

Systematic Review of Dietary Patterns and Sustainability in the United States

Online Supplementary Material: Methods, Bias Assessment, and Evidence Grading Tools

Reinhardt, S.L. et al. (2020)

Systematic Review Methodology

To produce this systematic review, we first sought to replicate the original literature search performed by the US Department of Agriculture and 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee (DGAC), which included studies published between January 2000 and March 2014, to verify whether the search terms provided in Appendix E-2.37 of the Scientific Report of the 2015 DGAC could reliably replicate the original search results. Because the original methods did not consistently detail the advanced search strings and scientific journal databases are not static (e.g., search terms are periodically updated, databases undergo structural changes, etc.), the search terms required some modifications to achieve the desired results.

To better understand how studies had been categorized in various databases in 2014 and how these categorizations may have changed over time, we utilized tools such as the MeSH (Medical Subject Headings) Analyzer. The search methodology was ultimately revised with additional geographical search terms in Embase, new MeSH terms and database specific descriptors, and greater specification of some fields searched in the original DGAC search. Several new MeSH terms were included because annual additions and changes are made to the MeSH thesaurus. For example, “Greenhouse Gases” became a new MeSH term between 2015 and 2019 and consequently it was added to the PubMed search we conducted. However, we found that inclusion of this MeSH term did not alter the search results.

Additionally, because the publicly available DGAC documentation did not indicate which fields were being searched in each of the three databases, the study team reviewed the original search of these databases, and then adjusted database-specific search terms using title, abstract, keyword or subject headings.

After these modifications, the search methodology could reproduce the original search performed by the 2015 DGAC, as indicated by a comparable quantity of studies returned, and the inclusion of those studies named in the DGAC evidence portfolio on food sustainability. We then used these search terms to rerun the search for the time frame of July 2015 to September 2019.

Personal communications reported that the Navigator interface used for their search included three databases: BIOSIS Citations, CAB Abstracts, and FSTA. The current study team did not have access to a federated search that included all three indexes. Consequently, each database was searched separately, enabling us to use the native thesaurus and taxonomies for each.

Below is the search methodology used for each database, including dates searched, year or date range, and number of studies returned.

Dates Searched: 09/20/2019

Databases: BIOSIS Citations

Year Range: [2015-2019]

Results: 99

Search Terms:

((TI=((Food OR environment* OR diet) NEAR/4 (sustainab*))) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=BCI Timespan= All years

OR

(TI=("food insecurity" OR "food security" OR (greenhouse NEAR/1 effect*) OR ("greenhouse gas" NEAR/1 emission*) OR "land use" OR "water use")) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=BCI Timespan= All years

OR ((TI=((carbon OR environment*) NEAR/2 footprint))) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=BCI Timespan= All years

AND

((TS=(MedDietScore or "adequacy index" or kidmed or (index or score) near/2 ("diet quality") or dietary or nutrient* or eating or food or diet))) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=BCI Timespan=All years

OR TS=("diet quality" or "dietary approaches to stop hypertension" or vegan* or vegetarian* or "prudent diet" or "western diet" or omniheart or "Optimal Macronutrient Intake Trial to Prevent Heart Disease" or nordiet or "Nordic diet") **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=BCI Timespan=All years

OR (TI=((Okinawa* or asia* or Chinese or japan* or Hispanic* or ethnic or "plant based") near/3 diet*)) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Article) **AND TAXA NOTES:** (Humans)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TI=((omni or Mediterranean or DASH) near/3 diet*)) AND **LANGUAGE:** (English) AND **DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TI=((Diet or dietary or eating or food) near/2 (pattern* or profile* or habit* or guideline* or recommendation*))) **LANGUAGE:** (English) AND **DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Article) AND **TAXA NOTES:** (Humans)

Indexes=BCI Timespan=All years

PUBLICATION YEARS: 2015 OR 2016 OR 2017 OR 2018 OR 2019

Dates Searched: 09/20/2019

Databases: CAB Abstracts (Web of Science)

Year Range: [2000-2014], [2014-2015], [2015-2019]

Results: 86

Search Terms:

((Diet or dietary or eating or food) adj (pattern* or profile* or habit* or guideline* or recommendation*)).m_titl.

