REVIEW



I

WILEY

Differences in gastrointestinal hormones and appetite ratings between individuals with and without obesity-A systematic review and meta-analysis

Marthe Isaksen Aukan^{1,2} | Silvia Coutinho^{1,3} | Sindre Andre Pedersen⁴ Melanie Rae Simpson^{5,6} | Catia Martins^{1,2,7}

¹Obesity Research Group, Department of Clinical and Molecular Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

²Centre of Obesity and Innovation (ObeCe), Clinic of Surgery, St. Olav University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

³Department of Public Health Nutrition at the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo (UiO), Oslo, Norway

⁴Library Section for Research Support, Data and Analysis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

⁵Department of Public Health and Nursing, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway

⁶Clinical Research Unit Central Norway, St. Olavs Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

⁷Department of Nutrition Sciences, the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB), Birmingham, Alabama, USA

Correspondence

Marthe Isaksen Aukan, Department of Clinical and Molecular Medicine, NTNU, Forsyningssenteret, Prinsesse Kristinas gate 5, 7030 Trondheim, Norway. Email: marthe.i.aukan@ntnu.no

Funding information

The funding for this study is provided by the Liaison Committee between the Central Norway Regional Health Authority (RHA) and the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).

Summarv

Determining if gastrointestinal (GI) hormone response to food intake differs between individuals with, and without, obesity may improve our understanding of obesity pathophysiology. A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies assessing the concentrations of GI hormones, as well as appetite ratings, following a test meal, in individuals with and without obesity was undertaken. Systematic searches were conducted in the databases MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane Library, PsycINFO, Web of Science, and ClinicalTrials.gov. A total of 7514 unique articles were retrieved, 115 included in the systematic review, and 70 in the meta-analysis. The metaanalysis compared estimated standardized mean difference in GI hormones' concentration, as well as appetite ratings, between individuals with and without obesity. Basal and postprandial total ghrelin concentrations were lower in individuals with obesity compared with controls, and this was reflected by lower postprandial hunger ratings in the former. Individuals with obesity had a lower postprandial concentration of total peptide YY compared with controls, but no significant differences were found for glucagon-like peptide 1, cholecystokinin, or other appetite ratings. A large methodological and statistical heterogeneity among studies was found. More comprehensive studies are needed to understand if the differences observed are a cause or a consequence of obesity.

KEYWORDS

appetite, ghrelin, obesity, PYY

Abbreviations:: AUC, area under the curve; BMI, body mass index; CCK, cholecystokinin; DTE, desire to eat; GI, gastrointestinal; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; PFC, prospective food consumption; PYY, peptide YY.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2022 The Authors. Obesity Reviews published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of World Obesity Federation.

1 | INTRODUCTION

WILEY-OBESITY

Obesity is a chronic relapsing disease,¹ characterized by excessive fat accumulation and defined as a body mass index (BMI) \ge 30 kg/m² (with cutoffs varying among ethnicities).² The prevalence of obesity has increased dramatically over the past five decades resulting in socioeconomic challenges and public health issues. Obesity is associated with reduced quality of life and poorer mental health, increased risk of noncommunicable diseases, and shortened life expectancy.³ Thus, obesity represents one of the greatest global health problems of our times.

The causes of obesity are multifactorial, and genetics play an important role.⁴ The contribution of the gut-brain axis and the underpinnings of homeostatic body weight regulation have been frequently investigated in the context of obesity pathophysiology.⁵ Ingestion of food leads to the stimulation, or inhibition, of the secretion of different hormones from distinctive sites of the gastrointestinal (GI) tract.⁶ These peripheral signals have the potential to modulate food intake and long-term body weight homeostasis, both via hormonal and vagal pathways.⁷ Ghrelin is the only known peripheral hormone with orexigenic properties.⁸ Its plasma concentration peaks during fasting and in anticipation of the upcoming meal and declines in the postprandial period.⁹ On the other hand, as macronutrients interact with receptors of enteroendocrine cells, several anorexic peptides, including glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1), peptide YY (PYY), and cholecystokinin (CCK), are secreted from the GI tract, promoting satiation and satiety.¹⁰⁻¹²

Obesity has been shown to be associated with alterations in the secretion of several GI hormones, increased fasting gastric volume, accelerated gastric emptying, and decreased satiety.¹³⁻¹⁵ Many studies have measured the basal and postprandial plasma concentrations of GI hormones in individuals with obesity, and the majority reports lower basal and postprandial plasma concentrations of ghrelin compared with individuals without obesity.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ However, results regarding satiety peptides are inconclusive, most likely due to different hormonal fractions being measured.^{14,16,18} Understanding if obesity is, or not, associated with alterations in the secretion of GI hormones, and subjective appetite feelings, will improve our knowledge on the pathophysiology of this chronic disease. Therefore, this systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to compare basal and postprandial plasma concentrations of GI hormones, as well as subjective appetite ratings, between individuals with and without obesity.

2 | METHODS

This systematic review and meta-analysis is registered in PROS-PERO (PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020161552) (https://www.crd.york. ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020161552). The PRISMA statement for systematic reviews and meta-analyses was followed.¹⁹

2.1 | Literature search

A structured database search was conducted in MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane Library, PsycINFO, Web of Science, and ClinicalTrials.gov. The query involved a combination of thesaurus- and free-text terms optimized to capture studies comparing appetite/appetite markers between individuals with and without obesity. The search strategies excluded studies focusing exclusively on nonadults, or animals, and publication types like comments, editorials, or news. The searches were also restricted to studies written in English, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Portuguese, French, or Spanish (see Supporting Information for a detailed description of the search strategies adopted in the different databases).

2.2 | Study selection

Two reviewers (MIA, SC) independently screened titles and abstracts of the identified articles based on the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Results from each reviewer were compared to ensure that exclusions were made on the same basis before screening full text articles. Any disagreements between the reviewers were discussed, and a third reviewer (CM) involved if needed. Full text articles were screened, and assessment of risk of bias was performed for all the included articles in the meta-analysis.

2.3 | Eligibility criteria

The database search was conducted based on the following inclusion criteria: A study population of adults with obesity (BMI \ge 30 kg/m²) and a control group without obesity (BMI 18.5-29.9 kg/m²); assessing one or several of the following variables in the fasting state and/or after a test meal (using total area under the curve (AUC) as a measure of postprandial response): Plasma or serum concentrations of total or active ghrelin, total or active GLP-1, total or active PYY, or CCK, and/or appetite ratings of hunger, fullness, desire to eat (DTE), or prospective food consumption (PFC) measured with a visual analog scale.²⁰ Postprandial data were not included if appetite measures were taken under infusion of pharmacological agents or hormonal infusion. Exclusion criteria included diabetes or other endocrine disorders known to affect appetite, previous bariatric surgery, and current or recent use of medications known to affect appetite or body weight. Because ketosis is known to affect appetite,²¹ studies were excluded if the appetite measurements were taken while participants were ketotic (defined as a plasma ßeta-hydroxybutyrate concentration >0.3 mmol/L).

2.4 | Data extraction

The two reviewers (MIA, SC) extracted the data of all included articles. General characteristics of the participants (i.e., age, sex, BMI, and body composition) were extracted from each article along with energy and macronutrient composition of the test meal used, duration of postprandial period, and frequency of blood sampling/appetite ratings assessment.

2.5 | Risk of bias assessments

Depending on the study designs, the risk of bias in the articles included in the meta-analysis was assessed using the Cochrane tools ROB-2²² and ROBINS-1²³ for randomized and nonrandomized studies, respectively (Supporting Information). The tools identified to what extent studies addressed the possibility of bias in their design, conduct, and analysis. Any disagreements that arose between the reviewers were resolved through discussion and assistance of a third reviewer when required.

2.6 | Statistical analysis

The mean and standard deviation for hormone concentrations and appetite ratings in the fasting, and postprandial state (AUC) were extracted. Articles with extreme values (more than 10-fold larger than the average) were excluded from the meta-analysis. Articles reporting incremental AUC or calculating total AUC using "O" as basal value were also excluded. When not reported, the standard deviation was calculated from the provided standard error or confidence intervals. Data reported as medians and interquartile range were converted to means and standard deviations (SDs).²⁴ If hormonal concentrations were reported in metric units, data were converted to SI units as follows: ghrelin pg/ml \times 0.3 = pmol/L. GLP-1 pg/ml \times 0.33 = pmol/L. PYY pg/ml \times 0.25 = pmol/L. All values for subjective appetite ratings were converted to millimeters. AUC data were converted to minutes whenever necessary. Some studies reported data on subgroups within the obesity and controls groups, for example, for men and women separately. Prior to inclusion in the meta-analysis, outcomes for these subgroups were pooled to obtain a single pooled mean and standard deviation within the obesity and control groups separately. For studies including more than one test meal, the meal closest to the balanced dietary recommendations in terms of macronutrient composition was selected. For studies including more than one basal measure, before different infusions of nutrients, a basal value was chosen at random. When two basal values were given before infusion of saline or a hormone, the basal value measured before hormone infusion was selected. The corresponding authors of the respective articles were contacted for further information or clarification when needed. If the missing data were not obtained, the respective article was included in the systematic review, but not in the meta-analysis.

Meta-analyses were conducted to compare the obesity and control groups for each outcome, when there were at least three studies. Pooled estimates of standardized mean differences (SMDs) were obtained using a random-effects model. Statistical heterogeneity was investigated using the l^2 statistic and a threshold of 75% was considered to represent high heterogeneity.²⁵ Evidence of publication bias was assessed by visual inspection of Funnel plots and Egger's test. Analyses were performed using Stata version 16.1 (Stata Corp., College Station, Texas, USA).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Search result

A total of 13,273 records were obtained by collecting the results from the different databases into a common library. After removing duplicates, 7514 unique records remained. Manual screening of the records, based on title and abstract, identified 163 potentially relevant records. Further full-text screening of these records identified 115 studies relevant for inclusion. A flow chart of the search results and selection process can be seen in the Supporting Information.

3.2 | Systematic review

A systematic review comparing concentrations of GI hormones, as well as appetite ratings, between individuals with and without obesity was conducted. A total of 115 articles were included, resulting in the comparison of 22 variables.

3.2.1 | Concentrations of GI hormones in the fasting state

Basal active ghrelin

Twenty-four articles compared basal active ghrelin between individuals with obesity and controls. Fifteen studies reported higher basal active ghrelin concentrations in controls,^{16,26-39} whereas seven articles found no differences between groups,⁴⁰⁻⁴⁶ and two reported higher concentrations in individuals with obesity.^{43,47}

Basal total ghrelin

Fifty-one articles compared basal total ghrelin between individuals with obesity and controls. Forty articles reported higher basal total ghrelin concentrations in the control group,^{14,15,26,31,34,45,48-81} whereas 11 articles found no differences between groups.^{82–92}

Basal active GLP-1

Sixteen articles compared basal concentrations of active GLP-1 between individuals with obesity and controls. One study found individuals with obesity to have lower basal concentrations,⁹³ 14 studies found no significant differences between groups,^{40,43,55,66,94-103} and one study found higher basal active GLP-1 concentrations in individuals with obesity.⁵²

Basal total GLP-1

Eighteen studies compared basal total GLP-1 concentration between individuals with obesity and controls. One study reported lower basal WILEY-<mark>OBESITY</mark>

concentrations in individuals with obesity,¹⁰⁴ 15 studies found no significant differences between groups,^{35,42,58,89,102,105-114} and two studies reported higher basal total GLP-1 in individuals with obesity,^{103,115}

Basal active PYY

Fourteen studies compared basal concentrations of active PYY between individuals with obesity and controls. Four studies reported lower basal active PYY concentrations in individuals with obesity,^{45,49,71,116} and 10 studies found no significant differences between groups.^{67,78,83,89,100,104,107,117-119}

Basal total PYY

Ten studies compared basal concentrations of total PYY between individuals with obesity and controls. Three studies reported lower basal total PYY concentrations in individuals with obesity,¹²⁰⁻¹²² and seven studies found no significant differences between groups.^{42,84,90,117,120,123,124}

Basal CCK

Twelve articles assessed basal CCK concentrations. One study reported individuals with obesity to have lower basal CCK concentrations compared with controls,¹²⁵ nine articles found no differences between groups,^{52,66,104,107,118,119,126-128} and two studies reported greater basal CCK concentrations in individuals with obesity.^{18,101}

3.2.2 | Concentrations of GI hormones in the postprandial state

Active ghrelin (AUC)

Ten articles assessed postprandial active ghrelin. Five articles reported lower concentrations in individuals with obesity,^{16,26,27,35,38} three articles found no differences between groups,^{40,42,116} and two articles reported individuals with obesity to have higher concentrations.^{47,129}

