Dietary lipids with potential to affect satiety: Mechanisms and evidence.
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Abstract

Dietary fat has been implicated in the rise of obesity due to its energy density, palatability and weak effects on satiety. As fat is a major contributor to overall energy intake, incorporating fat with satiating properties could potentially reduce energy intake. This review outlines the potential mechanisms, as far as we know, by which Medium-Chain Triglycerides (MCT), Conjugated Linoleic Acid (CLA), Short-Chain Fatty Acids (SCFA), Diacylglycerol (DAG), n-3 PUFA, and Small Particle Lipids, exerts their satiating effects. The evidence suggests that the lipid with the most potential to enhance satiety is MCT. SCFA can also promote satiety, but oral administration has been linked to poor tolerability rather than satiety. Data on the appetite effects of CLA is limited but does suggest potential. Research comparing these lipids to each other is also lacking and should be explored to elucidate which of these ‘functional lipids’ is the most beneficial in enhancing satiety.
Introduction

The continual growth of global obesity is well documented (WHO 2000), as is the concomitant rise of comorbidities such as type 2 diabetes, various cancers and cardiovascular disease (Guh et al. 2009). The main driver of weight gain is a positive energy balance, where an individual consumes more energy than they expend, for a prolonged period. The current obesogenic environment we live in can promote obesity due to the large volume of time spent sedentary (Deforche et al. 2015; Dong, Block, and Mandel 2004) as well as increases in the energy density (Stelmach-Mardas et al. 2016), portion size (Ello-Martin, Ledikwe, and Rolls 2005) and relative cost (Drewnowski and Darmon 2005) of food, all promoting overconsumption. Dietary fat has also been implicated in the rise of obesity due to its energy density, palatability and weak effects on satiety (Blundell et al. 1993; Blundell and MacDiarmid 1997).

Appetite is the internal driving force for the search, choice and ingestion of food (De Graaf et al. 2004). Humans eat in episodes consisting of either meals or snacks (Gibney and Wolever 1997). The way in which food intake is controlled is described within the satiety cascade (Blundell, Rogers, and Hill 1987). Satiation occurs during the course of eating and eventually brings the period of eating to an end. Satiety occurs after the end of an eating episode and is the situation in which initiation of further eating is inhibited (Blundell et al. 2010). Calorie restriction is a common method employed by individuals trying to achieve weight loss (Das et al. 2007). The lack of success of many of these calorie-restricted diets lies in the individual’s failure to adhere to the diet (Heymsfield et al. 2007), due to feelings of intense hunger, constant thoughts of food, and emotional changes; all of which can culminate in temptations to break the diet (Franklin et al. 1948). Foods or ingredients with the potential to enhance satiety could be beneficial in augmenting the success of calorie restricted diets, by decreasing the adverse effects associated with low energy intake and prolonging the feeling of fullness (Chambers, McCrickerd, and Yeomans 2015). Indeed,
results have shown that consumers are willing to try satiety-promoting foods and that many would also prefer a greater amount of foods with this functional element (Hetherington et al. 2013).

Although dietary fat can lead to passive overconsumption (Green et al. 2000), there is a growing body of research which suggests that some fats may elicit stronger satiety responses than others. These fats may not be able to match the satiating properties of protein or carbohydrate on an isocaloric basis (Blundell and MacDiarmid 1997); however given that fat should make up to 35% of energy intake (Department of Health 1984) and some obese individuals have reported intakes exceeding 40% (Dreon et al. 1988), incorporating lipids with satiating properties has the potential to reduce overall energy intake. Data investigating lipids with satiating properties is still inconclusive.

The purpose of this review is to highlight fat with the potential to promote satiety in humans, the mechanisms by which they work and to evaluate which has the greatest potential to be utilised in weight management strategies. We discuss the potential role and mechanisms of medium chain triglycerides, conjugated linoleic acid, short-chain fatty acids, diacylglycerol, omega-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids, and small particle lipids on satiety, satiation and perceptions of these.

Acute research refers to studies which examine the transient effect of dietary lipids, usually a single bolus, whereas chronic adaptation refers to the study of a dietary lipid administered over two or more days. Studies were included that focused on satiety, satiation, perceived satiety or satiation (i.e. visual analogue scales) or included elements that allowed for speculation into the effects of satiety (i.e. energy intake). This allowed for discussion into the potential role of a lipid where limited research is currently available. Due to the production of SCFA in the gut, both ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ studies are included; the direct administration of SCFA in a vehicle, or indirectly via insoluble fibre which is fermented in the gut. Where possible, human studies are included, but where mechanistic data in human studies are missing, animal studies are discussed.

### Medium-Chain Triglycerides
Medium-Chain Triglycerides (MCT) are triglycerides (esters derived from glycerol and three fatty acids) with fatty acid chain lengths of 6-12 carbon atoms. These include: capronic acid (C6:0), caprylic acid (C8:0), capric acid (C10:0) and lauric acid (C12:0). Along with synthetically produced oils, MCTs are found naturally in coconut oil, palm kernel oil, and a small amount in dairy fat (Marten, Pfeuffer, and Schrezenmeir 2006). According to the 2014 report on nutrient intake in the U.S, approximately 1.8% of all fat is MCFA (Agriculture 2014). However, due to a growing global popularity for coconut oil, this is likely to have increased.

**Mechanisms of Satiety**

MCT have been proposed to affect satiety by a number of mechanisms which may be cumulative.Outlined below are some of the possible mechanisms.

**Absorption**

In 1951, Bloom, Chaikoff, and Reinhardt (1951) tested absorption rates of different $^{14}$C labelled acids and found that lauric acid and capric acid (both medium chain fatty acids) are transported via the portal venous system, unlike long-chain triglycerides (LCT) which are transported by the lymphatic system. This method of absorption is faster and more efficient than triglycerides with a longer chain. Further, the esterification of MCT is limited, resulting in high levels of oxidation to the point of MCT behaving more like glucose than fat (Marten, Pfeuffer, and Schrezenmeir 2006). The results of Van Wymelbeke and colleagues (Van Wymelbeke, Louis-Sylvestre, and Fantino 2001) and Rolls *et al.* (Rolls *et al.* 1988) indicate pre-absorptive mechanisms pertaining to the rapid rate of absorption of MCT. Where LCT result in two ‘peaks’ of absorption; that being at the initial point of ingestion and a second delayed peak at the beginning of the next meal (Fielding *et al.* 1996; Evans *et al.* 1988; Cohn *et al.* 1988), MCT are fully absorbed at the point of ingestion. Therefore, MCT may contribute to satiation by this ‘full absorption’ mechanism.
Substrate Oxidation

Fatty acid oxidation has been linked with increased satiety (Langhans and Scharrer 1987; Friedman et al. 1999). MCT may have an anorexigenic effect through the concomitant production of ketones that is a result of increased acetyl-CoA influx (Tsuji et al. 2001). Ingestion of MCT has been shown to lead to increased concentrations of the ketone body β-hydroxybutyrate (Page et al. 2009), which is thought to suppress appetite (Laeger, Metges, and Kuhla 2010; Scharrer 1999). The increase in ketone bodies provides a substrate for energy, thereby sparing glucose (Zhang et al. 2013) and decreasing food intake (Mayer 1953).

Satiety Hormones

Few papers have examined the response of these satiety hormones to MCT consumption (Maas et al. 1998; Barbera et al. 2000; M-P St-Onge et al. 2014). Cholecystokinin (CCK) was the first gut hormone found to influence satiety (Gibbs, Young, and Smith 1973). Lipid ingestion is linked to the secretion of CCK, however this is dependent on the fatty acid chain length. The majority of MCT do not lead to increased CCK levels (McLaughlin et al. 1999; Beglinger et al. 2010). However, in a study by McLaughlin and colleagues (McLaughlin et al. 1999) CCK was released after either emulsions of capric (C10) or lauric (C12) acid were infused into the gut of healthy volunteers. The control lipid in that study was Tween 80 mixed with a phosphate-buffered saline, which also increased CCK secretion above baseline, meaning that the increase observed by C10 was not significant. Feltrin and colleagues (Feltrin et al. 2004) aimed to address this limitation by using an appropriate control and found that both C12 and C10 lead to increased CCK release, although the magnitude of this increase was greater with C12. Further, C12 significantly decreased perceptions of hunger, desire to eat, and prospective food consumption as well as energy intake at an *ad libitum* buffet meal, whereas C10 did not. This suggests that even though some fatty acids with chain lengths below 12 cause secretion of CCK, this is unlikely to affect appetite sensation. Multiple
studies confirm that fatty acids with chain lengths of 12 and above are able to stimulate CCK, whereas chain lengths of 10 and below are not as effective (D Matzinger et al. 2000; J. T. McLaughlin et al. 1998; Feltrin et al. 2007, 2006; Feinle et al. 2001; Lal et al. 2004; French et al. 2000). Furthermore, despite initial findings suggesting otherwise (Hildebrand et al. 1990), CCK receptor antagonist studies indicate no role of CCK in fat induced satiety (Drewe et al. 1992). Despite the controversial role of CCK, it is still widely reported that CCK is a mediator of fat-related satiety, through a delaying of gastric emptying (Liddle et al. 1986; Daniel Matzinger et al. 1999) by modulation of antropyloroduodenal motility (Feltrin et al. 2004), and a reduction of the capacity that can be tolerated in the upper gastrointestinal (GI) tract (Lal et al. 2004); processes which rely on the digestion of triglycerides into free fatty acids (Feinle et al. 2001; D Matzinger et al. 2000; Feinle et al. 2003; Pilichiewicz et al. 2003). Therefore as MCT do not require bile salts, secreted by CCK, for emulsification (McLaughlin et al. 1999), this could explain the lack of CCK response by shorter chain fatty acids. Despite this, MCT do seem to have appetite-suppressing effects, which are independent of CCK.

PYY is a 36 amino acid peptide belonging to the pancreatic polypeptide family, and its secretion is initiated by the sensing of nutrients, primarily protein (Batterham et al. 2006) and fat (Aponte et al. 1985; Pironi et al. 1993), in the GI lumen. Its anorectic effect has been demonstrated via peripheral administration of PYY3-36, which increases c-fos expression in the arcuate nucleus (ARC); and direct injection into the ARC inhibits food intake in rats and mice (Batterham et al. 2002; Riediger et al. 2004). After administering intraduodenal infusions of LCFA (corn oil) or MCT (56% octanoic acid and 43% decanoic acid), Maas et al. (Maas et al. 1998) found that MCT did result in PYY secretion, but not to the same extent as LCT. However, the caloric load of each infusion differed; 11.6 kJ·min from MCT and 22.7 kJ·min from LCFA which may have affected the potential for PYY release. C10 has also been shown to stimulate PYY secretion in a dose-dependent manner
Feltrin et al. 2007). It must be noted that CCK is a potent stimulator of PYY secretion (Marie-Pierre St-Onge and Jones 2002), which could explain the weaker release of PYY by MCT. To date no study has investigated MCT alongside PYY receptor antagonists, which could provide conclusive information as to the effects of MCT on PYY release (St-Onge et al. 2014).

A more recent pilot study in overweight men investigated MCT ingested orally (as opposed to these aforementioned studies which utilised duodenal infusions) on a variety of gut peptide hormones, and found that, compared to LCT, MCT did not affect total ghrelin or GLP-1; but leptin and PYY concentrations remained higher after the MCT meal (St-Onge et al. 2014). However, correlations between these results and food intake at the *ad libitum* meal provided were opposite to the expected direction, suggesting that the MCT suppression of food intake is not mediated by gut peptide hormones. While these results do not appear to show a link between gut peptides and MCT driven satiety, there is clearly more work to be done to confirm this.

