

1 **Title: Higher energy requirement during weight-loss maintenance on a low- versus high-**  
2 **carbohydrate diet: secondary analyses from a randomized controlled feeding study**

3  
4 **Authors:** Cara B Ebbeling, Lisa Bielak, Paul R Lakin, Gloria L Klein, Julia MW Wong, Patricia  
5 K Luoto, William W Wong, David S Ludwig

6  
7 **Author affiliations:**

- 8 • New Balance Foundation Obesity Prevention Center (CBE, LB, GLK, JMWW, DSL); and  
9 Institutional Centers for Clinical and Translational Research (PRL); Boston Children’s  
10 Hospital and Harvard Medical School  
11 • Department of Food and Nutrition, Framingham State University (PKL)  
12 • USDA/ARS Children’s Nutrition Research Center, Department of Pediatrics, Baylor College  
13 of Medicine (WWW)

14  
15 **Conflicts of interest:** see section following Acknowledgements

16  
17 **Correspondence to:**

18 David S Ludwig, [david.ludwig@childrens.harvard.edu](mailto:david.ludwig@childrens.harvard.edu)

19 300 Longwood Ave, Boston, MA 02115, USA

20 ORCID Number 0000-0003-3307-8544

21  
22 **Sources of support:** This work was conducted with grants from Nutrition Science Initiative

23 (made possible by gifts from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation and Robert Lloyd Corkin

24 Charitable Foundation), New Balance Foundation, Many Voices Foundation, and Blue Cross  
25 Blue Shield. DSL was supported by a mid-career mentoring award from the National Institute of  
26 Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (K24DK082730). Nutrition Science Initiative  
27 monitored study progress and was given an opportunity to comment on the manuscript. The  
28 funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and  
29 interpretation of the data; approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for  
30 publication. The content of this article is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not  
31 necessarily represent the official views of the study sponsors.

32

33 Running head: Energy requirements on a low-carbohydrate diet

34

35 Abbreviations: body mass index (BMI); carbohydrate-insulin model (CIM); doubly-labeled  
36 water (DLW); dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA); estimated energy requirement for  
37 weight maintenance (EER); insulin concentration at 30 minutes following a 75-gram oral glucose  
38 load (Insulin-30); Intention-to-Treat (ITT); Per Protocol (PP); total energy expenditure (TEE)

39

40 Clinical trial registration:

41 ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02068885 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02068885>

42

43 Manuscript length: 4500 words, 3 tables, 2 figures, and an online only supplement

44

45 **ABSTRACT**

46 Background: Longer-term feeding studies suggest that a low-carbohydrate diet increases energy  
47 expenditure, consistent with the carbohydrate-insulin model of obesity. However, the validity of  
48 methodology utilized in these studies, involving doubly-labeled water, has been questioned.

49 Objective: The aim of this study was to determine whether dietary energy requirement for  
50 weight-loss maintenance is higher on a low- versus high-carbohydrate diet.

51 Methods: The study reports secondary outcomes and exploratory analyses from a feeding study  
52 in which the primary outcome was total energy expenditure. After attaining a mean Run-in  
53 weight loss of 10.5%, 164 adults with pre-weight-loss BMI of  $\geq 25$  were randomly assigned to  
54 Test diets containing Low (20%), Moderate (40%) or High (60%) carbohydrate for 20 weeks.  
55 Calorie content of Test diets was adjusted to maintain individual body weight within 2 kg of the  
56 post-weight-loss value. In analyses by Intention-to-Treat (ITT, study completers, n=148) and Per  
57 Protocol (PP, those achieving the weight-loss maintenance target, n=110), we compared  
58 estimated energy requirement from 10 to 20 weeks on the Test diets using ANCOVA. Insulin  
59 secretion was assessed pre-weight-loss as insulin concentration 30 minutes following 75 grams  
60 oral glucose (Insulin-30).

61 Results: Estimated energy requirement was higher in the Low vs High group by models  
62 involving ITT (ranging from 181 [CI 8–353] to 223 [40–406] kcal/d;  $P \leq 0.04$ ) and PP (ranging  
63 from 245 [43–446] to 295 [91–499] kcal/d;  $P \leq 0.02$ ). This difference remained significant in  
64 sensitivity analyses accounting for change in adiposity and possible non-adherence. In  
65 observational analyses, pre-weight loss Insulin-30 predicted adverse change in body composition  
66 following weight loss.

67 Conclusions: Energy requirement was higher on a low- versus high-carbohydrate diet during  
68 weight-loss maintenance, commensurate with total energy expenditure. These data are consistent  
69 with the carbohydrate-insulin model and lend qualified support for the validity of the doubly-  
70 labeled water method with diets varying in macronutrient composition.

71

72 Key words: obesity, dietary carbohydrate, dietary fat, carbohydrate-insulin model, energy  
73 requirements, energy expenditure, feeding study, metabolism

74

## 75 INTRODUCTION

76 The independent effect of dietary composition on energy expenditure remains a topic of  
77 controversy. According to the carbohydrate-insulin model (CIM) of obesity, the high ratio of  
78 blood insulin-to-glucagon concentration in the postprandial period with consumption of a high  
79 glycemic load diet partitions metabolic fuels toward fat storage (1, 2). As a result, hunger may  
80 increase and (under some conditions, such as post-weight loss) energy expenditure may decrease  
81 relative to a low glycemic load diet. Because reduced energy expenditure following weight loss  
82 may predispose to weight regain (3-5), research into the dietary determinants of metabolic rate  
83 holds both scientific and clinical significance.

84 A recent meta-analysis reported little effect of dietary carbohydrate-to-fat ratio on energy  
85 expenditure (6), but the included studies had a median duration of < 1 week. As previously  
86 reviewed (2), the adaptation to a low-carbohydrate diet takes at least 2 to 3 weeks, limiting  
87 inferences about chronic macronutrient effects that can be drawn from these very short trials.  
88 The few prior studies of at least 2.5 weeks duration consistently showed a numerical advantage  
89 favoring the low-carbohydrate diet (2), but each of these had important methodological  
90 limitations, such as low statistical power, lack of randomization and physical confinement (*e.g.*,  
91 in respiratory chambers) confounding activity-related energy expenditure.

92 In the longest feeding study addressing this question (7), we reported that total energy  
93 expenditure (TEE) was about 200 to 250 kcal/d higher on a low- vs high-carbohydrate Test diet  
94 throughout 20 weeks of weight-loss maintenance, as determined using doubly-labeled water  
95 (DLW) methodology. However, the validity of DLW with diets varying in macronutrient  
96 composition has recently been called into question (8).

