Extreme Temperatures Promote High-Fat Diets

Ding Ma[1*] Shuo Li[2*†] Xi Chen[34†] Jintao Xu[1†]

Affiliations:

1 National School of Development, Peking University, Beijing, China (D. Ma; J. Xu Ph.D.)

2 Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China (S. Li Ph.D.)

3 Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, United States (X. Chen Ph.D.)

4 Department of Economics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, United States (X. Chen Ph.D.)

* These authors contributed equally: Ding Ma, Shuo Li.

† Corresponding authors: Correspondence to Shuo Li, Xi Chen, or Jintao Xu.

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Shuo Li, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China (shuoli@hku.hk)

Dr. Xi Chen, Department of Health Policy and Management, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, United States; Department of Economics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, United States (xi.chen@yale.edu)

Dr. Jintao Xu, National School of Development, Peking University, Beijing, China (xujt@pku.edu.cn)

Classification: Social Sciences/Sustainability Science

Keywords: Climate change; extreme temperatures; dietary patterns; macronutrient intake; climate adaptation technologies

We thank Hao Li, Xianling Long, Min Wang, Qinrui Xiahou, and Yuliang Zou for their helpful suggestions and comments. X.C. acknowledges research funding from the US National Institute on Aging (R01AG077529; K01AG053408) and Yale Economics Department, Yale Macmillan Center Faculty Award. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Extreme Temperatures Promote High-Fat Diets

Abstract: Extreme temperatures threaten agriculture and exacerbate global food insecurity, yet their direct impact on dietary choices remains poorly understood. We provide the first evidence of how short-term exposures to hot or cold weather may affect macronutrient intake in China. We find that hot weather reduces carbohydrate and protein consumption but not fat intake, while cold weather increases all nutrient intakes, particularly fats. Both conditions elevate high-fat diet risks. Fans, air conditioners, and heating systems mainly mitigate these effects by altering thermal comfort, whereas refrigerators, which primarily serve to store food, show minimal impact. These results suggest that temperatures may influence dietary patterns more through physiological appetite regulation than food accessibility. Socioeconomic disparities are evident, with rural and less-educated individuals more likely to adopt high-fat diets. Projections indicate that climate change will generally increase high-fat diet probabilities, with northern regions experiencing declines and southern regions rising due to differing temperature changes.

Significance statement: Climate change poses an increasing threat to global food security, and earlier research primarily focused on how temperature affects agricultural supply. Since the specific effects on individual dietary behavior remain poorly understood, this study presents the first systematic evidence linking extreme temperatures to changes in macronutrient intake. It demonstrates how both heat and cold can influence household food consumption. These shifts in diet, particularly towards higher-fat foods, increase the risk of obesity. It may lead to significant public health challenges, especially in countries where healthcare costs associated with obesity are projected to rise sharply. These insights are essential for developing integrated strategies to mitigate the impacts of climate change on human health and long-term food systems.

Climate change's impact on agriculture threatens global food security[1]. While extensive research has examined how temperature fluctuations affect agricultural production[2-7], little is known about how extreme temperatures influence individual nutritional intake—a critical factor for both food security and human health. This gap is particularly significant because individual dietary choices mediate the link between climate change and health outcomes, yet most studies have focused on aggregate food availability rather than consumption patterns. Understanding these effects is essential for addressing the dual challenges of climate adaptation and public health.

This study provides the first systematic evidence of the link between extreme temperatures and food consumption by revealing how heat and cold alter macronutrient intake. We leverage the China Health and Nutrition Survey (CHNS), a longitudinal dataset that tracks individual-level food consumption and macronutrient intake across nine provinces in China from 1991 to 2011 (see Figure 1). The long period and wide geographic coverage of the CHNS allow us to capture rich variations in both temperature and dietary patterns, enabling robust identification of their relationship. Unlike conventional supply-side analyses, this approach provides direct insights into consumer behavior. As China is one of the largest and most climate-vulnerable countries, understanding its dietary responses to extreme temperatures offers valuable insights for other regions facing similar climate challenges.



Figure 1. Survey provinces, months, and the distribution of 3-day temperature. These figures show the survey provinces used in this paper (in (a)), the distribution of survey months in each year (in (b)), and the distribution of the 3-day temperature exposed by respondents (in (c)). The average temperatures are limited to days above 30°C and below 0°C, because the survey months mainly concentrated on September to November. The distribution patterns for maximum and minimum temperatures were similar to those of the average temperature, albeit with an overall shift in the distribution.

We attempt to establish causality through a fixed-effect econometric model, incorporating individual, year-month, and province-month fixed effects. This approach allows us to isolate the causal effects of extreme temperatures on macronutrient intake by controlling for observed heterogeneity. We find that heat decreases carbohydrate and protein intake but does not significantly affect fat intake. In contrast, cold weather increases fat intake relative to carbohydrates and proteins, leading to a higher proportion of energy from fat—a key indicator of a high-fat diet. This shift, driven by increased consumption of milk, eggs, nuts, and oil, is a notable risk factor for non-communicable diseases (NCDs)[8-10].

Adaptation strategies may reduce the anticipated negative impacts of climate change[11]. We examine how two types of strategies—modifying indoor temperatures (mainly by fans, air conditioners, heating systems) and improving food storage (mainly by refrigerators)—affect dietary responses to extreme temperatures. Fans, air conditioners, and heating systems significantly mitigate the impacts of heat and cold on food consumption and macronutrient intake. Refrigerators, however, show limited effects. These results suggest that extreme temperatures influence nutrition mainly through physiological appetite regulation, not food accessibility. This highlights the need for greater attention to the long-term impacts of climate change on dietary patterns and public health.

Subgroup analyses reveal significant heterogeneity. Socioeconomically disadvantaged populations, especially those in rural areas or less educated, are more likely to adopt high-fat diets. This pattern may worsen health inequalities under climate change, underscoring the need for targeted interventions such as nutrition education and subsidies for vulnerable groups.

Finally, we project the future impacts of extreme temperatures on high-fat diets under four scenarios, combining two adaptation strategies (current-level or complete adaptation) with two representative concentration pathways (RCP4.5 or RCP8.5). Our projections indicate that climate change may increase the prevalence of high-fat diets in most cities, particularly under RCP8.5. However, widespread adoption of air conditioners and fans could significantly mitigate these effects. These findings underscore the importance of integrating climate adaptation technologies into public health strategies to address the dual challenges of climate change and diet-related health risks.

Results

This paper presents four key findings. First, we use an econometric model (as detailed in equation (a) in the Data and Methods section) to assess how heat and cold affect macronutrient intake and the shifts in dietary patterns. Second, we test the effectiveness of adaptation technologies, including fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators. It reveals that physiological appetite regulation, rather than food accessibility, underlies these dietary changes. Third, we uncover significant heterogeneity in dietary responses, with rural and less-educated populations more prone to high-fat diets, highlighting a potential source of climate-related health inequality. Finally, we project the proportion of energy from fat and the probability of high-fat diets by the end of the

century under different adaptation scenarios. These projections underscore the need for targeted policies to mitigate climate-induced dietary risks.

Temperature effects on food consumption and macronutrient intake. Figure 2 (a) (or Table A2) shows the effects of extreme temperatures on diet estimated by equation (a). Heat significantly reduces both food consumption and energy intake, while cold has the opposite effect. For every 1°C above 25°C over the past three days, food consumption decreases by 0.267% ($P < 0.01$, 95% CI: -0.448% to -0.086%, in column (1)), and energy intake declines by 0.292% ($P < 0.01$, 95% CI: -0.446% to -0.139%, in column (3)). In contrast, for every 1°C below 5°C, food consumption increases by 0.152% ($P < 0.05$, 95% CI: 0.009% to 0.294%, in column (2)), and energy intake rises by 0.148% ($P < 0.05$, 95% CI: 0.023% to 0.274%, in column (4)). These findings align with the common sense that heat suppresses appetite, whereas people need to increase food intake to maintain body temperature during cold days.

The distinct impacts between food and energy extend to macronutrient composition, including carbohydrates, proteins and fat intake. From column (5) to (10), each 1°C above 25°C decrease the intake of carbohydrates by -0.388% ($P < 0.01$, 95% CI: -0.559% to -0.217) and the intake of proteins by -0.590% ($P < 0.01$, 95% CI: -0.766% to -0.413%), but slightly increase the intake of fat by 0.029% ($P > 0.1$, 95% CI: -0.262% to 0.319%). Conversely, each 1°C below 5°C increase the intake of carbohydrates, proteins and fat intake by 0.101% ($P > 0.1$, 95% CI: -0.040% to 0.242%), 0.152% ($P < 0.05$, 95% CI: 0.016% to 0.289%), and 0.335% ($P < 0.01$, 95% CI: 0.130% to 0.541%). In a word, heat reduces carbohydrate and protein intake but leaves fat intake relatively stable, resulting in a smaller calorie decline. Cold increases fat intake more than carbohydrates and proteins, driving higher energy intake.

Although heat and cold have opposite effects on food consumption, both lead to higher fat intake. To directly examine these effects on dietary health, we focus on two indices: the proportion of energy from fat and the likelihood of a high-fat diet (defined as over 30% energy from fat)[12]. Regression results in columns (11) to (14) show that extreme temperatures increase both the proportion of energy from fat and the probability of high-fat diets. Specifically, each 1°C above 25°C raises the proportion of energy from fat by 0.091% ($P < 0.01$, 95% CI: 0.037% to 0.145%) and the likelihood of a high-fat diet by 0.464% ($P < 0.01$, 95% CI: 0.209% to 0.719%). Conversely, each 1°C below 5°C increases the proportion of energy from fat by 0.031% ($P > 0.1$, 95% CI: -0.009% to 0.071%) and the likelihood of a high-fat diet by 0.179% ($P < 0.1$, 95% CI: -0.015% to 0.373%).

