



UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

ARCHIVIO DELLA RICERCA

University of Parma Research Repository

Italian consumers standing at the crossroads of alternative protein sources: Cultivated meat, insect-based and novel plant-based foods

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Original

Italian consumers standing at the crossroads of alternative protein sources: Cultivated meat, insect-based and novel plant-based foods / Mancini, M. C.; Antonioli, F.. - In: MEAT SCIENCE. - ISSN 0309-1740. - 193:(2022), p. 108942. [10.1016/j.meatsci.2022.108942]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11381/2948053 since: 2024-11-23T18:25:05Z

Publisher:

ELSEVIER SCI LTD

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.meatsci.2022.108942

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

Italian consumers standing at the crossroads of alternative protein sources: Cultivated meat, insect-based and novel plant-based foods

Maria Cecilia Mancini

Federico Antonioli

1. Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that intensive livestock farming is under pressure due to several factors. Indeed, it is responsible for about 15% of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (OECD & FAO, 2021) and is associated with the degradation and depletion of land, soil, and water as well as biodiversity loss (Yitbarek, 2019). Not less importantly, intensive livestock farming is deemed to treat farmed animals as units of production rather than sentient beings, entailing practices that include crowded facilities, routine amputations, and brutal slaughter techniques. Besides the animal discomfort, health and quality issues can arise as animals subject to stress and pain are more prone to disease and produce lower quality products (Smith & Lewis, 2019).

At the same time, population growth and rising incomes in developing countries, together with the inability of Western consumers to substantially reduce meat consumption (Tobler, Visschers, & Siegrist, 2012) - despite their nominal willingness to shift towards more sustainable diets (European Commission, 2013) - will inflate the global demand for meat, with expectations suggesting an increase by more than two-thirds by 2050 (FAO, 2018).

Therefore, food systems are called to implement viable actions to meet the increasing demand for protein sources while addressing social and environmental priorities. One of the strategies supported by some actors of the scientific community and policymakers is the promotion of alternative sources of proteins that are obtained from novel sources, including microorganisms (fungi and bacteria), algae and microalgae, and insects (Pojić, Mišan, & Tiwari, 2018) or grown in laboratories. Within such a wider category, an increasing attention are gaining the so-called “meat analogues”, i.e. those alternatives that approximate the sensory characteristics of animal-sourced meats (Lusk, Blaustein-Rejto, Shah, & Tonsor, 2022).

At the moment being, several factors still affect the commercial success of the majority of novel protein sources; technical challenges prevail for some of them (Colgrave et al., 2021), whereas legislative deadlocks are slowing down the market entry of some others.

Nevertheless, several reports predict scenarios where the novel alternative proteins would disrupt the conventional meat industry, unlike the classic vegan and vegetarian meat replacements for which is

34 expected a growth that will not substantially threaten the existence of intensive livestock farming and
35 the meat industry (e.g. Tubb & Seba, 2021; Gerhardt, 2020).

36 However, a key issue for the future of all novel proteins is consumers' acceptance (see, among others,
37 Onwezen, Bouwman, Reinders, & Dagevos, 2021; Van Loo, E. J., Caputo, V., & Lusk, 2020).

38 Therefore, the research question of this paper is about the main drivers and obstacles posed by
39 consumers' perception that foster and hamper the development of those alternative protein sources
40 that fall within the category of "novel foods", i.e. cultivated meat, insect-based food, and novel plant-
41 based products.

42 Cultivated meat is defined as the meat produced under lab conditions by introducing muscle cells
43 (biopsied from donor bovine animals) to a culture medium, where they proliferate under controlled
44 conditions and develop into muscle fibres (Post, 2012), whereas insect-based food refers to insect
45 species used for human consumption, both whole or as an ingredient in processed food products such
46 as burger patties, pasta, or snacks. The third category under analysis is the novel plant-based food
47 which is made of novel plant-based ingredients, such as heme or seaweed, and includes but is not
48 limited to those alternatives that approximate the sensory characteristics of animal-sourced meats
49 (Lusk, Blaustein-Rejto, Shah, & Tonsor, 2022). The conventional plant-based products, such as soy
50 burgers, are not within the scope of this review, as a category available in the market for many years,
51 therefore lacking the "novelty" feature and, as mentioned above, is not expected to disrupt the current
52 livestock chains.

53 More specifically, this paper aims at providing a critical assessment of the available literature on
54 consumers' perception concerning cultivated meat, insect-based food, and novel plant-based products
55 with reference to the Italian context.

56 The reason for investigating Italian consumers' perception towards novel proteins is that meat plays
57 an important role in the Italian traditional cuisine and food culture. Indeed, Italy is where valuable
58 indigenous cattle breeds are reared and well reputed PDO and PGI¹ meat products are produced. As
59 Italian gastronomy impacts gourmets and foodies in Europe and worldwide, the understanding of
60 Italian consumers can play a role to envisage the future of food cultures in other countries, especially
61 where meat plays a crucial role in daily dishes.

62 Moreover, meat consumption is significant in Italy, making the Italian consumers of meat and meat-
63 based products of interest if novel sources of proteins took hold as substitutes for conventional meat.

¹ PDO (Protected Designation of Origin) and PGI (Protected Geographical Indication) products are the result of the combination of human and environmental factors that are characteristic of a specific territory. The PDO and PGI schemes are defined by the Regulation (EU) 1151/2012.

64 In 2021, meat consumption in Italy was about 59 kg per person per year², comprehensive of fresh and
65 processed meat and meat substitutes, this latter with a negligible 0.1 kg, covering all types of meat-
66 like products that approximate certain aesthetic qualities (primarily texture, flavour, and appearance)
67 or chemical characteristics of specific meat. According to Statista (Fig.1), a slight increase in meat
68 consumption is forecast in the Italian market as the result of two opposite dynamics: on the one hand,
69 an increasing trend in fresh meat and meat substitutes consumption and, on the other hand, a
70 decreasing trend of processed meat consumption over the next few years.

71 [Figure 1 about here]

72 These data support the idea that new dietary patterns are taking hold and possibly affecting the Italian
73 consumers' attitudes towards alternative protein sources. Indeed, according to Coop (2021), Italian
74 consumers seem to be more and more sensitive to the negative externalities ascribed to the meat sector
75 and its products for human health, natural resources, and animal welfare. In 2020, more than half of
76 Italian consumers stated to have reduced meat consumption to meet the principles of ethical
77 consumption. In the same year, 8% of Italians declared to be vegan or vegetarian (Eurispes, 2021)
78 and a growing number of consumers labelled themselves as "part-time vegans" (Coop, 2021), a
79 category including consumers who approach the vegan world motivated by health, animal welfare,
80 and environmental principles but are unable to fully join a vegan lifestyle.

81 Therefore, the emerging consumption trends pose the question about the Italian consumers'
82 acceptance of novel protein sources.

83 The remainder of the paper is the following: Section 2 describes the aim and how the literature review
84 concerning Italian consumers' perception of three novel protein sources has been performed; Sections
85 3, 4, and 5 focus on the Italian consumers' perception towards the cultivated meat, insect-based foods,
86 and novel plant-based products, respectively; Section 6 provides an assessment of the state of the art;
87 while Section 7 concludes with some final remarks.

88
892. Aim and method

90 In this paper, we aim at providing an assessment of the available literature on consumers' perception
91 towards three novel protein sources, specifically cultivated meat, insect-based foods and novel plant-
92 based products, with reference to the Italian context.

² <https://www.statista.com/outlook/cmo/food/meat/italy?>

The research used reference databases (i.e., Google Scholar, Scopus, Science Direct), and included articles from academic journals and papers from conferences over six years (2016-2021). Boolean operators (AND, OR) were used in the research along with the following keywords: insect, entomophagy, plant-based, novel, pulses, algae, seaweeds, alternative protein sources, meat substitutes, meat analogues, synthetic meat, cell-based meat, cultivated meat, clean meat, animal-free meat and slaughter-free meat, chemical meat, artificial meat, and fake meat associated with the words Italian, consumer, Italian market, Italy, perception, willingness, and acceptance.

While the literature review specifically focused on studies regarding Italian consumers' acceptance (i.e. 5 for cultivated meat, 16 for insect-based foods and 3 for novel plant-based products Tab. 1), further wider-focus studies were included when the information provided suited the scope of the current review.

[Table 1 about here]

3. Cultivated meat

Cultivated meat³ represents a scenario of alternative protein sources, although still in its incipient phase. Indeed, cultivated meat is yet to be scaled up at the industrial level, besides being eventually evaluated as a novel food to be allowed into EU markets (Mancini & Antonioli, 2022). Moreover, tasting experiments are not performed within the EU, and consequently, the literature investigating Italian consumers' attitude and perceptions towards this (yet abstract) food is weak.

