

## Composition differences between organic and conventional meat: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis

Dominika Średnicka-Tober<sup>1,7</sup>, Marcin Barański<sup>1</sup>, Chris Seal<sup>2</sup>, Roy Sanderson<sup>3</sup>, Charles Benbrook<sup>4</sup>, Håvard Steinshamn<sup>5</sup>, Joanna Gromadzka-Ostrowska<sup>6</sup>, Ewa Rembiałkowska<sup>7</sup>, Krystyna Skwarło-Sońta<sup>8</sup>, Mick Eyre<sup>1</sup>, Giulio Cozzi<sup>9</sup>, Mette Krogh Larsen<sup>10</sup>, Teresa Jordon<sup>1</sup>, Urs Niggli<sup>11</sup>, Tomasz Sakowski<sup>12</sup>, Philip C. Calder<sup>13</sup>, Graham C. Burdge<sup>13</sup>, Smaragda Sotiraki<sup>14</sup>, Alexandros Stefanakis<sup>14</sup>, Halil Yolcu<sup>1,15</sup>, Sokratis Stergiadis<sup>1,16</sup>, Eleni Chatzidimitriou<sup>1</sup>, Gillian Butler<sup>1</sup>, Gavin Stewart<sup>1</sup> and Carlo Leifert<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nafferton Ecological Farming Group (NEFG), School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University, Nafferton Farm, Stocksfield, Northumberland NE43 7XD, UK

<sup>2</sup>School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Human Nutrition Research Centre, Newcastle University, Agriculture Building, Kings Road, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK

<sup>3</sup>School of Biology, Newcastle University, Ridley Building, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK

<sup>4</sup>Center for Sustaining Agriculture and Natural Resources, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

<sup>5</sup>Food and Agriculture Division – Grassland and Forage, Norwegian Institute of Bioeconomy Research (NIBIO), Gunnars veg 6, N-6630 Tingvoll, Norway

<sup>6</sup>Department of Dietetics, Faculty of Human Nutrition and Consumer Sciences, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Nowoursynowska 159c, 02-776 Warsaw, Poland

<sup>7</sup>Department of Functional and Organic Food and Commodities, Faculty of Human Nutrition and Consumer Sciences, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Nowoursynowska 159c, 02-776 Warsaw, Poland

<sup>8</sup>Department of Animal Physiology, Faculty of Biology, University of Warsaw, Miecznikowa 1, 02-096 Warsaw, Poland

<sup>9</sup>Department of Animal Medicine, Production and Health, University of Padua, Viale dell'Università 19, 35020 Legnaro, Italy

<sup>10</sup>Department of Food Science – Food Chemistry & Technology, Aarhus University, Blichers Allé 20, Building F20/8845, 8830 Tjele, Denmark

<sup>11</sup>Research Institute for Organic Agriculture (FiBL), Ackerstrasse 113, CH-5070 Frick, Switzerland

<sup>12</sup>Institute of Genetics and Animal Breeding, Polish Academy of Science, Jastrzębiec, Postępu 36, 05-552 Magdalenka, Poland

<sup>13</sup>Human Development and Health Academic Unit, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton SO16 6YD, UK

<sup>14</sup>National Agricultural Research Foundation (NAGREF), Veterinary Research Institute of Thessaloniki, 57001 Themi, Thessaloniki, Greece

<sup>15</sup>Kelkit Aydin Vocational Training School, Gumushane University, Kelkit, Gumushane, Turkey

<sup>16</sup>Food Production and Quality Division, School of Agriculture, Policy and Development, Centre for Dairy Research, University of Reading, PO Box 237, Earley Gate, Reading RG6 6AR, UK

(Submitted 12 January 2015 – Final revision received 13 November 2015 – Accepted 18 November 2015)

### Abstract

Demand for organic meat is partially driven by consumer perceptions that organic foods are more nutritious than non-organic foods. However, there have been no systematic reviews comparing specifically the nutrient content of organic and conventionally produced meat. In this study, we report results of a meta-analysis based on sixty-seven published studies comparing the composition of organic and non-organic meat products. For many nutritionally relevant compounds (e.g. minerals, antioxidants and most individual fatty acids (FA)), the evidence base was too weak for meaningful meta-analyses. However, significant differences in FA profiles were detected when data from all livestock species were pooled. Concentrations of SFA and MUFA were similar or slightly lower, respectively, in organic compared with conventional meat. Larger differences were detected for total PUFA and *n*-3 PUFA, which were an estimated 23 (95% CI 11, 35)% and 47 (95% CI 10, 84)% higher in organic meat, respectively. However, for these and many other composition parameters, for which meta-analyses found significant

**Abbreviations:** ALA,  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid; DMI, DM intake; DPA, docosapentaenoic acid; EU, European Union; FA, fatty acids; LA, linoleic acid; MPD, mean percentage difference; SMD, standardised mean difference; UM, unweighted meta-analysis; VLC, very long-chain FA; WM, weighted meta-analysis.

\* **Corresponding author:** Professor C. Leifert, fax +44 1661 831 006, email [carlo.leifert@newcastle.ac.uk](mailto:carlo.leifert@newcastle.ac.uk)

44 differences, heterogeneity was high, and this could be explained by differences between animal species/meat types. Evidence from controlled  
 45 experimental studies indicates that the high grazing/forage-based diets prescribed under organic farming standards may be the main reason  
 46 for differences in FA profiles. Further studies are required to enable meta-analyses for a wider range of parameters (e.g. antioxidant, vitamin  
 47 and mineral concentrations) and to improve both precision and consistency of results for FA profiles for all species. Potential impacts of  
 48 composition differences on human health are discussed.

**Key words: Organic foods: Animal products: Meat: Iron: Copper: Meat fat composition: n-3 PUFA: n-6 PUFA**

50 The demand for organic meat products has increased steadily  
 51 over the last 20 years<sup>(1)</sup>. A major driver for this increase has  
 52 been consumer perception that organic livestock products  
 53 typically contain higher concentrations of nutritionally desirable  
 54 compounds, therefore making them 'healthier'<sup>(2,3)</sup>. However,  
 55 there is still considerable scientific uncertainty over whether,  
 56 and to what extent, organic production standards result in sig-  
 57 nificant and nutritionally relevant changes in food quality<sup>(3-6)</sup>.

58 In Western European diets, meat is an important source of  
 59 protein, essential fatty acids (FA), minerals (e.g. Fe, Zn, Se, Cu)  
 60 and vitamins (e.g. vitamin A, vitamin B<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>6</sub> and B<sub>12</sub>, riboflavin,  
 61 folate, niacin, pantothenic acid)<sup>(7)</sup>. Over the last 20 years, an  
 62 increasing number of scientific studies have compared con-  
 63 centrations of nutritionally relevant compounds in meat from  
 64 organic and conventional livestock production systems. Most  
 65 comparative studies have reported data on meat fat composi-  
 66 tion, whereas there are limited published data on mineral and  
 67 vitamin concentrations<sup>(4,8,9)</sup>.

68 The SFA in meat, in particular lauric (12:0), myristic (14:0)  
 69 and palmitic (16:0) acids, are widely considered to have  
 70 negative effects on human health, as they are linked to an  
 71 increased risk of CVD in humans<sup>(10)</sup>, although this is not  
 72 universally accepted<sup>(11-13)</sup>.

73 In contrast, a range of PUFA found in meat are thought to  
 74 reduce the risk of CVD<sup>(14)</sup>. This includes linoleic acid (LA; the  
 75 main n-6 PUFA found in meat),  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid (ALA, the main  
 76 n-3 PUFA found in meat) and, in particular, the very long-chain  
 77 (VLC,  $\geq$ C20) n-3 PUFA EPA, docosapentaenoic acid (DPA) and  
 78 DHA. Both LA and ALA are known to reduce LDL production  
 79 and to enhance its clearance<sup>(14)</sup>, whereas VLC n-3 PUFA are  
 80 also shown to reduce arrhythmias, blood pressure, platelet  
 81 sensitivity, inflammation and serum TAG concentrations<sup>(15,16)</sup>.  
 82 There is also evidence of other health benefits from increasing  
 83 VLC n-3 PUFA (especially DHA) intakes, including improved  
 84 fetal brain development, delayed decline in cognitive function  
 85 in elderly men and reduced risk of dementia (especially  
 86 Alzheimer's disease)<sup>(17)</sup>.

87 Although LA may reduce CVD risk, intakes associated with  
 88 typical Western diets are thought to be too high<sup>(18)</sup>. This is  
 89 mainly because LA is the precursor of the pro-inflammatory n-6  
 90 PUFA arachidonic acid (AA). In contrast, n-3 FA are considered  
 91 to have an anti-inflammatory effect<sup>(15,16,19,20)</sup>. In addition, high  
 92 dietary n-6 PUFA intakes have been linked to an increased risk  
 93 of other chronic diseases including certain cancers, inflamma-  
 94 tory, autoimmune and CVD<sup>(16,21)</sup> as well as shown to stimulate  
 95 adipogenesis (and thereby the risk of obesity) to a greater  
 96 extent compared with n-3 FA<sup>(22)</sup>. Excessive LA intakes during  
 97 pregnancy and in the first few years of life have been linked to a  
 98 range of neurodevelopmental deficits and abnormalities in

children<sup>(23)</sup>. LA may also reduce the rate of conversion of ALA  
 to VLC n-3 PUFA in humans, because ALA and LA compete for  
 $\Delta 6$  desaturase enzyme activity<sup>(24)</sup>.

Systematic literature reviews and meta-analyses of compara-  
 tive composition data for (1) crops, (2) milk and (3) milk, eggs  
 and meat together have been published<sup>(4,5,8,9,25)</sup>, but there are  
 no published meta-analyses in which the composition of  
 organic and non-organic meat is compared. In this study, we  
 report the results of a systematic review of the literature  
 published before March 2014 and meta-analyses of data  
 designed to quantify nutritionally relevant composition para-  
 meters in organic and conventional meat products.

For meta-analyses and interpreting the overall strength of  
 evidence, total PUFA and n-3 PUFA concentrations were con-  
 sidered the primary outcome, because they are considered to  
 be most closely linked to potential human health outcomes  
 (see above). A range of other nutritionally relevant meat fat  
 parameters were considered secondary outcomes.

Where possible, additional meta-analyses were carried out;  
 these included some individual FA, the thrombogenicity and  
 atherogenicity indices (which might be used to compare the  
 overall CVD risk associated with different meat FA profiles<sup>(19,26,27)</sup>)  
 and a range of other composition parameters (e.g. total protein,  
 minerals, toxic metals), but for many of these only a small number  
 of data pairs ( $n$  3-5) were available. We were therefore unable to  
 carry out meaningful meta-analyses for nutritionally relevant  
 minerals, antioxidants and vitamins found in meat.

Previous meta-analyses of composition differences between  
 organic and conventional foods (i.e. for crops, and milk and  
 dairy products) have used variable inclusion criteria, data  
 extraction and synthesis methods<sup>(4,5,8,9,25)</sup>. In the present study,  
 sensitivity analyses designed to identify the effect of using  
 different inclusion criteria, extraction and analysis methods  
 were therefore performed to assess the consistency of findings.  
 Results are discussed in the context of known information on  
 (1) the effects of livestock management practices (especially  
 feeding regimens) and breed choice on meat composition and  
 (2) potential health impacts of composition differences between  
 organic and non-organic meat.

## Methods

### Data acquisition: literature search strategy and inclusion criteria

The systematic review methods are described in a previously  
 published meta-analysis by Barański *et al.*<sup>(25)</sup> focused on  
 identifying composition differences between organic and con-  
 ventional crops. The methods were based on a more detailed

145 protocol for systematic reviews of composition differences  
 146 published by Brandt *et al.*<sup>(28)</sup>. However, the protocols used in  
 147 this study and by Barański *et al.*<sup>(25)</sup> differed from the detailed  
 148 protocol published by Brandt *et al.*<sup>(28)</sup>, notably in the emphasis  
 149 on weighted meta-analysis (WM) rather than unweighted  
 150 meta-analysis (UM), which had previously been recommended  
 151 by Brandt *et al.*<sup>(5,28)</sup> and Dangour *et al.*<sup>(4)</sup>.

