



# Dietary change in high-income nations alone can lead to substantial double climate dividend

Zhongxiao Sun <sup>1,2</sup>✉, Laura Scherer <sup>1</sup>, Arnold Tukker<sup>1,3</sup>, Seth A. Spawn-Lee <sup>4,5</sup>, Martin Bruckner <sup>6</sup>, Holly K. Gibbs<sup>4,5</sup> and Paul Behrens <sup>1,7</sup>

**A dietary shift from animal-based foods to plant-based foods in high-income nations could reduce greenhouse gas emissions from direct agricultural production and increase carbon sequestration if resulting spared land was restored to its antecedent natural vegetation. We estimate this double effect by simulating the adoption of the EAT-Lancet planetary health diet by 54 high-income nations representing 68% of global gross domestic product and 17% of population. Our results show that such dietary change could reduce annual agricultural production emissions of high-income nations' diets by 61% while sequestering as much as 98.3 (55.6–143.7) GtCO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, equal to approximately 14 years of current global agricultural emissions until natural vegetation matures. This amount could potentially fulfil high-income nations' future sum of carbon dioxide removal (CDR) obligations under the principle of equal per capita CDR responsibilities. Linking land, food, climate and public health policy will be vital to harnessing the opportunities of a double climate dividend.**

Agriculture is key to determining the rate and depth of climatic change. Current food system emissions alone may preclude the limiting of climate warming to 1.5°C or even 2°C above pre-industrial levels<sup>1</sup>, yet simultaneously, radical land-use and agricultural management interventions may be crucial strategies for limiting climatic change<sup>2</sup>. Dietary change, for one, has been found to be a practical and effective strategy in multiple studies<sup>3,4</sup>. The global food system is responsible for ~13.7 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e emissions per year, accounting for 26% of anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions<sup>5</sup>. Agricultural production, particularly animal-derived products and land-use change, accounts for the largest proportion of these emissions<sup>6</sup>. In 2013, per capita meat consumption in high-income countries was almost six times greater than that in low-income countries<sup>6</sup>. Animal-derived products account for 70% of food-system emissions in high-income countries but only 22% in low-middle-income countries<sup>7</sup>. Attribution of these emissions is complicated by agricultural globalization, whereby food consumption in high-income countries drives overseas GHG emissions through international trade<sup>8</sup>. As such, dietary change in high-income countries may hold the potential to substantially reduce agricultural emissions around the world—a potential climate 'dividend'.

Shifting from current dietary patterns in high-income nations to healthier alternatives with few or no animal products could simultaneously spare agricultural land for other uses. While a portion of this land may ultimately be used for various types of development and/or bioenergy, its use for intentional ecosystem restoration—a 'natural climate solution'<sup>2,9</sup>—would represent a second additional carbon dividend from dietary change. In many regions, reverting cropland to its antecedent or 'potential' natural vegetation (PNV) can substantially increase aboveground biomass carbon (AGBC), belowground biomass carbon (BGBC) and soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks<sup>8,10–13</sup> with additional co-benefits for biodiversity<sup>14</sup> and other ecosystem services. Recent studies highlight the large

magnitude of this sequestration potential. Global vegetation is believed to currently store less than 50% (450 GtC) of its potential carbon stock (916 GtC) due to appropriative land use<sup>11</sup>. Likewise, global soils have lost 116 GtC over the course of agricultural history due to carbon-cycle imbalances imposed by cultivation and other human appropriation<sup>15</sup>. A substantial portion of these carbon stocks could be recovered if land is spared by dietary change and subsequently restored to PNV. However, the extent to which land could be spared has not been comprehensively assessed due, in part, to the complex trade relationships between food producers and consumers<sup>8</sup>. Such relationships are particularly relevant to the land-use footprints of high-income nations that import large amounts of food from around the world<sup>16</sup>.

We assess the potential for a 'double dividend' for GHG emissions mitigation via dietary change from both reduced direct agricultural production emissions and carbon sequestration via land sparing whereby agricultural lands can revert to other uses. While linked, these elements play out over two different timeframes: the first, reduced production emissions, influences the sector's annual GHG contribution, while the second, sequestration, often requires decades or even centuries to realize its full potential. We conceptualize the latter effect as a one-time 'committed' mass of carbon that is sequestered over an unspecified period after restoration is initiated (Methods). In addition, information and knowledge nudges could motivate the public's perception and individual intrinsic identity on sustainable diets, which would facilitate value-driven actions on diet change<sup>17,18</sup>. However, such climate benefits will materialize only if land upstream in the supply chain is spared from agricultural activities. We use data for the year 2010 from the Food and Agriculture Biomass Input–Output dataset (FABIO)<sup>19</sup> to relate the international final demand for food items with primary agricultural production. FABIO is a physical global multi-regional input–output table and so avoids price-based impacts and issues in estimating

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Environmental Sciences (CML), Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands. <sup>2</sup>College of Land Science and Technology, China Agricultural University, Beijing, China. <sup>3</sup>The Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research TNO, The Hague, the Netherlands. <sup>4</sup>Department of Geography, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA. <sup>5</sup>Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment (SAGE), Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA. <sup>6</sup>Institute for Ecological Economics, Vienna University of Economics and Business, Vienna, Austria. <sup>7</sup>Leiden University College The Hague, The Hague, the Netherlands. ✉e-mail: [z.sun@cml.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:z.sun@cml.leidenuniv.nl)

environmental pressures embodied in global supply chains<sup>19</sup>. As our focus is on emissions from agricultural activities and the carbon opportunity as a result of land spared due to dietary change, we include all food consumption (that is, in households and through service activities such as restaurants) and do not include GHG emissions from non-agricultural sectors such as transportation, processing, refrigeration, wholesale and retail. A GHG emissions dataset derived from the Food and Agriculture Organization's statistical database (FAOSTAT) at the national level is linked to FABIO to quantify emissions from agriculture in diets<sup>20</sup>. Agricultural production is mapped to spatially explicit cropland and pastureland, which we linked to the latest harmonized global AGBC and BGBC map<sup>21</sup>; a SOC stock map of the top 100 cm (ref. 15); and a PNV map with AGBC, BGBC and SOC<sup>11,12</sup>. The result is a spatially explicit multi-regional input–output (SMRIO) model with a uniform resolution of 5 arcmin (ref. 22,23). We use the recommendations of the EAT–Lancet Commission as a basis for dietary change in high-income countries<sup>3</sup>. The EAT–Lancet Commission aims to develop healthy human diets and sustainable food production while meeting United Nations sustainable development and climate goals<sup>3</sup>. Such diets are characterized by reduced meat-product consumption and result in lower agricultural land requirements (Methods and Supplementary Table 3). For our double-dividend scenario, we assume spared land is restored to PNV (Methods and Supplementary Information) and determine the ensuing carbon sequestration potential as the difference between the carbon stock of PNV and that of current use.

## Results

**Dietary change mitigation potential.** A shift to a country-specific EAT–Lancet diet from current dietary patterns (that is, in benchmark year 2010) in high-income nations would reduce annual emissions from direct agricultural production by 61.5% or 0.75 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup>. This results in an average per capita reduction in high-income nations of 0.65 tCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup>. Our estimate of GHG reduction due to dietary change is in line with those in the literature<sup>24</sup> (Fig. 1 and Supplementary Fig. 2). On the basis of other recent estimates, a further 0.54 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> of reduction could be possible from downstream sectors (for example, transportation, processing, packaging, retail, consumption and end of life) proportional to these sectors for the same high-income nations we examine<sup>25</sup>. About half of this reduction would collectively occur in the United States (29.9%), France (7.1%), Australia (6.5%) and Germany (4.4%) (Fig. 1c). Some large exporting middle- and low-income countries would also see emissions reductions via reduced exports of agricultural products to high-income countries. These include India (3.1% of India's emissions from agricultural production) and Brazil (3.2% of Brazil's emissions from agricultural production).

