Table S1. Association between sociodemographic and economic factors and criteria for food choices.

	Price	**Fresh**	**Expiration date**	**Nutritional Value**	**Local food**	**Brand**	**Certification**	**Buy in bulk**
Age (N=366)								
< 35 years (%Yes)	51.3	49.5	50.0	34.8	22.3	22.3	13	4.3
≥ 35 years (%Yes)	48.7	61.5	37.5	34.6	43.4	12.6	9.9	4.9
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.045; 0.387	**0.122; 0.020**	**-0.144; 0.006**	0.002; 0.973	**0.225; < 0.001**	**-0.127; 0.015**	-0.049; 0.344	0.014; 0.786
Sex (N=366)								
Female (%Yes)	84.5	58.6	42.4	34.4	31.9	19.5	13.4	5.9
Male (%Yes)	77.3	53.8	43.8	34.9	34.4	16.4	7.8	2.3
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.088; 0.092	0.046; 0.377	0.013; 0.809	0.005; 0.924	0.025; 0.635	-0.039; 0.450	0.084; 0.107	0.08; 0.125
Education level (N=348)								
High School (%Yes)	80.8	53.2	46.2	26.9	27.6	21.8	12.8	4.5
University (%Yes)	82.3	58.9	41.7	43.8	38.5	14.6	11.5	5.2
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.020; 0.715	0.057; 0.291	0.045; 0.401	**0.174; 0.001**	**0.116; 0.031**	-0.094; 0.080	-0.021; 0.680	0.017; 0.756
Income (N=311)								
< 1500 € (%Yes)	82.7	48.2	41.7	30.7	25.2	13.7	11.5	2.9
≥ 1500 € (%Yes)	80.8	55.3	43.6	69.3	40.7	19.2	11.0	7.6
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.025; 0.664	**0.158; 0.005**	0.019; 0.739	**0.214; <0.001**	**0.163; 0.004**	0.074; 0.195	-0.007; 0.898	0.102; 0.071
Residence (N=366)								
Large City (%Yes)	82.6	54.3	46.5	36.4	30.4	16.3	13.0	4.9
Medium/Small City (%Yes)	82.2	56.4	28.0	35.6	35.6	17.8	7.9	3.0
Rural Area (%Yes)	80.8	59.1	24.8	30.8	34.6	20.5	12.8	6.4
Effect size; p-value (2)	0.041; 0.895	0.108; 0.235	0.083; 0.472	0.081; 0.493	0.051; 0.812	0.060; 0.725	0.078; 0.526	0.061; 0.715

Associations were tested with Phi (1) or Cramers'v test (2). Values of percentages are percentage of yes responses within each class of sociodemographic factor. In bold the significant associations ($p < 0.05$). Strength of the effect size was considered as >0.25 Very strong; >0.15 Strong; >0.10 Moderate; >0.05 Weak; >0 No or very weak [13].

Table S2. Association between sociodemographic and economic variables with health concerns, food waste and sustainable behaviors.

Sociodemographic and economic factors	Health concerns % Yes	Food waste concerns % Yes	Meals without animal protein % Yes	Meal planning % high frequency
Age (N=366)				
< 35 years	87.0/	75.0	40.8	35.9
≥ 35 years	86.8	50.0	50.5	51.6
Effect size; p-value (1)	-0.002; 0.968	**-0.258; <0.001**	0.098; 0.060	**0.159; 0.002**
Sex (N=366)				
Female	86.6	64.7	49.6	42.9
Male	87.5	58.6	38.3	45.3
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.013; 0.798	0.06; 0.249	**0.108; 0.038**	-0.024; 0.652
Education level (N=348)				
High School	86.5	67.3	38.5	42.3
University	89.1	58.3	54.2	45.8
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.039; 0.472	-0.092; 0.086	**0.156; 0.004**	0.035; 0.510
Income (N=311)				
< 1500 €	80.6	73.4	38.8	48.9
≥ 1500 €	91.9	53.5	54.1	44.2
Effect size; p-value (1)	**0.166; 0.003**	**-0.204; <0.001**	**0.152; 0.008**	-0.047; 0.405
Residence (N=366)				
Large City	88.0	57.1	48.4	45.7
Medium/Small City	87.1	68.3	36.6	45.5
Rural Area	84.6	67.9	52.6	38.5
Effect size; p-value (2)	0.067; 0.648	0.114; 0.188	**0.147; 0.049**	0.099; 0.305

Associations were tested with Phi (1) or Cramers'v test (2). In bold the significant associations ($p < 0.05$). Strength of the effect size was considered as >0.25 Very strong; >0.15 Strong; >0.10 Moderate; >0.05 Weak; >0 No or very weak [13].

Table S3. Association between sociodemographic and economic factors and reward systems.

	Money	**Local/organic food**	**Hygiene products**	**Leisure activities**	**Pet products**	**Slow-fashion**
Age (N=366)						
< 35 years (%Yes)	59.8	32.1	34.2	24.5	11.4	8.7
≥ 35 years (%Yes)	44.0	49.5	22.5	20.9	14.8	1.6
Effect size; p-value (1)	**-0.158; 0.002**	**0.177; <0.001**	**-0.130; 0.013**	-0.043; 0.414	0.051; 0.332	**-0.159; 0.002**
Sex (N=366)						
Female (%Yes)	47.9	41.2	33.6	21.4	12.2	5.9
Male (%Yes)	59.4	39.8	18.8	25.0	14.8	3.9
Effect size; p-value (1)	**-0.110; 0.036**	0.013; 0.805	**0.157; 0.003**	-0.041; 0.437	-0.038; 0.472	0.042; 0.416
Education level (N=348)						
High School (%Yes)	46.8	38.5	30.1	26.9	13.5	3.2
University (%Yes)	54.7	43.8	28.1	20.3	13.0	6.8
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.079; 0.143	0.053; 0.319	-0.022; 0.682	-0.0784; 0.147	-0.006; 0.904	0.080; 0.135
Income (N=311)						
< 1500 € (%Yes)	49.6	33.1	29.5	24.5	15.8	4.3
≥ 1500 € (%Yes)	53.5	48.3	23.3	26.2	9.3	4.7
Effect size; p-value (1)	0.038; 0.500	**0.153; 0.007**	-0.071; 0.212	0.019; 0.732	-0.099; 0.081	0.008; 0.887
Residence (N=366)						
Large City (%Yes)	54.3	42.9	25.0	25.0	13.0	4.3
Medium/Small City (%Yes)	53.5	35.6	27.7	22.8	12.9	3.0
Rural Area (%Yes)	43.6	43.6	38.5	15.4	14.1	10.3
Effect size; p-value (2)	0.090; 0.398	0.102; 0.286	0.130; 0.105	0.131; 0.100	0.038; 0.913	0.123; 0.138

Associations were tested with Phi (1) or Cramers'v test (2). Values of percentages are percentage of yes responses within each class of sociodemographic factor. In bold the significant associations ($p < 0.05$). Strength of the effect size was considered as >0.25 Very strong; >0.15 Strong; >0.10 Moderate; >0.05 Weak; >0 No or very weak [13].