and nutritionally adequate (FAO, 2010). This definition moves beyond the singular focus on caloric sufficiency to encompass a holistic view of food systems that integrates health, equity, and ecology.

This paper argues that sustainable diets are not merely a passive outcome of agricultural efficiency but an active driver of sustainable agriculture and global food security. By shifting dietary patterns—specifically reducing the reliance on animal-source foods and minimizing food waste—societies can alleviate the pressure on agricultural land, thereby enabling the adoption of regenerative farming practices and enhancing the resilience of food supplies.

This research is structured into five sections. First, it defines the theoretical framework of sustainable diets and planetary boundaries. Second, it analyzes the environmental impact of current dietary patterns, focusing on GHG emissions, land use, and water scarcity. Third, it explores the bidirectional relationship between sustainable diets and agricultural systems, including the role of agroecology. Fourth, it examines the implications of dietary shifts for global food security and nutritional adequacy. Finally, it discusses policy implications and barriers to adoption, concluding with recommendations for a systemic transition.

Theoretical Framework: Sustainable Diets and Planetary Boundaries

To understand the role of sustainable diets, one must first situate them within the concept of "Planetary Boundaries." Introduced by Rockström *et al*. (2009) [36], this framework identifies nine critical Earth system processes that regulate the stability of the planet. Transgressing these boundaries increases the risk of irreversible environmental change. Agriculture is the primary driver of transgression in several key boundaries: nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, freshwater use, land-system change, and biodiversity loss (Steffen *et al*., 2015) [41].

1. Defining Sustainable Diets

The FAO's definition of sustainable diets highlights three core pillars: nutrition/health, environment, and socio-culture. Unlike "healthy diets" or "environmental diets" viewed in isolation, sustainable diets require the optimization of all three simultaneously (Masset *et al*., 2017) [26].

- **Nutritional Adequacy:** Diets must meet energy and nutrient requirements without excess. This includes addressing the "double burden of malnutrition"—the coexistence of undernutrition and obesity—prevalent in both developing and developed nations (Popkin *et al*., 2020) [34].

- **Environmental Sustainability:** This refers to the capacity of the diet to be produced without depleting natural resources or exceeding the Earth's carrying capacity. Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) is the primary tool used to quantify this, measuring impacts from "cradle-to-grave" (i.e., from farm to fork and waste) (Notarnicola *et al*., 2017) [31].

- **Cultural Acceptability:** A diet cannot be sustainable if it is not adopted. Cultural norms and culinary traditions play a decisive role in food choices, making the imposition of uniform dietary models ineffective (Trichopoulou *et al*., 2014) [45].

2. The EAT-Lancet Commission Framework

A seminal contribution to this field is the EAT-Lancet Commission report, which attempted to define a "Planetary Health Diet" (Willett *et al*., 2019) [49]. The report established scientific targets for food production that respect planetary boundaries while providing a healthy diet for 10 billion people. It proposes a flexitarian approach: a diet that is predominantly plant-based but allows for moderate consumption of animal-source foods (approximately 14g of red meat per day and 25g of poultry/dairy). This framework demonstrates that while sustainable diets are diverse, they share a common characteristic of significantly lower animal product intake compared to current global averages.

The Environmental Footprint of Current Dietary Patterns

The transition from traditional diets to Westernized, high-calorie, and animal-heavy diets is a primary driver of environmental degradation. This section analyzes the specific environmental impacts of current dietary patterns, supported by Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) data.

1. Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGE)

Food systems contribute approximately 21–37% of total anthropogenic GHG emissions (Crippa *et al*., 2021) [7]. The variation depends on the inclusion of land-use change (e.g., deforestation for soy cultivation). Animal agriculture is disproportionately responsible for these emissions. Ruminants (cattle, sheep, goats) produce methane (CH_4) through enteric fermentation, a potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential 28–34 times greater than CO_2 over a 100-year horizon (IPCC, 2013).

