Reducing Meat Consumption by Appealing to Animal Welfare: Protocol for a Meta-Analysis and Theoretical Review

Maya B. Mathur^{*1}, Thomas N. Robinson^{†2}, David B. Reichling^{‡3}, Christopher D. Gardner^{§4}, Janice Nadler^{¶5,6}, Paul A. Bain^{||7}, and Jacob Peacock^{**8}

¹Quantitative Sciences Unit, Stanford University

²Stanford Solutions Science Lab, Department of Pediatrics, Stanford University

³Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, University of California at San Francisco (ret.)

⁴Stanford Prevention Research Center, Stanford University

⁵American Bar Foundation

⁶Pritzker School of Law, Northwestern University

⁷Countway Library of Medicine, Harvard University

⁸The Humane League Labs

¹ *Authorship order after the first author was randomized.*

^{*}Correspondence to: Maya B. Mathur (mmathur@stanford.edu), Quantitative Sciences Unit, 1701 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA, 94304.

[†]tom.robinson@stanford.edu

[‡]nervefiber@gmail.com

[§]cgardner@stanford.edu

[¶]jnadler@law.northwestern.edu

^{||}paul_bain@hms.harvard.edu

^{**}jpeacock@thehumaneleague.org

Abstract

Background: Reducing meat consumption may improve human health, curb environmental damage and greenhouse gas emissions, and limit the large-scale suffering of animals raised in factory farms. Previous work has begun to develop interventions to reduce individual meat consumption, often by appealing directly to individual health motivations. However, research on nutritional behavior change suggests that interventions additionally linking behavior to ethical values, identity formation, and existing social movements may be particularly effective and longer-lasting. Regarding meat consumption, preliminary evidence and psychological theory suggest that appeals related to animal welfare may have considerable potential to effectively leverage these elements of human psychology. We aim to conduct a systematic review and quantitative meta-analysis evaluating the effectiveness of animal welfare-related appeals on actual or intended meat consumption or purchasing. Our investigation will critically synthesize the current state of knowledge regarding psychological mechanisms of intervening on individual meat consumption and empirically identify the psychological characteristics underlying the most effective animal welfare-based interventions.

Methods: We will systematically search eight academic databases and extensively search unpublished grey literature. We will include studies that assess interventions intended to reduce meat consumption or purchase through the mention or portrayal of animal welfare, that measure outcomes related to meat consumption or purchase, and that have a control condition. Eligible studies may recruit from any human population, be written in any language, and be published or released any time. We will meta-analyze the studies, reporting the pooled point estimate and additional metrics that describe the distribution of potentially heterogeneous effects. We will assess studies' risk of bias and conduct sensitivity analyses for publication bias. We describe possible follow-up analyses to investigate hypothesized moderators of intervention effectiveness.

Discussion: The findings of the proposed systematic review and meta-analysis, including any identified methodological limitations of the existing literature, could inform the design of successful evidence-based interventions with broad potential to improve human, animal, and environmental well-being.

Systematic review registration: The protocol was preregistered via the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/d3y56/registrations>).

Key words: Behavior change, nutrition, meat consumption, meat paradox, animal welfare

36

1. BACKGROUND

37 Excessive consumption of meat and animal products may be deleterious to human health
38 (with meta-analytic evidence regarding cancer^{26;11;15;9}, cardiovascular disease^{17;10;51}, metabolic
39 disease^{35;23;14}, obesity⁴¹, stroke²², and all-cause mortality^{49;25}, albeit sometimes subject
40 to methodological limitations), promotes the emergence and spread of antibiotic-resistant
41 pathogens²⁹, is a major source of greenhouse gas emissions and environmental degradation⁴⁴,
42 and contributes to market demand for industry practices that cause the preventable suffering
43 of more than one billion animals in the United States annually⁴⁵. Therefore, developing
44 simple, effective interventions to reduce meat consumption could carry widespread societal
45 benefits. Direct appeals regarding individual health may be effective⁵, but comparatively
46 little attention has been devoted to appeals regarding animal welfare⁵. However, the nascent
47 literature on the psychology of meat consumption suggests that animal welfare appeals
48 might be particularly promising³⁴. Whereas behavior-change appeals emphasizing individual
49 health sometimes suffer from high recidivism^{37;16}, interventions that instead link behavior
50 to ethical values, self-identity, and existing social movements may be especially potent and
51 long-lasting^{37;38;47}. Interventions of this type, sometimes termed “stealth interventions”, have
52 for example successfully reduced childhood obesity-related behaviors and risk factors for
53 cardiovascular disease and diabetes by appealing to cultural and ethical values in order to
54 increase physical activity, rather than by appealing directly to obesity reduction or other
55 health benefits^{39;40;50}.

56 Ethical concern about farm animal suffering is now a majority stance in several developed
57 countries⁷, yet meat consumption remains nearly universal (the “meat paradox”³). How
58 does meat-eating behavior survive the resulting cognitive dissonance? Individuals may, post
59 hoc, reduce their attributions of mind and sentience to meat animals, limiting the moral
60 relevance of eating meat. For example, subjects randomly assigned to eat beef subsequently
61 reported that cows are less capable of suffering, and they showed less moral concern, than

subjects randomly assigned to eat nuts²⁸. Simple appeals encouraging mind attribution to meat animals may disarm this dissonance-reduction strategy, thus reducing willingness to eat meat^{4;24;1}. Additionally, physical disgust and moral disgust are closely intertwined. Experiencing physical disgust can amplify negative moral judgments, even when the two sources of disgust are conceptually unrelated (e.g., viewing physically disgusting video clips versus judging cheating behavior); conversely, experiencing moral disgust can induce physical disgust⁶. Given the powerful impact of physical disgust on food choices⁴³, evoking moral disgust regarding animal suffering may be a particularly potent means of shaping food choices¹². Furthermore, many appeals regarding animal suffering are themselves physically disgusting (e.g., by depicting conditions in factory farms), perhaps further leveraging the moral-physical disgust connection.

