



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Citation:

Blundell, JE and Finlayson, G and Gibbons, C and Caudwell, P and Hopkins, M (2015) The biology of appetite control: Do resting metabolic rate and fat-free mass drive energy intake? *Physiology & Behavior*, 152 (Pt B). pp. 473-478. ISSN 1873-507X DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2015.05.031>

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/3163/>

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 **The Biology of Appetite Control: do Resting Metabolic Rate and Fat-Free Mass drive Energy**
2 **Intake?**

3 **Blundell JE^a, Finlayson G^a, Gibbons C^a, Caudwell P^b and Hopkins M^c**

4 ^aFaculty of Medicine and Health, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK. ^bMedical and Healthcare
5 Affairs, AstraZeneca, Horizon Place, 600 Capability Green, Luton, LU1 3LU UK. ^cAcademy of Sport and
6 Physical Activity, Faculty of Health and Wellbeing, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, S10 2BP,
7 UK.

8 **Key Words:**

9 Energy Intake, Resting metabolic rate, Fat-free mass, Fat mass, Energy balance

10 **Running Title:**

11 The Biology of Appetite Control

12 **Acknowledgements:**

13 The research reported was funded by Biotechnology and Biological Research Council (BBSRC) grants
14 BBS/B/05079 and BB/G005524/1, and by the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7
15 2007 – 2013) under grant agreement number 266408. The authors would like to thank Dr James
16 Stubbs, Dr Stephen Whybrow and Dr Graham Horgan for scholarly support.

17 **Conflict Statement:**

18 The authors declare no conflict of interests.

19 **Corresponding Author:**

20 Professor John Blundell
21 Institute of Psychological Sciences
22 Faculty of Medicine and Health
23 University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

24
25 Tel: 44 (0) 113 343 5742

26 Fax: 44 (0) 113 343 6674

27 PA: 44 (0) 113 343 5718

28

29 Email: j.e.blundell@leeds.ac.uk

30

31

32 **Abstract**

33 The prevailing model of homeostatic appetite control envisages two major inputs; signals from
34 adipose tissue and from peptide hormones in the gastrointestinal tract. This model is based on the
35 presumed major influence of adipose tissue on food intake. However, recent studies have indicated
36 that in obese people fat-free mass (FFM) is strongly positively associated with daily energy intake
37 and with meal size. This effect has been replicated in several independent groups varying in cultural
38 and ethnic backgrounds, and appears to be a robust phenomenon. In contrast fat mass (FM) is
39 weakly, or mildly negatively associated with food intake in obese people. In addition resting
40 metabolic rate (RMR), a major component of total daily energy expenditure, is also associated with
41 food intake. This effect has been replicated in different groups and is robust. This action is consistent
42 with the proposal energy requirements – reflected in RMR (and other aspects of energy
43 expenditure) constitute a biological drive to eat. Consistent with its storage function, FM has a
44 strong inhibitory effect on food intake in lean subjects, but this effect appears to weaken
45 dramatically as adipose tissue increases. This formulation can account for several features of the
46 development and maintenance of obesity and provides an alternative, and transparent, approach to
47 the biology of appetite control.

48 **Background: Current Views on the Biology of Appetite Control**

49 Over the course of 50 years scientific thinking about the mechanisms of appetite control has
50 changed dramatically. In the 1950s and 1960s the hypothalamic ‘dual centre’ hypothesis was
51 believed to provide a comprehensive account of the initiation and inhibition of food intake e.g.
52 Anand & Brobeck (1951) [1]. Following technological advances in the identification of
53 neurotransmitter pathways in the brain, the 2-centre hypothesis was replaced by a model which was
54 based on catecholaminergic and serotonergic aminergic systems [2]. At the time this approach was
55 understood to provide a modern and powerful explanation of appetite. Later, with the discovery of
56 families of neuropeptides, the peptide hypothesis of central control of appetite replaced the
57 ‘somewhat dated’ aminergic ideas. Current neural models propose complex networks of transmitter
58 pathways and receptors that receive both stimulatory and inhibitory inputs from the periphery [3].
59 Important peripheral agents have been incorporated into a recent conceptualisation that has
60 proposed a theory of appetite control based on an interaction between adipose tissue (and
61 prominent adipokines) and peripheral episodic signals from intestinal peptides such as ghrelin,

62 cholecystokinin (CCK), Insulin, glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1), peptide tyrosine-tyrosine (PYY),
63 amylin and oxyntomodulin [4]. This 2 component approach apparently summarises current thinking.
64 However, the history of the physiology of appetite control illustrates that any model can be
65 improved by new findings and that some models have to be completely replaced following the
66 advent of new knowledge. Commenting on the regulation of body fat in an editorial in American
67 Journal of Physiology (2004) Wade commented that 'a facile explanation has the potential to set
68 back progress in a field by years, because the problem has been thought to have been solved' (when
69 it has not)[5]. Therefore the current conceptualisations should not be regarded as permanent
70 fixtures; they are transient representations of the current state of knowledge.