A dietary shift from national average diets to the country-specific EAT–Lancet diet across high-income countries would also result in substantial opportunities for carbon sequestration. We find that a shift of this nature could spare more than 426.35 Mha—an equivalent area slightly larger than that of the European Union. Subsequent committed sequestration over the long term on this land could increase carbon stocks by 98.25 (55.62–143.68) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e. This is about 60% of the global carbon accumulation estimated by Cook-Patton et al. from 349 Mha potential natural forest regrowth for the first 30 years<sup>13</sup> and 21% carbon sequestration over the long term if all global populations adopt the country-specific EAT–Lancet diet<sup>26</sup>. If the committed sequestration can be achieved by the end of the twenty-first century (2010–2100), the annual average sequestration rate would be 1.09 (0.62–1.60) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup>. This rate is about 1.5 times the benefit from production emissions due to dietary change in high-income nations. However, this average hides substantial differences in annual sequestration rates over time, which vary depending on different land-use conversions, different potential natural vegetation across different sites<sup>27,28</sup>,


nonlinear carbon update of vegetation over time<sup>29,30</sup> and variations in sequestration based on uncertain climate conditions, soil and land-management techniques<sup>30</sup>. It also ignores potential losses due to climate-related events such as wildfires, changing albedo with the recovery of potential natural vegetation and changes to albedo from forest-related cloud-cover changes<sup>31,32</sup>. Further discussion on the nonlinear sequestration of carbon by soils and biomass is given in Supplementary Table 10. Spared agricultural land would be composed of 343.62 Mha pastureland and 82.73 Mha cropland, with major abandonment hotspots expected in the western half of the United States, Central Europe and the eastern states of Australia (Supplementary Fig. 3). The spared pastureland and cropland would increase carbon sequestration by 56.20 (29.93–84.59) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e and 42.05 (25.69–59.09) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 7).

Carbon sequestration would be achieved predominately in large countries with large amounts of agricultural production, especially feed crops and pasture. For example, more than half of the increase in global carbon sequestration would occur in four nations alone: the United States (26.3%, 25.85 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e), Australia (13.5%, 13.28 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e), Germany (7.7%, 7.55 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e) and France (7.6%, 7.45 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e), collectively (Fig. 1a). Regionally, major hotspots for sequestration include the US Midwest, Central Europe and the eastern states of Australia (Fig. 1a and Supplementary Fig. 2), where the potential natural vegetation is forest with a high-carbon density<sup>11,26</sup>. Australian dietary changes would see the largest per capita carbon benefit overall at 574.90 Mg CO<sub>2</sub>e of sequestration (6.7 times the average of all high-income countries; Supplementary Fig. 11), driven largely by a shift away from animal products and a restoration of mixed native grassland and forest<sup>26</sup>.

As a percentage of the total sequestration potential of dietary change, 35.5% lies outside of the consuming country (that is, dietary change in a high-income country influences production in another country)—23.6% would be located in other high-income countries, and around 11.9% would be located in middle- and low-income regions (Fig. 1a and Supplementary Fig. 2). These latter regions would also be located mainly in countries providing large amounts of agricultural production for high-income nations, such as Brazil (1.63 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e) and Botswana (1.23 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e).

**Animal products' role in the carbon cycle.** Given the large land requirement and high emissions intensity of animal agriculture, a shift away from animal-product consumption comprises the largest opportunity for both increased carbon sequestration via land sparing and emissions reductions from the food system itself<sup>7,24,26</sup>. Reductions in meat-product consumption would result in 103.90 (58.62–151.75) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e of sequestration over the long term, along with annual agricultural emissions reductions of 0.69 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 2). The reduced consumption of dairy products and eggs would result in an additional sequestration of 18.99 (10.87–27.52) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e and emissions reductions of 0.02 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 2). A further 0.05 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> reduction in emissions would come from reduced added fats and sugars, grains, tubers and vegetables (Fig. 2). Land spared by reducing the consumption of meat products, dairy products and eggs could capture and store 81 times the annual GHG emissions from annual agricultural production (1.22 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup>) of food consumed in high-income countries in 2010.


Climate mitigation due to dietary change depends on both local agricultural production practices and local dietary preferences. Dietary changes in the United States and Australia contribute the largest carbon benefits because they are mostly composed of reductions in animal-product consumption (Fig. 2 and Supplementary Fig. 11). This is due to the scale of beef production systems in the United States and Australia<sup>7</sup>. We find a different situation in East Asian countries with high populations. In South Korea and Japan, the opportunity for carbon sequestration is offset slightly by 0.28 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e and 0.35 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e due to an expected increase in dairy



**Fig. 1 | Changes in net carbon sequestration and net GHG emissions due to dietary change in high-income countries. a**, Net carbon sequestration is the sum of AGBC, BGBC and SOC (shown in Robinson projection). **b**, Three major hotspots of carbon sequestration are shown for the US Midwest (shown in United States Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic projection), central Europe (shown in Europe Albers Equal Area Conic projection) and coastal regions in Australia (shown in Australian Albers projection). NA, no data availability. **c**, Net GHG emissions are shown in Robinson projection. Further maps of the global spatial distribution of changes in these variables are in Supplementary Fig. 8. The lower and upper bound for the global spatial distribution of changes in these variables are shown in Supplementary Figs. 9 and 10.

products consumption under the EAT–Lancet diet recommendations (Fig. 2 and Supplementary Fig. 11). Given that the current low levels of dairy consumption in East Asia are driven by high levels

of lactose intolerance<sup>33</sup>, our finding highlights the need for locally appropriate dietary recommendations that consider both public health and environmental outcomes.




**Fig. 2 | Potential sequestration and emissions changes due to dietary changes.** **a,b**, Potential carbon sequestration (**a**) and potential GHG emission change (**b**) by food category due to dietary change in high-income nations. Food categories are divided into animal products, mixed animal- and plant-based products and plant-based products. We show detailed sectors for animal-protein groups given their important role. Methods and Supplementary Table 2 provide detailed reporting of all products. In cases where sequestration increases (for example, with the reduction of animal agriculture activities), the carbon sequestration opportunity is calculated as the difference between the potential natural vegetation and the current agricultural vegetation. In cases where sequestration decreases (by increased plant-protein production), the carbon sequestration opportunity is calculated as the difference between potential natural vegetation minus that of increased agricultural vegetation. The red line in **a** shows an equivalent +5 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e sequestration across product groups. The red line in **b** shows -0.01 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e emissions across product groups. The error bars show the range of potential carbon sequestration.

The reduction in meat products would be offset slightly by an increase in plant-protein production. Increased production of plant-based alternatives would also be needed to satisfy other nutrient demands such as vitamin B12 and Omega 3<sup>34</sup>. Increasing plant proteins and fruit production would result in a small offset—35.07 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e—of the gains made from reducing animal products. The increase in direct emissions from the agriculture sector would be very small at just 0.01 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 2). This is somewhat unsurprising when we consider that the energy feed-to-food conversion efficiency of animal products is low and varies from 3% for beef to 17% for eggs within animal products<sup>35,36</sup>. In addition, the grains fed to livestock (for example, maize and soybean) could be redirected to human consumption or spared land could be used to produce plant-based products without expanding net agricultural land (Supplementary Fig. 3).