97           The aim of the present study was to examine estimated energy requirement (EER) for  
98 maintenance of stable weight following weight loss in our study, based on the energy provided to  
99 participants in carefully controlled Test diets. If TEE increases with reduction in dietary  
100 carbohydrate and DLW methodology is valid for measuring TEE when comparing different  
101 macronutrient diets, we would expect to see corresponding dietary effects on EER.

## 102 **METHODS**

### 103 *Overview of parent study design and original findings*

104 This study presents secondary and exploratory (*post hoc*) analyses from a feeding trial for which  
105 the methods (trial design, participants, dietary interventions, sample size, randomization),  
106 participant flow, adverse events and primary outcome were previously reported (7, 9, 10).  
107 Briefly, 164 participants with overweight or obesity who lost at least 10% of their body weight  
108 during the Run-in phase on a hypocaloric diet were randomly assigned to low- (LOW, 20%  
109 carbohydrate, 60% fat), moderate- (MOD; 40% carbohydrate, 40% fat) or high- (HIGH, 60%  
110 carbohydrate, 20% fat) carbohydrate Test diets controlled for protein (20%). During the 20-week  
111 Test phase, dietary energy provided to participants in prepared meals was adjusted with the aim  
112 of keeping weight within 2 kg of the post-weight loss, pre-randomization baseline value. TEE  
113 was measured using DLW at four time points: 1) pre-weight loss (PRE), 2) start of trial (START,  
114 weeks -2 to 0, post-weight-loss), 3) midpoint of Test phase (MID, weeks 8 to 10) and 4) end of  
115 Test phase (END, weeks 18 to 20). The primary finding of the trial was that TEE was  
116 significantly greater on LOW vs HIGH in an Intention-to-Treat model (ITT: 209 kcal/d, n=162,  
117  $P=0.002$  for overall group effect) and a Per Protocol model that excluded participants who did  
118 not achieve weight stability at 10 or 20 weeks (PP: 278 kcal/d, n=120, overall  $P<0.001$ ).

119 We previously conducted a preliminary analysis in the PP group (n=120, including 10  
120 participants who achieved weight stability at MID but did not complete the trial), comparing  
121 change in estimated energy intake from START to the average of MID (10 weeks) and END (20  
122 weeks) using dietary data for the days when we assessed TEE (7). Change in energy intake  
123 increased in a pattern consistent with the dietary effect on TEE, though without significant group  
124 differences (HIGH 139, MOD 175, LOW 269 kcal/d, overall  $P=0.36$ ). This pattern strengthened

125 as expected among those in the highest tertile of insulin secretion at PRE (37, -24, 340 kcal/d,  
126 respectively, overall  $P=0.05$ ). However, as discussed in our initial report, these preliminary  
127 analyses were imprecise and inaccurate, with probable bias against those with higher energy  
128 requirements, thereby limiting scientific inference.

129

### 130 *Conceptual approach for current analyses*

131 For the current study, we considered four potential reasons for imprecision and inaccuracy in the  
132 initial estimates of energy requirements used to calculate energy intake: 1) excessive variability  
133 in the START estimate used in models of change; 2) the limited time frame (using dietary data  
134 only from the days when we assessed TEE) for evaluating energy intake during the Test phase;  
135 3) unaddressed factors affecting EER, including provision of additional snacks to some  
136 individuals to assist with weight-loss maintenance and 4) change in body composition affecting  
137 energy balance calculations.

138 To begin our exploration of these issues, we extracted data from food production sheets  
139 throughout the Test phase on daily dietary energy provided to every participant, as periodically  
140 adjusted to maintain weight loss within the target range. Visual inspection revealed large changes  
141 ( $>500$  kcal/d) in dietary energy provided for many participants in all 3 diet groups from the  
142 weight stabilization period at the end of the Run-in phase through the first few weeks of the Test  
143 phase, demonstrating that our initial estimates of energy requirements were imprecise. By MID  
144 (week 10 of the Test phase), estimates of energy requirements had stabilized, with relatively few  
145 participants requiring substantial adjustments in dietary energy to maintain weight loss from that  
146 point through END (week 20). This imprecision would not have biased the primary study  
147 outcome involving TEE, because the initial dietary energy level for each participant was



148 established prior to randomization and there was no significant difference in body weight among  
149 the diet groups during the assessment periods. However, imprecision in the START value for  
150 energy intake would erode power for the change models originally reported (11, 12).

151 As an alternative approach to the inherent limitations of an imprecise baseline (START  
152 value) in measurement of a change variable, we examined EER with general linear models  
153 (ANCOVA) adjusted for baseline covariates that would plausibly influence energy requirements  
154 (such as age, sex and weight). We focused on the daily average energy provided from 10 to 20  
155 weeks as our most accurate measure of EER, with primary interest in the HIGH vs LOW diet  
156 comparison in the PP analysis to maximize power. Consistent with the approach used with our  
157 original TEE outcome, we calculated EER per kg and normalized the results as kcal/d using the  
158 average START weight of our participants (82 kg). We examined diet group differences in EER  
159 at START and during weeks 10 through 20 of the Test phase, with and without adjustment for  
160 the START value. In sensitivity analyses, we explored how changes in body fat mass might  
161 influence EER and how possible non-adherence to energy prescription might influence EER.

162

### 163 *Assessment of Test diet energy*

164 Details regarding the dietary interventions were published previously (9, 10). In brief, the  
165 hypocaloric Run-in diet comprised 45% of energy from carbohydrate, 35% from fat, and 25%  
166 from protein. Eucaloric Test diets were controlled for protein and varied in carbohydrate-to-fat  
167 ratio as indicated above. Standardized menus were calculated for 2000-kcal Run-in and Test  
168 diets using Food Processor Nutrition Analysis Software (ESHA Research Inc., Salem, OR) with  
169 energy distributed across breakfast (450 kcal), lunch (650 kcal), dinner (650 kcal), and an  
170 evening snack (250 kcal). Data for each menu item were exported from the ESHA Food

171 Processor to Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA), and gram weights were imported from Excel  
172 into SAS (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC). In SAS, 2000-kcal menus were scaled to coincide with  
173 individualized energy levels, and food production sheets (1 sheet per participant per meal or  
174 snack) were generated to specify gram portions of each menu item.

175 Estimating and adjusting Run-in and Test diet energy levels. Individualized energy levels  
176 were estimated and then adjusted when necessary, but not more frequently than every two weeks.  
177 To inform adjustments, body weight was measured daily using Wi-Fi scales (Withings Inc.,  
178 Cambridge, MA) synced with a study-specific online portal (SetPoint Health, Needham, MA). At  
179 the beginning of the Run-in phase (PRE), energy levels were set at 60% of estimated needs (13),  
180 and then adjusted to achieve targeted weight loss. Energy levels for weight stabilization at the  
181 end of the Run-in phase were estimated based on rate of weight loss over 20 days: energy intake  
182 during weight loss (kcal/day) + rate of weight loss (kg/day  $\times$  7700 kcal/kg). During the Test  
183 phase, energy levels were adjusted when deviation from the START anchor weight exceeded  $\pm 2$   
184 kg and/or the slope of weight regressed on time was  $\geq 15$  g per day over 14 days.

