Rebound effects may undermine benefits of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as animal feed in China

Weitong Long[1,2], Xueqin Zhu[1*], Hans-Peter Weikard[1], Oene Oenema[2,3], Yong Hou[2*]

[1]Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Group, Wageningen University, Hollandseweg 1, 6706 KN Wageningen, The Netherlands

[2]State Key Laboratory of Nutrient Use and Management, College of Resources and Environmental Science, China Agricultural University, 100193 Beijing, China

[3]Wageningen Environmental Research, 6708 PB Wageningen, The Netherlands

∗ Corresponding author at: Wageningen University, 6706 KN Wageningen, The Netherlands; China Agricultural University, 100193, Beijing, China.

E-mail addresses: xueqin.zhu@wur.nl (X. Zhu); yonghou@cau.edu.cn (Y. Hou).

Abstract

Upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as animal feed could reduce environmental impacts of livestock production, but rebound effects, where lower feed costs lead to livestock production expansion, may diminish these benefits. Using an integrated environmental-economic model, we assess the impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed in China's monogastric livestock production. We find that the upcycling increases monogastric livestock production by 23-36% and raises total emissions of acidification pollutants in China by 2.5-4.0%. In contrast, domestically total greenhouse gas emissions decrease by 0.5-1.4% through less food waste and food processing by-products in landfills and incinerators and contraction of the non-food sector. This upcycling, accompanied by resource reallocation across the entire economy, enhances food security and has significant knock-on effects beyond the agricultural sectors, thereby influencing sectoral employment, gross domestic product, and household welfare. Implementing appropriate emission taxes provides an opportunity to absorb the rebound effects on emissions but may negatively affect food security indicators and shift emission-intensive sectors from China to its trading partners, depending on the height of the taxes. Our study, thus, supports policy design aimed at achieving environmental sustainability and food security.

Keywords

circular food system; food waste; food security; environmental impacts; environmental-economic modelling; rebound effects.

Main

Animal-sourced food (ASF), such as meat, milk, and eggs, is the main contributor to the environmental impacts of food systems, including global warming potential (GWP), acidification potential (AP), and eutrophication potential (EP) [1,2]. The global demand for ASF, driven by population growth and increased prosperity and urbanisation, is expected to double by 2050, while growth is more pronounced in low-income countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia [3-5]. This surge in livestock production has exacerbated food-feed competition and significantly contributed to the exceedance of the planetary boundaries (PBs) for emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs), acidification pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants [6]. Currently, 70% of global agricultural land is used for producing animal feed [7], and global livestock production accounts for 13-18% of the total anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions [8], 40% of the ammonia (NH_3) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) emissions [9], and around 24% of nitrogen (N) and 55% of phosphorus (P) losses to water bodies [10]. Given that livestock production dominates the environmental impacts of food systems, achieving the global 1.5°C climate target and reducing emissions of acidification and eutrophication pollutants will remain challenging without mitigating emissions from livestock production [11-13].

Globally, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimated in 2011 that one-third (1.3 billion tons per year) of food produced for human consumption was lost or wasted [14]. In 2021, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) estimated this figure at 40% (2.5 billion tons per year) [15], which includes on-farm food losses (not included in earlier studies) and uses updated data on losses in supply chains and waste at retailing and consumption, offering a more comprehensive assessment of food loss and waste. A large proportion of food waste ends up in landfills or incinerators, exacerbating GHG emissions and associated climate change [16]. Upcycling food waste and food processing by-products (also called "low-opportunity-cost feed products (LCFs)"), as animal feed is, thus, crucial for reducing environmental impacts and building more cir cvbbfgydcular food systems, as it offers a pathway to mitigate land-related pressures [17], alleviate the food-feed competition [18], and reduce emissions from food systems and improper food waste disposal [19]. By upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as animal feed, livestock could recycle nutrients that would otherwise be lost in food production [20]. This upcycling prioritises arable land for food rather than feed

3

62   production, allowing livestock to support the food supply without requiring additional arable land,

63   thereby enhancing food security, reducing the environmental impact of food systems [17-19], and

64   contributing to achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including SDG 2 (zero hunger),

65   SDG 6 (clean water and sanitation), SDG 13 (climate action), and SDG 15 (life on land) [21].

66   While many studies acknowledge the environmental benefits of upcycling food waste and food

67   processing by-products as animal feed, some gaps remain in the existing literature. First, previous

68   studies [17-19] employing linear optimisation models to evaluate the environmental impacts of a

69   transition towards circularity may have overestimated the environmental benefits by disregarding

70   "rebound effects" (also known as "Jevons paradox") [22,23]. The rebound effect, where lower feed

71   costs lead to livestock production expansion, may diminish the environmental benefits of feeding

72   animals with food waste and food processing by-products. The "rebound effect" has been

73   extensively studied in energy systems [24,25], but studies of its implications in food systems are largely

74   lacking. Although previous studies have explored rebound effects related to a global dietary shift

75   towards plant-based food [26] and halving food loss and waste [27], there is still limited understanding

76   of the rebound effect of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as animal feed.

77   Second, strategies to absorb these negative rebound effects resulting from upcycling food waste and

78   food processing by-products as animal feed have not yet been explored. Implementing synergistic

79   emission taxes that encompass emissions of GHGs and pollutants leading to acidification and

80   eutrophication is considered an effective policy instrument to identify the most economically cost-

81   effective mitigation pathway for achieving given emission mitigation targets [28-31]. Such emission

82   taxes could drive emission reductions by curbing production in emission-intensive sectors (e.g.,

83   livestock) while incentivising producers and consumers to transition from emission-intensive

84   activities, commodities, and technologies to cleaner alternatives, ensuring a cost-effective

85   mitigation strategy in the entire economy. Thus, a coordinated strategy that integrates upcycling

86   with emission taxes is essential to help absorb the rebound effects on emissions. For example,

87   several countries, such as the United States, France, Canada, and New Zealand, have implemented

88   various forms of carbon taxes to mitigate GHG emissions [32]. However, unilateral carbon taxes may

89   lead to "carbon leakage", as the production of emission-intensive goods may shift from carbon-

90   constrained regions to those with weaker or no carbon regulations, thereby reducing policy

4

91 effectiveness [33,34]. As climate change is a global public good, effective GHG mitigation requires

92 coordinated international action, such as the recent commitments to net-zero targets under the Paris

93 Agreement [35,36]. Additionally, an integrated tax plan for taxes on emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2),

94 nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) from energy use in China could reduce

95 socioeconomic and welfare costs by 50% compared to independent plans [31]. This underscores the

96 importance of an integrated tax strategy, combining carbon and other environmental taxes, to

97 achieve a win-win situation for the economy and the environment.

98 Our study focuses on China because it is the world's largest animal producer, accounting for 46%,

99 34%, and 13% of global pork, egg, and poultry meat production, respectively, in 2018 [5]. Moreover,

100 around 27% of food produced for human consumption is lost or wasted in China [37], implying a great

101 opportunity to upcycle the discarded food waste as feed. In addition, the Chinese government has

102 proposed to lower the agricultural product processing loss to below 3% by 2035 [38], and to substitute

103 human-edible feed ingredients, such as soybeans and maize, in animal feed with food processing

104 by-products [39]. Furthermore, the Chinese government recently released a national plan to reduce

105 concentrated feedstuffs such as soybean and maize in pig and chicken production sectors through

106 improved feeding strategies, including upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as

107 animal feed [40]. Evidently, there is a great need to better understand potential rebound effects that

108 may influence the expected benefits of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as

109 animal feed before this action plan is widely implemented in China.

110 To address these knowledge gaps, this study uses an integrated environmental-economic applied

111 general equilibrium (AGE) modelling approach to assess the impacts of the environmental and

112 economic impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed in China's

113 monogastric livestock production, capturing both domestic effects in China and cross-border

114 impacts on its main food and feed trading partners (MTP, including Brazil, the United States, and

115 Canada) through bilateral trade. We also explore how implementing regional uniform emission

116 taxes across all sectors on economy-wide emissions (i.e., total emissions from all sectors in the

117 entire economy) of GHGs (including CO_2, methane (CH_4), and N_2O), acidification pollutants

118 (including NH_3, NO_x, and SO_2), and eutrophication pollutants (including N and P losses to water

119 bodies) in China and MTP could absorb the rebound effects of this upcycling while safeguarding

120 food security. We address three main research questions. First, how will an increased utilisation of

121 food waste and food processing by-products as feed influence livestock production, food supply,

122 and other non-agricultural sectors in China and MTP? Second, how will an increased utilisation of

123 food waste and food processing by-products influence economy-wide emissions of GHGs,

124 acidification pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants, as well as food security indicators (i.e.,

125 average food price, food affordability, population at risk of hunger, and food availability)? Third,

126 how will emission taxes absorb the rebound effects of this upcycling while safeguarding food

127 security?

128 We examine five scenarios: (i) the baseline (S0) scenario represents the economic and

129 environmental conditions of all sectors (including agriculture, industries, and services) in the entire

130 economies of China and MTP in 2014; (ii) scenario S1 involves partially upcycling food waste and

131 food processing by-products (54% of food waste and 100% of food processing by-products) as feed

132 for monogastric livestock production in China; (iii) scenario S2 involves fully upcycling food waste

133 and food processing by-products (100% of food waste and 100% of food processing by-products)

134 as feed for monogastric livestock production in China; (iv) scenario S3 adds a modest emission

135 mitigation target to S1 which entails implementing regional uniform emission taxes across all

136 sectors to ensure that economy-wide emissions of GHGs, acidification pollutants, and

137 eutrophication pollutants in China and MTP do not exceed their baseline (S0) levels; (v) scenario 4

138 adds an ambitious emission mitigation target to S1 which entails implementing regional uniform

139 emission taxes across all sectors to meet China's and the MTP's annual economy-wide GHG

140 mitigation targets under the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDC) of the Paris

141 Agreement [35,36], as well as China's emission reduction goals for economy-wide emissions of

142 acidification and eutrophication pollutants in line with the "14th Five-Year Plan" [41]. In S1, cross-

143 provincial transportation of food waste with high moisture content is not allowed, which limits the

144 maximum utilisation rate of food waste to 54% in China, according to Fang, et al. [17], whereas it is

145 allowed in S2. We consider food waste (cereal grains waste, vegetables & fruits waste, roots &

146 tubers waste, and oilseeds & pulses waste) during distribution, retailing, and consumption (both

147 households and out-of-home), as well as food processing by-products (cereal bran, alcoholic pulp,

6

148 and oil cakes). When substituting primary feed (i.e., feed crops and compound feed) in animal diets

149 with food waste and food processing by-products, the total protein and total energy supplies per unit

150 of animal output are kept constant in all scenarios. Detailed information on the scenarios and a series

151 of sensitivity analyses is provided in Supplementary Information (SI).

