



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Citation:

Hopkins, M and Gibbons, C and Caudwell, P and Blundell, JE and Finlayson, G (2016) Differing effects of high-fat or high-carbohydrate meals on food hedonics in overweight and obese individuals. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 115 (10). pp. 1875-1884. ISSN 1475-2662 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114516000775>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/3082/>

Document Version:

Article (Accepted Version)

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

1 **Differing Effects of High Fat or High Carbohydrate Meals on Appetite and Food**
2 **Hedonics in Overweight and Obese Individuals.**

3

4 Mark Hopkins^{1, 2}, Catherine Gibbons², Phillipa Caudwell^{2, 3}, John E. Blundell² &
5 Graham Finlayson².

6

7 ¹Academy of Sport and Physical Activity, Faculty of Health and Wellbeing, Sheffield
8 Hallam University, Sheffield, S10 2BP, UK. ²Institute of Psychological Sciences,
9 Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK. ³Medical
10 and Healthcare Affairs, AstraZeneca, Horizon Place, 600 Capability Green, Luton,
11 LU1 3LU, UK.

12

13 **Corresponding author:**

14

15 Dr Mark Hopkins,
16 Academy of Sport and Physical Activity,
17 Faculty of Health and Wellbeing,
18 Sheffield Hallam University,
19 Sheffield,
20 United Kingdom.

21

22 Tel: +44 (0) 1142 255368.

23 Email: M.Hopkins@shu.ac.uk.

24

25 **Running title:**

26

27 Macronutrient composition & food hedonics

28

29 **Key Words:**

30

31 Macronutrient composition: Energy intake: Satiation: Satiety: Food hedonics

32

33 **Abbreviations:**

34

35 HFLC, high fat/low carbohydrate foods; LFHC, low fat/high carbohydrate foods; SQ,
36 satiety quotient; LFPQ, Leeds Food Preference Questionnaire.

37 **ABSTRACT**

38

39 While the effects of dietary fat and carbohydrate on satiety are well documented, little
40 is known about the impact of these macronutrients on food hedonics. We examined
41 the effects of *ad libitum* and isoenergetic meals varying in fat and carbohydrate on
42 satiety, energy intake and food hedonics. In all, sixty-five overweight and obese
43 individuals (BMI = 30.9 ± 3.8 kg/m²) completed two separate test meal days in a
44 randomised order in which they consumed high-fat/low-carbohydrate (HFLC) or low-
45 fat/high-carbohydrate (LFHC) foods. Satiety was measured using subjective appetite
46 ratings to calculate the satiety quotient. Satiation was assessed by intake at *ad libitum*
47 meals. Hedonic measures of explicit liking (subjective ratings) and implicit wanting
48 (speed of forced-choice) for an array of HFLC and LFHC foods were also tested
49 before and after isoenergetic HFLC and LFHC meals. The satiety quotient was greater
50 after *ad libitum* and isoenergetic meals during the LFHC condition compared to the
51 HFLC condition ($P = 0.006$ and $P = 0.001$, respectively), while *ad libitum* energy
52 intake was lower in the LFHC condition ($P < 0.001$). Importantly, the LFHC meal
53 also reduced explicit liking ($P < 0.001$) and implicit wanting ($P = 0.013$) for HFLC
54 foods compared to the isoenergetic HFLC meal, which failed to suppress the hedonic
55 appeal of subsequent HFLC foods. Therefore, when coupled with increased satiety
56 and lower energy intake, the greater suppression of hedonic appeal for high-fat food
57 seen with LFHC foods provides a further mechanism for why these foods promote
58 better short-term appetite control than HFLC foods.

59 INTRODUCTION

60

61 The role of dietary carbohydrate in the etiology and treatment of obesity is
62 controversial, with some arguing that carbohydrate intake plays a more prominent
63 role in promoting overconsumption and weight gain than dietary fat^(1, 2). While this
64 view has been strongly debated⁽³⁾, it has long been established that dietary
65 macronutrients exert a hierarchical effect on appetite-related processes such as satiety
66 and short-term food intake⁽⁴⁾. When expressed relative to energy content rather than
67 weight of food, protein exerts the strongest effect on satiety, followed by
68 carbohydrate, whilst fat exerts the weakest effect⁽⁵⁾. This hierarchical effect has been
69 demonstrated under a variety of laboratory and free-living conditions using subjective
70 measures of appetite, biomarkers of satiety and food intake⁽⁶⁻¹¹⁾. However, the
71 underlying metabolic, and in particular, behavioural mechanisms that promote
72 overconsumption following the consumption of energy dense, high-fat foods are not
73 well understood.

74 The differential effects of dietary macronutrients on satiety may relate to differences
75 in pre-ingestive cognitive and sensory signals generated at the time of consumption⁽¹²⁾
76 and/or the post-ingestive metabolic effects of these foods⁽¹³⁻¹⁵⁾. However, recent
77 evidence suggests that the hedonic value of foods encountered following consumption
78 (e.g. food liking and wanting), which is closely linked to the perceived taste and
79 energy content of food, can also influence appetite and energy intake⁽¹⁶⁾. For example,
80 a heightened liking (the perceived pleasurable sensory properties of food) and
81 wanting (the attraction towards a specific food over available alternatives⁽¹⁷⁾) for high
82 fat, high sweet foods has been noted in overweight and obese individuals⁽¹⁸⁾ and those
83 who demonstrate binge eating⁽¹⁹⁾. Despite this, the effect of macronutrient
84 composition on food hedonics has received little attention and existing data are
85 contradictory.

86 While high protein meals (25% of total energy) have been shown not to effect food
87 hedonics compared to isoenergetic low protein meals (7% of total energy)⁽²⁰⁾,
88 Lemmens et al.⁽²¹⁾ reported that a meal containing 65% of its total energy from protein
89 reduced 'wanting' to a greater extent than an isoenergetic high carbohydrate meal
90 (65% of total energy). Furthermore, a 14 day low protein diet (0.5 g protein·kg body
91 weight⁻¹·d⁻¹) was found to increase protein intake, wanting, preference for savoury

92 high protein foods⁽²²⁾ and the neural activation to savoury food cues in brain reward
93 regions⁽²³⁾ compared to a high protein diet (2.0 g protein·kg body weight⁻¹·d⁻¹).

94 While these data suggest that dietary macronutrients may also differentially effect
95 food hedonics, the acute effects of macronutrient composition, and in particular,
96 dietary fat, on food hedonics has yet to be examined. Given the controversy over the
97 relative contribution of dietary fat and carbohydrate in promoting overconsumption
98 and weight gain, this warrants further attention. Therefore, the aim of the present
99 study was to examine the effects of *ad libitum* and isoenergetic meals varying in
100 dietary fat and carbohydrate on energy intake, satiety and food hedonics in
101 overweight and obese individuals.

