

# Gastric modulation of food reward, olfaction and taste in obesity and bariatric surgery: an artificial intelligence assisted scoping review protocol

Nina Ritsch<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>

Camille Bourque<sup>4</sup>

Frederic Bergeron<sup>5</sup>

Julie-Anne Nazare<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Anestis Dougkas<sup>1,3</sup>

Sylvain Iceta<sup>4,6</sup>

1. Institute Paul Bocuse Research Center, Lyon, France.
2. Centre de Recherche en Nutrition Humaine Rhône-Alpes (CRNH-RA), Laboratoire Centre Européen Nutrition et Santé (CENS), Pierre-Bénite, France.
3. CarMeN, Unité INSERM 1060, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Pierre-Bénite, France.
4. Research Center of the Quebec Heart and Lung Institute, Québec, QC, Canada.
5. Bibliothèque – Direction des services-conseils, Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada
6. Department of Psychiatry and Neurosciences, Laval University, Québec, QC, Canada.

**Corresponding author:**

Sylvain Iceta  
Sylvain.iceta.1@ulaval.ca

## Registration information

The protocol has been registered on the Open Science Framework (OSF) and is available at: <https://osf.io/gykj2/>

## Acknowledgments

n/a

## Funding

NR is supported by grants from Agence Nationale Recherche et Technologie (ANRT), grants from Foundation GÉRARD PÉLISSON and from the Faculty of Medicine of Université Laval, Québec, Canada. SI is supported by Fond de Recherche du Quebec – Research Scholar Junior 1 grant. NR and SI grants are not directly linked to this scoping review project but provide part of their wages. The funders have not been involved in this project in any manner.

## Author contributions

NR, SI, and FB contributed to the development and drafting of the first version of the scoping review protocol, including the development of the search equation and data extraction instrument. The protocol manuscript has been revised by JAN and AD. NR will be the first reviewer, CB will be the second reviewer, and SI will be the third reviewer. Data extraction will be conducted by NR and CB. Results and manuscript will be primarily drafted by NR, as the scoping review is contributing to a PhD for NR. Revisions and additional intellectual contributions to the writing will be made by JAN, AD and SI.

## Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest in this project.

## 1 Abstract

2 **Objective:** To understand the extent and nature of the available research on gastric  
3 modulation of food reward, olfaction, and taste in people with obesity or those who have  
4 undergone bariatric surgery.

5 **Introduction:** Bariatric surgery-induced weight loss is partially attributed to shifts in food  
6 preferences resulting from alterations in sensory perceptions and changes in reward system.  
7 The stomach's innervation and mechanical function have been theorized to play a significant  
8 role in these modifications, as suggested by numerous preclinical studies. However, the extent  
9 and nature of these connections in clinical settings require further elucidation.

10 **Inclusion criteria:** This review will examine studies on the influence of gastric innervation  
11 and/or mechanical function on food reward, olfaction, and taste. Selected studies will include  
12 participants of all ages with obesity or bariatric surgery. Both observational studies and  
13 controlled experiments will be considered, while study protocols, opinion articles, letters to the  
14 editor, book chapters, oral communication or poster abstracts and systematic reviews will be  
15 excluded.

16 **Methods:** The search will be undertaken in MEDLINE, Embase, PsycINFO, CINAHL, Web of  
17 Science, Google Scholar, and gray literature. No date parameters will be set, and all  
18 languages will be considered. Citations will be uploaded into EndNote 20.0 and duplicates  
19 removed using Covidence. The remaining studies will be analyzed by 3 reviewers using a two-  
20 stage procedure with the ASReview python package. The full-text screening and the data  
21 extraction will be conducted by 2 reviewers on Covidence. An additional reviewer will be  
22 consulted in the event of disagreement. Tabulated results will be accompanied by a narrative  
23 summary.

## 24 Introduction

25 Obesity is a global public health problem, partly attributed to the dysregulation of eating  
26 behavior. Among other things, it is associated with impairment in both the homeostatic and  
27 hedonic control of food intake<sup>1</sup>. While bariatric surgery is recognized as the most effective  
28 treatment for obesity, it still results in weight failure (i.e., no weight loss or weight regain) in 20  
29 to 30% of cases at 10 years<sup>2</sup>. Weight loss, however, is not solely driven by a reduction in food  
30 intake due to decreased gastric volume. It is also linked to shifts in food preferences caused  
31 by alterations in sensory perceptions<sup>3,4</sup>, and remodeling of reward circuit<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, our  
32 research team has shown that the dietary preferences of patients with weight failure differ from  
33 those who have achieved successful post-operative outcomes<sup>4</sup>. These findings suggest that  
34 the variances observed in weight loss trajectories may be partially attributed to the diversity of  
35 responses of food intake control mechanisms.