152 **Results**

153 **Overview of current utilisation of food waste and food processing by-products.**

154 According to the FAO [5], China produced about 104 Tg (1 Tg = 10^6 tons) of monogastric livestock

155 products (pork: 57 Tg; poultry meat: 18 Tg; egg: 29 Tg) and 53 Tg of ruminant livestock products

156 (milk: 42 Tg; beef: 6 Tg; lamb: 4 Tg) in 2014. We estimate that 226 Tg food waste (equivalent to

157 54 Tg in dry matter; 7 Tg in crude protein; 690 billion MJ in energy) and 155 Tg food processing

158 by-products (equivalent to 139 Tg in dry matter; 49 Tg in crude protein; 1907 billion MJ in energy)

159 was available in China in 2014, but only 39% of the food waste and 51% of the food processing by-

160 products were recycled as feed for monogastric livestock production, with the remainder disposed

161 in landfills and incinerators (Supplementary Tables 3-4). The limited use of food waste for feed

162 production in China is primarily due to the early stage of industrialization of recycling food waste

163 as feed, which currently has a low processing capacity [42], and the reliance of industrialized livestock

164 production on concentrated feed [3]. In addition, despite being protein-rich, food processing by-

165 products, such as unprocessed oil cakes, contain anti-nutritional factors that may hinder protein

166 absorption by animals. Although fermentation can effectively eliminate these anti-nutritional factors

167 and enhance digestion and growth performance [43], its limited adoption in China leads to a large

168 amount of these by-products being discarded in landfills or incinerators.

169 **Rebound effects of livestock production expansion.**

170 Unlike previous studies that considered recycling food waste and food processing by-products

171 feed to be costless [17-19], we assume that increasing costs of more recycled food waste and food

172 processing by-products as feed are born by monogastric livestock producers, and consumers benefit

173 from decreasing costs associated with less waste ending up in landfills and incinerators. We find

174 that upcycling 54-100% of food waste and 100% of food processing by-products as feed in scenarios

7

175   S1 and S2 increases the share of food waste and food processing by-products used as feed within

176   the total feed use in dry matter from 43% in S0 to 53-58% in S1 and S2 (Supplementary Fig. 2b).

177   Upcycling increases the supply of feed protein by 27-40% and feed energy by 26-39%, and reduces

178   total feed cost (including feed crops, compound feed, food waste, and food processing by-products)

179   per unit of monogastric livestock production by 2.1-3.0%. Consequently, the upcycling expands

180   monogastric livestock production by 23-36% in S1 and S2 (Fig. 2b). This expansion improves

181   China's comparative advantage in monogastric livestock trade in the global market, transforming it

182   from a net importer (importing 1% of output in S0) to a net exporter (exporting 18-25% of output

183   in S1 and S2) (Fig. 2e) while displacing production in its trading partners, which declines by 41-63%

184   (Supplementary Fig. 8b,d). As a result, total monogastric livestock production across China and its

185   trading partners increases only slightly (0.08-0.18%), leading to a minute decline (0.11-0.19%) in

186   the global monogastric livestock price (Supplementary Fig. 15). Ruminant livestock production

187   decreases by 3% as the expansion of monogastric livestock reduced the availability of feed crops

188   and compound feed to ruminant livestock (Fig. 2b). To meet domestic demand, ruminant livestock

189   imports rises from 1% of output in the baseline (S0) to 4% (Fig. 2e).

190   Expanded monogastric livestock production raises the demand for primary feed (i.e., feed crops and

191   compound feed), which surprisingly outweigh the reduction in primary feed use by substituting it

192   with food waste and food processing by-products. The overall feed demand for both monogastric

193   and ruminant livestock increases by 17-34% due to a 33-67% rise in feed demand in fresh form for

194   monogastric livestock (Fig. 3b). The upcycling increases the feed conversion ratio (FCR, the ratio

195   of fresh feed inputs to live weight gain) for monogastric livestock by 0.22-0.62 kg kg^{-1}, but decreases

196   the edible feed conversion ratio (eFCR, the amount of human-edible feedstuffs, i.e., feed crops and

197   compound feed, used for per unit of live weight gain) by 0.11-0.19 kg kg^{-1}, indicating its reduced

198   reliance on human-edible feedstuffs (Supplementary Fig. 3a). Since feed crops and compound feed

199   account for only 12% of ruminant feed (compared to 88% from grass, see Supplementary Fig. 4d),

200   upcycling has a minor impact on ruminant production and its FCR and eFCR (Supplementary Fig.

201   3b). The growing demand for crops used as animal feed increases reliance on crop imports, with the

202   import share rising from 11% in the baseline (S0) to 15-19% (Fig. 2d), considering that the total

203   crop production declines by 1.2-4.4% (Fig. 2a). Despite the decline in crop production, the

8

cultivated crop area expands by 0.6-13% (Fig. 3a), driven by higher labor costs (Supplementary Fig.

5) and reduced labor availability (Supplementary Fig. 7), which incentivise crop producers to

substitute labour with increased cropland use. Detailed impacts on crop production structure, as well

as the use of nitrogen and phosphorus fertilisers, are presented in Supplementary Results (see

Supplementary Figs. 4 and 6).

Adjustments in crop and livestock production also have knock-on effects beyond the agricultural

sectors in the broader economy, thereby influencing sectoral employment, gross domestic product

(GDP), and household welfare (a measure of economic well-being in US dollars). We observe that

the increase of 11.5-18.4 million people employed in monogastric livestock production is largely a

transfer from the non-food sector (i.e., industries and services; detailed in Appendix Table 1)

(Supplementary Fig. 7a,c). Output in the non-food sector declines slightly by 1.0-1.4%

(Supplementary Fig. 8a,c) with an absolute loss of 28-41 billion US dollars (USD, 2014 constant

price) (Supplementary Fig. 9a). In contrast, nitrogen and phosphorus fertiliser production surges by

35-36% and 20-59% (Fig. 2c), respectively, due to rising demand and decreased production costs,

as the shrinking non-food sector improves the availability of inputs to fertiliser production. As a

consequence, China becomes an exporter of nitrogen and phosphorus fertiliser (Fig. 2f). The

absolute value of fertiliser output rises by 5.4-7.0 billion USD (Supplementary Fig. 9a), which

compensates for less than one-fifth of the total output decrease of the non-food sector. The economic

losses in the crop and non-food sectors are largely offset by the expansion of the monogastric

livestock and fertiliser sectors (Supplementary Fig. 9a). The overall impact on China's economy is

a 0.02-0.07% (0.8-2.6 billion USD) decrease in GDP (Supplementary Fig. 11) and a slight positive

impact on household welfare (0.18-0.32%) (Supplementary Fig. 12).

Asymmetric impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products on food security and environment sustainability.

We find that the 23-36% expansion in monogastric livestock production under scenarios S1 and S2,

along with its knock-on effects beyond the agricultural sectors, increase Chinese economy-wide

emissions of acidification pollutants by 2.5-4.0% (Fig. 4b) and eutrophication pollutants by ±0.2%

(Fig. 4c). In contrast, the 0.5-1.4% decrease in economy-wide GHG emissions in China is caused

by less food waste and food processing by-products in landfills and incinerators and contraction of the non-food sector (Fig. 4a). Economy-wide emissions in MTP are reduced by 1.1-1.3% for GHGs, by 8-13% for acidification pollutants, and by 2.5-4.0% for eutrophication pollutants. These environmental benefits for MTP arise from a reduction in their domestic livestock and fertiliser production, as China shifts from a net importer to an exporter of livestock products and fertilisers (Fig. 2e,f).

For assessing food security, we use four indicators covering two dimensions: two indicators for food availability, i.e., dietary energy availability and the population at risk of hunger; two indicators for food access, i.e., cereals affordability for labour force and the average food price (including primary food products and processed food). Population at risk of hunger is estimated by multiplying the prevalence of undernourishment (PoU) by the total population, with PoU determined based on dietary energy availability from our model and other parameters following the FAO-based approach [44,45]. Cereals affordability for labour force is estimated by subtracting changes in the average wage across the entire economy from fluctuations in cereal prices. Our findings suggest that upcycling, accompanied by resource reallocation across the entire economy, enhances food security in China without compromising that of its trading partners. In addition, the reduced cost of collecting food waste and food processing by-products for landfill and incineration enables consumers in China to allocate more of their income to food consumption. Since the cost of food waste collection for landfill and incineration was quite small in the baseline (S0), the impact of reduced collection costs only has a modest positive effect on most food security indicators. Globally, the average food price declines by 0.1-0.2% (Fig. 5a,e). In China, dietary energy availability increases by 0.2-0.3%, and the population at risk of hunger, representing 17% of the global population at risk of hunger, decreases by 1.6-3.2% (Fig. 5c,d). Cereals affordability for labour force increases by 0.3-0.5% (Fig. 5b), as a result of a rise in the average wage across the Chinese economy (0.13-0.22%) (Supplementary Fig. 5) and a decrease in cereals price (0.16-0.26%) (Supplementary Fig. 15).

Absorbing rebound effects through emission taxes.

The modest mitigation target of S3 absorbs the rebound effects estimated for S1 of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed in China (Fig. 4) and safeguards global food security.