102 **METHODS**

103 **Participants**

104 In all, sixty-five overweight and obese males ($N = 26$) and females ($N = 39$) were
105 recruited onto this randomised, crossover design study. Descriptive characteristics of
106 participants are displayed in Table 1. All participants were non-smokers, physically
107 inactive (≤ 2 hrs·wk⁻¹ of exercise over the previous six months), weight stable (± 2 kg
108 for the previous three months) and not taking medication known to affect metabolism
109 or appetite. This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the
110 Declaration of Helsinki, and ethical approval was granted by the Leeds West National
111 Health Service Research Ethics Committee (09/H1307/7). All participants provided
112 written informed consent before taking part. The project was registered under
113 international standard identification for controlled trials ISRCTN47291569.

114

115 *Table 1 here.....*

116 **Study Design**

117 Participants completed two separate probe test meal days in a randomised order in
118 which they consumed either high fat/low carbohydrate (HFLC) or low fat/high
119 carbohydrate (LFHC) meals across the day that were matched for sensory properties
120 and taste. Total daily energy intake was measured using a laboratory-based test meal
121 design that included fixed energy and *ad libitum* meals, while satiation (energy intake
122 during a single meal) was measured during *ad libitum* meal consumption only. Satiety

123 was measured using subjective appetite ratings adjusted for energy intake from the
124 breakfast and lunch meals to calculate the satiety quotient (SQ) (24). Hedonic
125 measures of explicit liking (subjective ratings) and implicit wanting (speed of forced-
126 choice) for an array of HFLC and LFHC foods were also tested before and after the
127 isoenergetic lunch meal using the Leeds Food Preference Questionnaire (LFPQ)⁽²⁵⁾.

128

129 **Procedures**

130 **Total Daily Energy Intake and Satiation**

131 Total daily energy intake and satiation (measured via energy intake during a single
132 meal) were measured using a laboratory-based test meal protocol in which
133 participants consumed either HFLC or LFHC foods across the whole day. Test days
134 were separated by at least two days, and the order in which participants performed the
135 HFLC and LFHC days was randomized and counter-balanced. The form of the meals
136 on each test day was identical, with foods similar in appearance and taste
137 acceptability so participants could not detect the nutritional manipulation. The mean
138 proportion of energy contributed by fat, protein, and carbohydrate to total daily
139 energy intake on the HFLC and LFHC test days was $56.0 \pm 3.2\%$, $13.9 \pm 2.1\%$, and
140 $30.1 \pm 3.9\%$, and $23.0 \pm 3.3\%$, $13.5 \pm 1.5\%$, and $63.5 \pm 4.4\%$, respectively. Mean
141 taste acceptability for the HFLC and LFHC conditions was assessed using visual
142 analogue scales in a sub-sample of participants ($N = 16$) who took part in the wider
143 study, and no differences existed between the HFLC (62.3 ± 7.2 mm) and LFHC
144 conditions (56.9 ± 6.1 mm; $P = 0.242$). Similarly, mean food satisfaction was also
145 assessed using visual analogue scales following the HFLC (63.8 ± 7.9 mm) and
146 LFHC (62.2 ± 6.6 mm) conditions, and again, did not differ between conditions ($P =$
147 0.724).

148 During the test days, participants consumed an *ad libitum* breakfast meal, a fixed
149 energy lunch (800 kcals) and an *ad libitum* dinner meal (four hours apart). After the
150 dinner meal, participants were free to leave the research laboratory but were given an
151 *ad libitum* snack box of foods to consume if desired during the evening. All meals
152 provided on the test day were either HFLC or LFHC, and participants were required
153 to consume only the foods and drinks provided on these test days. Details of the

154 individual food items, macronutrient composition and weight of food consumed can
155 be found in Supplementary Table S1 and elsewhere⁽²⁶⁾.

156 All meals consumed in the research unit were eaten in isolation, with participants
157 instructed to eat as much or as little as they wanted until comfortably full during *ad*
158 *libitum* meal consumption. Food was provided in excess of expected consumption,
159 with participants able to request further food or water if required. Prior to
160 participation individuals completed a food preference questionnaire, and if they
161 strongly disliked any of the test foods, participants were excluded if a suitable
162 alternative (matched for macronutrient composition) could not be found. Energy
163 intake was calculated by weighing the food before and after consumption (to the
164 nearest 0.1 g), and with reference to the manufacturers' energy values. To calculate
165 test meal energy intake, the energy equivalences used for protein, fat and
166 carbohydrate were 4, 9 and 3.75 kcal·g⁻¹, respectively. Total daily energy intake was
167 taken as the energy consumed during the breakfast, lunch and dinner meals, and
168 intake from the snack box. Energy intake during the *ad libitum* breakfast and dinner
169 meals was used to represent satiation in the present paper.

170 **Subjective Appetite Ratings**

171 Subjective ratings of appetite were measured during test meal probe days using visual
172 analogue scales presented on a validated hand-held electronic appetite rating system
173 (EARS II)⁽²⁷⁾. On each day, ratings were recorded immediately before and after a
174 meal, and at hourly intervals throughout the day (from 0800 to 1800 hours). The use
175 of visual analogue scales for the measurement of subjective appetite has previously
176 been shown to be valid and reproducible⁽²⁸⁾. Furthermore, visual analogue scales have
177 been used to detect changes in appetite following manipulations of energy intake^(29, 30)
178 and diet composition⁽³¹⁾, while the EARS II electronic rating system has been
179 validated against the traditional pen and paper technique⁽²⁷⁾.

180 **Satiety**

181 The suppression of hunger per calorie of intake for the *ad libitum* breakfast meal and
182 fixed energy lunch meals was assessed by calculating the satiety quotient (SQ). The
183 SQ was developed by Green et al.⁽²⁴⁾, and expresses changes in post-prandial appetite
184 ratings relative to the energy content of a meal. As such, it reflects the capacity of a

185 meal to modulate the strength of post-prandial satiety sensations. The SQ of a meal
186 was calculated using the following formula using subjective hunger ratings⁽²⁴⁾, with a
187 higher SQ indicative of a greater satiating efficiency:

$$\text{Satiety Quotient} = \frac{\text{rating pre-eating episode} - \text{rating post-eating episode}}{\text{intake of eating episode}} \times 100$$

188

189 It has been suggested that the SQ provides a better marker of satiety than post-
190 prandial hunger ratings, as it takes into account both the pre-meal appetite sensations
191 and the energy content of the meal consumed⁽³²⁾. The SQ has also been shown to be
192 associated with *ad libitum* food intake following a variety of nutritional
193 interventions^(32, 33).

