

Energetic closure of the spatially resolved global food system

Maxwell Kaye^{1,3}, Graham K. MacDonald², and Eric Galbraith³

¹Department of Mathematics, McGill University

²Department of Geography, McGill University

³Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, McGill University

Abstract

The global food system provides the energy that supports human metabolism, with complex spatial interdependencies between food production, transformation, and consumption. Empirical food system data for these global processes are often fragmented and inconsistent, with only certain components captured in spatially resolved formats. Here we propose a flexible approach to allocating country-level food system data sub-nationally. We estimate the spatial patterns of food energy production and supply, which we compare to estimates of human metabolism based on average body size. We downscale these rates onto a one-degree resolution grid with 95 corresponding food types to derive an internally consistent, energy-conserving, and spatially resolved dataset. We show that national food supply varies linearly with metabolism per capita, with about half the variation in food supply explained by metabolic rates. Our data processing pipeline is openly available and can readily incorporate new inputs in order to advance trans-disciplinary food system modeling efforts.

The global geography of food is complex, in part due to the increasingly interconnected nature of food flows across scales. The percentage of food produced for human consumption that was traded internationally has steadily increased in recent decades, growing from 15% in 1986 to 23% in 2009[7]. Global food trade has the potential to help reduce food insecurity[39, 7], and could help to contribute to healthier and more sustainable diets[3]. Not only is long distance food trade an increasingly important component of our food system, but it has become infeasible to persist exclusively on local production in many locations. For example, given the current demand for specific crops and distributions of their production, it has been estimated that only 20% of the world's population could in principle be supported by food production within a 100-km radius[25]. Because of this interdependence, it is important to have detailed spatial quantification of each activity in the global food system.

However, the availability and heterogeneity of data on different aspects of the global food system remain substantial practical impediments to holistically capturing food flows from production to final consumption[24]. While national scale data on agricultural production and food supply are increasingly abundant[42], including crop, livestock and fishery production, inconsistencies between countries can make it difficult to compare these data between regions[8]. The need for systemic approaches that consider the entire food supply chain is well established[44], and in relation to this need, the OECD recently identified inconsistencies between methodologies and a lack of detail as significant inhibitors of progress in food systems research[4]. Similarly, it has been argued that more databases with consistent, comparable, and publicly available data are required[50].

Advances in remote sensing technology and agricultural data tracking have resulted in increasing availability of global gridded food production data [18, 15, 6, 41, 15, 47]. While these works paint a detailed picture of agricultural land use for food production, the connection to final metabolism remains less understood. Global diets have separately been assessed in the context of sustainability and public health[46],

however connecting diets to original production in a spatially resolved manner is a considerable challenge, often requiring a case by case approach across each study or model. The data sources underlying these analyses can differ significantly, and often change considerably with new generations of data around agricultural land use and productivity[40, 47]. Efforts to amalgamate disparate food system data sources must therefore be flexible, in order to accommodate updates and comparisons in the modern era of quickly changing data landscapes and evolving trade flows.

A growing body of research has taken more biophysical-based approaches to aspects of the food system[21]. These approaches include representing crop production in terms of calories for human diets[2], analysis of embodied land use[33] and human appropriation of net primary production (HANPP)[17], Food Loss and Waste (FLW)[1, 26], as well as the notion of 'foodsheds' to describe geographic food sourcing for population centers [25]. Datasets such as M3/EarthStat [32], SPAM[47, 41] and GAEZ[15] provide key gridded global maps of crop areas and yields, but they do not include downstream use of crops, nor spatial heterogeneous livestock production (e.g., [13]). While global caloric production and nutritional assessments exist [18, 5, 25], to our knowledge, there does not yet exist a gridded assessment of global food energy from production to metabolism that maintains a high commodity resolution and coverage.

Here we provide a flexible and adaptable yet comprehensive approach to studying the global food system from production to metabolism. Our data processing pipeline downscales national food production, consumption, and utilization data proportionally to local grid reference data. This approach robustly incorporates data updates and improvements, and leverages the physical conservation principle that all food that is produced must then be metabolized by humans, utilized in some other form (direct or indirect use by humans), or else lost from the food system. In other words, the global sum of all food sources equals that of food sinks. We use energy as a standard metric to quantify and compare food between different stages, locations, and food groups, and to put initial production and final metabolic end use into direct correspondence.

We assemble data on marine fish catch, livestock production, crop production, animal feed consumption, and human food supply onto a unified gridded dataset to study how food flows from land and seascapes to end use. Finally, we approximate global human metabolic rates, and compare these with food supply at the national scale, closing the loop from food production to human bioenergetics.

Results

Global food balance

We first present the harmonized global food energy flow by food item, production type, and utilization category (Figure 1). There are large differences between crops in terms of their degree of transformation (e.g., via processing or use as feed inputs to produce animal products) and their relative contribution to the food supply. Our estimate of human metabolism represents just over one third of the total annual crop production by energy after factoring its transformation into animal products. This globally aggregated energetic accounting (Figure 1) does not yet represent spatial distributions, but simply demonstrates the total quantities of each food type at each stage of the food system.