260   Changes in food security indicators under S3 are nearly identical to those in S1 (Fig. 5). This is due

261   to the implementation of a low tax rate on emissions of acidification pollutants (3 $ ton^{-1} NH$_3$-eq)

262   in China. The reduction in emissions of all pollutants in S3 is mainly attributed to a decrease in total

263   crop production compared to S1 (Fig. 2a; Fig 4; Supplementary Fig. 14a,b,c). Monogastric and

264   ruminant livestock production decreases slightly by 0.40% and 0.03%, respectively, in scenario S3

265   compared to S1 (Fig. 2b). The reduction in total feed cost per unit of monogastric livestock

266   production in S3 remains virtually unchanged from S1. Phosphorus fertiliser production increases

267   by 40% while nitrogen fertiliser production decreases by 6% compared to S1 (Fig. 2c). As a result,

268   emissions increases in MTP compared to S1 (Fig. 4) due to a shift of emission-intensive production

269   from China to MTP. Nonetheless, emissions of all pollutants in MTP still remain below baseline

270   (S0) levels.

271   The ambitious emission mitigation target of S4 counteracts the rebound effects further and achieves

272   a further emission reduction but poses a risk to food security, as the average global food price

273   increases by 9.4% (Fig. 5a,e) and cereals affordability for labour force decreases by 20.2% in China

274   (Fig. 5b) and by 14.5% in MTP (Fig. 5f). The negative impact on food security in China and MTP

275   is a result of the higher tax rates on emissions in both regions (5 $ ton^{-1} CO$_2$-eq , 788 $ ton^{-1} NH$_3$-

276   eq, and 6969 $ ton^{-1} N-eq in China; 2.5 $ ton^{-1} CO$_2$-eq in MTP). Emission taxes on acidification and

277   eutrophication pollutants are significantly higher than those on GHGs because their lower emission

278   levels compared to GHGs (see Appendix Tables 5-7) required higher tax rates to achieve the same

279   mitigation target. Food availability in MTP decreases by 3.3%, while it increases by 3.6% in China

280   (Fig. 5d,h). The rise in food availability in China is primarily due to the reallocation of crops from

281   animal feed to human food consumption (Supplementary Fig. 4c) following the reduction in

282   livestock production in S4 compared to S1 (Fig. 2b). Additionally, this increase is further supported

283   by a dietary shift in China from animal-based food to more affordable, energy-dense plant-based

284   food (Supplementary Table 8), which accounts for 84% of food availability in S0 (Supplementary

285   Fig. 16a). Consequently, the population at risk of hunger in MTP increases by 346% but declines in

286   China by 36% (Fig. 5 c,g). The 2.6% and 2.5% reduction in economy-wide emissions of GHGs and

287   acidification pollutants in China in S4 are largely driven by the non-food production contraction

288   compared to S1 (Fig. 4a,b). The 2.0% reduction in economy-wide emissions of eutrophication

11

pollutants (Fig. 4c) in China is primarily driven by 16% less monogastric livestock production and a 7% decline in ruminant livestock production in S4 compared to S1 (Fig. 2b; Supplementary Fig. 14f). The total feed cost per unit of monogastric livestock production in S4 decreases by an additional 2.3% compared to S1, driven by a shift in feed composition from human-edible feedstuffs (i.e., feed crops and compound feed) to less expensive food processing by-products and food waste. This transition is reflected in a further 0.07 kg kg^{-1} reduction in eFCR for monogastric livestock (Supplementary Fig. 3a). For MTP, the 2.0% reduction in economy-wide GHG emissions can largely be attributed to reductions in total crop and livestock production (Fig. 4a). Meanwhile, economy-wide emissions of acidification and eutrophication pollutants decrease both by 5% in MTP (Fig. 4b,c).

Discussion

We explore the possible environmental and economic consequences of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products in China's monogastric livestock production, and provide possible solutions to absorb the rebound effects in China and safeguard global food security. Our study serves as a step towards bridging monetary AGE models with biophysical and nutritional (i.e., protein and energy) constraints. Our integrated environmental-economic framework complements previous linear optimisation studies [17-19], which overlooked market-mediated effects via the price system. Our modelling framework captures the indirect "rebound effect" of livestock production expansion induced by lower feed costs and its knock-on effects beyond the agricultural sectors, which may undermine the expected environmental benefits in the transition to more circular food systems. Further, we show that changes in China's food systems has significant cross-border impacts on its trading partners through bilateral trade.

Upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as animal feed.

The primary challenges in upcycling food waste and processing by-products as animal feed are concerns over food and feed safety and potential animal health risks. For example, European Union (EU) legislation prohibits food waste in animal feed due to disease transmission concerns [46]. In contrast, feeding animals with food waste is more prevalent in Asian countries such as China, South Korea, and Japan, driven by growing demand for animal-sourced food, resource constraints that

12

prioritise food production over feed, and the preference for low-cost alternative feeds among small-scale farms [16]. Extensive field-based evidence has demonstrated that feeding animals with properly treated food waste is safe for animals with minimal health risks [47]. Thermal treatment methods, including heating, drying, and dehydration, are the most commonly used approaches to effectively reduce pathogen transmission risks and ensure food and feed safety [16]. While upcycling food waste as feed has been shown not to affect livestock productivity [16], to gain acceptance and adoption among livestock producers, livestock production from food waste must demonstrate its economic competitiveness against conventional feed [47]. Upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed necessitates various investments and policies to support the construction of municipal food waste collection plants to efficiently collect, sanitize, and package discarded food waste and food processing by-products for sale to livestock producers as feed [17]. Achieving near-full use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed appears feasible in China in the future due to several reasons. First, the food waste treatment industries (i.e., food waste collection service and food waste recycling service) have seen significant development and expansion in recent years [48]. Second, reinforced policies on municipal solid waste separation and collection guarantee a stable feed supply for monogastric livestock production [49,50]. For example, the Chinese government recently launched an action plan to reduce reliance on soybean imports, which includes a key initiative to give a trial to feed production from food waste in 20 cities by 2025 [51]. Additionally, the geographic proximity of industrial livestock farms to municipal food waste processors in China further facilitates the feasibility of upcycling [48].

Rebound effects of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as animal feed.

Our findings are particularly informative for policymakers focusing on reducing the environmental impact of food systems and enhancing food security, as we unveil the asymmetric impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed on food security and environment sustainability. A decreased eFCR for monogastric livestock reflects reduced reliance on human-edible feedstuffs per unit of production. While these benefits align with prior findings, our study additionally identifies rebound effects of expanded livestock production, its knock-on effects beyond the agricultural sectors, and cross-border impacts on other countries, which were missing in

13

345 previous linear optimisation studies [17-19]. We find that partially or fully upcycling food waste and

346 by-products as feed, intended to reduce livestock demand for human-edible feedstuffs and lower

347 emissions, can backfire, as a 2.1-3.0% reduction in feed costs drives a 23-36% expansion in

348 monogastric livestock production, ultimately increasing emissions. This livestock expansion is

349 consistent with findings by Tong, et al. [52], who argued that upcycling food waste as feed could

350 increase pork production in China by 14-29%, even when costs and prices remain constant.

351 Additionally, this expansion, along with its knock-on effects beyond the agricultural sectors,

352 increase economy-wide emissions of acidification and eutrophication pollutants in China by 2.5-

353 4.0% and by ±0.2%, respectively, in scenarios S1 and S2. In contrast, the 0.5-1.4% decrease in

354 economy-wide GHG emissions in China is caused by less food waste and food processing by-

355 products in landfills and incinerators and contraction of the non-food sectors. China's trading

356 partners obtain environmental benefits through reducing their domestic livestock and fertiliser

357 production, as China shifts from a net importer to an exporter of livestock products and fertilisers.

358 This upcycling, accompanied by resource reallocation across the entire economy, enhances food

359 security in China without compromising that of its trading partners. Our estimation of the rebound

360 effect aligns with Wang, et al. [53], who, using an agro-economic model, found that accelerated

361 investments in technology and infrastructure, which drive crop yield increases in China, would not

362 only increase GHG emissions from agriculture, forestry, and other land-use sectors due to expanded

363 crop production for export but also improve domestic food security by lowering food prices. Our

364 results also echo the findings of Hegwood, et al. [27], who argued that rebound effects could offset

365 more than half of avoided food loss and waste, thereby reducing environmental benefits while

366 enhancing food security. Our analysis, thus, enhances the understanding of synergies and trade-offs

367 between economic impacts and multiple environmental stresses associated with upcycling food

368 waste and food processing by-products as animal feed.

369 **Interconnection between food security and environmental sustainability.**

370 Our study highlights the need to integrate both food security and environmental sustainability into

371 policy decisions to leverage potential win-win opportunities, especially under the current challenges

372 such as climate change and resource constraints. In essence, policymakers should pay closer

14

373 attention to the interconnection between food security and environmental sustainability to better

374 leverage potential synergies and minimise trade-offs [54]. The reduction in GHG emissions, coupled

375 with the enhancements in food security, underscores the rationale for policymakers to promote

376 upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed. This also aligns with China's recent

377 emphasis on carbon neutrality and food security as leading priorities [55,56]. However, policymakers

378 should remain vigilant regarding indirect effects and spillovers, particularly the unintended

379 increases in emissions of acidification and eutrophication pollutants. We implement two emission

380 taxes to absorb the rebound effects of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed

381 in China. Our findings show that ambitious emission taxes counteract rebound effects but lead to a

382 9.4% rise in food prices, thereby threatening global food security. This aligns with findings of

383 Hasegawa, et al. [29], who revealed the risk of increased food insecurity under stringent global climate

384 change mitigation policy. Conversely, modest emission taxes provide an opportunity to absorb the

385 rebound effects in China and safeguard global food security. Therefore, to avoid unintended

386 negative environmental impacts and achieve the dual dividend of environmental sustainability and

387 food security, it is essential to carefully design and implement tailored, complementary policies

388 rather than relying on a single, one-size-fits-all solution. In China, the responsibility for food

389 security and environmental sustainability falls on different government agencies, highlighting the

390 pressing need for improved coordination and consistency within the government to effectively

391 tackle these intertwined issues [57]. In addition, a globally coordinated mitigation policy is imperative

392 for reducing the exceedance of the planetary boundaries for emissions of GHGs, acidification

393 pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants, as unilateral environmental policies can lead to "carbon

394 leakage" by outsourcing the production of emission-intensive goods to countries which lack

395 environmental regulations [33].

