# PNAS www.pnas.org 

## Supplementary Information for

## Impact of increasing vegetarian availability on meal selection and sales in cafeterias

Emma E. Garnett ${ }^{\text {a, } 1}$
Andrew Balmford ${ }^{\text {a }}$
Chris Sandbrook ${ }^{\text {b }}$
Mark A. Pilling ${ }^{\text {c }}$
Theresa M. Marteau ${ }^{\text {c }}$
${ }^{a}$ Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, CB2 3EJ, UK; ${ }^{b}$ Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, CB2 1QB, UK; ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Behaviour and Health Research Unit, University of Cambridge, Institute of Public Health, CB2 0SR, UK
${ }^{1}$ To whom correspondence may be addressed: Emma E. Garnett Email: eg334@cam.ac.uk ; ee.garnett@gmail.com

This PDF file includes:
Fig. S1
Tables S1 to S21


Fig. S1. Photo of College C cafeteria with four options served.

## Study 1: Example menus

Table S1. College A, example of a menu listed online. (v)=vegetarian, (ve)=vegan. Although the menus present 3 options, the number of meals served at the cafeteria often varied.

| Lunch |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Teriyaki Marinated Pork <br> Steak with Toasted <br> Cashews |
| Creamy Chicken \& Bacon <br> Pasta with Basil |  <br> Guinness Flaky Pastry Pie | Shepherd's Pie | Chicken Tikka |  |
| Vegetable Samosa with <br> Coriander Lentil Dahl <br> (ve) | Glamorgan Sausage \& Red <br> Onion Gravy (Veggie of <br> Course) (v) | Tofu \& Cashew Nut Stir <br>  <br> Spring Onion (ve) | Sweet Potato \& Leek <br> Gratin with a Crispy <br> Oregano Topping (v) | Butternut Squash \& Field <br> Mushroom Moussaka (v) |
| Oriental Loin of Cod <br> With Asian Vegetables |  <br> Spinach Pasta Bake (v) | Grilled Fillet of Hake, <br> Tomato \& Chorizo Sauce | Quorn Fajita, with <br> peppers, tortillas, salsa <br> and sour cream (v) | Chip Shop Style Fried <br> Fish <br> With Homemade Tartare <br> Sauce |
| Dinner | Wednesday | Thursday |  |  |
| Monday | Tuesday | Lemon, Thyme, \& Garlic <br> Butterflied Chicken Fillet | Lamb Hotpot | Friday |
| Beef \& Broccoli Stir Fry <br> with Ginger. | Honey Glazed Gammon <br> Steak with Char Grilled <br> Pineapple | Mushroom Stroganoff (v) | Red Pepper \& Aubergine <br> Lasagne (v) | Moroccan Spiced <br> Vegetable Tagine with <br> Apricots (ve) |
| Kadala Curry, with Chick <br> Peas \& Spinach (ve) | Baked Potato Skins filled <br>  <br>  <br> Chives (v) |  | Moqueca | Chicken \& Mushroom Pie | | Fresh Fish of The Day |
| :--- |
|  <br> Spring Onion Fishcakes, <br> Pea \& Mint Sauce | | Beef Lasagne |
| :--- |

Table S2: College B, example of a menu listed online. (V)=vegetarian, (ve)=vegan. Although the menus present 3 options, the number of meals served at the cafeteria often varied.

| Lunch |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
| Chicken, Mediterranean vegetable and Chorizo Paella | Maple glazed bacon chop with an apple and sage fritter | Roast leg of English lamb with sautéed tarragon and pears | Mediterranean vegetable and galbani mozzarella en croute with a Provençale sauce (v) | Barbecue Quorn, roasted pepper and plum tomato pizza with mozzarella (v) |
| Spaghetti Bolognese with parmesan | Moroccan chicken on garlic flatbread with tomato and coriander salsa and Monterey jack cheese | Roast loin of pork with mustard crackling and apple sauce | Cauliflower florets in a spicy batter with a curried tikka masala sauce (v) | Puy lentil and Mexican vegetable fajitas with guacamole (ve) |
| Mushroom, spinach, and sweet potato wellington with camembert cheese, tomato sauce (v) | Chick pea, local fenland vegetable and basil tagine, red onion cous-cous (ve) | Leek, mushroom and goats cheese filo pastry strudel with a grain mustard sauce (v) | Griddled rump of beef with tomato, onion rings and a peppercorn sauce | Piri-Piri fillet of chicken with a coriander and tomato guacamole |
| Dinner |  |  |  |  |
| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
| Roasted tofu, broccoli and courgette pad Thai with sesame and cilantro (ve) | Deep fried scampi with lemon and lime wedges | Jamaican jerk pork curry with a coconut, mango and pea rice | Minced beef and spinach lasagne | Beer battered fillet of cod with lemon |
| Winter vegetable and cannellini bean stew with crispy herb dumplings (v) | Braised topside of beef steak in local ale, grelots and wild mushrooms | Creamy garlic and basil baked fillet of chicken with a warm Caesar salad | Panko breaded butterfly chicken breast with a Katsu sauce and rice | Lamb and minted winter vegetable casserole with redcurrants and crusty bread |
| Lamb jalfrezi with a mushroom and coriander rice pilau, poppadum's | Broccoli, cashew nut and halloumi curry, herb pilaff rice (v) | Roasted asparagus, sun blushed tomato and chestnut mushroom carbonara (v) | Sri Lankan dahl and Vegetable curry with wholemeal rice (ve) | Wild mushroom, roasted butternut squash and sun blushed tomato risotto with parmesan (v) |

## Study 1: Effect of removing meals with no vegetarian options

Table S3: Comparing GLMs with vegetarian availability as the only predictor when meals with no vegetarian options are included and excluded. Including mealtimes with no vegetarian options increases the level of variation explained by vegetarian availability (McFadden's pseudo $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ ) but this risks overestimating its effect on vegetarian sales. Mealtimes with no vegetarian options were excluded from the main analyses.

|  | College A |  | College B |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mealtimes with <br> no veg options <br> excluded | Mealtimes <br> with no veg <br> options <br> included | Mealtimes with <br> no veg options <br> excluded | Mealtimes <br> with no veg <br> options <br> included |
| Number of meals | 269 | 277 | 266 | 269 |
| McFadden's R |  |  |  |  |
| (univariate | 0.209 | 0.267 | 0.319 | 0.332 |
| GLM) |  |  |  |  |

## Study 1: Frequency of vegetarian and total options

Table S4: Frequency of vegetarian options by total options in College A and B across all meals assessed.