Total ghrelin (AUC)

Sixteen articles assessed postprandial total ghrelin. Thirteen articles reported lower concentrations in individuals with obesity^{15,17,26,53,54,57,59,63,67,71,78,100,129} and three articles found no differences between groups.^{82,88,130}

Active GLP-1 (AUC)

Nine studies assessed postprandial concentrations of active GLP-1. Four studies reported lower postprandial concentrations in individuals with obesity^{15,16,94,101} and five studies found no significant differences between groups.^{40,97,99,100,131}

Total GLP-1(AUC)

Eight studies measured postprandial concentrations of total GLP-1. Four studies reported individuals with obesity to have lower postprandial concentrations of total GLP-1,^{102,105,114,122} and four studies found no significant differences between groups.^{42,103,113,115}

Active PYY (AUC)

Five articles assessed postprandial concentrations of active PYY. Two studies found that individuals with obesity had lower postprandial concentrations of active PYY compared with controls,^{71,116} whereas three studies found no differences between groups.^{67,78,100}

Total PYY (AUC)

Seven studies measured postprandial concentrations of total PYY. Four studies reported postprandial total PYY concentrations to be lower in individuals with obesity compared with controls,^{14–16,121} whereas three found no differences between groups.^{42,130,131}

CCK (AUC)

Five studies assessed postprandial concentrations of CCK. One article reported individuals with obesity to have lower postprandial CCK concentrations compared with controls,¹⁶ three studies found no differences between groups,^{101,128,130} whereas one study reported individuals with obesity to have greater postprandial concentration of CCK.¹⁸

3.2.3 | Appetite ratings in the fasting state

Hunger

Eighteen articles assessed hunger ratings in the fasted state. Three studies showed that individuals with obesity reported lower hunger ratings compared with controls, ^{114,116,132} whereas 15 studies found no differences between groups. ^{16,18,31,42,47,58,88,90,103,104,107,113,133-135}

Fullness

Eighteen articles reported ratings of fullness in the fasted state. Fourteen found no differences between groups,^{18,29,42,58,88,90,94,103,104,107,113,133-135} whereas four studies reported greater fullness in individuals with obesity compared with controls.^{107,114,116,132}

DTE

Nine articles measured DTE in the fasted state. One study reported that individuals with obesity had lower DTE compared with controls¹³² and eight studies found no differences between groups.^{16,18,47,88,94,133-135}

PFC

Nine articles assessed PFC in the fasted state. One study reported individuals with obesity to have a lower PFC compared with controls,¹³² whereas eight studies found no differences between groups.^{16,42,58,88,103,113,133,135}

3.2.4 | Appetite ratings in the postprandial state

Hunger (AUC)

Postprandial hunger ratings were assessed in 16 articles. Two studies reported individuals with obesity to have lower postprandial ratings of

TABLE 1 Overall meta-analysis results

Outcome	No. of studies	Reference nr.	SMD (95% CI)	p value	l ²	Egger's test (p value)
Basal hormone conce	entrations					
Active ghrelin	16	14,24,25,27-32,38-41,43-45	-0.66 (-1.69 to 0.37)	0.21	97.98	0.33
Total ghrelin	33	12,15,24,26,30,41,43,47,49-53, 55-58,60-63,65-68,82-89	-1.42 (-2.07 to -0.76)	<0.001	96.96	0.03
Active GLP-1	7	14,38,50,92,93,96,101	0.14 (-0.12 to 0.40)	0.29	32.81	0.53
Total GLP-1	13	40,53,56,87,94,101-104,106-108,111	-0.19 (-0.52 to 0.14)	0.26	62.35	0.06
Active PYY	8	43,47,65,87,88,102,105,115	-0.49 (-1.14 to 0.16)	0.14	85.12	0.35
Total PYY	7	14,40,82,115,118,121,122	-0.36 (-0.83 to 0.11)	0.14	90.09	0.60
СКК	7	14,16,50,102,123,125,134	0.01 (-1.49 to 1.51)	0.99	96.29	0.16
Postprandial (AUC) h	ormone concentratio	ns				
Total ghrelin	5	13,15,51,65,86	-1.35 (-2.36 to -0.33)	0.01	86.16	0.06
Active GLP-1	4	13,14,92,95	-0.67 (-1.58 to 0.24)	0.15	88.92	0.48
Total PYY	3	13,14,118	-0.84 (-1.61 to -0.07)	0.03	80.08	0.88
Fasting appetite ratin	igs					
Hunger	11	14,27,29,45,56,88,101,102,105,130,133	-0.10 (-0.26 to 0.06)	0.23	0.00	0.40
Fullness	9	14,27,56,88,101,102,105,130,133	-0.02 (-0.39 to 0.36)	0.94	71.80	0.36
DTE	4	14,45,130,133	-0.21 (-0.55 to 0.13)	0.22	54.70	0.95
PFC	5	14,56,101,130,133	0.18 (-0.34 to 0.70)	0.49	81.42	0.32
Postprandial (AUC) a	ppetite ratings					
Hunger	5	14,45,86,101,133	-0.66 (-1.01 to -0.32)	<0.001	41.82	0.08
Fullness	4	14,86,101,133	0.43 (-0.38 to 1.24)	0.30	87.63	0.38
DTE	4	14,86,101,133	-0.01 (-0.24 to 0.22)	0.91	0.00	0.48
PFC	4	14,86,101,133	-0.02 (-0.30 to 0.25)	0.88	13.94	0.46

Abbreviations: AUC, area under the curve; CCK, cholecystokinin: DTE, desire to eat; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; PFC, prospective food consumption; PYY, peptide YY; SMD, standardized mean difference.

hunger compared with controls,^{18,88} whereas 14 studies found no differences between groups.^{16,42,47,66,90,103,113,114,116,121,130,133-135}

Fullness (AUC)

Postprandial fullness ratings were assessed in 16 studies. One article showed that individuals with obesity had lower postprandial ratings of fullness,¹¹⁴ whereas 15 studies found no differences between groups.^{18,42,66,88,90,94,103,113,114,116,121,130,133-135}

DTE and PFC (AUC)

Eight studies measured postprandial DTE,^{16,18,47,88,94,133-135} and seven studies measured postprandial PFC.^{16,42,88,103,113,133,135} All studies reported no differences in DTE or PFC between individuals with obesity and controls.

3.3 | Meta-analysis

A total of 70 articles were included in the meta-analysis, resulting in the comparison of 18 variables. An overview of the meta-analysis results can be seen in Table 1, and the pooled results in Figure 1. Twenty-eight studies were randomized control trials, whereas the remaining had a cross sectional design with a control group. The average BMI of the obesity groups ranged from 29.1 to 57.6 kg/m², whereas control groups had an average BMI range of between 18.5 and 27.6 kg/m². The average age of the obesity groups ranged from 20.8 to 68.5 years, and controls from 20.1 to 68.5 years. The smallest study comprised five individuals with obesity and seven controls,88 whereas the largest study comprised 779 individuals with obesity and 1315 controls.¹²³ Fourteen studies included only females. 31,41,43,46,55,57,62-64,70,90,117,125,136 12 studies included only males,^{30,47,52,58,84,91,103-105,107,113,124} three studies did not report on sex distribution, 15,69,127 whereas the remaining studies included a combination of both sexes. When reported, test meals had a varied macronutrient composition and its energy content ranged between 260-632 kcal. Only one study used a single macronutrient loading (75 g glucose).⁶⁷ The AUC period after the test meal varied between 60 and 330 min. For active ghrelin, total GLP-1, active PYY, and CCK, there were not enough studies (two or less) reporting total AUC concentrations to run the meta-analysis. Study characteristics and a summary of contributing articles can be seen in the Supporting Information.

-WILEY 5 of 18

Study			Effect Size
Study			with 95% Ci
Basal normone concentrations	_		
active ghrelin			-0.66 [-1.69, 0.37
total ghrelin			-1.42 -2.07,-0.76
active GLP-1			0.14 [-0.12, 0.40
total GLP-1	-	╶═╋╴	-0.19 [-0.52, 0.14
active PYY		┣━┼╴	-0.49 [-1.14, 0.16
total PYY			-0.36 [-0.83, 0.11
СКК		+	- 0.01 [-1.49, 1.51
			-0.40 [-0.80, 0.01
Postprandial hormone concentrations (A	NUC)		
total ghrelin		_	-1.35 [-2.36,-0.33
active GLP-1			-0.67 [-1.58, 0.24
total PYY			-0.84 [-1.61,-0.07
			-0.91 [-1.42,-0.41
Fasting appetite ratings			
hunger			-0.10 -0.26, 0.06
fullness			-0.02 -0.39, 0.36
DTE	-		-0.21 -0.55, 0.13
PFC			0.18 - 0.34, 0.70
			-0.09 [-0.22, 0.04
Postprandial appetite ratings (AUC)			
hunger		_	-0.66 [-1.010.32
fullness	_		0.43 -0.38. 1.24
DTE		-	-0.01 -0.24, 0.22
PEC			-0.02 -0.30 0.25
		T	-0.13 -0.52 0.26
			5.10 [5.62, 5.20
	Higher in contr	ols Higher in o	besity
	-2.00 -1.00	0.00 1.00	2.00

Random-effects REML model

3.3.1 | Concentrations of GI hormones in the fasting and postprandial states

Overall, we observed a high degree of statistical heterogeneity between studies investigating the concentration of GI hormones in the fasting and postprandial state. The l^2 statistic was over 80% for all GI hormones, both in the fasting and postprandial states, except for active and total GLP-1 with I^2 statistic of 32.8 and 62.4%, respectively (Table 1). Forrest plots for meta-analyses of basal concentrations of GI hormones are presented in Figure 2A-G and postprandial concentrations (AUC) in Figure 3A-C. In the comparison of basal concentrations, the pooled SMDs were observed to be lower in obesity for basal active and total ghrelin, total GLP-1, active PYY, and total PYY, although this was only statistically significant for basal total ghrelin (SMD: -1.42, 95% CI -2.07 to -0.76, $l^2 = 96.96\%$, p < 0.001) (Figure 2B). In the comparison of AUC, the pooled SMDs for total ghrelin, active GLP-1 and total PYY also indicated lower postprandial concentrations in the obesity group, with the AUCs for both total ghrelin and total PYY being statistically significantly smaller in obesity (Figure 3A and Figure 3C,

respectively). For the other GI hormones, the pooled SMD was associated with a large degree of uncertainty, such that it is not possible to conclude whether these hormones differ been individuals with and without obesity. In particular, the confidence intervals for basal active ghrelin, active GLP-1, total GLP-1, active PYY, total PYY, and CKK were consistent with there being between a substantially lower concentration in obesity, no difference, or even a moderately to substantially higher concentration in obesity. In contrast, the pooled results from the seven studies reporting on basal active GLP-1 indicated that any difference between the obesity and control group is likely to be small (SMD: 0.14, 95% CI -0.12 to 0.40, p = 0.29, $l^2 = 32.8\%$).

Visually, the funnel plots for active- and total ghrelin and total GLP-1 are suggestive of some publication bias, with the smaller published studies reporting large effect sizes. Furthermore, Egger's test also implied that there may be a small study effects for total ghrelin and total GLP-1 (Table 1). The funnel plots and Egger's test for other GI hormones, in the fasting and postprandial states, should be interpreted cautiously given that there are fewer studies in these comparisons.