396 Despite its integrated approach, this study has some limitations that necessitate some follow-up.

397 First, while some simplifications, such as assumptions of fixed budget shares for consumers, fixed

398 cost shares for producers, and the absence of trade barriers, in our model may exaggerate trends,

399 they are appropriate for illustrating rebound effects. Second, our model overlooks sub-national

400 heterogeneity and future research could address this by improving spatial resolution to provide more

401   precise region-specific policy insights. Third, we use dollar-based shares to allocate physical

402   material flows without accounting for variations in product quality along the global supply chain.

403   This may introduce uncertainties in converting dollar-based quantities to physical quantities, yet it

404   remains a common approach [26,58]. In the absence of a universally accepted method to resolve this

405   issue, future research could further address this limitation. Fourth, our estimates of impacts are

406   performed in the static modelling framework based on the current economic conditions. It does not

407   account for long-term dynamics (e.g., population growth, economic development, evolving trade

408   policies) or external shocks (e.g., African swine fever, the US-China trade war, COVID-19), which

409   could reshape crop and livestock production portfolios and impact global food security and

410   environmental sustainability. Future research could incorporate dynamic modelling and extra

411   scenario analyses to better capture these uncertainties. Since we recognise the importance of

412   accounting for uncertainties in model results, we conducted a series of sensitivity analyses and

413   decomposed uncertainties into five major sources: (1) feasibility of upcycling food waste and food

414   processing by-products as feed; (2) conversion of dollar-based quantities to physical quantities; (3)

415   substitution of cropland with other inputs for crop production; (4) cereal self-sufficiency target; (5)

416   cleaner crop and livestock production technology. While potential data variations may moderately

417   influence the magnitude of our results, they do not alter the overall trends of food security indicators

418   and environmental impacts, and our main conclusions remain plausible. Further details on these

419   limitations and uncertainties are detailed in the Supplementary Discussion. In essence, our

420   integrated environmental-economic framework supports policy design aimed at achieving the dual

421   dividend of environmental sustainability and food security. Our analysis holds significant policy

422   implications not only for China, a key global market for food and feed, but also serves as a blueprint

423   for other populous emerging economies striving to achieve a better balance between food security

424   and environmental sustainability.

Methods
425

426   **The integrated environmental-economic model and database.**

427   The integrated environmental-economic model based on an applied general equilibrium (AGE)
428   framework has been widely used to identify the optimal solution towards greater sustainability and
429   enable efficient allocation of resources in the economy under social welfare maximisation [59-63]. For
430   this study, we developed a global comparative static AGE model, a modified version of an integrated

environmental-economic model, [33,64-68] and enhanced sectoral representation for agricultural (6 crop types and 2 livestock categories) and non-agricultural (compound feed, food processing by-products, processed food, fertilisers, food waste treatment, and non-food) sectors (see Fig. 1). While the static model limits its applicability to short-term policy analysis, prior studies have shown that it minimises assumptions and uncertainties about future conditions on population and economic growth [30,69]. This allows us to isolate the impact of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as animal feed in China under current economic conditions.

AGE models grounded in microeconomic theory represent the entire economy by integrating consumer demand, producer decisions, and market clearing into a unified framework. Consumers maximise utility by allocating income across goods and services within budget constraints, given prices and initial endowments. Producers maximise profits by selecting optimal input combinations based on production technology and given prices under perfect competition, following a zero-profit condition. This condition means that output values match input costs, preventing excess profits in constant returns to scale firms, as new firms increase supply, lower prices, and drive profits to zero, while firms incurring losses will exit the market, maintaining market equilibrium. The market clearance condition states that a market is in equilibrium when total supply equals total demand. In line with this principle, the economy reaches equilibrium when total supply matches total demand across all markets, with relative prices adjusting until consumers and producers can meet their effective demand and supply. Total supply consists of domestic production and imports, while total demand includes intermediate use by firms, household consumption, and exports. The resulting equilibrium prices ensure that all markets are cleared. For international trade, our AGE model adopted the Heckscher-Ohlin (H-O) trade assumption, treating domestic and imported goods as perfect substitutes. Under this assumption, production occurs in countries with comparative advantages, meaning goods are produced where they can be most efficiently produced. Detailed specifications of our AGE model can be found in the Supplementary Information (SI).

Our model distinguishes two regions: China and its main food and feed trading partners (MTP, including Brazil, the United States, and Canada). We select 2014 as the reference year, as it is the latest available year in the Global Trade Analysis Project (GTAP) database [70] at the time of our research. Our model is solved using the general algebraic modelling system (GAMS) software package [71]. We exclude the rest of the world (RoW) because, according to GTAP [70] trade flow data, MTP accounts for over 75% of China's total food and feed trade value in 2014, while China's trade share with RoW is smaller at 25%. Detailed information on China's domestic use and trade shares of food and feed products with MTP and RoW is provided in Supplementary Table 9. We observe that China maintains nearly 99% self-sufficiency in monogastric livestock production, with imports accounting for only 1% (0.8% from MTP and 0.2% from RoW; see Supplementary Table 9). Furthermore, monogastric livestock production in China and MTP together represents approximately 50% of global production (Supplementary Table 10).Thus, China's domestic food production plays a primary role in shaping its trade balance with MTP. Our two-region framework effectively captures the most significant trade flows influencing China's food system, while simplifying the model calculations.

Modelling circularity in livestock production requires a detailed representation of biophysical flows to consider nutritional balances and livestock feeding requirements due to increased utilisation of food waste and food processing by-products as feed for monogastric livestock production. Following Gatto, et al. [26] and Chepeliev [58], we convert dollar-based quantities (million USD) to physical quantities (Tg; $1 Tg = 10^6$ tons) to allow the tracing of biophysical flows through the global economy. GTAP version 10 database [70] is used to calibrate our AGE model and provided dollar-based quantities. We designed a sectoral aggregation scheme comprising 16 sectors (see Appendix Table 1) based on the original GTAP database to produce social accounting matrices (SAM) (see Appendix Tables 2-3) in our study. In the SAMs from the GTAP database, dollar-based material balances for the reference year ensure that dollar-based production quantities for each commodity across countries equal the sum of dollar-based intermediate demand across sectors, dollar-based final demand from the representative consumer, and dollar-based net exports. Dollar-based bilateral trade quantities in the GTAP database are constructed based on the reconciled UN Comtrade Database [72], while physical bilateral trade quantities are obtained from FAO [5] trade data. To construct bilateral trade flows in physical quantities, we prioritise FAO-reported imports over

486   exports, assuming that import data is more reliable since importers have a stronger incentive to
487   provide accurate trade records for taxation purposes. We then apply the RAS approach (also referred
488   to bi-proportional balancing) [73] to balance physical bilateral trade quantities, ensuring consistency
489   between FAO-reported totals for exporting and importing countries. Physical production quantities
490   of crops, livestock, and fertilisers (see Supplementary Table 2) are obtained from FAO [5]. Physical
491   feed production quantities are extracted from the "Feed" category in the FAO Food Balance Sheet
492   (FBS). Since the FAO does not provide feed data by livestock type, following Gatto, et al. [74], we
493   allocated the physical production quantities of feed across livestock sectors based on dollar-based
494   feed demand shares across livestock sectors in the SAMs from the GTAP database. The physical
495   production quantity of grass from natural grassland is derived from Miao and Zhang [75]. We only
496   include grass from natural grassland where ruminant livestock is grazing for feed, and grass from
497   remaining grassland is excluded. The dollar-based production quantity of grass is estimated as the
498   value flow from the pastureland to ruminant livestock in the SAMs from the GTAP database. To
499   establish the link between dollar-based and physical quantities, we define material intensity
500   coefficients (kg USD^{-1}) for each commodity at the regional level as the ratios of physical production
501   quantities from FAO to dollar-based production quantities from GTAP, estimating these coefficients
502   using reference year data. This approach allows us to compute physical material balances once
503   dollar-based material balances are determined after each model run. However, physical material
504   balances may not hold for all commodities and countries. To address this, we adjust physical
505   production quantities to ensure that the supply of each commodity aligns exactly with FAO-FBS
506   data for further comparisons. This adjustment ensures consistent tracing of material flows in both
507   dollar-based and physical quantities for each commodity across countries. For simulations using the
508   static AGE model, physical material flows change proportionally to the corresponding dollar-based
509   material flows in response to an exogenous shock.

510   Livestock categories are aggregated into two sectors, i.e., monogastric livestock (including pigs,
511   broilers, and laying hens) and ruminant livestock (including dairy cattle, other cattle, and sheep &
512   goats). Furthermore, the inclusion of animal-specific dietary constraints in our model allows us to
513   calculate the nutritional balance (crude protein and digestible energy), feed conversion ratios (FCR,
514   the ratio of fresh feed inputs to live weight gain), and edible feed conversion ratio (eFCR, the amount
515   of human-edible feedstuffs, i.e., feed crops and compound feed, used for per unit of live weight gain)
516   [76] for each livestock sector. First, we estimate the physical quantities of feed protein (Tg) and energy
517   (billion MJ) required to produce the physical output of each livestock sector (Tg) in the reference
518   year based on the FAO-FBS data and nutritional (i.e., protein and energy) contents of feed sub-
519   groups (see Supplementary Table 7). Then, we obtain the initial composition of total feed (including
520   feed crops, compound feed, food waste, food processing by-products, and grass) supplied to each
521   livestock sector in the reference year. When substituting primary feed (i.e., feed crops and
522   compound feed) in animal diets with food waste and food processing by-products, the total protein
523   and total energy supplies per unit of animal output are kept constant in all scenarios. Our FCRs for
524   ruminant livestock are slightly different from FCRs in the literature, as we do not fully account for
525   maize silage, alfalfa hay, and roughage-like by-products, but this bias does not affect the impacts of
526   upcycling food waste and food processing by-products for monogastric livestock production.
527   Further model details, nutritional balance, and detailed composition of animals' diets are available
528   in the SI.