Piggybacking onto an existing, more broadly-based social movement regarding farm animal welfare may further enhance the impacts of such interventions by triggering additional “process motivations” for participation^{37;38}. That is, the process of participating in a social movement (e.g., reducing meat consumption due to ethical concerns) may be motivating in itself, above and beyond the motivation provided by the ultimate outcomes of participation (e.g., improved animal welfare). In addition to providing opportunities for self-, group- and social-identity development, participation in a social movement may also provide opportunities for social interaction, perceived belonging, social support, behavioral modeling, and activities that boost perceptions of collective efficacy². This may reduce risks of perceived individual failure and associated threats to self-efficacy² by defining participation in the movement itself as a success.^{37;38} A broader social movement may additionally trigger group- or societal-level changes (e.g., increased public attention, shifting norms regarding meat consumption, or decreased availability or increased prices of meat) that may alter the social and physical environments to make it easier to sustain the new behaviors.^{37;38}

Recognition of this rich social, moral, and affective psychology underlying meat consumption^{27;42} has led to some promising, theoretically motivated academic work on new

intervention strategies employing animal welfare-based appeals. In addition to that academic literature, evidence-based nonprofits have also started to produce some well-conducted, pragmatic experiments that have been reported in a separate body of “grey” literature. Through an interdisciplinary collaboration whose combined expertise spans nutrition, psychology, nonprofit research, statistics, and systematic reviews, we will conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to address the primary research question: “How effective are animal welfare appeals at reducing consumption of meat or animal products?” We define “meat” as edible animal flesh and “animal products” as other edible products harvested from animals, such as eggs and milk. As a second objective, we will evaluate risks of bias in this literature. As a third objective, we will discuss theoretical advances underlying effective interventions based on animal welfare appeals, highlighting any interesting connections between existing theories, which have often been pursued in isolation, and suggesting potential future directions for experimental psychology research.

2. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW METHODS

2.1. Eligibility criteria

Eligible studies will satisfy the following criteria:

- **Population:** Studies recruiting subjects from any human population, including online crowdsourcing websites, are eligible.
- **Intervention:** Our review will consider animal welfare appeals on meat consumption or purchase. Specifically, the intervention must be intended to reduce meat consumption or purchase and must include any explicit or implicit mention or portrayal of farmed animals, their suffering, their slaughter, or their welfare. Interventions need not specifically mention meat consumption or purchase. Interventions must directly depict or refer to farmed animals or items directly related to their welfare in any graphical,

visual, textual, or auditory format. Any format and duration of intervention is eligible. Composite interventions including both an animal welfare appeal and some other form of appeal (e.g., environmental) are eligible^a.

- **Comparison:** The study must include a control group, condition, or time period not subjected to any form of intervention intended to change meat consumption (e.g., a two-group study comparing an animal welfare appeal to an environmental appeal also intended to reduce meat consumption would be ineligible). Not exhaustively, eligible study designs therefore include randomized controlled trials, repeated-measures designs in which subjects serve as their own controls, and quasi-experiments such as interrupted time series analyses. For example, a repeated-measures study might estimate the difference in subjects' meat consumption after versus before all subjects are exposed to an eligible intervention. In a quasi-experiment, posters encouraging reduced meat consumption might be introduced to a cafeteria on a particular day, with meat consumption measured before and after this intervention.

- **Outcome:** Our review will consider meat consumption or purchase as outcomes. Specifically, the outcome must be actual (i.e., behaviorally measured rather than reported), self-reported, or intended consumption or purchase of meat or animal products. Willingness to pay for these products is an eligible outcome, though we anticipate that most such studies will include only comparisons of different meat products without a non-meat option, hence failing the previous inclusion criterion requiring a control condition. Studies assessing these outcomes in virtual or lab environments are eligible. Studies measuring only a specific type of meat or animal product (e.g., chicken) are eligible. Outcomes such as empathy, affective responses to meat, beliefs about factory farming, etc., are ineligible, though these outcomes may be relevant for

^aPer Section 3, we will conduct sensitivity analyses excluding composite interventions. We use “sensitivity analysis” to refer to analyses designed to assess the extent to which the results of primary analyses are affected by different design or analysis choices (e.g., alternative inclusion criteria or different statistical model specifications) or to internal biases such as publication bias²¹. Examples of eligible interventions are provided in **Additional file 1, Section 1**.

narrative discussion in the theoretical review. Table 1 provides examples of eligible outcome measures by category and method of measurement (actual, self-reported, or intended).

- **Time frame:** Articles released or published at any point prior to our final search are eligible.

Table 1: *Examples of eligible outcome measures by category (consumption or purchase) and method of measurement*

Measurement	Meat consumption	Meat purchase
Actual	Amount of meat (e.g., by weight) that subject self-served at a buffet	Total cost of meat purchases listed on subject's last grocery-store receipt
Self-reported	Amount of meat that subject reports having eaten during the past week	Amount of money that subject reports having spent on meat during the past week
Intended	Amount of meat that subject reports intending to eat during the next week	Reported willingness to pay for a meat versus non-meat dish

2.1.1 Search, review, and data extraction methods

In Stage 1 searches, we will search both the peer-reviewed literature and the grey literature to identify eligible articles. Then, in Stage 2 searches, we will use “snowballing” of the articles identified in Stage 1 to attempt to identify additional articles, as described below. We will include articles and grey literature published or released at any time and written in any language, seeking translation for full texts if necessary.