152 Relevant publications were identified through an initial  
 153 search of the literature in the Web of Knowledge, Scopus, Ovid  
 154 and EBSCO databases using the following search terms:  
 155 'organic\* or ecologic\* or biodynamic\*', 'conventional\* or inte-  
 156 grated' and 'livestock or meat or pork or beef or poultry or  
 157 chicken or turkey or lamb or goat or rabbit' (Fig. 1).


158 Papers in all languages, published in peer-reviewed and non-  
 159 peer-reviewed journals, and reporting data on both desirable  
 160 and undesirable compositional parameters, were considered  
 161 relevant for inclusion in the meta-analyses. The search was  
 162 restricted to the period between 1992 (the year when legally  
 163 binding organic farming regulations were first introduced in the  
 164 European Union (EU)) and the end of the project in March 2014  
 and provided 707 references. An additional seventeen

165 publications were found by studying lists of references or  
 166 directly contacting authors of published papers and reviews  
 167 identified in the initial literature search (Fig. 1).

168 The abstracts of all publications were then examined to  
 169 determine whether they contained original data obtained by  
 170 comparing composition parameters in organic and conven-  
 171 tional beef, lamb or goat meat, pork, poultry or rabbit meat.  
 172 This identified seventy-five suitable publications; of these, eight  
 173 were subsequently rejected, because they did not report  
 174 suitable data sets or contained the same data as other papers.

175 Data sets were deemed suitable if data for at least one meat  
 176 composition parameter were reported. As a result, sixty-seven  
 177 publications (sixty-three peer-reviewed) were selected for data  
 178 extraction (sixteen on beef, sixteen on lamb and goat meat,  
 179 fourteen on pork, seventeen on chicken meat, three on rabbit  
 180 meat and one on non-specified meats).

181 Data from forty-eight publications (forty-seven peer-  
 182 reviewed) fulfilled the criteria for inclusion in the random  
 183 effects WM and UM. The additional nineteen publications  
 184 (sixteen peer-reviewed) fulfilled the criteria for inclusion in the  
 185 UM only.



**Fig. 1.** Summary of the search and selection protocols used to identify papers included in the meta-analyses. CF, comparison of matched farms; BS, basket studies; EX, controlled experiments. \* Review carried out by one reviewer. † Data extraction carried out by two reviewers.

This represents a significantly greater evidence base compared with a previous systematic review of comparative studies by Dangour *et al.*<sup>(4)</sup> that (1) was based on eleven publications reporting meat composition data, (2) pooled meat, egg and milk/dairy product composition data and (3) used unweighted, under-powered analytical methods only. All publications included in this previous review were also used in the random effects WM reported in this study.

A Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses flow diagram illustrates the search and study inclusion strategies (Fig. 1). Eligibility assessment was performed by two independent reviewers, with discrepancies resolved by consensus and reference to a third reviewer when necessary.

### Data extraction

Data were extracted from three types of studies: (1) comparisons of matched farms (CF), farm surveys in which meat was obtained from organic and conventional farms in the same country or region; (2) basket studies (BS), retail product surveys in which organic and conventional meats were obtained from retail outlets; and (3) controlled experiments (EX) in which meat was obtained from experimental animals reared according to organic or conventional farming standards/protocols. Data from the three study types were deemed relevant for meta-analysis if the authors stated that (1) organic farms included in farm surveys were using organic farming methods, (2) organic products collected in retail surveys were labelled as organic and (3) animals from organically reared herds used in controlled experiments were managed according to organic farming standards, even if animals and land used for 'organic treatments' in experiments were not organically certified.

Several studies compared more than one organic or conventional system or treatment – for example, additional conventional systems were described as 'intensive' or 'free range'. In such cases, a pragmatic choice was made to compare the organic with the standard conventional (non-organic) comparator. Standard systems were identified as closest to the typical, contemporary organic/conventional farming system, as recommended by Brandt *et al.*<sup>(5)</sup>. Full references of the publications and summary descriptions of studies included in the meta-analyses are given in the online Supplementary Tables S1–S3.

Information and data were extracted from all selected publications and compiled in a Microsoft Access database. The database is freely available on the Newcastle University website (<http://research.ncl.ac.uk/nefg/QOF>) for use and scrutiny by others. A list of the information extracted from publications and recorded in the database is given in the online Supplementary Table S4.

Data reported as numerical values in the text or tables were copied directly into the database. Results only published in graphical form were enlarged, printed, measured (using a ruler) and then entered into the database as previously described<sup>(5)</sup>.

Data reported in the same publication for different animal species, products, study types, countries and outcomes were treated as independent effects. However, data extracted from the same publication for (1) different years, (2) different regions, retail outlets or brands in the same country or

(3) multiple time points within the same sampling year were averaged before use in the meta-analysis.

Two independent reviewers assessed publications for eligibility and extracted data. Discrepancies were detected for approximately 4% of the data, and in these cases extraction was repeated following discussion.

Study characteristics, summaries of methods used for sensitivity analyses and ancillary information are given in the online Supplementary Table S2–S7. They include information on (1) the number of papers from different countries and publication years used in the meta-analyses (see online Supplementary Fig. S1 and S2), (2) study type, location, meat product, animal group and information regarding FA analysis methods used in different studies (online Supplementary Table S2), (3) production system information for studies with more than two systems (online Supplementary Table S3), (4) the type of information extracted from papers (online Supplementary Table S4), (5) data handling and inclusion criteria and meta-analysis methods used in sensitivity analyses (online Supplementary Table S5), (6) the list of composition parameters included in the meta-analyses (online Supplementary Table S6) and (7) the list of composition parameters for which meta-analyses were not possible ( $n < 3$ ) (online Supplementary Table S7).

The online Supplementary Table S8 summarises the basic statistics on the number of studies, individual comparisons, organic and conventional samples sizes and comparisons showing statistically or numerically higher concentrations in organic or conventional meat for the composition parameters included in Fig. 2–4.


### Meta-analyses

In total, six analyses were undertaken (online Supplementary Table S5). The standard WM and UM sensitivity analysis 1 compared data only from pragmatically chosen standard organic and conventional systems. Fig. 2–4 show the pooled effects obtained using standard random-effects meta-analysis weighted by inverse variance and a common random-effects variance component and UM of differences in means. The standard WM protocol is the primary analysis, but it is useful to augment the results with UM (particularly to explore the impact of including data from the studies that do not report measures of variance, and thus a wider range of studies).

Four additional sensitivity analyses were carried out. Two analyses (sensitivity analysis 2 and 3) were designed to identify whether exclusion of data for comparisons with non-standard organic or conventional systems would affect the results of the meta-analyses; in these analyses, comparative data for all organic and conventional production systems reported by authors were included (see online Supplementary Table S3). In sensitivity analysis 4, we explored the effect of excluding the 20% of studies with the least precise treatment effects from the WM.

The suitability of analytical methods used in studies contributing data for WM and UM of FA profiles was assessed, and for most studies it was considered to be scientifically sound for comparison of relative differences between organic and conventional meat samples. Most studies used established





**Fig. 2.** Results of the standard weighted meta-analysis and sensitivity analysis 1 for fat composition of meat (data for all animal groups included in the same analysis). \* Numerical values for mean percentage difference (MPD) and 95% CI are given in the online Supplementary Table S9. † Ln ratio = ln (ORG/CONV × 100%). ‡ P value <0.05 indicates a significant difference between organic samples (ORG) and conventional samples (CONV). § Heterogeneity and the  $I^2$  statistic. ¶ Outlying data points (where the MPD between ORG and CONV was more than fifty times greater than the mean value including the outliers) were removed. ¶¶ Calculated based on published fatty acids (FA) composition data. n, number of data points included in meta-analyses; VLC n-3 PUFA, very long-chain n-3 PUFA; DPA, docosapentaenoic acid; OA, oleic acid; ALA,  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid; LA, linoleic acid; AA, arachidonic acid; SMD, standardised mean difference; ○, MPD calculated using data included in standard unweighted meta-analyses; ▷, MPD calculated using data include in standard weighted meta-analysis; ◆, SMD with 95% CI represented by horizontal bars.

GC-based protocols and described methods in sufficient detail. Seven studies may be classified as being of lower quality, which included two studies that used an near IR-spectroscopy method calibrated with GC data (ID209 and ID355) and five studies that provided only brief descriptions of the methods used (ID159, ID407, ID560, ID570 and ID606). When these studies were excluded from the meta-analyses (sensitivity analysis 5), broadly similar results were obtained. However, as the laboratories that carried out these five studies were reputable institutions and to minimise publication bias, we included data from all studies in the standard WM reported here. The results of sensitivity analyses 2–5 are available in the Appendix on the Newcastle University website (<http://research.ncl.ac.uk/nefg/QOF>).

Effect sizes for all WM were based on standardised mean differences (SMD) as recommended for studies that include data obtained by measuring the same parameters on different scales<sup>(29,30)</sup>.


Both WM and UM were carried out using the R statistical programming environment<sup>(31)</sup>. WM, with the SMD as the basic response variable, were carried out using standard methods and the open-source 'metafor' statistical package<sup>(32–35)</sup>. A detailed description of the methods and calculations is provided in the 'Additional Methods and Results' in the Supplementary Information available online.

A positive SMD value indicates that mean concentrations of the observed compound were greater in the organic meat samples, whereas a negative SMD indicates that mean concentrations were higher in conventional (non-organic) samples. The statistical significance of a reported effect size (i.e. SMD<sub>tot</sub>) and CI were estimated based on standard methods<sup>(36)</sup> using 'metafor'<sup>(32)</sup>. The influence of potential moderators, particularly (1) meat type (beef, lamb and goat, pork, rabbit or chicken meat) and (2) study type (CF, EX, BS), were additionally tested using mixed-effect models<sup>(37)</sup> and subgroup analyses (Fig. 3 and 4, and online Supplementary Fig. S3–S5).


We carried out tests of homogeneity ( $Q$  statistics and  $I^2$  statistics) on all summary effect sizes. Homogeneity was indicated when  $I^2$  was <25% and the  $P$  value for the  $Q$  statistics was >0.010. Funnel plots, Egger's tests of funnel plot asymmetry and fail-safe number tests were used to assess publication bias<sup>(38)</sup> (see online Supplementary Table S13 for further information).

For the UM, the ratio of organic means:conventional means ( $\bar{X}_O:\bar{X}_C$ ) expressed as a percentage was ln-transformed and values used to determine whether the arithmetic average of the ln-transformed ratios was significantly greater than ln(100), using resampling<sup>(39)</sup>. Reported  $P$  values were derived from Fisher's one-sample randomisation test<sup>(40)</sup>, and a  $P$  < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347



**Fig. 3.** Results of the standard weighted meta-analysis and sensitivity analysis 1 for different animal groups for fat composition in meat. \* Numerical values for mean percentage difference (MPD) and 95% CI are given in the online Supplementary Table S10. † For parameters for which  $n \leq 3$  for specific animal group, results obtained in the meta-analyses are not shown. ‡ Ln ratio =  $\ln(\text{ORG}/\text{CONV} \times 100\%)$ . § *P* value < 0.05 indicates a significant difference between organic samples (ORG) and conventional samples (CONV). *n*, number of data points included in the meta-analyses; OA, oleic acid; FA, fatty acids; SMD, standardised mean difference; ○, MPD calculated using data included in standard unweighted meta-analyses; ▷, MPD calculated using data included in standard weighted meta-analysis; ◆, SMD with 95% CI represented by horizontal bars.