71 An important component of the homeostatic approach to appetite and body weight has focussed on
72 the identification of key signals that could inform the brain about the nature of body stores. During
73 the 1950s three basic postulates promoted different signals for 'body weight regulation'; these were
74 the glucostatic [6], aminostatic [7] and lipostatic hypotheses [8]. These simple ideas exerted a mild
75 but pervasive influence on thinking about a complex problem. The discovery of leptin in 1994 by
76 Zhang et al. [9] seemed to provide conclusive proof of the authenticity of the lipostatic hypothesis
77 (which was based on a particular interpretation of the classic rat studies of Kennedy [8]), and leptin
78 was construed as 'the lipostatic signal' that was an essential component required in a negative
79 feedback process for the regulation of adipose tissue. This idea has been incorporated into models of
80 appetite control in which leptin is depicted as the major signal (the missing link) that informs the
81 brain about the state of the body's energy stores [4, 10]. Interpretations of this view have positioned
82 adipose tissue at the centre of appetite control [11]. In addition, it has been asserted that adipose
83 tissues are critical integrators of energy balance through the regulation of food intake and energy
84 expenditure [12]. These arguments have contributed to the view that adipose tissue is the main
85 driver of food intake, with day to day food intake controlled in the interests of regulating body
86 weight (and especially adipose tissue); this view appears to have been widely accepted. In addition,
87 leptin is understood to play a key role in the control of appetite by adipose tissue. Although it is
88 beyond doubt that leptin exerts a critical influence in many biochemical pathways concerning
89 physiological regulation [3, 13] it has been argued that the role of leptin in the etiology of obesity is
90 confined to very rare situations in which there is an absence of a leptin signal [14]. Others have also
91 argued that the role of leptin signalling is not concerned with satiety but is mainly involved in the
92 maintenance of adequate energy stores for survival during periods of energy deficit [15]. This is why
93 leptin may be critical in the resistance to weight loss with dieting. However, it has been noted that
94 the results following exogenous leptin administration in 'typical' obesity have been disappointing
95 [12]. Indeed, neither leptin nor adipose tissue itself has not been shown to exert an influence over

96 the parameters of hunger and meal size which are key elements in day to day control of appetite in
97 humans.

98 The second issue that appears to influence thinking is the notion called 'energy homeostasis'. This
99 idea has been proposed to account for the accuracy in which energy balance is maintained over time
100 in normal individuals. For example, some commentaries suggest that for a healthy adult weighing 75
101 kg who typically consumes approximately one million kcal each year, then a mismatch of just 1%
102 (expending 27 kcal per day fewer than consumed) will yield a body fat increase of 1.1 kg after 1 year
103 [16]. This type of calculation which uses the 1 kg of fat for 7700 kcal rule has recently been shown by
104 Hall [17] and others [18] to be simplistic and to produce implausible predictions. Moreover, given
105 the worldwide epidemic of obesity, and the apparent ease with which many human beings appear to
106 gain weight, it seems implausible that some privileged physiological mechanism is regulating body
107 weight with exquisite precision. If such a mechanism existed it would surely operate to correct
108 weight gain once it began to occur. As Speakman (2014) has pointed out 'If body fatness is under
109 physiological control, then how come we have an obesity epidemic?' [19].

110 The compelling phenomenon of dietary-induced obesity (DIO) in rats also suggests that physiology
111 can be overcome by a 'weight-inducing' nutritional environment, and that 'energy homeostasis'
112 cannot prevent this. The phenomenon of DIO in rats questions the notion of an all powerful
113 biological regulatory system. Moreover, this experimental 'fact' strongly resonates with the proposal
114 of a human 'obesogenic environment' that promotes weight gain in almost every technologically
115 advanced country on the planet [20]. The analogy with DIO in rats is quite compelling, and is usually
116 not denied.

117 The argument for body weight stability is not convincing. The existence of world wide obesity
118 suggests that body weight is not tightly regulated. Moreover, overfeeding does not lead to any
119 significant downregulation of energy intake [21, 22]. An alternative view that has been discussed for
120 decades is that regulation is asymmetrical [23]. Whilst the reduction in body weight is strongly
121 defended, physiological compensatory mechanisms do not resist an increase in fat mass [24]. Indeed
122 the physiological system appears to permit fat deposition when nutritional conditions are favourable
123 (such as exposure to a high energy dense diet). This means that the role of culture in determining
124 food selection is critical. In many societies the prevailing ideology of consumerism encourages
125 overconsumption. This applies not only to foods but to all varieties of material goods. The body is
126 not well protected from the behavioural habit of overconsuming food; processes of satiety can be
127 over-ridden to allow the development of a positive energy balance. This has been referred to as
128 'passive overconsumption' [25, 26] and is regarded as a salient feature of the obesogenic

129 environment (26). Consequently there are a number of aspects of the etiology and management of
130 obesity, and the obesity epidemic, that are difficult for the adipocentric theory to explain.