The three available surveys on Italian consumers show quite convergent findings. A generally positive attitude towards cultivated meat was found, ranging from 54 % (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019) up to 78 % of the respondents willing to try cultivated meat (Palmieri & Forleo, 2021). Positive perception is mainly focused on cultivated meat as being able to reduce the negative externalities of intensive livestock farming rather than its intrinsic attributes, i.e. flavour, nutritional and safety characteristics. Such perception is reasonable since no sensory tests have been performed yet to support the intrinsic features of cultivated meat, thus entailing unfamiliar feelings among consumers. Therefore, the main leverages for fostering the acceptance of cultivated meat are rather ethical (i.e.,

³ Many terms are used for cultivated meat. Some of the most common are: cultured meat, cell-based meat, in vitro meat, clean meat, synthetic meat, artificial meat, animal-free meat, slaughter-free meat, fake meat. They refer to the same product but imply different perceptions of the product (Mancini & Antonioli, 2022).

121 animal welfare, food security, and environmental concerns) centred and sometimes led by curiosity
122 towards an untasted food (Palmieri, Perito, & Lupi, 2020; Piochi, Micheloni, & Torri, 2022).

123 Interestingly, the findings of all surveys show that meat-eaters are potentially interested in cultivated
124 meat more than vegetarians and vegans. This is coherent with several studies according to which
125 people consume meat not because it comes from an animal, but rather despite the fact it comes from
126 an animal (Broad, 2020) and cultivated meat would help to relieve their sense of guilt by providing
127 them with a complement to conventional meat. Quite the opposite, vegetarians and vegans, despite
128 being in favour of any alternative to intensive livestock farming, do not appear willing to taste and
129 consume a product that is anyway derived from an animal source.

130 Both very young (under 25) (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019) and young people (under 30) (Piochi,
131 Micheloni, & Torri, 2022) resulted to be those having the most positive attitude towards cultivated
132 meat. The educational level proved to be significant in one survey only (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019)
133 to the extent that the higher the education degree the more positive attitude towards cultivated meat.
134 The positive perception by youngsters, highly educated respondents, and meat-eaters reflects a
135 willingness to pay a premium price for cultivated meat (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019).

136 Given the unavailability of cultivated meat on EU markets and the foreseen not too short time horizon
137 for its placement on supermarkets' shelves, the available exploratory consumer studies devoted much
138 room to analysing the extent to which information impacts consumers' behaviour.

139 About two-thirds of the Italian consumers declared to have beforehand information on cultivated meat
140 (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019; Piochi, Micheloni, & Torri, 2022), more than what was found in
141 previous studies across Europe, conducted a few years earlier (Verbeke, Sans, & Van Loo, 2015).
142 Consumers awareness has probably been boosted by the increasing attention of the media on the
143 soaring numbers of high-tech start-ups interested in this product that are attracting huge capital,
144 sometimes from world-renowned managers or celebrities of the entertainment industry. According to
145 Mancini & Antonioli (2019), 64% of the participants who were somehow familiar with the topic were
146 willing to try cultivated meat, whereas this percentage plunged to 40% for respondents who had no
147 familiarity with it. These findings are coherent with previous research on the sense of unfamiliarity
148 with novel technologies, such as genetically modified organisms (Frewer et al., 2013) with which
149 cultivated meat is associated (Verbeke et al., 2015), showing that unfamiliarity leads to a lack of trust
150 (Siegrist & Sütterlin, 2017), uncertainty, and concerns over potential adverse long-term
151 consequences.

152 Mancini & Antonioli (2020) also analysed to what extent the provision of positive information affects
153 the perception and acceptance of cultivated meat by measuring the variation in perception and

154 willingness to try, buy, and pay before and after the provision of positive information related to the
155 product. The results showed that perception is significantly affected when the information concerns
156 safety and nutritional characteristics, whereas the opposite occurs regarding the product flavour.
157 Findings also revealed that, while the willingness to buy increases after providing positive
158 information, the willingness to try does not. Indeed, willingness to try depends upon further stimuli
159 other than information, suggesting a deeper analysis of the food profile, and the values underlying it,
160 of the population of interest. Respondents' perception was less affected by additional information
161 concerning the externalities of cultivated meat, probably because they were aware of such positive
162 effects even before the provision of positive information.

163 In Piochi, Micheloni, & Torri (2022), the aim of the investigation was the impact of different types
164 of information on consumers' response to cultivated meat. Four information types: human safety
165 (HS); animal welfare (AW); environmental impact (EI); no additional information, were provided to
166 four samples and it was found that additional information on claims related to HS, AW, and EI aspects
167 of cultivated meat had a positive effect on increasing favour for cultivated meat and willingness to
168 substitute conventional meat with cultivated meat. This positive effect of the information in the whole
169 tested population was not specifically linked to any information type (no significant differences were
170 found among the blocks of the information nor across claims) although minor effects were found in
171 some subgroups.

172 Interestingly, both studies by Mancini & Antonioli (2019) and Piochi, Micheloni, & Torri (2022)
173 found that the provided information impacted females' perception and acceptance more than any
174 other subgroup whereas information was less effective among older respondents, implying that this
175 group prefers to maintain established habits, which can be translated into a cautious attitude towards
176 cultivated meat. Other categories who showed to be less impacted by information were those who do
177 not eat meat, as well as those who do not intend to reduce meat consumption and those who hold a
178 lower educational level (Mancini & Antonioli, 2020). The latter is consistent with previous research
179 reporting that people holding a higher education degree are more likely to engage in analytical
180 thinking (Sinclair, 2014) rather than emotional attitudes, possibly making them more available to new
181 food scenarios than lower educated consumers.

182 Sometimes contrasting initiatives are suggested to promote cultivated meat; Palmieri & Forleo (2021)
183 recommend marketing strategies supported by highly reputed institutions and targeted to those
184 consumers groups that showed to be most sensitive - young individuals - with the aim of sharing solid
185 scientific evidence about the potential advantages of new food technologies on health, whereas
186 Mancini & Antonioli (2020) believe that too much technical information would be counterproductive

187 and rather suggest to combine information with an approach based on the “understanding of the food
188 identity profile of the members of the population of interest [...] to tap the psychological variables
189 linked to the system of values that drive food choices” (Faccio & Fovino, 2019, p. 10).

190

1914. **Insect-based food**

192 Italy-related studies on consumers’ behaviour towards entomophagy flourished in the last years; the
193 strong and rooted Italian food tradition embed certain food neophobia character, attracting the interest
194 of behavioural applied economists, particularly concerning consumers’ acceptance of novel foods,
195 such as insect-based ones (Arena et al., 2020; La Barbera, Verneau, Amato, & Grunert, 2018; La
196 Barbera; Lombardi et al., 2019; Shelomi, 2016; Sogari, Menozzi, & Mora, 2017; Verneau et al., 2016,
197 2020).

198 The up to now available literature concerning Italian consumers has focused on a few themes, namely,
199 the main barriers to be overcome for reaching a higher acceptance rate towards insect-based foodstuff,
200 consumers’ willingness to try and pay for it, as well as the role of information as a driver to increase
201 consumers’ acceptance of edible insects.

202 More than 50% of the respondents express a low-to-negative acceptance of insect foods in Italy
203 (Tuccillo, Marino, & Torri, 2020), with a significant exception of a segment, named ‘Rational’
204 consumer group by Verneau et al. (2020), which shows the highest rate of interest and confirms the
205 existence of a niche market of ‘early-adopters’ (as this group represents 20% of the respondents’
206 panel).

207 There’s a consensus that both appearance and taste are the main barriers to be overcome, with gender
208 and education playing a significant role (Arena et al., 2020; Cicatiello, De Rosa, & Lacetera, 2016;
209 Palmieri, Perito, Macri, & Lupi 2019; Tuccillo, Marino, & Torri, 2020) to the extent that males, as
210 well as higher-educated people, show a higher willingness to eat insects. Highly educated people may
211 embed a stronger environmental awareness, explaining their more positive attitude towards insect-
212 based food (Cicatiello, De Rosa, & Lacetera, 2016). Moreover, the current literature is unanimous in
213 finding the more negative attitude of female consumers towards insects, even though little has been
214 said about the motive for such difference. Cicatiello, De Rosa, & Lacetera (2016) argue that, given
215 the yet central role of women in housework activities in Italy (as in further Mediterranean countries),
216 the introduction of insects within the daily diet may be perceived as a household management issue.
217 Insect foods simply do not adhere to the image of Western consumers’ food, and this probably
218 represents the most significant barrier to the successful introduction of insect foods into Italian

219 consumers' routine: a strong cultural and psychological prejudice (Tan, Verbaan, & Stieger, 2017),
220 as Western areas are not experienced nor familiar with insects as food, so that social norms regarding
221 entomophagy often relates with uncleanliness and health risks (Hartmann, Shi, Giusto, & Siegrist,
222 2015; Hartmann & Siegrist, 2017; Jensen & Lieberoth, 2019).

223 Neophobia is very often mentioned when consumers' acceptance of edible insects is considered.
224 Indeed, almost all works blame neophobia as the main enabler for negative sentiments towards insect-
225 based foods, although Iannuzzi, Sisto, & Nigro (2019) conclude that neophobia itself should not apply
226 to insect foods as it entirely depends on the nature of the novel food and not on its 'novelty'. That is
227 to say, there is an anchored behaviour that prevents some consumers to be willing to eat insect foods,
228 hence cultural references are pivotal.