|  |  | Total options available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\boldsymbol{8}$ |
| College | Vegetarian options available |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{A}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1 | 3 | 41 | 89 | 51 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 21 | 13 | 3 | 1 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1 | 0 | 99 | 89 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 2 | 0 | 20 | 28 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

## Study 1: Best models for vegetarian sales - aggregate data

Table S5: Best model for vegetarian sales at College A. VegSales ~VegAvailPercent + TotalMealsSold + TotalOptionsAvailable + Term + Meal + MeanTemp + VegNonVegPriceDifferential + Day + Week. AIC $=3082.8$, log-likelihood $=-1518.4$, McFadden's pseudo $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.261$. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvailPercent=25, TotalMealsSold=180, TotalOptionsAvailable=4, Term=Summer, Meal=Lunch, MeanTemp=10, VegNonVegPriceDifferential=0.2, Day=Wed, Week=5. Effect size calculated by taking the exponential of the model estimate.

| Variable | Effect size | Effect size 95\% CIs | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.028 | 1.026, 1.030 | <0.001 | Meals with higher vegetarian availability had higher vegetarian sales. | 25 | 24.1 | 50 | 39.0 |
| Total meals sold | 1.001 | 1.001, 1.002 | $<0.001$ | Mealtimes with more meals sold had higher vegetarian sales. | 100 | 22.1 | 200 | 24.6 |
| Total options available | 0.971 | 0.950, 0.992 | $<0.01$ | Mealtimes with more total options had lower vegetarian sales. | 3 | 24.6 | 5 | 23.7 |
| Summer term | 0.844 | 0.784, 0.909 | $<0.001$ | Summer term has lower vegetarian sales than spring. | Spring | 27.3 | Summer | 24.1 |
| Autumn term | 0.830 | 0.784, 0.878 | <0.001 | Autumn term has lower vegetarian sales than spring. | Spring | 27.3 | Autumn | 23.8 |
| Meal | 1.087 | 1.037, 1.139 | $<0.001$ | Dinner has higher vegetarian sales than lunch. | Lunch | 24.1 | Dinner | 25.7 |
| Mean temperature | 1.011 | 1.005, 1.016 | <0.001 | Warmer temperatures had higher vegetarian sales. | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 23.2 | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 25.1 |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | 1.475 | 1.224, 1.777 | <0.001 | Meals with relatively cheaper vegetarian options had higher vegetarian sales. | £0.05 | 23.1 | $£ 0.50$ | 26.3 |
| Tuesday | 1.130 | 1.060, 1.205 | $<0.001$ | Tuesdays and Thursdays had higher vegetarian sales than Monday. Wednesdays' and Fridays' vegetarian sales do not differ significantly from Mondays'. | Mon | 23.1 | Tue | 25.4 |
| Wednesday | 1.056 | 0.995, 1.121 | 0.073 |  | - | - | Wed | 24.1 |
| Thursday | 1.196 | 1.124, 1.272 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Thu | 26.4 |
| Friday | 0.953 | 0.892, 1.018 | 0.153 |  | - | - | Fri | 22.3 |
| Week 2 | 1.210 | 1.111, 1.318 | $<0.001$ | Weeks 2, 4, 5 and 8 had higher vegetarian sales than Week 1 . Weeks 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 week do not had significantly different vegetarian sales than Week 1. | Week 1 | 21.8 | Week 2 | 25.2 |
| Week 3 | 1.058 | 0.971, 1.153 | 0.198 |  | - | - | Week 3 | 22.8 |
| Week 4 | 1.097 | 1.008, 1.194 | 0.032 |  | - | - | Week 4 | 23.4 |
| Week 5 | 1.140 | 1.045, 1.244 | 0.003 |  | - | - | Week 5 | 24.1 |
| Week 6 | 1.009 | 0.923, 1.103 | 0.846 |  | - | - | Week 6 | 21.9 |
| Week 7 | 1.034 | 0.950, 1.125 | 0.440 |  | - | - | Week 7 | 22.4 |
| Week 8 | 1.185 | 1.076, 1.304 | <0.001 |  | - | - | Week 8 | 24.8 |
| Week 9 (Spring and Autumn term) | 1.046 | 0.940, 1.162 | 0.408 |  | - | - | Week 9 | 22.6 |
| May Week (Summer term only) | 1.149 | 0.942, 1.310 | 0.172 |  | - | - | Week 10 | 24.2 |
| Grad Week (Summer term only) | 1.111 | 0.940, 1.400 | 0.210 |  | - | - | Week 11 | 23.6 |

Table S6: Best model for vegetarian sales at College B. VegSales ~VegAvailPercent + TotalOptionsAvailable + Term + Meal + MeanTemp + VegNonVegPriceDifferential + Day + Week. AIC=2146.7, log-likelihood=-1052.3, McFadden's pseudo R2 = 0.393. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvailPercent=25,
TotalOptionsAvailable=4, Term=Summer, Meal=Lunch, MeanTemp=10, VegNonVegPriceDifferential=0.2, Day=Wed, Week=5. Effect size calculated by taking the exponential of the model estimate.

