

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

3 Evelyn Medawar<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Marie Zedler<sup>1</sup>, Larissa de Biasi<sup>1</sup>, Arno Villringer<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>, A. Veronica Witte<sup>1,4</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup> Department of Neurology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences,  
5 Leipzig, Germany

6 <sup>2</sup> Berlin School of Mind and Brain, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

7 <sup>3</sup> Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin; Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany

8 <sup>4</sup> Clinic for Cognitive Neurology, University of Leipzig Medical Center, Leipzig, Germany

9 Corresponding author: Evelyn Medawar, Department of Neurology, Max Planck Institute for  
10 Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Stephanstr. 1A, 04103 Leipzig, Germany,  
11 [medawar@cbs.mpg.de](mailto:medawar@cbs.mpg.de)

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

13 Classification:

14 Health sciences/Health care/Nutrition

15 Biological sciences/Psychology/Human behaviour

16

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

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

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 <sup>1,2</sup> and  
51 human health <sup>3,4</sup>. 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 <sup>5</sup>. 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 <sup>6</sup>. 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 <sup>7</sup>. Macronutrient content most likely modulates appetite control, as  
65 energy density or protein content of a single meal determines subsequent metabolic activity <sup>8,9</sup>  
66 and in turn influences future meal intake via gut-brain hormonal signaling <sup>10</sup>. 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 <sup>11</sup>. Indeed, repetitive cueing with  
69 highly palatable foods led to habituation of reward-associated dopaminergic signaling <sup>12</sup>. In  
70 contrast to high caloric foods, dietary fiber not only moderately improved body weight status  
71 independent of energy intake across 62 trials <sup>13</sup>, but also activates appetite-regulatory pathways  
72 via anorectic hormones, thereby ameliorating high-caloric food craving and other  
73 psychobiological processes <sup>14</sup>. 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 <sup>15</sup>. While the timeframe of those putative effects

76 remain unclear <sup>16</sup>, 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 <sup>17</sup> or  
79 by contributing to a healthy energy-harvesting profile of the gut microbiome <sup>18</sup>.

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 <sup>19</sup>. Pre-meal planning has been shown to be  
85 influenced by attentional focus at the time of choice <sup>20</sup> – 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 <sup>21</sup>). 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 <sup>22</sup>) and interventional studies <sup>23</sup>, potentially via microbiota-driven modification of gene  
94 expression and anti-inflammatory properties <sup>24</sup>. 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 <sup>25</sup> 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 <sup>26</sup>. 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 <sup>27</sup>. Also, discounting plant-based meals whilst increasing prices of meat-based  
103 dishes led to a slight increase in sales of the former <sup>28</sup>, whilst order of meals in close proximity

104 did not<sup>29</sup>. 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 products<sup>30</sup>. 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:  $3.48 \pm 1$  points vs. plant-based:  $3.52 \pm 1$  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 <sup>31</sup> (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  $0.2 \times 10^{-15}$ ) 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

207 meal. The interaction effect of a planned decision on higher hunger at post-meal was  
208 significantly lower for plant-based meal choices (decision\*post-meal\*plant-based:  $b = -0.04$ ,  $t = -$   
209  $0.9$ ,  $p < 2 \times 10^{-5}$ ), as well as less pronounced for lower mood (decision\*post-meal\*plant-based:  $b$   
210  $= -0.02$ ,  $t = -0.4$ ,  $p < 5 \times 10^{-6}$ ) compared to animal-based meals.

### 211 **Contentment when randomised to meal (study 3)**

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

224 Further, we tested the effect of assigned meal and subsequent liking as preregistered by  
225 defining three categories, namely voluntary ( $n = 174$ ) vs. non-voluntary-liked ( $n = 49$ ) vs. non-  
226 voluntary-disliked ( $n = 17$ ) of meal category across both sub-studies two and three. Mode of  
227 choice did not explain any significant variance on hunger, mood or stress levels across time on  
228 meal choice (preregistered model: all  $p > 0.14$ ). When looking at interaction of timepoint and  
229 mode of choice and meal category, post-meal hunger was higher for non-voluntary-liked ( $b =$   
230  $1.4$ ,  $t = 1.8$ ) and lower for non-voluntary-disliked ( $b = -1.6$ ,  $t = -1.4$ ) compared to voluntary  
231 choice for plant-based meals (model comparison  $p < 0.004$ ). Post-meal effects of mode of  
232 choice for plant-based meals showed higher mood for non-voluntary-liked ( $b = 0.34$ ,  $t = 0.5$ )  
233 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:  $3.86 \pm 1.23$ ;  
241 plant-based:  $3.77 \pm 1.27$ , 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  $2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ ).