529   **Modelling amounts and impacts of food waste and food processing by-products.**

530   In this study, we consider food waste and food processing by-products. Food waste is considered a
531   local resource within China, while food processing by-products can be traded between China and
532   MTP. We focus on food intended for human consumption that is wasted during distribution, retailing,
533   and consumption (both households and out-of-home), as it has a high potential for upcycling as
534   animal feed. In contrast, food loss, which occurs earlier in the supply chain, is often driven by poor
535   infrastructure and is not easily prevented or repurposed for feed use [17]; therefore, it is excluded from
536   our analysis. Additionally, we only consider plant-sourced food waste because animal-sourced food
537   waste may pose a risk of pathogen transfer, including foot-and-mouth and classical swine fever [77].
538   Food waste is quantified separately for each type of food product by multiplying primary food
539   products after processing by China-specific food waste fractions [37] following the FAO methodology
540   [78]. Four types of food waste are distinguished, including cereal grains waste, vegetables & fruits

541   waste, roots & tubers waste, and oilseeds & pulses waste. Food processing by-products refer to by-
542   products produced during the food processing stage, including cereal bran, alcoholic pulp (including
543   distiller's grains from maize ethanol production, brewer's grains from barley beer production, and
544   distiller's grains from liquor production), and oil cakes (including soybean cake and other oil cakes).
545   Food processing by-products are estimated by multiplying the production quantities of primary food
546   products by FAO technical conversion factors for various by-products [79]. The total amounts of food
547   waste and food processing by-products and their current use as animal feed and discarded biomass
548   (i.e., landfill and incineration) for China in S0 are presented in Supplementary Table 4.

549   Our model incorporate two food waste treatment sectors, i.e., "food waste collection service" and
550   "food waste recycling service" (Figure 1). The food waste recycling service sector recycles food
551   waste and food processing by-products as feed for monogastric livestock production. The food waste
552   collection service sector collects food waste and food processing by-prodcuts for landfill and
553   incineration. Waste collection, treatment and disposal activities were included in the "Waste and
554   water (wtr)" sector in the GTAP database. Food waste generation is added as a margin commodity,
555   similar to how GTAP treated transport costs following Peterson [80]. Thus, the consumer price of food
556   includes both the market price of food and the cost of collecting food waste and food processing by-
557   products. Consumers spend their income on both consumption of goods and food waste collection
558   service, but they derive utility solely from the consumption of goods. In terms of recycling food
559   waste and food processing by-products as feed, monogastric livestock producer bears the associated
560   cost. By multiplying the quantities of food waste with the unit costs of food waste treatment, we can
561   calculate the economic value of food waste generation. Physical quantities and prices of food waste
562   recycling and collection services in China are presented in Supplementary Tables 4-5.

563   **Environmental impact assessment.**

564   Economy-wide emissions considered in our study are limited to the production-related stages from
565   all sectors in the entire economies of China and MTP, excluding land use change and household
566   consumption. Specifically, emissions from both agricultural (6 crop types and 2 livestock categories)
567   and non-agricultural (compound feed, food processing by-products, processed food, fertilisers, food
568   waste treatment, and non-food) production are quantified. In line with other studies [81], land use is
569   considered to be constant here, allowing to focus on changes in total emissions from all sectors in
570   the entire economy without addressing the impacts of context-specific land use change. Detailed
571   information about emission sources across sectors is provided in Appendix Table 4.

572   Three main environmental impacts are distinguished, i.e., global warming potential (GWP, caused
573   by greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, including carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous
574   oxide (N_2O) emissions; converted to CO_2 equivalents), acidification potential (AP, caused by
575   pollutants leading to acidification, including ammonia (NH_3), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and sulphur
576   dioxide (SO_2) emissions; converted to NH_3 equivalents), and eutrophication potential (EP, caused
577   by pollutants leading to eutrophication, including nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) losses to water
578   bodies; converted to N equivalents). The conversion factors for GWP, AP, and EP are derived from
579   Goedkoop, et al. [82].

580   Data on CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O emissions are obtained from the Climate Analysis Indicators Tool
581   (CAIT) [83]. GHG emissions calculations in our model follow the IPCC National GHG Emission
582   Guidelines [84]. We derive NH_3, NO_x, and SO_2 emissions from Liu, et al. [85], Huang, et al. [86], and
583   Dahiya, et al. [87], respectively. We consider NO_x emissions from energy use only, as agriculture's
584   contribution to NO_x emissions is generally small ($\leqslant 2\%$) [88]. We use the global eutrophication
585   database of food and non-food provided by Hamilton, et al. [10] to obtain data on N and P losses to
586   water bodies. Emissions of food processing by-products (i.e., cereal bran, alcoholic pulp, oil cake)
587   are derived from Mackenzie, et al. [89]. We attribute the environmental impacts between the main
588   (e.g., cereal flour) and joint products (e.g., cereal bran) according to their relative economic values
589   (see Supplementary Table 6). Emissions of food waste recycling and collection services are obtained
590   from Alsaleh and Aleisa [90], Hong, et al. [91], and Hong, et al. [92].

591   The total emissions of GHGs, acidification pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants from all sectors
592   in the entire economy in the base year are calculated first. Then, we allocate the total emissions to
593   specific sectors according to the shares of emissions per sector in total emissions to unify the

594 emission data from different years. The sectoral-level emissions, as well as the dollar-based
595 emission intensities of GHGs (ton CO_2 equivalents million USD^{-1}), acidification pollutants (ton NH_3
596 equivalents million USD^{-1}), and eutrophication pollutants (ton N equivalents million USD^{-1}) are
597 presented in Appendix Tables 5-10.

598 Two types of land use, i.e., cropland and pastureland, are distinguished. We update the GTAP data
599 on crop harvested areas using the FAO [5] database. Pastureland is defined as areas where ruminant
600 grazing occurs. We derive nitrogen and phosphorous fertiliser use by crop types and countries from
601 Ludemann, et al. [93].

Food security indicators.

603 The FAO [94] defines food security as encompassing four key dimensions: availability (adequate food
604 supply), access (sufficient resources to obtain food), utilisation (nutritious and safe diets), and
605 stability (consistent access to food over time). We focuse on the first two dimensions. First, food
606 availability is defined as "calories per capita per day available for consumption". "Population at risk
607 of hunger" refers to the portion of people experiencing dietary energy (calorie) deprivation lasting
608 more than a year following the FAO-based approach [44,45]. This approach has been widely used in
609 agricultural economic models to evaluate the risk of food insecurity [29,95,96]. In essence, the
610 population at risk of hunger is determined by multiplying the prevalence of undernourishment (PoU)
611 by the total population. According to the FAO, the PoU is based on dietary energy availability
612 calculated by our model, the mean minimum dietary energy requirement (MDER), and the
613 coefficient of variation (CV) of the domestic distribution of dietary energy consumption in a country.
614 It is assumed that there is no risk of hunger for high-income countries; consequently, the population
615 at risk of hunger is not applied to the United States and Canada [29,95,96]. Second, the access dimension
616 is tied to people's purchasing power, which depends on food prices, dietary habits, and income
617 trends [97]. We calculate the average food price (including primary food products and processed food)
618 and estimated changes in food affordability by subtracting changes in the average wage across the
619 entire economy from fluctuations in cereal prices.

Definition of scenarios.

621 To estimate the impacts of increased utilisation of food waste and food processing by-products as
622 animal feed on food security and the environment, we examined five scenarios, including one
623 baseline (S0) scenario representing the economic and environmental conditions of all sectors
624 (including agriculture, industries, and services) in the entire economies of China and MTP in 2014,
625 two scenarios involving increased utilisation of food waste and food processing by-products as
626 animal feed, and two scenarios involving increased utilisation of food waste and food processing
627 by-products as animal feed combined with emission mitigation measures. We implement regional
628 uniform emission taxes across all sectors on economy-wide emissions of GHGs, acidification
629 pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants in China and MTP under the partial use of food waste and
630 food processing by-products as animal feed (scenario S1), considering the perishability and
631 collection challenges of food waste, as well as the reduced availability of food waste for feed
632 according to SDG 12.3 ("halving food waste") [21]. The latter four scenarios are compared to the 2014
633 baseline (S0) scenario. The scenarios are further described below and in Supplementary Table 1.

634 To ensure the feasibility of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed, scenarios
635 S1-S4 incorporate four key assumptions related to food waste source separation, collection,
636 transportation, pre-treatment technologies, and consumer acceptance. First, policies on food waste
637 source separation and collection, currently implemented mainly in major cities such as Beijing and
638 Shanghai [49,50], are assumed to gradually expand nationwide, accompanied by increasing awareness
639 and participation in food waste separation among households and restaurants in China. Second, food
640 waste collection and transportation logistics are designed to improve alongside policy developments
641 and infrastructure expansion. With increased financial support from the Chinese government,
642 including investments in infrastructure and technological innovations, pilot food waste collection
643 systems already operational in over 33 cities [98] are expected to scale up nationwide, enhancing waste
644 disposal infrastructure and ensuring sufficient capacity for efficient collection and transportation of
645 food waste. Third, pre-treatment technologies, including sorting, shredding, thermal treatment of
646 drying and dehydration, deodorizing, fermentation, hydrolysis, and extrusion of food waste into feed

647 pellets [90], are considered to remove excess moisture, reduce perishability, and extend shelf life,
648 thereby enhancing the feasibility of cross-provincial transportation of food waste. Fourth, consumer
649 acceptance of livestock products raised on food waste-based feed may be improved over time.
650 Extensive field-based evidence has demonstrated that properly treated food waste is safe for animals
651 with minimal health risks [47], and targeted education programs and community outreach can help
652 address consumer concerns about product safety and enhance acceptance of food waste-based
653 animal feed.