OBESITY -WILEY 7 of 18 Reviews



(A)								
		Obesi	ty		Cont	rol		Effect
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD	1	with 95
Andarini, 2017 [47]	16	1135.22	271.69	16	396.94	238.81		- 2.81 [1.8
Arafat, 2013 [26]	11	66.21	36.72	13	103.80	71.40		-0.62 [-1.4
Carrol, 2007 [40]	20	18.43	12.22	19	24.46	13.27		-0.46 [-1.0
Chearskul, 2012 [41]	33	223.37	88.47	53	264.24	102.65		-0.42 [-0.8
Dardzinska, 2014 [27]	12	13.20	7.80	12	44.40	16.80		-2.30 [-3.3
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	101.76	59.12	33	222.47	120.67		-1.26 [-1.7
Douglas, 2017 [42]	25	36.60	30.00	22	31.20	17.40		0.21 [-0.3
Heden, 2013 [97]	14	22.50	19.08	14	34.20	19.08		-0.60 [-1.3
Homaee, 2011 [30]	19	33.15	5.55	19	72.54	6.42		-6.43 [-8.0
lceta, 2019 [31]	55	10.80	13.35	29	32.10	19.39		-1.35 [-1.8
Karcz–Socha, 2011 [45]	96	45.41	18.02	46	49.62	16.08		-0.24 [-0.5
Kolodziejski, 2018 [43]	15	11.06	0.79	15	7.41	1.03		- 3.86 [2.6
Korek, 2013 [32]	19	5.72	1.46	17	19.01	6.94		-2.67 [-3.5
Krzyzanowska–Swinirska, 2007 [46]	30	6.51	3.48	32	6.63	2.55		-0.04 [-0.5
Lopez–Aguilar, 2018 [33]	50	10.59	9.99	80	15.87	12.66		-0.45 [-0.8
Marzullo, 2004 [35]	20	54.12	28.13	20	123.54	87.28	-	-1.05 [-1.7
Overall difference in active ghrelin (ba	isal)						•	-0.66 [-1.6
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 4.26$, $I^2 = 97.98\%$, H^2	= 49	.50					Higher in controls	Higher in obesity
Test of θ = 0: z = -1.26, p = 0.21							. iigiici iir controla	inglici in obcony
						-	10 –5	0 5

Random-effects REML model

(B)		Ohooi	• •		Contr	ol		-
Study	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		wi
Acosta, 2015 [14]	201	20.94	15.30	105	25.56	22.13		-0.26
Arafat, 2013 [26]	11	216.90	53.73	13	369.66	167.43	-	-1.14
Batterham, 2003 [49]	12	87.70	48.84	12	207.70	43.65		-2.50
Bogdanov, 2019 [51]	15	112.56	14.28	15	243.48	26.34		-6.01
Bowen, 2006 [52]	47	167.62	17.44	25	232.56	43.27		-2.21
Brownley, 2012 [53]	20	157.59	65.03	20	255.05	74.57		-1.37
Carlson, 2009 [54]	13	326.10	56.10	10	425.40	69.60		-1.54
Cassar, 2015 [55]	18	160.00	70.00	22	250.00	50.00		-1.48
Clamp, 2015 [84]	10	110.61	21.24	10	158.79	64.86	-	-0.96
Cremonini, 2006 [85]	25	23.70	4.50	13	35.70	7.20		-2.12
Daghestani, 2009 [57]	45	84.00	20.20	77	162.39	45.51		-2.04
Druce, 2005 [86]	12	440.80	49.10	12	459.60	45.20	-	-0.38
El Helou, 2019 [58]	15	48.39	10.92	15	73.02	42.18		-0.78
English, 2002 [28]	10	325.00	248.21	13	857.00	455.08		-1.35
Erdmann, 2005 [59]	128	111.09	64.65	56	166.71	119.40		-0.65
Espelund, 2005 [87]	16	180.00	84.00	17	201.00	111.32		-0.21
Frecka, 2008 [88]	5	119.67	15.03	7	118.65	39.92	-1	0.03
Guo, 2007 [60]	14	148.20	27.54	16	205.17	26.82		-2.04
Haltia, 2010 [89]	13	255.30	90.30	12	341.70	95.70		-0.90
Karcz-Socha, 2011 [45]	96	154.48	45.71	46	235.20	45.78		-1.76
Kheirouri, 2017 [62]	37	1710.00	1623.00	40	2706.00	2844.00		-0.42
Kiessl, 2017 [63]	43	153.25	67.88	42	217.84	108.93		-0.71
Kocak, 2011 [64]	22	66.00	39.00	19	183.00	102.00		-1.53
Kolodziejski, 2018 [43]	15	502.20	32.01	15	404.70	37.80		- 2.71
Korek, 2013 [32]	19	198.33	81.17	17	487.70	135.19		-2.57
Korner, 2005 [90]	12	127.20	8.40	8	169.20	30.90		-1.98
Lambert, 2011 [91]	11	4490.00	210.00	11	3650.00	66.00		- 5.19
Leonetti, 2003 [65]	8	122.19	6.48	10	243.90	21.72		-6.88
Marzullo, 2006 [17]	10	35.10	3.00	6	74.10	11.70		-4.99
Ozkan, 2009 [68]	21	17.79	9.06	10	54.87	18.51		-2.83
Papandreou, 2017 [69]	7	132.00	42.00	13	162.30	60.60		-0.53
Pavlatos, 2005 [70]	9	353.50	243.00	9	707.60	1474.20	-	-0.32
Outeiriño-Blanco, 2011 [67]	23	269.49	19.71	13	412.83	48.87		-4.24
Overall difference in total ghrelin	(basal)						•	-1.42
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 3.45$, $I^2 = 96.96\%$	5, H ² = 32	2.89				1	Higher in controls	Higher in obesity
Test of θ = 0: z = -4.23, p = 0.00								
						_	-10 -5	0 5

Random-effects REML model

FIGURE 2 (A-G) Meta-analysis results for basal concentrations of gastrointestinal hormones

1467789x, 0, Downloaded from https://milinetibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/obr.13531 by NTNU Norwegian University Of Science & Technology/Library. Wiley Online Library on [11:01/2023]. See the Terms and Conditions (https://milinetibrary.wiley .com/terms and-conditions) on Wiley Online Library for rules of use; OA articles are governed by the applicable Creative Commons License



		Obes	ity		Conti	rol		Effect size
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD		with 95% CI
Adam, 2005 [94]	28	8.01	28.32	30	3.90	2.67		0.21 [-0.30, 0.7
Bowen, 2006 [52]	47	5.25	1.92	25	4.41	0.56		0.52 [0.04, 1.0
Calanna, 2013 [95]	43	8.47	3.13	24	10.98	12.03		-0.33 [-0.82, 0.1
Carrol, 2007 [40]	20	3.43	2.95	19	3.69	3.00		-0.09 [-0.70, 0.5
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	27.16	6.56	33	26.73	4.61		0.07 [-0.40, 0.5
Mersebach, 2003 [98]	16	19.47	11.66	10	11.67	5.19		0.77 [-0.02, 1.5
Smith, 2021 [103]	12	0.79	0.40	12	0.78	0.53		0.02 [-0.75, 0.7
Overall difference in active GLP-1 (ba	asal))					+	0.14 [-0.12, 0.4
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.04$, $I^2 = 32.81\%$, H	² = 1	.49				liabor ir	n controlo Higher in chesit	,
Test of θ = 0: z = 1.06, p = 0.29						iigiiel li	in controls in igner in obesity	1
						_	-1 0 1	2

Random-effects REML model

(D)								
		Obes	sity	NI	Cont	rol		Effect size
Study	IN	wean	50	IN	wean	50	Н	With 95% CI
Carr, 2010 [105]	13	17.00	9.01	12	19.90	4.50		-0.39 [-1.15, 0.38]
Cassar, 2015 [55]	18	18.00	6.00	22	18.00	3.00		- 0.00 [-0.61, 0.61]
Chia, 2017 [106]	20	3.90	2.24	20	3.30	1.79	-+	- 0.29 [-0.32, 0.90]
Dirksen, 2019 [104]	10	5.40	1.58	10	6.30	2.85		0.37 [-1.22, 0.47]
Douglas, 2017 [42]	25	21.10	10.60	22	20.60	15.00	-#	- 0.04 [-0.53, 0.60]
El Helou, 2019 [58]	15	13.20	23.63	15	11.50	20.14		0.08 [-0.62, 0.77]
Elahi, 2016 [96]	12	5.00	2.42	12	12.20	4.85		-1.81 [-2.74,-0.89]
Greenfield, 2009 [108]	8	13.00	6.32	8	14.40	4.74		-0.24 [-1.17, 0.69]
Haltia, 2010 [89]	13	2.70	1.30	12	2.60	1.50		- 0.07 [-0.69, 0.83]
Heni, 2015 [109]	12	4.90	3.71	12	2.10	1.11	-	0.99 [0.17, 1.81]
Nguyen, 2018 [110]	22	32.90	2.60	10	32.80	3.90		- 0.03 [-0.70, 0.76]
Smith, 2021 [103]	12	17.29	4.63	12	25.78	9.24		-1.12 [-1.96,-0.29]
Verdich, 2001 [113]	19	9.50	4.34	12	11.90	5.48		-0.49 [-1.20, 0.23]
Overall difference in total GLP-1 (b	asal)							-0.19 [-0.52, 0.14]
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.23$, $I^2 = 62.35\%$,	$H^2 =$	2.66					Higher in controle	Jighor in obsoity
Test of θ = 0: z = -1.12, p = 0.26							Higher In controls	ligher in obesity
						-	-4 -2 0	2
Pandom offacto PEMI model								
nanuom-enecis neivie mouer								
Random-enects REME model								
(F)								
(E)		Obes	itv		Contr	ol		Effect size
(E) Study	N	Obes Mean	ity SD	N	Contr Mean	ol SD		Effect size with 95% CI
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49]	N 12	Obes Mean 10.20	ity SD 2.42	N 12	Contr Mean 16.90	ol SD 2.77		Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 -3.53,-1.44]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107]	N 12 13	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00	ity SD 2.42 57.69	N 12 8	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00	ol SD 2.77 14.14		Effect size with 95% CI -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] 0.64 [-0.23, 1.51]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104]	N 12 13 10	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 52.00	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14	N 12 8 10	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97		Effect size with 95% CI -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] -0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] -0.05 [-0.89, 0.79]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Hattia, 2010 [89]	N 12 13 10 13	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 52.00 23.25	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25	N 12 8 10	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50		Effect size with 95% CI -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] 0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] -0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Haltia, 2010 [89] Karcz-Socha, 2011 [45]	N 12 13 10 13 96	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 52.00 23.25 23.24	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25 6.20	N 12 8 10 12 46	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50 27.08	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50 6.38		Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] - 0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] - 0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] - 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05] -0.61 [-0.97,-0.25]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Haltia, 2010 [89] Karoz–Socha, 2011 [45] Korner, 2005 [90]	N 12 13 10 13 96 12	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 52.00 23.25 23.24 5.50	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25 6.20 1.25	N 12 10 12 46 8	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50 27.08 7.75	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50 6.38 1.75		Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] - 0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] - 0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] - 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05] -0.61 [-0.97,-0.25] -1.47 [-2.44,-0.50]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Haltia, 2010 [89] Karoz–Socha, 2011 [45] Korner, 2005 [90] Pfluger, 2007 [117]	N 12 13 10 13 96 12 15	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 23.25 23.24 5.50 22.88	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25 6.20 1.25 1.73	N 12 8 10 12 46 8 17	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50 27.08 7.75 24.05	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50 6.38 1.75 2.15		Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] - 0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] - 0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05] -0.61 [-0.97,-0.25] -1.47 [-2.44,-0.50] -0.58 [-1.28, 0.11]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Haltia, 2010 [89] Karoz–Socha, 2011 [45] Korner, 2005 [90] Pfluger, 2007 [117] Outeiriño–Blanco, 2011 [67]	N 12 13 10 13 96 12 15 23	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 52.00 23.25 23.24 5.50 22.88 33.85	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25 6.20 1.25 1.73 11.63	N 12 10 12 46 8 17 13	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50 27.08 7.75 24.05 33.30	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50 6.38 1.75 2.15 11.99		Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] - 0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] - 0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] - 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05] -0.61 [-0.97,-0.25] -1.47 [-2.44,-0.50] -0.58 [-1.28, 0.11] - 0.05 [-0.62, 0.71]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Haltia, 2010 [89] Karoz–Socha, 2011 [45] Korner, 2005 [90] Pfluger, 2007 [117] Outeiriño–Blanco, 2011 [67] Overall difference in active PYY (ba	N 12 13 10 13 96 12 15 23 33	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 23.25 23.24 5.50 22.88 33.85	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25 6.20 1.25 1.73 11.63	N 12 10 12 46 8 17 13	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50 27.08 7.75 24.05 33.30	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50 6.38 1.75 2.15 11.99		Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] 0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] -0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05] -0.61 [-0.97,-0.25] -1.47 [-2.44,-0.50] -0.58 [-1.28, 0.11] -0.05 [-0.62, 0.71] -0.49 [-1.14, 0.16]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Haltia, 2010 [89] Karcz–Socha, 2011 [45] Korner, 2005 [90] Pfluger, 2007 [117] Outeiriño–Blanco, 2011 [67] Overall difference in active PYY (ba Heterogeneity: r ² = 0.73, l ² = 85.12%.	N 12 13 10 13 96 12 15 23 ssal) H ² =	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 23.25 23.24 5.50 22.88 33.85 6.72	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25 6.20 1.25 1.73 11.63	N 12 10 12 46 8 17 13	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50 27.08 7.75 24.05 33.30	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50 6.38 1.75 2.15 11.99		Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] -0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] -0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05] -0.61 [-0.97,-0.25] -1.47 [-2.44,-0.50] -0.58 [-1.28, 0.11] 0.05 [-0.62, 0.71] -0.49 [-1.14, 0.16]
(E) Study Batterham, 2003 [49] Damgaard, 2013 [107] Dirksen, 2019 [104] Haltia, 2010 [89] Karcz–Socha, 2011 [45] Korner, 2005 [90] Pfluger, 2007 [117] Outeiriño–Blanco, 2011 [67] Overall difference in active PYY (ba Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.73$, $l^2 = 85.12\%$, Test of $\theta = 0$; $z = -1.48$, $p = 0.14$	N 12 13 10 13 96 12 15 23 ssal) H ² =	Obes Mean 10.20 62.00 23.25 23.24 5.50 22.88 33.85 6.72	ity SD 2.42 57.69 22.14 6.25 6.20 1.25 1.73 11.63	N 12 10 12 46 8 17 13	Contr Mean 16.90 31.00 53.00 21.50 27.08 7.75 24.05 33.30	ol SD 2.77 14.14 18.97 5.50 6.38 1.75 2.15 11.99	Higher in controls	Effect size with 95% Cl -2.48 [-3.53,-1.44] -0.64 [-0.23, 1.51] -0.05 [-0.89, 0.79] 0.29 [-0.48, 1.05] -0.61 [-0.97,-0.25] -1.47 [-2.44,-0.50] -0.58 [-1.28, 0.11] -0.05 [-0.62, 0.71] -0.49 [-1.14, 0.16] digher in obesity