**Fig. 4.** Results of the standard weighted meta-analysis and sensitivity analysis 1 for different animal groups for fat composition in meat. \* Numerical values for mean percentage difference (MPD) and 95% CI are given in the online Supplementary Table S10. † For parameters for which  $n \leq 3$  for specific animal group, results obtained in the meta-analyses are not shown. ‡ Ln ratio =  $\ln(\text{ORG}/\text{CONV} \times 100\%)$ . §  $P$  value  $< 0.05$  indicates a significant difference between organic samples (ORG) and conventional samples (CONV). II Outlying data points (where the MPD between ORG and CONV was more than fifty times greater than the mean value including the outliers) were removed. ¶ Calculated based on published FA composition data.  $n$ , number of data points included in the meta-analyses; ALA,  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid; DPA, docosapentaenoic acid; VLC *n*-3 PUFA, very long-chain *n*-3 PUFA; FA, fatty acids; LA, linoleic acid; AA, arachidonic acid; SMD, standardised mean difference; ○, MPD calculated using data included in standard unweighted meta-analyses; ▷, MPD calculated using data include in standard weighted meta-analysis; ◆, SMD with 95% CI represented by horizontal bars.

348 There are currently very few publications that report com-  
 349 parative data for thrombogenicity and/or atherogenicity indices,  
 350 and all provide information on lamb and goat meat only.

351 However, a much larger number of publications covering a  
 352 range of meat types reported sufficient data for individual  
 353 FA/groups of FA to calculate the two indices. On the basis of

351  
 352  
 353

those reported data, we calculated values of the thrombogenicity and atherogenicity indices as follows:

$$\text{Thrombogenicity index} = \frac{14:0 + 16:0 + 18:0}{(0.5 \times \text{MUFA}) + (0.5 \times n-6 \text{ PUFA}) + (3 \times n-3 \text{ PUFA}) + (n-3:n-6 \text{ PUFA})}$$

$$\text{Atherogenicity index} = \frac{12:0 + (4 \times 14:0) + 16:0}{\text{MUFA} + \text{PUFA}}$$

For the thrombogenicity index fifteen data points (three for beef, seven for lamb and goat meat, two for pork and three for chicken meat) and for the atherogenicity index thirteen data points (three for beef, eight for lamb and goat meat, one for pork and one for rabbit meat) were available. We carried out separate meta-analyses for the published and calculated estimates of the two indices (Fig. 2 and 4; online Supplementary Tables S9–S11 and Fig. S5). For all parameters (thrombogenicity index, atherogenicity index, total VLC *n*-3 PUFA, LA:ALA ratio) that were calculated based on published information it was only possible to carry out UM (Fig. 2–4), as measures of variance were not available.

Forest plots were constructed to show pooled SMD and corresponding 95% CI for all compositional parameters investigated. Additional forest plots were presented for selected

results to illustrate heterogeneity between subgroups based on types of meat (see online Supplementary Fig. S6–S35).

The mean percentage difference (MPD) was calculated for all parameters for which statistically significant effects were detected by either WM or UM. This was carried out to facilitate value judgements regarding the biological importance of the relative effect magnitudes using the calculations described by Barański *et al.*<sup>(25)</sup>.

We calculated MPD for data pairs included in both the WM and the UM in order to estimate the impact of excluding data for which no measures of variance were reported on the magnitude of difference. As the MPD can be expressed as ‘% higher’ in conventional or organic meat, they provide estimates for the magnitude of composition differences that are easier to relate to existing information on potential health impacts of changing dietary intakes for individual or groups of compounds than the SMD values. The 95% CI for MPD were estimated using a standard method<sup>(36)</sup>.

An overall assessment of the strength of evidence was made using an adaptation of the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE)<sup>(41)</sup> system (Table 1).

#### Estimation of fatty acid intakes

Intakes were estimated for FA parameters for which WM based on pooled data from all meat types had detected significant

**Table 1.** Grading of Recommendations Assessments, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) assessment of the strength of evidence for standard weighted meta-analysis for parameters shown in Fig. 2 (Standardised mean difference (SMD) values and 95% confidence intervals)

Parameters	SMD	95% CI	Effect magnitude*	Inconsistency†	Precision‡	Publication bias§	Overall reliability
<b>Fat composition</b>							
Fat	-0.35	-0.80, 0.10	Small	Low	Poor	Medium	Low
Intramuscular fat	-0.25	-0.74, 0.25	Small	Low	Moderate	Strong	Low
SFA	-0.35	-0.79, 0.10	Small	Medium	Poor	No	Moderate
12:0 (lauric acid)	-0.01	-0.55, 0.53	Small	Low	High	Medium	Moderate
14:0 (myristic acid)	-1.02	-2.09, 0.04	Moderate	High	Poor	Strong	Very low
16:0 (palmitic acid)	-0.47	-0.96, 0.02	Small	Low	Poor	Strong	Very low
MUFA	-1.01	-1.57, -0.45	Moderate	High	Moderate	Medium	Moderate
OA ( <i>cis</i> -9-18:1)	-0.48	-1.12, 0.16	Small	Low	Poor	Medium	Low
PUFA	1.15	0.51, 1.80	Moderate	High	Moderate	Medium	Moderate
<i>n</i> -3 FA	1.31	0.16, 2.45	Moderate	Medium	Poor	Strong	Low
ALA ( <i>cis</i> -9,12,15-18:3)	0.73	-0.27, 1.73	Small	High	Poor	Strong	Very low
EPA ( <i>cis</i> -5,8,11,14,17-20:5)¶	0.02	-0.85, 0.90	Small	High	Moderate	Strong	Very low
DPA ( <i>cis</i> -7,10,13,16,19-22:5)	0.40	-0.36, 1.17	Small	Low	Moderate	Strong	Low
DHA ( <i>cis</i> -4,7,10,13,16,19-22:6)	0.22	-0.17, 0.61	Small	Medium	High	Strong	Low
VLC <i>n</i> -3 PUFA (EPA + DPA + DHA)**	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
<i>n</i> -6 FA	0.97	0.15, 1.78	Moderate	High	Moderate	Strong	Low
LA ( <i>cis</i> -9,12-18:2)	0.65	-0.01, 1.30	Small	Medium	Poor	Medium	Low
AA ( <i>cis</i> -5,8,11,14-20:4)¶	0.45	-0.05, 0.94	Small	Medium	Poor	Medium	Low
LA:ALA ratio**	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
<i>n</i> -6: <i>n</i> -3 ratio	-0.75	-1.72, 0.23	Moderate	High	Poor	Medium	Low

OA, oleic acid; FA, fatty acids; ALA,  $\alpha$ -linolenic acid; DPA, docosapentaenoic acid; VLC *n*-3 PUFA, very long-chain *n*-3 PUFA; LA, linoleic acid; AA, arachidonic acid.

\* Study quality was considered low because of high risks of bias and potential for confounding. However, we considered large effects to mitigate this *sensu* GRADE; large effects were defined as >20%, moderate effects 10–20% and small <10%.

† Inconsistency was based on the measure of heterogeneity and consistency of effect direction *sensu* GRADE.

‡ Precision was based on the width of the pooled effect CI and the extent of overlap in substantive interpretation of effect magnitude *sensu* GRADE.

§ Publication bias was assessed using visual inspection of funnel plots, the Egger's test, two-tests of fail-safe *N* and trim and fill (see online Supplementary Table S13). Overall publication bias was considered high when indicated by two or more methods, moderate when indicated by one method and low when no methods suggested publication bias.

|| Overall quality of evidence was then assessed across domains as in standard GRADE appraisal; high when there was very high confidence that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate, moderate when there was moderately confidence in effect estimate and the true effect is likely to be close to the estimate but there is a possibility that it is substantially different, low when the confidence in the effect estimate was limited and the true effect may be substantially different from the estimate, very low when there was very little confidence in the effect estimate and the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate.

¶ Outlying data pairs (where the mean percentage difference between organic and conventional meat samples was over fifty times greater than the mean value including outliers) were removed.

\*\* Calculated based on published FA composition data.



396 differences between organic and conventional meat. All FA data  
397 extracted from the original publications were converted into a  
398 common unit (g/100 g total FA esters). These values were then  
399 used to calculate mean FA concentrations in different meat  
400 types. These means were then used to calculate total FA intakes  
401 from organic and conventional meats using (1) published data  
402 on fat consumption from different meat types in the EU<sup>(42)</sup> and  
403 (2) for mean concentrations of total FA esters in organic and  
404 conventional meats (Fig. 3 and 4). MPD in FA intakes between  
405 organic and conventional meats was then calculated  
406 (see Table 2). It should be pointed out that the European fat  
407 consumption data were based on means from all EU countries,  
408 whereas means for FA concentrations in organic and conven-  
409 tional meats were based on published data from eight EU  
410 countries (DE, DK, ES, FR, GB, IT, PL, SW; contributing  
411 approximately 70 % of data) and seven countries from outside  
412 the EU (CH, BR, KR, TR, TW, USA, UY). Estimates of FA intakes  
413 for specific countries were not possible owing to a lack of  
414 published data (comparative studies for all different meat types  
415 were not available for any one country).

## 416 Results

### 417 *Characteristics of studies and data included in the* 418 *meta-analyses*

419 The WM and UM were based on data from sixty-three peer-  
420 reviewed papers and four non-peer-reviewed studies, including  
421 publications reporting farm surveys (five papers), controlled  
422 experiments (forty-two papers) and BS (twenty papers).

423 Most of the eligible studies were from Europe, mainly from  
424 Spain, UK, Italy, Sweden, Poland and Germany, with most of  
425 the others coming from the USA and Brazil (online Supple-  
426 mentary Table S2 and Fig. S2). Publications reported data on  
427 373 different composition parameters, but the majority of  
428 studies (thirty-nine papers) focused on meat fat composition  
429 parameters (online Supplementary Tables S6 and S7). In  
430 contrast, relatively few studies (thirteen papers) reported data  
431 on mineral nutrients, toxic metals and/or other composition  
432 parameters. Meta-analyses were carried out on 122 meat-quality  
433 parameters (online Supplementary Tables S6 and S7).

### 434 *Composition of organic and conventional meat products*

435 **Fat composition.** When data for all meat types were analysed  
436 together, WM detected significant differences in FA profiles  
437 between organic and conventional meat (Fig. 2). Organic meat  
438 had similar SFA, lower MUFA and higher PUFA concentrations  
439 compared with conventional meat. The MPD (calculated based  
440 on data used for the WM) were -8 (95 % CI -13, -4) % for MUFA  
441 and 23 (95 % CI 11, 35) % for PUFA, respectively (Fig. 2 and  
442 online Supplementary Table S9).

443 When data for different meat types were analysed separately,  
444 no differences in SFA were detected for beef, lamb and goat  
445 meat and pork, but WM detected slightly but significantly lower  
446 SFA concentrations in organic chicken meat (Fig. 3 and online  
447 Supplementary Fig. S9). However, it should be noted that only  
448 five individual studies were available for WM of SFA contents in

449 chicken meat and that results differed between studies and/or  
450 countries/regions. Three studies (from GB and IT) reported no  
451 significant difference, whereas two others (from KR and the  
452 USA) reported significantly lower SFA concentrations in organic  
453 chicken meat (online Supplementary Table S9).

454 For MUFA, WM detected significantly lower concentrations  
455 for pork and chicken only (Fig. 3 and online Supplementary Fig.  
456 S14). However, it should be noted that only three and five  
457 individual studies were available for WM of MUFA contents in  
458 pork and chicken meat, respectively. For pork, results differed  
459 between studies and/or countries/regions; one study (from PL)  
460 reported no significant difference, and two (from KR and SE)  
461 studies reported significantly lower MUFA concentrations in  
462 organic meat (online Supplementary Table S14). For chicken  
463 meat, all five studies (from GB, IT, KR and the USA) reported  
464 significantly lower MUFA concentrations in organic chicken  
465 meat (online Supplementary Table S14).

