

Effects of single plant-based vs. animal-based meals on satiety and mood in real-world smartphone-embedded studies

Evelyn Medawar^{1,2,3}, Marie Zedler¹, Larissa de Biasi¹, Arno Villringer^{1,2,3,4}, A. Veronica Witte^{1,4}

¹ Department of Neurology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany

² Berlin School of Mind and Brain, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

³ Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin; Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

⁴ Clinic for Cognitive Neurology, University of Leipzig Medical Center, Leipzig, Germany

Corresponding author: Evelyn Medawar, Department of Neurology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Stephanstr. 1A, 04103 Leipzig, Germany, medawar@cbs.mpg.de

Preprint: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.10.24.21265240v1>

Classification:

Health sciences/Health care/Nutrition

Biological sciences/Psychology/Human behaviour

Keywords: plant-based, animal-based, single-meal, hunger, satiety, mood, planetary health diet, smartphone-based, online study

35 **Abstract (150 words)**

36 Adopting plant-based diets high in fiber may reduce global warming and obesity prevalence.
37 Physiological and psychological determinants of plant-based food intake remain unclear. As
38 fiber has been linked with improved gut-brain signaling, we hypothesized that a single plant-
39 based (vegetarian and vegan) compared to an animal-based (animal flesh) meal, would induce
40 higher satiety, higher mood and less stress. In three large-scale smartphone-based studies,
41 adults ($n_{\text{all}} = 16,379$) ranked satiety and mood before and after meal intake. Meal intake induced
42 satiety and higher mood. Plant-based meal choice did not explain differences in post-meal
43 hunger. Individuals choosing a plant-based meal reported slightly higher mood before and
44 smaller mood increases after the meal compared to those choosing animal-based meals.
45 Protein content marginally mediated post-meal satiety, while gender and taste ratings had a
46 strong effect on satiety and mood in general. We could not detect profound effects of plant-
47 based vs. animal-based meals on satiety and mood.

48 Introduction

49 Plant-based diets, high in fiber (i.e., non-digestible carbohydrates) stemming from grain
 50 products, bread, potatoes, vegetables, legumes and fruits, are linked with planetary ^{1,2} and
 51 human health ^{3,4}. An extensive meta-analysis showed that higher intake of food items rich in
 52 dietary fiber, such as whole-grain products, mediates the benefits of healthy lifestyles on non-
 53 communicable diseases such as obesity in a dose-response relationship ⁵. Consequently,
 54 increasing daily fiber intake from today's ~15 g to 50 g on a global scale, but in particular in
 55 Westernized diets, has been proposed to lead to overall extended lifespan and reduced health-
 56 care costs ⁶. Eventually, adopting more plant-based diets on a global scale could thus in the
 57 long run help to counter ever-increasing rates of obesity and greenhouse gas emissions
 58 likewise. Knowledge on the physiological and psychological factors, including hunger and mood
 59 related to plant-based meal consumption and food availability and culture, that link to food
 60 decision-making remain however surprisingly largely understudied.

61 On the one hand, several bottom-up physiological mechanisms, prompted by ingested nutrients
 62 and processed in the brain, have been proposed to mediate acute metabolic effects signaling
 63 post-prandial satiety, reward and contentment, but also long-term metabolic (dys-) regulation
 64 and (de-) sensitization ⁷. Macronutrient content most likely modulates appetite control, as
 65 energy density or protein content of a single meal determines subsequent metabolic activity ^{8,9}
 66 and in turn influences future meal intake via gut-brain hormonal signaling ¹⁰. In a three-group
 67 randomised cross-over study, plant-based compared to macronutrient-matched meat-based
 68 meal induced greater satiety independent of weight status ¹¹. Indeed, repetitive cueing with
 69 highly palatable foods led to habituation of reward-associated dopaminergic signaling ¹². In
 70 contrast to high caloric foods, dietary fiber not only moderately improved body weight status
 71 independent of energy intake across 62 trials ¹³, but also activates appetite-regulatory pathways
 72 via anorectic hormones, thereby ameliorating high-caloric food craving and other
 73 psychobiological processes ¹⁴. Moreover, in a triple-blind RCT, short-chain fatty acid
 74 administration, representative of fermentation products of dietary fiber, led to a reduction in
 75 psychosocial stress response after one week ¹⁵. While the timeframe of those putative effects

76 remain unclear ¹⁶, fiber and polyunsaturated fats may contribute to healthy feeding-related
77 signaling and neuronal survival, for example by improving glucose and insulin metabolism, by
78 balancing energy homeostasis through protecting hypothalamic neurons from inflammation ¹⁷ or
79 by contributing to a healthy energy-harvesting profile of the gut microbiome ¹⁸.

80 On the other hand, top-down psychological mechanisms include for instance (un-) successful
81 self-control and cognitive strategies towards health or moral goals help to make choices aligned
82 with inner beliefs and self-reinforce dietary habits. Those choices are planned not impulsive,
83 and in the case of food decision-making may often - but not always (e.g. in the case of eating
84 disorders) - lead to healthier food choices ¹⁹. Pre-meal planning has been shown to be
85 influenced by attentional focus at the time of choice ²⁰ – a cognitive control mechanism which
86 may be present in plant-based dieters for every meal planning, yet which has not been
87 investigated. In the case of vegetarians and vegans, restrictive eating has been linked with
88 higher risk for depressive symptoms (meta-analysis of n ~50k participants ²¹). The
89 determinants, the timeframe and the reasons for the potential link between restrictive diets and
90 depressive mood remain unclear and might include social exclusion, isolation or stigma in the
91 long term. Conversely, healthy and adequate nutrient intake, including high fiber intake, has
92 been associated with lower depressive symptoms and anxiety in observational (meta-analysis,
93 ²²) and interventional studies ²³, potentially via microbiota-driven modification of gene
94 expression and anti-inflammatory properties ²⁴. Studies investigating short-term effects of food
95 intake related to meal composition on mood are missing to our knowledge. Overall, reverse
96 causation for food-mood relationships remains an unsolved issue ²⁵ and whether single meals
97 different in fiber content affect mood remains unclear.

98 Targeting food choice environment such as labelling, reducing portion size, imposing taxes and
99 modifying availability are common tools to modulate food decision-making ²⁶. For instance, a
100 recent study in university cafeterias doubled the availability of vegetarian meals, which led to an
101 increase of 41-79% sales of plant-based meals across over 90,000 meals, without a drop in
102 overall sales ²⁷. Also, discounting plant-based meals whilst increasing prices of meat-based
103 dishes led to a slight increase in sales of the former ²⁸, whilst order of meals in close proximity

104 did not²⁹. Sales and attractiveness increased when product packaging included labels that
 105 prompt sensory or contextual experiences, which was found to be less frequent for plant-based
 106 products³⁰. While shaping food choice externally seems a promising tool to change dietary
 107 intake, perceived physiological and psychological effects linked to such decisions and meal
 108 intakes remain unknown.

109 In sum, plant-based diets high in fiber resemble the current diet of choice for climate reasons,
 110 and some, but not all, interventional studies and meta-analyses raise the hypothesis that plant-
 111 based diets contribute to better maintenance of gut-brain signaling including satiety regulation
 112 and food reward sensitivity through nutrient-related improvements in metabolic factors. Only few
 113 studies however report significant effects of a single plant-based meal on post-prandial satiety
 114 and mood, and which factors modify this relation. To address these questions, we aimed to
 115 determine satiety and mood before and after a single plant-based (vegetarian, vegan) meal or,
 116 as a comparison, animal-based (fish, meat) meal served in university cafeterias providing a
 117 broad selection of different meals in the same environment in a demographically homogeneous
 118 population. To this end, we designed a series of novel pre-registered smartphone-based
 119 studies: firstly, a large-scale study with free meal choice covering most of German university
 120 cafeterias, secondly, a study focusing on a smaller, deeply phenotyped sample of omnivorous
 121 individuals with free meal choice, and thirdly, a follow-up study of the latter with random
 122 allocation of meals.

123 We pre-registered the following hypotheses:

124 (1) A plant-based (i.e., vegan, vegetarian) meal will lead to better mood, higher satiety and less
 125 stress compared to an omnivorous meal.

126 (2) Higher fiber content in the meals will mediate higher mood and satiety and lower stress,
 127 whereas higher unrefined sugar and fat content will mediate the opposite.

128 (3) A voluntary decision to eat a plant-based meal (vegetarian or vegan) compared to an
 129 omnivorous meal will be more frequently made upon planned (vs. impulsive) decisions.

130 (4) The former potential effects (3) will be masked in participants that followed, and in particular
131 in those that also disliked, a non-voluntary decision of meal category.

132 We further explored if energy intake (kcal), fluids, environment, dietary habits, social interaction,
133 personality traits and other factors such as age, gender and socioeconomic status modulate the
134 above effects.

135 **Results**

136 **Sample size, dietary habits and gender distribution (studies 1, 2, 3)**

137 In total 16,135 observations were included in the analysis after data curation for the app study
138 (predominant dietary habits according to self-report: predominantly omnivorous, $n = 11,600$,
139 predominantly vegetarian, $n = 3,456$, predominantly vegan, $n = 911$), as well as 173 in sub-study
140 two and 71 in sub-study three (all omnivorous, with self-reported mean weekly meat intake of
141 about 480 g, representative of a German, Western-style diet with regular meat intake). Reported
142 meals were 47-61% animal-based across studies. Two of the most frequent meals were pasta
143 and currywurst, for study design and exemplary cafeteria meals, see **Figure 1**. Sample size
144 dropped for exploratory data analysis due to missing data (**Supplementary Figure 1**).

145 For details about demographic and other parameters see **Figure 2** and **Table 1**. Briefly, in the
146 app study omnivorous dieters chose an animal-based meal more frequently (69%) and
147 vegetarians and vegans mostly chose plant-based meals (84%) ($X^2(2) = 3679.3$, $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$).
148 Note, that a substantial proportion of those reporting to eat predominantly vegan/vegetarian
149 chose an animal-based meal (16%).