| Variable | Effect size | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect size } \\ & 95 \% \text { CIs } \end{aligned}$ | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.032 | 1.029, 1.034 | $<0.001$ | Meals with higher vegetarian availability had higher vegetarian sales. | 25 | 18.4 | 50 | 32.9 |
| Total meals sold | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model. | 100 | NA | 200 | NA |
| Total options available | 1.099 | 1.060, 1.139 | $<0.001$ | Mealtimes with more total options had higher vegetarian sales. | 3 | 17.0 | 5 | 19.9 |
| Summer term | 1.163 | 1.064, 1.272 | <0.001 | Summer term has higher vegetarian sales than spring. | Spring | 16.2 | Summer | 18.4 |
| Autumn term | 1.402 | 1.306, 1.504 | <0.001 | Autumn term has higher vegetarian sales than spring. | Spring | 16.2 | Autumn | 21.4 |
| Meal | 1.209 | 1.148, 1.273 | $<0.001$ | Dinner has higher vegetarian sales than lunch. | Lunch | 18.4 | Dinner | 21.4 |
| Mean temp | 0.992 | 0.985, 0.999 | 0.0254 | Warmer temperatures had lower vegetarian sales. | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 19.0 | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 17.8 |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | 0.327 | 0.207, 0.517 | <0.001 | Meals with relatively cheaper vegetarian options had lower vegetarian sales. | $£ 0.05$ | 21.1 | £0.50 | 13.9 |
| Tuesday | 0.986 | 0.909, 1.069 | 0.726 | Tuesdays did not have significantly different vegetarian sales to Mondays; Wednesdays and Fridays had higher vegetarian sales, and Thursdays lower, than Mondays. | Mon | 16.1 | Tue | 15.9 |
| Wednesday | 1.173 | 1.083, 1.271 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Wed | 18.4 |
| Thursday | 0.880 | 0.812, 0.954 | $<0.01$ |  | - | - | Thu | 14.5 |
| Friday | 1.098 | 1.010, 1.192 | 0.027 |  | - | - | Fri | 17.4 |
| Week 2 | 1.078 | 0.965, 1.204 | 0.181 | Weeks 2 and 10 did not have significantly different vegetarian sales from Week 1, Weeks 3, $4,5,6,7,8$ and 9 had higher vegetarian sales than Week 1. | Week 1 | 15.0 | Week 2 | 16.0 |
| Week 3 | 1.153 | 1.033, 1.286 | 0.011 |  | - | - | Week 3 | 16.9 |
| Week 4 | 1.148 | 1.029, 1.282 | 0.0138 |  | - | - | Week 4 | 16.9 |
| Week 5 | 1.275 | 1.141, 1.425 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Week 5 | 18.4 |
| Week 6 | 1.216 | 1.085, 1.364 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Week 6 | 17.7 |
| Week 7 | 1.163 | 1.043, 1.296 | $<0.01$ |  | - | - | Week 7 | 17.1 |
| Week 8 | 1.261 | 1.123, 1.417 | <0.001 |  | - | - | Week 8 | 18.2 |
| Week 9 (Spring and Autumn term) | 1.209 | 1.069, 1.366 | <0.01 |  | - | - | Week 9 | 17.6 |
| May Week (Summer term only) | 1.171 | 0.921, 1.482 | 0.192 |  | - | - | Week 10 | 17.2 |

## Study 1: Percentage of vegetarian meals bought by diners

Table S7: Levels of vegetarian meal consumption during the study period (2017) and the previous term (autumn 2016) used to calculate prior levels of vegetarian meal consumption.

|  |  | College A |  | College B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Autumn term 2016 | 2017 terms | Autumn term 2016 | 2017 terms |
| All diners | Number of diners | 940 | 1394 | 495 | 746 |
| Diners who bought 10 or more meals | Number of diners | 605 | 1013 | 227 | 565 |
|  | Omnivores, vegetarians and carnivores |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number of obligate vegetarians, (vegetarian $=100 \%$ ) | 12 | 6 | 7 | 14 |
|  | Number of omnivores | 533 | 970 | 144 | 496 |
|  | Number of obligate carnivores, (vegetarian $=0 \%$ ) | 60 | 37 | 76 | 55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentage of vegetarian meals bought by individual diners |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lower quartile | 7.7\% | 10.8\% | 0\% | 6.3\% |
|  | Median | 18.9\% | 21.4\% | 7.1\% | 16.4\% |
|  | Mean | 26.9\% | 28.3\% | 17.0\% | 24.9\% |
|  | Upper quartile | 36.4\% | 37.9\% | 22.7\% | 32.6\% |

## Study 1: Data included in individual-level analyses

Table S8: Number of cafeteria visits, meals bought and diners in the individual-level data included in analyses. We used a binomial ("VegModel") variable, representing each cafeteria visit made by identifiable diners, to analyse the data: if one or more vegetarian meals were bought at one mealtime this was coded as 1 , and 0 for one or more meat meals. If a diner bought a vegetarian meal(s) and a meat meal(s) at one meal time this was coded as NA and excluded from the analysis.

|  |  | College A |  |  | College B |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data type | Data | Cafeteria visits | Meals bought | Diners | Cafeteria visits | Meals bought | Diners |
| Aggregate data | Data from both guests and identifiable diners | NA | 51,251 | NA | NA | 35,681 | NA |
| Individual-level | All data | 43,751 | 46,109 | 1,394 | 31,956 | 34,191 | 746 |
| data | Data with a prior-level of vegetarian meals consumption value | 33,180 | 34,804 | 597 | 19,950 | 21,514 | 222 |
|  | Data with a VegModel variable | 43,052 | 44,568 | 1,386 | 31,488 | 33,147 | 741 |
|  | Data included in analysis (values for prior-level of vegetarian meal consumption and VegModel variable) | 32,687 | 33,729 | 597 | 19,663 | 20,856 | 222 |

## Study 1: Best models for likelihood of choosing a vegetarian meal - individual-level data

Table S9: College A, best model for likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal. VegModelVariable $\sim($ VegAvailPercent*PriorVegConsumptionQuartile) + TotalMealsSold + TotalOptionsAvailable + Term + Meal + MeanTemp + Day + Week + (1|CardUser). AIC=29499.7, log-likelihood=-14719.8. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvailPercent=25, TotalMeals=180; TotalOptionsAvailable=4; Term=Easter; Meal=Lunch; Mean temp=10; VegNonVegPriceDiff=£0.20; Day=Wed; Week=5; Vegetarian consumption quartiles weighted equally. Effect size calculated by taking the exponential of the model estimate.