### Other Considerations

MCFA are considered unpalatable, and if initially digested in the mouth MCT may play a role in sensory specific satiation (Clegg 2010). As well as their unpalatability, MCT have been shown to cause GI distress, including vomiting and cramping (Jeukendrup et al. 1998; Goedecke et al. 2005). This has been shown at high dosages of up to 85g, which are not typically used in appetite research; more so sports performance (Jeukendrup et al. 1998). Infusion studies have reported greater nausea after LCT than MCT (Barbera et al. 2000; Feinle et al. 2001), which is not supported by more recent findings that nausea was greatest after a breakfast containing MCT (Coleman, Quinn, and Clegg 2016). Regardless, this must be considered to ensure that any effects on satiety are not a result of GI distress.

### Effect of acute intake of medium chain triglycerides on satiety
Acute studies examining the effect of MCT on satiety and energy balance appear to have equivocal findings. Some studies have found reductions at *ad libitum* meals following intake of MCT (Rolls et al. 1988; Van Wymelbeke, Louis-Sylvestre, and Fantino 2001; Van Wymelbeke et al. 1998); whereas others have reported no effect (Barbera et al. 2000; Poppitt et al. 2010). There are limitations in several studies reporting no effect of MCT on satiety which suggests there is potential for MCT to increase satiety. In the first study to investigate the effect of MCT on satiety in humans, Rolls et al. (1988) administered three doses of either MCT or LCT (100, 200 and 300 kcal) in beverage form and examined the effect on food intake at an *ad libitum* meal in dieters and non-dieters. In dieters, they found no consistent change in intake. However, in non-dieters there was an overall decrease of ~14% in energy intake after MCT, and this was dose-dependent. Similarly, Van Wymelbeke et al. (1998) found that MCT led to decreased intake at lunch when it was added to a carbohydrate breakfast. Furthermore, in a later study by the same research group, there was decreased intake at dinner after an MCT lunch when compared to a lunch with either LCT, carbohydrate or a fat substitute (Van Wymelbeke, Louis-Sylvestre, and Fantino 2001). However, Poppit et al. (2010) report no influence of MCT on perceived satiety after 18 healthy men consumed high-fat breakfasts containing short-chain triglycerides, MCT or LCT. This could be explained by the small dose of MCT in that study (10g), whereas previous studies have observed significant results with doses of 20 g or more (St-Onge et al. 2014; Rolls et al. 1988; Van Wymelbeke, Louis-Sylvestre, and Fantino 2001; Van Wymelbeke et al. 1998).

As aforementioned, adverse effects related to MCT ingestion may confound any purported satiety effects. Therefore, this must be either considered when analysing results or, preferably, when designing the vehicle for the lipids. The studies of Poppit and colleagues (2010) and Van Wymelbeke and colleagues (1998) both administered visual analogue scales to examine if there were any subjective sensory differences between the meals provided and found that there was no
difference, concluding that any effects were not related to palatability. A later study by Van Wymelbeke’s group (Van Wymelbeke, Louis-Sylvestre, and Fantino 2001) along with the study by Rolls’ research group (Rolls et al. 1988) included a pre-test where palatability of the test meals were assessed; participants who registered low palatability scores were excluded in Rolls’ study, whereas the preliminary screening indicated participants were unable to distinguish between the breakfasts in the study by Van Wymelbeke.

**Effects on satiety of chronic consumption of medium chain triglycerides**

There are few long-term studies reporting the effects of MCT on satiety, though many have studied weight loss effects primarily through diet-induced thermogenesis. However, this is outside the scope of this review. Krotkiewski (2001) examined extreme hypocaloric diets combined with either MCT or LCT in overweight women. Weight loss was accelerated in the MCT group for the first two weeks; however this decreased in weeks 3 and 4. This pattern was also observed in perceived appetite and satiety, as after the first two weeks perceived appetite was lower at all time points and perceived postprandial satiety was higher. The difference between the groups diminished by week 4, perhaps indicating an adaptation to chronic MCT intake. However, it must be noted that the amounts of each fat provided in this study were very low (9.9g of MCT and 8.8g of LCT). Therefore if MCT has an effect at such low doses there is a rationale to increase the dose after the initial adaptation has taken place. The results of this study (Krotkiewski 2001) show some exciting potential as the decreased feelings of hunger may aid weight loss program adherence by reducing dropout rates.
Conjugated linoleic acid

Conjugated linoleic acid (CLA) is the name of a family of stereo and positional isomers of octadecadienoic acid (linoleic acid), meaning isomers with the same formula and constitution but different structures. ‘Conjugated’ refers to the conjugated double bonds, in that they are only separated by one single bond. Of the 24 isomers of CLA (Kreider et al. 2010), the most commonly examined in research are the cis-9, trans-11 CLA isomer, and the trans-10, cis-12 CLA isomer (Campbell and Kreider 2008). The richest sources of these isomers are meat and dairy derived from ruminants, of which approximately 90% is the cis-9, trans-11 isomer and the remaining 10% is the trans-10, cis-12 isomer (Mushtaq, Heather Mangiapane, and Hunter 2010; Kennedy et al. 2010). Commercially available CLA typically contain approximately equal amounts of the cis-9, trans-11 and the trans-10, cis-12 isomers (Hargrave et al. 2002; Norris et al. 2009).

Mechanisms of Satiety

CLA effects on body weight and body composition have been widely reported (Blankson et al. 2000; Belury, Mahon, and Banni 2003; Gaullier et al. 2007, 2005). CLA is thought to reduce the size of adipocytes through stimulation of pro-inflammatory cytokines such as TNFα (tumour necrosis factor α) and by the inhibition of PPARγ (peroxisome proliferator-activated receptors) receptors by inhibiting adipocyte differentiation (Salas-Salvadó, Márquez-Sandoval, and Bulló 2006; Cawthorn and Sethi 2008). The trans-10, cis-12 isomer is reported to exert the most anti-adipogenic effects through decreased expression of genes which regulate triglyceride storage and transport of fatty acids (Brown and McIntosh 2003).

Although CLA has received little attention to date in relation to satiety, it does also have the potential to reduce energy intake. Despite many not human studies specifically examining food intake following CLA consumption, various animal studies have shown a decrease in intake after
administration of CLA (Cao et al. 2007; Hargrave et al. 2002; Miner et al. 2001; Santora, Palmquist, and Roehrig 2000; Yeonhwa Park et al. 1997; R Dugan et al. 1997), although some studies found no effect (Tsuboyama-Kasaoka et al. 2000; DeLany et al. 1999; Wong et al. 1997). Furthermore, even when decreased food intake was observed, the reductions do not completely explain decreases in body fat (Shelton et al. 2012; Hargrave et al. 2002; Y. Park et al. 2007; Miner et al. 2001), suggesting favourable changes in body composition are independent of appetite control.

**Substrate Oxidation**

Despite a lack of studies specifically examining CLA and satiety, it is possible to discuss the potential link between the two. The glucostatic theory of appetite, developed by Mayer in the 1950s (Mayer 1953), proposed the presence of glucose receptors in the brain which respond to a fluctuation in glucose levels. Therefore, a drop in blood glucose level promotes an increase in hunger, and an increase in blood glucose (after exogenous carbohydrate ingestion) promotes the onset of satiation, due to the fact that glucose is the primary fuel for the central nervous system, and so it is tightly regulated in order to prevent hypoglycaemia (De Graaf et al. 2004; Campfield et al. 1996). CLA has been shown to increase lipolytic activity (Yeonhwa Park et al. 1997, 1999; Choi et al. 2000; Pariza, Park, and Cook 2001), which potentially may spare glucose oxidation and act as a satiety signal (Kamphuis et al. 2003; J. M. Brown and McIntosh 2003); however, this is speculative.

**Leptin**

Leptin is a satiety-promoting hormone which is released by white adipose tissue (Perry and Wang 2012). Leptin has been shown to inhibit orexigenic neuropeptide Y (NPY) and agouti-related peptide (AgRP) co-expressing neurons (Sahu 2003), meaning that the centre of the hypothalamus which promotes hunger is inhibited. Increased body fat is associated with increased leptin circulation (Myers, Cowley, and Unzberg 2008), whereas reduced sensitivity to leptin has been
shown to play a role in obesity, and can potentially be a strong driver of metabolic syndrome (Paz-Filho et al. 2009; J. M. Friedman and Halaas 1998). Medina et al. (Medina 2000) observed a decrease in leptin that was significant at 7 weeks of CLA supplementation but returned to normal in the final 2 weeks. There was no effect on energy intake or body mass index (BMI) between baseline and at the end of the study, suggesting CLA decreased leptin levels independently of body fat levels. Gaullier et al. (2005) also observed decreases in circulating leptin and energy intake after 24 months of supplementation with both triglyceride and free fatty acids forms of CLA. These findings suggest that, in the absence of leptin resistance, increased levels of leptin decreases energy intake (Klok, Jakobsdottir, and Drent 2007), indicating a potential mechanism for CLA-mediated satiety. Conversely, Iwata et al. (2007) reported an increase in leptin concentrations after CLA but no concurrent decrease in energy intake. However, leptin concentrations also increased in the placebo group, again with no change in energy intake indicating the changes in leptin are likely to be unrelated to CLA intake. Increased leptin concentrations was also reported after intracerebroventricular administration of CLA in rats, which decreased expression of NPY and AgRP and consequently feed intake (Cao et al. 2007). However, another study rejected the idea that CLA affects neuropeptide expression in the hypothalamus, as no CLA isomers were identified in the brain (Shelton et al. 2012). CLA did significantly decrease feed intake, but the authors suggest CLA may have altered serum hormone levels as opposed to a central mechanism.

Acute intake of conjugated linoleic acid on satiety

To date, there is only one study which has examined the effect of CLA on food intake (Coleman, Quinn, and Clegg 2016). In that study, participants consumed a smoothie drink containing either vegetable oil (as the control) CLA or MCT after which they consumed an *ad libitum* sandwich lunch, which was provided upon request. Both test fats elicited non-significant decreases at the *ad libitum* lunch, and intake throughout the rest of the day (and therefore overall energy intake) was
significantly lower following CLA and MCT compared to the control. CLA resulted in the longest
time-to-meal request. More research is required to examine further the effectiveness of CLA as a
method of reducing food intake and enhancing satiety.

**Effects on satiety of chronic consumption of conjugated linoleic acid**

Where few studies have examined CLA in the short term, there are many studies examining its
effects as a long-term dietary intervention for improving body composition and reducing body
weight. An excellent meta-analysis of this topic was conducted by Onakpoya and colleagues
(Onakpoya et al. 2012). We have included papers which allowed for speculation as to the satiety
effects of CLA.

The majority of studies have not shown any significant impact of CLA on energy intake, indicating
that there are satiating effects associated with CLA consumption (Cornish et al. 2009; Gaullier et al.
et al. 2010). Cornish *et al.* (2009) investigated the combination of mixed isomer CLA, creatine and
whey protein versus creatine plus placebo oil, and the placebo oil alone. Whereas there were
significant increases in lean mass and strength with all three supplements combined, there was no
difference in dietary intake between groups during the intervention period. The findings of Pinkoski
*et al.* (2006) corroborate this, as lean mass was increased to a greater extent after 7 weeks of mixed
isomer CLA supplementation alongside resistance exercise compared to a placebo. However, there
was no change in self-assessed energy intake between baseline and 7 weeks between the two
groups. Norris *et al.* (2009) reported reductions in BMI, in overweight postmenopausal women with
type 2 diabetes after 36 weeks of supplementation with 6.4g/d of mixed isomer CLA. Interestingly,
the decline in BMI had not yet reached a plateau, and there may have been further decreases had the
study period been longer. This study also showed no difference in energy intake over the study
period, which was assessed via 3-day diet diary 4 times over the intervention period. These studies
indicate that CLA may be beneficial for improving body composition and promoting weight loss; however these changes are achieved independently of satiety. Nonetheless, this is an inference based on self-reported diet diary data and satiety was not the primary measure of the aforementioned studies, and so more work is required to confirm this.