OR ((MedDietScore or "adequacy index" or kidmed or index or score) adj ("diet quality" or dietary or nutrient* or eating or food or diet)).mp. [mp=abstract, title, original title, broad terms, heading words, identifiers, cabicodes]

OR ("diet quality" or "dietary approaches to stop hypertension" or vegan* or vegetarian* or "prudent diet" or "western diet" or omniheart or "Optimal Macronutrient Intake Trial to Prevent Heart Disease" or nordiet or "Nordic diet")

OR ((omni or Mediterranean or DASH) adj diet*).m_titl.

OR ((Okinawa* or asia* or Chinese or japan* or Hispanic* or ethnic or "plant based") adj diet*).m_titl.

AND

((Food or environment* or diet) adj sustainab*).m_titl.

OR ((carbon or environment*) adj footprint).mp. [mp=abstract, title, original title, broad terms, heading words, identifiers, cabicodes]

OR ("food insecurity" or "food security" or (greenhouse adj effect*) or ("greenhouse gas" adj emission*) or "land use" or "water use").m_titl.

(English language and yr="2015-2019")

Dates Searched: 08/28/2019

Databases: Cochrane

Year Range: July 1, 2015 – August 15, 2019

Results: 15

Search Terms:

“diet quality” OR (dietary NEXT guideline*) OR (dietary NEXT recommendation*) OR ((food OR eating OR diet OR dietary) NEAR/3 (pattern OR profile OR habit)) OR (eating NEXT style*) OR (“dietary approaches to stop hypertension” OR vegan* OR vegetarian* OR “prudent diet” OR “western diet” OR nordiet OR “Nordic diet” OR omniheart OR "Optimal Macronutrient Intake Trial to Prevent Heart Disease" OR ((asia* OR western OR Okinawa* OR “plant based” OR Mediterranean OR DASH) AND (diet* OR food))) OR ((Index OR score OR indices OR scoring) NEAR/3 (dietary OR diet OR food OR eating)) OR “adequacy index” OR kidmed OR MedDietScore

((Food OR environment* OR diet) NEAR/4 (sustainab*)) OR ((carbon OR environment*) NEAR/2 footprint) OR “food insecurity” OR “food security” OR (greenhouse NEAR/1 effect*) OR (“greenhouse gas” NEAR/1 emission*) OR “land use” OR “water use”

Dates Searched: 09/11/2019

Databases: Embase

Year Range: [2000-2014], [2014-2015], [2015-2019]

Results: 322

Search Terms:

'adequacy index*' OR meddietscore OR kidmed OR 'healthy eating index'

OR ((index OR score OR scoring) NEAR/3 ('diet quality' OR dietary OR nutrient* OR eating OR food OR diet)):ti,ab

OR 'diet quality' OR 'eating habit'/exp OR 'mediterranean diet'/exp OR nordiet:ti,ab OR 'nordic diet':ti,ab OR dash:ti,ab OR 'dietary approaches to stop hypertension':ti,ab OR vegan*:ab,ti OR

vegetarian*:ab,ti OR 'vegetarian diet'/exp OR 'vegetarian'/exp OR 'prudent diet':ti,ab OR 'western diet':ti,ab OR omniheart:ti,ab OR omni:ti OR 'plant based diet'

OR ((dietary OR eating OR food OR diet) NEAR/2 (pattern? OR habit? OR profile? OR recommendation? OR guideline?)) OR (('ethnic, racial and religious groups'/exp OR okinawa* OR 'mediterranean') AND ('diet'/exp OR 'eating'/exp OR 'food intake'/de))