2.1.2 Stage 1 searches

Journal articles and academic grey literature We developed a sensitive search strategy for peer-reviewed literature in collaboration with an academic reference librarian (PAB). We will search eight databases (Medline, Embase, Web of Science, PsycInfo, CAB Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, and PolicyFile) using search terms

in **Additional file 1, Section 2**. A pilot search using these terms retrieved 3,779 articles after removing duplicates.

Non-academic grey literature An author (JP) who is the director of an evidence-based animal welfare research organization will lead the search for non-academic grey literature. We will identify relevant studies conducted or referenced by evidence-based animal welfare organizations by searching, not exhaustively, the websites of Faunalytics, Animal Welfare Action Lab, The Humane League Labs, Mercy for Animals, Animal Charity Evaluators, and Better Buying Lab (**Additional file 1, Section 3**). Additionally, JP will use his professional knowledge and personal contacts to identify other unpublished studies.

2.1.3 Stage 2 searches

In the Stage 2 searches, we will attempt to find missed articles by reviewing the reference lists of eligible and closely relevant articles identified during Stage 1. We will also consider sending a survey to corresponding authors of such studies and researchers at top animal welfare organizations to solicit leads to additional published or unpublished studies that may be eligible.

2.1.4 Article review

We will review articles and manage data using the software applications Covidence⁸ and Microsoft Excel. Each article retrieved from an academic database in Stage 1 will first undergo title/abstract screening by at least two reviewers. In this stage, reviewers will exclude articles that clearly fail the inclusion criteria. Remaining articles will proceed to a full-text screening, during which at least two reviewers will specifically assess each inclusion criterion. We will resolve conflicts between reviewers through discussion or adjudication by other authors. For articles identified through manual searches of grey literature or the manual processes in Stage 2, the author on our team who identified the article will assess whether the article clearly

fails inclusion criteria, conservatively retaining articles for further review that might satisfy inclusion criteria. These remaining articles will be entered in Covidence for full-text screening. We henceforth refer to articles ultimately judged to meet all inclusion criteria as “eligible”.

2.2. Data extraction methods

For each eligible article that reports sufficient statistical information, the statistician (MBM) will extract point estimate(s) and variance estimate(s) most closely approximating the treatment effect of the animal welfare appeal (see **Additional file 1, Section 4** for details). When relevant statistics are not reported, we will hand-calculate them from available statistics, plots, or publicly available datasets as feasible, or will contact study authors. Articles reporting multiple point estimates on separate subject samples or on samples sharing a control group may contribute all of these point estimates to the analyses; Section 3 discusses statistical assumptions regarding independence and alternative models if independence assumptions may be violated.

Articles reporting multiple point estimates on entirely overlapping samples (e.g., from a study measuring multiple eligible outcomes) may similarly contribute one point estimate per eligible intervention and outcome because different point estimates may be relevant to different moderator analyses described in Section 3. However, point estimates on entirely overlapping samples will not be included together in the same meta-analysis. Similarly, if multiple articles report on the same study, we will include the point estimate from the study with the largest sample size. For the main, overall analysis, we will designate a primary point estimate for each study with multiple eligible point estimates on the same subject sample as follows. With the following criteria considered in order, interventions will be given precedence when they are specific to animal welfare (e.g., they do not include other types of appeals), when they have the most detailed content, and when they have the longest duration. Some studies may report consumption of all meat or all animal products as well as of specific types of meats, in which case the outcome that most closely matches the intended scope

of the intervention will be given precedence (e.g., the outcome “beef consumption” for an intervention specifically targeting beef consumption; the outcome “all-meat consumption” for an intervention targeting all-meat consumption). As described in Section 3, we also plan to conduct sensitivity analyses excluding interventions that target consumption of a specific type of meat, rather than consumption of all meats. For longitudinal studies, outcomes measured with the longest follow-up will be given precedence.

3. QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE ANALYSES

3.1. Qualitative review

We will use a table to describe study characteristics, such as the study’s randomization status, the specific intervention and outcome (including which specific meats or animal products were included in the outcome measure), the length of follow-up between the intervention and outcome measurement, subject demographics (e.g., location, percent of male subjects, mean age), and the analyzed sample size. We will also descriptively present a table of risk-of-bias criteria (e.g., Table 2). To develop our risk of bias tool, we adapted from the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool for randomized studies²⁰ those criteria that are relevant to the literature we intend to synthesize (e.g., criteria related to selection bias, attrition bias, and reporting bias), removed some criteria that are not relevant or feasible for this literature (e.g., regarding blinding), and expanded the generic category “Other bias” into criteria of particular relevance to this literature (e.g., regarding the quality of outcome measurement and the potential for social desirability bias). We adapted the existing items in order, for example, to allow assessment of the stated type of bias in the diverse study designs that we expected to encounter. To develop the tool, a group of authors (MBM, JP, DBR, JN) read studies known to meet eligibility criteria and, based on their combined expertise in meta-analysis methodology and in research on interventions to reduce meat consumption, developed the risk of bias tool through discussion, piloting on eligible studies, and iterative revision.

For the narrative review of psychological theory underlying the interventions, we will read eligible articles in depth to identify categories of proposed mechanisms or theoretical motivations (e.g., attribution of sentience to meat animals). We will discuss the state of theoretical development and open issues in each of these categories, paying particular attention to any longitudinal studies that conduct mediation analyses using measurements of proposed mechanistic variables (e.g., a subject's estimate of a cow's capacity to suffer) occurring after exposure to the intervention and before measurement of the outcome. We may also discuss articles that contribute useful theoretical insights but that are not eligible for inclusion in the quantitative meta-analyses, for example because they measure proposed mechanistic variables without an eligible outcome measure of meat consumption or purchase.