In contrast, Kamphuis et al. (2003) found mixed isomer CLA dose-dependently increased feelings of fullness and decreased feelings of hunger after 13 weeks of supplementation with a low (1.8g) and high (3.6g) dose. This did not affect energy intake at breakfast, although as this was the only meal analysed it is possible that intake may have been affected during the rest of the day. Watras et al. (2007) reported that mixed isomer CLA led to decreased weight gain over a 6 month period compared to a placebo. This was especially true during the winter holiday period, when the placebo trial subjects increased their energy intake yet there was no change in energy intake in the CLA group indicating that the CLA may have suppressed food intake.

CLA does appear to be promising in the management of obesity and as a supplement to improve body composition (Blankson et al. 2000; Belury, Mahon, and Banni 2003; Gaullier et al. 2007, 2005); however, this appears to be achieved without increasing satiety. Further work is required before conclusions can be drawn, especially studies focusing on satiety and not body composition.

It is also noteworthy to mention that there have been some deleterious effects reported with CLA ingestion, particularly insulin resistance (Risérus, Berglund, and Vessby 2001; Medina et al. 2000; Smedman and Vessby 2001), which seems intuitive given the key role of leptin in glucose homeostasis (Denroche, Huynh, and Kieffer 2012) and the aforementioned reported decrease of leptin by CLA. An early review by Wahle and colleagues (Wahle, Heys, and Rotondo 2004) suggested that more research is warranted in order to conclude whether CLA is truly beneficial or detrimental to health.
Short-chain fatty acids

Short-chain fatty acids (SCFA) are carboxylic acids which are aliphatic, ranging from two carbons to four carbons in length. SCFA are made in the colon through bacterial fermentation when non-digestible carbohydrates pass through the upper GI tract and reach the large intestine (Byrne et al. 2015). The three main SCFA created are acetate (C2), propionate (C3) and butyrate (C4) in a ratio of approximately 60:20:20. There are also some dietary sources of SCFA such as sourdough bread, vinegar and vinegar-based products such as pickles, and finally some cheeses and other dairy products (Darzi, Frost, and Robertson 2011).

Mechanisms of Satiety

Central control of appetite

There are a number of potential mechanisms by which SCFA may influence satiety. These involve an increase in circulating anorexigenic hormones (Cani et al. 2006; E. S. Chambers et al. 2015; Nilsson et al. 2013) and a decrease in circulating ghrelin (Parnell and Reimer 2009). Acetate has also been shown to cross the blood-brain barrier and be taken up by the brain, specifically by the hypothalamus in both mice (Chambers et al. 2015) and humans. Appetite may be suppressed by SCFA via this mechanism, as the anorectic signal in the ARC produces increased expression of proopiomelanocortin (POMC) and reduced expression of AgRP (Frost et al. 2014). AgRP, along with NPY, is a potent stimulator of food intake, whereas POMC, along with cocaine- and amphetamine-regulated transcript (CART) provides a tonic anorexigenic signal to suppress appetite and food intake (Cone 2005; Wynne et al. 2005; Morton and Schwartz 2006; Millington 2007). SCFA may also be involved in a similar central control of feeding via intestinal gluconeogenesis (IGN). It has been shown that both butyrate and propionate stimulate IGN (Bienenstock, Kunze, and Forsythe 2015a; De Vadder et al. 2014). This is sensed by sodium-glucose cotransporters (possibly SGLT3) in the portal vein which send an afferent nervous signal to decrease food intake.
(Delaere et al. 2013). Butyrate has been shown to increase directly expression of phosphoenolpyruvate carboxykinase 1 (*PCK1*) and glucose-6-phosphatase catalytic subunit (*G6PC*) – genes involved in the regulation of IGN – 2 to 3-fold. In contrast, propionate does not directly stimulate IGN genes, but binds to FFA3, which sends signals to the parabrachial and paraventricular nuclei in the brain; driving a reflex arc to induce IGN in the gut (De Vadder et al. 2014).

**Satiety Hormones and Gastric Emptying**

The SCFA receptors FFA2 and FFA3 have been shown to be co-expressed in L-cells which release glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) and PYY (Byrne et al. 2015). Indeed, it has been shown that propionate stimulates the release of GLP-1 and PYY via FFA2 (Psichas et al. 2014). These findings are corroborated by animal models which show that GLP-1 concentrations are decreased in FFA2 knockout mice (Tolhurst et al. 2012) and likewise with PYY in FFA3 knockout mice (Samuel et al. 2008). The satiating effects of PYY have already been mentioned, and GLP-1 similarly enhances satiety via a delay in gastric emptying (Flint et al. 1998; Shah and Vella 2014). GLP-1 receptors appear in areas in the central nervous system which are involved in feeding control, such as the paraventricular nucleus (PVN), the ARC and on POMC neurons (Dailey and Moran 2013; De Silva and Bloom 2012).

The satiating properties of propionate have also been attributed to gastric emptying (Liljeberg and Björck 1996). Colonic contractile activity has been shown to be reduced in rats after SCFA infusion to the colon (Squires et al. 1992), but a more recent study showed no effect of colonic infusion on contractile activity in human volunteers (Jouët et al. 2013). Liljeberg and Björck (1996) found greater perceived satiety linked to slower gastric emptying after SCFA ingestion.

**Other considerations**
Darzi and colleagues (Darzi, Frost, and Robertson 2012) attribute the satiating effects of SCFA to the hedonic unpleasantness of propionate rather than post-absorptive mechanisms. They found no effect of bread containing a small amount of propionate, which was more acceptable and did not cause nausea, lending credence to this hypothesis. They concluded that any effects seen may be due to the palatability of orally administered SCFA, and do not support a role in appetite regulation (Darzi, Frost, and Robertson 2011). Future studies need to mask these unpleasant characteristics of the SCFA.

This review aims to discuss dietary lipids and satiety. However it must be briefly mentioned that studies in mice and rats have shown that fermentable carbohydrates (such as inulin and fructooligosaccharides [FOS]) lead to production of SCFA in the large intestine (Ten Bruggencate et al. 2005; Arora et al. 2012), and this may also affect satiety. Long-term ingestion of soluble fibre may also lead to increased satiety due to increased proliferation of GLP-1 producing L-cells (Kaji et al. 2011; Kuwahara 2014). Kuwahara (2014) explains how this can only occur after long-term ingestion of FOS, as fermentation can take a number of days to occur and only then can this affect GLP-1 production. This may not manifest in changes in short-term satiety, but possibly in long-term energy homeostasis.

**Acute intake of short-chain fatty acids on satiety**

As outlined above studies examine SCFA via two methods: direct administration (such as through the use of vinegar (Kondo et al. 2009; Ostman et al. 2005)) or indirectly (through the use of fibre (Nilsson et al. 2013) and fermented dairy beverages (Ruijschop, Boelrijk, and te Giffel 2008)). Ruijschop *et al.* (2008) examined the use of a dairy beverage fermented with *Lactobacillus acidophilus* and *Propionibacterium freudenreichii* on satiety and food intake, and found greater feelings of satiety when compared to a placebo although there was no corresponding change in food intake. This is the only study to date, to our knowledge, which has investigated cultured propionic
acid bacteria in a dairy beverage on satiety. Despite the fact there was no effect on energy intake, it would be apposite to conduct more studies to fully elucidate its potential.

A dose-response study investigating different amounts of acetate in the form of vinegar added to a bread meal found that there is a linear relationship between subjective satiety and acetate ingestion (Ostman et al. 2005). Similarly, Hlebowicz et al. investigated different breads soaked in acetic acid (white, wholemeal or wholegrain) and compared them to an un-soaked white bread control (Hlebowicz et al. 2008). While the wholegrain/acetate combination led to the greatest subjective satiety, these results must be treated with caution as there was no wholegrain control (i.e. not soaked with the acetate). Hence it is difficult to ascertain whether the wholegrain bread or the acetate influenced satiety in that study. Conversely, some studies have failed to link SCFA to satiety. Mettler et al. found no significant effect of adding either acetate, cinnamon, both, or neither to a rice pudding meal on subjective satiety (Mettler, Schwarz, and Colombani 2009). Poppit et al. (2010) also found no effect of short-chain triglycerides from soft fraction milk fat on subjective feelings of hunger or energy intake.

In the review by Darzi and colleagues discussing the role of SCFA in appetite regulation (Darzi, Frost, and Robertson 2011), the authors discuss unpublished data on which they conducted pooled correlations. According to the authors, these findings suggest that acetate-containing vinegar may influence satiety through palatability effects rather than any mechanistic/physiological effects of SCFA. More recently, the same group conducted a series of experiments investigating the satiety effects of vinegar alongside a study investigating the orosensory properties of a vinegar containing beverage (Darzi et al. 2014). These studies showed that tolerability of vinegar, as opposed to palatability per se, is the cause of nausea after ingestion. This is due to the significant increase in perceived nausea after consuming the test drink but no difference when the drink was sham fed (i.e. held in the mouth and then expectorated). These findings discredit the use of vinegar as a satiety-
enhancing product, as poor tolerability and nausea are possibly the main causes of reduced intake, rather than the physiological effect of activating FFA2 and FFA3.

Despite systematic reviews examining both acute and chronic randomised control trials concluding that fibre only yields small satiety effects (Wanders et al. 2011) and the majority of studies failing to find significant effects (Clark and Slavin 2013), fibre may promote satiety by delaying gastric emptying and leading to a greater release of satiety hormones (Chambers, McCrickerd, and Yeomans 2015). Nilsson et al. (2013) reported that feeding healthy participants an evening meal consisting of brown beans – which contain large amounts of indigestible carbohydrates – increases circulating PYY and decreases circulating ghrelin after a standard breakfast meal. This was attributed to propionate, as concentrations were significantly increased after the brown bean meal compared to the control. However, the results of this study could also be due to other characteristics of fibre and not SCFA exclusively. Tarini and Wolever (2010) found concentrations of plasma GLP-1 were increased and serum ghrelin were decreased after 24g of inulin was added to a test drink; effects attributed to increased colonic SCFA production. Considering that the daily reference value for fibre is 30g·day, this is a large bolus of fibre to consume in a single sitting; but it does demonstrate the potential for fermentable fibre to mediate satiety, possibly through increased SCFA levels in the gut.