654 **S1 - Partial use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed.** Scenario S1 analyses the
655 impacts of partially upcycling food waste and food processing by-products (54% of food waste and
656 100% of food processing by-products) as feed for monogastric livestock production in China. Cross-
657 provincial transportation of food waste is not allowed in S1, which limits the maximum utilisation
658 rate of food waste with high moisture content to 54% in China, according to Fang, et al. [17].

659 **S2 - Full use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed.** Scenario S2 analyses the
660 impacts of fully upcycling food waste and food processing by-products (100% of food waste and
661 100% of food processing by-products) as feed for monogastric livestock production in China. Cross-
662 provincial transportation of food waste is allowed in S2 because we consider that new technology
663 would become available for processing food waste with high moisture content. Economies of scale
664 in food waste recycling are considered in S2; a 1% increase in recycled waste results in only a 0.078%
665 rise in recycling costs [99]. Thus, as production scales up, marginal costs decrease and then stabilise.

666 **S3 - S1 + A modest emission mitigation target.** We implement regional uniform emission taxes
667 across all sectors to achieve a modest emission mitigation target, assuming that economy-wide
668 emissions of GHGs, acidification pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants in China and MTP do
669 not exceed their baseline (S0) levels. For a given emission mitigation target for each type of pollutant,
670 the AGE model can endogenously determine the emission taxes for various pollutants (expressed in
671 $ per ton of CO_2 equivalents, $ per ton of NH_3 equivalents, and $ per ton of N equivalents). This
672 approach is commonly used in the literature [29,31,96,100] and allows to identify the most economically
673 cost-effective mitigation pathway for achieving given emission mitigation targets.

674 **S4 - S1 + An ambitious emission mitigation target.** We implement regional uniform emission
675 taxes across all sectors to achieve an ambitious emission mitigation target, assuming that economy-
676 wide emissions of GHGs, acidification pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants in China and MTP
677 remain within the emission thresholds set by China's and the MTP's annual GHG mitigation targets
678 under the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDC) of the Paris Agreement [35,36], as
679 well as China's emission reduction goals for acidification and eutrophication pollutants in line with
680 the "14th Five-Year Plan" [41].

681 **Estimation of feed cost and cost savings under various scenarios.**

682 The total feed cost per unit of monogastric livestock production is calculated by dividing the total
683 feed cost (including feed crops, compound feed, food waste, and food processing by-products) by
684 the economic output of monogastric livestock in China. In S0, the costs of feed crops (including
685 cereal grains, oilseeds & pulses, vegetables & fruits, roots & tubers, and sugar crops), compound
686 feed, and select food processing by-products (including distiller's grains from liquor production,
687 brewer's grains from barley beer production, and oil cake), along with the economic output of
688 monogastric livestock, are derived from their market prices based on the SAMs in the GTAP
689 database. Specifically, value flows from feed crops, compound feed, and these food processing by-
690 products to monogastric livestock, as indicated in the SAMs, represent the corresponding feed costs.
691 The costs of additional food processing by-products (including cereal bran and distiller's grains
692 from maize ethanol production) are determined by multiplying their physical production quantities
693 (tons) from FAO by their corresponding prices (USD ton⁻¹), which are calculated using data from
694 UN Comtrade Database [72]. Detailed information on the costs of feed crops, compound feed, and
695 food processing by-products is provided in the notes under Appendix Table 1 in SI. The cost of food
696 waste (cereal grains waste, vegetables & fruits waste, roots & tubers waste, and oilseeds & pulses
697 waste) is estimated based on the price of food waste recycling service, which includes the cost of
698 sorting, shredding, thermal treatment of drying and dehydration, deodorizing, fermentation,
699 hydrolysis, and extrusion of food waste into feed pellets (see Supplementary Table 5). In S1-S4, the

cost associated with the increased utilisation of food waste and food processing by-products as feed is also estimated using the price of food waste recycling service. The cost savings from increased utilisation of food waste and food processing by-products as feed are then determined by comparing the total feed cost per unit of monogastric livestock production across scenarios S1-S4 with S0.

Sensitivity analysis.

To evaluate the robustness of our results and assess the relative importance of key input parameters, we conducted a series of sensitivity analyses and decomposed uncertainties into five major sources: (1) feasibility of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed; (2) conversion of dollar-based quantities to physical quantities; (3) substitution of cropland with other inputs for crop production; (4) cereal self-sufficiency target; (5) cleaner crop and livestock production technology. We employed the one-at-a-time method to assess the sensitivity of food security indicators and environmental impacts to variations in these uncertainty sources. This approach, widely used in marginal impact analysis, isolates the effect of a single input variable while keeping all others constant [101]. The larger the ratio of relative output change to relative input change, the greater the sensitivity of the results to that parameter. Further details on the series of sensitivity analyses are provided in Supplementary Discussion.

Data availability

The data and parameters that support the economic model in this study are available from the GTAP version 10 database (https://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/databases/v10/). The other data that support splitting agricultural (6 crop types and 2 livestock categories) and non-agricultural (compound feed, food processing by-products, processed food, fertilisers, food waste treatment, and non-food) sectors from the original database GTAP 10 are publicly available at FAOSTAT (http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data) and the UN Comtrade Database (https://comtrade.un.org/data). The authors declare that all other data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and its Supplementary Information files or are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

Code availability

The authors declare that the GAMS codes for producing the results of this study are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

References

1   Springmann, M. *et al.* Options for keeping the food system within environmental limits. *Nature*

562, 519-525 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0594-0

2   Leip, A. *et al.* Impacts of European livestock production: nitrogen, sulphur, phosphorus and

greenhouse gas emissions, land-use, water eutrophication and biodiversity. *Environmental*

Research Letters **10**, 115004 (2015).

3   Bai, Z. *et al.* China's livestock transition: Driving forces, impacts, and consequences. *Science*

Advances **4**, eaar8534 (2018). https://doi.org/doi:10.1126/sciadv.aar8534

737 4   Hu, Y. *et al.* Food production in China requires intensified measures to be consistent with

738   national and provincial environmental boundaries. *Nature Food* **1**, 572-582 (2020).

739   https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-020-00143-2

740 5   FAO. <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data> (2022).

741 6   Richardson, K. *et al.* Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries. *Science advances* **9**,

742   eadh2458 (2023).

743 7   Steinfeld, H. *et al. Livestock's long shadow: environmental issues and options*. (Food &

744   Agriculture Org., 2006).

745 8   Herrero, M. *et al.* Greenhouse gas mitigation potentials in the livestock sector. *Nature Climate*

746   *Change* **6**, 452-461 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1038/Nclimate2925

747 9   Uwizeye, A. *et al.* Nitrogen emissions along global livestock supply chains. *Nature Food* **1**,

748   437-446 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-020-0113-y

749 10   Hamilton, H. A. *et al.* Trade and the role of non-food commodities for global eutrophication.

750   *Nature Sustainability* **1**, 314-321 (2018).

751 11   Clark, M. A. *et al.* Global food system emissions could preclude achieving the 1.5 and 2 C

752   climate change targets. *Science* **370**, 705-708 (2020).

753 12   Bouwman, L. *et al.* Exploring global changes in nitrogen and phosphorus cycles in agriculture

754   induced by livestock production over the 1900–2050 period. *Proceedings of the National*

755   *Academy of Sciences* **110**, 20882-20887 (2013).

756 13   Webb, J. *et al.* Managing ammonia emissions from livestock production in Europe.

757   *Environmental pollution* **135**, 399-406 (2005).

758   14   Gustavsson, J., Cederberg, C., Sonesson, U., Van Otterdijk, R. & Meybeck, A. Global food

759   losses and food waste. (FAO Rome, 2011).

760   15   WWF. *Driven to waste: the global impact of food loss and waste on farms*,

761   <https://wwf.panda.org/discover/our_focus/food_practice/food_loss_and_waste/driven_to_wa

762   ste_global_food_loss_on_farms/> (2021).

763   16   Wang, Y. *et al.* Evidence of animal productivity outcomes when fed diets including food waste:

764   A systematic review of global primary data. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* **203**,

765   107411 (2024). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2024.107411

766   17   Fang, Q. *et al.* Low-opportunity-cost feed can reduce land-use-related environmental impacts

767   by about one-third in China. *Nature Food* (2023). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-023-00813-x

768   18   Van Zanten, H. H. E. *et al.* Defining a land boundary for sustainable livestock consumption.

769   *Global Change Biology* **24**, 4185-4194 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14321

770   19   van Hal, O. *et al.* Upcycling food leftovers and grass resources through livestock: Impact of

771   livestock system and productivity. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **219**, 485-496 (2019).

772   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.329

773   20   Garnett, T., Roos, E. & Little, D. C. Lean, green, mean, obscene…? What is efficiency? And is

774   it sustainable? animal production and consumption reconsidered. (2015).

775   21   UN. *Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development*,

776   <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda> (2015).

777   22   Ceddia, M. G., Sedlacek, S., Bardsley, N. & Gomez-y-Paloma, S. Sustainable agricultural

778   intensification or Jevons paradox? The role of public governance in tropical South America.

779   *Global Environmental Change* **23**, 1052-1063 (2013).

780   23   Berkhout, P. H. G., Muskens, J. C. & W. Velthuijsen, J. Defining the rebound effect. *Energy*

781   *Policy* **28**, 425-432 (2000). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215(00)00022-7

782   24   Schipper, L. & Grubb, M. On the rebound? Feedback between energy intensities and energy

783   uses in IEA countries. *Energy policy* **28**, 367-388 (2000).

784   25   Sorrell, S., Dimitropoulos, J. & Sommerville, M. Empirical estimates of the direct rebound

785   effect: A review. *Energy policy* **37**, 1356-1371 (2009).

786   26   Gatto, A., Kuiper, M. & van Meijl, H. Economic, social and environmental spillovers decrease

787   the benefits of a global dietary shift. *Nature Food* (2023). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-023-

788   00769-y

789   27   Hegwood, M. *et al.* Rebound effects could offset more than half of avoided food loss and waste.