194 **Hedonic Assessment of HFLC and LFHC Foods**

195 Immediately prior to and following the fixed energy lunch meal, the hedonic profile
196 of an array of foods was assessed using the Leeds Food Preference Questionnaire⁽²⁵⁾.
197 The LFPQ provides measures of different components of food preference and
198 hedonics. Participants are presented with an array of pictures of individual food items
199 common in the diet. Foods in the array are chosen by the experimenter from a
200 validated database to be either predominantly high (> 45% energy) or low (< 20%
201 energy) in fat but similar in familiarity, protein content, sweet or non-sweet taste and
202 acceptability. Each food category was represented by eight photographs of ready-to-
203 eat foods. Details of the mean energy density, serving and macronutrient composition
204 of food items and categories' used in the LFPQ can be found in Table 2. The LFPQ
205 has been validated against physiological and behavioural endpoints in a range of
206 research⁽³⁴⁻³⁶⁾. The specific endpoints examined from the LFPQ were explicit liking,
207 implicit wanting and food preference for HFLC relative to LFHC foods, as described
208 below. The LFPQ has been shown to demonstrate reliable immediate and post-meal
209 changes⁽³⁷⁾, and is a good predictor of food choice and intake in laboratory and
210 community-based samples^(22, 38).

211 *Table 2 here....*

212 **Explicit Liking and Implicit Wanting**

213 To measure explicit liking, participants rated the extent to which they liked each food
214 (e.g. how pleasant would it be to taste this food now?). The food images were
215 presented individually in a randomised order and participants made their ratings using
216 a 100 mm visual analogue scale.

217 Implicit wanting was assessed using a forced choice methodology in which the food
218 images were paired so that every image from each food category was compared to
219 every other type over 96 trials (food pairs). Participants were instructed to respond as
220 quickly and accurately as they could, indicating the food they want to eat the most at
221 that time (e.g. which food do you most want to eat now?). Following Dalton et al.⁽³⁹⁾,
222 the food pair trials were presented in three blocks, with each stimulus appearing eight
223 times. Stimuli were presented until a valid response was detected up to a maximum of
224 4000 ms with a variable 500-1000 ms washout between presentations in which a
225 central fixation cross was displayed. To measure Implicit Wanting, reaction times for
226 all responses were covertly recorded and used to compute mean response times for
227 each food type after adjusting for frequency of selection. Therefore, a positive score
228 indicates a more rapid preference for high fat foods over low fat foods and a negative
229 score indicates the opposite. A score of zero indicates that high fat and low fat foods
230 are equally preferred. A frequency-weighted algorithm was used so the Implicit
231 Wanting score could be influenced by both selection (positively contributing to the
232 score) and non-selection (negatively contributing to the score) of food type.

233 **Statistical Analysis**

234 Data are reported as mean \pm SEM throughout unless otherwise stated. Statistical
235 analyses were performed using IBM SPSS for Windows (Chicago, Illinois, Version
236 21). Where appropriate, Greenhouse-Geisser probability levels were used to adjust for
237 sphericity, and Bonferroni adjustments were applied to control for multiple *post-hoc*
238 comparisons. Our sample size of $N = 65$ was assessed for adequate power by a
239 posteriori power analysis using G*Power⁽⁴⁰⁾ to find an effect of macronutrient
240 composition on implicit wanting for HFLC food, based on data from Griffioen-Roose
241 et al.⁽³⁵⁾, and expected correlation of 0.5, $\beta = 0.8$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. A paired t-test was
242 used to examine differences between pre-meal subjective appetite ratings (hunger and
243 fullness) and total daily energy intake during the HFLC and LFHC conditions. To
244 examine the effects of macronutrient composition on satiation (i.e. energy intake

245 during breakfast and lunch meals) was examined using a two-way ANOVA
246 (meal*macronutrient composition) with repeated measures. Similarly, the effect of
247 macronutrient composition on satiety (SQ) was examined following the *ad libitum*
248 breakfast and fixed energy lunch meals using separate two-way ANOVAs
249 (time*macronutrient composition) with repeated measures.

250

251 For LFPQ measures, mean scores for HFCLC and LFHC categories were computed for
252 implicit wanting and explicit liking outcomes. Mean LFHC scores were then
253 subtracted from the mean for HFCLC scores to provide a composite score representing
254 hedonic value for HFCLC relative to LFHC food for liking and wanting. Using this
255 approach a positive score indicated greater liking or wanting for HFCLC foods over
256 LFHC foods; a negative score indicated greater liking or wanting for LFHC foods
257 over HFCLC foods; and a score of zero indicated an equal liking or wanting for HFCLC
258 and LFHC foods. The explicit liking and implicit wanting appeal bias scores were
259 examined separately using a two-way ANOVA (macronutrient composition*hunger
260 state) with repeated measures. Interactions were explored further using simple post
261 hoc comparisons. To test whether hedonic endpoints were associated with food
262 intake, simple linear regression was used to examine the relationships between
263 explicit liking and implicit wanting and *ad libitum* dinner meal intake.

264

265 **RESULTS**

266 **The Effect of Macronutrient Composition on Appetite, Satiation and Total Daily** 267 **Energy Intake**

268

269 No differences existed between the pre-breakfast ratings of subjective hunger ($63.3 \pm$
270 2.9 vs. 60.8 ± 3.1 mm; $P = 0.509$) or fullness (19.9 ± 2.34 vs. 24.4 ± 2.8 mm; $P =$
271 0.138) during HFCLC and LFHC conditions, respectively. Similarly, no differences
272 existed in ratings of hunger (62.3 ± 3.0 vs. 63.7 ± 3.0 mm; $P = 0.592$) or fullness
273 (30.1 ± 2.6 vs. 27.3 ± 2.6 mm; $P = 0.320$) immediately before the lunch meal during
274 HFCLC and LFHC conditions, respectively.

275

276 Total daily energy intake was significantly greater during the HFCLC condition
277 compared to the LFHC condition (990.4 ± 81.0 kcal; $P < 0.001$). As expected, no
278 differences existed in energy intake during the fixed energy HFCLC (799.9 ± 2.3 kcal)

279 and LFHC (785.8 ± 2.9 kcal; $P > 0.05$) lunch meals. In order to examine the effects of
280 macronutrient composition on satiation (i.e. energy intake during a single meal)
281 during the *ad libitum* breakfast and dinner meals, energy intake during the separate
282 test meals was examined. A two-way ANOVA (meal*macronutrient composition)
283 with repeated measures indicated a significant main effect of meal ($F_{(2.54, 162.81)} =$
284 35.926 ; $P < 0.001$; $\eta^2 = 0.360$) and macronutrient composition ($F_{(1, 64)} = 156.953$; $P <$
285 0.001 ; $\eta^2 = 0.710$). There was also a significant meal*macronutrient composition
286 interaction ($F_{(2.10, 134.64)} = 36.045$; $P < 0.001$; $\eta^2 = 0.360$), such that energy intake was
287 significantly higher at breakfast (337.2 ± 44.2 kcal; $P < 0.001$) and dinner ($531.8 \pm$
288 35.2 kcal; $P < 0.001$) during the HFLC condition compared to the LFHC condition
289 (Figure 1).