**Effects on satiety of chronic consumption of short-chain fatty acids**

Current knowledge on SCFA is limited as the majority of studies conducted to date are in animal models, with more studies in human participants required to elucidate the effects and mechanisms of SCFA on energy expenditure, intake, and balance. Kondo et al. (2009) conducted the first study to investigate the effect of SCFA (in the form of acetic acid present in vinegar) on body composition. This double-blind parallel study administered beverages with either no vinegar (control) or a low or high dose (15 and 30 ml, respectively) of cider vinegar for 12 weeks. They
found that body composition was improved in a dose-dependent manner, showing that acetic acid, in the form of vinegar, can beneficially alter body composition, fat mass, and body weight. However, there were no differences between any of the groups during the supplementation period for energy intake, macronutrient composition of foods eaten or physical activity. From this, we may infer that the beneficial effects of orally ingested acetate, the most abundant of the SCFA, are not linked to satiety. Conversely, in a study by Cani et al. (2006) two 8g portions of oligofructose were taken at breakfast and dinner for two weeks. Subjective satiety after an ad libitum breakfast was significantly higher than baseline after the supplementation and intake was lower at the meal. Intake was also lower at the ad libitum lunch provided, but not at dinner, corresponding to a significant decrease in energy intake throughout the whole day of approximately 5% after oligofructose intake. Despite discussing the fermentation of fibres at length and commenting on SCFA production, this paper, unfortunately, did not measure SCFA production, which would have allowed for a link between satiety and SCFA. SCFA concentrations, however, were reportedly increased after 6 weeks of oligofructose supplementation in another study, which corresponded to decreased energy intake and reported hunger, as well as increased PYY (Daud et al. 2014). Similarly, Chambers et al. measured the release of GLP-1 and PYY from L cells in vitro and found that SCFA led to significant increases in hormone release above basal levels (Chambers et al. 2015). That group produced a novel ester which bound propionate to inulin by an ester bond. This allowed delivery of propionate to the gut as inulin which was fermented by colonic fermentation, thereby releasing the propionate. In a 24-week follow-up supplementation study in 49 volunteers, 10g of propionate per day led to significant reductions in energy intake of 14% compared to the control group. This decrease was attributed to the increased stimulation of GLP-1 and PYY that the authors found in the in vitro part of the study. Similarly, Freeland et al. (2010) reported increased plasma butyrate and increased GLP-1 release after chronic intake of fibre. This may outline the mechanisms behind
SCFA and satiety, although these results were only observed after 9 months of intake (20g of fibre·day over baseline intake).

Clearly, the literature surrounding SCFA is far from unequivocal, although it is possible that the specific SCFA may exert different effects on satiation and body composition. This is an avenue for future work.
Diacylglycerol

Diacylglycerol (DAG) is a glyceride which consists of two fatty acids on a glycerol backbone and naturally occurs in small amounts in cooking oils; from 0.8% in rapeseed oil to 5.5% in olive oil and 9.5% in cottonseed oil (Rudkowska et al. 2005; Flickinger and Matsuo 2003; D'Alonzo, Kozarek, and Wade 1982). In 1999, the Kao Corporation in Japan introduced DAG oil which contained over 80% DAG and sold over 70 million bottles between then and 2003 (Flickinger and Matsuo 2003).

Mechanisms of Satiety

Substrate Oxidation

Chronic studies examining the effects of DAG on weight loss have attributed the decrease in adipose tissue to greater levels of β-oxidation (Maki et al. 2002; Nagao et al. 2000), although to the authors’ knowledge only one study has directly measured this (Kamphuis, Mela, and Westerterp-Plantenga 2003). Scharrer and Langhans (1986) first established that inhibited fatty acid oxidation stimulates feeding, and since then hepatic fatty acid oxidation has been linked with hunger (Kahler, Zimmermann, and Langhans 1999). Therefore the decrease in appetite shown in the study by Kamphuis et al. (2003) could be attributed to the lipoprivic control of eating.

Gastric Motility

The transport and absorption of DAG are similar to medium-chain triglycerides, despite the fact it is mainly comprised of long-chain fatty acids. Long-chain fatty acids (≥12 carbon atoms) slow gastric emptying – the rate of food leaving the stomach and entering the duodenum (Clegg and Shafat 2009) – to a greater extent than shorter chain fatty acids (Hunt and Knox 1968). It has been shown that gastric emptying is correlated with satiety, and therefore the longer food remains in the stomach the greater is the satiating effect (Bergmann et al. 1992; Geliebter 1988). Therefore it is possible
that DAG may influence satiety through delayed gastric emptying, although this is only speculation as there are currently no studies which have investigated this.

Satiety Hormones

Stoeckel et al. (2008) compared the effect of a high-fat beverage consisting mainly of DAG to a very low-calorie beverage on PYY release. Participants were divided into either high PYY release or low PYY release groups. In the high PYY group, the response was significantly higher after the DAG drink compared to the low-calorie drink, which also corresponded to decreased ratings of hunger. No other study to the authors’ knowledge has reported PYY ‘non-responders’ and it is not currently known why this study found this. It is tempting to speculate an effect of DAG on PYY release; however without a control oil to compare it to it is impossible to say whether this response is similar to other long-chain oils.

Acute intake of diacylglycerol on satiety

As aforementioned, Kamphuis, Mela and Westerterp-Plantenga (2003) examined the effect of energy-balance diets for 4.5 days on substrate oxidation, energy expenditure, and subjective appetite when 40% of the fat provided was either DAG or TAG oil. On the fourth day, DAG oil intake was 33.0 ± 2.3 g which provided 26.4 ± 1.9 g of DAG, and on the fifth day, DAG oil intake was 22.2 ± 1.4 g which provided 17.8 ± 1.1 g of DAG. DAG oil led to decreased subjective hunger and increased subjective satiety, which was attributed to higher rates of β-oxidation. Participants were fed a prescribed amount in order to achieve energy balance, and so whether these subjective feelings would lead to changes in ad libitum intake is unknown. Given that the inhibition of fatty acid oxidation stimulates hunger (Langhans et al. 2011; Leonhardt and Langhans 2004), it is possible that this increase in β-oxidation will have the opposing effect and prevent hunger, although this requires further study. To the authors’ knowledge, this is the only study to date which has
investigated the role of DAG on appetite. Taking into account the potential for cumulative mechanisms which could lead to enhanced satiety, this is an exciting avenue for further research.

**Effects on satiety of chronic consumption of diacylglycerol**

It has been repeatedly shown that chronic intake of DAG can lead to decreased body weight and reduced accumulation of adipose tissue (Kawashima et al. 2008; Li et al. 2008; Yasunaga et al. 2004; Maki et al. 2002; Yamamoto et al. 2001; Taguchi et al. 2001). There are clearly some long-term benefits associated with the intake of DAG, although this is outside the scope of the current review; however, readers are directed to the meta-analysis of Xu et al. (2008). To the authors’ knowledge, no study to date has investigated chronic DAG intake on satiety specifically. Self-reported diet diary data suggests that DAG has no long-term effect on satiety (Yamamoto et al. 2001) or can decrease energy intake but no more than a triacylglycerol control oil (Kawashima et al. 2008). Li et al. (2008) found that carbohydrate intake was decreased after 120 days of DAG supplementation, but the decrease in total energy intake only approached significance \( P = 0.08 \). It is noteworthy to mention that the study by Kawashima and colleagues (2008) administered DAG oil in an *ad libitum* protocol where participants merely swapped their normal cooking oil with DAG oil. This is of particular importance as most studies administer lipids by adding extra lipid to food, such as yoghurt (Kamphuis, Mela, and Westerterp-Plantenga 2003) or a beverage (Stoeckel et al. 2008), and so this *ad libitum* protocol has been shown to yield significantly positive effects without administering set doses. This study also reported no differences in fasting ketone bodies after the treatment period, which suggests the increase in hepatic fatty acid oxidation is transient. It would be pertinent to investigate if there is increased postprandial \( \beta \)-oxidation after chronic DAG supplementation to elucidate whether there is an added benefit to short-term intake. However, the current evidence suggests that DAG supplementation does not increase satiety.
Omega-3 Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids

Omega-3 (n-3) polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA) are essential fatty acids as they cannot be synthesized de novo (Lorente-Cebrián et al. 2013). The main n-3 PUFA are eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA, 20:5n-3) and docosahexaenoic acid (DHA, 22:6n-3) which are found in large quantities in certain fish, such as mackerel, salmon, and sardines; therefore these are considered to be ‘fish oils’ (Ackman 2008). Whereas n-6 PUFA possesses inflammatory properties by leading to the secretion of the proinflammatory cytokine interleukin-1 and the leukotriene LTB4, n-3 PUFA are anti-inflammatory and may help protect against inflammatory and autoimmune diseases (Simopoulos 2002). Research has shown positive effects of fish oil on cardiovascular diseases (Chowdhury et al. 2012; Ebrahimi et al. 2009), dyslipidaemia (Paniagua et al. 2011; Jiménez-Gómez et al. 2010) and body composition (Bender et al. 2014), however few studies to date have investigated the effect of n-3 PUFA on satiety and food intake.

Mechanisms of Satiety

Central control of appetite

The endocannabinoid system is a complex system with various physiological roles, one of which is the regulation of food intake (Pagotto et al. 2006). Lipids have diverse roles in the control of appetite through this system, such as the orexigenic anandamide (N-arachidonoylethanolamine, AEA) and the opposing anorexigenic oleylethanolamide (OEA) (Lambert and Muccioli 2007; Petersen et al. 2006). Levels of gut OEA are low during prolonged fasting and rise postprandially, and OEA has been shown to suppress food intake in rats through peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor α (PPARα) (de Fonseca et al. 2001; Fu J. et al. 2003). In contrast, anandamide has been shown to increase appetite to the point of inducing over-consumption (Williams and Kirkham 1999). Wood et al. (2010) noted that DHA-enhanced mouse-chow led to decreased plasma concentrations of both OEA and AEA, which may suggest a homeostatic mechanism in order to
maintain energy balance. However, given that OEA can exerts its anorexigenic effects when accumulating locally in the intestine without affecting plasma levels (Borrelli and Izzo 2009), this requires further research for confirmation.

As briefly mentioned previously, the hypothalamus is the main centre of the brain for regulating energy intake. In recent years, there has been emerging evidence that other areas of the brain are involved with energy intake, such as mesolimbic dopamine system (Volkow, Wang, and Baler 2011). The controversial idea of categorising appetite as an addiction and obesity as a neurobehavioral disorder has been proposed in recent years (Dagher 2009), and in this context, obesity may be a result of the excess energy intake from the consumption of energy dense foods due to their potent reward. Chalon (2006) found that the mesolimbic dopaminergic pathway was overactive in rats with n-3 PUFA deficiency, and this could possibly manifest in changes in eating behaviour due to its role in reward-seeking behaviours, such as the consumption of palatable foods. Indeed, Cordeira et al. (2010) found that depleted brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) led to increased intake of chow in mice due to modulation of the mesolimbic dopamine system. Further research is required to investigate the link between n-3 PUFA and the mesolimbic system, but if supplementation can suppress reward-seeking behaviour, it could be a useful tool for decreasing energy intake.

Increasing appetite

It is important to remember that not all individuals need to reduce their energy intake. Patients with cancer can suffer from cancer anorexia-cachexia, the muscle wastage that occurs as a result of the disease (Dodson et al. 2011). One of the complications of this condition is poor appetite, possibly due to cytokine-inhibition of neuropeptide Y (Donohoe, Ryan, and Reynolds 2011). Supplementation with n-3 PUFA can reduce the production of interleukin-1 and interleukin-6
cytokines (Barber, Ross, and Fearon 1998). Therefore, supplementation with EPA may help combat
the loss of appetite associated with this condition. This suggests that there may be a role for \( n-3 \)
 PUFA in overall energy intake regulation, managing both over- and under-consumption.

**Acute intake of omega-3 PUFA on satiety**

To the authors’ knowledge, there are no studies to date which have investigated the acute effect of
\( n-3 \) PUFA intake on satiety. \( n-3 \) PUFA appears to mediate its effects by increasing the phospholipid
content of the cell membrane of EPA and DHA (Calder 2010), which occurs in a dose-dependent
manner after supplementation (Rees et al. 2006). Therefore, there may be no benefit to satiety when
\( n-3 \) PUFA are taken acutely. Some studies have found that \( n-3 \) PUFA ingestion can lead to mild
side-effects, such as nausea (Bruera et al. 2003), and have an unpleasant taste (Damsbo-Svendsen,
Rønsholdt, and Lauritzen 2013). These are factors which must be taken into consideration when
studies assessing acute intake of \( n-3 \) PUFA on satiety are designed, as they may confound the
results.