Extreme temperatures significantly alter dietary patterns. The mean and standard deviation of the proportion of energy from fat are 0.272 and 0.115, respectively, while those for the probability of a high-fat diet are 0.395 and 0.489. A three-day heat wave (30°C average, CDD=15°C) increases the proportion of energy from fat by 1.365% (5.02% of mean, 11.9% of SD) and the probability of a high-fat diet by 6.96% (17.6% of mean, 14.2% of SD). In contrast, a three-day cold period (0°C average, HDD=15°C) increases the proportion of energy from fat by 0.465% (1.71% of mean, 4.04%

of SD) and the probability of a high-fat diet by 2.685% (6.80% of mean, 5.49% of SD). These results highlight the stronger impact of heat waves compared to cold periods on dietary shifts.

These dietary patterns pose serious health risks, particularly obesity. Excess calories convert into body fat when not burned. Even stable calorie intake with higher fat proportion elevates obesity risk. As shown in Appendix B, both calorie intake and fat proportion are positively and statistically associated with BMI. Obesity directly enables severe diseases like cardiovascular conditions, diabetes, and cancers[13-15]. While calorie intake often receives more attention, the high-fat diets highlighted in this study pose a hidden yet critical health threat. Extreme temperatures may increase the risk of obesity and NCDs (for example, diabetes, and cardiovascular diseases) through long-term diet changes.



Figure 2. Temperature affects food consumption and macronutrient intake. These figures illustrate the effects of temperature on 3-day food consumption, macronutrient intake, the proportion of energy from fat, and the probability of high-fat diets (in (a)) and the intake of six groups of food and condiments (in (b)). Total consumption is calculated by summing up all the food consumed by the individual, excluding sugar, salt, and oil, which are only usable after 1997. In figure (a), the outcome variables are the logarithmic form of the value of food consumption or macronutrient intake and the real value of the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diets. For ease of interpretation, we multiply the coefficients and CIs in Table A2 by 100 so that the results can be interpreted as a change in percentage. In figure (b), the outcome variables are the real value of the intake of each group of food and condiments. As shown in equation (a), the regression model includes individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects. The regression results are reported in Table A2 and Table A6. The findings indicate that heat reduces carbohydrate and protein intake without affecting fat intake, whereas cold weather increases all of them and has the largest effect on fat intake. The increase in the probability of a high-fat diet may be driven by the increase in milk, eggs, nuts, and oil intake. The circles and triangles represent the regression coefficients, and the dark (light) lines represent 90% (95%) confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the individual level.

We validate our findings through multiple robustness checks (see Data and Methods for details of the method and Table A3 to Table A5 for regression results). First, we cluster standard errors at both individual and household-year levels to account for within-household and temporal correlations. Second, we incorporate province-specific linear wave trends to control for heterogeneous provincial trends in economic development and healthcare access. Third, we restrict the sample to individuals with complete dietary survey records to ensure data quality. Fourth, we use the real value (rather than log transformation) of food consumption and macronutrient intake as alternative outcomes. Fifth, we control for physical activities and occupations to account for energy requirements across different lifestyles. Finally, we test alternative definitions of extreme temperatures, including varying thresholds and nonparametric models. All checks yield consistent estimates, supporting the robustness of our main findings.

Temperature effects on different food groups and condiments. We track dietary structure changes through 12 types of food (cereals, tubers, dried legumes, vegetables, fruits, fungus, seafood, meat, poultry, milk, eggs, nuts) and 3 types of condiments (sugar, salt, oil). We simplify these items into six aggregated groups for clearer pattern identification. Temperature-driven consumption changes for each group are presented in Figure 2 (b) and Table A6.

Heat reduces consumption of cereals (-0.024, $p < 0.1$, 95% CI: -0.050 to 0.002, in row(1)) and meats (-0.037, $p<0.01$, 95% CI: -0.051 to -0.023, in row (5)), while milk, vegetables, fruits, eggs, nuts, and oil show no significant changes ($p>0.1$, in row (3), (7) and (11)). According to China's Nutrition of Main Foods[16], cereals are low in fat (0.5-5g per 100g), while eggs (11.6g per 100g), nuts (40g per 100g), and oils are fat-dense. Notably, edible oil accounts for 50% of total fat intake in China[12]. Thus, heat-induced reductions in low-fat foods increase the proportion of energy from fat, even as high-fat item consumption remains stable.

In contrast, cold exposure increases consumption across most food groups, except cereals (-0.007, $p>0.1$, 95% CI: -0.033 to 0.018, in row (2)), sugar, and salt (-0.001, $p<0.05$, 95% CI: -0.003 to -0.0002, in row (12)). This broad increase weakens the per-degree temperature effect on high-fat diet adoption compared to heat. These shifts in food consumption patterns may have important implications for future food demand under climate change.

Adaptation strategies. Because of the immediate health effects of extreme temperatures, individuals adapt their behavior to mitigate potential health risks from temperature fluctuations[11,17-19]. There are two potential ways to consider food consumption and macronutrient intake. First, refrigerators enable the extension of food storage periods, alleviating the need for frequent shopping trips in extreme temperature conditions. Therefore, refrigerators contribute to reducing the influence of extreme temperatures on individual food consumption from a supply-side standpoint. Secondly, using fans, air conditioners, and heating systems directly modifies individuals' temperature perception. These technologies mainly mitigate the impact of extreme temperatures from a demand-

side perspective. Using equation (b), we simultaneously take all the above strategies (i.e., fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators) into consideration (see Figure 3 and Table A7).

In row (3) and (4) of each subfigure, fans and air conditioners mitigate the effects of heat. Air conditioner is widely seen as the main appliance for mitigating the effects of high temperatures[19-22]. However, in our dataset, the usage of air conditioners is lower than 20%. More than 50% of individuals have at least one fan in their household. These ratios are reasonable considering that the price and energy consumption of fans are lower than that of air conditioners. If we only consider the use of air conditioner, the adaptation effect would be underestimated. Therefore, we consider both the effect of fans and air conditioners. Fans reduce the decline in food consumption (0.637%, P <0.01, 95% CI: 0.163% to 1.110%), energy intake (0.532%, P <0.01, 95% CI: 0.141% to 0.924%), and the drop in the intake of carbohydrate intake (0.787%, P <0.01, 95% CI: 0.341% to 1.234%) and protein (0.807%, P <0.01, 95% CI: 0.371% to 1.243%) during hot weather. Air conditioners significantly lower the fat intake (-0.523%, P <0.05, 95% CI: -0.948% to -0.098%). Together, these technologies lessen the impact of heat on the proportion of energy from fat and the probability of adopting a high-fat diet.



Figure 3. Adaptation effects of fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators. These figures demonstrate the adaptation effects of home equipment on 3-day food consumption, macronutrient intake, proportion of energy from fat, and high-fat diet index. The outcome variables are the logarithmic form of the value of food consumption or macronutrient intake and the real value of the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diets. As shown in equation (b), the regression model includes individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects. The regression results are documented in Table A7. The findings reveal that fans and air conditioners significantly adapt on hot days by reducing the relative fat intake, while heating systems display a similar effect on cold days. Refrigerators don't prevent people from having a high-fat diet. The circles represent the regression coefficients, and the dark (light) lines represent 90% (95%) confidence intervals. For ease of interpretation,

we multiply the coefficients and CIs in Table A7 by 100 so that the result can be interpreted as a change in percentage. Standard errors are clustered at the individual level.

In contrast, heating systems mitigate cold exposure by warming indoor temperatures. In row (5) of each subfigure, this thermal regulation reduces food (-1.176%, P<0.01, 95% CI: -1.529% to -0.822%) and nutrient intake (-1.210%, P<0.01, 95% CI: -1.519% to -0.901%). The marginal effect on fat (-1.471%, P<0.01, 95% CI: -1.991% to -0.950%) is larger than on carbohydrates (-1.313%, P<0.01, 95% CI: -1.659% to -0.968%) and protein (-0.758%, P<0.01, 95% CI: -1.107% to -0.409%). As a result, heating systems slightly reduce the likelihood of high-fat diets.

Unlike temperature adjustment technologies, refrigerators mitigate temperature effects by improving food storage and accessibility. However, while refrigerators increase the intake of food (0.300%, P<0.05, 95% CI: 0.057% to 0.542%) and carbohydrate (0.227%, P<0.1, 95% CI: -0.038% to 0.492%) during heat, their impact on fat intake is minimal (see row (6) and (7) of each subfigure).

Overall, these findings highlight that indoor temperature adjustment is more effective than improved food accessibility in mitigating temperature-induced dietary changes. They also suggest that such dietary shifts may be driven more by biological factors, such as appetite or self-preservation during extreme temperatures, than by food availability.

Heterogeneous effects across subgroups. The analysis above proves that both heat and cold significantly affect diet structure and enhance the probability of having a high-fat diet. However, such impacts may differ based on individual characteristics. Figure 4 (and Table A8) presents the subgroup (see Data and Methods for details about the definitions of each subgroup) regression results for the two diet-related variables, leading to three key findings.



Figure 4. Heterogeneous effects of temperature on the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diets. These figures show the heterogeneity of the effect of extreme temperatures on the proportion of energy from fat and the probability of having a high-fat diet. The outcome variables are the real value. The regression model includes individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects. The regression results are reported in Table A8. The circles represent the regression coefficients, and the dark (light) lines represent 90% (95%) confidence intervals. For ease of interpretation, we multiply the coefficients and CIs in Table A8 by 100 so that the result can be interpreted as a change in percentage. Standard errors are clustered at the individual level.

First, in the first section of Figure 4, extreme temperatures affect older adults less than other age groups. Reduced appetite may buffer the elderly's responses. As for children, cold-related effects are higher than heat-related effects. Early-life macronutrient intake of children significantly influences health outcomes and the accumulation of human capital[23-27]. Gender differences remain minimal in dietary responses. Men and women exhibit similar temperature sensitivity (see the second section of Figure 4).

Second, in the third section of Figure 4, rural populations are more sensitive to temperature compared to urban residents. Rural residents exhibit stronger temperature-driven increases in proportion of energy from fat and higher propensity for high-fat diets under extreme temperatures. This urban-rural disparity stems from structural inequities in China. Rural areas face compounded vulnerabilities from inadequate food storage infrastructure, limited market access, and higher transportation costs[28]. Thermal technology adoption also lags in rural households[17] (in our sample, see summary statistics in Table A9). These systemic gaps, rooted in socioeconomic constraints and differential health literacy, concentrate climate risks more in rural communities. Urban areas disproportionately benefit from existing adaptations. This imbalance exacerbates nutritional climate injustice.