150 **Pre-registered main analysis**

151 **Effect of meal category on hunger, mood and stress (studies 1, 2, 3)**

152 In the app-study, in contrast to our hypothesis, there was no significant interaction effect of meal
153 category and timepoint for hunger ($p = 0.2$, **Figure 3A**, **Table 2**). While individuals choosing a

154 plant-based meal reported lower hunger on average (main effect, $\sim -1/10$ th points, $b = -0.10$, t
155 $= -6.8$, model comparison $p < .001$) independent of timepoint, average hunger dropped around
156 2 points on the 5-point Likert scale in both conditions (main effect, $b = -1.99$, $t = -179.4$, $p <$
157 0.001). Considering mood, contrary to our hypothesis, post-meal mood increased $\sim 2/5$ th points
158 less for individuals choosing a plant-based meal compared to an animal-based meal (interaction
159 effect, post-meal*plant-based: $b = -0.06$, $t = -3.6$, model comparison $p < .001$, **Figure 3B**). In
160 parallel, exploratively, mood was slightly higher in individuals eating a plant-based meal before
161 the meal (animal-based: 3.48 ± 1 points vs. plant-based: 3.52 ± 1 points) and increased in all
162 individuals after the meal (animal-based: $+0.26$ points, plant-based: $+0.20$ points). For sub-
163 studies 2 and 3 no significant interaction effects on hunger or mood were observed. There was
164 no significant main or interaction effects for stress. Average values and valence of betas of the
165 effects of interest appeared similar to the app study (for comparison of mean values see **Figure**
166 **3C-D, Table 2**).

167 **Pre-registered secondary analysis**

168 To further investigate underlying physiological and psychological factors explaining the effects
169 on hunger and mood overall and by meal category, we extended the main analysis and included
170 macronutrient composition available in a subset of datapoints (pre-registered). Also, we
171 investigated if random allocation to a meal, suppressing free choice, would mask any effects.
172 We further explored if taste ratings influenced the main analysis and additionally subdivided the
173 dataset by gender and by dietary adherence (in the app study only; exploratory analysis).

174 **Nutrient composition and satiety (study 1)**

175 Macronutrients between meal categories were not significantly different for energy content and
176 saturated fats, but significantly different for carbohydrates, sugar, fat and protein (all Wilcoxon p
177 < 0.01 , $n_{\max} = 1262$, **Figure 4, Supplementary Table 1**), with higher carbohydrates, higher
178 sugar, lower fat and lower protein for plant-based meals. The amount of protein, which was
179 approximately one third lower in plant-based meals compared to animal-based meals (**Figure**

180 **4F**), had a small effect on post-meal satiety, i.e. that higher protein content led to higher satiety
181 ($b = -0.01$, $t = -3.1$, $p = 0.002$), which was not significantly different between meal categories
182 (interaction effect, $p < 0.89$). No further significant interaction effects of nutrients were found for
183 the models on hunger and mood.

184 Analyses for fiber content as pre-registered could not performed, due to missing information on
185 fiber content in all cafeterias. We therefore explored differences in meal composition / food
186 components qualitatively in frequency plots of meal components and quantitatively by running
187 models on carbohydrate quality, which is a proxy for fiber content ³¹ (i.e. whole-grain vs. white
188 flour meals). Overall, description of plant-based meals showed higher frequency of vegetables
189 and salads, as well as other food items with high amounts of fiber, like whole grain, lentils or
190 sweet potatoes, compared to animal-based meals (**Supplementary Figure 5**). Further, when
191 comparing identical meal descriptions (most common meal was “spaghetti bolognese”) between
192 white flour ($n = 416$ meals (animal-based: 317, plant-based=99)) vs. whole-grain flour ($n = 26$
193 meals (animal-based: 2, plant-based=24))), we found no significant differences between kcal
194 and protein content (both $p > 0.54$), and assumed higher fiber content for whole-grain meals.
195 Accordingly, linear mixed models (LMMs) showed that hunger was lower ($b = -0.30$, $t = -1.7$, $p <$
196 0.2×10^{-15}) and mood was higher ($b = 0.15$, $t = 0.8$, $p < 0.8 \times 10^{-7}$) independent of timepoint for
197 spaghetti bolognese made of whole-grain flour compared to white flour. Post-meal ratings did
198 not differ for hunger ($b = -0.08$, $t = -0.28$, $p = 0.78$), mood was significantly increased after
199 whole-grain meals ($b = 0.41$, $t = 1.98$ $p < 0.05$) (**Figure 5**). Comparisons between meal category
200 were not possible due to limited group size for carbohydrate quality per meal category.

201 **Effects of pre-meal planning in meal choice (study 1)**

202 In the app study, choosing a plant-based meal was 10% more often reported to be a planned
203 decision, compared to that of an animal-based meal choice ($X^2 = 174$, $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-10}$, planned
204 plant-based = 72%, planned animal-based = 62%, **Table 1**). Moreover, we observed an
205 interaction effect between the feeling of planned decision-making at meal choice on higher
206 hunger ($b = 0.04$, $t = 2.8$, $p = 0.006$) and higher mood ($b = 0.13$, $t = 8.9$, $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$) after the

meal. The interaction effect of a planned decision on higher hunger at post-meal was significantly lower for plant-based meal choices (decision*post-meal*plant-based: $b = -0.04$, $t = -0.9$, $p < 2 \times 10^{-5}$), as well as less pronounced for lower mood (decision*post-meal*plant-based: $b = -0.02$, $t = -0.4$, $p < 5 \times 10^{-6}$) compared to animal-based meals.

Contentment when randomised to meal (study 3)

In sub-study three meal choice was randomly allocated and therefore not a confounding variable. Meal category was randomly assigned after filling out pre-questionnaires right before the planned meal. Contentment about randomization before the meal was not significantly different for animal-based versus vegetarian or vegan meals ($n = 71$, $X^2 = 9.6$, $df = 9$, $p = .27$, **Figure 6A**). Overall post-meal contentment after randomization was met more frequently for the animal-based condition ($n = 71$, $X^2 = 6.1$, $df = 2$, $p = .04866$, **Figure 6B**). Those who reported to be content with the randomization, did not differ between reasons for it ("chosen anyway", "preferred something else, but I liked it", "generally no preference", $X^2 = 0.03$, $df = 2$, $p = .98$, **Figure 6C**), compared to those who reported discontent ($n = 8$ "preferred vegan", $n = 9$ "preferred meat-based", $X^2 = 13.2$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$, **Figure 6D**). However, randomization contentment pre- and post-meal as a main factor did not explain a significant amount of variance with regard to satiety or mood (all betas < 0.28 , model comparisons all $p > 0.52$).

Further, we tested the effect of assigned meal and subsequent liking as preregistered by defining three categories, namely voluntary ($n = 174$) vs. non-voluntary-liked ($n = 49$) vs. non-voluntary-disliked ($n = 17$) of meal category across both sub-studies two and three. Mode of choice did not explain any significant variance on hunger, mood or stress levels across time on meal choice (preregistered model: all $p > 0.14$). When looking at interaction of timepoint and mode of choice and meal category, post-meal hunger was higher for non-voluntary-liked ($b = 1.4$, $t = 1.8$) and lower for non-voluntary-disliked ($b = -1.6$, $t = -1.4$) compared to voluntary choice for plant-based meals (model comparison $p < 0.004$). Post-meal effects of mode of choice for plant-based meals showed higher mood for non-voluntary-liked ($b = 0.34$, $t = 0.5$) compared to non-voluntary disliked ($b = -0.7$, $t = -0.7$) (model comparison $p = 0.028$). There was

234 no interaction effect of mode of choice on stress levels post-meal for plant-based meals ($p >$
235 0.9).

236 **Exploratory analysis**

237 **Effects of taste on hunger and mood independent of meal category (study 1)**

238 Post-meal taste ratings provided on a Likert scale from one to five stars were available in the
239 app study only and showed significant differences between meal categories, with animal-based
240 meals being rated higher in taste more frequently (mean \pm SD: animal-based: 3.86 ± 1.23 ;
241 plant-based: 3.77 ± 1.27 , Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2(1) = 21.8$, $p < .001$, scale from one to five stars; zero
242 stars for retracted rating, **Figure 7**).

243 According to LMMs, better taste was related to higher satiety and higher mood on average, with
244 a somewhat linear relationship from lowest to highest taste category, in particular for post-meal
245 mood ratings (**Figure 7, Supplementary Table 2**). Note that only 4.9% of individuals reported
246 lowest taste ratings, and 2.4% retracted the rating (corresponding to zero stars), whereas
247 35.2% reported maximal ratings across all meals. Overall, low taste ratings increased hunger
248 and high taste ratings lowered hunger considerably (post-meal*1 star: $b = 0.6$, $t = 6.4$; post-
249 meal*5 stars: $b = -0.5$, $t = -7.3$). Also, low taste ratings had a strong negative effect on post-
250 meal mood (post-meal*1 star: $b = -1.3$, $t = -19.8$), whereas high taste ratings moderately
251 elevated post-meal mood (post-meal*5 stars: $b = 0.5$, $t = 8.5$). This taste effect on hunger and
252 mood was significantly different between animal-based meals compared to plant-based meals,
253 showing a slightly stronger effect of taste on both hunger and mood after an animal-based meal
254 (**Figure 7**: triple interaction between timepoint, meal category and taste: all betas $> |0.01|$, all p
255 < 0.01) (**Supplementary Table 2**).

256 **Sensitivity analyses for the effects of gender, social interaction, finishing a meal** 257 **(study 1)**

258 Plant-based meals were more frequently chosen by female and diverse gender, eaten alone
259 and less often finished compared to animal-based meals (**Table 1**). To investigate the potential

260 confounding effects of these factors, we repeated the main models for satiety and mood
261 including these factors in separate models.

262 Overall, hunger was significantly different for gender, showing lower hunger in female ($b = -$
263 0.23 , $t = -15.6$) and higher hunger in diverse ($b = 0.21$, $t = 4.0$) compared to male gender (model
264 comparison $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$, **Figure 8A, Supplementary Table 3**). Mood in general was slightly
265 lower in female ($b = -0.01$, $t = -0.9$) and drastically lower in diverse gender ($b = -0.71$, $t = -13.8$)
266 (model comparison $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$, **Figure 8B, Supplementary Table 3**). When running gender-
267 stratified LMMs (male $n = 8291$, female $n = 7418$, diverse $n = 279$), post-meal hunger after
268 plant-based compared to animal-based meals was similarly higher for male ($b = 0.07$, $t = 2.2$, p
269 $= 0.03$) and female ($b = 0.09$, $t = 3.0$, $p = 0.003$) and not significantly different for diverse ($b = -$
270 0.08 , $t = -0.4$, $p = 0.7$). Models for post-meal mood were significant for both male and female (all
271 $p < 0.005$), but not for diverse gender ($p = 0.08$), with similarly lower mood ratings in both males
272 and females (male: $b = -0.07$, $t = -2.8$; female: $b = -0.1$, $t = -4.1$, diverse: $b = 0.35$, $t = 1.8$) after
273 plant-based vs. animal-based meals. Note, that taste ratings were similar across all genders
274 (**Supplementary Figure 7**).

275 Eating in company compared to eating alone was related to moderately higher hunger ($b = 0.1$,
276 $t = 6.1$) and higher mood ($b = 0.1$, $t = 6.4$) (model comparison all $p < 2.1 \times 10^{-10}$). Yet, social
277 company during meal intake did not explain significant variance of post-meal ratings for hunger
278 or mood by meal category (model comparison all $p < 0.68$).