Approximately 30% of calories are lost or utilized for purposes other than the food supply (not accounting for processing) (Figure 1). This estimate is in reasonable agreement with prior estimates of food loss during production of 24% (614 kcal/cap/day) [26]. Alexander et al.([1]) conducted a more detailed accounting of cumulative losses and waste in the food system, with slightly higher estimates of about 36% on an energy basis. Our approach yields reasonable agreement with this previous work across key stages of the global food system, with our human food consumption and crop production values being slightly higher.




Figure 1: Food energy flows from crops to metabolism using Voronoi Tree-maps to show the changing composition of the food system at each stage. Areas are proportional to the number of calories that food contributes to that category. Units are given in terms of total kilocalories per capita per day. New food items enter the system through one of Crop, Animal, or Processed Food Production, leaves the system through any of Feed, Processing, Other Loss/Utilization, terminating with the remaining food in the Food Supply. For simplicity, the figure omits a flow arrow from Processed Foods to Feed and from Animal Products to Processing, although for some food items such as soyabeans and animal fats, these flows exist as well. Due to a lack of human diet data, the distribution of diets as well as waste and excretion are visualized with the same distribution as the food supply.

Gridded food system patterns

Over the surface of the Earth, food production and consumption energy densities range from negligible to millions of Calories per km² per day (Figure 2). At first order, the spatial patterns of food production and final human metabolism are similar, with intensive production at or near the same locations where large population densities drive large metabolic fluxes. However, there are important differences in their distribution. The consumption distribution is unimodal with left-skew on log axes, intuitively reflecting that most metabolism occurs in population dense locations (especially urban areas), whereas the production distribution is multi-modal, reflecting the contrast of intensive agriculture with extensive pastureland and fisheries. This asymmetry between production and consumption is an important qualitative aspect of the spatially-resolved global food system, constraining the necessity for food to flow so that production can support consumption.

Whereas the production-consumption balance mapped in figure 2 sums over all types of food, the production-consumption balances of 6 types of foods are mapped in Figure 3. These panels show large differences among food types in the spatial patterns of where food is produced, relative to where it is consumed as food or feed. For example, most of India, China and the USA are characterized by local surpluses of cereal production, but have large areas with deficits of fruit and vegetable production. The animal product net caloric balance map reveals that marine animal products (fish) are of minor caloric importance compared to terrestrial animal production, except for the African coast, where they are often harvested at rates that exceed the African terrestrial animal production.

We find that, globally across these food categories, about 3.7 quadrillion Calories are available to sustain the local demand of human metabolism at the one-degree scale. This is the sum of all food supply Calories that could be provided by production of the same food category within the same grid cell. If we compare this energy supply with population densities, it is equivalent to 1382 kcal/cap/day, or roughly




Figure 2: Top Left: Total production of food balance sheet items, including both crops and animal products. In order to avoid double counting, non-primary food production rates (processed foods) are not included. For lack of surrogate data, freshwater fish is also not included. The map displays total Calories consumed in the year 2015 according to the FAO Food Balance Sheet [11] distributed according to the surrogate data in table 1. Top Right: Total human metabolism per square meter, obtained by distributing calculated national average metabolic rates onto population density. A cut-off of 5000 Calories/square kilometer/day was used to mask grid cells with negligible production. The distributions of caloric strengths are given in histograms below each map.

half of the average caloric demand. Others have estimated that far fewer can reasonably sustain their diets through local production[25]. In part, this can be attributed to major calorie dense crops like maize, wheat and rice being insufficient to sustain the nutritional (including vitamin and micronutrient) requirements of human populations[18]. Nonetheless this provides an indication to the degree to which diets could be sourced locally given potential changes in the distribution of crop types.

The geography of human metabolism of food

Food supply is the quantity of food theoretically available for for human consumption nationally. While food supply is often used as a proxy for diet, a significant fraction of available food is wasted and never consumed, hence we estimate actual human metabolisms and compare with food supply to follow calories through the entire food system. We find a linear correlation between metabolic rates and food supply at the national level (Figure 4), which is highly significant ($p < 10^{-23}$). As national metabolic rate per capita increases (according to body heights and weights), national food supply per capita increases proportionally, nearly at twice the rate. We note that our data sources for food supply (FAOSTAT Food Balance Sheets) and for height and weight demographics (Lancet pooled research reports[38, 35]) are entirely independent of each other.

The fact that the best fit regression has a slope significantly greater than 1 indicates that a proportionally greater loss of food energy occurs in countries with larger per capita food supplies. The difference between food supply and the best fit linear prediction is positively correlated with national gross domestic product (GDP), consistent with there being greater food waste in high-income settings. However, the relationship between log GDP per capita and the unexplained component left over after the first regression (residual value in figure 4) is weak ($r^2 \approx 0.15$). Thus, although our analysis is consistent with richer countries being more wasteful, it suggests that at the global scale, the more important factor is that people in rich countries are larger.