**Mitigation potential of non-EAT-Lancet food items.** There has been little discussion of stimulants (coffee and products; cocoa beans and products; and tea, including mate), alcoholic beverages

(wine, beer, fermented beverages and alcoholic beverages), edible offal and other meat (for example, horse, donkey, camel, rabbit and game meat) in previous studies, as these were not a focus of the EAT-Lancet diet<sup>24,37</sup>. We did not include these items in our main analysis but perform a separate assessment here to identify the additional climate-mitigation benefit. We find the maximum opportunity of climate mitigation if high-income nations cease all consumption of these items. Although these items comprise only 5.8% of dietary GHG emissions, they represent a non-negligible carbon sequestration opportunity. The cumulative total of these items represents a sequestration opportunity of 19.32 (10.72–28.34) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e (Fig. 3) or 19.7% of the total sequestration opportunity identified above (Fig. 1a) if high-income nations cease all consumption of these items.

While others have pointed to opportunities for sustainable intensification by abandoning luxury, low-nutrition crops such as feedstock for alcoholic beverages<sup>38</sup>, it would be a considerable challenge to model potential reductions in practice due to many sociological and policy complications. While stimulant consumption can be related to risks of anxiety and depression and there are relationships



**Fig. 3 | Potential carbon sequestration and emissions changes due to removal of non-EAT-Lancet food items.** **a,b**, Potential carbon sequestration (**a**) and potential GHG emissions change (**b**) due to removal of ignored food items in the EAT-Lancet diet for high-income countries. These food items are covered in the FAO diets but not considered in the EAT-Lancet diet. The error bars show the range of potential carbon sequestration.

between alcohol consumption and cancer, substantial reductions in these items would be a controversial cultural topic<sup>39–42</sup>. Nevertheless, per capita alcohol consumption of high-income countries, for example, is much higher than that of middle- and low-income countries, and some high-income countries (for example, in Europe) have been reducing alcohol consumption<sup>42,43</sup>.

Since edible offal is a co-product of meat production, it cannot be reduced unilaterally from other meats. However, offal is not typically consumed in high-income nations due to convention and consumer preference<sup>44</sup>. It is an effective way to reduce overall meat consumption and its associated carbon cost as a meat substitute in some products<sup>45,46</sup>. Finally, if the meat products listed in the country-specific EAT-Lancet diet were to satisfy human demand, other meat consumption (consumption not listed in the country-specific EAT-Lancet diet for meat varieties such as horse, donkey, rabbit and others) could be avoided, resulting in a sequestration opportunity of ~4.38 (2.33–6.58) GtCO<sub>2</sub>e (Fig. 3a).

**Implications for natural climate solutions.** Emissions trajectories as reported by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 1.5°C special report suggest that limiting the global average temperature increase to 1.5°C could require a cumulative carbon dioxide removal (CDR) of 348–1,218 GtCO<sub>2</sub> by 2100, with a ‘middle of the road’ scenario—one in which societal and technological development follows historical patterns—requiring an ~687 GtCO<sub>2</sub> reduction<sup>47,48</sup>. As with mitigation efforts under existing international frameworks for ‘shared but differentiated responsibilities’, there may be highly differentiated CDR targets for high-income countries. Others have allocated global CDR requirements to countries based on responsibility (per capita production-based carbon emissions since 1850), capability (per capita gross domestic product) and equality (per capita CDR quotas) principles<sup>48</sup>. Cumulative allocations to the 54 high-income countries we investigate here vary from

84.70 GtCO<sub>2</sub> to 530.98 GtCO<sub>2</sub>, depending on the allocation principle (ranging from equality to capability, respectively), compared with our calculated 98.25 GtCO<sub>2</sub> CDR by PNV restoration due to dietary change<sup>48</sup>. As such, our results suggest that ecosystem restoration facilitated by dietary change alone could potentially fulfil high-income countries’ CDR obligations needed to limit warming to 1.5°C under equality sharing principles (Supplementary Table 11).

## Discussion

Uniform adoption of the country-specific EAT-Lancet diet across high-income nations would benefit both the global environment and human health in high-income countries<sup>24,37</sup>. Land spared due to dietary change would expand opportunities for the implementation of natural climate solutions, such as regrowth of natural forest, which is arguably the single most effective natural climate solution throughout much of the world<sup>2,9,13</sup>. Nevertheless, it would probably be a challenging, long-term and complex process to restore the agricultural land spared by dietary change. A comprehensive analysis of social acceptance of land sparing is lacking but would probably find that success greatly depends upon local contexts<sup>49</sup>. In our analysis, we assume a scenario in which all spared land is restored to the potential natural vegetation associated with today’s climate to delineate the maximum potential<sup>11</sup>. However, this idealized opportunity is probably confounded by more nuanced biophysical and socioeconomic characteristics of various world regions.

Restoration is also just one of many potential end uses for spared land. Competition among end uses inevitably precludes 100% adoption of any one type of land use, and strategies are needed to identify ways in which trade-offs among uses can be optimally balanced<sup>50</sup>. For example, from an emissions mitigation perspective, some have recently proposed that restoration be prioritized based on the rate and degree to which candidate lands can recover carbon<sup>51</sup>. Yet, even recovery rates are not a trivial criterion. Many contingencies

determine these rates—for example, subsequent management, local climate, soil properties, surrounding ecology and so on—that ultimately influence the efficacy of restoration<sup>27</sup>. Passive restoration, for example, is sometimes desirable as species on spared land can undergo natural succession and recover quickly at no or low cost<sup>27</sup>. Even so, passive restoration may be a less-effective means of sequestering carbon than active restoration in systems in which successional dynamics favour the dominance of less-productive plant communities<sup>52</sup>. In either case, restoration is a relatively slow process, requiring decades or centuries to manifest its full effects. It therein requires a long-term mindset and commitment that may not be politically tenable.

Spared land could also potentially be used for bioenergy cultivation—albeit with different outcomes<sup>27,53</sup>. Traditionally, bioenergy has been regarded as an economically costly strategy for climate change mitigation with a lower efficacy per unit of land use compared with alternatives<sup>2,27,53,54</sup>. In addition, costly transportation, long-distance shipping and limited refinery plant capacity all have a critical impact on the economic and environmental sustainability of bioenergy production<sup>55</sup>. However, bioenergy cultivation may have higher cumulative carbon sequestration opportunities due to short rotation and sustainable harvest management<sup>56,57</sup>. For instance, a recent US case study suggests the climate-mitigation potential of second-generation bioenergy crops such as switchgrass (including carbon sequestration, avoided emissions from fossil fuels and carbon capture and storage during bioenergy production) in some US contexts could be 4 to 15 times greater than the sequestration attained by restoring current cropland or pastureland to natural forest and grassland over the first 30 years<sup>58</sup>. However, these efficiencies remain contingent upon ensuing improvements to energy crop yields and biofuel conversion technology in addition to carbon capture and storage technology as part of bioenergy carbon capture and sequestration approaches<sup>58</sup>. Carbon dioxide emissions from biorefinery operations are assumed to be captured and injected into geological storage. Bioenergy production on spared land could bring economic benefits and may offer an opportunity to offset impacts on rural livelihoods driven by dietary change, such as meat reduction. Moreover, unlike a return to PNV, the efficacy of bioenergy depends on technological and agricultural development<sup>59,60</sup>; it may depend on, or drive, greater use of agricultural inputs such as fertilizer, pesticides or irrigation; and its effects on biodiversity, water quality or other ecosystem services remain mixed for different generations of bioenergy (that is, first-generation biofuels compared with second-generation ones) but are probably less than those expected from PNV restoration<sup>58</sup>.