279 Finishing a meal was related to higher overall hunger ($b = 0.1$, $t = 5.4$) and higher mood ($b =$
280 0.4 , $t = 20.2$) (model comparison all $p < 7.0 \times 10^{-8}$). Moreover, finishing a meal also explained
281 slightly higher post-meal hunger ratings ($b = 0.05$, $t = 0.8$) but also slightly higher mood ($b =$
282 0.08 , $t = 1.6$) for plant-based compared to animal-based meals (model comparison all $p <$
283 2.2×10^{-16}).

284 **Subgroup analysis – dietary habits and time stamps (studies 1, 2, 3)**

285 To account for potential effects of dietary adherence, we repeated the analysis in subgroups for
286 predominantly omnivorous ($n = 11,600$), predominantly vegetarian ($n = 3,456$) and

287 predominantly vegan (n = 911) dieters (see **Supplements, Supplementary Table 4,**
 288 **Supplementary Figure 8**). Predominantly omnivorous dieters showed comparable results as
 289 the whole-group analysis, i.e. lowered mood and higher hunger after a plant-based meal.
 290 Analysis for the predominantly vegetarian group replicated for mood only, not hunger.
 291 Contrastingly, predominantly vegans showed higher mood and lower hunger after a plant-based
 292 meal. Taste ratings differed by dietary group, such that predominantly omnivores and
 293 predominantly vegetarians preferred animal-based meals, yet the opposite was true for
 294 predominantly vegans.

295 Further, we ran sensitivity analyses with restricted time frames around entry time to define a
 296 reasonable timeframe around actual food intake (see **Supplements**). Time difference between
 297 pre- and post-meal hunger entries in the app study varied quite drastically and was very small
 298 for most entries (mean \pm SD: 54 \pm 139 min, median: 0.5 min), whereas post-pre meal time
 299 difference in sub-studies 2+3 inferred from photo time stamps, was rather small with low
 300 variance (mean \pm SD: 15 \pm 7 min, median: 14 min, min: 5 min, max: 40 min), reflecting high
 301 compliance with the study design.

302 **Correlation of post-meal satiety, mood and stress (studies 1, 2, 3)**

303 Changes in satiety pre- to post-meal correlated with changes in mood pre- to post-meal, i.e.
 304 lower meal-induced hunger was associated with higher meal-induced mood, significant for data
 305 from the app study (Spearman's correlations 95%CI p-value; app study: $r = -0.19 [-0.21 -0.18]$ p
 306 $< .001$; sub-study free choice: $r = -0.08 [-0.23 0.07]$ $p = 0.3$; sub-study randomised allocation: r
 307 $= 0.13 [-0.10 0.35]$ $p = 0.27$, **Figure 9, Supplementary Figure 6**). There was no association
 308 between changes in hunger and stress levels (sub-study free choice: $r = 0.15 [-0.004 0.288]$ $p =$
 309 0.056 ; sub-study randomised allocation: $r = -0.10 [-0.32 0.14]$ $p = 0.43$) in the two sub-studies.
 310 There was a significant correlation between lower mood and higher stress levels pre- to post-
 311 meal in both sub-studies (sub-study free choice: $r = -0.34 [-0.46 -0.20]$ $p < 0.001$; sub-study
 312 randomised allocation: $r = -0.39 [-0.57 -0.17]$ $p < 0.001$, **Supplementary Figure 6**).

313 **Discussion**

314 In this series of large-scale online surveys of >16,300 individual data entries and three
 315 independent data collections in German cafeterias, we provide evidence based on pre-
 316 registered analyses that the category of a single meal (i.e. whether plant-based or containing
 317 meat/fish) exerts no effect on post-prandial hunger of the individual, and a certain, yet not
 318 considerably large influence on mood. Against our hypotheses, there was no significant
 319 interaction effect of meal category and timepoint for hunger, but for mood, however contrary to
 320 our hypothesis, with smaller post-meal increases in mood for individuals choosing a plant-based
 321 meal compared to an animal-based meal. The more deeply phenotyped sub-studies 2 and 3,
 322 profoundly smaller in sample size, indicated similar nominal differences between meal
 323 categories, yet did not support that those differences should be regarded statistically significant
 324 in the main pre-registered analyses. Additionally in exploratory analyses, we found that while
 325 participants report higher satiety and improved mood after a meal in general, mood was slightly
 326 higher in individuals choosing a plant-based meal before the meal.

327 Against our hypothesis, that plant-based meals would increase post-meal mood more strongly
 328 than animal-based meals, we found the opposite: namely, that post-meal mood was higher after
 329 an animal-based meal. Here, we might have neglected certain normative expectations towards
 330 the meal in a society that on average consumes meat and fish on a daily basis ³², in particular
 331 potential reservations against plant-based meals related to be lacking in something or not being
 332 hearty enough, which is also in line with in lower taste ratings of plant-based meals. These
 333 expectations might have influenced post-meal mood ratings. Yet, for a sub-analysis comparing
 334 whole-grain vs. white-flour meals, we found increased post-meal mood for whole-grain meals,
 335 supporting the initial hypothesis. Surprisingly, individuals choosing plant-based meals showed
 336 higher mood ratings before the meal, which is in contrast to meta-analytical evidence for higher
 337 depressive symptoms in long-term vegetarian/vegan dieters ²¹, but in line with improved mood
 338 related to pre-/probiotic diets ²². Note, that the short timeframe of a single-meal on mood ratings
 339 compared to epidemiological evidence of long-term dietary habits could explain the deviating
 340 results, and that the effect size of the present study must be considered small. Further, fiber-
 341 induced improvements on mood could be particularly effective for vulnerable individuals only, as

342 shown for patients suffering from inflammatory bowel syndrome or major depressive disorder
 343 ^{23,33}. While we assume that the majority of individuals was healthy in our studies assessing
 344 detailed medical history was out of scope in the presented online studies. Besides meal
 345 category, taste ratings showed a substantial impact on post-meal mood ratings, with higher
 346 mood for more tasteful meals. Importantly, as plant-based meals were ranked less tasty overall,
 347 especially by predominantly omnivores and vegetarians, cafeterias should aim to improve
 348 tastiness of plant-based meals in order to ensure equal enjoyment and satisfaction despite meal
 349 category. When limiting the analysis to identical meal descriptions such as spaghetti bolognese,
 350 note that those providing higher fiber content through whole-grain pasta induced higher satiety
 351 and higher mood compared to conventional pasta.

352 We hypothesized that plant-based meals would increase satiety due to a higher amount of fiber
 353 in those meals, which we could not evaluate due to missing information on actual fiber content.
 354 Further, in a sub-analysis comparing whole-grain vs. white-flour meals, we found no post-meal
 355 difference in hunger. This might imply that fiber content has only negligible effects on satiety,
 356 and/or that fiber was not different between meal categories on average. In addition, we found
 357 that plant-based meals had higher carbohydrate, higher sugar, lower fat and lower protein
 358 content compared to animal-based meals in a subset of available datapoints. This is insightful
 359 given that plant-based food consists of more carbohydrates, while meat and fish have more
 360 protein. Now, in a secondary analysis, we found that protein content contributed to satiety after
 361 the meal, arguing that plant-based vs. animal-based meals could relate to lower satiety due to
 362 the difference in protein content between meal categories, thereby concealing (potential) effects
 363 of higher fiber content on satiety. Indeed, cross-over within-subject studies reported that post-
 364 meal satiation did not differ dependent on protein source when adjusted for fiber content ³⁴ or in
 365 case of protein preload previous to ad libitum food intake ³⁵. Moreover, cafeteria meals overall
 366 might contain more processed and less balanced nutrient compositions compared to the
 367 average plant-based meal investigated in previous literature. Meals containing more plant-
 368 derived components are not necessarily healthier, as fast foods and ultra-processed foods, e.g.
 369 meat or dairy substitutes, are becoming more prevalent, oftentimes having similar or worse

370 nutrient composition than their animal-based counterparts. Whereas some may have higher
 371 sugar and salt content, yet replacements may contribute to improved diet quality by higher fiber
 372 and micronutrient levels ³⁶. Note that highly processed vegan meals, still four times higher in
 373 fiber, were also found to induce higher satiation in a within-subject randomised clinical trial
 374 compared to energy-matched meat-containing processed meals ³⁷. Another explanation for the
 375 lack of strong differences between meal categories might be that meals of both categories were
 376 composed of fiber-rich side dishes such as broccoli, thereby “bypassing” the hypothesized
 377 disadvantageous effect of animal-based meals on post-meal hunger ratings, potentially leading
 378 to comparable fiber content. Notably, participants choosing plant-based meals reported less
 379 hunger overall compared to those making animal-based choices. We speculate that this may be
 380 due to lower hunger pre-meal choice or due to metabolic adaptations of possibly eating plant-
 381 based meals frequently, so that satiety could not be achieved in similar magnitude between
 382 meal categories. Future studies could avoid this phenomenon through implementing a more
 383 controlled environment with e.g. a 12 h-fasting condition before the meal and thus comparably
 384 higher hunger before the meal. However, our large-scale analysis offers the advantage to study
 385 effects of a single meal in a real-world context. Thus, while participants choosing a plant-based
 386 meal in cafeterias were not more satiated by their current (fiber-rich) meal, they appeared less
 387 hungry on average, which might relate to more long-term effects of differences in dietary habits
 388 (see below). However, these considerations remain highly speculative given the timeframe of
 389 our study design.

390 Considering biopsychological mechanisms, taste ratings, which were overall slightly higher for
 391 animal-based meals, had a strong effect on satiety and mood, highlighting that taste shapes
 392 satiety and mood acutely after a plant-based meal and even more so after an animal-based
 393 meal. It has been shown that omnivorous individuals expect plant-based alternatives to be less
 394 tasty compared to a meat burger ³⁸. While impulsive decisions were more frequently made for
 395 animal-based meals, such a spontaneous decision further augmented the effect of taste on
 396 satiety and mood as shown by our data, whereas in plant-based meal eaters planned decisions
 397 had less effect on hunger and mood. Taste have also been shown to influence post-meal satiety

398 ^{39,40}, with greater satiation for tasteful meals independent of nutrient composition. Thus, while
 399 macronutrients dense in calories such as fat are often described as flavour carriers, and shown
 400 to elicit even supra-additive value if paired with carbohydrates on a neuronal level ⁴¹, low-calorie
 401 meals such as salad bowls may induce similarly strong satiety like mac'n'cheese if perceived
 402 similarly tasty. However, interoceptive signalling via emotion regulatory processes might
 403 determine the properties of any given food further, which may partly explain why some (often
 404 high-caloric) foods, such as pizza or burgers, are considered emotionally comforting and
 405 rewarding ⁴². Notably, besides the subjective component of taste, there could have been an
 406 objective difference in taste by meal category. Meat- and fish-based meals might have been
 407 higher in quality due to a longer tradition and knowledge of meal preparation for such ⁴³
 408 compared to rather recent developments of vegan and vegetarian cuisine in Germany, that is
 409 barely taught in conventional cooking trainings. Moreover, societally meat dishes are viewed as
 410 more valuable and might therefore have a higher intrinsic value for omnivorous eaters in meat-
 411 heavy culinary traditions ⁴⁴. This may be one of the many reasons why despite wanting to eat
 412 more sustainably only some individuals actually succeed in avoiding meat completely, while
 413 others continue eating meat occasionally, so called flexitarians ⁴⁵. Considering the university
 414 setting, choosing meat-based meals could also be motivated by maximizing food reward linked
 415 to expected taste for meaty meals. Although we did not evaluate meal price in this study,
 416 oftentimes in cafeterias plant-based meals subsidize animal-based meals leading to equal or
 417 even lower prices for meaty meals. Yet, in our analysis socioeconomic status was not a
 418 significant predictor of meal choice. Indeed, we also found that hunger and mood changes are
 419 not completely independent, but that higher meal-induced satiety correlated with stronger mood
 420 improvements.

