

## **Supplemental data**

### **Postingestive reinforcement is conserved in obesity and after bariatric surgery**

Gabriela Ribeiro, Ana B. Fernandes, Francisco P.M. Oliveira, João S. Duarte, Maria Oliveira, Clotilde Limbert, Durval C. Costa, Rui M. Costa, Albino J. Oliveira-Maia.

## **Supplemental figures**

**Supplementary Figure 1** - Complementary conditioning measures in healthy subjects.

**Supplementary Figure 2** - Flow diagrams of the clinical study groups.


**Supplementary Figure 3** - Complementary conditioning measures across the clinical study groups.

## **Supplemental Tables**

**Supplementary Table 1** - Demographic characteristics of healthy subjects.

**Supplementary Table 2** - Gustatory and psychometric measures of feeding behaviour in healthy subjects.

**Supplementary Table 3** - Associations between striatal dopamine DD2IR availability, the conditioning strength, and feeding behaviour.



### Supplementary Figure 1. Complementary conditioning measures in healthy subjects.

Across conditioning for CS<sup>-</sup> and CS<sup>+</sup> flavors, ratings did not vary according to stimulus or conditioning day for (A) **Hunger** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1,102)}=0.04$ ,  $P=0.8$ ; Day:  $F_{(1,102)}=3.0$ ,  $P=0.08$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,102)}=9.9$ ,  $P=0.9$ ) (B) **Thirst** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1,102)}=0.1$ ,  $p=0.8$ ; Day:  $F_{(1,102)}=3.2$ ,  $P=0.07$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,102)}=0.08$ ,  $P=0.8$ ) (C) **Novelty** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1,102)}=0.002$ ,  $P=0.9$ ; Day:  $F_{(1,102)}=2.7$ ,  $P=0.1$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,102)}=1.3$ ,  $P=0.3$ ) (D) **Intensity** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1,99)}=0.3$ ,  $P=0.6$ ; Day:  $F_{(1,99)}=0.09$ ,  $P=0.8$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,99)}=1.2$ ,  $P=0.3$ ) and (E) **Pleasantness** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1,98)}=0.9$ ,  $P=0.3$ ; Day:  $F_{(1,98)}=0.4$ ,  $P=0.5$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,98)}=1.9$ ,  $P=0.2$ ). (F) **Intake** volumes were higher for CS<sup>+</sup> than CS<sup>-</sup> ( $F_{(1,102)}=5.5$ ,  $P=0.02$ ), and decreased across conditioning days ( $F_{(1,102)}=8.1$ ,  $P=0.005$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,102)}=0.5$ ,  $P=0.5$ ; repeated-measures 2-way ANOVA).


(G) **Hunger** ratings remained stable from pre-to post conditioning ( $t_{(50)}=0.3$ ,  $P=0.8$ ) as well as (H) **Thirst** ratings ( $t_{(50)}=0.5$ ,  $P=0.6$ ; paired t-test). (I) **Novelty** ratings significantly decreased from pre to post-conditioning ( $F_{(1,51)}=10.2$ ,  $P=0.002$ ; post-hoc CS<sup>-</sup>,  $P=0.0001$ ; post-hoc CS<sup>+</sup>,  $P=0.01$ ) but similarly for both stimuli ( $F_{(1,51)}=0.17$ ,  $P=0.7$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,51)}=1.1$ ,  $P=0.3$ ). (J) **Intensity** ratings remained similar from pre to post-conditioning ( $F_{(1,51)}=0.6$ ,  $P=0.6$ ), for both CS<sup>-</sup> and CS<sup>+</sup> flavors ( $F_{(1,51)}=0.0003$ ,  $P=0.9$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(1,51)}=0.2$ ,  $P=0.7$ ; repeated-measures 2-way ANOVA).

Bar graphs represent mean  $\pm$  standard error of the mean (SEM).

gLMS/ gLHS - general labeled magnitude/hedonic scale.

VAS: Visual Analogue Scale.

\* $P \leq 0.05$ ; \*\* $P \leq 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $P \leq 0.001$















**Supplementary Figure 2. Flow diagrams of the clinical study groups.**

(A) Flow diagram of recruitment of the healthy control group. Six volunteers did not perform SPECT due to failures in  $[^{123}\text{I}]$ IBZM delivery or malfunction of the gamma camera. In 3 participants there was an error in FNC protocol.

(B) Flow diagram of the recruitment of the obesity and surgical groups. Across both groups, 5 participants were excluded from analysis of FNC according to exclusion criteria mentioned in methods.

FNC: Flavour Nutrient Conditioning protocol;  $[^{123}\text{I}]$ IBZM SPECT:  $[^{123}\text{I}]$  iodobenzamide ( $[^{123}\text{I}]$ IBZM) single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT).



