THE RELATIVE REINFORCING VALUE OF SNACK FOOD IS A SIGNIFICANT PREDICTOR OF FAT LOSS IN WOMEN WITH OVERWEIGHT OR OBESITY

Journal:	<i>Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism</i>
Manuscript ID	apnm-2021-0382.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Hintze, Luzia; University of Ottawa, School of Human Kinetics Doucet, Éric; University of Ottawa, School of Human Kinetics Goldfield, Gary; Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, Research Institute
Novelty bullets: points that summarize the key findings in the work:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No differences in RRV of food were noted between fast and slow weight loss, • Greater diet-induced increases in RRV snack was associated with less body fat-loss, • Weight loss from combined fast and slow groups led to a moderate-sized reduction in the total impulsivity
Keyword:	feeding behavior < behavior, body mass maintenance < body mass maintenance, dietary intake < diet, energy balance < energy regulation, obesity < metabolic syndrome, energy regulation < metabolism, behavioural nutrition < nutrition
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

THE RELATIVE REINFORCING VALUE OF SNACK FOOD IS A SIGNIFICANT PREDICTOR OF FAT LOSS IN WOMEN WITH OVERWEIGHT OR OBESITY

RATE OF WEIGHT LOSS, FOOD REINFORCEMENT AND IMPULSIVITY

Luzia Jaeger Hintze¹, Éric Doucet¹, Gary Goldfield²

¹ *School of Human Kinetics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, K1N 6N5, Canada*

² *Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Institute, Ottawa, K1H 8L1, Canada*

Corresponding author:

Gary S Goldfield, PhD.

Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Institute 401 Smyth Rd. Ottawa, ON K1H 8L1

Phone: 613-737-7600, Ext. 3288

email: ggoldfield@cheo.on.ca

Draft

ABSTRACT

Reinforcing Relative Value (RRV) of food and impulsivity are associated with energy intake and obesity. The study investigated the degree to which changes in RRV and impulsivity independently or interactively predict change in body weight and composition in women with overweight or obesity engaged in either a fast or in a slow weight loss programs. Body weight, body composition, Impulsivity (Barratt Impulsiveness Scale), RRV snack (computerized Behavioural Choice Task) were measured at baseline and post-intervention in 30 women with obesity undergoing either slow ($n=14$ -500 kcal/day, 20 weeks) or fast $n=16$ (-1000kcal/day, 10 weeks) weight reduction. No group*time effects were noted on body composition, impulsivity or RRV, so participants from both groups were pooled for analysis. Multiple regression analyses indicated that none of the impulsivity variables predicted weight- or fat mass (FM) loss. However, Δ RRV snack predicted Δ FM ($r=0.40$, $P=0.046$), whereby greater increases in RRV snack were associated with less FM loss. Results indicate that different rates of weight loss do not differentially affect RRV snack or impulsivity traits. However, changes in RRV snack predicted FM loss, suggesting that dietary interventions that either mitigate increases or foster reductions in the RRV snack may yield greater reductions in adiposity.

Trial Registration clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT04866875

NOVELTY POINTS

- No differences in RRV of food were noted between fast and slow weight loss
- Weight loss from combined fast and slow groups led to a moderate-sized reduction in the total impulsivity
- Greater diet-induced increases in RRV snack was associated with less body fat-loss

KEY WORDS: weight loss; delay discounting; reinforcement; impulsivity

ABBREVIATIONS:

25 BIS-11: Barratt Impulsiveness Scale; BMI: Body Mass Index; BW: Body weight; DXA: Dual Energy X-ray
26 Absorptiometry; FM: Fat Mass; RRV; Relative Reinforcing value;

27

Draft

INTRODUCTION

Impulsivity is a complex personality construct defined as the tendency to act without premeditation, a lower ability to control inappropriate behaviours and its consequences, as well as higher difficulty in delaying rewards (Patton et al. 1995; Dawe and Loxton 2004). More precisely in the body weight (BW) regulation field, this construct might provide an understanding of how different factors influence everyday food choices, which can lead to positive energy balance and potential weight gain (Epstein et al. 2007a, 2010; Stojek and MacKillop 2017). In fact, studies demonstrated that adults with a greater Body Mass Index (BMI) also presented higher impulsivity (Schag et al. 2013; Price et al. 2016). Particularly in women, studies have demonstrated that compared to leaner women, women living with obesity exhibited reduced delay of gratification evidenced by greater discounting of larger, future rewards in favour of smaller, more immediate rewards (Weller et al. 2008; Manwaring et al. 2011; Schiff et al. 2016). Impulsivity also plays a role in food choice and energy intake (EI) as women living with obesity with higher impulsivity tend to choose and consume away-from-home foods with a higher energy density (kcal/g), and in greater quantity (Appelhans et al. 2012). Measures of impulsivity in these studies included computer tasks (such as delay discounting tasks) (Leitch et al. 2013; Meule and Kübler 2014) and multi-dimensional self-report scales (*e.g.* Barratt Impulsiveness Scale) (Patton et al. 1995), with results indicating consistent findings with self-report and objective measures of impulsivity

Another factor that has been found to be a powerful determinant of food choice and energy intake is the relative reinforcement value of food (RRV) (Epstein et al. 2007a). Particularly in studies involving eating behaviours, the RRV characterizes how reinforcing energy-dense food items are to the individual in comparison to an alternative item available (Epstein et al. 2007a). Individual differences in the RRV of food exist, whereby the RRV of palatable snack food have been reliably demonstrated to be higher in adults living with obesity compared to lean individuals (Temple et al. 2009; Clark et al. 2010; Giesen et al. 2010; Epstein et al. 2011; Goldfield et al. 2011; Temple and Epstein 2011), to be positively associated to laboratory-measured energy intake (Epstein et al. 2004, 2011) and energy intake in free-living conditions (Epstein et al. 2011).