185 Some participants received unit bars (100 kcal per bar with diet-specific carbohydrate-to-  
186 fat ratio) and/or *ad libitum* snacks, in addition to the meals and snacks listed on food production  
187 sheets. The purpose of providing unit bars was to: 1) replace some of the meal calories, when  
188 large portions were a barrier to consuming all provided food and 2) immediately adjust energy  
189 levels, before meal adjustments could be implemented according to established production  
190 cycles, to achieve weight-loss maintenance ( $\pm 2$  kg of START anchor weight). The purpose of  
191 providing foods for *ad libitum* snacks (n=11) was to halt continued weight loss in participants  
192 who were already consuming large meals. Examples of snack foods (for each diet) included:  
193 banana, skim milk (HIGH); bagel chips, chocolate chips, apple, banana, nut butters (MOD); nuts,

194 nut butters, dark chocolate, whole milk (LOW). We conservatively estimated energy content of  
195 *ad libitum* snacks at 200 kcal per day, for the days when participants (n=11) received snacks. In  
196 preliminary analyses, we noted similar study outcomes with energy content estimated at 500 kcal  
197 per day (data not presented).

198 Quantifying unconsumed energy. Data on food consumption recorded in the online portal  
199 were used to calculate daily unconsumed energy, which totaled < 5% throughout the study. For  
200 supervised meals, unconsumed menu items were weighed, and gram amounts were entered into  
201 the portal by food service staff. Menu data exported from the ESHA Food Processor to Excel  
202 were used to create a “food library,” interfaced with the portal, for converting gram amounts to  
203 kcal. For unsupervised take-out meals, percentages of menu items consumed were recorded by  
204 participants, using a form in the online portal that was prepopulated with daily menus from food  
205 production sheets, so that unconsumed energy could be calculated as follows: energy provided –  
206 (energy provided × percentage consumed). Unconsumed energy during supervised and  
207 unsupervised meals was summed to obtain a total for each day. Food consumption data for  
208 calculating unconsumed energy were not available electronically for cohort 1 (n=25 in ITT, n=18  
209 in PP), prior to developing the online portal, and assumed to be 0 (this methodological limitation  
210 is addressed in a sensitivity analysis).

211 Calculating EER. An EER for each participant was calculated as the average daily energy  
212 level during weeks 10 through 20 of the Test phase. The calculation included energy in weighed  
213 meals and snacks (as specified on food production sheets), *ad libitum* snacks (200 kcal/d), and  
214 unit bars (based on the number provided), with correction for unconsumed energy in weighed  
215 meals and snacks. The first 10 weeks of the Test phase was considered adequate time for  
216 physiological adaptations to the Test diets, that could affect energy metabolism and fluctuations

217 in body weight (2), and fine-tuning initially imprecise estimates of energy levels for weight-loss  
218 maintenance. We also calculated EER for the first day of the Test phase (EER at START), to  
219 obtain insight regarding the level of imprecision and inaccuracy in the initial estimates of energy  
220 requirements, and for use as a baseline covariate in a statistical model.

221

### 222 *Assessment of body composition*

223 We assessed body composition by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA, Discovery A,  
224 Hologic Inc., Bedford, MA, USA) and isotope dilution. Data from DXA, the more precise  
225 method, were available for PRE, START and END. Data from isotope dilution were available  
226 for the same time points and also MID, allowing assessment of adiposity from weeks 10 through  
227 20 of the Test phase which was the exact timeframe of interest for determining EER (after the  
228 initial 10-week period of physiological adaptation). Total body water was estimated using the  
229 isotope dilution space for  $^{18}\text{O}$  (calculated as previously described) (9), divided by 1.01 (to correct  
230 for binding to non-exchangeable sites) (14). Total body water was divided by 0.73 to estimate  
231 fat-free mass (FFM). Fat mass (FM) was calculated by subtracting FFM from total body weight.  
232 Percent body fat was calculated as:  $\text{FM} / \text{body weight} \times 100\%$ .

233

### 234 *Statistical analyses*

235 For all summary and inferential computations, we used SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

236 Descriptive data. We inspected raw distributions of EER during the Test phase for the  
237 ITT and PP groups and compared raw distributions and descriptive data (mean and median) with  
238 those of TEE.

239 Variability in Estimated Energy Requirement at START. We used partial correlation  
240 analysis to determine whether excessive variability in EER might have obscured the effect of diet  
241 on change in EER in our preliminary analyses (7). Controlling for diet group, we evaluated  
242 partial correlation of the residuals from models comparing EER at START with EER during the  
243 Test phase (MID through END), and TEE at START with TEE during the Test Phase (average of  
244 MID and END).

245 Diet effect on Estimated Energy Requirement. The analytic framework for statistical  
246 inference on EER and other outcomes was the general linear model (GLM) including ANCOVA.  
247 We evaluated EER at START (with body weight at START included as a covariate) and EER  
248 during the Test phase (with and without EER at START as a covariate). To be consistent with the  
249 approach in our prior study (7), the reported models include diet group assignment and a design  
250 variable (a polytomous covariate labeled cohort, which captured all combinations of study site,  
251 cohort, and enrollment wave, including 11 categories). Because inclusion of this variable utilizes  
252 10 degrees of freedom, and we have no reason to hypothesize confounding by cohort, a model  
253 without this adjustment was evaluated. Other variables in the primary model included sex, age at  
254 randomization, weight loss during the Run-in phase (expressed as a percentage of PRE body  
255 weight), START weight, and START TEE. One participant who developed a medical condition  
256 (hypothyroidism) that affects energy expenditure was excluded in the final analysis plan on an *a*  
257 *priori* basis from the primary outcome in our prior study (7, 9). We present models with and  
258 without exclusion of this individual. The outcome was the Test phase average of EER from  
259 weeks 10-20, modified from our original change (pre-to-post) analyses, in consideration of the  
260 rationale above, and as further addressed in **Figure 1**.

261 From parameters of the fitted models, taking account of all data, we tested two  
262 hypotheses. First, that the outcome was uniform across all diet groups, using an  $F$  test with two  
263 degrees of freedom and a  $P \leq 0.05$  as a threshold for significance. The HIGH – LOW  
264 comparison was equivalent to a test for linear trend by carbohydrate proportion, given the equal  
265 increments of carbohydrate content (60%, 40%, 20%) across Test diets. In this second test, the  
266 null hypothesis was zero difference between HIGH and LOW in a two-sided Student's  $t$  test.