### 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:  $r = -0.19 [-0.21 -0.18]$   $p < .001$ ;  
306 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 <sup>32</sup>, 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 <sup>21</sup>, but in line with improved mood  
338 related to pre-/probiotic diets <sup>22</sup>. 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 <sup>23,33</sup>. 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 <sup>34</sup> or in  
365 case of protein preload previous to ad libitum food intake <sup>35</sup>. 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 <sup>36</sup>. 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 <sup>37</sup>. 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 <sup>38</sup>. 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 <sup>39,40</sup>, 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 <sup>41</sup>, 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 <sup>42</sup>. 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 <sup>43</sup>  
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 <sup>44</sup>. 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 <sup>45</sup>. 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 <sup>46</sup>.

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 <sup>47,48</sup> and the influence of others at meal intake <sup>49,50</sup> and the  
441 influence of finishing or not a meal on reported satiety <sup>51</sup> 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 <sup>48</sup>, show higher prevalence of eating  
447 disorders, body and shape concerns <sup>52</sup>, are more frequently and more strictly on plant-based  
448 diets <sup>47</sup>, follow restrictive diets and weight loss strategies more often, as well as having an  
449 increased awareness for health <sup>53,54</sup>. 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 <sup>55</sup>. 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

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

455 Subgroup analysis suggests that in particular self-reported predominantly omnivorous and  
456 predominantly vegetarian dieters are driving the observed interaction effects of meal category  
457 on mood but also on hunger in the subsample analysis, whereas effects in vegan dieters were  
458 reversed. This underlines the potential confounding of (presumed) expectations towards plant-  
459 based meals when being able to deliberately choose between animal-based and plant-based  
460 meals. Possibly, food decision-making in non-vegan dieters might not rely on self-set dietary  
461 goals as much and reservations about plant-based meals could be further fuelled by an  
462 unknown food composition or ingredients or unfamiliar taste. For vegan dieters meal choice is  
463 anyhow limited and food decision-making might rely on more long-term goals including health,  
464 ethical, and climate arguments <sup>56</sup>, all of which are not immediately to be processed at time of  
465 meal choice. Indeed, literature shows that vegan and vegetarian diets are associated with  
466 orthorexia nervosa, an eating disorder with an obsession for healthy eating <sup>57</sup>. Unexpectedly, in  
467 sub-study two with omnivorous dieters only we also found higher scores for cognitive restraint  
468 and hunger in those choosing plant-based meals. Overall well-being or emotional constitution  
469 were not assessed in the app study though. In sum, dietary adherence factors could have  
470 masked or distorted potential effects of meal category on hunger and mood, indicating that  
471 other factors than single meal choice exert again considerably stronger influence.

472 Online studies are gaining momentum, in particular hosted on crowdsourcing platforms, and  
473 have great potential in terms of collecting big datasets from the real-world <sup>58</sup>. Yet, several  
474 challenges in our study design should be noted as limitations:

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

481 available upon request. Note, that information on fiber content was not available, which might  
482 be due to a general lack of awareness and literacy on dietary fiber (“knowledge fiber gap”,  
483 compare <sup>59</sup>), to which end we advocate to extend nutrient labelling on food packaging, in  
484 menus, in nutrition apps and nutritional experimental databases etc. by dietary fiber. Further,  
485 online datasets require careful data curation strategies, including exclusion of duplicates,  
486 defining outliers, fake and non-compliant entries. Notably, when restricting our analysis for the  
487 app-based study to a pre-defined still liberal or conservative timeframe around meal intake  
488 when entries needed to have been made, sample sizes were drastically reduced and smaller  
489 differences did not reach significance anymore, somewhat limiting our conclusions. Also, while  
490 meeting targeted sample sizes in sub-studies 2+3 initially, data curation and exclusion of  
491 timepoints and participants led to a higher than expected dropout rates, may have led to  
492 underpowered results. To overcome this issue, future app studies might implement a technical  
493 solution that reminds participants to stick with certain time frames. Also when cooperating with  
494 already existing institutions and technological environments, the research team has to adapt to  
495 limitations or peculiarities of the dataset such as missing information or unusable data  
496 structures and should thus a priori consider how this would affect statistical analyses. Secondly,  
497 Likert scales were conceptualized and adapted to the virtual setting, making the use of  
498 established research tools difficult, but instead calling for new solutions and ideas for  
499 developing suitable, reliable research tools (such as emoji-based Likert scales). Emojis may be  
500 suitable for assessing emotions in humans: perception and interaction with facial emoji Likert  
501 scales <sup>60</sup> and consumers’ emotional reaction elicited by food or drink products after tasting the  
502 products <sup>61,62</sup> been investigated previously. Despite assessing a wide range of emojis, extreme  
503 anchors were “happy, content, joyful” and “unhappy, dissatisfied, stressed” <sup>62</sup>. Another, study in  
504 children found higher ratings for emoji-based vs. verbal-based Likert scale, yet found emoji-  
505 based results to be less reliable and valid <sup>63</sup>. Overall, the studies show the potential and certain  
506 benefits of using emoji-based scales, yet the selection of emojis and the multiple meanings call  
507 for considerate application in line with the study design. Further, due to the smartphone-based  
508 setting we decided to use subjective momentary well-being as a proxy for mood, refraining from  
509 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<sup>21,23,64</sup>, 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-ingestion<sup>16</sup>. 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 changes<sup>65</sup>. 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<sup>66,67</sup>. It is estimated that more than 50% of vegetarians were open to eating  
537 meat<sup>66</sup>, 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 societies<sup>68</sup>. 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