Poore and Nemecek (2018) [33] conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of LCA data covering 38,700 farms in 119 countries. Their findings were stark: animal products (meat, dairy, eggs) account for 58% of food-related emissions but provide only 37% of protein and 18% of calories. Beef production is the most emission-intensive, emitting 60 kg of CO_2-equivalents per 100g of protein, compared to 2.7 kg for tofu and 0.7 kg for nuts (Poore & Nemecek, 2018) [33]. This disparity indicates that dietary shifts toward plant-based proteins offer the most immediate leverage for reducing the food sector's carbon footprint.

2. Land Use and Biodiversity Loss

Agriculture occupies approximately 50% of the world's habitable land. Roughly 77% of global agricultural land is used for livestock grazing or feed production, yet livestock provides only 18% of global calories and 37% of protein (Poore & Nemecek, 2018) [33]. This inefficiency in land conversion is a leading driver of habitat destruction and biodiversity loss.

The expansion of pasture and cropland for animal feed (e.g., soy and corn) is the primary cause of deforestation in the Amazon basin and other critical biomes (Machovina *et al*., 2015) [24]. This land-use change not only releases stored carbon but also fragments ecosystems, threatening species survival. Furthermore, industrial monocultures used for animal feed reduce soil biodiversity and increase vulnerability to pests (Tscharntke *et al*., 2012) [46]. Sustainable diets, which require less land per calorie, can theoretically free up vast tracts of land for rewilding and restoration, thereby enhancing biodiversity and carbon sequestration (Clark *et al*., 2020) [6].

3. Water Scarcity

Water scarcity is a critical constraint on future food production. Agriculture accounts for approximately 70% of global freshwater withdrawals (FAO, 2017) [9]. The water footprint of animal products is significantly higher than that of plant products. For example, the production of 1 kg of beef requires approximately 15,415 liters of water (including green water from rain and blue water from irrigation), whereas 1 kg of cereals requires approximately 1,644 liters (Mekonnen & Hoekstra, 2012) [27].

While much of this water is "green water" (rainfall), the intensive irrigation required for feed crops in water-scarce regions (e.g., the Ogallala Aquifer in the US) depletes groundwater reserves faster than they can recharge (Wada *et al*., 2010) [48]. Shifting dietary patterns toward crops with lower water intensity can alleviate pressure on freshwater systems, particularly in arid regions where food security is already precarious.

4. Eutrophication

The overuse of synthetic fertilizers in crop production, particularly for animal feed, leads to nitrogen and phosphorus runoff, causing eutrophication in freshwater and marine ecosystems (Glibert, 2020) [12]. This results in hypoxic "dead zones" where aquatic life cannot survive. While plant-based diets are not immune to fertilizer use, the sheer volume of feed required to produce animal products amplifies nutrient pollution. Reducing the consumption of animal products directly reduces the demand for intensive feed cultivation, thereby lowering nutrient runoff (Leip *et al*., 2015) [20].

Sustainable Diets as a Driver of Sustainable Agriculture

The relationship between diets and agriculture is bidirectional. While current diets drive unsustainable farming practices, a shift toward sustainable diets can incentivize and enable the transition to sustainable agriculture. This section explores how dietary changes interact with agricultural systems, focusing on agroecology, crop diversification, and soil health.

1. Reducing the Feed-Food Competition

One of the most significant inefficiencies in the current food system is the competition for edible crops between humans and livestock. Currently, over one-third of global cereal production (approximately 1.1 billion tonnes) is fed to animals rather than humans (Mottet *et al*., 2017) [30]. In a scenario of global food security, this "feed-food" competition is unsustainable.

A transition toward sustainable diets—specifically reducing meat consumption—would decrease the demand for feed crops. This reduction does not imply an end to livestock farming but rather a shift in its role. In a sustainable agricultural system, ruminants can utilize non-edible biomass (grass, crop residues, and food waste) that humans cannot digest, thereby converting low-quality fiber into high-quality protein without competing for arable land (Makkar, 2018) [25]. This concept, known as "nutrient recycling," is central to agroecological systems. By reducing the demand for grain-fed livestock, sustainable diets free up arable land for direct human consumption or for ecological restoration.