36 Beyond its impacts on the hedonic regulation of food intake, bariatric surgery also deeply  
37 impacts the intestine-brain axis. It is hypothesized to normalize the composition of the  
38 intestinal microbiota and the secretion of digestive hormones<sup>6,7</sup>, both of which are altered in  
39 people with obesity. Furthermore, these changes seem to correlate positively with post-  
40 operative weight loss<sup>6,7</sup>. Similarly, increased blood levels of the gut hormones glicentin and  
41 oxyntomodulin are thought to be associated with changes in food preferences<sup>7</sup>, and the  
42 digestive hormone GLP-1 has been suggested as a key factor in the perception of  
43 sweetness<sup>8</sup>. Gut hormones and microbiota have been extensively investigated in the context  
44 of their significance in obesity<sup>9,10</sup> and bariatric surgeries<sup>11,12</sup>.

45 Nonetheless, other mechanisms may be involved, such as gastric motor functions and  
46 innervations. The association between some of the gut hormones and the brain may be  
47 mediated by the vagus nerve, responsible for visceral interoception. It connects the digestive  
48 system, notably the stomach or intestine and their mechano- and chemoreceptors, to the brain  
49 via the nucleus of the tractus solitarius<sup>13</sup>. This nucleus also receives afferents from the facial  
50 and glossopharyngeal nerves, responsible for taste sensitivity. Indeed, acute stimulation of  
51 the vagus nerve in depressed subjects seems to lead to an increase in the perceived intensity  
52 of sweet taste<sup>14</sup>. Paradoxically, the same study suggests that this stimulation also leads to an  
53 increase in detection thresholds for sweet, sour and bitter tastes. In addition, vagus nerve  
54 would increase olfactory discrimination scores in healthy subjects<sup>15</sup>, in line with the results  
55 obtained by Garcia-Diaz in 1984, who showed that acute stimulation of the vagus nerve  
56 increased electrical activity in the olfactory bulbs of rats<sup>16</sup>. Also, chronic stimulation of the  
57 vagus nerve in obese guinea pigs has been shown to modify food preferences, notably by  
58 reducing consumption of sweet foods<sup>17</sup>. Its chronic stimulation in obese guinea pigs induces  
59 changes in food preferences, including a reduction in the consumption of sweet foods<sup>17</sup>. It  
60 also increases dopamine secretion and influences food preferences in mice<sup>18</sup>. Regarding  
61 human studies, it has been shown that an acute stimulation of the vagus nerve in healthy  
62 subjects increases food reward seeking<sup>19</sup>. Iatridi et al. showed in 2011 that women who liked  
63 sweet tastes had higher interoceptive capacity than those who did not<sup>20</sup>. Notably,  
64 interoceptive abilities are positively associated with vagal tone<sup>21</sup>. These results could partly  
65 explain the positive impact of this stimulation on the weight of obese rat<sup>22</sup> and guinea pigs<sup>23</sup>.  
66 In humans, low vagal tone has been linked to obesity<sup>24</sup>, while reduced interoceptive capacity  
67 has been associated with higher BMI<sup>25</sup>. Figure 1 provides a summary of the connections  
68 between the vagus nerve and the stomach.

69 Bariatric surgery, particularly sleeve gastrectomy and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, impact the  
70 vagus nerve by modifying its structure<sup>26</sup>. Hence, it is imperative to elucidate the ramifications  
71 of this vagal restructuring on the homeostatic and hedonic mechanisms that influence food

72 choices and their interactions. Finally, understanding their links with post-operative weight loss  
73 could promote the success of future surgery.

74 However, if literature is available regarding the interaction between the gut and the reward  
75 systems, it focuses on animal studies. To our knowledge, no current reviews encompass both  
76 gut innervation and motility simultaneously, nor do they consider food reward, olfaction, and  
77 taste within the same review. Furthermore, these mechanisms altogether have been  
78 insufficiently studied in the context of obesity. Therefore, conducting a scoping review in this  
79 domain would provide a comprehensive overview of current knowledge and help to identify  
80 the gaps to fill in future studies.