790   *Nature Food* **4**, 585-595 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-023-00792-z

791   28   Avetisyan, M., Golub, A., Hertel, T., Rose, S. & Henderson, B. Why a Global Carbon Policy

792   Could Have a Dramatic Impact on the Pattern of the Worldwide Livestock Production. *Applied*

793   *Economic   Perspectives   and   Policy*   **33**,   584-605   (2011).

794   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/aepp/ppr026

795   29   Hasegawa, T. *et al.* Risk of increased food insecurity under stringent global climate change

796   mitigation policy. *Nature Climate Change* **8**, 699-703 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-

797   018-0230-x

798   30   Peña-Lévano, L. M., Taheripour, F. & Tyner, W. E. Climate Change Interactions with

799   Agriculture, Forestry Sequestration, and Food Security. *Environmental and Resource*

800   *Economics* **74**, 653-675 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00339-6

801   31   Jiang, H.-D., Liu, L.-J. & Deng, H.-M. Co-benefit comparison of carbon tax, sulfur tax and

802   nitrogen tax: The case of China. *Sustainable Production and Consumption* **29**, 239-248 (2022).

803   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2021.10.017

804   32   Nsabiyeze, A. *et al.* Tackling climate change in agriculture: A global evaluation of the

805   effectiveness of carbon emission reduction policies. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **468**, 142973

806   (2024). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.142973

807   33   Long, W., Zhu, X., Weikard, H.-P., Oenema, O. & Hou, Y. Exploring sustainable food system

808   transformation options in China: An integrated environmental-economic modelling approach

809   based on the applied general equilibrium framework. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*

810   **51**, 42-54 (2024). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2024.09.004

811   34   Gerlagh, R. & Kuik, O. Spill or leak? Carbon leakage with international technology spillovers:

812   A CGE analysis. *Energy Economics* **45**, 381-388 (2014).

813   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2014.07.017

814   35   IPCC-WGIII. Summary for policymakers (AR5). (2014).

815   36   UNFCC. Paris agreement. (2015).

816   37   Xue, L. *et al.* China's food loss and waste embodies increasing environmental impacts. *Nature*

817   *Food* **2**, 519-528 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00317-6

818   38   Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA). *Guiding Opinions on Promoting Loss*

819   *Reduction and Efficiency Increase in Agricultural Product Processing*,

820   <http://www.moa.gov.cn/govpublic/XZQYJ/202012/t20201225_6358876.htm> (2020).

821   39   Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA). *Technical solution for reducing corn and*

822   *soybean meal in pig and chicken feed*,

823   <http://www.moa.gov.cn/gk/nszd_1/2021/202104/t20210421_6366304.htm> (2021).

824   40   Ministry of Agriculture (MOA). *Group Standards of Low Protein Compound Feed for Pigs and*

825   *Chickens*, <http://www.moa.gov.cn/xw/zwdt/201810/t20181026_6161577.htm> (2018).

826   41   State Council of the People's Republic of China. *Notice of the State Council on Issuing the*

827   *Comprehensive Work Plan for Energy Conservation and Emission Reduction during the 14th*

828   *Five-Year Plan*, <https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2022-01-24/content_5670214.htm> (2022).

829   42   Wang, Y. *et al.* Pursuing zero-grain livestock production in China. *One Earth* **6**, 1748-1758

830   (2023). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2023.10.019

831   43   Mathivanan, R., Selvaraj, P. & Nanjappan, K. Feeding of fermented soybean meal on broiler

832   performance. *International Journal of Poultry Science* **5**, 868-872 (2006).

833   44   FAO. Methodology for the Measurement of Food Deprivation: Updating the Minimum Dietary

834   Energy Requirements. (2008).

835   45   Gabbert, S. & Weikard, H.-P. How widespread is undernourishment?: A critique of

836   measurement methods and new empirical results. *Food Policy* **26**, 209-228 (2001).

837   46   European Commission (EC). No. 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of

838   3 October 2002 laying down health rules concerning animal byproducts not intended for human

839   consumption. (2002).

840   47   Dou, Z., Toth, J. D. & Westendorf, M. L. Food waste for livestock feeding: Feasibility, safety,

841   and sustainability implications. *Global Food Security* **17**, 154-161 (2018).

842   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2017.12.003

843   48   Bai, Z. *et al.* Investing in mini-livestock production for food security and carbon neutrality in

844   China. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**, e2304826120 (2023).

845   https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2304826120

846   49   Zhou, M.-H., Shen, S.-L., Xu, Y.-S. & Zhou, A.-N. New policy and implementation of

847   municipal solid waste classification in Shanghai, China. *International journal of environmental*

848   *research and public health* **16**, 3099 (2019).

849   50   Li, Y., Jin, Y., Borrion, A. & Li, H. Current status of food waste generation and management in

850   China.   *Bioresource   Technology   **273**,   654-665   (2019).

851   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2018.10.083

852   51   Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA). *Three-year Action Plan for Reducing and*

853   *Replacing   Feed   Soybean   Meal*,   <https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2023-

854   04/14/content_5751409.htm> (2023).

855   52   Tong, B. *et al.* Lower pork consumption and technological change in feed production can reduce

856   the   pork   supply   chain   environmental   footprint   in   China. *Nature   Food* (2022).

857   https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-022-00640-6

858   53   Wang, X. *et al.* Assessing the impacts of technological change on food security and climate

859   change   mitigation   in   China's   agriculture   and   land-use   sectors. *Environmental   Impact*

860   *Assessment   Review   **107**,   107550   (2024).

861   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2024.107550

862   54   Kroll, C., Warchold, A. & Pradhan, P. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Are we

863   successful in turning trade-offs into synergies? *Palgrave Communications* **5** (2019).

864   55   Zhang, H. *Securing the 'Rice Bowl': China and Global Food Security*. (Springer, 2018).

865   56   Liu, Z. *et al.* Challenges and opportunities for carbon neutrality in China. *Nature Reviews Earth*

866   *& Environment* **3**, 141-155 (2022).

867   57   Lu, Y. *et al.* Addressing China's grand challenge of achieving food security while ensuring

868   environmental sustainability. *Science advances* **1**, e1400039 (2015).

869   58   Chepeliev, M. Incorporating Nutritional Accounts to the GTAP Data Base. *Journal of Global*

870   *Economic Analysis* **7**, 1-43 (2022). https://doi.org/10.21642/JGEA.070101AF

871   59   Keyzer, M. & Van Veen, W. Towards a spatially and socially explicit agricultural policy

872   analysis for China: specification of the Chinagro models. *Centre for World Food Studies,*

873   *Amsterdam, The Netherlands* (2005).

874   60   Fischer, G. *et al.* China's agricultural prospects and challenges: Report on scenario simulations

875   until 2030 with the Chinagro welfare model covering national, regional and county level.

876   (Centre for World Food Studies, VU University Amsterdam, 2007).

877   61   Greijdanus, A. *Exploring possibilities for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in protein-rich*

878   *food chains* MSc. thesis thesis, Wageningen University & Research, (2013).

879   62   Le Thanh, L. *Biofuel production in Vietnam: greenhouse gas emissions and socioeconomic*

880   *impacts* Ph.D. thesis thesis, Wageningen University & Research, (2016).

881   63   van Wesenbeeck, C. F. A., Keyzer, M. A., van Veen, W. C. M. & Qiu, H. Can China's overuse

882   of fertilizer be reduced without threatening food security and farm incomes? *Agricultural*

883   *Systems* **190**, 103093 (2021). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103093

884   64   Zhu, X. & Van Ierland, E. C. Economic Modelling for Water Quantity and Quality Management:

885   A Welfare Program Approach. *Water Resources Management* **26**, 2491-2511 (2012).

886   https://doi.org/10.1007/s11269-012-0029-x

887   65   Zhu, X., van Wesenbeeck, L. & van Ierland, E. C. Impacts of novel protein foods on sustainable

888   food production and consumption: lifestyle change and environmental policy. *Environmental*

889   *and Resource Economics* **35**, 59-87 (2006).

890   66   Zhu, X. & Van Ierland, E. C. A model for consumers' preferences for Novel Protein Foods and

891   environmental quality. *Economic Modelling* **22**, 720-744 (2005).

892   67   Zhu, X. *Environmental-Economic Modelling of Novel Protein Foods: A General Equilibrium*

893   *Approach*, Wageningen University & Research, (2004).

894   68   Zhu, X. & Van Ierland, E. The enlargement of the European Union: Effects on trade and

895   emissions   of   greenhouse   gases.   *Ecological   Economics*   **57**,   1-14   (2006).

896   https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.03.030

897   69   Xie, W. *et al.* Decreases in global beer supply due to extreme drought and heat. *Nature Plants*

898   **4**, 964-973 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-018-0263-1

899   70   GTAP. *GTAP version 10 Database*, <http://www.gtap.agecon.purdue.edu/> (2014).

900   71   GAMS. *General algebraic modeling system*, <https://www.gams.com/> (2022).

901   72   UN Comtrade Database. <https://comtrade.un.org/data> (2022).

902   73   Trinh, B. & Phong, N. *A Short Note on RAS Method. Advances in Management & Applied*

903   *Economics.*   *Vol.*   *3,*   *no.*   *4,*   *133-137,*

904   <https://www.scienpress.com/Upload/AMAE/Vol%203_4_12.pdf> (2013).

905   74   Gatto, A., Kuiper, M., van Middelaar, C. & van Meijl, H. Unveiling the economic and

906   environmental impact of policies to promote animal feed for a circular food system. *Resources,*

907   *Conservation   and   Recycling*   **200**,   107317   (2024).

908   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2023.107317

909   75   Miao, D. & Zhang, Y. National grassland monitoring report. (2014).

910   76   Wilkinson, J. M. Re-defining efficiency of feed use by livestock. *Animal* **5**, 1014-1022 (2011).

911   https://doi.org/10.1017/S175173111100005X

912   77   Shurson, G. C. "What a waste"—can we improve sustainability of food animal production

913   systems by recycling food waste streams into animal feed in an era of health, climate, and

914   economic crises? *Sustainability* **12**, 7071 (2020).