**Effects on satiety of chronic consumption of omega-3 PUFA**

Studies have measured the effect of \( n-3 \) PUFA in various chronic diseases, whereas the role of \( n-3 \)
PUFA in satiety has received little attention. The current evidence is equivocal. Parra et al. (2008)
examined the use of seafood diets and fish oil capsules on appetite in overweight and obese
participants who were already undergoing caloric restriction, and found that participants in the high
\( n-3 \) PUFA groups reported increased fullness and decreased hunger and desire to eat after a test
meal, assessed by visual analogue scale after the evening meal, which was consumed in habitual
conditions. However, it is difficult to conclude whether these effects are chronic effects from the
supplementation and diet manipulation or acute effects from the test meals, as the test dinners
differed between groups (cod in the low \( n-3 \) group, salmon in the high \( n-3 \) group). This does
indicate that the long-term intake is associated with appetite suppression, but more research is needed to confirm this. Furthermore, this study did not measure pre-meal appetite sensations and therefore the results must be interpreted with caution, as differences from baseline may have affected the results. Damsbo-Svendsen et al. (2013) found that fish oil tablets were not as effective as soybean tablets for increasing satiety, as they reported that postprandial fullness was increased and desire to eat decreased after soybean supplementation for 3 weeks. However, the washout period in this study was one week long, and this may not be enough to completely remove any effects from the previous supplementation (Brown, Pang, and Roberts 1991; Hansen et al. 1998).

Interestingly, Bruera et al. (2003) found that appetite decreased in both an intervention group and a control group. The aim of that study was to investigate whether n-3 PUFA can aid patients with cachexia, which can manifest in symptoms such as weight loss and a reduction in appetite. Unexpectedly, results from this study showed that appetite decreased in patients with cancer cachexia, although it has been previously shown that supplementation with EPA can improve appetite in these patients (Barber et al. 1999). Jatoi et al. (2004) examined the use of supplementing 1.09 g of EPA and 0.46 g of DHA versus the appetite stimulating progesterone megestrol acetate, and found no differences between the two (or a combination) in terms of appetite, as appetite ratings increased in all three arms. Where this showed no benefit of EPA compared to megestrol, it does show the ability of EPA to increase appetite in cachexia. Similar results have been found in Yehuda et al. (2005) who reported that a mixture of n-3 and n-6 fatty acids led to increased subjective appetite in those who suffered test anxiety compared to a placebo mineral oil. It was again further corroborated by Zaid et al. (2012), who found that there was an increase in subjective appetite ratings in children with leukaemia after 8 weeks of supplementation with 360 mg EPA and 240 mg DHA daily. These results also indicate that n-3 may be useful in appetite control, but for those who need to increase appetite and not for those undertaking a weight loss intervention.
Clearly, more research is needed in healthy volunteers and in a cohort attempting to lose weight. Some of these studies have shown that $n$-3 PUFA supplementation can increase appetite in inflammatory diseases (such as cancer cachexia), but, counterintuitively, they have also been shown to be beneficial in weight loss as well. More research is needed to strengthen our understanding of the role of $n$-3 PUFA in the modulation of appetite.
Small Particle Lipids

Research into lipid droplets is a relatively new field, as it was believed until the early 1990s that they were inert deposits (Suzuki et al. 2011). Lipids droplets consist of a core of lipids surrounded by a phospholipid monolayer (Tauchi-Sato et al. 2002; Fujimoto and Parton 2011) and range in size from 0.3 μm to 20 μm in various milks and infant formulas (Favé, Coste, and Armand 2004). Small particle lipids (SPL) are created via fractionation.

Mechanisms of Satiety

Digestion

Smaller lipid droplets lead to increased emulsion surface area, meaning that fat hydrolysis will increase, as lipase is active on the surface (Maljaars et al. 2012). Armand (Armand 2007) states that as lipase is abundant, therefore a larger lipid/surface inter-surface area allows for extra binding. Also, human pancreatic lipase is inhibited by large amounts of free fatty acids which accumulate at the surface of lipid droplets; a greater surface area delays this inhibition, thereby increasing the amount of hydrolysis (Armand et al. 1999; Patrick Borel et al. 1994). Increased rates of hydrolysis may increase satiety by increasing fatty acid sensing in the small intestine (Maljaars et al. 2012). Borel et al. (1994) conducted the first in vivo (in rats) study examining lipid droplet size and digestion, and found that finer emulsions led to greater hydrolysis than coarser emulsions. These findings were confirmed in healthy humans a few years later when emulsions were administered intragastrically (Armand et al. 1999). Furthermore, CCK was more potently released with emulsified LCT – with reduced droplet size – than non-emulsified LCT (Ledeboer et al. 1999).

Gastric Motility

The concept of the ‘ileal brake’ was first established in the mid-1980s and was shown to both reduce jejunal motility (Spiller et al. 1984) and delay gastric emptying (Read et al. 1984). The ileal brake has been shown to delay gastric emptying to a greater extent than the duodenal brake (Welch,
This was confirmed in later studies by the University Hospital Maastricht research group who showed that smaller lipid droplets led to increased peptide secretion and satiety scores over larger droplets, but only when infused into the ileum and not the duodenum (Maljaars et al. 2012). It must be noted that droplet size does also appear to have an effect when administered to the duodenum, as Seimon et al. (2009) found that infusion of lipids with a droplet size of 0.26 μm led to greater stimulation of CCK, PYY and hunger suppression, leading to decreased energy intake. However, it was also found in another study that this was only apparent when fat is infused as compared to oral consumption of the same load (Maljaars et al. 2011). However, intragastric infusions are not a feasible method of decreasing energy intake.

**Acute intake of small particle lipids on satiety**

Fabuless™ (previously Olibra™) is an emulsion comprised of palm oil and oat oil, produced by DSM (Delft, the Netherlands). GI transit time has been shown to be delayed when Fabuless™ was delivered intra-gastrically (Knutson et al. 2010). Early studies conducted at the University of Ulster showed that this product decreased energy intake by an impressive 22-27% when compared to a control fat in lean, overweight and obese subjects (Burns et al. 2002, 2001, 2000). These results have, unfortunately, not been replicated (Smit et al. 2011; Smit et al. 2012; Chan et al. 2012), even by the same research group (Logan et al. 2006). Smit and colleagues investigated the possible role in the processing of the emulsion, and even with minimal processing (i.e. no shear and a maximum temperature of 42°C), there were effects on subjective appetite or energy intake (H. J. Smit et al. 2012). This may explain why the early studies from Burns’ group found positive effects, whereas later studies did not; as processing may have rendered the active ingredient in the test drinks inactive. In reality, this study concludes there is no efficacy of Fabuless™ in improving satiety.
Fractionated oat oil (LOO) has a smaller particle size than milk globules (100 nm vs 1000 nm) and may remain partially undigested when entering the ileum. It has been shown to result in increased circulation of PYY, GLP-1, and CCK, but no changes in energy intake (Ohlsson et al. 2014). The authors claim that the concentration of polar lipid in the oil investigated is considerably higher than those in Fabuless™, and the resulting liposomes are stable enough to pass through the stomach without structural changes. This may explain the larger effect seen in postprandial concentrations of CCK, PYY, and GLP-1 with LOO compared to Fabuless™, but further study is required to confirm this.

Peters et al. (2014) reported no effect of droplet size when administered in a meal-replacement drink, and they discuss the potential for the background effect of the drink (which contained 10g of protein in the 606 kJ drink) which may have decreased sensitivity to the lipids added. This is in spite of the fact that lipolysis was significantly higher in the smaller droplet (0.1 \( \mu \)m) compared to the larger droplet (3 \( \mu \)m). Marciani et al. (2009) showed that acid-unstable emulsions were broken down in the stomach before entering the small intestine, whereas acid stable emulsions were not and led to slower gastric emptying and greater satiety scores. A more recent study also found no increase in subjective satiety or a decrease of energy intake when comparing Fabuless™ soft lipid emulsions or hard emulsions (dairy and palm oil, respectively) which were matched for particle size (Chan et al. 2017). The aforementioned findings regarding site delivery and acid stability may explain the lack of significant difference between the droplet sizes in the study by Peters and colleagues. Hussein et al. (2015) added locust bean gum to lipids of 6 \( \mu \)m or 0.4 \( \mu \)m and found that these were more stable than a control coarse lipid of 6 \( \mu \)m with no locust bean gum. This stability allowed for delivery of the lipids to the duodenum, and resulted in slower gastric emptying and decreased food intake, without altering subjective sensations of appetite. This shows that the development of novel foods containing small lipid droplets which remain unchanged in the stomach until breakdown in the duodenum could be a promising avenue to increase satiety.
Effects on satiety of chronic consumption of small particle lipids

To the authors’ knowledge, only three studies to date have investigated SPL chronically, and these investigated Fabuless™. Logan et al. (2006) found no significant suppressive effects of the novel lipid emulsion on either satiety or food intake. There are some methodological limitations which may have affected the results, such as the ad libitum trials being conducted in social environments instead of a secluded booth. However, despite errors in design, this study does not support the previous findings of Fabuless™ as a long term mediator of satiety. Diepvens et al. (2007) found that hunger was significantly decreased, and weight re-gain was significant in the placebo group but not in the emulsion group, indicating Fabuless™ may be useful in weight maintenance. However, Heer (2012) discussed that the 1.2 kg difference in body mass between groups may not be clinically significant or even attributed to the emulsion, as this can be achieved with a negative energy balance of 100 kcal·day over the 18 week period. A more recent study investigated the concurrent application of a low-calorie diet (1500 kcal·day), an exercise program, and supplementation of 4.2 g of Olibra or 3.9 g milk fat for a 12 week period (Rebello et al. 2012). They concluded no significant effect of supplementation with the emulsion on energy intake, subjective feelings of fullness or body weight/composition. Thus, there appears to be little evidence that Fabuless™ can be useful in promoting satiety and decreasing energy intake.

More studies are required, examining different small lipid droplet emulsions and satiety, to confirm whether there is a long-term effect. It would be beneficial to develop a novel lipid or food product – such as capsules – which could release smaller lipid droplets directly into the ileum. Once this has been developed and shown to decrease satiety when administered acutely, then chronic strategies to enhance satiety can be examined.
Discussion and future directions

There is some evidence to suggest that the lipids included in this review do provide satiating effects; however, the side effects of taking these, particularly in high doses, must be taken into consideration. The evidence presented here suggests that the lipids with the most potential to enhance satiety are MCTs. SCFA can also promote satiety, but oral administration is more likely linked to poor tolerability rather than a satiety effect. MCT have been shown to enhance satiety when administered in beverage form (Rolls et al. 1988), when added to pasta (Van Wymelbeke et al. 1998), and non-significant trends have been seen when incorporated into a fried breakfast (Clegg, Golsorkhi, and Henry 2013). As aforementioned, MCT exert their appetite-suppressing effects through an increase in ketone body production and not by an increase in appetite-suppressing hormones. Therefore it is possible that combining MCT alongside other nutrients that are potent stimulators of hormone release, such as protein (van der Klaauw et al. 2013) or indeed other fats (Huda, Wilding, and Pinkney 2006; McLaughlin et al. 1999), would lead to an even greater satiety response, although this is speculative.