131 **An Alternative Approach: Human Energy Balance and Appetite Control**


132 Not since the work done by Edholm [27, 28] and Mayer [29] in the 1950s has thinking about appetite
133 control taken account of evidence in the field of human energy balance research. Therefore it is
134 worth considering whether or not any light can be shed on the expression of human appetite from
135 an energy balance approach. A recent approach to the study of exercise on appetite control within
136 an energy balance framework has used a multi-level experimental platform in obese humans [30];
137 relationships among body composition, resting metabolism, substrate oxidation, gastrointestinal
138 peptides, sensations of appetite and objectives measures of daily energy intake and meal sizes, have
139 been examined. Such a multi-level approach has not previously been explicitly undertaken. An
140 important feature of the approach is that all variables have been objectively measured and
141 quantified. This is particularly important in the case of daily energy intake for which self-report or
142 self-recall do not provide data of sufficient accuracy to be used in assessments of the energy balance
143 budget [31, 32].

144 **Body Composition and Energy intake**

145 Using a multi-level systems approach [30] in several cohorts of obese (men and women), the
146 relationship between meal sizes, daily energy intakes and aspects of body composition (fat mass
147 [FM] and fat-free mass [FFM]) have been measured simultaneously in the same individuals at
148 different time intervals several months apart [33]. Contrary to what many would have expected, a
149 positive association was observed between FFM and daily energy intake (EI), and also with meal size
150 (see Figure 1). In other words, the greater the amount of FFM in a person, the greater was the daily
151 energy consumed and the larger the individual meal size (in self-determined, objectively measured
152 eating occasions). In order to enhance ecological validity, the study incorporated a schedule of
153 eating opportunities that was representative of real life in the local culture. The relationships
154 between FFM and EI were conserved over time (measures 12 weeks apart) and under quite
155 distinctive dietary challenges (high and low energy dense foods). There was no relationship with
156 body mass index (BMI) nor with the amount of adipose tissue (FM) suggesting that, in a free-running
157 situation (with participants not subject to coercive weight loss or dietary restriction), FM did not
158 exert control over the amount of food selected in a meal, nor consumed over a whole day [33]. This
159 outcome is clearly not consistent with an adipocentric view of appetite control. Moreover the
160 relationships were independent of sex. This means that sex does not explain the association of FFM

161 with EI. On the contrary FFM can explain the sex effect; men (in general) eat more than women
162 because they have greater amounts of FFM.

163



164 **Figure 1**

165 Scatter plot for a group of 46 overweight and obese individuals showing the relationship between fat
166 free mass and self determined total energy intake measured objectively and quantitatively under
167 laboratory conditions for one ad-libitum dinner meal (upper panel) and over the whole day (lower
168 panel). Measurements were made at the beginning, after 6 weeks and at the end (post intervention)
169 of a 12 week programme to improve physical activity. Participants were given 3 ad-libitum meals
170 and one fixed size meal (lunch) at each measurement point, and the daily intakes were averages of
171 days in which participants were offered high energy dense or low energy dense foods. The
172 relationship between FFM and EI is present at individual meals and for the total day energy intake.
173 This positive relationship is quite consistent with the data reported in papers by Lissner et al (1989)
174 and Weise et al (2013).

175

176 **Confirmation of the Relationship between Body Composition and Energy Intake: The Importance**
177 **of Replication in Science**

178 One of the most valuable but unpopular aspects of scientific investigations is the importance of
179 replication. With the emphasis in publications on novelty and originality, it is common to find many

180 findings reported on a single occasion only, with the implication that one demonstration of an effect
181 establishes that effect for ever [34]. Authors are not keen to perform the same study more than
182 once, and grant awarding bodies are not enthusiastic about funding repetitions. However, for any
183 new finding that may run counter to the currently accepted dogma, it is essential that it is replicated
184 in order to demonstrate its robustness.

185 Interestingly, our attention has recently been drawn to a study published in 1989 that produced
186 results in all aspects similar to those we reported in 2010 and published in 2011. The study by
187 Lissner et al. [35] was designed to investigate whether overweight women might overeat whilst
188 reporting under eating. Participants were observed for periods of 14 to 63 days and all
189 measurements were carried out in a metabolic unit that incorporated measures of body composition
190 using densitometry. Body composition, weight change and energy intake were precisely and
191 objectively measured by the investigators. The outcome showed that the energy requirement for
192 the maintenance of body weight was not correlated with adiposity expressed as a percentage of
193 body fat. In a regression analysis energy requirement was positively associated with lean mass ($p <$
194 0.0001), whereas fat mass added no predictive value to the model. The authors concluded that 'lean
195 mass was shown to be a significant predictor of energy requirement and fat mass was not' (p 324). A
196 further relevant comment was that 'The emphasis of research that focuses on the relationship
197 between energy intake and obesity is misplaced because energy requirement appears to be a direct
198 function of lean mass rather than adiposity' (p 324).