AND 'environmental sustainability'/exp OR 'food security'/exp OR 'carbon footprint'/exp OR 'human impact (environment)'/exp OR 'greenhouse effect'/exp OR 'ecosystem'/de OR 'land use'/de OR 'plant water use'/exp OR (food NEAR/5 sustainab*) OR 'food insecurity'/exp OR 'environmental impact' OR (environment* NEAR/2 footprint) OR (diet* NEAR/5 sustainab*)

AND [humans]/lim AND [english]/lim AND [embase]/lim AND [2000-2014]/py NOT [medline]/lim

Dates Searched: 09/24/2019

Databases: FSTA

Year Range: 2015-2019

Results: 246

Search Terms:

(TI=((Food OR environment* OR diet) NEAR/4 (sustainab*))) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TI=("food insecurity" OR "food security" OR (greenhouse NEAR/1 effect*) OR ("greenhouse gas" NEAR/1 emission*) OR "land use" OR "water use")) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TI=((carbon OR environment*) NEAR/2 footprint)) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

AND

OR (TI=((Diet or dietary or eating or food) near/2 (pattern* or profile* or habit* or guideline* or recommendation*))) **AND LANGUAGE:** (English) **AND DOCUMENT TYPES:** (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TS=((omni or Mediterranean or DASH) near/3 diet*)) AND LANGUAGE: (English) AND DOCUMENT TYPES: (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TI=((omni or Mediterranean or DASH) near/3 diet*)) AND LANGUAGE: (English) AND DOCUMENT TYPES: (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TI=((Okinawa* or asia* or Chinese or japan* or Hispanic* or ethnic or "plant based") near/3 diet*)) AND LANGUAGE: (English) AND DOCUMENT TYPES: (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TS=("diet quality" or "dietary approaches to stop hypertension" or vegan* or vegetarian* or "prudent diet" or "western diet" or omniheart or "Optimal Macronutrient Intake Trial to Prevent Heart Disease" or nordiet or "Nordic diet")) AND LANGUAGE: (English) AND DOCUMENT TYPES: (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

OR (TS=((MedDietScore or "adequacy index" or kidmed or index or score) near/2 ("diet quality" or dietary or nutrient* or eating or food or diet))) AND LANGUAGE: (English) AND DOCUMENT TYPES: (Journal Article)

Indexes=FSTA Timespan=All years

Combine and Indexes=FSTA Timespan=2015-2019

Dates Searched: 09/18/2019

Databases: PubMed

Year Range: July 2015 – September 2019

Results: 804

(((((("diet quality" OR dietary pattern* OR diet pattern* OR eating pattern* OR food pattern* OR eating habit* OR dietary habit* OR food habit* OR dietary profile* OR food profile* OR diet profile* OR eating profile* OR dietary guideline* OR dietary recommendation* OR food intake pattern* OR dietary intake pattern* OR diet pattern* OR eating style*) OR (DASH[ti] OR DASH[tw] OR ("dietary approaches"[ti] AND hypertension[ti]) OR "Diet, Mediterranean"[Mesh] OR Mediterranean [ti] OR vegan* OR vegetarian* OR "Diet, Vegetarian"[Mesh] OR "prudent diet" OR "western diet" OR nordiet OR omni[ti] OR omniheart[tiab] OR (Optimal Macronutrient Intake Trial to Prevent Heart Disease) OR ((Okinawa* OR "Ethnic Groups"[Mesh] OR "plant based" OR Mediterranean[tiab])OR

Nordic[tiab] OR "heart healthy"[tiab] OR indo-mediterranean) AND (diet[mh] OR diet[tiab] OR food[mh])) OR ("Guideline Adherence"[Mesh] AND (diet OR food OR eating OR eat OR dietary OR feeding OR nutrition OR nutrient*)) OR (adherence AND (nutrient* OR nutrition OR diet OR dietary OR food OR eat OR eating) AND (guideline* OR guidance OR recommendation*)) OR (dietary score* OR adequacy index* OR kidmed OR Diet Quality Index* OR Food Score* OR Diet Score* OR MedDietScore OR Dietary Pattern Score* OR "healthy eating index") OR ((index*[ti] OR score*[ti] OR indexes OR scoring[ti] OR indices[ti]) AND (dietary[ti] OR nutrient*[ti] OR eating[tiab] OR food[ti] OR food[mh] OR diet[ti] OR diet[mh]) AND (pattern* OR habit* OR profile*))))))