3.2. Quantitative meta-analyses

3.2.1 Primary analyses and sensitivity analyses

Pilot searches indicate that quantitative meta-analysis will be feasible. These searches indicated that at least 20 published and unpublished papers, totaling at least 50 point estimates, will meet inclusion criteria. Additionally, interventions to date have many common elements of design and delivery, such that a random-effects estimate of their mean treatment effect should have a meaningful interpretation. The statistician (MBM) will conduct all statistical analyses in R³⁶. We will extract point estimates on the risk ratio scale (see **Additional file 1** for details). We will fit random-effects meta-analysis models using restricted maximum likelihood (REML) via the R package `metafor`. If the point estimates appear non-normal or if many studies contribute multiple point estimates, potentially introducing correlation between point estimates, we will instead (or additionally) fit a robust semiparametric meta-analysis model using the R package `robmeta`^{18;13}. Reporting will focus primarily on point estimates, 95% confidence intervals, and *p*-values for the mean effect size and the estimated standard deviation of the effect sizes ($\hat{\tau}$). We will report *p*-values as continuous metrics rather than

relative to a dichotomous α threshold.

For the primary analysis, we will estimate the interventions' average effect size by meta-analyzing the point estimates from all eligible studies that provided sufficient information to extract data. We have designated this analysis as primary because it represents a reasonable first step in pursuing the first quantitative meta-analysis of this nascent literature. The primary analysis will aggregate across all eligible outcomes (Table 1) rather than distinguish between main versus additional outcome measures because we anticipate that a large majority of studies will fall into only one or two categories of outcomes. However, as described in Section 3.2.2 below, we will conduct subset or moderator analyses by outcome if feasible.

If the interventions' effects appear heterogeneous based on the statistical estimate of their standard deviation ($\hat{\tau}$), we will characterize heterogeneity as follows. First, we will estimate the percentage of true effects that are stronger than various effect-size thresholds (e.g., risk ratios of 1, 1.1, and 1.2)^{31;33}. We will additionally estimate the percentage of true effects with risk ratios less than 1, representing unintended *detrimental* effects of the interventions^{31;33}. These metrics can help identify if: (1) there are few effects of scientifically meaningful size despite a "statistically significant" pooled point estimate; (2) there are some large effects despite an apparently null point estimate; or (3) strong effects in the direction opposite of the pooled estimate also regularly occur^{31;33}. Second, as a hypothesis-generating method to help identify the individual interventions that appear most effective, we will estimate the true effect size in each study using a nonparametric shrinkage method⁴⁸, qualitatively reviewing the characteristics of those interventions with the largest estimated true effect sizes.

We will conduct several sensitivity analyses regarding statistical biases and the scope of articles included in the analysis. First, we will assess publication bias using selection model methods⁴⁶, sensitivity analysis methods³⁰, and the significance funnel plot³⁰. Given the relatively small anticipated number of eligible studies, we anticipate that selection models may fail to converge or may provide extremely wide, uninformative confidence intervals^b,

^bConvergence failure means that a statistical method is unable to arrive at a numerical estimate, usually due to small sample sizes or extreme distributions of data. Wide confidence intervals reflect uncertainty about

in which case we may omit them and present only the sensitivity analysis approach. As a further sensitivity analysis, we will exclude: (1) composite interventions (e.g., appeals discussing both animal welfare and carbon emissions); (2) studies that were borderline with respect to the inclusion criteria²¹; and (3) interventions targeting consumption of only a specific type of meat (e.g., beef) rather than consumption of all meat, which might potentially shift consumption from one type of meat to another (e.g., chicken) without reducing total consumption. If statistical confounding appears to be a widespread problem, we will consider conducting relevant sensitivity analyses³².

3.2.2 Secondary analyses

We will consider using meta-regression or subset analyses to assess the role of hypothesized moderators (e.g., Table 3), but we anticipate that sample sizes may be inadequate to yield precise conclusions using this approach. Additionally, we anticipate that most studies will report outcomes in terms of changes in servings of meat. We will conduct secondary analyses in which we instead express intervention effectiveness using metrics that more directly characterize societal impact, such as: (1) the estimated reduction in human all-cause mortality events²⁵; (2) the estimated reduction in the number of animals reared for consumption; and (3) the estimated reductions in greenhouse gas emissions based on estimates for different types of animals¹⁹. We will conduct separate meta-analyses using each of these three metrics.

4. DISCUSSION

Developing effective interventions to reduce excessive meat consumption could carry broad societal benefits to human health, animal welfare, and the environment. Interventions involving appeals regarding animal welfare may have unique potential to transform widespread ethical concerns about farm animal suffering into actual behavioral change and to tap potent psychological levers, such as cognitive dissonance and the connection between physical

a point estimate and can occur when the data do not provide enough information for precise estimation.

and moral disgust. However, these types of interventions have received little academic attention to date. The present systematic review will discuss theoretical advances underlying effective interventions based on animal welfare appeals. By further conducting the first quantitative meta-analysis of animal welfare-based appeals to reduce meat consumption, we will estimate the effectiveness of the interventions that have been attempted to date, assess what characteristics of interventions may contribute to greater effectiveness, and present findings using metrics that directly summarize their societal impact on human health, animal welfare, and the environment. Last, by carefully assessing risks of bias of the existing literature, we will provide concrete methodological recommendations for future work.

ABBREVIATIONS

REML: Restricted maximum likelihood

DECLARATIONS

Availability of data and materials

The manuscript will report and justify any deviations from the preregistration, and any analyses introduced post hoc will be delineated as such. All data, materials, and analysis code required to reproduce all results will be publicly released on the first author's Open Science Framework or Github repositories immediately upon publication (or earlier if possible given journal policies).