Random-effects REML model



3.3.2 | Appetite ratings in the fasting and postprandial state

Compared with the GI hormone concentrations, there was less statistical heterogeneity in the comparison of appetite ratings, although still high for fullness, both in the fasting and postprandial state, and fasting PFC (Table 1). The pooled SMD for fasting appetite ratings was small and not statistically significant (Figure 4A-D). In the comparison of postprandial hunger, the pooled SMD indicated lower hunger AUC in the obesity group (SMD: -0.66, 95% CI -1.01 to -0.32, p < 0.001, $l^2 = 41.8$) (Figure 5A). Postprandial fullness was observed to be higher in obesity, although this was associated with a high degree of statistical uncertainty and heterogeneity, and was not statistically significant (SMD: 0.43, 95% -0.38 to 1.24, p = 0.30,

(F)										
(•)		Obesi	ty		Contro	d			Effect size	
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD			with 95% CI	
Brownley, 2010 [120]	20	26.00	4.07	20	27.13	4.13		<u> </u>	-0.27 [-0.88, 0.3	
Cahill, 2011 [124]	28	29.73	14.13	41	29.38	14.52	+	—	0.02 -0.45, 0.5	
Cahill, 2014 [123]	779	28.80	19.10	1,315	28.31	18.62			0.03 [-0.06, 0.1	
Clamp, 2015 [84]	10	42.75	7.17	10	39.38	8.50			- 0.41 [-0.44, 1.2	
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	11.53	11.42	33	28.35	30.11			-0.73 [-1.22,-0.2	
Douglas, 2017 [42]	25	22.00	15.50	22	25.75	13.50		+	-0.25 [-0.82, 0.3	
Pfluger, 2007 [117]	79	11.06	1.50	66	13.10	1.15			-1.50 [-1.87,-1.1	
Overall difference in total PYY (bas	sal)						-	-	-0.36 [-0.83, 0.1	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.34$, $I^2 = 90.09\%$, H ² =	10.09					Higher in controls	Higher in (obesity	
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = -1.48$, $p = 0.14$							ingrier in controls	I lighter in t	Jucony	
						-	-2 –1	0 1	-	

Random-effects REML model

(G)

Study	N	Obesi Mean	ity SD	N	Contr Mean	ol SD				Effect size with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Bowen, 2006 [52]	47	0.40	0.45	25	0.80	0.42				-0.90 [-1.40,-0.40]	15.11
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	1.10	0.60	33	0.88	0.72		1		0.32 [-0.16, 0.79]	15.14
Dirksen, 2019 [104]	10	0.66	0.54	10	0.66	0.51			ŀ	0.00 [-0.84, 0.84]	14.66
French, 1993 [18]	8	2.43	0.71	7	1.09	0.50			-	2.03 [0.83, 3.23]	13.99
Lieverse, 1993 [126]	7	2.34	0.14	7	2.15	80.0				1.56 [0.42, 2.70]	14.12
Lieverse, 1998 [125]	7	2.40	0.20	7	3.20	0.10				-4.74 [-6.75,-2.73]	12.05
Milewicz, 2000 [127]	25	0.01	0.00	16	0.01	0.00				1.08 [0.42, 1.74]	14.93
Overall difference in CKK (b	asal)									0.01 [-1.49, 1.51]	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 3.81$, $I^2 = 9$	6.29%	, H ² =	26.99				Higher in c	ontrole	Higher	in obesity	
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 0.01$, $p = 0.9$	9						r ngher in ci	0111015	riighei	in obeany	
							10 -5	(0	5	

Random-effects REML model

FIGURE 2 (Continued)



(B)

		Obes	ity		Contr	ol		Effect s
Study	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		with 95%
Adam, 2005 [94]	28	295.20	212.40	30	441.60	246.60		-0.63 [-1.15
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	5079.84	599.11	33	5163.64	751.85	-	-0.12 [-0.60
Heden, 2013 [97]	13	52.50	22.79	13	51.19	20.28	_	0.06 [-0.69
Meyer-Gerspach, 2014 [15]	20	57.80	76.03	20	221.40	79.16		-2.07 [-2.82
Overall difference in active GLP-1 (AUC))						-0.67 [-1.58
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.76$, $I^2 = 88.92\%$,	$H^2 = 1$	9.03			Higher in contro	ls Higher in obesity		
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = -1.45$, $p = 0.15$							right in contro	ing ringhor in obcony
				-	-3 -2 -1	0 1		

Random-effects REML model

(C)								
(-/		Obes	sity		Cont	rol		Effect s
Study	N	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD		with 95%
Brownley, 2010 [120]	20	6094.13	8569.02	20	6727.38	8544.38		-0.07 [-0.68,
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	2283.35	1678.14	33	5671.68	4197.83		-1.05 [-1.56,
Meyer-Gerspach, 2014 [15]	20	370.00	659.64	20	1405.00	772.56		-1.41 [-2.09,
Overall difference in total PYY (A	UC)							-0.84 [-1.61,
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.37$, $I^2 = 80.08$	%, H	² = 5.02					Higher in controls	Higher in obesity
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = -2.14$, $p = 0.03$							riighter in dentroite	ingiter in obcony
							-2 -1	0 1
Random-effects REML model								

FIGURE 3 (A-C) Meta-analysis results for postprandial concentrations of gastrointestinal hormones

()		Obes	ity		Contr	ol		Effect size
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD		with 95% CI
Andarini, 2017 [47]	16	50.81	26.12	16	44.81	24.88		0.23 [-0.45, 0.91]
Barkeling, 1995 [132]	38	39.00	39.63	38	40.50	55.62		-0.03 [-0.48, 0.41]
Damgaard, 2013 [107]	13	53.00	25.24	8	65.00	11.31		-0.54 [-1.40, 0.32]
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	3.59	1.55	33	4.40	2.08		-0.44 [-0.92, 0.04]
Dirksen, 2019 [104]	10	52.73	15.86	10	58.77	10.26		-0.43 [-1.28, 0.42]
El Helou, 2019 [58]	15	60.00	23.24	15	55.00	23.24		0.21 [-0.49, 0.91]
Heden, 2013 [97]	14	49.00	26.19	14	63.00	22.45		-0.56 [-1.29, 0.18]
Iceta, 2019 [31]	55	39.30	23.73	29	38.60	24.23		0.03 [-0.42, 0.47]
Korner, 2005 [90]	12	47.00	31.18	8	56.00	22.63		-0.31 [-1.17, 0.56]
Painchaud Guerard, 2016 [135]	51	75.50	36.60	302	76.30	37.40	-	-0.02 [-0.32, 0.27]
Smith, 2021 [103]	12	64.58	18.75	12	61.25	18.75		■ 0.17 [-0.60, 0.95]
Overall difference in hunger (fasti	ng)							-0.10 [-0.26, 0.06]
Heterogeneity: τ^2 = 0.00, I^2 = 0.00%,	H ² =	= 1.00					Higher in controls	Higher in obesity
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = -1.19$, $p = 0.23$							r lighter in controlo	Inglier in obcorty

FIGURE 4 (A–D) Meta-analysis results for fasting appetite ratings

AUKAN ET AL.

Random-effects REML model

(B)

		Obes	ity		Contr	ol			Effect size
Study	N	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD			with 95% CI
Barkeling, 1995 [132]	38	28.00	28.96	38	18.50	19.41		┝═╌	0.38 [-0.07, 0.83]
Damgaard, 2013 [107]	13	33.00	21.63	8	16.00	11.31			- 0.88 [-0.00, 1.77]
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	2.26	1.77	33	2.36	1.86		 	-0.05 [-0.53, 0.42]
Dirksen, 2019 [104]	10	27.10	17.05	10	38.10	9.25		┢	-0.77 [-1.64, 0.10]
El Helou, 2019 [58]	15	31.00	27.11	15	27.00	19.36			0.17 [-0.53, 0.86]
Heden, 2013 [97]	14	20.00	22.45	14	9.00	11.22	-		0.60 [-0.13, 1.34]
Korner, 2005 [90]	12	25.00	24.25	8	33.00	22.63		-	-0.32 [-1.19, 0.54]
Painchaud Guerard, 2016 [135]	51	45.80	4.70	302	47.80	1.90	-		-0.80 [-1.10,-0.50]
Smith, 2021 [103]	12	23.75	17.53	12	23.42	17.53	—	-	0.02 [-0.75, 0.79]
Overall difference in fullness (fast	ing)								-0.02 [-0.39, 0.36]
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.22$, $I^2 = 71.80\%$	5, H ²	= 3.55				Hia	her in controls	Higher in (obesity
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = -0.08$, $p = 0.94$									
						-	2 –1	0 1	2

Random-effects REML model

(C)

Chudu	Obesity		Control			Effect size	w		
Siudy	IN	wean	5D	IN	wean	5D		With 95% CI	(
Andarini, 2017 [47]	16	51.16	22.23	16	52.13	25.02		0.04 [-0.72, 0.64]	16
Barkeling, 1995 [132]	38	47.50	27.75	38	65.50	21.98		-0.71 [-1.17,-0.25]	25
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	4.71	1.73	33	4.66	1.49		0.03 [-0.44, 0.50]	24
Painchaud Guerard, 2016 [135]	51	79.39	38.51	302	82.55	34.22		-0.09 [-0.39, 0.21]	34
Overall difference in DTE (fasting)						-	-0.21 [-0.55, 0.13]		
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.06$, $I^2 = 54.70\%$, $H^2 = 2.21$						Higher in controls Higher in obesity			
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = -1.22$, $p = 0.22$									
							-15 0	5	

Random-effects REML model

(D)

(-)										
	Obesity		Control					Effect size	W	
Study	Ν	Mean	SD	Ν	Mean	SD			with 95% CI	
Barkeling, 1995 [132]	38	56.00	21.28	38	63.50	16.47		-	-0.39 [-0.84, 0.06]	2
DeBenedictis, 2020 [16]	34	6.09	2.14	33	5.97	2.18		-	0.06 [-0.42, 0.53]	2
El Helou, 2019 [58]	15	64.00	19.36	15	62.00	19.36			0.10 [-0.60, 0.80]	1
Painchaud Guerard, 2016 [135]	51	80.70	1.70	302	76.80	4.10			1.01 [0.71, 1.32]	2
Smith, 2021 [103]	12	71.17	214.13	12	75.25	228.28			-0.02 [-0.79, 0.75]	1
Overall difference in PFC (fasting) Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.27$, $ ^2 = 81.42\%$, $H^2 = 5.38$						Higher in		Higher in obesity	0.18 [-0.34, 0.70]	
Test of θ = 0: z = 0.69, p = 0.49									7	

Random-effects REML model

 $I^2 = 87.6\%$) (Figure 5B). The estimated SMD and associated confidence intervals for meta-analyses of postprandial DTE and PFC indicate that it is unlikely to be any substantial difference in these appetite feelings between individuals with obesity and controls (Figure 5C and Figure 5D, respectively).