AND

((environmental footprint* OR Carbon Footprint*[tiab] OR environmental impact* OR food security* OR food insecurity* OR "Conservation of Natural Resources"[Mesh] OR "Greenhouse Effect"[Mesh] OR "Greenhouse Gases"[Mesh] OR "Carbon Footprint"[Mesh] OR "Environmental Monitoring"[Mesh] OR ((environment*[tiab] OR food[major:noexp] OR food[ti] OR diet[major])) AND sustainab*[tiab])) OR ("Conservation of Natural Resources"[major:noexp] OR "Greenhouse Effect"[major:noexp] OR "Greenhouse Gases"[major:noexp] OR "Carbon Footprint"[major:noexp] OR "Environmental Monitoring"[major:noexp]) OR ("Ecosystem"[Mesh] OR ecological system*[tiab] OR greenhouse*[tiab] OR "Ecosystem"[major] OR ecological system*[tiab] OR greenhouse*[tiab] OR "land use"[tiab] OR "water use"[tiab]))))

AND

("2015/07/01"[PDat] : "2019/09/17"[PDat]) AND English[lang]) AND (("Study Characteristics" [Publication Type] OR "clinical trial"[ptyp] OR "Epidemiologic Studies"[Mesh] OR "Support of Research"[ptyp]) NOT (editorial[ptyp] OR comment[ptyp] OR news[ptyp] OR letter[ptyp] OR review[ptyp]))

Systematic Review Critical Appraisal Checklist

The modified critical appraisal checklist was developed by USDA's Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion specifically for the 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee. The tool was developed to assess bias among the studies related to sustainable diets and dietary patterns. For more information on the development of the Critical Appraisal Checklist, see the 2015 DGAC report.

Modeling assessments should include:		Yes/No
1	A statement of the problem	
2	A discussion of the need for modeling vs. alternative methodologies	
3	A description of the relevant factors and outcomes	
4	A description of the model including reasons for this type of model and a specification of the scope including boundary conditions for analysis	
5	A listing of data sources (including subjective estimates), with a description of the strengths and weaknesses of each source	
6	A list of assumptions pertaining to the structure of the model and the data	
7	A list of parameter values that will be used for a base case analysis	
8	The results derived from applying the model for the base case	
9	A discussion of how the modelling assumptions might affect the results, indicating both the direction of the bias and the approximate magnitude of the effect	
10	A description of the validation undertaken, including the following where appropriate: concurrence of experts, internal consistency, external consistency, or predictive validity	
11	A description of the settings to which the results of the analysis can be applied and a list of factors that could limit the applicability of the results	
12	A description of research in progress that could yield new data that could alter the results of the analysis	

Evaluation of the quality of studies meeting inclusion criteria using the Critical Appraisal Checklist

The quality of studies meeting inclusion criteria, as determined by the modified critical appraisal checklist, was high, with all studies receiving scores of 8 out of 12 to 11 out of 12 with a mean of 10.5. All of the studies provided a statement of the problem which precipitated a need to complete the study (Criterion 1). Of the 22 included papers, only one paper provided a discussion of the need for modeling vs. alternative methodologies (Criterion 2) (1). In order to maintain consistency with previous reviews performed by the DGAC in 2015 and Nelson et al. in 2016, this question was included in the checklist; however, it may not warrant inclusion in the checklist for future applications, as modeling is currently the only viable methodology capable of measuring the impact of diets on environmental outcomes and climate change, and a discussion of alternative methodologies is not necessary.