81 The primary objective of this scoping review is to systematically examine and map the existing  
82 literature on gastric modulation of food reward and preference, olfaction, and taste in people  
83 with obesity or those who have undergone bariatric surgery. Specifically, it will examine i)  
84 mechanisms related to gastric innervation encompassing both sympathetic (i.e., splanchnic  
85 nerve), and parasympathetic (i.e., vagus nerve) innervation; and ii) mechanisms related to  
86 gastric satiation, dilatation and emptying. A secondary aim of this review will be to determine  
87 whether bariatric surgery can have an impact on these mechanisms. Lastly, we will summarize  
88 the tools used in the reviewed literature for assessing reward, olfaction, and taste. Based on  
89 the findings of this scoping review, we will identify gaps in the evidence for future research  
90 and may undertake a subsequent systematic review with quantitative synthesis (e.g.,  
91 investigating aspects such as the impact of vagal nerve modulation on food preferences).

92

## 93 Review question

94 What is the extent and nature of the available research literature related to gastric modulation  
95 of food reward, olfaction and taste in people who have obesity?

- 96 - Which mechanisms related to gastric innervation impact on food reward, olfaction, and  
97 taste have been studied in human studies on obesity?
- 98 - What published literature exists regarding gastric mobility, dilatation, and emptying on  
99 food reward, olfaction, and taste.
- 100 - What level of investigation exists regarding bariatric surgery's impact on these  
101 mechanisms?
- 102 - Which tools and outcome measures have been used to explore the gastric modulation  
103 of food reward, olfaction, and taste?

104

## 105 Keywords

106 Obesity; food reward; sensory perceptions; food preferences; gut-brain axis; vagus nerve;  
107 bariatric surgery.

108

## 109 Eligibility criteria

### 110 Participants

111 Articles including participants of any age and with obesity (Body Mass Index  $\geq 30$  kg.m<sup>-2</sup>) will  
112 be included in this review as well as participants who underwent bariatric surgery (e.g., sleeve  
113 gastrectomy, Roux-en-Y Bypass or Biliopancreatic derivation).

114

## 115 Concept

116 This review will examine studies on food reward, olfaction, and taste, whether these concepts  
117 were studied together or separately in studies.

118 Food intake is partly driven by food reward, which can be conceptualized as a system that  
119 assigns a hedonic value to food and generates motivation for food intake. Food reward  
120 intersects external inputs from the sensory aspects of food and internal signals from tissues,  
121 nutrients, and hormones from the gastrointestinal tract to guide eating behavior<sup>9</sup>. Rather than  
122 a unitary construct, food reward consists of distinct subcomponents, which remains a subject  
123 of controversy. For the purposes of this review, we will categorize food reward in a two  
124 dimensions model: Incentive Salience or Wanting (effort-based food-directed behavior), and  
125 Hedonic Evaluation or Liking (palatability, food preference)<sup>27</sup>. A variety of methods have been  
126 used to measure food reward. The most common measure of food reward is food liking, food  
127 wanting (e.g., implicit, and explicit wanting) and self-reported desire to eat a specific food.  
128 Mostly self-reported tools are used such as visual analog scales (VAS). In addition, more  
129 advanced questionnaires or computerized tasks can also be used (e.g., visual-probe task,  
130 forced choice tasks, or implicit association task). Although not a direct measure of food reward,  
131 food choices and preferences are commonly used as an indicator of variation in food reward<sup>28</sup>.  
132 Food preferences include the qualitative evaluation of foods, and quantitative food preference  
133 measurements (e.g., food preferences or frequency questionnaires).

134 Olfaction is defined at a peripheral level as “olfaction sensitivity,” where an odor is detected  
135 above a certain threshold that is specific to each individual. At a central level, olfaction gathers  
136 “indicators of olfactory performances” with odors identification abilities, and “odors perceptual  
137 ratings” with subjective characterizations of smells (intensity, familiarity, edibility). The hedonic  
138 aspect of olfactory perception is described by the perceived pleasantness of an odor.