| Variable | Effect size | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect size 95\% } \\ & \text { CIs } \end{aligned}$ | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Likelihood of selecting a veg meal | Example value | Likelihood of selecting a veg meal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.037 | 1.031, 1.042 | <0.001 | Likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal increased as vegetarian availability increased. The likelihood of the Most Vegetarian quartile selecting a vegetarian meal > MoreVeg > LessVeg > LeastVeg. | 25 | 0.605 | 50 | 0.791 |
| Quartile-MoreVeg | 0.174 | 0.128, 0.237 | $<0.001$ |  | 25 | 0.221 | 50 | 0.426 |
| Quartile-LessVeg | 0.095 | 0.069, 0.131 | $<0.001$ |  | 25 | 0.137 | 50 | 0.299 |
| Quartile-LeastVeg | 0.032 | 0.023, 0.045 | $<0.001$ |  | 25 | 0.062 | 50 | 0.181 |
| VegAvail:MoreVeg | 1.002 | 0.995, 1.010 | 0.522 | Only the Least Vegetarian quartile has a stronger response to increasing vegetarian availability than the MostVeg. | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| VegAvail:LessVeg | 1.003 | 0.996, 1.011 | 0.382 |  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| VegAvail:LeastVeg | 1.012 | 1.004, 1.020 | 0.004 |  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total meals sold | 1.002 | 1.001, 1.003 | $<0.001$ | Likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal increased as more meals were sold. | 100 | 0.181 | 250 | 0.231 |
| Total options available | 0.952 | 0.922, 0.983 | 0.002 | Lower likelihood of selecting a vegetarian when there were more total options. | 3 | 0.215 | 5 | 0.199 |
| Summer term | 0.821 | 0.735, 0.918 | $<0.001$ | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal in Spring term than Summer and Autumn. | Spring | 0.241 | Summer | 0.207 |
| Autumn term | 0.779 | 0.710, 0.854 | $<0.001$ |  | - |  | Autumn | 0.198 |
| Meal | 1.155 | 0.797, 0.943 | $<0.001$ | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal at lunch than dinner. | Lunch | 0.207 | Dinner | 0.184 |
| Mean temp | 1.010 | 1.001, 1.019 | 0.030 | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal at higher ambient temperatures. | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 0.198 | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 0.215 |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | 1.779 | 1.359, 2.343 | $<0.001$ | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal when they are relatively cheaper compared to meat meals | £0.05 | 0.193 | £0.50 | 0.237 |
| Tuesday | 1.270 | 1.156, 1.394 | $<0.001$ | Tuesdays and Thursdays had higher likelihoods of selecting a vegetarian meal than Mons. No significant difference in likelihood between Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. | Mon | 0.201 | Tue | 0.242 |
| Wednesday | 1.035 | 0.947, 1.130 | 0.449 |  | - | - | Wed | 0.207 |
| Thursday | 1.336 | 1.218, 1.464 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Thu | 0.252 |
| Friday | 0.896 | 0.810, 0.987 | 0.030 |  | - | - | Fri | 0.184 |
| Week 2 | 1.237 | 1.092, 1.401 | $<0.001$ | Weeks $3,4,6,7,9$ and 10 did not have significantly different likelihoods of selecting a vegetarian meal than Week 1; Weeks 2, 5, 8 and 11 had higher vegetarian sales than Week 1. | Week 1 | 0.183 | Week 2 | 0.217 |
| Week 3 | 1.082 | 0.953, 1.230 | 0.228 |  | - | - | Week 3 | 0.195 |
| Week 4 | 1.019 | 0.900, 1.155 | 0.770 |  | - | - | Week 4 | 0.186 |
| Week 5 | 1.162 | 1.018, 1.328 | 0.027 |  | - | - | Week 5 | 0.207 |
| Week 6 | 1.009 | 0.882, 1.158 | 0.894 |  | - | - | Week 6 | 0.185 |
| Week 7 | 0.976 | 0.860, 1.109 | 0.703 |  | - | - | Week 7 | 0.180 |
| Week 8 | 1.232 | 1.062, 1.431 | 0.006 |  | - | - | Week 8 | 0.216 |
| Week 9 | 1.105 | 0.935, 1.304 | 0.242 |  | - | - | Week 9 | 0.198 |
| May Week (Summer term only) | 1.223 | 0.939, 1.600 | 0.138 |  | - | - | Week 10 | 0.215 |
| Grad Week (Summer term only | 1.353 | 1.002, 1.832 | 0.049 |  | - | - | Week 11 | 0.233 |

Table S10: College B, best model for likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal. VegModelVariable ~ (VegAvailPercent*PriorVegConsumptionQuartile) + TotalOptionsAvailable + Term + Meal + MeanTemp + VegNonVegPriceDifferential + Day + Week + (1|CardUser). AIC=12906.6, log-likelihood= -6426.3. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvailPercent=25, TotalOptionAvailables=4; Term=Easter; Meal=Lunch; VegNonVegPriceDiff=£0.20; Day=Wed; Week=5; Vegetarian consumption quartiles weighted equally. Effect size calculated by taking the exponential of the model estimate.

| Variable | Effect size | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect size } 95 \% \\ & \text { CIs } \end{aligned}$ | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Likelihood of selecting a veg meal | Example value | Likelihood of selecting a veg meal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.030 | 1.023, 1.037 | <0.001 | Likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal increased as vegetarian availability increased. The likelihood of the Most Vegetarian quartile selecting a vegetarian meal > MoreVeg > LessVeg > LeastVeg. | 25 | 0.517 | 50 | 0.692 |
| Quartile-MoreVeg | 0.059 | 0.030, 0.116 | $<0.001$ |  | 25 | 0.086 | 50 | 0.227 |
| Quartile-LessVeg | 0.031 | 0.015, 0.067 | $<0.001$ |  | 25 | 0.052 | 50 | 0.159 |
| Quartile-LeastVeg | 0.012 | 0.006, 0.024 | $<0.001$ |  | 25 | 0.023 | 50 | 0.082 |
| VegAvail:MoreVeg | 1.016 | 1.007, 1.025 | $<0.001$ | All other quartiles had a stronger response to increasing vegetarian availability than the MostVeg quartile. | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| VegAvail:LessVeg | 1.020 | 1.010, 1.030 | $<0.001$ |  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| VegAvail:LeastVeg | 1.024 | 1.014, 1.034 | <0.001 |  | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Total meals sold | NA | 0.997, 1.141 | NA | Not included in best model | 100 | NA | 250 | NA |
| Total options available | 1.067 | 0.103, 0.545 | 0.061 | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian when there were more total options. | 3 | 0.091 | 5 | 0.102 |
| Summer term | 1.106 | 0.983, 1.245 | 0.094 | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal in Autumn term than Spring term, no significant difference between Spring and Summer terms. | Spring | 0.088 | Summer | 0.097 |
| Autumn term | 1.397 | 1.229, 1.587 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Autumn | 0.119 |
| Meal | 1.114 | 1.007, 1.233 | 0.036 | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal at dinner than lunch. | Lunch | 0.097 | Dinner | 0.107 |
| Mean temp | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | - | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | - |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | 0.237 | 0.103, 0.545 | $<0.001$ | Lower likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal when they were relatively cheaper compared to meat meals | £0.05 | 0.117 | $£ 0.50$ | 0.065 |
| Tuesday | 1.145 | 0.991, 1.323 | 0.067 | No difference for likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal on Tuesdays and Fridays, higher likelihood on Wednesdays and lower likelihood on Thursdays, compared to Mondays. | Mon | 0.071 | Tue | 0.080 |
| Wednesday | 1.408 | 1.222, 1.623 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Wed | 0.097 |
| Thursday | 0.846 | 0.731, 0.980 | 0.026 |  | - | - | Thu | 0.060 |
| Friday | 1.136 | 0.980, 1.317 | 0.091 |  | - | - | Fri | 0.079 |
| Week 2 | 1.273 | 1.053, 1.539 | 0.013 | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal during Weeks 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 compared to Week 1. No difference in likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal in Weeks 4, 9 and May Week compared to Week 1. | Week 1 | 0.077 | Week 2 | 0.096 |
| Week 3 | 1.281 | 1.064, 1.542 | 0.009 |  | - | - | Week 3 | 0.096 |
| Week 4 | 1.147 | 0.948, 1.386 | 0.157 |  | - | - | Week 4 | 0.087 |
| Week 5 | 1.284 | 1.067, 1.545 | 0.008 |  | - | - | Week 5 | 0.097 |
| Week 6 | 1.392 | 1.151, 1.683 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Week 6 | 0.104 |
| Week 7 | 1.275 | 1.054, 1.544 | 0.013 |  | - | - | Week 7 | 0.096 |
| Week 8 | 1.459 | 1.199, 1.776 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Week 8 | 0.108 |
| Week 9 (Spring and Autumn term) | 1.177 | 0.939, 1.475 | 0.158 |  | - | - | Week 9 | 0.089 |
| May Week (Summer term only) | 1.05 | 0.720, 1.530 | 0.801 |  | - | - | Week 10 | 0.080 |

