

Supplementary Material

Table S1. Socio-demographic characteristics of completers and non-completers plus drop-out analysis.

| Socio-demographic characteristics | Completers (N = 230) | Non-completers (N = 251) | Logistic regression DV ¹ = completion of diary study | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | M(SD) / N (%) | M(SD) / N (%) | OR ² | CI ³ |
| Age | 42.70 (17.25%) | 38.04 (16.68%) | 1.00 | 0.98 – 1.01 |
| Sex | | | | |
| Male | 135 (58.7%) | 133 (52.99) | Reference | |
| Female | 95 (41.30%) | 118 (47.01) | 1.34 | 0.90 – 1.99 |
| Employment status | | | | |
| Full-time | 102 (44.35%) | 125 (49.80) | Reference | |
| Part-time | 36 (15.65%) | 28 (11.16) | 1.99* | 1.09 – 3.68 |
| In education | 24 (10.43%) | 50 (19.92) | 0.67 | 0.35 – 1.24 |
| Non-working | 67 (29.13%) | 47 (18.73) | 2.05* | 1.15 – 3.71 |
| Missing | 1 (0.43%) | 1 (0.40) | 1.32 | 0.05 – 37.06 |
| Household composition | | | | |
| Other adults in the household | | | | |
| No | 37 (16.09%) | 49 (19.52%) | Reference | |
| Yes | 177 (76.96%) | 184 (73.31%) | 1.51 | 0.89 – 2.58 |
| Missing | 16 (6.96%) | 18 (7.17%) | 2.09 | 0.81 – 5.43 |
| Children in the household | | | | |
| No | 147 (63.91%) | 131 (52.19%) | Reference | |
| Yes | 47 (20.43%) | 68 (27.09%) | 0.57* | 0.35 – 0.94 |
| Missing | 36 (15.65%) | 52 (20.72%) | 0.56 | 0.31 – 1.00 |
| Monthly household net-income | | | | |
| ≤EUR 450 | 5 (2.17%) | 6 (2.39%) | 0.91 | 0.23 – 3.45 |
| EUR 450–<1500 | 42 (18.26%) | 54 (21.51%) | 0.82 | 0.46 – 1.44 |
| EUR 1500–<2500 | 64 (27.83%) | 68 (27.09%) | Reference | |
| EUR 2500–<4000 | 71 (30.87%) | 75 (29.88%) | 1.13 | 0.69 – 1.86 |
| ≥EUR 4000 | 44 (19.13%) | 41 (16.33%) | 1.42 | 0.79 – 2.58 |
| Missing | 4 (1.74%) | 7 (2.79%) | 0.76 | 0.18 – 2.84 |

¹ DV = dependent variable. ² OR = odds ratios. ³ CI = confidence intervals. * indicates $p < .05$.

Our analysis indicated differences in drop-out rates for the socio-demographic characteristics of employment and children in the household: there was a higher drop-out rate among participants who worked full-time compared to participants who worked part-time or not at all. Possible explanations could be that financial incentives were less important for full-time employees, while simultaneously less time was available due to employment. Further, there was a higher drop-out rate among participants with children living in the household compared to participants without children in the household. Reasons for this might include having less available time to complete the survey or difficulties meeting the survey deadlines. Future research should increase incentives or facilitate participation for these subgroups.

Table S2. Description of the clusters for breakfast.

| Cl ¹ | <i>n</i> _{breakfasts} ² | <i>n</i> _{participants} ³ | Situational dimensions | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | Location Mode (%) | Hunger Mode (%) | Social Mode (%) | Activity Mode (%) | Affect ⁴ Mode (%) |
| 1 | 258 | 104 | Home (100) | Satiated (100) | Alone (100) | With activity (55) | Low NA (52) |
| 2 | 191 | 82 | Home (100) | Hungry (100) | Alone (100) | With activity (58) | High NA (54) |
| 3 | 133 | 57 | Home (100) | Satiated (58) | With others (100) | Without activity (63) | Low NA (100) |
| 4 | 104 | 48 | Home (100) | Hungry (53) | With others (100) | With activity (55) | High NA (100) |
| 5 | 50 | 24 | Out of home (100) | Hungry (50) | Alone (78) | With activity (88) | High NA (74) |
| 6 | 34 | 15 | Out of home (100) | Hungry (65) | With others (76) | Without activity (97) | Low NA (76) |