Finally, the bottom section of Figure 4 shows that the diet-temperature relationship is stronger in the low-educated group than in the high-educated group. This disparity aligns with the evidence that people with higher levels of education tend to have more knowledge about nutrition and pay more attention to their dietary health[29,30]. Besides, people with lower education levels have less adaptation capacity, such as having less access to fans, air conditioners, and refrigerators (see Table A9), amplifying their climate-nutrition risks through both behavioral and structural pathways.

Projections of the proportion of energy from fat and probability of high-fat diet in 2080-2099. Finally, we project end-of-century temperature-induced changes in the proportion of energy from fat and the probability of having a high-fat diet using empirical relationships from equations (a) and (b) (see Data and Methods).

These two equations correspond to two adaptation strategies: (1) the current-level, where adaptation remains at the status quo, and (2) complete adaptation, where complete adaptation is achieved. While economic growth will likely increase the adoption of fans, air conditioners, and other heating products, complete saturation remains implausible. Our projections thus establish upper (baseline) and lower (complete adaptation) bounds for climate-driven dietary impacts.

We mainly focus on the scenario of RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. The first is a medium stabilization scenario, which assumes some global action has been taken to reduce emissions, and the second is a high-concentration pathway, assuming people make little effort to solve climate change problems[31].

The results shown in Figure 5 have three observations (for the projection results of other variables, see Figure A1). First, people in most areas are likely to consume excess fat and have a high-fat diet because of global warming. These effects are stronger under scenario RCP8.5 than RCP4.5. On average, climate change will increase the proportion of energy from fat by 0.05 (0.22) percentage point under RCP4.5 (8.5), and the probability of high-fat diet by 0.21 (1.04). Second, while the average effects of temperature are not substantial, spatial heterogeneity indicates a large difference between different cities. For example, the effect of temperature on the probability of having high-fat diet varies from -1.31 to 2.35 (-1.60 to 3.96) percentage point under RCP4.5 (8.5) across different cities. Overall, there are increased vulnerabilities in eastern and southern China, where individuals are more prone to high-fat diets. In the Northeast, people are less likely to have a high-fat diet, and this result is likely driven by a decrease in cold weather and an increase in relatively warm (rather than hot) weather. Third, adaptation technologies significantly mitigate the effects of extreme temperatures, especially for the probability of having a high-fat diet. On average, with adaptation, climate change will increase the proportion of energy from fat by 0.03 (0.10) percentage point under RCP4.5 (8.5), and the probability of a high-fat diet by 0.09 (0.56). Thus, adaptation strategies offset almost half of the effects of climate change. This result highlights the importance of adaptive behavior in improving individual dietary health.



Figure 5. End-of-century projections and distribution of daily average temperature in 343 cities. Figure (a) shows the predicted impact of climate change on the proportion of energy from fat and the probability of a high-fat diet for each city in 2080-2099 relative to CHNS survey waves. Due to the limited coverage of provinces of CHNS (see Figure 1), results based on this database may not be representative of the national average, especially in the

Northwest region and the Tibetan Plateau. Therefore, we remove Qinghai, Tibet, and Xinjiang provinces from the forecast. Panel A and panel C show the projection results based on the equation (c) under the climate scenario RCP4.5 and RCP8.5, respectively. Panel B and D show the projection results based on the equation (d), which considers the adaptation effects of the fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators under the climate scenarios RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. All the scales in subgraphs are uniform. Red means the proportion or probability will increase, while blue shows the opposite effect. Figure (b) shows the distribution of daily temperature in three scenarios. The first scenario is the average daily temperature during the CHNS survey years, which are 1991, 1993, 1997, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2009, and 2011. The second scenario is the projected average daily temperature in RPC4.5, and the third is RCP8.5. We average the data to the city-day level and plot the density picture.

Discussion

Climate change has resulted in increasing extreme weather conditions globally. This paper leverages rich longitudinal data on individual-level dietary intake to estimate the impact of extreme temperatures on macronutrient intake. We find that heat reduces carbohydrate and protein intake without significantly affecting fat intake, whereas cold weather significantly increases the intake of all three macronutrients. Consequently, people tend to derive more energy from fat and adopt high-fat diets when experiencing both extremely hot and cold temperatures. The shift toward high-fat diets is driven by increased consumption of milk, eggs, nuts, and oil. While air conditioners and fans mitigate the adverse impacts of hot days on high-fat diets, heating systems exhibit an adaptation effect during cold days. However, the adaptation effect of refrigerators on fat intake is minimal. There would be potentially enlarged disparities under future climate change scenarios as rural and low-educated residents seem more sensitive to extreme temperatures than their counterparts. End-of-century projections show that people in South and East China tend to consume more fat compared to people living in Northeast China, and adaptation strategies could partially mitigate the prevalence of high-fat diets across these regions.

This paper is among the first to directly investigate the temperature-induced diet changes. Dietary pattern is a key determinant of human health, and shifts toward high-fat diets can exacerbate risks of obesity. In recent years, obesity has become an increasingly important issue globally[32,33]. It presents a substantial burden on healthcare systems. Projections show that the obesity epidemic can lead to a 2.9% reduction in global gross domestic product (GDP) by 2035, equating to a loss of $4 trillion[15]. In 2021, China has the largest number of overweight and obese adults[15], and obesity could account for 22% of China's total healthcare costs in 2030[34]. Thus, understanding how short-term temperature extremes shape dietary behavior is essential for addressing public health challenges. While numerous studies have emphasized the harmful effects of extreme temperatures on health[35-38], few have investigated the channel of dietary behaviors. Huang and Hong find that higher temperatures increase the national obesity rate but don't provide data on individuals[39]. We contribute to the understanding of the impacts of climate change on dietary patterns.

Moreover, this paper speaks to the big question of how climate change threatens agriculture and food security. Recent studies show the severe impact of climate change on agriculture (see the

literature summary in Table A10). High temperatures significantly reduce crop output[2,40,41], and agricultural TFP[3,42]; cold days are also unsuited to crop growth and output per hectare[3,4,40]. Rather than merely from the supply-side perspective, our findings suggest that climate change may affect long-term agricultural production through household food consumption.

This study has some caveats and limitations. First, the impacts documented are essentially general equilibrium effects, as we do not explicitly analyze and disentangle the responses of food producers. Future studies may better distinguish the demand-side from the supply-side responses to extreme temperatures. Second, this study does not account for variations in individuals' optimal nutritional levels, and the losses or gains in food consumption should not be interpreted as deviations from the optimal level. Therefore, future work should take more steps to translate the change in food consumption into health impacts. Third, food availability has changed dramatically over the past decades, and changing dietary patterns over the years may call for more careful explanation. Fourth, our results represent shorter-term effects of extreme temperatures, which cannot be interpreted as long-term effects of climate change. Fifth, food consumption data in the survey is collected by the 3-day recall method, which may have recall biases. Since this paper focuses on the effects of short-term fluctuations in temperature on food intake, it remains to be explored if measurement errors may impact the findings.

Data and Methods

1. Household data.

We use the individual-level data from the China Health and Nutrition Survey (CHNS). It encompasses 28,941 individuals from 7,057 households in 9 provinces from 1991 to 2011 (see Figure 1). This dataset has three advantages. First, encompassing nine provinces across China, this comprehensive scope permits a robust exploration of temperature variation. Second, the dataset itself is rich and multifaceted, incorporating diverse facets such as respondents' household income, assets, detailed information regarding individual food consumption (for more details about the questionnaire on food consumption, see Figure A2) and household condiments consumption (sugar, salt, and oil), and the exact interview time of each individual. Third, the dataset furnishes individual-level information on macronutrient intake, explicitly capturing the 3-day average intake of carbohydrates, proteins, and fats. Thus, it provides a good way for us to investigate the change in macronutrient intake.

Following the guidance of *Chinese dietary reference intakes—Macronutrient (WS/T 578.1-2017)*, we calculate the energy intake in calories based on the amount of carbohydrates, protein, and fat intake. According to the guidance, different macronutrients provide different calories—1g protein or 1g carbohydrate both provide 4 kcal energy, and 1g fat provides 9 kcal energy. Therefore, if the intake of carbohydrates and protein decreases by 1%, while fat intake remains unchanged, the percentage decrease in calorie intake will be less than 1%.

2. Meteorological data.

The meteorological data comes from the China Meteorological Data Sharing Service (CMDSS) system. It includes daily average temperature, wind speed, accumulated rainfall, relative humidity, and sunshine hours from more than 2000 weather stations in China. We construct the daily county-level weather variables by taking an inverse-distance weighted average of all the stations located within a 50-mile radius of the county centroid. The weights are the distances between the county centroid and stations.

The measurement window of the dependent variable is only three days. Thus, we use the cumulative cooling degree days (CDD) and heating degree days (HDD) of the past three days to characterize high and low-temperature exposure, respectively. In light of the distribution of average daily temperature experienced by the respondents (in Figure 1 (c)), we define high temperature as above 25°C and a threshold of 5°C for low temperature. Then, we calculate the cumulative CDD and HDD over three days. For example, if the average temperature for three consecutive days is 23°C, 25°C, and 27°C, the CDD for these three days is 0°C, 0°C, and 2°C, and the 3-day CDD for three days is 2°C. These two cutoffs are also applied in the *Uniform standard for the design of civil buildings (GB 50352- 2019)*, which suggests that the number of days with annual average daily temperatures below 5°C and above 25 °C can be used as an auxiliary indicator when dividing the temperature zones.

3. Climate projections.

We use the climate projection data provided by the NASA Earth Exchange Global Daily Downscaled Projections (NEX-GDDP) to predict the impacts of climate change on food consumption and macronutrient intake by the end of this century (2080-2099). The NEX-GDDP dataset includes downscaled projections for four Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPS) from 21 models conducted under the Coupled Model Inter-comparison Project Phase 5, developed to support the Fifth IPCC report. We use RCP4.5 (an emissions stabilization scenario) and RCP8.5 (a scenario with intensive growth in fossil fuel emissions, namely "business-as-usual")[43-45] in line with literature. The dataset contains daily maximum and minimum temperatures at a spatial resolution of 0.25 degrees. Our projection is based on the median projected temperature and climate from the 21 models.