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Funding

This research was funded by The Pershing Square Fund for Research on the Foundations of Human Behavior. The funders had no role in the design, conduct, or reporting.

Authors' contributions

MBM conceptualized the project and serves as its guarantor. MBM, JP, DBR, and PAB designed the methodology. MBM designed statistical analyses. DBR, JP, JN, and MBM reviewed articles for eligibility. MBM led manuscript-writing, with all authors contributing critical revisions. All authors read and approved the final draft.

Acknowledgments

Jo Anderson (Research Director, Faunalytics) provided helpful suggestions on a draft of this protocol. Sophie Attwood (Senior Behavioral Scientist, Better Buying Lab) provided leads to grey literature.

REFERENCES

- [1] Catherine E Amiot, Guy El Hajj Boutros, Ksenia Sukhanova, and Antony D Karelis. Testing a novel multicomponent intervention to reduce meat consumption in young men. *PloS One*, 13(10):e0204590, 2018.
- [2] Albert Bandura. Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory. In David F Marks, editor, *The health psychology reader*, page 94. 2002.
- [3] Brock Bastian and Steve Loughnan. Resolving the meat-paradox: A motivational account of morally troublesome behavior and its maintenance. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21(3):278–299, 2017.

- [4] Brock Bastian, Steve Loughnan, Nick Haslam, and Helena RM Radke. Don't mind meat? The denial of mind to animals used for human consumption. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(2):247–256, 2012.
- [5] Filippo Bianchi, Claudia Dorsel, Emma Garnett, Paul Aveyard, and Susan A Jebb. Interventions targeting conscious determinants of human behaviour to reduce the demand for meat: a systematic review with qualitative comparative analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 15(1):102, 2018.
- [6] Hanah A Chapman and Adam K Anderson. Things rank and gross in nature: a review and synthesis of moral disgust. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(2):300, 2013.
- [7] Amelia Cornish, David Raubenheimer, and Paul McGreevy. What we know about the public's level of concern for farm animal welfare in food production in developed countries. *Animals*, 6(11):74, 2016.
- [8] Covidence Development Team. *Covidence systematic review software*. Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia, 2019.
- [9] Alessio Crippa, Susanna C Larsson, Andrea Discacciati, Alicja Wolk, and Nicola Orsini. Red and processed meat consumption and risk of bladder cancer: a dose-response meta-analysis of epidemiological studies. *European Journal of Nutrition*, 57(2):689–701, 2018.
- [10] Kun Cui, Yabin Liu, Lingjun Zhu, Xia Mei, Ping Jin, and Yuhui Luo. Association between intake of red and processed meat and the risk of heart failure: a meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1):354, 2019.
- [11] Maryam S Farvid, Mariana C Stern, Teresa Norat, Shizuka Sasazuki, Paolo Vineis, Matty P Weijenberg, Alicja Wolk, Kana Wu, Bernard W Stewart, and Eunyoung Cho. Consumption of red and processed meat and breast cancer incidence: A systematic

review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *International Journal of Cancer*, 143(11):2787–2799, 2018.

[12] Matthew Feinberg, Chloe Kovacheff, Rimma Teper, and Yoel Inbar. Understanding the process of moralization: How eating meat becomes a moral issue. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2019.

[13] Zachary Fisher and Elizabeth Tipton. Robumeta: An R-package for robust variance estimation in meta-analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02220*, 2015.

[14] Amanda M Fretts, Jack L Follis, Jennifer A Nettleton, Rozenn N Lemaitre, Julius S Ngwa, Mary K Wojczynski, Ioanna Panagiota Kalafati, Tibor V Varga, Alexis C Frazier-Wood, Denise K Houston, et al. Consumption of meat is associated with higher fasting glucose and insulin concentrations regardless of glucose and insulin genetic risk scores: a meta-analysis of 50,345 caucasians. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 102(5):1266–1278, 2015.

[15] Patrizia Gnagnarella, Saverio Caini, Patrick Maisonneuve, and Sara Gandini. Carcinogenicity of high consumption of meat and lung cancer risk among non-smokers: a comprehensive meta-analysis. *Nutrition and Cancer*, 70(1):1–13, 2018.

[16] Bruce J Grattan and Josephine Connolly-Schoonen. Addressing weight loss recidivism: a clinical focus on metabolic rate and the psychological aspects of obesity. *ISRN Obesity*, 2012, 2012.

[17] Marta Guasch-Ferré, Ambika Satija, Stacy A Blondin, Marie Janiszewski, Ester Emlen, Lauren E O’Connor, Wayne W Campbell, Frank B Hu, Walter C Willett, and Meir J Stampfer. Meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials of red meat consumption in comparison with various comparison diets on cardiovascular risk factors. *Circulation*, 139(15):1828–1845, 2019.

- [18] Larry V Hedges, Elizabeth Tipton, and Matthew C Johnson. Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 1(1):39–65, 2010.
- [19] Mario Herrero, Petr Havlík, Hugo Valin, An Notenbaert, Mariana C Rufino, Philip K Thornton, Michael Blümmel, Franz Weiss, Delia Grace, and Michael Obersteiner. Biomass use, production, feed efficiencies, and greenhouse gas emissions from global livestock systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(52):20888–20893, 2013.
- [20] Julian PT Higgins, Douglas G Altman, Peter C Gøtzsche, Peter Jüni, David Moher, Andrew D Oxman, Jelena Savović, Kenneth F Schulz, Laura Weeks, and Jonathan AC Sterne. The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*, 343:d5928, 2011.
- [21] Julian PT Higgins and Sally Green. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*, volume 4. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [22] Kyuwoong Kim, Junghyeon Hyeon, Sang Ah Lee, Sung Ok Kwon, Hyejin Lee, NaNa Keum, Jong-Koo Lee, and Sang Min Park. Role of total, red, processed, and white meat consumption in stroke incidence and mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, 6(9):e005983, 2017.
- [23] Youngyo Kim and Youjin Je. Meat consumption and risk of metabolic syndrome: Results from the Korean population and a meta-analysis of observational studies. *Nutrients*, 10(4):390, 2018.
- [24] Jonas R Kunst and Sigrid M Hohle. Meat eaters by dissociation: How we present, prepare and talk about meat increases willingness to eat meat by reducing empathy and disgust. *Appetite*, 105:758–774, 2016.