421 As hypothesized we found that plant-based meals were more frequently made upon planned
 422 decisions compared to impulsive meal decisions. To our knowledge, there are no concrete
 423 studies on meal planning in vegetarians and vegans, yet more planning seems expectable, due
 424 to constraints in choice from only a subset of meals and meeting pre-defined dietary goals that
 425 are in line with their vegetarian identity ⁴⁶.

426 Further, even though contentment about meal category at time of being informed about
427 randomization was not different between meal groups, post-meal contentment about the
428 allocation differed, with more participants reporting that they would have preferred an animal-
429 based meal when they were dissatisfied with the allocation. Yet, hunger and mood ratings
430 remained unaffected, highlighting that individual preference for category per se did not affect
431 satiety and mood that much. However, when meal category was randomly allocated hunger and
432 mood seemed to be higher when the meal was liked, and both were lower when disliked,
433 showing opposite effects in this study setting compared to the free choice setting. This indicates
434 that a forced choice might enhance the importance of the subjective liking of a certain meal
435 category on hunger and mood, a notion that can inform policy-making when aiming to increase
436 plant-based dieting.

437 Moreover, gender and whether the individual finished their meal or not could explain a high
438 share of hunger and mood rating differences, whereas social interaction during meal time was
439 not explanatory of post-meal hunger and mood ratings. Previously, evidence for gender
440 differences in eating behaviour ^{47,48} and the influence of others at meal intake ^{49,50} and the
441 influence of finishing or not a meal on reported satiety ⁵¹ have been shown. Female and diverse
442 gender showed differential effects on hunger and mood ratings related to general meal intake,
443 yet for post-meal ratings for plant-based meals females and males showed similar effects for
444 lowered mood, yet this effect was not present in diverse gender (however note the small sample
445 size for diverse in comparison). Indeed psychological mechanisms of food intake differ by
446 gender, i.e. females score higher on unhealthy eating traits ⁴⁸, show higher prevalence of eating
447 disorders, body and shape concerns ⁵², are more frequently and more strictly on plant-based
448 diets ⁴⁷, follow restrictive diets and weight loss strategies more often, as well as having an
449 increased awareness for health ^{53,54}. Only few studies considered gender diverse individuals,
450 yet some evidence supports a heightened risk for eating disorders in sexual and gender diverse
451 students ⁵⁵. Moreover, future studies should consider drink intake of all kinds, including coffee,
452 in the time previous to meal intake. In sum, these findings underline the importance of designing

gender-sensitive public health strategies with regard to diet, e.g. tailoring differences in health awareness, mood and emotion regulation and openness to plant-based meals to the individual.

Subgroup analysis suggests that in particular self-reported predominantly omnivorous and predominantly vegetarian dieters are driving the observed interaction effects of meal category on mood but also on hunger in the subsample analysis, whereas effects in vegan dieters were reversed. This underlines the potential confounding of (presumed) expectations towards plant-based meals when being able to deliberately choose between animal-based and plant-based meals. Possibly, food decision-making in non-vegan dieters might not rely on self-set dietary goals as much and reservations about plant-based meals could be further fuelled by an unknown food composition or ingredients or unfamiliar taste. For vegan dieters meal choice is anyhow limited and food decision-making might rely on more long-term goals including health, ethical, and climate arguments⁵⁶, all of which are not immediately to be processed at time of meal choice. Indeed, literature shows that vegan and vegetarian diets are associated with orthorexia nervosa, an eating disorder with an obsession for healthy eating⁵⁷. Unexpectedly, in sub-study two with omnivorous dieters only we also found higher scores for cognitive restraint and hunger in those choosing plant-based meals. Overall well-being or emotional constitution were not assessed in the app study though. In sum, dietary adherence factors could have masked or distorted potential effects of meal category on hunger and mood, indicating that other factors than single meal choice exert again considerably stronger influence.

Online studies are gaining momentum, in particular hosted on crowdsourcing platforms, and have great potential in terms of collecting big datasets from the real-world⁵⁸. Yet, several challenges in our study design should be noted as limitations:

Firstly, all results were based on self-reported subjective ratings and we expected compliance by the participants with the study set-up, yet fake ratings could not be excluded. The virtual setting and a resulting lower commitment to complete the study might also explain relatively large amounts of missing values for some of the confounding variables. Moreover, nutritional values were only available in a subset of data, further limiting power in the respective analyses. Nutritional information is publicly provided by very few providers only (8 out of 57), and was not

available upon request. Note, that information on fiber content was not available, which might be due to a general lack of awareness and literacy on dietary fiber (“knowledge fiber gap”, compare ⁵⁹), to which end we advocate to extend nutrient labelling on food packaging, in menus, in nutrition apps and nutritional experimental databases etc. by dietary fiber. Further, online datasets require careful data curation strategies, including exclusion of duplicates, defining outliers, fake and non-compliant entries. Notably, when restricting our analysis for the app-based study to a pre-defined still liberal or conservative timeframe around meal intake when entries needed to have been made, sample sizes were drastically reduced and smaller differences did not reach significance anymore, somewhat limiting our conclusions. Also, while meeting targeted sample sizes in sub-studies 2+3 initially, data curation and exclusion of timepoints and participants led to a higher than expected dropout rates, may have led to underpowered results. To overcome this issue, future app studies might implement a technical solution that reminds participants to stick with certain time frames. Also when cooperating with already existing institutions and technological environments, the research team has to adapt to limitations or peculiarities of the dataset such as missing information or unusable data structures and should thus a priori consider how this would affect statistical analyses. Secondly, Likert scales were conceptualized and adapted to the virtual setting, making the use of established research tools difficult, but instead calling for new solutions and ideas for developing suitable, reliable research tools (such as emoji-based Likert scales). Emojis may be suitable for assessing emotions in humans: perception and interaction with facial emoji Likert scales ⁶⁰ and consumers’ emotional reaction elicited by food or drink products after tasting the products ^{61,62} been investigated previously. Despite assessing a wide range of emojis, extreme anchors were “happy, content, joyful” and “unhappy, dissatisfied, stressed” ⁶². Another, study in children found higher ratings for emoji-based vs. verbal-based Likert scale, yet found emoji-based results to be less reliable and valid ⁶³. Overall, the studies show the potential and certain benefits of using emoji-based scales, yet the selection of emojis and the multiple meanings call for considerate application in line with the study design. Further, due to the smartphone-based setting we decided to use subjective momentary well-being as a proxy for mood, refraining from using more comprehensive measures of mood. Thirdly, meal categorisation into animal-based

510 vs. plant-based was based on provided information by the cafeteria meal plans on allergens and
 511 meal description using keywords for classification. Manual categorisation was only done in sub-
 512 studies 2 and 3. Therefore, only unambiguously classified meals could be included, leading to a
 513 reduction in sample size. Furthermore, we did not differentiate between vegetarian and vegan
 514 dishes. Fourthly, the timeframe of investigating single meal choices may be a methodological
 515 limitation. The present acute effects are somewhat in contrast to epidemiological evidence
 516 showing higher satiety and both either higher or lower depressive symptom scores in
 517 vegan/vegetarian dieters^{21,23,64}, we did not observe higher satiety and mood at post-meal for
 518 plant-based meals. In dietary adherence subgroup comparisons we found that lower satiety and
 519 lower mood at post-meal for plant-based choices occurred in the predominantly omnivorous and
 520 vegetarian group only, yet effects were inverse for the predominantly vegan subgroup. This
 521 could be due to the limited timeframe of the intervention only looking at acute postprandial
 522 changes in satiety and mood after a single meal in contrast to long-term dietary habits in
 523 epidemiological studies, that might be better suited to capture changes in gut-brain signalling
 524 and host physiology in response to higher fiber intake. A systematic review further highlights
 525 that although fiber indeed leads to satiety-inducing effects, the expected timeframe of action is
 526 rather 3 to 15 hours post-ingestion¹⁶. Indeed, it has been shown that diet can rapidly change
 527 host gut microbiome, yet these changes only occur within 24 to 72 hours after drastic dietary
 528 changes⁶⁵. Also, we found that individuals choosing a plant-based meal showed lower overall
 529 hunger and higher mood before the meal compared to animal-based meals. In sum, these
 530 findings underline that contrary to our hypothesis, not the acute meal choice, but rather habitual
 531 dietary patterns and other characteristics such as dietary adherence may determine the effects
 532 of a meal. Dietary adherence groups are based on self-report and predominant dietary habits,
 533 and therefore might not reflect real dietary intake. Note, that self-reported dietary identification
 534 may be less distinct for the predominant vegetarian group as compared to predominant
 535 omnivores and vegans, due to numerous factors influencing dietary adherence identification in
 536 vegetarian dieters^{66,67}. It is estimated that more than 50% of vegetarians were open to eating
 537 meat⁶⁶, therefore our predominantly vegetarian group likely includes semi-vegetarians and
 538 flexitarians. Also generalisability to the general population is limited, as our selected sample is a

539 young, student population. Fifthly, we did not assess important psychological factors that might
 540 have influenced meal choice, in particular, health awareness, dieting goals, sport habits and
 541 ethical concerns.