2. Agroecology and Biodiversity

Sustainable diets are intrinsically linked to agroecology—a farming approach that applies ecological concepts to agricultural systems. Agroecology emphasizes biodiversity, crop rotation, and the reduction of external inputs (Altieri, 2018) [2]. Monocultures, which dominate industrial agriculture, are largely driven by the need for uniform, high-yield feed crops (corn, soy) for concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs).

Conversely, diverse, plant-forward diets drive demand for a wider variety of crops (legumes, tubers, vegetables, and ancient grains). This consumer demand supports polyculture and intercropping systems, which are more resilient to climate shocks and pests (Lin, 2011) [21]. For instance, integrating legumes into crop rotations fixes atmospheric nitrogen, reducing the need for synthetic fertilizers and improving soil health (Jensen *et al*., 2015) [19]. Therefore, sustainable diets act as a market signal that encourages farmers to adopt diversified, regenerative practices rather than industrial monocultures.

3. Soil Health and Carbon Sequestration

Soil degradation is a major threat to long-term agricultural productivity. Industrial farming, particularly tillage and heavy chemical use, depletes soil organic carbon (SOC). Sustainable diets, particularly those rich in plant foods produced via regenerative agriculture, can enhance SOC sequestration.

While livestock grazing can contribute to soil carbon storage when managed holistically (managed grazing), the net effect of industrial livestock production is often negative due to soil compaction and erosion (Machmuller *et al*., 2015) [23]. By contrast, perennial crops and cover crops—often associated with diversified plant-based food systems—build soil organic matter. A shift in dietary demand toward these foods supports farming systems that prioritize soil health, creating a positive feedback loop: healthy soils produce more nutritious food with fewer inputs, supporting both environmental health and human nutrition (Montgomery, 2017) [9].

4. The Role of Food Waste Reduction

Sustainable diets are not only about *what* is eaten but also *how much* is wasted. Approximately one-third of all food produced for human consumption is lost or wasted globally (FAO, 2019) [5]. Food waste represents a massive inefficiency in resource use; the water, land, and energy embedded in wasted food are lost without providing nutritional benefit.

Dietary choices can influence waste generation. For example, highly perishable animal products (fresh meat and dairy) have higher waste rates in retail and household settings compared to shelf-stable plant staples (grains, legumes) (Beretta & Hellweg, 2019) [3]. Sustainable diets that emphasize whole, minimally processed plant foods tend to have longer shelf lives and lower waste profiles. Furthermore, reducing food waste at the consumption level effectively increases the availability of food without expanding agricultural land, a critical factor for food security (Springmann *et al*., 2018) [40].

Sustainable Diets and Global Food Security

Food security is defined by four pillars: availability, access, utilization, and stability. Sustainable diets intersect with all four, challenging the notion that environmental sustainability compromises food security. Instead, evidence suggests that sustainable dietary patterns are a prerequisite for long-term food security in a resource-constrained world.

1. Availability and the "Feeding 9 Billion" Challenge

The challenge of feeding a growing population is often framed as a supply-side problem requiring increased production. However, this perspective overlooks the inefficiency of current consumption patterns. If current dietary trends (high meat and dairy consumption) continue, the required expansion of agricultural land would likely exceed planetary boundaries, leading to ecological collapse that undermines future production (Willett *et al*., 2019) [49].

Research by Springmann *et al*. (2016) [38] modeled three dietary scenarios: business-as-usual, vegetarian, and vegan. The study found that while business-as-usual required a 50% increase in food production by 2050, a global shift to vegan diets could support the projected population with existing agricultural land. More realistically, a flexitarian diet (sustainable diet) could reduce the need for agricultural expansion significantly while still meeting nutritional needs.

This is particularly relevant for developing nations. In regions where land is scarce or degraded, shifting to plant-centric diets reduces the pressure on local ecosystems. For example, in Sub-Saharan Africa, where livestock productivity is low and climate variability is high, integrating sustainable diets that rely on drought-resistant crops (e.g., millet, sorghum) can enhance local food security more effectively than expanding cattle ranching (Herrero *et al*., 2010) [8].