139 Similarly, to olfaction, taste corresponds to “gustatory sensitivity,” where a taste is detected  
140 above a certain threshold that is specific to each individual. It also brings together “indicators  
141 of gustatory performances” with taste identification abilities, and “tastes perceptual ratings”  
142 with subjective perceptions of tastes (intensity, familiarity). The hedonic aspect of gustatory  
143 perception is described by the perceived pleasantness of taste.

144

## 145 Context

146 This scoping review will include studies that explored the modulation or control of food reward,  
147 olfaction, and taste by the stomach. The stomach is a complex organ with mechanical and  
148 endocrine functions. The stomach’s four key digestive functions are reservoir function, acid  
149 secretion, enzyme secretion and involvement in gastrointestinal motility. The stomach’s  
150 reservoir capacity (around 1 to 2 liters) allows its volume to increase, while internal pressure  
151 increases modestly (i.e., gastric interoception). Stomach contraction and relaxation are partly  
152 mediated by a vasovagal response. Enteroendocrine hormones have pleiotropic effects in  
153 both central and peripheral systems involved in energy homeostasis and obesity regulation<sup>9</sup>.  
154 As many reviews have already been conducted regarding hormonal modulation and even if  
155 endocrine functions were of major interest, we decided to focus on gastric mechanical  
156 functions and gastric innervation, since we believe these components are less known.

157 Observational studies, as well as controlled experiments will be considered. This scoping  
158 review will include studies conducted in all countries and territories. Information about the  
159 location of each study will be integrated in the data extraction and the findings will be presented  
160 by continents or relevant geographic regions. Only studies in humans will be considered.

161

## 162 Types of Sources

163 This scoping review will consider peer-reviewed quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods  
164 study designs, and relevant gray literature if it meets the inclusion criteria. Observational  
165 studies including prospective and retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies and cross-  
166 sectional studies will be considered for inclusion.

167 The review will exclude study protocols, opinion articles, letters to the editor, book chapters,  
168 oral or poster abstracts, and systematic reviews. All sources that are included in the review  
169 will have their references examined for other potential studies to include.

170

## 171 Methods

172 The proposed scoping review will be conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for  
173 scoping reviews<sup>29</sup>. This scoping review project's protocol was first registered in The Open  
174 Science Framework (OSF) website on 2023/09/18. All materials, including the original  
175 protocol, revised protocol, and database search results, will be accessible through OSF  
176 registration website (<https://osf.io/>).

177

### 178 Search strategy

179 The development of the three-stage research strategy will follow JBI's recommendations.  
180 Step 1, the research team will identify a series of terms that will be used to launch an initial  
181 search in PubMed. Using data mining software (PubReMiner v1.31), an analysis of the words  
182 contained in the titles and abstracts of the articles, as well as the indexing terms, will follow.

183 The final search strategy will be formulated according to PCC elements: population, concepts,  
184 and context. In our research, the target population is people suffering from obesity (BMI  $\geq$  30  
185 kg.m<sup>-2</sup>) and people who had undergone bariatric surgery (e.g., Obesity OR Bariatric Surgery  
186 OR Sleeve Gastrectomy OR Roux-en-Y Bypass). Our concept of interest in this review is food  
187 reward (e.g., Feeding Behavior OR Food Preferences OR Food Reward OR Liking OR  
188 Wanting OR Olfaction OR Olfactory OR Taste OR Gustatory). Finally, the last concept will  
189 focus on gastric related terms (Gastr\* OR Stomach-OR Gastric Dilatation OR Interoception).

190 In step 2, the final search strategy will be adapted and performed in the following databases:  
191 Medline (Ovid), Embase, (Embase.com), CINAHL (EBSCO), PsycInfo (Ovid) and Web of  
192 Science. In addition, Google Scholar search engine and Hal Documentation  
193 (<https://hal.science/>) will be searched to retrieve gray literature. No restrictions will be set to  
194 ensure no relevant sources are missed. All languages will be included to reduce the risk of  
195 missing relevant sources. Languages other than English will be translated by colleagues who  
196 are fluent in the language or through Google Translate or DeepL. A draft Medline search  
197 strategy can be found in Appendix 1.

198 In step 3, reference lists of all included articles will be screened to identify additional relevant  
199 articles. If key authors publishing on the review topics are identified, a specific search will be  
200 conducted on these authors.