542 Besides the listed limitations, the presented studies have several strengths:

543 Firstly, the real-life experimental setting of all three studies is a major strength aiming to
 544 enhance application and conclusions to the living population without being in a highly controlled
 545 research environment. Secondly, pre-registered sample size estimations on statistical power
 546 were met: especially the app study consists of a huge sample and has been collected nation-
 547 wide in Germany and partly in Austria increasing generalizability of the results independent of
 548 cafeteria location or regional differences. Also sub-studies 2 and 3, although lower in sample
 549 size, are thoroughly phenotyped datasets with a multitude of potential confounders assessed.
 550 Indeed, we observed high compliance of the participants and high commitment to submit
 551 voluntary pre- and post-meal photos (~62%). Thirdly, all studies contain pre- and post-measures
 552 that allow linear mixed effects modeling correcting for the individual participant and the
 553 respective cafeteria location. Fourthly, addressing the complexity of real-life settings, various
 554 confounding factors were assessed and included in exploratory analyses to enhance the
 555 understanding of multimodal influences on meal decision-making and subsequent hunger,
 556 mood and stress ratings. Lastly, all three datasets have been carefully curated and sanity
 557 checks have been performed to ensure reliability of virtually collected ratings.

558 **Conclusion & Outlook**

559 In summary, this series of large-scale surveys showed that overall effects of single plant-based
 560 meals compared to animal-based meals on satiety and mood are rather small compared to
 561 main effects of timepoint, underlining that meal category only has a minor impact. This notion
 562 alleviates some of the reservations against plant-based meals potentially not being satisfying
 563 enough or not leading to fullness, in modern societies⁶⁸. Protein content and taste of meals
 564 were shown to contribute to satiety and mood. Thus, they should be increased in university
 565 cafeterias, in particular for plant-based meals, in order to enhance satisfaction and lastly also

acceptability and prevalence of those meals that are regarded climate-friendly. Increasing plant-based choices remains an important societal task with the aim to improve not only individual but also planetary health⁶⁹. Moreover, promoting plant-based offers and increasing the proportion of plant-derived ingredients through science communication and the above discussed mechanisms might help to counter the rising obesity epidemic, particularly by replacing Western(-ized) diets.

Overall, animal-based vs. plant-based meal category has only minor influence on post-meal satiety and mood in university cafeterias compared to other demographic and external factors influencing meal choice. Future longitudinal studies, for example using smartphone-integrated real-world big data sampling are warranted to further understand the acute and long-term determinants of healthy food choices, possibly also assessing internal beliefs related to food decision-making. Our findings might help to develop strategies to increase acceptability of healthy and sustainable plant-based food choices.

Materials and methods

Ethics

The Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty of the University of Leipzig approved the study protocol and all participants provided written informed consent. The study was divided into three sub-studies and pre-registered at <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/A7YTS> (28 Nov 2019). All data was collected from Jan 2019 until Feb 2020.

Recruitment

Study 1 - app study. For the first sub-study, all users of the smartphone app iMensa and Mensaplan (provided in Germany, Austria, Switzerland by Aimpulse Intelligent Systems GmbH, Bremen, Germany) were invited to take part in a brief survey consisting of 12 questions. The app has been originally developed to provide meal plan information and collect meal ratings of student cafeterias (mostly run by the local “Studierendenwerk”) with approximately 300,000 users and about 5,000 ratings per week.

592 *Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* In the second and third sub-studies, all visitors of the
593 student cafeterias in Leipzig, Berlin, Halle and Jena who planned to have lunch on-site, were
594 over 18 years old and who had access to a LimeSurvey www.survey3.gwdg.de via a mobile
595 device could take part in the study. Before eating a meal, a baseline survey served as a
596 screening tool to exclude visitors reporting known food allergies, food intolerances, eating
597 disorders, neurological and/or psychiatric disorders, and other diseases that may have an effect
598 on diet and mood like depression, schizophrenia, multiple sclerosis or Crohn's disease. Also,
599 vegetarians and vegans were excluded for better comparability of meal categories among
600 omnivorous subjects and to enable random allocation to meals for the third sub-study.
601 Participants were free to choose the day of the study.

602 **Study design**

603 *Study 1 - app study.* In the app, users were asked to report hunger and happiness before and
604 after consuming a meal on a 5-point Likert emoji scale each, accompanied by the originally app-
605 provided rating of the respective meal on a 5-star scale (hunger: “*How hungry are you today*
606 *before/after meal intake?*” translated from the original “*Wie hungrig bist du heute vor/nach dem*
607 *Essen?*”, mood: “*How happy are you today before/after meal intake?*” translated from the
608 original “*Wie glücklich bist du heute vor/nach dem Essen?*”). For the additional study-specific
609 questions, emoji-based 5-point scales (**Figure 1**) were used to increase user-friendliness and to
610 blend into the technological interface, selected based on maximal ratings on comprehension of
611 the respective measure of interest in a pilot study (hunger: n = 29, 45% approval for emoji
612 “plate”; mood: n = 30, 47% approval for emoji “smileys”, further details in **SI**). In addition, we
613 asked for meal decision (spontaneous or planned), gender (female, male, diverse), usual
614 predominant dietary habits (omnivorous, vegetarian, vegan) (“*Which dietary pattern do you*
615 *adhere to predominantly?*”), amount of liquid intake in the last 2 hours (< 0.5L, < 1L, > 1L),
616 whether they ate alone or in company, whether they finished their meal or not, frequent
617 smartphone use during the meal (yes or no), and sleep quality of the last night (good, normal,
618 bad). All data was provided with anonymous user identifiers by the app provider, along with
619 exact date and time stamps of each question. The specifics to the app study (compared to sub-

620 studies 2+3) were 1) both predominantly omnivorous and vegetarians/vegans took part in the
621 study, no non-voluntary meal choice has been performed, 2) mood was asked with “how happy
622 are you today ...”?, 3) the study did not assess stress levels and 4) meal categories were
623 specified based on the available information provided by the cafeterias.

624 *Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* In sub-studies two and three, after the initial baseline
625 survey, in a subsequent pre-meal survey, participants were asked to rate momentary satiety,
626 happiness and contentment on a 10-point Likert scale scale (hunger: “How hungry are you right
627 now?” translated from the original “Wie hungrig sind Sie im Moment?”; mood: “How happy are
628 you right now?” translated from the original “Sind Sie im Moment zufrieden?”; stress: “Do you
629 feel stressed right now?” translated from the original “Fühlen Sie sich im Moment gestresst?”)
630 **(Figure 1**, before either freely choosing a meal (sub-study 2) or being randomly assigned to eat
631 a animal-based or a plant-based (vegetarian or vegan) meal (sub-study 3). After finishing the
632 meal, participants were instructed to again report satiety, happiness and contentment on the
633 same 10-point Likert scale. Moreover, age, gender, height (in 5 cm categories) and weight, as
634 well as net monthly income (<500€/500-1000€/1000-1500€/1500-2000€/2000-2500€/>2500€)
635 were assessed. In addition, a) estimated portion size, b) whether the meal was fully eaten up or
636 not (yes/no), (c) whether side dishes or desserts have been chosen, (d) a questionnaire on
637 habitual food intake (Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ), DEGS-1 ⁷⁰), e) a personality
638 inventory (NEO-FFI) ⁷¹ and f) a questionnaire on eating habits (TFEQ) ⁴⁸. In addition, the survey
639 asked about social contact during lunch (Did you have lunch alone or with others? Have you
640 been looking at your mobile longer? Did you sit alone?). Information about the study and its
641 goals was provided right at the beginning of the baseline survey before meal intake. Optionally,
642 participants could upload pre-lunch and post-lunch photos of their meals to monitor meal choice
643 and compliance. In the randomised condition, the post-survey also asked whether participants
644 were satisfied with the randomised condition, or if not, which meal choice they would have
645 preferred.

646 **Dietary adherence**

647 *Study 1 - app study.* Usual predominant dietary habits (omnivorous, vegetarian, vegan) were
648 asked with “Which dietary pattern do you adhere to predominantly?”. Individuals reporting all
649 adherences were eligible to take part in the study.

650 *Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* Dietary adherence was asked with “What is your diet
651 type?”(translated from the original “Wie ernähren Sie sich?”) with the answer options:
652 omnivorous (both plant-based and animal-based), lacto-ovo-vegetarian (incl. dairy products),
653 pesco-ovo-vegetarian (incl. fish and dairy products), pesco-vegetarian (incl. fish), vegetarian,
654 vegan. Only participants choosing omnivorous were admitted to proceed with the study. Based
655 on self-reported Food Frequency Questionnaire data, we estimated mean daily intake of 68 g or
656 weekly intake of 478 g of meat for our selected cohort. German Nutrition Foundation
657 recommendations for meat intake is 300-600g per week. Therefore, we esteem our selected
658 cohort to be within the expected range representative of a standard, German Western-style diet,
659 consuming meat on a regular basis.

660 **Remuneration**

661 *Study 1 - app study.* Participants of sub-study 1 were not remunerated due to a very brief study
662 completion time.

663 *Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* Sub-studies 2+3 were remunerated with 9 € for
664 participation, with an optional extra 2 € per questionnaire (TFEQ, FFQ, NEO-FFI).

665 **Measures**

666 *Main variables.* As pre-registered, main outcome measures were mood (pre/post), satiety
667 (pre/post), stress (pre/post) (only in studies 2+3). As preregistered, we omitted stress levels in
668 the app-based study due to anticipated short attention span whilst using smartphone-embedded
669 surveys and to maximize re-voting on multiple days on our two main questions which are mood
670 and hunger. For this project, mood is defined as subjective momentary well-being, capturing

671 happiness⁷², and can therefore only be considered as a proxy for mood, as no comprehensive
672 scales or validated questionnaires have been employed.

673 *Control variables: Study 1 - app study.* Control variables included meal category, time lag
674 between measures, macronutrients (calories kcal / 100g, carbohydrates mg / 100g, sugar mg /
675 100g, fat mg / 100g, saturated fats mg/100g, protein in mg / 100g), fluid intake in last 2h
676 (<0.5l/<1.0l/>1.0l), predominant dietary adherence (omnivorous/vegetarian/vegan), gender
677 (f/m/d), sleep (bad/normal/good), social interaction during meal (alone/in company), prolonged
678 mobile use during meal (yes/no), finished meal (yes/no), pre-meal planning (planned
679 decision/impulsive decision), liking of meal (taste rating from 1-5 stars), place of meal (name of
680 cafeteria).

681 *Control variables: Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* Control variables included meal
682 category, time lag between survey responses, age (), gender (f/m/d), body size and body weight
683 to compute BMI in kg/m², net monthly income (<500€/500-1000€/1000-1500€/1500-
684 2000€/2000-2500€/na), estimated portion size (very small/small/normal/big/very big), fully eaten
685 up or not (yes/no), drinking volume last 2h (water, sugar drinks, tea, coffee, juice, alcoholic
686 beverages, others; each on a 6-point scale), side dishes (yes/no and meal description) or
687 desserts (yes/no and meal description), social interaction during meal (alone/ in company),
688 prolonged mobile phone use during meal (yes/no). Questionnaires on well-being (WHO-5⁷³),
689 eating traits (TFEQ⁷⁴), personality traits (NEOFFI⁷¹) and regular eating habits (DEGS-1 FFQ⁷⁰)
690 were administered. Questionnaires were scored according to the respective manual. For FFQ
691 data additional scoring on food intake quantity was performed to retrieve nutrient intake as
692 described previously⁷⁵.