4. Summary statistics.

Table A1 shows the summary statistics about the variables used in this paper, providing two important messages. First, the overall 3-day energy intake for the entire sample was approximately 6398 kcal, with a protein intake of around 195 g. According to the *Chinese dietary reference intakes - Macronutrient (WS/T 578.1-2017)*, adults' recommended daily energy intake ranges from approximately 2100 to 3200 kcal, while the reference protein intake is about 55-65 g/day. Considering the inclusion of children in the sample, the average values for the entire sample may

exhibit slight deviations from those of the population aged 18 years and older. Consequently, the observed energy and protein intakes can be considered within the normal range.

Second, the average HDD (0.504°C) is lower than CDD (0.668°C). The maximum 3-day HDD is 45.79°C, but for CDD, it is 20.42°C. The survey timing largely influences the difference between CDD and HDD. Figure 1 (b) shows the CHNS survey month from 1991 to 2011. It's revealed that most surveys are concentrated from September to November. Therefore, most respondents encountered average temperatures ranging from 10 to 25°C, with a limited number of instances falling below 0°C or exceeding 30°C (see Figure 1 (c)). The summer daily temperature in Southern China can exceed 40°C; this temperature distribution of our sample may underestimate hot days since the survey periods do not overlap with extremely hot days in July and August.

Method.

1. Baseline model.

To investigate the effects of extreme temperatures on diet, we use the ordinary least squares (OLS) approach to estimate the following regression:

$$Y_{icymd} = \alpha + f(temp_{cymd}) + \beta W_{cymd} + \lambda_{ym} + \gamma_{pm} + \sigma_i + \epsilon_{icymd} \qquad (a)$$

where Y_{icymd} represent the outcome variables which we are interested in over the past three days for individual i in county c, year y, month m, and day d, including the total food consumption, macronutrient intake, proportion of energy from fat, high-fat diet index, and six groups of food and condiments. We use the logarithmic form of total consumption, energy, carbohydrates, proteins, and fat to explore the changes in growth rates due to extreme temperatures. As for the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diet index, we use the real value because they already represent the proportion. Each group of food and condiments has zero values (see Table A1) and is small. Thus, we use the real consumption value for each group as the outcome variable instead of the logarithm form after adding one.

$temp_{cymd}$ is the key independent variable, representing the daily average temperature. $f(temp_{cymd})$ represents a function of the $temp_{cymd}$. W_{cymd} is a vector of the 3-day average meteorological variables other than temperature, including precipitation, relative humidity, wind speed, and sunshine hours.

We add a series of fixed effects to rule out the omitted variable problem. Year-month fixed effects (λ_{ym}) control for time-variant but individual invariant factors, such as the level of economic development, the popularization of food, etc. Province-month fixed effects (γ_{pm}) control for province-by-month characters, such as regional dietary differences and temperature differences in different seasons. Individual fixed effects (σ_i) control for all unobservable time-invariant variables at the individual level, such as individual's food taste. ϵ_{icymd} is the error term, and the standard errors are clustered at the individual level.

2. Robustness analysis.

To ensure our results are convincing, we adopt a series of robustness tests, shown in Table A3 to Table A5. Specifically, we first estimate standard errors clustered within individuals and household-years to account for autocorrelation and household-by-year correlation of the error terms. Second, in addition to the fixed effects considered in the baseline model, we include the provincial wave trend, which allows different wave trends in each province. Third, we drop observations that we don't have an exact 3-day dietary intake survey. There are almost 35% observations only have a household survey date instead of the clear date of each day in the 3-day dietary surveys. We don't drop them in the baseline and use the household survey date as the final date of food surveys because the sample is relatively large. Fourth, we change the outcome variables to real value. Fifth, we take account of the potential bias brought by physical activities and different occupations. They can lead to various nutritional demands of individuals, but this information is incomplete throughout our whole study period in CHNS. Therefore, we only use this information in the robustness tests. More specifically, based on baseline regression, we added time trends for different jobs, whether or not to exercise, and the amount of time to exercise. These regression results are shown in Table A3.

Sixth, we change several cutoffs of extreme temperatures. Although the *Uniform standard* uses 5°C and 25°C as the suggested cutoffs, we try several different divisions, such as 4-26°C, 6-24°C and 10-20°C. Besides, we use the daily maximum and minimum temperature to calculate the 3-day cumulative CDD and HDD. Since the distributions of maximum temperature are significantly shifted to the right compared with the average temperature (as shown in Figure 1 (c)), the cutoff values are adjusted to 30°C for maximum temperature. These results shown in Table A4 are consistent with our baseline estimates.

Finally, we consider the non-linear effect of temperature on diet, which means the form of $f(temp_{cymd})$ is $\sum_k Tbin_{cymd}^k$. We generate several bins to capture the non-linear effect. Depending on the distribution of 3-day average temperature, we set 7 bins which are 0°C and below, (0°C, 3°C], (3°C, 6°C], (6°C, 24°C], (24°C, 27°C], (27°C, 30°C], and 30°C and above. To avoid complete multicollinearity problems, the temperature bin (6°C, 24°C] is dropped as the reference group, which is more suitable for human health and could make it easier to observe the effects of high and low temperatures. If the 3-day average temperature falls into the kth temperature bin, then $Tbin_{cymd}^k = 1$. Regression results are shown in Table A5.

3. Adaptation strategies.

We take all strategies (i.e., fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators) into consideration to estimate the effects of adaptation. There may be some endogeneity when installing these home appliances. Extreme temperatures may affect the work time[46,47] and income[48] of individuals, which determines the household purchasing power. Therefore, we use information on the respondents' initial per capita household income by year fixed effects to control for the impact of wealth. All the income variables are deflated by the management of CHNS, so they are comparable even though different households may enter the survey in different waves.

Since the CHNS questionnaire does not document the adoption of district heating systems in households, we use an alternative approach—whether the county respondents lived in a provided

collective heating service. Specifically, households are defined as having heating systems if their county offered collective heating services (i.e., in the south of the Qinling-Huaihe line) during the survey period from November to February. The regression model employed in this section is as follows:

$$Y_{icymd} = \alpha + f(temp_{cymd}) + f(temp_{cymd}) * mod_{it} + mod_{it} + \beta W_{cymd} + \lambda_{ym} + \gamma_{pm} + \sigma_i + \epsilon_{icymd} \quad (b)$$

where, mod_{it} represents a vector of adaptation technologies of individual i in year t, including whether there are fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators in the household. If the answer is yes, the dummy variable mod_{it} is 1; otherwise, 0. Because the fans, air conditioners, and heating systems always work in summer and winter, respectively, we only interact with them with CDD (for air conditioners and fans) and HDD (for heating systems). Air conditioners may be used for both heating and cooling. However, given the early time period of our study and the overall low rate of air conditioning ownership, we argue that people used air conditioning primarily for cooling during the study period. The remaining variables and symbols are the same as the ones in the equation (a).

4. Heterogeneous effects.

In heterogeneity analysis, we first focus on age and gender. Next, we compare people living in urban and rural areas. Third, we focus on the education level. China implemented nine years of compulsory education in the 1980s. Therefore, most people have junior high school diplomas. Since high school graduation requires an age of 18, we excluded the sample below 18 years old. We define highly educated people here as those who have earned a senior high school degree.

5. Projections.

Climate projections predict that global will experience more extremely hot days and fewer extremely cold days by the end of this century (see Figure 5 (b)). Hence, we try to predict the overall impact of temperature changes based on our baseline regression results (in Table A2) for each city j in Chinese mainland using the model as follows:

$$\Delta Y_j(\%) = \left(\hat{\beta}_{cdd} \times \Delta CDD_j + \hat{\beta}_{hdd} \times \Delta HDD_j\right) * 3 * 100 \quad (c)$$

where $\Delta Y_j(\%)$ indicates the temperature change impacts on food consumption and macronutrient intake of individuals in city c. $\hat{\beta}_{cdd}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{hdd}$ represent the estimated coefficient for 3-day CDD and 3-day HDD in our baseline regression, respectively. ΔCDD_j and ΔHDD_j are the predicted change of yearly-average 1-day CDD and HDD in city j. Here we consider the changes between our survey waves (i.e., 1991, 1993, 1997, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2009, and 2011) and 2080-2099.

We also consider the effect of adaptation strategies. This projection scenario assumes that each individual simultaneously has an air conditioner, fan, refrigerator, and heating system in the household. Not all individuals may be equipped with all adaptation methods (e.g., residents in South China may have no heating systems). Thus, the result in this scenario is a lower bar of the actual effect of extreme temperatures because we may overestimate the effects of adaptation behavior at the aggregate level. The model is as follows:

$$\Delta Y_j(\%) = [(\hat{\beta}_{cdd} + \hat{\beta}_{cdd*ac} + \hat{\beta}_{cdd*fan} + \hat{\beta}_{cdd*ref}) \times \Delta CDD_j + (\hat{\beta}_{hdd} + \hat{\beta}_{hdd*heat} + \hat{\beta}_{hdd*ref}) \times \Delta HDD_j] * 3 * 100 \quad (d)$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{cdd*ac}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{cdd*fan}$ represents the coefficient of 3-day CDD by air conditioners and fans in Table A7. $\hat{\beta}_{cdd*ref}$ represents the coefficient of 3-day CDD by refrigerators, and $\hat{\beta}_{hdd*ref}$ means the coefficient of interaction of 3-day HDD and refrigerators. $\hat{\beta}_{hdd*heat}$ represents the coefficient of 3-day HDD by heating systems. These four coefficients capture the effects of adaptation strategies.