267 We conducted four sensitivity analyses using GLM (ANCOVA) to explore the potential  
268 effects of changes in body composition and non-adherence on EER during weight-loss  
269 maintenance. These analyses were based on our most conservative estimate of EER in the weight  
270 stable PP group (Table 2, model 2). For every kilogram increase or decrease in FM from START  
271 to END, assessed by DXA, we subtracted or added 55 kcal/d ( $7700 \text{ kcal/kg} \div 140 \text{ days}$ , the  
272 relevant time period). Similarly, for change in FM from MID to END, assessed by isotope  
273 dilution, we subtracted or added 110 kcal/d ( $7700 \text{ kcal/kg} \div 70 \text{ days}$ , the relevant time period).  
274 As a proxy measure of non-adherence, we defined energy discrepancy as the ratio of EER-to-  
275 TEE and excluded participants with energy discrepancy in the top quintile (those most likely to  
276 have under-consumed provided foods) and bottom quintile (those most likely to have consumed  
277 foods off protocol). In a final model, we excluded individuals in cohort 1, for whom we had no  
278 food consumption data in the online portal to calculate unconsumed energy as a measure of non-  
279 adherence.

280 Changes in body composition. We analyzed change in percent body fat from START to  
281 END with DXA, and also from MID to END with isotope dilution. These models included only  
282 design variables (diet group, cohort). In cross-sectional and prospective observational analyses  
283 involving the Run-in phase, we evaluated the associations of Insulin-30 (measured at PRE) with

284 PRE body weight or percent body fat by DXA, and with change in percent body fat by DXA  
285 (from PRE to START). These models include participant characteristics (sex, age).

286

287 *Ethics*

288 The study protocol was approved by the institutional review board at Boston Children's Hospital  
289 and registered at ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02068885.

290 **RESULTS**

291 *Descriptive data*

292 We randomly assigned 164 participants to a diet group for the Test phase. Of these, 148  
293 completed the trial and were included in the ITT analyses. Among the completers, 110 achieved  
294 weight-loss maintenance and were included in PP analyses. **Table 1** summarizes baseline data  
295 describing the cohort, including those who completed the weight loss Run-in phase (for analysis  
296 of Insulin-30 and body composition) and those in the ITT and PP groups (for the trial outcomes).  
297 About two-thirds of the cohort were women, mean age was ~30 years, and mean BMI at PRE  
298 was ~32 kg/m<sup>2</sup>. **Supplemental Figure 1** illustrates raw distributions of EER for the ITT and PP  
299 groups. Overall, the median and mean values of EER were 89.2% and 87.7% of TEE,  
300 respectively.

301

302 *Variability in Estimated Energy Requirement at START*

303 To determine whether excessive variability might have obscured the effect of diet on energy  
304 requirements in our preliminary analyses of change (7), we compared EER at START with EER  
305 measured from weeks 10 through 20 of the Test phase. As shown in **Figure 1**, the partial R<sup>2</sup> after  
306 adjusting for diet group (0.54) was much weaker than the partial R<sup>2</sup> involving TEE (0.85). These  
307 findings suggest that analytic models of change have adequate power for evaluating TEE but not  
308 EER (11, 12), providing rationale for using an alternative approach (ANCOVA).

309

310 *Diet effect on Estimated Energy Requirement*

311 **Table 2** shows EER by diet group in the ITT and PP analyses. At START, EER did not differ by  
312 diet. From weeks 10 through 20 of the Test phase, EER was significantly higher in LOW vs



313 HIGH, ranging from a mean of 181 to 323 kcal/d in models with varying covariate structure. In  
314 sensitivity analyses (**Table 3**), this diet effect remained robust after accounting for concurrent  
315 change in body composition, excluding individuals for whom the EER-to-TEE ratio raised the  
316 possibility of non-adherence, and additional exclusion of individuals in cohort 1 lacking non-  
317 adherence data from the online portal. The nominal order of effect by group, with MOD  
318 intermediate between LOW and HIGH, showed a pattern similar to that of TEE. The ratio of  
319 EER-to-TEE did not differ by diet group (**Supplemental Figure 2**), indicating no selective non-  
320 adherence or bias in group comparisons.

321

### 322 *Changes in body composition*

323 As shown in **Supplemental Table 1**, there were no significant diet group differences in adiposity  
324 by DXA or isotope dilution throughout the study.

325 In cross-sectional analyses, Insulin-30 was strongly associated with PRE body weight  
326 (4.4 kg per 100  $\mu$ U/mL increase in Insulin-30,  $P$  for linear trend = 0.0005; **Figure 2A**) and  
327 adiposity (1.2% body fat per 100  $\mu$ U/mL increase in Insulin-30,  $P$  for linear trend = 0.005; data  
328 not depicted). Insulin-30 also predicted change in adiposity during weight loss, with percent  
329 body fat decreasing less from PRE to START among individuals in the top versus bottom  
330 quintiles of Insulin-30 (-3.1% vs -3.8%,  $P=0.0085$ ;  $P$  for linear trend = 0.002; **Figure 2B**). This  
331 prospective association was moderately attenuated, but remained statistically significant, with  
332 further adjustment for PRE body weight, BMI or adiposity. (However, inclusion of these  
333 adiposity measures may over-correct the models, due to potential collinearity with Insulin-30.)

334

335 **DISCUSSION**

336 In this analysis of a large feeding study, we observed higher estimated energy requirement on a  
337 low- vs high- carbohydrate diet during weight-loss maintenance. The magnitude of this effect  
338 (about 200 to 300 kcal/d, or  $\geq 50$  kcal/d for every 10% decrease in carbohydrate as a proportion  
339 of total energy) and the numerical order across groups (LOW > MOD > HIGH) are  
340 commensurate with previously reported changes in TEE (7), supporting the CIM. If reproducible  
341 and generalizable, this finding may inform the scientific understanding of how dietary  
342 composition affects metabolism and the design of more efficacious long-term obesity treatment.

343 These results also have relevance to outpatient metabolic study methods. In a recent  
344 analysis of an observational pilot study, Hall *et al.* (8) questioned the validity of DLW  
345 methodology to compare diets differing in carbohydrate-to-fat ratio, in part due to the  
346 “theoretical possibility that ... [differential] fluxes through biosynthetic pathways” could inflate  
347 measured energy expenditure on diets with lower carbohydrate content. However, their estimates  
348 of isotopic trapping through *de novo* lipogenesis, the pathway of greatest potential concern,  
349 appear overstated, and DLW has worked well in animals with diets varying widely in  
350 macronutrient ratio, including obligate carnivores (7, 15). The congruence in dietary effect on  
351 energy intake and expenditure from our trial provide qualified validation for the use of DLW in  
352 human diet studies, though the possibility of other, unrecognized biases cannot be excluded. In  
353 contrast to the theoretical concerns involving DLW, whole room calorimetry – the other gold  
354 standard method – has been shown to underestimate adaptive thermogenesis (16) because of  
355 inherent constraints on physical activity energy expenditure (a confounding issue in the analyses  
356 of Hall *et al.* (8)). Recognizing that reduction in dietary carbohydrate has been hypothesized to  
357 attenuate adaptive thermogenesis with weight loss (2, 7), macronutrient studies utilizing whole

358 room calorimetry may yield results biased against low-carbohydrate diets. Indeed, the prior  
359 validation study (16) found a better correspondence between dietary calorie titration and TEE –  
360 the approach we used here – for DLW *vs* whole room calorimetry under several physiological  
361 conditions.