201

### 202 Study/Source of Evidence Selection

203 Following the search, all identified citations will be collated and uploaded into EndNote 20.0  
204 (Clarivate Analytics, PA, USA) and duplicates removed using Covidence. The remaining

205 studies will be analyzed using a two-stage procedure with the ASReview Lab v1.2.1 python  
206 package <sup>30</sup>.

207 In the first stage, screening will be conducted independently on titles and abstracts by two  
208 coders (NR and CB) with an AI-assistant tool, ASReview, which adopted Natural Language  
209 Processing technique <sup>30</sup>. At the beginning, abstracts will be randomly selected to train the two  
210 coders. A coder could end the screening if ASReview yielded 1% of the total number of  
211 abstract continuous irrelevant abstracts (with a minimum of 10% of total abstracts screened).  
212 The first round of screening will use default ASReview parameters (i.e., Term Frequency-  
213 Inverse Document Frequency, TF-IDF as feature extraction technique and Naive Bayes as  
214 classifier) and each reviewer will use a different set of records as prior knowledge. The  
215 consistency of the two coders' decisions had to exceed 75% <sup>31</sup>. Another round of screening  
216 for training purposes will be considered if the first consistency is not satisfied. As the best  
217 active learning criterion remains controversial, we will provide a more heuristic approach by  
218 using a 'switching strategy'. To do so, a third reviewer (SI) will proceed to a new screening  
219 round using a more advanced and intense computational model active learning model  
220 (Doc2Vec as feature extraction technique and the fully connected neural network with 2 hidden  
221 layers as classifier). The 20 relevant and 20 irrelevant abstracts labeled in the first screening  
222 round as prior knowledge set. Same stopping criterion will be used.

223 The second stage focuses on the full-text screening and will be conducted on Covidence. Like  
224 the abstract screening, according to JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis, a pilot training  
225 procedure is recommended before the formal full-text screening <sup>31</sup>. Inclusive/exclusive  
226 decisions in the pilot stage of two coders will be compared until a 90% agreement rate is  
227 obtained. The final consistency between the two coders will be reported. Reasons for  
228 exclusion of sources of evidence at full text that do not meet the inclusion criteria will be  
229 recorded and reported in the scoping review. Any disagreements that arise between the  
230 reviewers at each stage of the selection process will be resolved through discussion, or with  
231 an additional reviewer (SI or JAN experts in obesity and food reward). The results of the search  
232 and the study inclusion process will be reported in full in the final scoping review and presented  
233 in a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis extension for  
234 scoping review (PRISMA-ScR) flow diagram <sup>32</sup>.

235

## 236 Data Extraction

237 Data will be extracted from papers included in the scoping review by two independent  
238 reviewers using Covidence as a data extraction tool. The data extracted will include specific  
239 details about the participants, concept, context, study methods and key findings relevant to  
240 the review questions.

241 A draft extraction form is provided (see Appendix II). Two independent reviewers will pilot test  
242 the data extraction tool using 10 sources that will include a mix of original research, reviews,  
243 editorial papers, opinion papers, and gray literature. The draft data extraction tool will be  
244 modified and revised as necessary during the process of extracting data from each included  
245 evidence source. Modifications will be detailed in the scoping review. Any disagreements that  
246 arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion with an additional reviewer  
247 (SI). If appropriate, authors of papers will be contacted (a maximum of twice) to request  
248 missing or additional data, where required.

249



## 250 Data Analysis and Presentation

251 The data presentation will be based on JBI scoping review guidelines. The forthcoming  
252 presentation of the scoping review's outcomes will be structured into xx distinct sections. The  
253 first section will provide detailed reporting of the search strategy results, the selection process  
254 and the characteristics of the excluded studies, clarified with the help of a visually intuitive flow  
255 chart. The following 3 sections will present in a narrative format, as well as in synthetic tabular  
256 format, the results for olfaction, taste, and food reward in people with obesity. As results for  
257 the bariatric population are expected to be scarcer, the three dimensions (i.e., olfaction, taste,  
258 and reward) will be merged into a fourth section devoted to this population. A fifth section will  
259 then focus on a narrative presentation of the assessment tools or methods used to explore  
260 olfaction, taste, and reward. Finally, we will discuss the overall results and perspectives  
261 resulting from this work.