199 This article and its outcome appears to have been completely overlooked for over 20 years, possibly
200 because the findings were discordant with the prevailing interest in the lipostatic hypothesis and the
201 role of fat in appetite control. The similarity between figure 2 in the study by Lissner et al [35]-
202 showing a relationship between EI and lean body mass - and figure 1 in our more recent paper [33]
203 is compelling. In addition the relationship of FFM and EI has been more recently demonstrated in a
204 large group of obese ethnically diverse individuals from a quite different geographical and cultural
205 environment [36]. This sample ($n = 184$) included Asian, African Americans, Caucasians, Hispanics
206 and Native Americans. The main outcome demonstrated that FFM (and the fat-free mass index
207 (FFMI) – FFM divided by height squared) was correlated positively with objectively measured EI.
208 Moreover in this sample there was a weaker but negative association of FM with daily EI. The
209 authors concluded that food intake could be predicted by FFM (and FFMI) and to a lesser extent by
210 FM. As proposed earlier [33, 37] these authors concluded that FFM and FM have opposing effects on
211 energy homeostasis.

212

213 **Fat-free Mass and Energy Intake – What is the Mechanism?**


214 In order to establish biological explanations for behavior it is first necessary to demonstrate clear
215 and unambiguous relationships between the biological and behavioural variables. This establishes a
216 valid relationship and provides at least *prima facie* evidence that biology is causing the behavior. In
217 turn this poses a question about the mechanism (or mechanisms) that embodies the causal link. Our
218 research has demonstrated that some signal associated with FFM exerts a determining effect over
219 the amount of food consumed. One possibility is that some privileged biochemical molecule
220 associated with skeletal muscle (or some other organ that comprises FFM) could act as a signal to
221 the central nervous system networks controlling EI. This is a possibility but there are many candidate
222 molecules since skeletal muscle tissue produces large numbers of myokines and related entities that
223 could embody signaling properties [38].

224 However, an alternative hypothesis arises from the known influence of FFM on energy expenditure
225 and energy balance. In our studies, and those of others, FFM is highly correlated with the energy
226 expended in resting metabolism i.e. resting metabolic rate (RMR) (FFM-RMR: r values = 0.51 – 0.85,
227 $p < 0.0001$). Consequently one possibility is that the association between FFM and EI is generated by
228 the energy demand from FFM and reflected in RMR. In other words the energy required to maintain
229 the body's lean tissues (including all vital organs) determines a minimum level of EI at meals and
230 over the whole day.

231 **Fat-free Mass, Resting Metabolic Rate and Appetite Control**

232 This association between FFM and eating behaviour has implications for an energy balance approach
233 to appetite control, and for the relationship between energy expenditure and EI as described by
234 Edholm [27, 28]. It is well established that FFM is the primary determinant of RMR, and that RMR is
235 the largest component of total daily energy expenditure [39]. From a homeostatic standpoint, an
236 ongoing and recurring drive to eat arising from the physiological demand for energy (e.g. RMR)
237 appears logical, as this energy demand would remain relatively stable between days and would
238 ensure the maintenance and execution of key biological and behavioural processes. Consequently it
239 might be predicted that RMR, the major component of daily energy expenditure (60 – 70%) could be
240 associated with the quantitative aspect of eating behaviour and with daily EI. When this was
241 examined [40], it was demonstrated that RMR was a significant determinant of the size of a self
242 determined meal, and of daily energy consumed (when measured objectively and quantified). This
243 effect has been demonstrated in several cohorts of obese and lean individuals and is a robust finding
244 (see Figure 2). In addition, RMR was associated with the intensity of hunger objectively rated on

245 hand held electronic data capture instruments [41]. Consequently, these findings – that are broadly
246 consistent with the early predictions of Edholm – have demonstrated an association between the
247 major components of daily energy expenditure and daily EI. In other words, they demonstrate that
248 appetite control could be a function of energy balance.



249

250 **Figure 2**

251 This figure shows a scatter plot of the relationship between daily energy intake and resting
252 metabolic rate (RMR) for a group of 30 normal weight and 29 overweight men and women. The daily
253 self determined food intake was measured objectively for a period of 11 days in a nutrition research
254 unit. Subjects were free to make choices between food items but all items consumed were
255 quantitatively recorded. These data formed part of a study on actual and reported food intakes
256 under energy balance conditions (Stubbs et al, 2014).