362 In observational analyses, pre-weight loss insulin secretion was strongly associated with  
363 greater body weight and adiposity before weight loss, and prospectively with an adverse change  
364 in body composition (a lesser decrease in adiposity) following weight loss, potentially  
365 predisposing to weight regain. Although we cannot rule out reverse causation and confounding,  
366 the findings are consistent with other lines of investigation free from such limitations. According  
367 to the CIM, increased primary insulin secretion (versus secondary hyperinsulinemia in  
368 compensation for insulin resistance) partitions metabolic fuels away from oxidation and instead  
369 into storage, lowering energy expenditure and promoting adiposity. Indeed, individual  
370 predisposition to high insulin secretion has been linked to weight gain in translational research  
371 (17), a cohort study (18), a Mendelian randomization study (19) and several clinical trials (20,  
372 21). These relationships appear to be strongly attenuated on a low-glycemic load diet, as was  
373 also reported for TEE among individuals with high insulin secretion in our recent trial (7). In  
374 contrast, DIETFITS found no effect modification involving insulin secretion for weight loss on  
375 lower-fat *vs* lower-carbohydrate diets, but that null finding might relate to the focus on reducing  
376 sugar and other processed carbohydrates throughout the trial, resulting in a low glycemic load in  
377 both diet groups (22). Thus, our current study provides additional data on a novel diet-phenotype  
378 interaction and highlights a high-risk subgroup that may do especially well with dietary  
379 carbohydrate restriction, similar to findings from DiOGenes and other trials involving fasting  
380 glucose or insulin resistance (23).

381 Strengths of this study include relatively large size and long duration for a feeding trial,  
382 demonstration of weight stability during the Test phase, state-of-the-art methods to produce  
383 nutrient-controlled diets and monitor quality control, concurrent measurement of body  
384 composition, and sufficient power to conduct informative sensitivity analyses. The main  
385 limitation is non-adherence to the Test diets. This methodological issue, common to all long-  
386 term outpatient feeding studies, could lead to an overestimation of the diet effect on energy  
387 requirement under two conditions: if individuals on the low- versus high-carbohydrate diet  
388 consumed less of the provided food than reported when not under direct observation; or if those  
389 on the high- versus low-carbohydrate diet consumed more food off protocol. Either of these  
390 scenarios might arise if the low-carbohydrate diet were less palatable or more satiating.  
391 Conversely, the high-carbohydrate diet was substantially lower in energy density; the diet effect  
392 could be underestimated if participants in that group had difficulty consuming the larger volume  
393 of food. However, we designed the diets to be as similar as possible in types of foods included,  
394 cooking methods and palatability (10). Moreover, we saw no discrepancy in the ratio of EER-to-  
395 TEE across diet groups, nor evidence of overall bias in a sensitivity analyses excluding  
396 individuals with EER-to-TEE ratio in the highest quintile (for whom energy intake might have  
397 been overestimated) and in the lowest quintile (for whom energy intake might have been  
398 underestimated). Moreover, the findings strengthened in the PP analyses, involving participants  
399 who demonstrated successful weight-loss maintenance as an objective measure of compliance  
400 (the opposite would be expected if non-adherence contributed importantly to the observed  
401 effect).

402 Other study limitations include the inherent imprecision of methods for measuring small  
403 changes in body composition during weight-loss maintenance, and possible inaccuracy arising

404 from changes in body water on diets differing in macronutrient content. However, on the latter  
405 issue, any changes in body water resulting from reduction in dietary carbohydrate would stabilize  
406 after a few weeks, allowing for an unconfounded measurement of body composition between 10  
407 and 20 weeks of the Test phase, the relevant period for our calculations of energy requirements.  
408 Furthermore, our estimates of energy requirements vary based on covariate structure of the  
409 analytic models and other assumptions, and the 3-way diet comparison is not significant in some  
410 models. However, the comparison between the low- and high-carbohydrate diet was consistently  
411 significant as hypothesized in multiple models and sensitivity analyses. In light of the foregoing,  
412 our estimates of the magnitude of the diet effect on energy requirements should be interpreted  
413 cautiously.

414           Because of the inherent limitations of outpatient feeding studies discussed here, some  
415 suggest that the only informative diet studies are those conducted on metabolic wards (24), but  
416 these too have major limitations. For logistical and financial reasons, ward studies rarely exceed  
417 a few weeks in duration – too short to distinguish transient adaptive processes from the chronic  
418 metabolic effects of macronutrients (2, 25). Ward studies also entail an artificial environment,  
419 constraint on spontaneous physical activities, and the psychobiological effects of social isolation  
420 and other stresses. Moreover, even with presumably maximum control, substantial “unaccounted  
421 energy” – the basis of criticisms of our trial by Hall *et al.* (26) – may occur, as was seen in the  
422 control diet arm of a recent trial by Hall *et al.* (27). Discrepancies in energy balance are  
423 unsurprising, considering the cumulative error that would arise in comparisons encompassing  
424 three imprecise measures (energy intake, energy expenditure, and body energy stores), even with  
425 optimal conditions.

426 To elucidate underlying mechanisms involving diet and chronic disease, we will need a  
427 variety of complementary study designs, novel methods for ensuring high levels of dietary  
428 control for longer periods, multiple methods for measuring energy expenditure and substrate  
429 metabolism, and attention to effect modification by biological predisposition (2, 23, 28).  
430 Although research into more powerful behavioral and environmental interventions is also  
431 warranted, these approaches will be most effective when informed by accurate knowledge of the  
432 metabolic effects of dietary composition.

433

#### 434 **Acknowledgments**

435 We thank Steven Heymsfield and Henry Feldman for critical feedback on the manuscript, and  
436 Stephanie Dickinson for verifying the data analyses. The study was funded by Nutrition Science  
437 Initiative (made possible by gifts from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation and Robert  
438 Lloyd Corkin Charitable Foundation), New Balance Foundation, Many Voices Foundation, and  
439 Blue Cross Blue Shield. DSL was supported by a mid-career mentoring award from the National  
440 Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (K24DK082730).