53

54 In situations where food or reinforcing alternatives are not freely available, such as fasting and dieting periods,
55 the deprivation might increase RRV, making it more difficult to resist these foods and maintain dietary adherence
56 over time (Epstein et al. 2007a). In this case, the motivation to obtain food may gain strength over time and people
57 may allocate greater resources to obtain and consume these reinforcing foods compared to lower- energy dense
58 foods needed for weight loss. Accordingly, there is evidence suggesting that after a few hours of fasting (Raynor
59 and Epstein 2003; Epstein et al. 2003; Polivy et al. 2005) and 16-week caloric restriction periods (Best et al.
60 2012); individuals have an increased RRV of palatable energy-dense foods compared to healthier food and non-
61 food alternatives. This evidence supports the idea that caloric restriction can increase RRV, and RRV is a potent
62 predictive measure of food choice and short-term energy intake, which thus may play an important role in dietary
63 adherence needed for successful weight management. Accordingly, decreases in RRV for palatable snack foods
64 was found to predict greater weight loss in children with obesity (Buscemi et al. 2014). However, less is known
65 about how diet-induced changes in RRV predict weight loss in adults with obesity, as well as the influence of
66 different rates of calorie restriction and rate of weight loss on food reinforcement.

67

68 RRV of food and impulsivity may independently exert effects on BMI and weight status (Carr et al. 2014).
69 Previous evidence indicated that individuals with obesity commonly present higher RRV of food compared to
70 individuals with healthy weight (Epstein et al. 2007b; Buscemi et al. 2014). Along the same lines, impulsivity
71 was found to be associated with higher BMI in women living with obesity (Appelhans et al. 2012). However,
72 when high RRV for food and high impulsivity interact, a phenomenon recently known as reinforcement
73 pathology, this combination of traits provides better prediction of obesity status than either construct alone
74 (Appelhans 2009; Epstein et al. 2012b; Meule and Kübler 2014). Even though it is still uncertain whether these
75 variables interact to predict energy intake and potentially weight loss, previous evidence demonstrated that
76 impulsive reactions to high-calorie food-cues seem to be more pronounced when both impulsivity and food

craving are high. On the other hand, in situations where levels of impulsivity are low and food cravings are high, reactions to high-calorie food-cues are less obvious (Meule and Kübler 2014). Even though food craving and RRV of food represent different constructs, they are both reward-seeking variables and thus conceptually related. More precisely in women, RRV of food was found to predict energy intake only when participants had more difficulty in delaying gratification, which is one of the traits of impulsivity (Rollins et al. 2010). Conversely, a recent study has shown that food reinforcement, but not impulsivity, was independently associated with energy intake in adults, suggesting that food reinforcement might be a more powerful independent predictor of energy intake, and by extension, weight loss (Brace and Yeomans 2016).

The inconsistency in evidence existing in the scant amount of studies demonstrates the need of further investigations to gain a better understanding of the independent and combined effect that impulsivity and food reinforcement have on energy intake and potentially on the treatment response to weight loss interventions. No previous studies have investigated the role of rate of weight loss induced by varying degrees on RRV and impulsivity. Given the potential role that RRV of snack food and impulsivity play on energy intake, this evaluation would be critical for informing individualized dietary prescriptions to obtain a better treatment outcome.

Accordingly, the purpose of the study was first to investigate the changes in RRV of food and impulsivity in premenopausal women engaged in either a fast (-1000 kcal/ day, 10 weeks) or in a slow weight loss (-500 kcal/day, 20-week) programs. Second, we examined whether or not changes in RRV for snack and impulsivity independently or interactively predict BW and fat losses. We hypothesized that: 1) no differences in RRV of food or impulsivity between groups would be noted given the study was designed to promote similar weight losses and both groups would be in a state of energy deprivation; 2) that greater increases in RRV and impulsivity would be associated with poorer BW and fat mass (FM) losses and that 3) the interaction between impulsivity and RRV for snack food would predict final weight and fat losses better than either variable alone.

METHODS

Participants

A total of 36 pre-menopausal women living with overweight or obesity were enrolled in the program; however, only 30 completed the intervention. During the intervention period, 6 participants (or 16.7%) quit the study. Reasons included lack of motivation (n=3), lack of time (n=2), and personal/health problems not related to the trial (n=1). As such, 30 participants were included in the analyses (slow: n=14; fast: n=16). The inclusion criteria were as follows: $27 \leq \text{BMI} \leq 40 \text{ kg/m}^2$ 18 years and older, waist circumference $> 88 \text{ cm}$, weight-stable ($\pm 2 \text{ kg}$ last 6 months), not meeting the current physical activity guidelines for adults (i.e. less than 150 minutes per week of moderate to vigorous physical activity), no history of alcohol or drugs abuse, no food allergies, non-smoker, pre-menopausal with a regular menstrual cycle, not pregnant, not taking any medication that can interfere with energy intake and energy expenditure (e.g. psychiatric medications, appetite suppressants), normal scores in Binge Eating (Gormally et al. 1982) and depression symptoms (Beck et al. 1961). Furthermore, participants who self-reported having any history or evidence of: 1) cardiovascular disease, peripheral vascular disease, or stroke, 2) diabetes (75g oral glucose tolerance test), 3) known renal and liver disease, 4) asthma requiring therapy, plasma cholesterol $> 8 \text{ mmol/L}$, 5) systolic blood pressure $> 140 \text{ mmHg}$ or diastolic blood pressure $> 90 \text{ mmHg}$, 6) previous history of inflammation disease, or cancer, 7) untreated thyroid or pituitary disease, 8) medications that could affect cardiovascular function and/or metabolism, 9) food allergies, could not be included in the study (n=12). All participants gave their written informed consent to participate in this study, which was approved by the University of Ottawa, Research Ethics Board (#H08-15-27).