229 Research investigating the impact of information on consumers' acceptance of insect-based foods
230 shows controversial findings, mainly dependent upon the type of information provided. Conti et al.
231 (2018) find that providing information about the nutritional value of eating insect foods – especially
232 on essential amino acids daily requirements – does not entail any significant increase in participants'
233 willingness to accept them, in line with several studies (Hartmann, Shi, Giusto, & Siegrist, 2015;
234 Verbeke, 2015; Iannuzzi, Sisto, & Nigro, 2019); on the contrary, information about the future
235 challenge of food security that worldwide food systems will have to face seems to play a significant
236 role in shaping insect foods acceptance into the Italian society, as also asserted by Cicatiello, De Rosa,
237 Franco, & Lacetera (2016). According to Iannuzzi, Sisto, & Nigro (2019) and Menozzi et al. (2017),
238 the health and environmental benefits of insect foods seem successful elements on which leveraging
239 interventions (e.g. advertising campaigns from agri-food companies). According to Lombardi et al.
240 (2019), when not provided with any piece of information, consumers equally-to-slightly-negative
241 price insect foods; while, when information on the benefits of insects is given, WTP increases for all
242 insect-based products and the disgust sensation weakens (Mancini et al., 2019). The idea that peers'
243 recommendations together with familiarity with the food item increase the willingness to consume
244 insect foods is cemented by the study of Sidali, Pizzo, Garrido-Pérez, & Schamel (2019), where is
245 highlighted that introducing cultural contextual information about insects is pivotal for preventing the
246 false assumptions on this novel food. Indeed, both either personal or close network past experiences
247 with insect foods represent pieces of information (positively) shaping consumers' attitudes (Conti et
248 al. 2018; Menozzi et al., 2017; Roma, Ottomano Palmisano, & De Boni 2020). Nevertheless, Arena
249 et al. (2020) find no significant effect of information on consumers' perception of insect food, as no
250 statistically significant difference arose between the 'informed' and 'non-informed' groups. This
251 hints at the fact that consumers' prejudices endure even when positive information is provided (Conti,
252 Costa, Balzaretto, Russo, & Tedesco, 2018).

253 The little attention paid to the cuisine-related aspects has likely played a major role in the persistence
 254 of negative prejudices (Deroy, Reade, & Spence, 2015; Shelomi, 2016; Vecchione et al., 2012).
 255 Therefore, a path that seems to be crucial for a more targeted behavioural control, is the development
 256 of insect foods by mimicking those food products already rooted in Western diets, like chocolate
 257 cookies or pizza (Arena et al., 2020; Cicatiello, Vitali, & Lacetera, 2020; Iannuzzi, Sisto, & Nigro,
 258 2019; Roma, Ottomano Palmisano, & De Boni, 2020; Sogari, Menozzi, & Mora, 2017). As insect
 259 foods do not adhere to the image of Western consumers' food, processing them beyond recognition
 260 may represent an (initial) step towards their acceptance and routinely consumption. Lombardi et al.
 261 (2019) found that staple (and savoury) foods, like pasta (with insects as ingredients), are deemed more
 262 palatable than sweet foodstuffs such as chocolate bars or cookies: insects are seen as substitutes for
 263 protein hence sweet preparations are less suitable to Italian consumers, as found by more general
 264 studies (Shelomi, 2015; Tan et al., 2015). In line with their conclusions, Conti et al. (2018) find that
 265 insect (salty) snacks are higher appreciated. The way the insect food is prepared and presented
 266 undoubtedly entails a significant impact on the willingness to consume such foods: the lesser the
 267 insect is visible, the higher the probability for the consumer to eat the insect-based product, as this is
 268 valid also for other Western countries (de-Magistris, Pascucci & Mitsopoulos, 2015; Schösler, Boer
 269 de, & Boersema, 2012).

270 There's an important limitation in almost all studies cited above that referred to young and well-
 271 educated consumers, as the majority of studies took place within Italian Universities or relied on
 272 academic networks. This, on the one hand, may find a justification as young and well-educated
 273 consumers will be those potentially consuming insect foods as part of their diet in the next future
 274 (Sogari, Menozzi, & Mora, 2017, 2019), proving to represent the most interesting niche market for
 275 (insect) agri-food companies (Cicatiello et al., 2020; Gmuer, Nuessli Guth, Hartmann, & Siegrist,
 276 2016; Iannuzzi et al., 2019; Roma Ottomano Palmisano & De Boni, 2020; Schouteten et al., 2016;
 277 Verneau et al., 2020) but, on the other hand, such limitation calls for more research efforts towards
 278 different segments within the young-adults bandwidth and testing other types of insect-food products.

279 As a main result, this review suggests that insects may be first introduced as ingredients, coherently
 280 with what was reported by several Western-related works (Caparros Megido et al., 2016; Cunha,
 281 Cabral, Moura, & de Almeida, 2018; Gmuer, Nuessli Guth, Hartmann, & Siegrist, 2016; Iannuzzi,
 282 Sisto, & Nigro, 2019; Roma, Ottomano Palmisano & De Boni, 2020; Tan, Fischer, van Trijp, &
 283 Stieger, 2016). This entails that further technological improvements seem to be needed for a smoother
 284 acceptance of insect foods and to promote their introduction into regular diets (Tan, Verbaan, &
 285 Stieger, 2017). Therefore, such a transitional phase could represent the best-suited marketing strategy

286 to introduce insects into Western diets before a wider diffusion (La Barbera, F., Verneau, F., Amato,
287 M., & Grunert, K.; Caparros Megido et al., 2016; Iannuzzi, Sisto, & Nigro, 2019; Mancini et al.,
288 2019).

289

2905. **Novel plant-based products**

291 For a long time, soybean has been the most popular ingredient in plant-based meat, although
292 companies recently started introducing other sources. Eventually, these ingredients have become
293 prominent due to advances in technology enabling superior functionality, including more meat-like
294 flavour profiles, textures, and appearances (Lusk, Blaustein-Rejto, Shah, & Tonsor, 2022).

295 To the best of our knowledge, two papers only (Palmieri & Forleo, 2020, 2021), that report the
296 findings of the same survey, analysed consumers' perception of novel plant-based sources of proteins,
297 namely seaweeds, in the Italian context at the time of this writing. A third paper focussed on
298 consumers' perception of the construction of a microalgae production plant rather than the product
299 microalgae itself. However, some evidence can be drawn. The theme around which Palmieri and
300 Forleo (2020, 2021) focussed their survey was the overall acceptance, more specifically the
301 familiarity with seaweeds, and the willingness to try them. As a result, 75% of the sample composed
302 of 257 Italian consumers had heard about edible seaweed whereas the percentage of those who had
303 eaten them was not very high (57%) compared with other studies such as Birch, Skallerud, & Paul
304 (2019), which reported a past consumption of 75% for their sample of Australian consumers.
305 Nevertheless, 77% of the sample of Italian interviewers were willing to eat seaweed, coherently to
306 the available literature (Al-Thawadi, 2018; Böhrlen, Canavari, & Breitschopf, 2005).

307 The socio-demographic predictors of acceptance, the most common objections and perceived
308 benefits, as well as the role of information in consumers' perception, are the main issues of the third
309 research (Lafarga et al., 2021) that investigated the attitude of citizens in Almeria (Spain) and Livorno
310 (Italy) towards the construction of a microalgae production plant and bio-refinery. One main result is
311 the weaker consciousness of Italian consumers compared to Spanish respondents about microalgae,
312 provided that approximately 60–70% of the Italian respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the
313 production of microalgae, independently of the location of the facility. What the two cities' samples
314 resulted to have in common is the socio-demographic response to the extent that the share of
315 respondents over 49 years old agreeing with the construction of both microalgae's production plant
316 and bio-refinery was higher than the sample average in both cities, and the higher the educational
317 attainment, the higher the acceptance rate of respondents.

318 Safety, health, and the economy (i.e., the opportunity for new jobs) are the main reasons for agreeing
319 with this type of production in the Italian sample, consistently with the motivations mentioned by
320 Spanish citizens in a survey that took place in 2020 (Lafarga et al., 2021). Not surprisingly and
321 coherently with other studies about consumers' perception of cultivated meat and insect-based food
322 (e.g. Mancini & Antonioli, 2020; Conti et al., 2018), information provision positively impacts the
323 consumers' acceptance levels. Indeed, increasing knowledge about microalgae and microalgae-
324 derived products led to a shift from undecided respondents to positive answers. Results suggest that
325 increasing consumer knowledge about the environmental and health benefits of microalgae could lead
326 to a higher interest in the topic and acceptance of microalgae-based processes and products. The
327 findings also suggest that information can be used to address consumers' worries, in particular risk
328 perception which is the key factor influencing consumer interest in production technologies,
329 coherently with previous research (Cardello, Schutz, & Lesher, 2007).