Figure 3: Net Caloric food balance maps. Each grid cell value stores the difference between caloric production of that group of foods and its corresponding consumption, where consumption is the sum of the feed and food supply values obtained by dasymetric mapping. Net producing grid cells are shown in color (corresponding to the associated color of that food group in figure 1). Net consuming grid cells are shown in gray scale.




Figure 4: Left: Correlation between human consumption of food (total metabolic rate = basal metabolic rate + active metabolism) and food supply in each country. Right: Correlation between log GDP per capita and the residual consumption of the food supply (the difference between amount of food metabolized and the amount of food available). For the countries under the zero line in the residual plot, either their food supplies are under-reported in the source data (FAOSTAT) or we are over estimating their metabolism in this study.

Overall these observations suggest a general tendency for humans to grow larger, while metabolizing a smaller fraction of the available food supply, as the food supply becomes more abundant.

Discussion

In this study, we have applied a relatively straightforward but holistic framework to infer the global spatial patterns of food energy production and consumption, including the metabolic rates from demographic data. Our analysis shows characteristic differences among the geographic distributions of different foods, highlighting the importance of accounting for heterogeneous role of distinct food types in global food system assessments and future projections. We found a linear relationship between metabolic rate and food supply at the national scale with a slope significantly greater than 1, which suggests a consistent tendency for food waste to grow as the per capita food supply increases.

Previous approaches to track food loss and waste throughout the global food system operated under the assumption that every individual consumes a constant number of Calories, ranging from 1995 kcal/person/day[26] to 2342 kcal/person/day[1]. By estimating this metabolism value as a function of demographic data and resolved as food items, rather than as a uniform distribution across the global population, our approach provides opportunity for more fine-grained analysis of a key component of the food system. Body mass plays a crucial role in consumption rates, which must be acknowledged in future projections, since the spread of the obesity epidemic might reasonably increase global consumption by the equivalent of 1 billion people[45]. Given that both number of people and size of people are non-negligible contributors to human consumption rates, we suggest that these two characteristics should be explicitly accounted for in future assessments of spatial metabolic distribution.

Our inclusion of all the food groups covered in the FAOSTAT database (Food Balance Sheets) enables direct comparison with metabolism data, although the

precise data for each commodity should be improved in future assessments. An important next step would be to compare these two variables at the grid level with higher precision spatial surrogates or proxies. Metabolism surrogates would benefit from more precise local data, including heights, weights, ages, and diets[49, 27]. Similarly production data would benefit from more precise surrogates for specific crops. For example, some of the GAEZ+2015 surrogate data (ie. "cropsNES") correspond to multiple unique crops (ie. apples and almonds), which are not necessarily spatially correlated, yet we distribute each included crop proportionally to the same reference data. Our approach is also limited by the fact that locations of food transformation (i.e. food processing plants) are not spatially explicit. Open source data should be developed that includes locations of food processing and key supply chain hubs[28, 20], to assist in downscaling production of processed foods and processing rates. Furthermore, spatial data on fresh water fish catch are difficult to incorporate in global studies, despite comprising a large share of global fish catch and playing a crucial role in diets worldwide[14].

Our global food system assessment compiles data from multiple sources and across phases of the food system, hence there are many possible sources of uncertainty and inaccuracy. For example, we rely on calorie density conversion factors, which are assumed to be uniform for each food type, but which in reality vary geographically and at different degree of transformation or food preparation that are not accounted for in our pipeline. For example, the calorie density of a crop in the farm might be different than its density in the grocery store. On the consumption side, while demographic average weights and heights, as well as food supplies, were taken over different regions and distributed according to populations, these distributions are not necessarily uniform in reality. However, our approach facilitates easy updating, allowing for users to input new spatial demographic data. Future efforts to study how food flows from production to metabolism might adapt this method by distributing more accurate national data onto grid cells, using more detailed caloric conversion factors that have different values for different stages of the food system, and including better

surrogate data for more precise spatial distributions.

Our analysis represents an important step toward expanding the breadth of spatially explicit global food system analysis from production to metabolism with a relatively detailed tracking of specific food groups. We hope that, by expanding the breadth of food system analysis from production to metabolism, across nearly all foods and with global coverage, our work contributes to an improved holistic understanding of the food system. Further work on the global food system can continue to reveal emergent behavior of the billions of actors in the food system, which cannot be gleaned from the study of the sum of its local parts.

The authors declare no competing interests.

Methods

We allocate national components of food production, transformation, and supply, before using dasymetric mapping with spatial surrogates to downscale this data geographically. We start by processing the Food Balance Sheet (FBS)[11] data at the national scale, in order to maintain food energy conservation. Then in order to distribute food production, feed, and food supply to each grid cell, we obtain gridded surrogate data from a variety of sources, including global gridded crop production maps (GAEZ)[15], the Global Livestock of the World Database[13], fish catch estimates[16], as well as population [48]. We convert all food flow mass quantities into calories, using mass-energy conversion factors[10, 22][29]. We estimate total human metabolic rates based on physiological measures, and compare this with the food supply. The result is a spatially resolved, global account of production, food supply, metabolism, and other food flow quantities for every food category. Table 1 outlines the FBS elements, their corresponding surrogate variables, and their data sources.