Only one study to date has investigated CLA, and CLA led to reduced energy intake compared to a control, but with no significant difference to MCT (Coleman, Quinn, and Clegg 2016). There was no difference in self-reported hunger, fullness, desire to eat or prospective food consumption between any of the three oils. Further studies should aim to analyse this further, in different modes of delivery (i.e. liquid vs solid food).

SCFA do appear promising in the promotion of satiety, although this is difficult to quantify due to the background effect of fibre utilised in many studies (Nilsson et al. 2013; Johansson et al. 2013; Hlebowicz et al. 2008). Earlier studies investigating oral administration of SCFA initially seemed promising, with reported increases in satiety (Ostman et al. 2005; Hlebowicz et al. 2008; Kondo et al. 2009). A recent paper by Darzi and colleagues concluded that the apparent satiety effect is
actually poor tolerability (Darzi et al. 2014). Whilst this indicates that oral administration of these SCFA (acetate and propionate) is not recommended, no study to date has investigated oral administration of butyrate. It is likely that the same result will be seen, and so studies investigating this should consider nausea as a possible explanation for any apparent satiety effect.

DAG may influence satiety through a variety of mechanisms. The major limitation of DAG is its availability. The product used in some of the studies mentioned in this review (Maki et al. 2002; Yamamoto et al. 2001; Kamphuis, Mela, and Westerterp-Plantenga 2003) has since been withdrawn from production, due to the presence of the carcinogenic glycidol fatty acid ester. DAG oil has been verified as safe, with no adverse effects reported during 12 weeks of supplementation with a high dosage of 0.5 g·kg⁻¹·d (Yasunaga et al. 2004), although the DAG in this study was created by the research group and not purchased commercially. Until a safe version of DAG is available which can be purchased commercially, this does not appear to be a feasible avenue for the promotion of satiety.

The evidence in support of fish oil and SPL is equivocal at best, with a majority of the research indicating no benefit of SPL (Y. K. Chan et al. 2017; Peters et al. 2014), despite earlier studies suggesting otherwise (Burns et al. 2001, 2000, 2002). In one study, fractionated oat oil was shown to increase satiety and the circulating concentration of satiety hormones (Ohlsson et al. 2014), and so more data is required to support these initial positive findings. n-3 PUFA can possibly be utilised in increasing appetite in scenarios where this is necessary, such as in cancer patients (Jatoi et al. 2004; Zaid et al. 2012). There is a lack of studies investigating n-3 PUFA and satiety, and some of the current evidence did not measure satiety or appetite specifically.

A recurring limitation of the use of functional lipids in the enhancement of satiety is the adverse side effects commonly reported (Table 1). Both CLA and fish oil supplementation have been reported to result in adverse side-effects in small doses of 6.8 g·d with CLA (Blankson et al. 2000)
and 5 ml·d with n-3 PUFA (Damsbo-Svendsen, Rønsholdt, and Lauritzen 2013). Intakes of 85 g have been reported with MCT (Jeukendrup et al. 1998). Where this high amount did result in GI distress, it does show the potential for larger increases in satiety compared to some other lipids.