330 Although the very limited numbers of studies, the available literature agrees in providing two main
331 recommendations for increasing seaweeds acceptance and consumption; the first one consists of the
332 promotion of institutional and commercial campaigns to raise awareness about the health
333 characteristics and the large variety of sensory qualities (such as flavour, texture, and colour) of
334 seaweeds; and, the second one focuses on getting the consumers acquainted with these products
335 through seaweeds tasting, especially combined with familiar products such as seaweed-based snacks
336 (Chapman, Stévant, & Larssen, 2015). For instance, the Italian guidelines for healthy eating,
337 recommending the consumption of seaweeds as a source of iodine and Vitamin B12, are mentioned
338 as an excellent tool to increase awareness (Palmieri & Forleo, 2021). It is reasonable to envisage that
339 more familiarity will gradually turn the consumer into a diet that includes an increasing share of this
340 product category.

341

3426. Discussion

343 6.1 Cross-sectional reading of the literature review

344 The literature review conducted on consumers' perception towards novel protein sources in the Italian
345 context reveals a common line of investigation to the extent that the surveys mainly analyse the
346 barriers and the role of information as a driver for their acceptance.

347 According to the findings, the same profile of consumer is likely to be favourable to both cultivated
348 meat and insect-based food, i.e. a young and highly educated consumer, with some gender
349 differences. Indeed, males result more positive than females, this latter becoming favourable once

350 informed about the positive externalities of cultivated meat and insect-based food on the environment
351 and food security.

352 What is very different in consumers' perceptions towards the two novel products is the distrust origin:
353 technological for cultured meat, as this being perceived as a food disconnected from the natural
354 production processes, whereas a culture-related opposition prevails for insects, that are out of the
355 collective food imagination of Western consumers. The third category – novel plant-based food –
356 seems to be less problematic, as it does not present the technological and cultural barriers of the other
357 two novel protein sources.

358 Information results to be the best strategy to increase Italian consumer acceptance of all novel protein
359 alternatives. Indeed, this is true for cultivated meat, especially at this stage when the consumer is not
360 able to test the product yet and verify the contents of the information, and for insects and plant-based
361 food as well. However, the latter categories benefit from two conditions precluded to cultivated meat.
362 Firstly, insect foods and plant-based products are going to be or are already available for tasting, thus
363 making their promotion easier to succeed; secondly, they can be easily used as ingredients for the
364 production of familiar and attempting foods.

365 The main outputs of the literature review are shown in Tab. 2.

366

367 [Table 2 about here]

368

369

370 As a matter of fact, the three alternative protein sources take along specific challenges as they differ
371 in technological innovation, face different degrees of institutional barriers and have different impacts
372 on the environment (Mancini & Antonioli, 2022).

373 Indeed, cultivated meat requires a higher degree of technological change compared to plant-based
374 products or edible insects (Tomiya et al., 2020) and scientists are still working to definitively
375 overcome some major technical barriers such as an animal-free medium to meet the animal rights
376 activists' expectations or the production of structured meat cuts, at least for beef production (Allan,
377 De Bank, & Ellis, 2019). These challenges have led to the assertion that “in vitro meat is still in its
378 infancy” (Chriki & Hocquette, 2020; p.7). What's promising for the future of cultivated meat is that
379 such highly technological foods may have an advantage in that they can catch the investments of
380 innovative companies willing to support technological breakthroughs, which does not seem to be true
381 for other alternative protein solutions as they lack the involvement of powerful corporates (van der
382 Weele et al., 2019).

383 The regulatory frameworks differ as well; plant-based protein sources fall under to a large extent
384 established legislation, whereas insects are gradually gaining EU legal authorizations on diverse
385 insect-based products⁴; differently from cultivated meat whose legal reference framework seems to
386 be still very far from a setting in the EU (Seehafer & Bartels, 2019).

387 Lastly, the environmental impact differs among alternative protein categories. Although the early
388 studies quantified drastic reductions in energy consumption, land and water usage, and energy
389 consumption for cultivated meat compared to conventional livestock farming (Tuomisto & Teixeira
390 De Mattos, 2011), it has been more recently acknowledged that the environmental assessment of its
391 production needs more data, particularly related to inputs and the industrial-scale production (e.g.
392 Mattick, Landis & Allenby, 2015). Conversely, it is well established that insects require no land,
393 little food and water for their growth, and have a rapid growth rate (Premalatha, Abbasi, Abbasi &
394 Abbasi, 2011), whereas plant-based foods tend to be less resource-intensive and environmentally
395 destructive, especially due to lower levels of greenhouse gas emissions compared to raising animals
396 for human consumption (Lynch, Johnston & Wharton, 2018) to different extents depending on the
397 specificity of the production process.

398

399 6.2 Future consumption scenarios

400 Despite a very uncertain future for some of these alternative protein sources, the report of Tubb and
401 Seba (2021) depicts two technological innovations - precision fermentation (i.e., the combination of
402 precision biology with the process of fermentation) and cell-based meat as being able to reduce the
403 cost of modern foods by up to 80% compared to the products they would replace. A second report by
404 Gerhardt et al. (2020) predicts a scenario in which cultivated meat represents 35% of the global meat
405 market in 2040, with the remaining shares divided between conventional (40%) and novel vegan meat
406 replacements (25%). Unlike classic vegan replacements (e.g., tofu, seitan, mushrooms, or jackfruit),
407 novel vegan meat replacements would benefit from sensory profiles much closer to conventional meat
408 due to the use of haemoglobin and binders extracted via fermentation from plants. Whereas classic
409 vegan replacements are estimated unlikely to grow beyond the current trend, the report forecasts the
410 disruption of the conventional meat industry due to the inexorable technological progress of start-ups
411 working on cultivated meat and novel vegan meat replacements, supported by large corporations
412 funding. The report closes up by stating that cultivated meat will eventually prevail over the novel

⁴ On 10 February 2022, the Commission has authorised the placing on the market of a third insect, *Acheta domesticus* (house cricket).

413 vegan meat replacements in the long run, whereas the latter is depicted as a transitional product
414 category that will bridge the consumers to the new food model based on cell-based meat.

415 Interestingly, consumer resistance to modern food disruption is not considered a major barrier as
416 “resistance is never as deep-rooted or intransigent as we may think” (Tubb and Seba, 2021, p. 35).
417 This still has to be proved in the Italian market, in particular concerning those alternative protein
418 sources that have not been tasted by consumers yet, in particular cultivated meat and, to a large extent,
419 insects as well. As mentioned, cultivated meat acceptance finds the main obstacles in food and food
420 technology neophobia (Palmieri, Perito, & Lupi, 2020; Piochi, Micheloni, & Torri, 2022) and
421 expectations of taste (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019) whereas entomophagy is mainly rejected based on
422 the disgust factor (Sogari, Menozzi, & Mora, 2017; Tuccillo, Marino, & Torri, 2020) and the fear of
423 health risk (Moruzzo, Mancini, Boncinelli, & Riccioli, 2021). Moreover, these two novel foods are
424 entering the market at a very crucial moment. COVID pandemic and the recent start of the military
425 conflict in Ukraine represent societal events that seem to bear a negative influence on the acceptance
426 rate of technological and novelty factors in food production; indeed, Italian consumers tend to
427 increasingly associate positive perceptions with local, traditional and natural (low-processed) foods
428 (Coop, 2021).

429 The acceptance of plant-based foods seems to be less challenging, both for their availability – at least,
430 for some of them - on supermarkets’ shelves, thus making these products more familiar to consumers,
431 and because they are not perceived as intensively technological processed foods. Therefore, their
432 acceptance could be quite easily increased by reducing the health risk perception through information
433 (Lafarga et al., 2021).

434

435 *6.3 Communication and promotion strategies*

436 It is likely that environmental sustainability will be one of the main leverages for the promotion of
437 alternative protein sources in the Italian market, but it is the authors’ suggestion not to underestimate
438 that the concept of sustainability in Italian consumers’ eyes greatly differs and encompasses several
439 values. For 33% of Italians, a food product is sustainable when organic, environmentally friendly
440 produced and does not use additives or antibiotics. A similar percentage associates sustainability with
441 products made from eco-friendly materials and packaging. For 25 % of Italian consumers,
442 sustainability has to do with a controlled supply chain, local or domestic production while for 9% a
443 food product is sustainable when fair remuneration to workers and respect for their rights is granted
444 (Coop, 2021). Therefore, despite an increasing interest in sustainable food products, the concept of

445 sustainability is subject to a wide range of interpretations that has to be taken into account in the
446 definition of marketing strategies for alternative protein sources.

447 What seems to be underestimated in the up-to-now available literature concerning Italian consumers’
448 perception is the role that intermediate institutions may play, in particular producers’ associations and
449 other agents of the conventional meat supply chain. At the time being, despite some concerns
450 expressed towards all types of alternative protein sources, the spotlight is very much on cultivated
451 meat. In this regard, Italian producers’ associations have addressed major concerns about the future
452 of national livestock farming. With a production value of almost 10 billion euros, the Italian meat
453 sector accounts for about one-fifth of the value of national agricultural production; in some areas, it
454 can even exceed 30% of the value of agricultural production. Livestock farming also activates both
455 up and downstream agents along the supply chain, such as the feed industry, with a total turnover of
456 over 7.5 billion euros (Assalzoo, 2020), besides the production of PDO and PGI meat products
457 (Mancini, 2012) which account for 1.9 billion euros, rising to 5 billion euros on the final consumer
458 market (Ismea - Qualivita, 2021).