In addition to natural climate solutions that ensue from the sequestration element of the double dividend, other supplementary natural climate solutions address production emissions. These solutions, including improved nutrient management, cover crops and biochar (Supplementary Information), do not require extra land but instead target emissions reductions from remaining cropland<sup>2,27</sup>. Moreover, their effects are realized quicker (days to years) than those of PNV restoration which may make them more tractable for producers and policymakers. Even so, governance of land-use changes implied by both elements of the double dividend will probably require new technological (for example, remote-sensing monitoring) and financial support (for example, reforestation and afforestation)<sup>27,61,62</sup>. In addition, payments for ecosystem services (for example, for carbon sequestration) from consumers to producers could offset some of the loss of income landowners may face due to land sparing from fodder and livestock reductions<sup>63</sup>.

To harness the GHG mitigation potential of dietary change, a holistic social policy that coordinates among food, environment and public health systems will be essential. Decision makers could repurpose taxes and regulations on unhealthy food<sup>64</sup>. However, nutritious foods can, in some regions, have higher prices than unhealthy foods

high in saturated fat, sugar or starch. This could result in a substantial financial burden on lower-income consumers. Food assistance programmes may need to be adopted in some locations to provide better access to planetary healthy foods<sup>65</sup>. The question is not necessarily one of available investment; global agricultural subsidies currently reach ~US\$700 billion yr<sup>-1</sup> and yet result in unsustainable production and consumption<sup>64,66</sup>. These subsidies could instead be redirected along the lines of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices and healthy diets<sup>66</sup>. In addition, actions to reduce food loss and waste are an essential climate intervention along with dietary change. For example, a reduction in global food waste of 50% would result in further GHG mitigation of 0.9 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> (ref. <sup>67</sup>). Without additional policies—especially support for local producers that provide most agricultural products for the international market—this could cause a massive social upheaval as livelihoods in export-oriented commodity crops or animal agriculture face rapid and deep change.

High-income countries stand to achieve the largest per capita carbon reductions by shifting to the country-specific EAT–*Lancet* diet due to the large proportion of their average diet currently devoted to carbon-intensive meat-products consumption<sup>24,26</sup>. We aim to isolate the current carbon opportunity due to dietary change in high-income nations alone, assuming all other economic conditions are unchanged. With such a change in diets and production systems, there may be direct and indirect rebound effects which could be modelled in future work. Rebound effects may offset mitigation efforts<sup>68,69</sup>, but research into rebound effects in the food system is highly challenging given the uncertainty surrounding future food prices, differences in meat and meat-substitute prices and potential future policy controls on rebounds. What we present here is the total current opportunity based on production structure in the benchmarked year (that is, the year 2010 in the study). We leave rebound assessments for future studies (which may involve lower sectoral and spatial resolution along with different social and economic modelling approaches)<sup>70</sup>.

To provide a more transparent assessment of today's overall carbon sequestration opportunities (and opportunity costs), we also take a static approach for economic structures. It is very challenging to predict future production structures and trade patterns between economic sectors within and among nations. For example, production structures are heavily determined by technological change and do not evolve linearly<sup>71</sup>. Future trade patterns are also difficult to predict because they are impacted by many factors such as labour and land costs, not to mention geopolitical tensions, trade agreements and governmental policies<sup>71</sup>. While other studies, for example, on biofuels, have attempted to investigate some aspects of these changes using scenarios and models with a lower sectoral resolution and lower spatial resolution, their findings are contested and highly sensitive to assumptions<sup>70</sup>. Because we assess carbon sequestration/mitigation based on physical flows, we avoid some of the issues that price-based analyses may face. However, the total opportunity assessed here represents an upper bound of possibilities.

While we estimate the magnitude of the potential carbon sequestration benefit due to dietary change in high-income nations, we do not include non-agricultural sectors such as transportation, processing, wholesale, retail, hotel and restaurant food emissions. Further, given the number of datasets integrated into this analysis, uncertainties in both data<sup>11,21</sup> and modelling<sup>19</sup> mean that estimates for specific crops in individual nations should be interpreted cautiously. Nevertheless, our analysis sheds light on the indirect ways in which dietary change may offer substantial opportunities for GHG reductions via enhanced natural climate solutions and the deep and complex policy changes upon which they are predicated.

## Methods

We employed a SMRIO model to derive GHG emissions and carbon sequestration change after a dietary shift from national average diets in the year 2010 to a

planetary health diet proposed by the EAT–Lancet Commission in high-income countries<sup>3</sup>. We focus on GHG emissions and sequestration—the latter distinguishing AGBC, BGBC and SOC of crop and livestock production for human consumption. GHG emissions and sequestration requires two different timeframes: the reduced production emissions influence the sector's annual GHG contribution, while sequestration requires decades or even centuries to realize its full potential. Therefore, we assess a double dividend for emissions mitigation from annual reduced direct agricultural production emissions<sup>24</sup> and carbon sequestration via land sparing over the long term<sup>11,26</sup>. To keep the geographic data consistent, we aggregate all spatial maps to a uniform resolution of 5 arcmin. We outline the construction of the model for each plant type in turn.

**Biomass carbon and soil organic carbon in current vegetation.** *Primary crops and fodder.* We calculated AGBC and BGBC for herbaceous crops and fodder using the approach of Spawn et al.<sup>21</sup> (equations (1) and (2)) based on the crop-production data at national scale from FAOSTAT<sup>20</sup> (Supplementary Table 1 and Supplementary Methods). We then allocated AGBC and BGBC into grid cells based on the spatial distribution of the 29 herbaceous crops in the spatial production allocation model (SPAM)<sup>72</sup> and the fodder crop map in EarthStat<sup>73</sup>

$$\text{AGBC} = \gamma\omega \left( 0.451h^{-1} + 1.025c - 0.451 \right) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{BGBC} = 0.451\gamma rh^{-1} \quad (2)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the production of a specific crop or fodder item (in t),  $\omega$  is the dry-matter fraction of its harvested biomass,  $h$  is its harvest index (fraction of total AGBC collected at harvest),  $c$  is the carbon-content fraction of its harvested dry mass and  $r$  is the root-to-shoot ratio of the crop (Supplementary Table 1). We assume that 2.5% of all harvested biomass is lost between the field and farm gate and that unharvested residue and root mass is composed of 44% carbon (following Wolf et al.<sup>74</sup>).

As some regions saw multiple harvests in a single year, we further determined the harvest frequency ( $f$ ) of each grid cell by dividing a cell's harvested area by its physical area as reported in SPAM. If  $f$  was greater than one, multiple harvests were assumed, and AGBC and BGBC were divided by  $f$  to ensure that AGBC and BGBC estimates did not exceed the maximum standing biomass density<sup>21</sup>.

Woody crops such as fruit, nuts and oil palms were addressed separately, and their biomass was assumed to be captured by the harmonized biomass AGBC and BGBC map from Spawn et al.<sup>21</sup>. The AGBC and BGBC were extracted based on the share of the physical area of 11 woody crops in SPAM on the grid cell area. We then allocated the AGBC and BGBC of 11 woody crop groups into individual crops based on the share of AGBC and BGBC calculated in equations (1) and (2) at the national level.