Study design and procedures

Participants who met all inclusion criteria and completed all measures of the preliminary session and baseline were then randomized in two distinct groups: fast weight loss (-1000 kcal/day) and slow weight loss (-500kcal/day) (Figure 1). The randomization was performed using a random number generator sequence in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 15.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Once participant's eligibility to join to the study was confirmed, a block of 6 participants were randomized at a time ensuring that three patients were allocated to the fast weight group and three patients to slow weight loss. The total duration of the program was thus 10 and 20 weeks for the fast and slow groups, respectively, since we wanted to match the total weight loss between groups. Both groups were assessed at baseline, and post-intervention for body composition, impulsivity and RRV. More details of the study design can be found elsewhere (Hintze et al. 2019, 2021).

Nutritional intervention

The nutritional interventions consisted of caloric restrictions of -500 kcal/day and -1000 kcal/day, for the slow and fast weight loss, respectively. These restrictions were calculated from their individual daily energy requirements. Total energy expenditure was estimated from measures of indirect calorimetry and biaxial accelerometer placed around the upper arm (mid-distance between the acromion and the olecranon). The SenseWear Professional software (version 7.0, Bodymedia, Pittsburgh, PA, USA) was used to retrieve the data once the accelerometer was returned to the laboratory as previously described (McNeil et al. 2016). The diet macronutrient composition was personalized for each participant based on the results of 2-day energy intake during the preliminary session, as previously described (Hintze et al. 2019). To achieve and maintain their respectively degrees of energy restriction, each participant received explanation about the Food exchange system - Canadian Diabetes Association (Lawton 2004). This method allows participants to select foods that they enjoy during the weight loss, however in smaller quantities. Weekly counselling was provided to help with potential difficulties with diet compliance throughout the dietary intervention. Even though no compliance measures were

taken during this period, a previous study from our group noted the degree of energy compensation was approximately 50% in both groups (Hintze et al. 2019).

Measures

Body composition

BW was measured to the nearest 0.1 kg on a calibrated balance scale (HR-100; BWB-800AS, Tanita Corporation, Arlington Heights, IL., USA) and standing height was measured using a wall stadiometer (Tanita HR-100, Tanita Corporation of America, Inc, Arlington Heights, IL). Fat Free Mass (FFM) and FM were measured using dual energy X-ray absorptiometry – DXA (Lunar Prodigy, General Electric, Madison, WI, USA). In our laboratory, the coefficient of variation and correlation for body fat percentage measured by DXA scanner in 12 healthy participants were 1.8% and $r=0.99$, respectively.

Relative Reinforcing Value of Food

RRV is defined and measured as the amount of work (button presses) performed to obtain palatable snack foods relative to the amount of work performed to obtain the alternative reinforcer, which in this study was fruit and vegetables, with greater amount of points earned (or button presses) reflecting greater RRV. A validated computerized task (Epstein et al. 2012) assessed the RRV of snack food vs fruits/vegetables (Epstein et al. 2012b) at 180 min after a standard breakfast, just prior to lunch. In our trial, the reinforcement schedule for fruits/vegetables remained constant at variable ratio (VR2) whereby participants earned points for this alternative every second button press (on average). The work requirements to obtain snack food remained constant at VR5, whereby participants had to press the button 5 times (on average) to obtain snack food points. Food points were earned by selectively working for the food item of choice, and this was accomplished by activating a slot machine-like program with a simple 2-button joystick. Button 2 allowed the user to freely switch between the snack or fruit/vegetable screen and button 1 started the slot game. Participants were asked to taste-test and rate the

palatability of a 10 gr sample of their favourite snack and fruit/vegetable, served before starting of the computer task, and their highest rated snack food and fruit/vegetables were used in the reinforcement computer task. They were also informed that every 5 points earned in the game, 25 gr of the item chosen would be served to them during lunch time.

Impulsivity

The Barratt Impulsiveness Scale-11 (BIS-11) (Patton et al. 1995) was used to assess impulsivity. The BIS-11 consists of a 30 item self-report instrument designed to assess the personality/behavioral construct of impulsivity on attentional (*e.g.* I do not 'pay attention'; I have 'racing thoughts'), motor (*e.g.* I do things without thinking; I act on the spur of the moment) and planning (*e.g.* I am more interested in the present than the future; I concentrate easily) sub-scales. Participants were instructed to rate the frequency in which items apply on a Likert-type scale (1=rarely; 2= occasionally; 3=often; 4=almost always). The scale was computed and scored according to the authors' previous instructions, and this measure has been found to have sound psychometric properties (Patton et al. 1995). The measure was administered at baseline and post weight loss, at 30 min after a standard breakfast. Higher scores indicate higher levels of impulsivity on all domains.

Statistical Analysis

All data were analyzed with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 15.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Normality of the data was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test, and results showed that transformations were not required. Variables with a parametric distribution are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation. Two-way repeated measures ANOVA were performed for changes in BW, FM, RRV of snack food and impulsivity at baseline and post-weight loss intervention within each group and between groups (*time x group* interaction). Effects were considered significant at $P < 0.05$. Moreover, in order to assess the magnitude of observed differences, the effect size was computed (eta squared, η^2). The values of 0.0099, 0.0588, and 0.1379 were considered mid-range benchmarks for small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively (Richardson 2011).