459 Producers’ associations also claim the remarkable role of animal husbandry in the production of
460 biogas, electricity and hydrogen, and more generally as a main element for the circular economy.
461 Furthermore, the by-products of livestock as manure, are a source of nitrogen, besides other essential
462 organic minerals especially used in organic farming as soil conditioners to improve soil fertility. In
463 such a framework, some producers’ associations have taken action in consumer communication.
464 Coldiretti, the largest Italian producer association accounting for 1.5 million members, recently issued
465 a nine minutes video entitled “Frankenstein meat, the future to fear”⁵ in which the association explains
466 its reasons for claiming the potential benefits advocated by cultivated meat supporters false and
467 misleading. It is interesting to briefly analyse the narrative and the wording chosen for the video
468 campaign. The video starts by providing a very technical description of the process using scientific
469 terms⁶. Cultivated meat is then blamed for lack of natural origin, likely to be more environmental
470 impacting than conventional meat farming and potentially dangerous for human health because of the
471 residues of organic and chemical molecules in the water. Much room is also devoted to the
472 explanation of how foetal serum is provided, being extracted by pregnant cows, and the impact that
473 foetal serum procurement will have on livestock farming that will turn to become a foetal provider.
474 Cultivated meat is finally presented as a business that will benefit large corporations, thus contributing
475 to the marginalisation of farmers and the local systems of production.

⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n8RIOGNQ3_k

⁶ As previously mentioned, technical descriptions of novel foods are likely to produce negative reactions by raising a sense of unfamiliarity and discomfort. See also Bryant & Dillard (2019).

476 This resembles an example of how a sectorial association is attempting to preserve the traditional
477 meat sector by raising societal aversion, disseminating incomplete information and inflating alarmism
478 on scientific issues that have not been cleared yet by any robust scientific result.

479 It is hardly predictable whether such communication will impact consumer behaviour in particular
480 those segments who seem to be the potential consumers of cultivated meat: young and highly
481 educated people who tend to prefer sources of information alternative to institutional bodies.
482 However, it is likely that some stakeholders' lobbying activities will be able to slow down a
483 legislation framework favourable to meat analogues and rather support regulations that act as entry
484 barriers for companies, thus hindering their drive for innovation (Lähteenmäki -Uutela, Rahikainen,
485 Lonkila, & Yang, 2021).

486 However, what's up most evident in Italy at the moment is the chaotic flow of information provided
487 by media that misleads consumers. Cell-based meat is often described as an artificial product made
488 in laboratories from scratch, whose animal cell origin is neglected; moreover, different types of meat
489 analogues are named under the same term. Newspapers, magazines, television, and social media label
490 both cultivated meat and plant-based meat as "synthetic meat". Because of the bivalent use of this
491 term, many consumers believe that cell-based meat is available on the market, raising
492 misunderstandings that will ultimately damage consumers and potential developments for such novel
493 foods production. To this extent, producers' associations' intervention is understandable, particularly
494 their call for a clear legislative framework on the naming/labelling of alternative (hence not even
495 similar because of a very different nature) products - which is not the case, so far, neither at EU nor
496 at the national level⁷.

497

4987. **Final remarks**

499 Whereas some authors argue that alternative protein products compete against each other (Sexton,
500 Garnett, & Lorimer, 2019), the authors' opinion is they are likely to have different roles depending
501 on their different strengths and weaknesses. Novel plant-based food and edible insects represent a
502 valuable alternative protein source from the nutritional perspective. Moreover, plant-based food can


⁷ In the case of milk alternative products, the words milk, cheese, cream, and others, were prohibited for products not derived from mammary secretions - see the European Court of Justice case of 2017 'TofuTown' decision that denied the use of dairy names even when they are sided by clarifying designators such as 'vegan' or 'plant-based' (Carreño & Dolle, 2018). Differently, although specific names for beef, pig meat, and chicken are protected, the names referring to shapes and composition of meat products (steaks, sausages, and burgers) are not (Lähteenmäki -Uutela, Rahikainen, Lonkila, & Yang, 2021). An additional confusing factor resides in the differences between EU countries' legislations. An example is provided by the French food labelling law in force since the beginning of 2021 that prevents plant-based products from using names related to the shapes and composition of meat products.

503 be made available to a wide range of consumers, embracing vegetarians and vegans as well. However,
504 palatability, appearance, flavour, and texture still represent critical weaknesses that need to be
505 overcome. On the opposite, cultivated meat is an animal's muscle-based product representing the
506 only meat alternative comparable to traditional meat. This feature makes it unsuitable or undesirable
507 for some segments of consumers but appealing to some others, specifically meat consumers who are
508 not willing to reduce or drop out of meat consumption, but are keen to reduce their environmental
509 impact. However, major barriers, mainly related to the scaling-up of production and the consumer
510 market price, still have to be overcome. It is currently very hard to predict the market share that these
511 alternative protein sources will be able to gain in the Italian market but it seems reasonable to envisage
512 a complementary, if not even partially supplementary, relationship with traditional meat.

513 Many factors play a role in alternative protein source diffusion, including technological progress,
514 price, industry communication, and, last but not least, institutional support. Indeed, the latter may
515 resemble the turning point for avoiding harsh confrontations between the traditional meat sector and
516 societal urgencies. Agri-food policies may need to seriously consider the effects of alternatives on
517 the conventional side of the production process, offering economic and financial solutions to either
518 support and smooth the transition from conventional to alternative, or provide aides or solutions to
519 avoiding a massive exit from the sector and its welfare-related consequences (Mancini & Antonioli,
520 2022). On the consumption side, the choices of today's very young consumers, supported by their
521 ethical principles, will contribute to deciding the future of the market for these products.

522
523

524 **Fig.1.** Meat and meat substitutes consumption per capita (kg), Italy (2014-2027)
525



526
527
528 Source: authors' elaboration on Statista <https://www.statista.com/outlook/cmo/food/meat/italy>
529

Authors	Publication year	Title	Journal
<i>Cultivated meat</i>			
Piochi et al.	2022	Effect of informative claims on the attitude of Italian consumers towards cultured meat and relationship among variables used in an explicit approach	Food Research International
Mancini, Antonioli	2020	The role of information on consumer acceptance of Novel Food: The cultured meat	BioLaw Journal
Mancini, Antonioli	2020	To What Extent Are Consumers' Perception and Acceptance of Alternative Meat Production Systems Affected by Information? The Case of Cultured Meat	Animals
Palmieri et al.	2020	Consumer acceptance of cultured meat: some hints from Italy	British Food Journal
Mancini, Antonioli	2018	'Exploring consumers' attitude towards cultured meat in Italy	Meat Science
<i>Novel plant-based products</i>			
Lafarga et al.	2021	'Consumer Attitudes towards Microalgae Production and Microalgae-Based Agricultural Products: The Cases of Almería (Spain) and Livorno (Italy	ChemEngineering
Palmieri, Forleo	2021	An Explorative Study of Key Factors Driving Italian Consumers' Willingness to Eat Edible Seaweed	Journal of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing
Palmieri, Forleo	2020	The potential of edible seaweed within the western diet. A segmentation of Italian consumers'	International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science
<i>Insect-based food</i>			
Arena et al.	2020	Exploring consumer's propensity to consume insect-based foods. Empirical evidence from a study in Southern Italy	Applied System Innovation
Cicatiello et al.	2020	How does it taste? Appreciation of insect-based snacks and its determinants	International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science
Roma et al.	2020	Insects as novel food: A consumer attitude analysis through the dominance-based rough set approach	Foods
Tuccillo et al	2020	Italian consumers' attitudes towards entomophagy: Influence of human factors and properties of insects and insect-based food	Food Research International
Iannuzzi et al.	2019	The willingness to consume insect-based food: An empirical research on italian consumers	Agricultural Economics
Lombardi et al.	2019	Willingness to pay for insect-based food: The role of information and carrier	Food Quality and Preference

Mancini et al.	2019	Factors predicting the intention of eating an insect-based product	Foods
Palmieri et al.	2019	Exploring consumers' willingness to eat insects in Italy	British Food Journal
Sidali et al.	2019	Between food delicacies and food taboos: A structural equation model to assess Western students' acceptance of Amazonian insect food	Food Research International
Sogari et al.	2019	The food neophobia scale and young adults' intention to eat insect products	International Journal of Consumer Studies
Conti et al.	2018	Survey on food preferences of university students: from tradition to new food customs?	Agriculture
Sogari et al.	2018	Sensory-liking expectations and perceptions of processed and unprocessed insect products	International Journal on Food System Dynamics
Menozzi et al.	2017	Eating novel foods: An application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to predict the consumption of an insect-based product	Food Quality and Preference
Sogari et al.	2017	Exploring young foodies' knowledge and attitude regarding entomophagy: A qualitative study in Italy	International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science
Cicatiello et al.	2016	Consumer approach to insects as food: barriers and potential for consumption in Italy	British Food Journal
Verneau et al.	2016	The effect of communication and implicit associations on consuming insects: An experiment in Denmark and Italy	Appetite

Source: authors' elaboration.