262 Moreover, comprehensive data set will be presented in a tabular format, following the  
263 extraction form presented in Annex II. Tables will be available for each dimension studied:  
264 taste, olfaction, reward, and for both obesity and bariatric surgery population. Tables will be  
265 provided in the supplementary materials to avoid overloading the article.

266

267 **Appendices**

268 **Appendix I: Databases search strategy (draft)**

269

270 **Medline (Ovid)**

271 **Date of the search:** XX-XX-2023

272 **Database limit:** XX

273

#	Search strategy	Results
1	exp Obesity/ OR Obesity.ti,ab,kw,kf	
2	exp Bariatric Surgery/ OR Biliopancreatic Diversion/ OR Gastrectomy/ OR ((Bariatric? OR Metabolic) adj2 (Surg* OR Operation? OR Procedure?)).ti,ab,kw,kf OR ((biliopancreatic OR "bilio-pancreatic" OR Gastro* OR gastric OR Intestin* OR Jejuno* OR stomach OR ileojejunal OR "ileo-jejunal") adj2 (diversion? OR Bypass* OR Surg* OR derivation OR bypass*)).ti,ab,kw,kf OR Roux-en-y.ti,ab,kw,kf OR Scopinaro.ti,ab,kw,kf OR ((gastric OR stomach OR surger* OR procedure? OR vertical) adj1 band*).ti,ab,kw,kf OR (sleeve adj1 (gastrectomy OR gastric OR Surg* OR Operation? OR Procedure?)).ti,ab,kw,kf OR Gastroplast*.ti,ab,kw,kf OR "gastro-plast".ti,ab,kw,kf OR "duodenal switch".ti,ab,kw,kf OR Gastrectom*.ti,ab,kw,kf OR gastroresection.ti,ab,kw,kf OR hemigastrectomy.ti,ab,kw,kf OR "gastric resection".ti,ab,kw,kf OR (stomach adj1 (extirpation OR resection OR transection)).ti,ab,kw,kf	
3	1 OR 2	
4	Feeding Behavior/ OR Eating/ OR Food Preferences/ OR Appetite Regulation/ OR ((Diet? OR Feeding OR food OR Eating OR Nutrition) adj1 (Behavior? OR Habit? OR Pattern? OR preference? OR intake OR choice? OR Reward OR liking OR wanting OR selection)).ti,ab,kw,kf OR palatability.ti,ab,kw,kf	
5	Smell/ OR olfacti*.ti,ab,kw,kf OR olfacto*.ti,ab,kw,kf OR smell*.ti,ab,kw,kf OR odor?.ti,ab,kw,kf	
6	exp Taste/ OR Taste Perception/ OR Tast*.ti,ab,kw,kf OR gustation.ti,ab,kw,kf OR gustatory.ti,ab,kw,kf	
7	4 OR 5 OR 6	
8	Stomach/ OR Vagus Nerve/ OR Spinal Nerves/ OR exp Satiation/ OR Gastrointestinal Motility/ OR Gastric Emptying/ OR Gastrointestinal Transit/ OR Gastric Dilatation/ OR satiation?.ti,ab,kw,kf OR satiety.ti,ab,kw,kf OR ((Intestinal OR Gastrointestinal) adj2 (Motilit* OR Transit?)).ti,ab,kw,kf OR (Gastric adj2 (Dilation OR Emptying?)).ti,ab,kw,kf OR Stomach?.ti,ab,kw,kf OR ((vagus OR vagal OR Spinal) adj2 nerv*).ti,ab,kw,kf	
9	3 AND 7 AND 8	
10	9 NOT (Animals/ NOT humans/)	

274

275

## 276 Appendix II: Data extraction instrument

277

### 278 **General information:**

- 279 - Author (year)
- 280 - Publication type/source (e.g., journal, thesis)
- 281 - Country
- 282 - Research design
- 283 - Study aims / objectives
- 284 - Population / Participants
- 285 - Specific inclusion / exclusion criteria

### 286 **Population of the study:**

- 287 - Numbers of participants (n)
- 288 - Male – Female (%)
- 289 - Time of menstrual cycle
- 290 - Age (years)
- 291 - Type 2 Diabetes (%)
- 292 - BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)
- 293 - Waist circumference (cm)
- 294 - Waist/Hip ratio
- 295 - Visceral fat mass (kg or %)
- 296 - Subcutaneous fat mass (kg)
- 297 - Total fat mass (kg)