2. Access and Economic Equity

Food security is not merely about total production but about economic access. The volatility of food prices is a major determinant of food insecurity for the global poor. The production of animal-based foods is generally more resource-intensive and expensive than plant-based foods. While meat and dairy provide dense nutrients, their economic cost per calorie is significantly higher than staples like rice, beans, or tubers.

In a world facing climate-induced supply shocks, the price of animal feed is likely to become more volatile, driving up the cost of meat and dairy. Sustainable diets that prioritize locally sourced, diverse plant foods can insify vulnerable populations from global market fluctuations (Ivanova *et al*., 2019) [47]. Furthermore, shifting subsidies from feed crops toward diverse fruit and vegetable production could make nutritious food more affordable, improving access for low-income households (Friel *et al*., 2015) [11].

3. Nutritional Utilization and Health

A common critique of sustainable diets is the risk of nutrient deficiencies, particularly protein, iron, zinc, and vitamin B12 in strictly plant-based regimens. However, well-planned sustainable diets can me*et al*l nutritional requirements. The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics states that appropriately planned vegetarian and vegan diets are healthful and nutritionally adequate for all stages of the life cycle (Melina *et al*., 2016) [28].

Moreover, sustainable diets often correlate with higher intakes of fiber, antioxidants, and phytochemicals, reducing the prevalence of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) such as type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and obesity (Clark *et al*., 2019) [5]. The Global Burden of Disease study indicates that suboptimal diets are a leading risk factor for mortality globally, driven largely by low consumption of fruits, vegetables, and whole grains, and high consumption of red and processed meats (Afshin *et al*., 2019). Therefore, transitioning to sustainable diets improves "food security" in the utilization pillar by enhancing health outcomes and reducing the burden of diet-related diseases.

4. Stability and Resilience

Climate change threatens the stability of food systems through extreme weather events, pests, and shifting growing zones. Monoculture systems, heavily reliant on synthetic inputs and specific crop varieties, are particularly vulnerable. Sustainable diets, linked to agroecological farming, promote genetic diversity and resilience.

Polyculture systems, which produce a variety of crops for diverse diets, are less susceptible to total crop failure than monocultures (Lin, 2011) [21]. By consuming a diverse range of species (including underutilized crops like millet, teff, and legumes), consumers support agricultural biodiversity, which is a buffer against climate instability. This genetic diversity in the field ensures that food supplies remain stable even when specific crops fail due to changing weather patterns.

Socio-Cultural and Economic Barriers to Adoption

While the scientific case for sustainable diets is robust, the transition faces significant socio-cultural and economic barriers. Understanding these obstacles is essential for designing effective interventions.

1. Cultural Identity and Meat-Centrism

Food is deeply embedded in culture, identity, and tradition. In many societies, meat consumption is a symbol of prosperity, masculinity, and celebration (Rozin *et al*., 2012) [37]. The "meat paradox" describes the cognitive dissonance consumers experience when they care about animals but continue to eat them (Loughnan *et al*., 2014) [22]. Overcoming this requires culturally sensitive communication that reframes sustainable diets not as a sacrifice but as a progression toward health and modernity.

2. Economic Incentives and Subsidies

Current economic structures favor animal-based foods. In many high-income countries, the production of feed crops (corn, soy) is heavily subsidized, artificially lowering the cost of meat and dairy production (Tilman *et al*., 2002) [44]. Additionally, externalities—such as environmental degradation and healthcare costs associated with diet-related diseases—are not reflected in market prices. This creates a distorted market where sustainable options (fresh produce, organic grains) appear more expensive than processed, animal-based foods. Correcting these market failures through fiscal policies (e.g., carbon taxes on food, removal of feed subsidies) is necessary to make sustainable diets economically viable for all income levels (Springmann *et al*., 2017) [39].