466 For PUFA, significantly higher concentrations were detected  
467 for pork and chicken meat, but not for beef and lamb and goat  
468 meat (Fig. 3 and online Supplementary Fig. S19). However, it  
469 should be noted that only four and five individual studies were  
470 available for WM of PUFA contents in pork and chicken meat,  
471 respectively, and for both pork and chicken meat results  
472 differed between studies and/or countries/regions (online  
473 Supplementary Table S19). For pork, one study (from SE)  
474 reported no significant differences and two studies (from KR  
475 and PL) reported significantly higher PUFA concentrations in  
476 organic meat. For chicken meat, two studies (from GB and IT)  
477 reported no significant differences, whereas three studies (from  
478 GB, KR and the USA) reported significantly higher PUFA in  
479 organic chicken meat (online Supplementary Table S19).

480 When data for all meat types were analysed together, WM  
481 identified significantly lower concentrations of the SFA myristic  
482 acid (14:0) and palmitic acid (16:0) in organic compared with  
483 conventional meat. The MPD were -18 (95 % CI -32, -5) % for  
484 myristic acid and -11 (95 % CI -28, 5) % for palmitic acid (Fig. 2).

485 When data for different meat types were analysed separately,  
486 WM detected significantly lower 14:0 concentrations for organic  
487 chicken meat only (Fig. 3 and online Supplementary Fig. S11).  
488 However, it should be noted that only four studies were  
489 available for WM of PUFA in chicken meat and that results dif-  
490 fered between studies and/or countries/regions; two studies  
491 (both from GB) reported no significant difference, whereas two  
492 others studies (from GB and KR) reported significantly  
493 lower 14:0 concentrations in organic chicken meat (online  
494 Supplementary Fig. S11).

495 For 16:0, WM detected no significant difference for all indi-  
496 vidual meat types (Fig. 3 and online Supplementary Fig. S12).

497 When data for all meat types were analysed together, WM  
498 detected significantly higher *n*-3 and *n*-6 concentrations in  
499 organic compared with conventional meat (Fig. 2). The MPD  
500 (calculated based on the data used for the WM) were 47 (95 % CI  
501 10, 84) % for *n*-3 PUFA and 16 (95 % CI 2, 31) % for *n*-6 PUFA,  
502 respectively.

503 When data for different meat types were analysed separately,  
504 WM detected significantly higher concentrations of total *n*-3  
505 PUFA in organic chicken meat only (Fig. 3 and online Supple-  
506 mentary Fig. S20). However, it should be noted that only six

studies were available for WM of *n*-3 PUFA in chicken meat and that results differed between studies and/or countries/regions; two studies (both from GB) reported no significant difference, whereas four other studies (from GB, IT, KR and the USA) reported significantly higher *n*-3 PUFA in organic chicken meat (online Supplementary Fig. S11).

WM detected no significant differences for CLA, EPA, DPA and DHA, a range of other SFA, MUFA and PUFA and the *n*-6:*n*-3 ratio (Fig. 2 and online Supplementary Table S12).

UM were carried out as 'sensitivity analyses' to estimate the extent to which an increase in the evidence base (inclusion of publications in which no measures of variance were reported) would identify additional composition differences. When data for different meat types were pooled, UM results were similar to those obtained by WM for total SFA, MUFA and PUFA and for *n*-3 PUFA, *n*-6 PUFA, 14:0 and 16:0 (Fig. 2). However, different to the WM, the UM-based sensitivity analyses also detected significant differences for a range of other fat composition parameters. Specifically, UM detected (1) lower total fat and oleic acid concentrations, (2) higher ALA, DPA and total VLC *n*-3 PUFA (EPA+DPA+DHA) concentrations, (3) a lower *n*-6:*n*-3 PUFA ratio and (4) a lower thrombogenicity index in organic meat (Fig. 2; online Supplementary Table S9).

For individual meat types, UM (sensitivity analysis 1) allowed comparisons for a wider range of composition parameters for all meat types and detected additional differences between organic and conventional meats (Fig. 3). This included (1) lower 14:0 and MUFA but higher PUFA, *n*-3 PUFA, EPA, DPA and total VLC *n*-3 PUFA concentrations in beef, (2) higher PUFA and ALA concentrations in lamb and goat meat and (3) lower SFA concentrations in organic pork (Fig. 3).

**Estimation of fatty acid intakes from organic and conventional meats.** Accurate comparisons of FA intakes between organic and conventional meats are currently not possible, due to (a) the contrasting pattern of total meat and types of meat (e.g. beef, lamb, pork, chicken meat) consumed in different countries and (b) lack of sufficient comparative data sets to estimate FA composition difference for specific countries. This makes it impossible to carry out country-specific intake estimates. Estimates of FA intakes were therefore calculated using published meat fat consumption data for the EU and mean FA composition data obtained from the systematic literature review. Moreover, intake estimates were only carried out for FA parameters for which relatively large data sets ( $n > 20$ ) were available and for which the WM had detected significant differences between organic and conventional meat (Table 2).

Intakes of total SFA and palmitic acid had similar numerical values, whereas values for myristic acid (14:0) were lower with organic meat consumption (Table 2). Larger differences in numerical values were found for beef (-12%), pork (-16%) and chicken (-50%), and overall the intake of myristic acid was estimated to be 16% lower based on average meat consumption pattern in the EU (Table 2).

Intakes of total MUFA with meat were estimated to be similar (-5%) based on average meat consumption pattern in the EU (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Estimated fatty acids (mg/person per d) intake from organic (ORG) and conventional (CONV) meat based on FAO's fat supply quantity data<sup>(42)</sup> for bovine meat, pig meat, sheep and goat meat and poultry meat in the European Union, calculated using the data included in the unweighted meta-analysis shown in Fig. 2

Parameters	Consumption associated with														
	Beef*			Lamb and goat meat†			Pork‡			Chicken meat§			Total meat		
	ORG	CONV	MPD	ORG	CONV	MPD	ORG	CONV	MPD	ORG	CONV	MPD	ORG	CONV	MPD
SFA	1518	1507	1	527	528	0	6648	6868	-3	1408	1419	-1	10100	10322	-2
14:0 (myristic acid)	59	66	-12	60	61	-2	217	252	-16	27	41	-50	363	420	-16
16:0 (palmitic acid)	709	715	-1	252	254	-1	4238	4368	-3	993	999	-1	6191	6337	-2
MUFA	1307	1395	-7	406	414	-2	8229	8417	-2	1587	1858	-17	11528	12083	-5
PUFA	525	455	15	142	132	8	2930	2561	14	1482	1200	24	5080	4348	17
<i>n</i> -3 PUFA	128	78	64	41	40	2	419	360	16	161	136	19	748	613	22
<i>n</i> -6 PUFA	290	277	5	94	95	-1	4400	3637	21	1396	1100	27	6180	5110	21

MPD, mean percentage difference.

\* Calculated assuming an average fat consumption from bovine meat of 3.5 g/person per d.

† Calculated assuming an average fat consumption from sheep and goat meat of 1.2 g/person per d.

‡ Calculated assuming an average fat consumption from pig meat of 19.1 g/person per d.

§ Calculated assuming an average fat consumption from poultry meat of 4.7 g/person per d.

Larger numerical differences in intakes were calculated for total PUFA, *n*-3 PUFA and *n*-6 PUFA, which were all higher (by 17, 22 and 21%, respectively) with organic meat consumption based on average meat consumption pattern in the EU (Table 2). However, there was considerable variation in the MPD calculated for intakes for different meat types (Table 2). Owing to the more limited data available, comparisons of intakes with organic and conventional meat are currently not possible for other FA parameters including VLC FA (EPA + DPA + DHA).

#### *Minerals, toxic metals and other composition parameters.*

Compared with fat composition parameters, relatively few comparative data sets were available for meta-analyses of minerals (e.g. Fe, Se, Zn), toxic metals (e.g. As, Pb, Cd) and other composition parameters (including protein, vitamins and pesticides) in meat (online Supplementary Tables S6, S7 and S12). The meta-analyses detected some significant effects (e.g. for Cu), but these are not presented in detail in this study, because of the high level of uncertainty associated with meta-analysis results based on data from a very few studies.

#### *Effects of livestock species, study type and other sources of variation*

Heterogeneity was high ( $I^2 > 75\%$ ) for nearly all composition parameters, with  $I^2$  ranging from 79% for fat content to 98% for 14:0 and *n*-3 PUFA concentrations (Fig. 2).

When meta-analysis results obtained from different study types (BS, CF and EX) were compared, broadly similar results were obtained for most of the composition parameters included in Fig. 2 (see online Supplementary Fig. S3–S5). However, there was considerable variation between results for different meat types or studies carried out in different countries (see Fig. 3 and online Supplementary Fig. S6–S35).

Non-weighted MPD were calculated to aid the biological interpretation of effect size magnitude where either the weighted or UM had identified statistically significant differences. For many parameters, MPD based on all the available data produced values very similar to those calculated using only data for which measures of variance were reported (those used for the WM; Fig. 2). However, for some parameters (*n*-3 PUFA, ALA), inclusion criteria had a moderate effect on the MPD.

In addition, when the calculated MPD were superimposed onto SMD results (with 95% CI) at an appropriate scale (−80 to +80 for MPD and −3 to +3 for SMD), a reasonable match was observed, with MPD for most compounds being present within the 95% CI for SMD (Fig. 2). However, for some parameters (fat, intramuscular fat, PUFA, *n*-3 PUFA, DPA and DHA), MPD were outside the 95% CI of SMD, and therefore these should be seen as less reliable.

Sensitivity analyses designed to identify the effect of using different inclusion criteria and data-handling methods yielded results broadly similar to those of the standard weighted and UM for the composition parameters included in Fig. 2. The sensitivity analyses, designed to identify the effect of removing data from the 20% of studies with least precise treatment effects also yielded broadly similar results, except for 14:0 and 16:0 and

total *n*-3, for which non-significant differences were detected in some of the sensitivity analyses (see <http://research.ncl.ac.uk/nefg/QOF> for detailed results of the sensitivity analyses).

#### *Strength of evidence*

The overall assessment of the strength of evidence based on WM using an adapted GRADE<sup>(41)</sup> approach highlighted strong uncertainties, with the overall strength of evidence being very low or low for most composition parameters, and moderate overall reliability was found only for 12:0, SFA, MUFA and PUFA concentrations (Table 1).

In general, there were substantial issues with study quality and reporting measures of variance, which were not generally mitigated by large effects. Inconsistency was high and precision was low. Strong or medium funnel plot asymmetry consistent with publication biases was also apparent for many parameters (see online Supplementary Table S13). However, it is not possible to definitely attribute discrepancies between large precise studies and small imprecise studies to publication bias, which remains strongly suspected rather than detected where asymmetry is severe.

#### **Discussion**

Results of the meta-analyses reported in this study indicate for the first time that there are significant and nutritionally meaningful composition differences between organic and non-organic meat. This contradicts the results of a previous literature review by Dangour *et al.*<sup>(4)</sup>, which pooled comparative data for meat, eggs, milk and dairy products in their analyses and concluded that overall there are no significant composition differences between organic and conventional livestock products (meat, dairy products and eggs). However, results for specific parameters reported in this study were variable, and both previous reviews<sup>(4,9)</sup> covering livestock products and the present study acknowledge serious deficiencies in the evidence, which result in considerable uncertainty. Plausible mechanistic explanations for the findings in this study are discussed below.

Meta-analysis results suggesting that certain organic meats (beef, lamb and pork) have higher concentrations of PUFA and *n*-3 PUFA are broadly consistent with results from controlled animal experiments that studied the effect of grazing or high-forage diets and the use of legume-rich forages (both of which are typically used in organic production) on meat quality<sup>(43–45)</sup>. However, it should be pointed out that (a) the evidence base for individual meat/types/livestock species was very small (usually between two and seven studies), (2) the meta-analyses did not detect significant differences for all meat types/livestock species and (3) that results for PUFA and *n*-3 PUFA varied between individual studies and studies carried out in different countries/regions. Other composition differences (e.g. the lower concentrations of 14:0 and 16:0 and higher concentrations of total *n*-6 PUFA in organic chicken meat) detected by meta-analyses may also be explained by differences in management practices between organic and conventional production systems<sup>(46–48)</sup>.