915   78   Gustafsson, J., Cederberg, C., Sonesson, U. & Emanuelsson, A. The methodology of the FAO

916   study: Global Food Losses and Food Waste-extent, causes and prevention"-FAO, 2011. (SIK

917   Institutet för livsmedel och bioteknik, 2013).

918   79   FAO. Technical Conversion Factors for Agricultural Commodities. (1997).

919   80   Peterson, E. B. Gtap-m: a gtap model and data base that incorporates domestic margins. *GTAP*

920   *Technical Papers* (2006).

921   81   Laborde, D., Mamun, A., Martin, W., Piñeiro, V. & Vos, R. Agricultural subsidies and global

922   greenhouse   gas   emissions.   *Nature   Communications*   **12**,   2601   (2021).

923   https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-22703-1

924   82   Goedkoop, M. *et al.* ReCiPe 2008: A life cycle impact assessment method which comprises

925   harmonised category indicators at the midpoint and the endpoint level. 1-126 (2009).

926   83   Climate Analysis Indicators Tool (CAIT). <https://www.climatewatchdata.org/?source=cait>

927   (2014).

928   84   IPCC.   1-21 (Published: IGES Japan, 2006).

929   85   Liu, L. *et al.* Exploring global changes in agricultural ammonia emissions and their contribution

930   to nitrogen deposition since 1980. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**,

931   e2121998119 (2022). https://doi.org/doi:10.1073/pnas.2121998119

932   86   Huang, T. *et al.* Spatial and Temporal Trends in Global Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides from

933   1960 to 2014. *Environmental Science & Technology* **51**, 7992-8000 (2017).

934   https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b02235

935   87   Dahiya, S. *et al.* Ranking the World's Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) Hotspots: 2019–2020. *Delhi Center*

936   *for Research on Energy and Clean Air-Greenpeace India: Chennai, India* **48** (2020).

937   88   Lamsal, L. *et al.* Application of satellite observations for timely updates to global anthropogenic

938   NOx emission inventories. *Geophysical Research Letters* **38** (2011).

939   89   Mackenzie, S. G., Leinonen, I., Ferguson, N. & Kyriazakis, I. Towards a methodology to

940   formulate sustainable diets for livestock: accounting for environmental impact in diet

941   formulation. *British Journal of Nutrition* **115**, 1860-1874 (2016).

942   https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114516000763

943   90   Alsaleh, A. & Aleisa, E. Triple Bottom-Line Evaluation of the Production of Animal Feed from

944   Food Waste: A Life Cycle Assessment. *Waste and Biomass Valorization* **14**, 1169-1195 (2023).

945   https://doi.org/10.1007/s12649-022-01914-7

946   91   Hong, J., Li, X. & Zhaojie, C. Life cycle assessment of four municipal solid waste management

947   scenarios in China. *Waste Management* **30**, 2362-2369 (2010).

948   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2010.03.038

949 92 Hong, J. *et al.* Intensification of municipal solid waste disposal in China. *Renewable and*

950   *Sustainable Energy Reviews* **69**, 168-176 (2017).

951   https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.11.185

952 93 Ludemann, C. I., Gruere, A., Heffer, P. & Dobermann, A. Global data on fertilizer use by crop

953   and by country. *Scientific Data* **9**, 501 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01592-z

954 94 FAO. Rome Declaration on World Food Security and World Food Summit Plan of Action.,

955   (1996).

956 95 Hasegawa, T., Fujimori, S., Takahashi, K. & Masui, T. Scenarios for the risk of hunger in the

957   twenty-first century using Shared Socioeconomic Pathways. *Environmental Research Letters*

958   **10**, 014010 (2015).

959 96 Hasegawa, T. *et al.* Consequence of climate mitigation on the risk of hunger. *Environmental*

960   *science & technology* **49**, 7245-7253 (2015).

961 97 Lele, U. *et al.* Measuring food and nutrition security: An independent technical assessment and

962   user's guide for existing indicators. *Rome: Food Security Information Network, Measuring*

963   *Food and Nutrition Security Technical Working Group* **177** (2016).

964 98 Wen, Z., Wang, Y. & De Clercq, D. Performance evaluation model of a pilot food waste

965   collection system in Suzhou City, China. *Journal of Environmental Management* **154**, 201-207

966   (2015). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.02.025

967 99 Cialani, C. & Mortazavi, R. The Cost of Urban Waste Management: An Empirical Analysis of

968   Recycling Patterns in Italy. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities* **2** (2020).

969   https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2020.00008

970   100   Havlík, P. *et al.* Climate change mitigation through livestock system transitions. *Proceedings*

971   *of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**, 3709-3714 (2014).

972   101   Zhuo, L., Mekonnen, M. & Hoekstra, A. Y. Sensitivity and uncertainty in crop water footprint

973   accounting: a case study for the Yellow River basin. *Hydrology and earth system sciences* **18**,

974   2219-2234 (2014).

975

Acknowledgements

Author contributions

987 W.L., X.Z., H.P.W., and Y.H. designed the research; W.L. and X.Z. developed the model; W.L.,
988 X.Z., H.P.W., O.O., and Y.H. analysed data; W.L., X.Z., H.P.W., O.O., and Y.H. wrote the paper.
989 All authors contributed to the analysis of the results. All authors read and commented on various
990 drafts of the paper.

Competing interests

992 The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

994 Details about the data, methods, and framework are presented in Supplementary Information (SI).

Fig. 1 | Representation of the economy in China in the applied general equilibrium (AGE) framework with food waste and food processing by-products. The framework includes four parts: (1) Production; (2) Consumption; (3) Net export; (4) Food waste generation; (5) Food waste treatment. The generated food waste and food processing by-products are sent either to the "food waste recycling service" sector or the "food waste collection service" sector. The food waste recycling service sector recycles food waste and food processing by-products as feed for monogastric livestock production. The food waste collection service sector collects food waste and food processing by-products for landfill and incineration. The consumer price of food includes both the market price of food and the cost of collecting food waste and food processing by-products. The monogastric livestock producer bears the cost of recycling food waste and food processing by-prodcuts as feed. Detailed information is presented in Methods and Supplementary Information.

Fig. 2 | Impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed in China's monogastric livestock sector on domestic production and net export of total crop, livestock, and fertiliser. Total (**a**) crop, (**b**) livestock, and (**c**) fertiliser production (Tg) in scenarios. Total (**d**) crop, (**e**) livestock, and (**f**) fertiliser net export (Tg) in scenarios. Total crop production exclude food waste and food processing by-products used by "food waste recycling service" and "food waste collection service" sectors (see Supplementary Table 4 for detailed data). Definitions of scenarios (S1 - 'Partial use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S2 - 'Full use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S3 - 'S1 + A modest emission mitigation target'; S4 - 'S1 + An ambitious emission mitigation target') are described in Supplementary Table 1.

36

a Total agricultural land use (Mha)

S4	100	39	88			**235**
S3	79	49	39	11	88	**267**
S2	96	56	38	9	88	**289**
S1	95	28	38	8 8	88	**267**
S0	94	29	37	8 7	88	**266**

0   160   320

- Cereal grains
- Oilseeds & pulses
- Vegetables &fruits
- Roots & tubers
- Sugar crops
- Other non-food crops
- Pastureland

b Total feed demand by monogastric livestock (Tg)

S4	92	86	123	121	**423**
S3	112	103	135	121	**471**
S2	113	112	142	226	**593**
S1	112	103	136	121	**472**
S0	104	85	78	88	**355**

0   400   800

- Feeding crops
- Compound feed
- Food by-products
- Food waste

Fig. 3 | Impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed in China's monogastric livestock sector on domestic total agricultural land use and feed demand. (**a**) Total agricultural land use (crop harvested area and pastureland) (Mha) and (**b**) feed demand by monogastric livestock (Tg) in scenarios. Definitions of scenarios (S1 - 'Partial use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S2 - 'Full use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S3 - 'S1 + A modest emission mitigation target'; S4 - 'S1 + An ambitious emission mitigation target') are described in Supplementary Table 1.

37

1018

Fig. 4 | Impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed in China's monogastric livestock sector on economy-wide emissions in China (CN) and China's main food and feed trading partners (MTP). Changes in (**a**) economy-wide emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) (Tg CO_2-eq), (**b**) acidification pollutants (Tg NH_3-eq), and (**c**) eutrophication pollutants (Tg N-eq) in China and MTP in scenarios with respect to the baseline (S0). Economy-wide emissions refer to total emissions of GHGs, acidification pollutants, and eutrophication pollutants in the entire economies of China and MTP. MTP includes Brazil, the United States, and Canada. Definitions of scenarios (S1 - 'Partial use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S2 - 'Full use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S3 - 'S1 + A modest emission mitigation target'; S4 - 'S1 + An ambitious emission mitigation target') are described in Supplementary Table 1.

Fig. 5 | Impacts of upcycling food waste and food processing by-products as feed in monogastric livestock sector on food security indicators in China (CN) and China's main food and feed trading partners (MTP). Changes in (**a**) average food price (including primary food products and processed food), (**b**) cereals affordability for labour force, (**c**) population at risk of hunger (million people; S0 = 140.7 million people), and (**d**) food availability (kcal capita^{-1} day^{-1}) in China in scenarios with respect to the baseline (S0). Changes in (**e**) average food price (including primary food products and processed food), (**f**) cereals affordability for labour force, (**g**) population at risk of hunger (million people; S0 = 5.3 million people), and (**d**) food availability (kcal capita^{-1} day^{-1}) in MTP in scenarios with respect to the baseline (S0). (**i**) Net imports (Tg) of main food and feed products from MTP to China in the baseline (S0). MTP includes Brazil, the United States, and Canada. According to the FAO approach, it is assumed that there is no risk of hunger for high-income countries; consequently, the population at risk of hunger is not applied to the United States and Canada [29,95,96]. Definitions of scenarios (S1 - 'Partial use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S2 - 'Full use of food waste and food processing by-products as feed'; S3 - 'S1 + A modest emission mitigation target'; S4 - 'S1 + An ambitious emission mitigation target') are described in Supplementary Table 1. Credit: World Countries base map, Esri (https://hub.arcgis.com/datasets/esri::world-countries/about).