SOC, the carbon remaining in the soil after partial decomposition of any material produced by living organisms, constitutes a primary element of the global carbon cycle through the atmosphere, vegetation, soil, rivers and the ocean. About 50% of total global SOC (that is, top 300 cm depth) is stored in the top 100 cm depth, so SOC stock-change assessment should be made to at least 100 cm depth<sup>75</sup>. In this paper, we used a soil organic carbon stock map for the year 2010 by Sanderman et al.<sup>15</sup>, representing stocks integrated to a depth of 100 cm. It is the result of machine-learning ensemble models run at a spatial resolution of 5 arcmin. A similar dataset recently produced by the International Soil Reference and Information Centre (ISRIC; <https://www.isric.org/>) known as SoilGrids version 2.0<sup>76</sup> provides a lower comparable estimate of global SOC stocks in the upper 30 cm of soil and is in better agreement with a recent comprehensive empirical inventory<sup>77</sup>. Downward revisions by SoilGrids version 2.0 are most pronounced in permafrost regions such that they minimally affect our estimates for modern agricultural areas<sup>15,76</sup>. Notwithstanding this, because SoilGrids version 2.0 provides SOC estimates only for the topsoil (0–30 cm depth), we used the ratio between mean SOC from SoilGrids version 2.0 and the comparable estimate by Sanderman et al. for the top 30 cm to scale SOC in the top 100 cm provided by Sanderman et al., such that estimates for subsoil carbon stocks (30–100 cm depth) are similarly revised<sup>15,76</sup>. We used the share of the physical area of 40 crops in SPAM and a fodder map from EarthStat to extract the value of SOC, and we then allocated the value into separate crops based on their harvested area in FAOSTAT and SPAM in 2010.

*Pastureland.* We used the latest year of pastureland for feeding livestock in the year 2010 provided by Sloat et al.<sup>78</sup> and calibrated it based on capping 100% total land-use coverage in each grid cell (Supplementary Methods). AGBC and BGBC of pasture are from the harmonized biomass carbon map of pasture provided by Spawn et al.<sup>21</sup>. SOC is based on the same dataset as above cropland. We extracted the value of AGBC, BGBC and SOC based on the percentage of pasture in a grid cell.

**GHG emissions.** The GHG emissions for agricultural production in tCO<sub>2</sub>e yr<sup>-1</sup> were calculated following the tier 1 methodology of FAOSTAT for the year 2010<sup>20</sup> applied at the national level rather than the grid cell level (Supplementary Methods).

**AGBC, BGBC and SOC of potential natural vegetation.** To calculate the potential additional carbon storage of returning land to natural vegetation, we used the work of Erb et al.<sup>11</sup> and Sanderman et al.<sup>15</sup>. Erb et al. generated a land use-induced biomass (AGBC and BGBC) stock-reduction percentage map based on 42 potential–actual biomass stock-difference maps by combining the seven actual biomass stock maps with the six potential biomass stock maps<sup>11</sup>. In addition, Erb et al. adjusted the maps to guarantee the actual biomass stocks would not surpass the potential biomass stocks<sup>11</sup>. We used the AGBC and BGBC maps constructed as above as the actual biomass stock map and used a reduction percentage map from Erb et al.<sup>11</sup> to get AGBC and BGBC of potential natural vegetation. Sanderman et al. estimated SOC stock loss between historical natural vegetation and current land use for 2010 at 5 arcmin using machine-learning techniques<sup>15</sup>. Sanderman et al. provided three layers of SOC stock in the upper 30 cm, 100 cm and 200 cm. We used the percentage SOC loss from Sanderman et al. in the upper 100 cm for the spatially explicit vegetation potential of SOC. Although many grid cells may contain both agricultural and natural land, which leads to some inaccuracy, the overestimation of absolute SOC stocks might compensate for the underestimation of relative SOC losses and vice versa so that our absolute SOC loss estimates might remain representative.

**Dietary change in high-income countries.** Source data for average national diets were obtained from FAO food balance sheets (FBSs) in 2010<sup>20</sup>. FBSs are available as calories (kilocalories per person per day) and weights (grams per person per day)<sup>20</sup>, which can be used to compute the food-specific energy content (calories per unit food) for each country. We used food supply from FBSs and did not include stock variation and food loss because these are not consumed in human diets. The food used in feeding and processing are reflected by the input–output relationship in FABIO.

For targeted healthier diets in high-income countries, we chose the food recommendations from the Universal Healthy Reference Diet (EAT–Lancet), which follows the guidelines on healthy diets and sustainable food systems<sup>3,37</sup>. For each country, we aggregated food demand (in grams per capita per day) for each classification of the EAT–Lancet diet (Supplementary Table 2 shows the detailed mapping relationship between FABIO sectors and EAT–Lancet classification), calculated the energy content (kilocalories per capita per day) in each classification, adjusted the energy intake for each classification to conform with the recommendation of EAT–Lancet and adjusted all energy intake to 2,500 kcal per capita per day, similar to the method in previous studies<sup>24,37</sup>. Most food items reduced shifting from the average national diet to the country-specific EAT–Lancet diet across high-income countries (Supplementary Table 9 shows specific food item changes). However, some food items (especially fruits and plant-protein food) increased in some high-income countries (Supplementary Table 9 shows specific food item changes). Food quantities (in grams per capita per day) in each classification were split using proportions in the national average diets for reduced and increased food items. As a result of these changes, we would witness an increase in soybean food supply for the plant-protein group in the country-specific EAT–Lancet diet due to increased availability of soybeans from land producing soybeans as feed for animal-product consumption. The difference between the average national diet and the country-specific EAT–Lancet diet is the dietary change used in this study. There are no recommendations for alcohol, coffee, tea, cocoa, other meat (for example, horse, mule, camel, rabbit and snails) and edible offal intake in the EAT–Lancet diet, so we assumed these items to stay unchanged at the national average level<sup>37</sup>.

It is important to note several critiques of the country-specific EAT–Lancet diet, most of which centre on the use of the universal diet for middle- and low-income nations<sup>79,80</sup>. Here, we avoid much of this critique by focusing on high-income dietary changes. However, as noted above, there are some food groups and regions where the universal diet may need localization even in high-income nations (for instance, with respect to dairy intake in East Asia).

**Physical input–output model for agricultural products: FABIO.** FABIO is a consistent, balanced and physical input–output database based on FAOSTAT data, covering 191 countries and 128 agriculture, food and forestry products from 1986 to 2013<sup>19</sup>. For further information on its construction, see Bruckner et al.<sup>19</sup>. In this paper, we use the 2010 version of FABIO.