In conclusion, future work should examine the combination of these lipids with other macronutrients (including fat) and other methods of promoting a negative energy balance in order to assess the cumulative effects. As there is currently no study directly comparing the effects of these lipids, it would be pertinent for this to be investigated. Finally, only one of the studies discussed in this review has employed a design by which the participants swapped their daily oil for the test oil (Kawashima et al. 2008). Considering that adding lipids to foods is counter-intuitive to an individual attempting to decrease energy intake, this protocol should be examined in more studies for ecological validity.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Fat used</th>
<th>Major Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbera <em>et al.</em> (2000)</td>
<td>Infusion study</td>
<td>0.9% Saline, 20% LCT or 22% MCT emulsions</td>
<td>↑ gastric volume and satiation after LCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑ gastric volume after MCT but not enough to induce the same satiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑ CCK, GIP, neurotensin and PP after LCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltrin <em>et al.</em> (2004)</td>
<td>Infusion study</td>
<td>Lauric acid (C12), Decanoic acid (C10), and</td>
<td>Both C12 and C10 elicited CCK release, ↑ in C12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>control infused at a rate of 0.375 kcal min⁻¹</td>
<td>↓ subjective sensations of hunger and EI after C12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krotkiewski <em>et al.</em> (2001)</td>
<td>Infusion study</td>
<td>9 g MCT, 8.8 g LCT or low-fat control (3 g fat)</td>
<td>MCT ↓ hunger and ↑ satiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑ ketones in MCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCT ↑ BW loss after 2 weeks, but no difference by week 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maas <em>et al.</em> (1998)</td>
<td>Infusion study</td>
<td>LCT (corn oil) or MCT (octanoic and decanoic</td>
<td>↑ PYY secretion after LCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>acid) infused at a caloric load of 22.7 kJ min⁻¹ and 11.6 kJ min⁻¹ respectively</td>
<td>PYY was released after MCT, to a lesser extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaughlin <em>et al.</em> (1999)</td>
<td>Infusion study</td>
<td>Various fatty acids of different chain lengths from butyric acid (C4) to octadecanoic acid (C18)</td>
<td>Fatty acids with chain length ≤¹₁C: ↔ CCK secretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fatty acids with chain length ≥¹₂C: ↑ CCK secretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppit <em>et al.</em> (2010)</td>
<td>High-fat breakfast in healthy men</td>
<td>SCT (milk fat), MCT (coconut oil) or LCT (tallow). <em>Ad libitum</em> meal 210 min after breakfast</td>
<td>↔ <em>ad libitum</em> EI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ subjective sensations between trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizzo <em>et al.</em> (2016)</td>
<td>Preload study in 36 healthy women</td>
<td>Ice cream containing different ratios of coconut oil (CO) and sunflower oil (SO)</td>
<td>↓ fat intake after High CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inverse trend of CO and EI at dinner, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Authors</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls et al. (1988)</td>
<td>Preload study in 24 women, 12 dieters, and 12 non-dieters</td>
<td>High CO: 75%CO:25%SO, Equal: 50:50, High SO: 75%SO:25%CO</td>
<td>30% fat liquid preload of which all 30% LCT or 24% MCT and 6% LCT, 3 doses of each providing 100, 200 or 300kcal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Onge et al. (2014)</td>
<td>2 studies: one breakfast study and one preload study.</td>
<td>Both studies: breakfast containing 20g of either MCT or LCT (corn oil), Preload study: 3h after breakfast participants consumed a preload yoghurt containing an extra 10g of either oil.</td>
<td>↓ intake at ad lib lunch after MCT, ↑ PYY and leptin after MCT, ↔ total ghrelin and GLP-1, ↑ suppression after preload as opposed to the breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Wymelbeke et al. (1998)</td>
<td>High carbohydrate breakfast in 12 healthy volunteers</td>
<td>4 high CHO breakfast with either 70 kJ fat substitute, or 1460 kJ from different fats: saturated LCT (from 42 g lard), monounsaturated LCT (from 40 g olive oil) or MCT (from 43 g of Ceres MCT oil).</td>
<td>↓hunger after MCT, ↔ in time to request lunch other than ↓ in fat substitute, ↔ in time to request dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Wymelbeke, Louis-Sylvester and Fantino (2001)</td>
<td>Preload lunch in 10 men</td>
<td>4 lunches: 2310 kJ meal containing 40 kJ fat substitute (Sub), 32 g LCT, 35 g MCT or 53 g CHO and 8 g LCT (CHO)</td>
<td>↑ delay in meal request in CHO, ↑ delay in MCT over LCT and Sub, but not as long as CHO, ↓ EI in MCT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MCT: Medium-chain triglycerides; LCT: Long-chain triglycerides; EI: Energy Intake; CCK: Cholecystokinin; GIP: Gastric Inhibitory Peptide; PP: Pancreatic Polypeptide; BW: Body Weight; CHO: Carbohydrate. ↑ shows increased or greater ↓ shows decreased or lesser ↔ shows no change or difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Fat used</th>
<th>Major Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blankson et al. (2000)</td>
<td>12 weeks supplementation study</td>
<td>CLA capsules: 75% CLA, equal parts c9,t11 and t10,c12 isomers</td>
<td>↓ Appetite after 12 week period in 3.4g and 7.8g CLA groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Placebo capsules: olive oil</td>
<td>↑ Lean mass after all CLA doses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varying dosages: Placebo: 9g olive oil. CLA doses of 1.7g, 3.4g, 5.1g or 6.8g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, Quinn and Clegg</td>
<td>Preload breakfast in 19 men</td>
<td>22g vegetable oil (control)</td>
<td>↓ (non-sig) EI at ad libitum lunch in both CLA and MCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 g CLA and 16g vegetable oil (CLA)</td>
<td>↓ Overall EI in MCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 g MCT oil (MCT)</td>
<td>↑ Time to meal request in CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornish et al. (2009)</td>
<td>5-week strength training, 69</td>
<td>3 groups:</td>
<td>↔ EI in all groups from baseline to 12 weeks and between groups from self-reported diet diary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants</td>
<td>6 g·d CLA (36.1% c9,t11 and 36.3% t10,c12 isomers), 36 g·d whey and 9 g·d creatine (CPP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 g·d whey, 9 g·d creatine and placebo oil (CP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Placebo oil (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaullier et al. (2005)</td>
<td>2 year CLA supplementation study</td>
<td>4.5 g·d olive oil (Placebo)</td>
<td>↓ EI by 1289kJ·day in CLA-TG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 g·d Triglyceride CLA (CLA-TG) providing 3.4 g active isomers</td>
<td>↓ EI by 870kJ·day in CLA-FFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 g·d Free fatty acid CLA (CLA-FA) providing 3.6 g active isomers</td>
<td>↓ Leptin both CLA-TG and CLA-FFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwata et al. (2007)</td>
<td>12 weeks supplementation in 60</td>
<td>5.4 g CLA-triacylglycerol (3.4 g as CLA isomers)</td>
<td>↔ In energy intake after treatment: no effect of CLA on satiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>healthy volunteers</td>
<td>10.8 g CLA- triacylglycerol (6.8 g as CLA)</td>
<td>↑ Leptin in all groups (including placebo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (Year)</td>
<td>Duration and Description</td>
<td>Intake Details</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamphuis et al. (2003)</td>
<td>3 weeks of very low-calorie diet in 54 healthy volunteers before 13 weeks of supplementation</td>
<td>High or low doses&lt;br&gt;High doses: 3.6 g·day of CLA or Placebo&lt;br&gt;Low dose: 1.8 g·day of CLA or Placebo</td>
<td>↔ EI at standardized breakfast&lt;br&gt;↑ Fullness and satiety in CLA&lt;br&gt;↓ Hunger in CLA&lt;br&gt;↔ Weight regain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert et al. (2007)</td>
<td>12 weeks supplementation in 64 healthy volunteers</td>
<td>3.9 g CLA capsule (65.9% CLA: 29.7% c9,t11; 30.9% t10,c12; 2.9% other isomers)&lt;br&gt;3.9 g high-oleic acid sunflower oil (placebo)</td>
<td>↔ Subjective sensations (fullness, appetite, satiety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina et al. (2000)</td>
<td>64 days supplementation in 17 healthy women</td>
<td>3.9 g CLA (65% CLA: 22.6% t10,c12; 23.6% c11,t13; 17.6% c9,t1; and 36.2% other isomers)&lt;br&gt;3 g placebo (72.6% linoleic acid)</td>
<td>Leptin initially ↓ but then returned to baseline in CLA&lt;br&gt;↔ appetite, despite ↓ leptin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris et al. (2009)</td>
<td>36-week supplementation study in 55 obese postmenopausal women with T2D</td>
<td>CLA: 8.0 g·day oil providing 6.4 g·day CLA (41.6% c9,t11 and 40.4% t10,c12 isomers) and 1.6 g oleic/palmitic acids&lt;br&gt;Placebo: 8.0 g·day oil providing 8.0 g·day safflower oil</td>
<td>↓ BMI&lt;br&gt;↔ EI (from self-reported diet diary data)&lt;br&gt;↔ Leptin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkoski et al. (2006)</td>
<td>7 weeks resistance training with supplementation in 76 healthy men and women</td>
<td>Placebo: 7 g·day sunflower oil&lt;br&gt;CLA: Tablets containing ~66% CLA (of which 36.1% c9,t11 and 36.3% t10,c12 isomers) providing 5 g·day</td>
<td>↑ Lean tissue mass after CLA for 7 weeks&lt;br&gt;↔ Self-assessed energy intake after the intervention period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wanders et al. (2007)        | 3-week supplementation                                                                    | Fed diet containing 14.6 g c9,t11 CLA and                             | ↔ Self-assessed energy intake during the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>6-month supplementation study</th>
<th>Placebo: 4 g·day safflower oil providing 3.2 g·day CLA (39.2% c9,t11 and 38.5% t10,c12)</th>
<th>↓ Weight gain over the 6 month period in CLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watras et al. (2007)</td>
<td>6-month supplementation study</td>
<td>Placebo: 4 g·day safflower oil CLA: 4 g·day of oil providing 3.2 g·day CLA (39.2% c9,t11 and 38.5% t10,c12)</td>
<td>↓ Weight gain over the 6 month period in CLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLA: Conjugated Linoleic Acid; EI: Energy Intake; CCK: Cholecystokinin; GIP: Gastric Inhibitory Peptide; PP: Pancreatic Polypeptide; BW: Body Weight. ↑ shows increased or greater; ↓ shows decreased or lesser; ↔ shows no change or difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Fat used</th>
<th>Major Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cani et al. (2006)</td>
<td>2 x 2-week crossover with 10 healthy subjects</td>
<td>16 g·day oligofructose (OF)</td>
<td>↑ satiety after breakfast with OF intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 g·day placebo (PLA)</td>
<td>↓ intake at breakfast and lunch after 2 weeks of OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-week washout between each.</td>
<td>↓ overall EI in OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers et al. (2015)</td>
<td>24 weeks parallel in 60 subjects</td>
<td>10 g·day inulin-propionate (IP)</td>
<td>↑ PYY and GLP-1 release after IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 g·day of inulin-control (CON)</td>
<td>↓EI after IP by 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ Subjective sensations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwiche et al. (2001).</td>
<td>Breakfast study in 9 healthy volunteers</td>
<td>Control bread made with basic recipe, or same bread with the addition of sodium propionate</td>
<td>↓ GE after bread containing propionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darzi, Frost and Robertson (2012)</td>
<td>Breakfast study in 20 healthy unrestrained eaters</td>
<td>Sandwiches made with a propionate rich sourdough to yield 4.8 mmol propionate per 100 g of bread or a control equivalent</td>
<td>↔ EI at <em>ad lib</em> lunch between trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ 24 h EI between trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ Appetite ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darzi et al. (2014)</td>
<td>2 studies investigating the oral properties of SCFA</td>
<td>Study 1: Control drink: 75g in 275g water across two drinks</td>
<td>↑ Nausea after unpalatable drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpalatable drink: 25g vinegar and 25g squash in 100g water followed by 50g squash in 100g water</td>
<td>↓ <em>ad lib</em> and 24 h EI after vinegar treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palatable drink: 25g vinegar and 75g squash in 250g water across two drinks</td>
<td>Study 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓ Pleasantness after vinegar drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ Nausea ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Duration/Details</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified sham feeding of a control drink (180g water) or a vinegar drink (230g white wine vinegar in 150g water)</td>
<td>↔ Appetite ratings ↔ EI at <em>ad lib</em> meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daud et al. (2014)</td>
<td>6 weeks parallel in 22 subjects</td>
<td>30 g·day oligofructose (OF) 30 g·day cellulose (CON)</td>
<td>↑ acetate concentrations after OF ↑ fasting serum propionate and butyrate after OF ↑ PYY AUC after OF ↑ GLP-1 AUC after CON ↓ EI and hunger after OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeland et al. (2010)</td>
<td>One year dietary modification to alter fibre intakes in 28 hyperinsulinaemic volunteers</td>
<td>Two groups: High-wheat fibre cereal (All Bran) Low-fibre cereal (Rice Krispies)</td>
<td>↑ plasma butyrate and GLP-1 secretion after 9-12 months of high fibre intake ↑ EI ↓ agouti-related peptide expression ↑ proopiomelacocortin expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Series of tests in mice</td>
<td>$^{11}$C Acetate injections</td>
<td>↓ EI ↓ agouti-related peptide expression ↑ proopiomelacocortin expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlebowicz et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Crossover trial with 15 healthy subjects</td>
<td>28 mmol acetate soaked in different breads: White (W), Wholemeal (WM) Whole kernel wheat (WK) Unsoaked white bread (CON)</td>
<td>↑ satiety in WK ↔ GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jouët et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Perfusion study in 20 healthy</td>
<td>SCFA mixture: 66% acetic acid, 24%</td>
<td>↔ colonic motility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Authors &amp; Year</td>
<td>Design Details</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondo et al. (2009)</td>
<td>12 week parallel supplementation study in 155 obese individuals</td>
<td>0 mg/100 ml acetate (PLA)</td>
<td>↔ EI, macronutrient breakdown or EE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 mg/100 ml acetate (LOW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 mg/100 ml acetate (HIGH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liljeberg and Björck (1998)</td>
<td>Breakfast study with 12 healthy volunteers</td>
<td>Different breads baked to include lactic acid, sodium propionate or basic whole meal (as a control).</td>
<td>↓ GE after bread containing propionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↑ satiety after bread containing propionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mettler, Schwarz and Colombani (2009)</td>
<td>Repeated measures study in 27 subjects</td>
<td>Milk rice meal with either:</td>
<td>↔ satiety AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additive (CON)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 g cinnamon (CIN)</td>
<td>↓ satiety 15-30 min post ingestion in C&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 mmol acetate (ACE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinnamon and acetate (C&amp;A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilsson et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Crossover trial in 16 healthy adults</td>
<td>Evening meal of Swedish brown beans (SBB) or white bread (WB), in portions to provide 35g of starch,</td>
<td>↑ PYY (51%) and oxyntomodulin after SBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>given the night before a standardised breakfast.</td>
<td>↓ ghrelin after SBB (by 14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ subjective sensations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostman et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Crossover trial with 12 healthy subjects</td>
<td>White bread (CON)</td>
<td>↑ satiety in HIGH: dose-response relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With 18 mmol acetate (LOW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With 23 mmol acetate (MED)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With 28 mmol acetate (HIGH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell and Reimer (2009)</td>
<td>12-week supplementation in 48 overweight/obese individuals</td>
<td>21 g·day oligofructose (OF)</td>
<td>↓ ghrelin after OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 g·day maltodextrin (PLA)</td>
<td>↑ PYY after OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ GIP and GLP-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓EI after OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruijschop et al.</td>
<td>Preload study in 43 healthy</td>
<td>Non-fermented dairy beverage (placebo)</td>
<td>↑ fullness after fermented and non-fermented beverage with addition of calcium propionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>women</td>
<td>Fermented dairy beverage</td>
<td>↔ Ad lib EI between all conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-fermented beverage with the addition of 0.6% calcium propionate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarini and Wolver</td>
<td>Acute feeding study in 12</td>
<td>Three test drinks:</td>
<td>↑ serum SCFA concentrations after inulin ingestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>healthy participants</td>
<td>80g high fructose corn syrup</td>
<td>↓ ghrelin after inulin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56g high fructose corn syrup and 24g inulin</td>
<td>↔ GIP and GLP-1 between inulin and 80g high fructose corn syrup drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56g high fructose corn syrup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GE: Gastric emptying; EI: Energy Intake; EE: Energy Expenditure; BW: Body Weight; PYY: Peptide YY; GLP-1: Glucagon-Like Peptide 1; GIP: Gastric Inhibitory Peptide. ↑ shows increased or greater ↓ shows decreased or lesser ↔ shows no change or difference.
Table 4. Studies on the effect of diacylglycerol on satiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Fat used</th>
<th>Major Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kamphuis et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Crossover trial with 12 healthy women</td>
<td>36h stay in respiration chamber where 40% of fat came from DAG or TAG oil after 3 days of energy maintenance</td>
<td>↑ satiety after DAG ↑ β-oxidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawashima et al. (2008)</td>
<td>1 year parallel trial in overweight or obese individuals</td>
<td>Participants were given DAG or TAG oil to replace normal cooking oil.</td>
<td>↓ EI in both groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li et al. (2008)</td>
<td>120 day parallel in 127 individuals with T2D</td>
<td>25 g·day diacylglycerol (DAG) 25 g·day triacylglycerol (TAG)</td>
<td>↓ CHO intake after DAG ↓ EI (non-sig) after DAG ↑ leptin after TAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoeckel et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Acute study in 12 normal-weight humans</td>
<td>Control beverage: 21 kcal lipid free beverage Lipid beverage: made from 16 g ethyl oleate and 28g Enova oil which contains 80% diglycerides and 20% triglycerides</td>
<td>Participants stratified into high and low PYY responders. ↑ Plasma PYY after lipid drink In high PYY responders, lipid beverage ↑ satiety No effect in low PYY group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamamoto et al. (2001)</td>
<td>12 week parallel trial in 16 diabetic patients</td>
<td>10 g·day diacylglycerol (DAG) 10 g·day triacylglycerol (TAG) – normal cooking oil</td>
<td>↔ EI (from self-reported diet diary data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAG: Diacylglycerol; TAG: Triacylglycerol; GE: Gastric emptying; EI: Energy Intake; EE: Energy Expenditure; BW: Body Weight; PYY: Peptide YY; GLP-1: Glucagon-Like Peptide 1; GIP: Gastric Inhibitory Peptide; CHO: carbohydrate. ↑ shows increased or greater ↓ shows decreased or lesser ↔ shows no change or difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Fat used</th>
<th>Major Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bruera et al. (2003)  | 2-week high-dose supplementation study in patients with cancer cachexia                                                                   | Control: 1000 mg·day olive oil
Intervention: 1000 mg·day fish oil (providing 180 mg EPA and 120 mg DHA)                                                          | ↔ change in appetite after 2 weeks supplementation                                                                                      |
| Damnsbo-Svendsen, Rønsholdt and Lauritzen (2013) | 3 weeks supplementation in healthy individuals                                                                                     | Control: 10 soybean tablets a day providing a total of 5.2 g soybean oil
Intervention: 10 fish oil tablets a day providing a total of 3.5 g n-3 PUFA, of which 1.9g was EPA and 1.1g was DHA | ↑ appetite and ↓ postprandial fullness after fish oil supplementation                                                                  |
| Jatoi et al. (2004)   | An international clinical trial involving supplementation in 421 patients with cancer. Median study involvement of volunteers was “slightly more than 3 months” | Supplementation was as follows:
1.09 g of EPA and 0.46 g of DHA a day
600 mg·day megestrol acetate
Or a combination of the two | ↔ appetite improvement in all three groups                                                                                           |
| Parra et al. (2008)   | Supplementation of during the last phase of a weight loss program in overweight and obese individuals                                    | 4 diets
Control: no seafood, 6 placebo capsules a day
Lean fish: 150 g cod 3 times a week
Fatty fish: 150 g salmon 3 times a week
Fish oil supplementation: 6 capsules a day
The two low n-3 PUFA provided > 260 mg·day n-3 fatty acids.
The two high n-3 PUFA provided > 1300 | ↑ fullness in high n-3 groups
↓ hunger and desire to eat in high n-3 groups                                                                                       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yehunda, Rabinovitz and Mostofsky (2005)</td>
<td>3-week supplementation study in students</td>
<td>33 students in control group received a placebo “mineral oil” 88 students took Awake (TransCulture, Japan tables containing n-3 and n-6 in a ratio of 1:4)</td>
<td>↑ appetite after supplementation with the mixture of lipids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaid et al. (2012)</td>
<td>8-week supplementation study in 51 children with leukaemia</td>
<td>2 groups: Control group that received individualised dietary advice Trial group that received individualised dietary advice alongside fish oil supplementation: 1 x 1200 mg capsule per day containing 360 mg EPA and 240 mg DHA</td>
<td>↑ appetite in children with leukaemia  ↑ energy intake over control group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPA: eicosapentaenoic acid; DHA: docosahexaenoic acid; PUFA: polyunsaturated fatty acids. ↑ shows increased or greater ↓ shows decreased or lesser ↔ shows no change or difference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Fat used</th>
<th>Major Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burns et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Acute feeding study in two groups of 30 volunteers</td>
<td>Control: Yoghurt containing 6 g dairy fat Test: Yoghurt containing 5 g Olibra™ and 1 g dairy fat</td>
<td>↓ Energy intake, food intake, and intake of all macronutrients after test food at 4 h ↔ subjective sensations of appetite and hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Breakfast study in healthy weight, overweight and obese participants</td>
<td>Control: Yoghurt containing 6 g dairy fat Test: Yoghurt containing 5 g Olibra™ and 1 g dairy fat</td>
<td>↓ fat, carbohydrate, protein and total energy intake at both 4 h and 8 h after test infusion across all groups ↔ Obese intake at 4 h ↓ Obese intake at 8 h ↔ subjective sensations of appetite and hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Breakfast study in 50 healthy individuals</td>
<td>Yoghurt with varying doses of Olibra™: 0g (control), 5 g, 10 g, or 15 g. 5 and 10 g amounts also had 10 and 5 g of milk fat, respectively, whereas the control was 15 g of milk fat.</td>
<td>↑ suppression with food intake as dose of Olibra™ increased ↔ subjective sensations of appetite and hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Acute crossover feeding study</td>
<td>4.2 g lipids from a control or 15 g of Fabuless™ provided in (or alongside) liquid form, semi-solid form and solid form, with a control for each state: Liquid emulsion (LE) Liquid control (LC) Semi-solid emulsion (LE + Yoghurt) Semi-solid control (LC + Yoghurt) Solid emulsion (LE + Muffin)</td>
<td>↑ fullness after LE + Yoghurt, no effect of Fabuless™ in liquid or solid form ↔ EI across all conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chan et al. (2017)</strong></td>
<td>Acute crossover feeding study</td>
<td>6 conditions, 4 lipids and 2 controls:</td>
<td>↔ satiety ratings between lipids and respective controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabuless™ emulsion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy emulsion with dairy emulsifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy emulsion with soy lecithin emulsifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy control (non-emulsified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmolein emulsion with dairy emulsifier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Palmolein control (non-emulsified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diepvens et al. (2007)</strong></td>
<td>18-week weight maintenance and dietary manipulation in 50 overweight women</td>
<td>Control: 500 g of yoghurt containing 10 g milk fat, split into 2 doses</td>
<td>↓ hunger after test product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test: 500 g of yoghurt containing 6 g milk fat and 4 g vegetable fat from Olibra™, split into 2 doses</td>
<td>↑ CCK, GLP-1, and βHB after test product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓ weight regain after test product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hussein et al. (2014)</strong></td>
<td>Crossover feeding study in 11 healthy people</td>
<td>3 emulsions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control: Coarse emulsion (6 μm droplets)</td>
<td>↓ GE after LBG, of which Fine+LBG ↓ the most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coarse+LBG: Coarse emulsion (6 μm droplets) + 0.5% locust bean gum</td>
<td>↑ CCK after both LBG trials, no diff between Coarse+LBG and Fine+LBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine+LBG: Fine emulsion (0.4 μm droplets) + 0.5% locust bean gum</td>
<td>↓ EI after both LBG trials, greater ↓ after Fine+LBG compared to Coarse+LBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↔ VAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knutson et al. (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Intragastric perfusion study</td>
<td>Control: 300 g of yoghurt containing 8.5 g dairy fat</td>
<td>↑ Lipids remaining in the jejunum after test perfusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test: 300 g of yoghurt containing 8.5 g of Fabuless™ emulsion</td>
<td>↓ GE after test perfusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ledeboer et al.</strong></td>
<td>Randomised crossover study involving intraduodenal</td>
<td>Control: Saline with emulsifier</td>
<td>↑ CCK release and gallbladder contraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Design Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Infusion study in 6 healthy men</td>
<td>Emulsion trial: Emulsified soybean oil</td>
<td>Non-emulsion trial: Non-emulsified soybean oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Crossover dietary manipulation study</td>
<td>Control: 5 g milk fat</td>
<td>Test: 12.5 Olibra™ providing 5 g fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Acute feeding study with specially designed lipid emulsions</td>
<td>Emulsions made from [13C]palmitate-enriched olive oil, providing 50 g of fat in 3.6 μm droplets. Two conditions were ‘acid-stable’ and ‘acid-unstable’ emulsions</td>
<td>↑ GE in acid-unstable emulsion ↓ ratings of hunger and appetite after acid-stable emulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Two acute feeding studies</td>
<td>Three doses of lipids from yoghurt (control) or fractionated oat oil (LOO):</td>
<td>1.8 g, 14 g, and 35 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fat-free drink with:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5g fat in 3 μm droplets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9g fat in 3 μm droplets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5g fat in 0.1 μm droplets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9g fat in 0.1 μm droplets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12-week dietary supplementation study</td>
<td>Control group: yoghurt providing 1.95 g milk fat twice daily</td>
<td>Test group: yoghurt providing 2.1 g Olibra™ twice daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Randomised crossover study involving intraduodenal infusion study in 10 healthy men</td>
<td>Control: Saline</td>
<td>0.26 μm droplet infusion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IntraLipid (Fresenius Medical Care)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Subjective Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smit et al. (2011) Breakfast study in 24 healthy volunteers</td>
<td>Test drinks with 5 g milk/corn fat added (‘Control’) or 12.5 g of Fabuless™ (containing 5 g of fat) added: During the manufacturing process (‘Processed’) After the manufacturing process (‘Unprocessed’)</td>
<td>↔ In EI at <em>ad lib</em> lunch ↓ In EI at <em>ad lib</em>_ dinner after Unprocessed ↔ on subjective sensations across trials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smit et al. (2012) Breakfast and preload study comprising of 2 separate studies</td>
<td>100 g test drinks comprising of: 2.0 g added milk fat 2.0 g added fat from 5 g Fabuless™ 3.2 g added milk fat 3.2 g added fat from 8 g Fabuless™</td>
<td>↔ energy intake and subjective sensations of satiety when comparing each dose to the control ↑ hunger at one timepoint after the Fabuless™ drink, no other differences ↑ EI at one timepoint after the Fabuless™ drink, no other differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EI: Energy Intake; GE: Gastric Emptying; VAS: Visual Analogue Scale; CCK: Cholecystokinin, GLP-1: Glucagon-Like Peptide 1; βHB: β-Hydroxybutyrate. ↑ shows increased or greater ↓ shows decreased or lesser ↔ shows no change or difference.
Table 7. Summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the functional lipids discussed within this review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium chain triglycerides</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conjugated Linoleic Acid</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong potential to mediate satiety (Coleman, Quinn, and Clegg 2016; Rolls et al. 1988; Van Wymelbeke et al. 1998; Van Wymelbeke, Louis-Sylvestre, and Fantino 2001).</td>
<td>• Repulsive taste, ecological validity possibly questionable (Miriam E Clegg 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe for consumption.</td>
<td>• Can cause nausea when ingested in high amounts (Jeukendrup et al. 1998; Goedecke et al. 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible for effects to be additive with other satiating foods due to hormone-independent effects (Miriam E Clegg 2010).</td>
<td>• Chronic studies indicate no effect on satiety (Blankson et al. 2000; Belury, Mahon, and Banni 2003; Gaullier et al. 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can beneficially alter body composition without altering appetite or satiety (Krotkiewski 2001).</td>
<td>• Lack of short-term data investigating effects regarding appetite, more studies needed to draw conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugated Linoleic Acid</td>
<td>• Possible deleterious effects related to insulin resistance (Medina et al. 2000; Ulf Risérus et al. 2002; Smedman and Vessby 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only one study investigating the acute use of CLA on satiety found it suppressed hunger compared to a control oil, even in small amounts (Coleman, Quinn, and Clegg 2016).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Satiety-independent effects on weight loss (Blankson et al. 2000; Belury, Mahon, and Banni 2003; Gaullier et al. 2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Chain Fatty Acids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Various mechanisms by which SCFA can regulate satiety, including stimulation of satiety hormones (Psichas et al. 2014; Tolhurst et al. 2012; Samuel et al. 2008), intestinal gluconeogenesis (Bienenstock, Kunze, and Forsythe 2015b; De Vadder et al. 2014) and gastric emptying. Could possibly be additive with other functional lipids or foods with satiating properties (Liljeberg and Björck 1996; Darwiche et al. 2001).