4 | DISCUSSION

This systematic review and meta-analysis represent the first comprehensive effort to investigate if the plasma concentration of GI hormones and subjective appetite ratings differ between adults with, and

FIGURE 5 (A–D) Meta-analysis results for postprandial appetite ratings



without, obesity. The systematic review showed a trend toward an attenuated hormonal response to nutrient ingestion in individuals with obesity. The meta-analysis showed that individuals with obesity indeed present with statistical significantly lower basal and postprandial total ghrelin concentrations compared with controls, lower postprandial concentrations of total PYY, and lower postprandial hunger ratings. No convincing differences were found for GLP-1, CCK, or fullness, DTE or PFC ratings. However, there was a large methodological and statistical heterogeneity among studies. Interestingly, a similar systematic review and meta-analysis previously conducted in children reported the same results, with an attenuated postprandial total ghrelin and total PYY response in children with obesity, despite large heterogeneity.¹³⁷

Ghrelin is produced in the fundus of the stomach and stimulates appetite. Its concentration peaks during fasting, and in anticipation of the upcoming meal, and declines in the postprandial period.^{8,9} It has long been reported that individuals with obesity have a lower basal and postprandial concentration of ghrelin compared with controls.²⁸ This meta-analysis confirmed these findings. However, for active ghrelin, the differences were associated with a large degree of uncertainty, preventing conclusions to be drawn.

As macronutrients interact with receptors in enteroendocrine cells, satiety peptides are secreted from the GI tract.^{10-12,138} It is generally accepted that obesity is associated with lower postprandial concentrations of satiety peptides and a weaker satiation/satiety.^{13,14,94,114,139} Centrally, through hypothalamic actions and the vagal-brainstem signaling pathway, GLP-1 promotes satiation and post meal satiety by reducing food intake in a dose-dependent manner.^{140,141} The present meta-analysis, however, found no conclusive evidence of a difference in the plasma concentration of active or total

WILEY-OBESITY

GLP-1 between individuals with and without obesity. There was an overall trend for a higher postprandial concentration of active GLP-1 in controls, but this was not statistically significant, and with a high degree of statistical heterogeneity among the studies. Discrepancies in the literature have previously been observed in both human and animal studies.¹⁴² And as such, it may be difficult to determine the role of GLP-1 in common obesity, especially in a state of weight stability.

PYY is thought to be involved in post meal satiety¹⁴³ and thereby decrease food intake.¹² Its plasma concentrations increase within 15–30 min after a meal and peak around 60–90 min postprandially. The quantitative analysis demonstrated that postprandial total PYY concentrations were statistically significantly lower in individuals with obesity compared with controls. This is in line with a previously published paper from our group showing that PYY postprandial response is poor in class I obesity compared with individuals without obesity, and completely absent in class II and III obesity.¹³ It has been suggested that the lower postprandial PYY concentrations measured in obesity would result in increased food intake in order to achieve the same degree of fullness as that seen normal weight individuals.¹³⁹

CCK is the best established and most important satiation signal, being involved in meal termination, and possibly also early phase satiety,¹⁴⁴⁻¹⁴⁷ and acts primarily through vagal afferent fibers.^{148,149} Unfortunately, few studies have assessed concentrations of CCK in individuals with and without obesity, and we were therefore unable to run a meta-analysis on this hormone. Based on the systematic review alone, results were rather inconclusive. Even if no true differences in CCK (or GLP-1) plasma concentrations exist between individuals with and without obesity, one cannot rule out the importance of the vagus nerve in regulating appetite. The chronic ingestion of energy-rich diets has been shown to reduce the sensitivity of vagal afferent neurons to peripheral signals, which would be sufficient to drive both hyperphagia and obesity.¹⁵⁰

In laboratorial settings, infusion of GI hormones has been shown to affect eating behavior in both individuals with normal-weight and obesity.^{12,86,138,139,151} However, the association between plasma concentration of GI hormones and appetite ratings is highly complex and the evidence for their influence on food intake at normal physiological levels less clear.¹⁵² An important aspect to consider is that subjective appetite ratings do not provide the full spectrum of either appetite control/behaviors or actual food intake. Subjective appetite ratings may merely represent an individual's interpretation of his/her feelings and motivations to eat, rather than direct measures of the underlying physiological processes controlling eating.40,153,154 It was early reported that subjective appetite ratings in individuals with and without obesity showed similar sensitivity to macronutrients¹⁵⁵ and dietary manipulations.¹⁵⁶ However, because obesity is associated with greater energy intake,¹⁵⁷ it was somewhat surprising that in the present metaanalysis, individuals with obesity presented with lower postprandial hunger ratings compared with controls. One hypothesis is that obesity, through distinctive processes (i.e., reduced vagal sensitivity as previously discussed, or other central mechanisms), dysregulates the sensing of appetite. For example, in individuals with a normal weight, ghrelin and PYY concentrations are correlated with hunger and fullness

ratings, respectively, whereas no association has been found in individuals with obesity.¹⁵⁸ A second alternative hypothesis is that once an individual reaches his/her genetically determined weight, no differences in appetite markers are seen between individuals with normalweight and obesity. However, the lower ghrelin plasma concentrations, both in the fasting and postprandial states, and lower postprandially PYY secretion seen in individuals with obesity, questions this hypothesis and asks for more research. Finally, it is also possible that food intake in individuals with obesity is driven by the hedonic system. There is evidence that GI hormones also mediate the hedonic appetite system.¹⁵⁹ Hedonic appetite can easily override homeostatic signals when food is easily available and highly palatable, even in the absent of physiological hunger.¹⁶⁰ This is particularly important considering the obesogenic environment that has emerged over the past decades. Hedonic characteristics might, therefore, offer an additional proxy to help reflect motivation to eat and actual food intake.

Diet-induced weight loss has consistently been shown to modulate the plasma concentration of Gl hormones, and appetite ratings, including increases in ghrelin plasma concentrations, as well as hunger and fullness ratings,^{16,161,162} despite inconsistent findings regarding satiety peptides.^{14,16,18} Interestingly, our research group has recently demonstrated that the increased orexigenic drive to eat seen after weight loss likely reflects a normalization toward a lower body weight, given that no differences were seen between reduced-obese individuals and fat mass matched controls.¹⁶ Moreover, maintaining weight loss after dietary restriction has been suggested to be dependent on increases in postprandial GLP-1 and PYY responses.¹⁶³ Even though establishing a direction of causality if difficult, and out of the scope of this review, the previously discussed findings point to obesity being a cause, not a consequence, of potential abnormalities in the homeostatic appetite control system.

This review has several strengths. It is the first systematic review and meta-analysis comparing GI hormones and appetite ratings between adults with obesity and controls. Second, the analysis was conducted following the PRISMA statement guidelines, and used well established tools during the whole selection process. Third, its comprehensiveness provides a warranted descriptive picture of the topic of interest. Unfortunately, this analysis also has some limitations. First, several studies were not included in the meta-analysis due to missing data. This might have affected the results and contributed to the lack of significant differences between groups for some of the outcome variables. Second, the heterogeneity in most meta-analyses conducted in this study was also relatively high and, as such, conclusions should be made with caution. When interpreting the present results, it is critical to consider timing, nature, and structure of the test-meal, important aspects in modulating the outcome variables of this review. The statistical heterogeneity seen in this meta-analysis, particularly for the GI hormone comparisons, is likely to be the result of differences in the underlying study populations, test-meals used, and sample processing. For example, GLP-1 is rapidly degraded, and accurate methods are crucial to obtain precise measures. Also, the adequate measure of L-cell secretion is total GLP-1, whereas active GLP-1 provides information about the endocrine part of the peptide's actions.¹⁶⁴ Thus,

developing an optimized standardized method to assess hormonal responses and subjective appetite is needed. Third, transparent research and reporting of results should be encouraged, as there is some indication of publication bias with an apparent small study effect among the published results for basal hormone concentration. Fourth, different GI hormones are stimulated by specific nutrients in the lumen.⁵ This means that the mixed meals used (liquid or solid), with different macronutrient composition, or even single macronutrient meals, might not have been the best to maximize the inhibition of ghrelin, or the release of the different satiety peptides. For example, among the included studies in the analysis for active GLP-1 (AUC), higher concentrations were seen in controls, versus individuals with obesity, after a 750 kcal liquid meal,¹⁵ whereas no differences were reported between groups after a 450-650 kcal solid meal.^{16,94,97} Another important aspect to take into consideration is if the tests meals were similar in the obesity and control groups, or if they were adjusted for body weight. Most of the studies have used the same test meal in both groups. This ensures that the same stimuli is given to each subject but does not account for individual nutritional needs. Lastly, although all efforts were made to ensure that measures were comparable, the length of the postprandial period could affect the results.

5 | CONCLUSION

Obesity is associated with lower basal and postprandial concentrations of total ghrelin, lower postprandial concentration of total PYY, and lower postprandial hunger ratings, but large variations exist. More studies are needed to better understand the implications of these findings and to determine if they are a cause or a consequence of obesity. Further, it is important to establish if an association exists between the alterations in Gl hormones seen in individuals with obesity and their actual food intake. This will provide a better understanding of the pathophysiology of this chronic disease.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The funding for this study was provided by the Liaison Committee between the Central Norway Regional Health Authority (RHA) and the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflict of interest to disclosure.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Catia Martins, Marthe Isaksen Aukan, and Silvia Coutinho formulated the research questions and designed the study. [Correction added on 15 December 2022, after first online publication: The author names have been updated in the preceding sentence, in this version.] Marthe Isaksen Aukan and Silvia Coutinho conducted the reviewer process. Sindre Andre Pedersen conducted the literature search. Melanie Rae Simpson conducted the statistical analysis. All authors were involved in the writing of the manuscript.

ORCID

Marthe Isaksen Aukan D https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0458-3640

REFERENCES

- Bray GA, Kim KK, Wilding JPH. Obesity: a chronic relapsing progressive disease process. A position statement of the World Obesity Federation. *Obes Rev.* 2017;18(7):715-723. doi:10.1111/ obr.12551
- Caleyachetty R, Barber TM, Mohammed NI, et al. Ethnicity-specific BMI cutoffs for obesity based on type 2 diabetes risk in England: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2021; 9(7):419-426. doi:10.1016/s2213-8587(21)00088-7
- Walls HL, Wolfe R, Haby MM, et al. Trends in BMI of urban Australian adults, 1980–2000. Public Health Nutr. 2010;13(5): 631-638. doi:10.1017/s1368980009991455
- Rohde K, Keller M, la Cour PL, Blüher M, Kovacs P, Böttcher Y. Genetics and epigenetics in obesity. *Metabolism*. 2019;92:37-50. doi:10.1016/j.metabol.2018.10.007
- Steinert RE, Feinle-Bisset C, Asarian L, et al. GLP-1, and PYY(3-36): secretory controls and physiological roles in eating and glycemia in health, obesity, and after RYGB. *Physiol Rev.* 2017;97(1):411-463. doi:10.1152/physrev.00031.2014
- Druce M, Bloom SR. The regulation of appetite. Arch Dis Child. 2006; 91(2):183-187. doi:10.1136/adc.2005.073759
- Hansen TT, Mead BR, Garcia-Gavilan JF, et al. Is reduction in appetite beneficial for body weight management in the context of overweight and obesity? Yes, according to the SATIN (Satiety Innovation) study. J Nutr Sci. 2019;8:e39.
- Wren AM, Seal LJ, Cohen MA, et al. Ghrelin enhances appetite and increases food intake in humans. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2001; 86(12):5992. doi:10.1210/jcem.86.12.8111
- Patterson M, Bloom SR, Gardiner JV. Ghrelin and appetite control in humans-potential application in the treatment of obesity. *Peptides*. 2011;32(11):2290-2294. doi:10.1016/j.peptides.2011.07.021
- Holst JJ. The physiology of glucagon-like peptide 1. Physiol Rev. 2007;87(4):1409-1439. doi:10.1152/physrev.00034.2006
- Bacarese-Hamilton AJ, Adrian TE, Bloom SR. Distribution and heterogeneity of immunoreactive cholecystokinin (CCK) in the mucosa of the porcine gastrointestinal tract. *Regul Pept.* 1984;9(4):289-298. doi:10.1016/0167-0115(84)90081-8
- Batterham RL, Cowley MA, Small CJ, et al. Gut hormone PYY(3-36) physiologically inhibits food intake. *Nature*. 2002;418(6898): 650-654. doi:10.1038/nature00887
- Aukan MI, Nymo S, Haagensli Ollestad K, et al. Differences in gastrointestinal hormones and appetite ratings among obesity classes. *Appetite*. 2022;171:105940. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2022.105940
- Acosta A, Camilleri M, Shin A, et al. Quantitative gastrointestinal and psychological traits associated with obesity and response to weightloss therapy. *Gastroenterology*. 2015;148(3):537-546. doi:10.1053/j. gastro.2014.11.020
- Meyer-Gerspach AC, Wolnerhanssen B, Beglinger B, et al. Gastric and intestinal satiation in obese and normal weight healthy people. *Physiol Behav.* 2014;129:265-271. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.02.043
- DeBenedictis JN, Nymo S, Ollestad KH, et al. Changes in the homeostatic appetite system after weight loss reflect a normalization toward a lower body weight. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2020;105(7): 01. doi:10.1210/clinem/dgaa202
- Marzullo P, Caumo A, Savia G, et al. Predictors of postabsorptive ghrelin secretion after intake of different macronutrients. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2006;91(10):4124-4130. doi:10.1210/jc.2006-0270
- French SJ, Murray B, Rumsey RD, Sepple CP, Read NW. Preliminary studies on the gastrointestinal responses to fatty meals in obese people. Int J Obesity Related Metab Dis: J Int Assoc Study Obes. 1993; 17(5):295-300.