### Supplementary Figure 3. Complementary conditioning measures across the clinical study groups.

Across conditioning for CS<sup>-</sup> and CS<sup>+</sup> flavours, ratings did not vary according to stimulus or group for **(A) Hunger** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1, 50)}=0.003$ ,  $P=0.96$ ; Group:  $F_{(2, 50)}=2.2$ ,  $P=0.1$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(2, 50)}=0.1$ ,  $P=0.7$ ); **(B) Thirst** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1, 50)}=0.01$ ,  $P=0.9$ ; Group:  $F_{(2, 50)}=1.5$ ,  $P=0.22$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(2, 50)}=0.96$ ,  $P=0.4$ ) and **(C) Novelty** (Stimulus:  $F_{(1, 50)}=1.6$ ,  $P=0.2$ ; Group:  $F_{(2, 50)}=1.8$ ,  $P=0.17$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(2, 50)}=0.5$ ,  $P=0.6$ ). **(D) Intensity** ratings were different in CS<sup>-</sup> vs. CS<sup>+</sup> ( $F_{(1, 50)}=5.2$ ,  $P=0.03$ ), with a non-significant effects for Group ( $F_{(2, 50)}=0.1$ ,  $P=0.9$ ) nor for interaction ( $F_{(2, 50)}=0.9$ ,  $P=0.4$ ). **(E) Pleasantness** ratings, however, did not differ according to stimulus ( $F_{(1, 50)}=0.5$ ,  $P=0.5$ ) nor according to group ( $F_{(1, 50)}=0.7$ ,  $P=0.5$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(2, 50)}=2.5$ ,  $P=0.1$ ). **(F) Intake** was similar across conditioning for CS<sup>-</sup> and CS<sup>+</sup> flavours ( $F_{(1, 50)}=0.5$ ,  $P=0.5$ ) and despite findings of a significant group effect ( $F_{(1, 50)}=7.5$ ,  $P=0.001$ ), interaction between factors was not significant ( $F_{(2, 50)}=1.0$ ,  $P=0.4$ ; mixed-model 2-way ANOVA).

From pre- to post-conditioning days, ratings remained stable, and did not vary according to group for **(G) Hunger** (Time:  $F_{(1, 47)}=0.2$ ,  $P=0.6$ ; Group:  $F_{(2, 50)}=1.98$ ,  $P=0.2$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(2, 47)}=0.3$ ,  $P=0.7$ ); and **(H) Thirst** (Time:  $F_{(1, 47)}=0.05$ ,  $P=0.8$ ; Group:  $F_{(2, 50)}=2.5$ ,  $P=0.1$ ; Interaction:  $F_{(2, 47)}=0.8$ ;  $P=0.5$ ). **(I) Novelty** ratings changed from pre to post-conditioning ( $F_{(1, 50)}=12.9$ ,  $P=0.001$ ), with a significant effect for group ( $F_{(2, 50)}=3.4$ ,  $P=0.04$ ) and a non-significant interaction between factors ( $F_{(2, 50)}=0.7$ ;  $P=0.5$ ). Post-hoc tests showed significant decreases for the surgical group ( $P=0.05$ ), while in the remaining groups results did not reach significance (Healthy,  $P=0.4$ ; Obese,  $P=0.1$ ). **(J) Intensity** ratings remained similar from pre to post-conditioning ( $F_{(1, 50)}=0.7$ ,  $P=0.4$ ), with no effects for group ( $F_{(2, 50)}=0.66$ ,  $P=0.52$ ) nor interaction ( $F_{(2, 50)}=1.5$ ;  $P=0.2$ ; mixed-model 2-way ANOVA).

Bar graphs represent mean  $\pm$  standard error of the mean (SEM).

gLMS/ gLHS - general labeled magnitude/hedonic scale.

VAS: Visual Analogue Scale.

\* $P \leq 0.05$ ; \*\* $P \leq 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $P \leq 0.001$

**Supplementary Table 1. Demographic characteristics of healthy subjects.**

Variable	Healthy 'FNC development' protocol			P-value <sup>C</sup>
	All (n=52)	Baseline low intake %pref. CS <sup>+</sup> (n=28) <sup>A</sup>	Baseline high intake %pref. CS <sup>+</sup> (n=24) <sup>A</sup>	
	Mean (SD), Min-Max or No. (%)			
Age, years	28.5 (7.1), 18 – 48	28.46 (7.25), 18 – 47	28.58 (7.17), 20 – 48	0.95
Gender (male)	15 (28.8%)	7 (25.0%)	8 (33.3%)	0.51
BMI, Kg/m <sup>2</sup>	23.1 (3.2), 18.0 – 34.0	22.92 (2.57), 19.08 – 31.16	23.22 (3.88), 17.99 – 34.01	0.74
Education, years	14.2 (2.6), 9 – 19	13.71 (2.66), 9 – 19	14.83 (2.46), 12 – 17	0.12
Smokers	12 (23.1%)	7 (11.1%)	5 (20.8%)	0.72

<sup>A</sup>Baseline low intake preference for CS<sup>+</sup> < 50% in the pre-test; <sup>B</sup>Baseline high intake preference for CS<sup>+</sup> ≥ 50% in the pre-test.