290

291 *Figure 1 here....*

292

293 **The Effect of Macronutrient Composition on Satiety Following *Ad Libitum*** 294 **Breakfast Meal Consumption**

295

296 There was a significant effect of macronutrient composition on SQ following the
297 consumption of the *ad libitum* breakfast meal, with a two-way ANOVA
298 (time*macronutrient composition) with repeated measures indicating a significant
299 main effect of time ($F_{(1.49, 95.49)} = 97.024$; $P < 0.001$; $\eta^2 = 0.603$) and macronutrient
300 composition ($F_{(1, 64)} = 8.072$; $P = 0.006$; $\eta^2 = 0.112$). Furthermore, there was a
301 significant time*macronutrient composition interaction ($F_{(2.27, 143.20)} = 19.687$; $P <$
302 0.001 ; $\eta^2 = 0.235$), such that the LFHC breakfast SQ was significantly higher than the
303 HFLC breakfast SQ immediately after ($P < 0.001$) and at 60 ($P < 0.001$) and 120
304 minutes post meal consumption ($P = 0.001$; Figure 2).

305

306 *Figure 2 here....*

307

308 **The Effect of Macronutrient Composition on Satiety Following Consumption of** 309 **the Isoenergetic Lunch Meal**

310

311 There was also an effect of macronutrient composition on SQ following consumption
312 of the fixed energy lunch meal (Figure 2), with a two-way ANOVA

313 (time*macronutrient composition) with repeated measures indicating a significant
314 main effect of time ($F_{(2.56, 164.38)} = 109.980$; $P < 0.001$; $\eta^2 = 0.632$). There was also a
315 significant main effect of macronutrient composition ($F_{(1, 64)} = 11.314$; $P = 0.001$; $\eta^2 =$
316 0.150), such that SQ was significantly higher following consumption of the LFHC
317 meal compared to the HFLC meal ($P = 0.001$). However, there was no
318 time*macronutrient composition interaction ($F_{(2.96, 189.57)} = 0.187$; $P = 0.945$; $\eta^2 =$
319 0.003).

320

321 **The Effect of Macronutrient Composition on the Hedonic Assessment of Food** 322 **Following Isoenergetic Meal Consumption**

323

324 When the explicit liking score for HFLC relative to LFHC foods was examined, a
325 two-way ANOVA with repeated measures indicated a significant main effect of
326 macronutrient composition ($F_{(1, 64)} = 8.432$; $P = 0.005$; $\eta^2 = 0.116$), such that explicit
327 liking for HFLC foods was greater during the HFLC condition. There was also a
328 significant macronutrient composition*hunger state interaction ($F_{(1, 64)} = 5.993$; $P =$
329 0.017 ; $\eta^2 = 0.086$). While explicit liking did not differ between conditions in the
330 hungry state i.e. pre-meal ($P = 0.519$), explicit liking for HFLC foods was
331 significantly lower in the fed state following the consumption of the LFHC meal
332 compared to the HFLC meal ($P < 0.001$; Figure 3).

333

334 *Figure 3 here...*

335

336 When the implicit wanting score for HFLC relative to LFHC foods was examined, a
337 significant main effect of macronutrient composition was seen ($F_{(1, 64)} = 4.846$; $P =$
338 0.031 ; $\eta^2 = 0.070$), such that implicit wanting was higher during the HFLC condition.
339 There was no main effect of hunger state ($F_{(1, 64)} = 0.205$; $P = 0.652$; $\eta^2 = 0.001$), and
340 the macronutrient composition*hunger state interaction approached significance ($F_{(1,$
341 $64)} = 2.851$; $P = 0.096$; $\eta^2 = 0.043$). As can be seen in Figure 3, consumption of the
342 HFLC meal increased wanting (1.00 ± 2.92) while LFHC foods decreased wanting ($-$
343 3.57 ± 3.35). Post hoc comparisons indicated that implicit wanting for HFLC foods
344 did not differ between conditions in the hungry state (i.e. pre-meal; $P = 0.427$), but
345 was significantly lower in the fed state following the consumption of the LFHC meal
346 compared to the HFLC meal ($P = 0.011$; Figure 3).

347

348 **Association between the Hedonic Assessment of HFLC and LFHC Food and *Ad***
349 ***Libitum* Food Intake**

350

351 To examine whether the hedonic assessment of food was associated with food intake,
352 simple linear regression was used to examine the relationships between explicit
353 liking, implicit wanting and *ad libitum* dinner intake. As can be seen in Table 3,
354 positive associations were seen between explicit liking and implicit wanting (in the
355 hungry and fed states) and *ad libitum* dinner intake during the HFLC and LFHC
356 conditions.

357

358 ***Table 3 here....***

359

360 **DISCUSSION**

361

362 The aim of the present study was to examine the effects of macronutrient composition
363 on energy intake, satiety and the post-ingestive hedonic assessment of subsequent
364 foods. When participants were allowed to eat *ad libitum*, consumption of LFHC foods
365 resulted in greater post-prandial satiety (higher SQ values), greater satiation (lower
366 self-selected meal intake) and lower total daily energy intake compared to the
367 consumption of HFLC foods. Importantly, despite controlling for energy content,
368 weight and palatability, the explicit liking and implicit wanting for high fat foods
369 were also suppressed to a greater extent following consumption of the LFHC lunch
370 meal compared to the HFLC meal. As such, these data indicate that changing the
371 composition of meals from HFLC to LFHC not only reduces energy intake and
372 increases satiety, but also reduces the relative hedonic value of other high fat/low
373 carbohydrate food options. Taken together, these findings suggest that LFHC foods
374 may promote better short-term appetite control than HFLC foods via both hedonic
375 and appetite-based mechanisms.

376

377 **The Effects of Macronutrient Composition on Satiety and Food Intake**

378 A clear effect of macronutrient composition on energy intake was observed in the
379 present study, with total daily energy intake and self-selected intake (satiation) during

380 the *ad libitum* breakfast and dinner meals significantly lower during the LFHC
381 condition compared to the HFLC condition. There was also a strong effect of
382 macronutrient composition on satiety, with the *ad libitum* LFHC breakfast found to be
383 more satiating than the equivalent HFLC breakfast (as indicated by higher post-
384 prandial SQ scores). Indeed, the consumption the LFHC breakfast increased satiety
385 despite the lower energy content of the LFHC breakfast meal (and no differences in
386 fasting hunger or fullness between conditions). This effect was transient however,
387 with no differences in SQ noted between conditions 180 minutes post consumption.
388 The effect of macronutrient composition was also apparent under isoenergetic feeding
389 conditions (albeit to a lesser extent), with greater SQ again seen following the LFHC
390 lunch meal. In line with previous findings^(5, 8), these data indicate that switching from
391 HFLC to LFHC foods not only reduces energy intake, but also increases the potency
392 of postprandial satiety under *ad libitum* and isoenergetic feeding conditions.