Reference

1 Barrett, C. B. Overcoming Global Food Security Challenges through Science and Solidarity. *Am J Agr Econ* **103**, 422-447 (2021). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1111/ajae.12160

2 Burke, M. & Emerick, K. Adaptation to Climate Change: Evidence from US Agriculture. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **8**, 106-140 (2016). https://doi.org:10.1257/pol.20130025

3 Aragón, F. M. *et al.* Climate Change and Agriculture: Subsistence Farmers Response to Extreme Heat. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **13**, 1-35 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1257/pol.20190316

4 Miller, S. *et al.* Heat Waves, Climate Change, and Economic Output. *J Eur Econ Assoc* **19**, 2658-2694 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1093/jeea/jvab009

5 Deschênes, O. & Greenstone, M. The Economic Impacts of Climate Change: Evidence from Agricultural Output and Random Fluctuations in Weather. *American Economic Review* **97**, 354-385 (2007). https://doi.org:10.1257/aer.97.1.354

6 Costinot, A. *et al.* Evolving Comparative Advantage and the Impact of Climate Change in Agricultural Markets: Evidence from 1.7 Million Fields around the World. *Journal of Political Economy* **124**, 205-248 (2016). https://doi.org:10.1086/684719

7 Burke, M. *et al.* Global non-linear effect of temperature on economic production. *Nature* **527**, 235-239 (2015). https://doi.org:10.1038/nature15725

8 Chen, Z. *et al.* Adiposity and risk of ischaemic and haemorrhagic stroke in 0·5 million Chinese men and women: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Global Health* **6**, e630-e640 (2018). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30216-X

9 Kivimäki, M. *et al.* Body-mass index and risk of obesity-related complex multimorbidity: an observational multicohort study. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology* **10**, 253-263 (2022). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(22)00033-X

10 Blüher, M. Obesity: global epidemiology and pathogenesis. *Nature Reviews Endocrinology* **15**, 288-298 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41574-019-0176-8

11 Kahn, M. E. The Climate Change Adaptation Literature. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* **10**, 166-178 (2016). https://doi.org:10.1093/reep/rev023

12 Wang, L. *et al.* Elevated Fat Intake Increases Body Weight and the Risk of Overweight and Obesity among Chinese Adults: 1991–2015 Trends. *Nutrients* **12** (2020).

13 Soerjomataram, I. & Bray, F. Planning for tomorrow: global cancer incidence and the role of prevention 2020–2070. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology* **18**, 663-672 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41571-021-00514-z

14 Sung, H. *et al.* Emerging cancer trends among young adults in the USA: analysis of a population-based cancer registry. *The Lancet Public Health* **4**, e137-e147 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1016/S2468-2667(18)30267-6

15 Ng, M. *et al.* Global, regional, and national prevalence of adult overweight and obesity, 1990–2021, with forecasts to 2050: a forecasting study for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet* (2025). https://doi.org:10.1016/S0140-6736(25)00355-1

16 State Food and Nutrition Consultant Committee. *Nutrition list of main foods*, <https://sfncc.caas.cn/yyjk/37012.htm> (2004-10-16).

17 Yu, X. *et al.* Temperature effects on mortality and household adaptation: Evidence from China. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **96**, 195-212 (2019). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2019.05.004

18 Hua, Y. *et al.* The effects of temperature on mental health: evidence from China. *J Popul Econ* (2022). https://doi.org:10.1007/s00148-022-00932-y

19 Randazzo, T. *et al.* Adaptation to climate change: Air-conditioning and the role of remittances. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **120**, 102818 (2023). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2023.102818

20 Mullins, J. T. & White, C. Temperature and mental health: Evidence from the spectrum of mental health outcomes. *Journal of Health Economics* **68**, 102240 (2019). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2019.102240

21 Barreca, A. *et al.* Adapting to Climate Change: The Remarkable Decline in the US Temperature-Mortality Relationship over the Twentieth Century. *Journal of Political Economy* **124**, 105-159 (2016). https://doi.org:10.1086/684582

22 Davis, L. W. & Gertler, P. J. Contribution of air conditioning adoption to future energy use under global warming. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 5962-5967 (2015). https://doi.org:doi:10.1073/pnas.1423558112

23 Almond, D. *et al.* In Utero Ramadan Exposure and Children's Academic Performance. *The Economic Journal* **125**, 1501-1533 (2015). https://doi.org:10.1111/ecoj.12168

24 Chong, A. *et al.* Iron Deficiency and Schooling Attainment in Peru. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **8**, 222-255 (2016). https://doi.org:10.1257/app.20140494

25 Coffey, D. *et al.* Sanitation, Disease Externalities and Anaemia: Evidence From Nepal. *The Economic Journal* **128**, 1395-1432 (2018). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12491

26 Hjort, J. *et al.* Universal Investment in Infants and Long-Run Health: Evidence from Denmarks 1937 Home Visiting Program. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **9**, 78-104 (2017). https://doi.org:10.1257/app.20150087

27 Maluccio, J. A. *et al.* The Impact of Improving Nutrition During Early Childhood on Education among Guatemalan Adults*. *The Economic Journal* **119**, 734-763 (2009). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2009.02220.x

28 Liu, J. *et al.* Access to variety contributes to dietary diversity in China. *Food Policy* **49**, 323-331 (2014). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2014.09.007

29 Variyam, J. N. *et al.* Mothers Nutrition Knowledge and Childrens Dietary Intakes. *Am J Agr Econ* **81**, 373-384 (1999). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.2307/1244588

30 Variyam, J. N. *et al.* Characterizing the Distribution of Macronutrient Intake among U.S. Adults: A Quantile Regression Approach. *Am J Agr Econ* **84**, 454-466 (2002). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8276.00310

31 van Vuuren, D. P. *et al.* The representative concentration pathways: an overview. *Climatic Change* **109**, 5 (2011). https://doi.org:10.1007/s10584-011-0148-z

32 Phelps, N. H. *et al.* Worldwide trends in underweight and obesity from 1990 to 2022: a pooled analysis of 3663 population-representative studies with 222 million children, adolescents, and adults. *The Lancet* **403**, 1027-1050 (2024). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)02750-2

33 Okunogbe, A. *et al.* Economic impacts of overweight and obesity: current and future estimates for 161 countries. *BMJ Glob Health* **7** (2022). https://doi.org:10.1136/bmjgh-2022-009773

34 Wang, Y. *et al.* Health policy and public health implications of obesity in China. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology* **9**, 446-461 (2021). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00118-2

35 Barreca, A. *et al.* Convergence in Adaptation to Climate Change: Evidence from High Temperatures and Mortality, 1900-2004. *American Economic Review* **105**, 247-251 (2015). https://doi.org:10.1257/aer.p20151028

36 Ebi, K. L. *et al.* Hot weather and heat extremes: health risks. *The Lancet* **398**, 698-708 (2021). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01208-3

37 Hoegh-Guldberg, O. *et al.* The human imperative of stabilizing global climate change at 1.5°C. *Science* **365**, eaaw6974 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1126/science.aaw6974

38 Patz, J. A. *et al.* Impact of regional climate change on human health. *Nature* **438**, 310-317 (2005). https://doi.org:10.1038/nature04188

39 Huang, K. & Hong, Q. The impact of global warming on obesity. *J Popul Econ* **37**, 59 (2024). https://doi.org:10.1007/s00148-024-01039-2

40 Chen, S. *et al.* Impacts of climate change on agriculture: Evidence from China. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **76**, 105-124 (2016). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2015.01.005

41 Colmer, J. Temperature, Labor Reallocation, and Industrial Production: Evidence from India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **13**, 101-124 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1257/app.20190249

42 Chen, S. & Gong, B. Response and adaptation of agriculture to climate change: Evidence from China. *Journal of Development Economics* **148**, 102557 (2021). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2020.102557

43 Carleton, T. *et al.* Valuing the Global Mortality Consequences of Climate Change Accounting for Adaptation Costs and Benefits*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **137**, 2037-2105 (2022). https://doi.org:10.1093/qje/qjac020

44 Li, Y. *et al.* Climate change and residential electricity consumption in the Yangtze River Delta, China. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 472-477 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1073/pnas.1804667115

45 Lai, W. *et al.* Adaptation mitigates the negative effect of temperature shocks on household consumption. *Nature Human Behaviour* **6**, 837-846 (2022). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41562-022-01315-9

46 Heyes, A. & Saberian, S. Hot Days, the ability to Work and climate resilience: Evidence from a representative sample of 42,152 Indian households. *Journal of Development Economics* **155**, 102786 (2022). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2021.102786

47 Somanathan, E. *et al.* The Impact of Temperature on Productivity and Labor Supply: Evidence from Indian Manufacturing. *Journal of Political Economy* **129**, 1797-1827 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1086/713733

48 Carleton, T. A. Crop-damaging temperatures increase suicide rates in India. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, 8746-8751 (2017). https://doi.org:doi:10.1073/pnas.1701354114

49 Chen, X. *et al.* Differentiated agricultural sensitivity and adaptability to rising temperatures across regions and sectors in China. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **119**, 102801 (2023). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2023.102801

50 Wang, D. *et al.* Adaptation to temperature extremes in Chinese agriculture, 1981 to 2010. *Journal of Development Economics* **166**, 103196 (2024). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2023.103196

51 Cui, X. & Zhong, Z. Climate change, cropland adjustments, and food security: Evidence from China. *Journal of Development Economics* **167**, 103245 (2024). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2023.103245

52 Cui, X. & Tang, Q. Extreme heat and rural household adaptation: Evidence from Northeast China. *Journal of Development Economics* **167**, 103243 (2024). https://doi.org:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2023.103243

Appendix A: Data cleaning

1. Food and condiments consumption records.

Detailed food consumption information is collected using the 3-day recall method, with each food item assigned a corresponding food code from the Chinese Food Composition Table (FCT). To derive the average daily food consumption, we aggregate individual-level food consumption over the 3-day interview period and divide it by the total person-days for each type of food. Any observations with missing food codes are excluded from the analysis. For individuals with multiple records on the same day, we consider the highest number of person-days as the count. Only 1,512 of 3,040,836 observations have this problem. In the raw data, approximately 95.7% of person-days are recorded as 1, so we substitute the incorrect person-days with the value of 1. It is worth noting that while most individuals have complete 3-day records, some only have 1-day or 2-day records. We opt to drop these observations for two reasons. First, food consumption data from individuals with less than a 3-day record raise reliability concerns. Second, 1-day or 2-day records are more prone to measurement errors compared to 3-day records, which could potentially bias the estimation. We drop 27,792 of 3,040,836 observations in this step.