All of the studies provided description of the relevant factors and outcomes, as well as a description of the models used (Criterion 3 and 4). Explanations of the rationale for the use of modeling was less common, although some papers provided this explanation as a strength of the methodology used. In the explanation of the data sources used, many studies cited literature reviews or analysis performed in previously published articles. This was commonly done with respect to Life Cycle Assessments (LCA) and water footprint analysis (Criterion 5) (2–17). Discussion of the assumptions in the analysis was completed by all but one of the studies with varying degrees of explanation (8). Supplemental materials often contained additional support for various assumptions (Criterion 6) (3,9,18). All articles had sufficient discussion of the base case analysis; however, the presentation of outcomes associated with the base case scenario varied (Criterion 7). Many studies examined the base case in the analysis, while others calculated only the impact of shifting current consumption to recommended diets. In the case of the latter, it was possible to have the results presented as the percent change to the recommended diet without outcomes reported on baseline conditions, although this occurred in a minority of cases (Criterion 8) (1).

All studies indicated, to some degree, the use of assumptions in the analysis; however, there were substantial disparities in how study authors discussed how the modeling assumptions might affect the results, including the direction and magnitude of bias (Criterion 9). Various validation techniques were undertaken, including Monte Carlo Simulations, providing upper and lower limits of estimates, internal data consistency checks, and others. There was consistent discussion of studies applying similar methodologies or examining similar research questions and how the findings of the current study compared (Criterion 10).. All studies addressed settings in which results could be applied (Criterion 11). All but one study indicated the need for future research and how future analyses could be improved upon (Criterion 12) (13,17). However, there was little discussion of whether future improvements to the body of research could alter the results of the analysis at hand.

Nutrition Evidence Systematic Review Grading Rubric
 US Department of Agriculture Nutrition Evidence Systematic Review (NESR) | NESR.usda.gov

	Strong	Moderate	Limited	Grade Not Assignable
Risk of bias	Across the body of evidence, there is a <i>strong</i> likelihood that the design and conduct of the studies has prevented or minimized bias such that the reported results are the true effects of the intervention/ exposure, and plausible bias and/or potential limitations are unlikely to alter the results	Across the body of evidence, there is a <i>moderate</i> likelihood that the design and conduct of the studies has prevented or minimized bias such that the reported results are the true effects of the intervention/ exposure, and plausible bias and/or potential limitations are unlikely to alter the results	Across the body of evidence, there is a <i>limited</i> likelihood that the design and conduct of the studies has prevented or minimized bias such that the reported results may not be the true effects of the intervention/ exposure, and plausible bias and/or potential limitations may have altered the results	A <i>grade is not assignable</i> for this element because it cannot be adequately assessed
Consistency	The body of evidence demonstrates findings with <i>strong</i> consistency in direction and magnitude of effect; or, any inconsistencies in findings can be explained by methodological differences	The body of evidence demonstrates findings with <i>moderate</i> consistency in direction and magnitude of effect; some of the inconsistencies in findings can be explained by methodological differences	The body of evidence demonstrates findings with <i>limited</i> consistency in direction and magnitude of effect; few of the inconsistencies in findings can be explained by methodological differences	A <i>grade is not assignable</i> for this element because it cannot be adequately assessed
Directness	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>strong</i> directness, such that studies are designed to directly examine the relationships among intervention/exposure, comparator, and outcomes of primary interest in the systematic review question	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>moderate</i> directness, such that some studies are designed to directly examine the relationships among intervention/exposure, comparator, and/or outcomes of primary interest in the systematic review question	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>limited</i> directness, such that few studies are designed to directly examine the relationships among intervention/exposure, comparator, and/or outcomes of primary interest in the systematic review question	A <i>grade is not assignable</i> for this element because it cannot be adequately assessed
Precision	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>strong</i> precision based on a substantial number of sufficiently-powered studies with a narrow assessment of variance	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>moderate</i> precision based on an adequate number of sufficiently-powered studies with a narrow assessment of variance	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>limited</i> precision based on an inadequate number of sufficiently-powered studies with a narrow assessment of variance	A <i>grade is not assignable</i> for this element because it cannot be adequately assessed
Generalizability	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>strong</i> generalizability to the U.S. population of interest with regard to: a) the participant characteristics b) the intervention/exposure and outcomes studied	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>moderate</i> generalizability to the U.S. population of interest with regard to: a) the participant characteristics b) the intervention/exposure and outcomes studied	The body of evidence demonstrates <i>limited</i> generalizability to the U.S. population of interest with regard to: a) the participant characteristics b) the intervention/exposure and outcomes studied	A <i>grade is not assignable</i> for this element because it cannot be adequately assessed