## Study 1: Best models for total sales

Table S11: College A, best model for total sales. TotalMealsSold ~VegAvailPercent + TotalOptionsAvailable + Term + Meal + Day + Week.
AIC $=2788.1$, log-likelihood $=-1373.0$, Adjusted $R^{2}=0.425$. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvailPercent=25; TotalOptionsAvailable=4, Term=Easter, Meal=Lunch, Day=Wed, Week=5. Effect size calculated by adding the model estimate to the intercept (162) and dividing by the intercept.

| Variable | Effect size | Effect size CIs | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Predicted total sales | Example value | Predicted total sales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.001 | 0.997, 1.003 | 0.707 | Vegetarian availability had no significant effect on total sales. | 25 | 216.8 | 50 | 219.2 |
| Total options available | 1.064 | 1.041, 1.078 | $<0.001$ | Higher total sales when there were more total options available, an average of 10.3 additional meals sold for every additional meal option. | 3 | 206.5 | 5 | 216.8 |
| Summer term | 1.157 | 1.097, 1.195 | <0.001 | Higher total sales in Summer term than Spring term. | Spring | 191.4 | Summer | 216.8 |
| Autumn term | 1.011 | 0.916, 1.072 | 0.783 | No difference in total sales between Autumn term and Spring term. | - | - | Autumn | 193.1 |
| Meal | 1.140 | 1.100, 1.166 | <0.001 | On average 22.7 more meals sold at dinner than lunch. | Lunch | 216.8 | Dinner | 239.5 |
| Mean temperature | NA | 0.698, 0.965 | NA | Not included in best model | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | NA | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | NA |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | NA | 0.876, 1.077 | NA | Not included in best model | $£ 0.05$ | NA | $£ 0.50$ | NA |
| Tuesday | 0.861 | 0.765, 1.008 | 0.005 | Tuesday and Friday had lower total sales than Monday; Wednesday and Thursday did not have significantly different total sales from Monday. | Mon | 217.0 | Tue | 194.4 |
| Wednesday | 0.999 | 0.648, 0.932 | 0.979 |  | - |  | Wed | 216.8 |
| Thursday | 0.913 | 0.676, 1.014 | 0.080 |  | - |  | Thu | 202.9 |
| Friday | 0.821 | 0.741, 1.055 | <0.001 |  | - |  | Fri | 188.0 |
| Week 2 | 0.882 | 0.679, 1.013 | 0.087 | Weeks 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 did not have significantly different total sales from Week 1 ; Weeks 6, 8, 9, May Week and Grad Week had significantly lower total sales than Week 1. | Week 1 | 231.2 | Week 2 | 212.0 |
| Week 3 | 0.933 | 0.717, 1.036 | 0.325 |  | - | - | Week 3 | 220.2 |
| Week 4 | 0.882 | 0.609, 0.966 | 0.084 |  | - | - | Week 4 | 212.1 |
| Week 5 | 0.911 | 0.722, 1.041 | 0.190 |  | - | - | Week 5 | 216.8 |
| Week 6 | 0.827 | 0.450, 0.869 | 0.011 |  | - | - | Week 6 | 203.0 |
| Week 7 | 0.916 | 0.439, 0.885 | 0.217 |  | - | - | Week 7 | 217.6 |
| Week 8 | 0.706 | -0.061, 0.641 | $<0.001$ |  | - | - | Week 8 | 183.4 |
| Week 9 (Spring and Autumn term) | 0.711 | -0.403, 0.434 | <0.001 |  | - | - | Week 9 | 184.3 |
| May Week 10 (Summer term) | 0.366 | 0.674, 1.308 | <0.001 |  | - | - | Week 10 | 128.3 |
| Week 11 (Summer term) | 0.107 | 1.041, 1.078 | <0.001 |  | - | - | Week 11 | 86.3 |

Table S12: College B, best model for total sales. TotalMealsSold ~VegAvailPercent + Day + Week
AIC $=2378.3$, log-likelihood $=-1173.1$, Adjusted $R^{2}=0.421$. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvailPercent=25, Day=Wed, Week=5. Effect size calculated by adding the model estimate to the intercept (166) and dividing by the intercept.

| Variable | Effect size | Effect size 95\% CIs | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Predicted total sales | Example value | Predicted total sales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 0.998 | 0.997, 0.999 | <0.001 | Significantly fewer main meals were sold as vegetarian availability increased. | 25 | 137.6 | 50 | 127.8 |
| Total options available | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model | 3 | NA | 5 | NA |
| Summer term | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model | Spring | NA | Summer | NA |
| Autumn term | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model | Spring | NA | Autumn | NA |
| Meal | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model | Lunch | NA | Dinner | NA |
| Mean temperature | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | NA | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | NA |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model | $£ 0.05$ | NA | $£ 0.50$ | NA |
| Tuesday | 0.927 | 0.872, 0.976 | 0.003 | Thursday did not have significantly different sales from Mondays. Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Fridays had significantly lower total sales than Mondays. | Mon | 157.7 | Tue | 145.6 |
| Wednesday | 0.879 | 0.820, 0.931 | <0.001 |  | - |  | Wed | 137.6 |
| Thursday | 0.963 | 0.910, 1.009 | 0.120 |  | - |  | Thu | 151.5 |
| Friday | 0.863 | 0.802, 0.917 | <0.001 |  | - |  | Fri | 135.0 |
| Week 2 | 0.976 | 0.906, 1.036 | 0.449 | Weeks 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 did not have significantly different sales compared to Week 1. Weeks 8, 9, May Week and Grad Week had lower total sales than Week 1. | Week 1 | 136.4 | Week 2 | 132.3 |
| Week 3 | 1.004 | 0.937, 1.062 | 0.910 |  | - | - | Week 3 | 137.0 |
| Week 4 | 0.990 | 0.922, 1.049 | 0.747 |  | - | - | Week 4 | 134.7 |
| Week 5 | 1.007 | 0.941, 1.066 | 0.816 |  | - | - | Week 5 | 137.6 |
| Week 6 | 0.983 | 0.914, 1.044 | 0.603 |  | - | - | Week 6 | 133.6 |
| Week 7 | 0.982 | 0.913, 1.042 | 0.565 |  | - | - | Week 7 | 133.3 |
| Week 8 | 0.895 | 0.820, 0.961 | 0.001 |  | - | - | Week 8 | 118.9 |
| Week 9 (Spring and Autumn term) | 0.924 | 0.844, 0.995 | 0.035 |  | - | - | Week 9 | 123.8 |
| May Week (Summer term) | 0.532 | 0.398, 0.648 | <0.001 |  | - | - | May <br> Week | 58.5 |