3. The "Meat Tax" Debate

The implementation of taxes on animal products to internalize environmental costs is a contentious policy tool. While economically efficient, regressive taxes could disproportionately affect low-income households, threatening food security (Wirsenius *et al*., 2011) [50]. Policy solutions must therefore be progressive, using revenue from environmental levies to subsidize plant-based staples and improve access in food deserts.

4. Food Environments and Marketing

Individual choices are heavily constrained by the food environment. In many urban areas, ultra-processed foods and fast food (high in animal fats and refined carbs) are cheaper and more accessible than fresh, whole foods (Swinburn *et al*., 2011) [43]. Furthermore, aggressive marketing by the meat and dairy industries shapes consumer preferences from a young age. Transitioning to sustainable diets requires restructuring food environments to make the healthy, sustainable choice the easy choice. This includes front-of-pack labeling, restrictions on marketing unhealthy foods to children, and ensuring plant-based options are available in schools and public institutions.

Policy Implications and Future Directions

To operationalize sustainable diets at a global scale, multi-level governance is required, ranging from international agreements to local community initiatives.

1. Integrating Food Systems into Climate Policy

Historically, climate negotiations (e.g., the Paris Agreement) have focused heavily on energy and transport, largely overlooking agriculture and diets. Recent reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) have highlighted food systems as central to climate mitigation

(IPCC, 2019; IPBES, 2019) [17]. National Determined Contributions (NDCs) should explicitly include dietary shifts and reduction of food waste as key mitigation strategies.

2. Dietary Guidelines and Public Procurement

National dietary guidelines are powerful tools for shaping public perception and behavior. Currently, few guidelines explicitly integrate environmental sustainability (Herforth & Ahmed, 2015) [13]. Countries like Brazil, Sweden, and Qatar have pioneered the inclusion of environmental criteria in their food-based dietary guidelines. Public procurement policies—such as "Meatless Mondays" in schools, hospitals, and government canteens—can drive significant market shifts and normalize sustainable eating patterns (Bryngelsson *et al*., 2016) [4].

3. Agricultural Subsidy Reform

Transitioning from input-intensive industrial agriculture to agroecology requires financial support for farmers. Current subsidies often reward yield volume and monocultures. Future subsidies should be decoupled from production and linked to ecosystem services, such as soil carbon sequestration, water conservation, and biodiversity maintenance (Pe'er *et al*., 2019) [15]. This would lower the cost of sustainable produce and make plant-based diets more economically competitive.

4. Technological Innovations

While dietary shifts are paramount, technology also plays a role. Precision fermentation and cellular meat (cultured meat) offer potential pathways to produce animal proteins with drastically lower environmental footprints (Post *et al*., 2020) [35]. However, these technologies should complement, rather than replace, a transition to whole-food, plant-based diets. Furthermore, digital tools and apps can help consumers track the environmental impact of their food choices, increasing awareness and facilitating behavioral change.

Conclusion

The evidence is unequivocal: the current global dietary pattern is unsustainable. It drives environmental degradation, undermines long-term food security, and contributes significantly to the global burden of disease. Sustainable diets—characterized by high intake of plant-based foods and low intake of animal-based foods—are not a niche lifestyle choice but a systemic necessity for navigating the twenty-first century.

This research has demonstrated that shifting toward sustainable diets offers a synergistic solution to multiple interconnected crises. By reducing the demand for resource-intensive animal agriculture, sustainable diets alleviate pressure on land, water, and climate systems. This, in turn, enables the transition to agroecological farming practices that restore soil health and biodiversity. Furthermore, by prioritizing nutritional adequacy and reducing food waste, sustainable diets enhance food security, ensuring that the growing global population can be fed within planetary boundaries.

However, achieving this transition requires more than individual willpower. It demands structural changes in economic incentives, agricultural policies, and food environments. Governments must integrate food systems into climate mitigation strategies, reform subsidies to support regenerative agriculture, and ensure that sustainable foods are accessible and affordable for all socioeconomic groups.

In conclusion, sustainable diets represent the critical nexus where human health and planetary health converge. By redefining what it means to eat well—shifting the focus from quantity and excess to quality and sustainability—we can cultivate a food system that nourishes both people and the planet for generations to come.