- [25] Susanna C Larsson and Nicola Orsini. Red meat and processed meat consumption and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 179(3):282–289, 2013.
- [26] Susanna C Larsson and Alicja Wolk. Meat consumption and risk of colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *International Journal of Cancer*, 119(11):2657–2664, 2006.
- [27] Steve Loughnan, Brock Bastian, and Nick Haslam. The psychology of eating animals. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(2):104–108, 2014.
- [28] Steve Loughnan, Nick Haslam, and Brock Bastian. The role of meat consumption in the denial of moral status and mind to meat animals. *Appetite*, 55(1):156–159, 2010.
- [29] Bonnie Marshall and Stuart Levy. Food animals and antimicrobials: Impacts on human health.
- [30] M Mathur and TJ VanderWeele. Sensitivity analysis for publication bias in meta-analyses. 2019. Preprint retrieved from <https://osf.io/s9dp6/>.
- [31] Maya B Mathur and Tyler J VanderWeele. New metrics for meta-analyses of heterogeneous effects. *Statistics in Medicine*, 2018.
- [32] Maya B Mathur and Tyler J VanderWeele. Sensitivity analysis for unmeasured confounding in meta-analyses. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–20, 2019.
- [33] Maya B Mathur and Tyler J VanderWeele. Robust metrics and sensitivity analyses for meta-analyses of heterogeneous effects. *Epidemiology*, in press.
- [34] Gonzalo Palomo-Vélez, Joshua M Tybur, and Mark van Vugt. Unsustainable, unhealthy, or disgusting? comparing different persuasive messages against meat consumption. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 58:63–71, 2018.

- [35] An Pan, Qi Sun, Adam M Bernstein, Matthias B Schulze, JoAnn E Manson, Walter C Willett, and Frank B Hu. Red meat consumption and risk of type 2 diabetes: 3 cohorts of us adults and an updated meta-analysis. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, 94(4):1088–1096, 2011.
- [36] R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2019.
- [37] Thomas N Robinson. Save the world, prevent obesity: piggybacking on existing social and ideological movements. *Obesity*, 18(S1):S17–S22, 2010.
- [38] Thomas N. Robinson. Stealth interventions for obesity: strategies for behavioral, social, and policy changes. In Kelly D. Brownell and B. Timothy Walsh, editors, *Eating disorders and obesity: a comprehensive handbook*, chapter 99, pages 609–613. Guilford Publications, 2017.
- [39] Thomas N Robinson, Joel D Killen, Helena C Kraemer, Darrell M Wilson, Donna M Matheson, William L Haskell, Leslie A Pruitt, Tiffany M Powell, AS Owens, and NS Thompson. Dance and reducing television viewing to prevent weight gain in African-American girls: the Stanford GEMS pilot study. *Ethnicity and Disease*, 13(1; SUPP/1):S1–65, 2003.
- [40] Thomas N Robinson, Donna M Matheson, Helena C Kraemer, Darrell M Wilson, Eva Obarzanek, Nikko S Thompson, Sofiya Alhassan, Tirzah R Spencer, K Farish Haydel, Michelle Fujimoto, et al. A randomized controlled trial of culturally tailored dance and reducing screen time to prevent weight gain in low-income african american girls: Stanford gems. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 164(11):995–1004, 2010.
- [41] MH Rouhani, A Salehi-Abargouei, PJ Surkan, and L Azadbakht. Is there a relationship between red or processed meat intake and obesity? a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Obesity Reviews*, 15(9):740–748, 2014.

- [42] Paul Rozin. Towards a psychology of food and eating: From motivation to module to model to marker, morality, meaning, and metaphor. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 5(1):18–24, 1996.
- [43] Paul Rozin and April Fallon. The psychological categorization of foods and non-foods: A preliminary taxonomy of food rejections. *Appetite*, 1(3):193–201, 1980.
- [44] K Sakadevan and ML Nguyen. Livestock production and its impact on nutrient pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. *Advances in Agronomy*, 141, 2017.
- [45] National Agricultural Statistics Service (USDA/NASS) U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- [46] Jack L Vevea and Larry V Hedges. A general linear model for estimating effect size in the presence of publication bias. *Psychometrika*, 60(3):419–435, 1995.
- [47] Gregory M Walton. The new science of wise psychological interventions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(1):73–82, 2014.
- [48] Chia-Chun Wang and Wen-Chung Lee. A simple method to estimate prediction intervals and predictive distributions: Summarizing meta-analyses beyond means and confidence intervals. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 2019.
- [49] Xia Wang, Xinying Lin, Ying Y Ouyang, Jun Liu, Gang Zhao, An Pan, and Frank B Hu. Red and processed meat consumption and mortality: dose–response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Public Health Nutrition*, 19(5):893–905, 2016.
- [50] Dana L Weintraub, Evelyn C Tirumalai, K Farish Haydel, Michelle Fujimoto, Janet E Fulton, and Thomas N Robinson. Team sports for overweight children: The Stanford Sports to Prevent Obesity Randomized Trial (SPORT). *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 162(3):232–237, 2008.
- [51] Yi Zhang and Dian-zhong Zhang. Red meat, poultry, and egg consumption with the

488 risk of hypertension: A meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Journal of Human*
489 *Hypertension*, 32(7):507, 2018.