566 acceptability and prevalence of those meals that are regarded climate-friendly. Increasing plant-  
567 based choices remains an important societal task with the aim to improve not only individual but  
568 also planetary health<sup>69</sup>. Moreover, promoting plant-based offers and increasing the proportion  
569 of plant-derived ingredients through science communication and the above discussed  
570 mechanisms might help to counter the rising obesity epidemic, particularly by replacing  
571 Western(-ized) diets.

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

## 579 **Materials and methods**

### 580 **Ethics**

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

### 585 **Recruitment**

586 *Study 1 - app study.* For the first sub-study, all users of the smartphone app iMensa and  
587 Mensaplan (provided in Germany, Austria, Switzerland by Aimpulse Intelligent Systems GmbH,  
588 Bremen, Germany) were invited to take part in a brief survey consisting of 12 questions. The  
589 app has been originally developed to provide meal plan information and collect meal ratings of  
590 student cafeterias (mostly run by the local “Studierendenwerk”) with approximately 300,000  
591 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](http://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 <sup>70</sup>), e) a personality  
638 inventory (NEO-FFI) <sup>71</sup> and f) a questionnaire on eating habits (TFEQ) <sup>48</sup>. 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 happiness<sup>72</sup>, 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/m<sup>2</sup>, 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-5<sup>73</sup>),  
689 eating traits (TFEQ<sup>74</sup>), personality traits (NEOFFI<sup>71</sup>) and regular eating habits (DEGS-1 FFQ<sup>70</sup>)  
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 previously<sup>75</sup>.

### 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,

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

## 706 **Missing data and data selection/exclusion**

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

713 *Time stamps.* Data entry plausibility was monitored with time stamp information (app study)  
714 and, if available, based on the creation dates of the uploaded meal photos (substudies 2+3). In  
715 sensitivity analyses, data was excluded according to the following criteria: post-meal entries  
716 appeared to be made prior than pre-meal entries; data entry outside of liberal time frame for  
717 more than 5 min and more less 3 h time lag between pre- and post-meal (hunger) entries (pre-  
718 and post-meal entries outside of 7:45 am and 10:30 pm (cafeteria opening hours (10:45 am to  
719 7:30 pm) + 3 h data entry time frame); as well as data entry outside of a conservative time  
720 frame more than 20 min and less than 1.5 h time lag between pre- and post-meal (hunger)  
721 entries; (pre- and post-meal entries outside of 9:15 am and 9 pm (cafeteria opening hours + 1.5  
722 h data entry time frame)) (note: we corrected timings indicated in the pre-registration). In sub-  
723 studies 2 and 3 only, duplicate records of the same participant were checked for consistency  
724 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](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. Papiés, 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

## 1015 Figure Legends

1016 Figure 1: Study design: Adults (m, f, d) consuming a single meal in university cafeterias rated hunger and  
1017 mood (and stress) using Likert scales before and after that meal with smartphones or mobile devices, in  
1018 an app study ( $n_1 = 16,135$ , 5-point scales, in dark blue) or in a more detailed web-based survey  
1019 (omnivorous diet habits only, 10-point scales,  $n_2 = 173$ : free choice (in petrol),  $n_3 = 71$ : randomised choice  
1020 (in turquoise)). Photos show exemplary pre- and post-meal plates for both meal categories (in petrol).  
1021 Screenshots taken from iMensa app directly and meal photos provided by study participants (available at  
1022 <https://osf.io/mqc5d/>). Maps for Germany and Austria made by Vemaps.com. Copyright for the app icons  
1023 "iMensa" and "Mensaplan" has been granted by Aimpulse Intelligent Systems GmbH and is under the  
1024 GNU General Public License for the icon for "LimeSurvey" (<https://www.limesurvey.org/>, LimeSurvey  
1025 GmbH, Hamburg, Germany). Images from Flaticon.com (DinosoftLabs and Freepik) and from Apple  
1026 Keynote were used.