393

394 Alterations in the physiological signals arising from the fat and carbohydrate content
395 of the meals may underlie the differences in satiety seen in the present study, with the
396 macronutrient composition of meals mediating the secretion of post-prandial satiety
397 hormones such as glucagon-like peptide-1 and peptide YY⁽¹³⁻¹⁵⁾. Mixed macronutrient
398 meals representative of the natural local eating habits of the participants were used in
399 the present study. The mean carbohydrate content during the HFLC was $30.1 \pm 3.9\%$
400 (as opposed to $63.5 \pm 4.4\%$ in the LFHC condition), similar to that recommended by
401 the recent Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition recommendations on
402 carbohydrates⁽⁴¹⁾. As such, the carbohydrate content of the HFLC meals would have
403 still stimulated the release/suppression of post-prandial satiety hormones, but to a
404 lesser extent than the LFHC meal. This may help account for why the differences in
405 SQ between conditions were smaller under isoenergetic feeding condition, a finding
406 that has been previously reported⁽⁴²⁾.

407

408 **The Effect of Macronutrient Composition on Food Hedonics**

409

410 Although differences in the hedonic assessment of food is increasingly being
411 recognised as a risk factor for overconsumption and weight gain⁽²⁵⁾, the effect of
412 macronutrient composition on the liking and wanting for subsequent foods has
413 received little attention. Importantly, the present study demonstrated that explicit

414 liking for high fat foods was reduced to a greater extent following consumption of a
415 LFHC test meal compared to a HFLC meal (despite controlling for the energy, weight
416 and palatability of food). Furthermore, similar trend effects were observed for implicit
417 wanting, with the LFHC meal decreasing wanting for high fat foods while the HFLC
418 meal increased wanting for high fat foods. These findings are interesting given that
419 pre-meal appetite sensations (hunger and fullness) did not differ between conditions.
420 It is also interesting to note that when hungry, individuals preferred HFLC foods
421 relative to LFHC foods to a similar degree during both conditions. This preference
422 changed away from HFLC foods in the fed state during the LFHC condition, but
423 remained during the HFLC condition. While this apparent dissociation during the fed
424 state might counter-intuitively suggest that individuals increased their preference for
425 the more satiating LFHC foods in the fed state during the LFHC condition (despite
426 already being more satiated), the decreased appeal bias scores in the fed state during
427 the LFHC condition are more likely to reflect a reduced preference for HFLC, rather
428 than an increased preference for LFHC foods *per se*. Indeed, previous studies have
429 shown that when satiated, individuals tend to experience a reduced preference for
430 HFLC compared to LFHC under *ad libitum* feeding conditions^(25, 37). As such, it was
431 interesting to observe in the present study that the consumption of HFLC food did not
432 reduce liking or wanting for HFLC foods to the same extent as consumption of LFHC
433 food under isoenergetic conditions. Therefore, a sustained liking and wanting for high
434 energy foods when satiated may throw new light on how high fat diets lead to
435 overconsumption.

436

437 The underlying mechanisms behind this macronutrient derived effect on food
438 hedonics are unknown, but may again be linked to the metabolic consequences of
439 food ingestion. Leptin and insulin, which are both thought to tonically inhibit brain
440 reward pathways⁽⁴³⁾, are known to exhibit differential responses to dietary fat and
441 carbohydrate ingestion⁽⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶⁾. While pre-breakfast ratings of hunger and fullness did
442 not differ between conditions (indicating that participants started each condition with
443 the same motivation to eat), it is possible that the response to breakfast may have also
444 influenced the subsequent responses to lunch. However, no differences existed
445 between conditions for pre-lunch subjective hunger, fullness or SQ, suggesting the

446 observed differences in post-meal liking and wanting were due to differences in the
447 meal characteristics rather than a 'carryover' effect from breakfast.

448

449 These novel findings, found using a robust sample size ($N = 65$) and a validated
450 measure of food liking and wanting⁽³⁴⁻³⁶⁾, suggest a role for macronutrient
451 composition in mediating the perceived hedonic value of food during the fed state.
452 This is of importance as the attenuated post-meal suppression of food liking and
453 wanting following HFLC food consumption may pose as a risk factor for later
454 snacking or larger subsequent meal intake. Indeed, in the present study explicit liking
455 and implicit wanting were positively associated with energy intake during the *ad*
456 *libitum* dinner meal, indicating that the changes in food hedonics were expressed
457 behaviourally through subsequent food intake (although differences in breakfast
458 intake and satiety would have also influenced dinner intake). It is interesting to note
459 that Lemmens et al.⁽²¹⁾ reported that the consumption of a high protein, but not
460 carbohydrate, meal reduced wanting. These data are in contrast to the current findings
461 in which the LFHC meal actually suppressed liking and wanting for high fat foods.
462 However, while hedonic reward was measured using behaviourally relevant tasks
463 during the present study using a large sample ($N = 65$), Lemmens et al.⁽²¹⁾ measured
464 wanting via engagement with memory games in a small sample of individuals ($N =$
465 16) characterised by disinhibited eating behaviour (defined as a score > 5 on the
466 Three Factor Eating Questionnaire⁽⁴⁷⁾).

467

468 It should be noted that while the present study indicates that LFHC foods dampen the
469 hedonic appeal of high fat foods to a greater extent than HFLC foods (while also
470 resulting in greater satiety and lower energy intake), eating behaviour was only
471 measured across a single day. As such, inferences about the long-term effects of a
472 habitual LFHC diet on food hedonics cannot be made in the present study. However,
473 Martin et al.⁽⁴⁸⁾ has reported that individuals ($N = 134$) following a two year low
474 carbohydrate diet were 'less bothered by hunger' and demonstrated decreased
475 cravings for carbohydrates and preferences for high carbohydrate and sugar foods
476 compared to those following a low fat diet ($N = 136$). Furthermore, protein status
477 following a 14 day high protein diet has been shown to affect subsequent protein
478 intake, wanting and preference for savoury, high protein foods⁽²²⁾ and neural
479 activation in brain reward regions in response to savoury food cues⁽²³⁾. However,

480 further research is needed to examine the long-term effects of diets varying in
481 macronutrient composition on food hedonics.