During the survey periods, three versions of the FCT were available, requiring the alignment of food codes with specific species. We classify all items into 12 distinct food categories, primarily aligning them with the current version of the FCT. These 12 categories encompass cereals, tubers, dried legumes, vegetables, fungi, fruits, nuts, meats, poultry, dairy products, eggs, and seafood. To ensure the accuracy of the data, individuals displaying extreme values are excluded from the analysis. Specifically, observations are omitted if the z-score for any food category exceeds 10. Furthermore, specific categories such as infant foods, ethnic cuisine, fast food, and beverages are disregarded due to the varying classifications and definitions across different versions of the FCT. We sum up all the 12 types of food consumed by the individual as one variable, i.e., total food consumption. Since CHNS only provides the total consumption amount of each household for the condiments, we average the total amount for everyone who eats at home.

We drop the data from the first and final surveys in our analysis for three reasons. First, the sample size in 1989 was relatively small compared with other waves. Only people aged 1-6 and 20-45 were collected in the food consumption survey. Second, the first wave lasted from 1989 to 1990. Finally, the official CHNS website does not provide information on food consumption and macronutrient intake for 2015. Before using the data in empirical analysis, we exclude observations in which the key dependent variables—total food consumption, carbohydrate, protein, and fat—fall outside the 0.5 to 99.5 percentile range.

Appendix B: Correlation of BMI with energy intake and dietary structure

We use the OLS approach to reveal the correlation of BMI with energy intake and dietary structure. We estimate the following regression:

$$Y_{icymd} = \alpha + \beta_1 Cal_{icymd} + \delta Fat_{icymd} + \lambda_{ym} + \gamma_{pm} + \sigma_i + \epsilon_{icymd} \qquad (e)$$

where Y_{icymd} represent the BMI of adult (age ≥ 18) i in county c, measured at year y, month m, and day d. Cal_{icymd} are the amount of calorie intake of adult i over the past three days. Fat_{icymd} represent the fat-related variables, including the real amount of fat intake, the proportion of energy from fat, or the probability of having a high-fat diet. The remaining variables and symbols are the same as the ones in the equation (a).

Table A11 shows the regression results, and reveals three messages. First, energy intake is highly correlated with BMI. People who intake more calories tend to have a higher BMI. Second, both the amount of fat intake and the proportion of energy from fat are statistically associated with BMI. Third, people who have a high-fat diet are more likely to have a high BMI.

Appendix Figures



Figure A1. End-of-century projections by city for food consumption and macronutrient intake. This figure shows the predicted impact of extreme temperature for each city in 2080-2099 relative to CHNS survey waves. Due to the limited coverage of provinces of CHNS (see Figure 1), results based on this database may not be representative of the national average, especially in the Northwest region and the Tibetan Plateau. Therefore, we remove Qinghai, Tibet, and Xinjiang provinces from the forecast. Panel A and panel C show the projection results based on the equation (c) under the climate scenario RCP4.5 and RCP8.5, respectively. Panel B and D show the projection results based on the equation (d), which considers the adaptation effects of the fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators under the climate scenarios RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. All the scales in subgraphs are uniform. Red means the proportion or probability will increase, while blue shows the opposite effect.

[Back to page 10]

Table 4. Individual Record of Daily Food

Household ID: _ _ Province (T1) _ Site (T2) _ City/County (T3) _ _ Neighborhood/Village (T4) _ _ _ HH (T5)

Name:_____ Line Number:_____ _ _ _A1

Interview Day: 1. Day 1 2. Day 2 3. Day 3 _VD

Person-Day _._V35a

Interview Date: _____Year _____Month _____Day _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ T7

1 Item Number **V40**	2 Meal **V40**	3 Recipe Name	4 Ingredient Name	5 Ingredient Code **V14b**	6 Amount (gm) **V39a**	7 Edible Portion? **V39b**	8 Processed food? **V39c**	9 Meal Location **V41**	10 Preparation Method **V42**	11 Preparation Location **V43**
1	_			_ _ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_	_	_	_	_
2	_			_ _ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_	_	_	_	_
3	_			_ _ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_	_	_	_	_
4	_			_ _ _ _ _ _	_ _ _ _	_	_	_	_	_

Figure A2. CHNS questionnaire: Food consumption (2011 version). This figure shows part of the CHNS questionnaire.

[Back to page 12]

Appendix Tables

Table A1. Descriptive statistics

Variables	Unit	Number	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Total consumption	100g/3-day	91,570	30.58	10.67	6.750	72.73
Energy	100kcal/3-day	92,500	63.98	20.20	12.34	155.2
Carbohydrate	100g/3-day	93,899	9.705	3.764	2.151	23.78
Protein	100g/3-day	93,900	1.953	0.697	0.451	4.581
Fat	100g/3-day	93,899	1.929	1.056	0.156	6.365
Proportion of energy from fat	-	92,500	0.272	0.115	0.0181	0.780
High-fat diet	-	92,500	0.395	0.489	0	1
Cereal, tuber and dried legumes	100g/3-day	91,570	15.54	6.580	0	60.50
Vegetable, fruit and fungus	100g/3-day	91,570	10.85	6.076	0	55.70
Seafood, meat and poultry	100g/3-day	91,570	3.110	3.146	0	34.03
Milk, egg and nut	100g/3-day	91,570	1.072	1.810	0	21.90
Sugar and salt	100g/3-day	64,627	0.328	0.255	0	2.946
Oil	100g/3-day	64,924	1.137	0.774	0	6
BMI	-	68,933	22.75	3.287	14.79	39.37
Urban	-	102,089	0.292	0.455	0	1
High school	-	77,630	0.223	0.416	0	1
Age	Year	102,931	36.85	20.91	0	101
Male	-	102,942	0.497	0.500	0	1
Air conditioner	-	102,942	0.137	0.344	0	1
Fan	-	102,942	0.749	0.434	0	1
Refrigerator	-	102,942	0.403	0.490	0	1
Heating system	-	102,942	0.0799	0.271	0	1
3-day CDD	°C	102,942	0.668	2.433	0	20.42
3-day HDD	°C	102,942	0.504	2.913	0	45.79
3-day average humility	%	102,942	73.39	11.09	31.76	98.12
3-day average precipitation	mm	102,942	1.948	3.874	0	33.16
3-day average wind speed	m/s	102,942	1.838	0.843	0.140	6.630
3-day average sunshine duration	h	102,942	5.356	3.104	0	12.09

Notes: This table shows the statistics of key variables in the empirical analysis. The variables related to food and macronutrient calculate the total consumption in the past 3 days, and the units are in 100g (or 100 kcal).

[Back to page 13]

Table A2. Baseline results

Variables	(1) Total consumption	(2) Energy	(3) Carbohydrate	(4) Protein	(5) Fat	(6) Proportion of energy from fat	(7) High-fat diet
3-day CDD	-0.0027***	-0.0029***	-0.0039***	-0.0059***	0.0003	0.0009***	0.0046***
	(0.0009)	(0.0008)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)	(0.0015)	(0.0003)	(0.0013)
3-day HDD	0.0015**	0.0015**	0.0010	0.0015**	0.0034***	0.0003	0.0018*
	(0.0007)	(0.0006)	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0010)	(0.0002)	(0.0010)
Observations	85,236	86,147	87,612	87,593	87,584	86,147	86,147
R-squared	0.4691	0.5077	0.5723	0.4782	0.4809	0.5361	0.4354
Dep. Var. Mean	30.58	63.98	9.705	1.953	1.929	0.272	0.395

Notes: (1) We use the logarithmic form of total consumption, energy, carbohydrate, protein and fat to explore the changes in growth rates due to heat and cold. As for the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diet index, we use the real value because they are already representing the proportion. (2) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (3) Standard errors shown in parentheses are clustered at the individual level. (4) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. (5) The observations are smaller than those in the descriptive statistics because single observations (singleton observations) are removed during the estimation process. (6) Dep. Var. Mean shows the mean of Y in real values, instead of log(Y).

[Back to page 4]

Table A3. Robustness tests

Variables	(1) Total consumption	(2) Energy	(3) Carbohydrate	(4) Protein	(5) Fat	(6) Proportion of energy from fat	(7) High-fat diet
Panel A							
3-day CDD	-0.0027**	-0.0029***	-0.0039***	-0.0059***	0.0003	0.0009**	0.0046***
	(0.0013)	(0.0010)	(0.0012)	(0.0012)	(0.0021)	(0.0004)	(0.0018)
3-day HDD	0.0015	0.0015*	0.0010	0.0015*	0.0034**	0.0003	0.0018
	(0.0010)	(0.0008)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)	(0.0014)	(0.0003)	(0.0013)
Panel B							
3-day CDD	-0.0025***	-0.0029***	-0.0038***	-0.0057***	0.0003	0.0009***	0.0047***
	(0.0009)	(0.0008)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)	(0.0015)	(0.0003)	(0.0013)
3-day HDD	0.0021***	0.0024***	0.0018**	0.0026***	0.0041***	0.0003	0.0018*
	(0.0007)	(0.0006)	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0011)	(0.0002)	(0.0010)
Panel C							
3-day CDD	-0.0014	-0.0027***	-0.0030***	-0.0051***	-0.0010	0.0005	0.0037**
	(0.0010)	(0.0008)	(0.0010)	(0.0010)	(0.0016)	(0.0003)	(0.0015)
3-day HDD	0.0051***	0.0015*	0.0005	0.0022**	0.0052***	0.0006**	0.0017
	(0.0009)	(0.0008)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)	(0.0014)	(0.0003)	(0.0013)
Panel D							
3-day CDD	-0.0672**	-0.1699***	-0.0317***	-0.0109***	-0.0006		
	(0.0270)	(0.0459)	(0.0074)	(0.0016)	(0.0027)		
3-day HDD	0.0452**	0.1036***	0.0135**	0.0025*	0.0046**		
	(0.0214)	(0.0388)	(0.0064)	(0.0013)	(0.0020)		
Panel E							
3-day CDD	-0.0023*	-0.0020**	-0.0037***	-0.0049***	0.0014	0.0011***	0.0046**
	(0.0012)	(0.0010)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0021)	(0.0004)	(0.0019)
3-day HDD	0.0024***	0.0023***	0.0017*	0.0017**	0.0047***	0.0004	0.0027**
	(0.0009)	(0.0008)	(0.0009)	(0.0009)	(0.0014)	(0.0003)	(0.0014)