257

258

259 Importantly the relationship between RMR and daily EI has been replicated in a completely
260 independent large data set from participants of variable BMIs allowed to freely select their own diet
261 under meticulously controlled semi-free living conditions [42]. This study was actually conducted to
262 assess the degree of dietary under-reporting that would occur under strictly controlled scientific
263 conditions. Significantly, in this investigation, which included measurements of all aspects of body
264 composition and the energy balance budget, RMR emerged as the strongest determinant of daily EI.
265 These reports indicate that the association between RMR and EI is robust and is not restricted to a
266 particular group of people measured in a specific geographical location. Since FFM and RMR are both

267 strongly associated with EI, the question arises whether or not the effect of FFM on EI is explained
 268 by its impact on RMR. We have investigated this issue using mathematical modeling and the
 269 outcomes suggest that the influence of FFM on EI can be accounted for by the mediation of RMR.

270 **Effects in Lean Individuals**

271 The studies described above have been carried out mainly on overweight and obese individuals
 272 (men and women). The number of lean (and young) individuals was small. However, associations
 273 among FFM, FM and EI in obese people may not be typical for people of normal or low body mass.
 274 We have therefore measured the relationship between body composition and EI in a group of young
 275 lean male and female subjects with an average BMI of 22 kg/m² and an average age of 20 years. The
 276 outcome was clear but different from the effects seen in obese participants. As shown in Table 1,
 277 and in keeping with previous data, FFM and FFMI were strongly positively correlated with meal size
 278 and total energy intake (sum of 2 meals). However, in contrast to the finding in obese people, FM
 279 and FMI were significantly negatively associated with EI. These associations remained highly
 280 significant even after conducting partial correlations controlling for sex (FFMI and EI, $r = 0.35$; FMI
 281 and EI, $r = -0.37$). This observation that FM is negatively associated with EI implies that in lean
 282 individuals with low levels of body fat (average fat mass and % body fat- 10 kg and 14.9%,
 283 respectively), the adipose tissue is exerting an inhibitory effect on food intake.

284

	EI Breakfast	EI Lunch	Total
BMI (kg/m ²)	-.005	.015	.009
Body Fat (%)	-.548**	-.509**	-.624**
Fat Mass (kg)	-.483**	-.418**	-.529**
Fat-free Mass (kg)	.541**	.516**	.628**
RMR (kcal/day)	.425**	.436**	.519**
FM-I	-.519**	-.471**	-.583**
FFM-I	.447**	.429**	.522**

285 **Table 1** This table shows the degree of association between the variables of body composition (left
 286 hand column) and energy intake (EI) at Breakfast (BFEI), lunch (EI lunch) and the total intake for the
 287 two meals. The figures in the body of the table are correlation coefficients (r) for 47 participants (24
 288 male and 23 female) with mean BMI = 22 and age = 20. These participants were lean, healthy active

289 people who took part in sports. Lean body mass was 60.9 kg and fat mass 10.2 kg. FFM-I = Fat-free
290 Mass Index; FM-I = Fat Mass Index.

291 ** = $p < .001$. see text for details.

292


293

294 It can be deduced that this observation is in keeping with the role of fat as a store of energy, and
295 adipose tissue as a generator of negative feedback indicating adequate energy reserves in the body.
296 It also suggests that the feedback signals engage with highly sensitive receptor mechanisms. We
297 envisage that both insulin and leptin would operate as feedback signals (but the strength of their
298 effect is mediated by adiposity levels). Since leptin and insulin resistance increase as adiposity
299 increases this implies that the inhibitory action of FM on EI would weaken with increasing FM. In
300 obesity the dampening effect of the large amount of energy stored in adipose tissue would be mild.

301 **A New Formulation for the Biology of Appetite Control**

302 It is often inferred that food intake is a function of energy requirements, but this assumption lacks
303 empirical support, and until recently, it has not been convincingly demonstrated that energy
304 expenditure influences within-day appetite control. Indeed, current theoretical models used to
305 explain appetite control do not incorporate energy expenditure (or metabolic signals relating to fat-
306 free mass or resting metabolic rate) as putative signals of food intake. Rather, appetite is thought to
307 be a function of signals arising from adipose tissue and the gastrointestinal tract. In contrast to the
308 prevailing 'adipocentric' view of appetite control, our data (and that of others) indicate that in
309 addition to signals from adipose tissue and gastrointestinal peptides, there is input from metabolism
310 associated with FFM and the energy requirement associated with RMR. Consequently, the
311 conventional adipocentric model should be revised to allow for an influence of FFM – in addition to
312 FM. The role of FFM in determining food intake can also be interpreted in the light of the re-analysis
313 of the Keys' human starvation studies carried out by Dulloo et al [43]. The post-starvation recovery
314 period has been analysed in detail and indicates that weight is regained until a certain level of FFM
315 has been reached (while there is an overshoot in the restoration of FM). This suggests a relationship
316 between EI and FFM during recovery from a huge weight loss. In addition, the association of FFM
317 and EI is in keeping with the amino-static hypothesis put forward more than 60 years ago by
318 Mellinkoff [7] and the more sophisticated proposal for a protein-stat described by Millward [44].