195

196 Linear multiple regression analysis was used to examine the independent and combined impact of delta changes
197 in RRV and in impulsivity scales (motor, attentional, planning and total score), as predictors of weight loss and
198 fat loss. Regression analyses were based on the pooled sample given there were no differences in changes in
199 weight loss or body composition between groups. All variables were centered before entering in the linear
200 regression model. The centered values were obtained by subtracting the mean from the measured value of the
201 median of the variable. We calculated delta change scores observed in the trial by subtracting final measures from
202 baseline measures. Probability to enter the model was set at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Draft

RESULTS

At baseline, no differences were noted between groups for any of the physical and demographic characteristics of participants as reported in **table 1**. As previously reported, total weight loss after both interventions were -6.23 (3.06) % ($p=0.001$) and -4.46(3.99) % of body weight ($p<0.001$) in the fast and slow groups, respectively (Hintze *et al.*, 2019). The rate of weight loss was -0.52 (0.25) kg/week and -0.21 (0.18) vs. ($p < .001$), in the fast and slow groups, respectively. Overall, a significant time effect with a large effect size was observed for reductions in body weight ($P<0.01$; $\eta^2= 0.73$) and in fat mass ($P=0.008$, $\eta^2=0.213$), but no time*group interaction effects were observed ($P=0.169$; $\eta^2= 0.067$ and $P=0.801$; $\eta^2=0.002$, respectively), indicating changes between groups were not significantly different. BW and body composition results were reported somewhere else (Hintze *et al.* 2019).

Table 2 presents the changes in impulsivity and RRV in completers of the slow and fast weight loss groups. As shown in **Table 2**, no changes over time ($P=0.428$; $\eta^2=0.023$) or group*time interaction ($P=0.978$) were noted in RRV of snack food. Moreover, no effects of time were noted for any component of the impulsivity data, except for a trend toward improvements in the planning scale ($P=0.05$; $\eta^2=0.128$). A similar trend was observed for the BIS-11 total score ($P=0.079$; $\eta^2=0.106$). No group*time interactions were observed for any of the impulsivity variables; however, for motor scale of BIS-11, the interaction trended toward significance and a large effect size was noted ($P=0.081$; $\eta^2=0.105$). More precisely, the slow weight loss group showed increases over time on motor impulsivity whereas values decreased over time in the fast weight loss.

Table 3 displays the results of the regression models for changes in RRV, each impulsivity scale and their interaction as independent variables. The results demonstrated that only Δ RRV snack were found to predict Δ FM. However, the model that also included changes in impulsivity planning, predicted 16% of the variance in FM loss. As shown in Table 3, greater increases in RRV snack were associated with poorer fat losses. None of changes of impulsivity-related variables either entered independently or with RRV snack were found to predict FM losses. Changes in impulsivity motor scale showed a trend toward predicting FM loss; however, the results were not statistically significant ($B=0.841$, $P=0.060$). The interaction between impulsivity scales and RRV

did not predict fat losses either. Of note, the model 3 did not include the interaction between Δ RRV snack and Δ BIS-11 attentional scale given the the high collinearity (Variance Inflation Factor =7.51) observed in this variable when included in the model.

DISCUSSION

This study is the first to examine the effects of different rates of weight loss on impulsivity and RRV food, as well as to examine whether or not the interaction between those two constructs would predict treatment response (changes in BW and FM) in women living with obesity. The findings of the present study do support our initial hypothesis that no differences in RRV of food or impulsivity between groups would be noted given the study was designed to promote similar weight losses and both groups would be in a state of energy deprivation. On the other hand, weight loss from combined fast and slow groups led to a moderate-sized reduction in the total impulsivity score, but this trend did not reach significance. Additionally, participants in the fast weight loss group reported a reduction in motor -related impulsivity scores, whereas participants enrolled in the slow weight loss exhibited a slight increase in motor scale, whereby a large effect size for this interaction was observed. We partially confirmed our second hypothesis, that greater increases in RRV of snack food were associated with poorer fat losses; however, none of the impulsivity scales were predictive of BW or FM loss in the regression models. We did not confirm our third hypothesis as the interaction between impulsivity and RRV for snack food did not predict final weight and fat losses better than either variable alone.

Impulsive characteristics were previously found to be greater in participants who were energy and water deprived (Kirk and Logue 1997; Manasse et al. 2017), and these traits were associated with worse weight management (Best et al. 2012; Kishinevsky et al. 2012; Weygandt et al. 2015; Brockmeyer et al. 2017). In fact, previous evidence has shown that when participants were more energy and water deprived (approximately 16h of deprivation), they exhibited lower self-control and were less able to wait for food reinforcers compared to