Derived grid variable	FBS Element source	Spatial surrogate variable	Surrogate variable source
Human food supply	Food supply (kcal)	Population	WorldPop[48]
Animal feed	Feed	Livestock Units	GLW[13]
Crop production	Production	Crop production	GAEZ+2015[15]
Animal product production	Production	Livestock units	GLW[13]
Marine food production	Production sum	Catch rate	BOATSv2[16]

Table 1: Data sources and relationships. Column 1 gives types of inferred gridded data in the dataset, and column 3 gives the types of data used as a spatial surrogate for distribution. Column 2 gives the associated food balance sheet sheet source element and column 4 gives the surrogate data source for downscaling. Data from column 2 was dasymetrically mapped proportionally to the surrogate data in column 4 in order to obtain local grid variables corresponding to column 1.

Food Balance Sheet data processing

We first preprocess national food supply data, obtaining globally consistent annual production and consumption/utilization quantities for each FBS food item, in units of calories per year. The FBS methodology is predicated on the *supply = utilization* identity [12, 19]. In practice, this manifests in the following equation on FBS elements, both for each country, and globally.

$$Production + Imports - Exports + \Delta Stocks = Supply = Utilization \quad (1)$$

where *Utilization* includes *Feed, Seed, Losses, Processing, Other uses (non – food), Tourist consumption, Residuals, and Food* FBS elements.

We formulate a similar concept of food energy conservation, specifically accounting for utilization through the human food supply, processing, and feed data, and collect other SUA (Supply Utilization Accounts) variables such as Other Uses, Feed,

Seed, Waste, Processing, Stocks, into a single scale factor used to match production energy with consumption energy. We use the term production to refer to edible animals or plant matter entering the global system (including crop growth, livestock growth, and processed food production), and consumption to refer to the edible plant and animal matter leaving the system (including food that is lost, wasted, utilized, metabolized by humans, or by animals). This choice is motivated by simplicity and data availability. Since alternative surrogate grid data exist (such as alternative cropland maps) and new datasets may become available, in principle, the other food balance sheet elements could be disaggregated and distributed onto the grid. Our approach builds off previous studies (e.g., [2]), and helps address problems with the SUA methodology, including sometimes heterogeneous national reporting methodologies[19]. Our dataset satisfies the following equation:

$$\sum Production = \sum (Food\ Supply + Feed + Processing + Utilization\ and\ Loss) \quad (2)$$

where *Utilization and Loss* is used to balance the rest of the data in the equation, and has physical interpretation as data represented by FBS columns *Seed, Losses, Other Uses, Tourist consumption, and Residuals*.

Food energy conservation

Our goal is to track food from production to consumption throughout the food system, therefore we assume the following "Food Energy Conservation" equations to be true. Given regions i , we have the following three equations:

$$\sum I_i = \sum E_i \quad (3)$$

$$\sum P_i = \sum C_i \quad (4)$$

$$I_i + P_i = E_i + C_i \quad (5)$$

where I_i , P_i , E_i , and C_i denote a region's imports, production, exports, and consumption/utilization, respectively. Equation 3 follows from the notion that the system is closed; all imported food must have been exported elsewhere. Equation 4 follows from the notion that the total production is equal to the total consumption. This is analogous to the FBS supply utilization equation (equation 1). Equation 5 describes how food can enter a region only through production or imports, and it can leave only through consumption (including utilization, loss, and waste) or exports.

Notably, Equations 3, 4, and 5 are not dependent on food system nodes being grid cells. The system of equations describes the conservation of mass or energy of any closed food system network at any scale. This means that the equations hold whether the index set labels nations, grid cells, or any other food system network, as long as food only enters the system through P_i and only leaves through C_i , and trade is closed between nodes in the system.

In principle, the total import quantity should be equal to the total export quantity, since all exported food must go somewhere (except for relatively small amounts of food that are lost in transit). However, trade data asymmetries are known to exist due to re-exports, insurance policies, tariffs on imports, misreporting and under-reporting, among other factors [29, 22, 30, 23]. This error is propagated into other areas of the FBS so that equation 1 is satisfied. In the FBS, global total import quantity exceeds total export quantity (by about 20 Megatons of food in 2015), which places approximately 14% of global food trade and 4% of the human food supply, in apparent violation of equation 3. Since countries are more likely to accurately track and report their own imports [23], we assume the import quantities to be more accurate, and therefore scale the export quantities to match so that equation 3 is satisfied. We proportionally scale all production values by 2% to as well, since the uncounted food must come from somewhere, so that equation 4 remains satisfied.

Next, we convert production, feed, and processing into units of Calories (kcal). For each food, the energy density is obtained using caloric conversion factors [10, 29]. For a small number of food items where conversion factors were unavailable, we infer the

energy density as the fraction of the FBS 'Food supply (kcal)' divided by the 'Domestic Supply Quantity' for each country and year. We then use this energy density to convert each element in the food balance sheet (production, processing, imports, exports, food, feed, etc.) to units of Calories/year.