Notes: (1) We use the logarithmic form of total consumption, energy, carbohydrate, protein and fat to explore changes in growth rates due to heat and cold except panel D. As for the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diet index, we use the real value because they already represent the proportion. (2) In panel A, the standard errors are clustered within individuals and household-year; in panel B, we add provincial-wave linear trends; in panel C, we drop observations that do not have an exact date of each day in 3-day dietary intake survey; in panel D, we change the explained variables to real values; in Panel E, we added time trends for different jobs, whether or not to exercise, fitness, and the amount of time to exercise. (3) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (4) Standard errors shown in parentheses except in scenario 1 are clustered at the individual level. (5) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

[Back to page 6]

Table A4. Robustness tests – different temperature definition

Variables	(1) Total consumption	(2) Energy	(3) Carbohydrate	(4) Protein	(5) Fat	(6) Proportion of energy from fat	(7) High-fat diet
Cutoff: Ave-temp 4-26°C							
3-day CDD	-0.0020*	-0.0027***	-0.0049***	-0.0058***	0.0032*	0.0016***	0.0074***
	(0.0012)	(0.0010)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0019)	(0.0003)	(0.0017)
3-day HDD	0.0015*	0.0011	0.0005	0.0012	0.0035***	0.0004*	0.0023**
	(0.0008)	(0.0007)	(0.0008)	(0.0008)	(0.0012)	(0.0002)	(0.0011)
Cutoff: Ave-temp 6-24°C							
3-day CDD	-0.0032***	-0.0032***	-0.0036***	-0.0059***	-0.0017	0.0005**	0.0031***
	(0.0007)	(0.0006)	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0012)	(0.0002)	(0.0010)
3-day HDD	0.0013**	0.0017***	0.0014**	0.0017***	0.0030***	0.0002	0.0012
	(0.0006)	(0.0006)	(0.0006)	(0.0006)	(0.0009)	(0.0002)	(0.0009)
Cutoff: Ave-temp 10-20°C							
3-day CDD	-0.0014***	-0.0015***	-0.0017***	-0.0026***	-0.0005	0.0002**	0.0020***
	(0.0004)	(0.0003)	(0.0004)	(0.0004)	(0.0006)	(0.0001)	(0.0005)
3-day HDD	0.0010***	0.0018***	0.0018***	0.0019***	0.0022***	-0.0000	-0.0003
	(0.0004)	(0.0003)	(0.0004)	(0.0004)	(0.0006)	(0.0001)	(0.0005)
Cutoff: Max-temp 30°C, min-temp 5°C							
3-day CDD	-0.0037***	-0.0032***	-0.0040***	-0.0056***	0.0000	0.0008***	0.0033***
	(0.0007)	(0.0006)	(0.0007)	(0.0007)	(0.0011)	(0.0002)	(0.0010)
3-day HDD	0.0018***	0.0012***	0.0012***	0.0018***	0.0022***	0.0000	0.0001
	(0.0004)	(0.0004)	(0.0004)	(0.0004)	(0.0006)	(0.0001)	(0.0006)

Notes: (1) We use the logarithmic form of total consumption, energy, carbohydrate, protein and fat to explore the changes in growth rates due to heat and cold. As for the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diet index, we use the real value because they already represent the proportion. (2) In this table, we change the cutoff standard used in baseline regression. Ave-temp, max-temp, min-temp mean daily average temperature, daily maximum temperature and daily minimum temperature, respectively. (3) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (4) Standard errors shown in parentheses are clustered at the individual level. (5) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

[Back to page 6]

Table A5. Robustness tests – temperature bins

Variables	(1) Total consumption	(2) Energy	(3) Carbohydrate	(4) Protein	(5) Fat	(6) Proportion of energy from fat	(7) High-fat diet
≤0°C	0.0111	0.0050	-0.0154	0.0073	0.0686***	0.0115**	0.0339
	(0.0174)	(0.0146)	(0.0162)	(0.0160)	(0.0242)	(0.0045)	(0.0213)
(0°C, 3°C]	0.0097	0.0856***	0.0844***	0.0381***	0.0941***	0.0027	0.0161
	(0.0144)	(0.0131)	(0.0144)	(0.0143)	(0.0221)	(0.0040)	(0.0196)
(3°C, 6°C]	0.0114	0.0552***	0.0607***	0.0505***	0.0376***	-0.0027	-0.0139
	(0.0086)	(0.0074)	(0.0086)	(0.0083)	(0.0125)	(0.0025)	(0.0124)
(24°C, 27°C]	-0.0536***	-0.0388***	-0.0311***	-0.0541***	-0.0508***	-0.0031*	-0.0002
	(0.0057)	(0.0050)	(0.0057)	(0.0057)	(0.0093)	(0.0017)	(0.0078)
(27°C, 30°C]	-0.0568***	-0.0390***	-0.0335***	-0.0754***	-0.0181	0.0032	0.0120
	(0.0102)	(0.0086)	(0.0097)	(0.0099)	(0.0162)	(0.0030)	(0.0141)
>30°C	-0.0435**	-0.0658***	-0.1106***	-0.1007***	0.0425	0.0292***	0.1455***
	(0.0179)	(0.0152)	(0.0175)	(0.0171)	(0.0274)	(0.0054)	(0.0258)
Observations	85,236	86,147	87,612	87,593	87,584	86,147	86,147
R-squared	0.4698	0.5087	0.5730	0.4790	0.4813	0.5363	0.4357
Dep. Var. Mean	30.58	63.98	9.705	1.953	1.929	0.272	0.395

Notes: (1) We use the logarithmic form of total consumption, energy, carbohydrate, protein and fat to explore the changes in growth rates due to heat and cold. As for the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diet index, we use the real value because they already represent the proportion. (2) Temperature bins are defined by whether past 3-day's average temperature falls into the specific bin. (3) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (4) Standard errors shown in parentheses are clustered at the individual level. (5) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. (6) The observations are smaller than that in the descriptive statistics because single observations (singleton observations) are removed during the estimation process. (7) Dep. Var. Mean shows the mean of Y in real values, instead of log(Y).

[Back to page 6]

Table A6. Different foods

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Variables	Cereal, tuber and dried legumes	Vegetable, fruit and fungus	Seafood, meat and poultry
3-day CDD	-0.0244*	-0.0114	-0.0367***
	(0.0132)	(0.0175)	(0.0072)
3-day HDD	-0.0074	0.0327***	0.0045
	(0.0132)	(0.0123)	(0.0047)
Observations	85,236	85,236	85,236
R-squared	0.5327	0.3895	0.5732
Dep. Var. Mean	15.54	10.85	3.110
	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Milk, egg and nut	Sugar and salt	Oil
3-day CDD	0.0053	0.0003	-0.0002
	(0.0038)	(0.0007)	(0.0022)
3-day HDD	0.0153***	-0.0014**	0.0041**
	(0.0050)	(0.0006)	(0.0021)
Observations	85,236	58,133	58,441
R-squared	0.5276	0.4302	0.3965
Dep. Var. Mean	15.54	10.85	3.110

Notes: (1) We use the real values as dependent variables in the regression because there are zeros in each of the outcome variables. (2) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (3) Standard errors shown in parentheses are clustered at the individual level. (4) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. (5) The observations are smaller than those in the descriptive statistics because single observations (singleton observations) are removed during the estimation process. (6) Dep. Var. Mean shows the mean of Y, which is the real value of each type of food in total food consumption, measured in 100g/3-day.

[Back to page 6]

Table A7. Adaptation effects

Variables	(1) Total consumption	(2) Energy	(3) Carbohydrate	(4) Protein	(5) Fat	(6) Proportion of energy from fat	(7) High-fat diet
3-day CDD	-0.0092***	-0.0077***	-0.0113***	-0.0118***	0.0057	0.0029***	0.0096***
	(0.0025)	(0.0020)	(0.0023)	(0.0022)	(0.0036)	(0.0006)	(0.0028)
3-day HDD	0.0097***	0.0104***	0.0101***	0.0069***	0.0149***	0.0008*	0.0030
	(0.0016)	(0.0014)	(0.0015)	(0.0016)	(0.0024)	(0.0004)	(0.0021)
3-day CDD * fan	0.0064***	0.0053***	0.0079***	0.0081***	-0.0040	-0.0020***	-0.0044
	(0.0024)	(0.0020)	(0.0023)	(0.0022)	(0.0035)	(0.0006)	(0.0028)
3-day CDD * ac	-0.0019	-0.0022	-0.0026	-0.0022	-0.0052**	-0.0001	-0.0002
	(0.0015)	(0.0014)	(0.0017)	(0.0015)	(0.0022)	(0.0005)	(0.0023)
3-day HDD * heat	-0.0118***	-0.0121***	-0.0131***	-0.0076***	-0.0147***	-0.0004	-0.0009
	(0.0018)	(0.0016)	(0.0018)	(0.0018)	(0.0027)	(0.0005)	(0.0024)
3-day CDD * ref	0.0030**	0.0013	0.0023*	-0.0018	-0.0016	-0.0004	-0.0019
	(0.0012)	(0.0011)	(0.0014)	(0.0012)	(0.0019)	(0.0004)	(0.0019)
3-day HDD * ref	0.0023**	0.0017*	0.0027***	0.0011	0.0007	-0.0004	-0.0009
	(0.0011)	(0.0009)	(0.0010)	(0.0011)	(0.0016)	(0.0003)	(0.0014)
Observations	84,750	85,644	87,103	87,084	87,075	85,644	85,644
R-squared	0.4711	0.5102	0.5743	0.4808	0.4857	0.5395	0.4372
Dep. Var. Mean	30.58	63.98	9.705	1.953	1.929	0.272	0.395

Notes: (1) This table shows the adaptation effects of three types of adaptation strategies. Fan, ac, heat, and ref refer to whether there are fans, air conditioners, heating systems, and refrigerators in the households in each wave. (2) We use the logarithmic form of total consumption, energy, carbohydrate, protein and fat to explore the changes in growth rates due to heat and cold. As for the proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diet index, we use the real value because they already represent the proportion. (3) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (4) Standard errors shown in parentheses are clustered at the individual level. (5) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. (6) The observations are smaller than those in the descriptive statistics because single observations (singleton observations) are removed during the estimation process. (7) Dep. Var. Mean shows the mean of Y in real values, instead of log(Y).