WILEY 13 of 18

H of 18 WILEY-OBESI

- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- 20. Stubbs RJ, Hughes DA, Johnstone AM, et al. The use of visual analogue scales to assess motivation to eat in human subjects: a review of their reliability and validity with an evaluation of new hand-held computerized systems for temporal tracking of appetite ratings. Br J Nutr. 2007;84(04):405-415. doi:10.1017/s0007114500001719
- Paoli A, Bosco G, Camporesi EM, Mangar D. Ketosis, ketogenic diet and food intake control: a complex relationship. *Front Psychol.* 2015; 6:27. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00027
- Sterne JACSJ, Page MJ, Elbers RG, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2019;366:14898.
- Sterne JACHM, Reeves BC, Savović J, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomized studies of interventions. BMJ. 2016;355:i4919. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919
- McGrath S, Zhao X, Steele R, Thombs BD, Benedetti A. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from commonly reported quantiles in meta-analysis. *Stat Methods Med Res.* 2020;29(9): 962280219889080. doi:10.1177/0962280219889080
- Higgins JPTTJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (Eds). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 6.3 (updated February 2022). Cochrane; 2022. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook
- Arafat AM, Weickert MO, Adamidou A, et al. The impact of insulinindependent, glucagon-induced suppression of total ghrelin on satiety in obesity and type 1 diabetes mellitus. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2013;98(10):4133-4142. doi:10.1210/jc.2013-1635
- Dardzinska JA, Malgorzewicz S, Kaska L, et al. Fasting and postprandial acyl and desacyl ghrelin levels in obese and non-obese subjects. *Endokrynol pol.* 2014;65(5):377-381. doi:10.5603/EP.2014.0052
- English PJ, Ghatei MA, Malik IA, Bloom SR, Wilding JP. Food fails to suppress ghrelin levels in obese humans. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2002;87(6):2984. doi:10.1210/jcem.87.6.8738
- Heden TD, Liu Y, Park Y, Dellsperger KC, Kanaley JA. Acute aerobic exercise differentially alters acylated ghrelin and perceived fullness in normal-weight and obese individuals. J Appl Physiol. 2013;115(5): 680-687. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00515.2013
- Homaee HM, Moradi F, Azarbayjani MA, Peeri M. Relationships between acylated ghrelin with growth hormone, insulin resistance, lipid profile, and cardio respiratory function in lean and obese men. *J Res Med Sci.* 2011;16(12):1612-1618.
- Iceta S, Julien B, Seyssel K, et al. Ghrelin concentration as an indicator of eating-disorder risk in obese women. *Diabetes Metab.* 2019; 45(2):160-166. doi:10.1016/j.diabet.2018.01.006
- Korek E, Krauss H, Gibas-Dorna M, Kupsz J, Piatek M, Piatek J. Fasting and postprandial levels of ghrelin, leptin and insulin in lean, obese and anorexic subjects. *Przeglad Gastroenterologiczny*. 2013; 8(6):383-389. doi:10.5114/pg.2013.39922
- Lopez-Aguilar I, Ibarra-Reynoso LDR, Malacara JM. Association of nesfatin-1, acylated ghrelin and cortisol with scores of compulsion, food addiction, and binge eating in adults with normal weight and with obesity. Ann Nutr Metab. 2018;7(1):54-61. doi:10.1159/ 000490357
- Marzullo P, Verti B, Savia G, et al. The relationship between active ghrelin levels and human obesity involves alterations in resting energy expenditure. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2004;89(2):936-939. doi:10.1210/jc.2003-031328
- Seyssel K, Allirot X, Nazare JA, et al. Plasma acyl-ghrelin increases after meal initiation: a new insight. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2016;70(7): 790-794. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2015.181
- Slama FB, Jridi N, Rayana MCB, Trimeche A, Hsairi M, Belhadj O. Plasma levels of leptin and ghrelin and their correlation with BMI, and circulating lipids and glucose in obese Tunisian women. *Asian Biomed.* 2015;9(2):161-168. doi:10.5372/1905-7415.0902.382

 Suematsu M, Katsuki A, Sumida Y, et al. Decreased circulating levels of active ghrelin are associated with increased oxidative stress in obese subjects. *Eur J Endocrinol.* 2005;153(3):403-407. doi:10.1530/ eje.1.01977

AUKAN ET AL.

- Tentolouris N, Kokkinos A, Tsigos C, et al. Differential effects of high-fat and high-carbohydrate content isoenergetic meals on plasma active ghrelin concentrations in lean and obese women. *Horm Metab Res.* 2004;36(8):559-563. doi:10.1055/s-2004-825761
- Valera Mora ME, Scarfone A, Valenza V, et al. Ghrelin does not influence gastric emptying in obese subjects. *Obes Res.* 2005;13(4): 739-744. doi:10.1038/oby.2005.83
- Carroll JF, Kaiser KA, Franks SF, Deere C, Caffrey JL. Influence of BMI and gender on postprandial hormone responses. *Obesity*. 2007; 15(12):2974-2983. doi:10.1038/oby.2007.355
- 41. Chearskul S, Kooptiwut S, Pummoung S, et al. Obesity and appetite-related hormones. *J Med Assoc Thai*. Nov 2012;95(11): 1472-1479.
- Douglas JA, King JA, Clayton DJ, et al. Acute effects of exercise on appetite, ad libitum energy intake and appetite-regulatory hormones in lean and overweight/obese men and women. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2017;41(12):1737-1744. doi:10.1038/ijo.2017.181
- 43. Kolodziejski PA, Pruszynska-Oszmalek E, Korek E, et al. Serum levels of spexin and kisspeptin negatively correlate with obesity and insulin resistance in women. *Physiol Res.* 2018;67(1):45-56.
- Wadden D, Cahill F, Amini P, et al. Serum acylated ghrelin concentrations in response to short-term overfeeding in normal weight, overweight, and obese men. PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource]. 2012; 7(9):e45748. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0045748
- Karcz-Socha I, Zwirska-Korczala K, Zembala M, Borgiel-Marek H, Karcz K. Ghrelin PYY 3-36 serum changes in left ventricular hypertrophic, insulin-resistant, hypertensive obese patients. *Obes Facts*. 2011;4(5):386-392. doi:10.1159/000334198
- 46. Krzyzanowska-Swiniarska B, Kempa A, Miazgowski T, Pilarska K. Serum acylated ghrelin, adiponectin and leptin levels in normalweight and obese premenopausal women. *Horm Metab Res.* 2007; 39(11):835-839. doi:10.1055/s-2007-991175
- Andarini S, Kangsaputra FB, Handayani D. Pre- and postprandial acylated ghrelin in obese and normal weight men. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr. 2017;26(Suppl 1):S85-S91. doi:10.6133/apjcn.062017.s5
- Afify M, Samy N, El-Maksoud MA, Hasheim M, Saleh O, Elnemr M. Assessment of biochemical changes among Egyptian women with increased body weight. *Asian Biomedicine*. 2012;6(6):833-840. doi:10.5372/1905-7415.0606.129
- Batterham RL, Cohen MA, Ellis SM, et al. Inhibition of food intake in obese subjects by peptide YY3-36. N Engl J Med. 2003;349(10): 941-948.
- Beasley JM, Ange BA, Anderson CA, Miller Iii ER, Holbrook JT, Appel LJ. Characteristics associated with fasting appetite hormones (obestatin, ghrelin, and leptin). *Obesity*. 2009;17(2):349-354. doi:10. 1038/oby.2008.551
- Bogdanov VB, Bogdanova OV, Dexpert S, et al. Reward-related brain activity and behavior are associated with peripheral ghrelin levels in obesity. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2019;112:104520. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2019.104520
- Bowen J, Noakes M, Clifton PM. Appetite regulatory hormone responses to various dietary proteins differ by body mass index status despite similar reductions in ad libitum energy intake. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2006;91(8):2913-2919. doi:10.1210/jc.2006-0609
- Brownley KA, Heymen S, Hinderliter AL, Galanko J, Macintosh B. Low-glycemic load decreases postprandial insulin and glucose and increases postprandial ghrelin in white but not black women. *J Nutr.* 2012;142(7):1240-1245. doi:10.3945/jn.111.146365
- Carlson JJ, Turpin AA, Wiebke G, Hunt SC, Adams TD. Pre- and postprandial appetite hormone levels in normal weight and severely obese women. *Nutr Metab.* 2009;6:32. doi:10.1186/1743-7075-6-32

- Cassar S, Teede HJ, Harrison CL, Joham AE, Moran LJ, Stepto NK. Biomarkers and insulin sensitivity in women with polycystic ovary syndrome: characteristics and predictive capacity. *Clin Endocrinol* (*Oxf*). 2015;83(1):50-58. doi:10.1111/cen.12619
- Corbalan-Tutau MD, Madrid JA, Garaulet M. Timing and duration of sleep and meals in obese and normal weight women. Association with increase blood pressure. *Appetite*. 2012;59(1):9-16. doi:10. 1016/j.appet.2012.03.015
- Daghestani MH. A preprandial and postprandial plasma levels of ghrelin hormone in lean, overweight and obese Saudi females. J King Saud University Sci. 2009;21(2):119-124. doi:10.1016/j.jksus.2009.05.001
- El Helou N, Obeid OA, Olabi A. Effect of meal acceptability on postprandial appetite scores and hormones of male participants with varied adiposity. *Obesity*. 2019;27(10):1627-1633. doi:10.1002/oby. 22583
- Erdmann J, Lippl F, Wagenpfeil S, Schusdziarra V. Differential association of basal and postprandial plasma ghrelin with leptin, insulin, and type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes*. 2005;54(5):1371-1378. doi:10.2337/ diabetes.54.5.1371
- Guo ZF, Zheng X, Qin YW, Hu JQ, Chen SP, Zhang Z. Circulating preprandial ghrelin to obestatin ratio is increased in human obesity. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2007;92(5):1875-1880. doi:10.1210/jc. 2006-2306
- Kamal M, Mohi A, Fawzy M, El-Sawah H. Fasting plasma ghrelin in women with and without PCOS. *Middle East Fertility Soc J.* 2010; 15(2):91-94. doi:10.1016/j.mefs.2010.04.006
- Kheirouri S, Haghighi S, Saidpour A. Brain-derived neurotrophic factor in obese women and its relationship with leptin and ghrelin. *Progress in Nutrition*. 2017;19(2):169-175. doi:10.23751/pn.v19i2. 4858
- Kiessl GRR, Laessle RG. Stress does not affect ghrelin secretion in obese and normal weight women. *Eating Weight Disorders: EWD*. 2017;22(1):79-84. doi:10.1007/s40519-016-0316-2
- Kocak H, Oner-Iyidogan Y, Gurdol F, Oner P, Esin D. Serum asymmetric dimethylarginine and nitric oxide levels in obese postmenopausal women. J Clin Lab Anal. 2011;25(3):174-178. doi:10.1002/ jcla.20452
- Leonetti F, Silecchia G, lacobellis G, et al. Different plasma ghrelin levels after laparoscopic gastric bypass and adjustable gastric banding in morbid obese subjects. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2003;88(9): 4227-4231. doi:10.1210/jc.2003-030133
- Mans E, Serra-Prat M, Palomera E, Sunol X, Clave P. Sleeve gastrectomy effects on hunger, satiation, and gastrointestinal hormone and motility responses after a liquid meal test. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2015; 102(3):540-547. doi:10.3945/ajcn.114.104307
- Outeirino-Blanco E, Garcia-Buela J, Sangiao-Alvarellos S, Pertega-Diaz S, Martinez-Ramonde T, Cordido F. Growth hormone, ghrelin and peptide YY secretion after oral glucose administration in healthy and obese women. *Horm Metab Res.* 2011;43(8):580-586. doi:10. 1055/s-0031-1279779
- Ozkan Y, Aydin S, Donder E, et al. Effect of orlistat on the total ghrelin and leptin levels in obese patients. *J Physiol Biochem*. 2009;65(3): 215-223. doi:10.1007/BF03180574
- Papandreou D, Karavolias C, Arvaniti F, Kafeza E, Sidawi F. Fasting Ghrelin levels are decreased in obese subjects and are significantly related with insulin resistance and body mass index. *Open Access Macedonian J Med Sci.* 2017;5(6):699-702. doi:10.3889/oamjms. 2017.182
- Pavlatos S, Kokkinos A, Tentolouris N, Doupis J, Kyriaki D, Katsilambros N. Acute effects of high-protein and high-fat isoenergetic meals on total ghrelin plasma concentrations in lean and obese women. *Horm Metab Res.* 2005;37(12):773-775. doi:10.1055/s-2005-921101
- 71. Rubio IG, Castro G, Zanini AC, Medeiros-Neto G. Oral ingestion of a hydrolyzed gelatin meal in subjects with normal weight and in obese

patients: postprandial effect on circulating gut peptides, glucose and insulin. *Eating & Weight Disorders: EWD*. 2008;13(1):48-53. doi:10. 1007/BF03327784