**Environmentally extended multi-regional input–output model.** Environmentally extended multi-regional input–output (MRIO) models have been widely used in studying environmental impacts driven by global consumption. In this work, we followed the standard Leontief model to compute the biomass carbon and GHG emissions driven by food consumption changes in high-income countries. The standard approach is:

$$\Delta F = \text{diag}(\mathbf{e})(I - A)^{-1}(\Delta Y)$$

If the number of countries is  $R$ , agricultural sectors is  $N$  and high-income countries is  $H$ , then  $\Delta F$  is a matrix ( $RN \times H$ ) of environmental-impact change driven by final-demand change in every country. In addition,  $\mathbf{e}$  is an environmental-impact intensity row vector with dimension  $1 \times RN$ ,  $\text{diag}(\mathbf{e})$  is a

matrix of vector  $e$  when diagonalized. In this paper,  $e$  stands for the production of crops, fodder and pasture, or GHG emissions of crops, fodder and livestock (including those emissions from enteric fermentation and manure management).  $A$  is a matrix of technical coefficients with dimension  $RN \times RN$ , which gives the number of inputs that are required to produce a unit of output, and  $\Delta Y$  is a matrix of food-demand change (measured in physical units) in high-income countries with dimensions  $RN \times H$ . The vector  $i$  is derived from the last part ('dietary change in high-income countries') based on the difference between FBS and country-specific EAT–Lancet diet.  $I$  is an identity matrix with dimension  $RN \times RN$ .

**Carbon change due to dietary shift.** We calculated GHG emissions at the national level, so the GHG change due to a dietary shift from average national diets to the country-specific EAT–Lancet diet can be directly calculated from the environmentally extended MRIO model.

For decreased crops and forage (fodder and pasture) production, first, we calculated the production change of crops or forage at the national level and then allocated them to grid cells proportionally as in previous SMRIO studies<sup>23</sup>. We used AGBC as a proxy of production for pasture because aboveground biomass is used to feed livestock. Second, we used gridded production change divided by yield to get the spatial distribution of harvested area. The change in physical area was calculated by dividing harvested area by harvest frequency. The spared physical area of cropland and pastureland is where the potential natural vegetation can be restored.

For increased crop or forage production, we first multiply the spared physical area map with the harvest frequency map to get the spatial distribution of harvested area and then multiply with the yield maps of existing crops and pasture to get the spatial distribution of potential additional production. This means the potential production maps consist of grid cells where the products are already produced and the land is spared. Second, we allocate national increased production derived from the MRIO model into the aforementioned potential production maps. We redirect some production to other countries if the spared land is not enough to produce more of specific crops. In our research, the redirection occurs in just a few small countries or countries with little production for some specific crops. Third, we used the increased production of crops and forage divided by their yield maps to get the spatial distribution of the harvested area, and then we can get physical area change through the harvested area divided by the harvest frequency. The physical area offset the spared cropland or pastureland to restore potential natural vegetation.

We used the physical area maps to calculate the change of AGBC, BGBC and SOC between actual vegetation and potential natural vegetation as in the aforementioned method. In this paper, we focus on net carbon sequestration change, which is the sum of carbon sequestration of potential natural vegetation and increased agricultural vegetation minus the carbon stock in current agricultural vegetation.

**Reporting of results.** The analysis was performed for the 54 high-income countries available in FABIO (there is no food supply data in FAOSTAT for four small high-income countries in FABIO: Bahrain, Puerto Rico, Qatar and Singapore). The results were reported in ten categories for ease of inspection as in previous studies<sup>24</sup>: whole grains, tubers or starchy vegetables, vegetables, fruits, dairy and eggs, meat and seafood, plant proteins (nuts and legumes), added fats, added sugars and others (namely, missing items in the EAT–Lancet diet) (Supplementary Tables 2 and 3).

**Reporting Summary.** Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

### Data availability

All generated data are available in the main text or the supplementary materials. Secondary data used in this study are all from publicly available sources and referenced in the Methods section. Source data are provided with this paper.

### Code availability

All codes used in the analysis are available upon request.

Received: 14 January 2021; Accepted: 11 November 2021;

Published online: 10 January 2022

### References

- Clark, M. A. et al. Global food system emissions could preclude achieving the 1.5° and 2°C climate change targets. *Science* **370**, 705–708 (2020).
- Griscom, B. W. et al. Natural climate solutions. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 11645–11650 (2017).
- Willett, W. et al. Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* **393**, 447–492 (2019).
- Searchinger, T., Waite, R., Hanson, C. & Ranganathan, J. *Creating a Sustainable Food Future: A Menu of Solutions to Feed Nearly 10 Billion People by 2050* (World Resources Institute, 2019).
- Poore, J. & Nemecek, T. Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. *Science* **360**, 987–992 (2018).
- Sahlin, K. R., Rööös, E. & Gordon, L. J. 'Less but better' meat is a sustainability message in need of clarity. *Nat. Food* **1**, 520–522 (2020).
- Behrens, P. et al. Evaluating the environmental impacts of dietary recommendations. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 13412–13417 (2017).
- Marques, A. et al. Increasing impacts of land use on biodiversity and carbon sequestration driven by population and economic growth. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 628–637 (2019).
- Fargione, J. E. et al. Natural climate solutions for the United States. *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaat1869 (2018).
- Lamb, A. et al. The potential for land sparing to offset greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. *Nat. Clim. Change* **6**, 488–492 (2016).
- Erb, K. H. et al. Unexpectedly large impact of forest management and grazing on global vegetation biomass. *Nature* **553**, 73–76 (2018).
- Searchinger, T. D., Wierseni, S., Beringer, T. & Dumas, P. Assessing the efficiency of changes in land use for mitigating climate change. *Nature* **564**, 249–253 (2018).
- Cook-Patton, S. C. et al. Mapping carbon accumulation potential from global natural forest regrowth. *Nature* **585**, 545–550 (2020).
- Soto-Navarro, C. et al. Mapping co-benefits for carbon storage and biodiversity to inform conservation policy and action. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **375**, 20190128 (2020).
- Sanderman, J., Hengl, T. & Fiske, G. J. Soil carbon debt of 12,000 years of human land use. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, 9575–9580 (2017).
- D'Odorico, P. et al. The global food–energy–water nexus. *Rev. Geophys.* **56**, 456–531 (2018).
- Morren, M., Mol, J. M., Blasch, J. E. & Malek, Ž. Changing diets—testing the impact of knowledge and information nudges on sustainable dietary choices. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **75**, 101610 (2021).
- Eker, S., Reese, G. & Obersteiner, M. Modelling the drivers of a widespread shift to sustainable diets. *Nat. Sustain.* **2**, 725–735 (2019).
- Bruckner, M. et al. FABIO—the construction of the food and agriculture biomass input–output model. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **53**, 11302–11312 (2019).
- FAOSTAT (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2020); <https://www.fao.org/faostat/>
- Spawn, S. A., Sullivan, C. C., Lark, T. J. & Gibbs, H. K. Harmonized global maps of above and belowground biomass carbon density in the year 2010. *Sci. Data* **7**, 112 (2020).
- Sun, Z., Scherer, L., Tukker, A. & Behrens, P. Linking global crop and livestock consumption to local production hotspots. *Glob. Food Sec.* **25**, 100323 (2019).
- Kanemoto, K., Moran, D. & Hertwich, E. G. Mapping the carbon footprint of nations. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **50**, 10512–10517 (2016).
- Semba, R. D. et al. Adoption of the 'planetary health diet' has different impacts on countries' greenhouse gas emissions. *Nat. Food* **1**, 481–484 (2020).
- Crippa, M. et al. Food systems are responsible for a third of global anthropogenic GHG emissions. *Nat. Food* **2**, 198–209 (2021).
- Hayek, M. N., Harwatt, H., Ripple, W. J. & Mueller, N. D. The carbon opportunity cost of animal-sourced food production on land. *Nat. Sustain.* **4**, 21–24 (2021).
- Yang, Y. et al. Restoring abandoned farmland to mitigate climate change on a full earth. *One Earth* **3**, 176–186 (2020).
- Heinrich, V. H. A. et al. Large carbon sink potential of secondary forests in the Brazilian Amazon to mitigate climate change. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1785 (2021).
- Jones, H. P. et al. Restoration and repair of Earth's damaged ecosystems. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**, 20172577 (2018).
- Poorter, L. et al. Biomass resilience of Neotropical secondary forests. *Nature* **530**, 211–214 (2016).
- Drever, C. R. et al. Natural climate solutions for Canada. *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabd6034 (2021).
- Duveiller, G. et al. Revealing the widespread potential of forests to increase low level cloud cover. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 4337 (2021).
- De Vrese, M. et al. Probiotics—compensation for lactase insufficiency. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **73**, 421s–429s (2001).
- Scherer, L., Behrens, P. & Tukker, A. Opportunity for a dietary win–win–win in nutrition, environment, and animal welfare. *One Earth* **1**, 349–360 (2019).
- Shepon, A., Eshel, G., Noor, E. & Milo, R. The opportunity cost of animal based diets exceeds all food losses. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, 3804–3809 (2018).
- Shepon, A., Eshel, G., Noor, E. & Milo, R. Energy and protein feed-to-food conversion efficiencies in the US and potential food security gains from dietary changes. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **11**, 105002 (2016).
- Laroche, P. C. S. J., Schulp, C. J. E., Kastner, T. & Verburg, P. H. Telecoupled environmental impacts of current and alternative Western diets. *Glob. Environ. Change* **62**, 102066 (2020).
- Scherer, L. A., Verburg, P. H. & Schulp, C. J. E. Opportunities for sustainable intensification in European agriculture. *Glob. Environ. Change* **48**, 43–55 (2018).