We therefore discuss below (1) current knowledge about the effects of management practices (especially feeding regimens)

that may explain composition differences between organic and conventional meat, (2) the strength of evidence and potential reasons for the heterogeneity of the available data/evidence, (3) potential nutritional/health impacts of meat from organic and other grazing or high-forage livestock production systems, (4) the need for expanding the current evidence base available for meta-analysis and (5) the requirement for dietary intervention and/or cohort studies to quantify potential health impacts of organic meat consumption.

#### Links between livestock management and meat composition/quality

Organic livestock production standards prescribe that livestock are to be reared outdoors for a part of the year, although the length of outdoor periods differs among regions and livestock species<sup>(49–51)</sup>. EU organic standards prescribe that (1) ruminants receive at least 60% of total DM intake (DMI) from forage (from grazing, cut fresh forage or conserved forage such as silage or hay) and (2) pigs and poultry are provided with access to forage but intake levels are not specified<sup>(49–51)</sup>. For ruminants, organic regulations also prescribe that fresh forage intake is from grazing ‘when conditions allow’, and as a result the duration of grazing and the ratio of fresh:conserved forage in organic diets vary significantly between European regions, mainly due to differences in pedo-climatic and agronomic conditions<sup>(48,52)</sup>. Where organic pigs and poultry have access to grassland, this may also result in significant fresh forage intake, but in many regions organic pigs and poultry are fed conserved forage only<sup>(46,47)</sup>.

In contrast, in conventional beef, pork and poultry (and in some regions also lamb and goat) production, there has been a trend towards (1) reduced outdoor grazing or all-year-round housing and (2) reductions in both fresh and conserved forage intakes, but (3) increased use of concentrate feeds based on maize, other cereals, soya, other grain legumes and by-products from the food processing industry<sup>(53–55)</sup>.

**Feeding regimens.** A range of controlled animal experiments showed that high grazing/forage-based diets (similar to those prescribed under organic farming standards) reduce the total fat and/or nutritionally undesirable SFA (12:0, 14:0 and/or 16:0) content, while increasing concentrations of total PUFA, *n*-3 PUFA and VLC *n*-3 PUFA in meat, compared with concentrate-based diets (typical for intensive conventional farming systems)<sup>(43–45)</sup>. These results suggest that the relative divergence in feeding practices between the organic and conventional livestock sectors is a major driver for both the differences in meat FA composition between systems and the variability of results between countries/regions and individual studies detected in this study by meta-analyses.

Differences in meat composition (e.g. for *n*-3 PUFA) reported by controlled experimental studies are greater than the differences detected in this study between organic and conventional meat by meta-analysis, especially for ruminant livestock – for example, in beef production, a switch from grain- to grass-based finishing diets produced significant increases in total PUFA (45%), total *n*-3 PUFA (>3-fold), ALA (>3-fold), EPA (>5-fold), DPA (>2-fold) and DHA (129%) in the intramuscular

fat in the *longissimus* muscle of beef, although it had no significant effect on total *n*-6 PUFA or LA concentrations<sup>(44)</sup>. In lamb production, a switch from grain- to grass-based finishing diets significantly increased ALA (>2-fold), EPA (>2-fold), DPA (88%) and DHA (100%) in the intramuscular fat of pelvic limb muscle meat and decreased concentrations of LA (30%) and AA (21%)<sup>(43)</sup>. Although forage intakes in monogastric livestock are much lower than that in ruminants, free-range rearing of pigs with access to pasture grazing had significantly increased concentrations of PUFA, *n*-3 PUFA and ALA in the intramuscular fat when compared with meat from pigs reared indoors on standard concentrate-based diets<sup>(45)</sup>. However, the relative differences were smaller (<50%) than those detected in studies with beef and lamb<sup>(43,44)</sup>. This suggests that there is considerable potential for both conventional and organic production to increase *n*-3 PUFA (including VLC *n*-3 concentrations) concentrations in beef, lamb and pork meat by further increasing grazing and the proportion of forage in livestock diets.

For poultry, there are limited data from controlled experimental studies that could potentially explain impacts of feeding regimens used in organic farming systems on meat quality, but access to forage may also at least partially explain the differences detected.

For pigs and poultry, differences in the type of concentrate (and in particular protein supplements) may also contribute to composition differences between organic and conventional meat, especially FA profiles – for example, although conventional pig and poultry production relies on chemically extracted soya meal (which has low levels of residual fat) to supply high-quality protein, organic standards only allow cold-pressed soya and other oil seed meals (which have a higher oil content). Moreover, on-farm-produced grain legumes (peas and beans) are more widely used as protein supplements in organic production, mainly because there is a need for a proportion of feed to be produced on farm because of the limited availability, high cost and ethical concerns about imported feeds<sup>(46,47,55)</sup>. The higher intake of soya oil (which has a high LA content) with cold-pressed soya meal may therefore explain the higher LA and *n*-6 concentrations detected by meta-analyses for organic chicken meat<sup>(46,47)</sup>.

**Breed choice.** The use of traditional and robust breeds/genotypes is often recommended by organic sector bodies and advisors. However, there is limited information on the relative differences in breed choice/breeding regimens between organic and conventional beef cattle, lamb, goat, pig and poultry production systems, and the papers used for meta-analyses provided no or insufficient data on the breeds used in the organic and conventional systems they compared.

It was therefore not possible to determine whether breed choice contributed significantly to the composition differences reported in this study. However, controlled experimental studies have demonstrated that breed choice does affect FA profiles of meat<sup>(43–45)</sup>.

**Grassland/forage composition.** The composition of grazing swards and conserved forages may also partially explain the differences between organic and conventional meat. Most



781 importantly, forage-legume (e.g. clover, lucerne) or grass-  
 782 legume mixtures are typically used in organic farming systems  
 783 (where standards demand a specific proportion of fertility-  
 784 building legume crops in the rotation). In contrast, pure grass or  
 785 swards with a high proportion of grasses are more widely used  
 786 in conventional/non-organic production systems, because the  
 787 permitted use of mineral NPK fertilisers allows for higher DM  
 788 yields per hectare compared with legume-grass mixtures.  
 789 Evidence from studies comparing milk fat composition in  
 790 extensive (grazing only) organic and non-organic dairy  
 791 production systems (which use similar cross-breeds and grazing  
 792 DMI) showed that organic milk (from cows grazing swards with  
 793 a higher clover content) had significantly more *n*-3 PUFA, but  
 794 lower CLA concentrations compared with milk from  
 795 non-organic farms<sup>(56,57)</sup>. Similar impacts of legumes have also  
 796 been reported for meat quality<sup>(58)</sup>: *longissimus dorsi* muscle  
 797 from lambs grazing lucerne or red clover swards (more widely  
 798 used in organic production systems) had significantly greater  
 799 PUFA:SFA ratios and higher concentrations of both LA and ALA  
 800 compared with lambs grazing grass swards.

801 **Mineral supply and supplementation.** Although some trends  
 802 towards differences in mineral composition were detected by  
 803 meta-analyses, these were based on a very limited evidence  
 804 base and cannot be used to draw conclusions. However, they  
 805 demonstrate the importance to carry out additional  
 806 well-designed comparative studies, as organic and conventional  
 807 livestock systems differ in a range of management practices that  
 808 may affect the mineral composition of meat – for example,  
 809 (1) conventional forage and grain crops often receive high  
 810 inputs of mineral P fertilisers, a practice that has been linked to  
 811 higher Cd concentrations in crops<sup>(25,59)</sup>, and (2) conventional  
 812 livestock feeding regimens often use higher levels of mineral  
 813 supplementation (e.g. more widespread use of Cu supplements  
 814 in conventional pig production). In addition, Fe concentrations  
 815 in meat may be increased by access to the outside or higher  
 816 proportions of forage in the diet (as recommended by organic  
 817 farming standards), as forages contain higher Fe concentrations  
 818 than concentrate feeds, and it is well recognised that piglets  
 819 with access to soil in their environment do not need Fe  
 820 injections, routinely used in housed production systems<sup>(60)</sup>.  
 821 In contrast, Cu deficiency in organically reared calves was  
 822 linked to high forage and low concentrate intakes in one recent  
 823 study<sup>(61)</sup>, and this may have been due to low Cu contents in  
 824 soils used for forage production and/or the mineral  
 825 supplements in the concentrate feed used for rearing calves in  
 826 conventional systems.

### 827 *Strength of evidence and potential reasons for the* 828 *heterogeneity of the available data/evidence*

829 The high inconsistency and low precision of meta-analyses for  
 830 many meat composition parameters may reflect both the  
 831 paucity of information and variability associated with agri-  
 832 production systems and especially livestock diets (see detailed  
 833 description below). This highlights the need for (1) further  
 834 well-designed studies delivering substantial additional primary  
 835 data sets, (2) reporting of measures of variance in publications

836 to facilitate inclusion in WM and (3) the establishment of  
 837 registers of primary research<sup>(29)</sup>.

838 However, despite these uncertainties, there is a substantial  
 839 body of evidence indicating that overall organic meat may have  
 840 a more desirable FA profile than non-organic comparators. The  
 841 consistency of association directions across the multiple  
 842 outcomes and analyses mitigates some of the uncertainty  
 843 associated with individual parameters from a decision-analytical  
 844 perspective, but the currently available evidence requires  
 845 cautious interpretation.

846 A major reason for the heterogeneity of the available data is  
 847 likely to be the considerable variation in the intensity of both  
 848 conventional and organic meat production systems. Non-  
 849 organic production may range from intensive indoor produc-  
 850 tion systems with high concentrate-based diets (>90% of total  
 851 DMI for pigs and poultry) to extensive outdoor grazing-based  
 852 systems with high fresh and/or conserved forage (up to 100%  
 853 of total DMI) diets<sup>(53–55)</sup>. Although limited by the restrictions of  
 854 organic farming regulations, there is also variation in production  
 855 intensity within organic systems – for example, concentrate  
 856 intakes may vary between 0 and 40% of DMI for organic  
 857 ruminant diets<sup>(48,52)</sup>. In addition, although organic ruminant  
 858 diets are thought to be based on higher fresh forage from  
 859 grazing and lower concentrate intakes in most European  
 860 countries/regions, lower grazing-based DMI in organic, com-  
 861 pared with extensive non-organic, have been documented for  
 862 some ruminant livestock species in some regions of Europe –  
 863 for example, dairy cattle in Southern Wales<sup>(52,56)</sup> and dairy  
 864 sheep and lamb meat production systems in Crete (Smaro  
 865 Sotiraki, personal communication). This could explain why  
 866 some studies showed a different trend (e.g. lower PUFA and *n*-3  
 867 FA in organic meat) to the overall results obtained by  
 868 meta-analyses of pooled data or data for individual livestock  
 869 species/meat types.

870 Other potential sources of heterogeneity are the range of dif-  
 871 ferent livestock species, meat types and countries and/or variable  
 872 study designs and methodologies used in the studies from which  
 873 data were extracted. In addition, data used in the meta-analyses  
 874 were collected over a >20-year period and agronomic practices  
 875 in both organic and conventional systems may have changed  
 876 over time; this may also have contributed to heterogeneity.

877 As described in previous reviews focused on composition  
 878 differences between organic and conventional crop-based  
 879 foods<sup>(5,25)</sup>, pooling diverse information was necessary, because  
 880 for most composition parameters the number of published studies  
 881 available was insufficient to carry out separate meta-analyses for  
 882 specific countries/regions, livestock species/meat types or study  
 883 types. Consequently heterogeneity was high, although only PUFA  
 884 appeared to be sensitive to variable inclusion criteria.