693 **Meal categorisation**

694 For analysis meal categorisation was done by study personnel based on provided meal
695 category (vegetarian, vegan, meat or fish) and more specific meal description as given in the
696 menu and by information on allergens (keywords: *animal-based*: poultry, pork, beef, lamb, meat,
697 fish, scampi, seafood, deer, piglet, duck, goose, salami, ham, wiener; *plant-based*: vegan,

vegetarian, meat-free, tofu, soy). In brief, categorisation was done so that animal-based meals contained animal flesh and plant-based meals did not, the latter consisting of both vegetarian and vegan meals. Categorisation was done manually and in case of ambiguity based on consensus amongst study personnel. All remaining ambiguous meals were assigned missing value (e.g. in case meal description included both animal-based and plant-based keywords, e.g. “Tofuwurst oder Currywurst”, “...also available in vegan”, “Salatbuffet je 100g Auswahl an frischen Salaten, Gemüse-, Fisch-, Geflügel-, Schweine- und Rindfleisch- und vegetarischen und veganen Gerichten”).

Missing data and data selection/exclusion

Plausibility. All data was screened for plausibility, consistency and distribution and curated as appropriate. This included assigning meal category based on available information (meal description, information on allergens, meal photo). In sub-study 3, non-compliance with the assigned meal category led to exclusion. Implausible datapoints were treated as missing. Missing data was treated as missings (linear mixed models), except for meal category, which led to exclusion of the datapoint in all analyses.

Time stamps. Data entry plausibility was monitored with time stamp information (app study) and, if available, based on the creation dates of the uploaded meal photos (substudies 2+3). In sensitivity analyses, data was excluded according to the following criteria: post-meal entries appeared to be made prior than pre-meal entries; data entry outside of liberal time frame for more than 5 min and more less 3 h time lag between pre- and post-meal (hunger) entries (pre- and post-meal entries outside of 7:45 am and 10:30 pm (cafeteria opening hours (10:45 am to 7:30 pm) + 3 h data entry time frame); as well as data entry outside of a conservative time frame more than 20 min and less than 1.5 h time lag between pre- and post-meal (hunger) entries; (pre- and post-meal entries outside of 9:15 am and 9 pm (cafeteria opening hours + 1.5 h data entry time frame)) (note: we corrected timings indicated in the pre-registration). In sub-studies 2 and 3 only, duplicate records of the same participant were checked for consistency and curated accordingly so that each participant would only be counted once.

725 For detailed information on data curation for sub-studies 2+3, see <https://osf.io/ucq6r/>.

726 **Data analysis**

727 As pre-registered (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/A7YTS>), main pre-registered statistical
728 analyses comprised linear mixed model comparisons using lmer() in R for hunger, mood and
729 stress as dependent variables, meal and timepoint as factors and/or interaction terms,
730 modelling individual and cafeteria as random factors. Alpha level was adjusted to multiple
731 comparisons (3 main tests per study), with the significance threshold set to $p < 0.05/3 = 0.0167$,
732 and $p < 0.05$ for all other (and exploratory) models. For pre-registered secondary analyses, chi-
733 square tests were performed for categorical outcome (planned vs. impulsive decision).
734 Deviating from the pre-registration, models (and planned mediation analyses) for fiber content
735 could not be performed, as data was not available. All other statistical analyses, including
736 subgroup analysis and correlation analysis, are considered exploratory analysis.

737 **Power calculation**

738 The ethics proposal submitted to the institutional ethics board of the Medical Faculty of the
739 University of Leipzig, Germany, (228/18-ek) included power calculations for all three studies.
740 *Study 1 - app study*. For the app study, power calculation was based on a study by Koenig et al.
741 (2018), resulting in a target sample size of 126, assuming the observed effect size. This study
742 observed an effect in the eating decision behavior depending on the adaptation of a behavior
743 model ($\eta^2 = 0.03$, corresponds to an effect size $d = 0.35$
744 (https://www.psychometrica.de/effect_size.html)). However, it is difficult to estimate the effect
745 size of our study, since many influencing factors cannot be determined within the framework of
746 an app study. The analyses therefore remain largely explorative. Due to the large number of
747 users of the app (currently: approx. 300,000 users, approx. 30,000 meal evaluations per
748 month), groups of the same size can be pseudorandomized for better statistical evaluation. If
749 10% of active users are included in the study, 3,000 meal-well-being associations per month
750 can be collected. Therefore, we assume to achieve a sufficient sample size to determine a
751 possible effect.

752 *Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* Sub-studies 2 + 3 were based on the effect size of the
 753 study by Reed and Ones (2006) ($d = 0.47$), which examined the effect of a one-time sporting
 754 activity on mood values (studies that examined the influence of a one-time meal on mood are
 755 missing so far). Study 2 has the following special features: a) a smaller effect was assumed ($d =$
 756 0.30) than in study 3, because of the absence of randomization, b) a dropout rate of 20% was
 757 added to the calculated sample size, c) a 1:3 distribution from plant-based dishes to meat
 758 dishes was assumed. Thus, based on the sample size of the power analysis of 172 test people,
 759 a sample size of 210 subjects suggested to observe the desired effect. For sub-study 3, power
 760 calculation is analogous to sub-study 2, but defers in the following points: a) effect size of the
 761 study by Reed and Ones (2006) was assumed ($d = 0.47$), which investigated the effect of a
 762 one-time physical activity intervention on mood. Assuming a dropout rate of 20%, we assume
 763 that a targeted sample size from 85 (up to 6,300 portions per day in one of the locations of the
 764 Leipzig student union, source: Mensa im Park, see [https://www.l-iz.de/detector/movement-](https://www.l-iz.de/detector/movement-detector/2015/04/three-headed-team-takes-over-leading-of-the-mensa-am-park-des-studentenwerkes-leipzig-84262)
 765 [detector/2015/04/three-headed-team-takes-over-leading-of-the-mensa-am-park-des-](https://www.l-iz.de/detector/movement-detector/2015/04/three-headed-team-takes-over-leading-of-the-mensa-am-park-des-studentenwerkes-leipzig-84262)
 766 [studentenwerkes-leipzig-84262](https://www.l-iz.de/detector/movement-detector/2015/04/three-headed-team-takes-over-leading-of-the-mensa-am-park-des-studentenwerkes-leipzig-84262)).

767 **Stopping rule**

768 *Study 1 - app study.* Sample size in the app-study largely exceeded the predicted sample of $n =$
 769 126 to detect a small effect ($n = 16,135$ unique ratings). This was indeed due to the rapid data
 770 collection within the app and data extraction after certain time periods as agreed on in the
 771 contract with the developer. Therefore, during data collection, we could not monitor exact
 772 ratings, but rather stopped data collection after the given time frame.

773 *Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* For sub-studies 2+3, estimated sample sizes were strictly
 774 adhered to while recruiting in person and stopped once the expected numbers plus estimated
 775 drop-out rates were obtained. We met the targeted sample size, yet data curation and exclusion
 776 of timepoints and participants led to a higher than expected dropout rate and therefore, sample
 777 size was not met in sub-study 3.

778 **Meal photos**

779 *Study 2+3 – browser-based studies.* Meal photos before and after meal intake were optionally
780 uploaded by the participants in sub-studies 2+3 (before data curation 78% (sub-study 2: 216 out
781 of 273; sub-study 3: 114 out of 149)), after data curation 62% (sub-study 2: 108 out of 173; sub-
782 study 3: 44 out of 71) with pre- and post-meal photos). Photos were used to check accordance
783 with self-reported meal description, as well as time stamps of the photos and compliance with
784 study design for randomized choice in sub-study 3. All photos are stored at <https://osf.io/mqc5d/>
785 and can be used for further nutrient analysis or other purposes upon request to the
786 corresponding author.

787

788 **Emoji-based Likert scales**

789 *Study 1 - app study.* Due to the absence of suitable, validated emoji-based scales, we self-
790 developed those and validated comprehension of the measure of interest in a pilot study in $n \geq$
791 26. (**Supplementary Figure 1**). We showed participants (researchers in the fields of
792 neuroscience, psychology, medicine) scales and let them rate two dimensions. Firstly, “*What do*
793 *you think is most likely to be rated on this scale?*” with an open text field, and second: “*Which*
794 *scale (listed from top to bottom 1 to 3) represents "momentary well-being" best?*” (or the
795 respective construct) in a rank order question compared to all other scales representing this
796 construct. We then quantified relative preference ratings for each construct, and chose those
797 scales, that showed highest relative preference for representing a construct.

798 **Data availability**

799 The datasets generated and analysed during the current study are available in the Open
800 Science Framework repository at <https://osf.io/mqc5d/>.

801 **Code availability**

802 The code generated during the current study are available from the corresponding author on
803 reasonable request.

804 **Acknowledgments**

805 We would like to thank Maria Paerisch for the administrative advice and support for setting up
806 the online studies, Lena Weidert for initial data curation of sub-studies two and three and David
807 Villringer for initial data analysis of the app study. We thank Aimpulse Intelligent Systems
808 GmbH, Bremen, Germany and the local Studierendenwerke (student unions) for integrating our
809 study into their services and for providing the data. We also thank all the participating
810 volunteers. Funding was provided by the Max Planck Society and a promotion stipend by the
811 German Federal Environmental Foundation (EM). Open Access funding enabled and organized
812 by Projekt DEAL.

813 **Competing interests**

814 The authors declare no competing interests. Authors had the following dietary adherences at
815 the time of study: omnivorous (LdB, AV), vegetarian (AVW), vegan (EM, MZ).

816

817

818 **Author Contributions**

819 EM, AV, AVW: study conception and design; EM, LdB, MZ: data collection and data
820 management; EM: data curation; AVW: meal category labelling for the app-study; EM, AVW:
821 data analysis of all sub-studies; EM: data visualization; EM, AVW: first manuscript draft; EM:
822 revisions. All authors contributed to and accepted the final manuscript.