References

1. Mulik K. O. Cropland Implications of Healthier Diets in the United States. *J Hunger Environ Nutr.* 2015;115.
2. Blackstone NT, El-Abbadi NH, McCabe MS, Griffin TS, Nelson ME. Linking sustainability to the healthy eating patterns of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans: a modelling study. *Lancet Planet Health.* 2018;
3. Tom MS, Fischbeck PS, Hendrickson CT. Energy use, blue water footprint, and greenhouse gas emissions for current food consumption patterns and dietary recommendations in the US. *Environ Syst Decis.* 2016;36:92–103.
4. Hallstrom E, Gee Q, Scarborough P, Cleveland DA. A healthier US diet could reduce greenhouse gas emissions from both the food and health care systems. *Clim Change.* 2017;142:199–212.
5. Gephart JA, Davis KF, Emery KA, Leach AM, Galloway JN, Pace ML. The environmental cost of subsistence: Optimizing diets to minimize footprints. *Sci Total Environ.* 2016;
6. Shepon A, Eshel G, Noor E, Milo R. The opportunity cost of animal based diets exceeds all food losses. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2018;
7. Stylianou K.S., Heller M.C., Fulgoni V.L., Ernstoff A.S., Keoleian G.A., Jolliet O. A life cycle assessment framework combining nutritional and environmental health impacts of diet: a case study on milk. *Int J Life Cycle Assess.* 2016;734.
8. Rose D., Heller M., Willits-Smith A., Meyer R. Relation between healthiness of the diet and greenhouse gas emissions from food in the USA: A population-based cross-sectional study. *The Lancet.* 2017;S18.
9. Peters CJ, Picardy J, Wilkins JL, Griffin TS, Fick GW, Darrouzet-Nardi AF. Carrying Capacity of U.S. agricultural land: Ten diet scenarios. *Elem Sci Anthr.* 2016;4:1.
10. Blas A, Garrido A, Willaarts BA. Evaluating the Water Footprint of the Mediterranean and American Diets. *Water.* 2016;8:448.
11. Eshel G, Shepon A, Noor E, Milo R. Environmentally optimal, nutritionally aware beef replacement plant-based diets. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2016;50:8164–8.
12. Kim BF, Santo RE, Scatterday AP, Fry JP, Synk CM, Cebon SR, Mekonnen MM, Hoekstra AY, de Pee S, Bloem MW, et al. Country-specific dietary shifts to mitigate climate and water crises. *Glob Environ Change.* 2019;101926.
13. Ritchie H, Reay DS, Higgins P. The impact of global dietary guidelines on climate change. *Glob Environ Change.* 2018;46–55.
14. White RR, Hall MB. Nutritional and greenhouse gas impacts of removing animals from US agriculture. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2017;114:E10301–8.

15. Birney CI, Franklin KF, Davidson FT, Webber ME. An assessment of individual foodprints attributed to diets and food waste in the United States. *Environ Res Lett.* 2017;12.
16. Behrens P, Jong JCK, Bosker T, Rodrigues JFD, Koning A de, Tukker A. Evaluating the environmental impacts of dietary recommendations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2017;114:13412–7.
17. Mekonnen MM, Fulton J. The effect of diet changes and food loss reduction in reducing the water footprint of an average American. *Water Int.* 2018;43:860–70.
18. Rehkamp S, Canning P. The Potential for Healthier and Energy Efficient American Diets. *Choices.* 2017;32:1–9.