### 885 *Potential nutritional impacts of composition differences*

886 **Fat composition.** The lower thrombogenicity index detected by  
 887 UM for organic meat fat was due to both (1) lower concentra-  
 888 tions of undesirable 14:0 and 16:0 (linked to an increased risk  
 889 of CVD) and (2) higher concentrations of *n*-3 PUFA (linked to a  
 890 decreased risk of CVD) found in organic meat. However, it  
 should be pointed out that the thrombogenicity index as a



891 predictor for CVD risk<sup>(19)</sup> has not so far been validated in human  
 892 dietary intervention or cohort studies. It is therefore currently not  
 893 possible to estimate to what extent the changes in FA profiles  
 894 and intakes may affect CVD risk (see also discussion below).

895 Increasing *n*-3 (especially VLC *n*-3) PUFA intake in human  
 896 diets has been linked to a range of other health benefits in  
 897 humans<sup>(16,17,21–23)</sup>. The 47% higher total *n*-3 PUFA concentration  
 898 detected by WM and estimated 17% higher *n*-3 PUFA intake  
 899 with organic meat could therefore be potentially beneficial,  
 900 especially if intakes of VLC *n*-3 PUFA were increased. However,  
 901 it is currently unclear whether there are systematic differences in  
 902 VLC *n*-3 PUFA concentrations between organic and conventional  
 903 meat, because there is currently insufficient data to carry out WM  
 904 comparing VLC *n*-3 PUFA concentration in most individual meat  
 905 types. UM were possible for a larger number of meat types and  
 906 detected higher concentrations of VLC *n*-3 PUFA in beef, but not  
 907 other meat types for which sufficient data were available.

908 Meat fat is an important source for VLC *n*-3 PUFA. Average  
 909 consumption levels of meat have been estimated to be 240 and  
 910 340 g/d per person, with red meat at 184 and 270 g/d per person  
 911 in Europe and the USA, respectively<sup>(62)</sup>. For the majority of North  
 912 American and European consumers, meat is therefore the main  
 913 dietary source for VLC *n*-3 PUFA, supplying up to an estimated  
 914 50% of the recommended adequate intake. A priority for future  
 915 studies should therefore be to substantially expand the evidence  
 916 base for VLC *n*-3 PUFA for all meat types to allow accurate  
 917 estimates of composition differences and dietary intakes with  
 918 organic and conventional meat.

919 Although UM of pooled data for all meat types and beef  
 920 indicated that organic production may reduce the LA:ALA and  
 921 *n*-6:*n*-3 ratio, this cannot currently be confirmed by WM. These  
 922 ratios may be nutritionally relevant, as additional VLC *n*-3 PUFA  
 923 may be generated from dietary ALA, because humans can  
 924 elongate ALA to produce longer-chain *n*-3 PUFA<sup>(17,24,63–75)</sup>.  
 925 However, ALA to EPA conversion rates are thought to be low in  
 926 humans and synthesis of DHA is very low, especially in men<sup>(71)</sup>.  
 927 The proportion of ALA (the main *n*-3 in the human diet)  
 928 converted to longer-chain *n*-3 FA in humans is thought to  
 929 increase with decreasing LA:ALA ratios in the diet, as ALA and LA  
 930 compete for  $\Delta 6$  desaturase activity<sup>(24)</sup>. In addition, the nutritional  
 931 impact of switching consumption from conventional to organic  
 932 meat (or that from other high-forage systems) relating to higher  
 933 *n*-3 PUFA intakes (and conversion of ALA to VLC *n*-3 PUFA) will  
 934 depend on a range of other dietary factors including total fat  
 935 intake, the proportion of dairy products, meat and vegetable fat  
 936 in total fat intake, the type of vegetable fats in the diet and the  
 937 relative capacity of individuals to convert/elongate ALA into  
 938 longer-chain *n*-3 PUFA<sup>(17,24,63–75)</sup>.

939 A recent dietary intervention study showed that concentrations  
 940 of VLC *n*-3 PUFA in both plasma and platelets were significantly  
 941 higher in individuals consuming pasture-finished compared with  
 942 concentrate-finished beef and lamb<sup>(76)</sup>. This indicates that  
 943 consumption of meat from grazing/forage-based systems (such  
 944 as organic meat) may raise VLC *n*-3 concentrations in the human  
 945 body, although it is currently unclear to what extent this is due to  
 946 (1) higher VLC *n*-3 intakes or (2) higher ALA to VLC *n*-3  
 947 conversion associated with the low LA:ALA ratio in meat from  
 948 grazing-based systems.

Overall, results of the meta-analyses indicate that the relative  
 impact of using organic production methods on meat FA profiles  
 differs between livestock species. The impact of switching to  
 organic meat consumption therefore not only depends on the  
 amount but also on the type of meat consumed. However, there  
 are large differences in the relative amounts of beef, lamb, pork  
 and chicken meat fat consumed between countries/regions in  
 the EU and elsewhere<sup>(42)</sup>. In addition, calculations of estimated  
 FA intakes assumed that (1) fat concentrations in organic and  
 conventional meats are similar and (2) there is no difference in  
 the relative proportion of different types of meat consumed by  
 organic and conventional consumers, whereas there is insuffi-  
 cient published information to confirm that these assumptions  
 are correct. However, it is well documented that (1) meat intakes  
 vary considerably between individuals, (2) the FA composition  
 of intramuscular fat may differ significantly from that of  
 subcutaneous/storage<sup>(48)</sup> and (3) meat processing and con-  
 sumption methods (e.g. amount of fat being removed) may  
 greatly affect both total fat and FA intakes. Estimates of total daily  
 FA intakes calculated using data on current average EU meat fat  
 consumption therefore have to be interpreted with caution.

The currently very high level of meat, particularly red meat,  
 consumption is thought to be nutritionally undesirable, as it has  
 been linked to obesity, CVD, type 2 diabetes and a range of  
 cancers<sup>(77)</sup>. Current dietary recommendations in the USA and  
 Europe are to reduce red meat intakes to <70 g/d<sup>(78,79)</sup>. Com-  
 pliance with these guidelines will substantially reduce total fat  
 and VLC *n*-3 intakes. The need to identify alternative approaches  
 to increase VLC *n*-3 PUFA intake is discussed in the  
 supplementary data (see online additional discussion section).

**Minerals.** Owing to the very limited evidence base, it is not  
 currently possible to estimate differences in mineral composi-  
 tion and potential impacts on human health. The need to  
 investigate the potential effects of organic and conventional  
 production protocols on the mineral composition of meat is  
 discussed in the supplementary data (see online additional  
 discussion section).

#### *Deficiencies in the evidence base*

**Meat composition data.** Compared with the large amount of  
 comparative composition data now available for crop-based  
 foods<sup>(25)</sup>, the data sets available for the meta-analyses of meat  
 composition parameters reported in this study were limited.  
 Results showed low statistical power for many parameters and  
 limited ability to understand between-study heterogeneity, and  
 these are the major reasons for the very low or low overall  
 reliability for many of the outcomes. However, for a range of  
 composition parameters for which significant differences were  
 detected, the method of synthesis did not have large effects, in  
 terms of either statistical significance or effect magnitude.  
 Additional data from further, well-designed studies would  
 alleviate the current uncertainties in the evidence and may  
 allow exploration of between-study covariates. Future studies  
 should be registered to eliminate potential publication biases.  
 Apart from FA profiles, a particular emphasis should be placed  
 on comparing nutritionally important meat composition

1003 parameters for which there are currently no or too few studies  
1004 to carry out meta-analyses, especially antioxidants/vitamins  
1005 (e.g. vitamin A, vitamin B<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>6</sub> and B<sub>12</sub>, riboflavin, folate, niacin,  
1006 pantothenic acid) and minerals (e.g. Fe, Zn, Se) for which meat  
1007 is a major dietary source.

1008 **Effect of specific agronomic practices.** Current knowledge on  
1009 the effect of feeding regimens on meat quality and the results of  
1010 the meta-analyses reported in this study suggest that increasing  
1011 the requirements for grazing and applying further restrictions  
1012 on the use of concentrate feeds (especially during the finishing  
1013 period) under organic and other extensive (e.g. pasture-reared)  
1014 production standards will further improve the nutritional quality  
1015 of meat and the differential in quality compared with meat  
1016 products from intensive indoor meat production systems<sup>(48)</sup>.  
1017 However, additional well-designed comparative studies are  
1018 needed to increase the sensitivity of meta-analyses and to  
1019 quantify more specifically which production system parameters  
1020 (e.g. specific feed composition components, especially during  
1021 the finishing period, breed choice/breeding systems, veterinary  
1022 interventions) are the most significant drivers for nutritionally  
1023 relevant composition differences for different livestock species.

1024 **Dietary intervention and cohort studies.** Potential impacts of  
1025 composition differences in meat composition on human health  
1026 (e.g. risk of CVD) currently have to be extrapolated from  
1027 existing information about the effects of compounds such as  
1028 12:0, 14:0 and 16:0 SFA, LA and *n*-3 (especially VLC *n*-3)  
1029 PUFA on human health, as there are a few studies that have  
1030 assessed impacts of organic food consumption on animal or  
1031 human health or health-related biomarkers. If the significant  
1032 differences in nutritionally relevant compounds identified in this  
1033 study are confirmed, this would highlight the need to carry out  
1034 human dietary intervention and cohort studies designed to  
1035 quantify the potential health impacts of switching to organic  
1036 food production. Experimental studies comparing meat from  
1037 non-organic forage and concentrate-based production systems  
1038 suggest that other grazing-based livestock production systems  
1039 deliver similar improvements in FA profiles<sup>(43-45)</sup> and poten-  
1040 tially other meat-quality parameters. This should be considered  
1041 in the design of future dietary intervention/cohort studies.

1042 The potential of carrying out dietary intervention/cohort  
1043 studies was demonstrated by a recent investigation into the  
1044 effect of organic milk consumption on eczema in children  
1045 younger than 2 years of age in the Netherlands (a country with  
1046 relatively high milk consumption)<sup>(64)</sup>. It reported that eczema  
1047 was significantly reduced in children from families consuming  
1048 organic rather than non-organic milk. This may have been  
1049 caused by the higher *n*-3 PUFA concentrations and lower  
1050 *n*-6:*n*-3 PUFA ratio in organic milk, as there is increasing evi-  
1051 dence for anti-allergic effects of *n*-3 FA<sup>(65)</sup> – for example, a  
1052 recent animal study showed that increasing dietary VLC *n*-3  
1053 PUFA intake prevents allergic sensitisation to cows' milk protein  
1054 in mice<sup>(66)</sup>. However, it is important to point out that there are  
1055 so far no cohort studies showing a link between organic meat  
1056 consumption and reduced incidence in eczema and other  
1057 positive health outcomes.

