

Winter Meeting, 6–7 December 2011, 70th Anniversary: Body weight regulation – food, gut and brain signalling

The effect of supplementation with different oil emulsions on energy intake and body weight – the results of two different studies

C. J. Harden^{1,2,3}, V. Dible¹, M. E. Barker¹, N. J. Hepburn⁴, I. Garaiova⁴,
S. F. Plummer² and B. M. Corfe¹

¹Molecular Gastroenterology Research Group, Academic Unit of Surgical Oncology, Department of Oncology, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S10 2RX, ²Cultech Ltd., Unit 3, Christchurch Road, Port Talbot, West Glamorgan, SA12 7BZ, ³Centre for Food Innovation, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, S1 1WB and ⁴Obsidian Research Ltd., Unit 2, Christchurch Road, Port Talbot, West Glamorgan, SA12 7BZ, UK

The presence of fat in the small intestine and its subsequent digestion into free fatty acids slows gastric emptying, stimulates gastrointestinal hormone release and suppresses appetite and energy intake⁽¹⁾. Lipids vary substantially in fatty acid composition, chain length and degree of saturation so may not all elicit the same response⁽²⁾. The differential effects of long chain fatty acids on energy intake and body weight are not comprehensively understood⁽³⁾. This study aimed to investigate the effect of omega-3-rich and -poor emulsions on subsequent energy intake.

A controlled, crossover intervention using normal and overweight males ($n = 18$) was conducted to examine 24-hr energy intake after two different 45% oil-in-water emulsions of (docosahexaenoic acid) DHA and oleic acid (OA), compared to no treatment (NT). Energy intake was 12,097 kJ after NT, 9,912 kJ after OA and 8,539 kJ after DHA. The difference between DHA and NT was statistically significant (Table 1).

A double-blind, randomised controlled parallel trial was conducted to examine the effects of DHA consumption over twelve weeks compared to OA on energy intake and body weight. Overweight and obese females ($n = 40$) consumed either emulsion before lunch and evening meal for twelve weeks. Mean body weight (kg) was significantly reduced by 3.5% in the DHA group compared to 1.1% in the OA group ($P = .037$). Body mass index (kg/m^2) was significantly reduced by 3.9% in the DHA group compared to 1.9% in the OA group ($P = .032$). There was no effect of treatment on body composition. Differential reduction in energy contribution between macronutrient groups was noted (Table 2).

Table 1. Results of the acute feeding experiment

Treatment	Energy (kJ)		$p =$
	Mean	SD	
NT	*12,097	(5,429)	0.048
OA	9,912	(2,733)	
DHA	*8,539	(2,720)	

*Post hoc tests indicate mean energy intake for NT was significantly ($P = .039$) different from DHA.

Table 2. Results of the 12 week intervention presented as change from baseline

Measurement	Treatment Type				$p =$
	DHA		OA		
	Change from baseline		Change from baseline		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Body weight (kg)	-3.24	1.93	-1.66	1.25	0.037
BMI (kg/m^2)	-1.38	0.94	-1.66	1.25	0.032
Energy (kJ)	-2,514	1,979	-531	1,594	0.020
Protein (g)	-12	18.8	-3.4	13.7	0.320
Carbohydrate (g)	-63.3	56.3	-22.1	50.0	0.037
Fat (g)	-26.8	22.9	-5.5	23.1	0.045
Saturated fat (g)	-9.9	7.0	-1.6	7.8	0.021

In two human feeding studies, DHA consumption significantly reduced total daily energy intake in comparison with isocaloric dosing of a non-omega-3-rich preparation. These data suggest that position of desaturation may play a role in the regulation of appetite by lipids.

1. Little TJ, Russo A, Meyer JH *et al.* (2007) *Gastroenterology* **133**, 1124–1131.
2. McLaughlin J (2007) *Biochem Soc Trans* **35**, 1199–202.
3. Li JJ, Huang CJ & Xie D (2008) *Mol Nutr Food Res* **52**, 631–645.