39. Lire Wachamo, H. Review on health benefit and risk of coffee consumption. *Med. Aromat. Plants* **6**, 301 (2017).
40. Osorio-Paz, I., Brunauer, R. & Alavez, S. Beer and its non-alcoholic compounds in health and disease. *Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr.* **60**, 3492–3505 (2019).
41. Zaitso, M., Takeuchi, T., Kobayashi, Y. & Kawachi, I. Light to moderate amount of lifetime alcohol consumption and risk of cancer in Japan. *Cancer* **126**, 1031–1040 (2020).
42. de Coninck, P. & Gilmore, I. Long overdue: a fresh start for EU policy on alcohol and health. *Lancet* **395**, 10–13 (2020).
43. Manthey, J. et al. Global alcohol exposure between 1990 and 2017 and forecasts until 2030: a modelling study. *Lancet* **393**, 2493–2502 (2019).
44. Bansback, B. Future directions for the global meat industry? *EuroChoices* **13**, 4–11 (2014).
45. Xue, L. et al. Efficiency and carbon footprint of the German meat supply chain. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **53**, 5133–5142 (2019).
46. Anzani, C., Boukid, F., Drummond, L., Mullen, A. M. & Álvarez, C. Optimising the use of proteins from rich meat co-products and non-meat alternatives: nutritional, technological and allergenicity challenges. *Food Res. Int.* **137**, 109575 (2020).
47. IPCC *Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C* (eds Masson-Delmotte, V. et al.) (WMO, 2018).
48. Pozo, C., Galán-Martín, Á., Reiner, D. M., Mac Dowell, N. & Guillén-Gosálbez, G. Equity in allocating carbon dioxide removal quotas. *Nat. Clim. Change* **10**, 640–646 (2020).
49. Folberth, C. et al. The global cropland-sparing potential of high-yield farming. *Nat. Sustain.* **3**, 281–289 (2020).
50. Khanna, M. et al. Redefining marginal land for bioenergy crop production. *Glob. Change Biol. Bioenergy* **13**, 1590–1609 (2021).
51. Goldstein, A. et al. Protecting irrecoverable carbon in Earth's ecosystems. *Nat. Clim. Change* **10**, 287–295 (2020).
52. Yang, Y., Tilman, D., Furey, G. & Lehman, C. Soil carbon sequestration accelerated by restoration of grassland biodiversity. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 718 (2019).
53. Lewis, S. L., Wheeler, C. E., Mitchard, E. T. A. & Koch, A. Restoring natural forests is the best way to remove atmospheric carbon. *Nature* **568**, 25–28 (2019).
54. van Zalk, J. & Behrens, P. The spatial extent of renewable and non-renewable power generation: a review and meta-analysis of power densities and their application in the U.S. *Energy Policy* **123**, 83–91 (2018).
55. Ko, S., Lautala, P. & Handler, R. M. Securing the feedstock procurement for bioenergy products: a literature review on the biomass transportation and logistics. *J. Clean. Prod.* **200**, 205–218 (2018).
56. Favero, A., Daigneault, A. & Sohngen, B. Forests: carbon sequestration, biomass energy, or both? *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaay6792 (2020).
57. Kalt, G. et al. Natural climate solutions versus bioenergy: can carbon benefits of natural succession compete with bioenergy from short rotation coppice? *Glob. Change Biol. Bioenergy* **11**, 1283–1297 (2019).
58. Field, J. L. et al. Robust paths to net greenhouse gas mitigation and negative emissions via advanced biofuels. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 21968–21977 (2020).
59. Tilman, D., Hill, J. & Lehman, C. Carbon-negative biofuels from low-input high-diversity grassland biomass. *Science* **314**, 1598–1600 (2006).
60. Robertson, G. P. et al. Cellulosic biofuel contributions to a sustainable energy future: choices and outcomes. *Science* **356**, eaal2324 (2017).
61. Philipso, C. D. et al. Active restoration accelerates the carbon recovery of human-modified tropical forests. *Science* **369**, 838–841 (2020).
62. Zahawi, R. A., Reid, J. L. & Holl, K. D. Hidden costs of passive restoration. *Restor. Ecol.* **22**, 284–287 (2014).
63. Salzman, J., Bennett, G., Carroll, N., Goldstein, A. & Jenkins, M. The global status and trends of payments for ecosystem services. *Nat. Sustain.* **1**, 136–144 (2018).
64. *Growing Better: Ten Critical Transitions to Transform Food and Land Use* (The Food and Land Use Coalition, 2019).
65. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2020. Transforming Food Systems for Affordable Healthy Diets* (FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO, 2020); <https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/ca9692en>
66. Scown, M. W., Brady, M. V. & Nicholas, K. A. Billions in misspent EU agricultural subsidies could support the sustainable development goals. *One Earth* **3**, 237–250 (2020).
67. Roe, S. et al. Contribution of the land sector to a 1.5°C world. *Nat. Clim. Change* **9**, 817–828 (2019).
68. Haberl, H. et al. A systematic review of the evidence on decoupling of GDP, resource use and GHG emissions, part II: synthesizing the insights. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **15**, 065003 (2020).
69. Keyßer, L. T. & Lenzen, M. 1.5°C degrowth scenarios suggest the need for new mitigation pathways. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 2676 (2021).
70. Malins, C., Plevin, R. & Edwards, R. How robust are reductions in modeled estimates from GTAP-BIO of the indirect land use change induced by conventional biofuels? *J. Clean. Prod.* **258**, 120716 (2020).
71. Yu, Y., Feng, K., Hubacek, K. & Sun, L. Global implications of China's future food consumption. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **20**, 593–602 (2016).
72. International Food Policy Research Institute Global Spatially-Disaggregated Crop Production Statistics Data for 2010 version 2.0. *Harvard Dataverse* <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/PRFF8V> (2019).
73. Ramankutty, N., Evan, A. T., Monfreda, C. & Foley, J. A. Farming the planet: 1. geographic distribution of global agricultural lands in the year 2000. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GB002952> (2008).
74. Wolf, J. et al. Biogenic carbon fluxes from global agricultural production and consumption. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **29**, 1617–1639 (2015).
75. Lal, R. Digging deeper: a holistic perspective of factors affecting soil organic carbon sequestration in agroecosystems. *Glob. Change Biol.* **24**, 3285–3301 (2018).
76. De Sousa, L. M. et al. SoilGrids 2.0: producing soil information for the globe with quantified spatial uncertainty. *Soil* **7**, 217–240 (2021).
77. Jackson, R. B. et al. The ecology of soil carbon: pools, vulnerabilities, and biotic and abiotic controls. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **48**, 419–445 (2017).
78. Sloat, L. L. et al. Increasing importance of precipitation variability on global livestock grazing lands. *Nat. Clim. Change* **8**, 214–218 (2018).
79. Hirvonen, K., Bai, Y., Headey, D. & Masters, W. A. Affordability of the EAT–Lancet reference diet: a global analysis. *Lancet Glob. Health* **8**, e59–e66 (2020).
80. Hanley-Cook, G. T. et al. EAT–Lancet diet score requires minimum intake values to predict higher micronutrient adequacy of diets in rural women of reproductive age from five low- and middle-income countries. *Br. J. Nutr.* **126**, 92–100 (2020).