individuals that consumed a preload meal (approximately 200 kcal) (Kirk and Logue 1997). Along the same lines, a recent study suggested that two constructs of impulsivity, namely inhibitory control and delay discounting, may play a role in predicting weight loss outcomes (Manasse et al. 2017). Specifically, poorer general inhibitory control was associated with reduced weight loss after 12 months. Moreover, in a clinical context, greater inhibitory control promoted better adherence to the diet and made it less difficult to resist palatable, high-calorie food items (Manasse et al. 2017). Our data are not consistent with previous findings as only one of the impulsive indicators (planning) were impacted by caloric deprivation and none were found to predict weight or fat losses. The discrepant findings could be due, in part, because baseline scores of impulsivity values in our study were lower than normative samples, and/or the fact that we did not measure delay discounting or inhibitory control directly through behavioural tasks; rather we used subjective (self-perception) measures of impulsivity sub-traits, which may be less sensitive in detecting changes from bioenergetic challenges. Nevertheless, our findings are novel in that different levels of food deprivation inherent in the different rate of weight loss led to comparable reductions in future thinking relative to immediate thinking, which is a construct that is conceptually similar to delay-discounting. Even though no significant associations were observed between BIS-11 planning and FM losses in our study, the literature still considers the planning facet as important contributor of WL maintenance given that those with cognitive styles that focus more on the future rather than immediate rewards are more likely to purchase healthier foods and make healthier food choices (Epstein et al. 2011). In fact, improving delay of gratification through a method known as episodic future thinking demonstrates the importance of shifting time horizons and its impact on energy intake (Epstein et al. 2011, 2012a). In looking at potential mechanisms for our novel findings, it is possible that the improved self-regulation reflected in the conscious effort of selecting and consuming lower energy dense foods over high-calorie foods on a regular basis required to meet a longer-term goal of weight loss translated to a shift towards future thinking of non-eating related behaviors, goals, or outcomes. It is also possible that the caloric restriction itself had some direct effects on the BIS-11 Planning subscale given the animal and human data showing that caloric restriction and intermittent fasting enhances various aspects of cognition and executive functioning (Anton et al. 2018; Mattson 2019). Future research is needed to better understand how dietary prescriptions that vary in caloric restriction and macronutrient intake

impacts both cognitive and behavioural indicators of impulsivity and how these changes predict long term weight maintenance/relapse in individuals living with obesity.

Conversely, no group differences were noted over time for the RRV of snack food, which is in agreement with previous results (8 week caloric restriction; -700kcal/day) (Cameron et al. 2008). On the other hand, other studies suggested that caloric restriction increases RRV of snack food after short (Raynor and Epstein 2003; Epstein et al. 2003; Polivy et al. 2005) and long caloric restriction periods (Best et al. 2012); which might lead to increases in EI, an effect that could compromise weight loss and maintenance. Indeed, our results also demonstrated that RRV of snack food changes were positively associated with changes in FM. In other words, increases in RRV were associated with poorer fat losses at the end of the study. In accordance with our results, previous evidence demonstrated that RRV predicts BMI increases after 12-months of follow up in both adults (Carr et al. 2014) and children (Hill et al. 2009; Feda et al. 2015); while decreases in RRV food were found to predict greater weight losses at 6 months of weight loss in adults with obesity (Buscemi et al. 2014). Along the same lines, several studies show an association between greater RRV of snack food with increased EI (Epstein et al. 2004, 2007b, 2011; Brace and Yeomans 2016). A recent study has shown that food reinforcement, but not impulsivity, was independently associated with EI in adults, suggesting that food reinforcement might be a more powerful independent predictor of EI (Brace and Yeomans 2016). In the long-term, the change in food reinforcement could complicate the achievement and maintenance of negative energy balance, thus compromising weight loss and weight loss maintenance.

The present study has some limitations. First, our sample size was limited to 30 pre-menopausal women, which might not provide sufficient power to detect all associations and effects of interest. Second, we measured impulsivity with a questionnaire that was not specifically developed to measure impulsivity towards food. Accordingly, the use of more specific food-related impulsivity measures, behavioural inhibition or delay discounting as indicators of impulsivity could have led to different results. Third, given this is a sub-study of a larger study, we included a briefer protocol to measure food reinforcement in our participants, and this may have

influenced some of the null associations. Finally, we did not include compliance measures during the dietary intervention. However, our previous study showed that the weight and energy compensation data showed a good compliance based on indirect estimates. On the other hand, our results are strengthened by its experimental design (i.e., randomized controlled trial), as well as by the novelty of the study. Other methodological strengths of our study include the use of gold-standard techniques in the measure of body composition and control for the phase of the menstrual cycle, which strengthen the internal validity of our results.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, our results suggest that different rates of weight loss by varying levels of caloric restriction do not adversely affect RRV for snack foods or impulsivity traits in women. However, greater changes in RRV for snack was predictive of poorer FM losses. Neither RRV nor impulsivity were associated with weight losses, highlighting the need to include body composition assessments rather than solely relying on weight loss as outcomes. The results highlight the need to address increases in RRV for snack foods during weight loss in order to optimize the outcome of weight loss interventions. Further studies including larger sample sizes and more intensive food reinforcement schedules are recommended to confirm and extend the findings of the present study.

Figure 1. Study Design

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare there are no competing interests

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge Elsevier for allowing the re-use of the table 1 published in Hintze *et al.*. The rate of weight loss does not affect resting energy expenditure and appetite sensations differently in women living with overweight and obesity, Physiology Behavior, vol. 199, p. 314-321, copyright Elsevier (2019).

FUNDING SOURCES

Luzia Jaeger Hintze was supported by Coordenação de Pesquisa e Ensino Superior, Sciences Without Boards Program and she was recipient of the Ontario Graduate Scholarship.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

LJH carried out the literature study, data collection, the statistical analysis and contributed to draft the manuscript. ED conceived the study, coordinated the data collection, helped to draft the manuscript. GSG conceived the study, helped to draft the manuscript.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

The data sets used and/or analysed during the current study is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request