Overall, the present study indicates that organic livestock 1058  
production may change the FA profiles, and possibly other 1059  
composition parameters, and that some of these changes (e.g. 1060  
higher *n*-3 PUFA) may be nutritionally desirable. It is therefore 1061  
important to carry out additional studies to address the limita- 1062  
tions in the current evidence base. If nutritionally relevant 1063  
composition differences can be confirmed and/or linked to 1064  
specific agronomic practices (e.g. high forage diets), this would 1065  
then justify dietary intervention or cohort studies designed to 1066  
identify the impact of consuming meat with contrasting com- 1067  
position generated by switching to organic production or spe- 1068  
cific agronomic practices. 1069

## Acknowledgements 1070

Support from Lord Peter Melchett (Policy Director, Soil Asso- 1071  
ciation, Bristol, UK) and Bruno Martin (Centre Clermont- 1072  
Ferrand-Theix, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, 1073  
INRA, Saint Genès Champanelle, France) for the critical review/ 1074  
editing of the manuscript is gratefully acknowledged. 1075

The authors are grateful for funding from the European 1076  
Community financial participation under the Sixth Framework 1077  
Programme for Research, Technological Development and 1078  
Demonstration Activities for the Integrated Project QUALITY- 1079  
LOWINPUTFOOD, FP6-FOOD-CT-2003-506358. The authors 1080  
also gratefully acknowledge financial and technical support 1081  
from the Sheepdrove Trust for 'The meta-analyses of data on 1082  
composition of organic and conventional foods'. The Shee- 1083  
pdrove Trust supports independent R&D underpinning the 1084  
development of organic and sustainable farming and food 1085  
systems. Financial support by the Trust was without conditions, 1086  
and the Trust had no influence on the design and management 1087  
of the research project and the preparation of publications from 1088  
the project. 1089

D. Ś.-T. is a nutritionist who carried out a major part of the 1090  
literature search and extraction and contributed to writing the 1091  
manuscript. M. B. is an animal and food scientist who designed 1092  
the database, carried out most of the meta-analyses and con- 1093  
tributed to writing the manuscript. C. S. is a human nutritionist 1094  
who contributed to the design of the study, discussion of 1095  
potential health impacts of composition differences and the 1096  
critical review of the manuscript. R. S. is an environmental 1097  
modeller and data analyst, who helped design the literature 1098  
search and database storage, helped to design the study and 1099  
provided guidance the meta-analyses used. C. B. is an 1100  
agronomist specialising on organic production systems, who 1101  
supported the literature review (especially with respect to stu- 1102  
dies in North and South America) and the preparation/review of 1103  
the manuscript. H. S. is an animal nutritionist, who supported 1104  
the literature review and critical revision of the manuscript, 1105  
especially with respect to studies from Scandinavian countries. 1106  
J. G.-O. is a human nutritionist, who supported the literature 1107  
review and the discussion of potential health impacts of 1108  
composition differences identified in the meta-analyses. E. R. is 1109  
a human nutritionist, who supported the literature review and 1110  
critical revision of the manuscript, especially with respect to 1111  
human intervention studies focused on health impacts 1112  
of organic food consumption. K. S.-S. is an animal nutritionist/ 1113


1114 physiologist who supported the literature review and critical  
 1115 revision of the manuscript, especially with respect to animal  
 1116 dietary intervention studies focused on physiological and health  
 1117 impacts of organic feed consumption. M. E. is an ecologist and  
 1118 statistician who advised and supported the statistical analyses.  
 1119 G. C. is an animal scientist, who supported the literature search,  
 1120 critical review of the manuscript and the discussion relating to  
 1121 interactions between feeding regimens and meat quality.  
 1122 M. K. L. is a biochemist/nutritionist and provided data sets and  
 1123 supported the literature review and critical review of the  
 1124 manuscript. T. J. is the Nafferton Ecological Farming Group  
 1125 office manager and supported the literature search and data  
 1126 extraction. U. N. is head of FiBL, Europe's largest organic  
 1127 farming institute, and supported the literature review (especially  
 1128 with respect to studies linking feeding regimens and meat  
 1129 quality parameters) and critical review of the manuscript. T. S. is  
 1130 an animal physiologist and supported the literature review and  
 1131 critical revision of the manuscript, especially with respect to  
 1132 studies from Eastern European countries. P. C. C. is a nutritionist  
 1133 who supported the preparation (in particular introduction and  
 1134 discussion sections describing potential health impacts of  
 1135 changes in fatty acid profiles in meat) and critical review of the  
 1136 manuscript. G. C. B. is a nutritionist who supported the pre-  
 1137 preparation (in particular introduction and discussion sections  
 1138 describing potential health impacts of changes in fatty acid  
 1139 profiles in meat) and critical review of the manuscript. S. S. is a  
 1140 veterinarian and animal scientist who supported the literature  
 1141 review and critical review of sections of the discussion. A. S. is a  
 1142 veterinarian and animal scientist who supported the literature  
 1143 review and critical review of sections of the introduction and  
 1144 discussion. H. Y. is forage-production agronomist who sup-  
 1145 ported the literature review and preparation of the discussion  
 1146 sections dealing with associations between forage-based feeding  
 1147 regimens and meat composition. S. S. is an animal scientist who  
 1148 supported the literature review and prepared sections of the  
 1149 discussion. G. B. is an animal nutritionist/scientist who sup-  
 1150 ported the literature review and critical review of the manuscript.  
 1151 G. S. is a lecturer in Evidence Synthesis who provided advice on  
 1152 the conduct and interpretation of the meta-analysis and critical  
 1153 review of the manuscript. C. L. is an agronomist specialising on  
 1154 agricultural production systems design/improvement and the  
 1155 study of interactions between agronomic practices and food  
 1156 quality and safety. He led the design of the study, management  
 1157 of research project and the preparation of the manuscript.

1158 The senior author of the paper, C. L., owns farmland in  
 1159 Germany that is managed by conventional farming standards  
 1160 and a smallholding in Greece that is managed by organic  
 1161 farming standards.

## 1162 Supplementary material

1163 For supplementary material/s referred to in this article, please  
 1164 visit <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1017/S0007114515005073>

## 1165 References

- 1166  1. Willer H & Kilcher L (2011) *The World of Organic Agriculture. Statistics and Emerging Trends 2011. FiBL-IFOAM Report.* ■: IFOAM, Bonn and FiBL, Frick.
- 1167
- 1168
2. Yiridoe EK, Bonti-Ankomah S & Martin RC (2005) Comparison  
 of consumer perceptions and preference toward organic  
 versus conventionally produced foods: a review and update  
 of the literature. *Renew Agric Food Syst* **20**, 193–205.
3. Oughton E & Ritson C (2007) Food consumers and organic  
 agriculture. In *Handbook of Organic Food Quality and Safety*,  
 pp. 74–94 [J Cooper, U Niggli and C Leifert, editors].  
 Cambridge: Woodhouse Publishing Ltd.
4. Dangour AD, Dodhia SK, Hayter A, *et al.* (2009) Nutritional  
 quality of organic foods: a systematic review. *Am J Clin Nutr*  
**90**, 680–685.
5. Brandt K, Leifert C, Sanderson R, *et al.* (2011) Agroecosystem  
 management and nutritional quality of plant foods: the case of  
 organic fruits and vegetables. *Crit Rev Plant Sci* **30**, 177–197.
6. Cooper J, Niggli U & Leifert C (2007) *Handbook of Organic  
 Food Safety and Quality*. Cambridge: CRC Press.
7. Williams P (2007) Nutritional composition of red meat. *Nutr  
 Diet* **64**, S113–S119.
8. Palupi E, Jayanegara A, Ploeger A, *et al.* (2012) Comparison of  
 nutritional quality between conventional and organic dairy  
 products: a meta-analysis. *J Sci Food Agric* **92**, 2774–2781.
9. Smith-Spangler C, Brandeau ML, Hunter GE, *et al.* (2012) Are  
 organic foods safer or healthier than conventional alternatives?  
 A systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* **157**, 348–366.
10. Hu FB, Manson JE & Willett WC (2001) Types of dietary fat  
 and risk of coronary heart disease: a critical review. *J Am Coll  
 Nutr* **20**, 5–19.
11. Parodi PW (2009) Has the association between saturated fatty  
 acids, serum cholesterol and coronary heart disease been over  
 emphasized? *Int Dairy J* **19**, 345–361.
12. German JB, Gibson RA, Krauss RM, *et al.* (2009) A reappraisal  
 of the impact of dairy foods and milk fat on cardiovascular  
 disease risk. *Eur J Nutr* **48**, 191–203.
13. Kliem KE & Givens DI (2011) Dairy products in the food  
 chain: their impact on health. *Annu Rev Food Sci Technol* **2**,  
 21–36.
14. Sun Q, Ma J, Campos H, *et al.* (2007) Plasma and erythrocyte  
 biomarkers of dairy fat intake and risk of ischemic heart  
 disease. *Am J Clin Nutr* **86**, 929–937.
15. Wijendran V & Hayes KC (2004) Dietary *n-6* and *n-3* fatty acid  
 balance and cardiovascular health. *Annu Rev Nutr* **24**, 597–615.
16. Simopoulos AP & Cleland LG (2003) Omega-6/omega-3  
 essential fatty acid ratio: the scientific evidence. *World Rev  
 Nutr Diet* **92**.
17. Givens DI & Gibbs RA (2008) Current intakes of EPA and DHA  
 in European populations and the potential of animal-derived  
 foods to increase them. *Proc Nutr Soc* **67**, 273–280.
18. Blasbalg TL, Hibbeln JR, Ramsden CE, *et al.* (2011) Changes in  
 consumption of omega-3 and omega-6 fatty acids in the United  
 States during the 20th century. *Am J Clin Nutr* **93**, 950–962.
19. Ulbricht TL & Southgate DA (1991) Coronary heart disease:  
 seven dietary factors. *Lancet* **338**, 985–992.
20. Calder PC (2015) Marine omega-3 fatty acids and inflamma-  
 tory processes: effects, mechanisms and clinical relevance.  
*Biochim Biophys Acta* **1851**, 469–484.
21. European Food Safety Authority (2010) Scientific opinion on  
 dietary reference values for fats, including saturated fatty  
 acids, polyunsaturated fatty acids, monounsaturated fatty  
 acids, trans fatty acids, and cholesterol. *EFSA J* **8**, 1461.
22. Massiera F, Barbry P, Guesnet P, *et al.* (2010) A western-like  
 fat diet is sufficient to induce a gradual enhancement in fat  
 mass over generations. *J Lipid Res* **51**, 2352–2361.
23. Ryan AS, Astwood JD, Gautier S, *et al.* (2010) Effects of  
 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acid supplementation on  
 neurodevelopment in childhood: a review of human studies.  
*Prostaglandins Leukot Essent Fatty Acids* **82**, 305–314.