15 of 18

WILFY

- Shiiya T, Nakazato M, Mizuta M, et al. Plasma ghrelin levels in lean and obese humans and the effect of glucose on ghrelin secretion. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2002;87(1):240-244. doi:10.1210/jcem.87. 1.8129
- Skoczylas A, Adamczak M, Chudek J, Wiecek A. Cilazapril increases plasma ghrelin concentration in obese patients with arterial hypertension. *Endokrynol Pol.* 2010;61(1):21-27.
- Sondergaard E, Gormsen LC, Nellemann B, Vestergaard ET, Christiansen JS, Nielsen S. Visceral fat mass is a strong predictor of circulating ghrelin levels in premenopausal women. *Eur J Endocrinol*. 2009;160(3):375-379. doi:10.1530/EJE-08-0735
- Tassone F, Broglio F, Destefanis S, et al. Neuroendocrine and metabolic effects of acute ghrelin administration in human obesity. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2003;88(11):5478-5483. doi:10.1210/jc.2003-030564
- 76. Tritos NA, Mun E, Bertkau A, Grayson R, Maratos-Flier E, Goldfine A. Serum ghrelin levels in response to glucose load in obese subjects post-gastric bypass surgery. *Obes Res.* 2003;11(8):919-924. doi:10.1038/oby.2003.126
- 77. Wroblewski E, Swidnicka-Siergiejko A, Hady HR, et al. Variation in blood levels of hormones in obese patients following weight reduction induced by endoscopic and surgical bariatric therapies. *Cytokine*. 2016;77:56-62. doi:10.1016/j.cyto.2015.10.013
- Yang N, Liu X, Ding EL, et al. Impaired ghrelin response after highfat meals is associated with decreased satiety in obese and lean Chinese young adults. J Nutr. 2009;139(7):1286-1291. doi:10.3945/ jn.109.104406
- 79. Ybarra J, Bobbioni-Harsch E, Chassot G, et al. Persistent correlation of ghrelin plasma levels with body mass index both in stable weight conditions and during gastric-bypass-induced weight loss. *Obes Surg.* 2009;19(3):327-331. doi:10.1007/s11695-008-9748-8
- Yildiz BO, Suchard MA, Wong ML, McCann SM, Licinio J. Alterations in the dynamics of circulating ghrelin, adiponectin, and leptin in human obesity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S a*. 2004;101(28):10434-10439.
- Veiga L, Brito M, Silva C, Silva-Nunes J. Glucose homeostasis in obese women is not associated to unacylated ghrelin plasma levels. *Biomark Insights.* 2020;15:1177271920928923. doi:10.1177/ 1177271920928923
- Adamska-Patruno E, Ostrowska L, Goscik J, et al. The differences in postprandial serum concentrations of peptides that regulate satiety/hunger and metabolism after various meal intake, in men with normal vs. excessive BMI. Nutrients. 2019;11(3):26. doi:10. 3390/nu11030493
- Brandao PP, Garcia-Souza EP, Neves FA, dos Santos Pereira MJ, Sichieri R, Moura AS. Appetite-related hormone levels in obese women with and without binge eating behavior. *Revista De Nutricao-Brazilian J Nutr.* 2011;24(5):667-677. doi:10.1590/s1415-52732011000500001
- Clamp L, Hehir AP, Lambert EV, Beglinger C, Goedecke JH. Lean and obese dietary phenotypes: differences in energy and substrate metabolism and appetite. *Br J Nutr.* 2015;114(10):1724-1733. doi:10.1017/S0007114515003402
- Cremonini F, Camilleri M, Vazquez Roque M, et al. Obesity does not increase effects of synthetic ghrelin on human gastric motor functions. *Gastroenterology*. 2006;131(5):1431-1439. doi:10.1053/j. gastro.2006.09.021
- Druce MR, Wren AM, Park AJ, et al. Ghrelin increases food intake in obese as well as lean subjects. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2005;29(9): 1130-1136. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0803001
- 87. Espelund U, Hansen TK, Hojlund K, et al. Fasting unmasks a strong inverse association between ghrelin and cortisol in serum: studies in

obese and normal-weight subjects. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2005; 90(2):741-746. doi:10.1210/jc.2004-0604

- Frecka JM, Mattes RD. Possible entrainment of ghrelin to habitual meal patterns in humans. *Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol*. 2008;294(3):G699-G707. doi:10.1152/ajpgi.00448.2007
- Haltia LT, Savontaus E, Vahlberg T, Rinne JO, Kaasinen V. Acute hormonal changes following intravenous glucose challenge in lean and obese human subjects. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest*. 2010;70(4):275-280. doi:10.3109/00365511003792975
- Korner J, Bessler M, Cirilo LJ, et al. Effects of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery on fasting and postprandial concentrations of plasma ghrelin, peptide YY, and insulin. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2005;90(1): 359-365. doi:10.1210/jc.2004-1076
- Lambert E, Lambert G, Ika-Sari C, et al. Ghrelin modulates sympathetic nervous system activity and stress response in lean and overweight men. *Hypertension*. 2011;58(1):43-50. doi:10.1161/ HYPERTENSIONAHA.111.171025
- Atas U, Erin N, Tazegul G, Elpek GO, Yildirim B. Changes in ghrelin, substance P and vasoactive intestinal peptide levels in the gastroduodenal mucosa of patients with morbid obesity. *Neuropeptides*. 2021;89:102164. doi:10.1016/j.npep.2021.102164
- Ahmed RH, Huri HZ, Muniandy S, et al. Altered circulating concentrations of active glucagon-like peptide (GLP-1) and dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP4) in obese subjects and their association with insulin resistance. *Clin Biochem.* 2017;50(13–14):746-749. doi:10.1016/j. clinbiochem.2017.03.008
- Adam TC, Westerterp-Plantenga MS. Glucagon-like peptide-1 release and satiety after a nutrient challenge in normal-weight and obese subjects. Br J Nutr. 2005;93(6):845-851. doi:10.1079/ BJN20041335
- Calanna S, Piro S, Di Pino A, et al. Beta and alpha cell function in metabolically healthy but obese subjects: relationship with enteroinsular axis. *Obesity*. 2013;21(2):320-325. doi:10.1002/oby.20017
- Elahi D, Ruff DA, Carlson OD, Meneilly GS, Habener JF, Egan JM. Does GLP-1 suppress its own basal secretion? *Endocr Res.* 2016; 41(1):16-20. doi:10.3109/07435800.2015.1038353
- Heden TD, Liu Y, Kearney ML, et al. Prior exercise and postprandial incretin responses in lean and obese individuals. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2013;45(10):1897-1905. doi:10.1249/MSS. 0b013e318294b225
- Mersebach H, Svendsen OL, Holst JJ, Astrup A, Feldt-Rasmussen U. Comparisons of leptin, incretins and body composition in obese and lean patients with hypopituitarism and healthy individuals. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 2003;58(1):65-71.
- 99. Seimon RV, Brennan IM, Russo A, et al. Gastric emptying, mouth-tocecum transit, and glycemic, insulin, incretin, and energy intake responses to a mixed-nutrient liquid in lean, overweight, and obese males. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab. 2013;304(3):E294-E300. doi:10.1152/ajpendo.00533.2012
- Vazquez Roque MI, Camilleri M, Stephens DA, et al. Gastric sensorimotor functions and hormone profile in normal weight, overweight, and obese people. *Gastroenterology*. 2006;131(6):1717-1724. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2006.10.025
- Wolnerhanssen BK, Cajacob L, Keller N, et al. Gut hormone secretion, gastric emptying, and glycemic responses to erythritol and xylitol in lean and obese subjects. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab.* 2016; 310(11):E1053-E1061. doi:10.1152/ajpendo.00037.2016
- 102. Wu T, Ma J, Bound MJ, et al. Effects of sitagliptin on glycemia, incretin hormones, and antropyloroduodenal motility in response to intraduodenal glucose infusion in healthy lean and obese humans and patients with type 2 diabetes treated with or without metformin. *Diabetes*. 2014;63(8):2776-2787. doi:10.2337/db13-1627
- 103. Smith K, Taylor GS, Allerton DM, et al. The postprandial glycaemic and hormonal responses following the ingestion of a novel, readyto-drink shot containing a low dose of whey protein in centrally

obese and lean adult males: a randomised controlled trial. Front Endocrinol. 2021;12:696977. doi:10.3389/fendo.2021.696977

AUKAN ET AL.

- 104. Dirksen C, Graff J, Fuglsang S, Rehfeld JF, Holst JJ, Madsen JL. Energy intake, gastrointestinal transit, and gut hormone release in response to oral triglycerides and fatty acids in men with and without severe obesity. Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol. 2019; 316(3):G332-G337. doi:10.1152/ajpgi.00310.2018
- 105. Carr RD, Larsen MO, Jelic K, et al. Secretion and dipeptidyl peptidase-4-mediated metabolism of incretin hormones after a mixed meal or glucose ingestion in obese compared to lean, nondiabetic men. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2010;95(2):872-878. doi:10. 1210/jc.2009-2054
- Chia CW, Carlson OD, Liu DD, Gonzalez-Mariscal I, Santa-Cruz Calvo S, Egan JM. Incretin secretion in humans is under the influence of cannabinoid receptors. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab.* 2017; 313(3):E359-E366. doi:10.1152/ajpendo.00080.2017
- 107. Damgaard M, Graff J, Fuglsang S, Holst JJ, Rehfeld JF, Madsen JL. Effects of oleic acid and olive oil on gastric emptying, gut hormone secretion and appetite in lean and overweight or obese males. *E-Spen Journal*. 2013;8(1):e8-e14. doi:10.1016/j.clnme.2012. 10.004
- 108. Greenfield JR, Farooqi IS, Keogh JM, et al. Oral glutamine increases circulating glucagon-like peptide 1, glucagon, and insulin concentrations in lean, obese, and type 2 diabetic subjects. Am J Clin Nutr. 2009;89(1):106-113. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2008.26362
- 109. Heni M, Kullmann S, Gallwitz B, Haring HU, Preissl H, Fritsche A. Dissociation of GLP-1 and insulin association with food processing in the brain: GLP-1 sensitivity despite insulin resistance in obese humans. *Molecular Metabolism*. 2015;4(12):971-976. doi:10.1016/j. molmet.2015.09.007
- Nguyen NQ, Debreceni TL, Burgess JE, et al. Impact of gastric emptying and small intestinal transit on blood glucose, intestinal hormones, glucose absorption in the morbidly obese. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2018;42(9):1556-1564. doi:10.1038/s41366-018-0012-6
- 111. Trahair LG, Marathe CS, Standfield S, et al. Effects of small intestinal glucose on glycaemia, insulinaemia and incretin hormone release are load-dependent in obese subjects. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2017;41(2): 225-232. doi:10.1038/ijo.2016.202
- 112. Valderas JP, Irribarra V, Rubio L, et al. Effects of sleeve gastrectomy and medical treatment for obesity on glucagon-like peptide 1 levels and glucose homeostasis in non-diabetic subjects. *Obes Surg.* 2011; 21(7):902-909. doi:10.1007/s11695-011-0375-4
- 113. Verdich C, Toubro S, Buemann B, Lysgard Madsen J, Juul Holst J, Astrup A. The role of postprandial releases of insulin and incretin hormones in meal-induced satiety--effect of obesity and weight reduction. *Int J Obesity Related Metab Dis J Int Assoc Study Obes*. 2001;25(8):1206-1214. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0801655
- 114. Wikarek T, Chudek J, Owczarek A, Olszanecka-Glinianowicz M. Effect of dietary macronutrients on postprandial incretin hormone release and satiety in obese and normal-weight women. Br J Nutr. 2014;111(2):236-246. doi:10.1017/S0007114513002389
- 115. Schwander F, Kopf-Bolanz KA, Buri C, et al. A dose-response strategy reveals differences between normal-weight and obese men in their metabolic and inflammatory responses to a high-fat meal. *J Nutr.* 2014;144(10):1517-1523. doi:10.3945/jn.114.193565
- 116. Witjaksono F, Simadibrata M, Lukito W, Wijaya A, Nurwidya F. Profiles of peptide YY and ghrelin, levels of hunger and satiety, and ad libitum intake in obese and non-obese Indonesian women. *Rom J Intern Med.* 2019;57(1):15-22. doi:10.2478/rjim-2018-0027
- Pfluger PT, Kampe J, Castaneda TR, et al. Effect of human body weight changes on circulating levels of peptide YY and peptide YY 3-36. J Clin Endocrinol Metabol. 2007;92(2):583-588. doi:10.1210/jc. 2006-1425
- 118. Stewart JE, Seimon RV, Otto B, Keast RS, Clifton PM, Feinle-Bisset C. Marked differences in gustatory and gastrointestinal

sensitivity to oleic acid between lean and obese men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2011;93(4):703-711. doi:10.3945/ajcn.110.007583