Spatial data allocation

We next populate a 1-degree resolution global grid (approximately 10,000 km² per grid cell at the equator), with the goal of distributing FBS data into each grid cell, proportionally to local variables (surrogate variables). This grid is based on aggregating higher resolution data for each surrogate variable. We obtain gridded maps of crop production in year 2015 from GAEZ+2015[15], which provides local surrogate data for production of crop foods in the FBS. Livestock counts are obtained from Gridded Livestock of the World[13], which form the basis for LSU (Livestock Units) surrogates for both feed consumption as well as animal product food production. Estimates of wild fish capture rates from 2015 are obtained from the data-constrained BoatSv2 model[16], which provide surrogate data for marine fishery production. The global human population map is obtained from WorldPop, providing the basis for food demand and metabolism per grid cell[48]. Our choice of a relatively coarse 1-degree resolution is intended to provide unified global perspective on the food system that captures subnational patterns without attempting to quantify local (e.g., city-level) flows. This resolution provides both the computational feasibility for polynomial time global grid analyses (such as analysis of the network of food flow between grid cells), as well as the granularity to visualize and compare the roles of population centers with large agricultural regions and hybrid areas, without being overwhelmed by fine-scale detail.

We then downscale country-level food production, feed, and food supply data from the 2015 FAO FBS proportionally to their associated grid-level surrogate variables. This procedure, known as dasymetric mapping, has a long history in cartography and

geography[34]. We chose dasymetric mapping as our approach for spatial allocation and downscaling, as it is a simple and non-trivial downscaling algorithm: regional data is distributed proportionally to a single grid-level surrogate. We seek to enable study of the relationship across scales, and hence need to rely on both local information and regional data. By distributing each regional quantity proportionally to a single surrogate quantity, we ensure easy reproducibility and interpretability of results. We formalize dasymetric mapping and distribute the data according to the dasymetric equation (equation 6, described in detail in [9]). X_C represents national scale data for country C , and x_{ij} is the corresponding distributed grid data at latitude i and longitude j . C_{ij} represents the area of country C 's jurisdiction over grid cell ij , and s_{ij} represents surrogate data in that grid cell.

$$x_{ij} = X_C * \frac{s_{ij}}{\sum_{ij \in C} C_{ij} s_{ij}} \quad (6)$$

We chose 2015 as a base year since it is the middle of the time-span represented by our input dataset. Table 1 summarizes the data sources and associated surrogate variables. Information about specific food types and categories, their proportion of the total food supply, and their correspondences with crop and livestock production surrogates are listed in the supplemental information. The foods which are distributed to the grid using a surrogate variable account for about 97% of the food supply and 99% of production reported by FAOSTAT for 2015. The remaining 1% of production corresponds to food items and types of utilization that lacked surrogate data, most importantly fresh water fish. Other FBS food items without a suitable surrogate were 'Beverages, Fermented', 'Beverages, Alcoholic', 'Freshwater Fish', 'Pepper', and 'Sweeteners, Other'.

We compute the net caloric production in each grid cell for each food type as the difference between the production and the food supply of that food. For some countries which have production values in the FBS, but no available corresponding surrogate variable in the country, production is distributed uniformly among grid cells.

Metabolism of the human population

We approximate human metabolism globally using a simplified version of the Mifflin-St Jeor Equation[31] (equation 7), averaged between males and females to estimate the average basal metabolic rate of individuals from each country.

$$BMR_i = 10W_i + 6.25H_i - 5A - 78 \quad (7)$$

where BMR_i is Basal Metabolic Rate in Calories/day, W_i is average weight in kg, and H_i the average height in cm for the i th country. A is age in years, taken to be 30 years old, which is approximately the average global age[37, 43]. The intercept -78 is the average of the male and female intercepts 5 and -161 respectively of the traditional Mifflin-St Jeor Equation. Height and weight data are obtained from Lancet pooled research report estimates[38, 35]. Basal metabolic rate is then dasymmetrically distributed proportionally to population density. We obtain an estimate of total energy expenditure by multiplying basal metabolic rate by $\frac{5}{3}$, based on estimates that 50-70% of total expenditure supports basal metabolism[36]. We distribute human metabolism according to the spatial distribution of human population (WorldPop), arriving at a spatial grid of production, feed, food supply, and approximate human metabolic rate per grid cell.

Data and code availability

Our effort to map and understand the global food system from farm to metabolism endeavors to reduce data transformation friction, and further future progress on global food system assessment. In order to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of how diverse components of the food system interact, some level of data manipulation is necessary. We provide an open source minimalist approach to compiling such data, to encourage reproducibility and interpretability. Data and code are available online at https://github.com/12nad1/food_energy_grid.git.