Table 1. List of references per category of alternative protein foods.

	Drivers for consumption	Barriers to consumption	WTT*	WTB**/ WTP***	Profile of potential consumer	Recommendations
Cultivated meat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical centred externalities (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019) and curiosity (Palmieri et al., 2020; Piochi et al., 2022). Information on safety and nutritional characteristics (information overcomes rejection in particular when addressed to females). Familiarity with the topic (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfamiliarity (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019; Palmieri et al., 2020; Piochi et al., 2022). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 78 % of the respondents (Palmieri & Forleo, 2021). 64% of those familiar with the topic; 40% of respondents who had no beforehand information (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019). Additional information does not increase WTT (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WTB increases after positive information (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019). Youngsters, highly educated respondents, and meat-eaters are more willing to pay a premium (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meat eaters (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019; Palmieri et al., 2020; Piochi et al., 2022). Very young (<25) (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019) and young people (<30) (Piochi et al., 2022). Highly educated consumers (Mancini & Antonioli, 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific communication on health advantages to young individuals (Palmieri & Forleo, 2021). Combining information with an approach based on the understanding of the food identity profile of the population of interest (Mancini & Antonioli, 2020).
Insect-based food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on environmental and health related externalities (Cicatiello et al., 2016; Menozzi et al., 2017; Sisto & Nigro, 2019; Sidali et al., 2019). Either personal or close network past experiences with insect foods (Menozzi et al., 2017; Conti et al. 2018; Roma et al., 2020). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appearance and taste (Cicatiello et al., 2016; Palmieri et al., 2019; Arena et al., 2020; Tuccillo et al., 2020). Cultural rejection (Iannuzzi et al., 2019) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low WTT due to cultural prejudice (Iannuzzi et al., 2019). Familiarity increases WTT (Sidali et al., 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After information, WTP increases and the disgust sensation weakens (Mancini et al., 2019). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly educated and male consumers (Cicatiello et al., 2016). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of insect-based foods by mimicking familiar food products (de-Magistris et al., 2015; Sogari et al., 2017; Iannuzzi et al., 2019; Lombardi et al., 2019; Arena et al., 2020; Roma et al., 2020; Cicatiello et al., 2020).
Plant-based food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety, health and positive economic impacts are the main reasons for consumers' acceptance of seaweed plants (Lafarga et al., 2021). Environmental and health related info (Lafarga et al., 2021) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 77% of the sample (Palmieri & Forleo 2020; 2021). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The higher the educational attainment of respondents, the higher the acceptance of construction of seaweed plant (Lafarga et al., 2021). Over 49 years old respondents agree on seaweed plant construction above the sample average (Lafarga et al., 2021) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion through campaigns about the health characteristics and sensory qualities and getting the consumers acquainted through seaweeds tasting, combined with familiar products (Palmieri & Forleo, 2020; 2021).

*Willingness to try (WTT)**willingness to buy (WTB) ***willingness to pay (WTP)

Source: authors' elaboration.

Table 2. Main findings of literature review on consumers' acceptance of cultivated meat, insect-based and plant-based food within the Italian context

537 **References**

- 538 Al-Thawadi, S. (2018) 'Public perception of algal consumption as an alternative food in the Kingdom
539 of Bahrain', *Arab Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, Vol. 25(1),1–12. Available at
540 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25765299.2018.1449344>.
- 541 Allan, S. J., De Bank, P. A., & Ellis, M. J. (2019) 'Bioprocess Design Considerations for Cultured
542 Meat Production With a Focus on the Expansion Bioreactor', *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*.
- 543 Arena, E., Mazzaglia, A., Selvaggi, R., Pecorino, B., Fallico, B., Serranò, M., & Pappalardo, G.
544 (2020) 'Exploring Consumer's Propensity to Consume Insect-Based Foods. Empirical Evidence from
545 a Study in Southern Italy', *Applied System Innovation*, Vol. 3(3), 38. Available at
546 <https://www.mdpi.com/2571-5577/3/3/38>.
- 547 Assalzoo. Annuario 2021. Available at: [https://www.assalzoo.it/wp-](https://www.assalzoo.it/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Annuario_2021_web-ottimizzato.pdf)
548 [content/uploads/2021/10/Annuario_2021_web-ottimizzato.pdf](https://www.assalzoo.it/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Annuario_2021_web-ottimizzato.pdf).
- 549 La Barbera, F., Verneau, F., Amato, M., & Grunert, K. (2018) 'Understanding Westerners' disgust
550 for the eating of insects: The role of food neophobia and implicit associations', *Food Quality and*
551 *Preference*, Vol. 64 120–125. Available at
552 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S095032931730229X>.
- 553 Birch, D., Skallerud, K., & Paul, N. (2019) 'Who Eats Seaweed? An Australian Perspective', *Journal*
554 *of International Food & Agribusiness Marketing*, Vol. 31(4), 329–351. Available at
555 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08974438.2018.1520182>.
- 556 Broad, G. M. (2020) 'Making Meat, Better: The Metaphors of Plant-Based and Cell-Based Meat
557 Innovation', *Environmental Communication*, Vol. 14(7), 919–932. Available at
558 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17524032.2020.1725085>.
- 559 Bryant, C., & Dillard, C. (2019) 'The impact of framing on acceptance of cultured meat', *Frontiers in*
560 *Nutrition*, Vol. 6(July) 1–10.
- 561 Bührle, B., Canavari, M., & Breitschopf, B. 'Determinants of consumer preferences towards
562 functional foods with seaweed ingredients', *97th EAAE Seminar on “The Economics and Policy of*
563 *Diet and Health”*, *Whiteknights Campus, University of Reading (UK), April 21-22, 2005*
- 564 Caparros Megido, R., Gierts, C., Blecker, C., Brostaux, Y., Haubruge, É., Alabi, T., & Francis, F.
565 (2016) 'Consumer acceptance of insect-based alternative meat products in Western countries', *Food*
566 *Quality and Preference*, Vol. 52, 237–243. Elsevier. Available at
567 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095032931630091X>
- 568 Cardello, A. V., Schutz, H. G., & Leshner, L.L. (2007). 'Consumer perceptions of foods processed by
569 innovative and emerging technologies: A conjoint analytic study', *Innovative Food Science &*
570 *Emerging Technologies*, Vol. 8(1), 73–83. Available at
571 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1466856406000580>.
- 572 Chapman, A. S., Stévant, P., and Larssen, W. E. (2015). 'Food or fad? Challenges and opportunities
573 for including seaweeds in a Nordic diet', *Botanica Marina*, Vol. 58(6), 423–433. Available at
574 <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/bot-2015-0044/html>.
- 575 Carreño, I., & Dolle, T. (2018). Tofu steaks? Developments on the naming and marketing of plant-
576 based foods in the aftermath of the TofuTown judgement. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 9,
577 575–584.
- 578 Chriki, S., & Hocquette, J.-F. 'The Myth of Cultured Meat: A Review', *Frontiers in Nutrition*, Vol. 7
579 (2020) 7. Frontiers Media S.A. Available at
580 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnut.2020.00007/full>.
- 581 Cicatiello, C., De Rosa, B., Franco, S., & Lacetera, N. (2016) 'Consumer approach to insects as food:
582 barriers and potential for consumption in Italy', *British Food Journal*, Vol. 118(9) 2271–2286.
583 Available at <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/BFJ-01-2016-0015/full/html>

584 Cicatiello, C., Vitali, A., & Lacetera, N. 'How does it taste? Appreciation of insect-based snacks and
585 its determinants' (2020), *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, Vol. 21 100211.
586 Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1878450X20300883>

587 Colgrave, M. L., Dominik, S., Tobin, A. B., Stockmann, R., Simon, C., Howitt, C. A., ... &
588 Vanhercke, T. (2021) Perspectives on future protein production. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*
589 *Chemistry*, 69(50), 15076-15083.

590 Conti, C., Costa, A., Balzaretto, C., Russo, V., & Tedesco, D. (2018) 'Survey on Food Preferences of
591 University Students: from Tradition to New Food Customs?', *Agriculture*, Vol. 8(10), 155. Available
592 at <http://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/8/10/155>.

593 Coop (2021). *Rapporto Coop 2021. Consumi e stili di vita degli Italiani di oggi e domani*. Rome,
594 Italy. Available at: <https://www.italiani.coop/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/rappcoop21.pdf>

595 Cunha, L. M., Cabral, D., Moura, A. P., & de Almeida, M. D. V. (2018) 'Application of the Food
596 Choice Questionnaire across cultures: Systematic review of cross-cultural and single country studies',
597 *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 64, 21–36. Available at
598 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329317302458>.

599 de-Magistris, T., Pascucci, S., & Mitsopoulos, D. (2015) 'Paying to see a bug on my food: How
600 regulations and information can hamper radical innovations in the European Union', *British Food*
601 *Journal*, Vol. 117(6), 1777–1792. Available at
602 <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/BFJ-06-2014-0222/full/html>.

603 Deroy, O., Reade, B., & Spence, C. (2015) 'The insectivore's dilemma, and how to take the West out
604 of it', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 44, 44–55. Available at
605 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329315000385>.

