Response Reviewer #1_*round2*:

Dear Professor,

Again, we would like to express our gratitude for the care you have taken in your detailed reading of our manuscript, and this second review. We have made the efforts to respond to all your past comments and suggestions in the best way possible, as well as the current one. Please find below our answer.

Yours sincerely,

*Reviewer's Comments*

1. *This paper is still a mess and not comprehensive. This paper lacks of novelty, very little impact. Additionally, the authors rebuttal does not adress the comments. Let me give an example. The authors claim in their paper that EATING meat contributes to global warming. This statement prompted a comment. The authors then produces a lenghty answer on how the PRODUCTION of meat contributes to global warming, which we can agree is a different story. However, they did not change their original statement in the revised manuscript. Some other statements are not supported by scientific evidence, and the results are only slightly discussed in the context of previous scientific litterature.*

Reply: Again, we appreciate your revision, which we have followed thoroughly. Considering this particular comment, first of all, the authors do not claim that eating meat contributes to global warming in the present paper. The IPCC suggests that a shift in dietary habits can achieve the targets proposed to mitigate climate change. Specifically, the report reads "*Balanced diets, featuring plant-based foods, such as coarse grains, legumes, fruits and vegetables, nuts and seeds, and animal-sourced food produced in resilient, sustainable and low-GHG emission systems, present major opportunities for adaptation and mitigation while generating co-benefits in terms of human health*" (IPCC, 2019). This shift of diet from animal-intensive to plant-based rich diets would mitigate climate change. We have never referred in the text that eating meat contributes to global warming, but that a shift in the current dietary habits could be beneficial for the planet and human health.

Moreover, we agree that eating meat contributes indirectly to climate change through the environmental impacts found in the production of meat. The demand for animal-based food creates its supply and therefore it could be said that consuming animal-based foods

is indirectly responsible for climate change and other environmental issues. Additionally, the use of animal-based "consumption" instead of "production" is often referred in the literature. For example Apostolidis and McLeay, 2016 start with "*High levels of meat consumption are increasingly being criticised for ethical, environmental, and social reasons*" and not meat production because consumption is what drives production as the law of supply and demand explains. Another example, Jalil et al., 2020 also reads "*Meat consumption is a major driver of climate change*" and not meat production. Another example, González et al., 2020, "*a great consumption of this source of proteins (meat) has also a negative environmental impact*". Another example, Neff et al., 2018, "*Excess meat consumption, particularly of red and processed meats, is associated with nutritional and environmental health harms*". Although we understand that production and consumption are different, if the production of a specific food is associated with a specific impact, then the consumer of this specific food is contributing to this specific impact by demanding more to be produced. We have not changed the statement because we have not referred anywhere in the text that eating meat contributes to global warming.

Considering the "other statements that are not supported by scientific evidence", it would be helpful to know which ones are being referred. We would gladly clarify all of them with additional scientific literature. Regarding the discussion section, it cites a total of 22 references which are used to discuss the current results. Six additional studies were cited in the discussion section of which three were suggested by the academic editor, according to the second revision, particularly:

1. Clonan, A.; Roberts, K.E.; Holdsworth, M. Socioeconomic and Demographic Drivers of Red and Processed Meat Consumption: Implications for Health and Environmental Sustainability. Proc. Nutr. Soc. 2016, 75, 367–373, doi:10.1017/S0029665116000100.

2. Gossard, M.H.; York, R. Social Structural Influences on Meat Consumption. Hum. Ecol. Rev. 2003, 10, 1–9.

3. Kirbiš, A.; Lamot, M.; Javornik, M. The Role of Education in Sustainable Dietary Patterns in Slovenia. Sustain. 2021, 13, 13036, doi:10.3390/su132313036.

4. Koch, F.; Heuer, T.; Krems, C.; Claupein, E. Meat Consumers and Non-Meat Consumers in Germany: A Characterisation Based on Results of the German National Nutrition Survey II. J. Nutr. Sci. 2019, 1–13, doi:10.1017/jns.2019.17.

5. Lacroix, K.; Gifford, R. Reducing Meat Consumption: Identifying Group-Specific Inhibitors Using Latent Profile Analysis. Appetite 2019, 138, 233–241, doi:10.1016/j.appet.2019.04.002.

6. Leroy, F.; Praet, I. Meat Traditions. The Co-Evolution of Humans and Meat. Appetite 2015, 90, 200–211, doi:10.1016/j.appet.2015.03.014.

We hope that discussing and confronting the present results in the context of 28 previous scientific studies is sufficient. Furthermore, concerning the review points of: relevance of the cited refences to the research, and the adequacy of the article's references, it seems in the second revision they went from "can be improved" to "must be improved", clearly showing a downgrade. We must make clear note that the first revised manuscript was updated according to the reference style of the journal and a total of 13 references were

added. We are not sure how this has deteriorated the manuscript, quite the opposite. Nonetheless, we hope with the additional six references, in light of the editor's suggestion, these points can be improved. Thank you.

References

Apostolidis, C., McLeay, F., 2016. Should we stop meating like this? Reducing meat consumption through substitution. Food Policy 65, 74–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.11.002

González, N., Marquès, M., Nadal, M., Domingo, J.L., 2020. Meat consumption: Which are the current global risks? A review of recent (2010–2020) evidences. Food Res. Int. 137, 109341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2020.109341

IPCC, 2019. Summary for policymakers, Climate Change and Land: an IPCC special report on climate change, desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786352.wbieg0538

Jalil, A.J., Tasoff, J., Bustamante, A.V., 2020. Eating to save the planet: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial using individual-level food purchase data. Food Policy 95, 101950. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2020.101950

Neff, R.A., Edwards, D., Palmer, A., Ramsing, R., Righter, A., Wolfson, J., 2018. Reducing meat consumption in the USA: A nationally representative survey of attitudes and behaviours. Public Health Nutr. 21, 1835–1844. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980017004190