References

- [1] Peter Alexander, Calum Brown, Almut Arneth, John Finnigan, Dominic Moran, and Mark D.A. Rounsevell. Losses, inefficiencies and waste in the global food system. *Agricultural Systems*, 153:190–200, 2017.
- [2] Emily S Cassidy, Paul C West, James S Gerber, and Jonathan A Foley. Redefining agricultural yields: From tonnes to people nourished per hectare. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(3):034015, 2013.
- [3] Felix Creutzig, Leila Niamir, Xuemei Bai, Max Callaghan, Jonathan Cullen, Julio Díaz-José, Maria Figueroa, Arnulf Grubler, William F. Lamb, Adrian Leip, Eric Masanet, Érika Mata, Linus Mattauch, Jan C. Minx, Sebastian Mirasgedis, Yacob Mulugetta, Sudarmanto Budi Nugroho, Minal Pathak, Patricia Perkins, Joyashree Roy, Stephane de la Rue du Can, Yamina Saheb, Shreya Some, Linda Steg, Julia Steinberger, and Diana Ürge Vorsatz. Demand-side solutions to climate change mitigation consistent with high levels of well-being. *Nature Climate Change*, 12(11):36–46, January 2022.
- [4] Koen Deconinck, Céline Giner, Lee Ann Jackson, and Lucinda Toyama. Overcoming evidence gaps on food systems. *OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers*, 2021.
- [5] Ruth DeFries, Jessica Fanzo, Roseline Remans, Cheryl Palm, Stephen Wood, and Tal L. Anderman. Metrics for land-scarce agriculture. *Science*, 349(6245):238–240, July 2015.
- [6] Jan Philipp Dietrich, Benjamin Leon Bodirsky, Florian Humpenoder, Isabelle Weindl, Miodrag Stevanović, Kristine Karstens, Ulrich Kreidenweis, Xiaoxi Wang, Abhijeet Mishra, and David Klein. Magpie 4 – a modular open-source framework for modeling global land systems. *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12(4):1299–1317, 2019.

- [7] Paolo D'Odorico, Joel A. Carr, Francesco Laio, Luca Ridolfi, and Stefano Vandoni. Feeding humanity through global food trade. *Earth's Future*, 2(9):458–469, 2014.
- [8] Laura Enthoven and Goedele Van den Broeck. Local food systems: Reviewing two decades of research. *Agricultural Systems*, 193:103226, October 2021.
- [9] Abdullah Faisal, Maxwell Kaye, Maimoonah Ahmed Ahmed, and Eric Galbraith. The sesame human-earth atlas: integration of human and earth system data.
- [10] FAO. *Food Balance Sheets: A Handbook*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 2001.
- [11] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Food Balance Sheets, 2020. Accessed: March 25, 2023.
- [12] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. New Food Balances Description of utilization variables , 2020. Accessed: July 24, 2024.
- [13] Marius Gilbert, Gaëlle Nicolas, Giusepina Cinardi, Thomas P. Van Boeckel, Sophie O. Vanwambeke, G. R. Wint, and Timothy P. Robinson. Global distribution data for cattle, buffaloes, horses, sheep, goats, pigs, chickens and ducks in 2010. *Scientific Data*, 5(1), 2018.
- [14] Christopher D. Golden, J. Zachary Koehn, Alon Shepon, Simone Passarelli, Christopher M. Free, Daniel F. Viana, Holger Matthay, Jacob G. Eurich, Jessica A. Gephart, Etienne Fluet-Chouinard, Elizabeth A. Nyboer, Abigail J. Lynch, Marian Kjellefold, Sabri Bromage, Pierre Charlebois, Manuel Barange, Stefania Vannuccini, Ling Cao, Kristin M. Kleisner, Eric B. Rimm, Goodarz Danaei, Camille DeSisto, Heather Kelahan, Kathryn J. Fiorella, David C. Little, Edward H. Allison, Jessica Fanzo, and Shakuntala H. Thilsted. Aquatic foods to nourish nations. *Nature*, 598(7880):315–320, October 2021.
- [15] Danielle Grogan, Steve Frolking, Dominik Wisser, Alex Prusevich, and Stanley Glidden. Global gridded crop harvested area, production, yield, and monthly physical area data circa 2015. *Scientific Data*, 9(1), 2022.

- [16] Jerome Guiet, Daniele Bianchi, Kim J. N. Scherrer, Ryan F. Heneghan, and Eric D. Galbraith. Boatsv2: New ecological and economic features improve simulations of high seas catch and effort. *Geoscientific Model Development Discussions*, page 1–48, May 2024.
- [17] Helmut Haberl, K. Heinz Erb, Fridolin Krausmann, Veronika Gaube, Alberte Bondeau, Christoph Plutzer, Simone Gingrich, Wolfgang Lucht, and Marina Fischer-Kowalski. Quantifying and mapping the human appropriation of net primary production in earth's terrestrial ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(31):12942–12947, July 2007.
- [18] Mario Herrero, Philip K. Thornton, Brendan Power, Jessica R. Bogard, Roseline Remans, Steffen Fritz, James S. Gerber, Gerald Nelson, Linda See, Katharina Waha, Reg A. Watson, Paul C. West, Leah H. Samberg, Jeannette van de Steeg, Eloise Stephenson, Mark van Wijk, and Petr Havlík. Farming and the geography of nutrient production for human use: a transdisciplinary analysis. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 1(1):e33–e42, April 2017.
- [19] Ladislav Kabat. Ess: Supply utilization accounts and food balance sheets - background information for your better understanding, 2023.
- [20] Deniz Berfin Karakoc, Megan Konar, Michael J. Puma, and Lav R. Varshney. Structural chokepoints determine the resilience of agri-food supply chains in the united states. *Nature Food*, 4(7):607–615, July 2023.
- [21] Thomas Kastner, Abhishek Chaudhary, Simone Gingrich, Alexandra Marques, U. Martin Persson, Giorgio Bidoglio, Gaëtane Le Provost, and Florian Schwarzmüller. Global agricultural trade and land system sustainability: Implications for ecosystem carbon storage, biodiversity, and human nutrition. *One Earth*, 4(10):1425–1443, October 2021.
- [22] Thomas Kastner, Michael Kastner, and Sanderine Nonhebel. Tracing distant environmental impacts of agricultural products from a consumer perspective. *Ecological Economics*, 70(6):1032–1040, April 2011.