606 Eurispes 33 *Rapporto Italia. Percorsi di ricerca nella società Italiana. Documento di Sintesi*.
607 Available at: [https://eurispes.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/eurispes_sintesi-rapporto-italia-](https://eurispes.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/eurispes_sintesi-rapporto-italia-2021.pdf)
608 [2021.pdf](https://eurispes.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/eurispes_sintesi-rapporto-italia-2021.pdf)

609 European Commission. (2013). Flash Eurobarometer on Attitudes of Europeans towards building the
610 single market for green products. In Brussels DG Communication COMM A1 'Research and
611 Speechwriting' Flash Eurobarometer 367 (Attitudes of Europeans towards Building the Single Market
612 for Green Products) (Issue December 2012). http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_367_en.pdf.

613 Faccio, E., & Fovino, L. G. N. (2019). 'Food Neophobia or Distrust of Novelties? Exploring
614 consumers' attitudes toward GMOs, insects and cultured meat', *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*, Vol.
615 9(20).

616 FAO (2018). World Livestock: Transforming the Livestock Sector through the Sustainable
617 Development Goals; FAO: Rome, Italy.

618 FAO (2006). *Livestock's long shadow: Environmental issues and options*: Rome, Italy.

619 Frewer, L. J., Van der Lans, I. A., Fischer, A. R. H., Reinders, M. J., Menozzi, D., Zhang, X., van
620 den Berg, I., et al. (2013). 'Public perceptions of agri-food applications of genetic modification—a
621 systematic review and meta-analysis', *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, Vol. 30(2), 142–152.
622 Elsevier.

623 Gerhardt, C., Suhlmann, G., Ziemßen, F., Donnan, D., Warschun, M., & Kühnle, H. J. (2020). 'How
624 will cultured meat and meat alternatives disrupt the agricultural and food industry?', *Industrial*
625 *Biotechnology*.

626 Grace, P. I., Ling, L. Y., & Mohd Alin, J. E. J. (2010). 'The influence of consumer characteristics
627 on the acceptance of new seaweed food products' *Journal Kemanus*, 15, 97–107.

628 Hartmann, C., Shi, J., Giusto, A., & Siegrist, M. (2015). 'The psychology of eating insects: A cross-
629 cultural comparison between Germany and China', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 44, 148–156.
630 Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329315001044>

631 Hartmann, C., & Siegrist, M. (2017). 'Consumer perception and behaviour regarding sustainable
632 protein consumption: A systematic review', *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, Vol. 61, 11–25.
633 Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0924224416302904>

634 Iannuzzi, E., Sisto, R., & Nigro, C. (2019). 'The willingness to consume insect-based food: an
635 empirical research on Italian consumers', *Agricultural Economics (Zemědělská ekonomika)*, Vol.
636 65(No. 10), 454–462. Available at
637 https://www.agriculturejournals.cz/web/agricecon.htm?type=article&id=87_2019-AGRICECON

638 Ismea – Qualivita (2021). Rapporto 2020 sulle produzioni agroalimentari e vitivinicole italiane DOP,
639 IGP e STG. Edizioni Qualivita. Siena.

640 Jensen, N. H., & Lieberoth, A. (2019). 'We will eat disgusting foods together – Evidence of the
641 normative basis of Western entomophagy-disgust from an insect tasting', *Food Quality and*
642 *Preference*, Vol. 72 109–115. Available at
643 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329318306736>.

644 Lafarga, T., Pieroni, C., D'Imporzano, G., Maggioni, L., Adani, F., & Acien, G. (2021) 'Consumer
645 Attitudes towards Microalgae Production and Microalgae-Based Agricultural Products: The Cases of
646 Almería (Spain) and Livorno (Italy)', *ChemEngineering*, Vol. 5(2), pp. 27. Available at
647 <https://www.mdpi.com/2305-7084/5/2/27>.

648 Lafarga, T., Rodríguez-Bermúdez, R., Morillas-España, A., Villaró, S., García-Vaquero, M., Morán,
649 L., Sánchez-Zurano, A., et al. (2021). 'Consumer knowledge and attitudes towards microalgae as
650 food: The case of Spain', *Algal Research*, Vol. 54 102174. Available at
651 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2211926420310420>.

652 Lähteenmäki -Uutela, A., Rahikainen, M., Lonkila, A., & Yang, B. (2021). 'Alternative proteins and
653 EU food law', *Food Control*, Vol. 130 108336. Available at
654 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0956713521004746>.

655 Lombardi, A., Vecchio, R., Borrello, M., Caracciolo, F., & Cembalo, L. (2019). 'Willingness to pay
656 for insect-based food: The role of information and carrier', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 72
657 177–187. Elsevier. Available at
658 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950329318305226>.

659 Lusk, J. L., Blaustein-Rejto, D., Shah, S., & Tonsor, G. T. (2022). 'Impact of plant-based meat
660 alternatives on cattle inventories and greenhouse gas emissions', *Environmental Research Letters*,
661 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac4fda>

662 Lynch, H., Johnston, C., & Wharton, C. (2018) 'Plant-Based Diets: Considerations for Environmental
663 Impact, Protein Quality, and Exercise Performance', *Nutrients*, Vol. 10(12):1841.
664 <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu10121841>.

665 Mancini, M. C. (2012). 'Protected Designation of Origin: an instrument of consumer protection? The
666 case of Parma Ham?', *Progress in Nutrition*, Vol.14(3), 161-176.

667 Mancini, M. C., & Antonioli, F. (2019). 'Exploring consumers' attitude towards cultured meat in
668 Italy', *Meat Science*, Vol. 150 (December 2018), 101–110. Elsevier. Available at
669 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2018.12.014>.

670 Mancini, M. C., & Antonioli, F. (2020). 'To What Extent Are Consumers' Perception and Acceptance
671 of Alternative Meat Production Systems Affected by Information? The Case of Cultured Meat',
672 *Animals*, Vol. 10(4), 656. MDPI AG. Available at <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/10/4/656>.

673 Mancini, M. C., & Antonioli, F. (2022) 'The future of cultured meat between sustainability
674 expectations and socio-economic challenges', *Future Foods*. 331–350. Elsevier. Available at
675 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/B9780323910019000244>

676 Mancini, M. C., & Antonioli, F. (2020). 'The role of information on consumer acceptance of Novel
677 Food: The cultured meat', *BioLaw Journal*, Vol (2), 103 – 116.

678 Mancini, S., Sogari, G., Menozzi, D., Nuvoloni, R., Torracca, B., Moruzzo, R., & Paci, G. (2019).
679 'Factors Predicting the Intention of Eating an Insect-Based Product', *Foods*, Vol. 8(7), 270. Available
680 at <https://www.mdpi.com/2304-8158/8/7/270>.

681 Mattick, C.S., Landis, A.E., & Allenby, B.R. (2015) 'A case for systemic environmental analysis of
682 cultured meat' *J. Integr. Agric*, Vol. 14 (2), 249–254. Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences
683 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(14\)60885-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(14)60885-6). Menozzi, D., Sogari, G., Veneziani, M., Simoni, E.,
684 & Mora, C. (2017). 'Eating novel foods: An application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour to predict
685 the consumption of an insect-based product', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 59, 27–34. Available
686 at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329317300319>

687 Moruzzo, R., Mancini, S., Boncinelli, F., & Riccioli, F. (2021). 'Exploring the Acceptance of
688 Entomophagy: A Survey of Italian Consumers', *Insects*, Vol. 12(2), 123. Available at
689 <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/12/2/123>

690 OECD & FAO (2021). *OECD-FAO agricultural outlook 2021-2030*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
691 <https://doi.org/10.1787/19428846-en>

692 Onwezen, M. C., Bouwman, E. P., Reinders, M. J., & Dagevos, (2021). H. A systematic review on
693 consumer acceptance of alternative proteins: Pulses, algae, insects, plant-based meat alternatives, and
694 cultured meat. *Appetite*, 159, 105058.

695 Palmieri, N., & Forleo, M. B. (2020). 'The potential of edible seaweed within the western diet. A
696 segmentation of Italian consumers', *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, Vol. 20
697 100202. Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1878450X19301453>

698 Palmieri, N., & Forleo, M. B. (2021). 'An Explorative Study of Key Factors Driving Italian
699 Consumers' Willingness to Eat Edible Seaweed', *Journal of International Food & Agribusiness*
700 *Marketing*, 1–23. Available at
701 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08974438.2021.1904082>

702 Palmieri, N., Perito, M. A., & Lupi, C. (2020). 'Consumer acceptance of cultured meat: some hints
703 from Italy', *British Food Journal*, Vol. 123(1), 109–123. Available at
704 <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/BFJ-02-2020-0092/full/html>

705 Palmieri, N., Perito, M. A., Macrì, M. C., & Lupi, C. (2019). 'Exploring consumers' willingness to
706 eat insects in Italy', *British Food Journal*, Vol. 121(11), 2937–2950. Available at
707 <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/BFJ-03-2019-0170/full/html>.