## Study 2: Example menus

Table S13: College C, control menu with no change to the number of vegetarian options on offer (usually one). (v)=vegetarian, (ve)=vegan. Although the menus present 4 options, the number of meals served at the cafeteria often varied.

| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brocolli and brie quiche <br> (v) | Welsh Glamorgan vegetarian <br> sausages with onion gravy <br> (v) | Sundried tomato gnocchi <br> with rocket (v) | Beef tomatoes stuffed <br> with coconut vegetables <br> (ve) | Vegetable jambalaya (ve) |
| Herby seafood crumble | Roast trout with spinach, <br> sage and prosciutto | Hake with braised <br> artichokes, peas and <br> bacon | Catfish with chipotle and <br> ancho chilli recado | Deep fried fish with tartar <br> sauce |
| Breaded chicken with <br> garlic and parsley butter | Denham farm state game and <br> red wine pie | Sweet potato and chicken <br> curry | Lamb and root vegetable <br> cobbler | Chicken, mushroom and <br> tarragon pie with <br> shortcrust pastry |
| Vegetable chimichangers <br> (ve) | Today's pasta with choice of <br> two sauces | Spicy chicken pasty with <br> sticky pickle | Today's pasta with choice <br> of two sauces | Pork fajita |

Table S14: College C, experimental menu with two designated vegetarian options. (v)=vegetarian, (ve)=vegan. Although the menus present 4 options, the number of meals served at the cafeteria often varied.

| Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agadeshi with buckwheat <br> noodles (ve) | Mediterranean stuffed <br> peppers (ve) | Roasted pepper and <br> applewood smoked <br> cheese quiche (v) | Porcini mushroom <br> bolognaise with <br> wholemeal spaghetti (v) | Lentil and barley burger <br> with spicy fruit salsa (ve) |
| Fish pie with a cheese and <br> pretzel crust | Smoked haddock fish cakes <br> with creamed leeks | Pan roasted salmon with <br> three tomatoes | Fish and prawn pasties | Deep fried fish with tartar <br> sauce |
| Chilli con carne finished <br> with 70\% dark chocolate | Chicken, smoked pancetta <br> and bean stew with crispy <br> sage | Spicy beef South African <br> curry | Crispy fennel pork belly <br> with herb salsa | Harissa and lime yoghurt <br> lamb steak |
| Gluten free pasta with <br> roasted red pepper and <br> tomoato sauce (ve) | Korean noodles with garlic <br> and ginger stir-fried <br> vegetables and noodles (v) | Gluten free pasta with <br> wild mushroom and <br> mascarpone sauce (v) | Blackened aubergine <br> veggie chilli (ve) | Gluten free pasta with <br> roasted butternut (ve) |

## Study 2: Frequency of vegetarian and total options

Table S15: Frequency of vegetarian options by the total options available and by experimental allocation, observations made at 44 lunchtimes.

|  | Total Options Available |  |  | Experimental allocation of number of vegetarian options |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vegetarian options available | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 <br> (Control) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & \text { (Experimental) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 1.5 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| 2 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 20 |

## Study 2: Best model for vegetarian sales - aggregate data

Table S16: Best model for vegetarian sales at College C. VegSales~VegAvailPercent+TotalMealsSold+MeanTemp+VegNonVegPriceDifferential+Day+Week. AIC $=464.6$, log-likelihood $=-212.3$, McFadden's pseudo $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.318$. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvailPercent=25, Total meals sold=150, Total options available=4, MeanTemp=10, VegNonVegPriceDifferential=0.2, Day=Wed, Week=5. Effect size calculated by taking the exponential of the model estimate.

| Variable | Effect size | Effect size 95\% CIs | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.018 | 1.007, 1.028 | <0.001 | Meals with higher vegetarian availability had higher vegetarian sales. | 25 | 19.1 | 50 | 26.9 |
| Total meals sold | 1.010 | 1.005, 1.015 | <0.001 | Mealtimes with more meals sold had higher vegetarian sales. | 100 | 12.5 | 200 | 28.0 |
| Total options available | 1.101 | 0.949, 1.277 | 0.205 | Mealtimes with more total options had lower vegetarian sales. | 3 | 17.7 | 5 | 20.6 |
| Mean temperature | 0.938 | 0.912, 0.966 | <0.001 | Days with colder temperatures had higher vegetarian sales. | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 24.5 | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 14.7 |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | 0.374 | 0.182, 0.766 | 0.007 | Mealtimes with relatively cheaper vegetarian options had lower vegetarian sales. | £0.05 | 21.5 | $£ 0.50$ | 15.0 |
| Day: Tue | 1.693 | 1.380, 2.078 | <0.001 | Tuesdays and Wednesdays had higher vegetarian sales than Mondays. Thursdays' and Fridays' vegetarian sales do not differ significantly from Mondays'. | Mon | 12.5 | Tue | 19.5 |
| Day: Wed | 1.650 | 1.343, 2.029 | <0.001 |  | - |  | Wed | 19.1 |
| Day: Thu | 1.167 | 0.960, 1.420 | 0.123 |  | - |  | Thu | 14.3 |
| Day: Fri | 1.048 | 0.843, 1.303 | 0.675 |  | - |  | Fri | 13.1 |
| Week 2 | 0.955 | 0.537, 1.712 | 0.876 | Week 9 had lower vegetarian sales than Week 1. All other weeks did not have significantly different vegetarian sales than Week 1. | Week 1 | 15.7 | Week 2 | 15.1 |
| Week 3 | 0.924 | 0.498, 1.740 | 0.804 |  |  |  | Week 3 | 14.7 |
| Week 4 | 1.409 | 0.853, 2.382 | 0.189 |  |  |  | Week 4 | 20.8 |
| Week 5 | 1.266 | 0.803, 2.052 | 0.323 |  |  |  | Week 5 | 19.1 |
| Week 6 | 1.127 | 0.685, 1.894 | 0.644 |  |  |  | Week 6 | 17.4 |
| Week 7 | 0.855 | 0.512, 1.458 | 0.556 |  |  |  | Week 7 | 13.8 |
| Week 8 | 1.130 | 0.690, 1.894 | 0.635 |  |  |  | Week 8 | 17.4 |
| Week 9 | 0.585 | 0.352, 0.994 | 0.043 |  |  |  | Week 9 | 9.8 |
| Week 10 (Christmas holidays) | 1.186 | 0.715, 2.007 | 0.516 |  |  |  | Week 10 | 18.1 |
| Week 11 (Christmas holidays) | 1.229 | 0.715, 2.157 | 0.463 |  |  |  | Week 11 | 18.7 |