References

1. Afshin A, Sur PJ, Fay KA, Cornaby L, Ferrara G, Salama JS, *et al*. Health effects of dietary risks in 195 countries, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. The Lancet,2019:393(10184):1958–1972.
2. Altieri MA. Agroecology: The science of sustainable agriculture. CRC Press,2018.
3. Beretta C, Hellweg S. Potential environmental benefits from food waste prevention in Switzerland. Environmental Science and Technology,2019:53(4):1628–1637.
4. Bryngelsson D, Wirsenius S, Hedenus F, Sonesson U. How can the Swedish climate policy influence the environmental impact of dietary choices? Food Policy,2016:59:1–11.
5. Clark M, Hill J, Tilman D. The dietary, environmental, and health impacts of animal and plant-based foods. Global Food Security,2019:19:38–45.
6. Clark MA, Springmann M, Hill J, Tilman D. Multiple health and environmental impacts of foods. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,2020:116(46):23352–23357.
7. Crippa M, Solazzo E, Guizzardi D, Monforti-Ferrario F, Leip AJ, Tubiello FN. Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions. Nature Food,2021:2(3):198–209.
8. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Sustainable diets and biodiversity: Directions and solutions for policy, research and action. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2010.
9. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Water for sustainable food and agriculture. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2017.
10. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The State of Food and Agriculture 2019. Moving forward on food loss and waste reduction. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2019.
11. Friel S, Barosh LJ, Lawrence M. Towards healthy and sustainable food consumption: An Australian case study. Public Health Nutrition,2015:18(13):2363–2372.
12. Glibert PM. Harmful algal blooms and eutrophication: “strategies” for nutrient uptake and growth outside the Redfield ratio. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology,2020:104(12):5181–5189.
13. Herforth A, Ahmed S. The food systems, nutrition and health framework: A guide for policy and program design. Global Food Security,2015:4:42–50.
14. Herrero M, Thornton PK, Notenbaert AM, Wood S, Msangi S, Freeman HA, *et al*. Smart investments in