### 298 *In addition, for bariatric surgery:*

- 299 - Type of surgery (sleeve gastrectomy, Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, biliopancreatic diversion)
- 300
- 301 - Time after intervention (months)
- 302 - BMI before the surgery (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)
- 303 - Weight loss outcome (e.g., %EWL, %TWL)
- 304 - Lowest BMI since surgery (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)

### 305 **Intervention and outcomes:**

- 306 - Intervention type (if any)
- 307 - Outcome measure
- 308 - Methodology
- 309 - Taste: taste modality (sweet, salty, sour, bitter, umami etc.); stimuli and concentration (sucrose, quinine etc.); and gustatory function (detection, identification, intensity, pleasantness etc.)
- 310
- 311
- 312 - Olfaction: olfactory function (detection, identification, intensity, pleasantness etc.) and methods (Sniffin Sticks, ETOC (European Tests of Olfactory Capabilities) etc.)
- 313
- 314 - Reward: type of reward measure, other measure (food frequency questionnaires, 24h recall etc.)
- 315
- 316 - Key results

317

## 318 References

- 319 1. Amin T, Mercer JG. Hunger and Satiety Mechanisms and Their Potential Exploitation in the  
320 Regulation of Food Intake. *Curr Obes Rep.* 2016; 5(1):106-12.
- 321 2. Shah M, Simha V, Garg A. Review: long-term impact of bariatric surgery on body weight,  
322 comorbidities, and nutritional status. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2006; 91(11):4223-31.
- 323 3. Guyot E, Dougkas A, Nazare JA, Bagot S, Disse E, Iceta S. A systematic review and meta-  
324 analyses of food preference modifications after bariatric surgery. *Obes Rev.* 2021;  
325 22(10):e13315.
- 326 4. Guyot E, Dougkas A, Robert M, Nazare JA, Iceta S, Disse E. Food Preferences and Their  
327 Perceived Changes Before and After Bariatric Surgery: a Cross-sectional Study. *Obes Surg.*  
328 2021; 31(7):3075-82.
- 329 5. Guyot E, Nazare JA, Oustric P, Robert M, Disse E, Dougkas A, et al. Food Reward after  
330 Bariatric Surgery and Weight Loss Outcomes: An Exploratory Study. *Nutrients.* 2022; 14(3).
- 331 6. Gasmi A, Bjørklund G, Mujawdiya PK, Semenova Y, Dosa A, Piscopo S, et al. Gut  
332 microbiota in bariatric surgery. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr.* 2022:1-16.
- 333 7. Nielsen MS, Ritz C, Wewer Albrechtsen NJ, Holst JJ, le Roux CW, Sjödén A. Oxyntomodulin  
334 and Glicentin May Predict the Effect of Bariatric Surgery on Food Preferences and Weight  
335 Loss. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2020; 105(4).
- 336 8. Jensterle M, DeVries JH, Battelino T, Battelino S, Yildiz B, Janez A. Glucagon-like peptide-  
337 1, a matter of taste? *Rev Endocr Metab Disord.* 2021; 22(4):763-75.
- 338 9. Crooks B, Stamatakis NS, McLaughlin JT. Appetite, the enteroendocrine system,  
339 gastrointestinal disease and obesity. *Proc Nutr Soc.* 2021; 80(1):50-8.
- 340 10. Torres-Fuentes C, Schellekens H, Dinan TG, Cryan JF. The microbiota-gut-brain axis in  
341 obesity. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2017; 2(10):747-56.
- 342 11. Debédat J, Clément K, Aron-Wisniewsky J. Gut Microbiota Dysbiosis in Human Obesity:  
343 Impact of Bariatric Surgery. *Curr Obes Rep.* 2019; 8(3):229-42.
- 344 12. Guerrero-Hreins E, Foldi CJ, Oldfield BJ, Stefanidis A, Sumithran P, Brown RM. Gut-brain  
345 mechanisms underlying changes in disordered eating behaviour after bariatric surgery: a  
346 review. *Rev Endocr Metab Disord.* 2022; 23(4):733-51.
- 347 13. Quadt L, Critchley HD, Garfinkel SN. The neurobiology of interoception in health and  
348 disease. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2018; 1428(1):112-28.
- 349 14. Sperling W, Biermann T, Spannenberger R, Clepce M, Padberg F, Reulbach U, et al.  
350 Changes in gustatory perceptions of patients with major depression treated with vagus nerve  
351 stimulation (VNS). *Pharmacopsychiatry.* 2011; 44(2):67-71.