## Study 2: Percentage of vegetarian meals bought by diners

Table S17: College C, levels of vegetarian meal consumption during the study period (lunches autumn term 2017) and the term (lunches and dinners summer term 2017) used to calculate prior levels of vegetarian meal consumption.

|  |  | Summer term <br> 2017 | Autumn term <br> 2017 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| All diners | Number of diners | $\mathbf{4 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 1}$ |
| Diners who <br> bought 10 or <br> more meals | Number of diners | $\mathbf{2 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 4}$ |
|  | Omnivores, vegetarians and carnivores |  |  |
|  | Number of obligate vegetarians, (vegetarian <br> =100\%) | 0 | 1 |
|  | Number of omnivores | 194 | 283 |
|  | Number of obligate carnivores, (vegetarian =0\%) | 30 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentage of vegetarian meals bought by <br> individual diners |  |  |
|  | Lower quartile | $5.9 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
|  | Median | $12.5 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ |
|  | Mean | $27.8 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ |
|  | Upper quartile | $26.9 \%$ |  |

## Study 2: Data included in individual-level analyses

Table S18: College C, number of cafeteria visits, meals bought and diners in the individual-level data included in analyses. We used a binomial ("VegModel") variable, representing each cafeteria visit made by identifiable diners, to analyse the data: if one or more vegetarian meals were bought at one mealtime this was coded as 1 , and 0 for one or more meat meals. If a diner bought a vegetarian meal(s) and a meat meal(s) at one meal time this was coded as NA and excluded from the analysis.

| Data type | Data | Cafeteria <br> visits | Meals <br> bought | Diners |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Aggregate data | Data from both guests and identifiable <br> diners | NA | 7712 | NA |
| Individual-level data | All data | 4565 | 5153 | 491 |
|  | Data with a prior-level of vegetarian <br> meals consumption value | 1661 | 1977 | 121 |
|  | Data with a VegModel variable | 4358 | 4716 | 482 |
|  | Data included in analysis (values for <br> prior-level of vegetarian meal <br> consumption and VegModel variable) | 1585 | 1718 | 121 |

## Study 2: Best models for individual-level analyses

Table S19: College C, best model for likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal. VegModelVariable~ (VegAvail *PriorVegConsumptionQuartile) +ObservedTotalOptionsAvailable+ TotalMealsSold+MeanTemp+Day+Week+(1|CardUser). AIC=1341.5, log-likelihood=-644.8. Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvail=25, TotalMealsSold=150, TotalOptionsAvailable=4, MeanTemp=10, Day=Wed, Week=5, Vegetarian consumption quartiles weighted equally. Effect size calculated by taking the exponential of the model estimate.

| Variable | Effect size | Effect size 95\% CIs | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Likelihood of selecting a veg meal | Example value | Likelihood of selecting a veg meal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.000 | 0.967, 1.034 | 0.983 | Likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal increased as vegetarian availability increased. The likelihood of the Most Vegetarian quartile selecting a vegetarian meal > MoreVeg > LessVeg > LeastVeg. | 25 | 0.350 | 50 | 0.348 |
| Quartile-MoreVeg | 0.110 | 0.025, 0.493 | 0.004 |  | 25 | 0.101 | 50 | 0.173 |
| Quartile-LessVeg | 0.038 | 0.006, 0.236 | <0.001 |  | 25 | 0.039 | 50 | 0.072 |
| Quartile-LeastVeg | 0.011 | 0.001, 0.086 | <0.001 |  | 25 | 0.021 | 50 | 0.070 |
| VegAvail:MoreVeg | 1.026 | 0.989, 1.063 | 0.168 | Only the Least Vegetarian quartile had a stronger response to increasing vegetarian availability than the MostVeg. | NA |  | NA |  |
| VegAvail:LessVeg | 1.027 | 0.983, 1.074 | 0.234 |  | NA |  | NA |  |
| VegAvail:LeastVeg | 1.053 | 1.002, 1.106 | 0.041 |  | NA |  | NA |  |
| Total meals sold | 1.016 | 1.002, 1.030 | <0.001 | Likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal increased as more meals are sold. | 100 | 0.036 | 200 | 0.159 |
| Observed total options available | 1.219 | 0.850, 1.749 | 0.273 | Higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal when there are more total options. | 3 | 0.065 | 5 | 0.093 |
| Mean temp | 0.880 | 0.812, 0.955 | 0.002 | Lower likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal at higher ambient temperatures. | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 0.138 | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 0.043 |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model. | $£ 0.05$ | NA | $£ 0.50$ | NA |
| Tuesday | 2.109 | 1.252, 3.550 | 0.005 | Tuesdays and Wednesdays had higher likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal than Mondays. No significant difference in likelihood between Mondays, Thursdays and Fridays. | Mon | 0.042 | Tue | 0.084 |
| Wednesday | 1.933 | 1.179, 3.171 | 0.010 |  | - |  | Wed | 0.078 |
| Thursday | 1.101 | 0.665, 1.822 | 0.710 |  | - |  | Thu | 0.046 |
| Friday | 0.743 | 0.423, 1.304 | 0.292 |  | - |  | Fri | 0.031 |
| Week 2 | 1.165 | 0.290, 4.684 | 0.830 | Lower likelihood of selecting a vegetarian meal in Week 9 than Week 1, no significant difference between Week 1 and other weeks. | Week 1 | 0.107 | Week 2 | 0.122 |
| Week 3 | 0.445 | 0.087, 2.267 | 0.229 |  | - |  | Week 3 | 0.051 |
| Week 4 | 1.061 | 0.299, 3.766 | 0.920 |  | - |  | Week 4 | 0.113 |
| Week 5 | 0.706 | 0.224, 2.230 | 0.541 |  | - |  | Week 5 | 0.078 |
| Week 6 | 0.567 | 0.161, 1.996 | 0.320 |  | - |  | Week 6 | 0.064 |
| Week 7 | 0.467 | 0.129, 1.689 | 0.200 |  | - |  | Week 7 | 0.053 |
| Week 8 | 0.811 | 0.240, 2.738 | 0.713 |  | - |  | Week 8 | 0.088 |
| Week 9 | 0.181 | 0.049, 0.673 | 0.008 |  | - |  | Week 9 | 0.021 |
| Week 10 (Christmas holidays) | 0.868 | 0.246, 3.054 | 0.825 |  | - |  | Week 10 | 0.094 |
| Week 11 (Christmas holidays) | 0.793 | 0.198, 3.178 | 0.736 |  | - |  | Week 11 | 0.087 |