708 Piochi, M., Micheloni, M., & Torri, L. (2022). 'Effect of informative claims on the attitude of Italian
709 consumers towards cultured meat and relationship among variables used in an explicit approach',
710 *Food Research International*, Vol. 151 110881. Available at
711 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S096399692100781X>

712 Pojić, M., Mišan, A., & Tiwari, B. (2018). Eco-innovative technologies for extraction of proteins for
713 human consumption from renewable protein sources of plant origin. *Trends in Food Science and*
714 *Technology*, 75(March), 93–104 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2018.03.010>.

715 Post, M. J. (2012). 'Cultured meat from stem cells: Challenges and prospects', *Meat Science*, Vol.
716 92(3), 297–301. Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0309174012001210>

717 Premalatha, M., Abbasi, T., Abbasi, T., & Abbasi, S. A. (2011) 'Energy-efficient food production to
718 reduce global warming and ecodegradation: The use of edible insects' *Renewable and sustainable*
719 *energy reviews*, Vol. 15(9), 4357–4360.

720 Roma, R., Ottomano Palmisano, G., & De Boni, A. (2020). 'Insects as Novel Food: A Consumer
721 Attitude Analysis through the Dominance-Based Rough Set Approach', *Foods*, Vol. 9(4), 387.
722 Available at <https://www.mdpi.com/2304-8158/9/4/387>.

723 Ritchie, H., & Roser, M. (2019). Meat and dairy production.
724 <https://ourworldindata.org/meatproduction#number-of-animals-slaughtered>.

725 Schösler, H., Boer, J. de, & Boersema, J. J. (2012). 'Can we cut out the meat of the dish? Constructing
726 consumer-oriented pathways towards meat substitution', *Appetite*, Vol. 58(1), 39–47. Available at
727 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0195666311005770>.

728 Schouteten, J. J., De Steur, H., De Pelsmaeker, S., Lagast, S., Juvinal, J. G., De Bourdeaudhuij, I.,
729 Verbeke, W., et al. (2016). 'Emotional and sensory profiling of insect-, plant- and meat-based burgers
730 under blind, expected and informed conditions', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 52 27–31.
731 Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329316300556>

732 Seehafer, A., & Bartels, M. (2019). 'Meat 2.0—The Regulatory Environment of Plant-Based and
733 Cultured Meat.', *European Food & Feed Law Review*, Vol. 14(4).

734 Sexton, A. E., Garnett, T., & Lorimer, J. (2019). 'Framing the future of food: The contested promises
735 of alternative proteins', *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, Vol. 2(1), 47–72. Available
736 at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2514848619827009>

737 Shelomi, M. (2015). 'Why we still don't eat insects: Assessing entomophagy promotion through a
738 diffusion of innovations framework', *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, Vol. 45(2), 311–318.
739 Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S092422441500151X>.

740 Shelomi, M. (2016). 'The meat of affliction: Insects and the future of food as seen in Expo 2015',
741 *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, Vol. 56 175–179. Available at
742 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0924224416301996>

743 Sidali, K. L., Pizzo, S., Garrido-Pérez, E. I., & Schamel, G. (2019). 'Between food delicacies and
744 food taboos: A structural equation model to assess Western students' acceptance of Amazonian insect
745 food', *Food Research International*, Vol. 115 83–89. Available at
746 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0963996918305659>

747 Siegrist, M., & Sütterlin, B. (2017). 'Importance of perceived naturalness for acceptance of food
748 additives and cultured meat', *Appetite*, Vol. 113 320–326. Elsevier.

749 Sinclair, M. (2014). *Handbook of Research Methods on Intuition*; Edward Elgar Publishing:
750 Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA, USA, ISBN 1782545999.

751 Smith, Lewis W. (2019). 'Forum – Helping Industry Ensure Animal Well-Being', *AgResearch*
752 *Magazine*. USDA, March 2005. Retrieved March 6,
753 from <https://www.ars.usda.gov/is/AR/archive/mar05/form0305.htm>

754 Sogari, G., Menozzi, D., & Mora, C. (2017). 'Exploring young foodies' knowledge and attitude
755 regarding entomophagy: A qualitative study in Italy', *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food*
756 *Science*, Vol. 7(a) 16–19. Elsevier. Available at
757 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1878450X1630066X>.

758 Sogari, G., Menozzi, D., & Mora, C. (2019). 'The food neophobia scale and young adults' intention
759 to eat insect products', *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, Vol. 43(1), 68–76. Available at
760 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ijcs.12485>.

761 Tan, H. S. G., Fischer, A. R. H., Tinchin, P., Stieger, M., Steenbekkers, L. P. A., & van Trijp, H. C.
762 M. (2015). 'Insects as food: Exploring cultural exposure and individual experience as determinants of
763 acceptance', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 42 78–89. Available at
764 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329315000221>

765 Tan, H. S. G., Fischer, A. R. H., van Trijp, H. C. M., & Stieger, M. (2016). 'Tasty but nasty? Exploring
766 the role of sensory-liking and food appropriateness in the willingness to eat unusual novel foods like

767 insects', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 48 293–302. Available at
768 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329315300021>.

769 Tan, H. S. G., Verbaan, Y. T., & Stieger, M. (2017). 'How will better products improve the sensory-
770 liking and willingness to buy insect-based foods?', *Food Research International*, Vol. 92 95–105.
771 Available at <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S096399691630624X>.

772 Tobler, C., Visschers, V.H.M., & Siegrist, M. (2012). Addressing climate change: Determinants of
773 consumers' willingness to act and to support policy measures. *J. Environ. Psychol.*, 32, 197–207.

774 Tomiyama, A. J., Kawecki, N. S., Rosenfeld, D. L., Jay, J. A., Rajagopal, D., & Rowat, A. C.
775 (2020). 'Bridging the gap between the science of cultured meat and public perceptions', *Trends in*
776 *Food Science and Technology*, Vol. 104(August), 144–152. Elsevier Ltd. Available at
777 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2020.07.019>

778 Tubb, C., & Seba, T. (2021). 'Rethinking Food and Agriculture 2020-2030: The Second
779 Domestication of Plants and Animals, the Disruption of the Cow, and the Collapse of Industrial
780 Livestock Farming', *Industrial Biotechnology*, Vol. 17(2), 57–72. Available at
781 <https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/ind.2021.29240.ctu>

782 Tuccillo, F., Marino, M. G., & Torri, L. (2020). 'Italian consumers' attitudes towards entomophagy:
783 Influence of human factors and properties of insects and insect-based food', *Food Research*
784 *International*, Vol. 137 109619. Available at
785 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S096399692030644X>.

786 Tuomisto, H.L. & Teixeira De Mattos, M.J. (2011). 'Environmental impacts of cultured meat
787 production' *Environ. Sci. Technol*, 45, 6117–6123.

788 Van Loo, E. J., Caputo, V., & Lusk, J. L. Consumer preferences for farm-raised meat, lab-grown
789 meat, and plant-based meat alternatives: Does information or brand matter? (2020). *Food Policy*, 95,
790 101931.

791 Vecchione, M., Caprara, G., Schoen, H., Castro, J. L. G., & Schwartz, S. H. (2012). 'The role of
792 personal values and basic traits in perceptions of the consequences of immigration: A three-nation
793 study', *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 103(3), 359–377. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Available at
794 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.2044-8295.2011.02079.x>

795 Verbeke, W. (2015). 'Profiling consumers who are ready to adopt insects as a meat substitute in a
796 Western society', *Food Quality and Preference*, Vol. 39 147–155. Available at
797 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0950329314001554>.

798 Verbeke, W., Marcu, A., Rutsaert, P., Gaspar, R., Seibt, B., Fletcher, D., & Barnett, J. (2015).
799 “‘Would you eat cultured meat?’: Consumers' reactions and attitude formation in Belgium, Portugal
800 and the United Kingdom', *Meat Science*, Vol. 102 49–58. Elsevier Ltd. Available at
801 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2014.11.013>.

802 Verbeke, W., Sans, P., & Van Loo, E. J. (2015). 'Challenges and prospects for consumer acceptance
803 of cultured meat', *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, Vol. 14(2), 285–294. Chinese Academy of
804 Agricultural Sciences. Available at [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(14\)60884-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(14)60884-4).

805 Verneau, F., La Barbera, F., Amato, M., Rivero, R., & Grunert, K. G. (2020). 'Assessing the Role of
806 Food Related Lifestyle in Predicting Intention towards Edible Insects', *Insects*, Vol. 11(10), 660.
807 Available at <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/11/10/660>.

808 Verneau, F., La Barbera, F., Kolle, S., Amato, M., Del Giudice, T., & Grunert, K. (2016). 'The effect
809 of communication and implicit associations on consuming insects: An experiment in Denmark and
810 Italy', *Appetite*, Vol. 106, 30–36. Academic Press. Available at
811 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0195666316300411?via%3Dihub>.

812 van der Weele, C., Feindt, P., Jan van der Goot, A., van Mierlo, B., & van Boekel, M. (2019). 'Meat
813 alternatives: an integrative comparison', *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, Vol. 88 (April),
814 505–512.

815 Yitbarek, M. B. (2019) 'Livestock and livestock product trends by 2050' *International Journal of*
816 *Animal Research*, 4, 30.

817