- 352 15. Maharjan A, Wang E, Peng M, Cakmak YO. Improvement of Olfactory Function With High  
353 Frequency Non-invasive Auricular Electrostimulation in Healthy Humans. *Front Neurosci.*  
354 2018; 12:225.
- 355 16. García-Díaz DE, Aguilar-Baturoni HU, Guevara-Aguilar R, Wayner MJ. Vagus nerve  
356 stimulation modifies the electrical activity of the olfactory bulb. *Brain Res Bull.* 1984; 12(5):529-  
357 37.
- 358 17. Val-Laillet D, Biraben A, Randuineau G, Malbert CH. Chronic vagus nerve stimulation  
359 decreased weight gain, food consumption and sweet craving in adult obese minipigs. *Appetite.*  
360 2010; 55(2):245-52.
- 361 18. Han W, Tellez LA, Perkins MH, Perez IO, Qu T, Ferreira J, et al. A Neural Circuit for Gut-  
362 Induced Reward. *Cell.* 2018; 175(3):665-78.e23.
- 363 19. Neuser MP, Teckentrup V, Kühnel A, Hallschmid M, Walter M, Kroemer NB. Vagus nerve  
364 stimulation boosts the drive to work for rewards. *Nat Commun.* 2020; 11(1):3555.
- 365 20. Iatridi V, Quadt L, Hayes JE, Garfinkel SN, Yeomans MR. Female sweet-likers have  
366 enhanced cross-modal interoceptive abilities. *Appetite.* 2021; 165:105290.
- 367 21. Richter F, García AM, Rodríguez Arriagada N, Yoris A, Birba A, Huepe D, et al. Behavioral  
368 and neurophysiological signatures of interoceptive enhancements following vagus nerve  
369 stimulation. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2021; 42(5):1227-42.
- 370 22. Yao G, Kang L, Li J, Long Y, Wei H, Ferreira CA, et al. Effective weight control via an  
371 implanted self-powered vagus nerve stimulation device. *Nat Commun.* 2018; 9(1):5349.
- 372 23. Sobocki J, Fourtanier G, Estany J, Otal P. Does vagal nerve stimulation affect body  
373 composition and metabolism? Experimental study of a new potential technique in bariatric  
374 surgery. *Surgery.* 2006; 139(2):209-16.
- 375 24. Riva P, Martini G, Rabbia F, Milan A, Paglieri C, Chiandussi L, et al. Obesity and autonomic  
376 function in adolescence. *Clin Exp Hypertens.* 2001; 23(1-2):57-67.
- 377 25. Robinson E, Foote G, Smith J, Higgs S, Jones A. Interoception and obesity: a systematic  
378 review and meta-analysis of the relationship between interoception and BMI. *Int J Obes*  
379 *(Lond).* 2021; 45(12):2515-26.
- 380 26. Ballsmider LA, Vaughn AC, David M, Hajnal A, Di Lorenzo PM, Czaja K. Sleeve  
381 gastrectomy and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass alter the gut-brain communication. *Neural Plast.*  
382 2015; 2015:601985.
- 383 27. Berridge KC, Robinson TE, Aldridge JW. Dissecting components of reward: 'liking',  
384 'wanting', and learning. *Curr Opin Pharmacol.* 2009; 9(1):65-73.
- 385 28. Recio-Román A, Recio-Menéndez M, Román-González MV. Food Reward and Food  
386 Choice. An Inquiry Through The Liking and Wanting Model. *Nutrients.* 2020; 12(3).

- 387 29. Peters MD, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated  
388 methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JB* evidence synthesis. 2020;  
389 18(10):2119-26.
- 390 30. Van De Schoot R, De Bruin J, Schram R, Zahedi P, De Boer J, Weijdema F, et al. An open  
391 source machine learning framework for efficient and transparent systematic reviews. *Nature*  
392 machine intelligence. 2021; 3(2):125-33.
- 393 31. Aromataris E, Munn Z. *JB* manual for evidence synthesis. Joanna Briggs Institute; 2020.
- 394 32. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension  
395 for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;  
396 169(7):467-73.