441

#### 442 **Conflicts of Interest Statement**

443 CBE and DSL have conducted research studies examining the carbohydrate-insulin model  
444 funded by the National Institutes of Health and philanthropic organizations unaffiliated with the  
445 food industry; DSL received royalties for books on obesity and nutrition that recommend a low-  
446 glycemic load diet. No other author has relevant disclosures.

447

448

449 **Author Contributions**

450 CBE designed study, secured funding, interpreted data, participated in drafting the manuscript;  
451 LB helped design the study and analyzed the dietary records; PRL conducted the statistical  
452 analysis, interpreted data and participated in manuscript revision; GLK directed the parent and  
453 participated in manuscript revision; JMWW co-directed the parent study, helped design the Test  
454 diets and participated in manuscript revision; PKL co-directed the parent study at the  
455 performance site and participated in manuscript revision; WWW advised on double labeled  
456 water methodology and participated in manuscript revision; DSL, designed study, secured  
457 funding, interpreted data, participated in drafting the manuscript.

458

459 **Data Sharing**

460 The protocol and full dataset is available at Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/rvbuy/>).

461

462 **REFERENCES**

- 463 1. Ludwig DS. The glycemic index: physiological mechanisms relating to obesity, diabetes,  
464 and cardiovascular disease. *Jama*. 2002;287(18):2414-23.
- 465 2. Ludwig DS, Ebbeling CB. The Carbohydrate-Insulin Model of Obesity: Beyond "Calories  
466 In, Calories Out". *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(8):1098-103.
- 467 3. Astrup A, Gotzsche PC, van de Werken K, Ranneries C, Toubro S, Raben A, et al. Meta-  
468 analysis of resting metabolic rate in formerly obese subjects. *Am J Clin Nutr*.  
469 1999;69(6):1117-22.
- 470 4. Rosenbaum M, Hirsch J, Gallagher DA, Leibel RL. Long-term persistence of adaptive  
471 thermogenesis in subjects who have maintained a reduced body weight. *Am J Clin Nutr*.  
472 2008;88(4):906-12.
- 473 5. Tremblay A, Royer MM, Chaput JP, Doucet E. Adaptive thermogenesis can make a  
474 difference in the ability of obese individuals to lose body weight. *Int J Obes (Lond)*.  
475 2013;37(6):759-64.
- 476 6. Hall KD, Guo J. Obesity Energetics: Body Weight Regulation and the Effects of Diet  
477 Composition. *Gastroenterology*. 2017;152(7):1718-27 e3.
- 478 7. Ebbeling CB, Feldman HA, Klein GL, Wong JMW, Bielak L, Steltz SK, et al. Effects of a  
479 low carbohydrate diet on energy expenditure during weight loss maintenance: randomized  
480 trial. *BMJ*. 2018;363:k4583.
- 481 8. Hall KD, Guo J, Chen KY, Leibel RL, Reitman ML, Rosenbaum M, et al. Methodologic  
482 considerations for measuring energy expenditure differences between diets varying in  
483 carbohydrate using the doubly labeled water method. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2019;109(5):1328-34.



- 484 9. Ebbeling CB, Klein GL, Luoto PK, Wong JMW, Bielak L, Eddy RG, et al. A randomized  
485 study of dietary composition during weight-loss maintenance: Rationale, study design,  
486 intervention, and assessment. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2018;65:76-86.
- 487 10. Wong JM, Bielak L, Eddy RG, Stone L, Lakin PR, Sandman M, et al. An Academia-  
488 Industry Partnership for Planning and Executing a Community-Based Feeding Study. *Curr*  
489 *Dev Nutr*. 2018;2(9):nzy060.
- 490 11. Van Breukelen GJ. ANCOVA versus change from baseline: more power in randomized  
491 studies, more bias in nonrandomized studies [corrected]. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2006;59(9):920-  
492 5.
- 493 12. Vickers AJ. The use of percentage change from baseline as an outcome in a controlled trial  
494 is statistically inefficient: a simulation study. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2001;1:6.
- 495 13. Mifflin MD, St Jeor ST, Hill LA, Scott BJ, Daugherty SA, Koh YO. A new predictive  
496 equation for resting energy expenditure in healthy individuals. *Am J Clin Nutr*.  
497 1990;51(2):241-7.
- 498 14. Schoeller DA, van Santen E, Peterson DW, Dietz W, Jaspan J, Klein PD. Total body water  
499 measurement in humans with <sup>18</sup>O and <sup>2</sup>H labeled water. *Am J Clin Nutr*.  
500 1980;33(12):2686-93.
- 501 15. Ludwig DS, Ebbeling CB, Wong JMW, Wolfe RR, Wong WW. Methodological error in  
502 measurement of energy expenditure by the doubly labeled water method: much ado about  
503 nothing? *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2019;in press.
- 504 16. Rosenbaum M, Ravussin E, Matthews DE, Gilker C, Ferraro R, Heymsfield SB, et al. A  
505 comparative study of different means of assessing long-term energy expenditure in humans.  
506 *Am J Physiol*. 1996;270(3 Pt 2):R496-504.

- 507 17. Pawlak DB, Kushner JA, Ludwig DS. Effects of dietary glycaemic index on adiposity,  
508 glucose homeostasis, and plasma lipids in animals. *Lancet*. 2004;364(9436):778-85.
- 509 18. Chaput JP, Tremblay A, Rimm EB, Bouchard C, Ludwig DS. A novel interaction between  
510 dietary composition and insulin secretion: effects on weight gain in the Quebec Family  
511 Study. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2008;87(2):303-9.
- 512 19. Astley CM, Todd JN, Salem RM, Vedantam S, Ebbeling CB, Huang PL, et al. Genetic  
513 Evidence That Carbohydrate-Stimulated Insulin Secretion Leads to Obesity. *Clin Chem*.  
514 2018;64(1):192-200.
- 515 20. Ebbeling CB, Leidig MM, Feldman HA, Lovesky MM, Ludwig DS. Effects of a low-  
516 glycemic load vs low-fat diet in obese young adults: a randomized trial. *Jama*.  
517 2007;297(19):2092-102.
- 518 21. Pittas AG, Das SK, Hajduk CL, Golden J, Saltzman E, Stark PC, et al. A low-glycemic load  
519 diet facilitates greater weight loss in overweight adults with high insulin secretion but not in  
520 overweight adults with low insulin secretion in the CALERIE Trial. *Diabetes Care*.  
521 2005;28(12):2939-41.
- 522 22. Gardner CD, Trepanowski JF, Del Gobbo LC, Hauser ME, Rigdon J, Ioannidis JPA, et al.  
523 Effect of Low-Fat vs Low-Carbohydrate Diet on 12-Month Weight Loss in Overweight  
524 Adults and the Association With Genotype Pattern or Insulin Secretion: The DIETFITS  
525 Randomized Clinical Trial. *Jama*. 2018;319(7):667-79.
- 526 23. Hjorth MF, Zohar Y, Hill JO, Astrup A. Personalized Dietary Management of Overweight  
527 and Obesity Based on Measures of Insulin and Glucose. *Annu Rev Nutr*. 2018.
- 528 24. Polychronakos C. Too sweet? Macronutrients and energy expenditure; a word of caution.  
529 *BMJ*. 2019;363: doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.k4583>.