- 1235 24. Emken EA, Adlof RO & Gulley RM (1994) Dietary linoleic acid  
1236 influences desaturation and acylation of deuterium-labelled  
1237 linoleic and linolenic acids in young adult males. *Biochim*  
1238 *Biophys Acta* **4**, 277–288.
- 1239 25. Barański M, Średnicka-Tober D, Volakakis N, *et al.* (2014)  
1240 Higher antioxidant and lower cadmium concentrations and  
1241 lower incidence of pesticide residues in organically grown  
1242 crops: a systematic literature review and meta-analyses. *Br J*  
1243 *Nutr* **112**, 794–811.
- 1244 26. Franci O, Bozzi R, Pugliese C, *et al.* (2005) Performance of  
1245 Cinta Senese pigs and their crosses with Large White. 1  
1246 Muscle and subcutaneous fat characteristics. *Meat Sci* **69**,  
1247 545–550.
- 1248 27. Nantapo CTW, Muchenje V & Hugo A (2014) Atherogenicity  
1249 index and health-related fatty acids in different stages of lac-  
1250 tation from Friesian, Jersey and Friesian×Jersey cross cow  
1251 milk under a pasture-based dairy system. *Food Chem* **146**,  
1252 127–133.
- 1253 28. Brandt K, Średnicka-Tober D, Barański M, *et al.* (2013)  
1254 Methods for comparing data across differently designed  
1255 agronomic studies: examples of different meta-analysis  
1256 methods used to compare relative composition of plant  
1257 foods grown using organic or conventional production  
1258 methods, and a protocol for a systematic review. *J Agric Food*  
1259 *Chem* **61**, 7173–7180.
- 1260 29. Stewart G (2010) Meta-analysis in applied ecology. *Biol Lett* **6**,  
1261 78–81.
- 1262 30. Koricheva J & Gurevitch J (2013) Place of meta-analysis  
1263 among other methods of research synthesis. In *Handbook*  
1264 *of Meta-Analysis in Ecology and Evolution*, pp. 3–13  
1265 [J Koricheva, J Gurevitch and K Mengersen, editors]. Prince-  
1266 ton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1267 31. Hallmann E & Rembialkowska E (2006) Antioxidant  
1268 compounds content in selected onion bulbs from organic and  
1269 conventional cultivation. *J Res Appl Agric Eng* **51**, 42–46.
- 1270 32. Viechtbauer W (2010) Conducting meta-analyses in R with the  
1271 metafor package. *J Stat Softw* **36**, 1–48.
- 1272 33. Hedges LV & Olkin I (1985) *Statistical Methods for*  
1273 *Meta-Analysis*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- 1274 34. Sanchez-Meca J & Marin-Martinez F (2010) Meta-analysis. In  
1275 *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 3rd ed.  
1276 pp. 274–282. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- 1277 35. Lipsey MW & Wilson DB (2001) *Practical Meta-Analysis*.  
1278 *Applied Social Research Methods Series*. Thousand Oaks, CA:  
1279 Sage Publications.
- 1280 36. Hedges LV, Gurevitch J & Curtis PS (1999) The meta-analysis  
1281 of response ratios in experimental ecology. *Ecology* **80**,  
1282 1150–1156.
- 1283 37. Mengersen K, Schmidt C, Jennions M, *et al.* (2013) Statistical  
1284 models and approaches to inference. In *Handbook of Meta-*  
1285 *Analysis in Ecology and Evolution*, pp. 89–107 [J Koricheva,  
1286 J Gurevitch and K Mengersen, editors]. Princeton, NJ: Prince-  
1287 ton University Press.
- 1288 38. Rothstein HR, Sutton AJ & Borenstein M (2006) Publication  
1289 bias in meta-analysis. In *Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis:*  
1290 *Prevention, Assessment and Adjustments*, pp. 1–7 [HR  
1291 Rothstein, AJ Sutton and M Borenstein, editors]. Chichester:  
1292 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- 1293 39. Gurevitch J & Hedges LV (1999) Statistical issues in ecological  
1294 meta-analyses. *Ecology* **80**, 1142–1149.
- 1295 40. Manly BFJ (2001) *Randomization, Bootstrap and Monte Carlo*  
1296 *Methods in Biology*, 2nd ed. pp. 96–97. New York: Chapman  
1297 and Hall.
- 1298 41. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, *et al.* (2008) GRADE: an  
1299 emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and  
1300 strength of recommendations. *BMJ* **336**, 924–926.
42. FAOstat (2011) Food supply – livestock and fish primary  
1301 equivalent dataset. Fat supply quantity. <http://www.faostat3.fao.org> (accessed June 2015). 1302  
1303
43. Fisher AV, Enser M, Richardson RI, *et al.* (2000) Fatty acid  
1304 composition and eating quality of lamb types derived from  
1305 four diverse breed x production systems. *Meat Sci* **55**,  
1306 141–147. 1307
44. Nuernberg K, Dannenberger D, Nuernberg G, *et al.* (2005)  
1308 Effect of a grass-based and a concentrate feeding system on  
1309 meat quality characteristics and fatty acid composition of  
1310 *longissimus* muscle in different cattle breeds. *Livest Prod Sci*  
1311 **94**, 137–147. 1312
45. Nilzen V, Babol J, Dutta PC, *et al.* (2001) Free range rearing of  
1313 pigs with access to pasture grazing-effect on fatty acid  
1314 composition and lipid oxidation products. *Meat Sci* **58**,  
1315 267–275. 1316
46. Hirt H & Zeltner E (2007) Effects of organic husbandry  
1317 methods and feeding regimes on poultry quality. In *Hand-*  
1318 *book of Organic Food Quality and Safety*, pp. 117–143  
1319 [J Cooper, U Niggli and C Leifert, editors]. Cambridge:  
1320 Woodhouse Publishing Ltd. 1321
47. Sundrum A (2007) Quality in organic, low-input and con-  
1322 ventional pig production. In *Handbook of Organic Food*  
1323 *Quality and Safety*, pp. 144–177 [J Cooper, U Niggli and  
1324 C Leifert, editors]. Cambridge: Woodhouse Publishing Ltd. 1325
48. Kamihiro S, Stergiadis S, Leifert C, *et al.* (2015) Meat quality  
1326 and health implications of organic and conventional beef  
1327 production. *Meat Sci* **100**, 306–318. 1328
49. European Council (2007) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/  
1329 2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of  
1330 organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91.  
1331 *Off J Eur Comm.* 1332
50. European Commission (2008) Commission Regulation (EC)  
1333 No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules  
1334 for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/  
1335 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products  
1336 with regard to organic production, labelling and control. *Off J*  
1337 *Eur Comm.* 1338
51. European Commission (2014) Commission Implementing  
1339 Regulation (EU) No 836/2014 of 31 July 2014 amending  
1340 Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 laying down detailed rules for  
1341 the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007  
1342 on organic production and labelling of organic products with  
1343 regard to organic production, labelling and control. *Off J Eur*  
1344 *Comm.* 1345
52. Butler G, Nielsen JH, Larsen MK, *et al.* (2011) The effects of  
1346 dairy management and processing on quality characteristics of  
1347 milk and dairy products. *NJAS Wagening J Life Sci* **58**, 97–102. 1348
53. Bouwman AF, Van der Hoek KW, Eickhout B, *et al.* (2005)  
1349 Exploring changes in world ruminant production systems.  
1350 *Agric Syst* **84**, 121–153. 1351
54. Bruinsma J (editor) (2003) *World Agriculture Towards 2015/  
1352 2030: An FAO Perspective*. London: Earthscan Publications  
1353 Ltd. 1354
55. Soil Association (2010) *Feeding Animals that Feeds Us*. Bristol:  
1355 Soil Association. 1356
56. Butler G, Collomb M, Rehberger B, *et al.* (2009) Conjugated  
1357 linoleic acid isomer concentrations in milk from high- and  
1358 low-input management dairy systems. *J Sci Food Agric* **89**,  
1359 697–705. 1360
57. Butler G (2014) Manipulating dietary PUFA in animal feed:  
1361 implications for human health. *Proc Nutr Soc* **73**, 87–95. 1362
58. Fraser MD, Speijers MHM, Theobald VJ, *et al.* (2004)  
1363 Production performance and meat quality of grazing lambs  
1364 finished on red clover, lucerne or perennial ryegrass swards.  
1365 *Grass Forage Sci* **59**, 345–356. 1366

- 1367 59. Cooper J, Sanderson R, Cakmak I, *et al.* (2011) Effect of  
1368 organic and conventional crop rotation, fertilization, and crop  
1369 protection practices on metal contents in wheat (*Triticum*  
1370 *aestivum*). *J Agric Food Chem* **59**, 4715–4724.
- 1371 60. Kleinbeck SN & McGlone JJ (1999) Intensive indoor versus  
1372 outdoor swine production systems: genotype and supple-  
1373 mental iron effects on blood hemoglobin and selected  
1374 immune measures in young pigs. *J Anim Sci* **77**, 2384–2390.
- 1375 61. Blanco-Penedo I, Shore RF, Miranda M, *et al.* (2009) Factors  
1376 affecting trace element status in calves in NW Spain. *Livest Sci*  
1377 **123**, 198–208.
- 1378 62. Daniel CR, Cross AJ, Koebnick C, *et al.* (2011) Trends in meat  
1379 consumption in the United States. *Public Health Nutr* **14**,  
1380 575–583.
- 1381 63. Raatz SK, Silverstein JT, Jahns L, *et al.* (2013) Issues of fish  
1382 consumption for cardiovascular disease risk reduction.  
1383 *Nutrients* **5**, 1081–1097.
- 1384 64. Kummeling I, Thijs C, Huber M, *et al.* (2008) Consumption of  
1385 organic foods and risk of atopic disease during the first 2 years  
1386 of life in the Netherlands. *Br J Nutr* **99**, 598–605.
- 1387 65. Calder PC, Kremmyda L-S, Vlachava M, *et al.* (2010) Is there a  
1388 role for fatty acids in early life programming of the immune  
1389 system? *Proc Nutr Soc* **69**, 373–380.
- 1390 66. van den Elsen LWJ, van Esch BCAM, Hofman GA, *et al.* (2013)  
1391 Dietary long chain *n*-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids prevent  
1392 allergic sensitization to cow's milk protein in mice. *Clin Exp*  
1393 *Allergy* **43**, 798–810.
- 1394 67. Childs CE, Romeu-Nadal M, Burdge GC, *et al.* (2008) Gender  
1395 differences in the *n*-3 fatty acid content of tissues. *Proc Nutr*  
1396 *Soc* **67**, 19–27.
- 1397 68. Williams CM & Burdge G (2006) Long-chain *n*-3 PUFA:  
1398 plant v. marine sources. *Proc Nutr Soc* **65**, 42–50.
- 1399 69. Brenna JT, Salem N Jr, Sinclair AJ, *et al.* (2009) alpha-Linolenic  
1400 acid supplementation and conversion to *n*-3 long-chain  
1401 polyunsaturated fatty acids in humans. *Prostaglandins*  
1402 *Leukot Essent Fatty Acids* **80**, 85–91.
- 1438
70. Welch AA, Shrestha SS, Lentjes MAH, *et al.* (2010) Dietary  
1403 intake and status of *n*-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids in a  
1404 population of fish-eating and non-fish-eating meat-eaters,  
1405 vegetarians, and vegans and the precursor-product ratio of  
1406 alpha-linolenic acid to long-chain *n*-3 polyunsaturated fatty  
1407 acids results from the EPIC-Norfolk cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr* **92**,  
1408 1040–1051.
71. Burdge GC & Calder PC (2005) Conversion of alpha-linolenic  
1410 acid to longer-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids in  
1411 human adults. *Reprod Nutr Dev* **45**, 581–597.
72. Henderson L, Gregory J & Swan G (2002) *The National Diet*  
1413 *and Nutrition Survey: Adults Aged 19 to 64 Years. Volume 1:*  
1414 *Types and Quantities of Foods Consumed.* London: TSO.
73. Mushtaq S, Mangiapane EH & Hunter KA (2010) Estimation of  
1416 cis-9, trans-11 conjugated linoleic acid content in UK foods  
1417 and assessment of dietary intake in a cohort of healthy adults.  
1418 *Br J Nutr* **103**, 1366–1374.
74. Kato T, Kolenic N & Pardini RS (2007) Docosahexaenoic acid  
1420 (DHA), a primary tumor suppressive omega-3 fatty acid,  
1421 inhibits growth of colorectal cancer independent of p53  
1422 mutational status. *Nutr Cancer* **58**, 178–187.
75. Pereira PM & Vicente AF (2013) Meat nutritional composition  
1424 and nutritive role in the human diet. *Meat Sci* **93**, 586–592.
76. McAfee AJ, McSorley EM, Cuskelly GJ, *et al.* (2011) Red meat  
1426 from animals offered a grass diet increases plasma and platelet  
1427 *n*-3 PUFA in healthy consumers. *Br J Nutr* **105**, 80–89.
77. Pan A, Sun Q, *et al.* (2012) Red meat consumption and mortal-  
1429 ity: results from 2 prospective cohort studies. *Arch Intern*  
1430 *Med* **172**, 555–563.
78. WCRF (2014) Does red meat get the red light for health? [http://](http://blog.wcrf-uk.org/2014/09/does-red-meat-get-the-red-light-for-health/)  
1432 [blog.wcrf-uk.org/2014/09/does-red-meat-get-the-red-light-for-](http://blog.wcrf-uk.org/2014/09/does-red-meat-get-the-red-light-for-health/)  
1433 [health/](http://blog.wcrf-uk.org/2014/09/does-red-meat-get-the-red-light-for-health/) (accessed January 2015).
79. NHS (2013) Red meat and the risk of bowel cancer.  
1435 <http://www.nhs.uk/Livewell/Goodfood/Pages/red-meat.aspx>  
1436 (accessed January 2015).
- 1437