482 The need to for long-term studies examining the effects of macronutrient composition
483 on food hedonics is emphasised by the on-going debate regarding the effectiveness of
484 diets differing in macronutrient composition on weight loss⁽⁴⁹⁾. The present findings
485 suggest that LFHC foods promote reduced energy intake, and are in line with
486 previous studies demonstrating low fat diets are effective for long-term weight
487 loss⁽⁵⁰⁾. However, inferences made about changes in body composition from studies
488 that manipulate dietary intake acutely should be made cautiously. Indeed, recent
489 findings have questioned whether low-fat diets are more effective than other
490 isoenergetic dietary interventions for weight loss (i.e. low carbohydrate or high
491 protein diets)⁽⁵¹⁾. It should also be noted that no control was made for menstrual cycle
492 phase in female participants. This may have contributed to the variability seen in food
493 hedonics, as studies have previously shown that eating behaviour and food hedonics
494 are influenced to a small extent by the phases of the menstrual cycle^(52, 53).
495 Furthermore, this study only included overweight and obese individuals, and
496 therefore, no inferences can be made as to whether macronutrient composition also
497 mediates food hedonics in lean individuals.

498 **Conclusions**

499

500 When consumed under *ad libitum* and isoenergetic feeding conditions, HFLC foods
501 have a weaker action on satiety and promote greater energy intake than compared to
502 LFHC foods. Importantly, HFLC foods also failed to dampen the subsequent appeal
503 bias for high fat foods compared to energy, weight and palatability matched LFHC
504 foods. Therefore, these data demonstrate the acute impact of dietary fat and
505 carbohydrate in moderating energy intake, and suggest that HFLC foods not only
506 promote subsequent energy intake via effects on satiation and satiety, but also through
507 an effect on the subsequent hedonic value of food. Taken together, these data suggest
508 that LFHC foods may help promote better short-term appetite control than HFLC
509 foods.

510 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT:**

511

512 Research relating to this study was funded by BBSRC (DRINC) grant BB/G005524/1
513 and European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant
514 agreement number 266408 'Full4Health'. Neither funding body had a role in the
515 design, analysis or writing of this article. The project was registered under
516 international standard identification for controlled trials ISRCTN47291569.

517

518 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST:**

519

520 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

521

522 **AUTHORSHIP:**

523 The authors' contributions are as follows: MH contributed to the data collection, data
524 analyses and wrote the manuscript. CG and PC contributed to the study design and
525 data collection. JEB contributed to the study design, interpretation of data and writing
526 of the manuscript. GF contributed to the study design, data analyses, interpretation of
527 data and writing of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of
528 the manuscript.

529 **REFERENCES**

530

- 531 1. Taubes G. Good Calories, Bad Calories: Challenging the Conventional
532 Wisdom on Diet, Weight Control, and Disease. Alfred A. Knopf, New York; 2007.
- 533 2. Taubes G. Why We Get Fat: And What to Do About It: New York, Random
534 House, Inc.; 2011.
- 535 3. Hall KD, Bemis T, Brychta R, Chen KY, Courville A, Crayner EJ, et al.
536 Calorie for Calorie, Dietary Fat Restriction Results in More Body Fat Loss than
537 Carbohydrate Restriction in People with Obesity. *Cell Metab.* 2015; **22**(3):427-436
- 538 4. Blundell J, Lawton C, Cotton J, Macdiarmid J. Control of human appetite:
539 implications for the intake of dietary fat. *Annu Rev Nutr.* 1996;**16**(1):285-319.
- 540 5. Blundell JE, Burley V, Cotton J, Lawton C. Dietary fat and the control of
541 energy intake: evaluating the effects of fat on meal size and postmeal satiety. *Am J*
542 *Clin Nutr.* 1993;**57**(5):772S-7S.
- 543 6. Cotton JR, Burley VJ, Weststrate JA, Blundell JE. Dietary fat and appetite:
544 similarities and differences in the satiating effect of meals supplemented with either
545 fat or carbohydrate. *J Hum Nutr Diet.* 1994;**7**(1):11-24.
- 546 7. Robinson TM, Gray RW, Yeomans MR, French SJ. Test-meal palatability
547 alters the effects of intragastric fat but not carbohydrate preloads on intake and rated
548 appetite in healthy volunteers. *Physiol Behav.* 2005;**84**(2):193-203.
- 549 8. Lawton C, Burley V, Wales J, Blundell J. Dietary fat and appetite control in
550 obese subjects: weak effects on satiation and satiety. *Int J Obes.* 1993;**17**:409-16.
- 551 9. Westerterp-Plantenga M, Rolland V, Wilson S, Westerterp K. Satiety related
552 to 24 h diet-induced thermogenesis during high protein/carbohydrate vs high fat diets
553 measured in a respiration chamber. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 1999;**53**(6):495-502.
- 554 10. Astbury NM, Stevenson EJ, Morris P, Taylor MA, Macdonald IA. Dose-
555 response effect of a whey protein preload on within-day energy intake in lean
556 subjects. *Brit J Nutr.* 2010;**104**(12):1858-67.
- 557 11. Holt S. The effects of high-carbohydrate vs high-fat breakfasts on feelings of
558 fullness and alertness, and subsequent food intake. *Int J Food Sci.* 1999;**50**(1):13-28.
- 559 12. Cecil J, Francis J, Read N. Comparison of the effects of a high-fat and high-
560 carbohydrate soup delivered orally and intragastrically on gastric emptying, appetite,
561 and eating behaviour. *Physiol Behav.* 1999;**67**(2):299-306.

- 562 13. Gibbons C, Caudwell P, Finlayson G, Webb D-L, Hellström PM, Näslund E,
563 et al. Comparison of postprandial profiles of ghrelin, active GLP-1, and total PYY to
564 meals varying in fat and carbohydrate and their association with hunger and the
565 phases of satiety. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2013;**98**(5):E847-E55.
- 566 14. Essah PA, Levy JR, Sistrun SN, Kelly SM, Nestler JE. Effect of macronutrient
567 composition on postprandial peptide YY levels. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.*
568 2007;**92**(10):4052-5.
- 569 15. Bowen J, Noakes M, Trenergy C, Clifton P. Energy intake, ghrelin, and
570 cholecystokinin after different carbohydrate and protein preloads in overweight men.
571 *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2006;**91**(4):1477.
- 572 16. Berthoud HR. Homeostatic and non-homeostatic pathways involved in the
573 control of food intake and energy balance. *Obesity.* 2006;**14**(S8):197S-200S.
- 574 17. Finlayson G, King N, Blundell J. Liking vs. wanting food: importance for
575 human appetite control and weight regulation. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.*
576 2007;**31**(7):987-1002.
- 577 18. Nijis IM, Muris P, Euser AS, Franken IH. Differences in attention to food and
578 food intake between overweight/obese and normal-weight females under conditions
579 of hunger and satiety. *Appetite.* 2010;**54**(2):243-54.
- 580 19. Davis CA, Levitan RD, Reid C, Carter JC, Kaplan AS, Patte KA, et al.
581 Dopamine for 'wanting' and opioids for 'liking': a comparison of obese adults with and
582 without binge eating. *Obesity.* 2009;**17**(6):1220-5.
- 583 20. Griffioen-Roose S, Mars M, Finlayson G, Blundell JE, de Graaf C. The effect
584 of within-meal protein content and taste on subsequent food choice and satiety. *Brit J*
585 *Nutr.* 2011;**106**(05):779-88.
- 586 21. Lemmens SG, Martens EA, Born JM, Martens MJ, Westerterp-Plantenga MS.
587 Lack of effect of high-protein vs. high-carbohydrate meal intake on stress-related
588 mood and eating behavior. *Nutr J.* 2011;**10**(136):22152216.
- 589 22. Griffioen-Roose S, Mars M, Siebelink E, Finlayson G, Tomé D, de Graaf C.
590 Protein status elicits compensatory changes in food intake and food preferences. *Am J*
591 *Clin Nutr.* 2012;**95**(1):32-8.
- 592 23. Griffioen-Roose S, Smeets PA, van den Heuvel E, Boesveldt S, Finlayson G,
593 de Graaf C. Human protein status modulates brain reward responses to food cues. *The*
594 *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2014;**100**(1):113-22.