Table 2: *Criteria for risk of bias*

Criterion	Example of low risk of bias	Example of high risk of bias
Exchangeability of the control and intervention groups	The study is randomized.	The study is observational with uncontrolled self-selection into the intervention group (e.g., inducing confounding by pre-existing interest in dietary change).
Proximity of the outcome measure to actual meat consumption or purchase	The study measures meat consumption using subjects' actual food choices in a cafeteria.	The study measures subjects' intended meat consumption.
Missing data	Nearly all enrolled subjects completed the intervention and provided outcome measures.	Many subjects failed to complete the intervention or were lost to follow-up before the outcome was measured.
Minimization of social desirability biases and demand characteristics	The intervention was subtly embedded in a decoy task about a topic unrelated to meat consumption, leading subjects to believe the study was not about meat consumption.	Subjects interact with experimenters who are clearly identifiable as animal welfare advocates.
Potential for selective reporting	The study was preregistered.	The study was not preregistered.
Analytic reproducibility	The study has publicly available data, materials, and code.	The study does not have publicly available data, materials, or code.

Table 3: *Hypothesized moderators for meta-regressive or subset analyses*

Hypothesized moderator	Possible categories for analysis
Study design	Randomized vs. all other designs
Sex ratio of subjects	0-30% female vs. 30-70% female vs. 70-100% female
Psychological theory/theories underlying the intervention	Mind attribution vs. disgust vs. social norms, etc.
Intensiveness of intervention	Total length of time subjects are exposed to intervention
Length of follow-up between intervention and outcome measurement	Days (continuous) or > 1 day vs. ≤ 1 day
Proximity of the outcome measure to actual meat consumption or purchase	Behaviorally measured vs. self-reported vs. intended consumption or purchase
Scope of meat outcome	All-meat consumption vs. any subset of meats (where studies excluding seafood consumption will be in the latter category)

Additional File 1: Reducing Meat Consumption by Appealing to Animal Welfare

CONTENTS

1	Examples of eligible interventions	1
2	Search terms by database	1
2.1	MEDLINE (Ovid)	1
2.2	Embase (Elsevier)	2
2.3	Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics)	2
2.4	PsycINFO (EBSCO)	2
2.5	CAB Abstracts (Clarivate Analytics)	3
2.6	Sociological Abstracts (ProQuest)	3
2.7	ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (ProQuest)	3
2.8	PolicyFile (ProQuest)	3
3	Examples of websites to be searched for grey literature	4
4	Details of data extraction	4

1. EXAMPLES OF ELIGIBLE INTERVENTIONS

Regarding explicit and implicit interventions, an eligible explicit intervention might involve calling subjects and asking them to reduce meat consumption in order to reduce animal suffering. An eligible implicit intervention might involve posting in a cafeteria photographs of animals reared in factory farms. Regarding direct depictions of or references to animal welfare, an intervention consisting only of a photograph of empty gestation crates would be eligible, but not an intervention consisting only of photographs of meat being processed in a physically disgusting manner. Possible examples of different formats and durations of interventions include durations of interventions: attendance in a class, receipt of daily text messages, receipt of a leaflet or mock news article, and exposure to a 10-minute video.

2. SEARCH TERMS BY DATABASE

2.1. MEDLINE (Ovid)

(animal welfare/ OR emotions/ OR disgust/ OR fear/ OR guilt/ OR empathy/ OR morals/ OR (emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR cognitive dissonan* OR meat paradox).ab,ti OR (animal* adj6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR well being

OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*).ab,ti) AND ((meat* OR animal product* OR beef OR veal OR lamb OR pork OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR pig OR cow OR sheep) adj6 (consum* OR eat? OR eating OR ate OR intak* OR purchas* OR buy* OR demand* OR choos* OR choice* OR avoid* OR prefer*).ab,ti

2.2. Embase (Elsevier)

('animal welfare'/exp OR 'emotion'/de OR 'disgust'/de OR 'fear'/de OR 'guilt'/de OR 'empathy'/exp OR 'morality'/exp OR (emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR 'cognitive dissonan*' OR 'meat paradox'):ab,ti OR (animal* NEAR/6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR 'well being' OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*)):ab,ti) AND ('meat consumption'/exp OR ((meat* OR 'animal product*' OR beef OR veal OR lamb OR pork OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR pig OR cow OR sheep) NEAR/6 (consum* OR eat OR eats OR eating OR ate OR intak* OR purchas* OR buy* OR demand* OR choos* OR choice* OR avoid* OR prefer*)):ab,ti)

2.3. Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics)

TS=("emotion*" OR "affective" OR "disgust*" OR "fear" OR "guilt*" OR "empath*" OR "suffer*" OR "moral*" OR "ethic*" OR "humane*" OR "anthropomorph*" OR "belief*" OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR ("animal*" NEAR/6 ("welfare" OR "rights" OR "wellbeing" OR "well being" OR "cruel*" OR "abuse" OR "mistreat*"))) AND TS=((("meat*" OR "animal product*" OR "beef" OR "veal" OR "lamb" OR "pork" OR "poultry" OR "chicken" OR "turkey" OR "pig" OR "cow" OR "sheep") NEAR/6 ("consum*" OR "eat" OR "eats" OR "eating" OR "ate" OR "intak*" OR "purchas*" OR "buy*" OR "demand*" OR "choos*" OR "choice*" OR "avoid*" OR "prefer*"))