REFERENCES

- Anton, S.D., Moehl, K., Donahoo, W.T., Marosi, K., Lee, S.A., Mainous, A.G., Leeuwenburgh, C., and Mattson, M.P. 2018. Flipping the Metabolic Switch: Understanding and Applying the Health Benefits of Fasting. *Obesity* (Silver Spring). **26**(2): 254–268. doi:10.1002/oby.22065.
- Appelhans, B.M. 2009. Neurobehavioral inhibition of reward-driven feeding: Implications for dieting and obesity. *Obesity* **17**(4): 640–647. doi:10.1038/oby.2008.638.
- Appelhans, B.M., Waring, M.E., Schneider, K.L., Pagoto, S.L., DeBiasse, M.A., Whited, M.C., and Lynch, E.B. 2012. Delay discounting and intake of ready-to-eat and away-from-home foods in overweight and obese women. *Appetite* **59**(2): 576–584. Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2012.07.009.
- Beck, A.T., Ward, C.H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., and Erbaugh, J. 1961. An inventory for measuring depression. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* **4**: 561–71.
- Best, J.R., Theim, K.R., Gredysa, D.M., Stein, R.I., Welch, R.R., Saelens, B.E., Perri, M.G., Schechtman, K.B., Epstein, L.H., and Wilfley, D.E. 2012. Behavioral economic predictors of overweight children's weight loss. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **80**(6): 1086–1096. doi:10.1037/a0029827.
- Brace, A., and Yeomans, M.R. 2016. The reinforcing value of palatable snack foods and its relationship to subtypes of behavioural and self-report impulsivity. *Eat. Behav.* **21**: 18–23. doi:10.1016/j.eatbeh.2015.12.001.
- Brockmeyer, T., Simon, J.J., Becker, A., and Friederich, H.C. 2017. Reward-related decision making and long-term weight loss maintenance. *Physiol. Behav.* **181**(September): 69–74. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2017.09.008.
- Buscemi, J., Murphy, J.G., Berlin, K.S., and Raynor, H.A. 2014. A behavioral economic analysis of changes in food-related and food-free reinforcement during weight loss treatment. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* **82**(4): 659–669. doi:10.1037/a0036376.
- Cameron, J.D., Goldfield, G.S., Cyr, M.-J., and Doucet, E. 2008. The effects of prolonged caloric restriction leading to weight-loss on food hedonics and reinforcement. *Physiol. Behav.* **94**(3): 474–80. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2008.02.014.
- Carr, K.A., Lin, H., Fletcher, K.D., and Epstein, L.H. 2014. Food reinforcement, dietary disinhibition and weight gain in nonobese adults. *Obesity* (Silver Spring). **22**(1): 254–9. doi:10.1002/oby.20392.
- Clark, E.N., Dewey, A.M., and Temple, J.L. 2010. Effects of daily snack food intake on food reinforcement depend on body mass index and energy density. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **91**(2): 300–8. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2009.28632.
- Dawe, S., and Loxton, N.J. 2004. The role of impulsivity in the development of substance use and eating disorders. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **28**(3): 343–51. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.03.007.
- Epstein, L.H., Carr, K. a, Lin, H., and Fletcher, K.D. 2011. Food reinforcement, energy intake, and macronutrient choice. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **94**(1): 12–8. doi:10.3945/ajcn.110.010314.
- Epstein, L.H., Carr, K. a, Lin, H., Fletcher, K.D., and Roemmich, J.N. 2012a. Usual energy intake mediates the relationship between food reinforcement and BMI. *Obesity* (Silver Spring). **20**(9):

1815–9. doi:10.1038/oby.2012.2.

- Epstein, L.H., Leddy, J.J., Temple, J.L., and Faith, M.S. 2007a. Food reinforcement and eating: a multilevel analysis. *Psychol. Bull.* **133**(5): 884–906. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.133.5.884.
- Epstein, L.H., Lin, H., Carr, K.A., and Fletcher, K.D. 2012b. Food reinforcement and obesity. Psychological moderators. *Appetite* **58**(1): 157–62. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2011.09.025.
- Epstein, L.H., Salvy, S.J., Carr, K.A., Dearing, K.K., and Bickel, W.K. 2010. Food reinforcement, delay discounting and obesity. *Physiol. Behav.* **100**(5): 438–445. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2010.04.029.
- Epstein, L.H., Temple, J.L., Neaderhiser, B.J., Salis, R.J., Erbe, R.W., and Leddy, J.J. 2007b. Food reinforcement, the dopamine D2 receptor genotype, and energy intake in obese and nonobese humans. *Behav. Neurosci.* **121**(5): 877–86. doi:10.1037/0735-7044.121.5.877.
- Epstein, L.H., Truesdale, R., Wojcik, A., Paluch, R. a, and Raynor, H. a. 2003. Effects of deprivation on hedonics and reinforcing value of food. *Physiol. Behav.* **78**(2): 221–227. doi:10.1016/S0031-9384(02)00978-2.
- Epstein, L.H., Wright, S.M., Paluch, R.A., Leddy, J., Hawk, L.W., Jaroni, J.L., Saad, F.G., Crystal-Mansour, S., and Lerman, C. 2004. Food hedonics and reinforcement as determinants of laboratory food intake in smokers. *Physiol. Behav.* **81**(3): 511–517. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2004.02.015.
- Feda, D.M., Roemmich, J.N., Roberts, A., and Epstein, L.H. 2015. Food reinforcement and delay discounting in zBMI-discordant siblings. *Appetite* **85**: 185–189. Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2014.11.023.
- Giesen, J.C. a H., Havermans, R.C., Douven, A., Tekelenburg, M., and Jansen, A. 2010. Will work for snack food: the association of BMI and snack reinforcement. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. **18**(5): 966–70. Nature Publishing Group. doi:10.1038/oby.2010.20.
- Goldfield, G.S., Lumb, A.B., and Colapinto, C.K. 2011. Relative reinforcing value of energy-dense snack foods in overweight and obese adults. *Can. J. Diet. Pract. Res.* **72**(4): 170–4. doi:10.3148/72.4.2011.170.
- Gormally, J., Black, S., Daston, S., and Rardin, D. 1982. The assessment of binge eating severity among obese persons. *Addict. Behav.* **7**(1): 47–55. doi:10.1016/0306-4603(82)90024-7.
- Hill, C., Saxton, J., Webber, L., Blundell, J., and Wardle, J. 2009. The relative reinforcing value of food predicts weight gain in a longitudinal study of 7 – 10-y-old children. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **90**(May): 276–281. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2009.27479.1.
- Hintze, L.J., Goldfield, G., Seguin, R., Damphousse, A., Riopel, A., and Doucet, É. 2019. The rate of weight loss does not affect resting energy expenditure and appetite sensations differently in women living with overweight and obesity. *Physiol. Behav.* **199**(July 2018): 314–321. Elsevier. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2018.11.032.
- Hintze, L.J., Goldfield, G., Séguin, R., Damphousse, A., Riopel, A., and Doucet, É. 2021. Early changes in appetite and energy expenditure are not associated to body weight and fat losses in premenopausal women living with overweight/obesity. *Physiol. Behav.* **228**(October 2020): 2–7. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2020.113201.
- Kirk, J.M., and Logue, a W. 1997. Effects of deprivation level on humans' self-control for food reinforcers. *Appetite* **28**(3): 215–26. doi:10.1006/appe.1996.0071.