- 595 24. Green S, Delargy H, Joanes D, Blundell J. A Satiety Quotient: A Formulation
596 to Assess the Satiating Effect of Food. *Appetite*. 1997;**29**(3):291-304.
- 597 25. Finlayson G, King N, Blundell J. The role of implicit wanting in relation to
598 explicit liking and wanting for food: Implications for appetite control. *Appetite*.
599 2008;**50**(1):120-7.
- 600 26. Caudwell P, Finlayson G, Gibbons C, Hopkins M, King N, Naslund E, et al.
601 Resting metabolic rate is associated with hunger, self-determined meal size, and daily
602 energy intake and may represent a marker for appetite. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2013;**97**(1):7-
603 14.
- 604 27. Gibbons C, Caudwell P, Finlayson G, King N, Blundell J. Validation of a new
605 hand-held electronic data capture method for continuous monitoring of subjective
606 appetite sensations. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2011;**8**(1):57-64.
- 607 28. Flint A, Raben A, Blundell J, Astrup A. Reproducibility, power and validity of
608 visual analogue scales in assessment of appetite sensations in single test meal studies.
609 *Int J Obes*. 2000;**24**(1):38-48.
- 610 29. de Graaf C, Schreurs A, Blauw YH. Short-term effects of different amounts of
611 sweet and nonsweet carbohydrates on satiety and energy intake. *Physiol Behav*.
612 1993;**54**(5):833-43.
- 613 30. Stubbs J, Rowley E, Hughes D, Johnstone A, Reid C, King N, et al.
614 Evaluating a new electronic appetite rating system (EARS). *Int J Obes*. 1997;**21**:405-
615 15.
- 616 31. Johnstone A, Stubbs R, Harbron C. Effect of overfeeding macronutrients on
617 day-to-day food intake in man. *Euro J Clin Nutr*. 1996;**50**(7):418.
- 618 32. Drapeau V, King N, Hetherington M, Doucet E, Blundell J, Tremblay A.
619 Appetite sensations and satiety quotient: predictors of energy intake and weight loss.
620 *Appetite*. 2007;**48**(2):159-66.
- 621 33. Drapeau V, Blundell J, Therrien F, Lawton C, Richard D, Tremblay A.
622 Appetite sensations as a marker of overall intake. *Br J Nutr*. 2005;**93**(2):273-80.
- 623 34. Finlayson G, Arlotti A, Dalton M, King N, Blundell JE. Implicit wanting and
624 explicit liking are markers for trait binge eating. A susceptible phenotype for
625 overeating. *Appetite*. 2011;**57**(3):722-8.
- 626 35. Griffioen-Roose S, Finlayson G, Mars M, Blundell JE, de Graaf C. Measuring
627 food reward and the transfer effect of sensory specific satiety. *Appetite*.
628 2010;**55**(3):648-55.

- 629 36. Verschoor E, Finlayson G, Blundell J, Markus CR, King NA. Effects of an
630 acute α -lactalbumin manipulation on mood and food hedonics in high-and low-trait
631 anxiety individuals. *Brit J Nutr.* 2010;**104**(04):595-602.
- 632 37. Finlayson G, King N, Blundell J. Is it possible to dissociate liking and
633 wanting for foods in humans? A novel experimental procedure. *Physiol Behav.*
634 2007;**90**(1):36-42.
- 635 38. French SA, Mitchell NR, Finlayson G, Blundell JE, Jeffery RW.
636 Questionnaire and laboratory measures of eating behavior. Associations with energy
637 intake and BMI in a community sample of working adults. *Appetite.* 2013;**72**:50-8.
- 638 39. Dalton M, Blundell J, Finlayson GS. Examination of food reward and energy
639 intake under laboratory and free-living conditions in a trait binge eating subtype of
640 obesity. *Front Psychol.* 2013;**4**:757.
- 641 40. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang A-G, Buchner A. G* Power 3: A flexible statistical
642 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav*
643 *Res Methods.* 2007;**39**(2):175-91.
- 644 41. Raben A, Agerholm-Larsen L, Flint A, Holst JJ, Astrup A. Meals with similar
645 energy densities but rich in protein, fat, carbohydrate, or alcohol have different effects
646 on energy expenditure and substrate metabolism but not on appetite and energy
647 intake. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2003;**77**(1):91-100.
- 648 42. Nutrition TSACo. The Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition
649 recommendations on carbohydrates, including sugars and fibre. 2015.
- 650 43. Morton G, Cummings D, Baskin D, Barsh G, Schwartz M. Central nervous
651 system control of food intake and body weight. *Nature.* 2006;**443**(7109):289-95.
- 652 44. Havel PJ, Townsend R, Chaump L, Teff K. High-fat meals reduce 24-h
653 circulating leptin concentrations in women. *Diabetes.* 1999;**48**(2):334-41.
- 654 45. Romon M, Lebel P, Velly C, Marecaux N, Fruchart J, Dallongeville J. Leptin
655 response to carbohydrate or fat meal and association with subsequent satiety and
656 energy intake. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab.* 1999;**277**(5):E855-E61.
- 657 46. Romon M, Lebel P, Fruchart J-C, Dallongeville J. Postprandial leptin response
658 to carbohydrate and fat meals in obese women. *J Am Coll Nutr.* 2003;**22**(3):247-51.
- 659 47. Stunkard A, Messick S. The three-factor eating questionnaire to measure
660 dietary restraint, disinhibition and hunger. *J Psychosom Res.* 1985;**29**(1):71-83.