- [23] Derek Kellenberg and Arik Levinson. Misreporting trade: Tariff evasion, corruption, and auditing standards. *Review of International Economics*, 27(1):106–129, 2019.
- [24] Kwang-Hyung Kim, Yasuhiro Doi, Navin Ramankutty, and Toshichika Iizumi. A review of global gridded cropping system data products. *Environmental Research Letters*, 16(9):093005, 2021.
- [25] Pekka Kinnunen, Joseph H. Guillaume, Maija Taka, Paolo D’Odorico, Stefan Siebert, Michael J. Puma, Mika Jalava, and Matti Kummu. Local food crop production can fulfil demand for less than one-third of the population. *Nature Food*, 1(4):229–237, 2020.
- [26] M. Kummu, H. de Moel, M. Porkka, S. Siebert, O. Varis, and P.J. Ward. Lost food, wasted resources: Global food supply chain losses and their impacts on freshwater, cropland, and fertiliser use. *Science of The Total Environment*, 438:477–489, 2012.
- [27] Julie E. Kurtz, Peter B. Woodbury, Zia U. Ahmed, and Christian J. Peters. Mapping u.s. food system localization potential: The impact of diet on foodsheds. 54:12434–12446, October 2020.
- [28] Graham K. MacDonald. Logistics hubs hold food supply chains together. *Nature Food*, 4(7):548–549, July 2023.
- [29] Graham K. MacDonald, Kate A. Brauman, Shipeng Sun, Kimberly M. Carlson, Emily S. Cassidy, James S. Gerber, and Paul C. West. Rethinking agricultural trade relationships in an era of globalization. *BioScience*, 65(3):275–289, March 2015.
- [30] Vladimir Markhonko. Asymmetries in official international trade statistics and analysis of globalization. *International Conference on the Measurement of International Trade and Economic Globalization*, October 2014.

- [31] MD Mifflin, ST St Jeor, LA Hill, BJ Scott, SA Daugherty, and YO Koh. A new predictive equation for resting energy expenditure in healthy individuals. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 51(2):241–247, February 1990.
- [32] Chad Monfreda, Navin Ramankutty, and Jonathan A. Foley. Farming the planet: 2. geographic distribution of crop areas, yields, physiological types, and net primary production in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 22(1), 2008.
- [33] Beibei Niu, Sha Peng, Cai Li, Qi Liang, Xinju Li, and Zhen Wang. Nexus of embodied land use and greenhouse gas emissions in global agricultural trade: A quasi-input–output analysis. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 267:122067, September 2020.
- [34] Andrey Petrov. One hundred years of dasymetric mapping: Back to the origin. *The Cartographic Journal*, 49(3):256–264, August 2012.
- [35] Nowell H. Phelps and Singleton. Worldwide trends in underweight and obesity from 1990 to 2022: a pooled analysis of 3663 population-representative studies with 222 million children, adolescents, and adults. *The Lancet*, 403(10431):1027–1050, March 2024.
- [36] Herman Pontzer, Yosuke Yamada, Hiroyuki Sagayama, Philip N. Ainslie, Lene F. Andersen, Liam J. Anderson, Lenore Arab, Issaad Baddou, Kweku Bedu-Addo, Ellen E. Blaak, Stephane Blanc, Alberto G. Bonomi, Carlijn V. C. Bouten, Pascal Bovet, Maciej S. Buchowski, Nancy F. Butte, Stefan G. Camps, Graeme L. Close, Jamie A. Cooper, Richard Cooper, Sai Krupa Das, Lara R. Dugas, Ulf Ekelund, Sonja Entringer, Terrence Forrester, Barry W. Fudge, Annelies H. Goris, Michael Gurven, Catherine Hambly, Asmaa El Hamdouchi, Marjije B. Hoos, Sumei Hu, Noorjehan Joonas, Annemiek M. Joosen, Peter Katzmarzyk, Kitty P. Kempen, Misaka Kimura, William E. Kraus, Robert F. Kushner, Estelle V. Lambert, William R. Leonard, Nader Lessan, Corby Martin, Anine C. Medin, Erwin P. Meijer, James C. Morehen, James P. Morton, Marian L. Neuhouser, Teresa A. Nicklas, Robert M. Ojiambo, Kirsi H. Pietiläinen, Yannis P. Pitsiladis,