319 Our findings do not imply that FM does not play a role in appetite control. Our interpretation is that,
 320 under normal weight conditions, FM has an inhibitory influence on food intake but the strength of
 321 this tonic inhibition is moderated by insulin and leptin sensitivity [37]. As people overconsume (due
 322 to cultural obesogenic influences), FM increases and the consequential increase in leptin and insulin
 323 resistance weaken the inhibitory influence of FM on appetite. This amounts to a 'dis-inhibition', so
 324 that accumulating FM fails to suppress food intake and permits more eating (over-consumption).
 325 Indeed there is good evidence that low insulin sensitivity reduces post-prandial satiety and weakens
 326 meal to meal appetite control [45]. Therefore, on the basis of these recent findings we have
 327 proposed a conjoint influence of FFM and FM on appetite control [33]. This is set out in Figure 3. This
 328 model provides a different theoretical approach to the biology of appetite control, with the
 329 influence of FFM and RMR, in addition to signals stemming from adipose tissue and GI peptides,
 330 providing a more comprehensive account of appetite.



331

332 **Figure 3**

333 This diagram shows a formulation for appetite control in which a proposed tonic signal for the drive
 334 to eat that reflects the body's demand for energy arises (mainly) from fat free mass and RMR. In turn
 335 this drive is under tonic inhibition from leptin whose action reflects the amount of stored energy
 336 reserves in the body. As adipose tissue increases, leptin insensitivity occurs and this tonic inhibition
 337 is reduced. The drive to eat is periodically interrupted and suppressed by episodic signals in the form
 338 of peptides released from the GI tract in response to food consumption. The resultant pattern of

339 eating is a consequence of the interactions among tonic and episodic physiological signals. See text
340 for further description.

341

342 It should be noted that the state of energy balance and changes in body composition may alter the
343 relationship between FFM, RMR and EI. Under conditions of significant energy deficit and weight loss
344 other regulatory signals (such as leptin) may feature more predominantly in the control of appetite
345 [46]. Therefore, it needs to be established how FM and FFM operate (independently or conjointly)
346 in the regulation of appetite during periods of significant weight loss. Developing clearer models
347 concerning the relationship between changes in body composition and signalling systems associated
348 with energy balance and imbalance has considerable implications for weight management in both
349 health and disease.

350 **Implications**

351 Do findings set out above, together with the new formula for the basic biology of appetite control,
352 offer any explanations for the puzzling problems that confront the study of weight regulation and
353 obesity? Many accounts of appetite control would benefit from the recognition that there exists a
354 tonic drive for energy that emanates from the continuous demand for energy to match energy
355 expenditure from skeletal tissue and the body's vital organs (heart, liver, gastro-intestinal tract and
356 brain).

357 One question that is rarely answered, partly because the question is rarely posed, is why obese
358 people continue to feel hungry and are driven to eat in the presence of large amounts of stored
359 energy in the body. Since obese individuals possess not only large amounts of adipose tissue but also
360 additional FFM, it would be expected that obese people would have a persistent drive to eat (from
361 the large FFM and higher RMR) that would be stronger than that of smaller and more lean
362 individuals of the same age. This explanation can also account for people feeling periodically hungry
363 in the absence of any obvious deficit or self deprivation. The uniform demand from RMR would be
364 expected to generate a drive to eat that would be episodically suppressed by the action of the
365 stomach and gastrointestinal (GI) peptides following the consumption of food. Therefore the pattern
366 of eating would arise from an interaction between the tonic drive to eat and episodic inhibitory
367 actions. In contrast to the episodic inhibitory action of most of the GI peptides, adipose tissues are
368 envisaged to exert a tonic inhibition (that depends on receptor sensitivity – see above).

369 Athletes competing in sports that require a high body mass (field events in athletics, American
370 football, rugby etc) with very high levels of skeletal muscle, would consume large amounts food and

371 display voracious appetites. In contrast elderly people with sarcopenia often suffer from a loss of
372 appetite. Our explanation would be that the loss of FFM results in a weakening of hunger and a
373 reduced food intake. Management of this condition may need to involve the gentle use of exercise
374 to stimulate lean mass. Such a mechanism may involve the activation of stem cells as proposed by
375 Gutin [47].

376 A model of appetite control that incorporates separate roles for FFM and FM can also help to explain
377 the inexorable progress of accumulating fatness as people progress from leanness to obesity. As fat
378 is gained the inhibitory effect of fat on appetite weakens (due to increasing receptor insensitivity)
379 whilst at the same time any incremental increase in FFM would augment the drive to eat.
380 Consequently as people become fatter it becomes easier to overeat, not more difficult. It follows
381 that obese people do not get any help from their stored fat to help them to resist the drive to eat; in
382 fact it makes it harder.