## Acknowledgements

We thank N. Ramankutty and L. L. Sloat for providing us the latest pastureland map data in the year 2010. The contribution of Z.S. was funded by the China Scholarship Council (201706040080). The contribution of M.B. was funded by the European Research Council (grant agreement number 725525) and the Austrian Science Fund (project number P 31598\_G31). The contribution of S.A.S.-L. to this work was supported by the National Science Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship Program under grant no. DGE-1747503. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

## Author contributions

All authors provided input into the final manuscript. P.B. designed the study. Z.S., S.A.S.-L. and M.B. contributed data. Z.S. performed the analysis with the help of P.B. and L.S. Z.S., L.S. and P.B. led the writing with contributions by A.T., S.A.S.-L., M.B. and H.K.G.

## Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

## Additional information

**Supplementary information** The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00431-5>.

**Correspondence and requests for materials** should be addressed to Zhongxiao Sun.

**Peer review information** *Nature Food* thanks Manfred Lenzen, Rylie Pelton, Christian Reynolds, Michael Clark and the other, anonymous, reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

**Reprints and permissions information** is available at [www.nature.com/reprints](http://www.nature.com/reprints).

**Publisher's note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2022

## Reporting Summary

Nature Portfolio wishes to improve the reproducibility of the work that we publish. This form provides structure for consistency and transparency in reporting. For further information on Nature Portfolio policies, see our [Editorial Policies](#) and the [Editorial Policy Checklist](#).

### Statistics

For all statistical analyses, confirm that the following items are present in the figure legend, table legend, main text, or Methods section.

n/a Confirmed

- The exact sample size ( $n$ ) for each experimental group/condition, given as a discrete number and unit of measurement
- A statement on whether measurements were taken from distinct samples or whether the same sample was measured repeatedly
- The statistical test(s) used AND whether they are one- or two-sided  
*Only common tests should be described solely by name; describe more complex techniques in the Methods section.*
- A description of all covariates tested
- A description of any assumptions or corrections, such as tests of normality and adjustment for multiple comparisons
- A full description of the statistical parameters including central tendency (e.g. means) or other basic estimates (e.g. regression coefficient) AND variation (e.g. standard deviation) or associated estimates of uncertainty (e.g. confidence intervals)
- For null hypothesis testing, the test statistic (e.g.  $F$ ,  $t$ ,  $r$ ) with confidence intervals, effect sizes, degrees of freedom and  $P$  value noted  
*Give  $P$  values as exact values whenever suitable.*
- For Bayesian analysis, information on the choice of priors and Markov chain Monte Carlo settings
- For hierarchical and complex designs, identification of the appropriate level for tests and full reporting of outcomes
- Estimates of effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's  $d$ , Pearson's  $r$ ), indicating how they were calculated

*Our web collection on [statistics for biologists](#) contains articles on many of the points above.*

### Software and code

Policy information about [availability of computer code](#)

Data collection Data processing was carried out using Microsoft Excel, ArcGIS version 10.6.1, Python version 2.7.14, Python version 3.6.8, R version 3.5.3

Data analysis Data processing was carried out using Microsoft Excel, ArcGIS version 10.6.1, Python version 2.7.14, Python version 3.6.8, R version 3.5.3

For manuscripts utilizing custom algorithms or software that are central to the research but not yet described in published literature, software must be made available to editors and reviewers. We strongly encourage code deposition in a community repository (e.g. GitHub). See the Nature Portfolio [guidelines for submitting code & software](#) for further information.

### Data

Policy information about [availability of data](#)

All manuscripts must include a [data availability statement](#). This statement should provide the following information, where applicable:

- Accession codes, unique identifiers, or web links for publicly available datasets
- A description of any restrictions on data availability
- For clinical datasets or third party data, please ensure that the statement adheres to our [policy](#)

All generated data are available in the main text or the supplementary materials. Secondary data used in this study are all from publicly available sources and referenced in the Methods section.

## Field-specific reporting

Please select the one below that is the best fit for your research. If you are not sure, read the appropriate sections before making your selection.

Life sciences  Behavioural & social sciences  Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences

For a reference copy of the document with all sections, see [nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf](https://www.nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf)

## Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences study design

All studies must disclose on these points even when the disclosure is negative.

Study description	A dietary shift from animal-based to plant-based food could reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from direct agricultural production and increase carbon sequestration if spared land is restored to its potential natural vegetation. Changing food behaviours in high-income countries thus provides an opportunity for a double carbon dividend. We investigate this dividend when national average diets shift to a planetary health diet proposed by the EAT-Lancet Commission in high-income nations. We linked a new physical Food and Agriculture Biomass Input-Output (FABIO) table (including 128 agricultural sectors and 191 countries) with spatially explicit harmonized aboveground biomass carbon (AGBC), belowground biomass carbon (BGBC), soil organic carbon (SOC), and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) to trace annual GHG emission reduction and long-term carbon sequestration in potential natural vegetation.
Research sample	Not applicable.
Sampling strategy	Not applicable.
Data collection	This study used existing data sources. All data sources are open and publicly available.
Timing and spatial scale	year 2010 and global scale
Data exclusions	Not applicable.
Reproducibility	Not applicable.
Randomization	Not applicable.
Blinding	Not applicable.
Did the study involve field work?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## Reporting for specific materials, systems and methods

We require information from authors about some types of materials, experimental systems and methods used in many studies. Here, indicate whether each material, system or method listed is relevant to your study. If you are not sure if a list item applies to your research, read the appropriate section before selecting a response.

### Materials & experimental systems

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| n/a                                 | Involved in the study                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Antibodies                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Eukaryotic cell lines         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Palaeontology and archaeology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Animals and other organisms   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Human research participants   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical data                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Dual use research of concern  |

### Methods

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| n/a                                 | Involved in the study                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> ChIP-seq               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Flow cytometry         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> MRI-based neuroimaging |

## Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH (“Springer Nature”).

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users (“Users”), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use (“Terms”). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

[onlineservice@springernature.com](mailto:onlineservice@springernature.com)