1027 Figure 2: Demographic factors and study sample descriptives of sub-studies 1, 2 and 3. On average,  
1028 women were more likely to choose a plant-based meal (app study:  $X^2 = 731.4$ ,  $p < 10^{-10}$ , female = 58%,  
1029 diverse = 45.3%, male = 37.3%; sub-study 2: female = 65%, diverse = 2%, male = 33%; sub-study 3:  
1030 allocation was randomised). Both female and diverse gender reported more than twice as often  
1031 predominantly vegan/vegetarian dietary habits compared to male in the app study ( $X^2 = 1266$ ,  $p < 10^{-10}$ ,  
1032 female = 40.4%, diverse = 54.8%, male = 16.5%). In sub-study 2, neither body mass index (BMI), income  
1033 or general well-being differed across meal categories ( $p_{\text{all}} > 0.26$ ). Omnivorous dieters choosing a plant-  
1034 based meal were characterized by significantly higher habitual fiber intake ( $22 \pm 11$  vs.  $18 \pm 9$  g fiber /  
1035 day,  $p < 0.05$ ) and marginally higher scores for cognitive restraint and hunger in the TFEQ subscales ( $p <$   
1036  $0.05$ ) compared to those choosing animal-based meals (**Table 1**). No differences in personality traits or  
1037 general well-being were found. Respective differences were not significant for the randomised allocation  
1038 samples in sub-study 3. Images from Flaticon.com were used: Freepik (smartphone, diet, water, network,  
1039 eat, clock, broccoli, tofu, peas, chickpea, soy, vegan, sausage, chop, food), Smashicons (brain),  
1040 DinosoftLabs (chicken leg), surgan (seafood).

1041 Figure 3: Mean ratings of pre- and post-meal meal category for hunger, mood/contentment and stress.  
1042 App-study ratings ( $n = 16135$ ) depicted in A) hunger B) mood, C) sub-study 2 with free meal choice  
1043 ( $n=173$ ) and D) sub-study 3 with randomised meal allocation ( $n=78$ ). Median depicted as line, mean as  
1044 dot, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as triangles.

1045 Figure 4: Nutrient composition between meal categories in a subsample of the app-study ( $n_{\text{max}} = 1262$ ,  
1046 data from app study). Macronutrient information per portion size for A) calories in kcal B) fat in grams C)  
1047 saturated fats in grams D) carbohydrates in grams E) sugar in grams and F) protein in grams. Median  
1048 depicted as line, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as dots.

1049 Figure 5: Mean ratings of pre- and post-meal for hunger and mood by white flour vs. whole-grain flour  
1050 bolognese meals (app-study only ( $n = 442$ ) depicted in A) hunger B) mood. Median depicted as line,  
1051 mean as dot, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as triangles.

1052 Figure 6: Post-randomization contentment and post-meal contentment and reasons for the latter (sub-  
1053 study 2,  $n = 71$ ). A) Pre-meal allocation contentment rating (1-10 Likert scale) by meal category. Mean  
1054 depicted as dot. B) Post-meal allocation contentment in categorical answers depicted as frequency by  
1055 meal category. C) Reasons for post-meal contentment in categorical answers depicted as frequency by  
1056 meal category. D) Reasons for post-meal discontentment in categorical answers depicted as frequency  
1057 by meal category.

1058 Figure 7: Effects of taste ratings on hunger and mood by star rating provided (app study only). A) Hunger  
1059 ratings by taste rating from 1 to 5 stars B) Mood ratings by taste rating from 1 to 5 stars. Median depicted  
1060 as line, mean as dot, outliers (according to interquartile rule) as small dots.

1061 Figure 8: Effects of gender on hunger and mood (app study only,  $n_{\text{male}} = 8291$ ,  $n_{\text{female}} = 7418$ ,  $n_{\text{diverse}} =$   
1062  $279$ ). 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****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



B



C



D