- 530 25. Ludwig DS, Astrup A, Bazzano LA, Ebbeling CB, Heymsfield SB, King JC, et al. Ultra-  
531 processed food and obesity: the pitfalls of extrapolation from short studies. *Cell Metab.*  
532 2019;online first June 20, 2019DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2019.06.004>.
- 533 26. Hall KD, Guo J. Carbs versus fat: does it really matter for maintaining lost weight?  
534 (Preprint). bioRxiv, The Preprint Server for Biology. 2019.
- 535 27. Hall KD, Ayuketah A, Brychta R, Cai H, Cassimatis T, Chen KY, et al. Ultra-Processed  
536 Diets Cause Excess Calorie Intake and Weight Gain: An Inpatient Randomized Controlled  
537 Trial of Ad Libitum Food Intake. *Cell Metab.* 2019.
- 538 28. Mendes-Soares H, Raveh-Sadka T, Azulay S, Ben-Shlomo Y, Cohen Y, Ofek T, et al.  
539 Model of personalized postprandial glycemc response to food developed for an Israeli  
540 cohort predicts responses in Midwestern American individuals. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2019.  
541

**Table 1. Participant characteristics**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>All Enrolled<sup>a</sup> N=164</b>	<b>Intention-to-Treat<sup>b</sup> N=148</b>	<b>Per Protocol<sup>c</sup> N=110</b>
<i>Categorical Variables, No (%)</i>			
Sex			
Men	49 (29.9%)	45 (30.4%)	33 (30.0%)
Women	115 (70.1%)	103 (69.6%)	77 (70.0%)
Hispanic Ethnicity	25 (15.2%)	21 (14.2%)	18 (16.4%)
Race			
White	128 (78.0%)	116 (78.4%)	84 (76.4%)
Black	17 (10.4%)	16 (10.8%)	11 (10.0%)
Asian	5 (3.0%)	5 (3.4%)	4 (3.6%)
Unknown/Other	14 (8.5%)	11 (7.4%)	11 (10.0%)
<i>Continuous Variables, mean (SD)</i>			
Age, years	38.04 (14.37)	38.62 (14.42)	39.83 (13.98)
Weight, kg	91.46 (18.17)	91.22 (18.23)	89.49 (16.56)
Height, cm	167.69 (9.99)	167.88 (10.04)	167.34 (10.28)
Body Mass Index (BMI), kg/m <sup>2</sup>	32.37 (4.83)	32.20 (4.77)	31.82 (4.17)
Weight Loss, % of PRE body weight	10.45 (1.68)	10.49 (1.59)	10.47 (1.53)
Total Energy Expenditure at START, kcal/d	2661 (547)	2651 (557)	2663 (559)

<sup>a</sup> Included in observational analyses of Insulin-30 and body weight and body composition  
<sup>b</sup> Study completers  
<sup>c</sup> Study completers who achieved weight-loss maintenance target

**Table 2. Effects of Test diets on Estimated Energy Requirement (EER) during weight-loss maintenance <sup>a</sup>**

Diet Group	INTENTION-TO-TREAT					PER PROTOCOL				
	EER Mean 95% CI	P <sup>b</sup>	Diet Group Contrasts for EER			EER Mean 95% CI	P <sup>b</sup>	Diet Group Contrasts for EER		
			LO – HI Mean 95% CI P	LO – MOD Mean 95% CI P	MOD – HI Mean 95% CI P			LO – HI Mean 95% CI P	LO – MOD Mean 95% CI P	MOD – HI Mean 95% CI P
<i>Baseline (START) <sup>c</sup></i>										
HIGH	2229 2152 to 2305					2277 2175 to 2378				
MOD	2276 2202 to 2350	0.54	56 -50 to 161 0.30	8 -95 to 111 0.88	48 -61 to 157 0.39	2309 2219 to 2398	0.73	53 -81 to 187 0.43	21 -101 to 143 0.73	32 -107 to 172 0.65
LOW	2284 2214 to 2354					2330 2247 to 2413				
<i>Diet Effect, Model 1 <sup>c</sup></i>										
HIGH	2303 2170 to 2435					2289 2127 to 2452				
MOD	2437 2308 to 2565	0.07	215 32 to 398 0.02	81 -97 to 259 0.37	134 -55 to 323 0.16	2447 2304 to 2591	0.04	276 61 to 490 0.01	118 -78 to 313 0.23	158 -66 to 382 0.16
LOW	2517 2396 to 2639					2565 2432 to 2698				
<i>Diet Effect, Model 2 (Model 1 additionally adjusted for START EER) <sup>d</sup></i>										
HIGH	2324 2199 to 2450					2308 2155 to 2460				
MOD	2429 2308 to 2550	0.12	181 8 to 353 0.04	76 -92 to 243 0.37	105 -73 to 283 0.25	2447 2312 to 2581	0.06	245 43 to 446 0.02	106 -77 to 289 0.25	139 -71 to 349 0.19
LOW	2505 2391 to 2620					2552 2427 to 2677				
<i>Diet Effect, Model 3 (Model 2 excluding participant with hypothyroidism) <sup>d, e</sup></i>										
HIGH	2323 2200 to 2447					2309 2160 to 2458				
MOD	2432 2312 to 2551	0.07	204 33 to 376 0.02	96 -70 to 263 0.25	108 -68 to 284 0.23	2448 2316 to 2579	0.03	272 74 to 471 0.008	134 -47 to 314 0.14	139 -67 to 344 0.18
LOW	2528 2414 to 2642					2582 2458 to 2706				

---

**Diet Effect, Model 4 (Model 3 without adjustment for the polytomous cohort variable) <sup>f</sup>**


---

HIGH	2288					2271				
	2156 to 2419					2120 to 2422				
MOD	2460	0.03	246	73	173	2467	0.008	323	127	196
	2333 to 2587		64 to 427	-104 to 250	-12 to 357	2331 to 2602		122 to 525	-60 to 314	-9 to 402
			0.009	0.42	0.07			0.002	0.18	0.06
LOW	2533					2594				
	2411 to 2656					2465 to 2723				

---

<sup>a</sup> Data calculated per kg and normalized to average weight of 82 kg at the START (post-weight loss, pre-randomization)

<sup>b</sup> Overall diet group effect

<sup>c</sup> Covariates included cohort, sex, age, Run-in weight loss (% PRE body weight), START TEE, and START body weight

<sup>d</sup> Covariates included cohort, sex, age, Run-in weight loss (% PRE body weight), START TEE, START body weight, and START EER

<sup>e</sup> As described in methods, 1 participant developed hypothyroidism and was excluded *a priori* from analyses of the primary outcome (7, 9)

<sup>f</sup> Covariates included sex, age, Run-in weight loss (% PRE body weight), START TEE, START body weight, and START EER (Elimination of the polytomous cohort variable decreased predictor df by 10 in ITT and 9 in PP; participants in cohort 2, wave D were not included in PP.)