823 References

- 824 1. Willett, W. *et al.* Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets
825 from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* **393**, 447–492 (2019).
- 826 2. Clark, M. A., Springmann, M., Hill, J. & Tilman, D. Multiple health and environmental
827 impacts of foods. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **116**, 23357–23362 (2019).
- 828 3. Medawar, E., Huhn, S., Villringer, A. & Veronica Witte, A. The effects of plant-based diets
829 on the body and the brain: a systematic review. *Transl. Psychiatry* **9**, 1–17 (2019).
- 830 4. Medawar, E. *et al.* Less Animal-Based Food, Better Weight Status: Associations of the
831 Restriction of Animal-Based Product Intake with Body-Mass-Index, Depressive
832 Symptoms and Personality in the General Population. *Nutr. 2020, Vol. 12, Page 1492* **12**,
833 1492 (2020).
- 834 5. Reynolds, A. *et al.* Carbohydrate quality and human health: a series of systematic
835 reviews and meta-analyses. *Lancet* (2019) doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31809-9.
- 836 6. O’Keefe, S. J. The association between dietary fibre deficiency and high-income lifestyle-
837 associated diseases: Burkitt’s hypothesis revisited. *The Lancet Gastroenterology and*
838 *Hepatology* vol. 4 984–996 (2019).
- 839 7. Berthoud, H. R., Münzberg, H. & Morrison, C. D. Blaming the Brain for Obesity:
840 Integration of Hedonic and Homeostatic Mechanisms. *Gastroenterology* **152**, 1728–1738
841 (2017).
- 842 8. Clegg, M. & Shafat, A. Energy and macronutrient composition of breakfast affect gastric
843 emptying of lunch and subsequent food intake, satiety and satiation. *Appetite* **54**, 517–
844 523 (2010).
- 845 9. Poppitt, S. D., McCorMack, D. & Buffenstein, R. Short-term effects of macronutrient
846 preloads on appetite and energy intake in lean women. *Physiol. Behav.* **64**, 279–285
847 (1998).
- 848 10. Zanchi, D. *et al.* The impact of gut hormones on the neural circuit of appetite and satiety:
849 A systematic review. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* vol. 80 457–475 (2017).
- 850 11. Klementova, M. *et al.* A Plant-Based Meal Increases Gastrointestinal Hormones and
851 Satiety More Than an Energy-and Macronutrient-Matched Processed-Meat Meal in T2D,
852 Obese, and Healthy Men: A Three-Group Randomized Crossover Study. *Nutrients* **11**,
853 157 (2019).
- 854 12. Burger, K. S. & Stice, E. Greater striatopallidal adaptive coding during cue–reward
855 learning and food reward habituation predict future weight gain. *Neuroimage* **99**, 122–128
856 (2014).
- 857 13. Jovanovski, E. *et al.* Can dietary viscous fiber affect body weight independently of an
858 energy-restrictive diet? A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled
859 trials. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **111**, 471–485 (2020).
- 860 14. Dalile, B., Van Oudenhove, L., Vervliet, B. & Verbeke, K. The role of short-chain fatty

- 861 acids in microbiota–gut–brain communication. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology and*
862 *Hepatology* vol. 16 461–478 (2019).
- 863 15. Dalile, B., Vervliet, B., Bergonzelli, G., Verbeke, K. & Van Oudenhove, L. Colon-delivered
864 short-chain fatty acids attenuate the cortisol response to psychosocial stress in healthy
865 men: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **45**, 2257–2266
866 (2020).
- 867 16. Clark, M. J. & Slavin, J. L. The effect of fiber on satiety and food intake: A systematic
868 review. *J. Am. Coll. Nutr.* **32**, 200–211 (2013).
- 869 17. Muth, A. K. & Park, S. Q. The impact of dietary macronutrient intake on cognitive function
870 and the brain. *Clinical Nutrition* vol. 40 3999–4010 (2021).
- 871 18. Cani, P. D. *et al.* Microbial regulation of organismal energy homeostasis. *Nature*
872 *Metabolism* vol. 1 34–46 (2019).
- 873 19. Boswell, R. G., Sun, W., Suzuki, S. & Kober, H. Training in cognitive strategies reduces
874 eating and improves food choice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, E11238–E11247
875 (2018).
- 876 20. Hege, M. A. *et al.* Eating less or more – Mindset induced changes in neural correlates of
877 pre-meal planning. *Appetite* **125**, 492–501 (2018).
- 878 21. Ocklenburg, S. & Borawski, J. Vegetarian diet and depression scores: A meta-analysis. *J.*
879 *Affect. Disord.* **294**, 813–815 (2021).
- 880 22. Lassale, C. *et al.* Healthy dietary indices and risk of depressive outcomes: a systematic
881 review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Molecular Psychiatry* vol. 24 965–986
882 (2019).
- 883 23. Taylor, A. M. & Holscher, H. D. A review of dietary and microbial connections to
884 depression, anxiety, and stress. *Nutritional Neuroscience* vol. 23 237–250 (2020).
- 885 24. Swann, O. G., Kilpatrick, M., Breslin, M. & Oddy, W. H. Dietary fiber and its associations
886 with depression and inflammation. *Nutrition Reviews* vol. 78 394–411 (2020).
- 887 25. Firth, J. *et al.* Food and mood: How do diet and nutrition affect mental wellbeing? *BMJ*
888 **369**, (2020).
- 889 26. Broers, V. J. V., De Breucker, C., Van den Broucke, S. & Luminet, O. A systematic
890 review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of nudging to increase fruit and vegetable
891 choice. *Eur. J. Public Health* **27**, 912–920 (2017).
- 892 27. Garnett, E. E., Balmford, A., Sandbrook, C., Pilling, M. A. & Marteau, T. M. Impact of
893 increasing vegetarian availability on meal selection and sales in cafeterias. *Proc. Natl.*
894 *Acad. Sci.* **116**, 20923–20929 (2019).
- 895 28. Garnett, E. E., Balmford, A., Marteau, T. M., Pilling, M. A. & Sandbrook, C. Price of
896 change: Does a small alteration to the price of meat and vegetarian options affect their
897 sales? *J. Environ. Psychol.* **75**, 101589 (2021).
- 898 29. Garnett, E. E., Marteau, T. M., Sandbrook, C., Pilling, M. A. & Balmford, A. Order of

- 899 meals at the counter and distance between options affect student cafeteria vegetarian
900 sales. *Nat. Food* **1**, 485–488 (2020).
- 901 30. Papies, E. K., Johannes, N., Daneva, T., Semyte, G. & Kauhanen, L. L. Using
902 consumption and reward simulations to increase the appeal of plant-based foods.
903 *Appetite* **155**, 104812 (2020).
- 904 31. Reynolds, A. *et al.* Carbohydrate quality and human health: a series of systematic
905 reviews and meta-analyses. *Lancet* **393**, 434–445 (2019).
- 906 32. Koch, F., Heuer, T., Krems, C. & Claupein, E. Meat consumers and non-meat consumers
907 in Germany: A characterisation based on results of the German National Nutrition Survey
908 II. *J. Nutr. Sci.* **8**, 1–13 (2019).
- 909 33. El-Salhy, M., Ystad, S. O., Mazzawi, T. & Gundersen, D. Dietary fiber in irritable bowel
910 syndrome (Review). *International Journal of Molecular Medicine* vol. 40 607–613 (2017).
- 911 34. Nielsen, L. V. *et al.* Protein from meat or vegetable sources in meals matched for fiber
912 content has similar effects on subjective appetite sensations and energy intake—A
913 randomized acute cross-over meal test study. *Nutrients* **10**, (2018).
- 914 35. Griffith, C., Piacquadio, K., Braden, M. & Leidy, H. Effects of Protein Source and Quantity
915 on Appetite Control, Satiety and Subsequent Food Intake in Healthy Adults. *Curr. Dev.*
916 *Nutr.* **5**, 409–409 (2021).
- 917 36. Farsi, D. N., Uthumange, D., Munoz Munoz, J. & Commane, D. M. The nutritional impact
918 of replacing dietary meat with meat alternatives in the UK: A modelling analysis using
919 nationally representative data. *Br. J. Nutr.* **127**, 1731–1741 (2021).
- 920 37. Klementova, M. *et al.* A plant-based meal increases gastrointestinal hormones and
921 satiety more than an energy-and macronutrient-matched processed-meat meal in t2d,
922 obese, and healthy men: A three-group randomized crossover study. *Nutrients* **11**,
923 (2019).
- 924 38. Michel, F., Knaapila, A., Hartmann, C. & Siegrist, M. A multi-national comparison of meat
925 eaters' attitudes and expectations for burgers containing beef, pea or algae protein. *Food*
926 *Qual. Prefer.* **91**, 104195 (2021).
- 927 39. Vadiveloo, M., Morwitz, V. & Chandon, P. The interplay of health claims and taste
928 importance on food consumption and self-reported satiety. *Appetite* **71**, 349–356 (2013).
- 929 40. Yin, W., Hewson, L., Linforth, R., Taylor, M. & Fisk, I. D. Effects of aroma and taste,
930 independently or in combination, on appetite sensation and subsequent food intake.
931 *Appetite* **114**, 265–274 (2017).
- 932 41. DiFeliceantonio, A. G. *et al.* Supra-Additive Effects of Combining Fat and Carbohydrate
933 on Food Reward. *Cell Metab.* **28**, 33-44.e3 (2018).
- 934 42. Weltens, N., Zhao, D. & Van Oudenhove, L. Where is the comfort in comfort foods?
935 Mechanisms linking fat signaling, reward, and emotion. *Neurogastroenterology and*
936 *Motility* vol. 26 303–315 (2014).
- 937 43. Strassner, C. Food, nutrition and health in Germany. in *Nutritional and Health Aspects of*