383 References

384 1. Anand, B.K. and J.R. Brobeck, *Hypothalamic control of food intake in rats and cats*. The Yale
385 journal of biology and medicine, 1951. **24**(2): p. 123.

386 2. Blundell, J., *Is there a role for serotonin (5-hydroxytryptamine) in feeding?* International
387 Journal of Obesity, 1976. **1**(1): p. 15-42.

388 3. Sainsbury, A. and L. Zhang, *Role of the arcuate nucleus of the hypothalamus in regulation of*
389 *body weight during energy deficit*. Molecular and cellular endocrinology, 2010. **316**(2): p.
390 109-119.

391 4. Badman, M.K. and J.S. Flier, *The gut and energy balance: visceral allies in the obesity wars*.
392 Science, 2005. **307**(5717): p. 1909.

393 5. Wade, G.N., *Regulation of body fat content?* American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory,
394 Integrative and Comparative Physiology, 2004. **286**(1): p. R14-R15.

395 6. Mayer, J., *Glucostatic mechanism of regulation of food intake*. The New England Journal of
396 Medicine, 1953. **249**(1): p. 13.

397 7. Mellinkoff, S.M., et al., *Relationship between serum amino acid concentration and*
398 *fluctuations in appetite*. Journal of Applied Physiology, 1956. **8**(5): p. 535.

399 8. Kennedy, G., *The role of depot fat in the hypothalamic control of food intake in the rat*.
400 Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B-Biological Sciences, 1953. **140**(901): p.
401 578.

402 9. Zhang, Y., et al., *Positional cloning of the mouse obese gene and its human homologue*.
403 Nature, 1994. **372**(6505): p. 425-432.

404 10. Morton, G., et al., *Central nervous system control of food intake and body weight*. Nature,
405 2006. **443**(7109): p. 289-295.

406 11. Woods, S.C. and D.S. Ramsay, *Food intake, metabolism and homeostasis*. Physiology &
407 behavior, 2011. **104**(1): p. 4-7.

408 12. Rosen, E.D. and B.M. Spiegelman, *Adipocytes as regulators of energy balance and glucose*
409 *homeostasis*. Nature, 2006. **444**(7121): p. 847-853.

410 13. Leibel, R.L., *The role of leptin in the control of body weight*. Nutrition reviews, 2002. **60**(s10):
411 p. S15-S19.

412 14. Jequier, E. and L. Tappy, *Regulation of body weight in humans*. Physiological reviews, 1999.
413 **79**(2): p. 451.

414 15. Chan, J.L., et al., *The role of falling leptin levels in the neuroendocrine and metabolic*
415 *adaptation to short-term starvation in healthy men*. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 2003.
416 **111**(9): p. 1409-1421.

417 16. Schwartz, M.W., *An inconvenient truth about obesity*. Molecular metabolism, 2012. **1**(1-2): p. 2.
418

419 17. Hall, K.D., et al., *Quantification of the effect of energy imbalance on bodyweight*. The Lancet,
420 2011. **378**(9793): p. 826-837.

421 18. Thomas, D., et al., *Why do individuals not lose more weight from an exercise intervention at*
422 *a defined dose? An energy balance analysis*. Obesity Reviews, 2012.

423 19. Speakman, J.R., *If body fatness is under physiological regulation, then how come we have an*
424 *obesity epidemic?* Physiology, 2014. **29**(2): p. 88-98.

425 20. Egger, G. and B. Swinburn, *An "ecological" approach to the obesity pandemic*. BMJ: British
426 Medical Journal, 1997. **315**(7106): p. 477.

427 21. Stubbs, R., et al., *A decrease in physical activity affects appetite, energy, and nutrient*
428 *balance in lean men feeding ad libitum*. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 2004. **79**(1): p. 62.
429

430 22. Schlögl, M., et al., *Overfeeding over 24 hours does not activate brown adipose tissue in*
431 *humans*. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism, 2013. **98**(12): p. E1956-E1960.