---

**Table 3. Sensitivity analysis of Estimated Energy Requirement (EER).<sup>a</sup>**

Diet Group	EER Mean 95% CI	P <sup>b</sup>	Diet Group Contrasts for EER		
			LO – HI Mean 95% CI P	LO – MOD Mean 95% CI P	MOD – HI Mean 95% CI P
<i>Adjusted for change in body composition by DXA<sup>c</sup></i>					
HIGH	2304 2145 to 2462				
MOD	2452 2313 to 2592	0.04	268 58 to 478 0.01	119 -71 to 310 0.22	149 -70 to 367 0.18
LOW	2572 2442 to 2702				
<i>Adjusted for change in body composition by isotope dilution<sup>c</sup></i>					
HIGH	2208 2027 to 2388				
MOD	2394 2234 to 2553	0.08	273 32 to 513 0.03	87 -131 to 305 0.43	186 -63 to 435 0.14
LOW	2481 2330 to 2631				
<i>Accounting for possible dietary non-adherence<sup>d</sup></i>					
HIGH	2347 2198 to 2495				
MOD	2369 2208 to 2531	0.02	285 76 to 493 0.008	262 37 to 486 0.02	23 -208 to 253 0.84
LOW	2631 2488 to 2775				
<i>As above, with additional elimination of participants lacking non-adherence data<sup>c</sup></i>					
HIGH	2345 2190 to 2499				
MOD	2456 2278 to 2634	0.02	292 84 to 501 0.007	181 -47 to 409 0.12	111 -140 to 362 0.38
LOW	2637 2501 to 2773				

- 
- <sup>a</sup> Calculations performed on Model 2 (Table 2) to examine how changes in body composition and potential non-adherence could influence the diet effect on EER in the Per Protocol group. Data calculated per kg and normalized to average weight of 82 kg at START (post-weight loss, pre-randomization)..
  - <sup>b</sup> Overall diet group effect
  - <sup>c</sup> See Methods for details
  - <sup>d</sup> Excluding 45 individuals with EER-to-TEE ratio in the top quintile (i.e., individuals most likely to have under-consumed provided foods) and in the bottom quintile (i.e., individuals most likely to have consumed foods off protocol)
  - <sup>e</sup> Excluding an additional 9 participants in cohort 1 for whom data on unconsumed energy were missing
-



## FIGURE LEGENDS

**Figure 1. Variability in estimated energy requirement (EER) and total energy expenditure (TEE).** The correlation between the baseline (START) and outcome measurements adjusted for diet was substantially lower for EER (Panel A) compared to TEE (Panel B), providing rationale for using ANCOVA rather than change models for EER.

**Figure 2. Associations of Insulin-30 with body weight and change in change in body fatness.** Individuals with high Insulin-30 prior to weight loss have higher body weight in a cross-sectional analysis (Panel A) and a more adverse response to weight loss (proportionately less fat loss) in a prospective analysis (Panel B).

Figure 1






Figure 2

Panel A

Panel B



## Supplementary Online Content

Ebbeling CB, Bielak L, Lakin PR, Klein GL, Wong JMW, Luoto PK, Wong WW, Ludwig, DS. Higher energy requirement during weight loss maintenance on a low- versus high-carbohydrate diet: secondary analyses from a randomized controlled feeding study

### ***TABLE OF CONTENTS***

**Supplemental Table 1.** Changes in body composition by DXA and isotope dilution throughout the study

**Supplemental Figure 1.** Distribution of Estimated Energy Requirement (EER) in the Intention-to-Treat and Per Protocol analyses.

**Supplemental Figure 2.** Ratio of Estimated Energy Intake (EER)-to-total energy expenditure as a measure of non-adherence.


**Supplemental Table 1. Changes in body composition by DXA and isotope dilution throughout the study.** No significant diet effects were observed during the Test phase. Change in percentage fat by DXA was assessed as a difference, END – START. Change in percentage body fat by isotope dilution was assessed as a difference, average (MID, END) – START. Statistical models were minimally adjusted for cohort; adjustment for other baseline covariates did not materially affect the results.

<b>Intention-to-treat</b>							
Diet Group	N	Timepoint				Overall P	LO – HI 95% CI P
		PRE	START	MID	END		
<i>Percentage Body Fat from DXA</i>							
HIGH	46	41.58	37.87	–	37.36	0.72	0.24
MOD	48	40.88	37.00	–	36.70		-0.35 to 0.84
LOW	54	39.77	35.96	–	35.71		0.42
<i>Percentage Body Fat from isotope dilution</i>							
HIGH	46	42.15	37.75	36.82	36.92	0.76	-0.30
MOD	48	41.19	37.49	36.77	37.03		-1.5 to 0.95
LOW	54	39.56	36.05	34.93	35.98		0.64

<b>Per protocol</b>							
Diet Group	N	Timepoint				Overall P	LO – HI 95% CI P
		PRE	START	MID	END		
<i>Percentage Body Fat from DXA</i>							
HIGH	31	42.23	38.53	–	38.35	0.97	-0.048
MOD	37	40.26	36.43	–	36.30		-0.58 to 0.48
LOW	42	39.74	35.93	–	35.71		0.86
<i>Percentage Body Fat from isotope dilution</i>							
HIGH	31	42.28	37.93	37.55	38.23	0.94	-0.62
MOD	37	40.91	36.54	36.17	36.71		-2.1 to 0.89
LOW	42	39.00	35.85	34.95	35.79		0.42

### Supplemental Figure 1. Distribution of estimated energy requirement (EER) in the Intention-to-Treat and Per Protocol analyses.



**Supplemental Figure 2. Ratio of estimated energy requirement (EER)-to-total energy expenditure (TEE) as a measure of non-adherence.** Differences by diet group were not significant, suggesting no systematic bias. EER as a proportion of TEE in HIGH, MOD and LOW were, respectively: 0.88, 0.91, and 0.85 in the Intention-to-treat; and 0.88, 0.89 and 0.87 in the Per Protocol analyses. Symbols: diamonds, mean; horizontal lines, median; grey shaded area, interquartile range (25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> percentile); bars, range (minimum to maximum).