- 119. Seimon RV, Taylor P, Little TJ, et al. Effects of acute and longer-term dietary restriction on upper gut motility, hormone, appetite, and energy-intake responses to duodenal lipid in lean and obese men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2014;99(1):24-34. doi:10.3945/ajcn.113.067090
- Brownley KA, Heymen S, Hinderliter AL, MacIntosh B. Effect of glycemic load on peptide-YY levels in a biracial sample of obese and normal weight women. *Obesity*. 2010;18(7):1297-1303. doi:10. 1038/oby.2009.368
- 121. Valderas JP, Irribarra V, Boza C, et al. Medical and surgical treatments for obesity have opposite effects on peptide YY and appetite: a prospective study controlled for weight loss. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2010;95(3):1069-1075. doi:10.1210/jc.2009-0983
- 122. Naslund E, Gryback P, Backman L, et al. Distal small bowel hormones: correlation with fasting antroduodenal motility and gastric emptying. *Dig Dis Sci.* 1998;43(5):945-952. doi:10.1023/A: 1018806129102
- Cahill F, Ji Y, Wadden D, et al. The association of serum total peptide YY (PYY) with obesity and body fat measures in the CODING study. PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource]. 2014;9(4):e95235. doi:10. 1371/journal.pone.0095235
- Cahill F, Shea JL, Randell E, Vasdev S, Sun G. Serum peptide YY in response to short-term overfeeding in young men. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2011;93(4):741-747. doi:10.3945/ajcn.110.003624
- 125. Lieverse RJ, Masclee AA, Jansen JB, Lam WF, Lamers CB. Obese women are less sensitive for the satiety effects of bombesin than lean women. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 1998;52(3):207-212. doi:10.1038/sj. ejcn.1600541
- 126. Lieverse RJ, Jansen JB, van de Zwan A, Samson L, Masclee AA, Lamers CB. Effects of a physiological dose of cholecystokinin on food intake and postprandial satiation in man. *Regul Pept.* 1993; 43(1–2):83-89.
- 127. Milewicz A, Bidzinska B, Mikulski E, Demissie M, Tworowska U. Influence of obesity and menopausal status on serum leptin, cholecystokinin, galanin and neuropeptide Y levels. *Gynecol Endocrinol*. 2000;14(3):196-203. doi:10.3109/09513590009167682
- Wisen O, Bjorvell H, Cantor P, Johansson C, Theodorsson E. Plasma concentrations of regulatory peptides in obesity following modified sham feeding (MSF) and a liquid test meal. *Regul Pept*. 1992;39(1): 43-54.
- 129. Barazzoni R, Zanetti M, Nagliati C, et al. Gastric bypass does not normalize obesity-related changes in ghrelin profile and leads to higher acylated ghrelin fraction. *Obesity*. 2013;21(4):718-722. doi: 10.1002/oby.20272
- 130. Brennan IM, Luscombe-Marsh ND, Seimon RV, et al. Effects of fat, protein, and carbohydrate and protein load on appetite, plasma cholecystokinin, peptide YY, and ghrelin, and energy intake in lean and obese men. Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol. 2012;303(1): G129-G140. doi:10.1152/ajpgi.00478.2011
- Ueda SY, Yoshikawa T, Katsura Y, Usui T, Nakao H, Fujimoto S. Changes in gut hormone levels and negative energy balance during aerobic exercise in obese young males. J Endocrinol. 2009;201(1): 151-159. doi:10.1677/JOE-08-0500
- 132. Barkeling B, Rossner S, Sjoberg A. Methodological studies on single meal food intake characteristics in normal weight and obese men and women. Int J Obesity & Related Metab Dis J Int Assoc Study Obesity. 1995;19(4):284-290.
- Barkeling B, King NA, Naslund E, Blundell JE. Characterization of obese individuals who claim to detect no relationship between their eating pattern and sensations of hunger or fullness. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2007;31(3):435-439. doi:10.1038/sj.ijo.0803449
- 134. Gavrieli A, Karfopoulou E, Kardatou E, et al. Effect of different amounts of coffee on dietary intake and appetite of normal-weight

and overweight/obese individuals. *Obesity*. 2013;21(6):1127-1132. doi:10.1002/oby.20190

-WILEY

- 135. Painchaud Guerard G, Lemieux S, Doucet E, Pomerleau S, Provencher V. Influence of nutrition claims on appetite sensations according to sex, weight status, and restrained eating. *Journal of Obesity*. 2016;2016:9475476. doi:10.1155/2016/9475476
- Lieverse R, Jansen J, Masclee A, Lamers C. Obese women are less sensitive for the satiety effects of bombesin than lean women. *Gastroenterology*. 1993;104(4):A837-A837.
- 137. Nguo K, Walker KZ, Bonham MP, Huggins CE. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of meal intake on postprandial appetite-related gastrointestinal hormones in obese children. Int J Obes (Lond). 2016;40(4):555-563. doi:10.1038/ijo.2015.256
- de Graaf C, Blom WA, Smeets PA, Stafleu A, Hendriks HF. Biomarkers of satiation and satiety. Am J Clin Nutr. 2004;79(6): 946-961. doi:10.1093/ajcn/79.6.946
- Ie Roux CW, Batterham RL, Aylwin SJ, et al. Attenuated peptide YY release in obese subjects is associated with reduced satiety. *Endocrinology*. 2006;147(1):3-8. doi:10.1210/en.2005-0972
- Parkinson JR, Chaudhri OB, Kuo YT, et al. Differential patterns of neuronal activation in the brainstem and hypothalamus following peripheral injection of GLP-1, oxyntomodulin and lithium chloride in mice detected by manganese-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (MEMRI). *Neuroimage*. 2009;44(3):1022-1031. doi:10.1016/j. neuroimage.2008.09.047
- Cork SC. The role of the vagus nerve in appetite control: implications for the pathogenesis of obesity. J Neuroendocrinol. 2018; 30(11):e12643. doi:10.1111/jne.12643
- 142. Hira T, Pinyo J, Hara H. What is GLP-1 really doing in obesity? Trends Endocrinol Metab. 2020;31(2):71-80. doi:10.1016/j.tem.2019. 09.003
- 143. Batterham RL, Heffron H, Kapoor S, et al. Critical role for peptide YY in protein-mediated satiation and body-weight regulation. *Cell Metab.* 2006;4(3):223-233. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2006. 08.001
- 144. Lieverse RJ, Jansen JB, Masclee AA, Rovati LC, Lamers CB. Effect of a low dose of intraduodenal fat on satiety in humans: studies using the type A cholecystokinin receptor antagonist loxiglumide. *Gut.* 1994;35(4):501-505. doi:10.1136/gut.35.4.501
- 145. Liddle RA, Goldfine ID, Rosen MS, Taplitz RA, Williams JA. Cholecystokinin bioactivity in human plasma. Molecular forms, responses to feeding, and relationship to gallbladder contraction. J Clin Invest. 1985;75(4):1144-1152. doi:10.1172/jci111809
- 146. Beglinger C, Degen L, Matzinger D, D'Amato M, Drewe J. Loxiglumide, a CCK-A receptor antagonist, stimulates calorie intake and hunger feelings in humans. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol. 2001;280(4):R1149-R1154. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.2001.280.4. R1149
- 147. Ballinger A, McLoughlin L, Medbak S, Clark M. Cholecystokinin is a satiety hormone in humans at physiological post-prandial plasma concentrations. *Clin Sci (Lond)*. 1995;89(4):375-381. doi:10.1042/ cs0890375
- 148. Moran TH, Baldessarini AR, Salorio CF, Lowery T, Schwartz GJ. Vagal afferent and efferent contributions to the inhibition of food intake by cholecystokinin. *Am J Physiol*. 1997;272(4 Pt 2):R1245-R1251. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.1997.272.4.R1245
- 149. Schwartz GJ, Moran TH. CCK elicits and modulates vagal afferent activity arising from gastric and duodenal sites. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 1994;713:121-128.
- de Lartigue G. Role of the vagus nerve in the development and treatment of diet-induced obesity. J Physiol. 2016;594(20): 5791-5815. doi:10.1113/jp271538
- Flint A, Raben A, Astrup A, Holst JJ. Glucagon-like peptide 1 promotes satiety and suppresses energy intake in humans. *J Clin Invest*. 1998;101(3):515-520. doi:10.1172/jci990

18 of 18 WILEY-OBESITY

- 152. Crum AJ, Corbin WR, Brownell KD, Salovey P. Mind over milkshakes: mindsets, not just nutrients, determine ghrelin response. *Health Psychol.* 2011;30(4):424-429. doi:10.1037/a0023467
- 153. Blundell J. Hunger, appetite and satiety—constructs in search of identities. *Nutr Lifestyles Appl Sci.* 1979;21-42.
- 154. Stubbs RJ, Hughes DA, Johnstone AM, et al. The use of visual analogue scales to assess motivation to eat in human subjects: a review of their reliability and validity with an evaluation of new hand-held computerized systems for temporal tracking of appetite ratings. Br J Nutr. 2000;84(4):405-415. doi:10.1017/s0007114500001719
- 155. Hill AJ, Blundell JE. Comparison of the action of macronutrients on the expression of appetite in lean and obese human subjects. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 1989;575(1) (The Psychobiology of Human Eating Disorders: Preclinical and Clinical Perspectives):529-531.
- 156. Rolls BJ, Bell EA, Castellanos VH, Chow M, Pelkman CL, Thorwart ML. Energy density but not fat content of foods affected energy intake in lean and obese women. Am J Clin Nutr. 1999;69(5): 863-871. doi:10.1093/ajcn/69.5.863
- 157. Epstein LH, Carr KA, Lin H, Fletcher KD, Roemmich JN. Usual energy intake mediates the relationship between food reinforcement and BMI. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2012;20(9):1815-1819. doi:10. 1038/oby.2012.2
- Maier C, Riedl M, Vila G, et al. Cholinergic regulation of ghrelin and peptide YY release may be impaired in obesity. *Diabetes*. 2008; 57(9):2332-2340. doi:10.2337/db07-0758
- Decarie-Spain L, Kanoski SE. Ghrelin and glucagon-like peptide-1: a gut-brain axis battle for food reward. *Nutrients*. 2021;13(3):977. doi: 10.3390/nu13030977
- Lutter M, Nestler EJ. Homeostatic and hedonic signals interact in the regulation of food intake. J Nutr. 2009;139(3):629-632. doi:10. 3945/jn.108.097618

- Nymo S, Coutinho SR, Jorgensen J, et al. Timeline of changes in appetite during weight loss with a ketogenic diet. Int J Obes (Lond). 2017;41(8):1224-1231. doi:10.1038/ijo.2017.96
- 162. Sumithran P, Prendergast LA, Delbridge E, et al. Long-term persistence of hormonal adaptations to weight loss. N Engl J Med. 2011; 365(17):1597-1604. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1105816
- 163. lepsen EW, Lundgren J, Holst JJ, Madsbad S, Torekov SS. Successful weight loss maintenance includes long-term increased meal responses of GLP-1 and PYY3-36. Eur J Endocrinol. 2016;174(6): 775-784. doi:10.1530/eje-15-1116
- 164. Heijboer AC, Frans A, Lomecky M, Blankenstein MA. Analysis of glucagon-like peptide 1; what to measure? *Clin Chim Acta Int J Clin Chem.* 2011;412(13–14):1191-1194. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2011.03.010

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Aukan MI, Coutinho S, Pedersen SA, Simpson MR, Martins C. Differences in gastrointestinal hormones and appetite ratings between individuals with and without obesity—A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews*. 2022;e13531. doi:10.1111/obr.13531