- Kishinevsky, F.I., Cox, J.E., Murdaugh, D.L., Stoeckel, L.E., Cook, E.W., and Weller, R.E. 2012. FMRI reactivity on a delay discounting task predicts weight gain in obese women. *Appetite* **58**(2): 582–592. Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2011.11.029.
- Lawton, C. 2004. Highlights of the 2003 Clinical Practice Guidelines for the prevention and management of diabetes in Canada. *CANNT J.* **14**(1): 40–3.
- Leitch, M. a, Morgan, M.J., and Yeomans, M.R. 2013. Different subtypes of impulsivity differentiate uncontrolled eating and dietary restraint. *Appetite* **69**: 54–63. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2013.05.007.
- Manasse, S.M., Flack, D., Dochat, C., Zhang, F., Butryn, M.L., and Forman, E.M. 2017. Not so fast: The impact of impulsivity on weight loss varies by treatment type. *Appetite* **113**: 193–199. Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2017.02.042.
- Manwaring J., Green L., Myerson J, Strube M., W.D. 2011. Discounting of Various types of rewards by women with and without binge eating Disorder: Evidence for general rather than specific Differences. *Psychol Rec* **61**(4): 561–582. doi:10.1007/BF02982967.
- Mattson, M.P. 2019. An Evolutionary Perspective on Why Food Overconsumption Impairs Cognition. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **23**(3): 200–212. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2019.01.003.
- McNeil, J., Doucet, É., Brunet, J.-F., Hintze, L.J., Chaumont, I., Langlois, É., Maitland, R., Riopel, A., and Forest, G. 2016. The effects of sleep restriction and altered sleep timing on energy intake and energy expenditure. *Physiol. Behav.* **164**. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2016.05.051.
- Meule, A., and Kübler, A. 2014. Double trouble. Trait food craving and impulsivity interactively predict food-cue affected behavioral inhibition. *Appetite* **79**: 174–82. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2014.04.014.
- Patton, J.H., Stanford, M.S., and Barratt, E.S. 1995. Factor structure of the Barratt impulsiveness scale. *J. Clin. Psychol.* **51**(6): 768–74.
- Polivy, J., Coleman, J., and Herman, C.P. 2005. The effect of deprivation on food cravings and eating behavior in restrained and unrestrained eaters. *Int. J. Eat. Disord.* **38**(4): 301–309. doi:10.1002/eat.20195.
- Price, M., Higgs, S., Maw, J., and Lee, M. 2016. A dual-process approach to exploring the role of delay discounting in obesity. *Physiol. Behav.* **162**: 46–51. Elsevier Inc. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2016.02.020.
- Raynor, H. a, and Epstein, L.H. 2003. The relative-reinforcing value of food under differing levels of food deprivation and restriction. *Appetite* **40**(1): 15–24. doi:10.1016/S0195-6663(02)00161-7.
- Richardson, J.T.E. 2011. Eta squared and partial eta squared as measures of effect size in educational research. *Educ. Res. Rev.* **6**(2): 135–147. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2010.12.001.
- Rollins, B.Y., Dearing, K.K., and Epstein, L.H. 2010. Delay discounting moderates the effect of food reinforcement on energy intake among non-obese women. *Appetite* **55**(3): 420–425. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2010.07.014.
- Schag, K., Teufel, M., Junne, F., Preissl, H., Hautzinger, M., Zipfel, S., and Giel, K.E. 2013. Impulsivity in binge eating disorder: food cues elicit increased reward responses and disinhibition. *PLoS One* **8**(10): e76542. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076542.
- Schiff, S., Amodio, P., Testa, G., Nardi, M., Montagnese, S., Caregaro, L., di Pellegrino, G., and Sellitto,

- M. 2016. Impulsivity toward food reward is related to BMI: Evidence from intertemporal choice in obese and normal-weight individuals. *Brain Cogn.* **110**: 112–119. Elsevier Inc. doi:10.1016/j.bandc.2015.10.001.
- Stojek, M.M.K., and MacKillop, J. 2017. Relative reinforcing value of food and delayed reward discounting in obesity and disordered eating: A systematic review. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* **55**(April): 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2017.04.007.
- Temple, J.L., Bulkley, A.M., Badawy, R.L., Krause, N., McCann, S., and Epstein, L.H. 2009. Differential effects of daily snack food intake on the reinforcing value of food in obese and nonobese women. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **90**(2): 304–13. doi:10.3945/ajcn.2008.27283.
- Temple, J.L., and Epstein, L.H. 2011. Sensitization of food reinforcement is related to weight status and baseline food reinforcement. *Int. J. Obes.* **36**(8): 1102–7. doi:10.1038/ijo.2011.210.
- Weller, R.E., Cook, E.W., Avsar, K.B., and Cox, J.E. 2008. Obese women show greater delay discounting than healthy-weight women. *Appetite* **51**(3): 563–569. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2008.04.010.
- Weygandt, M., Mai, K., Dommès, E., Ritter, K., Leupelt, V., Spranger, J., and Haynes, J.D. 2015. Impulse control in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex counteracts post-diet weight regain in obesity. *Neuroimage* **109**: 318–327. Elsevier Inc. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.12.073.