[Back to page 7]

Table A8. Heterogeneous effects

Variables	(1) Proportion of energy from fat	(2) High-fat diet
Panel A – Age group		
3-day CDD * children	0.0008	0.0032
	(0.0005)	(0.0022)
3-day CDD * adult	0.0012***	0.0057***
	(0.0003)	(0.0015)
3-day CDD * elder	0.0002	0.0026
	(0.0004)	(0.0021)
3-day HDD * children	0.0011***	0.0062***
	(0.0004)	(0.0020)
3-day HDD * adult	0.0003	0.0018*
	(0.0002)	(0.0011)
3-day HDD * elder	-0.0002	-0.0016
	(0.0004)	(0.0019)
Panel B – Gender		
3-day CDD * female	0.0009***	0.0051***
	(0.0003)	(0.0015)
3-day CDD * male	0.0009***	0.0042***
	(0.0003)	(0.0015)
3-day HDD * female	0.0004*	0.0016
	(0.0003)	(0.0012)
3-day HDD * male	0.0002	0.0020*
	(0.0002)	(0.0012)
Panel C – Rural and urban		
3-day CDD * rural	0.0010***	0.0051***
	(0.0003)	(0.0014)
3-day CDD * urban	-0.0002	0.0013
	(0.0004)	(0.0021)
3-day HDD * rural	0.0009***	0.0042***
	(0.0003)	(0.0012)
3-day HDD * urban	-0.0004	-0.0014
	(0.0003)	(0.0013)
Panel D – Education		
3-day CDD * non-high school	0.0009***	0.0050***
	(0.0003)	(0.0015)
3-day CDD * high school	0.0004	0.0014
	(0.0005)	(0.0026)
3-day HDD * non-high school	0.0004	0.0018
	(0.0003)	(0.0013)
3-day HDD * high school	0.0002	0.0011
	(0.0003)	(0.0015)

Notes: (1) Each panel shows the regression results of different heterogeneity analysis. (2) We use the real value of proportion of energy from fat and high-fat diet index, because they are already representing the meaning of proportion. (3) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (4) Standard errors shown in parentheses are clustered at the individual level. (5) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

[Back to page 8]

Table A9. Descriptive statistics in rural, urban and different education groups

Variables	Unit	Rural	Urban	diff	t-value
Total consumption	100g/3-day	30.82	30.09	0.729	9.425***
Energy	100kcal/3-day	64.80	62.16	2.643	18.179***
Carbohydrate	100g/3-day	10.16	8.681	1.475	55.594***
Protein	100g/3-day	1.937	1.994	-0.0580	-11.574***
Fat	100g/3-day	1.828	2.163	-0.336	-44.825***
Proportion of energy from fat	-	0.255	0.311	-0.0560	-68.852***
High-fat diet	-	0.334	0.532	-0.198	-57.249***
Cereal, tuber and dried legumes	100g/3-day	16.18	14.09	2.095	44.327***
Vegetable, fruit and fungus	100g/3-day	11.09	10.34	0.757	17.185***
Seafood, meat and poultry	100g/3-day	2.702	4.067	-1.366	-61.047***
Milk, egg and nut	100g/3-day	0.845	1.602	-0.757	-58.694***
Sugar and salt	100g/3-day	0.327	0.331	-0.00300	-1.499
Oil	100g/3-day	1.118	1.179	-0.0610	-9.109***
Air conditioner	-	0.0950	0.240	-0.146	-62.672***
Fan	-	0.710	0.843	-0.134	-45.155***
Refrigerator	-	0.300	0.653	-0.353	-110.679***
Heating system	-	0.0770	0.0850	-0.00700	-3.829***
		No high school	High school	diff	t-value
Total consumption	100g/3-day	31.94	32.82	-0.881	-9.393***
Energy	100kcal/3-day	67.19	65.75	1.442	8.197***
Carbohydrate	100g/3-day	10.36	9.152	1.207	36.332***
Protein	100g/3-day	2.025	2.135	-0.109	-17.916***
Fat	100g/3-day	1.976	2.310	-0.333	-35.104***
Proportion of energy from fat	-	0.266	0.314	-0.0480	-46.331***
High-fat diet	-	0.370	0.548	-0.178	-40.381***
Cereal, tuber and dried legumes	100g/3-day	16.67	14.97	1.704	28.818***
Vegetable, fruit and fungus	100g/3-day	11.39	11.58	-0.191	-3.430***
Seafood, meat and poultry	100g/3-day	2.975	4.529	-1.554	-53.509***
Milk, egg and nut	100g/3-day	0.901	1.741	-0.841	-53.141***
Sugar and salt	100g/3-day	0.333	0.322	0.0110	4.062***
Oil	100g/3-day	1.151	1.193	-0.0430	-5.237***
Air conditioner	-	0.111	0.296	-0.185	-61.069***
Fan	-	0.736	0.824	-0.0880	-23.775***
Refrigerator	-	0.352	0.706	-0.354	-86.875***
Heating system	-	0.0770	0.0950	-0.0180	-7.805***

Notes: (1) This table shows the mean value of outcome variables and four major adaptation appliances between four subgroups. (2) The unit of food and macronutrients are shown in the table. (3) The mean value of adaptation variables could be seen as the owning rate in each subgroup.

[Back to page 9]

Table A10. Examples of the effect of extreme temperature on agriculture in literature

Article	Area	Time period	Results
Burke and Emerick[2]	U.S.	1980-2000	(1) Each extra degree-day of heat above 29°C leads to a 0.44% reduction in total corn yield.
Chen, et al.[40]	China	2000-2009	(1) Crop yields have nonlinear and inverted U-shaped relationships with weather variables. (2) Over the research period, global warming has led to an economic loss of approximately $820 million for China's corn and soybean sectors.
Aragón, et al.[3]	Pure	2007-2015	(1) Extreme temperatures are associated with reductions in agricultural productivity, but increase in area planted, which means farmers partially offset the decline in output by increasing the area planted. (2) Each additional average cumulative exposure to temperatures above 33°C during the growing season results in a 7% decrease in agricultural productivity, and a 6% increase in planting area.
Chen and Gong[42]	China	1981-2015	(1) In short run, an additional one-day cumulative exposure to temperatures above 33°C during the whole year leads to a 2.6% decrease on agricultural TFP, and a 4.4% decrease on yield. (2) The long-run impact of extreme heating on TFP and agricultural yield is about 1.6% and 2.3%, respectively.
Miller, et al.[4]	Global	1979-2016	(1) An abnormally hot day (defined as a cell-level median (mean) of 89 (86) °F) not far from preceded by at least eight others reduces per-capita agricultural value added by approximately 1.7%.
Chen, et al.[49]	China	1995-2015	(1) An additional one-day exposure to temperatures above 35°C would lower the aggregate output of northern agriculture by about 4.95%, relative to the reference bin (10-15°C). (2) The reduction in aggregate output is mostly driven by cropping, livestock, and fishery sectors, with output value losses of 2.58%, 2.61%, and 2.11%, respectively. (3) There's no significant impact of temperature on agricultural output in southern China.
Wang, et al.[50]	China	1981-2010	(1) During 1981-1995, an additional 100-degree-day exposure to temperatures above 28°C led to a 23% loss in corn yield, while the corresponding estimate in 1996-2010 is -11.5%. (2) During 1981-1995, an additional 100-degree-day exposure to temperatures above 26°C led to a 15.7% loss in soybean yield, while the corresponding estimate in 1996-2010 is -8.3%.

			(3) The overall impacts of 100-day exposure to extreme high temperatures on corn and soybean yields in 1996 to 2010 is 40% to 50% less than that in the period of 1981 to 1995. This results in a loss reduction by about 14.5% of the national corn production and 7% of national soybean production.
Cui and Zhong[51]	China	1981-2015	(1) In cold regions where the average temperature in 1980 was below 10°C, a 0.1°C increase in the 30-year average temperature leads to a 2.4% expansion in cropland. (2) In mild regions, where the initial temperature ranges between 10-20°C, a 0.1°C long-term warming decreases total cropland areas by 1.2%. (3) This negative impact in hot regions is about 1.9% per 0.1°C.
Cui and Tang[52]	Northeast China	2004-2014	(1) An additional degree-day accumulated above 32°C in growing season (i.e., April to October) reduces corn yields by approximately 5.4% and household total corn outputs by about 5.0%. (2) This also leads to a reduction in aggregate farm revenue and net household income for corn households by 2.9% and 2.1%, respectively.

Notes: This table shows some of the results about the effects of extreme temperatures on agriculture in literature.

[Back to page 12]

Table A11. Correlation between BMI and nutrient intake

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Variables	BMI	BMI	BMI
Fat	0.0300***		
	(0.0106)		
Proportion of energy from fat		0.1379*	
		(0.0812)	
High-fat diet			0.0526***
			(0.0168)
Energy	0.0012*	0.0022***	0.0021***
	(0.0006)	(0.0005)	(0.0005)
Observations	60,461	60,461	60,461
R-squared	0.8423	0.8423	0.8423
Dep. Var. Mean	22.75	22.75	22.75

Notes: (1) We use the BMI of adults (age ≥ 18) as the outcome variables. (2) Individual fixed effects, year-month fixed effects, and province-month fixed effects are involved in all regressions. (3) Standard errors shown in parentheses are clustered at the individual level. (4) * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. (5) The observations are smaller than those in the descriptive statistics because single observations (singleton observations) are removed during the estimation process. (6) Dep. Var. Mean shows the mean of BMI in adults.

[Back to page 23]