- Jacob Plange-Rhule, Guy Plasqui, Ross L. Prentice, Roberto A. Rabinovich, Susan B. Racette, David A. Raichlen, Eric Ravussin, Rebecca M. Reynolds, Susan B. Roberts, Albertine J. Schuit, Anders M. Sjödin, Eric Stice, Samuel S. Urlacher, Giulio Valenti, Ludo M. Van Etten, Edgar A. Van Mil, Jonathan C. K. Wells, George Wilson, Brian M. Wood, Jack Yanovski, Tsukasa Yoshida, Xueying Zhang, Alexia J. Murphy-Alford, Cornelia Loechl, Amy H. Luke, Jennifer Rood, Dale A. Schoeller, Klaas R. Westerterp, William W. Wong, John R. Speakman, and IAEA DLW DATABASE CONSORTIUM. Daily energy expenditure through the human life course. *Science*, 373(6556):808–812, August 2021.
- [37] Hannah Ritchie and Max Roser. Age structure. *Our World in Data*, February 2024.
- [38] Rodriguez-Martinez. Height and body-mass index trajectories of school-aged children and adolescents from 1985 to 2019 in 200 countries and territories: a pooled analysis of 2181 population-based studies with 65 million participants. *The Lancet*, 396(10261):1511–1524, November 2020.
- [39] Nick W Smith, Andrew J Fletcher, Lakshmi A Dave, Jeremy P Hill, and Warren C McNabb. Use of the delta model to understand the food system and global nutrition. 151:3253–3261, October 2021.
- [40] Francesco N. Tubiello, Giulia Conchedda, Leon Casse, Pengyu Hao, Giorgia De Santis, and Zhongxin Chen. A new cropland area database by country circa 2020. *Earth System Science Data*, 15(11):4997–5015, November 2023.
- [41] Francesco N. Tubiello, Giulia Conchedda, Leon Casse, Hao Pengyu, Chen Zhongxin, Giorgia De Santis, Steffen Fritz, and Douglas Muchoney. Measuring the world’s cropland area. *Nature Food*, 4(1):30–32, 2023.
- [42] Francesco N. Tubiello, Mirella Salvatore, Simone Rossi, Alessandro Ferrara, Nuala Fitton, and Pete Smith. The faostat database of greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(1):015009, February 2013.
- [43] UN. World population prospects - population division - united nations.

- [44] Matteo Vittuari, Fabio De Menna, Laura García-Herrero, Marco Pagani, Laura Brenes-Peralta, and Andrea Segrè. *Chapter 17 - Food systems sustainability: The complex challenge of food loss and waste*, page 249–260. Academic Press, January 2019.
- [45] Sarah Catherine Walpole, David Prieto-Merino, Phil Edwards, John Cleland, Gretchen Stevens, and Ian Roberts. The weight of nations: an estimation of adult human biomass. *BMC Public Health*, 12(1):439, June 2012.
- [46] Walter Willett, Johan Rockstrom, Brent Loken, Marco Springmann, Tim Lang, Sonja Vermeulen, Tara Garnett, David Tilman, Fabrice DeClerck, Amanda Wood, Malin Jonell, Michael Clark, Line J. Gordon, Jessica Fanzo, Corinna Hawkes, Rami Zurayk, Juan A. Rivera, Wim De Vries, Lindiwe Majele Sibanda, Ashkan Afshin, Abhishek Chaudhary, Mario Herrero, Rina Agustina, Francesco Branca, Anna Lartey, Shenggen Fan, Beatrice Crona, Elizabeth Fox, Victoria Bignet, Max Troell, Therese Lindahl, Sudhvir Singh, Sarah E. Cornell, K. Srinath Reddy, Sunita Narain, Sania Nishtar, and Christopher J. L. Murray. Food in the anthropocene: the eat–lancet commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *The Lancet*, 393(10170):447–492, February 2019.
- [47] Ulrike Wood-Sichra, Alison B. Joglekar, and Liangzhi You. Spatial production allocation model (spam) 2005: Technical documentation. *HarvestChoice Working Paper*, November 2019.
- [48] WorldPop. Global 1km population total grid - 2000-2020, Apr 2020.
- [49] Ran Xu, Xiao Huang, Kai Zhang, Weixuan Lyu, Debarchana Ghosh, Zhenlong Li, and Xiang Chen. Integrating human activity into food environments can better predict cardiometabolic diseases in the united states. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):7326, November 2023.
- [50] Li Xue, Gang Liu, Julian Parfitt, Xiaojie Liu, Erica Van Herpen, Asa Stenmarck, Clementine OConnor, Karin Ostergren, and Shengkui Cheng. Missing food,

missing data? a critical review of global food losses and food waste data.
Environmental Science & Technology, 51(12):6618–6633, June 2017.