Mode of delivery varies between studies, so the determination of the effects of each different mode is difficult.

Many confounding factors, effects reported previously possibly not due to SCFA (J Darzi, Frost, and Robertson 2012; J Darzi et al. 2014).

Low tolerability and palatability of acetate means effects are not necessarily related to satiety (J Darzi et al. 2014).

No study to date has investigated the oral delivery of butyrate, no data on its effects.

Diacylglycerol

- Potentially cumulative mechanisms which, in theory, could result in a strong satiety signal.
- Shown to be effective when replacing other fats in the diet in an *ad libitum* protocol. Beneficial as DAG does not require set doses to elicit its effects (Kawashima et al. 2008).
- DAG used in previous studies no longer in production, and to the knowledge of the author, there is currently no other available source. Until another DAG is produced, this, unfortunately, does not seem a feasible avenue of research.
- No chronic adaptation; must be used repeatedly for repeated acute effects (Yamamoto et al. 2001).

n-3 PUFA
• Possibly as good as a steroidal treatment in increasing cancer patients’ energy intakes in an attempt to reverse cachexia (Bruera et al. 2003; M D Barber et al. 1999; Jatoi et al. 2004).

• Widely available.

• Possibly needs supplementation to induce effects, no acute effect.

• Various fish oil supplements commercially, with various concentrations and ratios of EPA:DHA, and some may be more beneficial than others.

---

**Small particle lipid emulsions**


• Strong evidence that droplet size can be linked to the ileal brake (Knutson et al. 2010; Hussein et al. 2015; Seimon et al. 2009).

• The only commercially available SPL has little evidence of its efficaciousness (H. J. Smit et al. 2012; Y.-K. Chan et al. 2012), other SPL are manufactured specifically for studies.

• A suitable emulsion still needs developing.

• Evidence supporting droplet size and the ileal brake focuses mainly on the intragastric administration of the SPL which are not feasible methods of increasing satiety.