- 661 48. Martin CK, Rosenbaum D, Han H, Geiselman PJ, Wyatt HR, Hill JO, et al.
662 Change in Food Cravings, Food Preferences, and Appetite During a Low
663 Carbohydrate and Low Fat Diet. *Obesity*. 2011;**19**(10):1963-70.
- 664 49. McNeil J, Doucet É. Possible factors for altered energy balance across the
665 menstrual cycle: a closer look at the severity of PMS, reward driven behaviors and
666 leptin variations. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2012;**163**(1):5-10.
- 667 50. McNeil J, Cameron JD, Finlayson G, Blundell JE, Doucet E. Greater overall
668 olfactory performance, explicit wanting for high fat foods and lipid intake during the
669 mid-luteal phase of the menstrual cycle. *Physiol Behav*. 2013;**112-113**:84-9.
- 670 49. Pagoto SL, Appelhans BM. A call for an end to the diet debates. *Jama*.
671 2013;**310**(7):687-8.
- 672 50. Lissner L, Levitsky DA, Strupp BJ, Kalkwarf HJ, Roe DA. Dietary fat and the
673 regulation of energy intake in human subjects. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1987;**46**(6):886-92.
- 674 51. Tobias DK, Chen M, Manson JE, Ludwig DS, Willett W, Hu FB. Effect of
675 low-fat diet interventions versus other diet interventions on long-term weight change
676 in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2015;
677 **3**, 12, 968–979.
- 678 52. McNeil J, Doucet É. Possible factors for altered energy balance across the
679 menstrual cycle: a closer look at the severity of PMS, reward driven behaviors and
680 leptin variations. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2012;**163**(1):5-10.
- 681 53. McNeil J, Cameron JD, Finlayson G, Blundell JE, Doucet E. Greater overall
682 olfactory performance, explicit wanting for high fat foods and lipid intake during the
683 mid-luteal phase of the menstrual cycle. *Physiol Behav*. 2013;**112-113**:84-9.

684

685 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

686 **FIGURE 1:**

687 **Figure 1:** Mean (SEM) total daily energy intake and energy intake during separate
688 meals during the high fat/low carbohydrate and low fat/high carbohydrate conditions.
689 HFLC, high fat, low carbohydrate; LFHC, low fat, high carbohydrate. *Significant
690 difference in breakfast intakes ($P < 0.05$). **Significant difference in dinner intakes
691 ($P < 0.05$). ***Significant difference in total daily energy intake as indicated by a
692 two-way ANOVA with repeated measures ($P < 0.05$).

693

694 **FIGURE 2:**

695

696 **Figure 2:** Mean (SEM) post-prandial changes in the satiety quotient following the
697 consumption of *ad libitum* high fat/low carbohydrate and low fat/high carbohydrate
698 breakfast (Panel A) and fixed energy lunch meals (Panel B). HFLC, high fat, low
699 carbohydrate; LFHC, low fat, high carbohydrate. *Significant difference in the satiety
700 quotient between conditions as indicated by a two-way ANOVA with repeated
701 measures ($P < 0.01$).

702

703 **FIGURE 3:**

704

705 **Figure 3:** Mean (SEM) explicit liking (Panel A) and implicit wanting (Panel B)
706 appeal bias scores for high fat foods relative to low fat foods before and after
707 consumption of isoenergetic high fat/low carbohydrate and low fat/high carbohydrate
708 meals. HFLC, high fat, low carbohydrate; LFHC, low fat, high carbohydrate.
709 *Significant difference in energy intake between conditions as indicated by a two-way
710 ANOVA with repeated measures ($P < 0.05$).

711 **TABLE 1**712 **Table 1:** Mean (\pm SD) descriptive characteristics for participants (n = 65).

	Whole Group	Males	Females
Age (yrs)	41.3 \pm 8.7	41.5 \pm 7.7	41.3 \pm 9.3
BMI (kg/m²)	30.9 \pm 3.8	30.6 \pm 4.4	31.0 \pm 3.5
Body Fat (%)	39.3 \pm 7.5	32.8 \pm 5.9	43.6 \pm 5.2
Fat Mass (kg)	35.4 \pm 9.3	32.8 \pm 10.8	37.2 \pm 7.9
Fat-Free Mass (kg)	54.5 \pm 10.4	64.8 \pm 6.8	47.7 \pm 5.9
RMR (kcal·day⁻¹)	1756.5 \pm 340.7	2037.0 \pm 283.4	1558.3 \pm 197.9

713 BMI, body mass index; RMR, resting metabolic rate. Body composition was
714 measured using air displacement plethysmography while resting metabolic rate was
715 measured using indirect calorimetry. Details of the procedures used can be found
716 elsewhere⁽²⁶⁾.

717 **TABLE 2**

718 Table 2. Nutritional characteristics for food images and food categories used in the Leeds Food Preference Questionnaire.

High Fat / Low Carbohydrate	% CHO	% Protein	% Fat	Kcal/serving	Low Fat / High Carbohydrate	% CHO	% Protein	% Fat	Kcal/serving
Salted peanuts	6.5	18	73.8	364	Savoury biscuits	64.2	12.4	19.4	480
Crisps	37.9	3.6	58.4	336	Pilau rice	86.6	10.3	3.1	145
Swiss cheese	0.1	24.4	75.5	250	New potatoes	90.8	8.4	0.8	150
Chips	48	4	48	361	Bread roll	73.0	14.0	13.0	265
Milk chocolate with nuts (Galaxy)	32.5	5.2	62.3	469	Marshmallows	94.1	4.9	0.7	384
Jam doughnut	44.9	6.6	48.5	380	Popcorn	89.0	3.0	7.0	390
Cream cake	42.1	6.1	49.7	198	Jelly babies	91.0	6.7	2.0	344
Shortbread	47.1	5.1	47.7	102	Fruit salad	84.0	4.0	12.0	130
Mean HFLC	32.4	9.1	58.0	307	Mean LFHC	84.1	8.0	7.3	286

719 CHO, carbohydrate; HFLC, high fat, low carbohydrate; LFHC, low fat, high carbohydrate.

TABLE 3

Table 3: Correlation coefficients between measures of explicit liking and implicit wanting and *ad libitum* dinner intake during the HFHC and LFHC conditions ($N = 65$).

	Explicit Liking: Hungry State	Explicit Liking: Fed State	Implicit Wanting: Hungry State	Implicit Wanting: Fed State
HFHC Dinner Intake (kcal)	$r = 0.313^*$, $R^2 = 0.098$	$r = 0.302^*$, $R^2 = 0.091$	$r = 0.271^*$, $R^2 = 0.074$	$r = 0.408^{**}$, $R^2 = 0.167$
LFHC Dinner Intake (kcal)	$r = 0.342^*$, $R^2 = 0.117$	$r = 0.369^*$, $R^2 = 0.136$	$r = 0.315^*$, $R^2 = 0.099$	$r = 0.453^{**}$, $R^2 = 0.206$

HFHC, high fat, low carbohydrate; LFHC, low fat, high carbohydrate. $*P < 0.05$; $**P < 0.001$. Simple linear regression was used to examine the relationships between explicit liking and implicit wanting and *ad libitum* dinner meal intake.