¹ Cl = Cluster.² *n*_{breakfasts} = Number of breakfasts per cluster. The total number of breakfasts was *N*_{breakfast} = 770.³ *n*_{participants} = Number of participants who ate at least one breakfast in the respective cluster. In the analysis, we only included participants who ate at least one breakfast during the observed period (*N*_{participants} = 191).⁴ NA = Negative affect.**Table S3.** Description of the clusters for lunch.

| Cl ¹ | <i>n</i> _{lunches} ² | <i>n</i> _{participants} ³ | Situational dimensions | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | Location Mode (%) | Hunger Mode (%) | Social Mode (%) | Activity Mode (%) | Affect ⁴ Mode (%) |
| 1 | 200 | 77 | Home (100) | Satiated (56) | With others (56) | Without activity (100) | Low NA (100) |
| 2 | 157 | 75 | Home (100) | Satiated (57) | Alone (100) | With activity (59) | High NA (100) |
| 3 | 139 | 66 | Home (100) | Satiated (50) | Alone (64) | With activity (100) | Low NA (100) |
| 4 | 103 | 52 | Home (100) | Satiated (62) | With others (100) | Without activity (56) | High NA (100) |
| 5 | 77 | 37 | Out of home (100) | Hungry (100) | Alone (51) | Without activity (100) | High NA (55) |
| 6 | 50 | 31 | Out of home (100) | Satiated (100) | With others (56) | Without activity (100) | Low NA (62) |
| 7 | 43 | 30 | Out of home (100) | Satiated (53) | With others (51) | With activity (100) | High NA (100) |
| 8 | 25 | 16 | Out of home (100) | Hungry (56) | Alone (52) | With activity (100) | Low NA (100) |

¹ Cl = Cluster.² *n*_{lunches} = Number of lunches per cluster. The total number of lunches was *N*_{lunches} = 794.³ *n*_{participants} = Number of participants who ate at least one lunch in the respective cluster. In the analysis, we only included participants who ate at least one lunch during the observed period (*N*_{participants} = 200).⁴ NA = Negative affect.

Table S4. Description of the clusters for dinner.

| Cl ¹ | <i>n</i> _{dinners} ² | <i>n</i> _{participants} ³ | Situational dimensions | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | Location Mode (%) | Hunger Mode (%) | Social Mode (%) | Activity Mode (%) | Affect ⁴ Mode (%) |
| 1 | 268 | 92 | Home (100) | Hungry (50) | With others (100) | Without activity (52) | Low NA (100) |
| 2 | 199 | 71 | Home (100) | Satiated (53) | Alone (100) | With activity (68) | Low NA (100) |
| 3 | 192 | 91 | Home (100) | Hungry (52) | Alone (51) | With activity (100) | High NA (100) |
| 4 | 171 | 67 | Home (100) | Satiated (56) | Alone (51) | Without activity (100) | High NA (100) |
| 5 | 34 | 22 | Out of home (100) | Hungry (53) | With others (62) | With activity (100) | High NA (79) |
| 6 | 22 | 17 | Out of home (100) | Hungry (73) | With others (100) | Without activity (100) | Low NA (64) |
| 7 | 11 | 7 | Out of home (100) | Hungry (55) | Alone (100) | Without activity (91) | Low NA (73) |

¹ Cl = Cluster.² *n*_{dinners} = Number of dinners per cluster. The total number of dinners was *N*_{dinners} = 897.³ *n*_{participants} = Number of participants who ate at least one dinner in the respective cluster. In the analysis, we only included participants who ate at least one dinner during the observed period (*N*_{participants} = 210).⁴ NA = Negative affect.