<sup>C</sup>Independent samples t-tests were performed for continuous variables and  $\chi^2$  tests for categorical variables for comparisons between baseline low and high intake preference for CS<sup>+</sup>

**Supplementary Table 2. Gustatory and psychometric measures of feeding behaviour in healthy subjects.**

Variable	Healthy ('FNC development' protocol)			P value <sup>C</sup>
	All (n=52)	Baseline low intake %pref. CS <sup>+</sup> (n=28) <sup>A</sup>	Baseline high intake %pref. CS <sup>+</sup> (n=24) <sup>B</sup>	
	Mean (SD), Min-Max or No. (%)			
Taste Tresholds, <i>dB</i>	4.27 (8.75), -6 – 34.0	2.84 (7.78), -6 – 24	5.78 (9.65), -6 – 34	0.31
Accuity	13.14 (2.49), 7.00 – 16.0	12.8 (2.5), 7 – 16	13.5 (2.48), 7 -16	0.38
Sour ratings, <i>mm</i>				
Intensity	57.11 (19.76), 20.00 – 98.0	56.26 (18.7), 20 – 97.5	58.13 (21.41), 27 – 98.0	0.76
Pleasantness	-33.71 (32.55), -94.75 – 41.5	-34.61 (31.62), -81 – 41.5	-32.63 (34.43), -94.75 – 29.25	0.84
Salt ratings, <i>mm</i>				
Intensity	28.38 (14.56), 5.75 – 72.75	26.24 (11.71), 11 – 51.25	30.95 (17.34), 5.75 – 72.75	0.29
Pleasantness	-4.59 (18.70), -76.0 – 25.75	-2.47 (16.13), -43 – 25.75	-7.13 (21.54), -76 – 15.75	0.42
Sweet ratings, <i>mm</i>				
Intensity	17.05 (8.0), 6.25 – 38.50	16.07 (6.90), 6.25 – 30.50	18.23 (9.19), 6.75 – 38.50	0.38
Pleasantness	8.97 (9.73), -16.75 – 34.50	7.48 (9.73), -16.75 – 27.75	10.75 (9.67), -5.25 – 34.50	0.27
Bitter ratings, <i>mm</i>				
Intensity	40.22 (20.15) 6.25 – 79.50	42.58 (21.26), 6.25 – 78.75	37.38 (18.86), 16.25 – 79.50	0.4

**Supplementary Table 2. (Continued)**

Variable	Healthy ('FNC development' protocol)			P value <sup>C</sup>
	All (n=52)	Baseline low intake pref. CS <sup>+</sup> (n=28) <sup>A</sup>	Baseline high intake pref. CS <sup>+</sup> (n=24) <sup>B</sup>	
	Mean (SD), Min-Max or No. (%)			
Pleasantness	-36.23 (24.02), -74.25 – -1.50	-39.46 (25.71), -74.25 – -1.50	-32.35 (21.82), -72.25 – -6.0	0.33
PFS – Aggregate score	2.28 (0.66), 1.13 – 3.80	2.23 (0.65), 1.13 – 3.67	2.35 (0.68), 1.47 – 3.80	0.51
YFAS – Diagnosis	0 (%)	0 (%)	0 (%)	-
YFAS – No. of symptoms	1.54 (1.09), 0 – 5	1.46 (1.04), 0 – 4	1.64 (1.18), 0 – 5	0.59
DEBQ – External Eat	2.77 (0.53), 1.5 – 4.30	2.66 (0.49), 1.5 – 3.60	2.92 (0.56), 2.20 – 4.30	0.08
DEBQ – Restrained Eat	2.35 (0.74), 1.00 – 4.50	2.28 (0.64), 1.3 – 4	2.42 (0.87), 1.0 – 4.50	0.51
DEBQ – Emotional Eat	1.99 (0.76), 0.77 – 4.38	1.81 (0.64), 0.77 – 3.15	2.21 (0.84), 1.0 – 4.38	0.06
FARS – Aggregate	401.87 (43.08), 303.0 – 506.0	399.46 (48.37), 303.0 – 506.0	404.39 (37.72), 332.0 – 471.0	0.70

<sup>A</sup>Baseline low intake preference for CS<sup>+</sup> <50% in the pre-conditioning; <sup>B</sup>Baseline high intake preference for CS<sup>+</sup> ≥ 50% in the pre-conditioning.