sustainable food production: Revisiting mixed crop-livestock systems. Science,2010:327(5967):822–825.
15. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, 2019.
16. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
17. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2019.
18. Ivanova D, Stadler K, Steen-Olsen K, Wood R, Vita G, Tukker A, Hertwich EG. Environmental impact assessment of household consumption. Journal of Industrial Ecology,2019:23(3):666–680.
19. Jensen ES, Peoples MB, Boddey RM, Gresshoff PM, Hauggaard-Nielsen H, Alves BJR. Legumes for mitigation of climate change and the provision of feedstock for biofuels and biorefineries. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development,2015:32(2):329–364.
20. Leip A, Britz W, Weiss F, de Vries W. Farm, land, and soil nitrogen budgets of agriculture in the European Union. Environmental Research Letters, 2015, 10(12).
21. Lin BB. Resilience in agriculture through crop diversification: A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development,2011:31(1):1–20.
22. Loughnan S, Bastian B, Haslam N. The psychology of eating animals. Current Directions in Psychological Science,2014:23(2):104–108.
23. Machmuller MB, Kramer MG, Cyle TK, Hill N, Hancock D, Thompson A. Emerging land use practices rapidly increase soil organic matter. Nature Communications, 2015, 6(1).
24. Machovina B, Feeley KJ, Ripple WJ. Biodiversity conservation: The key is reducing meat consumption. Science of the Total Environment,2015:536:419–431.
25. Makkar HPS. Review: Feed demand landscape and implications of food security in India. Animal Production Science,2018:58(7):1240–1250.
26. Masset G, Soler LG, Vieux F, Darmon N. Identifying sustainable foods: The relationship between environmental impact, nutritional quality, and prices of foods representative of the French diet. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics,2017:117(6):839–851.
27. Mekonnen MM, Hoekstra AY. A global assessment of the water footprint of farm animal products. Ecosystems,2012:15(3):401–415.
28. Melina V, Craig W, Levin S. Position of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics: Vegetarian diets. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics,2016:116(12):1970–1980.
29. Montgomery DR. Growing a revolution: Bringing our soil back to life. WW Norton and Company, 2017.
30. Mottet A, de Haan C, Falcucci A, Tempio G, Opio C, Gerber P. Livestock on our screens: Assessing global livestock distributions and their role in the global food system. Global Food Security,2017:13:26–33.
31. Notarnicola B, Tassielli G, Renzulli PA, Castellani V, Sala S. Environmental impacts of food consumption in Europe. Journal of Cleaner Production,2017:140:753–765.
32. Pe'er G, Bonn A, Bruggeman D, *et al*. Action needed for the EU Common Agricultural Policy to address sustainability challenges. People and Nature,2019:1(2):242–249.
33. Poore J, Nemecek T. Reducing food’s environmental impacts through producers and consumers. Science,2018:360(6392):987–992.
34. Popkin BM, Corvalan C, Grummer-Strawn LM. Dynamics of the double burden of malnutrition and the changing nutrition reality. The Lancet,2020:395(10217):65–74.
35. Post MJ, Levenberg S, Kaplan DL, Genovese N, Fu J, Bryant CJ, *et al*. Scientific, sustainability and regulatory challenges of cultured meat. Nature Food,2020:1(7):403–415.
36. Rockström J, Steffen W, Noone K, Persson Å, Chapin FS, Lambin EF, *et al*. A safe operating space for humanity. Nature,2009:461(7263):472–475.
37. Rozin P, Hormes JM, Faith MS, Wansink B. Is meat male? A quantitative multimethod framework to establish metaphysical relationships. Journal of Consumer Research,2012:39(3):629–643.
38. Springmann M, Godfray HC, Rayner M, Scarborough P. Analysis and valuation of the health and climate change cobenefits of dietary change. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,2016:113(15):4146–4151.
39. Springmann M, Mason-D'Croz D, Robinson S, Wiebe K, Godfray HC, Rayner M, Scarborough P. Mitigation potential and global health impacts from emissions pricing of food commodities. Earth's Future,2017:5(1):73–90.
40. Springmann M, Clark M, Mason-D'Croz D, Wiebe K, Bodirsky BL, Lassaletta L, *et al*. Options for keeping the food system within environmental limits. Nature,2018:562(7728):519–525.
41. Steffen W, Richardson K, Rockström J, Cornell SE, Fetzer I, Bennett EM, *et al*. Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. Science, 2015, 347(6223).
42. Stoate C, Boatman ND, Borralho RJ, Carvalho CR, de Snoo GR, Eden P. Ecological impacts of arable intensification in Europe. Journal of Environmental Management,2001:63(4):337–365.
43. Swinburn BA, Sacks G, Hall KD, McPherson K, Finegood DT, Moodie ML, Gortmaker SL. The global obesity pandemic: shaped by global drivers and local environments. The Lancet,2011:378(9793):804–814.
44. Tilman D, Cassman KG, Matson PA, Naylor R, Polasky S. Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. Nature,2002:418(6898):671–677.
45. Trichopoulou A, Soukara S, Vasilopoulou E. Traditional foods: a science and society perspective. Trends in Food Science and Technology,2014:38(2):96–102.
46. Tscharntke T, Clough Y, Wanger TC, Jackson L, Motzke I, Perfecto I, *et al*. Global food security, biodiversity conservation and the future of agricultural

intensification. Biological Conservation,2012:151(1):53–59.
47. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. World Population Prospects 2019: Highlights. United Nations,2019.
48. Wada Y, van Beek LP, van Kempen CM, Reckman JW, Vasak S, Bierkens MF. Global depletion of groundwater resources. Geophysical Research Letters,2010:37(20).
49. Willett W, Rockström J, Loken B, Springmann M, Lang T, Vermeulen S, *et al*. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. The Lancet,2019:393(10170):447–492.
50. Wirsenius S, Hedenus F, Mohlin K. Greenhouse gas taxes on animal food products: rationale, tax scheme and climate mitigation effects. Climatic Change,2011:108(1-2):159–181.