2.4. PsycINFO (EBSCO)

(DE ("Animal Welfare" OR "Animal Cruelty" OR "Animal Rights" OR "Emotional Content" OR "Emotional Responses" OR "Emotions" OR "Disgust" OR "Fear" OR "Guilt" OR "Empathy" OR "Morality" OR "Cognitive Dissonance") OR TI (emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR (animal* N6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR "well being" OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*))) OR AB (emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR (animal* N6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR "well being" OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*)))) AND (TI ((meat* OR "animal product*" OR beef OR veal OR lamb OR pork OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR pig OR cow OR sheep) N6 (consum* OR eat OR eats OR eating OR ate OR intak* OR purchas* OR buy* OR demand* OR choos* OR choice* OR avoid* OR prefer*)) OR AB ((meat* OR "animal product*" OR beef OR veal OR lamb OR pork OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR pig OR cow OR

sheep) N6 (consum* OR eat OR eats OR eating OR ate OR intak* OR purchas* OR buy* OR demand* OR choos* OR choice* OR avoid* OR prefer*))

2.5. CAB Abstracts (Clarivate Analytics)

TS=("emotion*" OR "affective" OR "disgust*" OR "fear" OR "guilt*" OR "empath*" OR "suffer*" OR "moral*" OR "ethic*" OR "humane*" OR "anthropomorph*" OR "belief*" OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR ("animal*" NEAR/6 ("welfare" OR "rights" OR "wellbeing" OR "well being" OR "cruel*" OR "abuse" OR "mistreat*")))) AND TS=((("meat*" OR "animal product*" OR "beef" OR "veal" OR "lamb" OR "pork" OR "poultry" OR "chicken" OR "turkey" OR "pig" OR "cow" OR "sheep") NEAR/6 ("consum*" OR "eat" OR "eats" OR "eating" OR "ate" OR "intak*" OR "purchas*" OR "buy*" OR "demand*" OR "choos*" OR "choice*" OR "avoid*" OR "prefer*"))

2.6. Sociological Abstracts (ProQuest)

(SU.EXACT("Animal Human Relations" OR "Emotions" OR "Guilt" OR "Fear" OR "Empathy" OR "Morality" OR "Moral Judgement" OR "Cognitive Dissonance") OR TI(emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR (animal* NEAR/6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR "well being" OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*))) OR AB(emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR (animal* NEAR/6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR "well being" OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*)))) AND ((meat* OR "animal product*" OR beef OR veal OR lamb OR pork OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR pig OR cow OR sheep) NEAR/6 (consum* OR eat OR eats OR eating OR ate OR intak* OR purchas* OR buy* OR demand* OR choos* OR choice* OR avoid* OR prefer*))

2.7. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (ProQuest)

noft(((meat* OR "animal product*" OR beef OR veal OR lamb OR pork OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR pig OR cow OR sheep) NEAR/6 (consum* OR eat OR eats OR eating OR ate OR intak* OR purchas* OR buy* OR demand* OR choos* OR choice* OR avoid* OR prefer*)) AND noft((emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR (animal* NEAR/6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR "well being" OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*))))

2.8. PolicyFile (ProQuest)

((meat* OR "animal product*" OR beef OR veal OR lamb OR pork OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR pig OR cow OR sheep) NEAR/6 (consum* OR eat OR eats OR eating OR ate OR intak* OR purchas* OR buy* OR demand* OR choos* OR choice* OR avoid* OR prefer*)) AND noft((emotion* OR affective OR disgust* OR fear OR guilt* OR empath* OR

suffer* OR moral* OR ethic* OR humane* OR anthropomorph* OR belief* OR "cognitive dissonan*" OR "meat paradox" OR (animal* NEAR/6 (welfare OR rights OR wellbeing OR "well being" OR cruel* OR abuse OR mistreat*))))

3. EXAMPLES OF WEBSITES TO BE SEARCHED FOR GREY LITERATURE

- Faunalytics (<https://faunalytics.org/library/>)
- Animal Welfare Action Lab (<http://www.awalab.org/>)
- The Humane League Labs (<http://www.humaneleaguelabs.org/reports/>)
- Mercy for Animals (<https://mercyforanimals.org/research>)
- Animal Charity Evaluators (<https://animalcharityevaluators.org/research/>)
- Better Buying Lab (<https://www.wri.org/our-work/project/better-buying-lab/research-and-resources>)

4. DETAILS OF DATA EXTRACTION

To ensure that point estimates are statistically and conceptually comparable across studies, we will extract, when feasible, point estimates for each study that represent the risk ratio of “low” versus “high” meat consumption or purchase. For studies reporting sufficient information or with raw data available, we will define “low” and “high” relative to the median consumption or purchasing outcome in the control condition (i.e., “high” consumption for a two-group randomized trial would be defined as consumption higher than the median consumption in the control group). Dichotomizing at the median, rather than at a more extreme value, improves statistical precision. For longitudinal studies, we will estimate the risk ratio controlling for subjects’ baseline consumption or purchase to increase statistical precision. Some studies may define the outcome measure not in absolute terms (e.g., servings consumed) but in relative terms (e.g., reducing meat consumption from one’s previous consumption), in which case we will use the risk ratio representing reducing (versus maintaining or increasing) consumption or purchase. For studies that do not report information sufficient to extract the above risk ratios, and for which raw data are not available for re-analysis, we will instead attempt to extract or calculate a risk ratio using the studies’ own criteria for “low” and “high” meat consumption if such a dichotomy was used. However, if the study treats consumption or purchase as continuous variables, we will extract or calculate a point estimate on the standardized mean difference scale and then approximately convert the estimate to the risk ratio scale^{1;2}.

REFERENCES

- [1] Susan Chinn. A simple method for converting an odds ratio to effect size for use in meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine*, 19(22):3127–3131, 2000.

- [2] Tyler VanderWeele. On a square-root transformation of the odds ratio for a common outcome. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.)*, 28(6):e58, 2017.