<sup>C</sup>Independent samples t-tests were performed for continuous variables and  $\chi^2$  tests for categorical variables for comparisons between baseline low and high intake preference for CS<sup>+</sup>.

DEBQ - Dutch Eating Behaviour Questionnaire; FARS - Food Action Rating Scale; PFS - Power of Food Scale; YFAS - Yale Food Addiction Scale.



**Supplementary Table 3. Associations between striatal dopamine DD2IR availability, the conditioning strength, and feeding behaviour.**

Striatal DD2IR availability	Healthy (n=18)		Obese (n=9)		Surgical					
					All (n=20)		Bypass (n=11)		Sleeve (n=9)	
	r	P-value	r	P-value	r	P-value	r	P-value	r	P-value
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	0.23	0.36	-0.78	0.01	-0.30	0.19	-0.05	0.89	-0.49	0.18
Δ intake pref. CS <sup>+</sup>	0.04	0.87	0.05	0.89	-0.14	0.57	-0.68	0.02	0.49	0.18
Taste Tresholds	-0.29	0.24	-0.25	0.52	-0.05	0.86	0.07	0.85	-0.18	0.70
Acuity	-0.20	0.42	-0.40	0.28	-0.14	0.55	0.28	0.41	-0.50	0.17
Sour ratings (mm)										
Intensity	-0.20	0.42	-0.40	0.28	-0.14	0.55	0.28	0.41	-0.50	0.17
Pleasantness	0.18	0.48	0.26	0.49	0.11	0.66	0.21	0.53	0.02	0.96
Salt ratings (mm)										
Intensity	0.05	0.83	-0.61	0.08	-0.38	0.10	-0.29	0.39	-0.44	0.24
Pleasantness	-0.08	0.76	0.65	0.06	0.05	0.85	0.38	0.24	-0.32	0.41
Sweet ratings (mm)										
Intensity	0.06	0.82	-0.44	0.23	-0.36	0.11	-0.46	0.15	-0.27	0.49

**Supplementary Table 3. (Continued)**

Striatal DD2IR availability	Healthy (n=18)		Obese (n=9)		Surgical					
					All (n=20)		Bypass (n=11)		Sleeve (n=9)	
	r	P-value	r	P-value	r	P-value	r	P-value	r	P-value
Pleasantness	-0.06	0.80	-0.03	0.94	0.19	0.42	-0.04	0.91	0.55	0.12
Bitter ratings (mm)										
Intensity	-0.06	0.80	-0.28	0.47	-0.34	0.14	-0.55	0.08	-0.06	0.88
Pleasantness	0.11	0.67	0.19	0.63	0.30	0.21	0.46	0.16	0.09	0.81
PFS – Aggregate score	-0.02	0.93	-0.63	0.07	0.13	0.60	0.17	0.61	0.13	0.76
PFS – Food Available	0.03	0.90	-0.58	0.10	0.15	0.55	0.41	0.20	-0.14	0.74
PFS – Food Present	0.14	0.57	-0.55	0.12	-0.10	0.69	-0.33	0.32	0.15	0.73
PFS – Food tasted	-0.25	0.32	-0.61	0.08	0.22	0.36	0.12	0.74	0.39	0.34
YFAS – No. of symptoms	-0.22	0.39	-0.61	0.08	-0.17	0.49	-0.11	0.76	-0.16	0.68
DEBQ – External Eat	-0.12	0.64	-0.46	0.21	0.16	0.51	0.36	0.28	-0.21	0.61
DEBQ – Restrained Eat	0.16	0.52	0.28	0.47	0.19	0.44	0.77	0.01	-0.26	0.54
DEBQ – Emotional Eat	0.16	0.53	-0.66	0.05	-0.22	0.39	0.16	0.65	-0.57	0.18
FARS – Aggregate	-0.29	0.25	-0.12	0.77	0.03	0.91	0.26	0.47	-0.23	0.58

BMI - Body Mass Index; DEBQ - Dutch Eating Behaviour Questionnaire; PFS - Power of Food Scale; FARS - Food Action Rating Scale; Striatal DD2IR availability – Striatal dopamine D2-like receptor availability; YFAS - Yale Food Addiction Scale.  $\Delta$  intake pref. CS<sup>+</sup> (i.e., 'the conditioning strength'): the difference between intake preference for CS<sup>+</sup> (%) in the post minus the pre-test.