- 432 23. Blundell, J. and A. Hill, *Analysis of hunger: inter-relationships with palatability, nutrient*
433 *composition and eating*. Recent Advances in Obesity Research, Libbey, London, 1985: p.
434 118–129.
- 435 24. Lenard, N.R. and H.R. Berthoud, *Central and peripheral regulation of food intake and*
436 *physical activity: pathways and genes*. Obesity, 2012. **16**(S3): p. S11-S22.
- 437 25. Blundell, J.E. and J.I. MacDiarmid, *Passive Overconsumption Fat Intake and Short - Term*
438 *Energy Balance*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1997. **827**(1): p. 392-407.
- 439 26. Blundell, J. and J. Macdiarmid, *Fat as a Risk Factor for Overconsumption:: Satiety, Satiety,*
440 *and Patterns of Eating*. Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 1997. **97**(7): p. S63-S69.
- 441 27. Edholm, O.G., et al., *The Energy Expenditure and Food Intake of Individual Men*. British
442 Journal of Nutrition, 1955. **9**(03): p. 286-300.
- 443 28. Edholm, O., *Energy balance in man. Studies carried out by the Division of Human Physiology,*
444 *National Institute for Medical Research*. Journal of Human Nutrition (UK), 1977. **31**(6): p.
445 413-431.
- 446 29. Mayer, J., P. Roy, and K. Mitra, *Relation between caloric intake, body weight, and physical*
447 *work: studies in an industrial male population in West Bengal*. American Journal of Clinical
448 Nutrition, 1956. **4**(2): p. 169.
- 449 30. Caudwell, P., et al., *The influence of physical activity on appetite control: an experimental*
450 *system to understand the relationship between exercise-induced energy expenditure and*
451 *energy intake*. Proceedings of the Nutrition Society, 2011. **70**(02): p. 171-180.
- 452 31. Blundell, J.E., *What foods do people habitually eat? A dilemma for nutrition, an enigma for*
453 *psychology*. Am J Clin Nutr, 2000. **71**(1): p. 3-5.
- 454 32. Archer, E., G.A. Hand, and S.N. Blair, *Validity of US nutritional surveillance: National Health*
455 *and Nutrition Examination Survey caloric energy intake data, 1971–2010*. PloS one, 2013.
456 **8**(10): p. e76632.
- 457 33. Blundell, J.E., et al., *Body composition and appetite: fat-free mass (but not fat mass or BMI)*
458 *is positively associated with self-determined meal size and daily energy intake in humans*.
459 British Journal of Nutrition, 2012. **107**(03): p. 445-449.
- 460 34. Smith, R., *The ethics of ignorance*. Journal of Medical Ethics, 1992. **18**(3): p. 117.
- 461 35. Lissner, L., et al., *Body composition and energy intake: do overweight women overeat and*
462 *underreport?* The American journal of clinical nutrition, 1989. **49**(2): p. 320-325.
- 463 36. Weise, C., et al., *Body composition and energy expenditure predict ad-libitum food and*
464 *macronutrient intake in humans*. International Journal of Obesity, 2013.
465 **doi:10.1038/ijo.2013.85**.
- 466 37. Blundell, J.E., et al., *Role of resting metabolic rate and energy expenditure in hunger and*
467 *appetite control: a new formulation*. Disease Models & Mechanisms, 2012. **5**(5): p. 608-613.
- 468 38. Pedersen, B.K. and M.A. Febbraio, *Muscles, exercise and obesity: skeletal muscle as a*
469 *secretory organ*. Nature Reviews Endocrinology, 2012. **8**(8): p. 457-465.
- 470 39. Ravussin, E., et al., *Determinants of 24-hour energy expenditure in man. Methods and results*
471 *using a respiratory chamber*. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 1986. **78**(6): p. 1568-78.
- 472 40. Caudwell, P., et al., *Resting metabolic rate is associated with hunger, self-determined meal*
473 *size, and daily energy intake and may represent a marker for appetite* American Journal of
474 Clinical Nutrition, 2013. **97**(1): p. 7-14.
- 475 41. Gibbons, C., et al., *Validation of a new hand-held electronic data capture method for*
476 *continuous monitoring of subjective appetite sensations*. International Journal of Behavioral
477 Nutrition and Physical Activity, 2011. **8**(1): p. 57-64.
- 478 42. Stubbs, R.J., et al., *Measuring the difference between actual and reported food intakes in the*
479 *context of energy balance under laboratory conditions*. British Journal of Nutrition, 2014.
480 **111**(11): p. 2032-2043.

- 481 43. Dulloo, A.G., J. Jacquet, and L. Girardier, *Poststarvation hyperphagia and body fat*
482 *overshooting in humans: a role for feedback signals from lean and fat tissues*. The American
483 journal of clinical nutrition, 1997. **65**(3): p. 717-723.
- 484 44. Millward, D.J., *A protein-stat mechanism for regulation of growth and maintenance of the*
485 *lean body mass*. Nutrition research reviews, 1995. **8**(01): p. 93-120.
- 486 45. Flint, A., et al., *Associations between postprandial insulin and blood glucose responses,*
487 *appetite sensations and energy intake in normal weight and overweight individuals: a meta-*
488 *analysis of test meal studies*. British Journal of Nutrition, 2007. **98**(1): p. 17-25.
- 489 46. Rosenbaum, M., et al., *Energy intake in weight-reduced humans*. Brain research, 2010. **1350**:
490 p. 95-102.
- 491 47. Gutin, B., *Diet vs exercise for the prevention of pediatric obesity: the role of exercise*.
492 International journal of obesity, 2011. **35**(1): p. 29-32.

493