- 938 *Food in Western Europe* 133–158 (Elsevier, 2019). doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-813171-
939 8.00008-1.
- 940 44. Biermann, G. & Rau, H. The meaning of meat: (Un)sustainable eating practices at home
941 and out of home. *Appetite* **153**, 104730 (2020).
- 942 45. Dagevos, H. Finding flexitarians: Current studies on meat eaters and meat reducers.
943 *Trends in Food Science and Technology* vol. 114 530–539 (2021).
- 944 46. Rosenfeld, D. L. & Burrow, A. L. Vegetarian on purpose: Understanding the motivations
945 of plant-based dieters. *Appetite* **116**, 456–463 (2017).
- 946 47. Rosenfeld, D. L. Gender differences in vegetarian identity: How men and women
947 construe meatless dieting. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **81**, 103859 (2020).
- 948 48. Löffler, A. *et al.* Age- and gender-specific norms for the German version of the Three-
949 Factor Eating-Questionnaire (TFEQ). *Appetite* **91**, 241–247 (2015).
- 950 49. Higgs, S. Social norms and their influence on eating behaviours. *Appetite* vol. 86 38–44
951 (2015).
- 952 50. Fletcher, A., Bonell, C. & Sorhaindo, A. You are what your friends eat: Systematic review
953 of social network analyses of young people's eating behaviours and bodyweight. *Journal*
954 *of Epidemiology and Community Health* vol. 65 548–555 (2011).
- 955 51. Laurier, E. & Wiggins, S. Finishing the family meal. The interactional organisation of
956 satiety. *Appetite* **56**, 53–64 (2011).
- 957 52. Hilbert, A., de Zwaan, M. & Braehler, E. How Frequent Are Eating Disturbances in the
958 Population? Norms of the Eating Disorder Examination-Questionnaire. *PLoS One* **7**,
959 e29125 (2012).
- 960 53. Grzymisławska, M., Puch, E. A., Zawada, A. & Grzymisławski, M. Do nutritional
961 behaviors depend on biological sex and cultural gender? *Adv. Clin. Exp. Med. Off. organ*
962 *Wroclaw Med. Univ.* **29**, 165–172 (2020).
- 963 54. Wardle, J. *et al.* Gender differences in food choice: The contribution of health beliefs and
964 dieting. *Ann. Behav. Med.* **27**, 107–116 (2004).
- 965 55. Grammer, A. C. *et al.* Characterizing eating disorder diagnosis and related outcomes by
966 sexual orientation and gender identity in a national sample of college students. *Eat.*
967 *Behav.* **42**, 101528 (2021).
- 968 56. Janssen, M., Busch, C., Rödiger, M. & Hamm, U. Motives of consumers following a
969 vegan diet and their attitudes towards animal agriculture. *Appetite* **105**, 643–651 (2016).
- 970 57. Brytek-Matera, A. Vegetarian diet and orthorexia nervosa: a review of the literature.
971 *Eating and Weight Disorders* vol. 26 1–11 (2021).
- 972 58. Grootswagers, T. A primer on running human behavioural experiments online. *Behav.*
973 *Res. Methods* **52**, 2283–2286 (2020).
- 974 59. Deehan, E. C. & Walter, J. The Fiber Gap and the Disappearing Gut Microbiome:

- 975 Implications for Human Nutrition. *Trends in Endocrinology and Metabolism* vol. 27 239–
976 242 (2016).
- 977 60. Alismail, S. & Zhang, H. Exploring and Understanding Participants' Perceptions of Facial
978 Emoji Likert Scales in Online Surveys: A Qualitative Study. (2020) doi:10.1145/3382505.
- 979 61. Jaeger, S. R. *et al.* Measurement of product emotions using emoji surveys: Case studies
980 with tasted foods and beverages. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **62**, 46–59 (2017).
- 981 62. Jaeger, S. R., Roigard, C. M. & Ares, G. Measuring consumers' product associations with
982 emoji and emotion word questionnaires: case studies with tasted foods and written
983 stimuli. *Food Res. Int.* **111**, 732–747 (2018).
- 984 63. İlhan, M., Taşdelen Teker, G., Güler, N. & Ergenekon, Ö. Effects of Category Labeling
985 With Emojis on Likert-Type Scales on the Psychometric Properties of Measurements. *J.*
986 *Psychoeduc. Assess.* **40**, 221–237 (2022).
- 987 64. Clark, M. J. & Slavin, J. L. The effect of fiber on satiety and food intake: A systematic
988 review. *J. Am. Coll. Nutr.* **32**, 200–211 (2013).
- 989 65. David, L. A. *et al.* Diet rapidly and reproducibly alters the human gut microbiome. *Nature*
990 **505**, 559–563 (2014).
- 991 66. Rosenfeld, D. L. What Does It Take to Get a Vegetarian to Eat Meat? Factors Predicting
992 Dietary Adherence. doi:10.31234/OSF.IO/97A2S.
- 993 67. Rosenfeld, D. L. & Burrow, A. L. The unified model of vegetarian identity: A conceptual
994 framework for understanding plant-based food choices. *Appetite* **112**, 78–95 (2017).
- 995 68. Rosenfeld, D. L. & Tomiyama, A. J. Taste and health concerns trump anticipated stigma
996 as barriers to vegetarianism. *Appetite* **144**, 104469 (2020).
- 997 69. Clark, M. A., Springmann, M., Hill, J. & Tilman, D. Multiple health and environmental
998 impacts of foods. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **116**, 23357–23362 (2019).
- 999 70. Haftenberger, M. *et al.* *Relative validation of a food frequency questionnaire for national*
1000 *health and nutrition monitoring*. <http://www.nutritionj.com/content/9/1/36> (2010).
- 1001 71. Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. *NEO PI/FFI manual supplement for use with the NEO*
1002 *Personality Inventory and the NEO Five-Factor Inventory*. (Psychological Assessment
1003 Resources, 1989).
- 1004 72. Diener, E., Oishi, S. & Lucas, R. E. Personality, Culture, and Subjective Well-being:
1005 Emotional and Cognitive Evaluations of Life. *Annual Review of Psychology* vol. 54 403–
1006 425 (2003).
- 1007 73. Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S. & Bech, P. The WHO-5 well-being
1008 index: A systematic review of the literature. *Psychother. Psychosom.* **84**, 167–176 (2015).
- 1009 74. Löffler, A. *et al.* Eating behaviour in the general population: an analysis of the factor
1010 structure of the German version of the Three-Factor-Eating-Questionnaire (TFEQ) and its
1011 association with the body mass index. *PLoS One* **10**, e0133977 (2015).

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

- 1012 75. Thieleking, R. *et al.* Nutrient scoring for the DEGS1-FFQ - from food intake to nutrient
1013 intake. *BMC Nutr.* (2022) doi:10.1186/s40795-022-00636-2.
- 1014

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Study design: Adults (m, f, d) consuming a single meal in university cafeterias rated hunger and mood (and stress) using Likert scales before and after that meal with smartphones or mobile devices, in an app study ($n_1 = 16,135$, 5-point scales, in dark blue) or in a more detailed web-based survey (omnivorous diet habits only, 10-point scales, $n_2 = 173$: free choice (in petrol), $n_3 = 71$: randomised choice (in turquoise)). Photos show exemplary pre- and post-meal plates for both meal categories (in petrol). Screenshots taken from iMensa app directly and meal photos provided by study participants (available at <https://osf.io/mqc5d/>). Maps for Germany and Austria made by Vemaps.com. Copyright for the app icons "iMensa" and "Mensaplan" has been granted by Aimpulse Intelligent Systems GmbH and is under the GNU General Public License for the icon for "LimeSurvey" (<https://www.limesurvey.org/>, LimeSurvey GmbH, Hamburg, Germany). Images from Flaticon.com (DinosoftLabs and Freepik) and from Apple Keynote were used.

Figure 2: Demographic factors and study sample descriptives of sub-studies 1, 2 and 3. On average, women were more likely to choose a plant-based meal (app study: $X^2 = 731.4$, $p < 10^{-10}$, female = 58%, diverse = 45.3%, male = 37.3%; sub-study 2: female = 65%, diverse = 2%, male = 33%; sub-study 3: allocation was randomised). Both female and diverse gender reported more than twice as often predominantly vegan/vegetarian dietary habits compared to male in the app study ($X^2 = 1266$, $p < 10^{-10}$, female = 40.4%, diverse = 54.8%, male = 16.5%). In sub-study 2, neither body mass index (BMI), income or general well-being differed across meal categories ($p_{all} > 0.26$). Omnivorous dieters choosing a plant-based meal were characterized by significantly higher habitual fiber intake (22 ± 11 vs. 18 ± 9 g fiber / day, $p < 0.05$) and marginally higher scores for cognitive restraint and hunger in the TFEQ subscales ($p < 0.05$) compared to those choosing animal-based meals (Table 1). No differences in personality traits or general well-being were found. Respective differences were not significant for the randomised allocation samples in sub-study 3. Images from Flaticon.com were used: Freepik (smartphone, diet, water, network, eat, clock, broccoli, tofu, peas, chickpea, soy, vegan, sausage, chop, food), Smashicons (brain), DinosoftLabs (chicken leg), surgan (seafood).

Figure 3: Mean ratings of pre- and post-meal meal category for hunger, mood/contentment and stress. App-study ratings ($n = 16135$) depicted in A) hunger B) mood, C) sub-study 2 with free meal choice ($n=173$) and D) sub-study 3 with randomised meal allocation ($n=78$). Median depicted as line, mean as dot, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as triangles.

Figure 4: Nutrient composition between meal categories in a subsample of the app-study ($n_{max} = 1262$, data from app study). Macronutrient information per portion size for A) calories in kcal B) fat in grams C) saturated fats in grams D) carbohydrates in grams E) sugar in grams and F) protein in grams. Median depicted as line, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as dots.

Figure 5: Mean ratings of pre- and post-meal for hunger and mood by white flour vs. whole-grain flour bolognese meals (app-study only ($n = 442$) depicted in A) hunger B) mood. Median depicted as line, mean as dot, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as triangles.

Figure 6: Post-randomization contentment and post-meal contentment and reasons for the latter (sub-study 2, $n = 71$). A) Pre-meal allocation contentment rating (1-10 Likert scale) by meal category. Mean depicted as dot. B) Post-meal allocation contentment in categorical answers depicted as frequency by meal category. C) Reasons for post-meal contentment in categorical answers depicted as frequency by meal category. D) Reasons for post-meal discontentment in categorical answers depicted as frequency by meal category.

Figure 7: Effects of taste ratings on hunger and mood by star rating provided (app study only). A) Hunger ratings by taste rating from 1 to 5 stars B) Mood ratings by taste rating from 1 to 5 stars. Median depicted as line, mean as dot, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as small dots.


Figure 8: Effects of gender on hunger and mood (app study only, $n_{male} = 8291$, $n_{female} = 7418$, $n_{diverse} = 279$). Median depicted as line, mean as dot, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as triangles.

1063 Figure 9: Correlation of post-pre changes between hunger and mood levels plotted by meal category
1064 (green: animal-based; orange: plant-based) (app study only). Spearman's correlation and 95% CI
1065 depicted.





1066 Table 1: Demographic information across studies according to meal choice. NB: Significant differences
1067 according to Chi-tests or Wilcoxon tests between meal categories are marked in bold. Abbreviations:
1068 N.A.: no answer; F: female; D: diverse; M: male

1069 Table 2: Ratings for hunger, mood, stress across all studies. Mean \pm SD. Significant models of interest
1070 compared to null model in bold (LMM comparison $p < 0.001$). NB: Significant effects between linear mixed
1071 models model comparisons are marked in bold. Note, that due to multiple comparison correction alpha-
1072 level was set to $0.05/3 = 0.0167$. P-values represent ANOVA model comparison of linear mixed models
1073 with fixed and random effects.






animal-based plant-based




A

calories




B

fat




C

sat. fats




D

carbohydrates




E

sugar




F

protein



A

hunger




white-flour



whole-grain flour


B

mood




A

hunger by taste rating




B

mood by taste rating




post-meal satiety correlates with meal-induced mood




A

hunger



B

mood




randomized meal allocation

animal-based plant-based


A

pre-meal allocation contentment




B

post-meal allocation contentment



C

reasons for post-meal contentment



D

reasons for post-meal discontentment