Draft

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the slow and fast weight loss groups

	Slow (n=17)	Fast (n=19)	P
Age (years)	30.18 (9.31)	33.05 (9.3)	0.361
BW (Kg)	85.25 (12.45)	92.64 (16.2)	0.137
BMI (kg/m2)	32.12 (3.12)	33.99 (4.38)	0.076
WC (cm)	93.8 (6.5)	96.7 (9.39)	0.295
%BF	45.99 (4.46)	47.39 (2.63)	0.256
Attempts to lose weight	3.82 (3.07)	4.16 (2.4)	0.714
Highest BW lifetime (Kg)	89.62 (12.22)	95.42 (16.15)	0.238
REE (kcal/day)	1404.81 (396.51)	1558.52 (190.17)	0.141
Estimated TEE (Kcal)	1872.47 (413.71)	2103.26 (264.16)	0.06
EI Breakfast (Kcal)	467.73 (188.04)	481.51 (173.61)	0.82
Ethnicity (n, %)			
Caucasian	11(30.6%)	13(36.1%)	0.458
Black	3 (8.3%)	1 (2.8%)	
Others	3 (8.3%)	5 (13.9%)	
Education (n, %)			
High school	4 (11.1%)	3 (8.3%)	0.487
Some college, no degree	3 (8.3%)	2 (5.6%)	
Associate's degree	2 (5.6%)	1 (2.8%)	
Bachelor's degree	2 (5.6%)	7 (19.4%)	
Master's degree	6 (16.7%)	5 (13.9%)	
Professional degree	0	1 (2.8%)	

Data presented as mean $\pm$ SD; Categorical variables present as frequency (percentage); BW: Body weight; BMI: Body Mass Index, WC: Waist Circumference; BF: Body Fat; REE: Resting Energy Expenditure; TEE: Total Energy Expenditure; EI: Energy Intake. This table has been published in: Hintze *et al.*. The rate of weight loss does not affect resting energy expenditure and appetite sensations differently in women living with overweight and obesity, *Physiology Behavior*, vol. 199, p. 314-321, copyright Elsevier (2019).

Table 2. Changes in Impulsivity, RRV of snack at baseline and post dietary intervention by group

	Slow (n=14)		Fast (n=16)		Changes Within Group		Changes Between Group	
	Baseline	Post Intervention	Baseline	Post Intervention	P	η2	P	η2
Body weight (Kg)	87.29(11.65)	83.36 (11.16)	92.18 (16.54)	86.69 (17.26)	<0.01	0.73	0.169	0.067
Fat Mass (Kg)	41.72 (7.83)	37.81 (12.86)	42.75 (7.57)	38.0 (12.84)	0.008	0.213	0.801	0.002
BIS - Attentional Facet	15.73 (2.05)	14 (4.94)	14.82 (3.02)	14.29 (4.71)	0.154	0.066	0.443	0.02
BIS - Motor Facet	20.93 (3.63)	21.57 (3.52)	20.50 (3.81)	19.06(2.91)	0.494	0.017	0.081	0.105
BIS - Planning Facet	22.14 (3.08)	21.50 (2.90)	22.81 (2.86)	21.50 (3.33)	0.05	0.128	0.493	0.017
BIS - total score	58.79 (5.34)	58.07 (7.47)	58.69 (6.35)	55.69 (6.78)	0.079	0.106	0.271	0.043
RRV snack	12.14 (11.13)	9.71 (9.09)	13.56 (9.89)	11.13 (22.57)	0.45	0.021	0.999	0

Data presented as mean ± SD; BIS: Barratt Impulsiveness Scale; **significant differences**

Table 3. Summary of hierarchical regression analysis for delta variables predicting changes in FM in both groups (n=30).

	Δ FM			
	R	R ²	B	P
Model 1				
Δ RRV snack	0.468	0.219	0.278	0.142
Δ BIS-11 Motor scale			0.841	0.060
Δ RRV snack x Δ BIS-11 Motor Scale			0.599	0.175
Model 2				
Δ RRV snack	0.400	0.160	0.525	0.046
Δ BIS-11 Planning scale			0.497	0.146
Δ RRV snack x Δ BIS-11 Planning scale			0.556	0.119
Model 3**				
Δ RRV snack	0.255	0.065	0.255	0.191
Δ RRV snack	0.255	0.065	0.255	0.199
Δ BIS-11 attentional scale			-0.015	0.939
Model 4				
Δ RRV snack	0.352	0.124	0.243	0.221
Δ BIS-11 Total score			0.542	0.277
Δ RRV snack x Δ BIS-11 Total score			0.381	0.443

RRV: Relative Reinforcing Value of snack foods; BIS: Barratt Impulsiveness Scale; BW: Body Weight; FM: Fat Mass; ** Model 3: the interaction between Δ RRV snack and Δ BIS-11 attentional scale was not entered as independent variable as it did not follow the collinearity criteria adopted in the models.