## Study 2: Best models for total sales

Table S20: College C, best model for total sales. TotalMealsSold $\sim$ VegAvailPercent + Week. AIC $=384.3$, log-likelihood $=-179.2$, Adjusted $R^{2}=0.679$.
Conditions used to generate predictions: VegAvail=25; Week=4. Effect size calculated by adding the model estimate to the intercept (160) and dividing by the intercept.

| Variable | Effect <br> size | Effect size 95\% CIs | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Predicted total sales | Example value | Predicted total sales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Veg Availability (\%) | 1.000 | 0.993, 1.004 | 0.942 | Vegetarian availability had no effect on total meals sold. | 25 | 188.0 | 50 | 188.8 |
| Total options available | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model. | NA |  | NA |  |
| Mean temperature | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model. | NA |  | NA |  |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model. | NA |  | NA |  |
| Tuesday | NA | NA | NA | Not included in best model. | Mon |  | Tue |  |
| Wednesday | NA | NA | NA |  | - |  | Wed |  |
| Thursday | NA | NA | NA |  | - |  | Thu |  |
| Friday | NA | NA | NA |  | - |  | Fri |  |
| Week 2 | 1.022 | 0.679, 1.223 | 0.865 | Weeks 3 had significantly higher, and Week 11 significantly lower, total sales than Week 1 . Weeks $2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9$ and 10 did not have significantly different total sales from Week 1. | Week 1 | 160.9 | Week 2 | 164.4 |
| Week 3 | 1.325 | 1.082, 1.468 | 0.018 |  |  |  | Week 3 | 212.9 |
| Week 4 | 1.170 | 0.901, 1.327 | 0.164 |  |  |  | Week 4 | 188.0 |
| Week 5 | 1.069 | 0.779, 1.239 | 0.549 |  |  |  | Week 5 | 171.9 |
| Week 6 | 1.231 | 0.999, 1.367 | 0.051 |  |  |  | Week 6 | 197.9 |
| Week 7 | 1.165 | 0.891, 1.325 | 0.181 |  |  |  | Week 7 | 187.2 |
| Week 8 | 1.155 | 0.882, 1.315 | 0.202 |  |  |  | Week 8 | 185.7 |
| Week 9 | 1.106 | 0.828, 1.268 | 0.363 |  |  |  | Week 9 | 177.8 |
| Week 10 (Christmas holidays) | 0.884 | 0.512, 1.102 | 0.340 |  |  |  | Week 10 | 142.2 |
| Week 11 (Christmas holidays) | 0.743 | 0.324, 0.988 | 0.038 |  |  |  | Week 11 | 119.7 |

## Study 2: Best model for vegetarian sales at dinner

Table S21: College C, Best model for vegetarian sales at dinner, only including meals bought by diners who attended 1 or more lunchtimes during the autumn term. VegSales $\sim$ ExperimentalCondition + MenuVegAvail + TotalMealsSold + MeanTemp + VegNonVegPriceDifferential+Day. AIC $=424.4$, log-likelihood=-202.2, McFadden's pseudo $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.246$. Conditions used to generate predictions: Experimental Condition=Control, VegAvail=25, TotalMealsSold=100, MeanTemp=10, VegNonVegPriceDifferential=0.2, Day=Wed. The total number of options served was not observed at dinnertimes, and therefore relative vegetarian availability was calculated from the listed menu options, however the actual options served may have differed. Effect size calculated by taking the exponential of the model estimate.

| Variable | Effect <br> size | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect size } \\ & 95 \% \text { CIs } \end{aligned}$ | p-value | Narrative | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) | Example value | Predicted veg sales (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition: <br> Experimental week | 0.953 | 0.795, 1.141 | 0.601 | Vegetarian sales at dinners in experimental and control weeks were not significantly different. | Control | 8.0 | Experimental | 7.6 |
| Veg Availability (\%) listed on menu | 1.000 | 1.000, 1.000 | <0.001 | Vegetarian sales increased with the vegetarian availability listed on the menu. | 25 | 8.0 | 50 | 15.7 |
| Total meals sold | 1.007 | 1.002, 1.011 | 0.005 | Dinners with higher sales sold relatively more vegetarian options. | 80 | 7.0 | 120 | 9.0 |
| Total options available | NA | NA | NA | The menu always listed 4 options (although in reality sometimes 5 or 6 options were sometimes served). | NA |  | NA |  |
| Mean temperature | 1.048 | 1.026, 1.070 | <0.001 | Days with higher temperatures had higher vegetarian sales. | $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 6.4 | $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 9.8 |
| Veg NonVeg price differential | 5.247 | 1.067, 26.072 | 0.042 | Mealtimes with relatively cheaper vegetarian options had higher vegetarian sales. | £0.05 | 6.3 | $£ 0.50$ | 12.4 |
| Tuesday | 1.248 | 0.978, 1.594 | 0.076 | Fridays and Wednesdays had lower vegetarian sales than Mondays. Thursdays' vegetarian sales were higher than Mondays' and Tuesdays' were not significantly different.. | Mon | 11.3 | Tue | 13.7 |
| Wednesday | 0.682 | 0.493, 0.938 | 0.019 |  | - |  | Wed | 8.0 |
| Thursday | 1.364 | 1.037, 1.792 | 0.026 |  | - |  | Thu | 14.7 |
| Friday | 0.602 | 0.376, 0.958 | 0.033 |  | - |  | Fri | 7.1 |

